

Public Copy of 08/28/15

Attendance

Date: 08/28/2015

Note taker: *Xiaoli Li*

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

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

Meeting Guest(s): *Lena Zentall*

Agenda

1. Roll call (Xiaoli, 1 min)
2. Approve minutes (Adrian, 2 min)
3. Melvyl Configuration Project Team (Lena/Lynne, 15 min)
4. Demo of UC Berkley's new Discovery system (Lynne, 15 min)
5. [Resource Sharing Project Team Charge](#) (Patti, 15 min)

Notes

Item	Notes	Decisions
Approve notes from last meeting	Group should review a few days before we meet	Approved (no changes suggested)

<p>1. Melvyl Configuration Project Team</p>	<p>Lena's report:</p> <p>The team thanks SAG2 for raising this issue. The team has proposed two recommendations - model A and B.</p> <p>Model A:</p> <p>Involves CDL adding the CDL-managed tier 2's to Central Index. Overall, it would add 24% more databases to Central Index (based on the April 2015 data). The actual % varies by campus. It's a significant benefit for and not a lot of effort since it's already part of CDL's workflow to manage these resources. There was a typo in the report which said 30%.</p> <p>Since the time the report was completed, the timeline for the WorldCat Discovery migration has changed - it's moved from "no sooner than December 2015" to "no sooner than June 2016". This affects the timing when it's optimal for implementing Model A if approved.</p> <p>A key recommendation of model A was to get the word out to the public services community especially the Digital Reference group since they support all instances of Melvyl. Lena has consulted with Cynthia Johnson at UCI who spearheaded the report on user impact. Cynthia believes the optimal date to implement and start spreading the word to the public services community is late September or early October</p> <p>CDL would need to update some procedural documentation - shouldn't be too significant.</p> <p>Model B:</p> <p>4 or more campuses would need to participate to justify the work involved in coordinating accounts with OCLC, creating liaison group and list, and drafting best practices in managing accounts, communications, etc. See Appendix D.</p> <p>There are also some technical challenges: Campus account managers would have access to ALL the administrative settings for their entire instance of Melvyl -- beyond the "Metadata Content" area where the Central Index databases are activated. They would be able to make changes to their live Melvyl instance. Clear guidelines would be needed.</p> <p>Would require campuses' resources to implement and maintain.</p> <p>Clarification: Model B would be done in addition to Model A, rather than replace it. so, will revise the report to make it clearer.</p> <p>Lena will revise the report - correcting the typo and clarifying the relationship between Model A and B.</p> <p>SAG2 discussions:</p> <p>talked about the approval process and decided that the recommendation should be forwarded to the Coordinating Committee who will then pass it to CoUL for the final approval. Discussed further about Model A and B. All supported Model A and questioned whether it would be worth the effort to implement Model B which would add very few Tier 3 resources (about 6%) into the Central Index.</p>	<p>DECIDED :</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Move forward with Model A 2. Re-visit Model B after Model A has been implemented
<p>2. Demo of UC Berkeley's new Discovery system</p>	<p>UCB's new discovery system does not have a name. It's been launched for 2 weeks. So far, only one feedback was received (good sign - people tend to complain if they do not like what they see). Planned to do more usability test and training so more resources can be added to the discovery layer. Cataloging records are loaded weekly, but the availability displayed is real-time.</p>	
<p>3. Resource Sharing Project Team charge</p>	<p>The revised charge incorporated feedback/comments received. A question about membership was raised. Also discussed how to get nominations. Charge was approved after the revision to "Proposed Expertise Membership" was made.</p>	