

From: [Joanne Miller](#)
To: UCLASCC-L@LISTSERV.UCOP.EDU
Cc: [Lorelei Tanji](#)
Subject: Message to Coordinating Committee from CoUL RE: HathiTrust Shared Monograph Program
Date: Friday, July 24, 2015 12:06:00 PM

Dear UCLAS Coordinating Committee,

The following message from CoUL (via Lorelei Tanji) is to be conveyed to the Shared Print Strategy Team members via SAG3 (CoUL→Coordinating Committee→SAG3→Shared Print Strategy Team.)

Thank you.

-Joanne Miller for Lorelei Tanji

Dear Shared Print Strategy Team members (via CC, SAG3),

CoUL has reviewed the update on the HathiTrust Shared Monograph Program provided by Emily Stambaugh and Erik Mitchell and would like further input from the Shared print Strategy (SPS) group to help draft a response for HathiTrust as well as a short document that outlines the potential implications of UC participation in such a program for review by CoUL/SLFB and potentially UCOLASC/SLASAC.

Recognizing the window to provide feedback to HathiTrust on the HTSMP we suggest that SPS provide both the HT feedback document and potential implications of UC participation document by the end of August 2015.

Below are discussion points raised during the CoUL meeting on your report.

- Discussions of UC participation should include the SLFB as well as UCOLASC and SLASAC.
- The response should comment on the potential impact/benefit of the broadened national access component of the HTSMP (e.g. HT members will have access to these collections in a new way)
- It may be necessary, if UC moves forward with participation, to socialize the program with campus faculty senates and other interested stakeholders.
- A response should include a comment on what impact the HTSMP might have on access - both to UC collections by external universities and for UC faculty seeking access to other HathiTrust member collections
- It might be useful to say what participation would impact (e.g. shared print) and what it would not (e.g. RLF allocations)

CoUL identified several themes that would be useful as feedback for HathiTrust to consider:

- CoUL identified risks associated with committing more than one copy of an item to such a partnership (e.g. limiting library ability to de-duplicate collections, limiting RLF flexibility in duplicate management). A response from SPS on potential implications should speak to the risks and benefits of committing to retain a single copy.

- Likewise, CoUL identified a potential need to remove committed copies that were inadvertently committed to the archive during phase 1 (e.g. duplicate volumes committed, out of scope volumes committed). The HTSMP plan should plan for these possibilities
- CoUL recognized the value of supplying archival commitments come from an organization, not a facility (e.g. UC Shared Print rather than SRLF or NRLF) in order to ensure future flexibility in storage choices.

Lorelei Tanji (on behalf of CoUL)

Joanne Miller
Systemwide Library Planning Analyst
California Digital Library
University of California, Office of the President
Ph: (510) 587-6141
joanne.miller@ucop.edu