

Unconference session: Building a Commons of Ideas, in which value is not always measured by whether something can be licensed or sold

Moderator: Marcus Banks

Note Taker: Christina Mune

How to build a commons of ideas that ensures open access but allows for ideas to be valued:

Universal open access for a basic access, but pay for value added things:

arxiv.org - a place where papers are free, but if someone wanted to create a service to abstract, summarize in plain language, etc. that would be worth it

Such as all govt. docs are suppose to be free, but we still have to buy things for value added factors - Proquest statistical abstract, Thomas, LexisNexis - we pay for these services despite for the info to be free through .gov sites

There is a mindset that if we pay for it its more valuable and if we don't its not valuable - in people don't value free things the same as what they pay for with their "hard earned money"

So how do we change the way people think? we want people to use and value free stuff. You need to change the mindset.

Could open access could make america not competitive, i.e. - how will we capitalize on ideas and inspire other to make them if you cannot make money and "patent" them? But ideas are not patented, but people confuse that ...

Manifestation of the idea to capitalize it is to publish it - do you not need that anymore? Are there other ways to capitalize on it? Can we change the ways ideas are valued to create other methods of capitalization?

Publishers/publishing industry - made sense when that was the only way

But for teaching and learning - who cares how students get the info? They just want to get it!

However, there are entire industries based on how students will get content.

While that exists, people who want to give it for free will threaten the industry, which in turn find ways to make free seem of lesser significance

Also, what about the time and effort it takes to put your idea into language? Is that devalued by open access and how is that devaluation sustainable?

That devalued unless we can get tenure and review committees to take OA seriously. Can that

be changed the same way we're working to evolve the ideas of online learning and teaching?
Can publishing be changed that same way we're adding value to online teaching?

But where will the quality control be without the publishers? Where is that and what does it mean?

Open access is peer reviewed, so perhaps there's a misconception about that. Perhaps replacement by retirement will cause an organic shift.

If we're going to be concerned with paying for ideas, or who will pay for the publishing - what about advertisement?

Should people pay to be published? How much does that equal vanity press? Who will be responsible for paying publishing fees - the university that required it, the academic, advertisers?

Article level metrics - impact factor, etc. may affect what published articles are worth and who gets paid for what. In publishing, some publishers are less opposed to OA now as well - they are finding other revenue stream.

Increasing Adoption of Open Access materials:

- Open Doors Group - creating a database of open books and who's adopted them
- SJSU using educational equity and affordability as a drive to get faculty to adopt them
- At CSU East Bay - imperative so that untraditional/disadvantaged students can access the class materials

Are students leading the push? Why not? They are generally overwhelmed.

At De Anza, students are leading the push and have been very successful - could that be a case study or a model?

- could be one or two students who really push the effort
- and then what happens when they graduate?

Mentorship - pairing students with others in the OA movement to lead the push. Student passing on the banner.

Sharing Resources in a System - Commons of Ideas?

If you have a system that is combined - like you can take any course at any CSU online for credit - can they all adopt the same book? Is that like making a commons of ideas? Is a commons of resources a commons of ideas?

UCSF - paying/getting permission to use pieces of works in MOOCs - could that have been replaced with OER? Librarians are educating the instructors on what is open and what needs to be licensed. How did UCSF spur that?

Some faculty getting together to boycott journals that are raising prices. Perhaps all libraries should we be sharing the price increases publically - not against the content to share the price increase percentage!

UC has recently adopted policy on requiring open access publishing, but kickback from humanities that does not want that requirement.

Local Commons vs. Wide Commons

Institutional Repositories a good place to promote OER and Open Access.

Lots of copyright - how to get pre-prints? how to get the rights, etc. A lot of people time.