UC Open Access Policy Proposal Update
October 2007

SLASIAC context: Universitywide scholarly communication proposal; copyright implications; future SLASIAC input.

For information only; no action requested at this time.

Background

- December 2005 – August 2006. Academic Council's [Special Committee on Scholarly Communication](#) (SCSC) convened; produces 5 whitepapers and draft copyright policy.

- May – July 2006 SCSC's [Proposal for UC Faculty - Scholarly Work Copyright Rights Policy](#) endorsed by the Academic Senate; Senate requests action from President Dynes; Faculty and staff working group convened.

- January 2007. Provost Hume requests Senate and administrative reviews of [DRAFT Open Access Policy and working group report](#) containing policy language and implementation options. Key phrases:

    o *[The policy seeks to achieve] a balance between the publisher's goals and the author's goals of sharing the material to further scholarship [and] asserts and confirms the UC faculty author as the copyright holder [and] supports authors' retention of rights in order to use and develop their works without restrictions...*

    o *[F]aculty shall routinely grant to The Regents of the University of California a license to place in a non-commercial open-access online repository the faculty member's scholarly work published in a scholarly journal or conference proceedings.*

    o *Faculty may opt out of this policy for any specific work...*

- July 2007. [Review responses](#) compiled and posted online.

Status

- Sense of the reviews: strong support for intent and goals, but consistent concerns about implementation, concentrating on:
    o Burden of opting out (default requirement to retain rights in a work and to deposit it for open access perceived as a threat to academic freedom; a workload burden; a threat to publishers);
    o Proposed link to academic reviews (recording the access characteristics of publications in review files perceived as inappropriate, burdensome, unnecessary);
    o Unknown but imagined large support structures and costs (to create "open access agents;" to support negotiations with publishers; to track compliance; to maintain a repository; etc.)
- Senate request: Provost should respond to comments, revise the policy in light of the comments, resubmit for review. The Academic Council "hopes it can decide to endorse the policy at that time."

Planned Next Steps

1. Revise and resubmit for community review a mission-related, strongly encouraged, *opt-in* policy with minimal procedural burdens and no prescribed tie to academic personnel processes. Consult with SLASIAC and UCOLASC as possible during development.

2. Perform, and make available, a feasibility assessment of service capacity and enhancements to support opt-in "open access," including:

   o Online resources for copyright guidance and a fill-in-the-blank author's rights addendum to publication agreements;

   o eScholarship Repository as a platform for material deposit, access, and preservation;

   o UC communiqués to major scholarly publishers re: the institutional commitment to maximum access and dissemination;

   o Policy promulgation (embedded in ongoing education/outreach by the UCOP Office of Scholarly Communication, eScholarship, UC libraries, and others);

   o Ongoing assessment of policy impact, costs and benefits (coordinated appropriately, among, e.g., SLASIAC, Senate UCOLASC committee).

3. Leverage, as appropriate, the intent of the policy and the capacity of related services, for institutional responsibilities associated with external funder-based mandates for public access to funded research results. [*n.b.* several mandates are already in place: Wellcome Trust, Howard Hughes Med. Institute, UK Research councils; an NIH mandate appears likely; other federal agency mandates are possible (cf. the Federal Research Public Access Act)]

Related links

o UC Open Access Policy and related materials - http://osc.universityofcalifornia.edu/openaccesspolicy/

o eScholarship Repository - http://repositories.cdlib.org/escholarship/

o SLASIAC Resolution I: The University's Role in Fostering Positive Change in Scholarly Communication - http://www.slp.ucop.edu/consultation/slasiac/SLASIAC_Resolution_I.html

o University [Senate] Committee on Library and Scholarly Communication - http://www.universityofcalifornia.edu/senate/committees/ucolasc/

o Registry of research funder policies mandating public access - http://www.eprints.org/openaccess/policysignup/

o Current NIH policy on public access - http://www.nhlbi.nih.gov/funding/policies/public-access.htm

o NIH policy developments - http://www.taxpayeraccess.org/NIH.html