

Public Copy of 01/23/15

Attendance

Date: 01/23/15

Note taker: *Xiaoli*

Attended: Robin Chandler, Sara Davidson, Catherine Friedman, Todd Grappone, Lynne Grigsby, Marti Jean Kallal, Xiaoli Li, Patricia Martin, Eric Milenkiewicz, Susan Boone, Sue Chesley Perry, Adrian Petrisor

Absent: Kristine Ferry

Agenda

1. Attendance (Xiaoli)
2. Approve public meeting minutes (Adrian)
3. Review of [newly designed SAG 2 page](https://wiki.library.ucsf.edu/pages/viewpage.action?pageId=350519798) (<https://wiki.library.ucsf.edu/pages/viewpage.action?pageId=350519798>) (Adrian, 5 minutes)
4. Coordinating Committee Update via email (Robin Chandler to circulate)
5. Ask a Librarian Manager position assessment update (Catherine, 10 minutes)
6. "Discovery White Paper" subcommittee report (Todd, 20 minutes)
7. Establish working group for **Digital Asset Management Strategic Planning White Paper** (Patti, 15 minutes)
8. Proposals from CKGs Outlined in CKG Guidelines, under Key Responsibilities & Appendix 2 [UC Libraries Advisory Structure](#)
9. Review [meeting minutes from previous meeting](#) (Patti, 10 minutes)
10. Review Action Items (Xiaoli)

Notes

Item	Notes	Decisions
Approve notes from last meeting	Group should review a few days before we meet	Approved
1. Review of newly designed SAG 2 wiki page Review of newly designed SAG2 page	Table 1 and Table 2 have been combined into Table 1. Question: should Table 1 has its own wiki page like other tables? Should the comments be deleted now that we have made decisions about various pages?	1. Table 1 should have its own page 2. All the comments can be removed

<p>2. Coordinating Committee Update</p>	<p>Coordinating Committee Meeting Report from Robin Chandler</p> <p>January 23, 2015</p> <p>I. Unfortunately, Ginny Steel, UCLA UL and CC Liaison was unable to meet with us today 1/23/15 so no input yet from CoUL on:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Assessment report <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • reaction to CC recommendations • reaction to Katherine Kott's recommendations • how/when to communicate results systemwide • ILS report direction • Metadata Policy <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Update on call: Patti Martin has received an email from CoUL and they are asking to have feedback from all CoUL members by 1/28/15 <p>II. Regards workplans for all SAGs/CLS communication to CoUL:</p> <p>1. CC is sending to CoUL via Ginny: the top 3 priorities for each of the groups document and an aggregated view spreadsheet of all workplans; this also includes the questions that have been surfaced by all of the SAGs/CLS where feedback is needed by us from CoUL</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SAG 2 discussion: RC relay to CC that there is extra work load making another layer of priority tracking <p>2. Additionally, CC will share all of these documents on shared wiki space with SAGs/CLS to keep in the loop; also shared as well as the detailed workplans</p> <p>III. Concerns expressed by CC regarding our DAMS White Paper:</p> <p>1. Make sure that our work considers the legacy work that's been completed about DAMs by the various task forces and POTS</p> <p>2. Consider a different means of communicating with CoUL, i.e. not a white paper</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SAG 2 discussion/conclusion: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Advise DAMs white paper subgroup we will establish: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Create a scope and determine the best way to report • Check-in with SAG2 group on scope and report direction and then go forward 	<p>1. Establish DAMs white paper subgroup.</p>
<p>3. Ask a Librarian Manager position assessment update</p>	<p>Catherine confirmed with the group that an evaluation of the Ask a Librarian Service Manager position by SAG2 should occur. especially since an evaluation of the position one year in was recommended to CoUL by the Administrative Services Advisory Group. A survey has already been done by the supervisor of the person who is doing this work, but the intent of that survey was to evaluate the impact of the position on UCI, the home library of the Service Manager. While the data from that survey will be useful, Catherine and Kristine will create another set of questions to be asked of the Service Manager and the Service Manager's supervisor concentrating on three areas: 1) Service Management 2) Professional Training and/or Development, and 3) Financial & Staffing Resources. They will also provide a n outline and timeline for the process. SAG2 will have a chance to review and comment on the questions and the process to be followed.</p>	

<p>4. "Discovery White Paper" subcommittee report</p>	<p>A subgroup - Todd, Lynne, Marti and Patti - had discussed about how to think about Discovery across UC.</p> <p>UCB is moving ahead with discovery system, based on analysis of library website, wanted a more cohesive search experience. Big focus was on article search. UCB has a discovery explore group, and UCB called peer institutions over the summer that had one of the top vendors in this space – EDS, Summon, Primo and recently added WorldCat. Talked to library staff, wanted Article Search and a bento box approach to discovery on the library website. Vetted with UCB's library council, and vendor visits are scheduled in February. UW went from WCL to Primo and now back to WCL. UCB has some interest in systemwide solution for novice users.</p> <p>Based on usability testing, UCB found end users did not understand they need to go to a database to get what they want.</p> <p>Where are users coming from? IDS are expensive and expensive to use. How to get close to the user base? Even though OPACS are bundled into ILS, they require staff resources to setup and maintain. UCLA looking at integration of ERMS and discovery. Should UCLA abandon discovery through a vendor and rely on a Google appliance?</p> <p>Focusing on next 2-5 years to see if UCB's solution works. Open to change, most end users are open to change, it's staff who are most resistant.</p> <p>Keep coming back to the problems with using Google – they do not have our licensed content. That is the problem that all vendors and discovery systems are trying to solve – and no one has the best solution.</p> <p>Possible idea – segment discovery by user audience. UCB has decided to focus its new discovery layer on undergraduate end users. They want to help undergraduates do their work. Focusing on the audience drives a lot of decision making.</p> <p>Most IDS (Integrated Discovery System) are expensive. Most end users come from search engines, what to do about that? How to gather evidence, and which evidence is needed to make sound recommendations in this space? Is a systemwide IDS good to have?</p> <p>UCB's approach is provocative. Would it be possible for UCB to provide novice user discovery across the UC system and another Discovery solution could address graduate students, faculty and staff?</p> <p>If SAG 2 does a white paper, will need to advocate for change, not on anyone's radar.</p> <p>Discussion of Melvyl 5 year snapshot and whether it could form the basis for a white paper moving forward.</p>	
<p>5. Establish working group for Digital Asset Management Strategic Planning White Paper</p>	<p>The group discussed about the goal of writing White Paper especially knowing it is not an optimal means of communicating with CoUL and asked the newly formed subgroup to create a scope and determine the best way to report to CoUL. The subgroup needs to check-in with SAG2 group on scope and report direction before going forward.</p>	
<p>6. Proposals from CKGs Outlined in CKG Guidelines, under Key Responsibilities & Appendix 2</p>	<p>ILL CKG submitted a project proposal to conduct a survey. The team is all set to go and Kristine is the liaison to the team.</p> <p>As a reminder, the process for CKGs to bring forward a project proposal is outlined in CKG Guidelines, under Key Responsibilities & Appendix 2. In addition, inviting CKG chair to talk about the proposal before proposing is a good thing to do.</p>	
<p>7. Others</p>	<p>Xiaoli reported on the UCD BIBFLOW project and recruitment UCD will undertaken. Patti reported three positions in CDL 's Discovery & Delivery team will be advertised soon.</p> <p>Catherine asked about two topics: UC-eLinks usage statistics and the update on the Cedilla project.</p>	