MINUTES

SCP Advisory Committee
Conference Call
Sept. 4, 2007
8:30-10:00 a.m.

Present: B. Culbertson, J. Dooley, S. Gardner, L. Hsiung, C. McEwan, J. Riemer
(Chair), S. Scott (recorder), A. Tarango, H. Tomren

One agenda topic, a question from the June CAMCIG minutes, was no longer a live issue
for discussion, so it was removed from the agenda. The group welcomed Holly Tomren
of Irvine to her first meeting.

1.   Update on latest developments in the UC-OCLC collaboration (John)

        The last meeting discussed implications on the workload of Technical Services.
John reminded the group that the scope of the project is found in the charge to the various
groups: to explore the feasibility of using WorldCat as the basis for the next generation
MELVYL and to work toward creation of a pilot for evaluation systemwide.

What this means is that for now the local OPACs and ILSs will remain in place. We can
expect 11 different views of MELVYL: 1 systemwide view, and 1 scoped view for each
of the 10 campuses (first grouping would be local campus view, then UC view, then the
entire WorldCat database.) The question was raised regarding small consortium catalogs
such as CIRCUIT, which is comprised of several libraries, not necessarily UC. Could
there be another tier inserted in the display? Customization will be an interesting topic;
we may be pushing the envelope right now by having 10 local displays. As it is, if there
are other ILS instances on campus, or non-UC libraries now represented in MELVYL,
they will not be included in the test pilot, other than to be represented in worldwide
WorldCat.

We are heading for a 3-month pilot which will likely begin in Feb. 2008 at the earliest,
during which an assessment will take place; if certain things don't seem to have worked,
they may be tried from another perspective. The single vs. multiple record approach still
remains an issue.

Currently there are about 100 different individual appointments working on about 20
teams divided among 6 major UC/OCLC Joint Working Groups. OCLC considers this
collaboration to be its top priority as an institution; they want this collaboration to be a
true development partnership.

A. Collections and Cataloging Joint Working Group (chaired by John)

        1. Missing Records Team (chaired by Sara Layne)

There is a difference between a reclamation project and a retrospective batch load. If a library has been keeping up with the deletion of holdings symbols but just has a group which needs holdings added, it will be considered a retrospective batch load. If a library hasn't kept up with either adding or removing holdings symbols, it will be considered a reclamation project. Once you get the record back, the OCLC number has to go into the OPAC record. The key for linking the "world" view of the record to the library's local record is the OCLC number, so that will have to be kept up to allow OCLC to get to it. OCLC is ready to do what is necessary to obtain vendor records for loading, which previously had not been made available.

The Missing Record Team has been responsible for choosing records to load; they have tried to select challenging ones. Two things they want to test: how do the records look once they're loaded, and what kind of problems were encountered in loading. Some types of records chosen were: SCP records (both mono and serial,) rare book records, Berkeley brief serial records; eventually there will be some "on-order" records.

A highlight of the U. of Washington pilot is article metadata being included; we also want to include some information from the e-Scholarship Repository and various digital library project metadata from UCLA and UCSD, so some was sent to see if it could be included in the project.

The last group of RLIN records (about 200,000) are being added directly to WorldCat; it would be too time-consuming to check for uniqueness. An issue for the Missing Records Team involves records which don't match (unresolved records"). These will have to be dealt with eventually

2. OCLC Symbols Team (chaired by Linda Barnhart)

They have learned there will be one ILS per campus (the main instance) included in the Pilot. It has been tentatively decided to create a parallel set of symbols for SCP records for the 10 campuses, using the 920 field in each record to set the symbols appropriately for each campus. The thought is that SCP maintenance would be easier.

The current thinking concerning the RLFs is to use 2 symbols which have been in existence but not used, ZAP for NRLF and ZAS for SRLF. The idea is to use these symbols for each title housed in the RLFs but also leave the symbol of the original owning library on the record. There could be some sort of deflection which would direct a user from the local library to the RLF. ILL traffic could be routed directly to the proper RLF.

3. Local bib data team (chaired by Randy Brandt)

Both Adolfo and Lai-Ying are members of the Team. A survey was done to determine what is put in records, both local information, and standard and non-standard fields. First recommendation was to not include local data for the test.

Discussion was held concerning the use of the Local Holdings Record, how and where to display holdings, use of holdings records with information in and from the 856s, etc.

B. Local Information Joint Working Group

    1. <u>Local ILS team (formerly Z39.50) chaired by Terry Toy)</u>

This team is working to determine how each local system works and how links work. Information they need will include exact locations, URLs, search data, tangible items.

    2. <u>Holdings Information Task Group</u>

C. Delivery Services Joint Working Group

    How will the request system work? What kind of circulation transactions will work? How will UC e-links work?

IV. Authentication Joint Working Group

    Will patrons have to reauthenticate numerous times?

V. User Assessment and Help Joint Working Group

How is University of Washington faring?
    They did not do a reclamation project. Access to local ILS is still available but not prominently displayed

Some observations:
    many records not there
    genre headings missed
    019 field needed as source of OCLC# matching (no local knowledge of changes)
    fulfillment options need to be better grouped
    no longer putting brief records in their catalog but input into OCLC
    ILL borrowing has gone up
    hard for users to distinguish reviews for books from records for books.

Some advantages:
    Presence of article content
    Improvements released monthly

2.   690 fields in SCP e-journal records (Adolfo or Becky)

SCP is examining the work they do in maintaining the 690 fields. For the campuses which still use the 690, are there other alternatives which would mean less work for SCP?

NAXOS is still having problems for some libraries; Becky is investigating. SPIE records are being redistributed, since UCR joined.

Next conference call: Tuesday, Oct. 9th, 8:30-10 a.m.