SOPAG Joint Meeting with All Campus Group Chairs
Friday, December 12, 2003
9:30-2:30pm
UCOP Kaiser Building

SOPAG Attendees: John Tanno (Chair, UCD), Phyllis Mirsky (UCSD), Julia Kochi (UCSF), Bernie Hurley (UCB), Bruce Miller (UCM), Tammy Dearie (LAUC), John Ober (CDL), Kate McGirr (UCSC), Marilyn Moody (UCSB), Lorelei Tanji (UCI & notetaker).
Absent: Stefanie Wittenbach (UCR), Terry Ryan (UCLA)

All Campus Group Chairs Attendees: Cindy Shelton (CDC), Isabel Stirling (HOPS), Carole Kiehl (HOTS), Amy Kautzman (LPL), Terry Toy (LTAG), Claire Bellanti (RSC)

1.   SOPAG discussion with ACG Chairs
Discussed and reviewed ACG goals and objectives, website, future activities, etc.

1.1 Collection Development Committee (C. Shelton/P. Mirsky).

a. SCAP Databases.
Background: CDC asked JSC to analyze and draft a proposal to address the reduction in resource sharing funds in support of SCAP databases. The proposal to cut three databases, which was discussed amongst several groups and received broad support, was approved by the University Librarians. The ULs have asked SOPAG to handle the transition and implementation in a timely manner with appropriate communication. J. Ober noted that the A&I database and MELVYL transitions provide some guidelines for how to implement and communicate this to our users.

ACTION: SOPAG will ask HOPS to work with CDL and communicate with CDC, HOTS, and other groups as appropriate to provide a smooth transition.

b. Elsevier Core Title Lists.
CDC is working with campus bibliographers to identify lists of core titles.

c. Pilot Elsevier/ACM Collection
The Pilot Elsevier/ACM Assessment Team will submit a report by March. As part of their charge, they will assess the costs of this pilot and whether it is scaleable to other journal packages, as well as other issues related to the implementation of this pilot project, such as the preservation issues identified by PAG.

d. Kluwer, Wiley, Nature Specialist ejournal packages
For the above ejournal packages, CDL negotiated a print copy that can be used for shared print collections. Issues will begin arriving January 2004.   CDC is discussing whether to go forward with processing these as shared print journal collections under the same principles and guidelines as the Elsevier/ACM pilot project. SOPAG recommended that CDC wait until the report of the Elsevier/ACM Pilot Assessment Team is made in March before making a decision.

ACTION: CDC will continue discussions.

Campuses are considering whether to add shared cataloging collection records to local online catalogs, and how to implement it. The holdings records are non-standard. This will be a local decision and may have a local cost. Currently, this is not part of the Assessment Team's charge, but it will need to be factored for future planning.

ACTION: HOPS will poll campuses to find if they are planning to add the UC shared collection records in their local catalogs and to share their rationale. NOTE: The shared collection records will be in MELVYL.

e. UCLA Proposal for a General Science Shared Collection
UCLA is consolidating four of its Science and Engineering Libraries (SEL) into three. In doing so it is going to eliminate duplicate holdings in six major science serial titles. They plan to create a dim archive held in a campus library (UCLA) and a dark archive held in SRLF. Going forward to create these shared collections with various assurances on how it will be maintained will help other campuses to make decisions.

1.2 Heads of Public Services (I. Stirling/M. Moody)
Their website is working well and the new structure is helpful for seeing minutes from other groups as they relate to what HOPS is doing.

a. Common Interest Group on Information Literacy – Carol Hughes (UCI), Chair.
The CIG is working through their charge. The next step involves addressing the relationship between the LAUC TF report and the CIG report; the CIG is waiting for input from the LAUC TF. The LAUC TF will disband upon the completion of their comments on the CIG report. CIG has decided to have a permanent LAUC representative.

ACTION: HOPS will need to identify a process for appointing a LAUC representative once the TF has been disbanded.

Re membership--Ellen Meltzer is replacing Rosalie Lack, and Clair Kuykendall is a new member. The group will have a conference call in January and select its own chair.

ACTION: HOPS Chair (Stirling) will send an email to SOPAG Chair (Tanno) indicating that the CIG Information Literacy report is now final and ready for distribution to the ULs and other groups (ACG and LAUC)

ACTION: SOPAG recommended that the CIG investigate potential links with campus education technology groups and their activities, such as UC Teaching, Learning and Technology Center (UC TLT; http://www.uctltc.org/).

b. CIG Web Based Services
This group will be more active in 2004, but has been inactive at this time for o a number of reasons, including the fact that the co-chairs stepped down. Julia Kochi will be coordinating a conference call to discuss future plans and activities.

ACTION: Stirling will keep in touch with this CIG, and perhaps will poll campuses and see if representation is still up-to-date and accurate.

It was noted that the LTAG Content Mgt Systems report mixes web content generation/management and digital object management.

ACTION: SOPAG recommends that the CIG Web Based Services review the LTAG report and communicate with LTAG as appropriate. [n.b. see also the related action under 1.5 below]

c. CIG Digital Reference Report
The report assesses digital reference, staffing, systems, etc. Digital reference is working well, but the software continues to evolve. There was brief discussion of the pros and cons of the UC Libraries using the same systems software, but the software has not evolved sufficiently to recommend one system. There is not a lot of enthusiasm for a UC-wide digital reference system because the types of questions are locally based. All campuses operate similar service hours, so there would not be much advantage for a systemwide approach. Next steps include keeping

up with technology, sharing "lessons learned", and investigating new features (e.g. voice over IP), staffing models, and user interests.

1.3 Heads of Technical Services (C. Kiehl/B. Miller)
There was much discussion of the goals and objectives

ACTION: HOTS Goal #7 (metadata standards and uses) has a phrase "usage outside of traditional catalogs", and SOPAG recommends that this be elaborated by explicitly listing some non-MARC examples related to access integration issues.

a. Communication.
Kiehl shared that early communication and consultation between CDL and HOTS on various projects and activities would be appreciated and would be mutually beneficial. HOTS is also consulting with other groups as appropriate (e.g., consulting with HOPS regarding the new URL structure for Gale databases).

b. Acquisitions Issues.
The focus in HOTS has often been on cataloging issues, and needs to be broadened to include Acquisitions and other appropriate TS issues. Kiehl shared that HOTS would like to facilitate communication among Acquisitions Heads and have them report to HOTS.

ACTION: SOPAG asked Kiehl to develop a list of the issues that an Acquisitions group of people would address that might help inform, whether a CIG is appropriate and/or she could submit a proposal to SOPAG to form a CIG Acquisitions Group (http://libraries.universityofcalifornia.edu/sopag/policies.html)

The question was also raised as to whether there was appropriate membership in HOTS to represent the breadth of Technical Services activities from an appropriate level of authority and decision making. Kiehl responded that—for a variety of historical reasons, there was not.

c. Classification of electronic monographs.
There are classification numbers assigned to serials, but there is no policy for monographs. So some SCP monograph records have classification numbers and some don't. HOTS is writing a brief white paper on the pros and cons of including classification numbers, since the benefits of adding them needs to be weighed against the potential workload.

d. Collaborative cataloging.
HOTS is also discussing collaborative efforts in cataloging between campuses when language/subject expertise is required and not available at a particular campus (Hebrew, Slavic, etc.).

1.4. Library Privacy Liaisons (A. Kautzman/J. Kochi)

a. Local library privacy policies.
Some UC campus libraries are in the process of developing their local library privacy policies. The MELVYL policy serves as one model policy, and there are other examples that can be used as a starting point.

ACTION: SOPAG recommended that LPL identify library privacy policies that can serve as models and provide links to them off the SOPAG LPL website. As UC campus libraries develop their policies, they could be added as links too.

b. Library privacy audit.
LPL has created a checklist that libraries can use to conduct a privacy audit of their systems and retention of records. LPL will be discussing this further at ALA Midwinter or via a conference call.

c. Campus records management.

The UC Records Disposition Schedule Manual (http://www.policies.uci.edu/adm/records/721-11a.html) is maintained by the UC Records Management Coordinators, and there is a section that applies to the management of library records. As libraries do their audit, they will want to refer to this. If there are systemwide changes desired, LPL could propose these changes through the UC Archivists Council member (Jennifer Jacobs , UCI), who serves as a liaison to the UC Records Management Committee. .

d. Current Awareness & Education

LPL is willing to assist campuses with information or programs for library staff education on privacy issues. LPL has discussed the possibility of doing a joint program with LAUC.

e. LPL Website on privacy issues.

The website is almost ready; SOPAG has conveyed various suggestions to LPL.

ACTION: Ober will send Kautzman a few more edits, before it is publicized/released.

1.5 Library Technology Advisory Group (T. Toy/T. Ryan)

a. Goals and objectives.
b. ACTION: SOPAG recommended that LTAG delete goal #2 and rephrase goal #7 so that it is clearer that LTAG serves as technical liaisons to shared resource programs as necessary rather than in a reporting relationship to CDL as is currently implied. Webconferencing systems report

SOPAG clarified that it was looking for effective alternatives to face-to-face meetings, and that they would like advice on features that would enhance productivity:

- Voiceover IP – save long distance costs
- Shared white board
- Track documents
- Mechanism for reviewing other people's works
- Ability to archive decisions

Some of these objectives might be achieved through a combination of technologies (telephone, videoconferencing, web CT, etc.).

ACTION: Ober volunteered to draft a statement of SOPAG needs for meeting support that might be addressed by web conferencing. Then LTAG will be asked to monitor UCLA's testing of SharePoint Team, and investigate licensing of products by the UC system.

c. Content Management Systems Report

The report was useful to see an implicit diversity of assumptions about what constitutes a content management system and what content management systems each library is using. However, prompted by recommendations in the Visual Resources Task Force report, SOPAG would like to know what campuses are using as content management systems for digital objects.

ACTION: SOPAG will establish some definitions of what we are trying to accomplish delineating various functionalities, and encourages LTAG to review the VRTF report. SOPAG will likely then ask LTAG to survey what systems are being used to support the management of digital objects, with particular attention to digital visual resources.

d.   UC Libraries Open Source Software

Campuses are welcome to use the code developed by other campus libraries (e.g., EAD software program; UCLA Reference statistics program; UCR's Timeclock program; Library Hours database). However, there are guidelines that need to be developed (e.g., modify at your own risk; limits to technical assistance).

ACTION: In addition to developing guidelines on sharing code, SOPAG asked LTAG to consider creation of a registry of programs that are available for sharing among UC libraries.

e. LTAG Privacy Guidelines

ACTION: LPL asked LTAG to label the Guidelines for Retention of UC Library Systems Records document submitted in October of 2002 as a "final" document and not a draft, and to send a copy so that it can be linked to the LPL website.

1.6 Resource Sharing Committee (C. Bellanti/T. Dearie)

Three goals were highlighted:

a. Desktop Delivery – Project completed. All campuses are providing web delivery to patrons as the automatic default.

b. Consortial Borrowing System is semi-implemented.
- UCLA and UCSB are using VDX for borrowing
- SRLF is using it for lending
- UCB and NRLF are using it for lending.
- 2-3 more campuses will implement in January or whenever the next release occurs.
- Other campuses will follow in Spring Quarter.
- UCLA staff member – scheduled to visit campuses and provide training

Outstanding issues for CBS include the following and will be summarized in a forthcoming report:

-Decentralization vs. centralization
Many campuses are decentralized (about half of the campuses); VDX will provide techniques and functions that will encourage centralization and campuses will need to weigh the pros and cons of reorganizing their units.

-DOCLINE does not work with VDX at this point. UC expressed concern to NLM. Need a test between VDX and DOCLINE; need to do programming. In the interim, biomedical libraries will have to run two systems (VDX and DOCLINE) which may involve double-keying and duplication of effort.

-CLIO system. Campuses will have to decide whether to run parallel systems, and for how long, to provide for statistics and billing features not yet implemented in VDX.

-Dealing with change.
- This is the most all encompassing change in ILL units since OCLC, and will require guidance and understanding.
- Melvyl Request activity has skyrocketed. Greater user convenience and ILL efficiencies have attendant large impacts on workload
- There have been some decreases in ILL staff.
- VDX requires a steep learning curve, training, and an understanding of how ISO works
- The goal is for all campuses to run on VDX in order to lower OCLC costs; though we will still use OCLC for ILL requests filled outside of UC.

ACTION: These various issues present potential stumbling blocks and many of them have to do with local processes, which are campus decisions. Some hurdles are fixable and some are not. RSC will continue to address these outstanding issues and consult with other groups as appropriate.

c. UC ILL/Special Collection Project Report
The ULs agreed in November to clarify with Heads of Special Collections (HOSC) that this is a permanent program, and they have charged SOPAG to make things work.

RSC's report which included consultation and input from HOSC lists 20 potential follow-up actions.
Some of the major issues that need to be addressed are:

- review the automated messages that users receive to ensure that the messages are clear and appropriate
- see if the system can be adjusted so circulating copies appear to the user first
- consider adjusting the location tables so that requests go to the borrowing units rather than the lending units; spread workload amongst campuses more evenly and place the responsibility on the requesting campus for reviewing and filtering out requests that can be filled by circulating stacks copies
- VDX might help staff to identify more easily which items are in Special Collections
- acknowledge that the willingness is there, but that there might be procedural barriers that need to be lowered
- acknowledge the range of ways that Special Collections units already participate in ILL
- learn from RSC's new charge to explore new delivery methods as satisfactory alternatives to meet user's needs

ACTION: Tanno will draft a letter to RSC, HOSC, and CDC. Since HOSC reports to CDC, he will recommend that CDC work with HOSC to clarify the issues, and in conjunction with RSC, they will continue to explore ways to improve this service.

2.   Report on CDL Related Items (J. Ober)

2.1 Electronic Resources Management Systems
Ober shared a document outlining various needs for managing electronic resources and an environmental scan of the commercial products available. Examples of needs: MARC updates; Automatic updates for SFX holdings; Merging 856 changes; A-Z lists, etc.

ACTION: SOPAG will create a needs assessment and list of the issues an ERMS could address to aid collective decisions and actions, and indicate whether we have identified any potential technological solutions. To assist initial analysis of the range of needs and their commonality, Hurley will draft a summary of the campus issues, and Ober will draft a list of CDL issues. SOPAG will continue to discuss forming a task force with various ACG representation to investigate this further. It was noted that SOPAG action may certainly inform local library actions but need not impede local pursuit of solutions to pressing needs.

2.2 CBS/Request/Desktop Delivery—Update (see RSC report above)

2.3 MELVYL-T and Bibliographic Services—Deferred

2.4 CDL Updates in the Spring--Deferred

3. Systemwide Library Planning (John Ober)

3.1. UC Libraries Website-Update—Deferred

3.2. UC Libraries Master Planning Project List--Update
Kochi shared the updated Master Planning Project List.

ACTION: SOPAG members should contact Kochi if they see any additional changes to make (e.g. links to reports). Kochi will send it to Gary Lawrence to be posted on the SLASIAC website.

4.   Government Information Task Force Report

4.1. Steering Committee Appointment—Tanno reported that the Steering Committee had been appointed.

4.2. Appointment of Workshop Development Group— Tanno reported that the Group had been appointed.

5.   E-Dissertations--Deferred

6.   Task Force on Visual Resources – Next Steps--Deferred.