Discussion continued on the Advisory Committee response to the Bibliographic Services Task Force Report. During our last call, we prioritized the subrecommendations as to whether they could be implemented in the short, medium or long term. In this meeting we prioritized the subrecommendations as to whether they are of high, medium or low importance, from the Shared Cataloging Program perspective.

Enhancing search and retrieval
I.1a. Have UC e-links take you to a logical, default choice with option to go back  LOW
I.1b. Provide an “I want this” button with the goal of always offering a fulfillment option  MEDIUM
I.2a. Provide both content- and filter-based recommender features  MEDIUM
I.3a. Allow user to define the set of resources/databases to search  MEDIUM
I.4a. Spell-checking  MEDIUM
I.4b. Offer constructive suggestions for zero-results searches  MEDIUM
I.5a. Implement FRBR concepts  HIGH
I.5b. Present all variant serial titles through linking fields  LOW
I.5c. Implement faceted browsing  LOW
I.6a. Integrate library content and services into campus content management systems  HIGH
I.6b. Imbed library content and services into institutional portals  HIGH
I.6c. Expose metadata to external search engines  HIGH
I.6d. Make our digital and unique collections available first within UC  HIGH
I.7a. Provide relevance ranking based on a broad set of criteria  MEDIUM
I.7b. Use full text for discovery and relevance ranking  LOW
I.8a. Provide better searching for non-Roman materials  HIGH

Rearchitecting the OPAC
II.1a. Create a single catalog interface  HIGH
II.2a. Pre-harvest metadata for the entire bibliographic information space  HIGH
II.2b. Provide result sets arranged by format grouped in terms of granularity  HIGH

Adopting new cataloging practices
III.1a. View UC cataloging as a single enterprise  HIGH
III.1b. Implement a single data store  HIGH
III.2a. Use appropriate metadata schema  MEDIUM (this will happen anyway)
III.2b. Consider FAST MEDIUM (in addition to existing subject heading strings, not as a replacement for them)
III.2c. Abandon controlled vocabularies for topical subjects LOW (we do not support this recommendation)
III.2d. Prefer allocating resources to catalog undiscoverable items; consider automated techniques for all textual materials MEDIUM (we question whether automated techniques can in fact be applied to all textual materials)
III.3a. Enhance names, titles, series and uniform titles for prolific authors HIGH (currently being done)
III.3b. Implement structures serial holdings format HIGH
III.4a. Encourage vendor metadata creation and ingest it early in the process HIGH
III.4b. Import enhanced metadata when available HIGH
III.4c. Automate the addition of geographic data LOW
III.4d. Change the processing workflow to shelve with existing metadata with ongoing metadata enhancement LOW (real danger that enhancement will not occur)
III.4e. Add enriched content (TOCs, etc.) MEDIUM

**Supporting continuous improvement**
IV.a. Institutionalize an ongoing process of identifying and prioritizing improvements MEDIUM
IV.b. Provide a robust reporting capability HIGH

We will continue working by email to have our response to HOTS by Friday, March 17. J. Dooley will forward draft HOTS responses to questions 3 and 4 for Advisory Committee reaction.

Next meeting: conference call Friday, March 17, 10:00-11:30 AM (if necessary)