Meeting, Monday, October 7, 2002

Minutes

Present: Tammy Dearie (UCSD & Chair), Charlotte Rubens (UCB), Gail Nichols (UCD), Pam La Zarr (UCI), Elaine Adams (UCLA & recorder), Donald Barclay (UCM), David Rios (UCR), Lucia Snowhill (LAUC), Deborah Turner (UCSC), Jackie Wilson (UCSF), Scott Miller (NRLF), Claire Bellanti (SRLF), Gary Lawrence (UCOP)

1. Introductions – Welcome to Donald Barclay, our new member from UC Merced.

2. Announcements – Gail Nichols will be the new RSC liaison to the Circulation Advisory Group (CAG).

3. Updates

3.1 Tricor - The base contract fees for Tricor service between campuses are paid centrally. However, the Laboratories and some Law Schools want to be included in the Tricor service. Dearie discussed the matter with SOPAG whose consensus was that if they (the laboratory or school) were willing to participate in Request, that is make their collections available to all other UC's, then they could be included in Tricor coverage. UCLA's Law Library has been participating in Request from the beginning and has been part of the Tricor contract. Hastings Law School, although loosely affiliated with the UC's, is not funded by the University of California or governed by the Regents, so Hastings will not be included. Dearie has extended an invitation to the Berkeley Law School but has not yet received a response. UC Davis Law has made its own contract with Tricor. (Davis Law resource sharing is mostly by fax, mostly between librarians, and they provide document delivery only for faculty.) Campuses continue to lend to the laboratories (LBL and LLNL), but the labs are not included in Tricor service.

Other concerns about the Tricor contract discussed were the billing problems with the small campus invoices for over weight charges and the insured value for lost books. Wilson noted that her staff spends a fair amount of time dealing with Tricor over erroneous charges, and that Tricor does not follow through in sending credits they have promised. Rios suggested that the current $100 book value be increased.

La Zarr suggests that RSC invite the new Tricor account representative to an IAG or RSC meeting. Dearie also proposed that any credits be saved up and presented to Tricor at the end of the year to be deducted from the bill.

3.2 Consortial Borrowing System status - Bellanti reported that three campuses are actively testing: Santa Barbara, San Diego, and Los Angeles. Uniformly, staff at these campuses have found the Windows client unacceptably slow. Los Angeles and Santa Barbara find the Web client works better, but San Diego finds it doesn't work that well either. Bellanti thinks we could start live testing in the Web client. However, we need book bands and pick lists developed for the Web interface. Also, the VDX patron information coming back is not sufficient for actual working conditions.

Bellanti has added a VDX implementation newsletter on the RSC web page and is drafting a new report. We are still expecting from Fretwell-Downing a connection for document delivery and Ariel interface with VDX, and an auto-updating feature. Bellanti will check on the status of billing and statistics programming in response to La Zarr's question. FD is still working on a DocLine/VDX interface.

3.3 Request Statistics – Dearie distributed the statistics tables for the calendar year. She will recompile the statistics into fiscal year and mount them on the RSC website when the edits are final. Of particular interest is the fact that the majority of REQUESTS that fail do so because "Patron ID not found".

3.4 Minolta Service Contracts - Campuses have been approached by Minolta to sign up for service contracts for the scanners purchased for DTD. About half the campuses have purchased the service contracts. Past RSC Chair Venita Jorgensen had posed the question to Dearie of negotiating a centrally funded service contract. Dearie noted that there is some variance on the price of the contract. Bellanti confirmed that the original scanner purchase contract language was vague indicating that Minolta would provide maintenance through local agents. Given the contract language, would we even be able to get a system wide contract? The question may be moot given the current budgetary situation.

3.5 Minolta, RLG and VDX – Bellanti reported that the real issue with Minolta and Ariel is getting the two to work together, especially when VDX is implemented. The RLG page indicates that Ariel 3.0 works with the Minolta 7000 series scanner and even gives instructions on how to configure the interface. However, some of our campuses are still unable to get the two pieces to work together. Minolta seems to say that RLG's twain drivers used in Ariel are not up to best efficiency. Minolta and RLG still need some nudging to work through this problem.

3.6 Mekel scanner proposal – The Mekel scanner is a $30K machine which will take microfilm and microfiche and scan them into several formats. The goal is to write a proposal to purchase two machines (one for each RLF) so that film or fiche items on deposit can be scanned and delivered electronically. Lawrence indicated that there is a project underway to review the collection areas systematically and identify which areas need to be digitized. When the collections have been identified, then it will become an economic decision whether to convert the materials in house or contract out the project.

On a slightly different note, Nichols announced that Davis has purchased a new machine to convert opaque micro cards. La Zarr indicated Irvine has made a similar purchase.

3.7 RSC-CAG Blocking proposal – See http://sshl.ucsd.edu/ucrsc/reports.html for text of the proposal. Dearie presented the proposal to SOPAG and recapped the early groundwork for the new member and with the new AUL. Dearie hopes to take the proposal back to SOPAG at their October 25th meeting.

3.8 RSC – CAG workshop (Bellanti and Dearie) – There are two proposals caught in the transition between CAG chairs. One is for a Best Practices in Circulation and another for Best Practices in EReserves.

4. Budget and Statistics (Lawrence)

4.1 Preview of preliminary statistical reports - Lawrence distributed copies of various tables. Overall they show a long term upward trend in the inter campus borrowing of returnables (attributable to REQUEST), and a long term downward trend in photocopies (attributable to increasing online access). The net lender chart shows that, with the exception of San Diego, the net lenders according to the 1997 baseline have experienced a significant reduction in net lending volume. Therefore, Lawrence is not recommending compensation for net lenders at this time.

Also, Lawrence will implement a "clean up" of how statistics are reported once the consortial borrowing system is fully implemented. (For instance, loans to UC labs are included by some campuses but not others.)

4.2 Resource Sharing Budget - Lawrence set the scene regarding announced $29M cuts to UC core needs, which includes libraries and impacts the funding for Resource Sharing. Some of these funds are allocated to the campuses as a lump sum and it will fall to the campus chancellor to further allocate reductions to various functions. In addition, the Governor can make further budget cuts before January, 2003.

In light of these circumstances, Lawrence urged that we be conservative in proposed spending since we don't know how cuts will affect resource sharing. Further, resource sharing funds provide an essential source of venture capital to allow us to invest in innovation (such as the scanners). We already have approximately $960K committed to long term projects (e.g. shared A&I databases, VDX software maintenance, Tricor contract). So the top priority is to protect the ongoing commitments. Therefore, this would not be a good time to recommend any further projects requiring long term funding. However, projects requiring only one time funding might still be possible.

5. Web presence (Dearie)

5.1. The RSC committee web page is available at http://sshl.ucsd.edu/ucrsc/. Committee members voiced approval of the page and its links. Dearie will add links to Lawrence's statistics when editing is complete.

5.2 The RSC-CAG web page is at http://library.ucsc.edu/uc-circ/.

5.3 The RSC-IAG web page is at http://sshl.ucsd.edu/iag. The IAG is currently updating the UC ILL manual and will mount it on their page when editing is complete.

Lawrence mentioned that the CDL libstaff website is expected to be redesigned within the next three to six months.

6. Goals and Objectives

The committee reviewed the draft of our updated goals and objectives statement. While to Goals remain essentially the same, some of the Objectives have changed. Dearie noted that many of the Goal 1 objectives will dovetail with full implementation of VDX. Dearie will edit and forward to SOPAG for approval.

7. Borrowing by UCM faculty/staff (Barclay)

Faculty for the new campus are starting to come in and they want to be able to use Request. Nichols has agreed that Davis will issue library cards to these faculty and provide ILL services (i.e. materials will be received at Davis then reshipped to Merced). Merced has agreed to get a UPS account for Davis to use for billing. Merced hopes to have interlibrary loan staff within the next year. They already have about 25,000 books on site.

8. Special Collections project (Dearie, Bellanti)

8.1 ILL special Collections survey (Turner) - Turner distributed a draft of a survey to gather qualitative data about the Special Collections Request project. The questions are aimed at both ILL and special Collections staff and are somewhat vague in order to elicit more discussion. Bellanti suggested that the two groups on each campus meet to fill out the questionnaire together and get a dialog started. She did observe that a facilitator might be needed for these discussions.

Turner questioned how wide the interest in the survey results might be. RSC members agreed that the results would be of interest to SOPAG and among the campuses.

The next step is to have each campus RSC representative contact the Special Collections representative and set up the meetings.

8.2 ILL pilot statistics – Bellanti and Dearie are working on a report, but the process (i.e. of loaning special collections items) is so complicated that it is difficult to track transactions and get meaningful

statistics. Dearie noted there were almost 300 requests made in one year, but there is no way to track the disposition. Rubens reported that two thirds of the requests they received were for rare, fragile, or manuscript materials – items that would never circulate. So it looks like users want access, but how can we make it more workable?

8.3 ILL report outline/recommendations – Since the statistics are inconclusive, what is our recommendation? Should the Special Collections Request program continue? Why or why not? Lawrence asked if we felt the need for a credible outside consultant to look at the project and make recommendations so we don't get stuck in a loop. His sense was that hiring consultants in this situation would be an appropriate use of RSC funds.

Dearie will draft an interim report for SOPAG without the results from the local campus meetings.

9. Shared Print Journal Collections (Dearie, Lawrence)

The Scholarly Information Program Task Force (SIP TF) , established by SLASIAC, has submitted a draft report on their charge to give a vision, goals and strategies for a post-Partnership policy and resource development for management of scholarly information. (Partnership here refers to an agreement the UC's entered into with the Governor of California which involved some financial aid by the State to the UC's. The Partnership was for a finite period, however, the state's financial difficulties may dissolve the Partnership before the specified end date.) The SIP TF report was forwarded to SOPAG, CDC and RSC for review and comment.

The meat of the report, entitled "Stategic Planning for Libraries and Scholarly Communication, is the eight strategies. Strategy number 4, "Development, Integration and Management of the Shared Collection", outlines a systematic expansion of the shared collection concept. Some of the specific projects within this strategy are "Developing a Shared Print Journal Collection", "Building a Unified Government Publications Repository," "and "New roles and processes for the Regional Library Facilities".

SOPAG also forwarded for comment a companion document prepared by Cecily Jones listing the kinds of issues that would have to be addressed in building shared print collections of journals. Some the issues are: where would the journals come from; where would the physically be located; who handles the processing, bibliographic control and conservation; access; ownership; and funding.

Lawrence noted that the results of CMI project show electronic access is adequate for most purposes and actually preferred for others by UC users. However, we would need to revisit the issues of accessibility to groups outside the UC community. The E Scholarship Repository was cited as one example of providing access to outside users.

The shared collection concept also raises questions about the University's archival obligations. In this regard, the SIP TF report cites a presentation by Abby Smith, Director of Programs at the Council on Library and Information Resources titled "The Evidenced in Hand: Report of the Task Force on the Artifact in Library Collections (see http://www.slp.ucop.edu/consultation/cmpg/CMPG_Notes_043003.html for a record of the ensuing discussion).

While much of this looks like Collection Development issues, there are significant service issues involved. Dearie will draft comments to both documents.

10. HOTS report and recommendations (Dearie)

HOTS Chair, Nancy Douglas, has asked for comments on three proposals that were made at recent meetings.

10.1 Minimal level bibliographic record standard – HOTS has agreed to adopt the national standard for minimal level bibliographic records as it appears in MARC21. RSC agrees since the minimal level standard allows ILL Request processes to work successfully. It would be helpful, however, to have a contact list, by campus, in the event of a problem.

10.2 Adding in-process and on-order records to the union catalog - There has been a long standing policy against adding these records into the union catalog, but the issue was raised thinking that it would be helpful for collection development and for users who could avoid searching multiple UC library catalogs. After discussion of specific problems (keeping such records updated, title changes between order and receipt, and user confusion), RSC members unanimously agreed that any Collection Development advantages were far outweighed by technical services workload issues and, especially, public service problems.

10.3 Use of separate records in MELVYL to catalog electronic monographs and the related issue of display and merging of print and electronic monographs on the same bibliographic record - According to their report, the HOTS recommendation for creating separate bibliographic records will provide the most flexibility for adding and deleting Shared Cataloging Project records. (The recommendation would apply to SCP records only.) However, their report also recognizes that once the records are created there are issues of how they may be displayed and how much merging or separation of records is desired in MELVYL. RSC members already deal with the consequences of multiple records in MELVYL for the same item in the same format. Our experience is that users select the first one they find in the list rather than scrolling further to find the one owned on their campus. So while separate records may be cleaner, we feel that merged records provide a better opportunity for users to find the "copy" (be it print or electronic) that best suits their needs.

Meeting was adjourned. Next meeting will be a conference call tentatively set for January 16, 2003.