Minutes

Meeting of Open Access Advisory Group

Date: 2nd May 2019

Present: Chair: John Derrick (JD)
Carmen O’Dell (CO), David Jones (DJ), Dorothy Kerr (DK), Alasdair Rae (AR), Tom Stafford (TS), Anne Horn (AH), Andrew Narracott (AN), Mark Dickman (MD), Simon Foster (SF), Andrew Booth (AB)

Secretary: Gavin Boyce (GB)


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action by</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Minutes of the meeting held 15th January 2019</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The group accepted these as a correct record.

Matters arising

Support for software as part of data management. A paper went to go to Senate on the 20th March to seek approval about core competencies and criteria for PhD students as part of the review “What is a PhD, Expectations of PGRs”. The next step is to think through changes needed to training for students and supervisors, any regs, guidance etc.. It is intended that DMP for all PGR students is wrapped up in this and this will afford an opportunity to scope software guidance and support.

The above does not cover support for staff around software. This is the subject of item 2b on the agenda.

2. Open Access Policy and Implementation

a) Grant Update for next period (CO)

UKRI final report for the 2018/19 period has been returned. 315 APCs have been paid for by the library using UKRI funds in this period. There were very few turn-aways and only a handful of disappointed enquirers. Some of the turn-aways were due to REF confusions. There are exceptions that allow a paper to be considered for REF where it hasn’t been made open access.
CO recommended that we carry on with existing policy through the 2019/20 period (wherein the University will be receiving a similar amount of funding) as this seems to be working well.

OAAG agreed that existing APC fund management approach should continue through to the next funding period.

b) Recommendation on software from CCP – (RM)

The Group considered the paper and agreed that there should be more support and guidance for research software. In discussing the appropriate sort of support and guidance for what is a burgeoning area of activity the group felt that a specific T&F group with expertise and interest in this area be asked to look at this. The group should at least include senior representatives with governance roles in The Dept. of Computing Science, Corporate Information & Computing Services, Research Services and the Library. The group should consider current research practice, funder requirements, commercialization and legal/contractual fundamentals and should make a recommendation back to OAAG.

The group offered its thanks to RM and the Copyright Community of Practice for their work on this.

c) Plan S – update (AH)

AH provided an update on the UKRI position:

++++extract from UKRI+++++

Funding for the block grant is currently confirmed up to 31 March 2020. Recognising the need to give appropriate notice to organisations about changes to funding, this correspondence is to confirm that the block grant will not end on 31 March 2020, and UKRI will continue to provide funding for Open Access to organisations in receipt of Research Council funding via a block grant for financial year 2020/21.

UKRI is currently undertaking a review of its Open Access policies and will report in March 2020. UKRI expects the revised policy to apply during 2020 and the exact start date will be confirmed in due course. The current RCUK and REF Open Access policies continue to apply over the period of the Review. Throughout the Review UKRI are engaging and consulting with the sector and a range of relevant stakeholders. There will be a public consultation on the draft policy during September to
November 2019.

+++++extract ends++++++++

UEB view is that we shouldn’t say something now given the external uncertainty. Transitional agreements with publishers are already in the pipeline through JISC.

SF mentioned that while academics in the Faculty of Science have been forewarned it will be unlikely that any change will happen until individuals need to do something.

It was noted that Wellcome provide a White List of acceptable publishers. SF asked if this could be provided to Wellcome Trust funded researchers on a rolling basis as a list of List of journals not publishers.

ACTION: COD to get in touch with Wellcome to see if this works for them, and then to come up with an iterative process with Research Services. Resultant messages should be checked with chair (JD) prior to being road-tested with a small pool of target researchers (Wellcome funded) in faculty of science.

d) Why are we doing Open Access? (AR)

AR introduced his paper and suggested that the drivers for OA could be considered as either stick or carrot. If carrot then the benefits of OA should be promoted more widely. This could be achieved through case studies for dissemination.

It was broadly agreed that the way to get researchers to engage with this topic was to answer the question “What’s in it for me?” The group also discussed the need to integrate any process into existing things that researchers are doing.

ACTION: AR to work with Library Scholarly Communications team to develop case studies (possibly video) extolling the benefits of open access to the research endeavor (answering the ‘what’s in it for me’ question).

II Research Data Management

e) Alternative approach - 2018 Survey of Research Practices (GB)

JD suggested that the methodology outlined verbally in meeting
(qualitative interviews with DDRIs) be trialed with Faculty of Arts (DK).

3. **AOB**

   f) What do we (OAAG) want to achieve in the next 12 months?

   It was noted that although TUOS has signed up to DORA, very few people were aware of this fact. There are implications for TUOS and Research Services is looking at this area.

   The chair asked that Research Services let HODs know that this work is happening.

   Over the 12 months the remit for OAAG was agreed as follows:

   1. Keep an overview of the work on DORA
   2. Keep an overview on the progress of Plan S
   3. Work on understanding existing practice and spreading best practice through:
      A) Trialing acceptable journal lists through FCP (using Wellcome white lists)
      B) Trialing Research Practices survey via interviews with DDRIs with FCA.
      C) Producing Best Practice case studies for dissemination with AR (FCS).

4. **Time and date of next meeting.**
   Thursday 13th June 2019
   10.30am to 12pm
   The Diamond, Meeting Room 1