

UC Libraries Open Access Resource Management Task Force Phase One Report

October 2021

Cynthia Johnson (Co-Chair), UCI
Tamara Pilko (Co-Chair), UCSC
Erica Zhang (Co-Chair), UCLA
Becky Culbertson, CDL
Lisa Mackinder, CDL
Tiffany Moxham, UCR
Jo Anne Newyear Ramirez, UCB
John Riemer, UCLA
Kerry Scott, UCSC
Christopher Thomas, UCLA
Sarah Troy (DOC Liaison)

Table of Contents

Table of Contents	2
Executive Summary	3
Introduction/Background	6
Definitions of OA	7
CDI and EasyActive	8
Phase One Deliverables	9
Principles	9
Theory and Guidelines	11
Proposed Framework	11
Conclusion/Looking Ahead to Phase Two	13
Appendix 1: Charge	14

Executive Summary

In June 2021, the Direction and Oversight Committee (DOC) formed the Open Access Resource Management Task Force (OARMTF), following a recommendation from the SILS Public Services Escalation Leaders Group (PSELG). PSELG had received the question, “Should we, as a system, use CDI [Central Discovery Index] to manage open access (OA) resources?” Findings from PSELG’s investigation into this question revealed that the issue of how OA resources should be managed in SILS is complex, crosses over multiple functional areas, and has implications for both UC and campus policies on resource management.

DOC charged the OARMTF with:

1. Investigating how best to manage OA resource activation across the UC Libraries system;
2. Developing a systemwide standard practice of how and when OA resources are included in the CDI; and
3. Conducting a review of current UC Libraries documents outlining the policies and procedures for shared cataloging, linking and management; recommend proposed revisions

The Task Force work was divided into two phases. The first phase, which ran from June to September, focused on three deliverables, which are discussed in this report:

1. Develop principles for managing open access resources within the UC Libraries, including tools relating to the Central Discovery Index, locally cataloged OA resources, records for OA material cataloged in Alma, and other sources for OA metadata;
2. Define the theory and guidelines upon which consortial management of OA materials will be based, including when distinctions are to be made between OA resources where UC has explicitly made a financial commitment, or where UC acts as the publisher/curator of the collection; and
3. Propose a framework for ongoing consortial management of OA resources in the CDI, including recommendation for positioning activities within the UC Library Search governance structure.

In the first phase, the Task Force began with discussions around the definition of Open Access, as well as learning more about the Shared Cataloging Program’s policies for cataloging OA materials. The Task Force then turned its attention to better understanding the CDI. Part of the conversation around the CDI included how the choice of EasyActive to manage the CDI may impact the UC’s control over which OA resources are discoverable in UC Library Search. Ultimately, these conversations led to a base understanding and dialogue about the principles and guidelines that should be in place regarding the effort the UCs will expend in making OA

resources findable and accessible through UC Library Search. The Principles agreed upon by the Task Force are as follows:

Quality

1. OA resources deemed to be of sufficient value to include in discovery tools at any one campus will be deemed good enough for all campuses.
2. Obtaining quality metadata for OA resources will be a combination of efforts to efficiently utilize existing metadata, create descriptions as needed, and advocate to providers of the resources.

Efficiency and Prioritization

3. OA resources selected by one campus should be made available for the discovery tools of all campuses.
4. Policies, practices, and methods of communication for OA resource management should be developed with attention to efficiency and de-duplication of effort across campuses.
5. Cataloging priority for OA resources needs to be parallel to that for paid/licensed resources.
6. Within cataloging open access resources, priority should be given to UC-sponsored projects and projects where the UCs have made a financial investment.¹

Maintenance/monitoring

7. As much as possible, use data-driven decision-making to monitor, maintain, and troubleshoot discovery and access to OA resources.²
8. We understand that maintenance and monitoring of OA resources is ongoing and that a system-wide group is needed to support this effort.
9. Ongoing maintenance is shared consortially.

¹ UC OA initiatives and investments include UC Transformative Agreements, such as the [Elsevier announcement](#), [Project Transform Working Group OA Principles](#), and [SCLG OA Memberships Principles](#).

² Examples of using data to monitor OA resources include using Alma and Primo Analytics to make decisions about whether to rely on CDI or catalog records in Alma, where to prioritize link maintenance, as well as using COUNTER reports to provide metrics on OA usage.

Governance

10. Stakeholders at every campus will have a voice in working toward shared practices developed through consensus.

Harmonization

11. The more our OA resource management activities are harmonized, the greater we will be able to work in shared files and benefit from each other's efforts.

Discoverability

12. OA resources will be clearly labelled so that this material is discoverable in UC Library Search.

Two overarching guidelines also emerged from our discussions and are at the core of many of the above principles:

1. Minimize duplication of effort across the UC Library System.
2. UC financial commitments and investments in Open Access materials and resources are priorities in making discoverable in UC Library Search by cataloging these materials.

Based on these principles developed with our current understanding of Alma, Primo VE, and the CDI, the Task Force also recommends that an Open Access Resource Management Shared Services Team be created for ongoing consortial management of OA resources.

The second phase of the Task Force will move from principles and theory to implementation. OARMTF will review and recommend workflows and management procedures for cataloging and discovery.

Introduction/Background

In June 2021, the Direction and Oversight Committee (DOC) formed the Open Access Resource Management Task Force (OARMTF), following a recommendation from the SILS Public Services Escalation Leaders Group (PSELG), which received an initial escalated question, “Should we, as a system, use CDI to manage open access (OA) resources?” Findings from PSELG’s investigation into this question revealed that the issue of how OA resources should be managed in SILS is complex, crosses over multiple functional areas, and has implications for both UC and campus policies on resource management. Some of the questions PSELG surfaced included: what is the difference, *from a user’s perspective*, between the UC’s cataloging an OA resource versus relying on metadata coming from the Central Discovery Index (CDI)? What UC Library groups have responsibility for OA cataloging decisions? What groups will have responsibility for decisions regarding the CDI?

With that, OARMTF was charged with:

4. Investigating how best to manage OA resource activation across the UC Libraries system;
5. Developing a systemwide standard practice of how and when OA resources are included in the CDI; and
6. Conducting a review of current UC Libraries documents outlining the policies and procedures for shared cataloging, linking and management; recommend proposed revisions.

The Task Force work was divided into two phases. The first phase, which ran from June to September, focused on three deliverables:

4. Develop principles for managing open access resources within the UC Libraries, including tools relating to the Central Discovery Index, locally cataloged OA resources, records for OA material cataloged in Alma, and other sources for OA metadata;
5. Define the theory and guidelines upon which consortial management of OA materials will be based, including when distinctions are to be made between OA resources where UC has explicitly made a financial commitment, or where UC acts as the publisher/curator of the collection; and
6. Propose a framework for ongoing consortial management of OA resources in the CDI, including recommendation for positioning activities within the UC Library Search governance structure.

Prior to beginning work on the deliverables, the Task Force first focused on understanding key elements of the charge, and held discussions to reach a shared understanding of what OA means, how CDI and the EasyActive setting work, and how CDI and cataloging work together to facilitate discovery.

In developing a better understanding of these concepts, the Task Force also identified areas in the charge that may need to be rearticulated or adapted.

Definitions of OA

As a term, OA broadly refers to resources that are free to read and free of most usage restrictions. However, within that definition are many different flavors of OA that exist along a spectrum of rights and restrictions, making it challenging to precisely define what is and is not an OA resource. Peter Suber's use of the terms "gratis OA" and "libre OA", which refer to "removal of price barriers alone" and "removal of price and at least some permission barriers," respectively, provided more granular vocabulary for our discussion.³

In terms of OA resource management at the UC level, the Shared Cataloging Program has defined OA as the following:

Open access resources have no financial or legal barriers to access for members of our user community. The following factors must be in evidence:

1. The publication must be available online at no charge to readers or institutions. No subscription can be required for online access. It is acceptable for the Issuing body to require registration as long as no cost is involved.
2. Readers must be permitted to use the material for any lawful purpose, including downloading, copying, making derivative works, distributing, printing, searching, or linking to the full texts of works, crawling for indexing, or passing as data to software.
3. No licensor/licensee relationship shall exist between the publisher or provider of the online publication and the individual user or institution.
4. The publication must not be a free trial, complimentary access with subscription, part of an open access pilot project, or an "opt-in" title.
5. The publication must not be part of a mass digitization project (e.g., Google books, Open Content Alliance, etc.).⁴

In reviewing this definition, the Task Force identified areas for further discussion and possible revision in Phase 2, including the clarification of "mass digitization project".

The Task Force also discussed local practices around OA cataloging. For instance, UCLA shared their experience identifying and tagging as OA resources that are free to read for anyone with an Internet connection - or "gratis OA" - including government publications, grey literature from nonprofits and think tanks, digital collections, and UCLA electronic theses and dissertations.

The Task Force also reviewed what Ex Libris considers OA to understand what is being labelled as such in the Central Discovery Index (CDI).

³ <https://sparcopen.org/our-work/gratis-and-libre-open-access/>

⁴ <https://cdlib.org/services/collections/licensed/policy/open-access-resources-at-the-uc-libraries/>

Content in the Central Index is considered Open Access if it meets the following general criteria:

- An item is freely available and openly accessible without requiring authentication by the user.
- An item is identified by the provider/publisher as Open Access.
- An item resides in a known Open Access repository, database, or journal collection that we [Ex Libris] determine to be Open Access.⁵

For resources managed in Alma, OA status is indicated in the bibliographic record with a specific value in the 506 field. The 506 field contains a “Restrictions on Access Note”, which is “information about restrictions imposed on access to the described materials”.⁶ This field *does not* contain information regarding any use or reuse of the resource after gaining access.

The Task Force reached consensus to define OA as broadly as possible for the purposes of our work in acknowledgment that what is considered OA is dynamic and ever-evolving.

CDI and EasyActive

With CDI being central to discussions of OA resource management, the Task Force also dedicated time to better understand how the CDI works, as well as the implications of the SILS decision to choose the EasyActive setting. CDI is part of the library services platform Alma/Primo that is managed by Ex Libris. It contains article, item, and full-text level metadata in a search platform that works alongside the information in the library catalog (Alma) to power UC Library Search. As an illustration of this, Alma contributes the journal *title* metadata to UC Library Search and CDI contributes the journal *article* metadata so that users can search for information contained in a particular journal. Metadata in CDI cannot be directly controlled (modified or removed) by the UC Libraries. However, it is possible to request Ex Libris to make changes, and we can advocate for additional content to be added to CDI.

The EasyActive setting makes the majority of records in the index searchable in the “Articles, books, and more” search scope without needing to manually activate collections in Alma. However, this also means that institutions are unable to deactivate any of these records for search; that is, they are not configurable.

What *is* configurable for search are some select collections in Ex Libris’ Exception list.⁷ In addition, the searchability of these records is separate from providing access to these records in the form of URLs - that is, the display of URLs for resources also requires activation of those resources in Alma. In other words, for OA resources, action must be taken to activate collections in Alma in order for full text URLs to display in UC Library Search.

⁵

[https://knowledge.exlibrisgroup.com/Primo/Product_Documentation/020Primo_VE/Primo_VE_\(English\)/030Primo_VE_User_Interface/Open_Access_Indication_in_Primo_VE](https://knowledge.exlibrisgroup.com/Primo/Product_Documentation/020Primo_VE/Primo_VE_(English)/030Primo_VE_User_Interface/Open_Access_Indication_in_Primo_VE)

⁶ <https://www.loc.gov/marc/bibliographic/bd506.html>

⁷ [https://knowledge.ExLibrisgroup.com/Alma/Product_Documentation/010Alma_Online_Help_\(English\)/Electronic_Resource_Management/060_Alma_Single_Activation_Source_for_CDI/050CDI_Collection_Lists_for_Alma_Customer_s#EasyActive_Collections_List](https://knowledge.ExLibrisgroup.com/Alma/Product_Documentation/010Alma_Online_Help_(English)/Electronic_Resource_Management/060_Alma_Single_Activation_Source_for_CDI/050CDI_Collection_Lists_for_Alma_Customer_s#EasyActive_Collections_List)

Phase One Deliverables

Principles

Develop principles for managing open access resources within the UC Libraries, including tools relating to the Central Discovery Index, locally cataloged OA resources, records for OA material cataloged in Alma, and other sources for OA metadata.

As a public university system that invests in both specific open access (OA) resources and the larger open access publishing ecosystem, we value the discoverability of open access materials alongside licensed library resources to increase bibliodiversity.

We also acknowledge that there are many flavors of OA, that it is an evolving type of electronic content, and that effort must be made in cataloging and discovery to denote OA materials as such. For the purposes of this document and our task force work, we interpret open access to mean “free to read” for anyone, anywhere, with an internet connection.⁸

OA resource management involves the selection, cataloging, and record/link maintenance across the lifecycle of these electronic resources. In managing OA resources, we will develop workflows that reduce unnecessary complexity and redundant work while meeting patron discovery and access needs.

We will also be guided by existing UC principles regarding selection, description/cataloging, and access to licensed resources and apply them in the context of OA.⁹ Many of our principles are also built upon the principles stated in the [SILS Mission, Principles, and Shared Assumptions](#).

The following principles will inform our work in recommending workflows and management procedures for the cataloging and discovery of OA resources.

Quality

1. OA resources deemed to be of sufficient value to include in discovery tools at any one campus will be deemed good enough for all campuses.
2. Obtaining quality metadata for OA resources will be a combination of efforts to efficiently utilize existing metadata, create descriptions as needed, and advocate to providers of the resources.

⁸ Definitions that the Task Force discussed include [Ex Libris' definition of OA](#), current [Shared Cataloging Program definitions of OA](#), as well as [Peter Suber's definitions of Gratis vs. Libre OA](#).

⁹ [Open Access Resources at the UC Libraries](#); [CDL's Collection Development Framework](#); [SILS Resource Management FG Decisions Page](#); [SILS Acquisitions & E-Resources FG Decisions Page](#). Also related are [Guidelines for Evaluating Transformative Open Access Agreements](#) and [Principles and Guidelines for Open Access Memberships](#).

Efficiency and Prioritization

3. OA resources selected by one campus should be made available for the discovery tools of all campuses.
4. Policies, practices, and methods of communication for OA resource management should be developed with attention to efficiency and de-duplication of effort across campuses.
5. Cataloging priority for OA resources needs to be parallel to that for paid/licensed resources.
6. Within cataloging open access resources, priority should be given to UC-sponsored projects and projects where the UCs have made a financial investment.¹⁰

Maintenance/monitoring

7. As much as possible, use data-driven decision-making to monitor, maintain, and troubleshoot discovery and access to OA resources.¹¹
8. We understand that maintenance and monitoring of OA resources is ongoing and that a system-wide group is needed to support this effort.
9. Ongoing maintenance is shared consortially.

Governance

10. Stakeholders at every campus will have a voice in working toward shared practices developed through consensus.

Harmonization

11. The more our OA resource management activities are harmonized, the greater we will be able to work in shared files and benefit from each other's efforts.

Discoverability

12. OA resources will be clearly labelled so that this material is discoverable in UC Library Search.

¹⁰ UC OA initiatives and investments include UC Transformative Agreements, such as the [Elsevier announcement](#), [Project Transform Working Group OA Principles](#), and [SCLG OA Memberships Principles](#).

¹¹ Examples of using data to monitor OA resources include using Alma and Primo Analytics to make decisions about whether to rely on CDI or catalog records in Alma, where to prioritize link maintenance, as well as using COUNTER reports to provide metrics on OA usage.

Theory and Guidelines

Define the theory and guidelines upon which consortial management of OA materials will be based, including when distinctions are to be made between OA resources where UC has explicitly made a financial commitment, or where UC acts as the publisher/curator of the collection.

This Task Force established that for this work, the terms “theory” and “guidelines” are interchangeable with principles. Our discussion centered around deduplication of effort across the campuses as well as cataloging equity, which are covered by principles #5 and #6. As such, using the existing UC framework around a tiered approach to collections, OA resources should be treated broadly as Tier 1¹² in their consortial management.

In addressing the latter aspect of the deliverable, the group agreed that financial commitments and other UC investments are priorities for us to make discoverable through UC Libraries cataloging of these materials.

The group identified UC financial commitments to include investment in tools such as Open Citations and the Open Access Switchboard, content services such as Biomed Central, Knowledge Unlatched, Reveal Digital, and the Directory of Open Access Books (DOAB), as well as the UC transformative agreements.¹³ The group also identified examples of UC priorities, such as the University of California efforts to advance affordable course materials and Open Educational Resources¹⁴, as a distinct category of OA materials to manage.

In terms of resources where UC acts as the publisher or curator, the group identified repositories such as eScholarship and Dryad, as well as UC Press.

Proposed Framework

Propose a framework for ongoing consortial management of OA resources in the CDI, including recommendation for positioning activities within the UC Library Search governance structure.

The group discussed broadening management of OA resources from just the CDI to UC Library Search. This change in the deliverable, “Propose a framework for ongoing consortial management of OA resources in *UC Library Search*,” is intended to encompass the UC’s cataloging activities of OA resources, in addition to managing OA resources in the CDI. This change reflects the principle of deduplicating effort across the system. Thus, based on our principles regarding efficiency and prioritization, as well as maintenance/monitoring, this Task Force recommends that an Open Access Resource Management Shared Services Team be created for ongoing consortial management of OA resources.

¹² <https://cdlib.org/services/collections/licensed/policy/tiered-approach-to-licensed-collections/>

¹³ <https://osc.universityofcalifornia.edu/uc-publisher-relationships/>

¹⁴ <https://regents.universityofcalifornia.edu/regmeet/july21/a3.pdf>

This proposed team would monitor, review and maintain OA resources that are added to UC Library Search (Alma/Primo VE) through the Ex Libris Central Discovery Index (CDI) records as well as the cataloging of records in Alma, and the loading of external records by other means (APIs, OAI-PMH, etc.). One major task will be activating OA resources in order for URLs to appear in search results. The exact mechanisms for this work will be specified in the deliverables of Phase Two of this Task Force.

This Task Force recommends that this new ongoing team will be a Shared Services Team¹⁵, reporting to one of the following within the UCLAS framework¹⁶, depending on the input of DOC: DOC, SILS Leadership Group or SILS Operations Team.

Membership of this Open Access Resource Management Shared Services Team will consist of individuals from specific UCLAS Subteams as well as area experts, for a minimum of six members, including one member from CDL. Individuals may fill more than one of these roles/expertise, as long as all of the following are represented:

- + One member from each of the following SILS Operations Subteams¹⁷:
 - + Acquisitions & E-Resources
 - + Discovery
 - + Resource Management (CatMet)
- + Expertise in the following areas:
 - + Shared collections
 - + Transformative agreements
 - + Scholarly communication, public services
 - + Open Access and/or Open Educational Resources (OER) initiatives
 - + E-resource management, linking
 - + Cataloging
 - + Discovery, CDI

This Task Force recommends re-evaluating this new team after two years and considering if it can be integrated with the group/process that is responsible for non-OA electronic resource management. We do not recommend integrating at this time, considering that these responsibilities currently reside primarily with CDL and would create an undue burden on CDL staff.

¹⁵ <https://libraries.universityofcalifornia.edu/sst>

¹⁶ https://libraries.universityofcalifornia.edu/groups/files/about/docs/UCLAS_org_chart.pdf

¹⁷

https://libraries.universityofcalifornia.edu/groups/files/sils/docs/SILS_UCLASintegrated_06232021_Final.pdf

Conclusion/Looking Ahead to Phase Two

Phase One of the Open Access Resource Management Task Force focused on the articulation of the principles and structural framework the UC Libraries will use to support the discovery of OA resources through cataloging and/or the CDI. In Phase Two, the Task Force will lay out how the UC Libraries can implement these principles: what workflows, policies, and mechanisms need to be in place. Included in Phase Two will be the following:

1. Conduct a review of the UC Libraries Policies and Procedures for Shared Cataloging, Linking, and Management;
2. Develop a systemwide standard of practice for how and when OA resources will be discoverable in UC Library Search
 - a. Note that we recommend changing the original deliverable (“Develop a systemwide standard of practice for how and when OA resources will be included in the CDI”) because of our improved understanding that with EasyActive, we have little to no choice about which OA resources are available and activated via the CDI.
3. Recommend policy and procedure updates for JSC and/or SCLG; and
4. Recommend areas of harmonization for campus policies and practices.

These deliverables will help resolve some of the questions originally raised by PSELG when they were approached with the question, “Should we, as a system, use CDI to manage open access (OA) resources?”

Appendix 1: Charge¹⁸

UCLAS Direction & Oversight Committee Revised:
05/07/21 by Hutchinson, Little, Poe, Troy

UC Libraries Open Access Resource Management Task Force Charge (FINAL)

Background

In March 2021, the SILS Public Services Escalation Leaders Group (PSELG) responded to the escalated question, "Should we, as a system, use CDI to manage OA resources?" with a recommendation for the immediate formation of a temporary, cross-functional subteam to investigate aspects of open access resource management across the UC Libraries, and the potential integration of the [Ex Libris Central Discovery Index \(CDI\)](#) into open access resource management workflows. An initial investigation of the question pointed to multiple intersections between work underway within the SILS Phase 4 implementation project and that of existing UC Libraries groups outside of SILS.

Given the broad scope of the question and in recognition of its importance, the PSELG chairs (Callahan, Ogawa), representatives of DOC (Little, Poe), and the SILS Shared Governance Task Force co-chairs (Steel, Sotelo) met with the SILS Working Group to affirm that escalating the PSELG decision page to DOC for next steps was appropriate.

Charge and High-Level Deliverables

Building and managing collections to provide access to a broad array of scholarly information resources remains one of the highest priorities for the UC Libraries, and significant resources are invested in ensuring the discoverability and use of collections, including open access resources.

Drawing upon the initial research and findings of the PSELG, including the [CDI to manage OA resources decision](#) and the [Summary of PSELG's findings on the question of using CDI to manage OA resources](#), the Open Access Management Task Force will:

1. Investigate how best to manage OA resource activation across the UC Libraries system
2. Develop a systemwide standard practice of how and when OA resources are included in the CDI; and
3. Conduct a review of current UC Libraries documents outlining the policies and procedures for shared cataloging, linking and management; recommend proposed revisions.

¹⁸ Charge can also be found on the Direction and Oversight Committee website: https://libraries.universityofcalifornia.edu/groups/files/doc/docs/OA%20Resource%20Management%20Task%20Force%20Charge_FINAL_May2021.pdf

Where appropriate, the Task Force should distinguish between OA resources within which UC has explicitly made a financial commitment or where it is the publisher, from those OA resources “in the wild” which may be represented in the CDI. Examples of investments may range from transformative journal publishing agreements, to one-time or ongoing support for e-book initiatives. Examples of UC as a publisher include local repositories and curated collections.

Principles

Early PSELG efforts to assess and build a framework for understanding the potential use of the CDI to manage OA resources quickly revealed a range of issues and divergent opinions. The group’s findings include:

“The question touches on many issues at the campus level and the organization as a whole, for functions where substantial expertise, personal identity, and financial investment have been made and will be made in the future... With each group, and even within groups, there is evidence of widely divergent views on the path forward, let alone the best solution. Any group taking up this question would need to balance philosophical and technical expertise with the ability to come to a practically implementable consensus.”

The Task Force shall utilize the [SILS Mission, Principles and Shared Assumption \(2020\)](#) for guidance in decision-making and in finding common ground. Also of value is the [SILS Discovery Vision \(2020\)](#), developed by the SILS 4 Discovery Functional Group, and the [SILS Harmonization Principles \(2019\)](#).

Projected Timeline & Activities

The UC Library Search service will launch on July 27, 2021. Phase 4 of the SILS implementation project will continue through December 22, 2021, at which time Phase 4 will officially conclude and the ongoing governance structure launch. The August-December transition period will be an opportunity for Phase 4 groups to turn attention to those activities not crucial to meeting the go-live date, and is expected to include post-implementation activities, clean-up and standardization work, refining workflows, drafting policy, and the like.

The Open Access Resource Management Task Force is encouraged and empowered to prioritize and act upon decisions that need to be made before the UC Library Search service launch on July 27th, and to defer those decisions that can be made during the August-December transition period.

The Task Force is broadly empowered to review and recommend revisions to the current [UC Libraries Policies and Procedures for Shared Cataloging, Linking, and Management](#). Consideration should be given to the potential use of the CDI to manage OA resources and to meet the discovery needs of UC Library Search users.

Phase 1: Months 1-4

Collection development principles and scoping of cataloging and discovery

1. Develop principles for managing open access resources within the UC Libraries, including tools relating to the Central Discovery Index, locally cataloged OA resources, records for OA material cataloged in Alma, and other sources for OA metadata;
2. Define the theory and guidelines upon which consortial management of OA materials will be based, including when distinctions are to be made between OA resources where UC has explicitly made a financial commitment, or where UC acts as the publisher/curator of the collection; and
3. Propose a framework for ongoing consortial management of OA resources in the CDI, including recommendation for positioning activities within the UC Library Search governance structure.

Phase 2: Months 5-8

Review and recommend workflows and management procedures for cataloging and discovery

1. Conduct a review of the [UC Libraries Policies and Procedures for Shared Cataloging, Linking, and Management](#);
2. Develop a systemwide standard of practice for how and when OA resources will be included in the CDI;
3. Recommend policy and procedure updates for JSC and/or SCLG; and
4. Recommend areas of harmonization for campus policies and practices.

Responsibilities & Reporting Line

The Open Access Resource Management Task Force is charged by the Direction and Oversight Committee, and will report on all completed outcomes to DOC. There are numerous systemwide, campus and SILS Phase 4 stakeholders and this Task Force should consult with these groups and convey their findings and decisions to them in a timely and appropriate manner. In DOC's role, the following groups will also routinely be kept informed: ASAG, PSELG, SILS Working Group, and related SILS ongoing governance groups.

Related Groups

- Shared Content Leadership Group (SCLG)
- Joint Steering Committee (JSC)
- CDL Shared Cataloging Program (SCP)
- SILS Phase 4 Functional Groups:
 - Resource Management
 - Discovery
 - Acquisitions/E-Resources

Membership & Roles

Membership will be expertise-based and drawn from an appropriate cross-section of campus library staff and CDL; members should bring a range of skills and experience to the project team, including:

- Ability to envision a systemwide approach to the collective collection while remaining practical about operational impact;

- Experience administering or working with the evolving landscape of Open Access resources and collections; and
- Competencies in technical services, public services, and/or collection development.

Membership

Name	Campus/CDL	Expertise
Tamara Pilko	UC Santa Cruz	Technical Services
Christopher Thomas	UC Irvine	Technical Services
Becky Culbertson	CDL	Technical Services
Erica Zhang	UCLA	Technical Services
Cynthia Johnson	UC Irvine	Public Services
Tiffany Moxham	UC Riverside	Collections / Transformative Agreements

Kerry Scott	UC Santa Cruz	Public Services/ Collections / Transformative Agreements
John Riemer	UCLA	Technical Services / Collections
Michael Walmsley	CDL	Shared Cataloging Program
Sarah Troy	DOC	DOC Liaison
Jo Anne Newyear Ramirez	UC Berkeley	Open Access/OERs, Technical Services, Discovery