

2011-02-04 SOPAG Minutes

UC Systemwide Operations and Planning Group (SOPAG)
Friday, February 04, 2011, 9:00am – 11:00am (conference call)
Meeting Notes

Present: Diane Bisom, Chair (UCR), Bernie Hurley (UCB), Gail Yokote (UCD), Susan Parker (UCLA), Donald Barclay (UCM), Lorelei Tanji (UCI), Lucia Snowhill (UCSB), Gail Persily (UCSF), Elizabeth Cowell (UCSC), Felicia Poe (CDL), Bob Heyer-Gray (LAUC)

Absent: Luc Declerck (UCSD)

Guest: Martha Hruska (UCSD) NGTS Steering Team (9:00am – 10:00am)

Note taker: Felicia Poe (CDL)

I. SOPAG meeting schedule revised

SOPAG will transition from a once-monthly 3-hour meeting schedule to a twice-monthly 2-hour meeting schedule beginning March 2011. Generally, meetings take place on Fridays 1:00 pm - 3:00 pm. Revised schedule begins Friday, March 04, 2011, 1:00 pm - 3:00 pm.

II. NGTS: Next steps and development plan

A. Background: “CoUL has asked SOPAG, working in consultation with NGTS, to develop a plan for implementing the prioritized recommendations above, including coordinating campus discussions, identifying or constituting appropriate groups to pursue specific recommendations, and integrating their pursuit into other systemwide processes and initiatives.” 12/14/10 memo from the Council of University Librarians to the UC Libraries Staff

B. Support document: “[Ranking by Timeframe to Implement](#)” (submitted to SOPAG by Martha Hruska)

C. NGTS2 Recommendations referred to below:

F2 Stable funding for positions doing systemwide work.

E6 Implement a ‘good enough’ record standard for all of UC.

NM1 Implement MPLP principles for processing archival and manuscript collections.

NM2 Streamlined processing with systemwide adoption of Archivists Toolkit.

D. Discussion:

- Strategy: Build trust and confidence through quick action and early successes, e.g. “Implement HOTS systemwide shelf-ready recommendations.” (Recommendation E5)
- Need to define framework/structure within which resources can be redirected to accomplish change and efficiencies; define when resource savings should be moved into additional systemwide activities and when they can be moved into the campus environment.
- Need to articulate systemwide funding models: Mechanisms must be developed by SOPAG and CoUL. Determine how are savings calculated? Do savings stay local? Are they funneled into systemwide activities? (Recommendation F2)
- Need to articulate systemwide commitment: “We’re going to fund and commit to these systemwide activities; in-kind contributions are not a workable approach.” One example of how this might be modeled is the systemwide CJK cataloger. (Recommendation F2)
- Justification: Shrinking resource environment requires UCL proactively shift the type of support given to collections; requires a change in current practices. Transition beneficial.
- Recommendation E6 is priority: “Implement a ‘good enough’ record standard for all of UC”. Essential discussion that should take place quickly. Define “good enough”.
- Recommendations E6, NM1, NM2 are priority because quick implementation should allow UCL to increase overall production and streamline processing. Resource savings can support other activities, particularly in the New Modes arena.
- Communication: Need for campus discussion as planning unfolds, e.g., Webinars, web site
- Project Management: SOPAG will continue discussion on how to identify and meet the significant project management needs connected to the NGTS implementation project.
- Consultation: SOPAG will continue discussion on how to draw upon the expertise of Martha Hruska and other NGTS members

E. Ways of grouping NGTS2 priority tasks (suggested by Martha Hruska):

Group 1: Systemwide technical services: efficiencies are necessary; include those operational activities that can be shifted from local to systemwide. Expertise may be *distributed* across campuses, but the activity can be designed to support systemwide efficiencies.

Group 2: Traditional technical services: local activities that require only limited collaboration.

Group 3: Technical services to support digitization projects, DLSTF2, and new modes.

III. Project Management Implementation Task Force (PMITF)

Discussion regarding modifications to the draft charge, to be presented at the 02/17/11 SOPAG-CoUL meeting:

- PMITF membership need not include representatives of all ten campuses plus CDL; membership will include representatives of at least five campuses.
- PMITF members should possess mid- to high-level expertise in project management.
- PMITF members will be asked to advise SOPAG on identifying and meeting the significant project management needs connected to the NGTS implementation project.