

Systemwide Operations and Planning Advisory Group (SOPAG)

UC University Librarians Joint Meeting with SOPAG, 11/19/99, Action Minutes

Present:

ULs: George Bynon (D) attending for Sharrow, Karen Butter (SF), Katie Fromberg (B) attending for Lowell, Lan Dyson (SC), Richard Lucier (OP), Gerry Munoff (I), Sarah Pritchard (SB, recorder), Brian Schottlaender (SD), Jim Thompson (R), Gloria Werner (LA).

SOPAG: Alison Bunting (LA), Cynthia Clark (I), Mary Heath (D), Cecily Johns (SB), Phyllis Mirksy (SD), Alan Ritch (SC), John Tanno (R).

CDL: Laine Farley, Trisha Cruse, Beverlee French.

1. Housekeeping:

Next meeting is a videoconference, Dec. 20 from 2:30 to 5:00 p.m.

A joint meeting with UCOL was planned for the winter but to date there has been no communication from UCOL that we are aware of. Richard will check with Bruce Tiffney (SB), current chair.

2. CDL Items:

2a. Government Information Initiative: B. French and T. Cruse presented a report with five major project proposals from Andrea Severson and the government documents librarians. It has been reviewed by HOTS, HOPS, LTAG and others. CDL staff see the "data warehouse" proposal as being the one with greatest potential impact, not only for UC but for government agencies, the K-12 community and local business. The other proposals were also discussed in some detail as to the benefits, and the resources needed (technology, programming, staff work). CDL is agreeable to funding the projects on a co-investment basis for a three-year period. It was understood that not all projects could be taken on at once. It was decided to start work on the data warehouse while at the same time exploring some elements of the other projects and re-evaluating their value, priority and feasibility as things go along. The project for a collaborative web site can move forward with work from campus documents librarians. The cataloging of digital government information resources can be folded into other electronic cataloging projects. If possible the data warehouse would be planned for the July 2000 release of the CDL. It was agreed that the CDL would commit to work on the data warehouse and the ULs agreed to provide support for the various projects from their own documents librarians.

2b. Shared cataloging for digital resources: L. Farley reported on the prototype project undertaken at UCSD. The test of the process worked well. The report also attempt to estimate ongoing costs. A major issue is URL displays and maintenance; costs of the latter are shown to be greater than expected. The CDL recommendation is to move ahead with a shared cataloging approach and to fund it centrally out of resource sharing funds. Mirsky and Lucier will prepare an implementation plan for the ULs. Campuses will not be assuming the cataloging costs, just local implementation costs. CDL will probably try as well to assume the cost of the PURL server, deemed essential to the maintenance of the records.

2c. January 2000 release of CDL: L. Farley gave an update, and more information is at the "library staff" web pages for CDL. REQUEST for articles is in test mode and proceeding well. In January the new ILL policy will go into effect, that is, if an item is checked out from the local campus, the patron will be able to borrow it from another UC library. This will only work at campuses where circ records are linked to Melvyl.

A new tool called Searchlight will be brought up, based on UCSD work, that will search multiple databases at once. It is being customized for each campus' set of local and shared databases.

Melvyl: The RFP steering committee is developing materials to outline functional requirements and to solicit user feedback on each campus. Local meetings will be scheduled and an online survey mounted. It is planned to have the detailed RFP issued by sometime in April. Relevant to this item, Melvyl performance (agenda #5e) was discussed. In preparation for the usual November peak, the CDL is trying to put safeguards in place because of the unusually heavy UCLA use (in the absence of their local catalog). If necessary, Z39.50 access will be blocked for external non-UC users. There was some general discussion about the status of system implementation at UCLA, and about faculty concerns there and elsewhere with the potential Melvyl transition.

3. SOPAG items (P. Mirsky reporting):

3a. Net lender compensation: A draft report is in preparation as to how to implement the policy that was endorsed by the ULs last spring. 1997-98 is being used as the "pre-PIR" base year. Key findings emerging in the report are that ILL activity was slightly *down* in 98-99 except for UCSD. There may be multiple factors at work here. The Resource Sharing Committee (RSC) suggests using CDL resource sharing funds to pay net lenders, not to use funds from the net borrower campuses. The committee is not recommending any money be allocated for reimbursements in FY2000 since there is only one net lender in the post-FY98 comparison. When article lending is implemented the pattern may shift.

Related to this is the issue raised by the RLF's, whether funding should be increased to support that portion of their activities. Some of the ULs feel that SOPAG needs to make a recommendation first and then it can be examined as a proposal. Activity data are not easily identifiable because transactions are counted as regular circ data from the library that owns the book. There was further discussion of "unfunded" costs in the RLF resource sharing workload.

Copyright compliance is another issue the RSC started to look into, and as a spin-off, documentation is being collected as to how campuses fund CCC charges. Payment models vary across campuses. The ULs and SOPAG agree that we do not want to pursue using resource sharing funds to reimburse campuses for copyright compliance costs. It was decided to seek a formal opinion from the UC general counsel's office, as to whether individual faculty requests via PIR count as "library to library" lending (and therefore would require copyright payment), or whether they are counted as individual instances covered by fair use.

3b. Task Force on Collection Management Strategies: The TF submitted a brief status report and described an "enabling strategy," starting with a pilot project using the JSTOR titles. The ULs noted a number of ancillary issues (ownership, access services, user acceptance) that have not

been examined by the group, which has been primarily focused on preservation. Other committees may ultimately need to be involved. Should the "copy of record" concept serve as our underlying philosophy? Some ULs definitely feel no. A timeline may need to be developed that shows a progressively advancing approach to moving from print to digital. The TF should be encouraged to deal with some of the broader issues, and to look at the discussion in the SLASIAC minutes of 9/23/99. The ULs will have to deal with ownership issues (the "statistics" problem).

It was agreed that the TF should continue and submit a final report; and that SOPAG and the ULs would identify other key issues to be dealt with and suggested mechanisms for addressing them. We will consider an all-UC conference for our librarians on the latest trends in digital archiving.

End of joint morning session.

[Go to SOPAG home page](#)