The 2019 Spring Faculty Roundtable was held April 4, 2019 at the home of President Mark Keenum. The theme was PUSHing toward Open Access and Open Data at MSU: What can we learn from Presidents United to Solve Hunger? The theme was spawned by the Presidents United to Solve Hunger (PUSH) report, Open Access & Open Data at PUSH Universities. Since Mississippi State is a PUSH university, the need to start the conversation about Open Access (OA) and Open Data (OD) campus wide drove the decision to start the discussion at the annual Spring Faculty Roundtable. The participation of the roundtable is significant for this type of discussion because faculty and administration representatives from across campus are invited to attend.

The 2019 participants:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Maroon Team</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Brent Fountain</td>
<td>Associate Extension Professor; Food Science, Nutrition, &amp; Health Promotion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Courtney Siegert</td>
<td>Assistant Professor; Forestry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federico Hoffmann</td>
<td>Associate Professor; Biochemistry, Molecular Biology, Entomology, &amp; Plant Pathology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frances Coleman</td>
<td>Dean; University Libraries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jenny Du</td>
<td>Professor; Electrical and Computer Engineering</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kent Hoblet</td>
<td>Dean, College of Veterinary Medicine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kenya Cistrunk</td>
<td>Assistant Professor; Sociology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lee Weiskopf</td>
<td>Director, University Governmental Support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mike Highfield</td>
<td>Professor; Finance and Economics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Silvina Lopez Barrera</td>
<td>Assistant Professor; School of Architecture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teresa Gammill</td>
<td>Assistant Vice President; Office of Research and Economic Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Randy Follett Facilitator</td>
<td>Associate Professor; Electrical and Computer Engineering</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>White Team</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Angela Savage</td>
<td>Instructor; Meridian Division of Arts &amp; Sciences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brian Counterman</td>
<td>Associate Professor; Biological Sciences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>George Hopper</td>
<td>Dean, College of Ag &amp; Life Sciences and College of Forest Resources; Director MAFES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judy Ridner</td>
<td>Associate Professor; History</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Julie Jordan</td>
<td>Associate Vice President; International Programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Melody Dale</td>
<td>Assistant Professor; University Libraries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patty Lathan</td>
<td>Associate Professor; CVM Clinical Sciences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rebecca Robichaux-Davis</td>
<td>Professor; Curriculum, Instruction &amp; Special Ed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sid Salter</td>
<td>Chief Communications Officer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steve Parrott</td>
<td>Chief Information Officer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary Ann Jones Facilitator</td>
<td>Associate Professor; University Libraries</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Since MSU is a PUSH University, it is important for MSU faculty and researchers to understand and know the meaning behind what PUSH is accomplishing across the world. At the time of the Roundtable, there were 110 global universities whose presidents had signed the Presidents’ Commitment to Food and Nutrition Security and MSU’s President, Dr. Mark Keenum, was Chairman of the PUSH steering committee. The goal of the Roundtable was to brainstorm how MSU can become more involved in the PUSH effort and how a broader understanding of Open Access and Open Data on campus can inform
this initiative. As noted in the report *Open Access and Open Data at PUSH Universities*¹, the authors found that “only 15 of the 99 PUSH universities surveyed had open access policies posted on their website, and none had specific open data policies.” The report cited different obstacles across the surveyed campuses that prevented OA and OD from being more prominent in the research conversation.

The purpose of the Roundtable’s discussion was to discern the perception of OA and OD at MSU and brainstorm ideas about how to push the conversation forward. The first session centered around the benefits of OA and OD, the perceived barriers, and the challenges of overcoming those barriers. The second session focused on ideas about what an OA/OD initiative would look like on our campus, and how to plan and implement OA/OD at MSU.

The Roundtable began with a short presentation by Mary Ann Jones, Faculty Senate Vice President and Melody Dale, Education and Business Librarian. The presentation explained the theme of the Roundtable, provided definitions of Open Access and Open Data, added context about open research already happening at MSU, and offered background on Presidents United to Solve Hunger (PUSH). The presentation slides are attached as Appendix 1.

**Team discussion and conclusions:** Each team was asked to discuss three questions in two sessions (total of six questions). Each team brainstormed answers and the facilitator listed those answers on poster board. At the end of each session, team members voted on their 3 top choices. The information provided in this report is the conclusion of those discussions and ideas for moving the conversation forward campus wide.

**Session 1, Question 1: What are some known benefits of open access?**

Maroon Team: The discussion resulted in a list of 18 known benefits; from that list the following received votes:

- Provides transparency to research (5 votes)
- Increased institutional visibility (5 votes)
- Increased collaboration (5 votes)
- Time savings (4 votes)
- More data to provide more accurate results (4 votes)
- Democratizes access (2 votes)
- Allows back testing (1 vote)
- Removal of pay-wall (1 vote)

White Team: The discussion resulted in a list of 22 known benefits from that list the following received votes:

- Free (7 votes)
- Sharing of knowledge (5 votes)
- Increase citations which increases profile (4 votes)
- Compliance with funder mandates (3 votes)
- Undermines corporate publishers (2 votes)
- Invites collaboration (1 vote)
- Use for other purposes – build upon, change, or replication (1 vote)
- Easier to find via search engines (1 vote)
- Opens opportunities for networking (1 vote)
**Session 1, Question 2: What are the perceived barriers?**

Maroon Team: The discussion resulted in a list of 22 perceived barriers; from that list the following received votes:

- Cost lies with the researcher (6 votes)
- Lack of oversight (6 votes)
- Lose competitive advantage (4 votes)
- Resistance to change (4 votes)
- Perception of low quality (2 votes)
- Reliability question for data (2 votes)
- Reduced confidentiality of subjects (1 vote)
- Questions about the legal ownership of data (1 vote)
- Increased time requirements for researcher (1 vote)

White Team: The discussion resulted in a list of 23 perceived barriers; from that list the following received votes:

- Expense (7 votes)
- Question of ownership / intellectual property (6 votes)
- Pushback from faculty/researchers (4 votes)
- Misinterpretation (2 votes)
- Inequality for authors (2 votes)
- Fear of self-diagnosis [readers would self-diagnose if they had access to research] (1 vote)
- Unintended consequences (1 vote)
- Redundancy (1 vote)
- Preservable formats (1 vote)
- Predatory publishers (1 vote)
- Verification of legitimacy (1 vote)

**Session 1, Question 3: What kind of challenges do you see for MSU researchers who want to publish open research?**

Maroon Team: The discussion resulted in a list of 11 perceived challenges; from that list the following received votes:

- Misunderstanding of Open Access (8 votes)
- No homogeneous solution (8 votes)
- Funding (7 votes)
- P&T barriers (2 votes)
- Increased publication cost (1 vote)
- Understanding licenses and complicated contracts (1 vote)
- Resistance to change [P&T] (1 vote)

White Team: The discussion resulted in a list of 16 perceived challenges; from that list the following received votes:

- Cost (12 votes)
- Variations in disciplines (5 votes)
- Lack of recognition for P&T (3 votes)
• Storage [large data sets] (2 votes)
• Compliance (2 votes)
• Takes more effort (2 votes)
• Prefers big publishers (2 votes)

Session 2, Question 1: What would an OA initiative look like at MSU?

Maroon Team: The discussion resulted in a list of 19 comments; from that list the following received votes:

• Standardized electronic system for storage (3 votes)
• Specialization and resulting cost (4 votes)
• Cyber security and data validity (4 votes)
• Administrative buy-in across the board (4 votes)
• Balanced and flexible across disciplines (3 votes)
• Linked to other systems (2 votes)
• Clear citation system [DOI] (2 votes)
• Identified funding sources (1 vote)
• Sensitivity to security of projects [one size does not fit all] (1 vote)

White Team: The discussion resulted in a list of 11 comments; from that list the following received votes:

• Address P&T issues (7 votes)
• Willingness to participate (5 votes)
• College driven / faculty driven (5 votes)
• Clear guidelines (3 votes)
• Representatives from across campus (2 votes)
• A list of journals [to avoid predatory publishers] (2 votes)
• Involve incentives (1 vote)
• Resources/funding source (1 vote)

Session 2, Question 2: Who needs to be involved?

Maroon Team: The discussion resulted in a list of 20 suggestions; from that list the following received votes:

• Faculty with experience in open access (7 votes)
• Vice President of the Office of Research and Economic Development (3 votes)
• Students (3 votes)
• Library and ITS [Information Technology Services] (2 votes)
• Executive Council (2 votes)
• Stakeholders (2 votes)
• Across disciplines (2 votes)
• Faculty / Faculty Senate (1 vote)
White Team: The discussion resulted in a list of 26 suggestions; from that list the following received votes:

- Faculty representing all colleges/disciplines (8 votes)
- P&T committees (8 votes)
- Library (5 votes)
- Marketing / PR [Office of Public Affairs] (5 votes)
- ITS [Information Technology Services] (2 votes)
- Stakeholders (2 votes)
- Deans (1 vote)

Session 2, Question 3: What is a potential timeline? The teams answered this question in different ways. The maroon team took into consideration what components needed to be included in defining a timeline; whereas, the white team answered the question in literal terms of when can we get this started.

Maroon Team: The discussion resulted in a list of 11 possible timeline components; from that list the following received votes:

- Steering committee (6 votes)
- Education across campus (6 votes)
- Research options and centers of excellence (5 votes)
- Identify existing and needed resources (4 votes)
- Blueprint infrastructure (2 votes)
- Internal RFPs (1 votes)
- Partnering outside MSU (1 vote)

White Team: The discussion resulted in a list of 5 timeline ideas; from that list the following received votes:

- Guidance for P&T needs to happen now (8 votes)
- Convene a budget planning team (8 votes)
- Implement in phases (8 votes)
- Everyone agreed it needs to happen within the next 5 years
Conclusions:

After session two was over, the teams came together to share the highlights of each team’s discussions. The following are the conclusions reached by the collective group summarizing each session.

Session 1

The known benefits of Open Access and Open Data include providing transparency to research, increasing institutional visibility, leading to increased collaboration, increasing citations, and most importantly freely shares knowledge and quality research with a wider audience. Also, the group concluded that open data provides access to more data which produces more accurate results. The group responded positively to the concept and believed the benefits make it worthwhile to pursue an OA/OD initiative at MSU.

The perceived barriers were concluded to be the cost of publishing open access, with researchers bearing the burden of article processing fees and a lack of funding to assist with those costs. Ownership of intellectual property was also perceived as a barrier. Other conclusions included the possible loss of competitive advantage to the researcher and/or institution, lack of oversight, and resistance to change. The group discussed possible ways to overcome these barriers and that these barriers can be addressed in any ensuing OA/OD initiative’s education and outreach elements.

The responses to the question of challenges to the implementation of an OA/OD initiative at MSU were, like the barriers, centered around funding and the cost of publishing open access and the unknown expense of hosting an open data repository. There was also discussion about the misunderstanding of OA/OD at MSU and that this challenge would take great effort to overcome. The conclusion was there is not any single, homogenous solution for a campus as varied in disciplines as MSU, but any OA/OD initiative would address these challenges head on and work to discover solutions.

Session 2

What would an OA/OD initiative look like at MSU? The group concluded that there would need to be buy-in across the administration and P&T issues would have to be addressed immediately. Discussion also led to the need to find balance and be flexible across disciplines and that college/faculty driven processes would lead to wider acceptance and willingness to participate. Other conclusions were that ITS would need to be involved to focus on a standardized electronic storage system, address cyber security and data validity issues, and provide linking to other campus systems.

The discussion of who needs to be involved in an OA/OD campus initiative varied between the two teams, but the overarching theme was that campus stakeholders, including faculty, researchers, centers & institutes, and students need to be involved in a campus wide initiative to adopt OA/OD objectives. Faculty with experience in open access publishing should be thoughtfully involved, as they can be leaders given their familiarity with OA and could help others to trust the system and see the benefits firsthand. Administration from the Executive Council, the Vice President of Research and Economic Development, and the University Libraries would all need to play a strategic role in implementing a plan to move forward with a campus OA/OD initiative.

The final discussion revolved around a potential timeline and what would be needed to get started. The teams varied in their responses to this question, but overall everyone agreed that education would be key and there would need to be a steering committee. The committee would identify existing and needed resources, address guidance for P&T, plan a budget, and most importantly set the standards for
which MSU would follow. It was also concluded that a phased approach would work best to address some reluctance and resistance. One team concluded that guidance for P&T should be addressed immediately and added that a five-year timeline would be acceptable, but quicker than 5 years would be preferred.

Comments from RHFS Vice President, Mary Ann Jones:

As the Vice President of the Robert Holland Faculty Senate, it was my sincere pleasure coordinating the Spring Faculty Roundtable. The inspiration for the topic came from a report I received in the fall of 2018 from which I discovered that MSU was a PUSH University and Dr. Keenum was the Chairman of the PUSH Steering Committee. This discovery propelled me into proposing this topic for the 2019 roundtable, which Dr. Keenum enthusiastically accepted. The mission of PUSH is to solve world hunger through sharing of research and data. Unfortunately, too few PUSH Universities have taken up the call to “Build and strengthen a university food and nutrition security network by sharing information and best practices across institutions in teaching, research, outreach, and student engagement.” It is my belief that Mississippi State University is in a unique position to take a leading role in advancing the PUSH goals.

As a professional librarian, I consider access to information to be the core of what I do, teach, and research. Open access to information provides the broadest access to everyone, no matter their location or position in life. Research that is conducted with federal funds, funded by the taxpayers, should be readily available for discovery and learning. As a land-grant research institution, it is part of our mission to spread knowledge as far and wide as possible. There is no better way to achieve this goal than to advance a culture of openly sharing, as much as possible, the research being conducted at MSU and the data that drives that research. It is my professional opinion that the time is now for MSU to take up the PUSH mission across all disciplines and share our knowledge with the world.
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**PUSHing Toward Open Access and Open Data at MSU:**

What can we learn from Presidents United to Solve Hunger?

---

**What is Open Access and Open Data?**

- **Open access** = free to read and reuse
- **Open data** = free to reuse, replicate, redistribute, and repurpose
Why Open Access and Open Data?

▸ Funders’ policies

▸ Public good

▸ Better exposure

For example: NSF policy

NSF requires that either the version of record or the final accepted manuscript in peer-reviewed scholarly journals and papers in juried conference proceedings or transactions be deposited in a public access compliant repository designated by NSF; be available for download, reading, and analysis free of charge no later than 12 months after initial publication; be managed to ensure long-term preservation; and be reported in annual and final reports during the period of the award with a persistent identifier that provides links to the full text of the publication as well as other metadata elements. 1
### Funder mandates:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Funder</th>
<th>OA Archive</th>
<th>When</th>
<th>Embargo</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agency for Healthcare Research and Quality</td>
<td>requires</td>
<td>earliest opportunity</td>
<td>12 months</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Autism Speaks</td>
<td>requires</td>
<td>earliest opportunity</td>
<td>12 months</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avon Foundation for Women</td>
<td>requires</td>
<td>acceptance</td>
<td>12 months</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation</td>
<td>requires</td>
<td>earliest opportunity</td>
<td>12 months</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gordon and Betty Moore Foundation</td>
<td>requires</td>
<td>unspecified</td>
<td>12 months</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Howard Hughes Medical Institute</td>
<td>requires</td>
<td>earliest opportunity</td>
<td>12 months</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institute of Education Sciences</td>
<td>requires</td>
<td>acceptance</td>
<td>12 months</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MacArthur Foundation</td>
<td>encourages</td>
<td>earliest opportunity</td>
<td>12 months</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NASA</td>
<td>requires</td>
<td>acceptance</td>
<td>12 months</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Institutes of Health</td>
<td>requires</td>
<td>acceptance</td>
<td>12 months</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Science Foundation</td>
<td>requires</td>
<td>earliest opportunity</td>
<td>12 months</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phelan-McDermid Syndrome Foundation</td>
<td>requires</td>
<td>acceptance</td>
<td>12 months</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Simons Foundation</td>
<td>encourages</td>
<td>unspecified</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US Department of Energy</td>
<td>requires</td>
<td>acceptance</td>
<td>12 months</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wikimedia Foundation</td>
<td>requires</td>
<td>publication</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>World Bank</td>
<td>requires</td>
<td>acceptance</td>
<td>18 months</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Funder policy URLs:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Funder</th>
<th>Repository name</th>
<th>Policy URL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agency for Healthcare Research and Quality</td>
<td>PubMed Central</td>
<td><a href="http://www.ahrq.gov/funding/policies/publicaccess/">http://www.ahrq.gov/funding/policies/publicaccess/</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Autism Speaks</td>
<td>PubMed Central</td>
<td><a href="http://www.autismspeaks.org/science/policy-statements/policy-public-access-research-ae-full/">http://www.autismspeaks.org/science/policy-statements/policy-public-access-research-ae-full/</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avon Foundation for Women</td>
<td>PubMed Central</td>
<td><a href="http://www.avonfoundation.org/grants/breast-cancer/research-grant-guidelines/">http://www.avonfoundation.org/grants/breast-cancer/research-grant-guidelines/</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation</td>
<td>PubMed Central</td>
<td><a href="http://www.galactofoundation.org/How-We-Work/General-Information/Open-Access-Policy">http://www.galactofoundation.org/How-We-Work/General-Information/Open-Access-Policy</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Howard Hughes Medical Institute</td>
<td>PubMed Central</td>
<td><a href="http://www.hhmi.org/about/research/japp.html">http://www.hhmi.org/about/research/japp.html</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MacArthur Foundation</td>
<td></td>
<td><a href="http://www.macfound.org/about/our-policies/intellectual-property/">http://www.macfound.org/about/our-policies/intellectual-property/</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Institutes of Health</td>
<td>PubMed Central</td>
<td><a href="http://publicaccess.nih.gov/policy.htm">http://publicaccess.nih.gov/policy.htm</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Simons Foundation</td>
<td>arXiv</td>
<td><a href="https://www.simonsfoundation.org/funding-opportunities/policies-and-procedures/">https://www.simonsfoundation.org/funding-opportunities/policies-and-procedures/</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wikimedia Foundation</td>
<td></td>
<td><a href="http://wikimediafoundation.org/wiki/Open-access-policy">http://wikimediafoundation.org/wiki/Open-access-policy</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Where to archive?

- Funder databases
  - PubMed Central, NSF-PAR, etc.
- Institutional Repositories
  - Scholars Junction [www.ir.library.msstate.edu](http://www.ir.library.msstate.edu)
- Subject repositories
  - ArXive, ICPSR
- General repositories
  - Dataverse
  - FigShare
  - DataCite’s repository finder [https://repositoryfinder.datacite.org](https://repositoryfinder.datacite.org)

MSU authors publishing open access:

- Articles with MSU affiliated authors reported in DOAJ – 376
- Articles published in:
  - MDPI journals – 210
  - PLoS journals – 135
  - BioMed Central journals – 208
  - SpringerOpen journals – 42
  - ScienceDirect open access – 637
Presidents United to Solve Hunger (PUSH) perspective

“In a field as dynamic and diverse as agriculture and nutrition, efficient data-driven decisions can contribute to sustainable livelihoods and drive progress toward the Sustainable Development Goal of “zero hunger”.”

“Unfortunately, a significant part of this data is lost, misplaced, or locked in closed repositories kept within the walls of the universities. If, however, all universities across the globe developed open data policies and released their data, think of how much more efficiently decisions could be made.”

“We understand that creating a culture of open data in universities is challenging. This is where PUSH can lead the way. The 99 (now 110) universities whose presidents have pledged to unite in this global fight . . . are in a unique position to show by example [that] . . . it can be done . . .”

Why PUSH as an example?

- MSU is a PUSH institution
- Dr. Keenum is Chairman of the PUSH Steering Committee
  - Mississippi State University President Mark Keenum, . . . added: “As we face the daunting challenge of feeding nearly 10 billion people by 2050, universities are being called upon to develop best practices and infrastructure to promote the sharing and use of open data to advance agriculture and nutrition research. At Mississippi State, we are working diligently to leverage the power of open access and data sharing to meet this challenge, and I encourage my fellow presidents and chancellors to join us.”
- It’s time to formalize the Open Access and Open Data efforts at MSU.
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Appendix 2: Additional items from each question that spurred the conversation but did not receive any votes.

Session 1:

What are some known benefits of open access?

- Public good
- Equal access
- Economics
- Prevent redundancy
- Speed of use
- Benefit for economically challenged areas
- Levels the playing field
- Aids preservation
- Improve credibility
- Learn about data science in the process
- Be aware of different journals
- Cost savings
- Ability to build on others’ research
- Increased citations and high impact rating
- Avoids duplication
- Students have better view of the world
- Enables research
- Allows benchmarking algorithms on common data
- Lowers barriers to international research
- Greater expectation for other funders to “see the light”

What are the perceived barriers?

- Fear of manipulation
- Lack of awareness
- Plagiarism
- Confusion
- Delivery and presentation of data
- Changes the way we teach research methods
- Attacks on researchers for misunderstanding
- Outdated data – purge process
- Credibility
- Data compliance
- Controlled Classified Information compliance
- Theft of data/hacking
- Increased possibility of conflict of interest
- Fear of “scooping”
- Increased responsibility on researcher
- Storage requirements and maintenance
- Potential misuse
- Questions of peer review
- Is adequate reward system being developed?
• Increase error rate
• Alignment between university and agency
• Data formatting and usability
• Potential for conflict with policy
• Loss of integrity of publications
• Risk to reputation

What kind of challenges do you see for MSU researchers who want to publish open research?

• Support
• Adoption of a central format
• Timing
• Facing the unknown
• Shift in mindset
• Training
• Policy?
• APC’s (article processing charges)
• Consideration of new agreements with publishers (by universities)
• Difficult to develop extended research track
• Penalizes some research specialties (classified/confidential)
• Fear of not being recognized

Session 2:

What would an open initiative look like at MSU?

• Need policy or directive
• Flexible publication options
• Ease of access
• System of reward and recognition
• Library resources
• Leading edge infrastructure
• Knowledge of external resources
• Community engaged
• Stimulates collaboration
• User tracking (and implications)

Who needs to be involved in planning an initiative?

• Department heads
• VPs
• Provost
• Budget
• Students
• Education
• Lack of punitive action
• Connected to teaching
• OPA for marketing
• P&T committees
What is a potential timeline to implement an open research initiative at MSU?

- Opportunity for input from stakeholders
- Outreach to existing centers
- Evaluation of quality of existing repositories
- Training