

**University of California  
Resource Sharing Committee  
Conference Call Minutes  
April 9, 2009**

Present: Charlotte Rubens (UCB), Linda Kennedy (UCD), Collette Ford (UCI), Don Sloane (UCLA), Eric Scott (UCM), Marlayna Christensen (UCSD, Chair), Peggy Tahir (UCSF), Gary Johnson (UCSB, Recorder), Scott Miller (NRLF), Colleen Carlton (SRLF), Sherry Willhite (CDL), Shannon Supple (LAUC)

1. Roll Call & Announcements

- 1.1. Welcome Peggy Tahir! She recently took over ILL at UCSF.
- 1.2. January conference call minutes approved via e-mail and posted to the RSC web site (<http://libraries.universityofcalifornia.edu/rsc/minutes.html>) put up without revision or correction.
- 1.3. Tammy Dearie will be AUL for Administrative Services at UCSD, effective April 13<sup>th</sup>.
- 1.4. Tricor update. No formal statement yet received concerning the MOU.  
**ACTION:** *Marlayna will pose a draft query to SOPAG but first route to RSC for its approval. When will the new arrangement begin? If a campus wanted to negotiate a separate stop what is the process? For a campus with multiple stops, can the campus specify which location is served by the MOU? For a campus with multiple stops that is reduced to one stop, will that location receive shipments for the remaining locations on campus with bins and bags bearing shipping labels specific to these locations?*
- 1.5. E-brary information recently distributed has been recalled. More current information will be available soon. Sherry Willhite will send out an update on the Springer e-books when available.

2. Action Item Updates

To be discussed on-line after this conference call. Members asked to review the list and report back to group on the progress or what has been completed.

**ACTION:** *Marlayna will send out the task list.*

3. IAG ILL Survey

Concerns about the survey from RSC, HOPS, and SOPAG have been acknowledged in the most recent version. RSC is supportive of moving forward with the survey and requests that the IAG ILL Survey committee consider refining the survey further in the following areas:

- Question # 4. Consider restating the question to gather specific data about which form the user prefers.
- Question #6. Why is the question exclusively focused on “not filled” rather than other types of statuses? Should the question be, “The information I receive through ‘My ILL Requests’ about the status of my ILL requests is adequate.”

- Question #7. These compound questions should be divided up and clarified. Rather than “My ILL loan periods, renewals, and restrictions are reasonable” change to “My ILL loan periods are reasonable.”

**ACTION:** *Don and Gary will draft a letter to send to the RSC-IAG ILL Survey committee expressing our concerns and acknowledge the good work that’s gone into this endeavor already. The draft first goes to RSC with a response deadline of April 14<sup>th</sup>.*

4. CDL Advisory Group for Request/VDX

Developing a new charge for this group is best handled by a small task force comprised by a few members from RSC and IAG.

**ACTION:** *Sherry Willhite and Gary Johnson volunteered to collaborate with a few volunteers from IAG in developing the charge with the goal of having a substantive draft submitted to RSC by May 22, 2009. Proposal for new group and charge will be submitted to SOPAG. Upon approval, IAG will be asked for volunteers to participate on this task force.*

5. Green ILL Proposal

The document entitled, “Tracking Interlibrary Loan of Licensed electronic content” originally discussed during the January 14<sup>th</sup> conference call was revisited. Our CDL journal licensing and negotiation colleagues, Ivy Anderson and Curtis Lavery, are on board with supplying ILL copies from an e-resource electronically rather than printing out then scanning again for delivery. Tracking ILL licensed e-content will be vastly simpler once an ERMS is in place. But how far off is that? In the meantime, we need a way to track these kinds of requests to comply with some of our journal subscription contracts.

**ACTION:** *To better inform the issues surrounding this topic RSC will ask IAG to develop a clear statement of needs from the ILL operations perspective, with supporting data (i.e. a sense of how much it costs to print then mail or send by Ariel). Charlotte will take the task to IAG.*

**ACTION:** *Sherry will ask Ivy Anderson and Curtis Lavery at CDL about their current negotiations relating to this topic and request that the “Interlibrary Loan” section of CDL’s “Standard License Agreement” be updated.*

6. Service Continuity Plan Update (To be discussed on-line after this conference call.)

6.1 Implement listserv.

6.2 Next steps.

7. Shared Print Steering Task Force update

SPSTF met four times via conference call since RSC’s last call on January 14<sup>th</sup> and now has a revised and expanded charge. The SPSTF has established four subgroups:

- Shared Print in Place Policy
- Common Access Policy
- Standard Acquisitions Processes
- Descriptive Service Standards

Each of the groups does work on the side, including conference calls, and then comes back to the main Task Force during its scheduled conference calls. The Descriptive Service Standards and Standard Acquisitions Processes groups began meeting in February and the Shared Print in Place and Common Access Policy groups began in March.

The crux of the Task Force's work is found in two documents sanctioned by CDC. The first is the "Memorandum of Understanding for prospective purchases of Shared Print Monographs using a Decentralized Collection Model." This was written so it was NOT UC specific and could include extramural partners. This is the "agreement" between campuses and institutions for conducting shared print acquisitions. The 2<sup>nd</sup> document is a report from the CDC/CDL Task Force on Prospective Shared Print Monographs. That report is called the "Prospective Shared Print Monographs: A Decentralized Model" which focuses initially on International and Area Studies.

SPSTF is gathering information from which to develop policies and standards as charged. The Acquisitions Common Interest Group (ACIG) was sent a questionnaire about ILS capabilities, campus accounting practices, and general costs associated with acquiring, cataloging and physically processing a single book. And the Standard Acquisitions Processing group has developed some draft Cataloging Guidelines for Shared Print which are being discussed. The Common Access Policy group has begun assessing how the proposed access to shared print described in the MOU might work with CDL Request in both Melvyl and NGM. To understand this a few Canadian Literature (AKA: Anglophone Project) titles were used to simulate ILL requests. There are about 1,000 monographs in this project and all are at SRLF. The analysis revealed that based on the stated MOU requirement that the shared print holding should be HH0, unmediated access to the material would be obstructed by extramural partners. HH0 is a non-supplier in OCLC and also the policy directory information points to CDL, where none of the shared print material is located.

Some questions have come up. Are Shared Print materials considered archival copies? If a walk-in visitor to one of our libraries purchases a library card, what would prevent that person from checking out a Shared Print monograph that's at one of the campuses or RLFs? Should access restrictions be placed on Shared Print material? Restricting access to only UC is incongruent with the Rethinking Resource Sharing Manifesto (<http://rethinkingresourcesharing.org/manifesto.html>) and our agreements with extramural partners for collaborative collection development endeavors. The Canadian Literature project proposal states that, "Items in the collection circulate to UC library patrons, including offsite use" but the Shared Print MOU was written to be inclusive of extramural partners. Since extramural access for shared print will be predominantly via ILL, what is the loss rate for ILL items as compared to materials loaned across our local service desks?

**ACTION:** For RSC: do we have any data on loss rates for ILL as compared to in-house? This data is not tracked and is not readily available. How much borrowing of monographs do we

*do from non-UC suppliers? RSC will respond by Friday, April 17<sup>th</sup> with the percentage of returnables borrowed from non-UC suppliers from September 1, 2008 to December 31, 2008.*

8. OCLC Next Generation Melvyl Catalog Update

We're on schedule for implementation by September, 2009. The biggest change at that point will be using NGM for getting holdings and availability for Request. To be added to our next RSC agenda: Planning for potential increase in ILL due to the increased use of NGM. The latest information about NGM was just sent out on Monday, March 13<sup>th</sup> by Ellen Meltzer with the subject line "Next Gen Melvyl Interface Changes Coming 4/20/09."

9. SOPAG Update

(The following update, penned by Susan Parker, was forwarded by Marlayna to RSC on 4/10/09 via email.)

IAG ILL Survey: First, about the survey: there are a lot of questions, along the lines of the HOPS questions, about timing. I have talked with Bob Freel a little bit about it, and I think that with offering some context and reviewing the objectives and some of the questions, SOPAG soon will be able to endorse and let you proceed. For example, why now? What is to be gained? Does it make sense to do this as a collaborative effort with HOPS? That sort of thing.

ISO ILL policy: Second, SOPAG asks regarding the ISO ILL policy about the larger picture, what revenue and OCLC fee how is it collected? Does it mean we have to institute new revenue procedures? Document should discuss the advantages and disadvantages of using VDX. Why is ISO ILL policy a problem or need? What are the issues? A change of policy does need SOPAG approval, but SOPAG needs to understand guidelines for adding. Then SOPAG would send off to ULs with a conveyance memo. There is a concern there about the impact on revenues.

HOPS: Has been discussing document delivery on campuses. Statistics from 24/7 reference show booming business.

HOTS: Continues to assist with Next Generation Melvyl and tracking reclamation project. Does existence of NGM team along with NGM Technical Services Task Force make HOPS obsolete? Luc is chair, rotating off in June, new chair search is ongoing.

Digital Task Force: Discussion of report to ULs revealed desire to discuss the CDC Briefing Paper to see how it might fit in, then how to break down the charge into tasks and sub groups. Discussion identified need for standards, best practices, and priorities and focus on digital material to avoid project creep. Perhaps it will be necessary to recommend a second phase to capture things that need follow-up.

Next Generation Technical Services: Will ask ULs about their 4 task groups and who should be assigned to them, how to populate these task groups with more staff. Discussion focused on the categories of focus for the 4 sub groups.

Next Generation Melvyl Task Force: Will focus on communication about moving ahead on the pilot and where the responsibility lies. If communication lags, it is going to be necessary to explain why the pilot is going to take a while to go into production mode.

Statistics Task Force: Report to ULs will cover the issue of the financial reports and request adoption of Tony Hargill's algorithm for counting serials. Further work, including identifying and defining qualitative measures, is needed. A reference to the Accountability Framework yielded the suggestion to set up a group to identify outcome measures. We need to tell our story in the accountability framework context.

Finally, in an effort to facilitate communication among various groups including SOPAG, ACGs, CIGs, TFs, groups are encourage to post communications on the ACG listserv. Share minutes in one place and remind people where to find them. Send out minutes. ACG chairs can send out minutes, even the SOPAG agenda minus dialing instructions.

The last SOPAG meeting was followed by a joint ULs/SOPAG meeting in which all these updates were discussed. Some assignments were given out, but await the ULs' announcement of them.

#### 10. CDL/VDX Update

OCLC is going straight to VDX version 4.1 but there's no release date yet. The earliest CDL could move to 4.1 would be early 2010. Version 4.1 contains secure FTP which is what UC requires for using VDX's document delivery feature. VDXtrouble-L converted into a ticketing system which is a superior way for CDL to track VDX issues.

*ACTION: Sherry will send out an update on Springer e-books and ILL rights soon.*

#### 11. CAG Update

(The following CAG update, penned by Marianne Hawkins, was provided by Sarah Troy to RSC on 4/8/09 via email.)

Website: M. Wepler-Selear reported that UCM would like to host the web site, and can provide student assistant help. A committee composed of S. Missaghieh Klawitter, V. Rom-Hawkins and J. Bareford was formed to provide input on the content and style. M. Christensen noted that the UCM hosting might need to be approved by CDL.

Emergency Preparedness Symposium: This idea was forwarded to RSC. RSC drafted a proposal and submitted it to SOPAG. After the second draft the big question was who was the target audience, and why would this need to be done. RSC's concern is continuity of services in the event of a disaster; RSC will be giving this charge to CAG and IAG. One item

approved by SOPAG is the creation of a listserv. Gary Johnson and Sarah Troy are working on this item.

Other: The Tricor contract, funded by UCOP, is under review. UCOP is intent on creating one stop per campus. The question has been put forward as to whether individual campuses can fund additional stops. There is no timeline on this change. A new version of VDX will be out in the next year and has substantial differences from the current version.

The CAG Annual Report should be written by the outgoing chair, rather than the incoming chair.

**ACTION:** *J. Edmondson will send the IAG Southern meeting minutes to CAG members, and will be the IAG liaison to CAG.*

**2009 CAG GOALS/OBJECTIVES:**

- Continuity of Service (charge from RSC)
- Web site – deadline agreed upon was the end of August
- Sharing opportunities (i.e., cost-saving ideas) - this included the ideas of sharing a machine that removes scratches from DVDs.

**NEXT GENERATION MELVYL:** A report with a power-point presentation was presented by AUL Amy Kautzman on the status of NGM.

**ELECTIONS & 2010 PLANNING:** Jason Schulz (UCSD) was elected as Chair-elect. The next CAG/Circ Heads meeting will be March 24-25 at UC Riverside. It was agreed that planning for a teleconference would be a good idea given the budget situation.

**12. IAG report**

RSC-IAG has a conference call scheduled for April 16, 2009.

**NEXT CONFERENCE CALL:      June 23, 10am – Noon**