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Existing challenges in compliance support

The Landscape has Changed since 2006

- Grants.gov no longer a novel system
- SPA must now use 75 different electronic agency proposal submission systems (20 more than just two years ago)
- Additional regulatory requirements (e.g., FCOI, subawards, data management plans) have increased the number of items to review
- Federal regulations require institutional proposal review to “ensure adherence to all regulatory and agency requirements”
- NSF has added extensive electronic controls that prevent SPA from submitting and removed a 5 day post-deadline SPA certification window

Source: Pamela Webb, UMN Associate Vice President for Research Administration, September 2015
Roles for libraries: collaborations and conversations
Federal Public Access Requirements

In 2013 the White House Office of Science and Technology Policy (OSTP) directed most U.S. grant-funding agencies to develop policy requirements on sharing federally grant-funded research publications and data. Requirements for research publications and data do differ. This page seeks to provide information on publication requirements; for data requirements, see funding agency requirements for access to research data.

U of M researchers are responsible for knowing their relevant agency’s requirements for making grant-funded publications publicly accessible. Some commonalities in policies include:

- Allowance of a 12 month embargo period from publication to public access
- A mechanism to submit an evidence-based request for embargo extension
- Article metadata (e.g., citation information) is required upon publication even if the full text will be embargoed

Some funders specifically scope their responses to only peer-reviewed journal articles. Others more broadly say peer-reviewed articles (which may or may not include peer-reviewed conference papers).

Compliance with these policies is the responsibility of the author. Authors should
Education
Pre-award services

MANAGING YOUR DATA

Got data? We’re here to help you manage, share, and preserve your research data. In addition to our Data Repository for the U of M curation services, the Libraries will help you navigate available campus resources throughout the data lifecycle:

Before Your Research Begins

- Schedule a data management plan (DMP) consultation (Request Form) or use our DMP templates.
- Explore funding agency requirements for data and learn best practices for getting IRB approval for sharing data.
- See more tools for planning for data management.

During Your Research

- Attend workshops and explore online training resources on best practices for data management.
Post-award support
Submission Methods

A

Journal, by contract with NIH, deposits the published version of all NIH-funded articles in PMC

B

Author arranges with Publisher to deposit published version of specific NIH-funded article in PMC

C

Author or delegate submits final peer reviewed manuscript to the NIHMS

D

Journal publisher submits final peer reviewed manuscript to the NIHMS

Author confirms the article is deposited in PMC

NIHMS sends author an email asking author to approve the submitted materials for processing

NIHMS sends author an email asking author to approve the submitted materials for processing

Author reviews and approves the PMC-formatted manuscript. PMCID is assigned

Author reviews and approves the PMC-formatted manuscript. PMCID is assigned

Credit (and previous slide): Katherine Chew, UMN BioMedical Library
Extending support

• Baseline from Libraries: extend and continue advisory/education role for articles and data, curation and repository services

• Charged a new team to work with Sponsored Projects Administration (SPA)
  – Monitor agency plans as they are finalized
  – Test systems and processes
  – Develop a new joint education program, staffing recommendations
Complex compliance picture

• NIH gap between voluntary (2005), mandatory (2008), funding impacts (2013). Will other agencies follow this pattern?

• Will Sponsored Projects Administration (SPA) have to work with more than 75 different systems?

• Administrative burden a significant concern: how can our communities work together to address?

• How will journals/publishers respond?
Policy/advocacy


Approaches to Data Sharing: An Analysis of NSF Data Management Plans from a Large Research University

Carolyn Bishoff, Lisa Johnston

Executive Directive on Public Access

On February 22, 2013, the White House issued an executive directive that requires the results of taxpayer-funded research — both articles and data — be made freely available to the general public with the goal of accelerating scientific discovery and fueling innovation.

Federal Agencies are in the processing of releasing draft plans and will begin implementation in the coming months.

About the Directive
The Executive Directive on Increasing Access to the Results of Federally Funded Scientific Research requires U.S. Government agencies with annual extramural research and development expenditures over $100 million make...

Harmonize Agency Public Access Procedures and Submission

AAU, COGR, and APLU recommend that OMB require all Federal agencies subject to OSTP’s 2013 policy memorandum, “Increasing Access to the Results of Federally Funded Scientific Research,” to harmonize the procedures by which extramural grantees submit final peer-reviewed manuscripts or final published documents and data to the agencies’ public access repositories. We believe that this harmonization process may most effectively be accomplished under the auspices of the National Science and Technology Council (NSTC).
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