



The
University
Of
Sheffield.

The University Library
Research & Innovation
Services

Minutes Meeting of Open Access Advisory Group

Date: 26th June 2018

Present: Chair: John Derrick (JD)
Alasdair Rae (AR), Jez Cope (JC), John Haycock (JH) Robert Shoemaker (RS), Simon Foster (SF), Andrew Booth (AB), Tom Stafford (TS), Carmen O'Dell (CO), Dave Jones (DJ)

Secretary: Gavin Boyce (GB)

Apologies: Tracey Clarke, Anne Horn, James Wilsdon, M Pidd, Robert Collins, John McAuley, Stephen Pinfield, Deborah McClean, Nathan Cunningham, Dorothy Kerr, Helen Kennedy

		<u>Action by</u>
1.	<p>Minutes of the meeting held 7th December 2017</p> <p>The group Accepted these as a correct record.</p> <p>Matters arising</p> <p>The chair noted that the March meeting of the group had been cancelled due to strike action. The only matter arising was that of faculty approaches to RCUK APC fund spending which was on the agenda at this meeting (item 2b)</p>	
2.	<p>Open Access Policy and Implementation</p> <p>a) RCUK Grant Report for 2017/18</p> <p>The RCUK Grant Report for the 17/18 session was received.</p> <p>Key figures noted were:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• The RCUK block grant for 2017/2018 was £676,410, with a further £47,998 of funding carried over from the previous year.• All available funds were fully committed by the end of December.	

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 381 APCs were paid for from the grant at a total cost of £722,203, with an average APC price of £1896. • The University reported an institutional compliance rate for this year of 77% with 61% gold, 16% green. <p>The Library was thanked for this work.</p> <p>b) OA model for 2018/19</p> <p>Historic data suggests that the amount of funding received for APC payments from RCUK will not cover the demand in the 2018/19 year. The group was asked to consider its preferred model for targeting available spend. It was agreed that although the suggestion that the available funding be targeted to support publication of the best quality papers has merit, this was not always practical. There was agreement that faculty specific approaches may be needed and that if that was the case some central mechanism for ensuring equitability across faculties may be needed. It was accepted that the only feasible way to do this may be via analysis of historical trends.</p> <p>ACTION: Faculty Directors would consider what, if any, approach to targeting APC payments might be appropriate, proportionate and workable for their faculty, informing OAG of their decision by the end of July 2018. After which time a decision on the way forward will be taken by chair's action.</p> <p>c) Update on the UK Scholarly Communications Licence</p> <p>The update was noted. There was some discussion of the appropriate response to the communication from the Royal Historical Society.</p> <p>It was agreed to keep this on the agenda for further update at the next meeting.</p> <p>II Research Data Management</p> <p>d) Text and Data Mining Service Scoping Proposal</p> <p>The group agreed that a light touch scoping project be carried out which would deliver recommendations to the group for consideration including an understanding of the costs and benefits of providing a TDM support service. It was considered that the proposed stakeholder group was appropriate and that academic colleagues should be invited to participate, although it was recognised some might be too busy.</p> <p>ACTION: Library to run scoping project</p>	<p>FDRIs</p> <p>Library</p> <p>Library</p>
--	---	---

	<p>e) DOI Discussion Paper</p> <p>The chair gave a strong steer that devolution of power to mint DOIs, and the associated responsibilities, to department level, was not desirable, however there might be merit in allowing larger groups with homogenous needs some responsibility under the auspices of the Library's contract with the British Library. It was agreed that where the minting of DOIs for non-University of Sheffield projects incurs an ongoing overhead for the University of Sheffield it would be appropriate to seek remuneration. It was considered that this might be worth evaluating on a pilot basis with DHI, with the view to identifying any issues.</p> <p>ACTION: Library to run pilot</p> <p>f) Survey of Research Practices: RDM</p> <p>OAG considered the proposed survey appropriate and agreed to its dissemination to target groups.</p> <p>ACTION: Send out Survey</p> <p>g) Sustainable RDM Service 2018/19</p> <p>The approach to provision of Research Data Management support services by the Library for the 2018/19 academic session was agreed as appropriate. The DMP review was recognised as valuable for new PIs but it was accepted that a fully-fledged 1-2-1 service might not be feasible as 'rare users can be very common'. The group supported a service focussed on guidance and peer support and approved the investigation of providing services chargeable to research projects.</p>	<p>Library</p> <p>Library</p>
3.	<p>AOB</p> <p>a) The group considered the TOR to be relevant. The reference to HRI should be updated to DHI.</p> <p>Post-meeting note 1: Gavin Boyce will serve as Secretary to the group until further notice.</p> <p>Post-meeting note 2: <i>Research England's "Monitoring sector progress towards compliance with funder open access policies" report is out this month.</i></p>	
4.	<p>Time and date of next meeting.</p> <p><i>20th September 2018</i></p>	