

March 25, 2006

TO: Jenny Reiswig, LAUC President

FROM: Lillian Castillo-Speed, LAUC-B Chair, 2005-2006

RE: Bibliographic Services Task Force Report: Rethinking How We Provide
Bibliographic Services for the University of California

LAUC-B discussions have been very positive about the report. There is consensus that we need to move to one catalog with greater search capability and we are excited about the possibility of a more visual, more intuitive interface. There is also consensus that options should be explored for "re-architecting" the cataloging workflow, especially if this allows local staff more time to concentrate on undercataloged and specialized collections. The concerns lie in the implementation of these concepts. A major concern was that there would be enough funding to adequately implement these changes, especially in terms of hiring and training staff. In order to create an entirely new structure that would save money in the long term, these investments need to be made in the short term. The following is a distillation of comments from a general LAUC-B meeting on March 23, 2006.

I. Enhancing Search and Retrieval

Please continue to involve public service librarians in these discussions and explain to them the outcome of a technical decision.

We need to keep the ability to search by subject, even if as a practical matter we have to give up the creating of rigid LSCH strings.

FAST Syntax and FRBR sound interesting as means of pulling together information and records to enhance searching.

I. Rearchitecting the OPAC

A single system would be particularly useful for UCB, which has long tried to develop a single system for all of its campus libraries, but there will need to be a mechanism to limit a search to particular segments of the library system (e.g., to a particular branch library or particular affiliated library).

The organizational structure of staff, allowing for timely and flexible decision-making, also needs to be considered in setting up the architecture of the OPAC.

II. Adopting New Cataloging Practices

If the recommendation is to take short cuts to avoid duplicative cataloging of general-interest, modern materials, allowing staff to spend more time cataloging the under-cataloged materials, then that would be much appreciated.

A single record is sensible, but we do not want to lose specialist information. We want to enhance the catalog, not take away information.

We are already doing some of the specific enhancements and cooperative measures mentioned in the report (outsourcing cataloging to Marcnow Innovative Solutions, cooperative cataloging and copy cataloging, incorporating vendor information, lending our subject expertise to other campuses), but all this could be expanded.

In the one-record scenario, we will have to find a way to have separate records for each copy of a rare book or to include disparate information (e.g., provenance, collation, binding, etc.) about each copy. This is essential information for such material. There may be similar one-record issues for other types of materials also.

Can the Shared Cataloging Program of CDL be a model for UC-wide cataloging, with specialty sub-groups of music catalogers, law catalogers, etc.? As stated above, the organizational structure needs more thought. If the staff is centralized along with the ILS, will the staff be able to address the special character and strengths of each campus?

III. Supporting Continuous Improvement

Before continuous improvement, we assume that further task forces will have to be formed regarding the next steps in this decision-making process by the ULs and in the implementation of their decisions. We hope that we will be kept apprised of their thinking. Among other issues, the impact on staff needs and public confusion during any transition period will have to be considered and mitigated by diffusion of information.

March 21, 2006

TO: Jenny Reiswig, LAUC President

FROM: Karleen Darr, LAUC Davis Chair

RE: Bibliographic Services Task Force Report: Rethinking How We Provide
Bibliographic Services for the University of California

The LAUC-D membership met on March 2, 2006 primarily to discuss the Bibliographic Services Task Force Report: Rethinking How We Provide Bibliographic Services for the University of California (BSTF). We also held two brown bag lunches on March 8 and March 16 2006 on the BSTF report. Several other library forums were held, an all staff meeting, a public services focus group and several technical services focus meetings. I am reporting on the highlights of the LAUC-D discussions.

Several members remarked that these recommendations are based on a set of assumptions with which we don't necessarily agree. The chief example is the concept that the library is a competitor in the information marketplace. The other concept is the importance of instant gratification for students. The academic environment is a learning institution and the undergraduate experience involves the need to teach students how to do research in their discipline. UC Davis librarians emphasized that the sociology of information needs to be understood by users so they can search effectively in whatever database or system they encounter. It is important to teach how information is organized for life long learning.

There is a healthy culture of faculty and students who use local collections and interact heavily with librarians. Librarians are in the business to train users to identify, access and use bibliographic tools such as Google, Amazon and hundreds of others. The report addresses very large technology strategies from a centralized viewpoint and doesn't focus enough on the relationship between librarians and users.

Librarians recommended that the task force pursue faculty input on this sweeping report as it has tremendous implications for the user community. While the focus of the report is on the OPAC and cataloging services, there ought to be discussion and review of the entire cycle of information service functions which are necessarily affected, including collection development, reference, acquisitions, circulation, reserves, interlibrary loan and systems coordination.

Generally speaking, librarians agreed that the report makes many positive suggestions to improve search and retrieval. There were several recommendations which particularly resonated with LAUC-D members.

- **Create a single interface for all of UC (BSTF II.1).** This campus satisfactorily used Melvyl as its OPAC for many years. We recognize that this initiative involves many complex hurdles.
- **Support searching across the entire bibliographic information space (BSTF II.2).** Legacy Melvyl and the early databases were more seamless and user friendly interfaces, but not sustainable models.

- **Rearchitect cataloging workflow; Organization option: Coordinating cataloging expertise and practice across the entire system expanding the Shared Cataloging Program model (BSTF III.1).** LAUC-D librarians support the SCP model and encourage planners to pursue further cooperation among all of the UC libraries' cataloging units.
- **Implement structured serials holdings format (BSTF III.3b).** Summary serials holdings statements will not be adequate if we move to a single OPAC. This library has implemented the serials holdings standards such that detailed holdings are available for discovery.

The LAUC-D membership uniformly agreed that several recommendations should not be pursued.

- **Consider using controlled vocabularies only for name, uniform, title, date, and place, and abandoning the use of controlled vocabularies...** (BSTF III.2c). Controlled subject headings are critical for discovery and for filtering findings.
- **Organization option: Consolidate cataloging into one or two centers within UC (BSTF III.1).** This option was considered a reduction in service to our users. Librarians were concerned that the general turnaround time for material from acquisition to shelf would be adversely affected; subject areas or specific titles deemed critical to one campus would not receive urgent processing; cataloging customization for subject specialties would be discouraged.

The LAUC-D librarians acknowledge that information in the future will be primarily electronic. We need a way to go beyond the walls of the library and the limits of format to allow access. On the other hand, we are in a time of limited resources, we need to balance investment in new glitzy tools and not sacrifice or neglect to improve things that are at the core of what libraries do best.

Despite concerns, the members of LAUC Davis look forward to working to achieve the priorities which come out from this report through further discussion and analysis. Attached to my comments are notes from our LAUC-D meetings and an individual comment.

LAUC-D Membership Meeting, March 3, 2006
Bibliographic Services Task Force Report Discussion

Report is big with a lot of issues; one thing tends to build on another

There is an assumption/vision of how a library operates that is part of the report that may not be shared by all so it's difficult to deal with the individual issues (library as competitor in information marketplace, instant gratification for students)

We live in a culture of convenience; University is out there to educate. We shouldn't try to compete with Google. We're not after simplicity, we're after clarity. The goal has to be agreed on before you can know how to make changes.

Google really changed our landscape with search tools. We didn't used to have competition. Our search tool is a tool not the library itself. We create the data that organizes all of the information. We're at a place where there is a shift in direction where we use the tool that others have created to allow others to access our collections.

Merge the best of the commercial sector and traditional library services to make it better (isn't that the point of the report)

Usually the Public Services components are done at the end, I'm glad to see its prominence in this report; how do we get the information about books/articles to the public as well as can be done; most of our students realize that you do have to look at Google and other things to get at information to build your knowledge: combination of free text and controlled language; discuss accessing information and the best way to present it to the user are big issues and 2 different things

It's not easy for librarians either to know the best way; you pick a place to start and learn as you do research

Emphasize the user's point of view and not just the lowest common denominator; it behooves us to teach that the most simplistic approach is not the best way

Hum/soc sci students need to learn the sociology of information created by different groups of people with different vocabularies and different cultures so that way people can search in whatever databases they need to; Google doesn't provide transparency of culture; the library tries to display different cultures of information (LCSH for example); teach users how information is organized so they can take that to whatever setting; if you go into changing the catalog without that perspective in the forefront then it's too late; maybe another report that could include that perspective?

We risk becoming mediocre; we want to stand out and not just help others to be able to find those tools that everyone else can and is finding via Google so we can't just offer a simple tool that students use in a simple way; report is asking how library systems can work as best as they can not making us become Google; we're not trying to crawl the web

We need robust algorithm behind our search and good options for sorting and limiting results with lots of flexibility; there needs to be flexibility for specialized areas which report does allow for

Enriching our access points is what report says and that we still should have way of complex searches

Any system that we come up with needs to be amenable to novice user and the novice specialized results but want to be able to go in and find intelligent results; make it look intuitive as to how to access our rich resources; we're using more commercial databases that we haven't had input on the design

There are good specific suggestions for improving in the report; our catalog was developed before some of the techniques that exist today and we're ignoring that they exist; we could put more into the catalog; main item we might want to discuss is getting rid of controlled vocabulary

Controlled vocabulary and indexing points have been the strengths of much of our databases so we need to make sure that we don't lose those; maybe start out simple but then allow for refinement of search results; without controlled vocabulary you can't find what you want; the keywords that people are searching on typically come up in the LCSH and nowhere else

How might this go down with the faculty? What about their input?

Our controlled vocabulary discussion has really far reaching public services implications; the sample search in the report using "intelligent design" what if there are no subject headings/controlled vocabulary, then the metadata must be fairly extensive to pull up relevant information

Report mentioned working with curriculum support databases and integrating catalog info; med school and vet school are ramping up electronic curriculum and adding MeSH (Medical subject headings) to access courses materials

New hire in computer science dept from the private sector uses Google Scholar which works for her; as the academy changes we need to take into account what people are used to using

We're rushing towards new metadata schemes; MARC is old school but it was created to be able to support all of these sources; Dublin Core has limited set of elements; don't undermine all that we're trying to achieve

Sociology of information and different communities come up with different content languages for their own use; struggle is to bring all of those different resources into our world and put them in our collection to present to users; want maintain its individualness but bring some sort of order to allow one to search across them

We're working at a time of limited resources and we need to realize that; bells and whistles would be great but there's a risk of going for the new glitzy stuff and sacrificing or neglecting to improve things that are at the core of what libraries do best; report talks about related records that acts like we can't do those things but we can; if we could offer it all (the one box that brings up stuff they don't care about the result) that would be great but we don't have the money to do that

Librarian reports on one faculty member's view: library architecture has to change or it won't be in business anymore; we do need to change and some of the report's suggestions are good; we have wonderful collection but we do need to help people find it; we need to come up with one interface but need to come up with making data better too; make it more useable to patron

System wide catalog, economic benefits to centralizing cataloging activities as opposed to each campus doing it; Single OPAC; we had that at Davis and the users loved it; Melvyl worked very well; however you'd still have to have local holdings info

For cataloging CDL licensed electronic resources it's been good to have centralized cataloging; print resources need to have local selectors because each campus specializes in certain things

There's a different between one catalog and centralized cataloging; Harvest has more detailed journal holdings info that Melvyl doesn't have

As we move to shared print collections in repositories, summary holdings may be ok as we cancel things at individual campuses; we do need local holdings for shared information from other campuses; we have the advantage of both now; if it's too expensive to operate both, we need to figure out which approach is best for the users

Centralizing cataloging won't work for special collections where you have a lot of contact between dept staff and catalogers; Potential of loss of user service since our catalog shows that something is here but not processed but now we can physically go pull the item out of the queue and get it to the user: centralization might not allow for that; separate Reserve catalog has items that are not in the other catalog but a single catalog might not allow for that; if you could incorporate the "in process" and reserve catalogs then having "a" catalog would work

It can take hours to catalog material from special collections; if the catalog unit was well staffed then high powered teams of catalogers with language expertise and pre 1801 expertise would be better than local but concern regarding our piece of the pie v. UCLA/UCB; dept/cataloger discussion about special notes that are necessary; what about manuscripts?

TS rearchitecture: 3 recommendations from report; not any one of those options is the way to go, should be a mix; consolidation of cataloging is not well received; the opportunities across UC to see cataloging as single enterprise in coordinating and divvying up where the expertise lies allow for options to be looked at but not go down to one or 2 centers of cataloging

Doesn't think they're talking about geographically but instead that there will be various modules at each campus that would feed into a central catalog but doesn't see 10 campuses agreeing on 1 vendor and give up their own

Some parts of the report seemed to say there is duplication of cataloging but we already have shared in OCLC or RLIN; a lot of these sharing ideas would be simpler if we were on one ILS so one idea that's being discussed is a single ILS but it's such a huge long term goal; the needs expressed in the report about users can't wait for this; could have a long term goal with smaller short term goals

It's not whiz kids v. luddites; the task force is thinking broadly about an environment that's going to be strictly electronic and coming up with maximization of resources. The future holds an opportunity to go beyond walls of the library and formats but bring it all together with a search engine that's not limited to print or electronic or web or journals. That's the long term vision.

Brown Bag Lunch Meeting, March 8, 2006

Developing a single OPAC is attractive; want detailed holdings for serials

Notion of silos is not a bad formula; human knowledge falls into meaningful silos; often appropriate to start in the right silo; Google is moving towards silos; silos are important, make them more apparent by educating users; use logical simple messages to direct users from OPAC to journal article databases

Like to think of silos as the network highway which are in need of more road signs; we had more transparent common interface in legacy Melvyl, moved away from simplified access

Brown Bag Lunch Meeting, March 16, 2006

Need user perspective in the report: interview faculty, instructional librarians

Report is looking at bibliographic system- OPAC, cataloging and metadata records; need to include the rest of the bibliographic system, collection development, acquisitions, circulation, interlibrary loan, reserves, Systems coordination All of these components affect what your ILS is; important to address the entire cycle not just cataloging

Individual BSTF response from a librarian at UC Davis.

Many of the recommendations presented in this report are based on a perception of the University Library and its purpose with which I fundamentally disagree. According to the Task Force, our job is to “assist our users in finding what they need without demanding that they acquire specialized knowledge or select among an array of “silo” systems whose distinctions seem arbitrary.” The Task Force appears to believe that the library is in competition with “our ‘for profit’ peers” (Google, itunes, Amazon) in something they call the “information marketplace.”

This view of the library is inaccurate in many respects. The library is an academic institution, not a business. Academic research is not like shopping, it is a complex, creative process that entails insight and intelligence and an informed use of the tools and resources available to the researcher—whether first year student or senior scholar. In order to do their work properly, researchers must understand the production, organization and sociology of knowledge within their disciplines—precisely the specialized knowledge that the Task Force thinks it is unnecessary for them to acquire.

Although service is an important component of our work, so also is education. It is not the library’s job to “satisfy” a patron by dumping decontextualized information in his or her lap. The library’s job is to empower our patrons by teaching them about how knowledge is organized and authenticated in their disciplines and teaching them how to use the tools available to intelligently select the best materials available to answer their questions. The library is not in competition with Google or Amazon; those are simply freely available tools among the hundreds that we have at our disposal to help researchers at their tasks.

Thus, the goal of the library should not be to create a simple “Google-like” meta-search screen. Such simplification obscures the origins of the information provided as well as the reasons why a given set of results came up. As such it facilitates a dependence on the part of the researcher on one particular system. Instead of simplicity our goal should be clarity, enabling the patron to comprehend both the reasons why a given set of results was returned and what the nature and authority of the returned information might be. In this way, we empower researchers to understand and control of the search and retrieval process, not leave them dependent on what happens behind the scene.

If the library’s purpose is understood in this way, then the Task Force’s recommendations on where to expend the library systems’ limited resources fall into three categories. 1. Beneficial; 2. Neutral, or of low priority; 3. Should not be pursued. I have added a fourth category of items on which I do not have sufficient knowledge to comment.

Task Force Recommendations that would be beneficial to implement (first three are in order of priority):

I.8a: Provide better searching for non-Roman materials, allowing searching in both Roman and in the vernacular, sorting results in language-appropriate ways, and displaying results in both Roman and vernacular forms.

I.5b: Follow all of the linking fields in serial records to present all of the variant titles to users in a “family tree.”

I.6d: Make our digital and unique collections available first within the UC community, then facing outwards.

I.5a: 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).

I.5c: Implement faceted browsing based on sophisticated analysis of the contents of the records.

II.1a: 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

III.3a: Enhance name, main title, series titles, and uniform titles for prolific authors in music, literature, and special collections.

Task Force Recommendations that would be of neutral impact, or useful but of low priority (unranked)

I.1a:

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.

I.1b: 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.

I.4a: Assess a user’s input for 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.

I.4b: 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.

III.4e: 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.

Task Force Recommendations that should not be pursued (unranked)

I.2a: Provide both content and filter based recommender features, which mine information in the bibliographic records, holdings information, aggregated use data, and the like, to offer suggestions of other works of interest.

I.3a: Allow user to define the set of resources/databases s/he wishes to search simultaneously, including a broader set of resources than those supported by current metasearch tools, such as Google restricted to .edu domains, museum and archive databases, and the like.

I.6a: Enable library content and services to be integrated within campus virtual learning environments/course management systems (VLE/CMS), e.g., Sakai, WebCT, Blackboard, etc.

I.6b: Enable library content and services to be embedded in institutional portals.

I.7a: 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.

I.7b: Use full text for discovery and relevance ranking when available. [*ok for discovery, not relevance ranking*]

II.2a: Pre-harvest metadata for the entire bibliographic information space that represents UC library collections for ease of searching.

II.2b: Provide result sets arranged by format, grouped in terms of granularity and other facets, together with user options to rearrange the default order.

III.2b: 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.

III.2c: 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. [*controlled vocabularies should never be abandoned*]

III.4a: Encourage the creation of metadata by vendors, and its ingestion into our catalog as early as possible in the process. [*My concern here is quality control.*]

III.4b: Import enhanced metadata whenever, wherever it is available from vendors and other sources. [*My concern here is quality control.*]

Task Force Recommendations that I cannot assess (unranked)

I.6c: Expose our metadata to external search engines as thoughtfully as possible.

III.1a: 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.

III.1b: Implement a single data store for UC, be it a single file of cataloging records or the entire ILS.

III.2d: In allocating resources to descriptive and subject metadata creation, consider giving preference to those items that are completely undiscoverable without it, such as images, music, numeric databases, etc. Consider whether automated metadata creation techniques can be used for all textual materials.

III.3b: Implement structured serials holdings format.

III.4c: Automate the addition of geographic data into our catalog to support existing services, and to support emerging services.

III.4d: 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.” [*note that the workflow at UCD is “Acquire-Evaluate-Catalog-Put on Shelf”*]

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.

IVb: Provide robust reporting capability (data warehouse).

The following scenario illustrates some of the concerns I have about the impact of the philosophy and changes recommended in the Task Force Report.

A student is writing a paper on the Amistad Mutiny and his professor has required the use of primary sources like letters and diaries for this paper. The student goes to the simple search box provided by the library on his personal website and types in “Amistad diary book.” He neither knows nor cares what sets of records are being searched, and intentionally or not, the decontextualized library search box endorses his disinterest.

A long list of titles shows up on his screen and a relevance sorting algorithm that weights the presence of search terms in the title puts this book near the top of the list. The diary of Kagne, Amistad captive, 1839-41, by Dorothy Tegeler. It sounds perfect. The student clicks the UC-eLinks and finds to his disappointment that it is not held in the UC system.

So the student selects the elinks option to try to buy the book. If it’s not too expensive, it would be worth it. A number of online bookstores offer the title for sale, along with many other works by Dorothy Tegeler, who mostly seems to write about Arizona. However, none of the stores have it in stock.

The student then clicks the elinks button for Interlibrary loan knowing that it might take a little more time, but confident in the library’s ability to satisfy his needs.

Two days later, to his satisfaction, he receives an email with a pdf version of the book attached. It shows that the original is in the Connecticut State Historical Society. The library has delivered, yet again and saved him the price of the book. He writes the paper citing this primary source and goes to bed happy.

What’s wrong? The diary of Kagne, Amistad captive, 1839-41, by Dorothy Tegeler is a real item. You can look it up on Google and you will find it listed for sale at more than a dozen

bookstore sites, including Amazon. But none of them actually have it available. You will also find it in WorldCat, held by the Connecticut State Historical Society. The combination of rapid ingest of records, and the for-profit world's desire to meet users' expectations for "simplicity and immediate reward" have led to the appearance that this is a widely available credible source by a known author. But it is not. The Diary of Kagne was written in the 1990s as a homework assignment by my niece, (not the Arizona author) then an elementary school student in Connecticut. I don't know how a copy landed in the State Historical Society. I thought the story of its online existence was just funny until I read the the BSTF report and realized how easily the above scenario could come to pass if libraries, emphasizing service over education and satisfaction over informed understanding, model themselves on Amazon and Google. Will the student and/or professor ever realize the mistake?

SOPAG BSTF Report – LAUC-LA Summary - March 21, 2006

This document is a summary of the complete LAUC-LA response to the SOPAG call for comments on the BSTF Report. For each of the six sections of the report we have attempted to provide a brief summary of the themes and/or issues expressed at two brown bag sessions and by means of responses to a survey. You will find the complete survey results and the comments from the two Brown Bag sessions in the Word document titled: SOPAG BSTF REPORT LAUC-LA Tally 3-20-06. We thank all who attended the Brown Bags and responded to the survey for their helpful and insightful comments.

LAUC-LA Library Plans and Policies Committee

Hannah Walker, Chair

Esther Grassian

Cynthia Lewis

Katalin Radics

Carol Sommer

Overview

It is clear that LAUC-LA members want the Library to provide better service to users, and most support a number of the recommendations in the Report. Among the headings, direct access to items (I.1) and better navigation of search results (I.5) received the largest number of votes, followed by offering alternative actions for failed or suspect searches (I.4), better searching for non-Roman materials (I.8), and creating a single catalog interface for all of UC (II.1).

Votes for subheadings reinforced these preferences, with I.1.b. (an “I want this” button) receiving the largest number of votes, followed by II.1.a. (creating a single catalog interface). III.1.a. (viewing UC cataloging as a single enterprise) and I.4.b (offering constructive suggestions for zero results), , a strong indication of LAUC-LA members’ awareness of the need to improve aid to users, streamline cataloging practice, and take fuller advantage of cataloging expertise across UC.

Votes for the next two subheadings, again, support improved searching capabilities— I.5.c (implement faceted browsing), and I.8.a. (improve searching for non-Roman materials). IV.a. tied with I.5.c and I.8.a., and indicate LAUC-LA members’ awareness of and support for continuous review, identification and prioritization of improvements to bibliographic services.

However, LAUC-LA members also expressed serious concerns regarding various recommendations in the Report. These concerns revolve around 5 main issues:

1. Resources needed to support the recommendations.
2. Effectiveness of proposed changes.
3. Need to maintain use of controlled vocabularies for topical subjects.
4. A one-size fits-all approach that does not address subject expertise, special and multimedia collections of all kinds, and local needs, including the time-critical needs of undergraduates.
5. Need to maintain individual cataloging centers at each campus and share expertise across the system.

We appreciate the opportunity to provide input regarding the BSTF Report. We hope that the ULs and SOPAG will continue to draw upon the expertise of LAUC members as we fulfill our important advisory role regarding proposed policies and plans for the UC libraries.

GENERAL COMMENTS

- Some people found the recommendations too radical and unrealistic ("a list of fantastical desiderata"); others thought they were timely and right on point, particularly making subject and unique collections more visible and ability to search across bibliographic space.
- Some thought that problems listed in the report could be eliminated with better management of cataloging; others considered the implementation of most or many of the recommendations to be necessary in order to solve those problems.
- In the rapidly changing environment where Google and Yahoo are taking over, all we can do is infiltrate their systems, expose our data to them more than we have up to now, and embrace the required changes regarding broadening of metadata schemes with which we work.
- Many of the recommendations require serious commitment of resources and have implications far beyond the catalog and cataloging. There was concern about where UC will find the resources to implement these recommendations if they are approved.
- The UC is a favorable environment, a natural context for cooperation.
- The report is difficult to understand; uses a lot of jargon and fuzzy concepts. It is difficult to see in which directions the recommendations will lead the library system.
- Certain elements have been underrepresented in the report, including public service, subject liaisons, and subject specialists.

VOTE TALLIES AND COMMENTS: HEADINGS AND SUB-HEADINGS

Votes – headings (in decreasing order by number of votes):

- I.1 Provide users with direct access to item [7]
- I.5 Offer better navigation of large sets of search results [7]
- I.4 Offer alternative actions for failed or suspect searches [5]
- I.8 Provide better searching for non-Roman materials [5]
- II.1 Create a single catalog interface for all of UC [5]

- III.3 Manually enrich metadata in important areas [4]
- III.1 Rearchitect cataloging workflow [3]
- I.2 Provide recommender features [2]
- I.6 Deliver bibliographic services where the users are [2]
- II.2. Support searching across the entire bibliographic information space [2]
- III.4 Automate Metadata Creation [2]
- I.3 Support customization/personalization [1]
- I.7 Provide relevance ranking and leverage full-text [1]
- III.2. Select the appropriate metadata scheme. [0]

Votes—subheadings (in decreasing order by number of votes)

- I.1b:** 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. [7]

- II.1a:** 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 [5]

- ❑ **III.1a:** 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. [5]
- ❑ **I.4b:** 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. [5]
- ❑ **I.5c:** Implement faceted browsing based on sophisticated analysis of the contents of the records. [4]
- ❑ **I.8a:** Provide better searching for non-Roman materials, allowing searching in both Roman and in the vernacular, sorting results in language-appropriate ways, and displaying results in both Roman and vernacular forms. [4]
- ❑ **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. [4]
- ❑ **I.4a:** Assess a user's input for 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. [3]
- ❑ **I.5a:** 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). [3]
- ❑ **II.2b:** Provide result sets arranged by format, grouped in terms of granularity and other facets, together with user options to rearrange the default order. [3]
- ❑ **III.3a:** Enhance name, main title, series titles, and uniform titles for prolific authors in music, literature, and special collections. [3]
- ❑ **I.1a:** 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.) [2]
- ❑ **I.6a:** Enable library content and services to be integrated within campus virtual learning environments/course management systems (VLE/CMS), e.g., Sakai, WebCT, Blackboard, etc. [2]
- ❑ **III.4a:** Encourage the creation of metadata by vendors, and its ingestion into our catalog as early as possible in the process. [2]
- ❑ **III.4c:** 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. [2]

- I.2a:** Provide both content and filter based recommender features, which mine information in the bibliographic records, holdings information, aggregated use data, and the like, to offer suggestions of other works of interest. [1]
- I.5b:** Follow all of the linking fields in serial records to present all of the variant titles to users in a “family tree.” [1]
- I.6c:** Expose our metadata to external search engines as thoughtfully as possible. [1]
- I.6d:** Make our digital and unique collections available first within the UC community, then facing outwards. [1]
- I.7a:** 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. [1]
- II.2a:** Pre-harvest metadata for the entire bibliographic information space that represents UC library collections for ease of searching. [1]
- III.1b:** Implement a single data store for UC, be it a single file of cataloging records or the entire ILS. [1]
- III.3b:** Implement structured serials holdings format. [1]
- III.4b:** Import enhanced metadata whenever, wherever it is available from vendors and other sources. [1]
- III.4c:** Automate the addition of geographic data into our catalog to support existing services, and to support emerging services. [1]

- I.3a:** Allow user to define the set of resources/databases s/he wishes to search simultaneously, including a broader set of resources than those supported by current metasearch tools, such as Google restricted to .edu domains, museum and archive databases, and the like. [0]
- I.6b:** Enable library content and services to be embedded in institutional portals. [0]
- I.7b:** Use full text for discovery and relevance ranking when available. [0]
- III.2a:** 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. [0]
- III.2b:** 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. [0]
- III.2c:** 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. [0]
- III.2d:** In allocating resources to descriptive and subject metadata creation, consider giving preference to those items that are completely undiscoverable without it, such as images, music, numeric databases, etc. Consider whether automated metadata creation techniques can be used for all textual materials. [0]
- III.4d:** 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.” [0]
- IVb:** Provide robust reporting capability (data warehouse). [0]

Question 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 following would you recommend, and why?

- Creating a single UC OPAC system [3]
- Outsourcing the UC OPAC (to OCLC, RedLightGreen, Google, etc) [3]

Question 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.

-If a decision is made to pursue this recommendation, which of the following organization options would you recommend, and why?

- Coordinate cataloging expertise and practice across the entire system. [6]
- Consolidate cataloging into one or two centers within UC. [0]
- Outsource a greater proportion of standard cataloging work. [1]

If a decision is made to pursue this recommendation, which of the following three architecture options would you recommend and why?

- Create a shared central file with a single copy of each bibliographic record. [3]
- Adopt a single ILS for the entire University of California system. [1]
- Rely on OCLC as the single UC database of record for bibliographic data. [0]

THEMES AND COMMENTS – HEADINGS AND SUB-HEADINGS

General:

- Report geared to undergrad needs; what about other needs—e.g., Special Collections
- Undergrads would probably welcome federated searching
- Favor one interface for UC

Controlled vocabulary:

- Users may not be aware of importance—we are

1.1. Provide users with direct access to item

- Can't always rely on UC-eLinks
 - problems with book chapters—doesn't always work
 - looping back and forth to Expanded Academic ASAP
 - some items not linked even if we license them
- Preference for “I want this” button next to choices, rather than UC-eLinks automatically taking you somewhere—confusing for users

1.4. Offer alternative actions for failed or suspect searches

- Strong support for both options—spelling error suggestions and zero results alternative suggestions

1.5 Offer better navigation of large sets of search results

- Admiration expressed for NCSU's faceted searching, but including controlled vocabulary.

1.8 Provide better searching for non-Roman materials

- Strong support for this recommendation, especially for search capability in vernacular scripts.

II.1 Provide a single catalog interface for all of UC

- Very strong support for this recommendation, as long as it works well.

- Need to be aware that this recommendation is for a single OPAC, not necessarily a tool that would search across databases.
- Single OPAC for UC would make for more efficient teaching and learning, and could save money currently invested in leasing, customizing and maintaining a number of different catalogs.
- Concerns re MELVYL and the fact that it doesn't work well at present; questions about whether or not this would be a single OPAC, or would be a single system for all functions. If the latter, would need to be aware of potential problems with cataloging (local customization), acquisitions, invoice payment, etc.

III.1. Re-architect cataloging workflow

- Strong support for doing more to share expertise across UC, though concern about motivation—cost-cutting, job elimination?

III.2. Select the appropriate metadata scheme

- Great concern regarding III.2c, proposed use of controlled vocabularies only for name, uniform title, date, and place.

III.4. Automate Metadata Creation

- Concern about for which types of materials this would be available, and at what quality.
- Additional concern about the ethics of relying on vendors to provide this data, especially summaries of materials, when vendors are geared to selling those materials. Some feeling that III.4e could be considered part of recommender systems, yet may be of marginal importance in comparison to other features.

IV. Supporting Continuous Improvement

- Support for IV.a. Institutionalize an ongoing process of identifying and prioritizing improvements to our bibliographic services, in such a way that we get more than incremental improvements, especially keeping track of new developments and research.

NOTES/THEMES/COMMENTS: Question 3

- Most people did not have a problem with having one single catalog interface for all of UC, but many expressed concerns regarding ILL, serials check in, access to specialized databases, and SRLF checking.
- Some felt that it wasn't feasible and needed more study before even trying to implement. Some felt that there were more immediate issues (e.g. "getting ILL to work better") and smaller projects that needed attention.
- Concerns expressed about local cataloging practices on the different campuses and the need to have a consensus on how various materials would be handled (e.g. archives) UC-wide.
- One person thought that users would be overwhelmed with "too much information" and suggested the ability to limit to a particular format (e.g. books, periodicals, etc.).
- Concern that the financial impact of having one catalog interface isn't discussed. Does it save money?
- 3 votes in favor of creating a single UC OPAC system. It was felt that "we have more control"; "easier and faster to make changes"; and "reduced vulnerability to outages" if done in-house.

- 2 votes in favor of outsourcing. Felt that "staff time is precious" and shouldn't be diverted into creating an in-house system. One felt that "territorialism and local practices have always gotten in the way" and that outsourcing would also be more cost efficient.

NOTES/THEMES/COMMENTS: Question 4

- Doesn't make sense to physically move catalogers; critical to retain local cataloging expertise for specialized collections
- Advantages of coordination: capitalize on strengths of the different campuses; use cooperative cataloging as way to process various specialized materials, including foreign languages, digital collections
- Build on existing cooperative cataloging programs at the national level
- No support for the idea of consolidating cataloging into one or two centers; alternatives to explore include hiring relevant specialists to handle materials for several campuses
- Creating a shared central file is viewed as problematic: concerns about separate campus materials fund operations, whole range of acquisitions process
- A single UC ILS might be desirable from a public service view but there is concern that no product currently would support it

NOTES/THEMES/COMMENTS: Question 5

- Several questioned who the audience for this is. There is a sense it's for undergraduates and lacks appreciation for the needs of the wider community of scholars we serve.
- A strong recommendation that the survey should be widened to different user groups to test stated assumptions and that the report should be redone.
- Need to have a UC-wide forum to address issues raised in the report
- Strong comments about the debate on subject headings
- Call for continuous review, evaluation to allow us to keep pace with the times
- A request that we receive a clear response about this process

NOTES/THEMES/COMMENTS: Question 6

- Check with users regarding recommendations in the Report.
- Support "hard research" into assumptions in the Report re benefits to users regarding authority control, relevance ranking, recommender features and controlled vocabulary
- Address need for clear and simple help
- Consult with public services librarians

LIBRARIANS ASSOCIATION OF THE UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

BERKELEY • DAVIS • IRVINE • LOS ANGELES • MERCED • RIVERSIDE • SAN DIEGO • SAN FRANCISCO



SANTA BARBARA • SANTA CRUZ

RIVERSIDE DIVISION

P.O. BOX 5900, RIVERSIDE, CALIFORNIA

92517-5900

March 21, 2006

TO: Jenny Reiswig, LAUC President

FROM: Kenneth Furuta, LAUC Riverside Chair

RE: Bibliographic Services Task Force Report: Rethinking How We Provide
Bibliographic Services for the University of California

The following is a summary of the LAUC-R discussion on the Bibliographic Services Task Force Final Report. LAUC-R met March 14, 2006 to consider the report.

In preparation for the discussion I worked with the Executive Board, as well as Sharon Scott, UCR's representative to SOPAG, and Margaret Hogarth, LAUC-R Secretary. We focused on those recommendations that created the most conversation through other channels since an exploration of the complete report would require more time than allotted for a membership meeting. In addition, I led the LAUC-R membership in the creation of a group ranking of all the recommendations.

The membership realized that the report goes beyond a simple re-writing of interfaces and addresses a paradigm shift in the provision of services. We approached the discussion as an opportunity to explore which pieces are most critical and to discover what is missing.

The meeting began with an exploration of the most talked about recommendations. They were:

II.1a: 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.

III.1a: 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.

III.4d: 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.”

Discussion

Recommendation II.1a lent itself to the exploration of users needs. Any system must be based on those needs. (We noted that researched-based user studies are not highlighted in the bibliography.) We serve a wide range of patrons; from high school students to full professors. Each group has different skills and information needs. Thus, “One size fits all,” may not fit all groups well.

The conversation then turned to the concept of one catalog for all UCs. (As background, we were told that there is strong support for the idea in other discussions.) We were unsure how the proposed system compared with Melvyl. It was noted that UCR used Melvyl as the OPAC years ago and that didn’t cause too much confusion.

A single interface might reduce “slogging” through to discover a title. On the other hand, would that cause more confusion, e.g., a southern campus freshman wondering where the Bancroft library is for a paper due tomorrow? Another comment questioned if this was “dumbing” things down too much by emphasizing the return of results at the expense of more precise searching offered by individual databases.

A different thread arose in this part of the dialogue. We questioned the limits of the proposed system. Why focus it on just the UCs, why not use OCLC as the catalog? Further, why constrain the proposal to books only; why not merge all the databases we can access?

There was concern about the emphasis on cost-savings as compared to the potential loss of local customization of catalog records. We also commented that this might have an impact on UCR’s local Link+ agreement with area libraries.

The LAUC-R membership next turned its attention to recommendation III.1a. Advantages included the thought that a few centers will make it easier to agree on cataloging practices than the current distributed model. In addition, it will focus expertise, such as languages, in those few locations. Finally, we noted that it’s difficult to recruit and train catalogers. The model could compensate for that.

The disadvantages are the potential loss of flexibility in creating localized records. For example, will Tier 2 databases or special collections materials receive the level of description necessary? Transporting material for cataloging to and from the center(s) may be time consuming and costly. The membership speculated that the proposal will result in job loss for current staff at a time when it is difficult to recruit and train catalogers.

Additional questions included why cataloging was selected as the starting point in the process. It is “downstream” from collection development and acquisitions. There is a 70% overlap of material in the UCs. Collaborative collection development and acquisitions could reduce duplication. However, that duplication is not necessarily a bad thing. Not only does it quickly serve local users, but it enables UC libraries grow in ARL ranking.

Next the LAUC-R membership explored cataloging practices under the proposed model. We noted differences that would have to be resolved. (A rhetorical question was raised, if this is the

main issue, then why hasn't it been resolved already?) We also wondered if the larger campuses would drive the process. For brief records we noted that the line is vague between those with sufficient information and those with less than that. A general discussion of whether cooperative efforts could succeed followed. It was noted that either Ohio or Illinois has implemented a similar model.

The exchange for recommendation III.4d was brief. It was noted that the discussion on it has dwindled in other channels. Comments included that this is a "backlog waiting to happen," and questions on the quality/accuracy of vendor supplied records.

Areas the membership thought weak in the report included the impression that it is written from the Technical Services point of view. We also questioned the budget projection and cost savings. Finally, we noted that it will be difficult to implement the recommendations and that the proposal requires more research and thought.

LAUC-R General Meeting Rankings:

As a group, the members ranked all of the recommendations in order of importance. We then ranked the sub-recommendations of the top three. The list below gives the top three recommendations, the votes received, and sub-recommendations voted most important.

1.5 - Offer better navigation of large sets of search results (7)

I.5a: 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).

I.5b: Follow all of the linking fields in serial records to present all of the variant titles to users in a "family tree."

1.1 - Provide users with direct access to item (4)

1.1a: The more important of the sub-recommendations - 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.)

2.2 - Support searching across the entire bibliographic information space (4) (The sub-recommendations are tied together).

II.2a: Pre-harvest metadata for the entire bibliographic information space that represents UC library collections for ease of searching.

II.2b: Provide result sets arranged by format, grouped in terms of granularity and other facets, together with user options to rearrange the default order.

1.3 - Support customization/personalization (3)

1.4 - Offer alternative actions for failed or suspect searches (3)

2.1 - Create a single catalog interface for all of UC (3)

- 3.3 - Manually enrich metadata in important areas (3)
- 1.6 - Deliver bibliographic services where the users are (1)
- 1.7 - Provide relevance ranking and leverage full-text (1)
- 1.8 - Provide better searching for non-Roman materials (1)
- 3.2 - Select the appropriate metadata scheme (1)
- 3.4 - Automate Metadata Creation (1)
- 4 - Supporting Continuous Improvement (1)

Summation

The report generated an interesting discussion in our meeting. We welcome the opportunity to continue that dialog.