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AGENDA

1. Approval of the March 21, 2013 Meeting Minutes (Attachment 1)
2. Chair’s Report — R. Schneider
3. Report from University Committee on Library and Scholarly Communication — R. Cucina
4. University Librarian Report — K. Butter
5. Update on UC Press — Alison Muddit, and George Rutherford, UC Press
6. Discussion of Predatory Journals (Attachment 2)
7. Analyst Update
8. Old Business
9. New Business

Senate Staff:
Shilpa Patel, Senior Analyst
shilpa.patel@ucsf.edu, 415/514-2696
The Committee on Library and Scholarly Communication (COLASC) was called to order by Chair Schneider on March 21, 2013 at 10:07 a.m. in room CL 201. A quorum was present.

Minutes of the January 17, 2013 Meeting
The minutes of the January 17, 2013 minutes were approved as amended.

Chair’s Report
Chair Schneider had these announcements:
• Richard Price, CEO of Academia.edu is here to discuss the metrics of Open Access as this the next phase of implementation for the UCSF Open Access Policy
• Chair Schneider has been invited to serve on a systemwide committee focusing on metrics.
• The next meeting of the Committee will feature an update from UC Press.
• At the last meeting of the year, we will invite Catherine Mitchell from the California Digital Library (CDL) to give an update on where the repository is as they are planning to go live with the new features on July 1.

University Committee on Library and Scholarly Communication (UCOLASC)
Vice Chair Cucina had these announcements from UCOLASC:
• UCOLASC met on February 22nd. The entire agenda was to review and debate feedback from local committees on the Open Access policy. There was a remarkable diversity of opinion on the drafting and adopting of a systemwide Open Access Policy. Most of the concerns are related to specificity in that certain things that are implied should be explicit. The two major points of contention are structural changes:
  o The UCSF Open Access Policy allows faculty to waive the grant of license; however, they cannot waive the deposit requirement. So effectively, if a faculty member chooses to grant rights to the publisher, the faculty member is still depositing to the University of California and the work is kept in a dark repository so as to not violate the granting of the license to the publisher. The question being asked is: Should the depository requirement be waived? According to Vice Chair Cucina, the Policy is unlikely to pass unless the depository requirement is waived. He noted that this concern comes mostly from disciplines such as Art History, Literature, Medieval Studies, etc., as those papers often contain multiple copyrights.
Since the University of California has this non-exclusive, pre-existing right, can the University commercialize that work without the participation of the author – either scholastically or financially? Does there to be specific language regarding commercialization? The UCSF Open Access Policy does state that the works cannot be sold. At the systemwide level, this language was taken out; however after much discussion, most are in favor of reinserting the language.

- In terms of next steps, the Policy will be returning to local committees for further review. Also of note, this policy is only binding on Academic Senate members. For all faculty to be included, the Office of the President (OP) will have to enact a separate policy. It is unclear whether OP will enact such a policy.
- The Federal Bill Fair Access to Science and Technology Research Act (FASTR) was enacted to make NIH-like policy more broadly applicable across federal funders. Currently, the California Legislature has an assembly bill pending that would require any work produced by a state employee in their role, be made publicly available. The bill is broadly written and is in the process of being revised.
- An executive directive came from the President's Office of Science and Technology Policy directing all federal agencies who fund research above a certain level to propose a policy that is similar to the NIH policy. The agencies have 6 months to propose a policy and 18 months until implementation.
- UCSF COLASC Response
  - Motion: Vice Chair Cucina moved that the COLASC vote in support of reinserting language pertaining to non-commercial use. COLASC accepts the addition of the ability for faculty to waive their deposit requirement. COLASC does not anticipate changing the current language that was passed at UCSF. COLASC unanimously approved the motion.

University Librarian’s Report
K. Butter had these announcements:

- "The Living Room" on the main floor of the Parnassus Campus Library is now open. This space is an informal, multipurpose space. It features comfortable furniture, new carpeting, and artwork; computers and printers for UCSF students and personnel; three group study areas; a popular reading collection; and eventually, a coffee cart. This was funded from some patent revenue the Library received a few years ago.
- At an earlier committee meeting, it was requested that the committee be updated on Special Collections and Archives. Polina Ilieva, UCSF Archivist, explained what the archives are, what is housed in the archives, and the role of the Library. The mission is to identify, preserve, collect, and provide access to unique materials to support research and teaching in the history of health sciences and UCSF. A full list of what is available in Special Collections and Archives can be found here: http://www.library.ucsf.edu/collections/archives

Open Access: New Metrics for Evaluating Faculty Productivity and Contributions -- Dr. Richard Price, Founder and CEO, Academia.edu
Dr. Price introduced Academia. Academia.edu is a platform for academics to share research papers. The company's mission is to accelerate the world's research.

Academics use Academia.edu to share their research, monitor deep analytics around the impact of their research, and track the research of academics they follow. 2,517,660 academics have signed up to Academia.edu, adding 1,650,579 papers and 724,821 research interests. Academia.edu attracts over 5 million unique visitors a month.

Metrics
Academia.edu is uses social signals as the metric to determine what research is of value. The most common metric used is audience metrics – how many people are viewing your work. Analytics give a deeper breakdown of the impact of your work. For example, when a member’s work or name is searched using google, Academia.edu can produce where the query came from, what keywords were used, and even what pages were viewed. Academia.edu can also generate maps to let members know where in the world their work is having most impact.

Business Model
Currently, the company is being funded through venture capital. The long term plan for monetizing the site is via R&D of large pharmaceutical companies. Pharmaceutical companies spend millions of dollars a month on R&D. Currently, R&D relies on impact metrics which take about 2-3 years. Academia.edu hopes to help R&D get a better sense of what is trending around them in real time.
**Old Business**
None.

**New Business**
None.

There being no further business, Chair Schneider adjourned the meeting at 11:11am.
Scientific Articles Accepted (Personal Checks, Too)

By GINA KOLATA

The scientists who were recruited to appear at a conference called Entomology-2013 thought they had been selected to make a presentation to the leading professional association of scientists who study insects.

But they found out the hard way that they were wrong. The prestigious, academically sanctioned conference they had in mind has a slightly different name: Entomology 2013 (without the hyphen). The one they had signed up for featured speakers who were recruited by e-mail, not vetted by leading academics. Those who agreed to appear were later charged a hefty fee for the privilege, and pretty much anyone who paid got a spot on the podium that could be used to pad a résumé.

“I think we were duped,” one of the scientists wrote in an e-mail to the Entomological Society.

Those scientists had stumbled into a parallel world of pseudo-academia, complete with prestigiously titled conferences and journals that sponsor them. Many of the journals and meetings have names that are nearly identical to those of established, well-known publications and events.

Steven Goodman, a dean and professor of medicine at Stanford and the editor of the journal Clinical Trials, which has its own imitators, called this phenomenon “the dark side of open access,” the movement to make scholarly publications freely available.

The number of these journals and conferences has exploded in recent years as scientific publishing has shifted from a traditional business model for professional societies and organizations built almost entirely on subscription revenues to open access, which relies on authors or their backers to pay for the publication of papers online, where anyone can read them.

Open access got its start about a decade ago and quickly won widespread acclaim. The advent of well-regarded, peer-reviewed journals like those published by the PLoS, known as PubMed, which are maintained by the National Library of Medicine, and selected for their quality.
But some researchers are now raising the alarm about what they see as the proliferation of online journals that will print seemingly anything for a fee. They warn that nonexperts doing online research will have trouble distinguishing credible research from junk. “Most people don’t know the journal universe,” Dr. Goodman said. “They will not know from a journal’s title if it is for real or not.”

Researchers also say that universities are facing new challenges in assessing the résumés of academics. Are the publications they list in highly competitive journals or ones masquerading as such? And some academics themselves say they have found it difficult to disentangle themselves from these journals once they mistakenly agree to serve on their editorial boards.

The phenomenon has caught the attention of Nature, one of the most competitive and well-regarded scientific journals. In a news report published recently, the journal noted “the rise of questionable operators” and explored whether it was better to blacklist them or to create a “white list” of those open-access journals that meet certain standards. Nature included a checklist on “how to perform due diligence before submitting to a journal or a publisher.”

Jeffrey Beall, a research librarian at the University of Colorado in Denver, has developed his own blacklist of what he calls “predatory open-access journals.” There were 20 publishers on his list in 2010, and now there are more than 300. He estimates that there are as many as 4,000 predatory journals today, at least 25 percent of the total number of open-access journals.

“It’s almost like the word is out,” he said. “This is easy money, very little work, a low barrier start-up.”

Journals on what has become known as “Beall’s list” generally do not post the fees they charge on their Web sites and may not even inform authors of them until after an article is submitted. They barrage academics with e-mail invitations to submit articles and to be on editorial boards.

One publisher on Beall’s list, Avens Publishing Group, even sweetened the pot for those who agreed to be on the editorial board of The Journal of Clinical Trails & Patenting, offering 20 percent of its revenues to each editor.

One of the most prolific publishers on Beall’s list, Srinubabu Gedela, the director of the Omics Group, has about 250 journals and charges authors as much as $2,700 per paper. Dr. Gedela, who lists a Ph.D. from Andhra University in India, says on his Web site that he “learnt to devise wonders in biotechnology.”

Open-access publishers say that the papers they publish are reviewed and that their businesses are legitimate and ethical.
“There is no compromise on quality review policy,” Dr. Gedela wrote in an e-mail. “Our team’s hard work and dedicated services to the scientific community will answer all the baseless and defamatory comments that have been made about Omics.”

But some academics say many of these journals’ methods are little different from spam e-mails offering business deals that are too good to be true.

Paulino Martínez, a doctor in Celaya, Mexico, said he was gullible enough to send two articles in response to an e-mail invitation he received last year from The Journal of Clinical Case Reports. They were accepted. Then came a bill saying he owed $2,900. He was shocked, having had no idea there was a fee for publishing. He asked to withdraw the papers, but they were published anyway.

“I am a doctor in a hospital in the province of Mexico, and I don’t have the amount they requested,” Dr. Martínez said. The journal offered to reduce his bill to $2,600. Finally, after a year and many e-mails and a phone call, the journal forgave the money it claimed he owed.

Some professors listed on the Web sites of journals on Beall’s list, and the associated conferences, say they made a big mistake getting involved with the journals and cannot seem to escape them.

Thomas Price, an associate professor of reproductive endocrinology and fertility at the Duke University School of Medicine, agreed to be on the editorial board of The Journal of Gynecology & Obstetrics because he saw the name of a well-respected academic expert on its Web site and wanted to support open-access journals. He was surprised, though, when the journal repeatedly asked him to recruit authors and submit his own papers. Mainstream journals do not do this because researchers ordinarily want to publish their papers in the best journal that will accept them. Dr. Price, appalled by the request, refused and asked repeatedly over three years to be removed from the journal’s editorial board. But his name was still there.

“They just don’t pay any attention,” Dr. Price said.

About two years ago, James White, a plant pathologist at Rutgers, accepted an invitation to serve on the editorial board of a new journal, Plant Pathology & Microbiology, not realizing the nature of the journal. Meanwhile, his name, photograph and résumé were on the journal’s Web site. Then he learned that he was listed as an organizer and speaker on a Web site advertising Entomology-2013.

“I am not even an entomologist,” he said.

He thinks the publisher of the plant journal, which also sponsored the entomology conference, —
just pasted his name, photograph and résumé onto the conference Web site. At this point, he said, outraged that the conference and journal were “using a person’s credentials to rip off other unaware scientists,” Dr. White asked that his name be removed from the journal and the conference.

Weeks went by and nothing happened, he said. Last Monday, in response to this reporter’s e-mail to the conference organizers, Jessica Lincy, who said only that she was a conference member, wrote to explain that the conference had “technical problems” removing Dr. White’s name. On Tuesday, his name was gone. But it remained on the Web site of the journal.

Dr. Gedela, the publisher of the journals and sponsor of the conference, said in an e-mail on Thursday that Dr. Price and Dr. White’s names remained on the Web sites “because of communication gap between the EB member and the editorial assistant,” referring to editorial board members. That day, their names were gone from the journals’ Web sites.

“I really should have known better,” Dr. White said of his editorial board membership, adding that he did not fully realize how the publishing world had changed. “It seems like the Wild West now.”

This article has been revised to reflect the following correction:

Correction: April 9, 2013

An article on Monday about questionable scientific journals and conferences misstated the name of a city in Mexico that is home to a doctor who sent articles to a pseudo-academic journal. It is Celaya, not Ceyala.

This article has been revised to reflect the following correction:

Correction: April 10, 2013

An article on Monday about questionable scientific journals and conferences erroneously included one publishing company among those on a list of “predatory open-access journals,” known as Beall’s list. Although Dove Press was on the list in 2012, it has since been removed.