

Meeting Notes 2011 March

SCO Conference Call notes

March 2, 2011

Attending: Martha Hruska (SD, chair), Brad Eden (SB), Susan Mikkelsen (M), Karen Andrews (D), Joanne Miller (CDL), Rhonda (Riverside), Lorelei Tanji (I), Anneliese Taylor (SF, notes),

Announcements

- HOTS wiki – Berkeley, Davis, Riverside, and San Diego can log in to the UCSF wiki using their local campus log-ins; other campuses require a guest UCSF MyAccess account
- Amer Chem Society now has an Open Choice option. Author fees, sliding scale: \$1,000 - \$3,000 (lowest=member; highest = non-ACS member)
- Karen is now interim, temporary Head of Biological & Agricultural Sciences Dept at Shields Library (in addition to Head of Physical Sciences & Engineering Library) .

Process and goals for a shared author fee pool (Martha)

- CDC planning an in-person meeting March 11. Agenda includes scholarly communications; how to articulate areas that SCO should be addressing. Likely topics: author fees. Budgetary commitments, carved out of collection funds. SCOAP document (below) lays out some of the philosophy. Discussion about thoughts about feasibility of doing a systemwide author fee fund; not all campuses think this would work.
- Perhaps SCO needs to explore alternative models first (La Jolla Manifesto, ARL studies into [new publication models](#) – other ways to publish research). There is much SC discussion going on, but the library not always involved. SCO would perform a review of transformative models, delve into pros and cons; which ones we want to offer incentives for. Faculty are asking for this kind of guidance. Including actions like educating our authors on retaining copyright so that they can make their articles OA. Issues to include: institutional culture around pressure to publish & where to publish.
- Corollary to Reshaping SC site – Characteristics of Scholarly Publishing – having such a chart to lay out the various models and their pros and cons would be a goal of such a review.
- Plan of action: use wiki space to add information about models. Anyone may select a particular model and develop the information. As a group, on calls, we'll discuss how we want to promote particular models.

Action Item: SCO group will create a page on the wiki space for a review of Scholarly Communication Models. Individual members will populate the space with information about the models. After discussion we'll then create a succinct table (akin to [Characteristics of Scholarly Publishing Options](#)) to summarize the aspects of the models for the UC community.

UC Discounts on Article Publication Charges (Joanne) – postpone until next call

SLASAC Planning TF [Action Memo Draft 5](#), **UC and the System of Scholarly Publishing** (Joanne, all)

Each action memo was a summary of discussion. For OA, a much more detailed document was written. For example – ideas such as: direct half of collection budget toward funding new resources, and how much that could save down the road on inflationary costs. To save money, takes money.

Audience for this report is the executive vice chancellors, since it's about funding, budgets.

Chair of UC Committee on Library & Schol Comm (UCOLASC) is enthusiastic about transforming school comm.

Initial push for policy for faculty to retain copyright; faculty misunderstood and thought they were being asked to give copyright to UC. Now, there is better understanding.

We need to be proactive and push UC administration and faculty at the upper end; fundamental change has to happen from there. Other factors affecting change:

- Economy may push changes, not the desire to change from within.
- Legislation – NSF and NIH mandates for sharing publicly funded research data. Other mandates will follow

[CDL SCOAP contribution discussion](#) - not enough time to get to this