

# Public Copy of 06/13/14

## Attendance

Date: 06/13/14

Note taker: *Sue Chesley Perry*

Attended: Robin Chandler, Sara Davidson, Kristine Ferry, Todd Grappone, Lynne Grigsby, Gary Johnson, Xiaoli Li, Patricia Martin, Sue Chesley Perry, Adrian Petrisor  
Absent: Michele Mizejewski, Catherine Friedman, Eric Milenkiewicz,

Meeting Guest(s): *None*

### Agenda

1. Attendance call (Sue, 1 min)
2. Approve public minutes from last meeting
3. Coordinating Committee Update (Robin, 5 min)
4. Continue review of [CLS Task Group report](#) (and [survey report](#)) - Article Level delivery services (Lynne, 15 minutes)
5. ILL CKG Proposals (3 document) (Patti, 30 minutes)
  - a. [ILL Systemwide Policies](#)
  - b. [Southern Northern ILL Meeting](#)
  - c. [ILL Survey](#)
6. [Review of items from previous meeting](#) (Patti, 10 min)
7. Review today's action items (Patti, 2 min)

### Notes

Item	Notes	Decision/Action
Approve notes from last meeting	Group should review a few days before we meet. <a href="#">Posted on the wiki.</a>	<b>DECIDED:</b> Minutes Approved.

<p>1. Coordinating Committee Report</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• CC met this morning 6/13/14 for the first time since 5/16/14</li> <li>• Rosalie Lack CC Convener attended part of the CoUL Face-to-Face meeting on 6/12/14 and reports the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• CoUL is preparing its Priorities for 2014-2017 and will be sharing this with UCLAS soon</li> <li>• CoUL wants to hire a consultant to assist with the UCLAS 1 year Assessment and is starting that process</li> </ul> </li> <li>• CC is forwarding names to CoUL to consider and select for the replacement of SAG 1 Portfolio Manager and the LAUC representative <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• SAG 3 has developed a 1: many model for managing affiliations with Shared Service Operations Teams and the Coordinating Committee wishes to share this model as an FYI with the other SAGs to consider if they wish as a light-weight means to manage this responsibility. I will forward the email from Diane Bisom to the CC separately to provide detail.</li> </ul> </li> </ul> <p>(Submitted by Robin via email 6/14/14)</p>	
<p>2. Continue review of <a href="#">CLS Task Group report</a> (and <a href="#">survey report</a>)</p>	<p>Discussion:</p> <p>Group discussed whether the report meets the charge, which was to explore a commercial article delivery service, in order to mitigate the impact of the Taylor and Francis cancellation.</p> <p>Discussion of the implementation details: it is unclear whether this is going to mediated or unmediated. Is there a recommendation for unmediated or mediated? If so, it should be stated clearly in the report because that will affect the workflows and timeframes. How will this affect or be integrated with existing workflows? Would it be part of the automated process or a separate process?</p> <p>On survey report, would be nice to know if campuses are using multiple delivery services. Many of these existing services were already engaged before the T&amp;F cancellation.</p>	

<p>3. ILL CKG Proposals (3 document)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. <a href="#">ILL Systemwide Policies</a></li> <li>b. <a href="#">Southern Northern ILL Meeting</a></li> <li>c. <a href="#">ILL Survey</a></li> </ul>	<p>Discussion:</p> <p><b>ILL systemwide policies.</b> SAG members raised questions about when the previous document was it last written. What will the update cycle be. It should include Interlibrary lending AND borrowing. Given the regular need to update policies, it might be better to use a wiki or website. Group needs to clearly state how it be used (what's the value).</p> <p><b>Southern / Northern ILL Meeting.</b> SAG members expressed concern over the endorsement of an ongoing meeting. We would like to see an agenda and justification for each. Concern over setting a precedent. We will ask the coordinating committee for guidelines and parameters. Gary sent <a href="#">guidelines</a> from SOPAG for advisory group face-to-face meetings.</p> <p><b>ILL Survey.</b> SAG2 would like to review questions. What are the specific actions that came from previous surveys (will help us establish the need.) How do they define success of previous surveys? Concern over privacy issues. Concern over survey fatigue with our faculty. Surveying ILL users does not get information about why some users don't use ILL. Are assessment specialists consulted in designing the survey? Can some data be pulled from analytics rather than asking our users (such as how often services were used)? Need to think about bigger picture of students and faculty needs and how shared services can meet them.</p>	
<p>4. <a href="#">Review of items from previous meeting</a></p>	<p>All items are completed except the Shibboleth document. Patti will share the internal document describing the (4) non-Shibboleth options supporting online education.</p>	
<p>5. Metadata Policy Project Team Update</p>	<p>The team has reviewed feedback from our last conference call and will present a revised policy and additional information after ALA. (submitted by Xiaoli via email 6/14/14)</p>	
<p>6. Operating Team Liaison Issues</p>	<p>The ops team assigned to Lynne Grigsby (Hosted licensed content) is not really an Operations Team.</p>	<p><b>DECIDED:</b></p> <p>Lynne will be the backup for the next need operations team liaison.</p>
<p>7. Representative to UC Trust Working Group</p>	<p>The LTAG representative on the UC Trust group working group, Terry Toy is retiring. Do we want to continue to having library representation?</p>	<p><b>DECIDED:</b></p> <p><a href="#">Adrian Petrisor</a> will take over representation on that group.</p>