

October 5, 2014

Attendees:

Sherri Barnes - UCSB - here  
(Christy Hightower for) Christy Caldwell - UCSC -here  
Beth Callahan - UCD - here  
Trisha Cruse - CDL - out  
Sharon Farb - UCLA -here  
Ann Frenkel - UCR (Coordinating committee rep) - here  
Diane Gurman - UCLA - LAUC rep - here  
Susan Mikkelsen - UCM - out  
David Minor - UCSD - here  
Catherine Mitchell - CDL – here  
Erik Mitchell - UCB - here!  
John Renaud - UCI - here  
Colby Riggs - UCI - Portfolio Manager - here  
Anneliese Taylor - UCSF - here

Announcements:

- David out next meeting (Oct 17) - can someone volunteer to run it.

- Coordinating committee report -

Assessment survey is be developed and CC is providing feedback to the consultant Katherine Kott right now. The link will be sent out on Oct. 10 to everyone involved in UCOLAS. Survey will have a short timeframe, closes on Oct 22nd. Katherine will followup w/ stakeholders if clarification is needed. Katherine's final report is due in November.

Are there plans to do ongoing assessments? Part of the assignment for Katherine is for her to recommend future assessments.

CC needs to coordinate when and how people step down. Need to determine how to retain institutional memory. Any ideas regarding this should be included in your assessment survey feedback. There is a question of how to handle the process of rotation. There are procedures already delineated, in many cases these are fairly simple and a UL can make an independent recommendation.

Discussion topics:

1. Transformative Publishing Models Pilot Review Team: Preliminary report

a. Report sent to group on 9/30

b. Anneliese and Christy Hightower to present

i. Debrief & discussion: See document for team members :-). In 2005, first document released, update in 2008. List of criteria to evaluate what types of resources we'd want to invest in. One of the main drivers of the report was to collect the diverse information in the two docs to be in one place, and make it easy to refer to the information.

1. Define the scope, it has changed since the first document was produced. Broaden to scholarly communication in scope, beyond traditional publishing initiatives. Added a definition of scholarly communication, used ARL definition. Combined tables and date to make them more easily understood.
2. Put forward two major points that hope would be met by the models. Open access is no longer considered transformative, but there are good reasons to invest.
3. Criteria: looked at initial criteria in 2005 also those in 2008. Felt it necessary to repeat what is transformative. Not every instance evaluated needs to meet every point. Recognize there may be subjective opinions about meeting criteria, this is inevitable.
4. Economic feasibility: difficult questions and much discussion about this aspect, sticky topic. Group didn't feel comfortable putting thresholds on the factors.
5. Operations sustainability: realize we don't always have as much information as we would like
6. Note: indicators may appear in multiple criteria
7. Note: table is ordered by importance of criteria
8. Looking for feedback and input on what's been put together so far. Talking to SAGs and....

ii. Questions

1. Information purposes: did group run current situations through the criteria. The committee is beginning to run through some instances, example: PeerJ.
2. Did group get a sense when working with 2005/2008 documents about what kind of meat needs to be behind these documents? What might be the best way to "enforce" these, how to

operationalize? Part 2 of charge, more formally run current business models through the criteria & put forward recommendations. Not sure how enforceable this might be on the campuses in every instance. Group thinks making it easy to use would help people use it.

3. Scoring: seemed as though it would be difficult to obtain to a useful score
4. Feedback: good to know there was a reason for the order of the criteria, it would be useful to make this more widely known.
5. Discussion about the parts of transformative and how to implement/apply the criteria.
6. Discussion of some descriptive language: advocacy organization in place of library groups
7. There was a former criteria that was removed, non-profit status. No longer valid criteria or as important as it was in 2005.
  - a. Feedback: Might be as important but should be stated. Non-profits should get credit for doing it.
  - b. Business tax status is not felt to be a credible criteria based on how businesses operations publish
8. Have until Oct 17th to send feedback to Annaliese
9. . Group wants comments & feedback to incorporate into final report.
  - a. Will be an agenda item at next meeting.
  - b. No need to repeat what was said today. Annaliese will be on next call and will aggregate the comments.
10. Group would really like feedback on scope.
  - a. Feedback: where would publishers fit in?

## 2. OSC Update -

- a. The OSC workplan for 14/15.
  - i. Discussion
  - ii. Mid- Oct release of SAG1 academic year plan
- b. Setup & highlights
  - i. This is the work of OSC to identify areas of engagement. Broad list & ambitious. Where does OCS have a role? Expect to collaborate with others. Provide scope statement under each category.

1. Looking for feedback on scope. Would like a clear sense of overlap redundancy, collaboration, anything missed.
2. Exchange of workplan will benefit both, SAG1 has group going to work on its workplan.

ii. Comments

1. This is a work in progress, iterative. Let Catherine/Sharon know if there are questions about things in the workplan are articulated.
2. Section on ETDs - what does this mean.
  - a. Working with grad divisions should be done in conjunction with campus.
  - b. This is something for CDL to do with all efforts on campus.
  - c. Idea was that certain things are/could be same across campuses. Are there things that would benefit people as they move across the campuses.
  - d. OSC gets involved when actions would benefit everyone across the campuses. OSC would work with in concert with campus contacts.
  - e. Initial discussion (on this and other items) could sit in SAG and SAG would decide if systemwide help needed, then bring in OSC to help
3. Nuance some of the ways things being talked about, trick to balance big ideas w/ too much granularity
4. If folks don't feel comfortable about items on list, could be removed from list
5. some topics have clear roles for several groups, there may be a need for a uber document that lays out the actions of the different groups, ie., SAG1 delineates their role
6. Licensing question: how does it fit into OSC? There is the CLS group and what is the relationship to OSC?
  - a. Highlight how people are working. Don't want to leave out how licensing impacts us, beyond acquisitions. There are a set of issues that policy & practical implications that involve copyright but go beyond. Ivy & group cannot do all that needs to be done. OSC can provide more resources to highlight issues in copyright.
  - b. What/where does OSC have an interest in topics that are already in discussion in other groups. Negotiation is

probably not the best term to describe the work.

- c. No one group can get all the necessary work done.

#### 7. Next steps

- a. Comment/question: SAG1 subgroup (workplan) yes this group will be coming back with shared plan that lines up with our discussion today.
- b. Process question: would Catherine want comments now or wait until edits complete.
  - i. any thoughts SAG1 has
  - ii. Next phase for document: will be discussed in UCOLAS, will have comments, reviewed in SLASIAC yesterday.
  - iii. If comments, please pass them along to Catherine. More iterations in the future but not endless revision. Hope to wrap up by end of Oct.
  - iv. We can take current document to use in discussion even if details change. Broad categories/view expressed by document seem comfortable.
  - v. Massive amount of work to be done, the more we figure how to cover the work and make progress is exciting.

#### 3. Subgroup to work on SAG1 priorities and deliverables

- a. Colby, Erik, Beth, Trisha, David
- b. Schedule?
  - i. Will be meeting ASAP
  - ii. Information for review by SAG group by October 17th?
- c. Emails going back & forth about the best way to meet. Beth, Erik & Trisha at UCB, David & Colby will dial in for a face-to-face. Kicking around possible dates.
- d. We are a bit stalled because of full schedules. There is some urgency in view of OSC workplan. Meeting, perhaps the 15th, after 1:00.
- e. Erik sent everyone an email invitation to the SAG1 workplan update session, feel free to decline. Please join onsite or via bluejeans.

#### 4. OA Policy implementation update

- a. Catherine presented to SLASIAC yesterday.

i. Going to make harvester to first three campuses on Oct 20th, first day of OA week. Campuses might delay individual rollout based on their own plans.

ii. All additional campuses will be depositing as of Nov 1, manual deposit process until end of summer 2015.

iii. Fun facts

1. 2042 manually deposited since July 2013 (faculty do not flock to manual deposit process)
2. of those deposited, they are viewed on avg 95 times each
3. 253 waivers processed since Jul 2013. 232 of these were from UCSF.

a. Nature is the publisher consistently requesting waivers

b. May do a study of waiver requests & publisher

4. harvester is up and running, now have 4066 records waiting to be claimed, represent corpus of work known for 5500 faculty in first 3 campuses.

a. Faculty do not know the articles are waiting to be claimed yet.

b. Trying to prepopulate records so faculty will see a full list of publications that can be accepted or rejected. for those articles that fall under policy, taken to workflow to deposit.

c. UCI (At least) is working on the outreach to happen before the faculty hear about this to make sure they understand what's going on and why their articles are showing up here.

d. there is quite a lot of on the ground communication that needs to be done, campuses are taking this on.

e. This is a labor intensive process. Only faculty are activated in the Elements database, not yet able to have proxy to load documents for faculty. UCSF hasn't mentioned capability of proxy help, cannot take on workload for faculty.

f. Not clear how to build in help for faculty into system, CDL is working on making interface user friendly (technical interface). Will need additional funding. Need to explore the social interface and how to make it happen.

g. Do not believe Scopus permanent funding was part of ask

for ....

- h. Rolling out harvester, will do a 12 month review, then bring other campuses online at end of summer 2015
- i. Catherine will contact campus for local contact to work with implementing harvester on campus

5. Data Curation CKG

- a. Shu Liu (Chair) will join us at a future meeting, sooner rather than later.
  - i. Go over what is discussed at CKG
  - ii. How to work together

6. Face to face meeting - annual?

- a. Yes, maybe winter or spring
- b. Not scheduled yet
- c. Be sure we have work that needs to have face to face conversation

Thanks to all for helping with minutes - BC