

Systemwide Operations and Planning Advisory Group (SOPAG)

University Librarians and SOPAG
Santa Cruz, CA
May 23, 2003

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

ULs attending: Karen Butter (SF)/recorder, Lan Dyson (SC), Dan Greenstein (SLP/CDL), Ruth Jackson (R), Tom Leonard (B), Bruce Miller (M), Gerry Munoff (I), Sara Pritchard (SB), Brian Schottlaender (SD).

SOPAG members: Tammy Dearie (SD/LAUC), Bernie Hurley (B), Julia Kochi (SF), Kate McGirr (SF), Phyllis Mirsky (SD), Terry Ryan (LA), Lorelei Tanji (I), John Tanno (D), Stefanie Wittenbach (R)/recorder.

Absent: Janice Koyama, UCLA, Marilyn Sharrow, UCD, Marilyn Moody, UCSB, John Ober, CDL

1. Collection Management Initiative:

Brian presented preliminary results of the CMI study. The final report will soon go to Mellon. Campus data can be provided by Brian for local use. Project staff has been approached by CLIR, C&RL, and CRL (Portal) to publish a full report on the project. A publicly available website will have the data. It was suggested that we try and get an article published in the Chronicle of Higher Ed. A wide announcement will be made to the UC community in the fall.

ACTION: Brian will e-mail the CMI PowerPoint to ULs and SOPAG. Brian will prepare a communication plan for announcing results, which will include press release(s), general information, and a public website.

2. Collection management and coordination strategy white papers:

The group discussed the process for distributing and reviewing the two White Papers developed by the ULs. One paper presents the overall framework for collection management coordination and the other describes the shared print concept. Final drafts of the papers will be distributed by SOPAG to the ACGs, LAUC and the campuses, asking for input. SOPAG will synthesize responses and report back to the ULs by September.

Important concepts related to the issues of counting, ownership, and access will be put together in a third paper that Brian and Tom are developing. The term "ownership" turned out to be a surrogate for governance, so it will be replaced with the term governance. The two white papers will be ready for distribution very quickly.

Also discussed were two other documents, a SLASIAC planning strategy paper, to be used in budgeting discussions, and a paper by Dan on the layered services model for shared services.

ACTION: Brian and Tom will create a third paper on the issues of counting, ownership and governance, and access for discussion amongst the ULs. Bernie will work with Brian and Tom on SOPAG's questions to make sure they are in concert with the three papers. The two papers and the questions will go out as a package for discussion by ACGs, LAUC, and on the campuses.

3. Objectives and planning considerations for workshops:

Because the Resource Sharing Budget has been reduced significantly, funding available for workshops has also decreased. The ULs do want to continue to fund workshops at some level that isn't clear yet. SOPAG will have to plan very carefully for priorities in workshops in order to ensure that they further strategic directions such as shared collections and collaboration. Workshops should be part of programmatic agendas and goals and assist in effecting change. The UL/SOPAG joint projects list can be used to determine appropriate workshops. One possible workshop would be on government information with outside speakers, etc. Another possibility is a workshop on privacy issues, but what priority would it

be? SOPAG could commission workshops on topics being discussed currently in programmatic planning. ULs can also feed workshop topics to SOPAG as their systemwide discussions are ongoing.

4. Provision for items from ULs' meeting:

Graduate Deans have received an offer to load dissertations into Proquest's Digital Dissertations. The Deans need to be apprised of the need to negotiate non-exclusive rights with Proquest in order to retain the local and systemwide capability to redistribute dissertations, including the right to load them into the CDL eScholarship repository. UCSF developed a one-page document for presentation to its Graduate Dean that will be distributed to the other campuses.

Resource Sharing Program: ULs decided that membership in CRL should no longer be funded centrally from the Resource Sharing budget. Costs for CRL membership will devolve go to the campuses FY04/'05, which can decide whether or not to continue membership. CRL has decided that a consortial discount will no longer be available beginning in 2006/07.

CDL had preliminary discussions with JSTOR about the possibility of working with UC to create a dark archive of JSTOR print titles.

The ULs have put together a list of information about issues to be used in discussions with faculty about library planning.

Gary Lawrence is working on a merged list of projects of the ULs and SOPAG that will be available on the UC libraries web page in July or August.

ACTION: The ULs asked SOPAG to take the document regarding the problem with Melvyl-T uniform titles and handle it. CDC is asked to respond to the ULs through SOPAG regarding consortial reasons/benefit to maintaining CRL membership on all campuses. CDC is asked to conduct a full review of A&I databases funded through the Resource Sharing funds for both programmatic reasons (importance, overlap, duplication) and with an eye toward cost savings. SOPAG is asked to look at the Shared Cataloging Project to see if there might be more cost effective ways to process the distributed records on campuses. Once received from the ULs, SOPAG will review the document on discussion items for talking with faculty. Dan will distribute his paper on shared services to SOPAG members.

5. SOPAG items:

5a. Shared print archive planning (CDC task force report):

SOPAG endorses the concept of doing this pilot. CDC will make a few revisions to the document. CDC will serve as the oversight committee for the pilot project to evaluate the outcome and economic issues and impact and report back to SOPAG.

ACTION: CDL will investigate getting more print copies from the vendors. The minimum number of copies to retain will be determined through the pilot project. Campuses can monitor the pilot project report and provide input to SOPAG (John T.). In addition, an evaluation process, managed by CDC, will provide other opportunities for feedback.

5b. Government Information Task Force:

The group discussed the report and the next steps for it.

ACTION: SOPAG will send the report to the ACGs and LAUC for review and comment. SOPAG will ask the Task Force to draft a charge for the Implementation Steering Committee and identify priorities for moving forward as expeditiously as possible.

5c. Task Force on Visual Resources:

The group discussed the report. It was agreed that further input on this report will need to have a lower priority than the white papers and associated work currently being done.

ACTION: John Ober has solicited input from the Task Force on specific SOPAG questions. He will distribute answers to the questions to SOPAG.

5d. Proposed HOPS CIG on Web services:

Discussion took place concerning the need for this CIG. While the ULs endorsed the creation of the CIG, they would like to see the name changed to Web-based Services since Web Services has a very specific technical meaning. It was agreed to ask the CIG to develop an agenda and give more specific examples of what this CIG will address.

ACTION: Tanno will let HOPS know that the CIG has been approved.

5e. Travel funding and meeting planning for groups reporting to SOPAG:

There was general discussion about the availability of alternatives to in-person meetings for SOPAG and ACGs.

ACTION: SOPAG has tasked LTAG to investigate teleconferencing software and other alternatives to in-person meetings.

5f. VDX implementation:

The RSC would like to recognize ILL staff for their efforts during the difficult transition to VDX and remind everyone that OCLC cost savings won't be realized until all campuses have fully implemented the software. All campuses are encouraged to begin the testing.