SOPAG Invitation to Comment on the Bibliographic Services Task Force Report
Analysis of Feedback
April 26, 2006

I.   Executive Summary

The Bibliographic Services Task Force report has proven to be both timely and impactful, leading to broad discussion throughout the profession.   Within the UC Libraries, that discussion has been particularly thorough and thoughtful. In February 2006, SOPAG invited comments from the All Campus Groups, LAUC, and each campus library through a series of six questions (see Appendix A). We received responses from LAUC, from 6 ACGs, and from each of the 11 campuses (including CDL). Several of the reports included extensive addenda from common interest groups, campus constituents, campus LAUC groups, and other interested parties. The full responses are posted on the SOPAG Web site (URL to be distributed later).   Section II of this report summarizes the responses to each of the six questions.

SOPAG was impressed by the amount of consensus found in the feedback from all the groups.   In this Executive Summary, we want to highlight those areas of consensus.

A.   Broad endorsement of the spirit of the BSTF report and its vision that combines next generation discovery tools with workflow redesign.

> "Users are interested in getting an item, not where it's located. Users don't want to click or read or make choices; need to develop good visual design so it's obvious what to do next; need to simplify and eliminate unnecessary choices/options." UCSF

> "The faceted browsing in NCSU's catalog is particularly appealing. If we begin to include a broader range of materials in the catalog, we'll also want to give patrons tools for wading through the larger results sets." UCSC

> "HOPS members felt strongly that bringing BS systems to the place where the users need them, such as Virtual Learning Environments, was extremely important. This is one area where we thought the BSTF report was too library centric and did not take the idea far enough." HOPS

> "We like the option of pre-harvesting metadata. However, to make this truly useful, it will be important to pre-harvest metadata for our most valuable resources. Just adding the metadata we can get easily won't be enough." UCSD

"[Creating a single catalog interface is] important to give users a single place to go and to provide a common tool for managing shared collections." UCLA

"[Viewing UC cataloging as a single enterprise} needs to be the overarching, guiding principle for UC cataloging." HOTS

"It's very important we put in procedures that make sure we continually improve our systems. Otherwise, in another 10 years, we'll be back where we are now." UCSF

B.   Broad agreement on the importance of metadata and a disinclination to abandon the use of controlled vocabularies for topical subjects.

"While we support ongoing research in the development of full-text searching techniques, we believe that for the foreseeable future continued use of controlled subject vocabularies will remain important for their value in searching, browsing and narrowing search results; their role in implementing many of the recommendations for improved sorting and display of search results contained in the report; their requirement in national cataloging standards and for contribution to CONSER and OCLC; the value of subject heading terms in keyword searches; their role in allowing English language searching of non-English texts; their role in providing consistency of terminology across languages. We also do not believe that the amount of time spent on controlled subject vocabularies is such that abandoning this practice would allow meaningful redeployment of staff to other activities, unless we also abandon the corresponding LC subject classification of materials. In any event, for mainstream materials, in our current cooperative cataloging environment much of the subject analysis is already done at the time we acquire the materials." HOTS

C.   Broad support for a single public catalog interface for all of UC that supports many views and subsets – for a campus, a library location, a kind of material, even an individual user. No consensus on the best option for implementing that single interface.

"We agree that a single point of entry should be pursued, and we suggest a group of experts be enlisted to determine what options should be considered." UCD

"The terms catalog and cataloging are too narrow to describe this new approach to managing our resources." HOPS

D.   Broad support for coordinating cataloging expertise and practice across the entire system and outsourcing some cataloging work. Strong objection to consolidating cataloging into one or two centers for the state.

"Recommend both outsourcing a greater proportion of standard cataloging work, whenever possible and then, coordinating cataloging expertise and practice for the more specialized materials across the entire system. Outsourcing the more standard cataloging work could free staff time for materials requiring special expertise. If expertise were coordinated across the entire system, we would not need to duplicate staff efforts at every campus." UCB

"Physical consolidation into one or two cataloging centers doesn't seem practical, would entail transporting a large volume of materials back and forth between the UC libraries and the proposed cataloging centers. Not necessary to be physically in one place in order to have use of a common system and follow common cataloging standards and practices. Need to accommodate the evolving closer relationship between acquisitions and cataloging, growing practice of receiving and cataloging items as a single operation." UCD

E.   **Broad support for a single ILS for the entire University of California system, with a shared central file of bibliographic records as a possible interim step.**

"While there are many concerns about the social issues (e.g., reaching agreement about a specific product, agreeing on standards and processes) and the technical difficulties (e.g., interfacing with each campus accounting system, adequate performance), these should not stop UC from moving ahead to explore the adoption of a single ILS. HOTS notes that this is not a cutting-edge idea and has been done by other large institutions (the University of Maryland System and Affiliated Institutions, for example)." HOTS

"If a single ILS is not feasible, or if it will take a long time to implement, a shared single file would be a viable interim solution." UCLA

F.   **Strong commitment to the goals of the report, and to taking action now.**

"Recognizing that libraries have a history of doing studies, and may have a tendency to overanalyze their research but are reluctant to put something out there or present new product. In comparison, commercial ventures such as Google puts out new features all the time, tests them in the real world. If they work, they stay, if not, they're gone. Build it, try it, improve it. Study the marketplace (Amazon, Google, etc.) for working models. We should not be afraid to make mistakes" UCI

"The UC Merced librarians strongly support the progressive spirit expressed in the BSTF Task Force Report.
The University of California Libraries should take advantage of the emphasis provided by the BSTF Report and see how far they can run with

it. Now is not the time for conservatism or timidity in thinking about how we can change academic libraries for the better." UCM

"HOPS applauds the Task Force for successfully laying the groundwork for a new bibliographic service environment." HOPS

"LTAG members have reviewed the BSTF report and we think it points to exciting new levels of service and look forward to providing technical expertise in support of any implementation plans that follow." LTAG

G. **Broad agreement that a wide range of library expertise needs to be involved in planning next steps**

"Because this work will affect all library functions beyond technical services, all divisions expressed a keen interest for clear communication about the process going forward and to keep public services librarians involved in the process." LAUC

"HOPS looks forward to playing a leadership role in addressing the public service requirements this environment. As indicated above, in addition to this response to SOPAG's RFC, HOPS will be sending SOPAG a short summary of our thoughts regarding how public services concerns dovetail with the BSTF report. We look forward to further action on the recommendations articulated in the BSTF report". HOPS

"We believe that, given the important and far-reaching nature of the report, all qualified bodies within UC, not just the Task Force, need to be involved in planning and implementation." HOTS

"LPL hopes that, as the Report is analyzed and specific elements are selected for further examination and implementation, privacy concerns and issues will continue to be given due attention and that LPL will continue to be consulted on privacy matters." LPL

"As we move forward with future discussions, it will be important to include all qualified groups within UC, not just the Task Force, in future planning and implementation. Pre-planning and development of shared practice and principles will be crucial to the success of this project and to buy in from all campuses." RSC

H. **Strong suggestion that the new system be user-driven, and that we involve users and user studies early in the implementation planning.**

"Need to understand more fully what our users want; pursue research into realistic user expectations; use current real student and faculty for usability

studies. Consider also what librarians want, how do we use these tools?" UCI

"Talk to users before making final implementation decisions". UCLA

"Test assumptions with users. Do we serve our users best by focusing on convenience and simplicity? Are features like recommenders, relevance ranking, and "bells and whistles" designed to emulate mass-market sites like Google and Amazon wanted by scholars and faculty? Are there other things we could do to enhance services that would be easier and provide more benefit?" LAUC

I. **Broad agreement that workflow redesign need to include the whole workflow process, not just cataloging.**

"The ACIG 'observed most particularly the brief attention given in the report to acquisitions functions as they relate to bibliographic services, which may reflect an underestimation of the contributions make to the collective bibliographic record. The functional lines between acquisitions and cataloging tasks frequently blur across organizational divisions, especially as acquisitions units take on an increasing amount of quick-cataloging.' " HOTS

"HOTS strongly supports the statement of the SCP Advisory Committee: 'In so far as the BSTF report represents a lot of new tasks that libraries need to take on in responding to user needs, every functional area in libraries should be looked at for work that could be done differently or discontinued, to free up resources to address the new work. It will not be enough to examine cataloging and technical services alone.' " HOTS

"Development of robust circulation and resource sharing systems will be critical for our users to be able to access the rich resources of the University of California libraries." RSC

J. **A wide-spread recognition that these changes will require major effort and resources, and that change of this magnitude will be challenging to implement.**

"There really aren't many of these recommendations that we can fully pursue with our current bibliographic systems. We thought that there may be a tension between moving forward incrementally vs. more boldly (i.e., more starting from scratch). It may be that we move boldly, or not much at all." UCB

"View UC bibliographic access as a single enterprise. This is not simply a rephrase of II.1 and II.2; it is the people/money infrastructure that would allow implementations of II.1 and II.2 to be effective and efficient. Having the appropriate organizational infrastructure to ensure effective

deployment and continuous improvement, determining a more visible way to understand shared costs for bibliographic access and developing a more direct cost-sharing model will reduce costs and will better ensure that systems meet both campus and patron needs. The decision to move UC Libraries to "One University, One Library, One OPAC" will definitely fail if the cost-sharing and institutional organization isn't well-considered." CDL

"We must craft a compelling story for users and campus administration, to generate support and funding for the major resource investment needed to transform our bibliographic services." UCLA

"Implementing the recommendations in the report will be expensive. Where will we get the resources to do this?" LAUC

II. Responses to SOPAG Questions

Question 1:   **Which 3-5 of these 15 major headings do you think are the most important for UC to address?**

Six recommendations appeared most often in the Top 5 lists
- I.1   Provide users with direct access to item (10 campuses, LAUC, 3 ACGs)
- I.5   Offer better navigation of large sets of search results (8 campuses, LAUC, 2 ACGs)
- I.6   Deliver bibliographic services where the users are (4 campuses, 3 ACGs.)
- II.1   Create a single catalog interface for all of UC (7 campuses, LAUC, 3 ACGs)
- II.2   Support searching across the entire bibliographic information space (7 campuses, LAUC, 3 ACGs)
- III.1   Rearchitect cataloging workflow (7 campuses, 1 ACG)

Five recommendations also appeared in at least one Top 5 list
- I.4   Offer alternative actions for failed or suspect searches (3 campuses)
- I.7   Provide relevance ranking and leverage full-text (1 campus)
- III.3   Manually enrich metadata in important areas (1 campus)
- III.4   Automate metadata creation (1 campus, 1 ACG)
- IV   Supporting continuous improvement (1 campus)

Question 1: Which 3-5 of these 15 major headings do you think are the most important for UC to address?														
o = Top 5 **x = Runner Up**														
	CDL	UCB	UCD	UCI	UCLA	UCR	UCSB	UCSC	UCSD	UCSF	LAUC	CDC	HOPS	HOTS	RSC
I1	o	o	o	o	o	o	o	o	o	o	o	o	o	o	
I2					x										
I3							x				x			x	
I4		o			o		o				x				x
I5	o	o	o	o	o	o	x	o	o		o			o	o
I6	o		o		o			o		x			o	o	o
I7	o				x					x			x		x
I8	x				x		x	x			x				
II1	o	o		o	o		o	x	o	o	o	o		o	o
II2	x		o	o	x	o	o	o	o	o	o	o	o	o	
III1	x	o	o	o	x		o	o	o	o	x	o	x		x
III2															
III3						o	x					x			
III4	x		x			o				x		o			
IV	x		x				x		x	o					x

Question 2: **Which of the sub-recommendations do you think should be given the highest priority, and why? Any to add? Any not to pursue?**

Eleven sub-recommendations were listed as high priority by at least four groups:

I1a.   Have UC eLinks take you to a logical, default choice (8 campuses, LAUC, 2 ACGs)
I1b.   Provide an "I-want-this" button with the goal of always offering a fulfillment option, no dead ends. (5 campuses, LAUC, 2 ACGs)
I5a.   Implement FRBR concepts (6 campuses, LAUC, 2 ACGs)
I5b.   Present all of the variant titles of a serial to users in a "family tree." (5 campuses, LAUC, 1 ACG)
I5c.   Implement faceted browsing (5 campuses, 1 ACG)
I6a.   Enable library content and services to be integrated within course management systems (4 campuses, 2 ACGs)
II1a. Create a single catalog interface for both local and system wide collections (4 campuses, LAUC, 1 ACG)
II2a. Pre-harvest metadata for the entire bibliographic information space (2 campuses, 2 ACGs)
II2b. Provide result sets arranged by format, grouped by other facets (3 campuses, 1 ACG)
III1a. View UC cataloging as a single enterprise, with no duplication, common practice, a single set of policies, shared expertise, and maximum efficiency (3 campuses, LAUC, 1 ACG)
IVa.   Institutionalize an ongoing improvement process, leading to action and making more than incremental improvements. (3 campuses, 1 ACG)

Twelve sub-recommendations were listed as high priority by at least one group:

I4a.   Offer alternatives for likely spelling errors, including multi-lingual (2 campuses, LAUC)
I4b.   Always offer suggestions when a search produces zero results (1 campus, 1 ACG)
I6b.   Enable library content and services to be embedded in institutional portals (3 campuses)
I6c.   Expose our metadata to external search engines (2 campuses, 1 ACG)
I6d.   Make our digital and unique collections available (1 campus, 1 ACG)
I7a.   Provide relevance ranking based on a broad set of criteria (1 campus, 1 ACG)
III1b. Implement a single data store for UC (2 campuses, 1 ACG)
III2a. Use metadata appropriate to the bibliographic resource (1 campus)
III2b. Consider implementing the FAST syntax (2 ACGs)
III4a. Encourage the creation of metadata by vendors, and its early ingestion into our catalog (2 campuses)
III4b. Import enhanced metadata whenever, wherever it is available (2 campuses)
III4c. Automate the addition of geographic data (1 campus)
III4e. Add enriched content such as Tables of Contents, etc; build services based on the content. (1 campus)
IVb.   Provide robust reporting capability (1 campus)

Sub-recommendation III2c (Consider abandoning the use of controlled vocabularies for topical subjects) is the idea everyone loves to hate. Seven groups recommended not pursuing.

Sub-recommendation III4d (Change the processing workflow from "Acquire-Catalog-Put on Shelf" to "Acquire-Put on Shelf with existing metadata-Begin ongoing metadata enhancement process through iterative automated query of metadata sources") is endorsed if metadata is enhanced automatically but

rejected by two groups if the expectation is that catalogers will revisit the records to add metadata manually.

Sub-recommendation III3b (Implement structured serials holdings format) is the only controversial one. One group listed it as a high priority and one group recommended not pursuing because of the growing reliance by users on electronic rather than print serials.

Eight sub-recommendations were recommended to be added:
- Add quality component to search and retrieval
- Base design and enhancements on user studies
- Make bibliographic services ADA compliant
- Provide rights metadata
- Support non-Roman databases
- Provide Help in a variety of formats
- Provide bibliographic and information management tools for users to manage content and results
- Support better integration with all of the tools our users employ, not just those mentioned

Question 2:   Which of the sub-recommendations should be given the highest priority? Any not to pursue?

O = Priority   N = Don't pursue

	CDL	UCB	UCD	UCI	UCLA	UCR	UCSB	UCSC	UCSD	UCSF	LAUC	CDC	HOPS	HOTS	RSC
I1a	o	o	o	o	o	o		o	o		o	o	o		
I1b	o		o	o					o	o	o	o	o		
I2a															
I3a															
I4a		o			o						o				
I4b					o						o				
I5a		o	o	o	o	o			o		o			o	o
I5b		o		o	o	o			o		o			o	
I5c			o	o	o			o	o					o	
I6a	o		o		o			o					o	o	
I6b			o		o			o							
I6c	o				o									o	
I6d					o									o	
I7a										o					o
I7b															
I8a															
II1a		o			o				o	o	o				o
II2a								o	o			o		o	
II2b			o						o	o				o	
III1a			o					o	o		o			o	
III1b		o						o						o	
III2a			o												
III2b												o		o	
III2c		N	N	N	N		N				N			N	

O = Priority   N = Don't pursue

	CDL	UCB	UCD	UCI	UCLA	UCR	UCSB	UCSC	UCSD	UCSF	LAUC	CDC	HOPS	HOTS	RSC
III2d															
III3a															
III3b						o			N						
III4a			o			o									
III4b			o			o									
III4c			o												
III4d			N?											N?	
III4e	o														
Iva			o						o	o					o
Ivb										o					

Question 2:	Which of the sub-recommendations do you think should be given the highest priority, and why?	
SUB-RECOMMENDATION	**WHY OR WHY NOT**	
DO IT	**WHY**	
I1a. Have UC eLinks take you to a logical, default choice, with option to go back to the menu if you want a different option. (If there is a reliable full-text link that would be first choice. This assumes that in the majority of times, we could correctly anticipate what service the user would want)	**CDL** ▪ Experiment; some of the barriers/excess clicks could be dropped in UC-eLinks, but it will not be perfect. Need experimentation to see what is tolerable and "good enough". **UCB** ▪ Users must go through too many links to find the full text; very confusing and time consuming. **UCD** ▪ Both recommendations (I.1.a & I.1.b) would greatly improve the current MELVYL **UCI** ▪ Both I.1a and 1.1b are important; both need the "artificial intelligence" to know what our users want and to make those direct connections to the content **UCLA** ▪ In most cases, the full text link will be the right choice, and we should take users to it as quickly and conveniently as possible **UCR** ▪ The more important of the sub-recommendations. **UCSC** ▪ Users want easy access to the total content of items they're looking for without having to click through various often-confusing menu choices. The systems should be able to find the online publisher with the full text and go to it, without making the patron choose from a list. The UC system must pressure publishers to adhere to standards so that users will consistently be able to access full-text without having to go through tables of contents or our local catalogs	

Question 2: Which of the sub-recommendations do you think should be given the highest priority, and why?	
SUB-RECOMMENDATION	**WHY OR WHY NOT**
	UCSD ▪ Quicker and easier is clearly better. Our overall concern is that users are forced to make fewer illogical clicks. We think a clearer segmentation of UC E-links, perhaps into online/print/request, would make it easier for users to understand their options LAUC ▪ No comments CDC ▪ Split on the sub-recommendations, though agree that users should be taken as directly to an item as possible, but never reach a dead-end in which there are no options presented. HOPS ▪ Our votes were split between having UC-eLinks take users to a logical default (1.1.a) and the concept of an "I-want-this" button (1.1.b). Many felt that the first option was a stepping stone toward the second option, which is a future, more full-service option.
DO IT I1b. Provide an "I-want-this" button that is present when the context warrants, with the goal of always offering a fulfillment option. No dead ends. Give the user an option to specify turnaround time; work behind the scenes to fulfill as well as we can.	**WHY** CDL ▪ Experiment; In Melvyl, revisit the capability to limit to online resources (full text, not just those with tables of contents) UCD ▪ See note for I1a. UCI ▪ See note for I1a. UCSD ▪ Quicker and easier is clearly better. UCSF ▪ Users are interested in getting item, not where it's located. Users don't want to click or read or make choices; need to develop good visual design so it's obvious what to do next; need to simplify and eliminate unnecessary choices/options LAUC ▪ No comments CDC ▪ Split on the sub-recommendations, though agree that users should be taken as directly to an item as possible, but never reach a dead-end in which there are no options presented. HOPS ▪ Our votes were split between having UC-eLinks take users to a logical default (1.1.a) and the concept of an "I-want-this" button (1.1.b). Many felt that the first option was a stepping stone toward the second option, which is a future, more full-service option.
DO IT I4a. Assess a user's input for	**WHY** UCB

Question 2:	Which of the sub-recommendations do you think should be given the highest priority, and why?
SUB-RECOMMENDATION	**WHY OR WHY NOT**
likely spelling errors and offer alternatives, particularly if a term has few or no hits. Extend the services offered by general English-language systems such as Google to reflect the greater complexity of scholarly inquiry, including multi-lingual spell-checking and sensitivity to abstruse scholarly terms	▪ No comments UCLA ▪ Would be a great improvement if it could be implemented effectively in a large multi-lingual research database LAUC ▪ No comments
DO IT I4b. Always offer constructive suggestions when a search produces zero results. Suggestions should include a broad range of options, including alternative search terms, related terms, options based on recommender features (ex: nothing on this topic found, would you be interested in this related topic?), offering to expand the search to other catalogs and/or WorldCat, offering to search Amazon or the Web, and options to get librarian assistance.	**WHY** UCLA ▪ A very important issue if we are serious about having a user focus. The challenge will be to craft suggestions that are appropriate for sophisticated scholarly research LAUC ▪ No comments
DO IT I5a. Implement FRBR concepts to present related works hierarchically, pulling together all records related to a particular work (e.g., Moby Dick), diverse expressions of that work (e.g., translations into German, Japanese and other languages), different versions of the same basic text (e.g., the Modern Library Classics vs. Penguin editions), and particular items (a copy of Moby Dick on the shelf).	**WHY** UCB ▪ I5a and I5b are highest priority, would have a huge beneficial public service impact. UCD ▪ Would make it possible to more directly access items wanted and correct a major deficiency—the inability to quickly find specific works by voluminous authors, in the desired format, and works which have common titles words. UCI ▪ Especially relevant for monographs UCLA ▪ Critical to better organize large retrieval sets in the online catalog. Good results would be available even before the bibliographic data is corrected UCR ▪ No comments

Question 2:	Which of the sub-recommendations do you think should be given the highest priority, and why?
SUB-RECOMMENDATION	**WHY OR WHY NOT**
	UCSD ▪ Users need help in navigation as the world of information is growing and becoming more complex. The increase in formats is only adding to this complexity. We support implementing FRBR concepts. LAUC ▪ No comments HOTS ▪ We believe that sub-recommendations I. 5a and I. 5b are of high priority, but implementing FRBR concepts (I. 5a) will have the greater long-term positive impact for users, though it is the sub-recommendation which will take the longest to accomplish. RSC ▪ No comments
DO IT I5b. Follow all of the linking fields in serial records to present all of the variant titles to users in a "family tree."	**WHY** UCB ▪ I5a and I5b are highest priority, would have a huge beneficial public service impact. UCI ▪ Addresses links between serials records UCLA ▪ Low hanging fruit; though it affects a small amount of records, anything to make it easier to trace serials would be welcome to both users and staff UCR ▪ No comments UCSD ▪ Some support for linking fields in serials LAUC ▪ No comments HOTS ▪ We believe that sub-recommendations I. 5a and I. 5b are of high priority. Present all variant serial titles through linking fields is very useful and should be able to be accomplished relatively quickly.
DO IT I5c. Implement faceted browsing based on sophisticated analysis of the contents of the records.	**WHY** UCD ▪ Would make it possible to more directly access items wanted and correct a major deficiency—the inability to quickly find specific works by voluminous authors, in the desired format, and works which have common titles words. UCI ▪ Faceted browsing will enhance user searching. UCLA ▪ Faceted browsing is something we can also offer in federated searching across many types of bibliographic data. The success of faceted browsing will depend on the quality of the metadata, need to continue investing in metadata.

Question 2:	Which of the sub-recommendations do you think should be given the highest priority, and why?
SUB-RECOMMENDATION	**WHY OR WHY NOT**
	UCSC ▪ The faceted browsing in NCSU's catalog is particularly appealing. If we begin to include a broader range of materials in the catalog, we'll also want to give patrons tools for wading through the larger results sets. UCSD ▪ We support implementing faceted browsing. Those of us who had seen the NCSU implementation thought it had merit but was too "busy." HOTS ▪ Faceted browsing (I. 5c) is desirable, but we are uncertain as to the amount of effort required to achieve it. Perhaps an analysis of the time and effort required for the North Carolina State Endeca implementation will help answer this question.
DO IT I6a. Enable library content and services to be integrated within campus virtual learning environments/course management systems (VLE/CMS), e.g., Sakai, WebCT, Blackboard, etc.	WHY CDL ▪ Experiment with using search boxes containing parameters to search subsets of Melvyl, using the "collections" function or other scoping. These can be placed in context on course pages, instructional pages, etc. UCD ▪ There is a growing national trend to provide more direct access to library resources through course management systems, to make it easier for faculty and students to have seamless access to materials in support of instruction. UCLA ▪ This is where our undergraduate users are, our faculty expect them to be there and we need to take up residence in this space. Could be done at various levels of complexity, evolutionary implementation. UCSC ▪ Though UCSC is already doing quite a bit of work incorporating links to library resources on course Web sites and providing links to Eres and librarian-created research guides on course pages on departmental servers and on WebCT. HOPS ▪ HOPS members felt strongly that bringing BS systems to the place where the users need them, such as Virtual Learning Environments, was extremely important. This is one area where we thought the BSTF report was too library centric and did not take the idea far enough. HOPS advises that in order to be successful, a variety of campus partners are required in this effort. HOTS ▪ We believe that Integrate library content and services into campus content management systems (I. 6a) is the most important of these sub-recommendations. Utilizing such content management systems will greatly expand our ability to deliver both content and services to students, faculty and staff *[Note significant typo in HOTS response: recommendation actually says "course management systems," not*

Question 2: Which of the sub-recommendations do you think should be given the highest priority, and why?	
SUB-RECOMMENDATION	**WHY OR WHY NOT**
	"content management systems."].
DO IT I6b. Enable library content and services to be embedded in institutional portals.	**WHY** UCD ▪ Important to bring library resources into campus portals UCLA ▪ Should pursue links to discipline portals as well.as campus ones. UCSC ▪ The UCSC student portal already has some links to library resources. Communication and cooperation with the campus portal about our presence in their service could/should be improved.
DO IT I6c. Expose our metadata to external search engines as thoughtfully as possible.	**WHY** CDL ▪ Realistically, we need to do both this and II.2 (search across information space) UCLA ▪ Many of our users are on commercial search engines more often than library systems. HOTS ▪ Important
DO IT I6d. Make our digital and unique collections available first within the UC community, then facing outwards.	**WHY** UCLA ▪ Need to eliminate our "cabinets of curiosity," increase the use of these materials HOTS ▪ Important
DO IT I7a. Provide relevance ranking based on a broad set of criteria, to arrange a set of retrieved records so that those most likely to be relevant to the request are shown at the top of the retrieved set.	**WHY** UCSF ▪ Anything is better than arbitrary ranking/sorting of results that we have in our current systems. Need data on which to base relevancy and make clear what relevancy is based on. RSC ▪ No comments
DO IT II1a. Create a single catalog interface for both local and system wide collections. Engage in a system wide planning process to identify the appropriate mechanism for implementing such a vision.	**WHY** UCB ▪ No comments UCLA ▪ Important to give users a single place to go and to provide a common tool for managing shared collections. Challenging to deal effectively with non-textual resources. Important to be able to provide multiple "views" within the single catalog: limit to a local campus or library; interfaces and collection subsets tailored to different user groups such as

Question 2: Which of the sub-recommendations do you think should be given the highest priority, and why?	
SUB-RECOMMENDATION	**WHY OR WHY NOT**
	undergraduates, faculty, citizens of California, and external research partners UCSD ▪ We feel there is much to be gained from this approach, including having more influence with vendors to get the kind of catalog we want and eliminating the need for users to learn two systems (local and system wide). There was concern that to achieve the full benefit of a single catalog interface, we might also need a single ILS. Based on what our users tell us, we think they will want to be able to "scope" the single catalog to see only material available locally. UCSF ▪ Default must be to search our own campus holdings first, or make it easy to tell if it's available at your campus (like the NCSU catalog that makes it clear if it's checked out or available). Let users know where the nearest copy is located if not available at your campus. Campuses need to be able to brand the interface. LAUC ▪ No comments. RSC ▪ No comments.
DO IT II2a. Pre-harvest metadata for the entire bibliographic information space that represents UC library collections for ease of searching.	**WHY** UCSC ▪ Everyone wants this ability, it's the Google results model. Studies and best practices should be conducted to discover the best ways to pre-harvest metadata to create better search results. UCSD ▪ We like the option of pre-harvesting metadata. However, to make this truly useful, it will be important to pre-harvest metadata for our most valuable resources. Just adding the metadata we can get easily won't be enough, and we wonder if it will be possible to get access from database vendors to their metadata. CDC ▪ To implement searching across the entire bibliographic information space, pre-harvesting of metadata has to occur HOTS ▪ We found it difficult to consider II.2.a and II.2.b in isolation since both address different aspects of searching across the entire bibliographic information space. Pre-harvesting metadata will require extensive negotiation with vendors and may therefore take longer to accomplish. At the same time, it promises to greatly improve searching and retrieval for users. Improving result set display could be pursued in parallel with other OPAC improvements.
DO IT II2b. Provide result sets arranged by format, grouped in terms of	**WHY** UCD ▪ If it were possible to provide result sets arranged by format, grouped in

Question 2:	Which of the sub-recommendations do you think should be given the highest priority, and why?
SUB-RECOMMENDATION	**WHY OR WHY NOT**
granularity and other facets, together with user options to rearrange the default order.	terms of granularity and other facets as described under sub-recommendation II.2.b., it would greatly enhance users' ability to discover resources that currently are divided into a variety of silos. UCSD ▪ Support was voiced for providing results sets arranged by format, even without metasearch. Another suggestion: "It would be great if Roger can have the Google style key match feature, pushing the most relevant title to the top of the list." UCSF ▪ Extremely important when searching across the entire bibliographic info space. Result sets need to be faceted to provide easier access to the information the user is looking for. HOTS ▪ See note for II2a.
DO IT III1a. 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.	**WHY** UCD ▪ We support a system-wide planning process to standardize cataloging practices and increase efficiency through cooperative programs. Expand to include acquisitions. Still need local practices to handle special collections materials and other unique holdings. UCSC ▪ This would help with consistency in serials cataloging. In choosing a mechanism, UC should research and determine best practices at other universities (e.g.,North Carolina; Maryland). UCSD ▪ We think there is much efficiency to be gained by viewing UC Cataloging as a single enterprise and eliminating duplication, allowing us to concentrate our efforts on unique resources and new applications. LAUC ▪ No comments. HOTS ▪ Needs to be the overarching, guiding principle for UC cataloging. Consistency in bibliographic data (both MARC and other metadata) facilitates improved bibliographic control across the entire bibliographic information space. In addition to improving data quality, viewing UC cataloging as a single, integrated endeavor will provide many opportunities for efficiency and improved service. Creating a structure to coordinate cataloging/metadata services formally could focus our work strategically and give direction to local efforts. Work in this direction could be carried out along with the other selected recommendations and it could be an ongoing endeavor.
DO IT III1b. Implement a single data store for UC, be it a single file of	**WHY** UCB ▪ No comments.

Question 2:	Which of the sub-recommendations do you think should be given the highest priority, and why?
SUB-RECOMMENDATION	**WHY OR WHY NOT**
cataloging records or the entire ILS.	UCSC ▪ Creation of a single data store is a very high priority HOTS ▪ Must be a very high priority because so many of the other recommendations rely on such a single data store.
DO IT III2a. Use level of description and schema (DC, LOM, VRA Core, etc,) appropriate to the bibliographic resource. Don't apply MARC, AACR2, and LCSH to everything.	**WHY** UCD ▪ A practice already in place in many cases, and a practice that should be continued
DO IT III2b. Consider the value of implementing the FAST syntax with special attention to 'place' and 'time periods' in order to support faceted browsing in those categories	**WHY** LAUC ▪ Do FAST, to pull information together to enhance searching HOTS ▪ Should be employed as a supplement in support of faceted browse capability, but not as a replacement for controlled vocabulary for topical subjects.
DON'T DO IT III2c. Consider using controlled vocabularies only for name, uniform title, date, and place, and abandoning the use of controlled vocabularies [LCSH, MESH, etc] for topical subjects in bibliographic records. Consider whether automated enriched metadata such as TOC, indexes can become surrogates for subject headings and classification for retrieval.	**WHY NOT** UCB ▪ Debated. More research needed before adopting UCD ▪ Little purpose or benefit to be gained, particularly since these headings are regularly included in records from bibliographic utilities, vendors, and other sources. Would not achieve any appreciable cost savings and would eliminate one effective way of bringing together seemingly disparate items. UCI ▪ Controversial issue that warrants wide discussion. UCLA ▪ We agree that that there is a value in looking at all of our metadata practices, to be sure that their benefit still justifies their cost. Our analysis concludes, though, that we should NOT abandon controlled vocabularies for topical subjects, since authorized subject headings offer one of the important "value adds" we bring to the information space – supports co-location, enhanced retrieval, and implementing recommender features, alternative suggestions after zero esults, faceted browsing, and FAST UCSB ▪ Concern was expressed LAUC ▪ Troublesome proposal. Need controlled subject headings for discovery

Question 2: Which of the sub-recommendations do you think should be given the highest priority, and why?	
SUB-RECOMMENDATION	**WHY OR WHY NOT**
	(especially non-English), filtering, faceted browsing, recommender systems <u>HOTS</u> ▪ With one exception, HOTS members are strongly opposed to the implementation of this. While we support ongoing research in the development of full-text searching techniques, we believe that for the foreseeable future continued use of controlled subject vocabularies will remain important for their value in searching, browsing and narrowing search results; their role in implementing many of the recommendations for improved sorting and display of search results contained in the report; their requirement in national cataloging standards and for contribution to CONSER and OCLC; the value of subject heading terms in keyword searches; their role in allowing English language searching of non-English texts; their role in providing consistency of terminology across languages. We also do not believe that the amount of time spent on controlled subject vocabularies is such that abandoning this practice would allow meaningful redeployment of staff to other activities, unless we also abandon the corresponding LC subject classification of materials. In any event, for mainstream materials, in our current cooperative cataloging environment much of the subject analysis is already done at the time we acquire the materials.
DO IT/DON'T DO IT III3b. Implement structured serials holdings format	**WHY** <u>UCR</u> ▪ No comments WHY NOT <u>UCSD</u> ▪ Given the push toward a single shared print collection and heavy reliance of users on electronic rather than print material, this does not seem worth the effort it would take.
DO IT III4a. Encourage the creation of metadata by vendors, and its ingestion into our catalog as early as possible in the process.	**WHY** <u>UCD</u> ▪ III.4.a b & c well worth pursuing if data can be acquired at a reasonable cost, and efficiently ingested into bibliographic systems <u>UCR</u> ▪ No comments
DO IT III4b. Import enhanced metadata whenever, wherever it is available from vendors and other sources.	**WHY** <u>UCD</u> ▪ See note on III4a <u>UCR</u> ▪ No comments

Question 2:	Which of the sub-recommendations do you think should be given the highest priority, and why?
SUB-RECOMMENDATION	**WHY OR WHY NOT**
DO IT III4c.Automate the addition of geographic data into our catalog to support existing services, and to support emerging services.	**WHY** <u>UCD</u> ▪ See note on III4a
DON'T DO IT (IF MANUAL) III4d.Change the processing workflow from "Acquire-Catalog-Put on Shelf" to "Acquire-Put on Shelf with existing metadata-Begin ongoing metadata enhancement process through iterative automated query of metadata sources."	**WHY NOT** <u>UCD</u> ▪ Machine enhancement of records should be fully explored, but the idea of manually touching the cataloging at a later date or mounting major cataloging projects to correct the records, should be rejected as impractical. Do it once and do it right, however "right" is defined. <u>HOTS</u> ▪ While HOTS is strongly in favor of making materials available to users sooner, we have serious reservations about the practicality of this. Our experience leads us to question whether there will be the ongoing institutional staff and budgetary commitment to go back and re-catalog materials already on the shelves. Will "acquire-put on shelf with existing metadata-begin ongoing metadata enhancement" become instead "acquire-put on shelf-forget?"
DO IT III4e.Add enriched content such as Tables of Contents, cover art, publisher promotional blurbs, content excerpts (print, audio or video), and bibliographies. Build retrieval, relevance, and navigation services on top of this content.	**WHY** <u>CDL</u> ▪ Experiment. Potentially one of the easiest to implement with great immediate impact to users. Provide a direct link from Melvyl to Amazon etc, or use service to add content (e.g., Syndetic Solutions). Consider using existing catalogs with some of these features to evaluate what is important to users.
DO IT Iva. Institutionalize an ongoing process of identifying and prioritizing improvements to our bibliographic services, in such a way that we get more than incremental improvements. Must lead to action, not just study. One task might be to track environmental scans, for example.	**WHY** <u>UCD</u> ▪ Should be an ongoing goal and a basic principle for the University of California Libraries. <u>UCSD</u> ▪ In the interests of time, we did not discuss this item, but we feel that it is very desirable. One department commented that research on our newest student users needs to become institutionalized so that we don't just design our systems for the current Net Generation. Another suggested we add "Expedite implementation once decisions are made." <u>UCSF</u> ▪ It's very important we put in procedures that make sure we continually improve our systems. Otherwise, in another 10 years, we'll be back where we are now.

Question 2:	Which of the sub-recommendations do you think should be given the highest priority, and why?
SUB-RECOMMENDATION	**WHY OR WHY NOT**
	RSC ▪ No comments
DO IT Ivb. Provide robust reporting capability (data warehouse).	**WHY** UCSF ▪ Need to provide robust reporting mechanisms that help us make more informed decisions

Question 2:	Any sub-recommendations to add?
GROUP	**ADDED SUB-RECOMMENDATIONS**
UCI	▪ Add a quality component to search and retrieval mechanisms ▪ Continue to conduct user studies to inform the design and future plans for enhancing bibliographic services
UCLA	▪ Ensure bibliographic services are ADA compliant ▪ Provide rights metadata
UCSD	▪ Include support for non-Roman databases in any customization or personalization strategies. ▪ ADA compliance needs to be considered. Some of the recommendations (e.g. FRBR) may well make pages more complex, complicating accessibility issues
LAUC	▪ Provide clear, simple and effective Help in a variety of formats, to accommodate a variety of learning styles and information needs. ▪ Provide support to librarians who want to develop Help in a variety of formats
HOPS	▪ Make content and results available for management by users. Users often want to take information from a variety of sources and manage it. It would be much simpler to have bibliographic and information management tools integrated and available for users as they pull together the various pieces of information they need. We need to think of information gathering and analysis as part of the research process; bibliographic searching and finding should not be segregated from this process. ▪ Better integration with the other tools our users employ

Question 3: **Which option would you recommend for creating a single public catalog interface for UC?**
- **Creating a single UC OPAC system**
- **Outsourcing the UC OPAC (to OCLC, RedLightGreen, Google, etc)**

Other options to consider? Alternative actions?

All of the reports agreed that a single public catalog interface was a good thing, though most included some concerns or issues to consider in implementation. Only 4 groups selected one of the two options to recommend, for several reasons: there was no consensus on the best choice, the group did not feel the options were well enough understood by them to make a choice, or the group believed that the best solution would be some combination or variation of the choices.

Some groups expressed reservations about UC's ability to sustain inhouse development and keep up with evolving technology. Others pointed out that the "marketplace" does not offer an obvious way to implement this recommendation and expressed concern about finding a vendor to provide a system or run it for us. Some reports suggested looking for a vendor partner to engage in shared development, or building an interface using common well-supported software.

A persistent theme expressed is the need for a single catalog interface to allow many views and subsets – for a campus, a library location, a group of users, a kind of material, even an individual user – and a desire to "brand" a campus view.

Question 3:	Which option would you recommend for creating a single public catalog interface for UC?	
	• **Creating a single UC OPAC system**	
	• **Outsourcing the UC OPAC (to OCLC, RedLightGreen, Google, etc)**	
	Other options to consider? Alternative actions?	
GROUP	**RECOMMENDATION**	**COMMENTS**
CDL	Option 1 Create a single UC OPAC system	▪ Outsourcing would give us less control, though should pursue whichever looks most promising after a formal analysis of costs and benefits. Consider combination of the two, could there be campuses that host specific subjects? ▪ Explore whether Common Framework architecture and a harvested metadata-only approach might be an ideal way to implement a cross-UC, cross-collection, cross-format interface – separate access system from variety of content mgmt systems.
UCB	Option 1 Create a single UC OPAC system	▪ We've had less than ideal customer service from some of the commercial systems mentioned for outsourcing. ▪ In perfect world, recommend using a single ILS for the entire UC system, makes sense to use an OPAC that is an integral part of the ILS. However, current ILS vendors may not be able to give us the type of OPAC envisioned by the BSTF report; then would recommend a single OPAC for UC that coordinated with campus systems for circulation, cataloging, acquisition and serials control, where the campus systems all came from the same ILS vendor.
UCD	Option 2 Outsource the UC OPAC (to OCLC, RedLight	▪ Reasons for discontinuing the in-house development of MELVYL still valid today, don't support UC attempting to develop its own OPAC system. Explore all possible means for outsourcing the UC

Question 3:	Which option would you recommend for creating a single public catalog interface for UC?

Question 3: **Which option would you recommend for creating a single public catalog interface for UC?**
- **Creating a single UC OPAC system**
- **Outsourcing the UC OPAC (to OCLC, RedLightGreen, Google, etc)**

Other options to consider? Alternative actions?

GROUP	RECOMMENDATION	COMMENTS
	Green, Google, etc) *Note: not recommending true outsourcing but partnership with vendor*	OPAC. Is there a vendor that could provide a path to enhancing search and retrieval in the ways the report envisions? Perhaps not; but perhaps other options would be closer; or perhaps the current vendor could continue to develop their product to come closer to this vision. ▪ We agree that a single point of entry should be pursued, and we suggest a group of experts be enlisted to determine what options should be considered. Whatever options are pursued, however, it should be possible to tailor the point of entry for different categories of users, e.g., undergraduates, graduates, faculty, patient care professionals, etc. In other words, while a single interface is desirable, it should be possible to customize the interface for different users.
UCI	No recommendation	▪ At least two approaches that can be taken; build on top of the existing "catalog" or build an infrastructure without the "catalog." ▪ We want more than the market place currently provides; will need to prioritize features/functionality. ▪ Concern about sustainability to create and maintain our own OPAC. ▪ Need to maintain the intellectual input in our legacy cataloging records, though we recognize there are trade-offs in allocating resources to maintain legacy cataloging of individual campuses vs. losing some of the (local) data in order to take advantage of mega-service sophisticated single catalog.
UCLA	No recommendation	▪ Need more clarification to make a well-thought-out decision. Single UC OPAC system would give us greater control but could be expensive and difficult to sustain. Outsourcing to Google appealing but may not be flexible enough for a research collection. ▪ If we do pursue creating a single catalog interface within UC, make it open source and develop in partnership with other research libraries. ▪ Consider a partnership with external providers in lieu of complete outsourcing, has the potential to give us the best of both options
UCR	No recommendation	▪ A single interface might reduce "slogging" through to discover a title. ▪ Potential for confusion if student finds an item in Bancroft for a paper due tomorrow and expects to find that locaction on campus. ▪ Why have the single interface focus on just the UCs? Why not use OCLC as the catalog? Why catalog entries only, why not integrate all of the databases we access? ▪ Possible impact on local cooperative arrangements, such as UR's Link+ agreement with area libraries

Question 3:	Which option would you recommend for creating a single public catalog interface for UC? ▪ **Creating a single UC OPAC system** ▪ **Outsourcing the UC OPAC (to OCLC, RedLightGreen, Google, etc)** **Other options to consider? Alternative actions?**	
GROUP	**RECOMMENDATION**	**COMMENTS**
UCSC	No recommendation	▪ Some believe strongly that we should not go with the usual OPAC vendors but look for alliances (Google or Amazon?) to capitalize on innovation, incorporating mixed materials (video, sound files, etc.) Other staff believe we should do it ourselves because we know the most about what our users want, so we should look for collaborative models across academic institutions that have worked (e.g., Sakai). Still others believe we should outsource the UC OPAC to a commercial vendor. ▪ Be sure that the performance of the new single catalog is superior to both our local catalog and Melvyl.
UCSD	No recommendation	▪ Options are points on a continuum. We could build our own (like the old MELVYL), use a vendor system (such as ExLibris), license pieces from a business like Google, or outsource the system entirely. In part a business decision, evaluate options based on least financial vulnerability, tradeoffs between cost and loss of control, whether we can find an outsourcing partner which shares our values. ▪ One does not usually outsource something that is core to one's business. ▪ Whatever option, the OPAC needs the ability to slice/scope the underlying data store for different campuses, groups of campuses, kinds of materials, etc. ▪ Hard to envision how we could obtain all the potential advantages of a single OPAC without a single ILS behind it. ▪ Need to find out what our users really want; how homogenous a group are our users, and where do the differences lie (between disciplines or between campuses)?
UCSF	No recommendation	▪ Maybe do a combination of both: collaborate with an outside party to build the interface but still maintain local control of the OPAC. ▪ Like the idea of working with a non-Library partner that treats the data as data rather than MARC records, and one who could put us at the front of technology and build excellent user interfaces. ▪ Concerns about ability to locally brand the site, how much we could customize the interface, losing control of our data.
LAUC	No recommendation	▪ Either option (creating/ buying/ outsourcing), so long as critical functionality is preserved. ▪ Issues to be weighed have to include risks of outages, cost, control, and impact on functions like serials, ILL, RLF circulation. ▪ Need to preserve a local view, down to individual library, and local customization.

Question 3: **Which option would you recommend for creating a single public catalog interface for UC?**
  - **Creating a single UC OPAC system**
  - **Outsourcing the UC OPAC (to OCLC, RedLightGreen, Google, etc)**

Other options to consider? Alternative actions?

GROUP	RECOMMENDATION	COMMENTS
CDC	No recommendation	▪ Do not feel we have the technical expertise to choose between a single system or outsourcing, and leave that to colleagues with more expertise in that area. ▪ We re-emphasize the need for streamlined workflow and simplified search and retrieval of records as essential to improving the potential for collaboration in collection development.
HOPS	No recommendation	▪ HOPS did not feel equipped to make a strong recommendation for a particular strategy. ▪ Some concerns to be addressed: Ability for users to create their own "search contexts," email results, RSS feeds, toolbars, etc. ▪ Add a "reference interview" option. ▪ Support federated searching not just traditional OPAC searching. ▪ Change the vocabulary, the terms catalog and cataloging are too narrow to describe this new approach to managing our resources.
HOTS	Option 2 Outsource the UC OPAC (to OCLC, RedLight Green, Google, etc) *Note: not recommending true outsourcing but partnership with vendor*	▪ In house development is hard to sustain and fund, so endorse the idea of outsourcing, though no agreement on a specific system or vendor. Interest in the North Carolina State/Endeca model of shared development. Is there a vendor who would be willing to work with us to create an "ultimate OPAC." ▪ Consider a shared development model, working with a commercial vendor.
RSC	No recommendation	▪ Some interest in outsourcing through an 'outsider' such as Google, who might help us re-envision what a catalog is, or through OCLC, whose catalog has proven promise; some interest in creating our own based on open source principles, since outsourcing raises issues of cost, responsiveness, timeliness, and support. ▪ RSC encourages the development of resource sharing and circulation functions as part of the public catalog. A request should not only be made, but tracked by the requester, seamlessly, in this same integrated system.

Question 4a: **Which organization option would you recommend for re-architecting cataloging workflow?**
  - **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**

Other options to consider? Alternative actions?

Most groups recommended a combination of coordinating cataloging expertise and practice across the entire system, while outsourcing a selective portion of standard cataloging work. Almost all groups had strong reservations about consolidating cataloging into one or two centers within UC.

Several groups pointed out that we should not consider only cataloging when redesigning workflow, since technical services operations are increasingly interdependent and cataloging staff also interact with a range of public services activities. Planning should consider the whole life cycle of material handling, from selection through acquisition to cataloging. Planning should also consider the specialized processing needs of special collection and archival material.

Question 4a:	Which organization option would you recommend for re-architecting cataloging workflow?	
	▪ **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**	
	Other options to consider? Alternative actions?	
GROUP	**RECOMMENDATION**	**COMMENTS**
CDL	No recommendation	▪ Pursue whichever looks most promising after a formal analysis.
UCB	Option 1 & 3 Coordinate cataloging expertise and practice across the entire system AND Outsource a greater proportion of standard cataloging work.	▪ Recommend both outsourcing a greater proportion of standard cataloging work, whenever possible and then, coordinating cataloging expertise and practice for the more specialized materials across the entire system. Outsourcing the more standard cataloging work could free staff time for materials requiring special expertise. If expertise were coordinated across the entire system, we would not need to duplicate staff efforts at every campus.
UCD	Option 1 & 3 Coordinate cataloging expertise and practice across the entire system AND Outsource a greater proportion of standard cataloging work. DON'T DO OPTION 2 Consolidate cataloging into one or two centers within UC	▪ First and third organization options are not mutually exclusive, so both would be recommended. Some efforts for coordinating cataloging expertise and practice have been successful over the years. Perhaps HOTS should be charged to further these efforts, or create a group specifically for coordinating cataloging practice. ▪ We believe that a combination of closely coordinating the cataloging for the UC Libraries and selectively outsourcing cataloging that can be more efficiently and cost effectively handled by others outside of UC would be a prudent way of streamlining current practices and containing cataloging costs. ▪ Physical consolidation into one or two cataloging centers doesn't seem practical, would entail transporting a large volume of materials back and forth between the UC libraries and the proposed cataloging centers. Not necessary to be physically in one place in order to have use of a common system and follow common cataloging standards

Question 4a: Which organization option would you recommend for re-architecting cataloging workflow?
▪ **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**
Other options to consider? Alternative actions?

GROUP	RECOMMENDATION	COMMENTS
		and practices. Need to accommodate the evolving closer relationship between acquisitions and cataloging, growing practice of receiving and cataloging items as a single operation.
UCI	Option 1, 2 & 3 Coordinate cataloging expertise and practice across the entire system AND Consolidate cataloging into one or two centers within UC AND Outsource a greater proportion of standard cataloging work.	▪ Consider a combination of all three, depending on type of cataloging. ▪ Will need better coordination of UC-wide workflow. ▪ Hope revamping the cataloging flow will allow local catalogers more intellectually stimulating work, while more rote mechanical activities will be centralized and automated. ▪ Focus high level skills where they will make the biggest impact. ▪ Consider the implications for other workflows. Acquisitions work needs to be factored into the entire workflow. Also consider changes which will positively impact access services workflow, etc
UCLA	Option 1 & 3 Coordinate cataloging expertise and practice across the entire system AND Outsource a greater proportion of standard cataloging work. DON'T DO OPTION 2 Consolidate cataloging into one or two centers within UC	▪ Options not mutually exclusive and options 1 and 3 could be combined – coordination for some proportion of cataloging work and outsourcing for as much of the standard cataloging work as is cost effective. ▪ Option 2 would adversely affect our ability to meet local priorities, to provide timely cataloging if material itself must be shipped, to maintain local metadata expertise for assisting public service staff and advising campus digital projects, and to respond to rush processing needs such as reserves. ▪ Be careful not to compromise the unique needs of specialized materials and collections.
UCR	No recommendation	▪ Advantages to physical consolidation: easier to agree on cataloging practices, focus expertise such as languages, compensate for the difficulty of recruiting and training catalogers in all locations. ▪ Disadvantages to physical consolidation: potential loss of flexibility in creating local records, transporting material time consuming and costly, could result in job loss for current staff. ▪ Why was cataloging selected as the starting point, downstream from collection development and acquisitions ▪ Duplication is not necessarily a bad thing. Serves local users quickly. Allows growing in ARL ranking.
UCSC	No recommendation except	▪ Physically consolidating cataloging will cause many workflow problems, remove local cataloging expertise from campuses, services

Question 4a: Which organization option would you recommend for re-architecting cataloging workflow?
▪ **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**
Other options to consider? Alternative actions?

GROUP	RECOMMENDATION	COMMENTS
	DON'T DO OPTION 2 Consolidate cataloging into one or two centers within UC	such as rush requests will deteriorate, remove cataloging from selection and acquisitions process.
UCSD	Option 1 Coordinate cataloging expertise and practice across the entire system DON'T DO OPTION 2 Consolidate cataloging into one or two centers within UC DON'T DO OPTION 3 LARGE SCALE Outsource a greater proportion of standard cataloging work	▪ Option 1 offers "virtual centralization," a practical and beneficial approach for leveraging expertise, reducing duplicate work and maintaining a high quality database. Major challenge would be to coordinate prioritization across campuses, and allowing campuses to enrich the records for items of high priority/importance on our campus. ▪ With physical consolidation, would lose communication with subject experts, close working ties between acquisitions and cataloging. Concerns about delays. All of the advantages could be achieved through "virtual centralization." ▪ Outsourcing is not cheaper and it increases your management overhead. OK on a smaller scale. Rather than outsource to vendors, "insource" to ourselves, eg one UC-wide Korean cataloger. ▪ We recommend small steps rather than a single leap into the unknown
UCSF	Option 2 Consolidate cataloging into one or two centers within UC *Note: Recommendation suggests consolidation could be virtual, not physical*	▪ Option 1 has been tried in the past and failed. ▪ More cost analysis needed to make a choice, but tended to favor consolidating cataloging though there are details to work out. Concern that consolidating could cause delays, wouldn't work for unique materials like archives, harder to tie in the rest of the process like acquisitions. Consider consolidating via technology rather than physically.
LAUC	No recommendation	.
CDC	No recommendation	
HOPS	No recommendation	
HOTS	Option 1 & 3 Coordinate cataloging expertise and practice across the entire system AND Outsource a greater proportion of standard cataloging work.	▪ Coordination of cataloging would include the use of outsourcing when cost-effective, and could also include the concentration of specialized expertise on one or more campuses if appropriate. Requires infrastructure to set priorities, cataloging standards and policies, and allocate resources to compensate for sharing expertise. ▪ Physical consolidation would be detrimental to the services that we provide, and would be both time-consuming and costly to implement. Consolidating cataloging without acquisitions problematic, consolidating cataloging and acquisitions without selectors also

Question 4a:	Which organization option would you recommend for re-architecting cataloging workflow?	
	▪ 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 Other options to consider? Alternative actions?	
GROUP	**RECOMMENDATION**	**COMMENTS**
	<u>DON'T DO OPTION 2</u> Consolidate cataloging into one or two centers within UC	problematic. Catalogers are integral part of campuses, removing them affects other services and activities. Shipping materials around costly and slow. Campuses would still need some local staff. Funding and managing could be complex.
RSC	<u>Option 1</u> Coordinate cataloging expertise and practice across the entire system	▪ RSC is less comfortable commenting on this question, as it is generally further from our expertise. However, coordinating cataloging expertise seems best.

Question 4b: **Which architecture option would you recommend for re-architecting cataloging workflow?**
- **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**

Other options to consider? Alternative actions?

Most groups felt that a single ILS would yield great benefits, including better user service, reduction of duplication, and better support for cooperative collection development.   The single ILS would also serve as a great catalyst for change. Many concerns were raised, though, about the challenges of implementation, including a doubt that any vendor exists who could support UC. If a single ILS can't be implemented, a shared central file is the most popular second choice. Even if a single ILS is feasible, some groups feel that the implementation would take so long that a shared central file could be a viable interim solution.

Question 4b:	Which architecture option would you recommend for re-architecting cataloging workflow?	
	▪ 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 Other options to consider? Alternative actions?	
GROUP	**RECOMMENDATION**	**COMMENTS**
CDL	No recommendation	▪ Pursue whichever looks most promising after a formal analysis. ▪ Consider a lower-cost, less catalog-like central index (replacing the union catalog) that would serve a singe user interface to all local catalogs. ▪ Consider XML-based data systems
UCB	<u>Option 2</u> Adopt a single ILS for the entire University of California system	▪ In the perfect world, we recommend adopting a single ILS for the entire University of California system, which has a single copy of each bibliographic record with holdings for each campus, but we don't see these three options as mutually exclusive. For the users, it would be a shared central file, whether the architecture of the ILS

Question 4b: Which architecture option would you recommend for re-architecting cataloging workflow?
  ▪ 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
  Other options to consider? Alternative actions?

GROUP	RECOMMENDATION	COMMENTS
		was actually a single shared file or not. ▪ We recommend separate "portals" for each campus. The ILS should allow local (i.e., campus level) holdings maintenance, acquisitions, auto-circ, reserves, reporting capabilities, etc. Make it a truly shared enterprise instead of following the model of separate campus ILS-s which the central system would need to feed records into and query for current circ status, etc.
UCD	Option 2 Adopt a single ILS for the entire University of California system OR, IF NOT FEASIBLE Option 1 Create a shared central file with a single copy of each bibliographic record DON'T DO OPTION 3 Rely on OCLC as the single UC database of record for bibliographic data	▪ Single ILS for all UC Libraries would be an ideal solution. Would enhance cataloging workflow and efficiency, provide users a much improved discovery and retrieval tool, would facilitate cooperative and standard cataloging practices, make cooperative collection development easier. However, the costs of purchasing the system and the staff effort necessary to implement and effectively use it may be beyond our means; would require some or all of the libraries to give up their current systems and implement a new, common one. Gains would be terrific, but the implementation would be painful. ▪ If single ILS not doable, a shared central file would be feasible, would eliminate the complicated merging of the various UC cataloging data flows in MELVYL, eliminate the duplicate records for the same bibliographic entity, and greatly enhance the quality and specificity of retrieval from the OPAC. While not the most ideal option, it is probably the most practical and less expensive than adopting a single ILS ▪ Relying on OCLC is the least desirable of the three options, though perhaps the easiest to implement. Limited ability for UC to control and influence such a large non-profit organization serving the international library community; wouldn't provide the kinds of search and retrieval enhancements the BSTF report recommends. ▪ One variation for creating a central file might be considered, and that is to expand the MELVYL OPAC by adding a cataloging module, making it possible for catalogers to catalog directly on the Aleph system, having a separate instance for the local catalog and system-wide instance to serve as the union catalog (MELVYL).
UCI	No recommendation	▪ Concern about preserving local notes, particularly for Special Collections. ▪ OCLC option may have limitations, needs further investigation
UCLA	Option 2 Adopt a single ILS for the entire University of California system OR, IF NOT FEASIBLE	▪ A single ILS would offer the cleanest solution though we would need to carefully evaluate feasibility of this option. There are many tricky implementation issues to be addressed. ▪ If a single ILS is not feasible, or if it will take a long time to implement, a shared single file would be a viable interim solution. ▪ OCLC option problematic. Unproven whether OCLC bib records

Question 4b: Which architecture option would you recommend for re-architecting cataloging workflow? ▪ **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** **Other options to consider? Alternative actions?**		
GROUP	**RECOMMENDATION**	**COMMENTS**
	Option 1 Create a shared central file with a single copy of each bibliographic record DON'T DO OPTION 3 Rely on OCLC as the single UC database of record for bibliographic data	could link to local holdings, items, orders, or to circ status and user-initiated services like renewals, recalls, etc. No obvious way to store local notes, especially needed for special collection materials. Some of the data we load into catalog records from vendors proprietary, can't be added to OCLC. ▪ Be careful about merging rare book records into a single file, could be problematic.
UCR	Option 2 Adopt a single ILS for the entire University of California system	▪ Not a unanimous choice. ▪ Concern that patrons may be confused rather than better served, and that the system might be too massive.
UCSC	Option 2 Adopt a single ILS for the entire University of California system	▪ Allows bibliographic, acquisitions, and holding information to be in one place for easy data manipulation and for collection planning activities. If a single ILS not possible and have to choose between a central file and an OCLC file, then UC has to evaluate what it wants to achieve.
UCSD	Option 2 Adopt a single ILS for the entire University of California system OR, IF NOT FEASIBLE Option 1 Create a shared central file with a single copy of each bibliographic record OR COULD CONSIDER Option 3 Rely on OCLC as the single UC database of record for bibliographic data	▪ See many benefits to a single ILS, for users and staff. Concerns about viability of the option, possible overwhelming complexity. Could any vendor deliver such a system? ▪ Shared central file is a possible interim step to creating a shared ILS. Concerns about uniting bib data and other data (acquisitions, circulation, etc.) ▪ OCLC option has some appeal. Advantages in taking MELVYL out of the workflow, one fewer silo. Might enhance consistency of practice across all 10 campuses. Concerns about the work to load local records not in OCLC now, not sure OCLC could handle all of our record types. ▪ We recommend small steps rather than a single leap into the unknown

Question 4b: Which architecture option would you recommend for re-architecting cataloging workflow? • 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 Other options to consider? Alternative actions?		
GROUP	**RECOMMENDATION**	**COMMENTS**
UCSF	No recommendation, except DON'T DO OPTION 3 Rely on OCLC as the single UC database of record for bibliographic data	• Didn't understand the 3 options well enough to be able to comment. • We did feel that we would not want to pursue option 3. For one thing, it would require everything be in MARC, which is too limited
LAUC	No recommendation	.
CDC	No recommendation	
HOPS	No recommendation	
HOTS	Option 2 Adopt a single ILS for the entire University of California system	• While there are many concerns about the social issues (e.g., reaching agreement about a specific product, agreeing on standards and processes) and the technical difficulties (e.g., interfacing with each campus accounting system, adequate performance), these should not stop UC from moving ahead to explore the adoption of a single ILS. HOTS notes that this is not a cutting-edge idea and has been done by other large institutions (the University of Maryland System and Affiliated Institutions, for example). The shared pursuit of a single ILS would act as a significant catalyst for change. • A shared central file should only be considered if it is a short term solution, laying foundation for a single ILS. HOTS believes that UC would lose efficiencies if bibliographic data was disconnected from the other data that is crucial for technical services work. Technical services functions cannot easily be split from each other. • The OCLC option should be considered only if neither of the other options are viable, and we want to consider WorldCat as a replacement for the current Melvyl. Even for that role, HOTS identified a number of concerns. • HOTS encourages broader thinking than the catalog-centric approach of the report. Cataloging is not an isolated enterprise, and technical services activities are increasingly interrelated and integrated, as we have seen in the emerging ERMS effort. The bibliographic services cycle often begins at the point of selection and acquisition as we rely on more vendor records and as UC engages in more formalized cooperative collection development. Therefore, it is important to examine the flow of bibliographic information from the very beginning and not just as a result of the cataloging process
RSC	No recommendation	• Many in RSC are less comfortable making recommendations. That said, there is some support for all three options.

Question 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?

Question 6: Is there anything else you think UC should be doing in pursuit of improving bibliographic services?

- Adopt the spirit of this important report
- Move to action
- Prototype and experiment
- If we can, make changes incrementally. But can we?
- Involve users and user studies early in the implementation planning.
- Address the needs of scholars
- Think about the whole workflow process, not just cataloging
- Involve a wide range of expertise in planning next steps
- Include a wide range of content, defining bibliographic systems broadly
- Agree on a shared set of criteria and principles
- Develop funding strategies
- Use technology that enables the new services and capabilities
- Support continuous improvement
- Leverage authority records

SUGGESTION	COMMENTS

Adopt the spirit of this important report	UCD
	  - If we can accomplish even a few of the recommendations of the report, the bibliographic services for the University Library will be improved considerably.
	UCI
	  - We think this is a great start and hope many of the report recommendations will come to fruition.
	UCM
	  - The UC Merced librarians strongly support the progressive spirit expressed in the BSTF Task Force Report.
	HOPS
	  - HOPS applauds the Task Force for successfully laying the groundwork for a new bibliographic service environment.
	LTAG
	  - LTAG members have reviewed the BSTF report and we think it points to exciting new levels of service and look forward to providing technical expertise in support of any implementation plans that follow.
	RSC

| Question 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? |
| Question 6: | Is there anything else you think UC should be doing in pursuit of improving bibliographic services? |

SUGGESTION	COMMENTS
	▪ This is an important, thoughtful and important report.
Move to action	**UCD** ▪ Continue the momentum gained and utilize the expertise of the Task Force to move forward as quickly and as efficiently as possible. **UCM** ▪ The University of California Libraries should take advantage of the emphasis provided by the BSTF Report and see how far they can run with it. Now is not the time for conservatism or timidity in thinking about how we can change academic libraries for the better.

Prototype and experiment	**CDL**
	▪ Figure out a way to scope a prototype, harvested metadata-only, Common Framework-based project to integrate metadata from Melvyl, OAC, and a couple campus-based content systems, so we can get a better understanding of all the metadata and access issues that this laudable integrated vision raises
	UCD
	▪ Whichever recommendations are pursued, it would be useful to develop prototype projects to test the concepts and possible approaches before full implementation is undertaken.
	UCI
	• Recognizing that libraries have a history of doing studies, and may have a tendency to overanalyze their research but are reluctant to put something out there or present new product. In comparison, commercial ventures such as Google puts out new features all the time, tests them in the real world. If they work, they stay, if not, they're gone:
	    • Build it, try it, improve it
	    • Study the marketplace (Amazon, Google, etc.) for working models
	    • We should not be afraid to make mistakes

If we can, make changes incrementally. But can we?	**CDL** ▪ Make simple changes. Build incrementally to test concepts and demonstrate feasibility. **UCLA** ▪ We need to balance ease of implementation with cost/benefit. When do we go for the low hanging fruit, and when do we invest instead in high cost/high impact projects? **UCSD** ▪ As a group, we are ready for change. We recommend small

Question 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?
Question 6:	Is there anything else you think UC should be doing in pursuit of improving bibliographic services?

SUGGESTION	COMMENTS
	steps rather than a single leap into the unknown. UCB ▪ There really aren't many of these recommendations that we can fully pursue with our current bibliographic systems. We thought that there may be a tension between moving forward incrementally vs. more boldly (i.e., more starting from scratch). It may be that we move boldly, or not much at all.
Involve users and user studies early in the implementation planning.	UCI ▪ Need to understand more fully what our users want; pursue research into realistic user expectations; use current real student and faculty for usability studies. Consider also what librarians want, how do we use these tools? UCLA ▪ Talk to users before making final implementation decisions. LAUC ▪ Test assumptions with users. Do we serve our users best by focusing on convenience and simplicity? Are features like recommenders, relevance ranking, and "bells and whistles" designed to emulate mass-market sites like Google and Amazon wanted by scholars and faculty? Are there other things we could do to enhance services that would be easier and provide more benefit?
Address the needs of scholars	UCI ▪ Keep as the central goal—connecting users to the content UCLA ▪ All of the services scenarios in the report feature undergraduate students, but our bibliographic systems must address the need of scholars. Comprehensive, well-organized access to sometimes rare and obscure materials is not attempted by any other provider of bibliographic services, and so is our most important "value add." In making decisions about our bibliographic services, remember this unique duty and role of research libraries. ▪ We should consider how to appropriately surface the complexity of a research collection to our users while still making our systems intuitive to use. How can we create systems that allow for sophisticated research, but are still accessible and convenient to use? LAUC ▪ The UC libraries serve a wide range of patrons from high school student to professors and a worldwide academic community. A "one size fits all" approach focusing on students may not fit all

| Question 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? |
| Question 6: | Is there anything else you think UC should be doing in pursuit of improving bibliographic services? |

SUGGESTION	COMMENTS
	groups well.
Think about the whole workflow process, not just cataloging	**UCI** ▪ Take a holistic systems analysis approach in analyzing what we expect to get out of new library system ▪ Take into account all workflows (acquisitions, access services, etc.) not just cataloging workflow **UCLA** ▪ The BSTF report identifies a lot of new tasks that libraries need to take on in responding to user needs. It will not be enough to examine cataloging and technical services workflow alone to free up resources to address this new work. Every functional area in libraries should be looked at for work that could be done differently or discontinued. **HOTS** ▪ The ACIG "observed most particularly the brief attention given in the report to acquisitions functions as they relate to bibliographic services, which may reflect an underestimation of the contributions make to the collective bibliographic record. The functional lines between acquisitions and cataloging tasks frequently blur across organizational divisions, especially as acquisitions units take on an increasing amount of quick-cataloging." ▪ HOTS strongly supports the statement of the SCP Advisory Committee: "In so far as the BSTF report represents a lot of new tasks that libraries need to take on in responding to user needs, every functional area in libraries should be looked at for work that could be done differently or discontinued, to free up resources to address the new work. It will not be enough to examine cataloging and technical services alone." **RSC** ▪ Development of robust circulation and resource sharing systems will be critical for our users to be able to access the rich resources of the University of California libraries.
Involve a wide range of expertise in planning next steps	**UCI** ▪ After the UC University Librarians identify priorities, we recommend that the group who is tasked to implement next steps include more members who are familiar with workflow issues, have practical experience with the infrastructure issues needed to go forward, and that there be campus representation. **LAUC** ▪ Because this work will affect all library functions beyond technical services, all divisions expressed a keen interest for

Question 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?
Question 6:	Is there anything else you think UC should be doing in pursuit of improving bibliographic services?

SUGGESTION	COMMENTS
	clear communication about the process going forward and to keep public services librarians involved in the process.
	HOPS
	▪ HOPS looks forward to playing a leadership role in addressing the public service requirements this environment. As indicated above, in addition to this response to SOPAG's RFC, HOPS will be sending SOPAG a short summary of our thoughts regarding how public services concerns dovetail with the BSTF report. We look forward to further action on the recommendations articulated in the BSTF report.
	HOTS
	▪ We believe that, given the important and far-reaching nature of the report, all qualified bodies within UC, not just the Task Force, need to be involved in planning and implementation.
	LPL
	▪ LPL hopes that, as the Report is analyzed and specific elements are selected for further examination and implementation, privacy concerns and issues will continue to be given due attention and that LPL will continue to be consulted on privacy matters.
	RSC
	▪ As we move forward with future discussions, it will be important to include all qualified groups within UC, not just the Task Force, in future planning and implementation.
	▪ Pre-planning and development of shared practice and principles will be crucial to the success of this project and to buy in from all campuses.
Include a wide range of content, defining bibliographic systems broadly	**CDL**
	▪ It is imperative that digital content that is located in systems such as the Online Archive of California, Calisphere, Counting California, e-Scholarship Editions, eScholarship Repository is integrated with a broader solution. The content must be easy to find and manipulate.
	▪ The range of content types also demand the ability for users to discover, view, and manipulate different types of content in different ways (for example a user using numeric data will have different needs than an a user searching for images.) Perhaps a model of "search together, use uniquely" is appropriate
Agree on a shared set of criteria and principles	**UCLA**
	▪ Before final decisions are made about which recommendations to pursue, the University Librarians should agree on a shared set of assumptions and a shared set of criteria to govern the

Question 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?
Question 6:	Is there anything else you think UC should be doing in pursuit of improving bibliographic services?

SUGGESTION	COMMENTS

	choices. Draft assumptions and criteria can be intuited from the design principles in Appendix C.
	▪ Develop and use robust assessment tools. After making any change, we should be able to answer the questions:
	   ▪ (1) Are our users better off now that the change has been made?
	   ▪ (2) Are staff better off (e.g., able to work more productively)?
	<u>CDC</u>
	▪ CDC recommends that the University Librarians establish what their agreed upon assumptions, criteria and design principles will be for this effort, so that decisions and choices of directions and recommendations pursued can be weighed against those criteria.

Develop funding strategies	<u>CDL</u> ▪ View UC bibliographic access as a single enterprise. This is not simply a rephrase of II.1 and II.2; it is the people/money infrastructure that would allow implementations of II.1 and II.2 to be effective and efficient. Having the appropriate organizational infrastructure to ensure effective deployment and continuous improvement, determining a more visible way to understand shared costs for bibliographic access and developing a more direct cost-sharing model will reduce costs and will better ensure that systems meet both campus and patron needs. The decision to move UC Libraries to "One University, One Library, One OPAC" will definitely fail if the cost-sharing and institutional organization isn't well-considered. ▪ Partner with economics faculty, management faculty in business schools, etc. to perform cost-benefit analysis and provide consulting on organizational infrastructure. <u>UCLA</u> ▪ We must craft a compelling story for users and campus administration, to generate support and funding for the major resource investment needed to transform our bibliographic services. <u>LAUC</u> ▪ Implementing the recommendations in the report will be expensive. Where will we get the resources to do this?
Use technology that enables the new services and capabilities	<u>UCI</u> ▪ Lobby vendors for better products <u>UCSB</u> ▪ Whatever is developed should be open source and depend as

| Question 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? |
| Question 6: | Is there anything else you think UC should be doing in pursuit of improving bibliographic services? |

SUGGESTION	COMMENTS
	little as possible on outside companies and on specialized code and databases. The whole lot needs to be Internet based.
Support continuous improvement	**UCSC** ▪ Although the heading "Supporting Continuous Improvement" did not rank high in either the blog responses or the campus meeting, it is worth mentioning that some feel that creating mechanisms to support continuous improvement is the first step in the whole process the BSTF is recommending. In addition to suggestions given in the report, a concentrated study of existing workflows, identifying redundancies, finding best practices, determining which best practices are already shared system-wide, identifying best practices to begin to share across the system and build processes/procedures and work tools that move UC forward on the mutually agreed recommendations from the report should all be employed. Finally, UC should institutionalize the process of continually reassessing and refining the processes we agree to follow. **HOTS** ▪ We did not include recommendation IVa institutionalize an ongoing process of identifying and prioritizing improvements in our answer to question one. At the same time, we feel that institutionalizing such a process is essential if the UC libraries are to be able to support our users' information needs. Indeed, many of the issues ably documented in the report are the result of the absence of such an ongoing process of evaluation. Our users didn't discover Google yesterday; neither did we discover our dataflow problems yesterday.
Leverage authority records	**UCLA** ▪ Explore the current and potential uses of authority records There are international developments that should make authority records even more valuable than they are now for the efficient provision of well-organized access to materials. **HOTS** ▪ Libraries continue to make a considerable investment in authority control and the creation of authority records. Methods should be developed to leverage this ongoing investment to facilitate improved search and retrieval.

Appendix A
Invitation for Comments on the Bibliographic Services Task Force Report

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.