

## Minutes

### **SCO Conference Call April 7, 2006**

Attendees: Susan Starr (SD), Gail Yokote (D), Cindy Shelton (LA), Lorelei Tanji (I), John Ober (OSC), Catherine Candee (OSC), Lucia Snowhill (SB), Margaret Phillips (B), Janet Carter (LAUC)

Absent: Donald Barclay (M), Beth Remak (SC), Rhonda Neugebauer (R)

Guest: Fran Allegri (NLM/AAHSL Fellow)

#### **I. Review of draft toolkit pages**

##### **a. Scholarly Societies:** SCO recommended the following changes to the draft

- Change the title of the table labeled “scorecard” to “checklist” OR create an actual score
- Make the relationship to our “Licensing Principles” more explicit, perhaps by including some text just above the table referring to the principles
- Change “knowledge advancement a core value” to “knowledge advancement explicit in mission statement”
- Not clear if Open Access is an example of “innovative dissemination”
- Need to add some examples of societies with poor “scores.”

**ACTION:** the subcommittee will make the changes, flesh out the examples in the “score card” and bring it back to SCO before a final review. Once the page is released, bibliographers will be asked to contribute information on additional societies to the table.

##### **b. Copyright**

The previous draft was changed to make it shorter and focused on librarians as the primary target audience.

- Fix typographical errors
- Do not include names of individuals who could be contacted; campuses should look for people at their own institution who can give testimonials.

**ACTION:** Ober will make changes to the draft page

##### **c. Economic messages**

- Change “Issues Overview for Faculty as Authors” to “Talking points for Faculty Discussion”
- Move table so it appears after the “Issues Overview”.
- Integrate overview for librarians with earlier text. Savings from deep resource sharing, the inevitability of future serials cancellations, and the impact of costs for

STM journals on social sciences and humanities are all items that could be included.

- Bold first part of each action in the table so it stands out more.
- Under people, list individuals who have written or spoken in the area with citations to their writing or speech.

**Action:** L. Tanji and C. Shelton will make revisions.  
SCO members should send L. Tanji URL links to reusable handouts and brochures.

**Action:** All changes should be to Ober by April 24 so that they can be incorporated into draft website by the SOPAG meeting on May 4.

## **II. Workshop at UCLA - Shelton**

Plans for the July 15, 2006 UCLA workshop, "Implementing and Managing a Scholarly Communication Program: the UC Libraries as a Case Study" were reviewed. The workshop will be held following the ACRL/ALA Scholarly Communication Workshop at UCLA.

**Action:** SCO Participants should confirm participation with C. Shelton

**Action:** J. Carter will check on the availability of the Guest House for those arriving the evening before.

## **III. Faculty Survey – Ober & Candee**

OSC has developed a faculty survey regarding their attitudes and behavior toward alternative forms of scholarly publishing and UC's eScholarship repository and a number of other scholarly communication issues. Some or all of the survey might be done under the aegis of the SCSC; however, in part because of delays in discussion of the white papers, SCSC would like to delay some key components of the survey until the fall. OSC would find it valuable to have the information sooner in order to assist them in developing eScholarship.

Ober and Candee explored with other SCOG members the possibility/feasibility of having the survey sent to faculty by each campus' library. If the survey was sent out from campus libraries, it would likely need to be sent to all academics, rather than just Senate members. The University Librarians would have to approve any distribution from the Libraries, and ideally all campuses would need to participate. UC Berkeley's semester ends in May, so the survey would have to be sent out quite soon or delayed until fall.

Concerns were expressed over the response rate if the survey is sent without support from SCSC. The previous survey sent on this topic was part of a Mellon-funded effort and it seems likely that this encouraged faculty response.

**ACTION:** None required. Subsequent to this discussion, OSC decided to focus on conducting their own survey of needs for current and future eScholarship services, using a sample of randomly selected faculty.

#### **IV. SCSC White Papers**

Because of other Senate business, the White Papers were not discussed by Academic Council on March 22 as planned; April 19 will be next chance for Council discussion. While it's possible the Assembly will consider the papers in May, it seems possible that discussion at the Assembly will be delayed until fall. According to informal reports from SCOG members, most discussion at the systemwide committee and divisional level to date has centered on the copyright proposal. Clarifications of that proposal are under consideration by the SCSC; an alternative would be to drop the proposal and draft it after the papers themselves are passed. If SCSC gets to this item, and changes they want to make are minor, it too could go to assembly in May.

#### **V. Faculty Outreach Campaign**

SCO discussed next steps in the charge to create a faculty outreach campaign. Discussion focused on the opportunity/need associated with potential legislation at the federal level proposing that any federal agency that provides over 100 million dollars in research funding would mandate publication of research results in an open access venue. If this happens, SCO might want to produce an FAQ explaining the legislation to our faculty or hold some kind of sessions on campus. Drafting a UC Library response or helping faculty committees develop comments are also possible roles for SCO. SCO will want to quickly convene a conference call to discuss how to respond. A more general outreach effort could involve turning our web pages into brochures in time to distribute to faculty in fall; UCB begins their fall term in August...

#### **VI. Next Conference Call**

The next conference call, tentatively scheduled for sometime the week of May 8, will include a "final" review of the website pages and a discussion of how to position SCO for rapid response to developments in scholarly communication.