

Queen's Digital Scholarly Record Working Group – Meeting Notes

March 29th, 2018

2:30-4:30pm

Stauffer Library Room 210

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

Regrets: Brenda Brouwer, Adam Grotsky

1. Review of agenda

No additions

2. Minutes of January 23rd, 2018

No changes

3. Research Data Management Surveys Summary of Findings – For information

The group discussed the summary, concluding that it provides useful insights to share with the community. The document will be available publicly. Some elements will be included in the working group's report.

4. Research training (work plan item 5.4) – For discussion

C. Matthews presented the research lifecycle visual of training opportunities for discussion. A new diagram was created to map the research process when different training is available. This visual shows how one aspect (ORCID, Data Mgmt Plan, Data Deposits, and Open Access Publishing) has many avenues of training available. The dots visual (bottom half of page) was determined to be too complex and made the information more challenging for quick visual recognition of training opportunities. The group decided to return to using the previous version of the research lifecycle with the 7 stages represented by connected circles. If a training module is developed, it was recommended that the diagram be reformatted to clearly indicate where a researcher can go for training at each point in process.

A question was raised about how the terms 'data' and 'project' are being defined. Does 'plan' and 'create' refer to the overall project or just the data collection? The example: one could spend a long time planning but only gain data at the end. Are we focusing on data or the plan? The point was made that in order to conceptualize the data when planning, the researcher needs a data management plan to receive funding, therefore individuals need to think about data as part of the plan right from the beginning. We are conceptualizing data and project as part of the same process – we are approaching this as the researcher is focusing on one overall project.

The group agreed that the ideal model of disseminating this information is by providing training around the needs of the researcher. The focus is a user driven module – to use training to creatively serve up solutions in a variety of support methods. Packaging it in a variety of educational ways to

help individuals with their unique needs. There is an identified need to encourage training on predatory publishers especially to get this information to graduate students.

C. Matthews asked if there was anything missing. How would researchers respond to this online self-serve approach? Layering of the information is effective – can package it for different purposes. The idea of a mandatory online training module, similar to the CORE training for research ethics was discussed. In theory training could be made mandatory or a suggested aspect of applying for grants.

It was suggested that there are two aspects to this training: identifying points of need to insert this information, and also creating a hub for researchers to come to for all the information they are looking for, that would link off to other services that we offer.

Group members will send any other feedback on these materials to C. Matthews. This draft training plan is particularly important as the foundation for further development of learning series and potentially a course that ties together the various elements.

5. Portage Draft Institutional RDM Strategy Template and Guidance Document – For information

The group reviewed this template with a view to its own report and to what will need to be addressed under the umbrella of the university's digital strategy development. Assessing institutional readiness was identified as an element of the template that Queen's is well positioned to address. Moving forward the information on data storage from the campus asset management plan will be helpful.

6. Working Group report drafting – For discussion

The group confirmed that the audience for the report are the sponsors – the Provost and Vice-Principal (Academic) and the Vice-Principal (Research) – and that it is intended to inform the development of the university's digital strategies in a process now under way. The report will be shared with the Senate Advisory Research Committee for information, if possible at their April 13 meeting.

M. Whitehead reviewed reactions to presentations that have introduced the VOICE principles proposed in the group's discussion paper. There was enthusiastic faculty engagement in the open publishing aspect following the presentation at the March Senate. Reflecting on other feedback in past presentations, it's not clear whether the term "digital scholarly record" is well received or understood. Explicit mention of "data management" and "scholarly publishing" seem necessary as well.

The group discussed elements to include and emphasize in the report. M. Whitehead and C. Fekken will provide a first draft early next week.

7. Other business

None

8. Next meeting – April 19th