

February 6, 2006

To: All Campus Groups (ACGs), LAUC, SOPAG

From: Bernie Hurley, Chair, SOPAG

Re: Invitation for Comments on the Bibliographic Services Task Force Report

In April 2005, SOPAG charged the Bibliographic Services Task Force to rethink how we provide bibliographic services and deliver a report with recommendations for creating a new bibliographic service environment. The Task Force's thoughtful report, posted at <http://libraries.universityofcalifornia.edu/sopag/BSTF/Final.pdf>, includes an extensive list of recommendations for our consideration. SOPAG invites your participation in a formal review of the report and asks for your comments to inform SOPAG's input to the University Librarians on which of the Task Force recommendations should be pursued as priority items.

To facilitate your discussions and to aid SOPAG in its synthesis of comments, we ask that your comments address the following questions:

1. The recommendations of the report are organized into four sections:

- I. Enhancing Search and Retrieval;
- II. Rearchitecting the OPAC;
- III. Adopting New Cataloging Practices
- IV. Supporting Continuous Improvement.

There are a total of 15 major headings under the four sections (I1 – I8; II1 – II2; III1 – III4; IV). While we recognize that many of these items are interdependent, that is, some must precede or accompany others, we ask that you try to comment on them without considering dependencies at this point. Which 3-5 of these 15 major headings do you think are the most important for UC to address?

2. For each of the 3-5 major headings selected above:

- Which of the sub-recommendations do you think should be given the highest priority; that is, which do you think UC should address first and why?
- Are there any recommendations that you think should be added? Why?
- Are there any recommendations that you think should NOT be pursued? Why not?

3. Section II.1 recommends creating a single public catalog interface for all of UC while recognizing that more debate and discussion is needed to identify the best option for that single interface.

If a decision is made to pursue this recommendation, which of the two options that the Task Force analyzed would you recommend, and why?

- Creating a single UC OPAC system
- Outsourcing the UC OPAC (to OCLC, RedLightGreen, Google, etc)

If you agree that we should pursue the recommendation to create a single point of entry for our users, are there other options we should consider? If you disagree that we should pursue the recommendation, what alternative action would you recommend?

4. Section III.1 recommends re-architecting cataloging workflow to view UC cataloging as a single enterprise while recognizing that more debate and discussion is needed to identify the appropriate mechanism for implementing such a single enterprise vision.
 - a. If a decision is made to pursue this recommendation, which of the three organization options that the Task Force analyzed would you recommend, and why?
 - Coordinate cataloging expertise and practice across the entire system.
 - Consolidate cataloging into one or two centers within UC.
 - Outsource a greater proportion of standard cataloging work.If you agree that we should pursue the recommendation to implement a single cataloging enterprise, are there other organization options we should consider? If you disagree that we should pursue the recommendation, what alternative action would you recommend?
 - b. If a decision is made to pursue this recommendation, which of the three architecture options that the Task Force analyzed would you recommend and why?
 - Create a shared central file with a single copy of each bibliographic record.
 - Adopt a single ILS for the entire University of California system.
 - Rely on OCLC as the single UC database of record for bibliographic data.If you agree that we should pursue the recommendation to implement a single cataloging enterprise, are there other architecture options we should consider? If you disagree that we should pursue the recommendation, what alternative action would you recommend?
5. Are there any other comments or suggestions you have with regard to the next steps that should be taken in following up on the recommendations of the report?
6. Is there anything else you think UC should be doing in pursuit of improving bibliographic services?

Thank you in advance for your comments and I look forward to receiving your response on or before March 31, 2006.