Shared Content Leadership Group

Meeting Minutes, June 2, 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), Ivy Anderson (CDL), Wendy Parfrey (CDL)

Absent: Kerry Scott (SC), Becky Imamoto (LAUC)

Announcements, Housekeeping and Calendar Review

1. On ongoing basis should someone be an assistant chair, for instance in Martha's absence? This would introduce consistency. This was run by Julia K and John R in their capacities as DOC members. Shall we think of the person in this role of assistant as ultimately moving into chairpersonship, or should we do as pilot? Decision: We will do as pilot, and call the question again around June 2018. Alison Scott will be first assistant chair, effective now.
2. Martha will not be here for 16 June 2017 meeting. Microforms group will be ready to present at this meeting. Alison will assist with agenda. Star Team will be ready to give a report on Open Library of the Humanities.
3. 12 May 2017 Notes: No second thoughts or revisions, they will be posted.

Frontiers Review by STAR Team: Considerations: Is it a fool's errand? Will it become a Tier 2 at least? There is a cost in investigating.

Decision: Unless there is majority support, should not do investigation centrally but rather interested campus should do that. Also, campus capacity for transformative activities is limited. We should wait for CoUL's conversation about developing an OA roadmap. A pause will let us proceed more strategically. We are not approving STARS looking at Frontiers.

Decision: Going forward, use the "Tier 2 type" rule of 5 or more campuses for STARS led investigation.

Collection Vision Update

Conversation: Version sent by Jim in email is linked in Agenda. Kerry sent her thoughts via email as she is not on this call. Jim has incorporated suggestions for the statement based on the Google Doc.

Question 1: Is the titling correct?

Question 2: There are conflicting comments around the question of "Collections As Services." We do need to address that. Is that an overarching theme that we wish to use?

Three parts/ three ways to think about this: 1) Our collections as a single, integrated shared collection. 2) Content that is outside of our direct control, that we do not control or own, but to which we wish to provide stewardship and other services. 3) Explosion of content types. This vision may pose challenges, but if we think of collections in this broad way, there are components of a vision there.

We are poised to, with our collection vision, service the new kinds of research that our scholars are engaging in.

Is this a matter of simply organizing, perhaps starting with a succinct statement and then adding the complexities later; or take the view that all content is data in some way, and then the difference lays in how it is curated based on its particular manifestation.

Restructure the document with background at the start, then a succinct, bold summary statement.

Question 3: Is this document really a collection vision?

Question 4: Who is the audience for this document?

Action: Additional volunteers needed. Martha will go back and ask Kerry to take a crack at it; JPR will take another look. Ideas for "pithy" statements welcome from all, more authors not needed. Conversation will continue on the SCLG list. Important to encapsulate collection and services.

Titling: Maybe we should just call it an update. But for now we need the 1-3 sentences that say what we think, overall, the UC Libraries collection *is*. Audience is the people who work in collections, as well as serve as the SCLG roadmap and workplan. We are writing for libraries and librarians. It is internal for our libraries and external for other libraries/ colleagues in the profession.

JSTOR Sustainability Collection

JSTOR webinar went well, took a while to get through slides. Slides are available, webinar was recorded.

What is the current value of JSTOR: it is a major reference source and easy to use, relatively affordable (12 cents per download) Now they are thinking about new collections and building infrastructure, tools, services, adding OA content, primary sources, ArtStor images, etc ... Very ambitious and very different direction.

JSTOR is still trying to focus its new vision and strategy; JSTOR wants to survey the library community on a list of potential new collections after Sustainability. Action points are to provide feedback as opportunities arise.

Ivy is working with JSTOR to arrange a "2020" meeting. JSTOR wants to understand what we are developing and what are our goals are. Columbia Univ. has been engaging with JSTOR around those topics. Meeting could be very rich, here in California. Since JSTOR is going around country and having these meetings, we should be part of it.

Do we have a way to manage our clear resource issues in terms of expectations? Should we be wary of creating one stop portals for subjects? Conversation will continue. We will reserve time on our next call to determine whether we feel these conversations with JSTOR will be valuable.

FTE Cost Modeling and Tier 1 Review

What do we need to do to clarify this information for our ULs. Round robin on collection budgets for FY18. For FY19 we will need to think about cutting back; there are issues of affordability with FTE model as per CoUL.

What can folks afford this year and next? We need that sense of budget. Is there an immediate need to do cuts? CoUL wants the FTE model in FY19 to be affordable for everyone so that is the focus.

UCSD: Flat with slight increase tied to cost-of -living increase; won't give enough to afford ongoing increases.

UC Davis: Slight increase to cover inflation this fiscal year. Budget covers collections, participation in OA initiatives and membership/participation fees (e.g. CRL, HathiTrust, etc.).

UC Merced: Finishing 6th consecutive year of flat budgets, next year will probably be the same. There is a large wish list from faculty that is unmet. Merced is meeting scheduled increases by cutting book budget. Not expecting cuts but expecting flat. For Merced, continuing to cut local book acquisitions is not sustainable; would support looking at duplicate or obsolete Tier 1's. Merced benefits from the FTE model; changing the cost model would not necessitate Tier 1 cuts.

UCSB: The model does not affect us negatively, they will have a flat budget next year; had increase in FY15. By all means, look at Tier 1's that would take effect in FY19 is important; not absolutely urgent for FY18.

UCSF: Looking at a flat budget; recipients of good news with the FTE model. A question is when the FTE model will be applied to journal packages, which is where most of their money is. [No journal packages renew until FY 19.] In a deficit due to Elsevier renewal.

UC Berkeley: Must cut $1.2 million now but they are using discretionary funds so that they have the next year, FY18, to do a thorough review and campus consultation around cuts to collections. The plan is to have our serial cuts ready to activate in June 2018. Every scrap of discretionary review that can be used is being used. By June 1 will have list of cancellations. FTE model will help them a lot. They can cope with Tier 1's this year, because they agreed to do consultations. Nothing they cancel would be effective until FY 19.

UCLA: Flat budget for FY18, worried about FTE model in FY19.

UC Riverside: In year 8 of flat budget; $300K structural deficit that has been covered with salary savings but that will not carry forward. Starting new FY in deficit. Have not heard from campus budget request. Smoke signals are that they should plan for a cut. In best case, will come out at zero, which means that will have to cut to manage inflationary increases.

UCSC (Kerry via email) - Not optimistic but want to "stay in" as much as they can.

UC Irvine - the collections budget is undetermined for FY 18.

Summary: Urgency of significant cuts immediately is not great, but it would be appreciated if possible in FY18 - but there are a lot of variables. For FY19, when many contracts renew, it is urgent.

List of FY18 renewals can be shared with librarians locally; maybe focus on databases? OR look at really low usage and target those? Will take this up on next call. We need ample time for faculty consultation. Time to look at usage statistics. We may find surprises – things that we can relinquish sooner rather than later.

Ivy: Do we want usage data centrally? Discussion about how much work is involved in gathering the usage stats. All the vendors are included in 3rd party supplied Counter Reports.

Action: Discussion will continue on list and in subsequent meetings. Assemble data as it can be assembled - as time allows. Timetable for assessment for future discussions.

Licensing Update

<u>CDL Updates</u>

New UC-eLinks OA Target – OADOI – As announced earlier, CDL launched the new "OADOI" target into UC-eLinks. This target brings more 'green' and 'gold' OA into UC-eLinks. Here is an example: https://tinyurl.com/msf52tq. Please contact Alison Ray if you have any questions or feedback.

<u>LICENSES</u>

Springer Nature – CDL signed Letters of Intent (LOI) on 5/16 (Tue). Access to listed licensed products is active, including Springer journals, Springer Protocols, Nature journals for all UC campuses, and *Pediatric Research* for five campuses (Berkeley, Davis, Los Angeles, San Diego, and San Francisco.) As for cataloging records, the initial set of 2017 Springer eBooks totaling 4,182 records, Springer journals (new & updated), and *Pediatric Research* were distributed to campuses on 5/30 (Tue). Business terms for Lawrence Berkeley National Laboratory (LBNL) and Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory (LLNL) are almost finalized. It's been a difficult process to separate the labs out of the existing UC license/pricing and to negotiate their pricing separately. The license is still under negotiation. CDL sent a draft (edits on general terms) to the vendor on 3/23, and still hasn't heard back. CDL has requested updates from the vendor several times, and expressed concerns, especially because some campuses are considering local purchases based on the CDL license. We hope that Springer Nature makes progress on the license, now that LOIs have been signed and labs' business terms are almost finalized. We'll inform SCLG as soon as it's signed.

JSTOR Sustainability (thematic collection) – There will be a webinar on 6/2 for SCLG and campus staff to learn more about this collection and to discuss co-investment options. It covers more than 20 disciplines within the theme of sustainability and includes journals, ebooks and research reports (http://www.jstor.org/sustainability/).

Institute of Physics (IoP) – Berkeley is sponsoring a Tier 2 to purchase the next ebook collection, Release 4. The collection includes 80 titles. The vendor extended the special pricing for 9 campuses. There are 7 approvals (B,I,LA,M,SD,SC,R). Replies are due from two campuses, if interested (SB, D).

IEEE's SMPTE Motion Imaging Journal –Three campuses have approved (B,LA,SD) a subscription to the Society of Motion Picture and Television Engineers digital library (Tier 2 from Berkeley). The collection includes the peer-reviewed SMPTE Motion Imaging Journal, proceedings from SMPTE conferences, 900 standards and other technical reports dating back to 1916. CDL will facilitate this Tier 3 purchase since the discounted pricing is tied to the CDL license with IEEE.

SCOAP3 Proposal – SCLG is reviewing a SCOAP3 co-investment proposal based on campus authorship rates for Phase 2, 2017-2019. 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 are short staffed and that they hope to finish reviewing our edits ASAP.

The <u>Licensing status</u> (<u>request CDL password</u>) page has been updated.

Future Agenda

OA Initiatives
SCOAP3 & Offsetting Goals