

HOTS

November 15, 2004

Minutes

Present: Gail McClenney (UCSB, Chair), Linda Barnhart (UCSD), Jim Dooley (UCM), Nancy Douglas (UCR), Jain Fletcher (LAUC), Pat French (UCD), Mary Heath (CDL), Lai-Ying Hsiung (UCSC), Carole Kiehl (UCI), Sara Layne (UCLA, recorder), Lee Leighton (UCB), John Riemer (SCP AC), Paul Wakefield (UCSF)

Guest: Nancy Kushigian (for agenda item 3)

1. Recorder: Sara volunteered. Lee will be the recorder for the next conference call.

2. Consortial databases

A. Reports on consortial databases.

John distributed a written report on the University of Maryland (Aleph). John highlighted the highly centralized nature of this consortium, in which circulation, acquisitions, and cataloging are all done in the same system. Primary goal was to have a system in which patrons could place holds. Single record used for everyone. Not much local variation is possible. There are some bugs in the system; for example, it is possible for an institution to pay another institution's invoice unintentionally. Authority control is not available within the system, but is (or will be) performed by an outside vendor. Lai-Ying noted that this arrangement appears to be similar to a Canadian consortium with which she is familiar.

Lee reported on Harvard University and Ohio-link.

Harvard (Aleph) has a centralized system, except for the business school. OCLC is the only utility used. First record in is the one that is kept in the system. If changes are desired to an existing record, central maintenance unit arbitrates. Authority control is shut off.

Ohio-link (Innopac) is a central union catalog consisting of master records with holdings. Links make it possible to look at records in individual OPACs. Ability to place holds is very important. They are proud of statewide borrowing. Maintenance, acquisitions, collection development are all done locally, wouldn't consider centralizing these. Several large committees provide governance; seems cumbersome but works quite well. Ohio State, which had a locally-developed system, felt they lost autonomy and control, but other members are quite happy.

ACTION: Complete research and reports on other consortia (Carole, Mary, Pat, Sara).

B. Melvyl: questions and discussion

Is the emphasis on resource sharing recent? What other purpose(s) are there for Melvyl? Resource sharing has always been the focus, but automated tools for resource sharing are recent.

Will SFX link in Aleph 16 eliminate the need for e-holdings information contributed from the campuses? Will SFX also provide linking to request?

Why do we need to preserve local versions of records? Ability to see local versions of serial records is valuable for catalogers. Local records may add additional access points.

Is there a more efficient way to get the SCP records get into the union catalog? Is there a more efficient way to get our local records into Melvyl?

Could we consider replacing Melvyl with a portal or interface to local catalogs?

Would it be better to build on what we have, and we have Melvyl; make changes to Melvyl in stages?

Who is planning for the future of Melvyl? SOPAG? The ULs? HOTS is eager to have a proactive role in planning.

ACTION: Gail, as Chair of HOTS, will communicate with other AC chairs and with SOPAG regarding planning for the future of Melvyl, and will also look at the planning document "Systemwide Strategic Directions for Libraries and Scholarly Information at the University of California"

http://libraries.universityofcalifornia.edu/planning/library_strategy.pdf to see what HOTS can contribute.

3. Nancy Kushigian: discussion regarding planning for shared print collections.

An Associate Librarian is being hired at UCLA to work on developing best practices for JSTOR and for the collections of different types identified in the Planning Framework Document, which can be found at <http://libraries.universityofcalifornia.edu/planning/SharedPrintPlanningFrameworkV1-4.pdf>

The document addresses collection development but not tech services issues. Nancy had originally intended to form a group charged with advising her on shared print issues, but plans now to ask HOTS for advice on tech services issues. Nancy sits on CDC, but plans to work closely with HOPS and HOTS as well. Planning for the JSTOR project is happening right now, we are identifying full runs of JSTOR journals. Nancy and HOTS identified and discussed several Shared Print Collection issues of interest to tech services:

A. Identifying each project for reporting and circulation purposes. Should each project or collection (e.g., JSTOR) have its own location code? Separate location codes would make it possible to have different circulation policies for each project or collection, and would also make reports easier to create. Having separate location codes does not necessarily mean that each code must be translated differently for public display, although having different translations would be a possibility. HOTS agreed that having a location code for each project or collection would be useful.

B. Identifying ownership (for retrospective collections such as JSTOR). Ownership (i.e., library by whom the material is contributed) will be coded at the item level in the UCLA-SRLF database, but item-level information is not contributed to Melvyl. However, item-level owning information for SRLF holdings is being made available by UCLA through a separate web-based tool that is searchable using the Voyager bibliographic record id. If ownership information is desired in Melvyl, it could be provided at the holdings or bibliographic level:

i. a note could be placed in a note field of the appropriate holdings record, saying something like "Volumes contributed by UCI and UCSD", or;

ii. a note could be placed in a note field of the bibliographic record, saying something like "Volumes for the UC Libraries JSTOR project contributed by UCI and UCSD." It would not be enough to say "Volumes contributed by UCI and UCSD" because there might be many different holdings records associated with the one bibliographic record, and the note would apply to just those holdings that are part of the JSTOR project.

C. Identifying each project for access and display.

i. Access. HOTS recommended discussing possible bibliographic access points with the SCP, which has experience in providing this kind of access point. HOTS did not favor making this access point a subject heading, but preferred a local title or corporate body access point. Or a local field could be designated for this purpose and an appropriate index created in Melvyl.

ii. Display. For display, it might be desirable to translate the location code (see B above) into a note in the holdings record. For example, the location code 'srjstor' might be used for the JSTOR project, and it could be translated in Melvyl holdings information as:

Library: So. Regional Library Facility

SRLF

Notes: UC Libraries JSTOR Project.

D. Distributed Shared Cataloging (for prospective projects). If campuses other than UCSD produce shared cataloging for these projects, the SCP might expand and become a coordinating structure. There would be a need to compensate other campuses in some way for shared cataloging that they produce. There are technical problems to be solved with respect to record distribution if records are created by campuses other than UCSD. The possibility of cataloging on OCLC 'as if' another campus were UCSD was mentioned.

E. Display of Shared Collection records and holdings in local catalogs. The issue of whether and how shared collection records and holdings will display in local catalogs needs to be resolved. This is a public service issue as well as a tech services/systems issue. A related issue is, if these records are placed in local catalogs, how can these local records be excluded from display in Melvyl? This also is a public service as well as a tech services/systems issue.

F. Involving HOTS early in the process of planning for Shared Collections. HOTS recommends that it be involved in the planning process for Shared Collections. The suggestion was made that CDL Alert be used to give notice of pending decisions about Shared Collections. All decisions need to be documented and posted in an easily accessible place; possibly in the tech services area of Nancy Kushigian's website.

ACTION: Gail to invite Nancy Kushigian to participate in future HOTS meetings.

4. Report on the Joint SOPAG/All Campus Group meeting (Gail)

A. HOTS revised charge was approved by SOPAG.

B. There is a desire to expand SCP responsibilities to include other formats; SOPAG wants guidance from HOTS on this. A collection that is not already cataloged needs to be identified (e.g., not the Rumsey map collection, which is already cataloged).

C. SOPAG asked HOTS to consider public service issues and make recommendations on the classification of e-monographs. HOTS believes that it has already done so. SCP AC will make recommendations on specific packages.

ACTION: Gail to draft letter to Bernie Hurley, HOTS to respond to the draft on 11/16. [This has been done.]

D. There is to be an RFP for the ERMS in the spring.

5. CDL Recharge discussion. Each campus needs details about what it is paying for at the title level, which funds are being used to pay, and also needs to be able to respond to mid-year needs for 'late-breaking' opportunities. Some possibilities that might make the recharges less onerous for the smaller campuses:

- i. A single invoice from CDL at the beginning of the year, with a supplemental invoice towards the end of the year
- ii. Quarterly invoices from CDL

ERMS is not going to include payment information; the priority for ERMS is data not found elsewhere, such as licensing and trouble-shooting information.

Possibly ask ACIG to look at the possibility of using EDI to pay CDL bills. Has ACIG been discussing title-level invoicing with CDL? ACIG is working on a report for HOTS.

ACTION: HOTS members to go back to their campuses and clarify with collections officers just what is needed, so that we can try to simplify the recharge process. Timeline: between Thanksgiving and Christmas.

6. Uniform title displays in Melvyl. Discussed the issue briefly, decided that this is a public service issue and that HOTS members could send individual, personal, responses to CDL.

7. "Cataloging" at the RLFs. HOTS agreed in principle with the proposal that UCLA merge and/or re-catalog SRLF records for problematic titles, and then notify the contributing campuses cataloging contacts in case they wished to alter their own records. It was suggested that this notification might be limited to those cases in which the merging/re-cataloging disrupted the merging of records in Melvyl. Lee noted that the NRLF operates very differently from the SRLF, and that the proposal is therefore not relevant for them.

A related topic: Jim Dooley described a project of digitizing Japanese camp newspapers, and finding very minimal records for these newspapers already in Melvyl. Jim enquired about the process for upgrading these records. He will report these records as appropriate to the originating library.

ACTION: Gail will consult with the SRLF Operations Committee about the UCLA/SRLF proposal.

8. Clarifications for SOPAG on our response to CDC on shared print collections in local catalogs. It was suggested that HOTS did not mean to recommend that no shared print collection should ever be represented in a local catalog. See also 3.E. above.

9. SCP Annual Report. HOTS had no questions on the SCP annual report. Linda then described an idea that had 'floated up' from operational staff: a spring 'road-show' about the SCP that would travel to each campus. This road-show would include a general presentation plus meetings with local cataloging and systems staff. The purpose would be not only to inform the campuses about SCP but to get feedback from the campuses and learn what they are doing with SCP records. This idea received a positive reaction from HOTS members.