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

SOPAG Meeting, 7/28/00, Action Minutes

Present: A. Bunting, K. Butter, M. Heath, L. Kennedy (LAUC), B. Hurley, C. Johns, S. Lessick, L. Millsap (Recorder), P. Mirsky (Chair), J. Tanno

1. Request

a. Consortial Borrowing System vendor evaluation status:

Butter reported that the PIR Project Team has decided the best method for choosing a system will be an RFP rather than selecting a sole source. After considerable discussion the Project Team decided there were significant advantages to a centralized approach. The market continues to be dynamic with new products and new features appearing. The team hopes to send out the RFP in September with implementation in March or April 2001. The evaluation process will follow that developed for the CDL databases. Whether systems meet standards continues to be an issue. The RFP will be shared with the Resource Sharing Committee (RSC) before it is sent out.

b. Desktop delivery:

Claire Bellanti and the planning and implementation committee have been asked to complete a plan within six months. New vendors are also appearing in this area. Since campuses may need to contribute toward the cost, SOPAG encourages the committee to make its recommendation before campus budgetary decision dates. One way of doing that would be to phase the report and make the software/hardware decisions before deciding on an evaluation method. No decision has been made on a centralized versus decentralized approach. With this project a decentralized system may be a reasonable option.

c. Request Phase 2 survey:

The survey showed that the great majority of staff were satisfied with Request and felt it made their work more
efficient. The following suggestions for priorities for changing Request were made:

1. extend to undergraduates
2. better processing, better matching, include non-circulating items but route to appropriate ILL unit, include borrower status, better checking on availability, add patron supplied document delivery account number
3. add patron tracking of requests
4. add unverified citations
5. extend to other databases (e.g., MLA, WorldCat)
6. Desktop delivery of scanned articles
7. acquire CBS that everyone uses

8. turn off telnet Request and make the Web the only option.

With the exception of the last, all these suggestions are in some stage of consideration by the PIR Task Force.

d. ILL Statistics:

The statistics show that load leveling is working and that overall activity is not increasing.

ACTION: Butter will redistribute the statistical spreadsheet with corrected formulas and will clarify whether the statistics are for Request activity only or for all ILL requests processed.

e. Extending Request to undergraduates: policies and rules:

All campuses agreed to the following policy recommendations:

1. Undergraduates with blocked circulation records should be blocked from using Request until their record is clear. Patron blocks are based on local campus policy and may include, but are not limited to, overdue items, billed items, non-return of recalled items, lost or missing materials, campus blocks due to judicial review or a leave of absence.
2. Existing blocks related to the circulating status of materials should continue to be implemented. Such items include, but are not limited to, videos, special collections, and reserve items.
3. Items checked out on the local campus and available from another campus can be requested by undergraduate students in circulation status is available for that item.
4. All other CDL Request policies already in place would remain the same for undergraduate students as for other users.

There were three unresolved points for consideration:

1. Undergraduates should initially be limited to requesting 5 items from MELVYL and a total of five article requests from the combined CDL linked and hosted databases per day. The limits should be reviewed during Winter quarter for possible increase. After discussion, this was accepted.
2. Campuses should continue to review ILL activity for possible abuse such as requesting interlibrary loans on behalf of a private employer, recreational use, or bypassing local policies. The review may take place after the Request has been placed, but could prevent future abuses or result in blocking the patron from future requesting. SOPAG agreed this was a campus decision.
3. Interlibrary loan items borrowed by undergraduate students should receive the loan period determined by the lending campus (as opposed to the UC-wide standard loan period for faculty and graduate students). SOPAG proposed that there be a standard four-week load period for undergraduates.

ACTION: Each campus will respond to Butter by August 11 to say whether they support the proposal.

All procedural recommendations were supported. Testing of real-time patron authentication will be done on DRA and Innovative systems in early September. Separate tables will be developed for each campus defining patron types and blocks. A symbol or letter will show staff patron status. The campuses are already working of messages and help screens. SOPAG supported requiring users to choose a "last usable date" that will automatically cancel unfilled requests. Campuses may consider creating a special OCLC profile that send requests to "Review" rather than sending "Direct" based on class of material.

ACTION: Butter will redraft the recommendations into a policy document. She encouraged all campus proposals for PIR/OPS come through the campus representatives.

2. RFP Update

Hurley reported that the process is on schedule. Discussions are in process with UCLA Purchasing to insure that the evaluation methodology follows university policies. The methodology must be completed before the bids are opened on August 4. The methodology and the vendors who respond will be public, but the deliberations of the Evaluation Steering Committee are strictly confidential. Eleven vendors have said that they intend to respond. The steering committee members are expected to explain the process to their campuses, including the faculty senate. In additional to the steering committee, three consultants will evaluate specific functions across all vendors.

The committee plans to have reports to the Academic Senate, SLASIAC, and the ULs and SOPAG in October and a final recommendation in November. Implementation would then be in summer 2001. If phase II evaluation is needed, implementation will be in 2002.

3. Collection Management Initiative

No project manager has been identified for the Mellon project, but Johns, Cate Hutton, and Gary Lawrence have developed an alternative plan. Johns has proposed to Richard Lucier that a working group of two or three librarians be appointed to work with her to provide feedback to drafts of an operational plan and the research design for the implementation phase to begin in early 2001, if funded by Mellon. The research design will include the following parts:
a. Cost elements of maintaining print and electronic resources
b. Usage measure by title, campus, and publication dates
c. Preference/Behavior data from users
d. Institutional impact, e.g., budgeting, space planning, etc.
Johns will send out a charge for the Working Group next week and ask for suggestions for members. They will also be looking for a project analyst to assist with the writing, budget development, and background research. Michael Cooper, faculty member at Berkeley, has developed suggested cost elements for the research design.

4. Task Force to consider future directions for CRL

The ULs are hoping to have information on how the CRL could better serve UC by the end of the year, but no draft charge has been received yet.

5. Statement of ILL needs for UC Special Collections

The HOSC document is to be forwarded by Bunting to RSC for comments, which will be reviewed at the September SOPAG meeting.

6. Review of the ILL workshops

The workshops covered practices that Mary Jackson had discovered made for the best, most efficient operations. There was a wide range of reaction to them. On August 21, there will be a follow up meeting with the ULs, AULs in charge of ILL, and ILL supervisors. That meeting will include a review of the goals for the workshops by Mirsky, a review of best practices by Mary Jackson, a look at some of the improvements and goals that have resulted from the workshops by Tammy Dearie, and a discussion with the ULs of desired future directions in ILL.

7. Follow up on Working Group on Library Management Data

SOPAG reviewed some questions the Working Group had about ILL statistics. The following decisions were made about what statistics would be reported systemwide. It is understood that ILL departments will keep additional statistics to document workload.

a. Report the number of transactions, not the number of volumes per transaction. A transaction should be defined to indicate 1 request = 1 transaction. SOPAG supported the idea of counting requests, not the number of volumes, microfiche or whatever per request.

b. Report lending transactions only. SOPAG supports this.

c. Consider the RLFs as separate campuses and loans from the RLFs to the campuses as ILL transactions. It was recognized that the way the RLFs do their work may require them to count items circulated rather than requests filled. SOPAG supports this.

ACTION: Mirsky will ask the RLFs to develop guidelines for recording ILL lending transactions for the RLFs for consideration by SOPAG at its September meeting.

d. Include categories and counts for non-UC lending activity. SOPAG did not support doing this yet but suggests deferring it for the Consortial Borrowing System (CBS).

e. Count filled and unfilled requests. SOPAG does not support reporting unfilled requests and suggests this also be deferred for CBS.

f. Include section to track referrals. SOPAG does not support reporting referrals.

g. Create Web-based system to record and track Systemwide statistics. SOPAG recommends this be deferred for CBS.

ACTION: Mirsky will inform G. Lawrence and RSC of the results of the SOPAG discussion.

8.   Metadata workshops

The workshops were very successful with over 250 UC library employees attending. For the next workshop, which will be in the fall, a session on current and future applications of metadata received the most interest. People wanted some hands-on training. If UC has adopted a standard, people would like to have training working with it. The possibility of linking such training with Robin Chandler and the OAC or with CORC was suggested.

ACTION: Nancy Douglas will be invited to replace Bob Alan on the Workshop Coordinating Task Group.

Go to SOPAG home page