

## SOPAG meeting February 23, 2007 Kaiser Building Room 712

Meeting began 09:30 concluded 14:30

Present: Bernie Hurley, UCB and Chair; Gail Yokote, UCD; Mary Linn Bergstrom, LAUC; Luc Declerck, UCSD; Bruce Miller, UCM; Julia Kochi, UCSF; Patricia Cruse, CDL; Lorelei Tanji, UCI; Patrick Dawson, UCSB; Terry Ryan, UCLA; Kate McGirr, UCSC; Diane Bisom, UCR; Guests: Catherine Candee, CDL; Patti Martin, CDL Notes taken by Dawson

**1. Agenda Review:** To accommodate Patti Martin and Catherine Candee, today's agenda will be taken out of order. Agreed to remove two completed items from agenda: 2.1.5 Binding Task Force; and 2.5.1 Web Conferencing Software

**2.6.1 VDX workshop** (discussion guided by Hurley's summation points *VDX workshop lessons learned for Verde*). Acknowledging that VDX was immature software, the scope of implementation was new to all. Failed to have coordinated pre-planning, communication processes and designated responsibility on the campus level. Lessons learned from this implementation process should be utilized for future project implementation such as Verde, the BSTF report recommendations, or for other in-house development efforts.

**Planning:** Need to plan at both the CDL and campus level, including workflow, assessment, training, communication and project management.

**Project Resources/Advocacy:** Cannot expect local implementation to rest upon operational staff. Projects need a strong administrative advocate who understand what local resources are needed. Local library administration needs to be aware of their individual cost, as CDL is only one part of the resource pie.

**Communication:** Needs to be dynamic, as planning and resource needs fluctuate, but also need to be predictable so staff know where to find information. CDL and campuses each need to develop a communication plan to keep all the stakeholders informed. Campus communication plan should follow the local communication culture.

**Training:** Need skill set for trainers, and training needs to reflect campus culture and workflow, and there needs to be an initial and ongoing training plan. Perhaps investigate a training plan across all campuses that are ongoing and dynamic. Training implies a need for documentation, which should be developed both by CDL and the campuses.

**Project Organization:** In addition to a central implementation team, each campus needs a local team that has responsibility for developing and executing plans for project management, communications, training and assessment. These "roles" need to be assigned to people on the local team and they need to be sure there is coordination between their local plans and central plans.

**Action:** Dedicate March 23<sup>rd</sup> face to face SOPAG meeting to address lessons learned from the VDX Workshop and possibly bring in a consultant for SOPAG to inform discussion on Project Management. Planning team for this meeting will be McGirr, Kochi and Cruse.

**Action:** Hurley will find a time for an additional SOPAG conference call to cover other issues SOPAG has pending.

**2.6.2 Extending the UC VDX Task:** When a project moves from implementation to production, there continues to be a need for project management. Should an ACG be the entity to monitor and evaluate/assess major changes to functionality in production? Should an ACG be charged with scanning the environment, and evaluating whether a better solution exists? Product maintenance/management is needed after implementation.

**Action:** SOPAG will extend the VDX Taskforce until SOPAG can review the structure of ACGs and Liaisons, with regards to their role in production system project management.

**3.2 ERMS Implementation Team:** Update will be done via e-mail from Cruse. Patti Martin will convey questions from SOPAG to Christensen on the ERMS implementation team. Campuses will need to assign persons on each campus to be responsible for ERMS implementation and prepare for coming implementation. Want to frame ERMS within lessons learned from VDX implementation.

**7. E-dissertations** Catherine Candee presented information on ETDs, background and current state. Provost Hume presented to the Graduate Division Deans a recommendation for electronic submission of ETDs. It is anticipated that the recommendation will be discussed and possibly ratified at the May COGD meeting. Workflow issues need be addressed, once this is endorsed. Question: Will campuses need to co-invest with CDL for storage?

**Action:** Until further notice, SOPAG member will be the point person for the library on e-dissertations.

**2.3.2 Engaging HOPS on Future Public Services:** SOPAG, HOPS and others (TBD) to brainstorm in a facilitated meeting to find the 2 to 3 most important issues that can be moved forward. From SOPAG, Bisom, Dawson and Miller will be on the preliminary planning committee

**Action: Hurley** will contact Carol Hughes (HOPS) to identify HOPS members for program committee. Program committee will draft a workshop program for SOPAG review.

**8. Proposed Workshop on Digital Library Development:** Digital Library Services Advisory Group (DLSAG (advisory to the CDL)) met at the CDL in early February. The

group discussed the outcome of campus visits and assessment activities conducted in spring 2006. The assessment activities surfaced the desire on campuses to find a way forward in Digital Library Development. Workshop would focus on developing a framework for responsibilities in stewardship for digital assets.

**Action:** Program committee of Declerck, Kochi, Hurley and Cruse will draft a workshop program for SOPAG review.

### **2.3.1 New HOPS Charge**

**Action:** Hurley will inform Carol Hughes that SOPAG endorses the new charge.

**4.2.3 BSTF Search Engine Possibilities Update:** This is the latter of two action areas defined by SOPAG in response to the BSTF report: possible catalog data partnership with OCLC and possible journal articles partnership with Google and Microsoft. Questions from Steve Toub – is this the information that SOPAG is looking for, and given that this is so loosely defined, is it time to revisit the charge?

**Action:** Send report to ULs with transmittal letter that there needs to be a conversation with Google at a higher level. Declerck will draft transmittal letter to ULs.

**Action:** Hurley will discuss with Robin Chandler Microsoft's request for input from UC Collection Development librarians on which content areas are highest priority for Microsoft Academic.

### **2.4.1 Investigation of OCLC as a Single Union Catalog Data Ingest Stream**

**Action:** Declerck and Ryan will draft follow-up charge to HOTS and CAMSIG based upon their previous report to SOPAG on OCLC as a single source catalog.

**3.1 Bibliographic Services Task Force:** ULs will appoint a group to go to the next steps in talks with OCLC.

**2.1.4 UCAC Workshop:** There were good outcomes and action items in hand from the workshop. CDC should review any project plan to come from the UCAC group.

**Action:** Tanji will write and thank for the group for the good work and say CDC are waiting for a project plan.

**4.2.1 NDIIPP Funding:** The Library of Congress' remaining NDIIPP funds (\$47 million) were rescinded as part of the Fiscal Year 2007 Continuing Appropriations Resolution (HJ Res 20). These funds were for future projects (2007-2010) and will not impact CDL's current NDIIPP funding and operational services such as the DPR. Current funding supports the development of a Web Archiving Service. The California Digital Library intends to have a production ready web archiving service in December 2007.