



UNIVERSITY COMMITTEE ON LIBRARY AND SCHOLARLY PUBLISHING

Minutes of Meeting
20 February, 2026

In attendance:

UCOLASC Members: Abe Stone (Chair), Jennifer LaFleur, (Berkeley), Michael Foster (Davis), Nicola Ulibarri (Irvine), Alan Fiske (Los Angeles), Christopher Ojeda (Merced), Joseph Genereaux (Riverside), Sebastian Salegh, (San Diego), Michael Oldham (San Francisco), Teresa Shewry (Santa Barbara), Michael Hance (Santa Cruz), Günter Waibel (Associate Vice Provost and Executive Director, California Digital Library), Heather Briston (LAUC President), Miranda Bennet (Director of Shared Collections, CDL), Mat Wilmott (Assistant Director of Shared Collections, CDL), Chris Shaffer, Catherine Mitchell (Director of Publishing, Archives, and Digitization, CDL), Erik Mitchell (University Librarian, San Diego), Danielle Watters Westbrook (Systemwide Library Planning Analyst), Shari Laster (Associate University Librarian and Director of Systemwide Library Facilities), Alice Parra Rios (Student Representative), James Steintrager (Irvine), William Garrity (CoUL Chair, UC Davis), Suzanne Wones (CoUL Vice Chair, UC Berkeley), Lorelei Tanji (CoUL Past Chair), Athena Jackson (UCLA), Haipeng Li (UC Merced), Mihoko Hosoi (UC Riverside), Erik Mitchell (UC San Diego), Chris Shaffer (UC San Francisco), Todd Grappone (UC Santa Barbara), Kerry Scott (UC Santa Cruz), Stefani Leto, Analyst

I. Chair's Announcements, Consent Calendar

Action: UCOLASC approved the agenda for February 20, 2026, and the minutes of October 31, 2025.

II. Opening Remarks (Joint UCOLASC/CoUL Meeting)

CoUL and UCOLASC members introduced themselves.

III. UC Libraries Budget Coalition and Coordinated Mitigation Strategy

CoUL briefed UCOLASC on a budget mitigation strategy employed by the UC Libraries at its October 2025 meeting. In this February 2026 update, CoUL members reiterated that the systemwide library licensed content budget coalition is funded by all participants through a fair cost share. This collective funding approach works well when funding levels at all campuses and OP are stable. This fiscal year, five of the campus libraries could not meet their cost share in the coalition due to local budget cuts, with the largest cut being 17 percent of a campus cost share, resulting in a hypothetical loss in purchasing power of 17 percent for the entire coalition. If libraries had to individually negotiate the agreements covered by the coalition, local costs would significantly increase. The mitigation strategy consists of making a smaller budget cut to the overall coalition budget (resulting in the cancellation of twenty

contracts) while bridge funding maintains access to most of the portfolio. However, this bridge funding is a one-time solution, buying time for budgets to recover, or for the more drastic cuts to be made. Members are encouraged to work with their local University Librarians to find ways to support and advocate for the libraries.

IV. Project Transformation Update

The Project Transformation Negotiating Team provided an update on ongoing and concluded negotiations with publishers. Following a 2025 two-year extension with Elsevier, negotiations will begin later this year for a new agreement with the publisher. Negotiations focus on commercial topics, with non-commercial topics such as author and user rights, providing guidance. Authors can fall afoul of federally funded author requirements for no embargo if they do not choose open access. Changing author workflows to encourage open access would help; this is part of the negotiation process.

The UC continues to negotiate with the American Chemical Society. Conflicts over author rights to use sandboxed AI data mining and AI-based research continue to be a sticking point. The UC is willing to act if they cannot reach agreement. UCOLASC's letter regarding their stance on author rights to this research is helpful for this process. Should the publisher not be willing to accommodate the UC's stance, the only leverage is to refuse engagement as was done with Elsevier, and the PTNT will reach out to chemistry faculty and discuss options.

V. Report on UC Libraries Open Monograph Activities

The UC Libraries have developed an Open Access Monograph Strategy through a coordinated approach and is working to translate these strategies to action. The goal of this work is to grow support for OA monograph publishing through a multi-faceted approach including:

- prioritize investments in book processing charge-based open access monograph initiatives that provide immediate benefit to UC authors.
- invest in a range of diamond open access monograph initiatives that are aligned with UC author publishing priorities
- invest in university presses open access publishing initiatives to advance our mission-aligned OA work
- make Investments in community-owned, non-commercial infrastructure that also bolsters underlying organization, discoverability and sustainability goals

These four focus areas will work together to provide direct benefit to UC authors and broader benefit through improved OA publishing infrastructure. Additionally, the program will grow and sustain a range of open access monograph models, sustain university presses, and invest in community-owned infrastructure. The steering committee charged with advancing this work will compare recommended strategies versus current investments and determine which strategies to pursue further.

As part of this effort, CDL has three pilot projects underway, including the University of California Press, Oxford University Press and Duke University. In addition, CDL is piloting a collaboration with the Big Ten Academic Alliance under a project called Big Ten Open Books. All of these pilots seek to publish or open titles under an OA license. The titles will also be added to eScholarship. Authors are typically contacted with this opportunity and are engaged

throughout the opening process. To date, the uptake has been positive. Additionally, these projects are attracting attention among the University Press community, and the team will talk about them at the Association of University Presses meeting.

VI. Systemwide Library Facilities (SLF) Update

The UC approach to shared library facilities is innovative as the approach prioritizes efficiency, sustainability, and effectiveness in managing these collections without ceding access, preservation, or stewardship. The governance structure is carefully constructed so that it continues as a shared resource, prioritizing active accessibility to the materials while the system moves from a regional structure to a system-wide one. A new full-time director of the Systemwide Library Facility, and Associate University Librarian, Shari Laster, will coordinate the transformation.

UCOLASC-Only Meeting

VII. eScholarship Publishing – Scholar-led Diamond OA Journals at UC

Catherine Mitchell, the Director of Publishing, Archives and Digitization at CDL, updated the committee on CDL's eScholarship program. eScholarship has a repository function and a publishing arm, specifically as a diamond open access journal publisher.

The repository function of eScholarship supports campus units and individual researchers in sharing their scholarly materials. All materials collected under the auspices of the UC Open Access polices are deposited in and available via eScholarship. Similarly, all theses and dissertations written by UC graduate students are submitted to ProQuest and displayed in eScholarship. A new function of the repository is to provide access to the UC-authored OA Monographs pilot.

eScholarship also provides a Diamond Open Access journal publishing program, publishing more than 90 UC-affiliated journals. Diamond OA refers to a scholarly publication model in which journals and platforms do not charge fees to either authors or readers. These journals are community-driven, academic-led, and academic-owned publishing initiatives. They have neither subscription charge nor APC. Because this model has no profit margins, it provides a more affordable approach to scholarly publishing. The eScholarship publishing budget is only two percent of the UC Publisher Licensing Budget.

eScholarship publishes journals representing a wide range of disciplines, especially humanities and social sciences which make up 50-70 percent of the output. Undergraduate and graduate student-published journals are also supported by this program, offering a UC-based training ground for developing editorial/publishing skills as part of students' education.

In a shift from commercial publishing models, prestige for Diamond Open Access journals rests with the editorial board, rather than the journal title or publisher. While most eScholarship journals are born open access, several journals have flipped to open access from commercial publishing environments, bringing their editorial boards with them. Promotion and Tenure committees need support in navigating a different kind of valuing for all these Diamond OA journals. The program is exploring various funding models including the

newly launched Open Journals Collective, providing a potential path toward sustainable Diamond open access publishing.

VIII. UC Arts and Humanities OA Fund

Mat Willmott updated UCOLASC on the UC Libraries Arts and Humanities Open Access Fund, launched in November 2026. This fund is managed by the library system and will fully cover fees for open access publishing by an eligible UC corresponding author (a UC-affiliated early career researcher, including students, postdocs, research staff, and pre-tenure faculty) in an eligible journal. Because transformative agreements are not possible with every single journal, this fund allows authors to choose open access by subsidizing the costs for eligible journals not covered by an existing transformative agreement.

The pilot is small in scale, with roughly 300 articles published each year across the UC system, and the team is using the pilot to learn what it would need to increase the scale. Outreach is targeted, and uptake has been slightly lower than hoped. UCOLASC was asked to take news of the program to their divisions: <https://osc.universityofcalifornia.edu/for-authors/open-access-publishing-at-uc/arts-humanities-open-access-fund/>

IX. Academic Senate AI Report

James Steintrager, former Systemwide Senate Chair, briefed UCOLASC about the work of the [Academic Senate Workgroup on Artificial Intelligence](#), charged with finding solutions to AI problems as well as identifying areas of opportunity for the university. The field evolved during the year the workgroup met. The group came up with principles, agency, adaptability, and trustworthiness, to guide work around AI use. In addition, the workgroup wanted to ensure that the university's approach to AI includes true consultation and integration of faculty.

The group identified standing Senate committees interested in AI and asked that they exercise ongoing attention to it. Faculty have responsibilities in two areas: education in critical AI literacy, and second, helping adjudicate the tension between open access and control of data. The group noted that they could identify many issues and problems but were less sanguine about solutions.

Discussion included concerns about the lack of dissemination of the report, and AI diminishing the trust people have in scholarly sources. Creative Commons licenses were raised as an illustrative example – it is a challenge to allow access, but restrict, and advance the public good. AI is not a novel problem, just a new form of the same one.

X. Tenure & Promotion – How to Evolve them to Accurately Incorporate Research Data Publications

UCOLASC member Michael Oldham presented work he has done for his division, “Recognizing Creation of Datasets in Academic Review,” and provided a rubric for universities to help them follow simple rules for recognizing data and software contributions for advancement. The rubric was created by the Implementing Data Evaluation in Academia Working Group (IDEA WG), and grew from a collaboration between Helios Open and Making Data Count.

Universities fall on a continuum beginning with those that treat data as incidental byproducts rather than meaningful research outputs and generally have no institutional standardization for promoting data sharing or measuring its dissemination and impact. At the other end of the spectrum are institutions that understand data sharing and reuse are central to the institution's abilities to achieve its goals. Expectations around data sharing, documenting, reporting, and evaluating shared data are standardized and widely distributed.

At UCSF currently, datasets are not used to their maximum effect but are treated as project-based outputs. With increasing reliance on machine learning and computational research, these data sets provide a rich vein that can be compared, aggregated, and used for cross-validation purposes. Currently if many research teams are provided the same question about the same data set, widely differing results ensue. Creating shared consensus about data analysis will answer this problem.

Contributing to a reproducibility crisis is that datasets in shared repositories do not have common identification for searching. A task force on research data and metadata standardization has been launched at UCSF by the COLASC. Their final report is forthcoming and will be shared with UCOLASC. When the question of why authors would go to the trouble of running their data through metadata filters like the ones developed at UCSF arose, it was answered by noting that the current reward system in academia focuses on publication. A search engine for biomedical research data sets is only valuable to authors if their data is rewarded in the tenure and promotion process.

At UCSF, ADVANCE is the software for creating standardized CVs that are reviewed by the Committee on Academic Personnel for promotion. The CV has no section for data sets or software. Sections exist for publications, grants, and other creative pursuits, which encompass all other outputs. Modernizing these fields to provide a reporting area for non-published work, as well as guidance for review committees to consider these new areas of production will help with more accurate valuation of faculty work in the promotion process.

XI. New Business

UCOLASC members discussed how they would like to engage with AI as a committee. Members agreed to review the Senate AI Task Force report and ask their local COLASCS for feedback and discuss it at the next meeting.

The committee adjourned at 3:12.

Minutes prepared by NAME, TITLE
Attest: NAME, COMMITTEE Chair