

Presidential Open Access Policy Review Comment Summary

Policy draft and cover letter: <http://www.ucop.edu/academic-personnel-programs/academic-personnel-policy/policies-under-review/uc-open-access-policy.html>

Comments from:

- Academic Senate: Ten Senate divisions and five systemwide committees (CCGA, UCAP, UCFW, UCOLASC, and UCORP) submitted comments
- California Digital Library (CDL)
- Council of University Librarians (CoUL)
- Systemwide Library and Scholarly Communication Advisory Committee (SLASIAC)
- Labor Relations (reporting no response from unions)
- 4 campuses: Irvine, San Diego, San Francisco, Santa Cruz

Concerns:

1. Scope – people: Extent it applies to graduate student employees; non-academic staff; non-compensated members of the UC community; work started or ended when not at employed at UC; joint-authorship; and “extracurricular” work.
2. Scope – “scholarly articles”: Clarify whether theses and dissertations would be included (among other works).
3. Administrative burden on non-Senate faculty.
4. Implications of copyright ownership and lack thereof.
5. Need to deposit work even when granted a waiver (and is it encouraged or required?).
6. Compliance – what are the consequences for not complying? Who will enforce the policy, and how?
7. Humanities publications and impact on publishing a book.
8. General concerns about publisher policies and agreements, and the policy having an undue influence on authors’ publishing decisions.

Other requests:

- Guidance on interaction with other Open Access requirements, such as NIH.
- Clear FAQ on procedures, rights & responsibilities, copyright concerns, etc.
- Some comments mentioned a “default” embargo period.
- Some said the “opt-out” option is too lenient & weakens the policy (but others would prefer an “opt-in” policy).
- Some seemed to be conflating “green” Open Access (the policy) with “gold” Open Access where there is often article processing charge.