

TSPC Conference Call
March 11, 2010
Minutes (Taken by Susan Heron, USF)

Attendance:

FAU: Maria Berenbaum, Janice Donahue, Deb Hoban, Helen Laurence
FCLA: Daniel Cromwell, Ellen Bishop, Mary Ann O'Daniel, Jean Phillips
FGCU: Catherine Gardiner
FIU: Sue Wartzok, Elaine Winske
FSU: Annie Glerum, Charles McElroy, Tamara Weatherholt, Ruth Ziegler, Amy Weiss
FSU-Law: Pat Bingham-Harper
NCF: Tom Tharrington
UCF: Kim Montgomery
UF: Betsy Simpson, Jimmie Lundgren, Priscilla Williams
UF-Law: Patricia Morgan, Susie Potter
UNF: Vicki Stanton, Jeff Bowen
USF: Susan Heron
UWF: Dan North

Minutes of February 11, 2010 conference call: Approved

Next meeting: April 8, 2010, 2 pm. **Notes:** Dan North, UWF

FCLA Report

Mary Ann O'Daniel:

Tomorrow FCLA is holding one of their periodic orientations about their services for new managers and deans.

The UBorrow task force is doing functional testing, with an April target date for all SULs to begin testing and expectation of a soft launch next summer.

The first test database of merged records for the Single Bib pilot is imminent; it will be easier to judge the wisdom of some of the decisions when a test database is available for review.

The MARC tag updates are being implemented in stages. How to deal with the 440 is still under discussion (see below).

Jean Phillips:

FIU and UF have implemented a method of allowing patrons to request in process materials in the OPAC and have email sent directly to technical services; USF is in the queue for this.

Daniel Cromwell:

FSU has submitted a request to OCLC for a reclamation project and should begin soon

CSUL Report

The Metadata Subcommittee will need to justify themselves with a new charge and a substantive action plan; CSUL will evaluate these and rule on whether they will continue as a subcommittee.

The storage facility is waiting on the legislature to provide money. It will take two years to plan and two years to build. Ongoing operating costs are as yet unknown; UF is trying to find a donor to fund this.

The state is expecting the newer law and medical schools to be supported by the libraries of the older institutions. The medical librarians are meeting to discuss this.

A 7% budget cut for FCLA is possible, which could impact funding for resources and local equipment. A proposal to consolidate hardware is rumored. Judy Ring of the State Library said that state aid to libraries could be cut.

CPC: FSU is going forward with a pilot on the single vendor venture; University of Miami and Nova are expected to participate. A speaker from Ithaca talked about how many copies of JSTOR journals are needed and how libraries can discard their print journals as use of ejournals rise.

Shared Bib Pilot Project

Daniel has created a table of MARC tags annotated by how they will be treated in the merge: which will be dropped, which will be added, which will have a delimiter 5 added, etc.; the representatives of the pilot libraries will discuss this tomorrow. Donna Alsbury has created new cleanup reports from which all libraries can benefit. One report shows all the uses of the 852 delimiter a values and helps to identify invalid MARC organization codes; a table can be modified to prevent the keying of invalid codes. The MOCs can be used in running reports. OWN codes will disappear from BIB records; it is possible to have them on HOL records, but it would be a major task to add them.

Setting Priorities

How do we determine what is most important for FCLA to work on? CSUL has declared the UBorrow and Single Bib projects to be the top priorities; beyond these, FCLA could work on Genload revisions, improved authority control linking, transformation of the 440s into 490s and 830s, MARC validation table updates, Marcive e-government documents, and other ad hoc projects. An attempt to vote on this had mixed results and it was decided that an email vote would be better. As an ongoing issue, however, a quarterly review or reevaluation was suggested. A mini action plan could be used, with very targeted, specific goals and measures. Amy, Sue, and Susan will work on this.

440 Project

Based on discussion earlier in the meeting, the Authority Subcommittee agreed to do some preliminary work on this and make a recommendation.

Liaison & Subcommittee Reports

Authorities

The results of the authority survey were sent to TSPC members by email; a detailed analysis will follow. The intended purpose was to determine the support for authority work and whether the current reports are adequate, user friendly and accomplished their purpose. Many libraries are interested in participating in the NACO funnel, including nonSUL libraries. Shared bib will significantly impact authority work including making it more feasible to consider authority control through a vendor, though a model of how to fund this has not yet been discussed.

OPAC

Technical difficulties interfered with this report, but Jimmie had sent an email outlining the significant points before the TSPC meeting.

Acquisitions

Technical difficulties interfered with Vicki's report, but she provided access to two reports:

1. Overview of acquisitions within the SULs:

<http://spreadsheets.google.com/ccc?key=0At5mb3irtRcJdF9qQnNMdDVkN0RsbndYM3dSMXdsbXc&hl=en>

2. Projects and activities at individual SULs:

<http://docs.google.com/Doc?docid=0Ad5mb3irtRcJZGY2NDQ4czJfMTFmZGtXZjhjcw&hl=en>

CPC

Cecilia was absent.

Metadata

The Metadata Subcommittee discussed redrafting the charge. They attempted to take a new look at the existing charge to determine which elements should be retained, reformed, or more actively implemented and what new elements should be introduced. Opening the charge up beyond just electronic/digital resources was discussed. Examples of specific projects that might be undertaken to implement existing charge elements would be creating a central resource point by pulling together best practices and recommended

standards, providing a forum for problem solving for cataloging issues and the posting of hints and tips. A wiki might be used for this. One issue that was discussed is where the boundaries should exist now that the DISC group has metadata in its charge and the Statewide Standards for MARC Advisory Group has been created. Discussions will continue in the next conference call and members have been encouraged to contribute via the listserv.