

# June 2012 Meeting Notes

SCO Call  
June 27, 2012  
1:00-2:00 pm

Minute Taker: Susan Mikkelsen (UCM)

Present: Margaret Phillips (UCB), Raquel Abad (UCD), Mitchell Brown(UCI), Lisa Federer (UCLA), Susan Mikkelsen (UCM ), Martha Hruska (UCSD), Sherri Barnes(UCSB), Katie Fortney (UCSC), Joanne Miller (CDL)

## May Minutes

**ACTION ITEM** – Martha will send a link for approval of May Minutes. Send corrections to Susan.

## Announcements

No announcements

## Update on OA Fund Proposal

The OA proposal is moving forward. CDL is basically accepting the proposal with some suggested edits. Margaret is working with Ivy on these. CDL wants us to spell out that it's not just about article fees and charges, that campuses like UCLA could use funds for other OA activities, e.g. using OA materials in the classroom. There are some branding issues that are also being worked out.

Next steps: Send revised document to SCOs and CDC for approval as official proposal of record. After that, develop an implementation plan.

Campus contributions: if campuses are asking for the \$10,000, the campus minimum investment is \$5,000.

The subgroup who worked on the original proposal will be reconvened to work out details for implementation and outreach. Others who are interested could also be included. Is it possible to have this done by the July 18<sup>th</sup> call?

Goal is to have something official to roll out by Open Access Week, October 22-28, 2012. We need to have materials to CDC for approval by early August. Goal is to have generalized materials available by early September so that campuses have time to customize and be ready to roll out during OA Week.

## Update on UCSF Open Access Policy (see Anneliese Taylor email 6/26)

Have there been similar actions on other UC campuses?

**Margaret** – Publishers are going to be confused when they hear that UCSF has an OA policy, they may assume that all UC campuses are included.

**Mitchell** – UCOLASC report. Policy is being taken to the faculty senate. If council agrees, they will present it to the full senate. They've decided not to include mandate in the APM because of concerns that there might be disciplinary actions taken against faculty who don't follow the policy. Instead the faculty senate would ask UCOP to issue a presidential directive. Not sure if faculty senate will accept this. So the policy would be enforced by the OP, but noncompliance would not result in disciplinary action since it's not in the APM. There was a question about how much the entire faculty is aware of UCOLASC discussions.

**Joanne** –Scholarly Communications page now has some information about the UCSF OA mandate. Page will have additional updates/changes soon. There is now a link to [UCSF Open Access Policy](#). PDF will be taken down soon.

**ACTION ITEM:** Revisit this during our July call.

## Update on Scholarly Communications discussions at ALA (SPARC, etc)

Scholarly Communications discussion group at ALA ended up being about Georgia State.

Chuck Eckman spoke about UCB and had a lot of good guidelines. Discussion: OA funds tend to favor some disciplines. Requests vary greatly on different campuses. To what extent does this really change the model? Is it just a redirection of funds? There was some discussion about whether to support hybrid journals. Harvard does not, but other campuses do. UCB only provides \$1500 toward hybrid journal articles and most faculty are not willing to put up the rest of the money.

**ACTION ITEM** - Margaret will request the slides from Chuck.

Question: if OA Fund pilot is successful, where will future OA funds come from? Collections budgets? UCB has used collection funds. Rutgers has been taking this issue of funding OA to their faculty senate to broaden the discussion and make them aware of the issues.

## Sage Open

Ivy has asked whether there is interest in following up on SAGE OPEN. Berkeley is moving forward because they feel that it is serving social

scientists who aren't served in other ways. UCI and UCM are interested in learning more. UCLA decided that it doesn't really benefit the humanities, only social scientists.

**Update on eScholarship** (see Catherine Mitchell 6/25 email)

Ran out of time to discuss.

**ACTION ITEM:** Revisit this during our July call.