Attendees:

> Sherri Barnes - UCSB
> Christy Caldwell - UCSC
> Beth Callahan - UCD
> Trisha Cruse - CDL
> Sharon Farb - UCLA
> Ann Frenkel - UCR (Coordinating committee rep)
> Diane Gurman - UCLA - LAUC rep
> David Minor - UCSD
> Catherine Mitchell - CDL -
> Erik Mitchell - UCB
> John Renaud - UCI
> Colby Riggs - UCI - Portfolio Manager
> Anneliese Taylor - UCSF

Announcements:
- OpenCon 2014 Scholarships -- spread the word! CDL is sponsoring someone and UCLA two people. Please encourage people to register and see if we can sponsor them. Ann - UCR doesn't have local sponsorship yet, could a registrant get a UC scholarship? A: potentially - they can apply for it via the website site, and then a candidate will be selected. Q: do we know if this will be an annual thing, so we can plan for it? A: Not sure on the funding side. Perhaps it's something that SAG1 could be involved in. They are hoping that the OpenCon will happen again, but still TBD at the moment. Trisha will put an "ad" together that will be shared with us.

- Coordinating committee report -

- The ULs are hiring a consultant to facilitate and manage the assessment of the UCLAS. The CC and SAG chairs have had a chance to review the draft plan for the consultant. Looks like the consultant will work with the CC to administer surveys to all members of the UCLAS. Consultant will analyze the data, document the process and make recommendations for next steps. Target completion date is November 30, so likely starting by September 1. Q: Is there a specific set of questions that CoUL is asking? Or is it just a general assessment? A: it's just a general assessment. The CC drafted a list of questions and shared it with CoUL, and they were folded into what was given to the consultant.

- A timeline of UL meetings and the process for updates and questions to go to the ULs and get

it on their agendas will be coming out.

- Documentation of the process for people leaving and being replaced on the SAGS will be coming out.

Discussion topics:
1. New Data Curation CKG
    a. Charter: http://libraries.universityofcalifornia.edu/groups/files/ckg/docs/UCDataCuration_CKG_Charter.pdf
    b. Comments, questions, etc. - Let's make sure we invite the co-chairs from the group to attend a meeting(s) and work closely with them as we look at our proceses.

2. Knowledge Unlatched Pilot, next steps
    a. Doc for review
    b. The CLS membership agrees with the pre-implementation group and thinks 28 monographs is not sufficient to assess the larger impacts of the KU pilot. We also believe that usage for open access titles may not be the easiest or best indicator of success.
    c. The CLS membership agreed that we could support this endeavor. They are asking JSC to come up with a proposed cost share model for the campuses to consider.
    d. Does SAG 1 want to continue with KU for round 2? (not yet launched, but in the works)
    e. Does SAG 1 think this is a good project to continue to support?
    f. Kerry Scott's points:
        g. **I think the biggest questions are:**
            i. do we want to do this again in the next round?
            ii. will campuses contribute to participate in the next round?
        h. **Reasons we may not want to:**
            i. is the inability to deduplicate content (from approval profiles) in a timely way (the refund process), too onerous for campuses?
            ii. did SCP have issues or concerns related to the MARC records? the project overall?
            iii. is the fact that usage data is currently only by

country (see attached) and that usage data will continue to be tricky given the open nature of the titles, a deal breaker?

  i. **Reasons we may want to:**

    i. is the greater good nature of this project and the nascent understanding of whether this will be a transformative model, reason enough to pay for year two?

j. The real challenge is at the campus level, it wasn't always clear whether it was worth supporting.

k. The UC rep for this project should be working with KU to address these issues. This also includes the relative lack of quality of the records.

l. It would be good for the Transformative Models Group to also hear what kinds of things are going on in the processes.

m. It's likely that if SAG1 recommended to wait and see where KU goes, there likely won't be heartbreak in CLS. (Also wouldn't be heartbreak if the recommendation was the opposite.)

n. UC should have someone on the KU steering committee to represent our perspective and share the kinds of issues that are coming up and assure their resolution.

o. We're supporting the concept and the idea, with some disappointment in the actual implementation.

p. WE do need to be looking broadly at other open publishing models (e.g. PEERJ, arXiv, etc.) - this is being looked at by the group Annaliese is on.

3. Open Access Publishing Fund Pilot Assessment Report

  a. Doc for review

  b. NB recommendation is on p. 14 if doc is TLDR.

    c. Main rec: UC needs to figure out whether an open access model is truly sustainable

4. Comments? Official SAG1 response?

    a. The questions were quantitative, rather than qualitative. e.g. even if the sustainability could be solved, is it worth pursuing - was it actually transformative? Annaliese has been thinking of doing a qualitative survey of her local researchers.

    b. Noted that there weren't many Arts and Humanities applicants. (May have to do with the journal publishing types in those fields.)

    c. Also note that in the reports, there's not a detailed / nuanced discussion of why applications may have been rejected.

       d.   Question of whether CDL will continue with the request for a match from CDL. We should recommend that it continues. We should ask Jackie this question since it doesn't appear in the report.

       e.   At SF this fund generated a bunch of questions and issues for discussion. They'd like to look at what this means for the UC to support these issues, and what might it mean to do it at a larger scale. What's the ultimate goal and how do we achieve it?

5. Shared Metadata Policy from SAG2 (David's email on 7/14)
   a. Working on final draft and will send in the next two weeks
   b. Update from Patti Martin: May I suggest this? SAG 1 accepts the draft report when I send it out, and then arranges with the co-chairs (Louise Ratliff and Claudia Hornung) to attend a SAG 1 meeting for discussion before further circulation. In other words, I don't see any reason why you can't shape the process further to suit your own wishes.

6. OSC Update -
   a. They are looking at the OSC workplan. This is planned to be shared with SAG1 during our Sep 5 meeting.

7. OA Policy implementation update
   a. Test instances of Symplectic's Elements have been implemented for the three initial campuses (Irvine; LA, SF). Faculty "testers" of the Elements system are being interviewed this week and next by CDL/eScholarship staff, identifying areas that need to be addressed before Elements is released broadly to Academic Senate faculty at UCI, UCLA, & UCSF.

8. Symplectic campus visits
   a. UCSC had about 10 people in person in attendance (4 librarians, 1 AUL, our UL and 4 people from Academic Personnel Office) and online Susan, Kerry Scott, and Justin Gonder. Really lively meeting, and we have a followup meeting with us and APO representatives end of August.
   b. UCB likewise had good attendance ~30 people including faculty from the Library faculty advising committee University IT. We had an animated discussion around versions of OA articles and the issues associated with pre/post prints, author copies as well as issues surrounding publications with content that has copyright issues (e.g. History of Art publications may feature images that were licensed for

publishing in a journal, cost might increase in an OA model).

    c. UCD had the presentation for OA Support group, Collection Strategist department and DUL and did not circulate the invitation widely. The discussion was good and I feel as though the discussion contributed to a greater understanding to the entire process for the group.

    d. There was also a presentation at UCOP focused more on systemwide things. There were people from the grants office who were interested in how they might be able to use the tool for tracking.

9. UC Code camp --
    a. Message to participants:

Hello code camp attendees!

It's about a month before UC Code Camp, and we have some updates and info for you:

(1) We've set up a website for the event at http://CDLUC3.github.io/UC-code-camp. The site includes logistics information, a list of attendees, and a draft agenda. Check it out!

(2) We want you to help us plan the agenda! Submit your ideas. See ideas others have submitted here.

(3) We are planning to have some "Dork Shorts" to kick off the camp. These are intended to be very brief lightning talks that introduce your campus, your projects, your tools, et cetera. **We need at least one volunteer from each campus to present a Dork Short**. Please volunteer by emailing Marisa Strong at marisa.strong@ucop.edu.

(4) We want to emphasize that this event will be focused on coding, development, and hacking for UC libraries projects and beyond. If that's not your bag, feel free to send me an email and I will cancel your order. No hard feelings!

---

10. Systemwide ORCID licensing?
    a. ORCID was presented to the ULs at their December meeting. ANDS has developed a good case study on the use of ORCIDs for data. We have incorporated ORCID into the DMPTool and have (or will) add it to Dash.

    b. We could invite Lisa Schiff to our next meeting and she could provide background on ORCID at UC. Perhaps we want to suggest a consortial approach to the ULs.

11. Transformative Scholarly Publishing Models Criteria Group (Ivy Anderson, Jackie Wilson, Christy Hightower, Nancy Stimson, Anneliese Taylor) have met by conference call twice and have started the process of updating the 2005 & 2008 criteria documents. Weekly calls are scheduled through August with the hope of completing a draft of the revised criteria document by then. After the criteria document is revised and approved, the group will move on to applying the new document to proposed publishing models.