

## **UC Libraries Scholarly Communication Officers Group**

### **DRAFT Notes 9/16/04**

**Attendees:** Margaret Phillips, Gail Yokote, Lorelei Tanji, Cindy Shelton, Donald Barclay, Rhonda Neugebauer, Susan Starr, Gail Persily, Gail McClenney, Beth Remak-Honnef, John Ober.  
**Absent:** Catherine Candee; **Guest:** Dan Greenstein

#### **1. Announcements**

The round-robin reports revealed a full range of activities on campuses, with active discussion reported at every campus, several established or nascent internal working groups (UCSF, UCLA, UCSD, UCSB, UCB, UCI), a handful of internal program plans in place or under development (UCSF, UCLA, UCSB, UCI, OSC), a faculty-library symposium under development at UCB, and a recent bibliographers retreat with a focus on scholarly communication issues at UCD.

**Action: Shelton will share UCLA program plan/elements**

#### **2. Program and Priorities**

##### **A. Education and outreach**

The need for sharing education and outreach activities was confirmed and will be done via the listserv and meetings. Additional suggestions for collective action included:

- Cooperative collection and maintenance of a database of UC faculty editors and society officers or activists
- Boilerplate or common questions for faculty to ask their societies
- Review and leveraging of non-UC efforts (e.g. the Johns-Hopkins site, Create Change, etc.)
- Group creation and editing of boilerplate messages for faculty (perhaps made available on the [osc.universityofcalifornia.edu](http://osc.universityofcalifornia.edu) website)

The need for common messages re: Blackwell (and other renewals) was discussed.

**Actions:** Ober will investigate feasibility of OSC creating editors database; Ober will send list of U.S. societies that publish with Blackwell; Phillips will share UCB symposia material as appropriate; Persily will share URL of UCSF Blackwell announcement [done]; group will nominate additional materials for development and/or posting on osc website; group will discuss library staff development options at their next meeting.

##### **B. eScholarship**

Greenstein reported on service developments and summarized promotion activities based at OSC/CDL and bepress. SCOs were encouraged to forward questions about communication and development plans to Candee.

##### **C. Copyright**

Tanji reported on UCI's copyright workshops for faculty. The approach and content seemed to work although attendance was low. UCLA is considering establishing copyright consulting office hours. Ober summarized some of the copyright related elements of OSC's Mellon grant. Discussion included the range of faculty interest in copyright and the potential utility of/need for other university units (e.g. Offices of Research) to be engaged.

**Action:** Tanji, McClenney, and Ober will create a proposal for development of a “copyright advice matrix” to be ready for discussion no later than the next meeting.

#### D. Selection principles

There was consensus that the CDC principles are a good start toward meeting the “Use library buying power” priority in the libraries’ scholarly communication program. It was noted that they do not go far enough in promoting transformative business models (see next items) and that they do not offer operational advice. While adoption of the CDC principles should be encouraged, so too should further discussion about how to effectively wield buying power, how to support and invest in transformative models, and how to change current practice. The possibility and advantages of a joint meeting between SCO, CDC, JSC, and ULs was discussed.

**Action:** Shelton (and other SCOs who are CDC members) will report SCO’s discussion to CDC; SCO’s will report discussion about the desirability of multi-party discussion to their ULs.

### 3. Open access and Institutional support for transformative models

The group discussed the short-term need for decisions based on BioMed Central, PLoS, Stanford Encyc. Of Philosophy, et al. There is some tension between the utility of guiding principles (as suggested by the discussion paper “UC Libraries Support of Transformative Business Models for Scholarly publishing; DRAFT for SCO Discussion 9/14/04”) and actions that are often based on current economic realities. The need for further discussion about how to effectively wield buying power, how to support and invest in transformative models, and how to change current practice and the possibility and advantages of a joint meeting between SCO, CDC, JSC, and ULs was discussed (see item 2.D. above).

Discussion and a poll confirmed that, for various reasons, no UC libraries were planning to join the Alliance for Taxpayer Access.

**Actions:** Until collective principles are discussed or created, the Office of Scholarly Communication, in cooperation with the Shared Collections Joint Steering Committee will forward proposals for co-investment in open-access resources. The SCO’s will report discussion about the desirability of multi-party discussion to their ULs.

### 4. Process review

The group agreed to meet quarterly, with every other meeting taking place face-to-face. Agenda building can follow the model used for the initial meeting, with OSC offering initial items and members suggesting additions and changes. Until and unless further guidance is given by the ULs, the SCOs will report the outcomes of their meetings individually with their UL. Meeting notes will be posted at <http://libraries.universityofcalifornia.edu/scholarly/sco/> and may be referenced in the OSC section of regular CDL/SLP/OSC reports to ULs.