<div align="center">**Systemwide Operations and Planning Advisory Group (SOPAG)**</div>

SOPAG Meeting, 4/9/99, Action Minutes

Present: C. Clark, L. Farley, (CDL), B. French, P. French (guest, AM), M. Heath, B Hurley, C. Johns, L. Kennedy (LAUC, recorder), P. Mirsky, Chair, A. Ritch, B. Schottlaender, J. Tanno, J. Wilson.

A. Electronic Resources Cataloging Task Force (TFER2) Report

Cynthia Clark led the discussion of the TFER2 report (located at http://neuheim.ucdavis.edu/staff/tfer2/). Pat French, co-chair of the Task Force on Electronic Resources was present to discuss the recommendations summarized in the Executive Summary. The key recommendations of the report are establishment of a centralized cataloging agency within UC and use of a single record. Although centralized cataloging is normally more cost efficient, Hurley expressed concern about the expense of modifying the centrally created records for local catalogs. It was generally agreed that our first priority is to get records into the MELVYL Catalog. The cost estimates included in the report need further development, but divided by campus the cost seems reasonable, given the value of the resources to which we are providing access. SOPAG accepted and endorsed the TFER 2
report. In approving the TFER2 report, SOPAG also approved the proposal for centralized URL resolution as of great potential benefit, especially for OAC collections. SOPAG commended the TFER2 committee on its comprehensive report and cataloging guidelines.

ACTION: Mirsky will send the TFER2 report to the University Librarians with a recommendation that it be implemented as soon as possible. The cover letter will make the following recommendations:

1) Establish, within UC, a centralized cataloging agency (CCA) with the responsibility of creating MELVYL records for items in the CDL.

2) Integrate electronic resources licensed by the CDL with comparable materials in other formats in the MELVYL Catalog whenever possible. The guidelines employ CONSER's "single" record concept delineating the digital counterpart of a print journal in cataloging records for the print. The guidelines adopt decision points that dictate cataloging of the digital version itself when the content of the digital differs substantively from the print. In this respect, the resulting product consists of records representing both single and separate record approaches.

3) Cost issues--one area the Task Force did not have sufficient time to fully complete were the cost estimates. Preliminary estimates place the cost somewhere around $90,000. SOPAG has decided to ask HOTS to carry on the issues surrounding cost estimates/compensation models. This seemed a more appropriate level for this type of input.

The Task Force is recommending the following cost sharing approach:

A. All campuses and the CDL must agree to contribute their fair share to the one time costs incurred by the CCA and CDL to
implement centralized cataloging and record distribution (e.g.., programming costs).

B. Compensation for ongoing cataloging and record distribution costs incurred by the CCA should be based on the value added to each campus online catalog and the MELVYL Catalog (i.e., the number of catalog records received).

C. Cost estimates should be reviewed each year and revised as necessary based on past experience and expected workload.

D. The compensation model should be efficient and provide the CCA with compensation for ongoing costs on a regular basis (e.g., monthly recharge).

The report will also be forwarded to HOPS, HOTS and JSC, and LTAG for information.

The charge to TFER2 specifically excluded display issues, which continue to be of great concern to catalog users. Farley reported that estimates had been done for programming costs for the TFER 1 recommendations. A minor display change in the order of subfields has been made. She needs additional input from public services librarians in order to develop additional programming needs. A request through the User Services Council did not produce results.

ACTION: Farley will establish a group of 4-5 people to work with the newly reconstituted User Services Council to develop recommendations for improved displays. Forward names to Laine as soon as possible.

ACTION: the TFER2 committee will be asked to further develop its cost estimates for the centralized cataloging agency be performed.

B. CDL related items:
1) Request/Phase II

French reviewed the "Summary of Patron Initiated Request Service Phase II 1999-2000," (prepared by the PIR Project Team, and available for review on the CDL web site). SOPAG closely reviewed the policy recommendations and identified which should be highlighted for review by the University Librarians.

Sept. 1999 is the target date for installing patron API software; SOPAG recommends that campus invest in such software. They may also need to purchase or provide space on an NT server. Laine Farley emphasized the importance of keeping campus patron databases available 24x7 for Request to function properly.

ACTION: French will revise the document per the SOPAG discussion and prepare a cover letter for the University Librarians. Issues to highlight include: allowing interlibrary requests for material that is checked out at the home campus, revising the limit per day from ten to twenty, load leveling, expansion of program to include journal literature, continuing to limit PIR to

faculty, staff and graduate students. French will rewrite the summary to clarify that one of the objectives of Phase II (and the RFP) is to accommodate all of the input sources of interlibrary loan requests so as to realize staff efficiency. The narrative will also be revised. French will revise the timetable to hold the PIR Update sessions will be the 2d or 3d week of June. Several campuses will be asked to present information on organization and workflow.

ACTION: Farley will ask the Resource Sharing Committee (if appointed by then), augmented by some systems representatives, to review the bids received on the PIR RFP

C. Planning for ULs/SOPAG joint meeting

The ULs have a very full agenda. Issues to stress include the identification of the initial OAC thematic collections for digitization. The OAC has recommended Ethnic Groups and Arts in California. Space management in the UC library system is another high-priority issue, given the loss of funding for the NRLF Phase III expansion.

D. Task Force on Collaborative Strategies for Archiving of Print in the Digital Environment.
The ULs have reviewed the charge. SOPAG discussed proposed membership for the committee.
ACTION: Mirsky will forward recommended names to Richard Lucier.

E. Review of Resource Sharing Committee
SOPAG reviewed the proposed charge of the Resource Sharing Committee and agreed it should be appointed. The charge should address consideration of local circulation policies that affect resource sharing. (The Circulation heads group will continue to operate, but not as a formal CDL group. More likely it will be reconstituted as a group reporting to RSC.)
ACTION: SOPAG numbers will consult with campus staff for additional wording for the Resource Sharing Committee charge re circulation issues.
Additional agenda items were deferred to the next meeting. Communication issues related to SOPAG and the CDL will be included in a future agenda.

Go to SOPAG home page