Participating	Alison Mudditt, AnnaLee Saxenian, Bill Jacob, Chris Kelty, Cynthia Johnson, Gary Strong, Gene Lucas (chair), Ginny Steel, Jim Phillips, Laine Farley, Laurie Monahan, Mario Biagioli, Rich Schneider, Rita Hao, Robin Garrell, Sandra Brown, Susan Carlson, Wendy Streitz, Guest: Keith Williams (for item 4)
Absent	Kris Hafner, Mark Aldenderfer, Pete Siegel
Staff	Joanne Miller

Meeting Notes

1. CDL budget status and update (Laine Farley, Susan Carlson)

While the budget process is not yet complete, Susan Carlson and Laine Farley described the decisions to date. The CDL will receive funding for a one-year pilot program to support UC's proposed Open Access policy in eScholarship. The other CDL request that will receive funding is the continuing implementation for disaster recovery. The other requested funds will not be granted this year.

Although the open access support funding is only for one year, there is the expectation that it will be continued if the UC Open Access policy is implemented. The funds would not be renewed automatically; a request will have to be made for the next fiscal year.

2. Open Access Issues, including UC's OA Policy update, state legislation, and federal agencies. (Chris Kelty, Laine Farley, and Mario Biagioli)

UC's Open Access Policy

Chris Kelty gave an update on the status of the proposed UC Open Access Policy, which was revised to accommodate requests made in the systemwide review. Deposit of work is now not required when opting out of the policy. The license restriction was also revised so that the default is a non-commercial Creative Commons license. The Academic Council reviewed the revised policy at its May meeting, and while some members still wanted some additional legal review, the Council is sending the revised policy back to campuses for "expedited" review. Responses are due on July 17 for the July 27 Academic Council meeting. More information here:
(http://senate.universityofcalifornia.edu/underreview/RLP_DivsCtes_OpenAccessPpl_finalexpeditedreview_FINAL.pdf).

Bill Jacob reported that, based on discussion at a recent UCORP meeting, he thought the systemwide response to the revised policy would be positive.

In response to a question about the compatibility of more and less restrictive policies, Chris said he did not foresee any problems.

In response to a question about faculty actually complying with the policy, Chris thought there were three avenues:

1. More education for faculty on the campuses.
2. The automated harvesting system that will be piloted by eScholarship includes an email sent to faculty who have published an article asking if it should be made available as open access.

3. Major publishers may help with the deposit requirement if made a part of contracts or licensing terms.

AB609: State-funded research

Laine Farley talked a little bit about the State bill, which would provide for public access to State-funded research, and described the process for the bill's official support letter from UC. The CDL provided some information to the bill's sponsors, and helped to rebut an opposing letter from the Association of American Publishers. Laine noted that because it's not known exactly how many state-funded articles come from UC's faculty, the implications for UC's eScholarship repository, which is named in the bill, were not yet clear.

Concern was expressed about the burden of the requirements on grantees, especially since the bill is somewhat unclear. Rita Hao said that she or OGC's new copyright attorney, Angus MacDonald, would be happy to review the bill.

Federal Agencies' Public Comment Meetings

SLASIAC member Mario Biagioli was asked to give an introductory talk at the first of two meetings on "Public Access to Federally-Supported Research and Development Data and Publications" that were sponsored by the federal agencies impacted by the OSTP's Public Access Policy directive (see the memo from Director John P. Holdren for details). Biagioli reported that the agencies offered 3-minute speaking opportunities for members of the public, educators, publishers, etc., to express their thoughts and offer advice. Biagioli's overall impression of the 2-day publications meeting was that speakers praised the government and made mostly vague suggestions. The recently-released Chorus proposal from the Association of American Publishers contains much of what the publishers said in their comments to the agencies. Biagioli said he noted that the publishers were met with some skepticism, and seen as trying to contain the effects of open access by offering solutions that merely tweaked the system. The second meeting, on research and development data, was more about standards and principles for moving forward because there is no solution for how to do it yet.

3. Copyright issues, including revised policy on use of copyrighted materials for teaching and research and "ancillary costs" memo

Rita Hao described the process of revising the UC Policy on Use (formerly "reproduction") of copyrighted materials. By removing the long set of guidelines that accompanied the policy, it has become more of a statement of principle rather than a procedure to follow. It was noted that policies are not supposed to interpret the law, so the separation of guidelines from the policy statement is the right thing to do [it also aligns with the instructions from the UCOP Policy Office on policy development]. The intention is that guidance for complying with the policy will be available on the UC Copyright Education Website, which will be linked to from the policy. The current policy was written before the prevalence of the web for disseminating information, and so the guidelines were distributed with the policy. De-coupling the policy from the guidelines means that the guidelines are easier to change and maintain as copyright law evolves. With a few minor changes, the Committee thought that the policy was ready for formal system-wide review after the next SLASIAC meeting, as long as guidelines – even in draft form – would be distributed along with the policy statement.

The Ancillary Fees memo from Rita Hao was drafted in response to a situation on a campus where there was uncertainty about a campus funding publication fees for faculty-owned work. Rita drafted a new, official memo to clarify that there was enough benefit to individual departments – and to the University – to allow for subsidizing those fees. Rita agreed to add a context paragraph at the beginning to clarify the

scope of the memo, and to add something about an analysis of specific situations (a "balancing test"). The revised draft will be circulated to SLASIAC when Rita is finished.

4. Online education issues (AnnaLee Saxenian, Keith Williams)

AnnaLee Saxenian noted the astonishing pace of change of online education. She said that online education is not just one thing; it's as diverse as classroom teaching, and MOOCs are just one model among many. Incoming students (and junior faculty) will be more and more technically savvy, and Dean Saxenian expects that online education in one form or another will be pervasive in another decade. The biggest benefit of the discussions around online education is the focus on teaching and learning. She also said to keep in mind that online education is not cheap; it might save money eventually, but its primary benefit is to increase access to education.

Questions remain regarding how to provide library and information access to non-enrolled online education students. Even campus-to-campus the availability of materials may differ.

The next phase of UC's online education program (the [Innovative Learning Technology Initiative](#), or ILTI), will include a requirement for multi-campus courses (of at least two campuses) to submit a proposal. Provost Dorr would like to see a "hub" developed, where any UC student could register for an online course on any UC campus.

Keith Williams gave more details about the current status and future plans for UC's online education program and ILTI. There is a wide-ranging group of ILTI stakeholders that have met to discuss topics leading to an official request for proposals from faculty that would use the $10 million that the governor has indicated would be put toward online education. Due dates are tentatively scheduled for end of July and November. The scope has been widened to include hybrid as well as fully online courses. Focus is on "gateway," high enrollment courses, but can include others as well. Williams foresees a high interest from faculty in submitting proposals. Cross-campus enrollment brings up a set of issues that aren't directly related to online learning and don't have simple answers. A workgroup is being formed that will consider the infrastructure for a central hub that could handle enrollments, but completion of a system could take a couple of years. Meanwhile, the group is looking at ways of doing cross-campus enrollment in the short term. Williams said that he is keenly aware that library and license-content use has to be considered as well.

On a related note, UCLA's Gary Strong relayed that the first batch of UCLA's faculty have submitted proposals for developing open access materials for courses, a program that was developed to help relieve student costs. More initiatives like UCLA's could help to make more material available.

Bill Jacob reported that California Senate Bills 1051 and 1052 were supposed to provide open access course materials, but there is a requirement for philanthropic contributions to match State costs.

Laine Farley suggested finding out what libraries are already doing in this realm, such as UCSF's library's involvement in the development of the online course from the beginning.

Williams noted that certain faculty are adamant about *not* wanting to make materials open access. He said that only eight out of 25 faculty were willing to do so in the last group of proposals.

5. Next Steps (Gene Lucas)

SLASIAC will make a statement about the need to continue some measure of UC investment in exploring open access issues, and the necessity of putting resources behind that. Laine Farley will draft a recommendation that includes suggestions for publishing models and funding.