2013-12-18 Agenda and Meeting Minutes (Published)

Date

18 December 2013 1pm-2:30pm

Attendees

- Diane B. Bisom (Chair, UCR)
- Myra Appel (UCD)
- Marcia Barrett (UCSC)
- Heather Christenson (CDL)
- Judy Consales (UCLA)
- Elizabeth DuPuis (UCB)
- Vicki Grahame (UCI)
- Martha Hruska (UCSD)
- Polina E Ilieva (UCSF)
- Emily Lin (UCM) (Notetaker)
- Angela Riggio (LAUC)
- Leslie Wolf (Portfolio Manager)
- Jean McKenzie (CLS)

Scheduled Absent

- Janet Martorana (UCSB)

Guests

Jim Soe Nyun, Linda Barnhardt, Cristela Garcia Spitz, Adolfo Tarango (UCSD)

Discussion Items

Time	Item	Who	Notes
5min	Call to Order, Agenda Review, Announcements	Diane	
15min 15min	NGTS Pilot Teams: 1. Review NGTS P-4: Non-Print Format Pilot (Martha is sponsor). 2. Review NGTS P-5: Electronic Resources Pilot Electronic resources Pilot Project Update December 2013 3. Dismiss Shelf Ready TF	Martha and Vicki 1. Martha (Sponsor) 2. Vicki (Sponsor) and Adolfo Tarango (UCSD) 3. Martha and Vicki	

1. NGTS P-4: Non-Print Format Pilot
   a. Team had reasons for structuring the project as we did – prepping materials we sent off did mean some overhead
   b. Showed that some types of materials can be cataloged from surrogates
   c. Shared UC CD Cataloging Standards were vetted with CAMCIG and music librarians, went to HOTS and no feedback came back. May stand as finalized, shared standards. Need to be officially endorsed and documented/maintained.
   d. Could readily be expanded to other works beyond Audio CDs. ACTION: Coordinating Commitee needs to come up with process
   e. Need to assess current need for this service. By the time team started, numbers starting to get stale.
   f. What is the way to go forward with in-sourcing?
   g. SAG 3 can take report back to campuses and gauge level of interest. Also going to be a matter of scaling. If it's a modest amount, some of the work can be "absorbed." If it's a more significant amount, then a question of how to scale.
   h. Are campuses expecting a modest amount of CDs on a regular basis? Need time to gather local responses.
   i. This leverages experts within system which are still needed; even if outsource, expertise needed for QC. Factors for insourcing vs. outsourcing are much more than comparing costs alone.

ACTION: Project Team will compose a cover to this report with set of questions that SAG 3 can take back to campuses in order to evaluate viability of ongoing service in mid-January (before ALA). Set a 3-week deadline for responses to assess current backlog and think strategically about campus needs in this area going forward. Team will then compile and compose final set of recommendations.

2. NGTS P-4: Electronic Resources Pilot

a. Project going well. Didn't give UCI an easy package to catalog, but relatively straightforward. ACM is going to complicate things a little more, and will see how that goes.

b. As start to look at productivity, will consider that these are more labor-intensive packages to catalog. SCP relies heavily on batch records, so efficiencies in the aggregate are much greater. At this point, the process is so smooth that UCSD gets email from UCI with catalog records attached and is able to load in a few minutes.

c. Minimal impact on SCP, no negative impact on either UCI or SCP. UCI meeting deadlines, same quality standards. UCI catalogers love that they are involved in consortial work, getting good feedback. By the measures we've talked about initially, it's been successful. At conclusion of work on second package (in ~6 months) team will have to assess whether this could be operationalized. SCP gave draft of its procedures to UCI, but left it up to UCI to figure out workflow. So this work can be adjusted to local processes.

This is also an example of where a shared catalog would be beneficial.

ACTION: SAG 3 will revisit progress in April, and expect report with proposal in May.

			Pilots are a proof of concept. In this instance, the pilot proves that shared cataloging can be distributed to different campuses. In the end, do we want to do that? ULs will have to say, we will give a portion of our staff to consortial work. Or bartering/trading work? See a theme emerging: campus needs and offers, and the need for a more dynamic way to do that rather than periodic inventories/surveys, i.e. an infrastructure for online exchange. There needs to be a way to formalize and measure these exchanges. 3. Dismissal of Shelf-Ready Task Force: **ACTION:** Diane Bisom forwarded email to SAG3 12/17. CC has acknowledged receipt of report, now awaiting response, in order for team to be dismissed.
10min	Shared ILS TF – Update	Vicki	Task force has received clarification on how to work with UCSC Purchasing to hire professional consultant. Vicki is working with UCSC and will send Scope of Work in January to at least 3 consultants and ask them to submit statement of work with pricing, deliverables. Once receive and evaluate submissions, M Smith will confirm how much willing to spend and approve hiring of consultant. Continue to reinforce that we are not talking to vendors at this point. This is a process. **ACTION:** Vicki and Diane are preparing a message to be sent out from CoUL in early January announcing and providing talking points for this project, ahead of ALA Midwinter and prior to sending out solicitation to consultants.
5min	Libraries Systemwide Plan and Priorities FY 2014 - 2017 and preservation issues		Discuss – Item scheduled for 12/4 conference call – Note new priorities identified for SAG3 by CoUL. Propose full discussion in January 2014. **ACTION**: Diane will send out Doodle poll for a separate 1 hour meeting. Emily and Diane will work on framing discussion.
20min	New Items/Updates	1. Beth 2. Beth	1. SAG 3 supports Beth in moving forward with this project.

1. UC Federal Documents Archive Project
2. Preservation
3. Collaborative Digitization subgroup

3. Heather

2. Draft Charge : How do we want to tackle this? Need to consider in discussion of overall priorities. A preservation CKG is forming, but the CKG is not the primary vehicle for carrying out projects/work. Will need to determine whether to charge a group.
3. The new SAG3 subgroup on collaborative digitization formed in October, added Mary Elings (UCB). Group will provide update/proposal to SAG3 1/22 meeting.

A. Activities so far:

* Reviewed previous CDC work and brought members up to speed who were not part of original CDC group. Scoped this (rather unwieldy) topic area and generated ideas

* Conducted an initial investigation into proposed digitization topic areas and their viability for collaborative projects. We each took a topic area and attempted to flesh it out. This proved to be a challenging task. Major issues identified were the list of collections is out of date, and we lack rights information on many.

* Discussed need for structure to support collaborative projects and sharing of digitization capacity across campuses. It is envisioned that collaborative projects with a topical focus could pilot a structure, but some structure may need to be developed first or in tandem

The group is in process of setting a granular plan of action with deadlines and assignments for Q1-2 2014.   Some of the action items on our list might be accomplished by other groups and we may need SAG3's help there.

B. Plans include:

* Develop a pilot UC collaborative project with a content vendor (ProQuest, etc.)

* Secure a collaborative agreement with a content vendor for digitization project

			* Develop a project proposal and bring to SAG3 to launch a project team
			* Create a proposal for a survey to present to SAG3 to update our current lists of collections and identify current potential digitization capacity
			C.
			* Develop pilot project that demonstrates structure for UC inter-campus digitization (UCLDC "pipeline")
			* Charge a second project team
			* Propose a method for ongoing (annual?) assessment/nomination of digital collections and digitization priorities

15min	Follow-Up Items:
	
	1. "UC Article Delivery Service Exploration Task Group" - Task Group Charge
	
	2. Role of the Collections Librarian/Bib Groups Message
	
	3. Tracking groups or projects we have oversight for
	
	    a. Shared Print teams - strategy and operations (Emily Stambaugh is managing these)
	
	    b. Article Delivery Service Exploration Task Group (CLS is managing this)
	
	    c. Are there others?
	
	4. Uploading more recent meeting notes to website (as of 12/17, 10/9/13 is the most recent)
	
	5. Call Preparation – posting reports, notes, etc.
		ALL	Question of how we select what we work on and how we track them. What is manageable and how to stage these things; how can Leslie help us sequence activities? Take CoUL priorities as priorities, know how to say no to things or sequence later depending on bandwidth.
			
			ACTION: Leslie and Diane will talk about setting up a calendar. This will also help us frame discussion in January.
			
			Follow-up Items
			
			1. As of 12/4: waiting for revisions to charge from SAG2; SAG2 nominated Lynne Grigsby-Stanfill to be the SAG2 rep.
			
			2. Myra has sent out a message on next steps for the report; SAG 3 should review for next discussion
			
			3. a . What is the "canonical place" where Shared Print teams report their work broadly (public availability vs wiki). Leslie will schedule with Emily Stambaugh to report quarterly (on the call and in writing)
			
			3. b. Waiting for revised charge from CLS, and proposed membership.
			
			4. Leslie will upload meeting minutes to the website and get us caught up.