Date
12 February 2014
1pm-2:30pm

Attendees

- Diane B. Bisom (Chair, UCR)
- Myra Appel (UCD)
- Marcia Barrett (UCSC)
- Judy Consales (UCLA)
- Elizabeth DuPuis (UCB)
- Vicki Grahame (UCI)
- Martha Hruska (UCSD)
- Polina E Ilieva (UCSF, Note Taker)
- Emily Lin (UCM)
- Janet Martorana (UCSB)
- Leslie Wolf (Portfolio Manager)
- Jean McKenzie (CLS Liaison)

Absent:

- Angela Riggio (LAUC)
- Heather Christenson (CDL)

Discussion Items

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Who</th>
<th>Discussion Notes</th>
<th>Decisions/Actions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5min</td>
<td>Call to Order, Agenda Review, Announcements, Updates</td>
<td>Diane</td>
<td>Time Keeper – Volunteer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-1:05pm</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time</td>
<td>Topic</td>
<td>Responsible Party</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 1:05-1:15pm | Using the Notes Template  
Public vs. Internal Version of SAG 3 Notes | Leslie            |
|           | **Using the Notes Template**  
Leslie uploaded past notes (10/23/2014 to 1/22/2014). For our special meeting on 1/21/14 (and meetings of the same type), confirmation needed that the level of detail, and the specific details are fine for publication. Is there a need for guidelines for internal vs. public notes? |                  |
|           | **Recorder will put notes in the Meeting Agenda and Minutes, using the “Discussion Notes” and “Decisions/Actions” columns.**  
**Action items should use the @ mention and the task boxes. Leslie can help if needed.**  
**Links to the draft meeting notes should be sent for review no later than 1 week and should be finalized and ready for uploading to the website no later than 2 weeks.**  
**We had questions only about the special 1/21/14 meeting. Leslie and Diane will review and refine the notes before publishing. We can discuss a guideline when we have more examples.** |                  |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Item</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>15min</td>
<td>1. Updates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:15-1:30pm</td>
<td>2. Coordinating Committee Update</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. Shared ILS/RMS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4. Chinese cataloging pilot background</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5. CLS</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 1. Updates

- Updates as needed; email updates are fine, unless actions are needed.

### 2. Coordinating Committee Update

- The Coordinating Committee (CC) will be meeting with SAG chairs and ULs next week to check what is working, figure out how to improve communications, discuss process of setting up and communicating SKG creation.
- The CC is trying to be more consistent about naming groups such as: project teams or working groups. It depends on varying levels of required project management. If we do have a formal project team it has to have project manager and project plan.
- Some of our [SAG3] reports don't include the necessary details. Questions were raised about what level of details to include in monthly reports.
- Suggestion that Marlo should send these reports, plus send a letter to the task force. A question was raised if we should do monthly reports, instead of bi-monthly.

### 3. Shared ILS/RMS

- The surveys from the campuses are due Friday, so far have 5 responses evaluating feedback from consultants, will be meeting on February 19th and decide on recommendations.

### 4. Chinese cataloging NGTS pilot background

- Chinese cataloging document: campuses will work on Chinese monograph backlog.
- Made call for campuses to volunteer their services. Peter [...], from Berkeley proposed doing something very different (they outsource to China their copy cataloging).

### 5. CLS

- CLS decided how we will move forward.

---

2. Martha Hruska will report SAG3 recommendations that the terminology [and naming of groups] should be descriptive and well defined, not to use project team too loosely.

Submit recommendations to the Coordinating Committee that it should define the communication process and path for distributing SAG reports.

Request the Coordinating Committee recommendations how often and how detailed reports should be.

4. Decided that instead we will forward the proposal to SAG3 to rethink and reshape that project, to create a working group that will create an inventory of all existing materials, CLE to talk with campuses that have these backlogs.

Will add to our next agenda to decide what actions to be taken — February 26. Martha Hruska will give an update about Chinese cataloging project.

5. Will form a small CLS team to deal with system-wide purchases of eBooks, by the end of February will assemble a team of 3 CLS representatives to work on questions and framework for eBooks project.
| 30min | Major Agenda Topic: Bibliographer Groups | Myra, Beth, Emily | Review Framework for Collection Librarians and gather comments, revisions, and nominations for task group membership. Goal is to finalize document and charge group to begin work by 3/1. POT7 LT2 Report - Sept 17 2013.pdf Working group presented a document they put together “New Framework for the Role and Engagement of UC Collections Librarians,” looking for feedback and to discuss next steps: • The goal of CKGs is information sharing, this document states that they will be involved in cooperative collection building. • Maybe these groups shouldn’t be CKGs; sometimes bibliographers who have an assignment on a narrower topic or work on a similar subject would want to create a low key communication channel and a group. • They should be able to create a CKG if they would like to formalize the group. • These small subgroups will be within a larger umbrella of a CKG • We should lay this vision down as part of this document. Should articulate the flexibility of this framework, how members will be nominated for the group. | Clarify and develop proposal process for CKG, and how the ideas proposed by them are implemented. By February 26th Emily Lin, Myra Appel, Elizabeth DuPuis will edit the Framework for Collection Librarians document and present it to the group. The names of 2-3 members for the task group should be submitted to SAG3 by each campus. Include both bibliographers for life sciences and physical sciences group. Diane B. Bisom will report to Marlo that we wrapped up this report and will dissolve the working group. |
| 15min | Major Agenda Topic: NGTS P-4 Pilot: Non-Book Pilot Project | Martha | 1/20/2014 email from Martha: As we discussed on our December 18 call, the NGTS P-4 Non-Book Pilot Project has now completed its work. The final report can be found at: https://wiki.library.ucsf.edu/pages/viewpage.action?pageId=326405847 Will do lightweight inventory; create a page on wiki with questions about the level of backlog, ongoing needs. SAG3 will thank and dismiss pilot task group. Martha Hruska will prepare a final report and letter. |
It has been shared and reviewed by interested music catalogers throughout the library system. The next steps we decided at our meeting were for SAG 3 to:

• review the document and share with any others on your campus who may be interested. As detailed in the report, we have learned that cataloging of compact discs using surrogates at a single campus location can be an attractive option for eliminating cataloging backlogs, producing cataloging that is both cost-effective and performed at a higher level of quality and adherence to UC standards than cataloging produced by vendors.

• inventory any significant local backlogs in this format

• consider whether eliminating these backlogs remains a priority, and if there would be interest in taking advantage of such a service at a single campus

• consider the value of pursuing a ‘Center of Expertise’ model for special format or language cataloging at a designated campus.

• determine where long term access to the Standards document should be archived? Documents section of SAG 3 website.

Please review by Feb. 5. So that we can discuss on our Feb. 12 agenda.

I would recommend that regardless of the outcome of these next steps, we plan to thank and dismiss the Pilot Project task group. Should there be interest in pursuing such a model, we can then take it up as a new project, and consult with ASAG on how to plan for staffing and other resources.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Speaker</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5min</td>
<td>Report from ALA Midwinter Big Heads: UCD's IMLS Grant</td>
<td>Myra</td>
<td>This is information only: <a href="http://library.ucdavis.edu/bibflow/">http://library.ucdavis.edu/bibflow/</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10min</td>
<td>Action Items/Recap</td>
<td>Polina (Note Taker) and Leslie (Portfolio Manager)</td>
<td>IMLS project in Davis was added to the agenda for March 26th.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>