

2010-09-16 SOPAG ACG minutes

SOPAG ACG Meeting

Thursday, September 16, 2010

9:30am-2:30pm.

Location: UCOP Franklin Building, 1111 Franklin Street, Room 10325, Oakland

Attendance:

SOPAG:

Bernie Hurley, UCB

Gail Yokote, UCD

Deborah Sunday, UCI

Susan Parker, UCLA

Donald Barclay, UCM

Diane Bisom, UCR; Chair

Luc Declerck, UCSD

Gail Persily, UCSF

Lucia Snowhill, UCSB

Elizabeth Cowell, UCSC

Bob Heyer-Gray, UCD/LAUC

Felicia Poe, CDL

ACGs:

Jim Dooley, UCM: CDC

Ann Frenkel, UCR: HOPS

Vicki Grahame, UCI: HOTS

Declan Fleming, UCSD: LTAG

Peggy Tahir, UCSF: RSC

Next Gen TFs:

Patti Martin, CDL: NG Melvyl

Guests:

Sherri Berger, CDL: note taker

Bruce Miller, UCM: ULs Group Convener

Patricia Cruse, CDL: UC3 presentation

John Ober, CDL: Shibleth TF Final Report

Joan Starr, CDL: Project Management Skills TF Final Report

1. Introductions, Agenda Review & Announcements (Diane Bisom)

- a) Introductions -- Round Robin
- b) Agenda review and announcements

2. University Librarians Report (Bruce Miller)

- a) UCOP review processes underway

- CDL: The review has been formally initiated. There is a process and a timeline in place for the review, and Laine Farley is directing it.

- UC Press: The review is complete, though no official reports or recommendations have been issued. UC Press Director Lynne Withey will retire at the end of 2010, and a search for her replacement is underway. The University Librarians have delivered a strong message that continued communication about actions coming out of the review is important.

eScholarship will very likely be affected by the review. There is some ambiguity surrounding its future development. Dan Greenstein has advised that the best approach towards eScholarship is to continue with "business as usual" and to submit as much content as possible, including ETDs. The Libraries have a stated commitment and a vested interest in open access and eScholarship, whatever form it takes, and they will evaluate future options as they arise. Questions can also be directed to Catherine Mitchell, CDL.

- UC Library Task Force: Dan Greenstein has initiated the review, and Larry Pitts, UCOP EVP and Provost, has requested that SLASAC "convene a task force to recommend the systemwide strategies and investments that the University needs to pursue with regard to library services". Dan Greenstein expressed to the ULs that because libraries are facing big challenges, a faculty-driven task force can identify and support the library initiatives needed for libraries to be sustainable.

The task force will include faculty members, librarians, and external partners, and will be convened by SLASAC convener Executive Vice Chancellor Gene Lucas. Membership will be finalized shortly. Timeline: initial report due in December 2010 and final report in February 2011.

Bruce will continue to communicate with SOPAG on this task force and its progress.

- b) University Librarians strategic directions

Bruce has been charged by the ULs to update the statements of UC libraries collective systemwide priorities.

Bruce started the process by culling all of the printed goals to date and organizing it in a single document. He took this to the ULs and was charged with developing a second iteration, which became "Priorities for Collective Initiatives, 2011-2014."

Highlights from the document include enumeration of several "forces for change" and three major initiatives that the UC Libraries are currently undertaking that represent collaborative, transformative strategies:

- The University of California Library Collection: Content for the 21st Century and Beyond
- Next Generation Melvyl
- Next Generation Technical Services

The strategies for these initiatives will:

- maximize library space; refocus collection management
- maximize library processing efficiencies; transform operations
- maximize digital library service capacities, including discovery and access to information resources
- maximize long-term access to digital content; capitalize on emerging technological and preservation opportunities

The ULs approved this document yesterday, and they forwarded it to Dan Greenstein to inform the SLASIAC task force work.

Next steps are to develop objectives, goals, and timelines.

Bruce said the goal is to develop a process of annual updates for the UC libraries strategic plans, objectives, and goals,

c) SOPAG planning & consultative structure restructuring

Bruce distributed a proposal for a new University Librarians advisory structure, with the goal of providing more effective strategic, operational, and tactical planning. The proposed structure replaces SOPAG and the ACGs and modifies CIG and task group structures. The proposal does not address CDL advisory and operations groups.

SOPAG and the ACGs will review the proposal during October. SOPAG will discuss it as a group at their October 29th conference call and will prepare comments for the ULs. The proposal will be on the agenda for the ULs conference call on October 7th, but discussion will be limited to questions of clarification. The ULs will defer in-depth discussion until their November 30th conference call to allow time for SOPAG and the ACGs to discuss and to provide input.

3. Next Generation Task Forces Reports

a) NGTS report (Bruce Miller in lieu of Martha Hruska)

- Reports were received last Friday (September 10, 2010)
- UL members of the SLASIAC Task Force will cite the reports as needed to inform the TF's work, as examples of directions in which the UC Libraries are headed.
- The ULs will discuss the reports on their October 7 conference call, look at NGTS and decide next steps.
- ULs are the charging and decision-making body, but decisions will be informed by discussion with colleagues broadly.
- The documents will be going out, but it is essential that people know they are not finalized, i.e. that recommendations in the reports have not yet been accepted, nor implementations decided. . We need to put the message out that these reports will be open for discussion and comment.

b) Next Generation Melvyl report (Patricia Martin)

- Patti circulated a handout report that showed projects and activities from the past year at CDL and OCLC.
- Current usage shows that more people are using World Cat Local than Melvyl, but there is still a constituency of loyal Melvyl users.
- Next steps: waiting for a "go/no-go" decision on whether to move this from a pilot to production. There is no timeline, nor any indication of which group will be making a decision.
- Next steps will also depend on governance, which dovetails with the earlier discussion.
- There was some discussion about the procedures for the RLF non-duplication policy and whether WCL should be used for this. Patti stated that WCL was not explicitly developed for librarian-side tasks, so we should exercise caution when crafting policies. HOTS and RLF will need to investigate the best tools for doing the de-duping work.
- They are still loading records into legacy Melvyl, and have been for about 8 months since the lift of the temporary freeze.

4. Major Initiatives

a) UC Curation Center (UC3) Presentation (Guest: Patricia Cruse) - Report

Trisha Cruse reported on the UC3 program and its range of services. UC3 is a partnership bringing together the expertise and resources of the UC system. The initial service offering includes:

- EZID: a service that makes it simple for libraries and researchers to obtain and manage persistent identifiers for their digital content.
- Merritt: a next generation repository that provides an easy to use interface or API for depositing, managing, sharing, preserving, and providing access via a persistent URL to content. Merritt will replace the Digital Preservation Repository (DPR). eScholarship is transitioning use of Merritt for content, and will harvest out of Merritt for access through the eScholarship interface.
- The UC3 services are available to the UC community and provide an opportunity for the libraries to work with faculty and researchers in new ways to manage and preserve their content. In the coming weeks UC3 will demo the systems via webinars and offered to visit the campuses to present to library staff and the campus community.
- Open Access week is in October and the campuses are encouraged to use the launch of Merritt and EZID as an opportunity to promote UC3 service. Trisha has handouts and supporting outreach materials - request them from her.

b) Shibboleth Task Force (Guest: John Ober) - Report

- The Task Force decided to continue to pursue Shibboleth in April due to several compelling reasons
- Follow-up work has confirmed that benefits outweigh costs, and implementation paths are not as daunting as they had feared
- They are still not yet sure how far to tackle tension between local vs. coordinated implementation. Shibboleth can be a complement to single sign-on approach at some campuses.
- All campuses except UCSB are members of InCommon
- SOPAG officially accepted the report with minor change of adding Riverside as a campus ready to implement Shibboleth for HathiTrust.
- SOPAG will officially thank and discharge the task force.
- SOPAG agreed that we could share this full report with the UC Trust group (but with caveat that it is not yet a declaration of commitment to Shibboleth)

ACTION ITEMS:

- Send report to the ULs for endorsement and approval to proceed with report recommendations.
- Recommend we start on the following tasks immediately:
 - o Work with CDL and CDC to include Shibboleth specifications in licenses
 - o UCLA, UCSD, UCR can immediately implement Shibboleth for HathiTrust: register it as a service provider and provide attributes

c) Project Management Skills Task Force ("PMSTF") (Guest: Joan Starr) - Report

SOPAG accepted and endorsed the majority of recommendations listed in the "Final Report on Project Management Skills of the University of California Libraries' Staff (July 2010)" with the following exceptions:

- A primary recommendation of the PMSTF is the creation of a new Project Management Common Interest Group (PMCI), reporting to SOPAG. SOPAG considered the recommendation and instead will recommend to the ULs that a Project Management Skills Implementation Team be charged. The initial charge will be for a two year time period, with review and consideration toward extending the charge at the end of two years.
- SOPAG accepted the PMSTF recommendation that an annual inventory identifying people in UC Libraries with PM skills be established, with the caveat that 1) inclusion on the list should be through a self-identification process, and 2) the list should be public (not restricted to SOPAG).
- Assuming a Project Management Skills Implementation Team will be charged, SOPAG will request the team:
 - Advise SOPAG regarding what skills are appropriate for projects overseen by an ACG.
 - Further develop the criteria for assigning a project manager to all-campus activities.

SOPAG formally accepted the Project Management Skills Task Force Report, the group was thanked for their excellent service, and the task force will be discharged.

ACTION ITEM: for the 10/29/10 SOPAG conference call, develop a charge for a 2-year Project Management Skills Implementation Team for consideration by the ULs.

5. Lunch (12:30 to 1:15 pm)

a) Face-to-face meetings of ACGs and CIGs

- Round robin-style to hear what the ACGs do: most haven't met in-person for approximately 2 years; LTAG is fully virtual
- All groups require an agenda to justify an in-person meeting
- CDC has written guidelines which determine when face-to-face meetings are warranted.

ACTION ITEM: Take the policy CDC is using, adjust for use by SOPAG, and distribute to all the groups as a unified policy.

b) LAUC reps to ACGs

- Confusion about length of appointment terms
- 2 or 3 years? It seems to have changed.

ACTION ITEM: Diane will coordinate clarification with Bruce Miller, and Michael Yonezawa (LAUC Chair.)

Note: All LAUC representatives to ACGs are 2-year appointments. SOPAG and SLASAC are 3-year appointments.

6. SOPAG and ACG strategic goals for 2010/11 (open discussion; Discussion Questions; moderator Deborah Sunday)

a) What strategic activities have already been launched and are in synch with strategic directions?

We referred to the three strategies and four areas of focus stated in the new "Priorities for Collective Initiatives" doc. Each ACG chair reported on goals or initiatives for the year that mapped to those areas of focus.

- CDC: Retreat notes are the best document to consult for the year's goals. Many of the ideas from the CDC retreat can be used as the basis for CDC goals. Also of note are the funding recommendations, that can cut across the board.
- HOPS:
 - o Support progress towards user-friendly integrated access = UC Collection; including sound and video; "hard formats"
 - o Interlibrary loan: see where there are synergies, with ILL, public services, acquisitions, etc.
 - o RLF: HOPS may need to explore impact on public service of non-duplication policy.
- HOTS: all of their initiatives relate to assisting with Next Gen Melvyl efforts and NGTS efforts.
- LTAG: Shibboleth task force, information-sharing, single project list; much of their role is supportive and enabling, but most of it applies to processing efficiencies
- RSC:
 - o ILL=operational efficiencies
 - o Analyze results of user survey
 - o ILL user satisfaction survey again in 2011
 - o ILL operations team at CDL cooperation
 - o ILL training checklist

b) What strategic activities are missing and who should undertake them?

- We made a list of some that immediately came to mind:

- o Implications of RLF de-dupe policy

- o How will space-saving affect ILL and staffing

- o How much does it cost to do ILL? Numbers are 5-6 years old

- o Same with print-on-demand

- o VDX is extremely customized and hugely expensive; can we streamline our practices? And policies?

- o Standardize/coordinate loan policies

- o Digital/print preservation: next steps systemwide?

- Some activities do not directly fit with the goals, but they promote efficiencies that free up time and people to do other things on the list.

Examples:

- o UC-wide research tutorial launching this year

- o Digital reference

- There was some discussion about how we frame these goals. We need more measurable targets and action words that go beyond "investigating"; also, every goal needs to state that it is a means to a particular end

- The desire was expressed to see the ULs take more of a leadership role in making stated goals more concrete and along those lines, so the groups underneath could follow

- Along with this is a structural need: how do we create clearer reporting lines and avenues for making suggestions and stating needs for various services and projects?

c) Should any current SOPAG or ACG activity be dropped or de-prioritized?

- We do need to consider this. The "so what?" test can be really helpful.

ACTION ITEMS:

- Go back to groups with the 5W's/H's: who, what, when, why, and how

- Do your goals have all of these covered?

- How do they fit with the broader goals outlined in the new Priorities doc (to be posted October 7)?

- How have you prioritized them? If they don't fit with the broader goals, they should be a lower priority.

- Feel free to talk with Bruce and he can liaise with ULs

Next SOPAG Meeting: Conference Call -- October 29, 2010, 1-4pm (Deb Sunday/UCI -- recorder)