

2015-04-22 Meeting Agenda and Minutes (Published)

Date

04-22-2015

1pm-2:30pm

Attendees

- Diane B. Bisom (Chair, UCR)
- Myra Appel (UCD) (Note Taker)
- Heather Christenson (CDL)
- Vicki Grahame (UCI)
- Martha Hruska (UCSD)
- Polina E Ilieva (UCSF)
- Emily Lin (UCM)
- Janet Martorana (UCSB)
- Kerry Scott (UCSC)
- Jean McKenzie (CLS Liaison)
- Angela Riggio (LAUC)

Planned Absence

- Elizabeth DuPuis (UCB)
- Judy Consales (UCLA)

Guest: Emily Stambaugh (CDL/Shared Print)

Discussion Items

Time	Item	Who	Discussion Notes	Decisions/Actions
5min	Call to Order, Agenda Review, Announcements	Diane	Volunteer Timekeeper SAG 3 Quarterly Report (formerly bi-monthly) updated to cover January, February, March 2015.	SAG3 members to review draft by 4/23/2015

15min 1:05 - 1:20	Updates Coordinating Committee UCLAS 2.0 SAG 3 Meeting Schedule CLS Collaborative Digitization Vendor Partnership Project Team	Martha All Diane Jean Myra	<p>CC will next meet Friday, April 24th to discuss next steps in the Advisory Structure reorganization and what to do until September. Martha encourages suggestions from SAG3 for moving forward. Ideas: DOC could replace CC and leave SAGs in place. Local campuses could pull off staff from committees, groups, etc. now, if needed. Martha will add to the agenda the suggestion that the Guidelines for bibliographer groups be distributed. SAG3 devoted significant time to creating these Guidelines, consulted widely on the drafts, and promised the bib groups several months ago that they would be receiving the Guidelines in the near future.</p> <p>The majority of SAG3 members attended the UCLAS 2.0 conference call. Diane has not received any communication to give guidance to SAG3 immediately or during the transition.</p> <p>SAG3 will hold a monthly conference call and reserve our additional Wednesday 1:00-2:30 time slot to meet as needed. Since SAG3 is overseeing several committees and projects, we need to be available to offer guidance and feedback.</p> <p>DDA pilot: Some publishers raised their prices on STL demand. Funds will last through November-December, 2015. The pilot will be assessed after it's completed.</p> <p>CLS approved Ivy to begin negotiations with Cambridge for a systemwide e-book license.</p> <p>CLS will conduct an E-book assessment discussion in the near future.</p> <p>Wendy and Ivy will include author processing charges in future CDL negotiations and CLS will re-visit this when they know more specifics.</p> <p>CLS engaged in discussions about a UC collection analysis project; overall, CLS is in agreement with SAG 3 to not do a collection analysis at this time.</p> <p>CLS and JSC are examining cost models for licenses and related Tier 1 issues; potential cost models are forthcoming for CoUL in May.</p> <p>ReadyTalk connection failed; Myra will send update to SAG3 via email</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> SAG3 will document work to date and make sure web pages are current Diane and Emily will review the calendar and update our meeting schedules; note taking will continue as assigned SAG3 will hold more informational updates with invited guest to keep up with the current projects Diane and Emily will review portfolio to determine what SAG3 needs to conclude
20min 1:20 - 1:40	Major Agenda Item Shared Print Strategy Team Update	Emily Stambaugh	<p>Discussion between SAG3 and Emily Stambaugh about UC collection analysis proposal:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Recap of the SAG3 position: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> SAG3 responded to the Shared Print Roadmap The project does not have clear or deliverable goals; we have concern over the high cost implications; other projects have higher priorities; the usefulness or value of the project is uncertain; there are questions about staffing availability to remove duplicates if the project did come to fruition <p>SAG3 added the following points:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> There is a need for an articulated and clear high level understanding among the UC libraries that the project is wanted and would be given priority Each campus must determine its respective collecting priorities; only then can the campuses individually commit, arrive at a systemwide consensus and develop a vision in common. The conversation needs to extend to faculty: what collections are needed to support local research? How will the faculty view such a project (the "optics")? There is a need for an overarching vision document about collections; faculty buy-in is essential What is the rationale for a collection analysis --- recoverable space? If so, how is recoverable space defined or measured? What are the services implications with shared collections? For example, UC libraries have yet to address all ILL issues Service level issues and agreements have not been addressed. For example, what minimum number of copies is sufficient or acceptable within the UC? <p>Emily Stambaugh's response:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The CoUL priorities document supports Shared Print projects (NOTE: SAG3 has not seen a copy of the most recent 2015 revised priorities.) The Strategy Team refers to and is keeping within the guidelines articulated in the 2010 CDC 21st Century collection development document that states an analysis of monograph collections is needed to understand space, possibilities for experimentation and the scope, strength and demand for monographic collections. (NOTE: this document is a white paper that CoUL did not sign.) <p>In sum SAG3 ended the discussion with the following comments and recommendations:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> We need a clear mandate or understanding from CoUL before we can endorse a UC collection analysis of this magnitude We need to know that local campuses have shared collections as a commitment The 2010 CDC 21st Century collections statement needs to be revisited and CoUL will need to sign off on operating principles and goals before SAG3 can support the Collection Analysis UC libraries have experienced significant changes in administration, organization, priorities and levels of resources over the past years since the CDC white paper was written We suggest the Strategy Team identify or define why they are gathering evidence? What are the goals? What are the hypotheses or assumptions? How will it be used? What are the UC obligations? What are the outcomes? What is quantifiable? What is the anticipated impact? What is the evidence? We suggest that the Strategy Team consider alternative ideas, instead of recommending a massive UC Collection Analysis. For example, develop a smaller analysis or pilot project based on a defined subject area(s) or parts of the collections <ul style="list-style-type: none"> SAG3 no longer has the responsibility to shape the project as we move through the Advisory Group transition 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Diane will draft the next SAG3 response to the Strategy Team
20min 1:40 - 2:00	Major Agenda Item Portico Audit	Martha	Deferred to May 13th	
10min 2:00-2:10	Future Agenda Items	Diane/Emily	<p>UCLA's Intota Collections Analysis (Angela)</p> <p>Update on BibFlow Project (invite Carl Strahmer, July)</p> <p>UCLDC (invite Sherri Berger)</p> <p>Merritt</p> <p>Archiv-IT and WAS Transition (invite Rosalie Lack)</p>	

5min 2:10 - 2:15	Wrap up and action steps	Note Taker		
------------------------	-----------------------------	------------	--	--