

April 6, 2006

TO: Bernie Hurley, SOPAG Chair

FROM: Gail Nichols, RSC Chair

RE: RSC Response to the BSTF Report

The following summarizes comments from members of RSC on the Bibliographic Services Task Force Report. Members of RSC commented on the report as part of their local campus reports as well. Nearly every recommendation received at least some support as a priority from members of RSC.

1. Which 3-5 of the 15 major headings that we think are the most important for UC to address?

From RSC's perspective they are:

1. **II.1 Create a single catalog interface for all of UC**
2. **I.5 Offer better navigation of large sets of search results**
3. **I.6 Deliver bibliographic services where users are**

Other recommendations that received votes are:

4. **I.4 Alternatives for failed searches or suspect searches**
5. **I.7 Provide relevance ranking**
6. **IV Supporting continuous improvement**
7. **III.1 Rearchitect cataloging workflow**

2. For each of the 3-5 major headings, which of the sub-recommendations do we think should be given the highest priority; that is, which do you think UC should address first and why?

RSC identified the following:

1. **II.1 This heading has no subdivisions**
2. **I.5a RSC supports implementing the IFLA Functional Requirements for Bibliographic Records (FRBR) concepts**
3. **I.6 There was no consensus on which of the four is most important**

Of the other recommendations that received votes from RSC members:

4. **I.7a Provide relevance ranking based on a broad set of criteria**
5. **IVa. Institutionalize an ongoing development process**

Are there any recommendations that we think should be added? Why?

RSC had no recommendations to add to the report.

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

RSC did not identify any recommendations that should not be pursued.

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?

Some members of RSC thought outsourcing should be explored, perhaps through an ‘outsider’ such as Google, who might help us re-envision what a catalog is, or through OCLC, whose catalog has proven promise (see CSU). Creating our own based on open source principles could also be interesting.

Other committee members thought that creating a single UC OPAC system seems preferable to outsourcing. Outsourcing typically raises issues of cost, responsiveness, timeliness, and support. Using the UC experience with VDX as a real life example, developing one centrally run system that meets the needs of 10 different campuses will be a complex undertaking that will require resources at the systemwide level as well as varying degrees of systems expertise at the local campus. The issues of cost, responsiveness, timeliness, and support have all been challenges for the VDX implementation.

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.

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?

RSC is less comfortable commenting on this question, as it is generally further from our expertise. However, coordinating cataloging expertise seems best.

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?

Again, many in RSC are less comfortable making recommendations. That said, there is some support for all three options.

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?

This is an important, thoughtful and important report. 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.

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

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. 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.