To: Jim Dooley, Chair, HOTS
From: Shared Cataloging Program Advisory Committee
Re: Comments on the Bibliographic Services Task Force Report
Date: March 18 2006

SOPAG has requested that comments address the following questions:

1. Which of these 15 major headings do you think are the most important for UC to address?
    - **II.1 Create a single catalog interface for all of UC**
    - **II.2 Support searching across the entire bibliographic information space**
    - **III.1 Re-architect cataloging workflow (single data store)**
    - **I.5 Offer better navigation of large set of search results**
    - **I.6 Deliver bibliographic services where the users are**

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?

HIGH PRIORITY		IMPLEMENTATION TIMETABLE		
		short	medium	long
I.6a	Integrate library content and services into campus content management systems	X		
I.6c.	Expose metadata to external search engines	X		
I.8a	Provide better searching for non-Roman materials	X		
III.1a	View UC cataloging as a single enterprise	X		
III.1b	Implement a single data store (single bib file)	X		
III.1b	Implement a single data store (single ILS)			X
III.3a	Enhance names, titles, series, and uniform titles for prolific authors	X		
III.4a.	Encourage vendor metadata creation and ingest it early in the process	X		
III.4b.	Import enhanced metadata when available	X		
I.6d.	Make our digital and unique collections available first within UC		X	
II.1a.	Create a single catalog interface		X	
II.2a.	Pre-harvest metadata for the entire bibliographic information space		X	
II.2b.	Provide result sets arranged by format grouped in terms of granularity		X	

III.3b.	Implement structured serial holdings format		X	
IVb.	Provide a robust reporting capability		X	
I.5a.	Implement FRBR concepts			X

		IMPLEMENTATION TIMETABLE		
MEDIUM PRIORITY		short	medium	long
I.3a.	Allow user to define the set of resources/databases to search	X		
I.4a.	Spell-checking	X		
I.4b.	Offer constructive suggestions for zero-results searches	X		
I.6b.	Embed library content and services into institutional portals	X		
I.7a.	Provide relevance ranking based on a broad set of criteria	X		
III.2a.	Use level of description/schema that is appropriate, not always MARC/AACR2	X		
III.2b.	Consider FAST			
III.4e.	Add enriched content (TOCs, etc.)	X		
IVa.	Institutionalize an ongoing process of identifying and prioritizing improvements	X		
I.1b.	Provide an "I want this" button with the goal of always offering a fulfillment option		X	
I.2a.	Provide both content- and filter-based recommender features		X	
III.2d.	Prefer allocating resources to catalog undiscoverable items; consider automated techniques for all textual materials		X	

Note: The sub-recommendations not listed here were considered Low priority by SCP AC.

- Are there any recommendations that you think should be added? **NO**
- Are there any recommendations that you think should NOT be pursued?
   III.2c Consider using controlled vocabularies only from name, uniform title, date and place and abandoning the use of controlled vocabularies for topical subjects in bibliographic records.
   Why not?
   We advocate the continued use of controlled vocabularies for topical subjects for more precise retrieval by subject. Controlled vocabularies are also important to searching across the many languages that are in the entire UC collection. Uncontrolled keywords are not an adequate substitute for topical access. Other search and retrieval improvements depend on controlled vocabulary.

FAST could be applied as a supplement, in support of faceted browse capability, but not as a replacement for pre-coordinated strings needed in browsing.

3-4. HOTS members on SCP AC shared near-final drafts of responses to questions 3, 4a, and 4b. SCP AC endorses those responses.

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 cataloging management team within UC should be charged to develop the single cataloging enterprise concept.

We also suggest that HOTS be charged with pursuit of a single data store for UC, an idea that originated with that group.

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

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.