

Resource Sharing Committee

Minutes for September 29, 2000

Present: Venita Jorgensen (UCR & Chair), Claire Bellanti (SRLF), Deborah Turner (UCSC), Marlayna Gates (UCSB), Lucia Snowhill (UCSB & LAUC Representative), Elaine Adams (UCLA & Recorder), Tammy Dearie (UCSD), Pamela LaZarr (UCI), Patricia Iannuzzi (UCB), Charlotte Rubens (UCB), Gary Lawrence (UCOP Representative), Jacqueline Wilson (UCSF), Scott Miller (NRLF), Gail Nichols (UCD)

1. Introductions and Roster changes:

Jorgensen circulated the current roster and asked members to make corrections.

ACTION: Jorgensen will update the roster and distribute via email.

2. FT99/2000 ILL Statistics: Lawrence distributed draft copies of ILL statistics, noting that the number of loans decreased overall, but increased more than 12% within the UC campuses. This trend was attributed to the implementation of CDL Request. The number of non-returnables decreased also, which was attributed to the CDL's licensing efforts for electronic journals. Some campuses remain as net borrowers, but at a lower rate than previously, and the level of net lending has declined (except for UCSD), so load leveling seems to be working. While a 12% increase of transactions within the UC is significant, Request has not produced the triple digit increase that some feared. Hence, we do not meet the criteria for net lender reimbursement, and can table that topic for another year. The data in the tables may change before publication for the public as they are still subject to the formal correction process.

3. Update on PIR: Dearie also distributed tables of statistics comparing Patron Initiated Request transactions between 1998/99 and 1999/2000. Dearie's tables chart only UC to UC transactions, but do show that lending patterns have changed. Unlike Lawrence's data, Dearie's shows that there is only a 3% increase within the UC's. Dearie expressed thanks to all the ILL units for providing data and asked that corrections be reported to her promptly. SOPAG will be reviewing the information at their next meeting. The PIR team has sent specifications for a Request for Proposal (RFP) for consortial borrowing software to UCLA to be processed. Target dates include October 15, 2000 for distribution of the RFP, November 15, 2000 for bids to be open, an evaluation period from November 15 to December 15, 2000, and January 1, 2001 to begin contract negotiations. Testing and implementation would then proceed throughout the first half of 2001. A circulation system is not required at this time, and there will be no vendor shows. Evaluation will be by scoring. Mary Heath and Tammy Dearie are working on a weighted scoring guide. Mary Jackson of ARL will be a consultant in the evaluation process. Members of RSC volunteered to assist in the evaluation process and recommended others as well.

ACTION: Dearie will send out a call for evaluators at a later date.

Nichols reported a problem she has encountered with Request and reserve materials. It seems that UC Davis users have found that they can successfully request materials that are available, but on reserve, at their home campus. Part of the problem is a technical one in that CDL looks at the status of an item (available, not available) and not the location. Depending on the circulation system, reserves are generally a location, not a status.

ACTION: RSC will revisit the issue to see how opening request to undergraduates influences this problem.

Future phases of PIR? Phase III will look at implementing Request in the Z39.50 databases. Dearie distributed a list of these CDL hosted databases with the total records in each and the number of searches in total and by campus. There are technical issues to be resolved, such as using the system's own PIR type feature or development of our own. CDC will be asked to prioritize or develop a method to prioritize the list. Wilson suggested that SOPAG appoint a joint committee with CDC and RSC members to develop the method for prioritizing. ACTION: Jorgensen will contact Mirsky regarding RSC representation in considering Z39.50 databases for PIR. Wilson and Snowhill volunteered to serve on such a committee.

Another possible Phase III task is to consider developing a blank Request form for use with other CDL licensed (but not mounted) databases. Such a mechanism would allow CDL to maintain borrowing limits. Adams asked if users have been hitting the limits and complaining to campus units. Dearie reported she had heard from a couple of UCSD faculty, but no major outcries. Lawrence mentioned that there is an annual report on usage mounted on the CDL libstaff web page. Limits are a topic for discussion on the Phase III task list.

4. Desk Top Delivery: Bellanti and her sub-committee had forwarded their proposal to SOPAG who received it favorably but wanted faster implementation than was proposed. SOPAG also wants to make sure that the project coordinates with PIR. Very recently SOPAG appointed Bellanti, Gates and Miller, among others, to a committee charged to provide electronic copies of paper documents on the web for users to obtain faster and more efficiently. The system must allow for requests to be made via any means and provide for scanned articles to be turned into Ariel, PDF or FTP formats. The committee is in the process of writing a plan with functional specifications for the UL's October 27th meeting. The plan will have a guideline for implementation within six months. Also, the software chosen must be compatible with the consortial borrowing system. All the software investigated so far will work with most scanners and can use existing Ariel stations. However, there may be issues with servers for the project. CDL staff do not have experience in NT based systems, but the campuses do. So it is possible that one campus could host a server for a group of campuses.

5. IAG, CAG status: The committee reviewed the report from the Interlibrary Loan Advisory Group (IAG) and the membership list. Although Jorgensen is listed as the HOPS Representative to the group, IAG reports to RSC so there is no direct HOPS liaison. Jorgensen's name will be deleted from the roster. Nichols is accurately listed as the RSC Liaison. IAG also has a clear list of achievements, many based on project assignments from RSC.

The email report from CAG chair, Vince Novoa, indicates CAG has been working on setting up a communication structure including an electronic discussion list and a website on the UCSC server http://library.ucsc.edu/uc_circ/. Since CAG has not had any assignments from RSC, they have been developing a list of topics based on the last meeting of the UC Circ Heads group. working with the UC Circ Heads group. CAG has identified the UCOP lending policycode, copyright for reserves, and a Circulation Workshop as areas that need further review or action by CAG. RSC endorses the idea of a workshop with an outside facilitator and will ask CAG to develop an agenda. Will SOPAG or the UL's be willing to fund an outside facilitator? Also, Spring may be an ideal time for a joint CAG/IAG meeting to discuss the implementation of the consortial borrowing software.

Bellanti, RSC's liaison to CAG, noted that it seemed that not all CAG members had received "official notification" of their appointment to the group, nor was Jorgensen notified of all names. The charge to the committee indicated that each campus UL or their designee would appoint the representative, but there seems to have been some confusion about where to report the names. Bellanti believes many went to SOPAG instead of Jorgensen.

ACTION: Jorgensen will encourage CAG to further explore the issues of the lending code and copyright, to document their findings, and to recommend further action.

In addition, she will ask them to explore the issue of cooperative sanctions on other borrowers. Their report on these matters will be due January 15, 2001. Jorgensen will also ask CAG to form a subcommittee to develop an agenda for a Circulation Workshop. Jorgensen will ask SOPAG to confirm the names of the members of CAG.

6. HOSC Statement of Special Collection ILL Needs: RSC members agreed that the issues raised in the document were important concerns, but were confused since the document seemed to address intra special collections loans and shipments of special collections materials from RLFs as well as strictly ILL issues. What prompted the development of the statement? Was it a reaction to the phasing out of inter-campus jitneys in the north? On the whole, RSC members felt additional, major issues of concern were communication and funding. Wilson suggested we recommend that SOPAG form a subcommittee of two RSC and two HOSC members to meet and determine the issues. The subcommittee would clarify and separate true ILL concerns from shipping and funding issues.

ACTION: Jorgensen will contact the Chair of HOSC for clarify what the origin and goals of the statement are.

7. UC Participation in the Library of California - who has joined, what are they doing? Jorgensen led off the discussion by announcing a Resource Libraries Meeting to be held in Sacramento in October. She then started a round robin by reporting that UCR has had a long association with the Regional network. Bellanti reported that UCLA is agreeing to reference referrals and on site lending (assuming we can keep the policy of making the public buy library cards), but will not participate in interlibrary loans. Bellanti and Janice Koyama (UCLA AUL for Public Services) have been talking about what to do with the Southern Regional Library Facilities, but no decision has been reached. UCSC has strong involvement with the Regional network and has joined the Library of California. UCSB reports there has been no formal notice of membership, but it seems that the campus is participating since their UL is on the regional board. UCD is a member of the Sierra Valley region. Davis had been an associate member of the Mountain Valley group for a long time before it merged to become the Sierra Valley region. Davis will continue to apply the same policies and has signed membership with the Library of California with conditions. Dearie, who is on the regional board and steering committee, reports that UCSC joined as a charter member and provides free loans to public libraries, but charges everyone else. UCI continues to provide free loans to public libraries. The AUL for Public Services at Berkeley will be attending the Sacramento meeting. UCB did not join the pilot. In general campuses reported being given different information concerning membership benefits and policies.

8. RSC - role, direction, goals: During RSC's first year we have been involved in several projects including funding Tricor, sponsoring the ILL Workshop, working on a net lender reimbursement formula, and developing system wide desktop delivery (still in development). Where do we go from here? PIR Phase III, evaluation of consortial borrowing software (CBS), working with special collections to develop guidelines, and perhaps a more defined role for the Circulation Advisory Group. Dearie suggested we might look into standardizing loan policies between UC campuses, although this involves the Senate Library Committees. When the consortial borrowing system is implemented we might also look at billing fines and policies. Wilson suggested a program to educate staff and users on copyright. Nichols is on a new UC wide copyright committee and volunteered to work with Wilson.

Iannuzzi asked what bodies deal with RLF projects and issues. Bellanti explained that each RLF has a governing board, but that RSC could make recommendations to SOPAG for RLF service enhancements, as well..

ACTION: Jorgensen appointed Miller, Bellanti, Turner, Dearie, and Iannuzzi to an ad hoc committee to look at RLF issues. They will report at the January RSC meeting.

9. Report on San Diego Circuit: The directors of the project are looking to expand to local community colleges and public libraries. However, they are encountering resistance because potential partners are either not III libraries or they are perceived as net borrowers. Dearie asked if any other UC III libraries are interested? The directors are developing a list of membership guidelines. Benefits of membership include same day delivery within the region, direct charge to patron, reciprocal arrangements for blocking users.

10. Next meeting: conference call in late January. Jorgensen will send out email asking for availability.