HOTS Conference Call Minutes
March 14, 2006

Present: Jim Dooley (UCM, Chair), Pat French (UCD), Tony Harvell (UCSD-LAUC), Lai-Ying Hsiung (UCSC), Sara Layne (UCLA), Lee Leighton (UCB), Patti Martin (CDL), John Riemer (UCLA-SCP AC), Sharon Scott (UCR), John Tanno (UCD-SOPAG Liaison), Paul Wakeford (UCSF, Recorder), Amy Weiss (UCSB)

Reminder: In-person meeting Friday April 21 – place and time to be announced

Discussion of the results of Jim's tally of votes on **Question # 1** allowed us to see that we had clustered around five recommendations. We decided to list them in order of greatest consensus:

II.1 (9 votes)
III.1(9 votes)
I.5  (8 votes)
II.2 (7 votes)
I.6  (5 votes)

UCB and UCD campus votes seemed to cluster similarly and UCSD also but to a lesser extent.

Spontaneous discussion of Recommendation IV, which did not make our top 5 list, inclined Jim to try to write up something about IV in response to **Question #5:** other comments or suggestions.

**Question #2** dealing with sub-recommendations for our top 5 played out differently for each recommendation and we addressed in the order of the report:

**I.5**: We decided that all 3 sub-recommendations were high priority and that we would rank them according to the order in the report, thus:
I.5a -  probably the most beneficial, but also the most difficult to accomplish
I.5b -  easier to accomplish but very useful
I.5c – also desirable but uncertain of the effort required

**I.6:** We decided I.6a was the highest priority

**II.1:** There are no sub-recommendations, but we want to reiterate the very high priority of this recommendation.

**II.2:** We thought 2a and 2b were difficult to consider in isolation and that both dealt with searching across a bibliographic space and, therefore, we would couple both of them and indicate highest priority.

**III.1**: We again thought 1a and 1b were equally important and highest priority by an overwhelming majority, except for UCLA who did not think Recommendation 1a &b even make the top five.

**III.2b:** The group is not opposed to FAST, but feels it should not replace existing subject headings although possibly supplement these.

**III.2c:** The group was unanimously, with the exception of Patti, and strongly opposed to abandoning controlled vocabularies because: 1) subject analysis has value in searching and browsing, 2) nationals standards as operative in CONSER and OCLC require this convention, 3) they help to narrow search results, 4) keyword searches glean some results from subject headings, 5) subject headings sometimes provide the only English access to foreign language records. We encourage research in this area.

**III2d:** This sub-recommendation actually has two parts – we support allocation for resources to catalog undiscoverable items, but not think automated techniques are appropriate or practical for all textual materials.

**Question #6**

Sara suggested that authority records and control should be considered in this discussion of bibliographic services.