APPENDIX

UC Heads of Public Services Votes and Comments on the Bibliographic Services Task Force Report

Here are the UC HOPS votes and comments made in response to the questions posed by Bernie Hurley, Chair, SOPAG, about the BSTF Report. This information was collected through a series of email exchanges and two teleconference discussions. Opinions expressed here are those of the *individual* members of UC HOPS, they do not reflect campus sentiments.

---

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

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

   Major headings receiving votes:

I.1: Provide users with direct access to item	(9 votes)
I.6: Deliver bibliographic services where the users are	(8 votes)
II.2: Support searching across the entire bibliographic information space	(7 votes)
I.3: Support customization/personalization	(4 votes)
I.7: Provide relevance ranking and leverage fulltext	(4 votes)
III.1: Rearchitect cataloging workflow	(4 votes)
I.5: Offer better navigation of large sets of results	(2 votes)
III.2: Select the appropriate metadata scheme	(2 votes)
I.2: Provide recommender systems	(1 vote)
I.4: Offer alternative actions for failed or suspect searches	(1 vote)
I.8: Provide better searching for non-Roman materials	(1 vote)

---

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?

   Sub-recommendations receiving votes:

I.6a: Integrate with VLE/CMS	(7 votes)
I.1a: Elinks to logical default	(5 votes)
I.1b: "I-want-this" button	(4 votes)
I.3a: User defines sets of resources	(3 votes)
I.7a: Relevance ranking on broad set of criteria	(3 votes)
II.2b: Provide result sets by format, granularity, etc.	(3 votes)
III.1a: UC cataloging as single enterprise	(3 votes)
II.2a: Pre-harvest metadata	(2 votes)
III.2a: Use the appropriate level of description and schema	(2 votes)
III.2d: Preference to items otherwise undiscoverable	(2 votes)
I.2a: Content & filter based recommenders	(1 vote)
I.4b: Constructive suggestions for zero results	(1 vote)
I.5c: Implement faceted browsing	(1 vote)
I.8a: Search in both Roman and vernacular	(1 vote)

III.1b: Single data store for UC   (1 vote)

III4.c: Add enriched content   (1 vote)

Comments about top sub-recommendations:

I.6a: Integrate with CMS/VLE
- CMS/VLE is prevalent on campuses. We know students go to their CMS/VLE because they must; we know that, for the most part, they don't go to their library catalog.
- Segments of the University are engaged in looking for a common collaboration and learning environment. The Library is a key player in all this. The aim is to reduce from some 28 odd course management systems to one (if we're lucky!). Bottom line - - this is where our users are. Our faculty expect them to be there, and we need to take up residence in this space.
- I think this one is critical but is the barrier our systems or the CMS/VLEs? How do we get traction?
- Users, particularly undergraduate students focus on their courses first and then move out from there; it seems like content descriptions or search/browsing features should be integrated within these systems

I.1a: Have UC eLinks take you to a logical default choice...
- Because in most cases this will be the right choice. Let's play to the rule, not the exception to the rule.
- I agree - - in most cases this will be the right choice.

I.1b: Provide an "I-Want-This" Button
- I feel like this is a step up from 1a. I'll take 1a but this would be even better!
- Let's go for this one—we could do I.1a tomorrow.
- Users need to get to the content they want and we need to make this as seamless as possible; we need to give options to users to get materials based on how quickly they need the materials, how much they are willing to pay (yes, maybe real $$), and how good the content must be; maybe some users will accept lesser quality or similar materials if they can get it faster

I.3a: Allow user to define the set of resources/databases s/he wishes to search...
- I was skeptical of this at first but now I believe we can implement good recommender features that work in an academic environment. We have a very rich data store that we are not using to provide "system" generated recommendations; user generated recommendations may be trickier, but could be useful if we are careful about how they are done. We did an analysis of recommender system characteristics and what builds trust that was very illuminating.

I.7a: Provide relevance ranking and leverage full-text
- Bring the cream to the top. Makes much more sense than the apparently random way Melvyl, for example, displays hits.
- Relevance ranking is becoming almost a de facto standard in search and discovery environs. We'd best jump on board, and control (through criteria) to the extent possible.

II.2b: Provide results sets arranged by format

- This will give even naive users some chance of understanding what it is they are seeing. This could actually go a long way towards promoting greater information literacy among the users.
- This is very similar to I.5c in that it allows users to winnow information down facet by facet and then provides group results where users can mix and match

III.1a: View UC cataloging as a single enterprise....
- I'm out of my league here. But I see what a drain on our resources this work is at our campus.
- Economy of scale. Elimination of confusing duplicate records. Easier to implement system-wide changes. Long overdue.

Comments about other sub-recommendations:

I.5 c: Faceted browsing
- Allow the users to winnow down their large sets using meaningful criteria such as language, date, subject, relevance, etc.; I am less concerned with multiple versions of the same work, but understand how that would be frustrating to some users

II.2a: Pre-harvest metadata
- If metadata from a variety of content is pre-harvested then it can be used in a variety of different ways; if we don't have this metadata, then we can't allow users or ourselves to take pieces of information and use how we want

III.2a: Use level of description and schema appropriate to the bibliographic resource...
- Essential if we are to maintain a predictable federated search across a wide set of resources, and to "be able to build high-level searching and display services based on that searching." Pre-harvesting metadata for the full set of UC Library collections is essential if we are to create quality search.

III.2.d: In allocating resources to descriptive and subject metadata creation, consider giving preference to those that are completely undiscoverable without it…
- I had a hard time picking one in this section but this one combines a couple of things that are worthy—changing how we allocate resources, using automated techniques where possible. This is my weakest vote, however.
- If the UC collectively accepts good quality metadata/cataloging, even if created through automated means, for widely-held materials, then we can concentrate our cataloging expertise and talent on describing and making visible hard-to-discover items; this will contribute to making more content findable rather than having the same widely-held content described by multiple people

III.4e: Add enriched content…
- Because our users value this and are already going elsewhere (guiltily) like Amazon to get it (see Shared Print report) and because it is pretty easy to do much of this.

- **Are there any recommendations that you think should be added? Why?**

- 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.
- Along the same lines, better integration with the other tools our users employ

- **Are there any recommendations that you think should NOT be pursued? Why not?**

  - Provide recommender features – I think it is a waste of time unless you know the well-defined context of the particular information inquiry
  - Create a single catalog interface for all of UC – I still want the "skin" for our campus to have our own branding.   I agree with that there should be one big data warehouse that feeds all of our brands
  - III.2c: I think this should be examined very carefully; the electronic universe is only going to expand and I'm not sure that relevance ranking is going to be an adequate substitute for organized searching within a domain.
  - I1.b, II.2b

---

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.
   - Difficult to envision this given the logistical difficulties with such a project. MELVYL is a good example of how difficult it is to hold a vendor to R&D priorities for features "required" in a system. Any effort will necessarily be a compromise.

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?

  - Outsourcing the UC OPAC
  - I agree that UC should aggressively pursue this option. I would most like to see the work outsourced to Google for the reason stated (its familiarity to users) and also because there is much to be gained on both sides - - and for our users' benefit, from collaboration and partnership here. Each of these issues - - creating a single public catalog interface for all of UC and outsourcing the UC OPAC is, at bottom, challenge us to rethink our roles as stewards on our campuses and within the University and as leaders within the profession.
  - I agree that UC should pursue this option. I would most like to see the work outsourced to Google simply because it is already familiar to, and used by, our users.
  - I have mixed feelings on this one. When people say "outsource to Google", I have to disagree if it assumes using their existing search engine which is a

one trick pony. If it means exposing our metadata so that catalog records are retrieved along with other results, then I agree but think it might be done better via efforts like OpenWorldCat. I still believe that there are reasons to keep catalog development within the library world as a supplement to what Google provides and a way to serve more specialized needs. But I'm not sure whether attempting to build it ourselves or outsourcing to OCLC/RLG or a typical ILS vendor is the way to go. I think NCSU's new catalog (which outsourced the search engine) needs to be evaluated carefully.

- I think there are advantages to creating a single point of entry, though allowing each campus to customize that portal in certain ways would be important. I do think that outsourcing the UC OPAC would be the most efficient strategy, but I am wary of doing this. The UC experience with Fretwell-Downing and VDX has shown us the true downside of outsourcing. You often have little control over changing the final product and if there are problems, they can get fixed slowly if they are addressed at all. If we outsource to Google, as has been suggested, do we actually get to know what their algorithm is for relevance ranking and how searching really works? Would we be able to change these algorithms or switch to different algorithms if the current ones don't meet our needs?

---

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?

      - Consolidate cataloging into one or two centers within UC. The shared cataloging records have to be massaged again when they come to the local campus and they are slower to arrive than the resource itself. It is not a model that works well, at least as it currently works. Outsourcing will be expensive and the Cataloging Center itself can explore outsourcing. Centralizing efforts does not preclude making better use of outsourcing
      - Re-architecting the cataloging workflow is probably overdue, if not on the verge of being overdue. The organization options presented could be combined - - coordination for some proportion of cataloging work; consolidation for another; and outsourcing for as much of the standard cataloging work.
      - Coordinate cataloging expertise and practice across the entire system.
      - I'd say consolidate and outsource.
      - I have no alternative, but hope that consideration will be given to the loss of incentive for innovation in a single catalog, i.e. the kinds of creativity we see in relation to local collections and constituencies that offers a richness lost in a single catalog.
      - I agree that UC should re-architect the cataloging workflow. It seems that either coordination or consolidation could work. Outsourcing as much of the standard cataloging work would have a huge payoff in cost savings and increased efficiency.

- I agree with comments about combined approaches. Regarding loss of local innovation, I would hope that could be accommodated as well. Maybe some specific examples would help shape solutions. If we are saving resources by consolidation, then perhaps we free up resources to do some innovation for local needs.
- It seems that there would be value to coordinating and consolidating cataloging workflow. Outsourcing standard cataloging work would free staff to pay attention to distinct and rare collections.

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?

- Pursuing a single cataloging enterprise is a logical direction, given trends, findings, etc. Without knowing more about the costs and challenges of each of the architecture options, I am not comfortable weighing in.
- Create a shared central file with a single copy of each bibliographic record.
- This is outside of my area of expertise. On a gut-reaction level, adopting a single ILS seems to make the most sense because it goes hand-in-hand with the idea of a single Web OPAC for UC.
- A hybrid of all 3: coordinate, consolidate, outsource (and retrain in house) where necessary.
- Realistically, creating a shared central file might be the most workable solution although having a single ILS would address issues beyond just cataloging and OPAC.
- It seems that the best option would be a shared central file, but then each campus would have to have the architecture to do something with that shared data. Do we even have the ability to manage and maintain a single ILS? I look at the examples of Melvyl and VDX and think they have their strengths and weaknesses. What would it take for us to do better?

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?

- The recommendations in Section I (Enhancing Search and Retrieval) have strong implications for the design and delivery of information, reference and research services on our campuses and system-wide. There are several underlying issues re: user services that should be referred to HOPS for discussion. For example, what do the Task Force's recommendations in this area suggest for the future for information literacy instruction? How might these recommendations impact the design and delivery of reference services? How might they impact the design and delivery of our Web space and our Web services - - locally or UC-wide? Perhaps HOPS might develop its own set of scenario planning exercises that will complement those provided in the report. Having these on hand would further help move the UC Libraries into the future.

- This is stating the obvious, but the ideas in the report are good ones, have been for years. devil is in the details and cooperation in implementing the recommendations.
- Our campus is just beginning the broader conversation of this document in public services and with other library councils, etc.
- HOPS needs to think about how the recommendations in the report would affect public services. Will the direction of centralization for bibliographic services force changes, planned and unplanned in the provision of other information services to users? Would there need to be more integration? HOPS will need to think about the implications of the report, and watch the progress of recommendations closely and see what next steps it needs to take.

---

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

- There were no comments.