Systemwide Operations and Planning Group (SOPAG)

SOPAG Meeting, September 13, 2002, Action Minutes

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

Present: A. Bunting (UCLA), T. Dearie (LAUC, recorder), B. Hurley (UCB), J. Kochi (UCSF), K. McGirrr (UCSC), B. Miller (UCM), P. Mirsky (UCSD), M. Moody (UCSB), J. Ober (CDL), L. Tanji (UCI), J. Tanno (UCD, Chair), S. Wittenbach (UCR)
Guests: M. Heath

Dates for next meeting:
October 25 Phyllis Mirsky
November 15 cancel
November 20 2-4 conference call Stefanie Wittenbach
December 12/13 John Ober
January 17 Lorelei Tanji
February 21 Bernie Hurley
March 21 Julia Kochi
April 25 Marilyn Moody
May 22/23 Kate McGirr
June 27 Bruce Miller

1.0   Report on CDL-Related Items--(John Ober)

J. Ober provided background information on resource liaisons and noted that a call for additional liaisons has been sent out. The item "A&I transition" was removed from the previous draft agenda because is the transition is now complete, i.e. replacement databases are active in vendor interfaces; CDL-hosted versions will be available through December '02. Included in the packets for the UL conference call yesterday was a report on CDL and Systemwide Library Planning. The document included several initiatives that SOPAG may find of interest.

ACTION: John O. will distribute CDL planning document to SOPAG.

1.1. Melvyl Transition:

Melvyl Catalog Transition: Policy Issues:
Policy decisions document has been updated. Comments for changes were noted.

ACTION: J. Ober will send out background documents on an issue relating to configuration of the location limits in MELVYL-T.

Melvyl T Production is on schedule for the fall quarter. Indexing will take 2-3 weeks and performance testing is proceeding.

Non UC Serials Only Contributors and Melvyl Transition Policy Issue: SOPAG endorsed loading of monographic records for non-UC contributors at the last meeting. CDL is recommending that we not load the non-UC contributors' serial records due to cost, existence of

alternative access methods, possible user confusion, and minimal use. SOPAG members will take the recommendation back to their campuses for more discussion. J. Ober will further investigate the issues related to loading the non-UC Serials only records into Melvyl-T ,verify the timing issues, if the deadline is hard and fast, and report back ASAP.

1.2 UC eLinks Update: Following the August discussion about campus "instances" of the SFX data being hosted at CDL, J. Ober distributed a spreadsheet of costs for discussion. The spreadsheet shows the cost to license SFX individually by campus in comparison to the cost of a consortium license. Although labor costs for data maintenance were roughly estimated and added to the spreadsheet using JSC's proportional cost sharing model, they will depend upon the number of campus-licensed resources each campus maintains (i.e. a technical services cost) and the efficiency of mechanisms for maintaining data within the campus SFX instances (there is an administrative interface that is reportedly easy to use). Software maintenance and automatic updates to the SFX "knowledgebase" were proposed for campus co-investment, which would be a precedent in a UC co-investment model. J Ober will bring a revised spreadsheet to the next meeting for review. J. Ober will start the process to purchase the software with CDL covering the software licensing cost and server labor cost, while campuses supply their own data maintenance and share the cost of software and knowledge base maintenance cost. J. Ober will ask CDL to provide information on the administrative and technical services impact. Software maintenance and knowledge base maintenance cost will not be in effect until the second year (campus cost).

ACTION: J. Ober was asked to begin the process to purchase the software with CDL covering the software licensing fee and CDL labor cost, with consensus agreement that campuses pay for annual software and knowledge base maintenance cost.

1.3 Request/Desktop Delivery (Web Doc Deli) Update: Mary Heath joined the group at 10:00 for a Request update. Concerning desktop delivery, the Fretwell Downing (FD) and RLG technical issue has been resolved, but RLG is asking for a royalty payment for each Ariel application that is used.

Minolta and Ariel communication issues are still unresolved. Minolta has a new version that they think will fix the problem with sending multi-page documents. RLG has said they have done everything they can do. If the new version does not fix the problem, CDL will contact the president of RLG for resolution.

VDX Implementation – progressing toward a go-live date. ILL staffs are testing all features and want to have a robust system before they go live. FD has done some new programming for us to allow all ILL units to send to OCLC under one OCLC code.

Desktop delivery –a few campuses are still not doing desktop delivery. Main reason is the Minolta software is cumbersome. CDL is acquiring disk space on a server for storage of articles.

M. Heath reported that campuses are sending reports of incomplete citations from A&I databases. CDL is working quickly to resolve issues as they are identified. Some databases with older citations do not work well and blank forms will need to be used. Blank forms will be

implemented next week or links to campuses blank web forms. Action: Mary will work on implementation and communication plans for informing public service staff.

Request activity has increased. See attached files.

1.4 CBS—Update: All campuses have endorsed CBS principles. They will be added to the CDL web page.

1.5 CMI—Update: No update.

1.6 eScholarship update: eScholarship working papers repository officially opened and launched in May 2002. Between May and now (August 2002), 20 ORU's have participated by depositing papers, 500 papers have been deposited and 15,000 downloads of the papers have occurred. Communication between CDL eScholarship staff and campuses could have been better coordinated. Contact went out first to the faculty, then the library heard about it (sometimes from the faculty before CDL informed the campuses). John O. brought forward a proposal, including a charge, for a campus liaison to the eScholarship program.

ACTION: SOPAG endorsed the recommendation to expand communication methods from CDL eScholarship program and the campuses. Campuses should send J. Ober the name of the campus liaison.

1.7 Digital Preservation: The request to hire a digital preservation manager has been approved. Position description will be posted as soon as possible.

2.0 All Campus Groups
2.1 RSC (Tammy)--Circulation Advisory Group Blocking Proposal: Comments from UCI have been sent to RSC-CAG for consideration and discussion.

2.2 LPL (John T.)—Update: Library Privacy Liaisons waiting for LAUC representative before appointing the task force. Julia will be the SOPAG liaison.

2.3 HOTS (Bruce)

2.3.1 Brief Record Standard—Report from HOTS: The committee recommended that UC adopt the national standard, but compliance is not mandatory. Standard based on MARC 21 plus additional elements that assist with the Melvyl merge process.

ACTION: John T. will respond back to HOTS with the following questions: why are the additional elements "encouraged" to be included, but not required? Second, why are the standards are not mandatory?

2.3.2 Single or Multi Record Formats—Report from HOTS: The report was discussed with several issues for further discussion identified. SOPAG members will discuss the issues on their campuses.

ACTION: John T. will thank the committee for their work and ask them to further address this question: Whether or not they are following the single serials standard for non-SCP records? Or should the same process for SCP records be followed for non-SCP records?

2.3.3 In Process/On Order Records: HOTS responded that they continue to adhere to the standard/agreement to not send the records to Melvyl.

ACTION: SOPAG accepted and agreed that we continue to adhere to the standard/agreement.

3.0 Task Forces
3.1. Task Force on Government Documents—Appointment and Charge: First meeting on October 11, 2002.

ACTION: J. Tanno will ask Lisa to put the charge on SOPAG website.

3.2 Task Force on Digital Visual Resources Planning--- Update: Task force is drafting the survey portion of the charge and moving forward with work of the committee. Deadline has been extended to February 2003. J. Ober will be the liaison.

3.2.1 Liaisons from Non-Represented Campuses: All liaisons have been named.

4.0 Access Integration (Bernie)--Further Discussion and Next Steps
SOPAG discussed Alison's proposed process for discussing the model. Bernie will share the slide show he is developing for LITA preconference. Questions need to be developed to lead the discussion on campuses.

Possible questions that were considered:

Does this model make sense conceptually, within the framework that planning for a new model is important.

If it doesn't make sense, why not?

Will this help you with development of projects on your own campus?

How would this model help us with decision-making processes in the short term?

If we were to adopt this model, how would we implement? How would it impact campus plans?

The assumption of the model is that we can't build one model to hold everything. Conceptually, can you deconstruct the catalog to develop a number of different systems that are better than the catalog, but able to come together in a global access portal model that allows access to everything?

What comes next after we have the discussion? If we accept this model, what are the steps we need to take next? How do we communicate with our users? What are the questions we need to

ask? What would come next? What are the next steps from your point of view? What are the right material types and how does that influence the decision?

The concept of the "catalog" needs to be discussed. It is no longer a homogenous, monolithic catalog that holds all. You don't have one system that does everything for everyone? What are other options? Catalog may become "a catalog" rather than "the catalog." How do you aggregate the data up from the various catalogs?

Can we come up with a comprehensive format typology for UC? If we don't agree on material types how can we proceed?

Comment: It might be useful for SOPAG to discuss the types of formats that we would identify? It may help form the process in our minds before we move it public. Bernie has identified 8 different materials types? The task force identified over 40.

ACTION: Alison will draft a list of questions for us to use to lead the discussion with the campuses, all-campus groups and LAUC. For the LAUC discussions the SOPAG representative would be willing to attend to lead the discussion.

ACTION: At the October meeting SOPAG will discuss the results of their campus discussions.

ACTION: John T. will send a message to all-campus groups and encourage them to participate in campus discussions. After the discussion, chairs of the groups to share any concerns/issues they have. Your local SOPAG person will be arranging a local meeting.

ACTION: Tammy will forward to LAUC for their feedback.

ACTION: Alison volunteered to compile the results of the campus reports.

5.0 Management of the SOPAG Website (Marilyn)

Marilyn continues to work diligently to maintain the SOPAG website. All-campus groups are continuing to develop their own web sites and will link to the SOPAG page.

6.0 Management of Print Collections in a Digital Age

The ULs have discussed this issue and will discuss again during the November retreat. They will send us a charge at a later date.

The issue of the "last copy" needs to be discussed. The ULs want a solution in place before the next round of budget cuts. Should we appoint a task force or ask CDC to recommend a policy? SOPAG needs to develop a charge.

Questions:
Do we need to keep a copy of every title in the system?
Do we need to keep print copies of digital titles?
We need to address policy of canceling titles based on knowledge and communication rather than canceling in the belief that others are not canceling.

Need definition of last copy, unique copy, archival copy,

ACTION: SOPAG members should think about what we should do. CDC is meeting in early October. We need to document what we're doing currently to see if we need another process. Phyllis, Lorelei, Bruce and Julia will carry the spirit of the discussion to CDC for their input. CDC will also take up the discussion.

7.0 Workshops
7.1 Circulation Best Practices (Tammy): Nothing to report.

7.2 UC Digital Library Forum (John Ober): Defer discussion for the next meeting.

8. Electronic Records Management Update (John T.)
ACTION: John T. will get more information before we proceed.

9. Information Literacy
At the request of the ULs, SOPAG discussed the IL memo to Provost King and Gerry Munoff. SOPAG is asked to take action by working with HOPS in creating a common interest group on information literacy. When developing the charge for the ILCIG it will be important to minimize overlap of effort with the LAUC task force.

ACTION: John T. will ask HOPS to draft a charge for a common interest group on information literacy that does not duplicate the efforts of the LAUC IL task force, but complements their work or builds upon it. For instance, survey what is being done by the campuses, creating training or workshops, reacting to the LAUC report, and communicating what is being done.