HOTS Conference Call
August 11, 2008

2:00 – 4:00 p.m.
Minutes

Present: Lee Leighton (UCB, chair), Mary Page (UCD), Vicki Grahame (UCI,recorder), John Riemer (UCLA), Lai-Ying Hsiung (UCSC), Martha Hruska (UCSD), Tony Harvell (LAUC), Manuel Urrizola (UCR), Linda Barnhart (UCSD/SCP)

Absent: Anneliese Taylor (UCSF), Brad Eden (UCSB), Jim Dooley (UCM), Patti Martin (CDL)

1. Draft SCP paper points 3-6 and 9

The group continued discussion of the scope statement of the HOTS Subgroup on SCP Funding with focus on questions 3-6 and 9 in the report sent to HOTS on July 7.

- Q. 3. Would it be better to have a more pinpointed scope instead of being all inclusive ?

  Yes, given the current funding the scope should be limited to electronic resources held communally with the highest priority being Tier I and Tier II resources. Ideally, if there were no financial constraints, the scope would include all formats and shared prints. We agreed that "classic SCP"could serve as a model on which to expand our future cooperative TS efforts. We should also leave Shared Print alone—it, and SCP, should remain two separate programs. Ideally, HOTS supports the format-neutral direction, but it is not reality right now.

- Q. 4. Do we agree that the acquisition method should not matter when deciding what to catalog ?

  No, we do care about the acquisition method. Free open access packages should not be done at the expense of Tier I and Tier II resources. "Courtesy" titles should not be done at the expense of paid resources, although there was general agreement that these could fall within SCP's scope. Both method of acquisition and total cost of the resource should play a part in the prioritization. We agreed that all should be prioritized by JSC. The group agreed that—all things being equal—the number of campuses getting a resource and the cost of the resource should be driving factors in the prioritization. HOTS is interested in knowing the priorities.

- Q. 5. How should Tier IIs be prioritized ?

  These should be prioritized by the number of campuses involved

- Q. 6. What process would be used to catalog those packages held by only two campuses ?

  Tony proposed a model that would consider the total dollar cost to the university in prioritizing all electronic resources. HOTS agreed that a process was needed but did not have time to determine what the best process should be.

  Q. 9. What is the plan for consulting on the scope statement?

  We agreed with the subgroup's suggestion that once HOTS has finished its discussion of the scope statement and the Subgroup has made the suggested changes, HOTS forward the final statement simultaneously to the ULs and to SOPAG. SOPAG would use the mechanisms in place for broad consultation (to HOPS, CDC, and other UC-wide groups), and they could collect the feedback.

ACTION: Linda will take the statement back to the subgroup for revision based on our discussions and send it to HOTS again before forwarding to SOPG and the ULs

2. Comments on UC-wide Collaborative Approaches to Technical Services

This agenda item was raised by a draft letter from SOPAG to the ULs that inquired whether now was the time to tackle the "backend" work raised in the BSTF Report. The group discussed unified, coordinated approaches to collection development, acquisitions and technical processing across the University of California system. Suggestions included collection development coordinating the number and location of resources across the system; acquisitions units coordinating vendor selection, ordering and receiving; and technical services coordinating record creation, maintenance and standards working with other large libraries and WorldCat Local partners such as the University of Washington and Ohio State University. The coordinated work should be done without cumbersome recharges or one-to-one reciprocal arrangements among the partners. Another suggestion was taking a look at the various TS practices across UC, giving up some local treatments in favor of a system-wide standard practice. The group was basically in agreement with the SOPAG draft letter and supported it going forward to the ULs.We agreed that we'd further discuss the Collaborative TS paper when we met in person, with the goal of developing more specificity to the suggestions brought forward in this meeting.

3. September/October date for a meeting in Oakland: we tentatively agreed to September 23.