SCP Advisory Committee Minutes
March 17, 2006

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

SCP Update:
The retrospective file of SCP serial records is scheduled to be sent on March 20. Some New and Delete records will be included; these will have 599 fields. All other records will be updates and will not have the usual 599 field because updates to records are numerous and various. There are still approximately 1,600 SCP serial titles lacking SFX ID numbers. SCP staff will be working out how to maintain the SFX ID numbers in future records.

Bibliographic Services Task Force Report:

The group reviewed draft responses prepared by HOTS in response to SOPAG's questions. They are as follows:

Question 2. For each of the 3-5 major headings selected above, which of the subrecommendations do you think should be given the highest priority; that is, which do you think UC should address first and why?

SCP AC categorized the subrecommendations according to importance/impact (priority) and probably timeline for implementation (short, medium, long):

HIGH PRIORITY		IMPLEMENTATION TIMETABLE		
		short	medium	long
I.6a	Integrate library content and services into campus content management systems	X		
I.6c.	Expose metadata to external search engines	X		
I.8a	Provide better searching for non-Roman materials	X		
III.1a	View UC cataloging as a single enterprise	X		
III.1b	Implement a single data store (single bib file)	X		
III.1b	Implement a single data store (single ILS)			X
III.3a	Enhance names, titles, series, and uniform titles for prolific authors	X		
III.4a.	Encourage vendor metadata creation and ingest it early in the process	X		
III.4b.	Import enhanced metadata when available	X		
I.6d.	Make our digital and unique collections available first within UC		X	
II.1a.	Create a single catalog interface		X	
II.2a.	Pre-harvest metadata for the entire bibliographic information space		X	

II.2b.	Provide result sets arranged by format grouped in terms of granularity		X	
III.3b.	Implement structured serial holdings format		X	
IVb.	Provide a robust reporting capability		X	
I.5a.	Implement FRBR concepts			X

MEDIUM PRIORITY		IMPLEMENTATION TIMETABLE		
		short	medium	long
I.3a.	Allow user to define the set of resources/databases to search	X		
I.4a.	Spell-checking	X		
I.4b.	Offer constructive suggestions for zero-results searches	X		
I.6b.	Embed library content and services into institutional portals	X		
I.7a.	Provide relevance ranking based on a broad set of criteria	X		
III.2a.	Use level of description/schema that is appropriate, not always MARC/AACR2	X		
III.2b.	Consider FAST			
III.4e.	Add enriched content (TOCs, etc.)	X		
IVa.	Institutionalize an ongoing process of identifying and prioritizing improvements	X		
I.1b.	Provide an "I want this" button with the goal of always offering a fulfillment option		X	
I.2a.	Provide both content- and filter-based recommender features		X	
III.2d.	Prefer allocating resources to catalog undiscoverable items; consider automated techniques for all textual materials		X	

Note: The sub-recommendations not listed here were considered Low priority by SCP AC.

Are there any recommendations that you think should be added?
SCP AC response: **no**

Are there any recommendations that you think should NOT be pursued?
SCP AC response: Do not pursue III.2.c (Consider using controlled vocabularies only for name, uniform title, date and place and abandoning the use of controlled vocabularies for topical subjects in bibliographic records). We advocate the continued use of controlled vocabularies for topical subjects for more precise retrieval by subject. Controlled vocabularies are also important to search across the many languages that are in the entire UC collection. Uncontrolled keywords are not an

adequate substitute for topical access. Other search and retrieval improvements depend on controlled vocabulary.
FAST could be applied as a supplement, in support of faceted browse capability, but not as a replacement for pre-coordinated strings needed in browsing.

Questions 3-4. HOTS members on SCP AC shared near-final drafts of responses to questions 3, 4a, and 4b. SCP AC endorses those responses.

Question 5 (other comments or suggestions regarding next steps):

SCP AC response: The cataloging management team within UC should be charged to develop the single cataloging enterprise concept. We also suggest that HOTS be charged with pursuit of a single data store for UC, an idea that originated with that group.

Question 6. Is there anything else you think UC should be doing in pursuit of improving bibliographic services?

SCP AC response: In so far as the BSTF report represents a lot of new tasks that libraries need to take on in responding to user needs, every functional area in the library should be looked at for work that could be done differently or be discontinued, to free up resources to address the new work. It will not be enough to examine cataloging and technical services alone.