

Systemwide Operations and Planning Advisory Group (SOPAG)

University Librarians Minutes of the Meeting April 28, 2000

Present: Lowell, Sharrow (co-recorder), Heath (co-recorder), Pritchard, Butter, Dyson, Werner, Bunting, Tanno, Johns, Schottlander, Mirsky, Lucier, Millsap, French, Kennedy, Hurley, Thompson, Munoff, Diana Paque (guest, Library of California), Laine Farley (guest, CDL)

1. General review

- a. ULs/SOPAG advisory structure – preliminary discussion on how well this structure is working; Kennedy will gather comments from LAUC assembly; agreement that structure is working well and should be continued; because this is not a formal structure of the University, details (i.e., org chart) are not made public on Systemwide Library Planning web site, and many campuses have provided more information on their local staff web sites; Kennedy will work on adding to LAUC web site.
- b. Human resources – more coordination between campus HR people and systemwide HR people to keep the systemwide web site current would be useful.
- c. UL meeting schedule for 2000-2001 – 8 meetings in past year, half video conferences, 3 in-person joint meetings, and one in-person alone; there will be a series of collection management meetings in the coming year requiring UL attendance which might require additional meetings; suggest scheduling 4 day-and-a-half meetings (2 with SOPAG) and a total of 10 of all types for the year.
- d. ARL statistics – Schottlander assembled a 5-year snapshot of statistics, and is concerned that much of our current efforts (e.g., collaboratively acquired digital collections) may not be reflected by these statistics; also, trends are uneven.

2. **Library of California** – Exec. Director Paque spoke to group: Library of CA established JAN 1999; funding of past 2 years for planning only; currently have 7 networks in development; another emphasis has been on building statewide infrastructure; a budget change request for 9.5 million has been submitted; additional priorities are for development of seed resource libraries; a primary issue is development of criteria and functions for regional resource libraries; they are hiring a library program consultant; original planning document was written in 1994 and omits issues and possibilities that have since surfaced. A Library Program Consultant will be working with resource libraries half-time; participation as such does not require that non-public libraries participate in all programs (e.g., a resource library could choose not to participate in ILL); they do plan to deal with the ILL compensation issues; participants in ILL program who receive State funding cannot charge people in their region. It may no longer make

sense to structure activities on a regional basis – for many things a statewide basis makes more sense. It might also make more sense to base the selection of resource libraries on services rather than on collection size. One project in planning is a statewide web based reference service. All of this has not been formally stated, and Paque will provide this group with a formal statement of current issues/plans to assist libraries in planning and decision making processes. Board membership is mandated by the Library of California act to include 2 academic library members; CLSA system has a different set of regions which is causing problems with the transition. Other states have similar programs, and Paque is examining their plans and structures. There will be planning and project funding in the coming year for which resource libraries can apply. Paque will investigate inviting UC participants in the coming workshop. Board appointments are made by the Governor. If we want to forward names for Board membership, Lucier suggests a letter be sent to SVP King with recommendations for forwarding to Arditti. Sarah Pritchard and Janice Koyama were mentioned as possibilities.

3. Systemwide library planning issues

a. Resource sharing

- i. Request – Butter reviewed the Needs Assessment and Phase II/III summary report. The Needs Assessment shows a clear need for further development to streamline local ILL processes. The development of 2 critical national standards has made it feasible for the project to move forward with trying to acquire a consortial borrowing system (CBS) which will also provide users with status-checking and notification capabilities. The Summary details issues and decisions that need to be made, but it is premature to ask this group for recommendations before a CBS system has been selected. The PIR Team is meeting next week with 5 vendors to review the CBS products now available. PIR Team has recommended a centralized system, but outcome will depend on the product acquired. This group confirms that CBS software is a high priority for this project, but implementation of a centralized system should not cause any campus to lose efficiencies that they now have in place. Butter thanked campus ILL staff for their participation. One important issue for phase III will be access for undergraduates; a report from Gail Nichols for RSC details current practices and statistics relating to this issue. The general consensus is to open the service to undergraduates; the Team and RSC will need to discuss whether this could be done by Fall quarter; it is strongly recommended that real-time patron authorization be in place by the time undergraduate access is implemented. Butter reviewed the statistics, and it was observed that it would be helpful to see how the Request statistics compare with the non-Request transactions; Tammy Dearie is gathering this data. Data for the first quarter of article request will be distributed within a month. Butter, the PIR Team, and campus ILL staff were commended for their work.

- ii. Desktop delivery – Bunting explained the history of the proposal, and that current projects at UCSD, UCB, and SRLF could be viewed as a limited pilot. The scanners included in the proposal will require space, but the preservation features provide a side benefit to using them. Though a centralized server is proposed, it need not be completely centralized. (UCB noted that they need 3 scanners.) One question is whether DMCA requires removal of the electronic copy after scanning, but maintenance of scanned copies of documents could be an additional workload. Implementation requires establishing a project team, and, if this project is a priority, this could be started now. However, at this time, the amount of resource sharing funding that will be available next year is unknown, and it is possible that the money might not be available from that source. Because this function is a part of some commercial ILL (CBS) systems, it is important that it be considered as in relation to the CBS software. SOPAG will recommend a project team leader. Lucier requests this project use the same model as the Request project. He will assemble a project team after receiving recommendations from SOPAG.
 - iii. Netlender reimbursement model – was developed to assist libraries who are overwhelmed with requests from Request. Bunting pointed out that borrowing is, overall, lower than for the base year, and that the load balancing seems to be changing the distribution of lending. There was agreement that, at this point in time, the data indicates a wait-and-see posture. The issue will be tabled and lending statistics monitored on a regular basis.
 - b. **Mellon Foundation proposal** – Lucier is very hopeful for the proposal funding. He recommends the project manager be an AUL-level person who could begin by summer. There was wide interest in participation. If the Mellon funding is not available, there was agreement that the project should still be made a priority. Mirsky emphasized that the report from the Task Force on Collaborative Strategies for Archiving of Print in the Digital Environment was accepted but not endorsed by SOPAG and should be regarded as a working report.
4. **SOPAG issues** – Digital Preservation Task Force proposal – Hurley introduced the 2 phases of the proposal by describing the urgent need for archiving procedures and the issues relating to the development of such procedures. The Technical Architecture and Standards Working Group has a critical relation to the proposed task force and the proposed membership does include 3 people from TASWG. A period of 3-4 months is envisioned for phase I. There was agreement to ask SOPAG to implement the proposal, and the membership proposed was approved. Mirsky reported that the Preservation group will be using this year to develop a budget proposal for the next budget cycle.
5. **CDL items**

- a. CDL-hosted databases RFP – Farley recapped the RFP development process to date. Part of the process was a survey that received more than 3500 responses. The final draft is now out for comment, and will soon be delivered to Lucier, who plans to issue it in June or July.
 - b. Government Information Initiative – a project team will begin working in June with a goal of beginning the actual implementation of a prototype in 2001. The project is now called California Counts, and is being supported with CSL funding. Additional funding may be sought from LSTA.
 - c. Online Archive of California – Robin Chandler has been appointed OAC Manager, and will be working on implementing phase IV goals, including coordinating the definition of a collecting policy for newly received funding.
6. **General items**
- a. UC Merced focus groups – there was general discussion of the issues that need to be raised in the focus groups, and what the focus groups might want to achieve.

[Go to SOPAG home page](#)