

## SCO conference call

April 17, 2013

### Meeting Notes

1. **Roll Call:** Margaret Phillips (UCB); Mitchell Brown (UCI, co-chair); Angela Riggio (UCLA); Susan Mikkelsen (UCM, co-chair); Rhonda Neugebauer (UCR); Nancy Stimson (UCSD); Anneliese Taylor (UCSF, notetaker); Sherri Barnes (UCSB); Christy Caldwell (UCSC); Robin Chandler (CDC); Jacqueline Wilson (CDL); Katie Fortney (CDL); Catherine Mitchell (CDL); Joanne Miller (CDL)

2. **Minutes:**

March meeting [minutes](#) were approved.

3. **Announcements:**

- California bill AB 609 hearing postponed to May 1.
- UCOP requested two amendments to AB 609, including one that excludes UC as one of the state agencies implicated. UC researchers receiving funding from one of the state funding agencies, they would comply with the bill. The other amendment was to extend the embargo period to twelve months. Assemblyman Nestande accepted both amendments.
- UCOLASC – revised version of policy; Academic Senate letter drafted to UCOP, requesting resources be committed to support the policy. The letter also asks for clarification from UCOP on the intent of the license, for what uses UC is assuming with the OA policy. Gene Lucas, EVC at UCSB and SLASAC Chair, will be leading the discussion of this issue at the next COVC (Council of Vice Chancellors) meeting. COVC will respond to the Senate letter. UC OA Policy will be voted on in either June or July.
- Laine and Catherine (CDL) are having a discussion with Symplectic tomorrow (April 18). Some interest in Elements database from Academic Personnel at campuses, outside of OA policy. Potential pilot.

4. **CDC Request: Evaluate PLoS membership and other support arrangements with PLoS and other OA publishers**

The PLOS institutional membership is sunsetting end of this year. CDL will be paying the 2013 membership bill shortly. The landscape has changed since original agreement was put in place. PLOS wants to grow their relationships with libraries, not end them.

CDC has asked SCO to:

"..provide feedback on our PLoS membership and other support arrangements with PLoS and other open access publishers and make a recommendation to CDC about whether these are still providing value and should continue, as well as what might be new that should be considered. To start this work, CDC is asking that SCO review the complete "ultimate" version of the Joint CDC/SCO Task Force document "Criteria to Determine the UC's Support for Transformative Scholarly Publishing Models" [[download attachment](#)] and additional documents attached [*see attachments on main SCO page*]. SCO will recall that in Spring of 2008, the public version of the document was shared by Gail Yakote." [March 6, 2013 email from Robin Chandler to SCO]

Questions that came up during the discussion:

- What value do we get from our membership?
- Does PLOS need us as members to continue?
- Would our authors still publish in PLOS journals without the 10% discount?
- Since discount membership model is ending in 2013, should we put those funds into something else? A more effective use of those funds may be to add it to the OA funds. Or to invest it in another kind of membership or model. PeerJ also has institutional members now.

Group members felt it was important to remain visibly supportive of PLOS. Potential collaborations could be: education for UC community on what OA is; faculty outreach; alt metrics workshops.

**ACTION ITEM:** Bring forward ideas on next SCO call about other collaborations. Consult with others as needed before the next call (May 15). Consider also, what other publishers do we want to talk to? Other models aside from APC. We will send our analysis to CDC following the May 15 discussion.

After the call, Susan Mikkelsen sent these questions to help guide our discussion and to come up with our recommendation in response to CDC's request:

1. Given that the original intent of UC/PLoS membership was to "break even" (author discounts roughly equal to membership fees), is it reasonable that PLoS would raise fees annually as greater numbers of UC authors publish and discounts put PLoS in the red? Is this sustainable?
2. Has the OA landscape progressed to the point that our PLoS membership is unnecessary/obsolete?
3. If PLoS is interested in a continued relationship with UC without a fee-based membership, should PLoS be responsible for developing that new model?
4. Would dropping our PLoS membership and eliminating author discounts result in fewer UC authors publishing in PLoS? Does that matter if they are publishing in other OA journals?

5. If PLoS membership monies were redirected to other OA funding programs, what would those be? (A fund designated solely for PLoS publications, additional money for general OA funds, etc.) Would such funds be administered through CDL or by individual campuses?
6. What would you and colleagues from your campus recommend going forward with PLoS?

**5. Updates from Institute on Scholarly Communications workshop prior to ACRL 2013, Indianapolis, April 9-10. (Mitchell)**

Mitchell attended the workshop and will send his notes to the email list.

**6. OA Fund Pilot (All)**

UCSD and UCSF have almost maxed out their funds (with funds committed). One option for stretching the funds further is to be more stringent with awarding funds. Several campuses (SB, SF, M) stipulate that OA journals have to be indexed in DOAJ.

**7. RSC Vouchers (All) - Not discussed**