To: Jean McKenzie, Chair, UC MicroCollections Task Force
From: Martha Hruska, Chair, UC Shared Content Leadership Group (SCLG)
Date: August 20, 2017

SCLG gratefully accepts the final report from the UC MicroCollections Task Force, chaired by Jean McKenzie. UC’s shared microform collections were established as part of the Shared Collections and Access Program or SCAP and were developed through the mid 1990’s. We appreciate the work of the Task Force, addressing and summarizing the current situation and making important recommendations on our options for the future preservation and discovery of, and access of this content.

SCLG has reviewed the eleven recommendations in the report and has agreed to take the following actions:

Recommendation 1: That further work be done by a knowledgeable person at each library to learn the whereabouts of the titles on the Not Found spreadsheet and make a final determination on whether or not they exist. If so, the inventory list should be corrected, the resources cataloged and made visible, and the titles covered by subsequent recommendations in this report; if not, the titles should be annotated with the correct status and date.


Recommendation 2: That the Shared Content Leadership Group (SCLG) initiate a discussion with the Shared Print Strategy Team (SPST) regarding expanding the UC Shared Print Program to encompass non-print materials, including asking that the governing documents be adapted as necessary so that non-print resources can be designated and retained as UC Shared Resources;

SCLG: Agree, will combine communication to SPST with Recommendation 3.

Recommendation 3: That SCLG designate the microform resources acquired with shared funds and listed in the attached inventory as UC Shared Collections; and a standard “shared” note be added to catalog records that do not have one;

SCLG: Agree, will refer disclosure question with Recommendation 2 above.

Recommendation 4: That SCLG asks the California Digital Library (CDL) to post this report and its attachments and appendices on its website and distribute it to all campuses;

SCLG: Agree the report will be posted in the Documents section of SCLG UC Libraries web site, along with the SCLG response.

Recommendation 5: That SCLG communicate with the Shared Library Facilities Board (SLFB) to ask for their commitment that the Regional Library Facilities (RLFs) will have sufficient climate-controlled space in which to house microform resources for archival and preservation purposes for the long future, and will continue to acquire current standard equipment and maintain staff to provide efficient access to such resources.

SCLG: Agree, combine SFLB communication with Recommendation 6 and 7.
Recommendation 6: That the UCs retain one copy of all shared purchase microform resources either as a Shared Print in Place (SPiP) resource in a campus library or a UC shared collection resource at one of the RLFs. In the few instances where there are multiple copies of a microform set, the owning campuses should discuss and decide which campus will deposit into an RLF, and how the other campus will handle its set. The campus whose copy will not be the shared one may retain, offer, deposit, or withdraw their copy as they deem appropriate.

SCLG: Agree and combine this SLFB communication with Recommendation 5 and 7.

Recommendation 7: That all microform resources are appropriate candidates for deposit into an RLF with the process for deposit being initiated by the library currently holding the set;

SCLG: Agree, combine SLFB communication with Recommendation 5 and 6.

Recommendation 8: That special attention be paid to the discoverability of these sets through identification of guides and indexes whether in print, microform, or online and to ensuring there are enough copies throughout the UC Libraries and at the RLFs.

SCLG: Agree, combine into charge for a follow up team to address 9, 10, and 11.

Recommendation 9: That SCLG appoint a team of relevant subject and language experts or microform collection specialists to check with publishers and vendors to gather data on whether digital versions exist, their completeness, and the cost for UC Libraries to purchase them. The data should be provided to the Common Knowledge Group (CKG) chairs so the resources can be discussed and prioritized for potential purchase.

SCLG: Agree that it is useful to know what digital versions may exist and will add that investigation to the charge for the specialist team. However, we will not ask that pricing be included until such time as funding is identified because any purchase decisions would be contingent on budget. We will combine Recommendations 8, 9, 10, 11 to charge one team.

Recommendation 10: That SCLG appoint a team to explore digitization of the guides/indexes for shared microform sets and having them cataloged for all UC Libraries by the Shared Cataloging Program. If guides can be digitized, team members should also consider how to promote them to library staff and how to monitor and report subsequent usage activity of the resources.

Recommendation 11: That SCLG appoint a team to distribute the inventory to relevant Common Knowledge Groups and work in conjunction with them to develop principles and criteria to prioritize digitization of microform resources, including locating copyright holders and developing a rights clearance process, identifying potential partners, and creating a budget for the work. Assessment of resources should include local use and interlibrary loan data (if available), availability in the broader library universe, overall value as research material, etc. Based on the assessment results, the team should choose a digitization partner to explore its services and costs of digitizing.