

**UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA
SHARED LIBRARY FACILITIES BOARD**

**Criteria for Evaluating Requests for Non-UC Deposits to UC Shared Library
Facilities**

Approved by the SLF Board via email, June 19, 2008

1. INTRODUCTION

Pursuant to University of California policy, non-UC libraries in California may deposit materials in the UC Regional Library Facilities, supported with designated additional funding described in the existing fee schedule for non-UC deposits.

2. POLICY

All deposits from any organization that is not administered by and accountable to a UC campus or the UC Office of the President are considered “non-UC” deposits and are subject to the provisions set out herein.

It is the policy of the Shared Library Facilities Board that requests for non-UC deposits will be evaluated in terms of the extent to which the proposed deposit is consistent with and advances the UC Libraries’ collaborative collection management strategy and the operating principles, programs and practices adopted by the Libraries to implement that strategy, as well as the on the size of the proposed deposit in relation to existing RLF space and processing capacity. Unless otherwise specified, it is expected that material deposited at the RLFs is intended for permanent storage. Materials may not duplicate items already held at any UC library or stored in the RLF, with the exception of certain Special Collections.

“Non-UC deposits” are subject to all policies and principles adopted by the Board to govern the use of the Regional Library Facilities, including but not limited to:

- The University of California Regional Library Facilities Statement of Operating Principles (November 27, 2006),
(http://libraries.universityofcalifornia.edu/planning/RLF_operating_principles_2006.pdf),
- Procedures for Annual Management of Deposits to the UC Regional Library Facilities. (November 8, 2006),
(http://libraries.universityofcalifornia.edu/planning/SLFB_deposit_management_final.pdf),
and
- Persistent Deposits in UC Regional Library Facilities (May 5, 2004),
(http://libraries.universityofcalifornia.edu/planning/RLF_Persistence_Policy.pdf)

It is the responsibility of the prospective depositor to provide to the Board and its staff the information necessary to evaluate the proposed deposit. The prospective depositor shall certify that it has reviewed all applicable policies and procedures, including those enumerated above,

and is either (a) committed to compliance with them in their entirety or (b) is requesting of the Board one or more specific exceptions.¹

The Shared Library Facilities Board shall review all requests for non-UC deposits in respect of this policy and the incorporated Strategic Criteria. The Board reserves the right to accept non-UC deposits as exceptions to this policy on a case-by-case basis.

3. STRATEGIC CRITERIA

Criteria to be considered in evaluating a non-UC deposit proposal's alignment with UC Libraries strategy include:

3.1. *The proposed deposit will broaden or deepen UC Library collections in the service of research and teaching.*

In assessing whether a candidate collection meets this criterion, the following questions might be asked:

- What UC academic programs and scholarly research areas will the proposed collection support?
- Will the collection provide significant benefits broadly across UC campuses?

3.2. *The deposit will enhance access by the research community to important cultural assets by ensuring persistence over time.*

- Is this collection a “copy of record,” even when a digital version exists elsewhere?
- Given that UC Libraries will never be able to acquire, preserve and manage the entire global printed cultural record, why is THIS collection an “important cultural asset” that should be preserved?
- Are titles in this collection broadly available in other libraries, or is there another archive elsewhere of this material? Why is it important that UC be archiving this collection? Are others libraries or institutions better positioned to do so?

3.3. *The deposit will enhance access for UC patrons through the inclusion of accurate and full bibliographic and holdings records in Melvyl (or future system-wide catalog) and/or other descriptive or delivery methods.*

- Are there complete online bibliographic records for the collection?
- Because of its coherence, does it offer benefits or potential benefits that distributed collections do not?
- Is there potential to build other access mechanisms (digitized TOCs for example) that would benefit the UC campus libraries?

3.4. *The deposit will enable UC Libraries to develop research collections that would otherwise be difficult or impossible to build.*

- Does the requested deposit allow the building of a richer and more extensive research collection than would be possible if the collection were not deposited?
- Does it relieve campus libraries of the necessity to collect these materials locally?

¹ Where non-UC depositors have certified their commitment to comply with all applicable Board policies and procedures, UC campuses seeking to deposit duplicates of items previously deposited by a non-UC library may instead withdraw these items and record them as “withdrawn in lieu of deposit.” A UC deposit that duplicates a prior non-UC deposit will be accepted only as an exception to policy on a case-by-case basis.