

SCP-AC Conference Call
Feb. 7, 2008
10-11:30

Present: J. Dooley (chair), S. Gardner (recorder), A. Tarango, B. Culbertson, L. Barnhart, C. McEwan, L. Rowlison, H. Tomren, E. McCracken, L. Hsiung, V. Bross, S. Scott

*January SCP minutes – No further edits, ready to be finalized

*OCLC Update – John Reimer was not available so he sent the update as an email attachment

*Next meeting – Mar. 13, 2008, 1:30-3pm

*Use of \$xSCP/\$xSCP UCSD in SCP monograph records: Adolfo clarified that these fields were used to show when a record came from OCLC versus when it was created in-house. Once all the records are loaded into OCLC for Local WorldCat, the differentiation should not matter.

*SCP budget discussion (the majority of the conference call)

The discussion began with some background: a letter from the University Librarian's Group to HOTS to look at ways to cut 18% of SCP's budget. Further complicating the issue is that most of SCP's budget is salaries and wages, so confidentiality is needed when looking at staffing positions. Other background documents included yearly productivity from SCP, as well as title counts, anticipated growth and backlogs for SCP packages. Jim, John, Adolfo, Linda and Martha Hruska have been tasked with writing draft response/recommendations for HOTS review.

Issues to consider:

- Consequences to campuses (needs and priorities of individual campuses)
- Campus priorities in 5 areas of resources (no distinction between monos and serials yet): Tier 1, Tier 2, Open access, CalDocs, and analytics. Database numbers are too small to be considered a factor
- Priority of backlogs
- Alternative ways of accessing titles besides the catalog (such as A&I databases). Many licensed resources can be accessed alternatively (especially LexisNexis and Elsevier titles), but this is not true for most open access resources and CalDocs.
- How other campuses can help: this may be necessary as SCP is forced to cut services, but could be problematic as it would require great coordination and standardization across many campuses with differing levels of staffing and expertise.
- Other factors such as record availability and ease/volume of downloading

Solutions/ideas to consider:

- Asking campuses to pay for special requests/services
- Analyze package costs and ask campuses to choose package by package

-SCP could better track the time and costs of their work so the campuses are better informed about the value. The question is, how detailed do you want the statistics to be? What should they track: time of catalogers, time of batch-processing and loading, PID validation?

-Give up cataloging of either Tier 2 resources, open access resources or both (most campuses would prefer to keep Tier 2 and sacrifice open access)

-The most labor intensive group, CalDocs, could be parceled out through the UC CONSER funnel. Campuses could report OCLC numbers to SCP who would then distribute the records.

-Certain campuses could specialize in some formats (i.e., maps at UCSB).

-Alternative funding models:

-Co-investment in SCP by all campuses. This was discussed at HOTS, but not all campuses agreed definitively or knew if it was feasible without further consultation.

-Include the price of processing/cataloging upfront with the acquisition cost of packages. This would most likely be met with resistance from CDC, but the money must come from somewhere or services will be cut.

-Cost sharing amongst campuses: calculate the cost of each record and have campuses pay per record.

-Rethink the resource-sharing fund: if it cannot grow to support the program, then have campuses make up the difference.

Summary of thoughts/ideas resulting from the discussion:

-It is ultimately up to the ULs to decide where the money will come from: collections or technical services.

-Most campuses are able to offer staff time rather than money, but the amount of time and training will need to be determined by each campus.

-Emphasize that cataloging IS access; if there is no cataloging, users cannot access materials. This lends credence to the idea of including cataloging and processing costs upfront with the basic acquisition costs of packages.

-The Shared Cataloging Program is already extremely efficient and cost-effective. Per title cataloging costs through SCP average \$4.87, which is remarkably cheap. Any cuts to funding this shared program will result in loss of services and will likely have to be made up by other campuses (at costs to each individual campus).

-It is likely that SCP will continue to catalog Tier 1 and 2 resources, but cut open access and CalDocs, eliminating 50% of a staffing position.

-This problem does lead to an opportunity for campuses to become more collaborative and cooperative, especially if campuses pick up CalDocs. While not all campuses participate in the UC CONSER funnel (yet), it does exist as a model of cooperative cataloging and can assist in taking the burden off of SCP.

-The idea of "Next Generation SCP," which focuses not only on this budget adjustment, but on broader issues of creative funding and resource allocation, with the goal of centralizing UC cataloging in a collaborative and cooperative arrangement, similar to the goals outlined in the Bibliographic Services Task Force report.