

Queen's Digital Scholarly Record Working Group

Meeting Notes of January 23, 2018

Present: Brenda Brouwer, Rosarie Coughlan, Amir Fam, Cynthia Fekken, Karina McKinnis, Heather McMullen, Courtney Matthews, Michael Vandenburg, Martha Whitehead (Chair)

Regrets: Don Aldridge, Adam Grotzky

1. Review of agenda

No additions.

2. Review of November 28, 2017 meeting notes

No changes.

3. Discussion paper presentations and feedback

M. Whitehead reported on discussion paper presentations to the Associate Deans Research and the Graduate Studies Executive Council, and invited comments from others present at either of those meetings (B. Brouwer, C. Fekken, A. Fam, K. McKinnis). In general, the questions and observations of meeting participants confirmed the challenge of terminology ("scholarly record" didn't resonate with health sciences researchers) and the need for messaging targeted to particular disciplines. As well, in the first meeting it was apparent that the messages delivered in various fora in 2016-17, regarding the challenges of the scholarly publishing environment, need to be repeated. A. Fam invited M. Whitehead to present at the faculty board of the Faculty of Engineering and Applied Science on February 14, tailoring the presentation to that audience. It was suggested that this and future presentations rebrand from "digital scholarly record" and emphasize actions/goals in the form of a few very simple statements, perhaps including particular researcher stories as examples.

4. Institutional Strategy outline

The group reviewed an outline of a document that will serve as the group's report with recommendations. Its sections relate to those anticipated in a template for institutional research data management plans, which may be required by the Tri-Agency in future. It was suggested that we provide a full strategic framework, with vision, mission, goals, objectives and actions. Articulating this will be the focus of the group's meeting on March 29th. That meeting will be extended to two hours. Other suggestions included ensuring that the "current state" articulates the relationship between local and external services and infrastructure. The "current state" discussions could be an aspect of the section on "assessing institutional readiness" and acknowledge that part of this readiness is whether there is an appetite to devote funding to the required services and infrastructure. The group discussed whether there is useful experience to draw upon from the roll-out of research ethics requirements: that was a two-year roll-out process that began with a pilot department, which is something to consider for matters such as support for data management plan requirements. It was agreed that M. Whitehead will revise the document outline based on this feedback, and work with D. Aldridge to complete the "current state" information.

5. Other business

No other business

6. Next meeting – February 7, 2018, 1:00-2:00 p.m. The main agenda item will be work plan item 5.4, researcher training that supports the full research lifecycle.