

DRAFT
12/16/02 (last updated 2/18/03)

POLICY	COMMENT
<p>GENERAL COMMENTS</p>	<p><i>UCSF:</i> <i>“Unofficial” Courses</i> It is unclear whether the policy applies to materials used in “unofficial” courses (i.e. courses with no formal syllabus directed to, for example, residents in a particular field). Clarification is needed regarding whether this policy would indeed apply to such courses and, in general, to course material not covered by a syllabus.</p> <p><i>Transfer of Course Material</i> Clarification is needed regarding whether this policy applies to material which may be used for a course other than the course for which it was originally prepared.</p> <p><i>Update of Material by New Faculty</i> The original author of course material should continue to be recognized when material is updated by a new faculty member. A trail of authorship should be maintained and described in this policy. Alternatively, this policy should encourage the maintenance of a trail of authorship and the mechanism to maintain such a trail should be outlined by the Course Materials Policy Committee.</p> <p><i>Definition of what constitutes a course</i> Should this be limited to what is listed in the course catalog for formal academic programs, and Continuing Education Courses, and Distance Learning Courses? Should any seminar series or faculty lectures be considered courses? We recommend that what is considered a course be defined under the definition section.</p> <p><i>UCR:</i> Given the great potential legal complexity of these matters, and the lack of expertise of most individual faculty, the administration should consult with legal counsel to the academic senate as a key part of the consultative process.</p> <p><i>UCB:</i> Faculty should have the right to remove their names from works derived from syllabi they create.</p>
<p>I. Purpose and Scope</p>	
<p>The University of California Policy on Copyright Ownership (August 19, 1992) sets forth the University's Policy on Copyright Ownership for works produced at, by, or through the University of California, its campuses, and the Department of Energy Laboratories.</p>	
<p>The purpose of this policy is to supplement the existing Policy on Copyright Ownership to address copyright ownership issues related</p>	

DRAFT
12/16/02 (last updated 2/18/03)

to materials prepared for instructional purposes.	
II. Definitions	
A. For purposes of this Policy, the following definitions shall apply:	
<i>1. Course Materials</i>	
Materials prepared for use in teaching, fixed or unfixed, in any form, including, but not limited to, digital, print, audio, visual, or any combination thereof. Course materials include, but are not limited to, lectures, lecture notes, and materials, syllabi, study guides, bibliographies, visual aids, images, diagrams, multimedia presentations, web-ready content, and educational software.	<p><i>UCSF:</i> It is not clear that this policy applies to web-based course materials. Assuming that the policy covers all course materials, explicit mention should be made of web-based materials.</p> <p><i>UCR:</i> Heading under II.A.1 should be enlarged to include problem sets.</p>
<i>2. Course Syllabus</i>	
A course description reviewed and approved pursuant to applicable Academic Senate regulations, consisting of a statement of learning objectives and a topical outline for an approved course of instruction.	<p><i>UCR:</i> The definition for syllabi ought to be more explicit—would like to define “syllabus” as “a particular faculty member’s implementation of the course”. Concern was raised about the ownership of the syllabi as proposed by the policy— suggested that the syllabus should be the exclusive intellectual property of the professor.</p> <p><i>UCPB:</i> When a Course Syllabus constitutes an original work, the intellectual property belongs, as a matter of federal law, to the faculty member who created it. The interests of the University in continuing to offer an approved course, however, have little relation to whether or not the materials originally submitted for approval were themselves copyright protected. In either case, the University expects to reproduce the approved course description in the course catalogue, and to make limited, non-exclusive use of the Course Syllabus (as defined in connection with a basic course outline) for the purpose of teaching the course on an ongoing basis. We believe, however, that the University’s expectations in this regard derive from its ordinary procedures for course approval, and should not be expressed in the language of copyright law. Nothing is lost by deleting the language of “licensure” from the proposed policy on the future use of the materials submitted as part of the proposal for a course.</p> <p>At the same time, we believe it is important as a matter of academic integrity to clarify that a faculty member who creates a Course Syllabus has the right to require, upon request, that his or her name be removed from the Course Syllabus and course outline</p>

DRAFT
12/16/02 (last updated 2/18/03)

	when used by other faculty members. Our proposed modifications in the attached [policy] also address this point.
3. <i>Exceptional University Resources</i>	
<p><i>University Resources</i> (including but not limited to <i>University Facilities</i> and <i>University Funds</i>, as described below) significantly in excess of the usual support generally available to similarly situated faculty members. Such things as ordinary secretarial support, library facilities, office space, personal computers, ordinary access to computers and networks, and academic year salary are not Exceptional University Resources.</p>	<p><i>UCR:</i> Concern over the language that “course materials created using “extraordinary university resources” may be appropriated by the University”: What constitute “extraordinary university resources?” Do “mini-grants” designated for course development fall under “extraordinary university resources”? If a faculty member includes his/her individual research into the classroom, will he/she cede the rights to the research findings beyond the senate-approved syllabus? What about work jointly authored/researched by graduate students and professors—will the university claim ownership under the policy since graduate students may be viewed as “extraordinary resources” provided by the university?</p> <p><i>UCSC:</i> Some suggest that the definition of Exceptional University Resources is too vague to be functional. Since the default as to ownership rights (of course materials) turns on this definition, it seems imperative that guidance beyond delegating the task to the proposed Course Materials Policy Committee be provided.</p> <p><i>Ac. Council:</i> offer a more specific definition of “exceptional resources”</p> <p><i>UCFW:</i> Our committee continues to feel that some further specification of the category of “exceptional resources” is called for. At the very least the policy should include an explicit statement that summer salary and Instructional Improvement Grants do not fall into this category. Resolving these issues in advance would avoid fruitless conflict and reduce the likelihood that the new policy would be inconsistently applied on the different campuses.</p> <p><i>UCPB:</i> Copyright belongs to the originator(s) of a work in the absence of a contract establishing joint ownership with the University. When the University commits “extraordinary resources” to a project, it is, therefore, desirable for it to negotiate joint ownership provisions in advance. Such a requirement is not only consistent with current federal and state laws; it also allows for clarity before a project begins and reduces the potential for later misunderstandings. The September 6th draft, however, eliminates the requirement of a contract by presuming that the University acquires joint ownership by investing “extraordinary resources,” even in the absence of a contract. We reject this reversal of the current legal presumption, and suggest that the proposed policy be rewritten to clarify the existing legal right of the University to condition the investment of “extraordinary resources” on a faculty member’s willingness to share ownership rights. In the event that the University concludes, after the inception of a project, that its investment has been (or is likely to become) “extraordinary,” it may propose joint ownership as a condition for continuing this investment on the understanding that the designated appointee has no obligation to</p>

DRAFT
12/16/02 (last updated 2/18/03)

	accept the University's terms, and that the University has no claim of ownership based on resources already invested in the project.
B. The following definitions from the University of California Policy on Copyright Ownership are also used in this Policy:	

DRAFT
12/16/02 (last updated 2/18/03)

<p><i>1. Designated Academic Appointees</i></p>	
<p>Those University employees who have a general obligation to produce scholarly/aesthetic works. Included are all appointees in the Professor series, In-Residence series, and the Professional Research series. Appointees in other academic titles may also be designated by the appropriate Chancellor or Vice President as having the obligation to produce scholarly/aesthetic works</p>	<p><i>UCSF:</i> Clinical Professors and Professors of Clinical X are not explicitly listed in Section B, Part B, Subsection 1. It may be that the “professor” series listed in this paragraph includes Clinical Professors and Professors of Clinical X. If this is the case it should be clarified. If this is not the case then these two series should be listed explicitly.</p> <p>“Designated Academic Appointees” should include the full spectrum of academic employees. The current listing of “designated academic appointees” is somewhat narrow and should be expanded – perhaps to include all Academic Senate Members and Clinical and Adjunct faculty.</p> <p><i>UCD:</i> The Undergraduate Council commented that the scope of the proposed policy is limited and reasonably well defined. There are important areas that are not covered-- those areas are emphasized in the third paragraph of Provost King's letter to the Chancellors, and in the "Designated Academic Appointees" paragraph of the Committee Report.</p> <p><i>UCR:</i> Definition of “academic appointee” seems vague. Had a particular problem with the language of “Appointees in other academic titles may also be designated by the appropriate Chancellor or Vice President as having the obligation to produce scholarly/aesthetic works.” Raised a question in relation to Lecturers: “Lecturers can propose courses. What are Lecturers’ legal right with respect to these language?”</p> <p><i>UCSB:</i> A second major concern expressed by another unit on our campus was the exclusion of lecturers from the proposed policy. I am attaching the comments from Professor Susan H. McLeod, Director of the Writing Program, in which she details a series of issues regarding the proposed Policy on Ownership of Course Material and Unit 18 lecturers. Her principal concern is that Unit 18 lecturers are not in the list of “Designated University Appointees.”</p> <p><i>UCB:</i> Lecturers and Graduate Student Instructors (GSIs) should have rights similar to those of faculty. The policy addresses only the rights of Designated Academic Appointees. Lecturers and GSIs remain covered by the 1992 Policy on Copyright Ownership, under which course materials developed by them is considered Institutional Work owned by the University. Lecturers and GSIs acting as primary instructors should have rights similar to those of Designated Academic Appointees. We recognize that this is a complicated matter likely to involve collective bargaining agreements, but we endorse the principle that if two individuals are doing the same work, their rights should be similar even if their job titles are not. At UC Berkeley,</p>

DRAFT
12/16/02 (last updated 2/18/03)

	<p>Lecturers are among the principal innovators and developers of educational technology: For example, they are the engines behind ambitious, visible, and successful instructional technology projects in Chemistry, Computer Science, and Interdisciplinary Studies.</p> <p><i>UCI:</i> The term “designated academic employees” raised some comment. Specifically, the definition in the existing copyright policy that includes “Professor series, In-Residence series, and Professional Research series” leaves many UC employees unmentioned. This raises questions about whether several categories of employees (which logically should be covered by the policy) are, or are not included, such as non-Senate academics (lecturers, visitors), students, including graduate students who teach. Of course, non-academic employees also are not covered by this policy which may leave a gap. We recognize that some of these groups are represented by collective bargaining agreements, or employment contracts that would have to be altered, amended, or re-negotiated.</p> <p><i>Ac. Council:</i> include in the category of “designated academic appointees,” Lecturers SOE and Clinical X faculty. The Academic Council understands that certain considerations my make this change inadvisable in the present draft, but strongly recommends that such policy be drafted as the Committee on Copyright’s next order of business.</p> <p><i>UCPB:</i> SOE Lecturers should be included in the list of University employees covered by the policy.</p>
<p>2. <i>Originator(s)</i></p>	
<p>One who produces a work by his or her own intellectual labor. When there is more than one originator, the ownership of each originator's contribution shall be considered separately pursuant to this Policy.</p>	
<p>3. <i>University Facilities</i></p>	
<p>Buildings, equipment, and other facilities under the control of the University, that are designated by the appropriate Chancellor, Laboratory Director, or Vice President as requiring an advance agreement, from non-University personnel and University personnel acting outside the scope of their employment, concerning the disposition of any copyrighted works that are originated with</p>	<p><i>UCD:</i> Third, please try for greater clarity and precision in section II.B.3. The opening sentence is lacking a verb, so it makes no sense.</p> <p>One exception to clarity is in definition II.B.3. This definition is actually not new to draft policy, but is taken from the policy on copyright ownership. It requires struggle to be able to read and understand the paragraph. Some additional clarity or discussion in that section may be appropriate.</p>

DRAFT
12/16/02 (last updated 2/18/03)

<p>the use of these facilities. Such facilities normally include campus computer centers and normally do not include University libraries. For the purposes of this Policy, the Department of Energy Laboratories are considered to be under the control of the University.</p>	<p>Within the scope of the draft document, the Undergraduate council believes that the policies are presented clearly and are advantageous to Designated Academic appointee faculty. One exception to clarity is in definition II.B.e. This definition is actually not new to draft policy, but it is taken from the policy on copyright ownership. It requires some struggle to be able to read and understand that paragraph. Some additional clarity or discussion in that section might be appropriate.</p> <p>UCSC: The inclusion of “campus computer centers” in the definition of “University Facilities” is very vague. Does it include all University-owned computers? University-owned network hubs? University-owned file servers? Does it include the School of Engineering machines? Does it include the workstation on my desk? ...</p>
<p><i>4. University Funds</i></p>	
<p>Funds, regardless of source, that are administered under the control, responsibility, or authority of the University.</p>	
<p><i>5. University Resources</i></p>	
<p>University funds or facilities.</p>	
<p><i>6. Work</i></p>	
<p>Any copyrighted expression, including literary work (written lectures are included); musical work including any accompanying words; dramatic work, including any accompanying music; pantomimes and choreographic work; pictorial, graphic, and sculptural work; motion pictures and other audiovisual work; sound recordings; and computer software.</p>	

<p>III. Ownership of Course Materials</p>	
<p><i>A. Ownership of Course Materials Originated by Designated Academic Appointees.</i></p>	
<p>Except as provided below, ownership of the rights to <i>Course Materials</i>, including copyright, shall reside with the <i>Designated Academic Appointee</i> who creates them. However, the University retains a fully paid-up, royalty-free, perpetual, and non-exclusive license to any <i>Course Syllabus</i> for the purpose of continuing to teach the course of instruction for which the syllabus was prepared, with the non-exclusive right to revise and update as required for this purpose.</p>	<p><i>UCD:</i> Second, and we think importantly, Term III.A. must be corrected to include the term “world-wide” so that the University’s right to use of the materials is not restricted geographically.</p> <p><i>UCI:</i> There is a continuing concern over the use of the word “syllabus.” While the term is carefully defined in the “definitions” section of the draft policy its use in the first paragraph of the policy raised some comment and confusion. It might be a good idea not to use the term and simply spell out the elements (brief description, learning objectives, and topical outline) or substitute another term (“standard minimum academic approval information”).</p>
<p><i>B. Personal Work, Student Work, Sponsored Work, Commissioned Work, and Contracted Facilities Work.</i></p>	
<p>Ownership of <i>Course Materials</i> that constitute Personal Works, Student Works, Sponsored Works, Commissioned Works, or Contracted Facilities Works are defined in and shall be governed by the University of California Policy on Copyright Ownership.</p>	
<p><i>C. Course Materials Created with the Use of Exceptional University Resources.</i></p>	
<p>Ownership of the rights to <i>Course Materials</i> created, in whole or in part, by <i>Designated Academic Appointees</i> with the use of <i>Exceptional University Resources</i> shall be governed by a written agreement entered into between the <i>Originator(s)</i> and the University. The agreement shall specify the way in which rights will be owned and controlled and the way in which any revenues will be divided if the materials are commercialized.</p>	<p><i>UCD:</i> The Committee on Courses of Instruction strongly endorsed the proposed policy and agreed that course materials developed by the instructor should belong to the instructor unless exceptional university resources were required in their preparation. Some of the committee members, although not opposed to the policy, believed that course materials in addition to syllabi (e.g., lab manuals, video tapes, others) should be freely available to other UC faculty, even if creation of those course materials did not require exceptional university resources. This point was considered moot by others, however, because most faculty prefer to develop their own course materials. All committee members agreed that it would be best if faculty and departments agreed in advance as to how course materials were to be developed.</p> <p><i>UCR:</i> Contract between university and faculty when “extraordinary resources” are involved: contract negotiation process is vague and may create a sense of</p>

DRAFT
12/16/02 (last updated 2/18/03)

<p><i>Originator(s)</i> and University officials are encouraged to explore the need for an agreement whenever it appears that <i>Exceptional University Resources</i> are involved in creation of a particular <i>Work</i> or when there is any uncertainty about the ownership of rights for the <i>Work</i>. It is in the interest of the <i>Originator(s)</i> and the University that assessment of the need for an agreement takes place at the earliest possible time in the life cycle of a project to which this provision might apply.</p>	<p>“administration vs. faculty”.</p> <p><i>Ac. Council:</i> require an agreement explicitly assigning ownership rights be drawn up in advance whenever the University makes available to the faculty member resources that it deems exceptional.</p> <p><i>UCFW:</i> There was some sentiment that the current language in the second paragraph under III. C... should be strengthened. If the practice were to make such an agreement a condition for the granting of resources deemed exceptional, then both parties would be aware of their rights and obligations from the outset, and the likelihood of subsequent disputes and recriminations would be reduced.</p>
<p>In the absence of an agreement, rights to <i>Course Materials</i> created with the use of <i>Exceptional University Resources</i> shall belong jointly to the <i>Originator(s)</i> and the University. Before these materials are commercialized, the <i>Originator(s)</i> and the University shall enter into a written agreement specifying who shall control the use of the materials and how any revenues will be divided. If no agreement can be reached, the matter shall be referred to the Course Materials Policy Committee.</p>	<p><i>UCSD:</i> On behalf of the San Diego campus, I applaud the efforts the University's Standing Committee on Copyright Materials in providing this draft for comments. We believe the overall concept on ownership determination is fair and clear. However, we have significant reservations concerning the approach to resolve the disposition of any materials that have been determined to belong jointly to the Originator(s) and the University in the absence of a prior written agreement (P.3, Paragraph 3 under C).</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Since most campuses already have standing committees or taskforces addressing copyright issues (e.g. on the San Diego campus, we already have a standing Technology Transfer Advisory Committee), it may be best for the existing committees or taskforces to determine a more precise mechanism to determine the disposition of the jointly owned materials that arise from the use of Exceptional University Resources rather than a mandate for the campuses to establish a new Course Materials Policy Committee. Certainly, for campuses that do not already have standing committees to address such issues, it would be appropriate for those campuses to do so. 2. Rather than on a "case-by-case" basis approach to reach an agreement to determine "who shall control the use of the materials and how the revenues will be divided," we believe a more precise and clear approach that is similar to the existing UC Patent Policy or the various campus guidelines for the management of copyrights is necessary. We believe a more concrete formula that predetermine that the University should have control over the commercialization of the Course Materials (when Exceptional University Resources are used) and then a fixed percentage revenue-sharing with the Originator(s) would provide UC employees a clear picture on what to anticipate should the employees use Exceptional University Resources. 3. In the immediate preceding paragraph, the document encourages the potential Originator(s) of any work to work with the University to explore the need for an agreement before the work begins to involve the use of any Exceptional University

DRAFT
12/16/02 (last updated 2/18/03)

	<p>Resources. The currently proposed approach to determine how the University and the Originator may enter into a written agreement after the work is already done would in fact act against such an intent.</p> <p>4. Once the above is done and no agreement is reached, the matter is currently recommended to be referred to the Course Material Policy Committee. No light is currently shed on how the Course Material Policy Committee would resolve the disagreement.</p> <p>We encourage the UC Standing Committee on Copyright to modify Paragraph 3 on P. 3 under subheading C to simply refer the matter to the standing committees or taskforces the campuses may already have to establish a "clear policy" to resolve this matter. The campus policies, then certainly should be copied to the UC Standing Committee on Copyright.</p> <p><i>UCR:</i> It is proposed that, rather than vesting joint ownership with use rights to course syllabi, the policy should vest ownership of syllabi in the faculty, who may grant rights to university of future use.</p>
<p>Copies of all agreements on <i>Course Materials</i> created with the use of <i>Exceptional University Resources</i> shall be filed with the UC Standing Committee on Copyright.</p>	
<p><i>D. Jointly Originated Works.</i></p>	
<p>Ownership of rights to <i>Course Materials</i> that are created by the intellectual labor of more than one person shall be owned jointly, pursuant to the provisions of the University of California Policy on Copyright Ownership, Section V. If <i>Course Materials</i> are created jointly, including the intellectual labor of <i>Designated Academic Appointee(s)</i> and others, ownership of the contributions of <i>Designated Academic Appointee(s)</i> shall be governed by this Policy, and the contribution of others shall be governed by the University of California Policy on Copyright Ownership. Ownership of the rights to jointly originated <i>Works</i> shall be determined by separately assessing the Category of Work of each <i>Originator</i> pursuant to the University of California Policy on</p>	

DRAFT
12/16/02 (last updated 2/18/03)

Copyright Ownership.	
IV. Course Materials Policy Committee	
<p>A Course Materials Policy Committee shall be established at each campus. The committee shall be advisory to the Chancellor and shall consist of at least five members, a majority of whom shall be appointed by the divisional Academic Senate. This committee will make recommendations to the Chancellor regarding any issues concerning: (1) what constitutes the use of <i>Exceptional University Resources</i>; and (2) the commercialization of <i>Course Materials</i> created with the use of <i>Exceptional University Resources</i>. The Course Materials Policy Committee shall make a written report of its recommended resolution of each issue, which shall be filed with the Chancellor of the campus and with the UC Standing Committee on Copyright.</p>	<p><i>LBNL</i>: We approve of the Policy, but as I mentioned in a recent telephone conversation with you, we have a suggested revision for the National Labs (Lawrence Berkeley National Laboratory, Lawrence Livermore National Lab, and Los Alamos National Lab.)</p> <p>As you know, the Labs do not create and provide academic courses as a primary activity, and the great preponderance of work performed at the Labs is under contract with the US Department of Energy, with ownership of works covered by the contract and/or the intellectual property acknowledgment signed by employees and guests. Therefore we expect only the most occasional case to arise, and so do not see the usefulness of a standing Course Materials Policy Committee (Section IV). Rather we propose to have a Point of Contact at the Labs who can put together a review committee should a case arise. For Berkeley Lab we would designate Karl Olson, our Conflict of Interest Coordinator, as our Point of Contact for this Policy.</p> <p><i>UCR</i>: On the campus level, the advisory committee assigned to assist the EVC with policy interpretation should be regulatory, not ad hoc.</p> <p><i>UCSB</i>: One suggestion from one of our reviewing units is that instead of requiring each campus to establish a “Course Materials Policy Committee,” the decision be left up to each individual campus as to whether they need such a committee or not. For example, some campuses do not have a high activity level with respect to the commercialization of course materials while this may not be true for other UC campuses. Thus from a resource standpoint, the instituting of a Course Materials Policy Committee may not be needed on some campuses.</p> <p>On the other hand, this reviewing unit points out that “It may be beneficial to one or more campuses with active licensing programs to delegate these decisions to one office or senior administrative position, to allow for efficient administration of the policy and its reporting requirements and to meet the needs of the commercial sector.”</p> <p><i>UCSC</i>: Given the potential for each campus’s Course Materials Policy Committee to develop differing interpretations of what constitutes “Exceptional University Resources” and who shall control the use of course materials created using these resources, what result for a faculty member teaching a Distance Education Course online to students registered at multiple campuses – which campus’s policy shall apply?</p>

DRAFT
12/16/02 (last updated 2/18/03)

	<p><i>Ac. Council:</i> the Council does not see the need to establish a standing Committee on Copyright [sic?], and advises rather that an existing Senate body conduct reviews of copyright issues.</p> <p>If the workload associated with the initial implementation of this new policy is expected to be too heavy and the creation of a separate body seems advisable, it should be appointed for a determinate time period and a sunset clause should provide for the reversion of its responsibilities to the appropriate Senate body.</p> <p><i>UCFW:</i> UCFW questioned whether the establishment of yet another committee is advisable. Since a majority of the members of this body would in any case be appointed by the divisional Academic Senate, would it not make more sense to add these new responsibilities to the charge of the existing committees charged on each campus with the oversight of curricular matters (variously the Committee on Educational Policy, the Committee on Courses, and/or the Committee on Graduate Education)?</p> <p><i>UCPB:</i> The proposed policy is unclear as to whether the Course Materials Policy Committee has the power to arbitrate after-the-fact disputes about whether “extraordinary resources” are involved in a project and thus whether joint ownership has been created. Such disputes would not arise if our suggested revisions are adopted: the University would have no claim to joint ownership unless there were agreement in advance about the conditions under which its “extraordinary” investment was made. The role of the Course Materials Policy Committee would then be to advise the University prospectively about when an extraordinary use of campus resources should be conditioned on acquiring a share of intellectual property. These policies should be published in advance, and a campus administration should be permitted to make such “extraordinary” investments only in accordance with these policies. In the event of a question about whether “extraordinary resources” are involved in a project or whether the project qualifies for such resources under the guidelines established by the Committee, the Committee should be consulted before the investment is made.</p>
<p>V. Standing Committee on Copyright</p>	
<p>For the purposes of promoting Universitywide consistency in the interpretation of this Policy and providing a means for the University to gain the benefit of the diverse experiences of the campuses, the UC Standing Committee on Copyright will regularly review the reports of the campus Course Materials Policy Committees and of agreements on <i>Course Materials</i> created with the use of <i>Exceptional University Resources</i>, and make</p>	<p><i>UCFW:</i> Concerns were also expressed over the composition of the Standing Committee on Copyright. Members felt that it would be more appropriate for this body to consist in its majority of members of the Academic Senate. UCFW recognizes that the current review deals only with the oversight responsibilities of the Standing Committee, not with its internal makeup, but this seems an appropriate topic for the Senate to discuss outside the context of the proposed policy changes.</p>

recommendations to the Provost and Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs for policy revisions or implementation guidelines that may be needed to achieve these purposes.	
VI. Using Course Materials Outside the University.	
In using <i>Course Materials</i> outside the University of California, <i>Designated Academic Appointees</i> shall abide by applicable University policies, including, but not limited to:	
▪ The use of the University's name (DA 0864, May 3, 1985) (http://www.ucop.edu/ucophome/coordrev/da/da0864.html) and seal (DA 0865, May 3, 1985) (http://www.ucop.edu/ucophome/coordrev/da/da0865.html)	
▪ The Policy on Conflict of Commitment and Outside Activities of Faculty Members (APM 025) (http://www.ucop.edu/acadadv/acadpers/apm/s1-025.html).	
▪ The prohibition on use of University facilities for commercial purposes (APM 015 Part II.C.3) (http://www.ucop.edu/acadadv/acadpers/apm/s1-015.html)	