Shared Content Leadership Group
Meeting Minutes, May 13, 2016

Attendees present: Martha Hruska (SD, chair), Susan Edwards for Jean McKenzie (B), Gail Yokote (D), John Renaud (I), Sharon Farb (LA), Jim Dooley (M), Allison Scott (R), Eunice Schroeder (SB), Kerry Scott (SC), Becky Imamoto (LAUC), Wendy Parfrey (CDL).

Absent: Ivy Anderson (CDL)**,** Jean McKenzie (B), Julia Kochi (SF)
Guests: Beth Dupuis, (B), Susan Edwards (B), Dana Peterman (I)

Announcements/Housekeeping

April 22 minutes are ready for posting on public site with clarification that John will refer the Landmarks of Science question to Shared Print Strategy Project Team, as liaison. UC Libraries SCLG site: http://libraries.universityofcalifornia.edu/sclg/meetings.

Vision statement will be posted on public site when completed.

Question: what does the "red lock" icon signify when it appears on a page in the wiki? Julia is probably best source for definitive answer, but icon probably designates authorization for access/editing, and its intermittent appearance may indicate ways that access to the wiki is being managed for STAR team members. Wendy will inquire.

STAR Team update (Jackie): meeting is scheduled to talk about next steps. The predecessor project team evaluated 3 publications and made recommendations to CLS, but they got lost in transition. Information will be refreshed and the recommendations re-sent within next 6 weeks. A call—to announce the STAR team to various constituencies and ask for suggestions—will be drafted and sent to SCLG for review; it will include a form for submission and consideration. Suggestion: a web page for/about the STAR Team on the central site would be useful.

Workplan Review/Update

Assignments: Individuals have been tagged with responsibilities in the "Who?" column of the Workplan.

Timeline: some near-term items have been scheduled (FedDocArc update today; scholarly publishing discussion on May 26, co-investment discussion on May 27), but many others are unscheduled. We agree that the vision statement for collections, cost models, and continuing exploration of scholarly publishing should be spring/summer projects, with others taken up in the fall.

Question: Concerning CKGs, John will convey to DOC that more clarity about creation, organization & documentation of CKGs would be appreciated. Particularly, once a CKG is formed, is it fair game for other groups, like SCLG, to tap for information, and is the process for forming CKGs now working

efficiently? See http://libraries.universityofcalifornia.edu/ckg. Wendy is tracking the movement of bib groups into CKGs; if a notable gap is identified, SCLG may want to intervene and would also like a comprehensive way to ask for input/information. For instance, Literature bib group does not want to reconvene as a CKG, but is interested in joining a Humanities CKG—who helps in this situation? DOC? SCLG?

ACTION John and Gail will pursue the question with DOC.

ACTION for All: Please make additions, edits and comments on the Workplan page.

Licensing Update/CDL Workplan 2015-2017

Thomson Reuters (Web of Science) license has been signed; new platform and new product, Essential Science Indicators, will be implemented. CDL is polling groups on interest/need for webinar training and will share information on SCLG list.

Cambridge University Press agreed to a lower journal price increase and to discuss a multi-year contract in 2017 (Oxford UP has agreed to this, too); procedures for print copies of Cambridge ebooks for Irvine and NRLF will be included in the CUP license.

Taylor & Francis: medical titles (Informa) have been reconciled and are all included in base cost.

ACS: resource is accessible and bill has been paid, but discussion continues about some license terms.

JSTOR journals: proposal for last Arts & Sciences collection has been distributed; next collection will concern "Sustainability".

JSTOR ebooks: after a discussion about duplication concerns, DDA task force is considering to start the pilot in January 2017 to allow for changes to local campus profiles.

Kanopy streaming video DDA: 96% of films used by UC are used only by a single campus which gives no clear path toward a consortial agreement, beyond licensing individual popular films. Question: could we arrange a license for a certain quantity of films, rather than specific titles, as a consortial project? Discussion: Kanopy does not offer volume discounts, and resource needs to be understood as a delivery mechanism rather than an acquisition.

Vendor Talking Points: Everyone is asked to "keep ears open" for information about Springer Nature.

CDL Work Plan 2015-2017: please submit corrections/questions by Tuesday, May 17.

Tier 2 Changes: Kanopy and JSTOR are the only Tier 1 resources currently in the pipeline. Many Tier 2 deals are underway, but need to be more effectively coordinated. CDL wants to make it easier to do Tier 2 packages, but needs to enforce information and approval requirements, especially the "brief

documentation form" and countersigned license. The "toolkit" documentation will be simplified, and a checklist for the responsibilities of sponsoring campuses for renewals will be added.

UC Collection Vision

Key issues and questions:
- Facilitated collections vs owned collections
- Understanding our stewardship role in such a world (examples: HathiTrust and shared print)
- How do we do own/share/access collections together in a coherent way?
- Acknowledging that we understand much of our responsibility now focuses on facilitated collections, we continue to curate "more traditional" collections.
- Should we let the 2009 vision document stand, update it, or start over?
- Do we want to re-affirm the 2009 goals?
- Who is the audience for a vision document, beyond ourselves?
- What is the shared (facilitated) content that we are defining and how is the vision to be implemented?

Discussion ensued.

Eunice: Essential to move forward with facilitated collections, building on local campus visions and our shared vision. Open-access collections are a particularly pertinent area of concern. Question: what about local vision statements and local collections policy? Documents are more muted than discussion.

Jim: Facilitated collections are what we've been doing at UC Merced for the last decade, but we need to articulate and document why we have taken this approach.

Gail: A vision document is important for ULs for framing shared content. It also underpins SCLG and CDL work plans, as the framework that ties efforts together. The document may be internal (for us), but is important for external validation. Definitions need modernization, and a contextual introduction about access and ownership is needed. The goals should include updated language/content to include transformative publishing efforts as aspects of facilitated collections. We are on an evolutionary path.

Jim: Don't throw the 2009 document out — much remains useful.

Susan (B): In terms of access and ownership, national and international partnerships need to be understood and included: not just OA, but truly cooperative collection development on a global scale. Research is changing, which is why we need to change/add formats. Open access is not simply a question of the need to challenge commercial control over scholarly publishing, it's about the affordability of access.

John: The line between content and tools is blurring: how do we address this, going forward? There is an important element of facilitation (and a challenge for wording).

Sharon: How much effort should we to devote to this? There are ways that it could be revised that would be a better reflection of how we do and want to work.

Martha: The overall concept is sound, but more/new elements could/should be introduced.

Gail: Next steps are to update the language, based on discussion today. Facilitated access is the key element. Is there any front-end agreement on points/ideas to be included?

Martha: What about title and structure? Vision is critical; the goals in the 2009 document are general enough not to be dated, but should goals be a separate element, frequently and regularly updated? Should we distinguish between aspirational goals and "objectives"? That depends on the goal for the goals—are goals tied to projects? Are they visionary or practical? Is this a strategic roadmap, used to develop more specific, active goals? Are we hanging "real" activities on aspirational goal statements?

Eunice: Have goals been used to support actual projects? Gail: Yes, in the context of California's tanking economy.

Martha: If a goal section is included, as aspirational, they should still be understood in relation to our actual work plan.

Timeline: Since we are doing this for ourselves, we don't want to drag it out but there is no deadline. Would like to have it ready for CoUL's next discussion of priorities. Not feasible to recast by end of June, but a reasonable summer project.

ACTION: Jim, John and Gail volunteered to begin re-drafting; this will be an iterative process and the working document will be put on the wiki (on a "thoughts" page, to allow for wider participation).

Fed Doc Arc Update (Beth Dupuis)

Full name: UC Federal Documents Archive Project.

Began about 18 months ago, as result of an earlier project that had explored development of a UC-wide repository for one print copy of US federal documents with ancillary digital versions. Report recommended HathiTrust as an appropriate repository for digital version (scans could come from UC or other HathiTrust members).

Phase 1: Starts with the RLFs—their collections are used to identify unique titles to be disclosed through shared holdings in catalogs, identify availability of valid digital copy, and identify duplicate copies for use in sheet-fed digitization. A good process is in place for disclosing shared-print serials, but a process for disclosing shared-print monographs had to be developed—this settled about 3 months ago, in collaboration with OCLC, HathiTrust, and the Berkeley systems office.

Monographic US federal documents held uniquely at just one RLF: 42K at NRLF, 140K at SRLF have been identified. Work is underway currently to add the shared print disclosures to these items.

Project members and UC Government Information Librarians (GILS) volunteers have also been reviewing lists of titles of monographs, MVMs, and serials which are held by both NRLF and SRLF.

"Human review" is refining these lists—identifying duplication, determining which copy to retain, determining if a second copy can be sent to Google for sheet-fed scanning if it is not yet available in HathiTrust. A pilot set of 5K items (instances where UC has a shared-print copy but no HathiTrust digital version) have been sent from NRLF to Google for sheet-fed scanning.

Disposition of duplicate print copies (instances where UC already has a shared-print copy and a reliable digital version) must follow the FDLP Needs & Offers procedures. Organizing large-scale processes (using Google sheets, docs, and forms) has been challenging, but six rounds of offers of items from SRLF and NRLF have already been completed.

Phase 2: Analysis of local collections, for contribution to RLF archive, campus retention, or withdrawal. GILS group will be involved. Riverside is the beta-test group: 30K items have already offered by UCR; 4 shipments of pallets documents for sheet-fed scanning have already been sent to Google. Once the disclosures are in place, it will be much easier for other campuses to get involved, although learning opportunities remain abundant.

Data is being gathered about project costs (including time) for analysis, to understand investment costs. A report is due to the UC Direction and Oversight Committee (DOC) and Council of University Librarians (CoUL) once the initial rounds of work at the RLFS are complete.

Project is on track to complete Phase 1 by December 2016.

Gail: How are things working with Google?

Beth: FedDocArc is a separate project from the "regular" Google projects, so an important step was changing the protocol for developing candidate lists for sheet-fed (destructive) scanning. We are allowed to send any titles/volumes that are US federal documents with care to avoid unintentional duplication.

Gail: Are other campuses able to participate in this processes?

Beth: Since there are complicated record-management issues involved, it will need to be successive, one campus at a time, rather than simultaneous participation.

Beth: This is not a mandated withdrawal project; we are, instead, identifying opportunities for permanent retention, which eases relations with FDLP.

Martha: How does duplicate detection work?

Beth: The original idea was to start by identifying documents by agency, but that turned out to be far too messy, since even the agencies don't know what they've issued. The HathiTrust registry project (https://www.hathitrust.org/usgovdocs_registry) might be useful to follow up, but starting by identifying materials within "location" collections seemed the best place to start.

Beth: It can be complicated to set up campus routines for Google participation, and the project group is thinking about ways to scan the things that Google won't.

Gail: The National Agricultural Library is working on a project which will include HathiTrust deposits, and UC working with (at least) four related projects with HathiTrust in mind. GPO has trust issues, but is watching with interest.

Beth: Behind the scenes, this is a hugely complicated project. Always happy to share information, and an announcement about progress is planned for the summer.