

2008-10-16 SOPAG Minutes

Joint Meeting - Systemwide Operations and Planning Group (SOPAG) and ACG Chairs Thursday, October 16, 2008

9:30am-3:30pm

Location: Kaiser Building Room 512. Directions: <http://www.ucop.edu/services/directions-kaiser.html>

Dutch Lunch - we will break so that people can buy their lunches from nearby cafes and reconvene for a working lunch.

Meeting Participants:

Bernie Hurley, HOPS Liaison, UCB; Gail Yokote, UCD; Lorelei Tanji, Chair, UCI; Susan Parker, UCLA; Bruce Miller, UCM; Diane Bisom, UCR; Luc Declerck, UCSD; Julia Kochi, CDC Chair and Liaison, UCSF; Lucia Snowhill, UCSB; Kate McGirr, UCSC; Mary Linn Bergstrom, LAUC Rep, UCSD; Patricia Cruse, CDL (recorder), Felicia Poe, incoming CDL representative; Catherine Friedman, HOPS Chair, UCSD; Lee Leighton, HOTS Chair, UCB; Lynn Grigsby, LTAG Chair, UCB; Marlayna Christensen, RSC Chair, UCSD.

Not in attendance: Mary Linn Bergstrom, LAUC Representative, UCSD

1. Agenda Review, Introductions, Announcements (Lorelei)

Patricia Cruse is stepping off of SOPAG to focus on Digital Preservation Program initiatives, and Felicia Poe will be taking her place as the CDL representative to SOPAG. Cruse was thanked for her many contributions to SOPAG.

2. Process for proposing things to SOPAG/ULs agendas (Lorelei)

Tanji provided an overview of the ULs' advisory structure, which includes SOPAG, the All Campus Groups, and the Common Interest Groups. In order for items to get on the ULs agenda, the proposed topic/idea must come to SOPAG approximately one month in advance of the ULs meeting. Final documents are due to SOPAG approximately 2 weeks in advance of the ULs meeting, since SOPAG needs a week to review documents and must send items to the ULs a week in advance.

The ULs normally send action items to SOPAG and then SOPAG acts as appropriate. For time-sensitive items the ULs have charged ACGs directly.

Action: ACG Chairs should work closely with their SOPAG Liaisons in planning, preparing, and submitting reports and other documents in order to facilitate distribution to the ULs Group, SOPAG or other ACGs.

3. Round Robin: All Campus Group Reports & Common Interest Group Reports

ACG Chairs were asked to highlight issues and activities where increased collaboration between All Campus Groups and Common Interest Groups could benefit the UC Libraries and/or strengthen the ULs Advisory Structure.

3.1 HOTS

3.1.1 Consortial Approach to Technical Services

SOPAG and the ACG chairs engaged in a rich discussion on the topics presented in the SOPAG discussion paper, "Adopting UC-wide Collaborative Approaches to Technical Services" and the

ULs email charge to SOPAG to develop a consortial approach to technical services. In addition to the activities outlined in the discussion paper there was a recognition that CAMCIG, HOTS, SCP have done a tremendous amount of work in this area and have started to think more broadly about managing the full information lifecycle and how to develop cross-campus collaboration. A consortial approach to technical service is a national issue and is an opportunity for UC to be involved in some of the leading efforts that are taking place nationally. UC can be a leader in these national efforts since we have some of the leading thinkers in this area. .

The group discussed the ULs request to establish an Interdisciplinary Group that will be modeled after the BSTF. The Interdisciplinary Group will outline the big issues and serve as the think tank. The Group will be empowered to use existing committee structures (ACGs, CIGs) and form special task groups to focus on specific topics as needed. The interdisciplinary group will coordinate and manage the work. An Executive Team will make and implement policy. There was general agreement that it is important to identify short term specific outcomes and longer term items. It was recognized that BSTF was successful due to commitment and buy-in by all of the campuses.

ACTION: Tanji, Snowhill, and Declerck will develop a charge for an Interdisciplinary group (4 to 5 people) that represents the key stakeholders. The charge will identify the scope of "technical services." The charge will be completed in time for the November UL/SOPAG meeting.

3.2 HOPS

C. Friedman asked if the Serials Solution ERMS could be exploited to generate information that would be useful to public service staff and end users - for example lists of tier 1 and tier 2 e-resources.

ACTION: F. Poe will work with CDL staff to connect C. Friedman HOPS and ERMS staff. SOPAG and the ACG Chairs reviewed and discussed HOPS' activities and accomplishments. See the HOPS annual report for detail.

Action: HOPS will work with RSC and LTAG together towards enhancing and improving the user experience.

3.3 RSC

SOPAG and the ACG Chairs reviewed and discussed RSC's activities and accomplishments. See the RSC annual report for detail.

Action: RSC, LTAG, and HOPS will work together towards enhancing and improving the user experience (e.g. ISO ILL guidelines). RSC in conjunction with other ACGs and CIG is preparing a proposal for a workshop on emergency response and disaster recovery.

3.4 LTAG

SOPAG and the ACG Chairs reviewed and discussed LTAG's activities and accomplishments. See the LTAG annual report for detail.

Action: LTAG, RSC, and HOPS will work together towards enhancing and improving the user experience (e.g. UC Trust)

3.5 CDC Report (Julia)

CDC did not prepare an Annual Report since they are meeting immediately after the joint SOPAG/ACG meeting. However CDC's strategic directions documents illustrate CDC's

accomplishments and tasks for the following year. J. Kochi provided an overview of some of their significant activities:

-- in order to optimize resources CDC is evaluating collaborative and cooperative collection development strategies. Specifically, CDC is evaluating the Canadiana literature project as a model for collaborative collection development. While Canadiana literature might not be the target collection the project illustrated that a collaborative model allows for the purchase of a wider variety of materials.

-- CDL is working collaboratively with CRL in order to build a shared print repository for preservation purposes.

-- the e-books task force is continuing to examine issues related to e-books. Specifically they are investigating e-book usage and how to make e-books available to the end-user. The trial Springer e-books are not currently cataloged and an analysis will be conducted on how much usage these materials get with being accessible for the catalog.

-- CDC received a charge from the ULs to evaluate SCAP funding of databases. CDC discovered that they could not review a particular set of databases in isolation. Therefore, in the coming year, campuses will be reviewing all tier 1 databases.

-- CDC will hold a 2-day meeting in February to develop and discuss strategic directions for collections.

3.6 SCO

B. Eden discussed the major issues that SCO addressed over the last year. See the SCO annual report for detail

4. Collaborative communication tools for SOPAG & ACGs

Chair Tanji asked for ideas that would promote communication between the ACGs and SOPAG, including cross group communication. The group agreed that a wiki that is available to all the ACGs would be helpful. The group also agreed that a list with ACG chairs and liaisons would help facilitate communication.

Action: Cruse will work with Poe to add the SOPAG ACG liaisons to the ACG chairs list. Poe will update SOPAG in January as to whether a wiki to support systemwide library groups is possible.

5. Digital Library Collaboration (Luc, Trisha)

The group briefly discussed the final report from the Digital Library Collaboration workshop and draft charge for a Digital Library Services Task Group. The three actions that came out of the workshop were discussed: Explore the notion of a UC Digital Collection; Continue digital collaboration "conversations"; Launch collaboration pilots

The group discussed forming a Digital Library Services Task Group. SOPAG made recommendations for modifications to the draft charge prepared by Declerck and Tanji. Specifically there was a request to include an examination of the costs and the benefits associated with the three actions.

Action: Tanji, Yokote, Declerck, and Snowhill will modify the charge and submit to the ULs for consideration.

6. Project Management Training for Consortial Collaborations (Kate)

The group discussed the need for project management training for UC library staff. The goal would be to have a basic understanding of core project management principles. Need to frame it as a project coming out of SOPAG to the University Librarians. There was a discussion to tie the project management training at the point of need. Some felt that it would be ideal to have a project manager on large project committees and also have training. Need to recognize that PM requires a particular skill set.

Action: McGirr, Kochi, Bergstrom, Bisom, Starr (CDL) will work together to develop a proposal for project management training/implementation to submit to the ULs for consideration.

7. Task Force Reports

7.1 Next Gen Melvyl (Luc)

Declerck confirmed that “Request” is working, but is not optimal. The robust “Request” will be working in the spring. This has a negative impact on the service and the Implementation Group is investigating various options and is consulting with the executive team and the University Librarians. P. Martin and T. Ryan are planning on attending the UL/SOPAG meeting in November to discuss. There was a discussion about the impact of on local OPAC (public view) once Next Gen Melvyl is available (and robust).

8. Report on CDL Related Items (Trisha)

8.1 Digital Preservation Program Services and Digital Preservation Pilot Project –

Stephen Abrams, Manager, Digital Preservation Technology, CDL and Patricia Cruse discussed shared with SOPAG the Digital Preservation Program’s vision of focusing on digital curation services. Towards this end the Program is engaged in a series of transformations to its fundamental outlook and efforts:

Preservation mission → Curation mission
Project activity → Programmatic activity
Systems orientation → Services orientation
Repository focus → Content focus

Abrams and Cruse envision a range of preservation solutions (DPR, Portico, Hathi) that will all fit with the revised vision of the Digital Preservation Program. The Group affirmed that there is a need to provide variety of services and prices so everyone can use. One of the goals of the digital curation services is to position libraries as part of the digital curation conversation on UC campuses. The Digital Preservation Program will work with campus community to discuss/address these needs. The group shared a range of ideas about how these re-envisioned

services might be used on campuses including using the services to store data that is the byproduct of a grant.

There was a brief introduction and discussion of HathiTrust. There was a discussion of how HathiTrust fits into the revised vision of digital preservation services. There was a discussion of when it makes sense to outsource and when to hold materials locally. There was agreement that when materials are external to UC it is crucial that we audit those services. There was a question about the decision making process in deciding what to outsource. There was recognition that governance is important and that there is a need to better understand how priorities are being set. There was a question of the resources needed to support Hathi Trust.

The Group also discussed the Digital Preservation Pilot Project Interim report which evaluated 4 bodies of content and evaluated the size, and preservation risk, and cost of preserving the content. The next step is to develop a business model that will be presenting to ULs at November meeting. The Digital Preservation Pilot Project tested and affirmed the revision of the Digital Preservation Program's services.

8.3 Web Archiving Service (Trisha)

P. Cruse announced that the Web Archiving Service will be available on October 28, 2008. There will be new web pages that describe the Service in detail. The pages will coincide with the rollout of the Web Archiving Service.

9. e-dissertations (Trisha)

P. Cruse shared information on activities of the ETD Task Group which is engaged in a pilot project with UCSD and UCSF to preserve ETDs locally. UC Davis is now submitting their dissertations electronically. UC Davis will begin working with the ETD Task Group.

10. Future meetings:

The November 20th SOPAG meeting will be held at the CDL in Room 411 and will begin at 10:30. Mary Linn Bergstrom is the notetaker. The November 21 (UL/SOPAG) will also be in Oakland and Bernie Hurley is the notetaker.