

Technical Services Planning Committee Meeting Minutes of March 16, 1995

Submitted by Mary Ann O'Daniel

Present:

- Saiyed A. Ahmad (FAMU),
- Michele Dalehite (FCLA),
- David H. Doerrer (UWF)(chair),
- Janice E. Donahue (FAU),
- Jim Gates (UF-Law),
- Kathie Goldfarb (FSU-Main),
- Sarah Harmon (USF-Med),
- John Hein (UNF),
- Susan Heron (USF-Main),
- Martha Hruska (UF-Main),
- Selma Jaskowski (UCF),
- Mary Ann O'Daniel (UF-Health)(recorder),
- Phoebe Phillips (FIU), and
- Janice S. Ross (FSU-Law)

Janice Donahue convened this first meeting of the SUS Technical Services Planning Committee (TSPC) at 9:30am. Michele Dalehite gave a brief history of the administration and organization of FCLA and its boards and committees. Discussion followed regarding the role of this committee vis-a-vis the FCLA Technical Services Committee (TSC). Kathie Goldfarb moved that a recommendation be sent to the SUS Directors that the old TSC be abolished and the TSPC assume the TSC's duties and responsibilities. David seconded the motion. It passed unanimously by acclamation.

It was recommended that the old FCLA Technical Services Committee should be abolished. The SUS Technical Services Planning Committee should assume its duties and responsibilities.

Election of the Committee Chair followed a brief discussion of the Chair's role. Martha Hruska nominated David Doerrer as chair; Kathie seconded it. He was elected unanimously by acclamation and assumed the Chair's duties immediately.

Discussion of the meeting schedule followed. The Committee's initial report and recommendations are due to the SUS Library Directors September 1. It was agreed that much of the Committee's business could be conducted via email and conference calls, which will minimize the number of face-to-face meetings required. A meeting was tentatively set for May 25 in Orlando. David will confirm the date and site via email.

Martha volunteered UF's sponsorship of a TSPC email discussion list. She predicted it would be available within a week; she will subscribe everyone on the Committee. After discussion, the Committee agreed that the list will be opened to all interested parties.

The next topic discussed was the rewrites of the acquisitions and serials check-in modules. The 1994 Joint Committees had discussed that other systems need to be looked at and evaluated and a needs assessment done before writing specs for a new system. The TSPC consensus was that TSPC subcommittees should be formed to look at acquisitions and serials check-in. John Hein agreed to chair them. Discussion followed regarding their composition and size.

It was agreed that:

- because acquisitions and serials control are so interrelated, one subcommittee should be established to examine both;
- acquisitions and serials people who are not TSPC members may be members of the subcommittee in order to take advantage of their knowledge and expertise;
- each library represented on the TSPC may appoint one to two representatives to the subcommittee as deemed appropriate by the library;
- the names of representatives should be sent to John Hein by March 24.

The Committee also discussed mechanisms for assessing needs and evaluating systems. The Joint Committees did not establish limitations regarding whether we would be rewriting what we have or acquiring something new. John commented that it might be a stretch to adequately integrate another system. Suggestions for proceeding included saying what we want in an ideal system, then prioritize the wants - e.g., what the first year, second year, etc. Options include taking an off-the-shelf system and trying to integrate it with NOTIS; modifying NOTIS; scrapping everything and starting from scratch. The subcommittee should do an inventory to discover what the libraries have and what they want. In response to questions about FCLA resources, Michele said it would probably take FCLA 7-10 person years to write a new module. Regarding the FCLA/SUS commitment to NOTIS, Michele responded that there's probably not another system that can be run centrally. She added that SUS installation is still running on the UF-Northwestern contract. FCLA isn't paying maintenance on NOTIS this year in exchange for providing command-code NOTIS to Ameritech.

The next discussion topic was digitization initiatives. Martha pointed out that these aren't just technical services issues; what should be selected should be coordinated with other SUS groups, i.e., Directors, Electronic Collections, Public Services. If there is grant funding to help with digitizing, projects that may attract grants are digitization of Florida resources, especially if they're not widely held. The SUS could pool collections and look at strategies for funding. While the decision to do this may properly belong with a group other than the TSPC, the TSPC represents the doers. Current UF projects include a Mellon Foundation grant for a pilot project to digitize Caribbean resources, the Florida newspaper project grant (NEH funding) for cataloging and some microfilming, and digitization of microfilm of Florida geological surveys. In an aside, Martha noted that microfilm is still a better quality and proven technology for archival purposes, so the microfilm remains the archival copy, while the digitized version is the copy for general use and distribution.

Discussion moved to the MARC 856 field for URLs and hot links from that field in NOTIS records. The question was raised whether that discussion should be done by a joint committee of the TSPC, the ECC, and the PSPC. We could propose to the directors to work in a coordinated manner and evaluate collections. Alternatively, the TSPC could look at things like utilizing of 856 fields in NOTIS records or implementing links between a Web homepage and the OPAC.

David asked whether FCLA is looking at a Web browser for a GUI client front end. Michele responded that NERDC is getting an SP2, which is a multiple parallel processor (several linked UNIX boxes) with 150gb storage (FCLA databases now use 90gb). The package includes IBM's Visual Info software. IBM would like to link what it calls our legacy system (NOTIS running in the traditional IBM mainframe environment) with UNIX and is supporting a "digital library" initiative, a cooperative project among IBM, NERDC, and FCLA. IBM is looking for the project to develop software to manage scanning, storage, retrieval, and display. FCLA is hiring programmers for the project, which in turn supports FCLA's five-year plan. The goal is to store full text journal articles as compound documents (image and text).

Martha commented that UF collection managers are interested in SGML text and in titles such as the OED and Encyclopedia Britannica in full text. She asked whether the 856 field could be used for a hot link to them. Michele pointed out that when the user goes out through a hot link, he or she leaves NOTIS; at this time there's not a way to get the user back to NOTIS. It's easier to manage hot links with open systems and Web software than with NOTIS.

A review of the committee's charge as distributed by Janice Donahue prior to the meeting followed. After some discussion, the consensus was to make no changes to STATUS or RECOMMENDATION. Questions arose over the MISSION that need to be sent to the directors. The first paragraph of the mission statement in the Committee Charge reads:

The Committee will articulate needs as well as recommended goals and objectives that will define, develop, and implement FCLA services that support technical service programs in the SUS libraries. Their immediate function is to advise SUS Library

Directors and work with FCLA staff during the transition to a client/server and open systems environment.

Questions for the directors:

Please clarify the scope and breadth of the Committee's charge regarding the first paragraph of the mission statement and whether the Committee is restricted to FCLA activities and projects or may concern itself with larger technical service issues. In addition, the Committee perceives a possible conflict between the second sentence of the first paragraph and Initial Activities. What is the time frame for "immediate"?

The next topic for discussion was authorities processing. Michele announced that FCLA has the LC NAF backfile through December 1994 and plans to load it within the next few weeks. The 1995 updates will be applied to the backfile after loading. In other developments, UNF has downloaded Gary Strawn's regularly-updated file of free-floating subdivisions. FCLA has loaded it into the test region, but there are questions about whether to load it into the main authority file. Since these are not regular authority records and since the free floater tags are not indexed in MHI, the records can be found only by NOTIS control number. MHI would have to be changed to make the records available for use.

Discussion regarding automated authority processing led to the sanctioning of a TSPC subcommittee on authority control, with the composition to be determined.

Michele surveyed the group on how often an authority record is overlaid with a new version from OCLC. Generally series authority records are overlaid more than names. She was assessing the need for a derive/overlay function for authority records. The question is whether the development of a derive/overlay function or the current derive new record/delete old record is a better use of FCLA's human and system resources.

Next there was discussion of technical services workstations. Martha commented that UF has a mix of, and too few, workstations. She suggested that the TSPC look at what's possible and what functionality we would like to see. There also is a need to communicate to the directors that technical services workstations are a high priority for consideration if money becomes available. In the discussion that followed, Phoebe commented that the committee should define what a technical services workstation is and what the minimal needs are. It was recommended that those who now have technical services workstations put that information on email, and that those who went to the SOLINET workshop put out those specs. The TSPC's workstation specs will need to include the hardware, software, and functionality (what people can connect to). The specs also need to make clear that the hardware life cycle is four to five years.

Discussion followed about cataloging outsourcing, PromptCat, and TECHPRO. FAU used TECHPRO for 3000 scores and is using it now for an arrearage project (6000 foreign language titles). The work on the scores was good; TECHPRO classified them and supplied authorities. The foreign language work is

uneven, which is in line with people's comments at ALA a couple years ago. Labeling is a problem; the call number on the label often doesn't match the call number in the record. FAU is receiving the TECHPRO records on disk. Michele issued the reminder that FCLA is not processing archive tapes any more, so libraries should not consider the option of receiving records on tape.

PromptCat will be available in April. FCLA's preference is that all PromptCat products come through OCLC's EDX service. There's an annual \$208 drop charge per library. However, Joanne Kepics (SOLINET) said that for all SUS records shipped to FCLA, there will be just one \$208 for all libraries involved, not \$208 per library. This does not include the per-library set up fee and per-record fee. Kathie noted that the records are shipped within 72 hours of when the books are shipped and asked how quickly FCLA could load the records. Michele responded that it would make a difference whether the libraries are using the same load options or tailored loads. PromptCat records are available on archive tape, EDX, Prism save file, and cards; records are not offered on diskette. As a side comment to concerns about receiving records for rejected approval books, Michele passed on comments from Ellen Waite, Chicago Loyola, an early test site for PromptCat. When asked what she was doing about rejected approval books, Ellen stated that the library doesn't return any approval books because the costs associated with rejecting 4% of the books outweighs the cost of the materials. According to Joanne Kepics, OCLC won't resend a record that already has the library's holding symbol on it; a report of the duplicate will be sent instead. FIU described its situation of two campuses and two approval plans with a low return rate.

Other issues came up related to loading PromptCat records. Michele commented that another ad hoc committee may be needed to discuss all the issues that arise. One question was how to verify whether a record had loaded but a book hadn't been shipped; an 035 tickler was suggested. OCLC will include authority records for a fee. There was discussion about getting updated records, e.g., when CIP records go to full, a serial title changes, or contents notes are added. About half of the committee is considering PromptCat.

Discussion of cooperative cataloging within the SUS followed. This may be of particular interest for materials that require special cataloging expertise, but for which individual libraries can't maintain a specialist. Examples are scores and foreign language materials. Discussion followed concerning using cataloging expertise within the SUS more effectively.

Finally there was brief discussion of format integration. The enhanced 505s are keyworded in KT=. Using the new subfielding doesn't cause problems.

The meeting adjourned at 3:50pm.