

**Technical Services Planning Committee Conference Call
MINUTES
Aug. 13, 2009**

Attendance

FAMU	Emmett Denny		Ruth Ziegler
FAMU-LAW	Linda Sobey	FSU-LAW	Pat Bingham-Harper
FAU	Teresa Abaid Maria Berenbaum Janice Donahue Helen Laurence	NCF	Tom Tharrington
		UF	Betsy Simpton Priscilla Williams Naomi Young
FCLA	Ellen Bishop Daniel Cromwell Mary Ann O'Daniel Jean Phillips Lisa Tatum	UF-LAW	Susy Potter
		UNF	Jeff Bowen Vicki Stanton
FGCU	Catherine Gardiner	USF	Susan Heron
FIU	Sue Wartzok (Chair) Elaine Winske	USF Health	Allison Howard
		UWF	Esmer Brown Shari Johnson Debbie Marshall
FIU-LAW	Masako Patrum		Dan North
FSU	Tamara Weatherholt		

Minutes of the July 23, 2009 meeting were approved.

Illuminate test:

The call began at 1:45 to give everyone a chance to connect and to learn some of the basic Illuminate functions. There were some problems with background noise, feedback and voices suddenly dropping away but most people were audible to the group.

Action Plan:

A new draft of the status column of the plan had been distributed. The first point to be discussed was activity 2 of Objective 1.6. Naomi reported that the Metadata Subcommittee had met the day before and they recommended that a task group be set up to “determine quality standards for MARC descriptive metadata created and purchased.” Standards such as these are difficult to determine and need to be discussed because these affect what our users see in the

catalog. Purchased records for large sets are seen as particular problems; they are often accepted simply because they are available rather than consciously chosen. As we look ahead to sharing bibliographic records, we need standards for what is acceptable and what is not acceptable. Naomi suggested that perhaps this topic could be one of the break-out groups during the morning session at the Cataloging Summit. If so, we could simply note in the action plan: Will be discussed at the Cataloging Summit.

Activity 3 of objective 3.1 was the next point to be discussed. During the call it was revised to read: The Subcommittee worked with the CPC Object Code Task Force on consistent material type and object codes for e-resources. The Task Force is implementing a pilot project with 6 libraries. At least 5 schools are actively using object codes for e-resources as they pay invoices.

The status of activity 1 of Objective 3.2 was also added: Ellen is using Elluminate sessions with small groups to get everyone doing things in the most efficient way.

The Authorities Subcommittee and the Metadata Subcommittee will send Sue those sections relating to their charge by August 26 at the latest since the revised Action Plan needs to be sent to CSUL on August 27.

Acquisitions Subcommittee organization:

In our quarterly report to CSUL, Sue will include as an action item a request for the approval of the Acquisitions Subcommittee.

Cataloging Summit:

The discussion of the Cataloging Summit began with a reminder that the survey deadline is Aug. 28. On the question of the number of titles cataloged per year, Betsy has added a space for comments so that libraries can indicate if their numbers include batchloaded records, and if so, which types of batchloaded records. The collations of the responses to mini surveys #1 & #2 are now posted on the TSPC swiki, although Sue would also like to do some analysis of the 2nd mini survey in addition to collecting the responses. There are also at least two citations for suggested readings now posted on the swiki. So far 44 people plan to attend. At this time, the task force is planning to alternate between small-group sessions with the groups then reporting back to the whole group; each group will have a facilitator and a recorder. Flip charts are planned so that the participants can see what the recorder is writing and help draft the notes. There are plans for at least four poster presentations with two more probable ones. Sue had weighted the responses to the topics survey and created a little spreadsheet which showed that the top topic is to get more uniformity in cataloging workflows and practices across the SUL.

A draft of a possible agenda for the Summit had been sent out ahead of the meeting. One question the planning task force wanted advice on was whether there should be format groups (serials, e-resources, music) or interest groups (law; med). One possibility would be for these groups to meet informally during lunch; another would be for them to meet at the same time that monographic catalogers are meeting to discuss uniformity in monographic cataloging practices and workflows.

The survey also showed that people are concerned about the probability of the need to learn and implement RDA in the next year to 18 months and training issues, both in general and as they relate to RDA implementation. Dean Garrison of USF is planning a presentation to CSUL on RDA during the September meeting. Susan emailed Garrison during the call and reported that he is willing to share the PowerPoints from his presentation with us.

Sharing bibliographic records across the SUL received the second highest number of total points. It was pointed out that perhaps the discussion of uniform monographic cataloging practices should take place in the context of shared bibs—what would be acceptable and unacceptable in that context. The point was also made that the discussion should be *outcome-based*; not an hour spent saying we don't want to share bibliographic records but an hour spent looking for the best way to do it.

Sharing bibliographical records for serials is a particularly difficult issue. It would be productive if serials reconciliation could be discussed. In particular, how to coordinate the normalizing of title changes; how to coordinate a consistent serials policy across the SUL. The idea of a statewide CONSER funnel came up but it was suggested that such might not be sufficient to reconcile policies.

The need to be *outcome-based* came up again, particularly in the matter of reaching consensus on cataloging policies and practices for the core elements of bibliographic records. However, every session should be outcome-based. Having task groups—with a facilitator who knows the ground rules for the discussions—was recommended as a good way to get decisions made.

Concern was expressed about the time line for the single bib project since the task force is behind in the proposed time line by six months. Specifications for the merge need to be drafted and then tested. How do we arrive at the initial specs and how can they be tested? The plan may be that the pilot libraries will draft the specs but on the other hand the TSPC wants all of us to be involved. Also, have other groups who have decided to share bibs published their specs. Should the whole meeting be devoted to sharing bibs or perhaps the meeting should focus on just two topics: 1) uniformity of cataloging standards and practices and 2) sharing bibs. Or—since this meeting was proposed to CSUL “to standardize cataloging practices and expand collaboration statewide” —perhaps another meeting should be convened to focus on sharing bibs. Sharing bibs is sufficiently major that we need time to plan and to implement. There are groups other than catalogers who need to be involved in decision-making, such as authorities and acquisitions librarians. What are the task groups that need to be formed.

The group asked Sue to meet with Dean Probst to ask about the task force's plans. She is to find out about the new time line for the pilot project; what TSPC can do to help and what we need to do at the Summit to help.

Action item:

Vicki Stanton proposed an action item from TSPC to CSUL to be voted on via email with a short timeframe: *TSPC will be holding a cataloging summit in Oct. What can TSPC do to assist with the single bib specs and development of the timeline?*

Remainder of agenda items:

There was not sufficient time to complete the agenda, including the FCLA report and liaison and subcommittee reports.

Next conference call: September 17.

Submitted by Sue Wartzok
Florida International University