

Systemwide Operations and Planning Advisory Group (SOPAG)

University Librarians and SOPAG
Bancroft Library, UC Berkeley
December 13, 2002

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

ULs attending: Bunting (LA), Butter (SF), Tanno (D), Dyson (SC), Greenstein (SLP/CDL), Jackson (R), Leonard (B), Miller (M), Munoff (I), Pritchard (SB)/recorder, Schottlaender (SD).

SOPAG members: Dearie (SD/LAUC), Hurley (B), Kochi (SF), Mirsky (SD), Moody (SB), Ober (CDL), Tanji (I), Wittenbach (R).

ACTION MINUTES:

1) Outcomes from the ULs retreat:

a) Planning: A summary draft was distributed listing the major outcomes from the retreat including planning for some shared collection projects. ULs will attend the LAUC spring assembly to report on this document. ULs noted several new documents they are working on to help frame the issues and communicate strategies, including a matrix of all current UC shared library projects, and a concept paper on the structure of CDL as core support for shared campus services.

b) CMPG report: CMPG had a lengthy discussion of the issues surrounding shared collections planning.

ACTION: The CMPG Steering Committee will draft a report to contextualize the definition of shared collections, including a statement of intent, a description of benefits and barriers, and differentiations such as last copy versus copy of record. There will be a list of candidate collections and a chart of collection "behaviors" (e.g., access, circulation, preservation, cataloging, digitization, retention, for various shared collections). SOPAG will be asked to solicit comment on the draft from all-campus groups; ULs may also share with their local librarians and with campus faculty groups.

ACTION: Systemwide Library Planning will draft a shared collection matrix that includes content categories and possible behavioral characteristics; the CDC will then be asked to populate this matrix.

Other CMPG issues raised: the infrastructure needed to support a digitization environment different from what we have now; the monetary and staffing implications for RLFs and campuses to manage shared collections; incentivizing deposit; ownership/statistics issues, and the need to distinguish among owning, counting, and reporting items; the need to review the ILL code.

c) Shared services strategy: Dan discussed an emerging model, with local campus services built on core CDL and systemwide services. He outlined coordinated infrastructure issues that underlie shared services. Overall we should be looking at a layered model, not a series of parallel services. We need not only technical infrastructure, but a stronger framework for cooperating to deliver local services.

ACTION: SLP will write up a background document and model of this concept.

d) Scholarly Information Task Force: The draft SIP report is being revised to include a statement of vision for the UC libraries, project outcomes, library innovations, and other content. Ultimately the document is to support advocacy and budget defense at the systemwide level and should be able to serve as a core statement for the next several years. It will be reviewed next by SLASIAC at its spring meeting.

e) RLFs: The ULs have finalized a charge for a task force to analyze current and future strategies and policies of the RLFs; it will be distributed to SOPAG as soon as editing is finished. Karen Butter and Gerry Munoff will serve as co-chairs.

f) Digital preservation: Dan reported on the convergence of several initiatives -- the IMLS and Mellon grants, and other aspects of digital content preservation as highlighted in the DPAC report. The scope so far is limited to UC-created digital files, and then to some government information. However, review is needed for issues related to preserving digital content from third party commercial producers. A director for CDL digital preservation programs is about to be hired, who will have broad coordinative oversight. An advisory group will be set up for the program, to address policy, collection development, and other issues; this group could also study the third party content problems.

g) Governance and communication: ULs reviewed the SOPAG summary of current projects, and a library planning task list from Dan.

ACTION: SLP will merge these two charts and put a version on the web.

2. Additional business from the ULs:

a) Terry Ryan will be recommended as the SOPAG member from UCLA.

b) RSC will be asked to revise the UC ILL code on lending items needed for reserves; SOPAG will begin to draft a charge to look broadly at UC ILL policies as they relate to a more active shared environment.

3. SOPAG items:

a) General: John updated the group on the status of various SOPAG projects and the work of the all-campus groups. There are 4 new chairs of the all-campus groups. HOTS has raised the issue of how local campus decisions affect the cost and effectiveness of Melvyl record content and system transition; this will be brought back to the ULs by SOPAG once it is more clearly articulated. SOPAG will also consider the broader issue of when does "policy become policy," and how do we know when it needs to be enforced.

b) Access Integration: There was a long discussion on the access integration model. It is an elaborate model but also a good framework for looking at projects as "access systems." The model could eventually be used as a criterion to decide what we want to get out of other related projects we might undertake. Some campuses have commented on the draft AIM. The end user needs to be better reflected in the model and its assessment. We should bifurcate the discussion of "access integration" as a general concept that informs our planning, and of this specific model as just one way to look at it.

ACTION: SOPAG will continue to refine the model and the document, and to see what additional research and discussion may be needed. The first few pages should be extracted for possible use with end-user groups. The issue will be kept at the forefront of our planning.

[Go to SOPAG home page](#)