Shared Content Leadership Group

Meeting Minutes, April 14, 2017

Present: Martha Hruska (SD, Chair), JoAnne Newyear-Ramirez (B), Myra Appel (D), John Renaud (I), Angela Riggio (LA), Jim Dooley (M), Alison Scott (R), Eunice Schroeder (SB), Julia Kochi (SF), Kerry Scott (SC), Becky Imamoto (LAUC), Mihoko Hosoi (CDL), Wendy Parfrey (CDL)

Absent: Kerry Scott (UCSC), Ivy Anderson (CDL)
Guests: Emily Stambaugh (CDL)

Announcements, Housekeeping and Calendar Review

CoUL meeting with Pres. Napolitano: some group members have heard from ULs; all are waiting to see the documents, especially concerning collections.

QUESTION: Is it appropriate, as SCLG, to request copy of report with update on next steps? DISCUSSION: Yes, in light of cost-share proposal that we are sending to them; will be important to have clarification, especially if there might be any new money coming.

ACTION: Ask for the meeting's document and for update on next steps, via DOC. John to act as conduit.

Face-to-face meeting for planning to plan for coming year.

ACTION: Martha will adjust summer schedule of calls (considering ALA), and identify possible dates.

ACTION: Please review minutes for March 24 meeting: at noon on Monday, April 20, they will be considered approved and move forward for distribution.

ANNOUNCEMENT: Davis is starting work with Greenglass (collection analysis tool)–monographs only (scores are included depending on cataloging); does not include journals or e-resources yet, but journals inclusion planned for 2018.

ANNOUNCEMENT: UCSF will make official announcement about new UL, Chris Shaffer, from Oregon Health & Sciences University.

QUESTION: Transition planning for group leadership: do we want to consider a "vice-chair" arrangement? John/Julia: DOC is talking about this; would probably entertain a proposal from us for this restructure, to enhance orderly succession, and sharing the logistical fun. Volunteers welcome.

ANNOUNCEMENT: Shared Microform working group: hard at work; figuring out how to complete inventory and identify next steps.

FTE Cost Model

Goal: Agreement on cost-share modelling proposal, in light of discussion and comments on wiki. How to send forward, with what modifications and attachments?

DISCUSSION: John: CoUL will have to look at implications of campus increases, and consider how to make the model sustainable. Martha: UL question about multiple factors? Addressed fairly well in proposal, but ULs may come back to ask for more nuanced modelling/factoring for mitigation. Ultimate

question: total commitment to system-wide resources continues to increase and will not be sustainable, no matter the modeling. Need to review continuations and consider scaling back. Need to mention this in "next steps" in proposal. John: Cost shares will always total 100%; using CDL funding to support transparent model. Martha: CoUL conversation with Pres. Napolitano about collections as future factor.

Berkeley: (Jo Anne) Support; include information about implementation of FTE model; weighting information would be overwhelming if sent in advance, but could be included in discussion.

Davis: (Myra) Cannot support FTE proposal – suggest sending proposal forward as majority opinion, with dissent; cannot predict budgets with new chancellor and economy of California; cost shares need to be based on variety of factors, more than just FTE (exclude "extension" employees, and growth in UG population not believed to map to need/use of Tier One resources), including budgets, usage (emphasizing graduate/faculty); if we go this way, must include 3-year average and staged roll-out.

Irvine (John): Support, with concerns.

UCLA (Angela): Cannot support FTE model, but it's time for proposal to go to CoUL.

Merced (Jim): Support (see comments on wiki); data presentation needs careful attention to provide best information to CoUL and local campus administration – needs to be (re)written to resonate with provosts/chancellors.

Riverside (Alison): Support; don't discount undergraduates as users of Tier 1 resources.

San Diego (Martha): Support; working on format and adaptation of report.

San Francisco (Julia); Support; optics--know this model is significant benefit to UCSF; don't re-write this document, but write one for "external" use, if we need one (depending upon CoUL decision about model).

Santa Barbara (Eunice): Support; sustainability is key question; agree with John's idea of central funding for core resources.

LAUC (Becky): OK, go ahead.

CDL (Mihoko): emphasis on system-wide perspective; what other options are there? If no models are acceptable, CDL as buying club, or what?

ACTION: Martha will lead efforts for minor editing of the document for the sake of effective presentation, and adding points concerning implementation, with Jim's help. Revision will be available for group early next week, with the goal of submission to CoUL by Tuesday, April 25.

Collection Vision Update

Current draft waiting on input re OA that Ivy promised.

ACTION: Add to agenda for next meeting.

Shared Print Update

HathiTrust Shared Print Monographs Program: Irvine, Santa Cruz, San Diego, Merced, UCLA and both RLFs participating in Phase 1. Mode: dedicated primary contact with responsibility to review draft policies and identify initial set of monographs for contribution. 2 review rounds for policies: access, disclosure, retention periods, etc. Monograph contributions: preferred metadata approach, and initial commitments (non-binding) to be identified, due at end of April. Final policy and binding MOU later in summer. 1.8million RLF monographs to be contributed in Phase 1. Shared Print holdings as default inclusion. ACTION: send data to Emily for system-wide coordinated picture. HT analysis of monographs will be valuable to UC shared print strategies.

RoadMap: strategic plan for UC shared print. Early 2018, re-start cycle of strategic planning. HT important to developing retrospective shared print collection. Defining scope of infrastructure and business model. Analytics capability will be critical–will involve analysis of HT and OCLC capabilities; nothing planned for UC only analytics.

JACS: Program designed to coordinate growth of journal backfiles as archive sets for defined title list. Volume level review by campuses not required; RLFs manage duplicates and intake, enabling significant reduction in campus staff-time needed for serial review. Hoping to increase level of contributions. Planning JACS 3 title list. Relationship of primary contacts to decision-making. Contributions against allocation impact participation, particularly if the actual impact on quota is not immediately known. Questions about discoverability, selectors' willingness to let go of journals, staffing levels, also contribute to ability to contribute. JACS 4: how to adjust allocation "barrier" – any new serial deposit as a shared "trigger" deposit, along with defined title list? Request for JACS4 planning document.

Licensing Update

Key Issues for Vendors, Spring 2017 Revision -- CDL's Licensed Content Group (LCG) prepared for updated Key Issues for Vendors and the Background documents for SCLG review (4/13 email to SCLG). SCLG members are encouraged to provide feedback to CDL if any, by 4/27 (Thur). Holly Eggleston coordinated this project.

CDL Acquisitions – FreshDesk Customer Relationship Management (CRM) Software – CDL Acquisitions will soon be implementing FreshDesk, a CRM software, to track customer inquiries and CDL Acquisitions' responses. The system will allow us to run reports so that we can review the current status (frequent customers, common questions, response time, etc.) and make any necessary changes in the unit's operation. We hope to implement the service by the end of the month, and will send updates as they become available.

LICENSES

Springer Nature – Nine campuses have approved the proposal for 2017-2019. The contract offers price stability, additional discounts for local and consortial journal subscriptions and systemwide access to five new Nature titles and six new collections of Springer/Palgrave ebooks. The contract also includes Springer Protocols and Scientific American and a 3-month trial of the new NANO database for interested campuses. The contract negotiation was complex and difficult. Business terms for Lawrence Berkeley National Laboratory (LBNL) and Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory (LLNL) are still under negotiation. They are going to be part of the CDL-managed license, and those terms also need to be included in the license. CDL sent a draft license agreement (general terms) to the vendor on March 23.

Once LBNL/LLNL business terms are confirmed, we can finalize the Letter of Intent, which will allow us to obtain access to negotiated products.

CRC STMnetbase proposal – All 10 campuses approved a major upgrade to a systemwide license for STMnetbase - the entire CRC Press ebook collection for 2017-2019. The consortial upgrade offers perpetual rights and wider access to over 1,100 ebooks published in the sciences. The ENGnetbase engineering evidence-based pilot will end after four years and be integrated into the STMnetbase acquisition. CHEMnetbase will continue to be a separate license. Management of the entire CRC contract by CDL staff will be easier including access, cataloging, invoicing and licensing. The upgrade also resolves a long-standing issue of duplicate titles in multiple CRC collections. Please contact Wendy Parfrey if you have any questions.

Electrochemical Society (ECS) Digital Library Update / ECS Plus – SCLG approved in February, and CDL sent the draft license to the vendor on 3/6 (Mon). The vendor indicated that they hope to finish reviewing our edits by 4/15.

SCOAP3 Phase 2 Renewal, 2017-2019 – CDL is working on a cost proposal for JSC approval and SCLG approvals.

The Licensing status (request CDL password) page has been updated.