

Shared Cataloging Program Advisory Committee

Conference Call Minutes

March 13, 2006

8:30-10:00 AM

Present: J. Dooley (recorder), P. French, V. Grahame, L. Hsiung, E. McCracken, C. McEwan, J. Riemer (chair), S. Scott, A. Tarango

Discussion continued on the Advisory Committee response to the Bibliographic Services Task Force Report. During our last call, we prioritized the subrecommendations as to whether they could be implemented in the short, medium or long term. In this meeting we prioritized the subrecommendations as to whether they are of high, medium or low importance, from the Shared Cataloging Program perspective.

Enhancing search and retrieval

I.1a. Have UC e-links take you to a logical, default choice with option to go back **LOW**

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 **MEDIUM**

I.4a. Spell-checking **MEDIUM**

I.4b. Offer constructive suggestions for zero-results searches **MEDIUM**

I.5a. Implement FRBR concepts **HIGH**

I.5b. Present all variant serial titles through linking fields **LOW**

I.5c. Implement faceted browsing **LOW**

I.6a. Integrate library content and services into campus content management systems
HIGH

I.6b. Imbed library content and services into institutional portals **HIGH**

I.6c. Expose metadata to external search engines **HIGH**

I.6d. Make our digital and unique collections available first within UC **HIGH**

I.7a. Provide relevance ranking based on a broad set of criteria **MEDIUM**

I.7b. Use full text for discovery and relevance ranking **LOW**

I.8a. Provide better searching for non-Roman materials **HIGH**

Rearchitecting the OPAC

II.1a. Create a single catalog interface **HIGH**

II.2a. Pre-harvest metadata for the entire bibliographic information space **HIGH**

II.2b. Provide result sets arranged by format grouped in terms of granularity **HIGH**

Adopting new cataloging practices

III.1a. View UC cataloging as a single enterprise **HIGH**

III.1b. Implement a single data store **HIGH**

III.2a. Use appropriate metadata schema **MEDIUM** (this will happen anyway)

- III.2b. Consider FAST **MEDIUM** (in addition to existing subject heading strings, not as a replacement for them)
- III.2c. Abandon controlled vocabularies for topical subjects **LOW** (we do not support this recommendation)
- III.2d. Prefer allocating resources to catalog undiscoverable items; consider automated techniques for all textual materials **MEDIUM** (we question whether automated techniques can in fact be applied to all textual materials)
- III.3a. Enhance names, titles, series and uniform titles for prolific authors **HIGH** (currently being done)
- III.3b. Implement structures serial holdings format **HIGH**
- III.4a. Encourage vendor metadata creation and ingest it early in the process **HIGH**
- III.4b. Import enhanced metadata when available **HIGH**
- III.4c. Automate the addition of geographic data **LOW**
- III.4d. Change the processing workflow to shelve with existing metadata with ongoing metadata enhancement **LOW** (real danger that enhancement will not occur)
- III.4e. Add enriched content (TOCs, etc.) **MEDIUM**

Supporting continuous improvement

- IV.a. Institutionalize an ongoing process of identifying and prioritizing improvements **MEDIUM**
- IV.b. Provide a robust reporting capability **HIGH**

We will continue working by email to have our response to HOTS by Friday, March 17. J. Dooley will forward draft HOTS responses to questions 3 and 4 for Advisory Committee reaction.

Next meeting: conference call Friday, March 17, 10:00-11:30 AM (if necessary)