

Systemwide Operations and Planning Group (SOPAG)

SOPAG Action Minutes – September 12, 2003

9:30-2:30

Location: Kaiser Building, Room 712 (UCOP, Oakland)

See also <http://libraries.universityofcalifornia.edu/sopag/>

Present: Tammy Dearie (SD/LAUC)/ recorder, Bernie Hurley (B), Julia Kochi (SF), Kate McGirr (SF), Bruce Miller, (M), Phyllis Mirsky (SD), Marilyn Moody, (SB), John Ober (CDL), Terry Ryan (LA), Lorelei Tanji (I), John Tanno (D)/chair, Stefanie Wittenbach (R)

1. Review Process for the CMPG White Papers:

The group praised John T. for his skillful rendering of comments into the document. John O. suggested we should include formal recommendations for next steps. Suggestions for additions;

- Updating areas to strengthen report.
- Bring the report up to date with current examples.
- SOPAG suggested adding their recommendations to coalesce the reports into one document.
- The third report mentioned in the white papers needs to be more clearly identified.
- The governance issue is very important and needs to be addressed.
- Before distribution, the governance and ownership issues need to be addressed in these papers or dealt with in a separate paper. A standalone document that includes all issues would be best.

Three action recommendations:

1. Combine papers.
2. Address governance (either separately in another paper or combined).
3. Bring report up to date with current status.

A question about the difference between reporting/synthesizing feedback and enumerating resulting SOPAG concerns was raised. Discussion centered on how the report and feedback to it implies a need to more intensely, and at a higher level, collaborate and coordinate more closely, or to make such collaboration and coordination a strategic priority. An implication of the document is to ratchet up the processes of collaboration and coordination; perhaps this needs to be explicit.

ACTION: Make suggested changes and distribute the documents to the University Librarians.

2. 2. Working Group on UC Shared Print Collection Pilot.

John Tanno reported on the conversation with the Chair of the ULs. There was concern expressed that the “hybrid” light/dim archive would put the print issues at risk. SOPAG recommends the hybrid light/dim archive approach as recommended by the Working Group be implemented.

ACTION: John T. will recommend to the ULs on behalf of SOPAG that the original hybrid light/dim approach be implemented for the pilot project.

3. Systemwide Library Planning

3.1. UC Libraries Website—Update

The Website will be released this month with a letter to Academic Council announcing the arrival of the web page and to the library community through the ULs, SOPAG, and CDLINFO (done on 9/23-25/03).

3.2. Update to UC Libraries Master Planning Project List—SOPAG’s Activities

Comments to add:

- CDC given two documents to flesh out in the matrix “behaviors of collections.”
- John Ober will draft a new section on “shared services.”
- Add the Privacy Liaison group to the Matrix .
- Add “Melvyl as pilot” to actions connected to privacy issues
- List will only include current projects or projects completed in the current fiscal year.

ACTION: Julia will revise the matrix based on input; Julia will apprise Gary Lawrence of the plan.

3.3. SOPAG Website, ACGs, and Webmasters

Concern about the ability to keep websites up-to-date. How do we continue to keep them update? It was suggested that ACG could provide an annual update be included along with goals. SOPAG confirmed that each ACG is responsible for maintaining their part of the website.

4. Government Information Task Force Report

Issues identified from the collective responses:

- Is this a pilot of a retrospective print shared collection?
- Should we be concerned with prospective digital collections?

SOPAG agreed to move forward on creating a Steering Committee with some revisions to the charge developed by the Task Force. SOPAG will continue to review the other Recommendations.

ACTION: John T. will incorporate suggested changes in the draft report to the ULs and transmit the revised report to the ULs along with the revised charge to the Steering Committee.

ACTION: John T. will ask original Task Force members for recommendations for appointees to Steering Committee.

4.1 Workshop

ULs had suggested that future workshops help inform the ULs’ agenda for future action, and the recommendations of the Government Information Task Force were mentioned as a possibility for such a workshop. One thought was that we may want to expand the concept to shared collection and collaboration. Something along the lines of

“Ratcheting up Collaboration” was a possible workshop concept. Discussion of future workshops will be kept on SOPAG’s agenda.

5. Report on CDL Related Items

- a. UC- eLinks: The shared infrastructure development for SFX has taken off and is moving fine. Phase 2 – adding A&I databases - is next. Julia noted that there seems to be an increase in confused patrons regarding UC- eLinks and asked if there is any usability testing planned, especially for UC- eLinks. Action: John O. will take the question back to CDL and report back.
- b. JSTOR – there are ongoing conversations with JSTOR about UC developing a repository for JSTOR titles. John O. will keep SOPAG informed.
- c. \$424K NSF/NSDL grant received to be used for exploring the integration of NSDL collections into library services. This joins a small suite of largely grant-funded explorations into federated searching and portals, including a partnership with the Digital Collections Research Project at Berkeley’s Center for Studies in Higher Education.

5.1 CBS/Request/Desktop Delivery--Update

- VDX testing with UCLA, UCSB and UCSD continues and UCLA and UCSB are ready to move forward.
- There are still problems with OCLC, although Version 2.4 of the software will solve most of them. Version 2.4 is due this month.
- Unanswered question: When will we move forward? Will all campuses come up at the same time?

ACTION: Tammy will ask RSC to bring forward a recommendation to SOPAG concerning the next steps for SOPAG to then take to the meeting in November.

5.2. Melvyl-T and Bibliographic services

The uniform title question response was shared with the group. In the larger context this issue brought up the need to identify priorities for enhancements to Melvyl and Melvyl’s role not only as a stand-alone service but as a core piece of technology connected to other services such as Request and UCeLinks (discussed in a paper title “Shared UC Bibliographic Services: Issues and Challenges). Regarding the uniform title question, the group discussed a draft summary title “The Uniform Title Question” and asked if CDL could change some wording to make it clear that the challenge is for discovering music and other materials, rather than one for specific libraries or librarians. Group recommended we develop principles for guiding the prioritization of development efforts identified or suggested for Melvyl and bibliographic/shared services.

ACTIONS: Ober will send revised analysis (“The Uniform Title Question”). Bernie volunteered to draft the statement of principles. He will send the draft to SOPAG for discussion at the next meeting. (note: a subsequent action was discussed and taken through email - the creation of a recommendation from SOPAG to CDL that work begin as soon as possible on the first two steps identified in “The Uniform Title Question” for further action.)

6. All Campus Groups—Update

6.1 HOTS Response to SOPAG’s questions regarding SCP Advisory Committee Draft Charge.

SOPAG agreed with CDC's rationale for having the Chair of the SCP Steering Committee serve as an ex officio member of HOTS and accepted the proposed charge and membership.

ACTION: John T. will ask HOTS to go forward with the appointment of the SCP Steering Committee as recommended.

6.2 LTAG (Terry)

LTAG had no updates to report since the chair (and probably many of the members) had been focused on patching and virus protection for the last month.

6.5. RSC (Tammy)

No update to report.

7. Task Force on Visual Resources—Next Steps

Revised version of the Task Force's report is now available on the Web.

ACTION: John O. will draft a set of questions to be sent out with the TF Report to facilitate its discussion and review by the ACGs and LAUC. The draft will be sent to SOPAG for discussion at the October meeting.

8. Theses, Dissertations, and ProQuest

ProQuest has started discussions with the Deans of Graduate Students about electronic submission of dissertations. The issue of campuses submitting dissertations electronically creates issues for the libraries. In this process, the libraries need to be involved in the discussion between the Dean of Graduate Students and ProQuest. We need to ensure that rights are not given away and we, the libraries, retain access rights to the digital archive of dissertations. It was noted that ProQuest uses Bepress, the same system we use for electronic publishing (eScholarship). Under the current CDL contract with Bepress for eScholarship we could create a preservation depository of UC dissertations.

ACTION: The purpose of the discussion was consciousness-raising. SOPAG members are encouraged to report back after meetings with the Graduate Student Deans concerning any developments. All Graduate Student Deans will be meeting at UCLA in November.

Next Meeting:

October 17, 2003 for a conference call 1:00-4:00 p.m.

Upcoming meeting schedule:

November 20 & 21 (at LAX?): Joint meeting with University Librarians

December 12 (in Oakland): In person meeting with All-Campus Group chairs.

[Go to SOPAG home page](#)