SCO Meeting Notes May 6, 2009

Marcus Banks, Donald Barclay, Kuei Chiu (Guest, UCR), Sharon Farb, Martha Hruska, Janice Contini, Catherine Mitchell, Mary Page, Gail Persily, Margaret Phillips, Barbara Schaeder, Jackie Wilson,

 Not attending: Robin Dale, Brad Eden, Lorelei Tanji

1. Gail announced that Margaret Phillips agreed to serve as SCO co-chair for the next 2 years.

2. The SCO wiki is live and everyone has been able to access it so far. We will tweak it as we go and hope for maximum utility. An RSS feed from Open Access News has stopped working, but UCSF's tech support is working on getting it working again.

3. Communication & Organization

- Janice summarized what she learned from discussions with Laine Farley and John Ober: Relationship between SCO Group and UCOP:
    - Personnel from the Office of Scholarly Communication and Library Planning are now part of the California Digital Library.
        - Laine Farley is very supportive of the scholarly communication activity and will serve as the primary contact person for the SCO Group for any advocacy issues.
            - She will assist by facilitating the action needed or by informing the group of the appropriate path and people to contact.
            - The SCO group will need to draft any documents required, such as letters.
            - Since the Office of Scholarly Communication no longer exists, she would like the report to include a recommendation for a new name for this activity. (It's necessary for the Reshaping website.)

Sharon Farb raised the concern that we are still left with a large communication gap in this decentralized model. The risk of missed opportunities for action on advocacy and other areas is high. SCOs agreed that the best approach is to be very explicit in the report that Janice prepares regarding 1) what we can realistically accomplish in this model, 2) what we cannot expect to accomplish, and 3) what resources are needed to fill that gap.

ACTION ITEM: Janice will include this in her report.

 Further discussed how to determine what the expectations are of leadership. What do they expect the SCOs can accomplish without the support of an OSC?

ACTION ITEM: Gail will draft a memo to SOPAG (via our liaison Gail Yokote) to ask them these questions. Gail will get input from Sharon on the memo and share with the group.

4. Website review

- Janice reported on the work reviewing the OSC website:
  - The group is working on the following:
    - Elise Proulx is getting traffic statistics for the site.
    - Catherine Mitchell requested and received a crawl of the site's live pages and Janice has created a spreadsheet with that data for the site review.
    - Bonnie Tijerina is pulling together some use cases they used for the UCLA website revision. (to help us determine the purpose and audience and stakeholders)
  - The website review report will be completed by mid-June, however it's content will be outlined in the main report.
- Janice also reported that CDL can provide tech support for website revisions and production, but the SCOs need to create the content.
- Janice asked for input from the SCOs regarding the purpose and audience of this website.
- ACTION ITEM: Janice will contact the SCOs and request input on these questions.

5. Springer Update

- Jackie reported on the work of the Springer Open Access Pilot Task Force on an assessment plan.
- UC authors lists were distributed to the SCOs via email so we could get an idea of how much our faculty are publishing in these journals. The lists do not contain all the data fields that we would like; Jackie & Ivy working on getting the needed fields in the reports from Springer.
- Discussion of how to use these lists at our campuses. Suggestions included: SCOs contact authors and make sure they know about the program; tell them this program also means their article will be in eScholarship.
- Talking points have been updated; added a few items to clarify the coverage of Springer journals - beyond STM. Added that authors are free to use articles on course websites.
- Mary suggested the talking points emphasize saving faculty the $3000 for Open Choice. Agreement that this was a good idea.
- Jackie reported that they are talking to Springer regularly - working on evaluation with them and also trying to get a list of UC authors who participated in Open Choice last year so we can contact them for outreach.
- A discussion took place about how to define UC affiliated authors for the purpose of using the Springer open access pilot. It was recommended that we have a simple policy with few exceptions. One idea for the Task Force to consider is that

only individuals on official employment or student lists be able to participate. The SCO's concurred that this topic should be discussed with HOPS and other UC groups before being decided. The Task Force working with Gail Persily will discuss how to get input from other UC Libraries groups.

ACTION ITEM: Jackie will take Mary's suggestion back and work on incorporating it into the talking points and into FAQ as well. The latest talking points are available on the SCO wiki.

6. UC recommended author's rights agenda

Discussed the desire to provide UC faculty with a copyright transfer addendum that is customized for UC. Martha proposed this wording to ensure deposit in eScholarship.

<Publisher> acknowledges that <Authors> retain the right to provide a copy of the final peer-reviewed manuscript in the institutional repository (UC eScholarship) upon acceptance for Journal publication.

SCOs agreed that an addendum with the above statement would be very helpful. eScholarship could link to it from their site, as well as it being on the OSC website. Other models were mentioned as options to look at: MIT's addenda generator and Science commons addenda generator.

ACTION ITEM: Martha will post this suggestion on the wiki page so we can return to it once the website review is complete.