HOTS Conference Call Minutes
2/14/2011, 2-4 p.m.

Present: Armanda Barone (UCB), Valerie Bross (LAUC), Karleen Darr (UCD), Jim Dooley (UCM), Brad Eden (UCSB), Vick Grahame (UCI, Chair), Lai-Ying Hsiung (UCSC, recorder), Martha Hruska (UCSD), Patti Martin (CDL), John Riemer (UCLA), Anneliese Taylor (UCSF), Manuel Urrizola (UCR)

A. Announcements:

   a. UCD will continue to do in house physical processing instead of paying for YBP's shelf ready services. They will further streamline their operations for efficiency and monitor system-wide related initiatives for ongoing assessments. UCSC is starting shelf ready with YBP in March or April and introduce more cross-training among existing staff to cover the void created by the two pending retirements in Technical Services.
   b. UCI, UCSD,UCSC and UCLA are working on virtual book plating. UCLA finds it possible to have the bookplate links embedded in the holdings records. One issue that needs to be addressed is how to do have virtual book plaing appear in WCL.
   c. New login information for the UCSF wiki moved from their Galen accounts had been distributed. Only UCB and UCD can use their existing campus accounts to log in via shibboleth. All other campuses need to set up a guest UCSF MyAccess account as soon as possible because Galen accounts are going away on February 22.
   d. There will be no joint CDC/HOTS in person meeting in March.

B. NGTS

   a. The stakeholders column in the "Ranking by Time Frame to Implement NGTS" document was reviewed with respect to what each recommendation means and what roles should HOTS play in their implementation. Which one would require HOTS involvement and which ones would require HOTS decision making? HOTS agreed about the list of stakeholders assigned under each recommendation in the document, but think that HOTS should be added as a stakeholder for E4 (System-Wide and Multi-Campus Collection Development Activities). Under E4, CDC will determine the type of activities to be undertaken, but Acquisitions will need to provide the necessary services to support CDC in their undertakings.
   b. HOTS agreed with the document that many of the recommendations are related and should be clustered, e.g. E7 (Define and Implement UC-Wide Collection Services Centers) and E12 (System-Wide Model for Collection Services Staffing and Expertise); E5 (Implement HOTS System-Wide Shelf-Ready Recommendations) and E6 (Implement a "Good Enough" Record Standard for All of UC). Many undertakings require the funding piece to go hand in hand with them. More discussions and definitions are required for effective implementation.

c. Many retirements and loss of expertise are happening in both Collections and Technical Services. Implementation of the recommendations may have to happen faster under the current budget situation. HOTS may think about what cooperative undertakings among campuses or even with outside entities are appropriate before even being charged.

d. A clearing house was suggested for campuses to offer or exchange expertise, e.g. UCSD is offering music cataloging expertise while UCR has the Thai language expertise. HOTS would like to have formal arrangements set up for such co-operations.

e. Should we have some more regular joint discussions with CDC, e.g. quarterly, on how identify overlapping issues and move forward?

f. E3 (Database of Record): HOTS would like to have clarification of its meaning because there seems to be different interpretations by different stakeholders. Are we talking about order and holdings records in addition to bibliographic records? Are we talking about ILS and ERMS? Where is the database where we all want to have our materials to be discoverable, findable and deliverable? How can we ensure that our data is secure and our local data are not affected by changes made at the network level?

g. E1 (Cloud-Based System-wide ILS) has been ranked as High Priority with large cost savings and highly transformative. However, since it is "bigger than NGTS", it has not been scheduled for implementation in the ranking chart. HOTS is wondering whether this core issue could be a possible solution for addressing E3 (Database of Record).

C. NGM:

a. Quarterly update to the WCL software will soon be posted. Recording of the WCL Users Group Meeting is available.

b. OCLC webinars "All about E: Management and Delivery of Electronic Content with WorldCat." and "WorldCat knowledge base data synchronization for WorldCat Local libraries" outlined some exciting developments. However, to use Pubget for loading local data into the WC Knowledge Base may mean that we no longer need to send ejournal holdings to WCL, only print journals, but the operational savings are not as high as anticipated. Much investigation still needs to be done.

c. On major goal of having a database of record is to reduce redundancy in data maintenance. Right now each campus has to maintain data in multiple databases and we may lose local data due to the shared record in the infrastructure. Keeping data in sync becomes complicated and time-consuming at times. Will there be a group charged to review all the various infrastructures that we have to maintain?

ACTION ITEMS:

a. Invite Linda Barnhart (UCSD) to clarify Database of records for HOTS

b. Ask Luc Declarck (SOPAG Liaison) to brief us on what happens at the upcoming SOPAG/UL meeting on NGTS.

D. Budget Cuts:

Severe budget cuts are affecting campuses across the board and some libraries have already announced drastic measures to cope with the situation, including closing libraries, consolidating and reducing services and collections, reducing library materials purchases, rapid shifting of the library collection to become more digital, buying just in time instead of just in case, and eliminating many more staff positions.