

Shared Content Leadership Group

Meeting Minutes, August 11, 2017

Present: Martha Hruska (SD, Chair), Roxanne Peck (LA), Alison Scott, Co-chair (R), Susan Edwards for Jo Anne Newyear Ramirez (B), Kerry Scott (SC), Julia Kochi (SF), Bob Heyer-Gray (D), Jim Dooley (M), John Renaud (I), Eunice Schroeder (SB), Becky Imamoto (LAUC), Mihoko Hosoi (CDL), Wendy Parfrey (CDL)

Absent: JoAnne Newyear-Ramirez (B), Ivy Anderson (CDL)

Announcements, Housekeeping and Calendar Review

July 28 meeting notes:

- Update sent to Ann Frankel @ DOC by Martha, 8/11/17 - highlighting current SCLG activity. Martha to meet with DOC on 8/25.

Feedback on previously posted notes, for example FTE cost model notes, can sometimes lack context. Notes should convey enough information so those not at meeting can understand. For example, should PPT and other referenced documents be appended to notes? It is possible for Wendy to put live links, but must be on server that doesn't require authentication or will just lead to broken links. What platform would work? **ACTION** for July 28 notes, Susan will talk with Rachel and Jo-Ann about place to post them at Berkeley site.

- Unanimous consent to approve and post July 28th notes once we have link to additional info.
- CoUL will discuss Offsetting via email.

ACTION: Martha will check with CoUL regarding green light for Offsetting Task Force.

ACTION: Message from Emily Stambaugh re August 25th meeting - we should review documents that she sent in advance of this meeting.

Planning for September In-person Meeting

Ideas: Morning would be about FTE Cost Model Implementation; Mihoko has sent basic proposal with spreadsheet and comments for background information. Want to go over principles that we will want to hold to as we go through process so that we stay with existing principles such as no one paying more than if they acted alone. Some of us have concerns with "rippling" impact of cutting back on Tier 1's - some might move to Tier 2, which would only shift costs and could cause some campuses to see increased costs. Want to build in key principles to keep in mind to avoid this.

Ivy/ CDL will provide inventory of resources that fall into each category by September 8th meeting. Mihoko points out that it will be more helpful if they do this in smaller, more manageable chunks. Start with Tier 1's, for example. Simpler to review this way than to look at 500 +/- resources all together. It will be more helpful to separate out e-books, journals, databases, etc ... Either way, goal is to have something before that meeting. Not sure how much data will be there as there has been staff transition and vacancies so CDL is stretched a bit thin.

ACTION: SCLG members to identify "SURE KEEPERS" so that the list for review will be shorter so that CDL can incorporate more information regarding those resources that actually are potentially on the chopping block. Not everything will require decision immediately. Also, important to identify overall target. We need to discuss this week and next. Basically, we must hold the line, but we never established cutback parameters. We need to set that target, along with renewal time frame. CDL has given us 17-18 renewals, and outline of when the others will come up and when the data might be available.

- One of positions lost at CDL will not be replaced; Mihoko is currently sole licensing person. Harder to make commitments in terms of deliverables but CDL wishes to be helpful.
- Overall SCLG goal is to manage spend, so on September 8th, 1/2 day will be talking through process.
- Afternoon of September 8th will be thinking about going beyond licensing and managing content spend, and think about the broader aspects of what we are doing with UC Collections – "the vision." We should think about how we manage our collective time over the course of the year, beyond just managing the collections spend.

ACTION(S): Fill in topics; Establish "cut target" between now and then (9/8). We need annual targets for planning process, based on when we "feel" the reductions in our budgets, as tied to renewal cycles in connection with FTE Cost Model (over next 3-4 FY). Sustainability is key. Not in place to see significant cost reductions in FY18. Besides automatically going to cost share, ensure that there is agreement that we do want to renew each resource. In this year, look at non-multi-year renewals. As CDL provides information, SCLG will weigh in.

- Better to be planfull, difficult to cancel "on a dime."
- Setting a target amount to cut - we can spend a little more time at our next meeting @ end of month and be thinking through via email between now and then. A mathematical calculation knowing how much spend is in all Tier 1s.
- Discussions about strategy will be important, for example, in the area of "big" packages. Consider what "ripples" will mean locally, so can establish a target cut.
- Should we be aiming at FTE Cost Share Model to be cost neutral (for those seeing increases?) Discussion ensued. "Cost neutrality" for everyone is not possible. Want to go to implementation in way that is effective and does not adversely impact individual campuses; must look at UC total spend and sustainability of increases over next 3-5 years, which is why we started down this road.
- A good point is that we must consider the value proposition of Tier 1 Resources.

ACTION: Follow up online as to what target might be, revisit at next meeting.

UC Micro Collections Review and SCLG Response

- Need to send out [SCLG response](#) and post on website, linked from agenda. Wording changes were largely from their recommendation. Do we wish to re-phrase their recommendation? Discussion ensued. We can edit our comments, but we should not edit the language of the Task Force, which is their language.

- Martha would like to send thank you to group, based on their report.
- Recommendation 8: Metadata CKG referral – what do we want them to do with #8? Not up to Metadata CKG to determine number of copies in libraries, for example. We could ask them to consider what is there & in what condition. HOSC has gone "out of business," metadata CKG is different. Fuzzy area in that there was a request to see where guides are and whether they should be catalogued.
- Could this be folded into new team that is looking at this? Answer = Yes, better to defer to Team being charged in recommendations #9, #10, & #11. For example, many titles on spreadsheet don't precisely match catalog record, so some instances are "best guesses."
- Action: #8, #9, #10, and #11 will be part of charge for new team; this will be follow up action – finalize charge and think about who should be "volunteering" for that group. Becky, Kerry, Jo Ann working on this. Include language regarding potential limitations imposed by budgeting realities. Martha to try and fix wording.
- Question: Do we even have budget to buy these in digital form (recommendation #10)? Are there ways to digitize without spending "real" money but rather by investing time?
- Should we modify charge so that there isn't an expectation that we buy them all, but rather have inventory of what is actually available for purchase? That saves some work in terms of getting cost information.
- We don't need cost information or prioritization for potential purchase to be done by this group; Can be assigned to CKGs or left for future generations to decide.
- Where to post/host inventory? Action: Wendy to check to see about CDL policies for hosting on public website. We agree the inventory should be available.

Collection Vision Update

- Revised by Martha this morning, 8/11/2017. Brief version supplied w/link.
- It now concentrates on 17-18 goals. Martha views SCLG as the *primary* audience but of course not the only ones. That informs how everything should be worded.

"All content ... available freely... is curated." That should be revised and curation taken out. "Curation" could be incorporated in the following sentence about "collections and content are envisioned as service." Action: Everyone think about the curation/freely available part and read/absorb the rest of it. Edit this document, not the older one. Do we have the key concepts?

Licensing Update

CDL Updates

Tier 2 Champions Recruitment – CDL is reviewing the list of Tier 2 licenses that were originally signed by campuses and are missing campus champions, and will be requesting that a campus champion be assigned to each resource and the champion join the Resource Liaison (RL) program. Champions will be recruited from campuses that signed relevant contracts. This will greatly facilitate Tier 2 renewals and all the background support that CDL staff provide on payment, cataloging and life cycle maintenance. CDL will continue managing renewals for licenses that were originally signed by CDL. Wendy Parfrey, Holly

Eggleston, and Adriana Moran are working on identifying Tier 2 licenses that were licensed by campuses and are currently missing campus champions. Wendy will reach out to campuses for campus champion recruitment purposes. Holly will orient new champions on RL program. Please contact [Wendy Parfrey](#) if you have any questions.

CDL Acquisitions – Document Sharing on SharePoint – CDL Acquisitions will soon start sharing acquisitions-related documents on SharePoint with SCLG members and campus acquisitions staff *via restricted access*. The goal is to enhance services to UC campuses and to increase efficiency of the acquisitions operation. The initial plan includes the following documents: payment documents (shared with SCLG and campus Acquisitions staff) and financial expenditure reports (projected annual expenditures, monthly expenditures, deposit balance – customized for and *restricted to each campus*). We are currently testing the site with several campus acquisitions staff to obtain initial feedback, and will reach out to SCLG when we are ready for more comprehensive testing, likely in mid-August. We hope to launch the site officially by 9/1. Please contact [Peter Rolla](#) (CDL Acquisitions) with any questions.

CDL Acquisitions – FreshDesk Customer Relationship Management (CRM) Software – Just a reminder that CDL Acquisitions implemented FreshDesk, a CRM software, to track customer inquiries and CDL Acquisitions' responses. Please use cdlacc@cdlib.org to contact CDL Acquisitions, instead of individual email addresses. We are curious to see if the system is helping with the efficiency and responsiveness, and will review transaction reports on a quarterly basis and welcome your feedback. Please contact [Peter Rolla](#) (CDL Acquisitions) with any questions and/or feedback.

LICENSES

Annual Reviews (AR) – Nine campuses have approved the 3-year migration plan to upgrade to the Complete (Sciences and Economics) collection. CDL is discussing with the publisher on systemwide options/alternatives. AR is now offering a 60% DDP discount for print (\$200/title), originally requested by UCLA. Background: The publisher announced a new pricing model based on Carnegie tiers earlier this year, which would result in higher costs for every UC campus starting in 2018. CDL negotiated a favorable systemwide contract with high discounts and a three-year migration plan. The package includes all journals currently published by AR with three new launches in 2018. AR is an independent, non-profit publisher with high value journals: 15 titles are ranked #1 in impact factor category. Overall usage is high, and we are exploring ways for us to retain this resource at a reasonable cost through systemwide negotiation.

Electrochemical Society (ECS) Digital Library Update / ECS Plus – CDL signed the license on 8/7, after several months' of licensing term negotiation. It'll be posted on the CDL web soon.

Company of Biologists – CDL signed the new license on 8/7. Waiting for a countersigned version.

EIU Country Commerce, Country Finance and Country Reports – CDL is working on a contract renewal that is due in September. The RL, Monica Hagan (UCLA) will be polling business colleagues across the UC campuses to discuss the declining usage and whether EIU is a possible cancellation target.

ArXiv, 2018-2022 – There is a new pricing model that introduces a top usage tier with a cost increase for research-intensive UC campuses. CDL is working on background and a proposal for SCLG consideration.

JSTOR DDA Pilot – The task force is finalizing an interim assessment report for SCLG which shows strong usage but lower systemwide spend than anticipated due to JSTOR’s free browsing model. One issue is the difficulty in adjusting local approval profiles and avoiding duplicate spend on purchased titles since not all publishers offer their total output in the JSTOR pilot.

Springer Nature – Springer Nature still hasn’t replied on the CDL’s edits on the draft terms & conditions, which was sent to Springer Nature on 3/23/2017. CDL has requested updates from the vendor numerous times, most recently on 7/17, and expressed concerns, especially because some campuses are considering local purchases based on the CDL license. The vendor should be able to move on with the license, now that Letters of Intent (LOI) for UC campuses as well as for Lawrence Berkeley National Laboratory (LBNL) and Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory (LLNL) have been signed and all invoices have been received/paid. 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.) We’ll inform SCLG as soon as the license is signed.

Berg Fashion Library – The vendor (Bloomsbury Publishing) requested that we update the existing license using a new template, and agreed to transfer existing terms into the new format. We are still waiting for the draft. UCSD joined the subscription starting this year.

The [Licensing status \(request CDL password\)](#) page has been updated.