

HOTS meeting minutes  
April 21, 2008

## Morning

Present: John Riemer, Lee Leighton, Martha Hruska, Linda Barnhart, Tony Harvell, Manuel Urrizola, Jim Dooley, Carole Kiehl, Patty Martin, Brad Eden, Karleen Darr, Lai-Ying Hsiung, Anneliese Taylor

### Announcements:

(Hruska) OCLC program/Cooperative collaborative management trust participation with UCLA/UCSD/others: storage commitments, use of 583 field (maintenance info, storage registry info).

### SCP budget cuts:

Barnhart gave out handouts showing convoluted reporting structure of SCP, and providing history of budget cut and how it would be applied. Because of SCP's reporting structure, changes to SCP's focus/work resulting from the budget cut are really Ivy Anderson's call. 50% LAIII cataloging is electronic Cal Docs and it is likely that this workload will be cut; CAMCIG has been discussing a collaborative project to take on this workload, should SCP stop cataloging Cal Docs. Because of incremental reductions to other SCP staff, it is likely that open access resources and some Tier 2's would not be cataloged as well. Priorities will continue to be 1) licensed databases, 2) newly licensed journal packages, 3) newly licensed monographic packages, and 4) open access materials.

Eden reported on discussion with California State Library (CSL) staff, they are interested in shared collection policies and cataloging. Ideas: 1) One campus does cataloging of Cal state doc, sends record to SCP for distribution to everyone, 2) one campus does cataloging of Cal state doc, adds 10 holdings symbols (combination of real time/batchloading) without distributing the record for loading into local ILSs, 3) 5 campuses taking up 10% of electronic Cal docs cataloging, if more volunteer, then so much the better. State documents staff should be the group to have conversation with State Library? Bring in CSU Libraries?

The sense of the group was that centralized cataloging (at least for electronic) was the more efficient model, and UC should move to decentralized cataloging (e.g., sharing the Cal Docs workload across multiple campuses) only if absolutely necessary. CAMCIG has been charged to explore these options.

**ACTION:** Short-term: continue to pursue collaborative model for cataloging electronic Cal Docs started in CAMCIG (although it would be preferable for SCP to do this centrally). Longer-term: talk with GILS group under CDC, hold meeting with representative UC, CSL, and CSU staff on future collaborative efforts. Try out some pilot projects. Focus on both paper and electronic. Need to find out more about paper Cal docs cataloging.

Discussion moved to future funding models for SCP. Cost share model based on package/collection size?

Idea: To ULs: recommend that SCP is exactly that: Shared Cataloging, not just CDL cataloging. Broad view rather than narrow view. LSTA grant (long term) to examine situation.

**ACTION:** Task group to put together a proposal of new funding and governance models for SCP. Jim Dooley, John Riemer, Linda Barnhart. Will bring proposal to June conference call.

**ACTION:** Ask the SCP AC to explore ideas listed in Section B of Appendix B of the HOTS report and identify ways that SCP can streamline and improve its efficiency. This should include looking at brief records/full records.

**ACTION:** HOTS members will look at Sections B and D in Appendix B immediately and send comments to HOTS list to let TF members and the SCP AC know which options should be explored, or if any should be dropped.

### **Institutional records in OCLC:**

There is a national debate underway on Institutional Records (IRs) and this was an opportunity for HOTS to weigh in on it. To review where IRs came from, they resulted from the WorldCat-RLIN database merger. OCLC has always operated on the master record concept. RLIN's database model was a cluster of everyone's individual edited version of the same record. As part of the merger, OCLC offered former RLG members the option of preserving those records, clustered around the master record.

John was alarmed to learn that in 2007 five-sixths of the RLG members opted for the IR option that OCLC offered. This conflicted so much with the BSTF Report recommendations on eliminating duplication of effort and local variation, as well as the benefits of relying on shared files. From speaking with ALA Big Heads members, he was reassured to hear them say this was a one-time warehousing effort for data that could no longer reside in RLIN. Few had any plans to perpetuate IRs into the future.

IRs are an issue for WorldCat Local; some have inquired whether programming will be done to support display of an institution's IR in lieu of the master record. OCLC has made no decision on committing the programming resources to make this possible; OCLC prefers to let the national debate play out on the wisdom of IRs.

Philosophically, John sees 3 potential good uses of IRs in WorldCat. (1) Pre-1850 imprints often are issued in multiple printings. The printing differences are sufficiently important that libraries will attempt to collect copies of each. However, the differences are not significant enough to warrant input of a separate record in WorldCat. (2) When the language of cataloging differs (English here and Spanish for libraries in Mexico) the various records could be grouped as IRs (3) When Google and the Open Content Alliance both digitize the same print title, the records also could be treated like IRs. What all three of these have in common is a possible sub-clustering of OCLC symbols, one level below the master record, so that libraries can signify "I have that version."

However, the type of IR that represents one and only institution's editing of a master record (what the current national debate is about) seems "off the chart" in terms of duplication of effort, sustainability, etc.

In the discussion, only one campus had plans to use IRs. OCLC members, not formerly in RLG, will have to pay to use IRs. It is possible to use IRs only for selected categories of material.

**Action:** As the consensus in HOTS appears to be against usage of IRs, CAMCIG is being asked to confirm if it agrees.

## Afternoon minutes

### Announcements

The WorldCat Local (next Generation Melvyl Pilot) release date has been postponed to May 19. UC Davis is doing an order record pilot with WorldCat Local. The local item status will display through the Z39.50 interface.

### Centers of Excellence in Technical Services for Shared Print

Emily Stambaugh, Shared Print Manager, presented a shared print overview. She covered both established shared print projects (Canadiana monos and journal packages) as well as those in process, policy considerations, and organizations such as the Cooperative Collection Management Trust (CCMT) that are guiding large shared print projects. A new Shared Print Web page just went live at <http://www.cdlib.org/inside/resources/sharedprint/>.

The group discussed the technical services aspects of shared print collections, including:

- The need to define processing standards and what we mean by shelf-ready
- Funding for these projects is expected to be absorbed into existing campus workloads. CDC is reviewing the costs for materials acquisition.
- The cost of recharging other campuses is very expensive; thus shared processing activities are more desirable, with resources being acquired in situ at each campus.
- With shared print monographic acquisitions, materials could also be sent for processing to the campus with cataloging expertise in that area. If this option were chosen, processing would have to be prioritized since other campuses would be waiting on the materials.
- UCLA is currently handling most shared print processing and is maxed out.
- MARC fields 042 and 583 should be used to indicate a shared print resource.
- With shared print, the issue of loss and persistence becomes important.

The Springer eBook pilot is a go. CDL needs technical services expertise to let Springer know what we need in terms of MARC records, whether they will display in OCLC, where the print archive for the e-books will be received and processed. The UC system purchases about 3,000 Springer print books per year.

**ACTION:** CDC is forming a Task Force to come up with all of the questions that need to be addressed for the Springer eBook pilot. HOTS recommends that the TF include an acquisitions person and HOTS member. Adolfo Tarango (UCSD) was suggested as a nominee.

### Consolidating processing across the UC system

The discussion focused on foreign language materials as groups of records that could benefit from shared processing. CJK materials are the most widely acquired, and are costly to process. B, D, I, LA, R, SC, and SD all acquire & process CJK materials, so we have substantial expertise in these languages amongst us.

Key points:

- It is better to use skeletal records for foreign language materials and rely on other libraries updating those records than to not order relevant materials.

- Campuses reported various experience with retrieving MARC records for CJK. UCSC uses a Chinese vendor located in Beijing, China National Publishing Industrial Trading Corp (CNPITC) for acquisition and full-MARC cataloging of these materials.
- For shared collecting and cataloging, it would help if all copies in the system were ordered at the same time. We'd have to all know if another campus ordered a copy. Tools such as WorldCat Selection could make this possible.

Material in less common languages such as Catalan, Hebrew, Greek, Tibetan, Vietnamese, and Slavic languages is acquired by some campuses. One way campuses find people to process these materials is to contact language departments to ask if there are students fluent in the tongue who'd like to work for the library.

One idea was to start with a smaller, niche collection for a shared print project rather than CJK.

**ACTION:** Everyone should review the Cataloging Expertise & Needs document at <http://libraries.universityofcalifornia.edu/hots/> and send updates to Lee Leighton.