

Resource Sharing Committee

Minutes of Conference Calls

December 9, 1999 & January 10, 2000

Roll Call: Lucia Snowhill (UCSB), Gary Lawrence (CDL), Charlotte Rubens (UCB), Tammy Dearie (UCSB), Claire Bellanti (SRLF), Gail Nichols (UCD & recorder), Deborah Turner (UCSC), Jacqueline Wilson (UCSF), Scott Miller (NRLF), Sara Eichorn (UCI), Venita Jorgenson (UCR & Chair), Alison Bunting (SOPAG), Elaine Adams (UCLA), Marlena Gates (UCSB)

1. Review of the charge for the Interlibrary Loan Advisory Group - (Charlotte Rubens, Chair IAG)

The charge was reviewed once more and a number of modifications were suggested. The type and number of meetings per year was discussed; there are expected to be five meetings per year, provided there is business to conduct. One of the meetings would be a workshop format. The inclusion of Stanford was reviewed, and it was agreed that the most compelling

argument for Stanford's continuing inclusion was the UC-wide reciprocal interlibrary loan agreement. Charlotte noted that Judi will take over as Chair of the IAG on January 1, 2000.

ACTION: Charlotte will draft a "framework sentence" for the beginning of the charge, incorporate the modifications as suggested, route to the committee for review, and create a final draft for SOPAG's review.

2. Review of the charge for the Circulation Advisory Group (a.k.a. UC Circheads) - (Claire Bellanti, acting as liaison)

The charge was reviewed and a number of modifications were suggested. The text will be made to parallel the format of the IAG charge, including the wording regarding type and number of meetings to be held.

ACTION: Claire will revise the text, draft a "framework sentence", and send it back to the Circheads for comment.

ACTION: RSC will appoint liaisons to each group.

3. Discussion of Tricor - (Venita Jorgenson)

The UL's already agreed to recommend that the Tricor bills continue to be paid from systemwide funds. Considerable confusion still exists with billing. Campus reimbursements from Tricor have not been received; Bruce Roberts assured Tammy that billing issues would be resolved. There may be a need to adjust some campuses weight allocations.

ACTION: Tammy will resend to campuses what the campus payment responsibilities are. Those include packaging, excess weight charges, and Stanford charges.

4. IAG Response to Preservation Group's Tricor Study - (Charlotte Rubens)

Members of the group shared campus reactions to the Preservation Advisory Group's packaging and shipping guidelines. These were discussed at the Collection Development Council's meeting; at least one campus thought it had been agreed and has begun using more extensive packaging. A number of suggestions were offered to the draft Guidelines that were developed by Judi Bube for the IAG. All agreed that one of the original reasons for using Tricor was to avoid extensive packaging for most library materials, and that Judi's guidelines represented a realistic approach. All agreed that extra packaging is required for special materials (e.g., media, special collections items). Collecting data on damaged materials, as previously discussed in IAG, will help quantify the extent of the problem.

ACTION: The IAG will modify the guidelines document to include what we are willing to have ILL units do for regular materials and the types of materials that need special attention. The report will include statistics of the volume of traffic and the fiscal implications of additional packaging. IAG will work on these by email and send the revised document to RSC for forwarding to SOPAG for their February meeting.

ACTION: Gail will make revisions to the draft reporting form and distribute to IAG for review. In the meantime, damage may be reported to Gail via email (gmnichols@ucdavis.edu) Gail will create an Excel file to tabulate reports.

5. Discussion of CCC costs - (Charlotte Rubens)

Alison reported that SOPAG wants to be sure that as we move into Request for articles, that campus units have procedures in place for monitoring copyright responsibilities. The University Librarian's want to know that appropriate procedures are in place. There are a variety of different policies in place, but everyone seems to have a policy. The idea of a checklist that campuses could use for a self-evaluation was suggested. Such a checklist would include such questions as: (1) Does your campus have a tracking system, (2) Is the campus registered, (3) Does the campus library have a fund in place for paying copyright charges, and (4) Does the campus have policy and guidelines that are followed? The checklist will be for each campus to use, but not to publish. SOPAG is interested in the existence of tracking.

ACTION: IAG will develop a checklist that campuses can use to assess their copyright compliance. The checklist will be forwarded to SOPAG.

At this point most were dropped from the conference call. A second session will be scheduled for early January.

RESUMED CONFERENCE CALL ON JAN. 10, 2000

Roll Call: Gary Lawrence (CDL), Charlotte Rubens (UCB), Tammy Dearie (UCSB), Claire Bellanti (SRLF), Gail Nichols (UCD & recorder), Deborah Turner (UCSC), Jacqueline Wilson (UCSF), Scott Miller (NRLF), Sara Eichorn (UCI), Venita

Jorgenson (UCR & Chair), Elaine Adams (UCLA), Marlena Gates (UCSB)

1. Review of the charge for the Interlibrary Loan Advisory Group and the Circulation Heads Advisory Group Approved with the addition of "as appropriate" to the text where monitoring national trends in resource sharing is mentioned.

ACTION: Charlotte (IAG) and Claire (CAG) are to forward revised texts to Venita who will forward them to SOPAG.

2. Request Update - (Tammy)

Request went live on January 7th. Adaptable text materials are available for campuses to use. Jacqueline reported big problems at UCSF and that Michael and Mary are working on them; the problem is with the ILL interface. Most campuses have made the necessary changes for CCG and CCL reporting. The routing on charged out items seems to be working. There were questions about why the implementation was scheduled for so early in January. Some campuses were still on quarter/semester breaks and had staff/students still on vacation. Several committee members indicated that they would like more discussion on the setting of the implementation dates with the campuses. It seemed that there was better communication

with the release of Phase I than Phase II.

3. ILL Workshop - (Tammy Dearie and Venita Jorgenson)

SOPAG sent a request to RSC to develop a workshop. Tammy developed a proposal that incorporates ARL's two ILL workshops analytical side of how to make changes and use technology and best practices. Tammy has talked to Mary Jackson and developed a list of possible dates and workshop ideas. Questions raised during the discussion included should we have regional workshops, possibly with overlapping attendees, what dates, and 1 or 2 days. The consensus was that there be one statewide meeting with a follow-up meeting of higher level managers (with or without Mary Jackson). It should take place in the spring or early summer.

ACTION: A small group (Charlotte, Marlana, Deborah, Tammy, and someone from SOPAG/CDL (Gary will get back to the group with the SOPAG/CDL input)) will develop a proposal for the workshop by February 7th. The draft will go to the RSC and will be forwarded in time for SOPAG's February meeting.

4. Desktop Delivery - (Claire Bellanti)

Claire reported on the activity of the subcommittee to date. The proposal includes a central server, funding some desktop delivery options on campuses, funding equipment for campuses that don't already have equipment, and funding special equipment (e.g., color scanners) for the net lenders and the RLFs. More investigation of color scanners is needed. Gary indicated that provision had been made in the universitywide Resource Sharing budget only for planning and piloting of new systemwide resource sharing initiatives. In this context, a request for systemwide funding of equipment to implement a systemwide program that has not yet been developed, approved or tested would most likely not be entertained. The proposal will include a description of what a systemwide program would look like and what the costs are, regardless of the funding source. The committee briefly discussed copyright and licensing issues. Since the proposal is only for the transmission of copies from print sources, not the transmission of copies from electronic sources, licensing issues are generally thought to be moot. Copyright reporting will be the responsibility of the borrowing campus, as is the current practice.

ACTION: The subcommittee will have a follow-up conference call, will revise the proposal, and send the draft out to the committee again in the first week of February so that the proposal can go to SOPAG in time for its March meeting.

5. Copyright Checklist - (Charlotte Rubens)

This is Charlotte's project; she was out most of December.

ACTION: Charlotte will get the draft checklist out to IAG for a quick review and then get it back to RSC for review so that it can be on SOPAG's February agenda.

6. Tricor

What to include in the "cost study" and the period of time to be studied was discussed.

ACTION: IAG will talk about the "cost study" at its January meeting and report to RSC.

ACTION: Gail will get the IAG Guidelines, the report form, and the statistics up on the web. Gail will distribute the problem report form to each campus as well.

Invoice problems and receiving credits continues to be a problem. Tammy said that she had made it clear to Bruce Roberts that payment of the January UCOP invoice is dependent upon the campuses receiving the credits they are due. Campuses should not be paying the \$18.30 NRLF charge.

7. Undergraduate Use of ILL

We need to develop a snapshot of undergraduate ILL use. Not many campuses can isolate undergraduate ILL usage.

ACTION: Gail will compile campus practices and whatever data is available on undergraduate ILL use for RSC and for forwarding SOPAG for its March meeting.

8. RLF Funding Issues

In response to the Net Lender reimbursement report, Phyllis Mirsky responded that the whole issue of budgetary needs for the RLFs needs to be addressed and indicated that it would be useful for RSC to provide SOPAG with an articulation of what the RLF issues are and make recommendations of what resources would be necessary for the RLFs to participate appropriately in the direct borrowing/lending of Request. Venita raised this agenda item to see if there were issues that the RLFs wanted to articulate, and Scott and Claire both responded that there are funding issues that need to be discussed.

ACTION: Venita will discuss this further with Phyllis to gain a better understanding of what SOPAG wants.

9. Other

UCSB is considering the purchase of the ILLIAD ILL management system and will have a local demonstration to which everyone is invited. A question was raised (and left unanswered) about how many "bridging" systems we can ask CDL to support for ILL management.

Tammy's "Needs Assessment Report" for ILL operations is now expected in February.

The next meeting: There will be an email discussion to determine whether a February conference call or a March in person meeting is needed.

[Go to SOPAG home page](#)