Charge for the Scholarly Communications Officers (SCOs)
2011/12

As the current scholarly publishing environment grows increasingly diverse, distributed and unsustainable, it is incumbent upon the University to protect and make widely visible the fruits of its academic labor or risk being divested of any control over this immensely valuable scholarly capital. Each year, UC faculty publish upwards of 30,000 journal articles in, mostly, commercial journals; researchers are granted nearly 300 patents for groundbreaking discoveries; and the University awards thousands of advanced degrees for the completion of theses and dissertations. The building blocks of these culminating research efforts are, of course, the working papers, seminar series, conferences, data sets, 3D visualizations, etc. that are produced across the UC system. It is this vast collection of UC-sourced knowledge that represents the *core intellectual capital* of the University of California.

CDC and SCO have an opportunity to engage with this burgeoning collection (and thus protect the interests of the institution and its researchers) by extending our notion of scholarly communications support. Specifically, we can frame the work we are doing in terms of the "UC Collection," which comprises both that which we license and that which we produce as an institution.[1] In particular, we can develop a model for engaging with faculty throughout the lifecycle of scholarly research, from the earliest explorations of the work of others through licensed content, to the management and curation of data and artifacts as they are being generated, to the dissemination of those same data and artifacts alongside the synthesizing papers, monographs and digital projects ultimately produced by our scholars. It is within this framework of the lifecycle, and all the emerging policies and procedures attendant upon that lifecycle, that we can focus the charge for SCO in the coming years.

CDC is charging the SCO to develop a framework for Scholarly Communications strategies. These resources (white papers, LibGuides, web-pages, etc.) will address:

- Communication strategies for addressing fundamental issues and challenges within scholarly communications
- Promotion of UC resources for research management and open access publishing services
- Best practices and new models emerging within the broader landscape of academic libraries and publishers

SCO should establish priorities, craft a work-plan for the various components, and prepare a timeline for action over the next 1-3 years. Note that SCO may want to consider using the 'Lightning Bolt' model to establish teams to deal with specific issues.

I. **Communication strategies for addressing fundamental issues and challenges within scholarly communications.** Communication has always been a priority for the SCOs and this charge expands on this critical responsibility to provide a resource of documents and guidelines easily

[1] The University of California Library Collection: Content for the 21st Century and beyond; July, 2009.
See also: University of California Libraries Priorities for Collective Initiatives, 2011-2014 and Final Report of the SLASIAC Library Planning Task Force (Dec, 2011).

accessible to all librarians, faculty, students, campus and system-wide administrators, CoUL, SLASIAC, UCOLASC.

a. With faculty – this is a key responsibility and the SCOs provide support in this area. The goal is not to tell faculty what to do but to provide the following information to them:

    i. Research management and publishing services
        - How faculty can make their research (publications and data) more visible
        - How open access publishing models can help them achieve these goals
        - How to discover and publish in open access journals
        - How open access serves more than just journal-type materials

    ii. The economics of the scholarly publishing environment
        - Why journals subscriptions are being cancelled
        - Information sources on trends, such as, Why book contracts are increasingly rare, How scholarly societies are implicated, What options exist to rebalance the market

    iii. Compliance
        - How to comply with NSF requirements for a data management plan
        - How to comply with NIH, Welcome Trust, etc regulations for depositing their articles in PubMed

    iv. Intellectual property
        - How to negotiate favorable contracts with publishers
        - How to protect their author rights within an open access environment (Creative Commons, etc.)
        - Information/data in support of faculty efforts to move forward on mandates to make their work open access (a la Harvard and MIT)
        - How to secure permissions in scholarly research and publishing
        - How to advise on best practices for using copyrighted content in teaching

b. With fellow librarians
    i. Ensuring awareness of UC goals, priorities and services in support of scholarly communications, enabling informed and effective conversations with faculty, publishers and vendors
    ii. Ensuring familiarity with UC-based research management and publishing services programs
    iii. Creating a template/talking points document that lays out the story of scholarly communications to bring to conversation with faculty

c. With campus administrators/stakeholders
    i. To help UCOP and campus administrations understand the issues and the importance of these issues to UC
    ii. Should we have a mechanism for alerting the ULs when we need their input ?
    iii. Formalize academic senate connection? VCs for research?
    iv. Partner more effectively with UCOLASC - SCO representation has been discouraged by UCOLASC. How can we obtain a seat at the table?

d. Coordinate campus and system-wide resources on scholarly communications with stakeholders across the board
    i. Web resources
        1. Need to be updated and revised in a timely manner – webmaster available?
        2. Need more instructional (how-to) guides; multimedia
    ii. Colloquia or conferences
    iii. Social networking?
    iv. Leveraging of established local champions (faculty talking to faculty)
    v. Open Access week planning – SCOs have very actively and successfully planned campus OA weeks. Some campuses have been more successful than others. Let's analyze and see if we can develop a core of successful activities.

II. **Promotion of UC resources for research management and open access publishing services**

a. Work with CDL to develop holistic picture of service offerings for the full lifecycle of research management and publishing services at UC. Promote opportunities for faculty/students to benefit from the full suite of services, including:

    i. eScholarship - the University's open access repository/publishing platform
        1. Staff/coordinate eScholarship Liaisons across campuses (user group model) to share best practices for encouraging faculty/student participation
        2. Provide CDL with campus input to help shape strategic goals /service enhancements

    ii. UC3 Services (Merritt , EZID, WAS, etc.)
        1. UC3 has already identified campus liaisons for data management plans and for web archiving services. SCO should maintain communication with UC3 and UC3 campus liaisons so that communications related to shared curation services are up-to-date, coordinated and integrated.
        2. SCO's communication efforts can help publicize some of the outreach strategies to UC Offices of Research to meet NIH, NSF etc data management plan needs. Extend publication discussions (with faculty/students) to include combined publication and data management plan opportunities at UC

b. Develop outreach plan that targets best /most-in-need prospects for these services (by discipline, by type of need, by ladder rank) and hones the message to address each community's specific concerns.
    i. Collaborate with CDL to develop joint marketing messages/materials
    ii. Identify and develop strategic stakeholders who could push this agenda forward on the campuses
    iii. Fold these messages into any education outreach efforts on the part of the libraries.

III. **Best practices and new models emerging within the broader landscape of academic libraries and publishers.** This should be done in collaboration with CDC and CDL so we are not 'reinventing' what is already in process and leverages the bandwidth and interests of the CDC, SCO and CDL. However, it is important for SCOs to maintain their knowledge of the changing scholarly communications landscape.

a. Assess/review existing membership models for OA (NAR, PLOS, etc) as directed by CDC
b. Explore using collection dollars to support open access models, including creating a pool for subsidizing authors' fees and tracking the efficacy of particular investments as directed by CDC.
c. Explore wave of new OA journals and models and how they can/should affect what we do at UC Send recommendations to CDC as relevant:
    i. Nature Scientific Reports
    ii. Sage Open
    iii. SpringerOpen
    iv. Wiley Open Access (which has a number of interesting models for institutional funding)
    v. Royal Society
    vi. APS, etc.

7/20/11