

# 2015-09-09 Meeting Agenda and Minutes (Published)

## Date

09-09-2015

1pm-2:30pm

## Attendees

- Diane B. Bisom (Chair, UCR)
- Myra Appel (UCD)
- Heather Christenson (CDL) (**Note Taker**)
- Judy Consales (UCLA)
- Elizabeth DuPuis (UCB)
- 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

## Guests

## Discussion Items

Time	Item	Who	Discussion Notes	Decisions/Actions
5min	<b>Call to Order, Agenda Review, Announcements</b>	Diane	Volunteer Timekeeper  SAG 3 Report for April, May, June, July, August 2015 submitted to Rosalie/CC & Donald/DOC on September 1, 2015	

<p>40min</p> <p>1:05 - 1:45</p>	<p><b>Updates</b></p> <p>UCLAS Transition, 8/26 Call with CC, SAG, and CLS members from Donald Barclay/DOC (email sent 9/8/2015)</p> <p>Coordinating Committee</p> <p>CLS</p> <p>Request from SAG 2 for nominations for Resource Sharing Project Team.</p> <p>Shared Print - Journal Validation Standards – Endorsed</p>	<p>Diane, Martha, Beth, Janet</p> <p>Martha</p> <p>Jean</p> <p>Diane</p> <p>Diane</p> <p>UCLAS Transition:</p> <p>DOC held a 2 day in-person meeting to review charge, assignment, get common understanding. Updated their charge and timeline. DOC will take as lightweight but coordinated approach as possible to projects already going on. Move away from extensive lists of projects - only highest priority projects will be conveyed to new structure. DOC:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>decided that there will still be a systemwide collections group w/representation from campuses &amp; CDL. The group will consist of an AUL or person with decision-making authority from each campus and CDL.</li> <li>will support shared services teams - reference, etc. will continue to exist</li> <li>decided that CKGs will continue. DOC role not finalized. CoUL intends not a lot of engagement from DOC &amp; CKGs being primarily for discussion, community, sharing of info. "Grass roots" CKGs are envisioned as outside of the advisory system. If projects emerge, they would be project teams separate from CKG. Intent is to have projects be strategic, and not numerous. Aligned to CoUL</li> <li>had lots of discussion about bibliographer groups. Emerging thinking is to fold bib groups into a new version of CKGs.</li> <li>Some groups may be formed by DOC, similar to the former HoHoHos. But that is also a different flavor of CKG</li> </ul> <p>DOC's purpose is to oversee big issues - shared ILS, WorldCat local transition, resource sharing, shared print, federal docs, etc.</p> <p>One of the SAG3 messages Janet &amp; Beth are carrying into the DOC is that we need better support for shared communication methods (esp. in light of lack of support for travel)</p> <p>DOC wants a standard overview of each project in a template, and a group is working on the project proposal/charge template. Each SAG will return to DOC this "briefing" to get them up to speed. Then these will be picked up by the new structure Nov. 1.</p> <p>"Ongoing" projects are the ones CoUL will continue in the new year.</p> <p>Still discussion going on re bib groups and transition. East Asia group meets next week (already approved by SAG3). CoUL doesn't want to collectively support groups or pay for the meetings. Support for travel falls to the campus. Still room for discussion here - they have a legitimate agenda, people can join virtually, etc.</p> <p>A broad communication from DOC will come out next week via Donald Barclay. SAG3 should keep in mind that DOC work is in progress - Beth and Janet are reporting progress as of today.</p> <p>Coordinating Committee:</p> <p>Now passing everything through to DOC.</p> <p>CLS:</p> <p>Is discussing:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>UC Press open access ebooks offering, Luminos.</li> <li>Fall decision on Scopus. Will campuses take over payment and continue? No decision yet.</li> <li>Cambridge Univ Press</li> <li>CLS expecting Taylor &amp; Francis data from Jacquie Wilson</li> </ul> <p>SAG 3 submitted 2 names (Vince Novoa/UCR and Judea D'Arnaud/UCSD) to SAG 2 (email sent 9/8/2015)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Beth recommends David Eifler from UCB</li> <li>CLS will discuss Friday as well</li> </ul> <p>As a follow-up to our August 12th meeting – we had agreed to check with our staff/colleagues, and send any comments on the attached Validation Standards for UC journal archive to the SAG 3 list by August 21st. Email sent 8/31/2015:</p> <p>To: Rosalie Lack, Chair, UCLAS Coordinating Committee</p> <p>Donald Barclay, Chair, UCLAS 2.0 Direction and Oversight Committee</p> <p>From: Diane Bisom, Chair, SAG 3</p> <p>Re: SAG 3 Endorsement: Validation Standards for UC Journal Archives</p> <p>Cc: Emily Stambaugh, Chair Shared Print Strategy Team</p> <p>SAG 3</p> <p>SAG 3 has reviewed and endorses the attached <b>Validation Standards for UC Journal Archives</b>, prepared by the Shared Print Strategy and Operations Teams.</p> <p>Please note: SAG 3 's endorsement does not preclude the possibility of defining case(s) in the future that might warrant a higher level of completeness and issue or page level validation.</p> <p>Thank you, Diane</p>	<p>SAG3 will continue until the end of October, although we can cease sooner if we complete our work.</p> <p>If requests from Bib Groups come to SAG3 now, we will forward to DOC.</p> <p>Diane will convey SAG3's recommendation of David Eifler (UCB) for SAG2's new Resource Sharing project team. <b>DONE:</b> email sent to P. Martin/SAG 2 9/9/2015.</p>
<p>15min</p> <p>1:45 - 2:00</p>	<p><b>Major Agenda Item</b></p> <p>FedDocArc Project Update</p>	<p>Beth</p> <p>Question for SAG3 - mailing costs issue</p> <p>FedDocArc is removing duplicates from RLFs, offering to CA State Library, and then offering to other CA FDLP libraries. If claimed, UC will need to get the docs to the claiming library. There is no mandate from FDLP, but precedent is that owning library pays some of the cost. So far no one has claimed anything. It's possible that no one will.</p> <p>Propose ask to CoUL for \$5000 from agility fund. If we hit more than \$5000, then will report back with more details on who is involved and why the costs exceed. UCSD question as to whether agility fund would be appropriate.</p> <p>Question as to the mechanism for the offers:</p> <p>Answer:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Offers go out as simple Google spreadsheet, with a link to "claim" an item. It is first sent to CSL.</li> <li>When a claim is made, RLF staff get an email to "pull" that item; at the end of that review period all items are pulled and mailed at one time to CSL.</li> <li>Then the next round is to filter out the items claimed by CSL and follow the same process with the CA FDLP libraries for claiming and mailing at the end of the review period.</li> </ul>	<p>SAG3 is in agreement that agility fund approach seems reasonable. Or an already established fund. Or have RLFs pay then if we run past cap, then reassess.</p>

<p>20min</p> <p>2:00 - 2:20</p>	<p><b>Major Agenda Item</b></p> <p>CCDD Vendor Project Update</p>	<p>Myra</p>	<p>Last week vendors were sent a list of UC library collections identified and confirmed as willing to digitize, along with info on faculty &amp; curricula</p> <p>Myra was impressed with the scope of what we have. She commends Angela Riggio and Renata Ewing on the great work to compile and present the info.</p> <p>Myra has heard a variety of comments from CoUL members and has concern about level of commitment and interest.</p> <p>Depending on response and vendor, the steps will vary. Project is further along, but could end if vendors are not ready or willing to participate. Once vendors have responded, then we will know.</p> <p>Question: Where will this go in the new structure? Seeing as CoUL doesn't seem strongly committed.</p> <p>DOC flagged as contributing to primary goal.</p> <p>But there are challenges</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Concern as to how we will handle systemwide when not uniform support across campuses, and vendors are happy to go to individual campuses.</li> <li>• Also who will negotiate the contract? Some campuses feel strongly that they do not want CDL doing the negotiation.</li> <li>• Difficult project to navigate through the shoals.</li> </ul> <p>Heather: Model license agreement is still a valuable tool for campuses - we could offer a unified front to get benefit for all campuses when negotiating agreements with vendors for digitization of special collections</p> <p>Myra: Collections list on food systems is also really valuable. It's a compelling statement of UC investment.</p> <p>Heather: might be worth going back to explore funding models from CCDD 1 and even back to CDC - maybe there is an alternative way to accomplish</p>	<p>Project will continue.</p>
<p>10min</p> <p>2:20 - 2:30</p>	<p>Future Agenda Items, wrap-up</p>	<p>Diane/Note Taker</p>	<p>Shared Print</p> <p>SAG3 was to provide feedback to Emily Stambaugh on HathiTrust Shared Print</p> <p>Last meeting?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Hold October 14 for next (final?) SAG3 call.</li> <li>• Agenda will focused on transition and final updates from remaining two ongoing projects, and shared print</li> </ul>	<p>Next SAG 3 Meeting: October 14, 2015</p> <p>SAG3 members use the listserv for important topics in the meantime</p> <p>SAG3 propose topics for October 14 agenda if necessary.</p>