

University Librarian/SOPAG Joint Meeting Minutes

November 17, 2005

Attendees: ULs Convener, S. Pritchard (SB), SOPAG Chair, B. Hurley (B), T. Ryan (LA), P. Dawson (LAUC), L. Tanji (I), S. Parker (LA), G. Steele (SC), R. Jackson (R), M. Moody (SB), S. Wittenbach (R), P. Cruse (CDL), K. McGirr (SC), J. Tanno (D), M. Sharrow (D), R. Miller (M), K. Butter (SF), T. Leonard (B), B. Schottlaender (SD), G. Munoff (I), D. Greenstein (CDL), S. Starr (SD), recorder.

I. Update from University Librarians' meeting of November 16, 2005

S. Pritchard reported on topics from the ULs meeting of the previous day.

- *Spring UL/SOPAG meeting* : tentatively scheduled for 5/11-5/12 but may be rescheduled to accommodate travel to the ARL meeting.
- *American Chemical Society*: negotiations will continue.
- *Open Content Alliance*: The ULs are seeking to understand the circumstances under which material may be rehosted at different libraries.
- *LAUC report*:
 - Bylaws are an important issue for LAUC this year. While the ULs supported streamlining of the bylaws, they also recommended that LAUC focus on what they want to accomplish and interpret the purpose statement in the bylaws broadly.
 - The LAUC Spring Assembly theme will be repositories. Repositories are one of many approaches to dealing with stewardship of digital assets, an issue of high priority for the University Librarians. LAUC may wish to look at new roles for librarians as our libraries take on a greater responsibility for digital stewardship.
- *Shared Library Facilities Board*: The Board's Operations Task Force is working to develop criteria for exceptional deposits, and to merge procedures documents for the two facilities. Phase 1 for developing a new Persistence Policy has been completed. The Shared Facilities Board will likely meet in the spring. The ULs will meet on January 30 at the NRLF to focus on RLF issues.
- *UC Bindery*: We are waiting for the RFP for transportation of materials from south to north to be developed. UC Bindery is looking at pricing models for transportation costs, which will likely be bundled into piece costs and shared across all the campuses proportional to their use of the facility. The plan is still to sell the building in Culver City and use the resulting funds to support transportation, however UCOP has not yet approved this, and there is another occupant of the building who may need to move first. Details are still to be finalized, but it appears to make sense to move to a single UC Bindery operation.
- *ULs Priorities*: The University Librarians have identified two top priority issues for the year, 1) stewardship of digital assets and 2) shared collections. Gary Lawrence is working on a scoping paper for the stewardship issues. Other important issues include bibliographic services, scholarly communications, shared services and shared

facilities, however other groups are working on these while the first two will likely require considerable discussion by the ULs this year.

II. Collaborative Collection Development

A. General Discussion

We now have four paths that allow us to jointly develop collections, 1) Licensed content, 2) Shared print, 3) Digital preservation and 4) Digital reformatting/mass digitization. We need to coordinate and manage these four streams in ways that will allow us to make informed decisions regarding pursuit of new and/or existing projects. That will require establishing criteria that will allow us to make choices and a planning process that is not as siloed as our existing procedures. One of the first steps will be to merge the principles outlined in the "*Principles for Acquiring and Licensing Information in Digital Formats (Collection Development Committee, DRAFT, October 2004*" with those in the "*UC Library Investments in Transformative Scholarly Communication Models: Discussion Paper from the UC Libraries Scholarly Communications Officers group.*" Greenstein and Munoff will draft a combined document for review by the ULs.

The group reviewed "*Towards a framework for developing systemwide library collections,*" a paper developed by Schottlaender and Greenstein. A few changes were suggested: adding patient care and service to the vision statement, putting an emphasis on support of academic programs in the criteria, adding the need to stay abreast of the activities of external entities with respect to projects for digital preservation and reformatting, and more clearly enunciating the four ways we now have to develop shared collections at the beginning of the document.

Discussion ensued on how this document could be used to help us define our priorities as we consider projects to develop shared collections. The principles should help us to ask the right questions when considering a new proposal. Making decisions with regard to shared collections is always difficult, as individual bibliographers, faculty, and ULs may all have different priorities. In the realm of digital materials, these decisions become even more complex as we must consider the role of external partners and publishers. Ideally we would develop a long-range plan and a mechanism that would allow us to set yearly goals within that planning framework, however the external environment is changing so fast that a long-range plan may not be feasible.

Schottlaender and Greenstein will make the changes suggested to the document and return it to the ULs for further review. When the document is finalized, SOPAG will be asked to consider what next steps are required to allow the document to serve as a framework for making decisions on shared collection development. A process is needed that will permit us to make co-investments wisely, enable bibliographers to actively participate in the planning process, and help us identify investment opportunities as they arise. Suggestions for SOPAG consideration included a flow chart showing how such decisions might be made and/or a matrix showing areas for shared collection development and paths we will pursue to develop those areas.

ACTION: Schottlaender and Greenstein to incorporate suggested revisions in the document.

B. LC/CLIR/DLF statement, “Urgent Action Needed to Preserve Scholarly Electronic Journals”

There are multiple opportunities for the University to participate in preservation of electronic journals: UC Libraries’ Digital Preservation Repository, LOCKSS, Portico, mass storage (e.g. SRB at SDSC), and publisher initiatives. In addition, we could develop plans for an emergency response that could be used if a particular set of journals was threatened. The ULs would like SOPAG to review possible strategies/scenarios for ejournal preservation, including the price of different options, and advise on one or more strategies UC might put in place. SOPAG does not need to make a recommendation, just lay out landscape and develop scenarios (in house, vendor, etc). Since so many strategies are emerging, doing nothing at this point may also be an option to consider. Testing our persistence clause with a vendor might be of interest as well.

Action: Greenstein will draft charge for SOPAG.

C. Planning for High Volume Digitization

Hurley reported on activities currently underway. SOPAG is continuing its demonstration project. The files have been returned from the vendor and a quality control process begun. SOPAG has also received a new charge from the ULs to provide a high level review of selection, access services, standards and resources for mass digitization.

Hurley asked for clarification on SOPAG's role with respect to identifying content for the Open Content Alliance. Greenstein confirmed that American Literature and 900 historical mathematics volumes will be digitized. Suggestions for additional projects that are worth doing and have reasonable scale are welcome. A project involving government documents has been proposed. Only published materials (no primary content) published prior to 1923 can be considered. Rare materials are not suitable at this time.

ACTION: Greenstein to send a list of projects under consideration to SOPAG who should feel free to add to it.

D. RLF Expansion

Greenstein reported that, at the request of UCOP, he will be developing a de-duplication plan for the two RLF's.

III. SOPAG updates

Persistence policy: SOPAG has been cleared to move to Phase II. The task force has lost two people, replaced one, and SOPAG will launch the reconstituted group within the next

week or so. At UL request, time to declare items persistent was increased from 6-9 months.

ISRAC update: HOPS is working with ISRAC, which was charged to advise CDL and communicate to campuses on the image services rollout. HOPS has reviewed and responded to this groups' recommendations. The group will probably complete its work in June 06. HOPS will evaluate whether this is a model for rollout of future shared services.

BSTF update: The Bibliographic Services Task Force was charged to flesh out a definition of problems we are experiencing with respect to bibliographic services, articulate a vision, and develop recommendations for UC. The task force issued an interim report in August and their final report is now due December 15, 2005. The final report can contain a range of options with pros and cons for alternatives; it is not necessary to push for consensus and a single recommendation in all cases.

ERMS Implementation update: The negotiation team has been working with ExLibris on the software and maintenance license and procedures for joint development. CDL requested SOPAG to charge an implementation team with a representative from each campus and the necessary range of background and skills e.g. acquisitions, cataloging, public services. Best guess at this point is that testing will begin once the team is in place and implementation may start in summer; a more definitive timeline will be developed by the implementation team as part of their charge. The ULs asked that the timeline should include a point, possibly the joint UL/SOPAG spring meeting, at which we can determine whether all campuses are still ready to participate.

The next version of Verde will be released in March. Some of the consortial items we requested in our RFP have already been developed and will be included in the March version, so campuses will be able to use the system fairly quickly. We have another 2 rounds of joint development and will have a formal process in place to contribute to those releases.

Loaning media: Tanno reported that SOPAG had asked RSC to look into loaning media. On basis of their report SOPAG identified barriers, such as unique materials, medium that doesn't permit loaning, etc. These barriers apply broadly across all formats, not just media. SOPAG is now working on a charge to RSC to revise our ILL code so that it encourages lending as broadly as possible and to introduce procedures that would permit exceptions to be sought when needed.

Digital Reference CIG: The CIG conducted a pilot project last year to share digital reference responsibilities across the system from 6 p.m. - 9 p.m., Thursday - Sunday. The pilot was successful and the CIG is working on a proposal to HOPS to establish this as an ongoing program, including recommendations for staffing. Any proposal will eventually come to SOPAG who will review it and bring the proposal to the University Librarians.

SCO: Starr reported that SCO is working on their charge to develop a program of outreach to faculty with respect to scholarly communication issues. They are concentrating on three areas: the economic aspects of the problem, the role of scholarly societies, and copyright. Butter reported that UCOL wants to host a symposium on scholarly communication issues at some point. Greenstein asked that SCO consider how they can position themselves to respond quickly when publisher negotiations or pending legislation requires.

ACTION: Starr will ask SCO to develop a plan for quick responses.