HOTS Conference Call, 3/14/2011
2:00-4:00

Present: Present: John Riemer (UCLA), Jim Dooley (Merced), Anneliese Taylor (SF), Karleen Darr (Davis), Lisa Rowlison de Ortiz (Berkeley), Vicki Grahame (Irvine, Chair), Brad Eden (SB), Lai-Ying Hsiung (Santa Cruz), Martha Hruska, recorder (SD), Patti Martin (CDL), Manuel Urrizola (UCR), Valerie Bross (LAUC), Luc Declerck, (SOPAG)

Guest: Linda Barnhart (SD and former NGTS Enterprise TF member)

1. Announcements
UCSB has announced decision about new UL, Denise Stephens. Bruce Miller, UL at Merced has announced he will be retiring effective May 15. Lorelei Tanjii will serve as the unofficial interim UL at UCI.

2. "Database of record" discussion with Linda Barnhart

In the HOTS earlier discussions of NGTS reports, one question surfaced: how does the Database of Record issue differ from a single systemwide ILS?
Linda noted that the discussion came up in the NGTS Enterprise group from:

1) extensive discussion based on CDC's collective collection concept. So if we are approaching things as collective collection, shouldn't we have one database of record in which to manage the collection
2) OCLC Web Scale Management product discussions.

The issue was based on the need to see what all campuses have and what they are thinking of buying, what do we have on order, so not just bib records, order records, holdings.
The Enterprise paper was based on exploring whether WorldCat could become the database of record? Aren't we already there? Why WCL cannot be the DB of record. Seeing that there is still layer of functionality, on orders, how many copies, which branches and where exactly they are.
It was noted that WC is still very bibliographic data oriented, doesn't have licensed and born digital types, so wouldn't there still have to have different databases of record? Split electronic and print??
In the UL and SOPAG reviews or the NGTS reports, the recommendation about a single ILS and DB of record, it was thought these need to be linked and both are set aside to be looked at together by SOPAG. Luc noted it would be helpful to focus on the requirements and expected benefits for a DB of record.
Luc asked if the OCLC Collection Analysis tool could be used to provide some of the information about the 'collective collection'?
But it was noted that that tool lacks the granularity needed, does not include order information, and does not contain all library holdings information.
Brad noted that the Enterprise report recommendation on the cloudbased ILS had originally been cast as the Web Scale Management ILS. But it was felt the time was not right to use that label.
Patti noted that NGM was never designed to be the collection management tool, it was designed just for discovery.
SOPAG will work on aligning the collective collection with what the database of record should be.
It was agreed this is an issue that needs to be tackled sooner rather than later.

Luc will communicate with SOPAG, letting them know how urgent and important it is to have the right tool for collective database management.

3. NGTS discussion -- implementation plan sent from SOPAG

Power of Three (POT) group concept is being used as the basic structure.
NGTS Management Team will serve as subset of SOPAG and the goal will be to work on both incremental changes and quick wins
Q: Are people going to be freed up from their day jobs to get this work done?
Q: Is the thinking that all these committees can be put in place and somehow all this work is going to get done simultaneously?
Q:When will this start? Not determined yet, different groups are already starting some of these. It does involve different groups and ACGs, so will spread out some of the work. It was noted that adjustments and release time may be required
John: what was thinking that put certain things from high prty list, some from medium prty list?
Luc: looked at what was already underway, what was most transformative. Some of the initiatives cluster together better
Question about NM1 and NM2 (metadata type issues) should HOTS be involved? Possibly could be on lightning bolt groups, depending.
Question about POT 5 why SCP and HOTS? Because POT5 *is* about SCP.
Question: How to populate the POT groups? From HOTS? Volunteers, assigned? Not yet fully decided
Lightning bolt teams could include new members, not necessarily HOTS members, allow that geographic location might matter so the group could meet facetoface and get work done.
Next Steps: SOPAG discusses at next meeting, this is framework, more work to do. Form the Management team and see that it meets asap to develop charges for POTs. Deadline in 3-4 weeks.
Patti: If you were asked to contribute to these, do people have capacity to do that?
Luc: SOPAG and ULs have discussed and endorsed that systemwide work is as important as local work.

4. CDC meeting - Jim and Martha
Jim: CDC agenda on the wiki
Bruce gave overview of SLASIAC TF report and UL s strategic priorities
Implications for CDC: Print management, reducing size of print collection quickly which would also have impact on HOTS. Framework for NGTS implementation including Diane Bisom also. Importance of systemwide work.
Trisha Cruse & Catherine Mitchell on UC3 and eScholarship issues
Allison Mudditt – UC Press director
CDC will work on Digital Collection development strategies, to relate to DLSTF2 and issues related to licensing
Changing role of bibliographer see NGTS section report, i.e., cataloging backlogs priority setting.
CDC will use POT 7
Luc: may very well be significant systemwide restructuring, pressure will come from SLASIAC report,
Patti: concern how can we position for success?

5. LAUC Assembly report -- Brad and others
Brad attended NGM NGTS presentations. Bruce Miller presentation, very forthright, emphasized the importance of going forward with recommendations without a lot more talk… sense that we don't want to hear opinions anymore.

UCLA noted the white paper they had prepared with comments. The response was, yes, but we are moving ahead anyway, don't want to hear opinions anymore. Showed new NGTS on piece of paper.

Gene Lucas presented the SLASIAC work, with agenda item #5 page 3, SLASIAC will take to all campuses. Buying power of libraries will erode over next 5 years. If each campus cut acq budget by 21%. System has to pay for pensions, retirements, cut ops budgets by 21%. See http://libraries.universityofcalifornia.edu/planning/taskforce/Mar2_SLASIAC_TF_Budget_Scenario_v2a.pdf

In the NGM discussion, it was pointed out that NGM was not meeting needs of users, and these concerns had been expressed, but many felt they were not getting answers to the concerns expressed.
Bruce: but point is we're still going to move forward. User stats show users are ok with NGM.
Patti: Luc and Patti have been passing the concerns along; however, both UC and OCLC have been focusing for now on several high priority functional requirements. OCLC is working on addressing user needs through the WCL Users Group. It is important to still have a UC voice in working with OCLC to improve WCL.
Luc: the BSTF group will use the LAUC event to go to next step, we do need to work on the management functionality.

6. NGM update

John: last quarterly report in Feb for film, music, theatrical, now MARC performers are included.
Improvements to LHRs are coming
OCLC webinar on new features and functionality: WCL Users Center Support site taking place of current web site. Plans to store local data that will be attached to master record. This includes storing local system id number
PQ EEBO records will be stored in parallel WCL database.
Plan for F12 includes ability to limit search to full text, limit by open access
Solution to known item searching problem fixed by planting the problem titles in top retrieval, e.g., ***Time***
Ability to email results without having to set up account and log in.

Q: List of category of records that were in old Melvyl and not in NGM? Does that still exist?
Vendor list was included and showed what they were working on including

CAMCIG asking about use of LHRs… are we going to expand our use of LHRs for non serials? Not yet. But will need to have if you ever want to see on order info
What would be purpose of LHRs for monos? Locations, and on orders… would need larger discussion
Important info for Special Collections etc. now appears that certain fields will be stored in association with master bib records.
BSTF team will consider what's possible for monos and consider if these need to be discussed more widely.