

Systemwide Operations and Planning Group (SOPAG)

ACTION MINUTES, January 23, 2004 (Conference Call)

Present: J. Ober (CDL), T. Dearie (LAUC), B. Hurley (UCB), J. Tanno (UCD, Chair), L. Tanji (UCI), T. Ryan (UCLA, recorder), B. Miller (UCM), S. Wittenbach (UCR), M. Moody (UCSB), K. McGirr (UCSC), P. Mirsky (UCSD), J. Kochi (UCSF).

1. Electronic Resources Management Systems.

SOPAG reviewed initial analyses of the issues and requirements for electronic resource management in UC Libraries, from both the CDL and campus perspectives, forwarded by Ober and Hurley. All of the UC libraries are grappling with the challenge of managing electronic resources. The recent Elsevier process demonstrated significant challenges in the current mechanisms for tracking, reporting on, and sharing decisions about licensing. Better tools are needed to support such tasks as shared selection and evaluation, management and tracking of resources and licenses, and Web-based end-user discovery and access. As reported earlier to SOPAG and CDC Ober reported that CDL had informally reviewed the current state of the market in commercial electronic resource management systems and failed to find a system that both addressed the workflow issues and also supported consortial needs. Hurley pointed out that many of the issues related to data flow. How many systems will we have to house information about electronic resources and how do we move data among the systems? Ryan clarified that UCLA had developed an electronic resource management system because existing acquisitions, catalog, and OPAC systems can't manage the complex management and presentation needs of electronic resources. Wittenbach pointed out that the III electronic resource management module had advantages for the III campuses, since it would integrate with their acquisitions modules. Can we encourage III to add consortial support to their product? Ober reported that ExLibris is also developing an electronic resource management module that might integrate well with Melvyl and with the SFX server.

Given that the marketplace is not quite ready with a commercial system that meets consortial needs, UC must either influence the emerging products, develop our own systemwide product, or both. To make a good decision, UC libraries need to come to agreement about the requirements, prioritize the requirements, and identify action steps. SOPAG agreed on the need for a fast-track process for coming to that agreement, to allow us to meet the urgent needs as soon as possible. Ober observed, for example, that if a system existed that would meet some agreed-upon top priority requirements, CDL might be able to acquire the system on a pilot basis. Such a pilot would allow us to meet some urgent needs, learn from the experience, and possibly influence the marketplace.

To get informed discussion and agreement quickly, SOPAG will ask UL approval to convene a planning meeting of no more than 4 people from each campus,

including attendees with expertise in acquisitions/processing, public services, and technical issues. The expected outcomes of the meeting will be:

- Statements of common needs and priorities from the acquisitions/processing perspective, the public services perspective, and the technical perspective.
- Identification of common and shared collection development decision making needs
- Consensus on which of these needs are the top priorities for UC Libraries to address
- Recommended next steps to make quick, concrete progress on the priority needs.

To ensure effective outcomes, all participants must share a vocabulary and understand the issues, so the meeting will begin with briefings and demonstrations. Attendees may also be asked to review material in advance and have some preparatory discussions on each campus.

ACTION: Tanno will inform the ULs of the proposed planning meeting. If ULs have no objections, SOPAG will appoint a program committee by Jan 30, made up of Wittenbach (convener), Tanji, and representatives from UCLA, UCSD, and CDL (representatives to be determined by Jan 27). The program committee will provide an update before SOPAG's Feb 27th conference call. The planning meeting will be held at UC Irvine on March 11-12 and SOPAG will review the recommendations at the March 19 meeting and propose next steps to the ULs.

2. Task Force on Visual Resources Report.

SOPAG requested and received input on the report that must be summarized. Based on the feedback, a key question is the priority that should be given to this initiative.

ACTION: Ober, Tanno, and Laine Farley will synthesize the input and annotate it with what's been learned from the CDL Image Demonstrator Project, for discussion and decision about next steps at the February SOPAG meeting.

3. UC Interlibrary Loan of Special Collections Materials.

The next steps outlined in Tanno's December 30 memo are in progress.

4. All Campus Groups Updates

4.1 CDC (Mirsky)

Goals for the next year are posted on the CDC Web site.

4.2 HOPS (Moody)

As requested, HOPS has sent recommendations on the SCAP database decommissioning process. HOPS recommended keeping Current Contents live until the subscription runs out at the end of the year.

ACTION: CDL will post information about the three cancelled databases, including an FAQ and charts about where the equivalent coverage will be available.

4.3 HOTS (Miller)

As requested, HOTS has revised their goals and are working on the list of acquisitions issues and how to address them.

4.4 LPL (Kochi)

The new Web site has been updated based on UL comments and adapted to the look and feel of the UC web site and so is ready to go live.

ACTION: Ober will launch the Web site. Kochi will ask the LPL about promotion/communication plans for library staff and end users.

4.5 LTAG (Ryan)

As requested, LTAG has revised their goals and will send the final version of their Privacy Report to LPL. LTAG will work on a registry of UC Library developed software and on further exploration of Web conferencing technology after receipt of Ober's draft of SOPAG's needs. LTAG has recommended that SOPAG also consider experimenting with collaboration software as another possible technology tool to improve productivity of systemwide groups.

ACTION: SOPAG members will tell Ryan what operating system and what wordprocessing and spreadsheet software exists on their desktops so she can assess whether SharePoint is viable as a collaborative software pilot for SOPAG. Tanno will tell Terry Toy that the requested survey of CMS systems used to manage digital visual resources can be lower priority, pending the SOPAG review of the comments on the Visual Resources Task Force report.

4.6 RSC (Dearie)

RSC recommended to SOPAG that CDL Request no longer block requests on materials for which an electronic version is available, since there is no way to detect how complete the electronic version is and so many valid requests are blocked.

ACTION: HOPS has been asked to comment on the proposal. If there are no objections from HOPS, Tanno will give official approval to CDL that the block can be removed. Report on Advanced delivery systems due on Feb 14, should be able

to make that date as long as the charge is not expanded again to include additional formats.

5. Report on CDL Related Items (Ober)

5.1 Co-branding Shared Collection Resources.

CDL has collected information via the Resource Liaisons and the Users Council on the licensed resources which allow branding and on the preferences for wording on such branding. Based on the input, the proposed wording for branding would be “Access paid by [campus library name]” when the vendor supports branding at the individual campus level and “Access paid by the University of California Libraries” when the vendor supports branding at the systemwide level only. SOPAG agreed that CDL should pursue branding and endorsed the proposed wording.

ACTION: Tanno will notify CDL that SOPAG has reviewed and endorsed the proposals for co-branding.

5.2 CBS/Request/Desktop Delivery.

UCD Law will be joining the Request system. For getting reports from VDX, CDL will initially offer canned reports and will hire someone to create a query engine so staff can ask for reports dynamically. Campuses can also use Crystal Reports to run reports directly.

ACTION: Ober will ask that Heath include in a future message to PIROPS and VDX listservs information on what kind of reports are possible with Crystal Reports. As part of the central purchase, a copy of Crystal Reports was bought for each campus. Heath will also be asked to clarify whether upgrades are covered in the VDX license, if any.

5.3 Melvyl update.

Planning is proceeding for the upgrade to version 16.2 in Fall 2004, which will solve some outstanding interface issues.

5.4 CDL Updates.

CDL Updates are being planned for sometime in the Spring, probably mid-May. At the February SOPAG meeting, Ober will share a tentative agenda for comment and advice.

5.5 Link Resolvers.

CDL currently runs a number of link-resolver services such as SFX, PID, and the like. A description of the challenges CDL faces in running multiple services and

some possible solutions has been shared informally with LTAG and SCP, and will soon be shared with HOTS. The document will be amended as needed based on these informal discussions and brought to SOPAG at the February meeting for advice on next steps.

6. Systemwide Library Planning (Ober)

6.1 UC Libraries Website [<http://libraries.universityofcalifornia.edu/>]
The new Web site seems to be working well.

6.2 UC Libraries Master Planning Project List.

Gary Lawrence is ready to incorporate SOPAG updates. Kochi sent the latest draft to SOPAG.

ACTION: SOPAG members will send Kochi any comments by Jan 28. Kochi will incorporate SOPAG comments and send to Gary Lawrence and copy Tanno. When the final version is posted, Tanno will request an update to the projects link on the SOPAG Web site.

6.3 Strategic Directions Document.

The ULs plan to finalize this document at their meeting in February, for submission to SLASIAC in Feb. Once accepted by SLASIAC, the document will be posted widely.

6.4 Scholarly communication planning

Scholarly communication is a strategic priority for the ULs and for the faculty. A new Faculty Senate committee on scholarly communication is being appointed. The topic is also on the ULs agenda in February.

7. e-Dissertations

The UCSF Library is partnering with the UCSF Graduate Division on a pilot program to receive electronic dissertations and hosted by the CDL eScholarship Repository. Several other campuses are still considering making such a switch. CDL is willing to work with any library which wants to do a similar pilot in conjunction with their campus graduate division. SOPAG was charged by the ULs to mount an exploration into the pros and cons of collaboration on the deposit of electronic dissertations/ theses into a preservation and/or access repository. The results of the UCSF pilot will inform that exploration. Upcoming UL discussions on digital preservation priorities will also inform the SOPAG analysis. For example, if the priority for digital preservation is given to materials at the most risk, one could argue that dissertations are at less risk than digital content produced by publishers with a worse track record for preservation than ProQuest/UMI. On the

other hand, if the priority for digital preservation is given to UC research output, dissertations would rank higher.

8. SOPAG agreed that the February 27 SOPAG meeting would be a conference call, with the March 19 meeting tentatively planned to be in Oakland.