Scholarly Communication Officers Group Meeting Minutes
Date: September 1, 2005
Recorder: Moody
Location: Oakland, CA

Present: Starr (co-chair, UCSD), Yokote (co-chair, UCD), Candee (CDL), Moody (UCSB), Ober (CDL), Neugebauer (UCR), Persily (UCSF), Phillips (UCB), Remak-Honnef (UCSC), Shelton (UCLA), Tanji (UCI)

Absent: Barclay (UCM)

1. Review of "Role of All Campus Groups"
Discussion of role of SCOs. Emphasis of the group is on what is going on at campuses. Expectation that members will communicate widely to their campuses on scholarly communication issues.

ACTION: Phillips volunteered to maintain SCO Web site pending approval at her campus. Neugebauer volunteered to take this on if Phillips could not do so.

ACTION: Yokote and Starr will draft goals for October ACG meeting and email to SCO for review.

2. Review of general charge from SOPAG to SCO.
Discussed charge from SOPAG and context of the charge. Discussion ensued regarding how scholarly communication policy is formed in UC, how decisions regarding scholarly communication are made, and the role of SCO in this process. Coordination and awareness of all that is going on in UC is a challenge. Ober passed out a document describing the planning and consultative structure for UC responses to Scholarly Communication issues and opportunities. Overlap between CDC and SCO exists, both in membership and substance, so there is a need to keep CDC informed of SCO actions. Possibly we will need to appoint a formal representative to CDC and vice versa. SCO Composition: Discussion of whether Members of SCO additionally serve as campus liaisons to the eScholarship program. LAUC has not yet appointed a LAUC member, but is in the process of appointing one.

ACTION: Ober and Candee will try to keep SCO aware of SLASIAC and Special Committee on Scholarly Communication actions and activities.

ACTION: Starr will take proposed changes to the charge to the October SOPAG/All Campus Group meeting:

Changes to the charge:

Add: "Identifies needs for expertise and infrastructure to support the scholarly communication agenda."

Change: "Identifies and addresses educational needs of faculty, staff and students across the UC Libraries with regards to scholarly communication issues

and options." *to* "Identifies and addresses educational needs of faculty, staff, and students across UC with regards to scholarly communication issues and options."

Add: "Keeps UC Libraries' scholarly communication agenda current and synchronized with UC activities and programs and other environmental factors."

Change: last sentence under SCO Composition to read: "Members of SCO additionally coordinate the implementation of the eScholarship program at their campus."

3. Discussion of expectations of SCO members for SCO.

ACTION: SCOs should provide information sharing of appropriate items for all members of SCO via the SCO listserv.

ACTION: At times SCO may need both public and private minutes and messages for the listserv.

ACTION: SCO members should indicate when items should not be distributed to others outside the group.

4. CDC related items

a. Review of UL/SOPAG charge to CDC
CDC has a task force looking at scenarios for systemwide negotiatons for electronic journals. Discussed work to date of this task force. The task force has been clarifying the assignment and assumptions about the charge. Notes document developed by task force will go to the ULs after SCO input. Task force is proposing to take two packages to develop as a case study using the two scenarios. SCO will be asked to respond to the scenarios developed by CDC. SCO reviewed the questions CDC is planning to pose in considering each scenario. Two additions were suggested: 1) consideration of licensing terms that foster goals for scholarly communication should be considered and 2) can the strategy adopted be effectively communicated to faculty? Need to also delineate what costs could be avoided and what costs will occur with each strategy.

ACTION: Yokote will route draft documents of the task force to SCO group for comments as they are produced.

b. CDC request to SCOs to "pursue" strategies for communicating to faculty the changes in the Biomed Central contract."

Change in the Biomed Central contract. CDC is asking SCO for common messages for campuses regarding the change. What is the best way to publicize we have a UC membership?
Ideas:
Provide a positive spin.
Push that we have a discount package we negotiated that provides these benefits.
Communicate this discount benefit to Office of Research on campus.
Point to web site for additional places to publish:
(http://osc.universityofcalifornia.edu/alternatives/).

5. Discussion of UC Scholarly Communication Websites—what is the relation between them.:
http://libraries.universityofcalifornia.edu/scholarly/
http://osc.universityofcalifornia.edu

Discussion of whether we need two separate pages and the functions of each page. Discussion of what should go on the http://libraries.universityofcalifornia.edu/scholarly page.   SCO concluded that the libraries…edu site is a "brochure site" which should include only major documents of interest to audiences such as UCOL and SLASIAC. The osc..edu site is the best place to direct faculty for information regarding scholarly communication.

ACTION: SCO will maintain the page at
http://libraries.universityofcalifornia.edu/scholarly

6. Update from OSC (Catherine Candee and John Ober)

1. The trend in eScholarship Repository service uptake is that adoption/participation levels off at around 5% of UC faculty. Our assumption is that we have reached the early adopters and that significantly broader use will result only when clear incentives and/or mandates emerge for faculty to embrace the service. In the meantime, we should continue to reach out to potential faculty authors who may not know of the current service, and continue to improve the service to meet current faculty needs.

2. Feature development for the eScholarship Repository this fall aims to streamline user experience (e.g., proxy upload), improve interoperability (e.g., multiple identifiers in MD) and enhance visibility and context for postprints but allowing post-submission gathering of postprints as a collection within ORU/department's site.

3. Following on the example of the UCIAS publication program, UC Press will be recruiting and vetting editors/editorial boards for new monographic series, which will be published in the eScholarship Repository. Distributing the editorial responsibility lessens the load on the UC Press editorial committee (which currently considers all manuscripts); producing the works within the eScholarship Repository lessens the load on the Press's production and financial resources while making good use of existing infrastructure at CDL. Series editors have already been selected in Literature, Classics, and Linguistic Anthropology.

4. Staffing/org infrastructure: Staff will be hired to replace Dayna/the operational function, as well as to manage higher-level outreach and marketing efforts that must be brought back in-house. SCO's should decide for their campus what staffing structure is appropriate, and alert OSC/CDL of the appropriate contact for eScholarship alerts and/or updates.

5. Ober reported on activities of the Academic Council's Special Committee on Scholarly Communication (SCSC), including: 1) the forwarding, endorsement,

and conveyance (by President Dynes) of a draft proposal for open access and archiving of stem cell research results funded by Proposition 71 (http://www.universityofcalifornia.edu/senate/reports/rcd.2.klein.icoc.cirm.0505.pdf); 2) deliberation on a series of white papers proposed to include a) faculty management of copyright, b) the role of societies and society publishing, c) monograph publishing and university presses, d) journal publishing esp. with regard to commercial publishers, e) the role of tenure and promotion processes. SCSC is hoping to conclude this work by early January and will help the Acad. Council consider mechanisms for ongoing faculty attention to scholarly communication issues.

7. 2005/06 charge to SCO—Developing a Faculty Outreach Plan
a. Review of charge
b. Brainstorming key areas and messages for outreach were identified.

ACTION: SCO will develop further actions regarding three areas: The Role of Scholarly Societies; Managing Your Copyright Options (for Faculty); Unsustainable Economics

ACTION: Work on defining scope of these three areas using questions identified in the brainstorming session as a starting point. Also, include any ideas for possible strategies.
    SCO members agreeing to work on:
    Societies: Ober, Remak-Honnef (convenor), Yokote
    Unsustainable Economics: Tanji, Moody (convenor)
    Copyright: Persily, Starr, Phillips (convenor), Ober

8. Future meetings/conference calls

ACTION: Starr/Yokote will survey SCO members by e-mail to determine time for the next meeting.

Miscellaneous: Ideas for Goals for SCO that came up during the meeting:

Review relevant documents by the ULs and academic scholarly communication groups and write interpretation of them.

Draft a description of the role of the SCO on each campus.

Compile a list/directory of "faculty champions" and "champion administrators."