## SOPAG's Letter of Transmittal to All Campus Groups and LAUC

June 11, 2003

To: All Campus Groups LAUC

From: John W. Tanno, Chair SOPAG

Re: Review of Shared Collections Papers

The University Librarians Retreat envisioned a series of white papers to help guide the collaborative planning effort of the UC Libraries. The first two white papers in this series are:

- 1. The Report to the Collection Management Planning Group (CMPG) on Collection Management and Coordination: A Strategy for the UC Libraries; and
- 2. The Report to the Collection Management Planning Group (CMPG) on Developing a Shared Collection for the University of California.

The University Librarians have asked SOPAG to coordinate a review of these documents and would particularly welcome comments on significant omissions and/or other, problematic areas of the documents, and identification of major implementation issues that are relevant to the collection management-framework the white papers describe. The ULs are not yet looking for comments on shared collections governance, ownership, or counting issues, as these will be the topic of a separate white paper.

SOPAG is now seeking your advice on these two papers and requests your committee's written response to the following questions by August 8, 2003

- 1. Do the reports adequately articulate the purpose and rationale for collection management and coordination for the UC Libraries and are the overall strategies reasonable?
- 2. Please describe any significant challenges, omissions, problematic areas, or major implementation issues that you see in further developing shared collections.
- 3. What do you believe to be the major benefits and drawbacks in further developing shared collections?
- 4. What are the characteristics that make a body of material attractive to include in a shared collection?
- 5. In your estimation, what shared collections would be most profitable to pursue in the next three years and why?

The ULs and SOPAG have noted that the framework set out in the papers allows for at least three distinct types of shared collections: digital, prospective print, and retrospective print collections. We realize that some of these questions may have a separate answer for each collections type and encourage you to pursue the differences. For example:

Shared Digital Collection: This collection already exists with a method for cooperative collections development (JSC), high-level services (joint licensing, SCP, etc.), a mostly decentralized operation (e.g., e-journal content decentralized on the web at publishers sites), and a known cost (including campus co-investments). For shared digital collections, the questions posed above could be used to explore new types of content (e.g., digital audio, video, scientific datasets, etc.) and services that can make this collection stronger and more effective.

Prospective Print Shared Collections: These represent shared collections for materials yet to be acquired. For example, the UC Libraries are already investigating the creation of a shared prospective print collection for future journals acquisitions that will also be published in digital form (starting with Elsevier

and ACM). The questions above could be applied to this investigation and then extended to other types of prospective print collections that you can suggest.

Retrospective Print Shared Collections: This would include a print shared collection created from materials that we already have in our libraries and regional storage facilities. Among the recommendations from the SOPAG charged Task Force on Government Publications is a proposal to create a shared print collection of these governmental materials. Please use the above questions to explore the major benefits and drawbacks that are unique to retrospective print shared collections?

Thank you in advance for your advice and I look forward to receiving your response by August 8, 2003.

Attachments: UL's Charge to SOPAG, Report to the Collection Management Planning Group (CMPG) on Collection Management and Coordination, Report to the Collection Management Planning Group (CMPG) on Developing a Shared Collection for the University of California.

Distribution: ACGs, LAUC President Grassian, SOPAG, ULs