

HOTS Conference Call

July 14, 2008

2:00 – 3:00 p.m.

draft Minutes

Present: Lee Leighton (UCB, chair), Patti Martin (CDL), Ivy Anderson (CDL/SCP), Mary Page (UCD), Vicki Grahame (UCI), Sara Shatford Layne (UCLA), Jim Dooley (UCM), Brad Eden (UCSB), Lai-Ying Hsiung (UCSC), Martha Hruska (UCSD), Anneliese Taylor (UCSF), Tony Harvell (LAUC), Manuel Urrizola (UCR, recorder).

Item 5 of the June 6, 2008, SOPAG minutes

Item 5 of the SOPAG minutes is labeled “HOTS.” The minutes record that Luc reported on the latest SCP proposal to meet the reduced budget target for fy08/09. The minutes also refer to a draft SOPAG discussion paper regarding consortium-based technical services. Finally, the minutes state that Luc and Gail will draft a SOPAG memo to the University Librarians to determine whether now is the right time to pursue such a topic.

HOTS members discussed item 5 of the SOPAG minutes:

- It seems that SOPAG is interested in asking the ULs if the back end of the BSTF report can begin.
- SOPAG is concerned that campuses may be consumed by OCLC reclamation.
 - ✓ In general, campuses are not consumed by reclamation.
 - ✓ Some campuses have already completed reclamation.
 - ✓ UCD is finishing the planning process for their reclamation and is nearly ready to begin. They do not anticipate this to be an onerous procedure.
 - ✓ UCB is cleaning up.
 - ✓ UCR is awaiting action by Systems Dept.
 - ✓ Some campuses have not addressed reclamation projects but need to, e.g. UCI has been consumed by other projects.
- In discussing coordinated tech services, HOTS members identified current and proposed instances of cooperation among the UCs:
 - ✓ SCP
 - ✓ Shared print proposal
 - ✓ Canadiana
 - ✓ Catalan language resources
- In discussing coordinated tech services, HOTS members had some observations and concerns:
 - ✓ Coordinated tech services need not be a physical coordination in 1 or 2 centers.
 - ✓ Difficult to separate acquisitions from cataloging.
 - ✓ Coordination and cooperation defined by projects.
 - ✓ Consortium model could be based on expertise (e.g., language expertise).
 - ✓ UCLA catalogs shared print stored in SRLF; individual campuses catalog shared print stored in NRLF.
 - ✓ We would like to see the draft SOPAG discussion paper mentioned in the SOPAG minutes.

ACTION: Lee will get back to Luc on points made in HOTS discussion, especially the desire of HOTS members to see the draft SOPAG discussion paper regarding consortium-based technical services.

Statement on the Scope of the Shared Cataloging Program

The Statement of the HOTS Subgroup on SCP Funding is a re-conceptualization rather than a restructuring of SCP. HOTS members answered some of the questions included in the Statement:

- 1. Yes, campuses support the expansion of the scope of SCP to include shared print materials. Resources held communally typically reside at RLFs but could reside at a campus. Campuses would not seek to be funded out of the SCP pot; in fact, five campuses, including UCSD, have agreed to catalog Cal Docs and have not asked for additional funding.
- 2. Yes, campuses support the concept that shared cataloging can be done at multiple sites. In fact, this is being done with shared print cataloging: UCLA catalogs shared print for SRLF; UCB and UCD will catalog IEEE shared print; UCB cataloging German material for UCSD (only under discussion at this point).
- 7. Yes and no. For now, SCP should continue to make added entries for package names. But other options (ERMS or other search strings) should be explored for tracking package names. Developments in a CDL ERMS, new search methodologies, and improvements to the SFX KB may enable SCP to stop maintaining package and coverage data via the 793 field in bib records.
- 8. Yes, both SFX and ERMS should be examined to see if they can adequately replace SCP coding of holdings statements in 856 fields. Ways to manage links, other than SCP PIDs, should be explored. SCP should investigate ways to avoid duplication of effort in maintaining holdings information.
- 9. The Statement on the Scope of the Shared Cataloging Program needs input from other UC groups, especially CDC. A status reports needs to be sent to the UL's. How exactly do we manage consultations?
- 3-6. Questions 3-6 were not answered or discussed.

ACTION: Patti will check out the number of clicks on Bib URLs (access via the Bib record) versus access to online resources through other means such SFX lists or databases.

ACTION: Discussion will continue. Questions 3-6 will be discussed and answered via email.

ACTION: When HOTS discussion is completed, Jim will summarize discussion. Statement and discussion will be shared with other UC groups (SOPAG, CDC); their input and clarification will be sought. Status report will be sent to ULs.

Meeting adjourned at ~ 3:00 p.m.