

MINUTES

HOTS Conference Call

Friday, August 27, 2004

9:00 – 10:30 a.m.

Present: Carole Kiehl (Chair), Linda Barnhart (recorder), Luc Declerck, Jim Dooley, Nancy Douglas, Pat French, Mary Heath, Lai-Ying Hsiung, Sara Shatford Layne, Lee Leighton, Gail McClenney, John Riemer

Absent: Paul Wakeford, Jain Fletcher, Bruce Miller

1. Draft ERMS consortial data elements

ACIG was asked independently of HOTS to respond to consortial data elements for the ERMS. HOTS expressed concern about not having direct involvement in providing commentary. Riemer provided background and clarified that other data element lists support other functions. Consortial data elements are an aspect that has not been defined yet elsewhere. HOTS concluded that this list looked good. A few specific elements to include were suggested:

- Who the provider is (this might be in another part of the spec)
- History at the title level for titles that keep changing packages
- History at the package level
- Ability to distinguish current access from backfiles

HOTS would like to see the RFI developed by the Task Group for the ERMS. Action may be taken on this at the September 10 SOPAG meeting, so comments need to be sent quickly, via email. McClenney will talk to the chair of ACIG about its relationship to HOTS; the groups need to work together instead of in parallel

In addition there is a document on the UC Shared Print Management Database that was routed to the UC CDC from Nancy Kushigan, Director of Shared Print Collections which HOTS also should review.

HOTS needs to be a formal part of processes that impact technical services, including collection development decisions. Kiehl will send a note to Bernie Hurley and John Tanno as a reminder.

McClenney will invite Hurley to brief HOTS at its next conference call about the potential integration of the ERMS with other systems.

Action: HOTS members should send individual comments on the RFI quickly to Riemer.

Action: McClenney will send the RFI to ACIG.

Action: Kiehl will contact Hurley and Tanno about processes.

Action: McClenney will contact Hurley about joining the next HOTS conference call.

2. HOTS proposal for classification of e-monos

Kiehl took comments and further revisions on the revised document sent earlier. Discussion centered on clarifying what was meant by "broad classification." HOTS agreed that "broad classification" means a range (e.g. "BF1-940" for psychology or "BF309-499" for personality) or an overly general classification (e.g. just "BF"). Both broad and specific classifications are found in the "subfield a" of call number fields. For original classification assignment, only the "subfield a" needs to be completed, whether the classification is broad or specific. (If other subfields are present

from copy, they will not be deleted.) HOTS discarded the notion of ranges of numbers as broad classification. There was some discussion of the principle "some bibliographic access is better than none" regarding the SCP distributing records without classification quickly, to have them overlaid later when classification could be assigned.

In other changes, Kiehl will look at moving the phrase "conceptual and hierarchical organization" to another part of the document that speaks to more general principles. Layne would like to add "flexible and efficient" to the sentence "...to support mappings to the broad subject terms..." Declerck suggested a revision to the final sentence of the document to clarify that the Shared Digital Content Director should be included in the decision-making stream for funding large projects.

Action: Kiehl will send one last draft before this document goes to SOPAG.

Action: Nancy Douglas will forward an article to HOTS on predicting classification from LCSH strings.

3. Rethinking Melvyl

Kiehl would like to develop a plan to give this discussion shape and direction. HOTS members agreed to divide up the work of contacting other consortia, to see how they manage their database(s).

Action: Ex Libris (Heath)

Florida (Kiehl)

Harvard (Leighton)

Illinois (Layne)

Maryland (Riemer)

Minnesota (French)

OhioLink (Leighton)

SUNY (Heath)

Declerck volunteered to do a literature search.

Questions for these consortia include:

(First and before contact, look at the consortial OPAC)

- How integrated is your system?
- What is centralized?
- Do you use multiple or single records, or merged records?
- What is your cataloging process? What utility do they use?
- How are holdings handled? For monographs? For serials?
- How does record loading work?
- Can you provide some background on your database situation before the consortium? Did you build this database from scratch or migrate from another system?
- Where is maintenance done (all types: bibliographic, authorities, holdings)
- How is authority control done?
- What is the relationship to campus acquisitions systems? Does the shared database include on-order records?
- How do you create local catalogs?
- What is the governance model for standards and procedures? How do members of the consortium come to agreement?

- Have you considered centralizing all functions? If not, why not?
- What is the impact of the consortial system on circulation? Is the circulation module integrated? Are other modules integrated? To what degree have policies (e.g., circulation policies) needed to be harmonized as a result of your model?
- What is the greatest benefit?
- What is the greatest drawback?
- If you could change three things about your consortial system, what would they be?

HOTS would like to have a progress report at the next conference call. After investigating other consortial solutions, the next step may be to brainstorm obstacles to change (both technical and sociological).

4. Other business

McClenney will become the chair of HOTS beginning September 1, 2004.

McClenney needs to present HOTS goals for 2004-05 at the joint SOPAG meeting in October. HOTS agreed to review goals via email.

Dooley inquired about the feasibility of a new loader profile to directly load SCP records into Melvyl. Heath thinks that such a concept/process would not happen quickly because there are ramifications for each campus. She recommended that it would be easier for CDL to develop a load profile just for UCM.

McClenney will schedule and convene the next HOTS conference call, and will give Hurley a choice of dates between October 4 and 15.

Note: The next in-person HOTS meeting in Oakland is scheduled for Monday, November 15. Nancy Kushigian has been invited as a guest.

Action: HOTS members should review 2004-05 goals via email.

Action: HOTS members should contact McClenney via email with the dates between October 4 and 15 that they are NOT available for a conference call.