

Heads of Technical Services

Minutes, April 25, 2005

Present: G. McClenney, P. Wakeford, L. Hsiung, P. Martin, L. Leighton, J. Riemer, L. Barnhart, N. Douglas, C. Kiehl, J. Dooley, J. P. French (recorder)

Guests: N. Kushigian, M. Heath

1. Continuing Discussion on Re-thinking Melvyl:

Survey response has been received from U. of Minnesota and was sent to HOTS members. Agreed that these issues now will become part of the Bibliographic Services Task Force work. J. Riemer (chair of the task force) will include in the process.

2. Bibliographic System Interrelationships Diagram:

M. Heath provided a flow chart showing relationships of UC systems that support bibliographic services, with the Request service in the central position. The future ERMS is not represented in the chart yet because its position and relationship is not yet known. The SCP database is not represented and will be added. The Bibliographic Services Task Force will probably develop similar charts with more detail as they begin their study. HOTS members think it might be useful for each campus to prepare additional charts showing the systems relationships at the campus level and provide them to the Task Force Chair (J. Riemer). They may request that campuses prepare additional charts showing systems relationships at the campus level. The ERMS group will also probably need to develop systems flowcharts. Further work and analysis on interrelationships will emanate from these two groups.

3. Bibliographic Services Task Force:

J. Riemer presented the BSTF charge and discussed possible methodologies. The implications for the study include a change to the underlying philosophy that frames the organization of technical services processing throughout UC and the systems infrastructure that supports it. It could extend as far as considering the merits of having campuses use a common ILS vendor. Primary measure of success would probably include whether a different system configuration would save time and the tradeoffs inherent in centralizing decision-making and local autonomy. A key question is how the task force can collect the type and amount of detailed input from campuses needed to inform their planning and to gain support for their recommendations. HOTS expressed interest in participating in a brainstorming meeting which would include campus AULs and department head staff. HOTS also urged that the task force remember to include acquisitions functions and nonprint materials in its thinking. A brainstorming meeting might be more successful if the task force develops some preliminary ideas as a starting point for participants to react to.

4. Shared Print Repository Issues:

N. Kushigian joined the meeting for a discussion of Appendices F & G of the Shared Print Repository Framework. The ULs have endorsed the framework and appendices F & G spell out principles, practices and the funding model for the shared print collection. An underlying premise of the funding model is that system wide funding will be provided to support the minimum level necessary to provide access; the sustainability of shared print processing will require funding contributions from campuses. The premise that reductions in campus workloads will offset contributions needed to support the Shared Print Repository is debatable in HOTS' view. Campus workloads reduced because of increase in shared purchasing/processing is already being offset by new types of work including coordinating local acquisitions decisions with CDL licensing terms. Joan Ariel joins the Shared Print Program on May 2 and

will build the model for prospective monographic acquisitions. Ownership of Shared Print materials will be prospective; no retrospective change of ownership is intended for materials already stored in RLFs. SCP staff is advising on cataloging practices and may have a role in distributing bib records for Shared Print titles to campuses.

1. Algorithm for Merging Non-Book Materials in Melvyl:

Feedback received on changes indicated that a new algorithm is needed for music and map materials. CDL will work on creating separate merge algorithms for these two categories of materials.

2. Classification of Electronic Monographs:

L. Barnhart confirmed that the SCP has been classifying e-monographs whenever feasible and that the policy to do so has been confirmed by SOPAG. SOPAG's decision was to take a practical approach when a large set is encountered for which classification will take a large amount of staff resources and to consider such cases individually as they arise. So far, no such sets have come up. When one does, SCP will consult with the SCP AC and to find a practical and appropriate strategy.

3. Round Robin & Miscellaneous News:

UCB initiated a project through Big Heads to coordinate cataloging of backlogged Western European language collections. Four libraries agreed to participate (Yale, Stanford, UCB and Harvard). L. Leighton also reported that many libraries are now cataloging on their local systems rather than on OCLC or RLIN. This means that they are only adding their holdings to OCLC records, not contributing records. OCLC is working with the four cooperative cataloging libraries to develop a 9XX field that will permit OCLC to identify their locally-created records to overlay lower level records in the OCLC database.

Digital Dissertations: UCSD and UCSF are doing a pilot project with Proquest that may result in a system wide contract with Proquest. Proquest will provide access to the digital dissertation; the CDL Digital Preservation Repository will be used for preservation. The DPR will require digitized dissertations to carry a METS metadata wrapper. At UCSF, Proquest is working with the Graduate Division and proposes to offer MARC records. At UCSD, approximately 50 students have volunteered to submit their dissertation in digital form this spring to Proquest. Proquest will do the quality control and will add the document to their database and into the CDL digital repository. The library is concerned that Proquest has not addressed questions about who owns the rights to the document. UCSB is keeping a print copy for archiving and linking to the digital copy through the catalog. This is done at UCD also. HOTS expressed concern that there are disparate conversations and initiatives occurring with digital dissertations with UC without coordination between them.

UC Merced is starting to process SCP records locally and will address how to handle them in Melvyl next. UCM opens its library on the day after Labor Day with a physical collection of 30,000 books.

Campus visits by SCP staff will probably begin after June. SCP would like to receive official invitations from campuses before scheduling a visit.

SCP staff is working with CDL on a pilot to move PIDs for serials to the CDL SFX KnowledgeBase with the goal of eliminating duplicate work between PIDs, ARKs and OpenURLs. The pilot (still under development) involves JSTOR titles. CDL and SCP are creating a set of guidelines for using PIDs and Open URLs. Campuses can contact Margery Tibbetts if they are interested in using PIDs for local resources.

The SCP AC needs to be reviewed and updated to reflect the wider diversity of materials now handled through the SCP. C. Kiehl will send out draft revisions. It will include a review of the timeline for membership rotation and how campuses are represented on the AC. An issue that was mentioned was that the SCP AC has not been included in conversations related to planning for the Shared Print Program and

the SCP's role in it.

The SCP AC continues to work on a proposal for using the 793 MARC field for CDL package names and a subfield g for coding that specifies active vs. inactive content.

UCB is temporarily closing its bookstore for selling discarded or donated volumes not selected for retention because of space issues. UCD is also ending its book sale. Several campuses have stopped accepting gift materials or are creating policies that limit the quantity of gifts they accept. This trend reflects the fact that the overhead of handling gifts is not worth the value received to the library and that book sales are not providing enough return to merit the time it takes to run them.

Some campuses are finding that deposits to the RLFs are more challenging than in the past for several reasons. Campuses which have greater space constraints want to send more material but are finding that the no duplication rule constrains their ability to send enough material. Other campuses are finding it more difficult to meet their annual commitment because there are fewer print serial volumes to send due to cancellations and the switch to electronic formats. Another trend on some campuses is that it is harder to meet the relocation commitment because there is less processing staff and fewer bibliographers to identify materials to send. The RLF strategy as a whole is under system wide discussion and there may be changes proposed to the formula for creating commitment targets.

UCLA is planning pilot tests for shelf ready material for approvals and Cornell's ITSO CUL system for firm orders. UCLA is finishing its first complete year on Voyager. In implementation, the load strategy for SCP serials has shifted to overlaying the local record with protection of URLs for locally-licensed access. UCLA is shopping for an authority vendor. Cataloging has experienced high turnover this year – over 20%.

Several campuses report significant reductions in technical services staff in recent years. UCI has identified core technical processing services which it will continue and others which it cannot continue due to staff reductions. UCB is doing a similar review. UCSC has only 15 staff left in technical services.

SOPAG is reviewing OCLC's recent decision to move to a subscription-only fee structure for resource sharing for next year and will consider whether to propose a UC system wide contract with OCLC for services.

HOTs plans to ask ACIG to identify extra acquisitions tasks that are now necessary to manage campus participation in system wide consortial acquisitions activities.