

Public Copy of 04/24/15

Attendance

Date: 04/24/15

Note taker: Susan Boone

Attended: Lynne Grigsby, Patricia Martin, Eric Milenkiewicz, Marti Jean Kallal, Susan Boone, Xiaoli Li, Adrian Petrisor

Absent: Kristine Ferry, Catherine Friedman, Robin Chandler , *Sara Davidson*, Todd Grappone, Sue Perry

Meeting Guest(s): *Cynthia Johnson (UCI), Emily Stambaugh*

Agenda

1. Attendance (Susan)
2. Approve public meeting minutes (Adrian)
3. [Reference CKG Update](#) (Cynthia Johnson - 15 minutes)
4. Review Shared Print Disclosure document (Emily Stambaugh - 30 minutes)
5. Coordinating Committee Update via email (Robin Chandler to circulate). (Robin, 5 minutes)
6. Metadata Policy Revision (XiaoLi - round up of responses, next steps - 10 minutes)
7. Update on [Melvyl Review Project Team Charge](#) - Patti will circulate via email
8. Discuss response to CoUL new structure proposal (Patti - 15 minutes)
9. UCLDC project discussion - Nuxeo exit strategy (Adrian - 10 min)
10. Review meeting minutes from previous meeting (Patti, 5 minutes)
11. Review Action Items (Susan)
12. If time... Lately I've been thinking of.....

Notes

Item	Notes	Decisions
2. Approve public meeting minutes (Adrian)	Public Copy of 03/20/15	Approved

<p>3. Reference CKG Update (Cynthia Johnson - 15 minutes)</p>	<p>The Reference CKG has been active for one-and-a-half years and has had regular participants. The two primary themes which have emerged are Reference statistics and Staffing models.</p> <p>Discussions have centered around the big-picture applications of statistical gathering and analysis which can best illustrate levels of service and impact (level of information, what's in demand), not just the number of patrons who've accessed Reference services in a given period. Comparisons of the kinds of information gathered at each campus, how it's used, and how it might be standardized for cross-campus comparisons has been investigated.</p> <p>Staffing models, in particular the use of grad and undergrad students, has been explored. UCB has trained students for basic Reference; the question of ensuring that referrals are handled correctly in order to best serve patrons is a concern for the pilot program at UCI. Three libraries at UCLA are using grad students. UCSD has students working in tandem with librarians.</p> <p>Survey of Interests is available on the UCSF wiki.</p> <p>Melvyl is of deep interest to the Reference CKG. The group would welcome regular communication on functionality enhancements and the potential inclusion of Tier 2 and Tier 3 resources. They would be particularly interested in contributing to or participating in any potential evaluation of discovery layers.</p> <p>Summary of report (full version is an attachment to email sent Mon 4/20/2015):</p> <p>Major areas of discussion in 2014/15</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reference statistics: software? kinds of information? How is info used? count off-the-desk ? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Interest in quality assessment & tracking trends to improve services • Staffing models • Reference training • Working with visitors at reference desks • UCSC survey at service points to better understand the complexity of the questions asked <p>Future topics may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • UCLA's reports about the data they collect and what it tells them about using students at reference desks and the impact on consultations. • UCSC will update us on their survey and on their application for ACRL's Assessment in Action. • UCI will update us on their assessment of their consultation service <p>Eric asked whether any of its members are from areas not traditionally associated with Reference: the answer is only from UCSF. He suggested that expanding the membership to Special Collections librarians (for instance) may be beneficial.</p>	
<p>4. Review UC Libraries Shared Print Disclosure Standards for Journals (Emily Stambaugh - 30 minutes)</p>	<p>Emily gave a walkthrough of the document.</p> <p>The goals of the standards are shared print journal discovery and display (machine-actionable information/data discoverable by user groups or systems), resource sharing, and collections analysis. The Shared Print Strategy Team focused on utilizing existing standards for disclosure, namely OCLC Print Archives Pilot Project and WEST Disclosure Guidelines. The UC Libraries guidelines will facilitate identifying the location and archival status of resources.</p> <p>Single, new OCLC Institution Symbol for all UC Shared Print holdings locations codes, for all projects are in place (Attachment 1). The MARC 583 Retention Note, subfield \$f, may be used identify the specific program (e.g. JSTOR, WEST). Creation of new LHRs will have the metadata specific to the shared resources for campus systems and Melvyl, and (eventually, once the technical details are sorted out) PAPER and JRNL systems.</p> <p>Xiaoli asked how the Shared Print Disclosure Standards for Journals differs from the Shared Print in Place program. The proposed standards for journals are in-line with OCLC's standards for enhanced disclosure and metadata. The Shared Print in Place was designed as a prospective program for monographic series identified by the UC Bibliographer Groups. The MARC field requirements are less robust for the Shared Print in Place items.</p> <p>Xiaoli pointed out that from the standpoint of MARC representation of serials, cataloging practice makes no distinction between journals and monographic series. CAMCIG will weigh in on the terminology for the resources. Doing a test case for analyzed series (individually cataloged volumes with titles within a series) might be a next phase for shared print.</p> <p>Patti asked whether there's been any investigation of the added workload associated with cataloging and enhancing records and what business model had been developed. Emily responded that most of the current work of enhancing metadata is accommodated by existing workflows and only represents a minor increase in workload.</p>	<p>Next steps:</p> <p>Gathering feedback from CKGs, SAG2, SAG3 (May)</p>

<p>5. Coordinating Committee Update via email (Robin Chandler to circulate). (Robin, 5 minutes)</p>	<p>Deferred.</p> <p>Coordinating Committee met today. Report forthcoming.</p>	
<p>6. Metadata Policy Revision (Xiaoli - round up of responses, next steps - 10 minutes)</p>	<p>Per Lynne's suggestion, Xiaoli edited the section <i>Guidelines for sharing metadata managed by the UC Libraries</i> to include language which that where there is a legal obligation not to share metadata it is made a clear exception:</p> <p>3. <i>If any campus wishes to opt out, that action would require approval by the Council of University Librarians who would make an evaluation based on the effect of such an action on the collective purpose of the UC Libraries and its relevant projects.</i></p>	
<p>7. Update on Melvyl Review Project Team Charge - Patti will circulate via email</p>	<p>Team Members:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lena Zentall • Lynne Grigsby • Holly Eggleston • Adriana Moran • Patrick Shannon (UCB) <p>Deliverables (from <u>Melvyl Review Project Team Charge</u>):</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Timeline and plan for addressing areas under consideration 2. Monthly reports to SAG 2 (or?) on progress 3. Final briefing document, including a short (no more than 2 page Executive Summary), and a set of recommendations. Please include the evidence used to make the recommendations. 	<p>DECIDED :</p> <p>Team membership approved</p>
<p>8. Discuss response to CoUL new structure proposal (Patti - 15 minutes)</p>	<p>Based on the current documents and webinar held April 15, the UCLAS 2.0 Proposal is too vague to assess for potential benefits or risks. The timeline to complete the proposed transition (September 2015) is ambitious.</p> <p>A more articulated plan outlining how the restructure will translate into better productivity and what steps will ensure no loss of momentum for currently active projects would be useful. Adrian suggested that a small group could be formed to draft initial charges and responsibilities for each group in the proposed UCLAS restructure, with clearly defined relationships between groups, and with an elaboration of expectations.</p> <p>Other questions raised in previous discussions:</p> <p>What are the levels of authority, communication roles, and decision making for each group? Will the Direction & Oversight Committee (DOC) be more like SOPAG in terms of defining strategic goals? Operations Advisory Groups (OAG) are skills-based (as the current CKGs are): what's their function? Are they exclusively operational or will they make strategic decisions as well? What's the relevance of Common Interest Groups (CIG) in the new structure? Where do CDL Operations teams fit in?</p> <p>(From Patti's email [SAG2-L] Reprise of our SAG 2 call on Wednesday, April 15, 2015 sent Fri 4/17/2015)</p>	

<p>9. UCLDC project discussion - Nuxeo exit strategy (Adrian - 10 min)</p>	<p>Eric pointed out that the report's recommendation for developing DAMS identified Fedora as the best long-term solution. The question becomes how much more investment in Nuxeo (time, customization, cost) is reasonable when it was seen as a product which could address immediate steps toward development of a content management system, but was not a candidate for a 10-campus DAMS. We need to survey campuses for who will use the system and who is still moving toward locally-developed solutions. Further, even if campuses aren't willing to use Nuxeo, they will want a single UI for digital collections.</p> <p>Xiaoli asked who's paying for the development of DAMS (what the business model is).</p> <p>Lynne stated it's difficult to evaluate the system based on the first seven months of development and with its current features. The de-coupling of the back end from the front-end gave the system more options.</p> <p>Adrian suggested the sub-team may recommend a Phase 2 for development after surveying campuses to see whether they intend to use Nuxeo. Now that there are more features in Fedora than were available when the project began, this may be a good opportunity to pause and re-evaluate.</p> <p>Robin suggested (email sent Fri 4/24/2015) that a " decision to abandon development in Nuxeo to transition to Fedora would need to be made in discussion with the UCLDC project team, CDL administrators and managers and ultimately CoUL."</p>	
<p>10. Review meeting minutes from previous meeting (Patti, 5 minutes)</p>	<p>NOTE: Meeting for Friday, April 10 was rescheduled. See email: [SAG2-L] Reprise of our SAG 2 call on Wednesday, April 15, 2015 sent Fri 4/17/2015</p>	
<p>11. Review Action Items (Marti Jean)</p>	<p>Adrian will create wiki page for SAG 2 DAMS subgroup questions when This is on hold while the subgroup meets. It might not be needed.</p>	
<p>12. Lately I've been thinking of.....</p>	<p><u>Patti</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • three open positions at the CDL: Director of the UC Curation Center (UC3) , Discovery & Delivery Services Product Manager, and Metadata Product Manager. • there is a system-wide discussion among the IT folks to implement a single ID provider. This will pave the way for implementing Shibboleth. <p><u>Xiaoli</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Peter Brantley has been hired as the new Director of Online Strategy at UCD. He starts in one month. 	