

Technical Services Planning Committee Minutes  
Mar. 29, 2007 1:30-2:30

Present:

**FAMU:** Emmett Denny, Linda Sobey (FAMU-LAW)  
**FAU:** Maria Berenbaum, Janice Donahue, Helen Laurence  
**FGCU:** Catherine Gardiner  
**FIU:** Sue Wartzok, Elaine Winske, Nancy Hershoff  
**FSU:** Ruth Zeigler, Carolyn Klatt, Charles McElroy, Libby Fairley  
Patricia Bingham-Harper (FSU-LAW), Suzanne Nagy (FSU-MED)  
**UCF:** Jeanette Ward, Kim Montgomery  
**UF:** Betsy Simpson, Jean Bostwick (UF-LAW), Cecilia Botero, **Chair** (UF-HSC)  
**UNF:** Vicki Stanton, Verna Urbanski, Ya'aqov Ziso  
**USF:** Susan Heron, Lee Ann Howlett (USF-HSC), Allison Howard (USF-HSC)  
**FCLA:** Daniel Cromwell, Mary Ann O'Daniel, Michelle Newberry, Lydia Motyka, Donna Alsbury

There was no one present from NCF and UWF

The minutes of the last meeting were approved. Cecilia received word from the Chair of the Endeca Committee that they would welcome a TSPC liaison. Ya'aqov Ziso volunteered to participate, and will sit in on the committee's conference calls.

This conference call focused the discussion on the ILS model of one bibliographic record for all SUL members. This could follow the CCLA model, and would be a change from our current policy of separate catalogs for each institution.

The discussion started by listing benefits and concerns:

#### Benefits

- Reindexing would be easier
- Endeca already merges records, so we would follow the public view
- We would need fewer instances of Aleph and Oracle, so FCLA could spend less effort for updates and patches
- We would have centralized authorities
- CCLA reported a savings in OCLC export charges for individual institutions
- Each institution has its own holdings and local notes

#### Concerns

- Loss of local authorities, would merge into one file
- Access points would be 'verified' centrally but would there be proactive review and authority maintenance?
- Purchased table of contents can't be shared. How to handle?
- Various practices for 856 fields, various hot links, may move to 505 fields
- MARC records for online products are not to be shared

Questions and comments included the following:

Would a single record slow down loading of data?

What kind of coordination would be required for loading large sets of records? How would MARC records from netLibrary and other vendors be blocked from non-subscribing institutions?

How would electronic access be noted on shared records? If all owned could there be a "global" OWN code?

How would serials cataloging issues involving pre-AACR cataloging and latest/earliest/successive titles be resolved?

How would parallel indexing work? Lydia said that indexing would be much faster than our current situation of indexing 11 institutions.

How would OWN codes prohibit/allow other users to update holdings? The OWN on the bib record would prohibit other users from updating. We would probably need to use the OWN code on the holdings records instead of bib records. Daniel commented that OWN codes were not now activated in the holdings record, but could be.

Ya'aqov asked Daniel if Daniel could send him the CCLA OCLC tab to review.

How would loads and overlay features work? We might need to use the Aleph native loader to protect fields from overlaying. (USF is using the Aleph loader now.) Maryann will ask Gene about modifying GenLoad to load only certain fields into existing records. TKR fields need to be able to remain in place.

The CCLA database is much smaller than the SUL database. They have separate bib records for print and e-resources, with an OWN code of "global." It would be good to get more statistics and information from CCLA, including stats on ordering. Many community colleges do not use the Acquisitions module. We need to look at other consortia. Harvard and the University of Maryland each use the single record approach. Harvard constantly updates its parallel indexing.

We need to know if the loaders have good duplication detection, and if the indexing is fast enough.

UF has moved to the one bib record for the campus. Centralized acquisitions is still on the horizon. Betsy explained that UF Health and UF Science order many of the same things. They are loading their own vendor records. PromptCat is an issue for UF Main and UF Health. However, for them, there is not a lot of overlap. The SUL would have a high rate of duplicate orders. UF law is still loading records manually.

It would be good to speak with other users at ALA and Eluna. Jeannette (UCF) and Ya'aqov (UNF) are attending Eluna. They will try to touch base with single record users and see what can learn.

We need to know how series will be handled, and if there are local HOL options. Aleph has a feature called EXPAND to create additional indexed fields.

We would need to examine different concepts of quality control, and establish one set of SUS guidelines for selection and maintenance of the bibliographic records.

The OhioLink libraries have been using a centralized union catalog with Innovative for over 12 years. We could speak with them about policies and procedures.

How would decisions be communicated throughout the SUL? How would different opinions/practices be resolved? There would need to be close cooperation between the TSPC members.

How would local decisions about collections be resolved? For instance, as 4,000 photos were digitized for one library, would the individual catalog records be added to the shared bibliographic file? Would this lead to difficult displays?

As part of the review of the "one record" style of database, the suggestion was made for TSPC to create a list of issues which need to be resolved. This list could be distributed to TSPC distribution list for work and cooperative review. [[Attached](#)]

The meeting ended at 2:30, when technical phone issues were unmanageable.

Minutes submitted by Vicki Stanton and Verna Urbanski, UNF