SCP ADVISORY COMMITTEE
MINUTES OF MEETING
MARCH 8, 2006

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

Discussion of the BSTF Report was continued from the last meeting. It was noted that Questions 4a and b from the "Invitation for Comments" had been discussed in detail so the question was raised as to what kind of response we should give. Since there is some contradiction in feeling the suggestion was made to address all recommendations in priority order.

Discussion then focused on the Subrecommendations and a method to go through the list. Some kind of direction is needed. Also it is necessary to remember that an underlying decision allowing us to move forward is the decision on having either a single ILS or a single file of bibliographic records. Lai-Ying mentioned several items currently under discussion by HOTS. There is some uncertainty as to whether SOPAG wants to identify something for immediate action or a long-term plan. There is some confusion among HOTS members as to the concept of a single file. She stated that HOTS feels the central file is not the hardest thing; more difficult are the issues surrounding other functions, such as acquisitions.

The BSTF list of subrecommendation was reviewed, with each recommendation being rated in a time frame of short, medium, or long as to the feasibility and practicality of implementation. (See list below.)

There was general agreement for John's list, distributed earlier:
II.1 Create a single interface for all of UC
II.2 Support searching across the entire bibliographic information space
III.1 Rearchitect the cataloging workflow (a single data store)
I.5 Offer better navigation of large set of search results
I.6 Deliver bibliographic services where the users are
Adolfo suggested III2a was also important and might be considered in place of I.6, since this is somewhat of a given. It should be acknowledged that we are coming from our own tech services perspective and leave some things for public services to advocate.

There is room for more discussion on 4a and 4b. Send any further comments to the list with a deadline of Sunday evening.

Next Meeting: March 13, 8:30

The Subrecommendations

Enhancing search and retrieval
I.1a. Have UC elinks take you to a logical, default choice with option to go back
SHORT
I.1b. Provide an "I want this" button with the goal of always offering a fulfillment option
MEDIUM
I.2a. Provide both content- and filter-based recommender features   **MEDIUM**
I.3a. Allow user to define the set of resources/databases to search   **SHORT**
I.4a. Spell-checking   **SHORT**
I.4b. Offer constructive suggestions for zero-results searches   **SHORT**
I.5a. Implement FRBR concepts   **LONG**
I.5b. Present all variant serial titles through linking fields   **SHORT**
I.5c. Implement faceted browsing   **MEDIUM**
I.6a. Integrate library content and services into campus content management systems
SHORT
I.6b. Embed library content and services into institutional portals   **SHORT**
I.6c. Expose metadata to external search engines   **SHORT**
I.6d. Make our digital and unique collections available first within UC   **MEDIUM**
I.7a. Provide relevance ranking based on a broad set of criteria   **SHORT**
I.7b. Use fulltext for discovery and relevance ranking   **MEDIUM**
I.8a. Provide better searching for non-Roman materials   **SHORT**

Rearchitecting the OPAC
II.1a. Create a single catalog interface   **MEDIUM**
II.2a. Pre-harvest metadata for the entire bibliographic information space   **LONG**
II.2b. Provide result sets arranged by format grouped in terms of granularity   **MEDIUM**

Adopting new cataloging practices
III.1a. View UC cataloging as a single enterprise   **SHORT**
III.1b. Implement a single data store   **SHORT**
III.2a. Use level of description/schema that is appropriate, not always MARC/AACR2
SHORT
III.2b. Consider FAST   **SHORT**
III.2c. Abandon controlled vocabularies for topical subjects; can TOC/indexes become
surrogates for subject headings and classification?   **SHORT**
III.2d. Prefer allocating resources to catalog undiscoverable items; consider automated
techniques for all textual materials   **MEDIUM**
III.3a. Enhance names, titles, series, and uniform titles for prolific authors   **SHORT**
III.3b. Implement structured serial holdings format   **MEDIUM**
III.4a. Encourage vendor metadata creation and ingest it early in the process   **SHORT**
III.4b. Import enhanced metadata when available   **SHORT**
III.4c. Automate the addition of geographic data   **SHORT**
III.4d. Support the processing workflow with ongoing metadata enhancement   **SHORT**
III.4e. Add enriched content (TOCs, etc.)   **SHORT**

Supporting continuous improvement
IVa. Institutionalize an ongoing process of identifying and prioritizing improvements
SHORT
IVb. Provide a robust reporting capability   **MEDIUM**