

SCO Meeting Notes

Wednesday, May 16, 2012

1:00 – 2:00 pm

Minute taker: Susan Mikkelsen (M) - subbing for UCR

Present: Mitchell Brown (Irvine), Martha Hruska (SD), Susan Mikkelsen (Merced), Joanne Miller (CDL), Catherine Mitchell (CDL), Margaret Phillips (Berkeley), Angela Riggio (UCLA), Anneliese Taylor (SF), Mary Wood (Davis) Sherri Barnes (SB).

1. Announcements & News

UC Riverside SCO representative

Still no word on the new UCR SCO. Martha will follow up again with UCR.

Web site review (Martha)

Rachael Hu (CDL) will get back to our group to get us to sign off on the changes made to the SCO site.

UCSF Open Access Policy (Anneliese)

The OA policy is coming up for a vote next Monday with UCSF faculty academic senate. The chancellor will be speaking at the meeting so they anticipate good attendance. Documentation was previously sent to faculty and available on library webpage. Anneliese will send us a link to the page. There have been letters of support from some campus committees. There must be a quorum to take a vote, but only a majority vote is needed to pass it.

The UCSF policy came up at the CDC all-day meeting earlier this week. There was discussion about having an infrastructure in place that could handle this if the policy is passed.

Catherine mentioned that CDL is working with UCSF to implement some kind of proof of concept. This will help begin a discussion on the complexities of implementation. What are we looking for in terms of assessment of such a program?

Mitchell mentioned that at the UCOLASC meeting on the 25th Chris Kelty asked for letters from individual campuses about their positions on the OA issue. This ties in with vote at UCSF. This may help push forward other local campus discussions.

New UL UCD

Mackenzie Smith will start June 1, 2012.

2. Approval of April Minutes

Thank you to Joanne for taking notes. Minutes were approved. Martha will get them moved to the website.

3. Updates

CDC discussion of OA proposal (Martha)

CDC met Monday. The OA proposal was high on the agenda, but the arrival of guests from UC press cut the discussion short. Consequently there is no final answer on the proposal; the discussion will be continued at the June CDC meeting. Overall, CDC's reception to the proposal was positive but there are some questions. Sharon Farb (UCLA) asked whether the SCO task force looked at subsidizing fees for OA monographs. Their Office of Research feels like the south campus has so much money they can already get grant funding and are not interested in partnering unless they did it for the North side. Margaret mentioned that the proposal was written in such a way as to allow that kind of freedom. In humanities there is more fear of OA publishing. These areas that lack awareness of OA may be places for good conversation, which is one of the goals of the pilot program.

Margaret mentioned that the pilot has multiple goals; along with starting the OA conversation, another goal is to get UC publications out there. However, the limited amount of funding raises the significance of the goal to start the OA discussion.

Mitchell asked if the UC Press presentation from the CDC meeting would be made available to the SCOs. There was no formal presentation, but once the CDC meeting notes are posted we will have access to them. Martha mentioned that the UC Press seems focused on subscriptions and marketing to libraries, and regard libraries as consumers rather than partners.

Margaret mentioned that the SCOs face a potential workload if/when the policy goes through and voiced concern that the delay by CDC could impact the implementation timeline. The initial hope was to get this done this summer. Assuming that a final decision will come by their next meeting (June 8th) will this give SCOs enough time for summer implementation? BRI model was offered up as a model to be adapted and used by other campuses. Once CDC makes a decision it will need to go to CDL; there seems to be general CDL support. CoULs will also need to be involved.

ACTION ITEM: Martha will let CDC know that we're hoping for a timely decision.

UCLA ebook task force - (Angela)

The UCLA's ebook value statement was shared and very well received at the CDC meeting. There was agreement that using the principles outlined in the document as a model for a systemwide statement will probably be an action item in the future. On a local level it will be sent to UCLA communications director for final approval. The question of whether the CDL ebook task force being made aware of this document came up. This group was looking at systemwide acquisition of ebooks, lending issues, etc. Yes, they are aware; they are the group that will be looking at the UCLA document for a model.

CDL updates: eScholarship journals (Catherine)

CDL has been evaluating escholarship service and how to bring the most value to the system. There has been enormous growth with the number of groups who want to start journals. Is the "take-all-comers" model still the right model? Publisher status has focused on providing the technical infrastructure of OA journals, but no editorial or production services. The more robust, mature journals have needs that escholarship can't meet now. Indexing, resources for outsourcing editorial and production work, business modeling for submission fees, etc. There is concern that as the service grows there is support for breadth, but not depth. CDL is considering a vetting process based on the maturity of the journal similar to a grant proposal. There would be an application process to gather information on the journal and how it was structured. This would help CDL plan their resources better. Martha asked if the application would be like a checklist or survey of journal editors. It would a form to gather background information on the journal.

Anneliese asked how journals are currently managing copyediting. They are using grad students or contracted copy editors. CDL could provide referrals for these types of editing services. Indexing is also important. Larger more mature journals have multiple indexes they would like to be included in. There is an application process with indexers that eScholarship could help with, but would need to create a new service to do so. Would SCOs feel better about recommending eScholarship if some of these services were available?

Some journals fold because they don't really know what they're getting into. A fuller suite of services could help lure faculty to publish OA. Semiannual release dates might also make it a more reputable platform. Do we really need more OA journals, or should established journals be moving to an OA platform? Some people who have published with bepress are unhappy that it was bought by DeGruyter. They might consider using eScholarship if additional resources were in place. These would need to be tiered, fee-based services.

OA critics have asked how much UC system spends on subsidizing OA platforms. Why not just put that money towards paying for the journal price increases?

ACTION ITEM: Catherine will work with her group to come up with a description of services, fee schedule, talking points, etc. Will bring back to the group for comment.

Open Access to data: management, storage, responsibility - Royal Society of Chemistry (Mitchell)

This was discussed a bit at the CDC meeting. There was a sense that we don't want publishers to be responsible for owning the data. UCSD is telling researchers that the data they create needs to be in a repository and managed.

Mitchell will track some of the related conversations going on in various societies.