



UNIVERSITY COMMITTEE ON LIBRARIES AND SCHOLARY COMMUNICATION

Minutes of Meeting

15 May 2026

In attendance: Abe Stone (Chair), Déborah Blocker (Vice Chair), Jennifer LaFleur (Berkeley), John Roberts (Berkeley), Michael Foster (Davis) Nicola Ulibarrí (Irvine), Christopher Ojeda (Merced), Joseph Genereux (Riverside), Sebastian Salegh (San Diego) Michael Oldham, San Francisco), Teresa Shewry (Santa Barbara), Michael Hance (Santa Cruz), Alice Parra Rios (undergraduate Student), Günter Waibel (Associate Vice Provost and Executive Director, California Digital Library), William Garrity (CoUL Chair), Miranda Bennett, Danielle Watters Westbrook, Heather Briston, Catherine Mitchell, Rich Schneider (San Francisco), Matthew Wimott (CDL), Stefani Leto (Analyst)

Item

I. Consent Calendar

Action: UCOLASC approved the May 15, 2026 agenda and the February 21, 2026 minutes

II. Chair's Announcements

Chair Stone thanked the committee for their work this year. He also thanked the California Digital Library (CDL) consultants for their sustained support of UCOLASC.

III. Council of University Librarians (CoUL) Update

William Garrity, CoUL Chair noted that the UC Libraries managed a challenging budget climate by reducing the systemwide portfolio of information resources by 3.7 percent through targeted contract cancellations, while CDL provided temporary bridge funding from their reserves.

The UC Libraries have been approached by tech companies interested in supporting collection digitization at the UC beyond UC's long-standing digitization partnership with Google.

IV. California Digital Library (CDL) Update

Günter Waibel, Associate Vice Provost and Executive Director, CDL, updated the committee on the OA Forward coalition, bringing worldwide chief negotiators together to discuss how to advance publisher based open access. All UC campuses and UCOP have signed an Expression of Interest (Eoi) in advancing OA through publisher negotiations. UC values and strategies are strongly represented in the statements shared at the recent conference. UCOLASC statements

have been used to shape global consensus. The UC then has increased heft in negotiations with publishers because its concerns are reflected in international statements.

CDL is partnering with the Big Ten Academic Alliance and Lyrasis on a research project funded by a grant from the Gates foundation to do a landscape analysis of Diamond OA publishing in the United States. CDL's Catherine Mitchell was part of the Projects Advisory Committee of this effort, and they focused on exploring specific examples of where Diamond Open Access is working and is delivering on its promise in areas such as equity, access, community, and sustainability. One outcome of this meeting is a survey of Diamond OA publishers and individual journals. Committee members were asked to share the survey with any Diamond OA journal publishers or independent journals.

CDL websites are experiencing increased bot traffic scraping data for incorporation into LLMs. Leadership is seeking solutions; all libraries are experiencing this now. One approach is technology mitigation, but there may be some degraded service while mitigation strategies are deployed.

V. AI and Journal Articles

AVP Waibel presented that any process for creating AI policies for UC data that requires the university to have a baseline shared understanding of the context within which specific types of data are situated. Policies must consider all existing laws, regulations, policies and guidelines about data at the university.

University stakeholders, including UCOLASC members have expressed specific hopes, dreams and fears regarding AI, including enabling academic AI, withholding content from commercial AI training, enabling federal compliance, and revenue generation. These ambitions interact in complex ways with the choices authors make when publishing.

In AVP/ED Waibel's analysis, only openly licensed publications definitively enables the academic AI training that UCOLASC has repeatedly supported in its statements; other than not publishing, there is no method that would definitively withhold scholarly content from commercial AI training; an open publication presents the most straightforward path to federal compliance; and the University has no pathway to seeking a revenue stream through based on its authors publishing activities. Closed publishing keeps copyright and logistical control over an article with the publisher, enabling a lucrative new revenue stream for the publisher to sell the articles to AI companies for LLM training, as well as to faculty and institutions who need to make computational uses to advance their research.

UCOLASC concluded that it is important to help authors understand that neither a closed publication or a CC-BY-NC(-ND) license protect against commercial AI training. For a closed publication, the copyright transfer to the publisher means that the publisher now can sell the article to an AI company. For a CC-BY-NC(-ND) license, many commercial publishers deliberately retain the exclusive commercial rights that enables them to sell the article to an AI company. Even if that were not the case, copyright and its fair use provision supersede any CC license, and there is a case to be made that commercial AI training is a fair use.

- Robust discussion focused on the constraints facing any effort to restrict AI use of UC assets.

VI. Discussion: Systemwide Report of the Academic Senate Workgroup on Artificial Intelligence

The Academic Senate Workgroup report makes statements regarding open access that seem to contradict longstanding Academic Senate advocacy for open access. UCOLASC was not invited to participate in the work, and the UC Libraries were not consulted by the Senate workgroup for this report. UCOLASC resolved to respond to the report and call out statements that contradict existing Academic Senate policy and statements and request direct involvement of UCOLASC in any future AI discussion or workgroup touching on scholarly publications and research data.

The committee plans to send a letter to Academic Council correcting the record and asking for involvement in ongoing Senate or systemwide discussions regarding AI, as well as appropriate consultation with UC Library experts.

Action: UCOLASC will respond with a letter detailing their concerns and suggestions for future consultation.

VII. Project Transform Update

Mat Willmott, CDL updated UCOLASC about the ongoing negotiation with Wiley. All other renewable contracts will be up for discussion next year. The UC negotiates on its own behalf, but also with the CSU and the Statewide California Electronic Library Consortium (SCELC), which broadens the financial coalition. The PTNT is trying to conclude early in the year to expedite the approval process. Author agreements with Wiley continue to be less than clear with respect to federal funder policy compliance. The team is awaiting their response to the most recent proposal.

Author uptake of open publishing continues to be suboptimal, possibly reflecting erroneous beliefs about saving money for institutions or preventing AI access to their work. In the Wiley negotiation, as in all transformative negotiations, the goal is to make open access the easy default for authors, so that they have to opt-out, and that the consequences of so doing are made clear.

VIII. American Chemical Society (ACS) Negotiation Update

The UC is still negotiating the 2026 agreement with the American Chemical Society (ACS). The point of disagreement point of contention with ACS has been the rights for researchers to use, ACS licensed content, with different types of artificial intelligence and text and data mining, and research methodologies. The team is working on an addendum specific to AI matters. A letter, signed by 119 UC faculty members emphasized the importance of AI research methods and the ability of faculty to use them without publisher restriction. There are other issues such as funder expectations for immediate public access to data, but they may prove easier to resolve. The ACS is reviewing the most recent proposal, and the team hopes to successfully

conclude negotiations. The ACS has, as is usual practice, maintained researchers' access to materials during the negotiation period.

IX. Federal Data Management Planning Policy Changes

Maria Praetzelis, CDL, shared that UC has a web application helping researchers create best practice data management plans called the DMP tool. Previously, the tool has been a communication tool between libraries and researchers, so that information and guidance could be delivered to researchers. Recent changes from both NSF and NIH to data management and sharing plans appear to be minor but have real world implications. NSF Data management Plans will now be moving into a closed federal portal – currently with no API, though the community is advocating for open APIs and interoperability. NSF researchers will now fill out their data management plan directly in the federal system rather than uploading a document. NIH researchers will continue to upload a document, but the format has changed from a narrative to primarily structured yes/no questions. In addition, the NIH has simplified the form so that narrative responses are removed. Navigating the NSF's system is likely to be more challenging to researchers; the NIH simpler.

The positive aspects of these changes are indications that data management is taken seriously, that machine actions will be enabled on data, and that compliance with data submission matters to the government.

The concerns expressed in the meeting surround the implementation of these changes. Libraries lose the ability to customize their guidance, researchers pursuing guidance will need to work outside of the government systems, and choosing a simpler approach foregoes collaboration with experts in the library. There is a lack of clarity about how the data can be searched, raising concerns about negative responses to researchers.

- Discussion focused on what the changes might mean, whether there is opportunity for feedback to the government and pushing to maintain open APIs, and how libraries and researchers can continue to stay connected despite these changes.

X. Campus Updates

Berkeley: The library wants involvement with all discussions about AI on campus. The committee is changing its name to conform with the UCOLASC naming convention. CAPRA had augmented the collections budget in prior years but were not able to because that kind of budget is capped, so the budget committee wants to supplement the collections budget and is pushing to change the budget structure to do so.

Davis: The library receives many requests for comment mostly on new degree proposals. These proposals, once approved, will increase the pressure on library resources. Overall budget cuts on campus, including the library, have pressured collections so the library has cut back on some spending while maintaining a high level of service. The committee submitted a letter to the campus senate, reminding the campus about the impact of resource cuts on downstream faculty and students. The library is profoundly woven into the fabric of research and instruction and therefore taken for granted.

Irvine: The committee has spent much time discussing the AI report, and AI implementation has been a focus for the committee. The campus has no standalone library committee, because it is shared with research and computing.

Merced: The University Librarian is retiring so a search produced great candidates, and one was hired. The library won a \$750,000 NEH award to do some renovations during the building of the Sierra Nevada and Central Valley Archive, which the chancellor matched, however due to increased construction costs not all planned renovations will be done but the project should be completed in the fall. Ongoing across campus budget cuts have heavily impacted the library's collections budget. Other senate committees have advocated funding for the library.

Riverside: Because the campus has had many years of budget cuts, the library faces no additional cuts. Some new hiring in the library. The committee supports normal advocacy for the library and reminds new programs that the resources they need have costs.

San Diego: Budget issues have been partially addressed through attrition, but this has caused library service to diminish and librarians to work much harder. A customer satisfaction survey revealed that respondents are aware that budget cuts, rather than the librarians, are responsible for any problems. The committee has spent time raising awareness of open access both within and outside of the committee; some authors still think they are saving money by opting out.

San Francisco: The library committee has been focusing on the impact of the federal open access policies and how their effect on investigators. The committee sent out a survey on the impact of those policies and is sharing the results with the campus senate in June. They will distribute guidance in the fall. The next issue is AI and its impact on research, researchers and publishers. A Research Data and Metadata Task Force presented their final report and will likely form a subcommittee of COLASC to produce standardized metadata schema for all mixed datasets at UCSF. The committee is applying for chancellor's funding for that effort. The subcommittee would have shared governance: library, faculty, and IT.

XI. Proactive New Business for 2026-27

UCOLASC discussed proactive topics for the committee for next year. Issues included:

Data management plans and more publicity about the DMP.

Proactive approaches to bridge funding so campus funds are not drained.

Securing funding for libraries and including local and systemwide advocacy.

The committee adjourned at 2:39.

Minutes prepared by Stefani Leto

Attest: Abe Stone, UCOLASC Chair