

UC CONSER Funnel Implementation Plan

February 16, 2006

Funnel Organization

The UC CONSER Funnel would be a formal entity in relation to CONSER but would operate as a virtual team within UC with only the amount of administrative structure necessary to sustain a coordinated effort. Campuses with current CONSER membership would maintain their independent status (including voting). The UC Funnel would have a group membership in CONSER and participate as a non-voting member. The minimum administrative structure needed to operate the Funnel is envisioned to be a small steering committee whose membership could rotate over time and a local contact/liaison on each campus. The steering committee would have the following positions and roles:

- **UC Funnel Coordinator** - general oversight of the Funnel operations and development; official liaison with CONSER for two-way communications; work with steering committee to plan implementation on campuses (training, mentoring process); identify policy and procedures that need discussion within the Funnel; periodic program assessment; prepare annual report to HOTS/CONSER.
- **Training Coordinator** – identify trainers & mentors; maintain list of trainers within UC; coordinate training plans for phased campus implementation; assess ongoing training needs; serve as clearinghouse for training resources, including Web-based and distance learning opportunities developed by LC
- **Communications Coordinator** – establish and maintain communication mechanisms among Funnel participants including a listserv for news and internal consultations (within Funnel) and a webpage for Funnel documentation; collect and make available Funnel documents such as FAQ for participants, list of contacts, documents on Funnel etiquette and procedures

Campus contacts for the Funnel would be responsible for coordinating training and mentoring at the local level and keeping local staff up-to-date on Funnel news.

Once a campus has completed the training and mentoring period, each campus would function independently in its CONSER work. That is, they would do their CONSER work directly on OCLC, receive OCLC CONSER enhance credits directly to their OCLC account and submit their own statistics to LC.

Funnel Establishment

The CONSER Coordinator at LC (Les Hawkins) and the BIBCO Coordinator (Carolyn Sturtevant) have reviewed the proposal and indicated their enthusiasm for establishing a UC Funnel for bibliographic information within CONSER. It is worth noting that this would be the first instance of a bibliographic funnel and that it is seen as an innovative and very worthwhile way to continue building a cooperative approach to national bibliographic access. The UC CONSER Funnel would be modeled on existing

NACO funnels, which currently exist to cooperatively build the national authority file at LC. OCLC would establish a CONSER authorization within a campus's existing location code to enable direct input into the CONSER database and would credit CONSER enhancement credits directly into the campus's OCLC account. Currently, CONSER enhancement credit is \$9.15 per transaction, which is double the amount that OCLC awards for other enhancements to the OCLC database. The CONSER credit is applied for any CONSER transaction at a flat rate regardless of the nature of the contribution (i.e., maintenance, upgrades and new original records all receive the same credit).

The Funnel would be established incrementally, with the goal of training and mentoring new campuses to participate in bibliographic maintenance activities first. Training and mentoring would be tailored to support this type of contribution initially. In the future, if campuses want to increase their level of participation to Associate or Full CONSER membership (contribute and authenticate full records), a plan for providing further training and mentoring could be developed with the steering committee. The campus could apply to the CONSER Program Coordinator through established channels (<http://www.loc.gov/acq/conser/forms.html>). It is not envisioned that this would take place during the first year. The initiative to propose an increase in participation would be left to campuses. The UC Funnel would provide a supportive environment for UC participants who might not otherwise have the infrastructure to go solo or have large enough contributions for the Associate or Full level.

Initial Funnel establishment would proceed in phases, with campuses wishing to start soon being brought into the process in a staggered sequence during the first phase, perhaps one campus every other month and then being mentored and released for independent work individually. Three campuses have indicated an interest in being part of the first phase: Davis, Berkeley and Irvine. Other campuses could determine their readiness to start as suits their needs. Prior to beginning training, campuses in the first phase could begin saving printouts and/or surrogates of their maintenance work in order to have a pool of records to begin with for practice and mentoring. The specific way a campus might choose to build this pool of records would be left to the campus and could take many forms. This would also provide a valuable estimate of the volume of maintenance work that must be reviewed during the mentoring period. Once mentoring is complete, campuses would begin doing maintenance transactions independently on OCLC and would receive OCLC CONSER enhance credits directly to their OCLC account.

Training and Mentoring

Initial training needs would be modest in light of the goal of starting with just bibliographic maintenance and the fact that Funnel participants are already experienced serial catalogers. Training could most likely take place within a single day and be comprised of a refresher on the rules and principles of serial bibliographic maintenance as well as a unit on the principles of CONSER participation and Funnel organization. The UC Funnel Coordinator or another CONSER mentor would probably be the presenter for the first sessions. Depending on the decision regarding first phase campuses, sharing this first session might be possible. Ideally, the first training would take place this spring, with scheduling and logistics to be determined. Several training tools already exist that could be used to design or supplement training. These include the Serials Cataloging Cooperative Training Program (SCCTP) workshops and the new PCC/ALCTS workshop on Cataloging for the Twenty-first Century. There are several trainers for these workshops within UC and these people could perhaps contribute to the training over time as needed. If a campus wanted a fuller review of serials cataloging, one or more of these workshops could be given at their

request. It is a significant advantage that a corpus of current training materials and trainers to present them in California already exists.

After receiving training, each campus would be assigned a mentor, who would review contributed maintenance work for a period of time. Work could be done and shared via OCLC Connexion's capability to share files. Surrogates might be requested for some types of work initially. Within UC, there are CONSER-trained catalogers who could share mentoring activities at UCLA and UCSD (after March). Mentors are available at UCLA to handle some non-Roman languages (Chinese, Japanese, Arabic, Farsi, Hebrew and Yiddish). As each campus joins the Funnel, its need for non-Roman mentoring could be negotiated. Mostly likely, a mentor would work directly with the campus's Funnel liaison rather than multiple individuals on a campus. The campus liaison would devise a way to batch maintenance work performed locally and submit it to the mentor. The specific logistics of this process would be worked out between the mentor and the campus in training. In general, the mentoring process would be devised to be as streamlined and short as possible to accomplish the goal of ensuring the campus catalogers understand the principles of maintenance and are contributing accurate and quality work.