Date
02-11-2015
1pm-2:30pm

Attendees
- Diane B. Bisom (Chair, UCR)
- Myra Appel (UCD)
- Heather Christenson (CDL)
- Judy Consales (UCLA)
- Elizabeth DuPuis (UCB)
- Vicki Grahame (UCI)
- Martha Hruska (UCSD)
- Emily Lin (UCM)
- Janet Martorana (UCSB) (Note Taker)
- Kerry Scott (UCSC)
- Angela Riggio (LAUC)
- Jean McKenzie (CLS Liaison)

Guest: Ivy Anderson (CDL)

Planned Absence
Polina E Ilieva (UCSF)

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</td>
<td>Diane</td>
<td>Volunteer Timekeeper</td>
<td>Vicki Grahame is timekeeper</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Emily Stambaugh will be on our next call's agenda.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Coordinating Committee (Martha):

Status of AV Preservation Proposal for CoUL (via CC); NEDCC Grant Opportunity (2/6/2015 email from Martha)

CC hasn’t met often, last on 23rd Jan, so not much regarding updates. AV Preservation proposal was submitted to CoUL, which will hopefully be on their next agenda; working on the work plans that SAG & CLS have submitted; question about the status of a SAG3 portfolio manager - no action taken on this to report yet.

CLS (Jean):

1. CLS agreed on its top three priorities from it workplan for this year and send to the CC chair. The three are:
   - Under CoUL Priority 4.5: Major Negotiations
   - Systemwide co-investment models
   - Investigate Tier 1 Licensing opportunities for streaming media and data services/vendors

   We also felt that CoUL Priority 5.3 was another important priority for us this year because the work of this group will ultimately influence and impact our future work, negotiations, and strategies.

2. CLS approved two documents with minor edits regarding Vendor Talking Points that will be distributed soon so people have them before attending ALA midwinter.

3. Ivy distributed a spreadsheet for campuses to fill in with 2014 and 2015 information on Taylor & Francis titles and prices as part of a brief assessment of the costs of that license breakdown.

4. Cost-shares: A group comprised of JSC members and Jean McKenzie (UCB) and Susan Parker (UCLA) will begin a discussion of factors that might go into cost-share calculations. First call on January 26th.

Vicki summarized the communication regarding M. Breeding’s request. SAG3 agreed to consenting to M. Breeding’s use of his research and repurpose of it in a generic form, without reference to UC.

Action: Ivy, Martha, and a representative from CLS (Catherine Nelson perhaps) to help draft a charge for a project team to identify and address these issues, how to include other universities and Portico, determine which publishers to work with, and how to establish an ongoing process and practice of auditing Portico.

Kerry will contact Catherine about joining Ivy and Martha to draft this charge.

The draft charge will be submitted to SAG3 and CLS to determine the next steps. Suggested members or type of member should be part of the draft.

Martha will let SAG3 know when to include this item on a SAG3 agenda for discussion.

20min

Major Agenda Item

Portico Audit

Ivy Anderson

Discussion of the scope of the issue, and possible next steps. Need to determine which next steps should go to a task group, which to higher level.

Ivy provided a brief summary of UC’s Portico Audit project charge and activities. Because of the important role of digital archives in UC’s strategies of shared print journal archives, the trust and reliability of Portico are critical. The scope for print archiving of our journal packages is contracting. The Preservation Advisory Group (PAG), now Preservation CKG, recently submitted a report that focused on retrospective collections in the Portico Archive. This is a broader issue than the scope of the CKG, and is a concern of other institutions beyond UC. It falls in SAG3’s portfolio. Reaching out to the CCDO (Chief Collection Development Officers at Large Research Libraries) might be a good place to raise this issue. A good strategy may be to form a working group to reach out to others and identify the issues. Ivy is willing to serve.

Action: Ivy will contact Catherine about joining Ivy and Martha to draft this charge.

The draft charge will be submitted to SAG3 and CLS to determine the next steps. Suggested members or type of member should be part of the draft.

Martha will let SAG3 know when to include this item on a SAG3 agenda for discussion.

20min

Major Agenda Item

Collections Librarian Groups – Guidelines

Beth, Janet

Discussion of CLS comments; finalize Guidelines with liaison responsibilities; discuss implementation/distribution.

Beth provided a summary of steps taken regarding the evolving draft of the guidelines. There was still a question about the liaisons and the different roles. CLS and JSC liaisons have been re-added to the guidelines. SAG3 responsibilities have been included as well. Question for SAG3: one SAG3 member to serve as liaison to all groups or divide among all members? How are the role and responsibilities defined? - serve as contact for the chairs to the groups; to manage requests for SLT meetings, receive and provide feedback to the groups' annual reports; manage requests for the (re-)organization of group and/or membership; manage any project or service proposals.

Agreement: the groups need CLS and JSC liaisons but also with overall review and management from SAG3, as these groups fall under our portfolio and responsibility. SAG3 will have one member serve as the liaison to all of the collection groups. Myra volunteered to take on the role as a 6-12 month test period. This will be reviewed to identify the issues, assess workload, etc. after that time.

Action: Beth, Diane, Janet to reinsert previous edits to an agreed-upon final version by end of day Tuesday, February 17. They will review responsibilities of liaisons so they're not overlapping.

Next steps: Distribute the revised guidelines to Collection groups. Myra will contact each of the chairs to inform them that she is serving as the SAG3 contact and liaison.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>15min</th>
<th>2:05 - 2:20</th>
<th>Major Agenda Item</th>
<th>Heather</th>
<th>Approval from CoUL (Email sent to SAG 3 2/3/2015); review of draft charge. CoUL endorsed the proposal for working with a vendor on the digitization project, but wants to be consulted prior to selection of the vendor and prior to an agreement with a vendor. The draft charge was discussed. Need to work to follow protocol regarding contracts. CCDD team is talking about other project possibilities – Council on Library and Information Resources (CLIR) has a grant to digitize hidden collections; goals of the grant fit in with what we’re doing. Considering the topic of water, a big topic across multiple UC campuses. Emily can take on the exploration of this proposal, what needs to be done to accomplish this.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5min</td>
<td>2:20 - 2:25</td>
<td>Next/Future Agenda Items</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>Update on UCD Bibflow project? Stahmer presentation at OCLC Library Data (R)Evolution. 2.10.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5min</td>
<td>2:25 - 2:30</td>
<td>Wrap up and action steps</td>
<td>Note Taker</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Action:** Martha will be attending CoUL meeting with this on the agenda. Heather will send Martha the document with bullet points that will highlight CoUL’s particular attention. Martha will report back to SAG3 about the CoUL meeting and discussion.

**Action:** Heather will revise the Deliverables of draft charge to indicate CoUL’s role and the specific process regarding any agreement. Contact AUL Collections to keep them apprised of this project.

**Action:** Emily will draft a one-page memo to fast track it to CoUL’s consent agenda and get in by Friday, informing them of our intent to pursue a CLIR grant for submission by April 30th. Diane offered to review the memo before submitting it to CoUL.