

Attendees:

Susan Borda - Merced
Beth Callahan - UCD
Trisha Cruse - CDL
Sharon Farb - UCLA
Ann Frenkel - UCR (Coordinating committee rep)
Carol Hughes - UCI -
David Minor - UCSD - out, sub Reid Otsuji
Erik Mitchell - UCB
Anneliese Taylor - UCSF

Announcements:

- Coordinating committee report

Met for 2 productive days, included meeting with ULs. Finalized overview of advisory structure and picture of work going on. Discussed questions raised about SAG functions and processes. Visioning exercise - what would success look like.

Met with ULs: receptive and successful presentation though there is was a lack of feedback from ULs.

Each SAG needs to appoint a SAG liaison to each operation team for shared services, CDL & campuses. CC is working on the charge for liaison to an operation team. Goal is to make sure all groups are looped into the structure.

ACTION: identify all operation teams and put them in one place; Ann Frenkel will lead by taking the Ops Teams that are connected with the SAG1 from the Excel spreadsheet.

Discussion about OSC and SAG1 wasn't on CC/UL agenda. SAG1 CC rep is still unclear about how we work with OSC, though the message is that SAG1 is to be working closely with OSC.

4 things from SAG1/OSC

1. SAG1 will designate 2 reps

- member of SAG1

- member at large

2. Catherine will participate in meetings, though in what capacity is unclear

3. General agreement of relationship with SAG1 & OSC.

4. Karen & Laine were going to take up the task of how the two groups would work together.

CC and SAG chairs met to discuss questions of coordination, overlap, general process issues. These meeting will be ongoing.

- there is overlap between SAGs

Discussion topics:

1. SCP CKG call is out. Comments?

- SAG1 is officially named in charge: from CC perspective, if there is a clear tie to a SAG it is called out. No specific obligation to/for SAG1
- Is this the same group as the SCOs? Is the work the same? Publishing means...
- This group seems to have a more narrow focus
- Wanted to separate itself from the SAG1 name
- Increasingly there are libraries that doing things closely resemble publishing, not necessarily covered by this group
- Will cover funding agency compliance: data, scholarship
- This is a CKG, it may be ok for the scope to be blurry
- Annelise will bring that one field involved (compliance) includes data management

2. Update on the Knowledge Unlatched pilot group

- Group is launched

3. Update on the OA Fund Assessment group

- Group is launched.

4. Systemwide plan and priorities for FY 2014-2017 (25 mins)

i. Beth has lead in crafting the team basics section (put links on wiki page)

- Please use Google docs version for commenting and editing.

- ACTION: review & comment by next meeting. All team members.

- Table: discussion on priorities for next meeting

ii. Trisha has lead in crafting stakeholders and audiences section

- Trish will flesh out text for stakeholders & audiences

iii. We need to start assigning names and dates to the other sections, ESPECIALLY ones related to OSC/SC:

- ACTION: table for David to clarify

5. DMPTool Operations team - questions lingering from last time. (10 mins)
 - a. Still have questions about: how does this compare to CDL operations team, campus liaisons and what the specific things this group will be doing. Related: can we just have one person/team at each campus that deals with each of the tools? [post meeting note: the functions of technical work and public services work for the tools are often handled by different library departments I would imagine].

Question: There is a DMPTool operations team (CDL). This tool is in SAG1 portfolio. The DMPTool liaison group has formed. Do we need to do a systemwide project for the DMPTool?

ACTION: SAG1 will declare a liaison to DMPTool operations group but not the liaison group

ACTION: SAG1 will wait & see if there is need for more involvement

New Discussion item: PeerJ

ACTION: Ask Ivy to SAG1 meeting to talk about PeerJ

Discussion about the PeerJ model. What is the point of an institutional model? Are they working only with libraries? Would they take Office of Research money? Should SAG1 take on helping libraries work with the Office of Research on funding this model.

It is uneven funding for subdisciplines? What could be done?

What should SAG1 do? We have a responsibility to look at the different models. Ties to guidelines for responsible publishing. We have discussed updating the guidelines so we can address all options as they come up.

Good to approach more globally, perhaps update the guidelines and identify more models.

Look at:

- ownership
- how each model deals with using their stuff
- other
- come up with policy to guide how SAG1 supports

ACTION: Erik will reach out to UCB contact(s) for more information about UCB's PeerJ

membership and report back to SAG1 (Email sent, will report back - ETM)

ACTION: Review “Criteria to Determine Support for Transformative Scholarly Publishing Models” guidelines and update come up with recommendations and then involve CLS. Christy & Anneliese