



# Operating Open Source Program Offices at the System Level

A Case Study of the University of California  
and University of Texas System-Wide OSPO  
Projects

Claire Baytas  
Dylan Ruediger

March 31, 2026



ITHAKA S+R

Through research, collaboration, and innovation, Ithaka S+R informs policy, guides strategies, and builds evidence-based tools to broaden access to postsecondary education, improve student and workforce outcomes, and advance scholarship.

Ithaka S+R is part of ITHAKA, a nonprofit with a mission to improve access to knowledge and education for people around the world. We believe education is key to the wellbeing of individuals and society, and we work to make it more effective and affordable.

Copyright 2026 ITHAKA. This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution Non-commercial 4.0 International License. To view a copy of the license, please see <https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0/>.



*This material is based upon work supported by Alfred P. Sloan Foundation under Grant No. G-2023-21013.*



# Introduction

Thanks to funding from the Alfred P. Sloan Foundation, several US universities have now founded Open Source Program Offices (OSPOs) across the past half decade.<sup>1</sup> In the past two years, these efforts have expanded. In spring 2024, the University of California (UC) system launched the UC Open Source Program Office (OSPO) network, building on the work of the OSPO at the Santa Cruz campus.<sup>2</sup> In summer 2025, the University of Texas (UT) system was also awarded a grant by the Sloan Foundation to scope a model for a system-wide OSPO, following the one established at UT Austin.<sup>3</sup> By operating at the system level, the UC and UT OSPOs aim to further embody principles of openness and more widely and effectively enable open source work, by making resources and expertise more scalable as well as establishing a framework to facilitate community-building and cross-institution collaboration.

The UC system's project to create an OSPO network for a university system was the first of its kind, as evidenced by the UT system's interest in pursuing a similar project, a model that can serve multiple campuses holds great appeal, and marks an important development in how future academic OSPOs may choose to structure themselves. With funding from the Sloan Foundation, we extended our earlier study of OSPOs to focus on these two system-wide frameworks in the UC and UT systems.<sup>4</sup> This issue brief contains our findings.

Our research was guided by the following questions:

- What are the anticipated (or already realized) benefits and challenges of implementing and operating a system-wide OSPO?

---

<sup>1</sup> Dylan Ruediger, Claire Baytas, Ruby MacDougall, and Chelsea McCracken, "University Open Source Program Offices," *Ithaka S+R*, August 14, 2025, <https://doi.org/10.18665/sr.323392>.

<sup>2</sup> University of California Open Source Program Office Network, <https://ucospo.net/>.

<sup>3</sup> Faith Singer, "UT System Advances Open Source Leadership with New Program Office," University of Texas Advanced Computing System, October 16, 2025, <https://tacc.utexas.edu/news/latest-news/2025/10/16/ut-system-advances-open-source-leadership-with-new-program-office/>.

<sup>4</sup> Ibid.

- What model(s) have been conceptualized for a system-wide OSPO framework? How do they address issues of sustainability and scalability?
- What can be learned from the experiences at the UC and UT campuses that can aid other university systems that may want to pursue a similar model in the future?

The UC and UT system-wide OSPO projects are both at early stages of their development. When we conducted interviews in October and November 2025, some interviewees at UC had been in their positions for less than a year, and UT was only a few months into their planning grant, not yet in operation.<sup>5</sup> The relative novelty of the phenomenon of developing OSPO services that operate across a system should be kept in mind when reading this issue brief: interviewee comments and Ithaka S+R analyses represent only the early stages of these projects.

# Defining and structuring a system-wide OSPO

## Developing the system OSPO concept

The notion of an OSPO that would serve constituencies from across a university system developed organically among Sloan grantees, their peers at other institutions, and in conversation with the Sloan Foundation. While it is possible that future system OSPOs might be centrally created and staffed, neither the UC nor UT system leadership have been heavily involved in planning, governance, or funding them thus far. Instead, these OSPO networks are led by open source advocates at individual campuses who are pooling resources and creating networks to support open source

---

<sup>5</sup> For this research, Ithaka S+R conducted interviews with ten individuals affiliated with either the UC or UT system OSPOs during October and November of 2025. The interviews were then transcribed and coded for analysis. Three Ithaka S+R staff read the transcripts and two worked on the analysis; findings across readers showed a high degree of consistency. Quotations from the interviews found in this issue brief are occasionally lightly edited for grammar or clarity.

software at institutions across the system. In other words, to date, these system OSPOs do not have a centralized office, but instead are managed by a network of individuals dispersed throughout various institutions in the system who act on behalf of the network as well as on behalf of their institution.

For example, within the UC system, interest in creating an OSPO network came from, as interviewees put it, “the bottom up.” While interviewees mentioned previous and continued conversations with the UC Office of the President (UCOP), the initial idea was conceptualized and driven by individual stakeholders in open source work at six UC campuses: Berkeley, Davis, Los Angeles, San Diego, Santa Barbara, and Santa Cruz. Following the establishment of the Santa Cruz OSPO through Sloan funding, interest grew at other campuses in establishing their own OSPOs. After a period of conversation among stakeholders at the six campuses and with Sloan, the group received a grant from Sloan to launch the network, rather than developing stand-alone OSPOs at each campus, with benefits such as scalability of resources, avoiding duplication, and a broader collaborative community in mind.

The UC OSPO network is run by a leadership team composed of representatives from each of the six campuses. This, according to interviewees, helps avoid hierarchies in favor of “consensus-based” decision-making processes. The leadership team includes people from a variety of units, including libraries, a data science institute, and an engineering department, as well as three individuals specifically hired for the network project, including one who serves as community manager. This cross-campus collaboration is crucial to how the network functions. One interviewee remarked that, even back in the planning stage, “we didn't think that one [centralized] OSPO could fulfill the needs of all of the individual campuses. And so, this network concept is what emerged... in terms of a governance structure, it very much is multi-campus. It wasn't one campus kind of bringing the others in.”

In the case of UT, conversations began with the Sloan Foundation about a UT system OSPO after the one at UC was funded. As with the UC OSPO, interest in developing a system-wide framework came from those already heavily involved in open source research support, rather than the UT system office directly. That said, UT interviewees felt strongly supported by senior leaders at UT Austin: they described a “deep connection” with the

research leadership who were encouraging the OSPO there to expand to the system level.

At the time of the interviews, UT was in the early stages of their planning grant. They had not yet settled on an organizational structure or staffing model for their future system-wide OSPO. Instead, they focused their initial efforts on gathering information from the three other campuses—Dallas, El Paso, and San Antonio—that will partner with UT Austin. Interviewees emphasized that this “grassroots understanding of what it is people want, need, desire” will be the basis for their organizational and governance decisions.

## **Establishing goals and scope of work**

Advancing the work of researchers and their software products is central to the missions of both the UC and UT system OSPOs. In the case of UC, it was decided early on that their work would be organized under three “themes”—discovery, sustainability, and education—each of which has a dedicated working group. For every interviewee we spoke to at UC, these three themes were central to their description of the OSPO network’s current scope of work. Interviewees all defined each theme consistently. These are also described on the OSPO network’s website: the discovery group has focused on documenting the open source landscape at UC, the sustainability group on developing and sharing best practices for open source sustainability, and the education group on assessing and circulating educational materials.<sup>6</sup>

UT interviewees did not want to delimit their scope of work at this early stage, emphasizing the importance of gathering more information about needs from their partner universities first. However, they did define themselves as a “pragmatic research support service” aiming to advance research and research maturity across the system. Raising research maturity levels is important because of the relative variation in institution types across the system. One interviewee elaborated on this by comparing the UT and UC systems: “The institutions in the California system are all R1 institutions. They all have a relatively similar level of maturity when it comes to research.” However, in the UT system, “our four initial partners will include some of the smaller institutions where the research maturity

---

<sup>6</sup> “Guiding Themes,” UC OSPO Network, <https://ucospo.net/about/guiding-themes/>.

level is not as high and they are perhaps not even R1 institutions yet.” As a result, they explained, “we understand that as much as we are helping with software development we’re going to be helping with research development in some of those smaller institutional environments.”

“If individuals are engaged in open source software development, then they're part of the community; or if they're interested in engaging with it, then they're part of the community.”

This emphasis on research and researcher support informs how both UC and UT incorporate students into their OSPOs activities. Neither identify students as their sole or even primary audiences; instead, they focus on supporting researchers and practitioners working in open source, which can include students. This does not mean the OSPOs do not engage with students: a few interviewees mentioned connecting with students as an important audience of the educational materials they are developing or workshops they are holding. But ultimately, most interviewees saw students as just one part of their larger research and software support missions. As one UC system interviewee explained, “our approach has been, with education and with services, on the product. It's on the software. And people can develop software as students, as researchers, as faculty members, as staff members within the university. And so, if individuals are engaged in open source software development, then they're part of the community; or if they're interested in engaging with it, then they're part of the community.” They elaborated that students are welcomed, but they are not teaching “101” courses for students with no experience or interest in getting involved in the space: “we’re not scaled to that; we don’t have the capacity to do that.” The UT team shares a similar outlook. One interviewee noted that “students are just part of our audience. We consider them researchers, so we make sure we’re incorporating students and we do have things that are special for students. But they are researchers as much as anyone else who uses our services is.”

Both systems anticipate that collaborating with technology transfer offices will take on increasing prominence. A few UC interviewees noted that the network’s engagements with tech transfer had deepened recently thanks to hiring a specialist in open source licensing. As one interviewee explained, “it’s such a critical part of why we’ve had good relationships

and positive momentum with UC legal and the tech transfer offices”; the legal specialist’s interactions with these offices have made collaboration “way faster, way easier because there was somebody speaking their language involved.”

Interviewees from the UT system described active conversations with tech transfer and envision them as significant partners. One interviewee mentioned recent “good discussions” with tech transfer offices about the possibility of “creating some common training tools.” As another explained, “in open source, for example, you want to have a super solid software base for sustainability, reliability of your open source code. You also want that if you’re going to commercialize your code, right? So, there’s actually some really nice areas of overlap that we’re currently talking about.” Another interviewee also noted that increasing engagement with research in open source artificial intelligence was a budding opportunity for the system OSPO. They explained, “I still think that we will have the research support flavor, but I think that [our work] will take on some different goals, given the parties of interest [tech transfer and open source AI].”

## **Leveraging existing networks**

Both the UC and UT teams noted that existing networks connecting campuses within the system are important building blocks for their system OSPO networks. Both saw the advantages of leveraging these existing structures—both as models for their own governance structure and as a way to increase their contacts throughout the system—rather than starting from scratch. When asked what advice they would give others hoping to create a system-wide OSPO, interviewees from both systems highlighted the importance of relying on existing structures. One from UC emphasized that it “makes a lot of sense” to create a system-wide OSPO “when there are systems that are already in place” rather than forcibly forming an “artificial grouping.”

In the case of UC, a few interviewees described the UC-wide library coordination through forums like the Council of University Librarians as a model for forming their network. Several, though not all, of the participating UC campuses in the OSPO network are operating primarily out of libraries. One interviewee pointed out how these librarian perspectives helped determine the shape of the OSPO network: “We had

libraries involved with the discussions. We had this library model that exists in the UC system that everybody seemed very comfortable with—this particular organization within the university libraries. All the university librarians work together.” It was thus decided that they would “create something similar to that.”

The importance of leveraging existing system-wide networks was even more prominent in our discussions with UT. They plan to build from the cross-campus partnerships the Texas Advanced Computing Center (TACC) has established particularly through its UT System Research Infrastructure (UTRC) program. The UTRC program enables campuses across the UT system to take advantage of TACC’s advanced computing resources.

Interviewees see this partnership with UTRC as beneficial for several reasons. It is an “agnostic, central organization not affiliated with any one campus.” It is helpful with outreach work: “they already have contacts at all of the institutions from the bottom up.” Finally, it is already doing work that strategically aligns with the OSPO mission. As one interviewee explained, UTRC’s support already aims to “help these smaller institutions really get a leg up on the compute and software infrastructure that they would need in order to execute that high level of research,” an initiative the OSPO will contribute to. As TACC funding for UTRC comes from the UT system, interviewees see openly sharing resources across the system as already part of the system’s values. Therefore, the idea of expanding the OSPO’s support services to the system felt “already baked into what we do.” In other words, partnering with TACC and UTRC will also help the system OSPO strategically align with the system’s existing initiatives.

## **Sharing resources and expertise**

Interviewees expressed that the potential to share resources and expertise across campuses was the primary benefit of forming a system-wide OSPO network. This point was frequently underlined in our interviews, especially in the conversation with UC affiliates. “The model that we are moving towards is this idea that each of the campuses will have an OSPO that essentially is providing access to the same things, but

they will not deliver the same thing,” one UC interviewee explained. In other words, different campuses bring different resources and expertise to contribute to the pool.

This variety of expertise across the network expands the range of services it can offer on the whole. One UC interviewee made this point by referencing a graphic that CURIOSS uses to define different OSPO activities<sup>7</sup>:

The idea is that most campuses do part of it. What we’re trying to do is almost all of it within the system. So, if any open source project coming from my campus goes, ‘Hey, I need to know more about sustainability,’ I’m going to send [them] to our sustainability working group.

While one campus may have more sustainability experts, another might have more education experts, and so on, since “each of the campuses have a certain level of excellence in one or two different areas.” Another interviewee elaborated on a similar point: “several of the people on the grant are open-source developers and contributors, so they can speak directly from their experience. Several people are educators, very committed to the education piece. There is a person who is an expert on licensing.” As a result, the network as a whole can reach out to different locations to leverage this varied expertise.

“To me, the biggest benefit of having a network is being able to access expertise that we would just not be able to afford as a single campus.”

Interviewees from UC also noted that their campuses likely would not have the budgets to hire the range of specialists they have access to through the network on their own. “To me, the biggest benefit of having a network is being able to access expertise that we would just not be able to afford as a single campus,” one interviewee stated. A few interviewees emphasized the particular importance of distributed expertise in times of financial crisis, citing UC’s budget struggles and the uncertain future of

---

<sup>7</sup> CURIOSS is the acronym for Community for University and Research Institution OSPOs—a community of academic OSPO members, in which both UT and UC are involved. See: [https://curiOSS.org/news/academic\\_ospo\\_defn/](https://curiOSS.org/news/academic_ospo_defn/).

research funding from the federal government. Remarking that campuses in the network are “stronger together,” one interviewee continued,

Maybe especially in these times of limited funding. If you can pool your resources, you are going to be better off than if you cannot.... So, when institutions are dealing with budget cuts across a bunch of different departments, which they are, they don't have to think: are we going to lose the licensing person? Are we going to lose the community person?

Organizers of the UT OSPO also stated that sharing resources and expertise across the network is a crucial benefit of a system-wide OSPO model. This is one of the key reasons they are partnering with TACC and UTRC, building on the work they already do to make their resources openly available to different institutions in the system and beyond. Additionally, sharing resources and expertise will be essential to UT's ambition to help support research and raise research profiles across participating universities. Because they are dedicating time to understanding the needs of their stakeholders, the planners of the UT system OSPO hope that the resources they share will be strategically targeted towards people's needs. “The power in a system of resources,” one interviewee explained, is that they are “homegrown, easy to access resources that are understood on your campus.” “There's a lot of value,” they added, in being able to say, “We know our researchers ask for these things. We know our researchers are looking for these things,” which they described as a “grassroots” understanding of researcher needs.

“The power in a system of resources,” one interviewee explained, is that they are “homegrown, easy to access resources that are understood on your campus.”

However, the reality is that network OSPOs cannot be maximally effective in both supporting their own campuses and sharing resources and expertise with other campuses when staff capacity is limited. UC interviewees made clear that campuses are relying on the network infrastructure to function because they are each operating on a small budget. As one remarked: “there is no way we'd be able to do anything like this if we weren't connected to this system.” Although the UC OSPO self-describes as a network, this does not indicate that each campus in

the network has an OSPO that could currently function independently. One interviewee explained that until they secured local funds to hire a staff person fully dedicated to their campus, they would not describe their campus as having an OSPO, but as having “OSPO activities.”

Many members of the leadership group, who are also leading efforts on their campuses, are only able to give in-kind or part time contributions to this work. Campuses do not necessarily have the equivalent of one full-time staff member for the OSPO at their campus, one interviewee pointed out. Some interviewees described the difficult balance between putting time towards their campus versus the network at large. “The actual activity that we’re doing on campus is of course impacted by the amount of time that we need to work on the network. It’s that balancing thing that I find very challenging in this period right now,” one interviewee explained. However, they also underlined the benefits of putting effort into the network: “the fact that we’re able to leverage all of our other campuses and the work that we’re doing, I know we’ll go further faster.”

Other UC interviewees had a similarly positive outlook on investing in the network’s activities and growth. That said, certain practical challenges remain when it comes to sharing across the network, as one interviewee described:

We haven't experienced this yet, but I think a potential challenge could be in terms of engaging with someone locally, and then saying, ‘Yeah, yeah, absolutely, we can help you with that. I'll just connect you to [another campus]’... I can imagine for some people that might feel like, ‘Oh, actually, you can't help me. You’re putting me out to another organization.’ And so, I could imagine that could be perceived as a negative, and therefore represent a challenge.

Another interviewee noted that sharing resources also means less control and decision-making for each individual campus when it comes to those resources: “I think that’s been one of the challenges, that the system is the lead. And we have to follow that lead most of the time.”

# Trust-building and collaboration

Interviewees from both systems are undertaking a significant amount of relationship building. This includes relationships between OSPO staff and leadership (and the units they work for), between the different campuses involved in an OSPO network, and between the OSPO and the community members it serves. Interviewees made clear that the success of these relationships was crucial to the overall success of their OSPO.

One articulated how these relationships between people need to be built on a foundation of trust: “The trust-building that’s required, both on campus, across campuses, across the different cultures, across the different domain areas, that’s actually where we’re putting our investment, because that’s going to be the sort of launch pad that makes a big difference.” When asked what advice they would give to others starting up a system OSPO, they remarked: “do not underestimate how much time and effort you are going to need, and you appropriately should, put into building trust, on your campuses, and across them.”

## Academic community relations

Some of that trust building needs to happen between the OSPOs and the academic communities they serve. Interviewees often described dedicating time to different types of outreach activities. UC interviewees mentioned administering a survey to assess challenges and needs among their open source community members. One UC interviewee described much of their current work as “building up momentum for the OSPO” on their respective campuses; another was dedicating time to explaining to their community members what an OSPO was. One UC interviewee also pointed out that outreach takes on a different dimension when reaching out to communities of individuals already active and prominent in open source; in these cases, the objective is not explaining basics but instead “making the OSPO a place that [these] people want to come and identify their projects with.”

The UT system sees its crucial goal as being a trusted support service, with intimate knowledge of the UT system and its needs. One interviewee elaborated on this point, stating that the system OSPO will be “a trusted entity” that “meets researchers where they are” through a “grassroots” understanding of researcher needs. They compared this with external consulting services that do not have the same in-depth knowledge of the campuses, key stakeholders, and available resources, and therefore do not merit the same degree of trust.

## Cross-unit collaboration

Running a system-wide OSPO also requires close collaboration between individuals housed within different units and based at different institutions. Indeed, Ithaka S+R’s prior research found that successful cross-unit collaboration is an important element of successful academic OSPOs.<sup>8</sup> A system-wide OSPO model facilitates these cross-unit collaborations, as different OSPOs in the system are led by different administrative units. Another level of relationship and trust-building is required when it comes to collaboration between stakeholders housed in different units at different campuses.

Interviewees emphasized the benefits of working with individuals with different perspectives and backgrounds and described these as a valuable component of how the system OSPO functioned. At the same time, they admitted these types of collaborations come with inevitable challenges because individuals, their units, and their campuses can have differing priorities. For instance, in the UC system, the leaders of the OSPO network are housed in libraries or programs such as engineering, data science, and computer science. One interviewee described the team running the OSPO as a combination of “software people,” “education people,” and “open-access, scholarly publishing, open-data, fair-data people,” as well as people who have more of “a library-type stance” or a “software kind of stance.” They emphasized that the “culture gap is pretty big across that divide,” but that it’s also “really beautiful to have those communities convene together.” The result of this level of collaboration is,

---

<sup>8</sup> Dylan Ruediger, Claire Baytas, Ruby MacDougall, Chelsea McCracken, “University Open Source Program Offices,” *Ithaka S+R*, August 14, 2025, <https://sr.ithaka.org/publications/university-open-source-program-offices/>.

in the words of another interviewee, that “you always have to balance everyone else’s goals and approaches.”

The unit that is most active in OSPO activities on a given campus often shapes the priorities of its contributions and approach to this work. One UC interviewee noted that even libraries at different campuses may not have the same priorities, depending on which other units it works most closely with, as well as the priorities of its broader university. One campus, they explained, might be more “driven by research development, grant funding, very typical university research-drive,” while another is more focused on “setting up a basic service so that we can answer questions for people who come in.” As a result, individuals within the leadership can come in with “different problem sets” necessitating conversations about where their priorities “sync up” or not.

Interviewees believe that a successful system OSPO network needs to understand and meet the needs of the different collaborators. One UC interviewee explained that, when conceptualizing a system-level OSPO, one needs to “really sit down and understand who your stakeholders are within the system ... and figure out what stakeholders want” especially if there are a “wide variety of mandates for campuses.” Another UC interviewee mentioned how they initially felt their campus had “idiosyncratic needs” specific to their local environment, but were pleased to find their needs “really aligned with what everyone else wanted in different ways,” which was crucial to their decision to join the system-wide OSPO. Looking ahead, the team planning the UT system OSPO wants to ensure they meet different stakeholder needs. One interviewee stated, “I worry about making sure each of the partners feel that they’re getting a fair share. Even if they’ve got different models and they’re doing different things, [I hope] that they feel they are meeting the needs at their own campuses with their own metrics.”

“The challenge of the separate parties working together is one thing, but the benefits way outweigh the challenges in the end.”

Additionally, for both the UT and UC systems, paying attention to the relative statuses of campuses within a system was an important component of this balancing act. Several interviewees mentioned being strategic about the role the flagship institution—or the “big whale,” “800

pound gorilla,” or “loudest in the system” —would play to help other institutions feel like equal partners in the collaboration.

Ultimately, in spite of inherent challenges to collaborating across units and campuses, interviewees reported the net results are positive. As one interviewee put it, “the challenge of the separate parties working together is one thing, but the benefits way outweigh the challenges in the end.”

## The future of system-level OSPOs

System-level academic OSPOs are a new phenomenon, so their path to sustainable, long-term funding is still unknown. The challenging budgetary landscape within higher education made it particularly difficult for interviewees to predict the future. Nonetheless, interviewees from both systems felt optimistic the system-level OSPOs would ultimately be able to prove their value and fully institutionalize themselves.

For the first 12 Sloan-funded OSPOs, predictions about their future sustainability were often linked to whether they felt strong support from senior leadership.<sup>9</sup> Support from senior leadership, on both the level of individual campuses and the system, is also an important factor in making the leaders of the UC and UT system OSPOs feel they will be able to sustain the network. UC interviewees, for instance, described their system OSPO network project as built from “the bottom up,” but also reported being in conversation with the UC Office of the President, as system level involvement may be essential to sustainability. A few UC interviewees also mentioned a budding relationship with the system procurement office, who were seeing the value in open source projects for the university.

---

<sup>9</sup> See Dylan Ruediger, Claire Baytas, Ruby MacDougall, and Chelsea McCracken, “University Open Source Program Offices,” *Ithaka S+R*, August 14, 2025.

<https://doi.org/10.18665/sr.323392>.

“When you build a community, you have a chance to have more people get invested and rely on you.”

Interviewees also indicated that being a part of a system-wide OSPO network would be beneficial when it came to sustaining themselves, in comparison to OSPOs at single campuses. They pointed out that when a single campus is offering a service that multiple campuses are using, if that service disappears, many more stakeholders are impacted. Ultimately, this should help the system OSPOs in proving value. One interviewee stated that they “believe that because there are more stakeholders [in a network model], it will be more sustainable.... Because so many of us benefit through a particular service, it makes more sense that we might be able to support this long term.” Another interviewee noted that, “when you build a community, you have a chance to have more people get invested and rely on you” which will help them “[show] we’re useful and we’ve helped people.”

External funding sources, such as through industry, may also be an option. One interviewee shared insight on why this might be an opportune moment to try such a strategy:

some industry is recognizing that federal money being taken away [from universities] is going to negatively impact their bottom line because of the lack of innovation that’s coming out of universities. So, they’re going to pop in and try and help. Not because they’re altruistic, but because they know that we’re going to have innovation dry up. Workforce development’s going to be a huge problem.

A system-wide OSPO, this interviewee argued, could be an appealing route in for industry. This kind of external partnership could also help gain internal support:

my focus because of that has been very much on: how do we get the tech transfer and the research impact part to be a fundamental part of how we are shown as valuable to the UC system? ... Because I think that that is where we’re going to have more long term support to be able to really institutionalize this and [expand to

other campuses in the system]... That tech transfer part that shows our value.

In essence, making strategic choices about how to maximize impact and prove the value of an OSPO with limited capacity is crucial to the success of the system level OSPO, much as it is for the campus-specific ones. When speaking about lessons learned, one interviewee remarked, “until you are institutionalized, you want to make sure your activities are focused on things that have the most impact so that you can show your most value without overstretching the resources you have.” They acknowledged, however, that this “was a really hard balancing act to do.” For another, maximum impact and value come from, as they put it, ensuring the OSPO shifts focus from “how do we build new stuff?” to “how do we support existing stuff?” They acknowledged achieving this kind of impact takes time, but insisted it was important to ensure that discovery and sustainability work, for instance, ultimately helps make existing open source projects more discoverable and sustainable.

## How far can the system OSPOs’ work extend looking forward?

How far can the system OSPOs’ work extend looking forward? Many interviewees hope their networks can expand, stating intentions to make their work accessible to not only other campuses outside the currently existing partnerships in the system, but other higher education institutions and the open source community beyond the university more widely. A few interviewees underlined that this is another part of an academic OSPO’s mission. As one interviewee put it, “from the beginning, I was always pushing to have the training, and to have the resources and everything just open to everybody... Everything we do should be open source. Everything we do should be applicable to everybody.” Along similar lines, another interviewee explained, “it’s not that you share information across the campuses. It’s that you share information with the world... you put stuff out into the world, and then everyone benefits—and that happens to include the UC campuses.” These interviewees sounded optimistic that the OSPOs could have significant impact by putting out resources with the community beyond the university system in mind.

One interviewee also hoped OSPO stakeholders would keep the bigger picture objectives of open work in mind, noting that “incentivizing creating

an OSPO is not the same as incentivizing doing better work for science and society, and education more broadly.” Those broader impacts are the important outcomes of an OSPO’s work, such as “better research from the universities, better education, better career pathways.” For this interviewee, “working openly as part of a public university network is one of the most critical things that I can do to protect democracy.”