

Conference Call, January 16, 2003

Minutes

Present: C. Rubens (for P. Iannuzzi, UCB); G. Nichols (UCD); J. Bareford (UCI); P. La Zarr (UCI); E. Adams (UCLA); D. Rios (UCR); T. Dearie (UCSD, Chair); K. Reavie (UCSF); L. Snowhill (UCSB); D. Turner (UCSC); S. Miller (NRLF, recorder); C. Bellanti (SRLF); G. Lawrence (UCOP); K. Scott (LAUC) Absent: D. Barclay (UCM)

1. Introductions – John Bareford (UCI) and Keir Reavie (UCSF) are the new RSC representatives for their respective campuses. Charlotte Rubens has indefinitely replaced Patty Iannuzzi as UCB's RSC representative.

2. Announcements – Revisions to the 10/7/02 Draft Minutes should be sent to E. Adams or T. Dearie by January 17. Final Minutes will be distributed on January 21.

3. CDL

3.1 VDX Implementation – Critical items that must be resolved before implementation can proceed include: symbol inheritance for use of OCLC; the bookband report for use in the web interface; getting patron email and VDX ILL number into the OCLC request; getting the patron email to show up in the responder's view of the request; and creating an overdue report. Mary Heath is pushing Fretwell-Downing on one item at a time, as that seems to be the only approach that works. She is focusing on the OCLC request issues. Symbol inheritance affects UCLA, UCSD, and UCI. They will work with Mary and FD to find an acceptable solution. Bellanti mentioned that getting consensus decisions from the UC-VDX email list has been a problem. It was suggested that requests for decisions include a deadline for response, and that certain requests or questions should go to the IAG email list as a way of generating greater response.

3.2 Elinks – CDL is having an on-going problem with dissertation abstracts. They hope to have it resolved in about a week. Inform Mary Heath if continuing problems are discovered. Rubens asked if there has been any usability testing of elinks. Bellanti will ask Heath and report back to RSC.

3.3 Desktop Delivery – UCD will be installing the new Ariel software soon and expect to be doing desktop delivery by the end of the fiscal year. UCSD has more programming to do and must resolve some issues regarding server space; they will be up and running soon. UCSF just got their server set up; they will be providing local desktop delivery in the next few months; systemwide desktop delivery will follow soon thereafter. Regarding a centrally funded maintenance contract for Minolta scanners purchased with Resource Sharing funds: Differences in the local availability of maintenance and local maintenance practices prevent UC from entering into a systemwide contract with Minolta or any other qualified maintenance provider. Lawrence added that all uncommitted Resource Sharing funds for the current fiscal year are being reserved to support the shared print journal project.

4. Special Collections Project status report

4.1 Draft Report for review – In response to a question from Dearie, the campuses verified that current practice is for special collections requests to go to the OCLC review file of the borrowing library where verification is done. The project report is not quite finished. Send additional comments to Dearie by the end of January. Scott will ask IAG for their comments. The draft report will be sent to SOPAG for review.

4.2 Special Collections survey – Turner reminded the group that, rather than a survey, RSC agreed to issue guidelines for discussion between ILL and Special Collections units on each campus. The guidelines were distributed in November. Turner will redistribute to RSC to be sure everyone has them. Local meetings between ILL and Special Collections should be completed by March 31. Results of the meetings will be added to the Special Collections Project report as it progresses to its final version.

5. Tricor MOU – The latest Memorandum of Understanding expired on January 1, 2003. The terms and conditions of the agreement continue on a month-to-month basis. Dearie will talk to Tricor regarding billing problems at some of the campuses and adding UCD Law Library to the MOU. Dearie will send RSC a reminder to review weight allowances and request increases (or decreases) as necessary. Deadline for response will be February 28.

6. Mekel Proposal – Dearie is proposing that large sets of microfilm and microfiche be stored at the RLFs where, with the use of Mekel scanners, digital copies would be provided on-demand and/or linked to their respective catalog records. She is creating a web site for the proposal and drafting a report; both will be distributed to RSC and shared with CDC when ready. The group had several comments: We need to evaluate our microform collections; some are decaying and could be saved through digitization. We need to define how these scanners will be used and what we want to accomplish with them. The California State Library has a Mekel scanner; we might want to explore whether they can provide this service to us. We need to be aware that digital scanning is moving into microform rooms on the campuses and it's a popular service. Dearie will ask CDC if they are working on any initiatives similar to this.

7. Access to the UCL Print Collections – SOPAG has charged a Working Group on the Shared Print Collection to develop procedures for establishing a shared print archive for the Elsevier and ACM print copies received as part of UC's electronic subscriptions. CDC manages the group, with representation from HOTS and SRLF. They plan to submit a report to SOPAG and CDC in February. Meanwhile, CDC is working on shared collection policies, the ULs have reached consensus on the definition of a shared print archive, and the Collection Management Planning Group is trying to define which collections should be included in the shared print archive. RSC agreed to monitor developments in this area and be ready to respond when asked.

8. Round Robin on services offered to the UC Washington Program – The UC Washington Center is a multi-campus residential, instructional and research center that provides UC students and faculty with opportunities to do research, work, study and live in Washington DC. Participants obtain library services from George Washington University, but the services are sometimes inadequate. Occasionally, UCDC participants request services from their home campus ILL units. Most campuses treat them as distance researchers, but the services offered vary from campus to campus. UCDC participants must be registered or identified at their home UC campus in order to have access to CDL-licensed digital content. It was pointed out that UC has existing overseas offices (e.g., London) and is in the process of setting up additional domestic offices (e.g., Sacramento). Along with DC, those offices may require UC library services. Dearie will send out a call for a task force to put together information to provide to the UC Washington Center and other distant offices regarding the library services that are offered campus-by-campus and where participants should go to receive the services.

9. CAG Issues

9.1 Workshop – CAG is still considering proposals for two workshops: Best Practices in Circulation and Best Practices in E-Reserves. Changes in membership have prevented these from moving forward. Dearie will consult with the CAG Chair.

9.2 Blocking Proposal – SOPAG asked that the proposal be redrafted as guidelines rather than policies. Dearie suggested to CAG that they consider creating a Resource Sharing Code, with the first piece being the blocking guidelines. RSC endorsed the idea with the recommendation that both Advisory Groups be involved in developing it. Dearie will write up a charge and send out a call to CAG and IAG for participation in a working group on the Resource Sharing Code

10. IAG Issues

10.1 RLFs and Reserves – There is inconsistency in the way requests for cross-campus reserves (i.e., materials not owned by the requesting campus but desired for reserve use at that campus) are handled by the two RLFs. The existing UC ILL Code regarding limitations on group use seems to cover these kinds of requests, but there may be reason to treat materials at the RLFs differently. The group discussed some of the factors that should be considered before making such loans (e.g., the condition of the material; the nature of its use) and some alternatives to lending the items themselves (e.g., scanning chapters). It was decided that Dearie would frame the issues and distribute that list to RSC. The group will then consider a long-term solution. In the short-term, requests will be handled as “special arrangements,” per the current code. (N.B., In a subsequent UL/SOPAG joint meeting, RSC was directed to develop a policy and guidelines to for these transactions. In consultation with the RLF managers, Dearie wrote a charge for a joint CAG/IAG working group to draft a policy and guidelines for RSC review by February 28, 2003. The charge was issued to the Chairs of CAG and IAG on January 31.)

11. Next meeting: Thursday, April 17, 2003 (recorder: UCM). Suggested agenda item: Round robin on responses to privacy policies.