

HOTS Conference Call Minutes 6/13/2011, 2:00-4:00 pm

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

1. Announcements

John Riemer will be new HOTS chair as of July. Karleen volunteered to be vice-chair since Davis was skipped over previously.

UCSC has started shelf-ready for firm orders in late May. Will expand to approvals in July.

2. SPIP recommendations -- comments & discussion phase 2

John queried whether "Maximize the number of shared print (in place or in RLF) collections at UC libraries to support CDC's vision of 21st Century collections." on page 3 meant there would be a restriction of a single copy of books throughout the system. Martha - the report focuses on establishing principles. There are projects being developed by shared mono coordinating group. No decisions have been made about how many copies. Karleen also noted that throughout the document it states that campuses may want to maintain duplicate books for specific purposes. One copy is not prescriptive as an end-all be-all for all titles.

Discoverability in WCL. Single holdings symbol. Expectation is that OCLC is the discovery and possibly delivery tool (via ILL). Puts urgency on implementation of 583 MARC field for shared print. WCL Master Records currently have 583 (Google Books scanned). A discussion ensued about whether we can actually produce large-scale LHRs for monographs, esp with Millennium. There are still LHR problems with WCL. Patti pointed out that if we do use LHRs for monos, then we don't get real-time circ info, and hinders Request service.

A potential solution would be to use the 583 in the Bibliographic record – not perfect, but, important for projects like WEST & HathiTrust (promoting info; has to be visible re. retention decisions, amongst ourselves and beyond). John – it could go there, but it could be confusing 583 appearing in two different places (serial info 583 would be in LHR; mono 583 would be in Bib record.). The 583 in Bib record for monos gets around the problem of creating check-in records for mono titles. For mono sets you can add check-in record on the set, and generate an LHR.

Recommendation # 3 - Microforms – aren't we already declining our micro-collections? If so, coordinating the collection may be more difficult. The coordination is also on withdrawal and consolidation of collections. UCSD has done fair amount of weeding since much of it is now online. CDC felt that recommendation 3 is lower priority.

5 – Blue Ribbon TF for prospective federal documents. GILS has been charged already to look at retrospective print. Most federal documents are online, but not all. Suggestion – focus on principles at this point. Emphasis on not duplicating formats, and favoring e- over print format when both are available.

#6 – Cloud-sourcing partnerships for print monos – not much understanding of what this is

#7 – campuses contribute holdings when called for by WEST and JSTOR – we are already doing

#8 – Disclose print resources that are mass digitized as shared print. Being able to see what has been digitized by mass dig collections. Melvyl displays digitization by Google & Hathi. This point talks about displaying when your library's print copy has been scanned for digitization. Info stored in Bib record; the item to be stored according to shared print policies. This could be a lot of work.

Also, if your campus' copy is digitized, and another copy is already at RLF, you should be able to forego your print copy. For the user it does not matter which print copy is retained. HOTS should comment and request clarification of the principle behind this recommendation. We'd like this one spelled out more clearly, because some of us are already taking different steps than what's outlined here.

#10 – Question about whether OCLC will be willing/able to provide lists of campus holdings at the RLF's? Also, what is the "system tool" in the 3rd bullet point on page 28.

#11 – May take a while for disclosure in OCLC of journal backfiles/Bronze Archives

3. Workflows for sending material to the RLF's.-- Anneliese

Tool being developed at Berkeley; phase 1 close to done. Lisa has seen demo for Berkeley. How it works: supply list of OCLC record numbers (up to 5,000) you want to deposit. For serials, it will return holdings, you check to verify volumes. For monos, it returns whether there are holdings at SRLF or NRLF. Next step: to be shared with CDL/Patti. Would like to include support for other campuses.

For NRLF, most items do have an OCLC number.

4. NGM update for Tech Services issues—John

Local data – can now include in batch updates, local fields such as 793 field for package title; unique fields in bib records. Early serial LHR submitters want to have other campuses go first with other formats.

Local 856's that got moved to "Details" portion of record – being worked on but not completed.

If UCLA sends local data fields, not sure if another campus can see that.

Serial LHRs – we should be able to have them display in fall at the earliest. CDL working on back-end to test display, response time, and consistency. Problem with default OCLC LHR display – doesn't map holdings to any particular library within a location.

856 in Item record – for e-bookplating – does not display. (UCSC wants to do this). Fields from item records do not include 856.

5. NGM issues --Patti

NGM Implementation Team gave recommendations to Exec Team on how to do project maintenance. Exec Team will discuss with SOPAG about how NGM should be run.

We can all join WCL Users' Group – community group. Sessions offered at ALA. Share your views and opinions.

6. NGTS updates -- Martha and Vicki

Work continues on charges for Power of Three (POT) groups. Each group has a SOPAG sponsor. Working hard on filling POTs with members.

DLSTF Report – SOPAG going through actions to coordinate with NGTS groups. Six POTs will start in near term. POTs will use lightning groups for specific issues (e.g., what does it mean to start working on shelf-ready? Good enough?)

Coordinate the shared collection development with the technical services aspects. Decision-making process will be very important to move things along.