

# 2011-02-16 SOPAG Minutes

## UC Systemwide Operations and Planning Group (SOPAG)

### Meeting NotesOakland

Wednesday, February 16, 2011

9:30am-5:00pm

LOCATION: CDL Offices, Oakland

**Present:** Diane Bisom (UCR, chair), Elizabeth Cowell (UCSC), Luc Declerck (UCSD), Lucia Snowhill (UCSB), Bob Heyer-Gray (LAUC), Bernie Hurley (UCB), Susan Parker (UCLA), Gail Persily (UCSF)

**Absent:** Donald Barclay (UCM), Lorelei Tanji (UCI)

**Guest:** Perry Willet

**Recorder:** Lucia Snowhill

### 1. Agenda Review

Added agenda item (Luc): UC Educational Technology Leadership Committee (ETLG)'s subcommittee on instructional technology is currently looking at copyright issues related to CMS and digital content and developing a report on copyright issues and recommendations, as well as creating training materials for students/faculty/staff about the lawful use of copyright, fair use. Library expertise may be of some assistance, but has not been requested.

**Action:** SOPAG members will do information gathering at campuses by contact their ETLG; SOPAG will discuss again with more campus information. Luc will send the link to the committee website and draft report.

### 2. DLSTF2 Report -- Guest: Perry Willet (CDL, DLSTF2 Chair)

With the addition of the NGTS new modes recommendations as charges for DLSTF2, the already extensive charge has become unmanageable. The task force is requesting direction and priorities from SOPAG for addressing their charge, given the range of directions that they could take and the work of some ACGs. In discussion, SOPAG concluded that the charge needs to be narrowed and refocused to concentrate primarily on

- Three NGTS New Modes tasks

-Systematically and efficiently digitize high-use, high-priority collections for access to UC primary resources

-Implement a coordinated, systemwide solution for creating and managing digital objects

-Using UC3 micro-services as the foundation develop and implement infrastructure to manage the unique digital assets created or purchased by the UC system.

- Recommend options for an organizational infrastructure to support the UC Digital Collection and other collaborative digital initiatives.
- Recommend the technical infrastructure needed to support the UC Digital Collection.
- Consult and communicate regularly with the relevant ACGs, NGM, NGTS, and others as needed.

Other elements of the charge will be reassigned or held for later consideration.

**Action:** SOPAG will ask CDC to identify a pilot within parameters to give DLSTF2 a sample project to define workflows and requirements.

**Action:** Diane will share the DLSTF2 December 7th report with CDC to help them identify an appropriate pilot.

### 3. NGTS Next Steps and development of plan

SOPAG had lengthy discussion of what to consider in implementing the CoUL's priority recommendations for NGTS and what role of SOPAG should take in the implementation. Primary roles for SOPAG are seen as:

--communicating/coordinating implementation

SOPAG needs to communicate consistent message: cost savings, efficiency, be transformative.

--recommending funding models to support new models

Considerable discussion on the roles/resources needed, including personnel. Need incentives

-evaluating when have reached good enough goals on the various recommendations.

**Organizing to move forward on NGTS:** It was agreed that overall coordination needs to lie within SOPAG. It was determined that there needs to be an executive team (SOPAG chair, project manager, Martha Hruska, communications coordinator) that will manage charges, communication, timeline, project management, and assessment. Including a project manager on the executive team is seen as essential. There will need to be consistent messaging about the goals of cost savings, efficiency and incentives of opportunities gained through money saved and the need for action and quick wins. In addition, 3-member "strike" teams will be assigned to each NGTS recommendation. All SOPAG members will be directly involved as heading one of the 3-member teams, which will also include a member of any appropriate ACG(s) or others, depending on the expertise needed. Where possible, the strike team membership will leverage geography, size, expertise, authority within each group, with consideration for CDL membership as well.

There was considerable discussion about roles/resources needed for each recommendation, including personnel. It was agreed that we should to start with projects that show funding goes further with system-wide projects. It was also agreed that there needs to be campus and systemwide commitment to funding upfront and various models for funding projects to transition us to a this kind of funding becoming business as usual.

Each NGTS top/medium priority was given a preliminary assignment to a group or combo of systemwide groups. The assignments and timeframes will be further refined by SOPAG.

F4a/F5 CDL acquisitions

E5 tech services

E8 SCP

E12/E7 cdc/hots

Nm1/nm2 cdc/hosc

Nm3/nm4/nm5 dlstf2/cdl/ltag

F1/f2 sopag

E2/E3 sopag

E4 CDC

**Action:** SOPAG will discuss proposed implementation structure with CoUL and continue to develop teams and select SOPAG members as members of teams\*.\*

## 5. Draft Charge for SOPAG Review of CoUL Advisory Structure

The CoUL draft charge to SOPAG was reviewed. Began to discuss what criteria and authority to act is needed in the ACGs, and what characteristics and roles are appropriate for other all campus interest and information groups and task forces are needed long-term. Some groups will appropriately be all-campus groups, but others may work better as smaller, more focused functional groups. Major initiatives going forward will factor heavily in determining the advisory structure. All agreed that CDC, HOTS, HOPS have ongoing roles as ACGs. The appropriate place in the structure for IT/LTAG expertise was not as easy to define, as there is a need for IT embedding that perspective in many/most groups. The appropriate role for RSC functions and CIGS was also discussed, with the general agreement that some adjustments for greater effectiveness should be considered. It was decided that there would be room for multiple systemwide special interest/information sharing groups that provide a network for similar functions across campuses. As SOPAG develops and refines an advisory structure recommendation, the role of CDL and how to incorporate it into the overall structure will need to be determined. It will be important to continue to have CDL integration in the structure.

**Action:** Put the SOPAG response to the September UL draft structure on wiki for us to refer to. Some charges have initial thinking in that document.

**Action:** SOPAG will develop a boilerplate for ACG charges by May 1<sup>st</sup>, and will finalize charges once an advisory structure is approved by CoUL.

**Action:** SOPAG will continue to develop and refine recommended structure and criteria for creation of the various types of advisory groups included.

## 4. Project Mgt. TF charge

The Project Management Task Force charge has been revised as a smaller group, no longer an all campus group, in order to better focus on NGTS implementation needs, rather than be created with a broader educational role. Once the change is agreed on by CoUL, SOPAG will work on identifying membership.

**ACTION:** SOPAG will get direction/confirmation from CoUL that the new direction is ok.

## **5. Discovery/Access White Paper discussion of 2/14/11 draft**

SOPAG discussed the latest subgroup draft of a discovery/access white paper draft focusing on establishing principle and criteria for access and discovery systems for UC. The document acts as a framing document, and sets out to develop principles and requirements for discovery/access systems to help determine when, and whether or not, to invest in new systems and when to rely on network level systems. A framing principle will be to the formation of aggregations and exposure of content, not building new services, but making our content exposed in network level systems that already exist and are widely used (e.g. Google, Worldcat local). Critical needs for building any custom access/discovery systems need to be identified before undertaking. There does not need to be an aggregation strategy embedded in each specific service.

Discussion included: The need to synchronize criteria with a new technical requirements document from CDL is coming out soon. Consider need for branding and placing a value on our content and metadata. Need to ensure UC brand has integrity and ownership.

There was some discussion of whether or not some of the principles in the draft are actually values, criteria, or goals.

**Action:** Felicia will present overall direction and concepts at the joint SOPAG/ CoUL tomorrow to make sure the general direction and strategy is agreed on. SOPAG will continue to develop the draft and a brief strategy.

## **6. CoUL Priorities Calendar**

SOPAG reviewed a draft annual calendar for review of the CoUL Priorities document. The purpose is to develop a regular review that works with the fiscal year. The proposed review cycle changes the calendar for ACG annual reports, moving reporting to spring. Need to time the reporting from the ACGs and keep lightweight. CoUL would review priorities annually in June for the following fiscal year, setting parameters for SOPAG's development and review of ACG advisory structure priorities.

Questions that arose in discussing the proposed calendar: Should we change reporting requirements? What's required/how will they be used? Do we need semi-annual progress reports? Should we move the SOPAG/ACG meeting to spring or leave it in the fall? What is needed in ACG reports---should they be simple strategic activity reports?

**Action:** SOPAG will discuss the calendar at the CoUL meeting tomorrow.

Meeting adjourned: 5:00pm

Next meeting: March 4<sup>th</sup>, conference call 1:00-3:00pm