**DRAFT Scholarly Communications workplan**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Scholarly Communication** |  |
| Definition | Scholarly Communication refers to the ways in which the methods, findings and implications of academic research are made available in a trusted way, now and in the future, to those who have an interest in them. |
| Key principles | Describe the principles that underpin and guide this working group     * That Jisc’s scholarly communication activities should benefit those who conduct and use research. * That disruption\* in the scholarly communication system provides opportunities as well as risks to our customers, and that it is Jisc’s role to help them exploit the opportunities and manage the risks. * That Jisc’s offer in this area should be coherent, efficient, effective, strategically planned, evidence-based and user-focused. * That Jisc’s customers benefit from an efficient and effective scholarly communications system, and Jisc has a leadership role in realising this benefit * That the Jisc offer in this area needs to be communicated effectively, and its value demonstrated through evidence.     \* “Disruption” here means the changes brought about by the affordances of networked, digital technologies, which bring new possibilities and perturbations into a scholarly communications system that was relatively stable until the advent of the internet. One of these affordances is Open Access. |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Key objectives | 1. **Exploration:** to identify opportunities and risks for Jisc’s customers, and provide them with information and new services that they use to exploit opportunities and manage risks. [research enablement, sector and enterprise efficiency]  2. **Engagement with technical standards**: specifically to:  (i) identify and help develop standards that would improve the efficiency and effectiveness of the scholarly communication system;  (ii) track existing standards initiatives to ensure they are fit for use by Jisc customers and their suppliers  (iii) use, and to help Jisc customers use, appropriate technical standards that reduce friction in the scholarly communication system  [sector and enterprise efficiency]  3. **Capacity building among Jisc customers:** to help Jisc customers define and deploy good practice in scholarly communication [research enablement, sector and enterprise efficiency, open agenda]  4. **Services (existing, emerging):** to enable Jisc customers to use appropriate services that are provided efficiently, and to enhance those services when needed, to improve scholarly communication. [research enablement, sector and enterprise efficiency, open agenda]  5. **Coordination and coherence**: to identify and exploit opportunities to rationalise Jisc’s offer in this area, to make it more efficient and easier to take up. [sector and enterprise efficiency]  6. **Market research / business case:** to use evidence of current and likely demand from universities’ and colleges’ research, teaching and business / community engagement activities, and of the value of potential Jisc interventions, to guide investment decisions and service offers. [sector and enterprise efficiency]  7. **Communications:** to communicate the Jisc offer to our customers honestly and effectively, so that Jisc is seen by our customers as a trusted and authoritative partner in scholarly communications, and our offer is valued and taken up. |
| Value | * Direct cost savings to institutions * Time saved by institutional managers and staff, researchers and research users. * Better services offered by institutions to their staff and students * Better products available to Jisc customers to support scholarly communication * Reduced risks faced by institutions in a disrupted scholarly communications system * New kinds of research possible as more scholarship becomes more openly available * Better decisions by institutions and Jisc in providing services to the academic community * Increased institutional capacity to manage and share their research outputs |
| Success criteria and indicators | Note that we expect to develop these criteria and indicators within a broader framework being developed for Jisc activities as a whole. The following high-level pointers provide a sense, and potential examples, of indicators, without pre-judging that broader framework. A key principle of the framework is likely to be that engagement with stakeholders and customers throughout the planning and execution of Jisc work is essential, and this includes the setting of success indicators that are relevant and meaningful for them.  Availability of hitherto unavailable scholarship to a wider user base, and its use and re-use.   * Direct cost savings to institutions: comparisons with alternatives to the Jisc offer, such as journal list prices. * Time saved by institutional managers and staff, researchers and research users: comparisons with alternatives to the Jisc offer, such as workflows that do not use Jisc services. * Better quality services offered by institutions: case studies and feedback from Jisc customers. * Better quality products available to Jisc customers: case studies and feedback from Jisc customers. * Reduced risks faced by UK institutions: international comparisons, and consultation with professional associations representing key groups in the sector. * New kinds of research possible will be indicated by case studies and, perhaps, changes in research funder programmes. * Better decisions by institutions and Jisc will be indicated by consultation with professional associations representing key groups in the sector, and by internal Jisc review. * Increased institutional capacity to manage and share their research outputs will be indicated by feedback from Jisc customers |
| Related activities, initiatives and stakeholders | Key stakeholders   * Institutional professionals (RLUK, SCONUL, ARMA, BUFDG, etc) * Research funders * National libraries * Publishers * Service providers, eg CrossRef, EuropePMC, OpenAIRE, SHARE * Software system suppliers * Researchers, students, other research users * Institutional leaders * Directors of IT * Jisc internal stakeholders   2. |

**A detailed activity plan is being developed, under the headings:**

* **Jisc impact area**
* **Rationale**
* **Activity**
* **Outputs**
* **Impact**
* **Milestones**
* **Year/s**
* **Evidence of demand**

| **Jisc impact area** | **Rationale** | **Activity** | **Outputs** | **Impact** | **Milestone** | **Year/s** | **Evidence of demand** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Activity 1: Exploration** | | | | | | | |
| Sector and enterprise efficiency; Open agenda; Research enablement | Outlined in Open Mirror report: this is a necessary piece of preparatory work to ensure Jisc investments are well-made | A systematic mapping exercise and review of the potential of elements of the infrastructure, national and international infrastructure for OA | A systematic mapping of OA infrastructure elements | Better Jisc investment decisions, with more support from our customers and stakeholders | May 2014 Start  Sept 2014 Complete | 2014 | Open Mirror report |
| Open agenda; Research enablement | Open Mirror report suggests but does not conclusively prove that valuable services / tools can be built over an OA aggregation. | A number of user-focussed, small pilot projects to demonstrate to end users the potential benefits of different uses of the OA aggregation. Views by subject will be important for researcher-focussed interfaces built on top of any aggregation | Reports  Tool / service concepts  Code  Evidence of the value of the aggregation in supporting new tools / services | Stimulate developers and system / service providers (including Jisc) to use the aggregation to build products of value to Jisc customers  Business case for aggregation accepted by stakeholders | July 2014 – start  Jan 2015 - complete | 2014-15 | Open Mirror report |
| Open agenda; Research enablement | Stakeholder response to Open Mirror study has been to ask for further consultation. | Managed consultation on Open Mirror (and perhaps related services) | Consensus on next steps in service provision in this area | Reduced risk of dissent or disagreement among Jisc stakeholders and customers on Jisc’s plans. | July 2014 – start  Jan 2015 - complete | 2014-15 | Open Mirror report |
| Sector and enterprise efficiency; Open agenda | Rationale: HEIs need help demonstrating compliance with funder OA mandates.  Value: Identification of services to increase efficiency and reduce risk of non-compliance | Jisc Monitor: testbeds and mini-pilots  Gold OA infrastructure group | Pilots / testbeds  Case studies  Options appraisal(s) for services  Requirements catalogue  Draft roadmap toward services  Standards development | Institutions have robust evidence to demonstrate compliance wth funder mandates  Examples could include:  •Improvement in compliance rates  •Economic value of such an improvement  Evidence of compliance needs to be provided by customers: baseline then changes. Could be sampled. | Delivered throughout 2014 and into 2015 as per agreed workplan | 2014-2015  2013- | Jisc APC case studies, Jisc APC evaluation activities, feedback from Jisc Monitor workshops. |
| Sector and enterprise efficiency; Open agenda | Rationale: Moves to Gold OA threaten to be too costly for institutions  Value: Improved Jisc negotiating position on behalf of institutions. | Collection and analysis of data on journal costs to institutions / sector  (some aspects of ORCID work)  ‘Total value of ownership’ | Internal reports and briefings  Buy-in from Jisc’s customers | Reports: value of any savings resulting from information in report. Internal reports: survey users on value  Buy-in: trend surveys (could be sample) of response |  | 2013-  2014-2015 |  |
| Research enablement: sector efficiency; open agenda | NHS Pilot: Extending access to academic licensed research contentt to NHS users. Provides users with content they do not have access to in support of their research activity in the NHS sector | Partnership building: NHS, publishers, academic; relationship and expectations management; procurement process, publisher negotiation, NHS user engagement, authentication issues, licensing, promotion, usage analysis, business modelling, reporting | Access to published journal content to NHS users for a free trial period; delivery of usage statistics; analysis and report including business model. | NHS users will have access to academic research content at minimal or no cost  Better treatment? | April-Dec 2013 - establish group and run procurement.Jan-March 2014 the Pre-Pilot period related to access. April 2014-March 2015 the pilot period. June - final report | NHS Pilot: 1.4.2014 - 30.3.2015 | Finch report |
| Research enablement: sector efficiency; open agenda | SME Pilot: Extending access to academic licensed research content to SME users. Provides users with content t hey do not have access to in support of their R&D activity and to help them grow and contribute to the UK economy. | Partnership building: SMEs, publishers, academic; relationship and expectations management; procurement process, publisher negotiation, SME user engagement, authentication issues, licensing, promotion, usage analysis, business modelling, reporting | Access to published journal content to SME users for a free trial period; delivery of usage statistics; analysis and report including business model. | SME users will have access to academic research content at minimal or no cost  Increase in quantity / quality of SME R+D activity, SME growth? | March 2014 start. April 2014 SMEs and publishers engaged. May 2014 trial access starts for 6 months. Oct-Dec usage analysis and business modelling. January 5th Final report to Jisc Collections | March 2014-January 2015 | Finch report |
| Research enablement; Open agenda | Rationale: OA seen as potential alternative to failing monographs business model  Value: Viable monograph models supporting largely AHSS research | OAPEN-UK, OAPEN deposit service, Knowledge Unlatched pilot | Reports on OA monograph publishing  Pilot deposit service  Pilot KU service | Increase in OA monograph publishing supported by evidence that Jisc work has been influential; case studies confirming relevance/significance of sample of OA monographs to avoid “vanity publishing” criticisms.  Survey users (depositors and readers) of deposit service to determine value and cost of alternative ways to achieve the same result. |  | 2011-2015 | Analytics would include downloads from repository/ies |
| Research enablement | Rationale: Changes are happening in peer review methods and accepted practice  Value: tbc | Review of peer review methods and the potential of new technologies | Review report | Better investment decisions by Jisc and HEIs in scholarly systems  Better products on offer to the sector | tbc | tbc | Anecdotal, to be confirmed by consultation with Jisc stakeholders, eg at the Scholarly Comms Advisory Group |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Activity 2: Technical standards implementation** | | | | | | | |
| **Jisc impact area** | **Rationale** | **Activity** | **Outputs** | **Impact** | **Milestone** | **Year/s** | **Evidence of demand** |
| Sector and enterprise efficiency | Rationale: Finch and Open Mirror reports identify major inefficiencies in institutional / shared systems eg repositories  Value: Increased efficiencies in repository / CRIS operations. | Repository and CRIS interoperability: RIOXX, CASRAI, V4OA, some elements of the “repository package”, ORCID pilots[[1]](#footnote-1) | Standards, protocols, vocabularies  Guidelines  Implementation guidance  Reference implementations | Will be able to track research across scholarly systems and tie publication with research funding.  Institutions are easily able to meet funder requirements (REF, RCUK policies etc) through their systems.  Funders better able to monitor compliance to policies and move towards a more automatic way of compliance.  Supports the building new services and functions needed by the community (Jisc Monitor) | Update RIOXX application profile to include V4OA outputs. Meets RCUK requirements and Where feasible also HEFCE requirements. (March/April 2014.  Update software patches: May (2014)  Repositories start to integrate plug-in/metadata in repositories. (July 2014 to July 2015)  RIOXX Guidance for repositories: June 2014  Consolidated web presence as part of UK repository package: September 2014 (TBC) | 2014-2016 | RCUK and HEFCE are both wanting RIOXX to be implemented within repositories to support data collection and compliance.  Improving metadata quality is required by a number of services such as IRUS, CORE, OpenAIRE, Jisc Monitor.  Institutions want guidance for metadata and common vocabularies as this is a common bottleneck for data sharing. |
| **Jisc impact area** | **Rationale** | **Activity** | **Outputs** | **Impact** | **Milestone** | **Year/s** | **Evidence of demand** |
| Open agenda; Sector efficiency; Research enablement | UK infrastructure needs to meet international requirements, eg H2020 OA policy, mobile researchers / ERA. | Partnership with OpenAIRE | Workshops, events, etc for Jisc customers  Enhancement of OpenAIRE infrastructure by reference to UK work.  Enhancement of UK infrastructure by reference to OpenAIRE work. | Seamless infrastructure reducing barriers to researchers moving across Europe.  Compliance with H2020 OA policy. | Jan 15 start  2018 finish? | 2015-18 | Open Mirror report  Other tbc |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Activity 3: Capacity building among Jisc customers** | | | | | | | |
| **Jisc impact area** | **Rationale** | **Activity** | **Outputs** | **Impact** | **Milestone** | **Year/s** | **Evidence of demand** |
| Sector and enterprise efficiency; Research enablement; Open agenda | Rationale: Institutions are faced with new roles and responsibilities under OA policies.  Value: Increased capacity to put in place better scholarly communication practices | OA Good Practice pathfinders and HEI OA Implementation community; some aspects of the “repository package”; some aspects of ORCID pilot | ‘Good Practice’ case studies: suite of products  Information and guidance  Self assessment toolkits, etc  Opportunities for networking and experience sharing  Technical support | Increased understanding leading to staff time saved;  Reduced risks, eg of non-compliance, or of inability to demonstrate compliance and meet reporting requirements (see above for ideas on quantification)  Pressure on market to produce better products (Would need to be able to show that new products were going to appear and get some confirmation that this was a result of Jisc activity.) | Delivering throughout 2014-16  Dec 15- final suite of products but will be delivering throughout project- exact dates TBC when Pathfinder project commissioned | 2014-2016 | Demand for action is evidenced in the following:    [Research Information Network (2013) Implementing RCUK OA requirements.](http://www.researchinfonet.org/implementing-rcuk-oa-requirements/) (33 HEIs consulted)  [Harris, S. (2013) Implementing Open Access APCs: the role of academic libraries](http://www.uk.sagepub.com/repository/binaries/pdf/apc.pdf) (10 librarians consulted)  Baseline value/ impact will give further info |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Jisc impact area** | **Rationale** | **Activity** | **Outputs** | **Impact** | **Milestone** | **Year/s** | **Evidence of demand** |
| Sector and enterprise efficiency; Research enablement | Rationale: Institutions facing significant investment decisions and uncertain requirements  Value: Increased capacity to select systems that meet requirements efficiently | Support for institutions procuring research information systems  1. get validated requirements  2. assess products against core requirements  3. consider framework agreements / discounts for the products that best meet requirements | Common / core requirements document  Product reviews against requirements  Framework / discount offers for these products negotiated by Jisc | Better decisions by institutions  Better products offered into the market | Proposed:  Oct 14: Common / core requirements document  Dec 14: Product reviews against requirements  From Feb 15: Framework / discount offers negotiated by Jisc | 2014-15 | Currently anecdotal: to be confirmed by consultation with stakeholders. |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Jisc impact area** | **Rationale** | **Activity** | **Outputs** | **Impact** | **Milestone** | **Year/s** | **Evidence of demand** |
| Sector and enterprise efficiency; Research enablement; Open agenda | Rationale: the transfer of copyright to third parties unnecessarily complicates the IPR landscape for research users.  Value: increased re-use and impact of UK research; reduced costs of achieving this. | Promotion of a non-exclusive “licence to publish” approach, whereby authors retain copyright. | Briefing materials  Events  Communication activities, in partnership with others | Increased re-use and impact of UK research; reduced costs of achieving this.  Evidenced by increased rights statements indicating rights retained by author; usage of material so licensed.  Uncertain how to evidence reduced costs. | Oct 2014 – start; update existing materials, product new ones  Jan 2014 – first event / dissemination  Dec 2015 - complete | 2014-15 | Open Mirror report  Other tbc |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Activity 4: Services (existing, emerging)** | | | | | | | |
| **Jisc impact area** | **Rationale** | **Activity** | **Outputs** | **Impact** | **Milestone** | **Year/s** | **Evidence of demand** |
| Sector and enterprise efficiency; Research enablement; Open agenda | Rationale: Publisher offers are increasingly complex. Collective action on behalf of institutions reduces costs, improves efficiencies and streamlines the market.  Value: Reduced costs, more efficiencies, better offers from publishers. | Jisc Collections negotiations involving OA; Nesli2, other.  TCO work | Agreements with publishers that meet the negotiation criteria and institutions renew their agreements in a timely manner | Reduced costs, more efficiencies, better offers from publishers.  (Need ways to measure this) | Delays in the negotiation process means that agreements are delayed. | 1st February - 30 September ideally in order to make the offer available to institutions, but if negotiations are delayed for whatever reason, the time period can reach into January 2015. | Orders to publishers received and licence agreements accepted via the online ordering and licence acceptance process.  Efficiency Gains reporting provides evidence of price reductions and sector efficiency |
| Sector and enterprise efficiency; Open agenda | Rationale: Reliable usage data enables benchmarking, evaluation, user services, etc.  Value: Institutions better able to benchmark, evaluate and provide services. | IRUS-UK | Usage statistics shared service for repositories  Appropriate interfaces  Review of opportunities to expand to cover publishers  Guidance for institutions  Sustainability plan | Institutions better able to benchmark, evaluate and provide services  Institutions able to easily provide robust usage figures for management reporting, wider business intelligence and benchmarking.  Increasing usage figures demonstrates the impact of OA repository infrastructure investment. (13.5 million downloads from July 2012 to March 2014 from 54 repositories.  (Take this as a baseline?)  Survey to check that downloads were valuable to Jisc customers | Production strength service infrastructure: July 2014  Improve UI (on-going to July 2015)  Modified API using SUSHI and COUNTER  Increase Repositories being harvested (on-going) Target 150? by July 2015 (TBC)  Tracker Code and guidelines via IRUS toolbox (Available)  Established helpdesk procedures: July 2014)  Draft sustainability plan Dec 2014) | 2013 - 2015 | Current annual usage survey is not yet closed so figures will change):  68% reported that IRUS-UK has improved statistical reporting  65% reported that IRUS-UK saves time collecting statistics  65% reported that IRUS-UK enables reporting previously unable to do  35% reported that IRUS-UK enhances decision making  83% hope to use IRUS-UK for benchmarking |
| Sector and enterprise efficiency; Open agenda | Rationale: HEFCE policy will require repositories to record all potential REF submissions.  Value: Reduced costs in populating repositories. | Repository Junction Broker (note: name will change) | Broker service  Appropriate interfaces  Sustainability plan | Reduced costs in populating repositories. (Need to quantify this)  More content in repositories deposited in an automatic way from content providers (publishers, subject repositories etc)  (perhaps the value is in the use of this content, hence data from IRUS-UK would help?) | All (?) repositories and CRISs have a mechanism to receive content: March 2015 (Date TBC)  Licence agreements with institutions for green OA are signed by all participating repositories. (Date TBC)  Draft SLA: March 2015 (TBC)  Draft sustainability plan: March 2014 (TBC) | 2013-2015 | Both EuropePMC and Nature Publishing Group participating in pushing data and see this as a benefit to institutions. Also identified by the Open Mirror work as a mechanism to assist in Gold OA landscape. |
| Sector and enterprise efficiency; Open agenda | Rationale: Authors and institutional need information on what they must and can do on OA.  Value: Time saved by authors and library staff checking policies and permissions | Sherpa RoMEO, Juliet, FACT | Information services  Appropriate interfaces  International sustainability plan | Time saved by authors and library staff checking policies and permissions  Institutions have clarity, transparency and confidence about deposit licences and compliance to funder policies. (RoMEO saves an institutions time £9,788pa approx) – extrapolated from (i) workflow analysis and (ii) RoMEO usage data | Robust technical infrastructure:  March 2015 (TBC)  Improved data quality (Dec 2015 - ongoing)  Improved UI for all services: March 2015 (TBC)  APIs for all the services: December 2014 (TBC)  Draft Sustainability Plan December 2014 (TBC) | 2013-2015 | · RoMEO receives over 30,000 visits per week and on average 15,000 requests per day. JULIET receives. FACT is being co-funded by RCUK and Wellcome to support compliance to OA policies. Initial usage statistics (Display of Results) January to March 2014 show 4717 unique page views. Juliet: (Need to get the latest usage figures) |
| Sector and enterprise efficiency | Rationale: Various end-user services require a reliable directory of OA repositories.  Value: More efficient end-user services. | OpenDOAR | Information service  Appropriate interfaces  International sustainability plan | More efficient end-user services.  (how to quantify?)  Documents the growth of the OA landscape. Can baseline this change. Need evidence that this is valued by customers  Other M2M services run more efficiently and effectively. (Need evidence for the benefits; reduced manual effort, better problem resolving because of data accuracy?) | Improved data quality and automatic harvesting. July 2014 (TBC)  Robust technical infrastructure: July 2014 (TBC)  Improved UIs built on flexible data architecture: July 2014)  Release API: July 2014 (TBC)  Draft sustainability plan: July 2014 (TBC) | 2013-2015 | OpenDOAR is a highly used international service. (Average unique visitors’ per week 2535)  This registry function is not being addressed by any other mainstream product or service. RJB uses OpenDOAR to identify repositories for deposit. COAR uses OpenDOAR to identify |
| Sector and enterprise efficiency; Research enablement; Open agenda | Rationale: OA aggregation can support a range of end-user services.  Value: More efficient end-user services | CORE / Open Mirror | Aggregation of UK OA content  Aggregation of OA content worldwide  Appropriate interfaces | Need user testimony of the value of these impacts..  Increased visibility and usage of OA content in repositories via the aggregation, search engines and library systems / services  Provides business intelligence and supports quality management and also management reporting for repository managers  Better business intelligence for standards development and monitoring uptake.  Better business intelligence for funders such as monitoring Gold OA | SEO for Google Scholar (April 2014)  Supplying OpenAIRE compliant records: September 2014 (TBC)  Robust Technical Infrastructure (date TBC)  Draft sustainability plan: April 2014 (TBC) | 2013-? | Need identified through the aggregation use cases and KPL search report. Currently the service receives (xxx) visits per week?? IRUS consolidates download stats from CORE. CORE Data has been integrated by Europeana via the API |
| Research enablement; Open agenda | Rationale to be developed from current NMS Futures work | Open Monograph publishing platform  NB – being taken forward in Futures | Use case/requirements documentation.  Hosted technical platform (such as OMP).  Framework agreements with presses and publishers.  Case studies/pilots.  Business and format experimentation exemplars/examples. | Increase in (institutional) monograph publishing.  Smaller institutions and HEIs establish small, open presses.  Increased partnerships/collaborations between institutions and libraries, and publishers and presses.  Improved long-term preservation of open, digital monographs for research, teaching and learning.  Improved skills base for institutions and libraries. | June 2014 - Use case and requirements gathering.  June/July 2014 - Technical and landscape review.  August 2014 - Platform alpha testing and piloting. .  January 2015 - proto-service pilot. | 2015- | Need evidence of demand to support impact claims. |
|  | Rationale to be developed from current Futures work | Open Journal publishing platform  NB – being taken forward in Futures | Hosted journal publishing platform (such as OJS).  Value-add services and plug-ins, such as SafeNet and Keepers.  Cases studies. | Increase in (institutional) journal publishing.  Increase in open access journals.  Reduced journal costs for libraries.  Increase in smaller and specialist journals.  Improved skills base for institutions and libraries. | July 2014 - Technical landscape review.  August 2014 - alpha testing and piloting.  January 2015 - proto-service pilot. | 2015- |  |
| Sector and enterprise efficiency; Research enablement; Open agenda | Rationale: Jisc customers benefit from trusted information and guidance  Value: More informed investment decisions by Jisc customers | Various Jisc advisory services | NOTE: These are delivered outside this workplan | Defined outside workplan? |  |  |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Activity 5: Coordination and coherence** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Jisc impact area** | | **Rationale** | | **Activity** | **Outputs** | | **Impact** | | | **Milestone** | **Year/s** | | **Evidence of demand** | |
| Sector and enterprise efficiency; Research enablement; Open agenda | Rationale: Jisc has and will support a range of work across several directorates and at NDCs, which will not be coherent without coordination.  Value: More efficient use of Jisc resources; more effective interventions | | Jisc internal Scholarly Communications Group  OA Good Practice | | | Operating plan  Notes from monthly meetings | | Supports impact of other activities | Monthly meetings | | | 2014- | |  |
| Sector and enterprise efficiency; Research enablement; Open agenda | Rationale: Jisc needs to hear views from stakeholders to ensure its initiatives are required and practical.  Value: More efficient use of Jisc resources; more effective interventions | | Jisc Scholarly Communications Advisory Group  OA Good Practice/ OA Implementation community | | | Notes from quarterly meetings | | Supports impact of other activities | Quarterly meetings | | | 2014- | | Positive responses to the invitation to join the group |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Activity 6: Market research / business case** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Jisc impact area** | | **Rationale** | **Activity** | | **Outputs** | | **Impact** | | **Milestone** | | **Year/s** | | **Evidence of demand** | | |
| Sector and enterprise efficiency; Research enablement; Open agenda | Rationale: Jisc’s work needs to be informed by demand from the sector.  Value: Appropriate Jisc interventions (as above, and in the future) meeting sector needs. | | | Jisc Scholarly Communications Advisory Group  Sector groups (OAIG, UUK Finch group)  OA Good Practice- OA Implementation community | | Notes from quarterly meetings  Notes from meetings | | Jisc offer that demonstrably meets an explicit business case drafted by Jisc and confirmed by Jisc’s customers. | | Quarterly meetings  OAIG twice yearly | | 2014- | | WIlson report |
| Sector and enterprise efficiency; Research enablement; Open agenda | Rationale: Without convincing evidence of the value and impact of Jisc’s work, then we will lose sector support.  Value: The sector risks losing valuable services through a lack of evidence of that value; this work reduces that risk.[[2]](#footnote-2) | | | Dedicated value and impact work | | TBC | | Risk reduction (see Value)  Jisc offer that demonstrably meets an explicit business case drafted by Jisc and confirmed by Jisc’s customers.. | | TBC | | 2014- | | WIlson report |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Activity 7: Communications** | | | | | | | |
| Sector and enterprise efficiency; Research enablement; Open agenda | Rationale: Jisc’s work needs to be communicated effectively for it to be used and valued.  Value: Maximises the value the sector gets from Jisc interventions.. | Communications planning  Website  Social media activity  Press releases  Design and production of major reports  Briefings for institutions  Events  OA Good Practice/ OA Implementation community | Gantt chart, regularly updated  Web content  Tweets, blog posts  Press releases  Reports  Briefings  Events | Maximises the value the sector gets from Jisc interventions  (overview of impact evidence; perhaps a survey)  Well-used services (absolute usage, trends, % of potential users actually using them, etc)  High awareness of and support for Jisc’s work in this area (% of people in relevant sectors/roles involved/aware, number reached by channels such as workshops, newsletters etc.) | Immediate milestones include:  April 2014:  Response to REF OA announcement;  Web presence for scholarly communications  Plan for monthly corporate blog posts  Thereafter, tbc | 2014- | Wilson report |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Impact Area** | **Definition** |
| 1. | Research enablement | Advance UK research through digital technology on a global scale. |
| 2. | Learning, teaching and the digital student experience | Support learning environment and practices, and an enhanced digital student experience, that are second to none. |
| 3. | Sector and enterprise efficiency | Promote and support the use of digital approaches that enable significant gains in efficiency and effectiveness at sector and enterprise level. |
| 4. | Collaboration and internationalism | Enable more effective working across time and distance through digital technology. |
| 5. | Open agenda | Foster and secure the benefits of open access to resources and open source software for research and education. |
| 6. | Data and analytics | Advance the exploitation of information, analytics and ‘big data’ for success. |
| 7. | Digital translation and transformation from other sectors | Search for promising ideas and effective ways to translate new digitally enabled paradigms from other sectors, countries and contexts – from big global organisations to smaller SME’s – to keep UK further and higher education ahead. |
| 8. | Institutional and academic leadership in the digital age | Equip a more ambitious leadership agenda and capability – institutionally and sector-wider – in the successful use of technology to advance academic, enterprise and sector opportunities and outcomes. |
| 9. | Cyber security and access and identity management | Ensure excellent security of all HE, Research, FE and Skills infrastructure and services, and facilitate access rights and appropriate personal identity validation and management. |
| 10. | Digital standards and policies at UK/European/ International level | Ensure that digital standards and policies at UK, European or International level are set in ways that promote and foster the efficient and advantageous use of technology and information in research and education in the UK. |

1. ORCID pilots being pursued in Jisc Futures, but might lead to service activity shortly. [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. Note that Hugh questions the use of a risk approach here, but another approach is not immediately obvious. [↑](#footnote-ref-2)