

Next Generation Technical Services

APPENDIX: Adopting UC-wide Collaborative Approaches to Technical Services—SOPAG Discussion Paper

Prepared July 27, 2008, revised August 20, 2008 and December 8, 2008

Hypothesis:

UC faculty, staff and students will benefit from the adoption of improved UC-wide collaborative approaches to Technical Services operations (acquisitions, cataloging, etc.).

Focused Question:

Is it feasible and practical to consider expanding UC-wide collaborative approaches to technical services functions (acquisitions, cataloging, etc.)?

Approaches may include acquisitions and cataloging vendor agreements and infrastructures (workflows, policies, and practices).

Background

The UC libraries have a proven track record of cooperation and collaboration as a consortium, especially for collection development and scholarly communications issues through the Collection Development Committee, Scholarly Communications Officers Group and the CDL. Key elements for these successful consortium-based activities include: sufficient technological developments and tools; campus budgetary constraints (dollars and personnel); the concept of the power of ten, growing diversity of research, teaching, and patient care needs; changes in the vendor landscape, especially publishing.

The UC Libraries and CDL's Shared Acquisitions and Shared Cataloging Programs are other examples of effective UC-wide collaboration. Key success factors for these collaborative activities include: reduced costs (average cost per bibliographic record is under \$5.00 and equals less than \$.50 per record per campus), maximal use of automated and batch processing techniques, and timely delivery of large sets of records.

Examples of Recent Activities Which Showcase Potential UC-wide Approaches

November 20, 2006 – CAMCIG report to HOTS

Revised Progress Report: Using OCLC as a single cataloging tool/data source

To support the HOTS and SOPAG discussion of the possible use of OCLC as a single cataloging tool for all campuses and as the single data source for the new Melvyl ...

<http://libraries.universityofcalifornia.edu/hots/camcig/usingOCLCAsASingleCatalogingTool.pdf>

December 2006 – CAMCIG + SCP Advisory Committee Report to HOTS

Single Record Policy for Serials

January 12, 2007 – HOTS

Ad Hoc Japanese Cataloging Task Group

Models for Collaborative Cataloging Across UC Campuses

CAMCIG report to HOTS

Comments on Models for Collaborative Cataloging Across UC Campuses

Driven by a key retirement at the UCSD Libraries and encouraged by the Shirley Leung 2006 East Asian Digital Resources Project Report to CDL, this ad hoc subgroup of HOTS explored “new ways to catalog Japanese language materials. However, by broadening the discussion, we hope to develop a framework that will assist decision-making for cataloging any kind of material. This report is the result of our exploration of various options for collaboration, and has been shared with CAMCIG for its input. We offer it to HOTS as a starting point for further work”.

April 2007

CDL/HOTS agreement to 3 year funding of temporary SCP Chinese cataloger.

January 14, 2008 – ALA Midwinter

Diana Brooking (U of Washington) presentation: Network Level Cataloging: The View from a Member Library

http://www.oclc.org/news/events/presentations/2008/brooking_netcat.ppt

January 15, 2008 – Library Journal

Robert Wolven

In Search of a New Model: Columbia University Libraries' Robert Wolven reflects on what's next for cooperative cataloging”

“We are approaching the end of an era. Over the last 30 years, libraries have developed a highly successful model of shared cataloging. Anchored by the output of the Library of Congress (LC), carried by MARC, OCLC, and RLG, and held together by allegiance to codes and standards, that model has allowed us to distribute widely the work of cataloging the books, journals, videos, and recordings in our collections. Now, though, this model is beginning to decompose. The near universal acceptance of common rules and norms of practice is eroding for reasons both practical and theoretical.”

<http://www.libraryjournal.com/index.asp?layout=articlePrint&articleID=CA6514925>

February 2008 – CAMCIG Discussions

Based on brainstorming draft prepared by Brad Eden: New Approaches for System-wide Cataloging Initiatives

<http://libraries.universityofcalifornia.edu/hots/camcig/BrainstormingDraftForCAMCIG.pdf>

April 7, 2008 – CNI, Minneapolis

Bill Jordan (U of Washington) and Mindy Pozenel (OCLC) presentation on WorldCat Local: Discovery to Delivery at the Network Level. Presentation includes discussion of benefits and barriers of cataloging at the network level.

<http://www.cni.org/tfms/2008a.spring/abstracts/PB-worldcat-jordan.html>

June 2-4, 2008 - RLG Programs 2008 Annual Partners Meeting, Philadelphia

Martha Hruska (UCSD), Lee Leighton (UCB), Patricia Martin (CDL), Gary Strong (UCLA) (and others from UC) participated in a meeting centered on 4 themes: (1) managing the collective collection; (2) modeling new service infrastructures; (3) renovating description and practices; and (4) supporting new modes of scholarship

<http://www.oclc.org/programs/events/2008-06-02.htm>

June 28, 2008 – ALA CCS Cataloging Norms Discussion Group – Anaheim

John Riemer and Linda Barnhart led discussion on “A California Adventure: WorldCat Local and Next-Generation Cataloging”

http://presentations.ala.org/images/0/01/Riemer_Barnhart_Next_Gen_Cataloging_Presentation.ppt

Sample Catalysts for Change

BSTF report

- Recommendation III.1.a: View UC cataloging as a single enterprise, eliminating duplication and local variability in practice, agreeing on a single set of policies, sharing expertise, and maximizing efficiency. Engage in a system wide planning process to identify the appropriate mechanism for implementing such a vision.

<http://libraries.universityofcalifornia.edu/sopag/BSTF/Final.pdf>

Calhoun report

- <http://www.loc.gov/catdir/calhoun-report-final.pdf>

LC Final Report of the Working Group on the Future of Bibliographic Control

- <http://www.loc.gov/bibliographic-future/news/lcwg-ontherecord-jan08-final.pdf>

Next-Generation Melvyl

- Requires harmonization of UC cataloging policies and process revisions for effective implementation
- Requires cooperative approaches to acquisitions practices
- Requires new ways of working with vendors (book and subscription agents)

UC-wide and campus financial pressures

Sample Possible UC-wide Technical Services Collaboration Models

Single centralized Cataloging Center with decentralized acquisitions centers?

Redesign of the Shared Acquisitions and Cataloging Programs

Distributed Centers of Specialization

Centralization of cataloging and/or acquisitions activities for specific languages, formats, or subjects

Possible barriers to adoption

Book-in-hand cataloging tradition

Local cataloging practice variations

Current investments and minimum and/or complementary staff complements

Restrictive editing control of master OCLC record

Format Enhance is unwieldy & unworkable

Format Enhance, no ability to edit your record after others have touched

Record maintenance tools not available

Batch updating versus batch load

Create lists, heading reports, etc.

No comprehensive post-submission authority control in OCLC

Use of different acquisitions vendors

Use of different Integrated Library Systems (ILSs)

Possible enablers

Availability of vendor/publisher-based bibliographic records

Improved OCLC tools

Network level maintenance tools to support batch operations

Signed bib edits with editor history and easy reversion

Network level authority control processes

More granular bib notify services

WorldCat Selection service

Improved OCLC/PCC policy

Make "Format Enhance" a community responsibility

Develop norms for quality of contributions

Develop standards and practices for handling master record as shared network resource

Provide a conflict resolution process

CDL's ERMS implementation

CDC's efforts towards coordinating prospective shared print acquisitions

Ability to leverage our investment in link resolver(s)

Possible Questions to Consider :

What would UC-wide collaborative technical services operations look like?

- vendor impact?

- campus infrastructure vs UC-wide infrastructure development (personnel, dollars, technology, policies, best practices)?

Why should UC consider "collaborative" technical services functions?

- what role does collaboration/cooperation play for technical services?

- what economies (personnel, dollars, etc.) are sought?

Who are the players that need to be involved in formulating collaborative approaches to technical services within UCs?

- how does the discussion start? (begin with identifying issues that need addressing earlier than later in developing consortium-based technical services operations)?

- Who should be charged to pursue this topic?

What is HOTS and CAMCIG' role?

Is there a role of the UC/OCLC Next-Gen Melvyl Implementation Team?

Is there a role of the UC/OCLC Next-Gen Melvyl Executive Team?

Is the timing right?

When should collaborative approaches to technical services operations be considered?

How should collaborative model for technical services be developed and implemented?

Do collaborative technical services models depend on shared UC collections?

Prepared July 27, 2008, revised August 20, 2008 and December 8, 2008

By Luc Declerck and Gail Yokote