

HOTS Conference Call Minutes 10/11/2010

Present: John Riemer (LA), Jim Dooley (Merced), Anneliese Taylor (SF), Karleen Darr (Davis, minutes), Armanda Barone (Berkeley), Vicki Grahame (Irvine, Chair), Lai-Ying Hsiung (Santa Cruz), Brad Eden (SB), Martha Hruska (SD), Manual Urrizola (Riverside), Patti Martin (CDL), Valerie Bross (LA, LAUC Representative)

1. Announcements

Brad announced that a state budget allocation was approved for a seismic renovation and addition to UCSB's Davidson Library.

2. RLF non-duplication—follow-up on responses from RLFs

The response from the RLFs on HOTS questions provided helpful information. There are discovery issues related to using NGM to detect duplication between RLFs and local campuses.

- RLF bibliographic displays versus individual campus displays
- LHR data displays are problematic

Action Item: Based on interest of the group to look at local campus transportation costs, Karleen will draft a short survey of questions for campuses regarding RLF shipment methods, statistics, and costs.

3. Proposed ULs Advisory Structure

HOTS members are not in favor of the proposed restructure. Our understanding is that there are two issues with the current structure—communication loopholes and the number of all-campus group memberships that stretch local campuses capacity to effectively serve on them. Comments were made concerning the lack of representation from all the campuses at the Operations Advisory Group (OAG) level. All-campus representation is important to share viewpoints and expertise from the local campuses. If CUL decides to move to this structure, term limits become extremely important. HOTS questioned whether the new structure would require expert task groups to support the OAG level which in turn adds more groups. NGM and NGTS groups as “lightning teams” appear to be out of conformity with the definition of tactical groups. They have been strategic in nature and have been in place for several years with no finite deadline. Proposed structure adds a new layer between “lightning teams” and decision making groups.

HOTS recommended keeping current structure “as is”. To improve communications, suggested establishment of a CUL web site populated with the strategic initiatives from the *Priorities for Collective Initiatives, 2011-2014*. Web site would include appropriate group reports updating progress on these initiatives. Assign SOPAG responsibility for currency of information and drawing relationships between reports and UC vision. Also suggested conducting coordinated meetings with related/overlapping all campus groups to move issues more efficiently to the decision-making groups. An example is a joint meeting between CDC and HOTS. Members suggested conducting more business in-between official conference calls. Questions were raised about implementation timetable and process going forward.

Another suggestion was to time the meetings of the ULS, SOPAG and groups needing advice to decrease the amount of time waiting for responses.

Action Item: Vicki will write draft response on this document and forward to HOTS for additional comment before sending to SOPAG.

4. UC Libraries Priorities for Collective Initiatives, 2011-2014

This document is important to review and ensure HOTS goals and objectives align with CUL initiatives. It will be helpful to refer to it as the year progresses.

5. NGTS- discussion to provide brief, broad comments for SOPAG

Discussed definition of “database of record” and WorldCat functionality. This area requires further clarification of what data to include. TF thought this action an important step toward a system-wide ILS and other Enterprise recommendations. Members cited examples in which “database of record” would be required—System-wide Shelf Ready Services and SCP records. SCP record processing includes redundant holdings maintenance. SCP distribution requires substantial effort to manipulate files for campus ingest to their OPACs. Public services reaction could be negative to the proposal of ceasing record distribution. If a campus chooses to continue SCP record loads, it would have to bear the costs and develop the workflow to support it.

HOTS supported work on “good enough” record standard.

The report groups actions into “suites” of recommendations tied together to have a transformative impact. It was emphasized that it is important to begin implementation of some projects. There will be some start-up investments to achieve efficiencies and to do things not currently addressed in technical services.

OCLC Web-Scale Management Services: don’t need agreement from all campuses; a few may choose to license as pilot for UC; move to web scale incrementally. Brad suggested HOTS view Andrew Pace presentation on WSMS. WSMS has Circulation and Acquisition services in place; development work proceeding on Serials and E-reserves. A question was raised about risks associated with using one vendor for both back-end and front-end cloud services.

Eliminate Non-Roman Backlogs: uncertainty expressed about whether this is a high priority action. Significant costs associated with its elimination even if “good enough” record standard used. Would “New Modes of Access” be considered higher priority? Do the language backlogs require a collection review and withdrawal policy? Few or no vendors available for outsource services. What are the implications for new material arriving in the same non-Roman languages that requires technical services processing? The main point is to implement some pilot projects through a UC-wide Collection Services Center. Pilot centers may discover efficient, automatic ways to handle non-Roman language materials.

HOTS suggested including technology sharing tools and instructions to support campus manipulation of data needs and to promote additional efficiencies.

Action Item: Vicki will schedule another conference call on Monday, October 18, 2:00pm-4:00pm to complete discussion of Enterprise Level Services, Financial Infrastructure, and New Modes of ... Access to Special Collections, Archive, and Digital Formats.