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PRESENT: Robin Corelli (Chair), Mohana Amritharajah (Vice Chair), Kit Chesla, Thuan Le

GUEST: Roberta Rehm, UCAF Rep

The Committee on Academic Freedom was called to order by Chair Corelli on January 26, 2011 at 8:39am in Room MUW 302. A quorum was present.

Chair's Report
After leading introductions, Chair Corelli made these announcements:
- APMs 15 and 10 passed unanimously at the Coordinating Committee

Open Access – Richard Schneider, Chair, University Committee on Library and Scholarly Communications (UCOLASC) and Vice Chair, UCSF Committee on Library and Scholarly Communication (COLASC)
R. Schneider gave the Committee a brief history of the issues surrounding scholarly communication and open access. Ultimately, he is looking to partner with CAF to find ways to transform faculty behavior and facilitate a shift towards an open access model.

Problems with the Current Model
There are two major problems with the current model:
1. In 99.9% of cases, faculty sign away rights to their copyright. As R. Schneider pointed out, there is no other discipline that follows this practice. Ideally, the institution should achieve an environment where publishers are not incentivized to retain faculty copyrights. Faculty need to realize that they are being charged per download. Accordingly, prices should not be increasing; rather, costs should be decreasing.
2. The faculty create the content and later edit content for free. After all of that work, it seems incongruous that our libraries be expected to buy back that content.

UCSF History with Major Publishers
In 1996, Elsevier bought Cell Press. Up until then, the University was paying $60-80K for access to Cell Press. After the purchase, Elsevier began charging the University over $1M. This increase in subscription fees resulted in a UC boycott led by UCSF faculty. The boycott meant a moratorium on submissions to and editing for Cell Press. Subsequently, Elsevier backed down.

In 2010, the University was faced with a similar situation involving the Nature Publishing Group (NPG). NPG came to the University requesting a 400% increase in subscription fees. In response, UCOLASC wrote the letter in August encouraging faculty members to discontinue publishing, editing and advertising in Nature publications. We are currently in negotiations with NPG.

The Future of Scholarly Communication
R. Schneider discussed the benefits of an open access model/public repository:
• A convenient substitute for the submission of print copies of articles in fulfillment of grants reporting requirements.
• Research is available to virtually all Internet users, regardless of whether their library subscribes to the journal in which the research is published. This will greatly expand access to the estimated 80,000 articles that result each year from NIH funding for use in research, teaching, and patient care. We estimate that UC articles make up 8% of that 80,000 or 6000 articles per year.
• A consequence of making work more visible among scientists around the world is greater impact. A number of studies on the citation advantage of open access have shown that open access articles are, on the whole, more highly cited.
• The open environment provided by NIH will facilitate development of new kinds of computational research techniques. Already the full-texts of journal articles in PubMed Central are linked to other scientific databases such as GenBank, enabling researchers to observe and explore relationships that may not previously have been apparent.
• The National Library of Medicine will provide long-term digital archiving of articles in PubMed Central, ensuring tomorrow’s researchers can build on today’s findings.
• The NIH policy precedent can open the door for institutions to secure expanded rights to use research in teaching, learning, and research.
• Adapted from NIH Public Access Policy: Guide for Research Universities by the Association of Research Libraries. Then went over open access and the benefits of it.

Next Steps
The Committee discussed possible actions to assist with open access initiatives:
• Drafting a letter speaking to how the policy works to advance the choices that faculty can make
• Creating an FAQ focusing on copyrights and the barriers to one’s own work
• Development of YouTube video to appeal to the faculty

UCAF Report
R. Rehm requested the Committee’s support in garnering support for the changes to APMs 10 and 15 approved by UCAF and CAF last year. Analyst Patel agreed to request that the changes be brought before the Coordinating Committee for approval.

There being no further business, Chair Corelli adjourned the meeting at 9:33am.