Minutes
CCLINC Steering/Implementation Team Meeting
January 9, 2001
3:00 p.m.

Present: Bob Blackmun, Roxanne Davenport, Pam Doyle, Debbie Luck, Kathy Martin, Chris Meister, Mario Ramos, Linda Stone, Dan Swartout, Renee Watson, Susan Williams, John Wood.

Absent: Gretchen Bell, Ruth Bryan, Barbara Glick, Raye Oldham, Angela Sox, Gloria Sutton, Luella Teuton

Luella was not able to attend, so she asked Debbie Luck to preside in her absence.

Agenda items:
1. Discuss the Unicorn 2000 upgrade: Pam reported that Ruth had contacted 11 libraries, of which only 1 has performed this upgrade. This library reported some problems and is in the process of fixing bugs. SIRSI has also requested that libraries that upgraded during Dec. 8-18 remove the upgrade and reinstall. A list of the issues regarding this upgrade is on the SIRSI web site. In discussing when to upgrade, a couple of questions for SIRSI arose:
    1) Does the 2001 upgrade incorporate the 2000 upgrade, i.e. can you upgrade to Unicorn 2001 without first having upgraded to Unicorn 2000? If so, does this install all the features of both upgrades?
    2) Is Unicorn 2000 considered a new release? How does one distinguish "major" vs "minor" releases/upgrades in SIRSI (i.e. correlate to Dynix's numbering majors 150, 160, etc. and minors 151, 152, etc.)
    After much discussion of pros and cons, the committee decided on the following timetable for loading the 2000 and 2001 releases:
    ▪ Upgrade test server to Unicorn 2000 in mid-March 2001.
    ▪ Upgrade production server to Unicorn 2000 in early May 2001, pending satisfaction with test server upgrade.
    ▪ SIRSI now has Unicorn 2001 scheduled for release in May 2001. If this schedule holds, plan to upgrade test server to Unicorn 2001 in early August 2001, with production server upgrade to follow pending release's performance in other libraries and on test server.

2. Planning for consultant: Bob Blackmun reported that due to reversions, no System Office money will be available for a outside consultant until after July 1, 2001. He will check into grant money or use of in-state resources such as library school faculty, college/university librarians with suitable credentials, or State Library personnel. Much discussion ensued, with the following points raised:
    ▪ LRS has been studied by "in-office" and "in-system" groups many times before, the latest being the Library Service Task Force report.

Recommendations are often made but not implemented due to such factors as lack of funding or objections by individual libraries.

- LRS does not operate in a vacuum, so its services must be examined in context of those services needed by all colleges, and how best to provide those services.
- An outside consultant would infuse a fresh viewpoint to the discussion.
- Presidents and local administrators must buy into the study to help ensure that recommendations can actually be enacted.
- "Concensus" should be defined upfront, so that parties to such a study understand that objections to outcomes should be raised during the process, and not after the completion of the study and its recommendations.

Following the discussion, the group recommended that Bob, Pam and Luella continue to pursue obtaining an outside consultant and funding for same. Pending their findings, the issue was tabled for future discussion.

3. Reserves/migration question from Linda Leighty: For INFORMATION: Pitt has discovered that some items that had once been on reserve in Dynix (but not at time of migration) are now showing up in SIRSI as "book" and with a current location of "reserve." The committee wondered if the cause could be that part of the database is constructed of records that were obtained from the Asheville data, which was extracted from Dynix at an earlier date than the "original" data tape.   At any rate, the warning is passed that schools may want to spot-check their records for such materials.

4. Email from Kathy Martin regarding serials: For INFORMATION: it was discovered that a serials librarian at one of the colleges was not aware that serials work is to be confined to the test server until the serials subcommittee works out its procedures. This gave rise once more to the perpetual discussion of communication difficulties:
- The CC CCLINC list in the GroupWise address book DOES NOT CONTAIN NAMES!!!!! It merely points to "LL" lists that are maintained by the local colleges. If you and your library staff are not on your local list (LL CCLINC), you will NOT GET mail directed to the CC CCLINC list.
- Much correspondence is directed only to the library directors. Library directors are asked to forward information to pertinent staff if for no other reason than the protection of redundancy. However, only the library director is presumed to "speak" for his/her library in policy matters without documentation of due authorization to another staffer.
- Subcommittee chairs are asked to build and share mailing lists. Mailing lists can be created, exported and imported within GroupWise.

Mario noted that the Serials group is to have their SureStart session on January 18, 2001. They hope to have questions answered at that time which will enable the group to define its procedures for serials control. Once the procedures are defined and tested, serials work can begin in the production server.

Subcommittee reports
- Acquisitions – preparing for their SureStart session
- Bridges Manual – No report
- Cataloging – the Subcommittee will be meeting to discuss several issues.
- Circulation/Reserves – Dan reported an issue that Gaston had experienced re stipulating a particular date as a due date. Alternatively, they wondered if it would be possible to add a 120 and a 150-day loan period. Kathy Martin and Mario Ramos gave Dan some input into the situation. No decision was made about adding these loan periods.
- Interlibrary Loan – No report
- Media Booking – Renee Watson reported that her subcommittee was looking at how equipment records are added. She noted that staff working with equipment often do not deal with "cataloging" per se. Discussion of the most effective way to construct an equipment record followed. It is possible to modify blank record templates, and it might be preferable to do this in Add Brief Title rather than opening up Add Title to inexperienced "catalogers." It was also noted that keeping bibs fairly generic would enable more than one school to attach to a record. "Shadowing" can be done at the bib, call number or copy level, so this could accommodate schools who do not want their equipment holdings to show up in WebCat.
- Serials – SureStart session on January 18, 2001.

The next conference call meeting is scheduled for January 30th at 3:00 p.m.