SCO Meeting Notes

May 15, 2013, 1:00 pm - 2:00 pm

Roll Call (Susan) 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); Mary Wood (UCD); Robin Chandler (CDC); Jacqueline Wilson (CDL); Katie Fortney (CDL); Catherine Mitchell (CDL); Joanne Miller (CDL)
Absent: Margaret Phillips (UCB)

Approve April 2013 Minutes: Approved

Announcements (All)

- Minutes through March are now on public SCO web page. http://libraries.universityofcalifornia.edu/sco/sco-meeting

- Update on California bill AB 609

Mitchell reported that the bill is still in committee. It was totally revised to mirror the CIRM public access policy and now specifically mentions CDL's eScholarship and CSU's California Digital Open Source Repository as examples of repositories where articles may be submitted. Because of the changes to the bill, UC will review it again, and perhaps make clear to the sponsors that eScholarship is not currently prepared to take non-UC deposits. The bill still needs to be voted out of committee. ACTION: Joanne will send the updated fact sheet. (Update: Joanne sent fact sheet and link to the revised bill during the call.)

Open Access Policy - Letter from Provost Dorr to Academic Council Chair Robert Powell (Mitchell)

1.
    1. See emails from Mitchell. UCOLASC and the Academic Council sent a letter to UC administration asking for certain UCOP guarantees regarding the Policy. The May 6 response from Provost Aimee Dorr largely complies with the request. It includes an agreement to provide funding for eScholarship to increase its workload. The plan is for an expedited campus review, followed by an Academic Council vote in July. There is definitely some optimism that the changes address concerns that have been expressed in the earlier reviews, including those about copyright issues for included images. This issue is now addressed by allowing for true opt out choice. If the July vote is positive, there should be funding to develop a robust implementation model for 3 campuses: UCSF and 2 others. eScholarship is moving forward with an RFP for a harvesting vendor as a

pilot, then would seek the funding the next fiscal year to extend to all campuses.
   2. Question about to what extent campus libraries are involved in campus discussions on the OA issue. Discussion pointed out the ranges of how much library involvement varies among the campuses..

UC Libraries statement for NAS Planning Meetings

   1.
      1. Statement from ULs that is helpful to reference. ACTION: Susan will add to wiki

CDC Request: Evaluate PLoS membership and other support arrangements with PLoS and other OA publishers (PeerJ)

   1.
      1. Since our last call, PLoS agreed to a renewal of our membership for 2013 at $55,000. They are 'working on a different program' for 2014 forward.
      2. Analysis of PLoS and other OA publishers (Dove Medical Press, Peerj, etc.)

Discussion Questions

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?

Has the OA landscape progressed to the point that our PLoS membership is unnecessary/obsolete?

If PLoS is interested in a continued relationship with UC without a fee-based membership, should PLoS be responsible for developing that new model?

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?

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?

What would you and colleagues from your campus recommend going forward with PLoS?

Discussion:

Still would be valuable to articulate what kind of model UC would like to see. A brief analysis of the program, what was useful, what not. Some other possible models that might serve the UC community. What is the extent of a reasonable amount of UC support. Consider approaching PLoS to draft joint white papers on Open Access, help fund studies related to open access publishing, addressing the sustainability question.

> Should the $55,000 for PLoS be shifted to other OA initiatives. What about PeerJ? and Dove?
>
> Consensus that it is important to building a portfolio of investment in diversified models to support OA
>
> Sense that there was very limited awareness among faculty of the library support for PLoS. Maybe they became aware when they actually paid the fees. But the library support has not seemed to be a motivator to submit to PLoS journals. Now that PLoS has determined that the library support is not advantageous to them to continue. Consider using the funds used for PLoS to support other open access publishing.
>
> PeerJ is a very different model that could work across disciplines. Some concern that they are so new, Binfield is visiting various campuses. Report back that yes, SCO interested in exploring PeerJ.
>
> > ACTION: Susan will draft report to send back to CDC on PLoS and the broader issue of using funds to support OA initiatives.

Open Access Theses and Dissertations (OATD.org): Request from Sherri that the campuses that make their ETDs publicly available share language, policies, or FAQs the library and graduate division use to support OA ETD programs. It was noted that there has been very uneven pickup on OA ETD's with Graduate Schools. UCLA now working on takedown policy.

ACTION: SCO's will post campus ETD policies on wiki.