

**SCP Advisory Committee
February 13, 2006, 3:00-4:30 p.m.
Draft Minutes**

Present: B. Culbertson, J. Dooley, P. French, V. Grahame, L. Hsiung, E. McCracken (Recorder), C. McEwan, J. Riemer (Chair), S. Scott, A. Tarango

1. SCP Mixed Subscription/Open Access Titles

SCP has an upcoming list of Blackwell-Synergy titles which have a significant portion of content which is freely available, though the current 12 months is licensed through CDL. B. Culbertson made suggestions for a new 856 public note statement that SCP could use to enable an easy overlay of these records at the receiving campuses. SCP AC discussed the phrasing of the public note, and recommend the following:

\$z HighWire. Current 12 months restricted to subscribers; all other issues freely available.

Action: Unless further instructions regarding phrasing are requested, B. Culbertson will instruct SCP catalogers to use the recommended public note.

2. Discussion of Bibliographic Services Task Force (BSTF) Report

J. Riemer sent the SCP AC a list of three questions to focus our discussion regarding the BSTF final report, and the recommendations covered in the four areas: Enhancing search and retrieval, Rearchitecting the OPAC, Adopting new cataloging practices, and Supporting continuous improvement.

Question 1: What in the BSTF report seems exciting to you?

In a round robin to answer this question, members of the SCP AC committee were clearly supportive of ***recommendation II.1a: Create a single catalog interface for both local and system wide collections.*** Whether a single catalog interface will require all campuses to adopt one ILS is unclear.

Other recommendations or concepts members favor:

- The concept of changing and rethinking the way technical services operates.
- Using OCLC for more services
- Enhanced search and retrieval features
- Sharing cataloging expertise across the UC library system
- Once the duplicated cataloging efforts are removed, catalogers will have more time for higher level cataloging, more original cataloging, and opportunities to organize the digital output of our campuses, consult with faculty on metadata needs, etc.
- FRBR concepts – specifically addresses users needs for rich data.
- The cataloging concepts fit well with RDA.
- With one common file, we could easily provide TOC enriched records.

Question 2: What parts of the report cause you concern, and why?

SCP AC committee members voiced a number of concerns generated by recommendations and implications of the BSTF Report.

- If the UC libraries adopt the single file of cataloging records idea, how will the data flow from Melvyl to local ILSs be managed; can it occur in “real-time”?
- Recommendation III.1a How will processing at a local level be impacted by the involvement of increased group decision-making for cataloging?

- Recommendation III.2 –Many members are concerned with an overall sense that the report overemphasizes retrieval at the expense of controlled vocabularies. Controlled vocabularies provide a rich pool for keyword searching. Also, by using database enhancements, such as buttons leading the patron to “More like this,” we can offer our patrons browsability via hyperlinks, without sacrificing controlled vocabularies.
- Recommendation III.4d: Change the processing workflow from “Acquire-Catalog-Put on Shelf” to Acquire-Put on Shelf with existing metadata-Begin ongoing metadata enhancement process through iterative automated query of metadata sources.” Many felt this recommendation is quite practical, and others felt we could support the recommendation as long as this process didn’t turn into Acquire – Put on Shelf – Forget.
- The report de-emphasizes local data, yet the UC Libraries still need to display unique local data. Local information perhaps could be restricted to the holdings record. OCLC is implementing MARC holdings this week.
- If we implement the BSTF recommendations, what are the staffing implications? The labor and technology efforts will be costly. Whereas the work of processing may be shifting, it will not be diminishing overall. We need to consider that some vendor records may need maintenance work to make them useable.
- There will be a need, as we move to an “integrated cataloging” model, for a UC Cataloging Policy Committee. SCP AC could morph into such a role. Although all the UC libraries follow national standards, we currently index our individual catalogs differently, and honor collection management or reference requests for unique treatment decisions that don’t follow LC practice. In our efforts to provide the best access for our users, the differences we create within a new system should be minimized. Customizing the database may be outside the realm of cataloging in the future.

3. UC CONSER Funnel Project

P. French has sent the “UC CONSER Funnel Implementation Plan” to the CONSER Funnel Subcommittee, and would like members to send her comments on the draft documents.

4. When to hold our next meeting

February 27, 2006 – 8:30-10:00 continued discussion of the BSTF Report