Lincoln University
Open Access Implementation Committee

Minutes of meeting held on 10 November 2015
at 10.00am in L114

Present: Deborah Fitchett (facilitator), Erin Skinner, David Simmons, Lorraine Petelo, Liz Wright, Timothy Curran, Lyndsay Ainsworth, Karaitiana Taiuru, Iain Winslade, Jacky Bowring, Hazel Gatehouse, Stuart Reilly

Minutes: Debbie Gillespie

Apologies: Damian Lodge, Sonja Wilkinson

Minutes of previous meeting: 11 August 2015
Approved, Deborah will send to Sheelagh to confirm they are OK to go on the web.

1. Matters Arising

2. Open Access Week

Deborah reported that this went well, although it is always a difficult time of year.
The Great Debate is on the Living Heritage site.

Considerable discussion about the timing of future open access events included the following points:
- October is not a good time of year and it is worth considering a different time when more people could attend
- Deborah reported some agreement with this in Tweet chat
- Holding Open Access Week during Open Education Week was suggested ie the week starting 7 March 2016
- There is no “best time” but more people would be around then
- The LTaR team would not be available, but Lyndsay agreed with the principle of this timing for the university as a whole
- There is some interest from other institutions to take advantage of Open Education Week
- It is useful to hold open access events at the same time as other organisations, to be able to connect in with other people and events
- The hashtag for the Tweet chat was asked for. The general open access one was used along with another, which Deborah will send out

ACTION: Deborah will send the Open Access Week Twitter hashtag to the committee. Deborah

- Participation in Open Access Week Tweet chat was good, but it was mostly people already known to Deborah through open access
- It was suggested that open access events could be held on a single day during Open Education Week, and less intensive activities (eg posters) could also be planned for Open Access Week later in the year

Targeting a single day during Open Education Week was discussed.
- Wednesday 9 March (3rd week of semester) was tentatively agreed on, pending checking the LU calendar and LUSA plans for beginning of year activities
- This would be as well as some involvement in Open Access Week later in the year.
- The focus could be on open education and other events could tie into this.
- The committee is to continue to think of ways to support this day and further discuss by email.

Committee discussion about open access resources for teaching included the following:
- It would be an interesting topic to focus on and would be good to encourage further. Progress has been made, but more needs to be done.
- It was suggested that there needs to be a much wider debate in the university about what open access means and what it may entail.
- People may be resistant because of misconceptions or perceived negative consequences e.g., open access would mean giving away some of LU’s unique course features for others to copy or giving away someone’s life’s work. In reality there could be one open course, and then “teasers” that are available to encourage people to take further courses that may not be open access.
- These ideas, expressed succinctly, may not yet have cascaded further out into the university, and therefore it would be sensible and easy to start by promoting open access with immediate benefits (e.g., open access slides that can be used in teaching).
- More long term goals such as open access courses are not realistic at present.
- Creating a long term (3 year) communication plan was suggested, so the committee can plan how open access promotion could be implemented.
- There are options about approaches that could be taken and these need to be considered e.g., start with a broad base (e.g., simple messages and demonstrations) and build up; or cascade down from top (e.g., leaders, exemplars); how open access promotes LU; build on the workshops already undertaken.

The committee agreed to focus on open access teaching resources on Wednesday 9 March during Open Education Week.

- The committee agreed that using incentives that will encourage people to become involved is the best approach.
- The day will need to be promoted in the faculties.
- Repeating a 1 hour workshop on this day would get more people attending (e.g., morning and afternoon). There is UFT but this can get overused.
- Room availability will need to be looked at.

2. Open Access Policy and Whenua Strategy

Deborah suggested:
   a) making sure the Open Access Policy doesn’t contradict any aspect of the Whenua Strategy and
   b) making sure it supports the Whenua Strategy priorities.

Karaitiana said that the Whenua Strategy is a key strategy of LU and the open access strategy does not take this into account. He wanted to highlight the gap here, and as LU states that it is committed to the Treaty, the current Open Access Policy doesn’t reflect this. This issue needs to be on the table.

It was acknowledged that the historic reason for this is because the Open Access Policy was written before the Whenua Strategy and therefore it may be time to re-look at it. It is due for review.

Discussion about this included the following:
- The new DVC Māori and Communities could be involved.
The committee could come up with suggestions then wait for the new DVC
- It was suggested that this topic needs to be checked with Damian as the format for policies is changing, so timing needs to be considered for efficiency
- The process needs to be carefully considered as there are big issues around Māori and open access and it is not necessarily straight forward – this involves sovereignty over knowledge and Māori may not subscribe to open access
- This is a big issue under WAI 262 (a Waitangi Tribunal declaration about Māori knowledge) and may be best worked through by the new DVC Communities and Māori
- Both the Open Access and Research Data Management Policies refer to bi-cultural issues as a reason for not making something open access
- Individual and iwi views on open access may vary
- Karaitiana suggested the discussion may be over complicating matters and in general, consultation with iwi about where information comes from is sufficient, along with noting that copyright laws don’t apply to traditional knowledge, moral rights are the standard. High level data sovereignty may be different.
- Deborah believes the principle is covered in what is stated in current policy, but the process needs to be clarified
- Carmel Reilly (LU Māori consultant) could be a useful contact for advice although it may not be her area of expertise
- There is a specialised Māori data sovereignty group in NZ which Karaitiana could consult with and relay advice back to group

The committee agreed that not a lot of work in this area should be undertaken until the new DVC Māori and Communities starts next year. It will be raised as an issue and the committee will talk about it again.

Further discussion carried forward to the first meeting for 2016.

3. Looking at 2016

3.1 Open Access and the Current Situation – Where to From Here?

Deborah asked the committee for feedback about the current situation in the faculties with open access.

- Tim reported greater awareness since workshop A has been done, (over 200 people have taken part) but there is still a level of concern about what open access means for teaching and its implications (eg workload)
- In the area of research within AGLS, it has generally been followed for some time, including providing data sets

The use of Research Gate was discussed, with some concerns expressed, although it was also considered to be informative. Discussion included the following:

- The main concerns are around trustworthiness (is it a stable platform?) and from an institutional perspective, copyright
- From a research data management point of view, there is concern about putting data sets on it as it makes it another outlet that needs to be tracked
- This topic has been discussed before and in the ELT Research committee, and concern was expressed that it may coerse academics to act illegally, which is an institutional risk
- It would be easier if researchers put material on Symplectic (where it can be monitored), and then through Research Archive - some people are doing both
- Research Gate provides the useful function of keeping researchers connected about what is going on, but education is needed about the risks.

Tim indicated that the main open access areas that need to be grown in AGLS next year are:
- Reassurances about open access and what it means in terms of teaching ie the support available and reinforcing the requirements learnt in the workshop.
- Adopting a long term view – part of a process which is being worked towards.
- Encouraging and facilitating the use of open access (not enforcing it) to alleviate people’s concerns.

Jacky agreed with the above point and also reported the following:
- Following the workshops, there is some concern and resistance about what it all means for staff and the implications for workload.
- There are questions that need to be addressed with definitive answers eg the terms on Camtasia recordings – a cheat sheet would be helpful so people can be sure they are doing the right thing.

The point was made that care needs to be taken not to confuse the areas of open access and copyright, although they do tie together.

The key message was clarified as:
- There is always copyright (individual or publisher).
- Open access is about giving permissions while retaining copyright.

It was agreed that copyright should not be focussed on during Open Access Week to avoid confusion, but in some areas it could be used as a known pathway to engage people eg researchers, as some of the MSc.’s have a requirement of open data and open access.

It was suggested these things could be addressed in series, rather than in parallel, and as part of a longer term plan or bigger strategy. People who are used to using open access are the ones who will allay fears and concerns.

Some disciplines are used to using open access in research. Tim said that it is often a requirement of publishing in his area and people are used to it, but there are concerns about translating research into teaching and how that gets used, which is a new area.

David reported that there are philosophical concerns in the Social Sciences about breaching moral and ethical codes. (Research in this area guarantees anonymity of participants.)

There can also be a confidence fear around teaching material - this is not present with research. Research is thorough (eg specific, time put in and peer review), but it is not necessarily the same, or possible with teaching material. This may be a reason why open access should not be lead with teaching material.

Hazel reported that there are common misunderstandings and misinformation about open access and the communication process is really important and needs to be part of the whole plan.

Iain said that there is a lot of fear at Telford around the area of open access. Encouraging a policy about this and copyright with the delivery partners would be a step forward.

Iain, Erin, Jacky, Stuart and David left the meeting at this point.

Lorraine reported that in her department, there is concern about making teaching material freely available and an increase in workload with little time available for this.
Hazel asked a question about text books that supply PowerPoint presentations, but it was clarified that open access does not apply to material owned by third parties ie it can’t be made open access. (The policy states it is about content LU has copyright to.)

Lyndsay stated that the ideas behind Learn Preview and what Sheelagh would like to happen in terms of attracting and retaining students are not dissimilar to open access, but not the same. Attracting and keeping students using “tasters” is not applicable to the way open access teaching materials are provided.

Learn will not be a platform for open access but Equella may end up being this.

If a course is developed that is open access it would be approached differently, with some aspects that are open and some not.

At the end of the meeting the discussion resumed with the following points made:
- It is important to acknowledge the number of staff that took part in the workshops and that huge steps have been made
- Deborah has considered an informal survey to see how many people have used open access
- It would be interesting to see how much Learn Preview has been used. This is in the final governance report for Learn Preview on The Hub.

**ACTION:** Debbie will try to find the final governance report for Learn Preview to be sent to the committee  
Debbie

Hazel would like to clarify her understanding of open access and suggested drafting her understanding in an email to Lyndsay. It was agreed that this could also be used to further understanding by sending it to divisions

**ACTION:** Hazel will draft an email summarising her understanding of open access and send to Lyndsay.  
Hazel

**ACTION:** Lyndsay will check and circulate this more widely.  
Lyndsay

### 3.2 Frequency of meetings

**The committee agreed to continue with quarterly meetings.**

A meeting will be needed about a month before the Open Access Day (9 March proposed date).

**ACTION:** Debbie will look at the availability of L114 on 9 March and book the whole day if free.  
Debbie

Meeting closed 11.08am

2016 meeting dates tba