

Heads of Special Collections -- HOSC

May 10, 2005

10 a.m.

Telephone conference call

Present: C. Bunting (SC), L. Claassen (SD), M. Conway (R.), C. Faulhaber (B), E. Lin (M)-recorder, L. Mix (SF), D. Morrison (D), V. Steele (LA), D. Tambo (SB)- Chair.

Absent: J. Dooley (I)

1. Online exhibits - copyright clearances (J. Dooley)

Dooley was ill and not present to discuss her question specifically. The group discussed common practices concerning copyright clearance for digital materials published online. The general practice was to proceed with online publishing when the copyright holder was not identifiable and take things down if requested. UCSD has an in-house counsel on IP and rights issues. Bunting recommended that Dooley check with Maureen Burns (VR specialist) at UCI on this question.

2. ILL Task Force (D. Morrison)

John Tanno, Chair of SOPAG, in an e-mail dated December 30, 2003, to RSC, CDC, and HOSC stated that the Resources Sharing Committee (RSC) report dated December 8, 2003 on the ILL/Special Collections Pilot Project was reviewed at a December 12, 2003, Joint SOPAG/ACG Chairs meeting. As a result of the discussion Tanno outlined six points for RSC, CDC, and HOSC to respond to. These points included references to the follow-up action points in the RSC Pilot Project report.

We are using these points as the RSC/HOSC ILL committee's charge and responding to each item.

Morrison is working with Gale Nichols, the RSC representative (also at UCD), and is in the process of finishing the report. [also Christine Bunting and other CDC person - ask Daryl]. The task force has been asked to submit the report to SOPAG by May 15, for a final report due in June.

SOPAG asked for HOSC, RSC, and AULs on campuses to meet to discuss issues. A lot of questions had to do with workflow issues; the task force determined it was best for these to be worked out at each local library.

- **Morrison: Are HOSC members were happy with selecting their own vendors/carriers, or with a predetermined vendor? How about the turnaround time?**

Faulhaber noted Berkeley was unhappy with the process from the beginning. As for feedback on the process, he would like a more formal questionnaire to solicit input from the staff. Conway noted campuses should be happy with the local practices they have established. There is considerable frustration among members that items at times are requested but no one comes in to use them, especially as ILL entails a pretty high volume of work.

- **Do items come directly to special collections, or go through the mailroom?**

Some members handle ILL solely through special collections. UCSC packs in special collections but ship through the mailroom. UCSB packages in Special Collections but then turns over to ILL, who handles.

- **What if items are available through general collections, or through OCLC?**
Steele noted that there had been a recommendation two years ago that OCLC, Melvyl improve the request process. Morrison believes there will be follow-up on this. If an item is identified as part of special collections in Melvyl Request, then the patron can make a more informed decision on whether to complete the request. Sometimes, however, the system will direct the request to special collections (without human intervention). OCLC can't filter requests unless items are identified by separate locations. The general concern is that 80% of requests can be fulfilled elsewhere (outside of Special collections).
- **Steele: mass digitization initiatives could have an impact on this**
Berkeley is only providing surrogates (facsimiles, microfilm) and is also working on linking digital files to bib records.
- **John Tanno has asked whether there should be systemwide support for this program**
HOSC would like to see systemwide support for building digital libraries-namely, support for equipment and human resources.

HOSC members would like to emphasize that there has been active interlibrary lending between UC Special Collections for many years. HOSC would like to see ILL go outside first and loan special collections as a last resort. Members continue to work out workflow issues at the local level and with each other, including tracking systems.

3. UC Preservation Repository (E. Lin)

Lin expressed the need for HOSC to communicate with and be made aware of the initiatives and ongoing development of the CDL Digital Preservation program. HOSC may want a voice in whether/how special collections digital objects are preserved in the UC Preservation Repository. Bunting pointed out that content selection will occur at the local campus level. Claassen noted there was a question of whether the Repository was dim or dark access.

Faulhaber reported UC has been pursuing a mass digitization project with an "unnamed organization" specifically for out-of-copyright monographs. The Bancroft Americana collection could be a potential target; they have provided information about the collection to Robin Chandler and Dan Greenstein. Faulhaber also briefly reported on the recent symposium on scholarly communication-the main objective of which was to raise faculty awareness.

ACTION: Tambo will invite Nancy Kushigian of the Shared Print Program and Tricia Cruse of the Digital Preservation Program to join our next meeting in Oakland for an update.

Digital Preservation

links: http://www.cdlib.org/programs/digital_preservation.html and <http://www.cdlib.org/inside/projects/preservation/>

4. Policies for Administration of University Archives (UC Archivists/HOSC)

UC Archivists Council (UCAC) has been developing this policies document over the past several years. It is now complete, and they are seeking review and feedback from HOSC

and the UC Records Managers group on the final draft. David Farrell (B), UCAC chair, will transmit it formally to HOSC in the near future.

HOSC would like to know what revisions have been made since the last version that was informally disseminated. Charlotte Brown (LA) has been in the lead on this project and is in the best position to answer any questions. Conway noted there are no policies included on the systematic submission of materials to the Archives.

The document outlines general policies; implementation is still up to individual campuses.

There is a representative from the Records Managers Committee on UCAC, and vice versa. All UC archivists are included in records management listserv. HOSC has links to both groups on the HOSC web site.

HOSC members saw no problems with the policies as presented

5. OAC (D. Tambo)

HOSC would like a general update on the OAC. There is concern about lack of activity and the lack of communication. The OAC Steering Committee, has not met since March 2003, was dissolved in March 2005.

Mix inquired about California Cultures because there has been a lack of news on the progress of this project. UCSB has been in contact with the Digital Publishing Group but has also experienced some lack of responsiveness. Steele noted the main obstacles appear to be technical and copyright clearance issues. The standstill has been due to systems problems: the TEI problem; the programming has not been finished; CDL developers have been stretched thin as with everyone else.

ACTION: Tambo and Faulhaber will ask their project managers to provide information on progress to the group. Tambo will follow up with Robin Chandler about providing an update on Cal Cultures and OAC in general. [R. Chandler sent a status report on Cal Cultures to HOSC in early June.]

6. Updates

The Bancroft reading room is open 4 hours/day currently and will be closed after June 1. Staff will be out of contact in August during the move; the Library will reopen in the fall (October).

Mix has met with archivists at UCB regarding a proposal to document stem cell research in California. She is also soliciting involvement from other interested campuses. The project will seek to preserve research papers and will also have an oral history component.

Lin raised the question of electronic theses and dissertations (ETDs), and whether HOSC had input on the recommendation for an electronic copy of record as well as submission procedures. At UCB, ETDs are not managed by Bancroft. UCSB is moving to fully electronic; UCSD is happy to keep the electronic copy as the copy of record. Most members prefer that handling and processing of ETDs be completed outside of their unit. UCAC discussed ETDs at length when they met at UCR on April 29th, and the minutes from that meeting should reflect the situation at each campus. A straw vote on the

question of who would be comfortable having a digital version in a UC preservation repository serve as the "archival" copy resulted in a vote of 7 in favor, 2 (D & R) against (Jim Dooley [Merced] planned to report this result to the UC preservation council, which he serves on). The library (i.e., university archives) has responsibility for administering TDs and implementing ETDs at only 3 campus (I, LA, SC), none of which are delighted to be in that situation. So far the campuses that have ETD pilots have it as an option for students, not a requirement, and everybody is also still getting a paper copy so far.

Bunting announced that the oral history of Rita Bottoms (former Head of UCSC Special Collections) is out, and she will send the URL to the group.

Conway reported on the Eaton Conference (science fiction). The conference will be held in Riverside in 2007.

Steele reported that UCLA is participating in the CLIR/Mellon postdoctoral fellowships. One is a science fiction specialist. Faulhaber reported that UCB also will host a CLIR fellow.

7. Next Meeting

HOLD THE DATES: Nov 7 or Nov 14 in Oakland.

Submitted by
Emily Lin, UCM

Document owner: Lisa Mix
Last reviewed: July 26, 2005