

3/29/06

TO: SOPAG

FR: Lorelei Tanji (UCI SOPAG Liaison)

RE: UCI Libraries Response to the BSTF Report

The UCI Libraries supports the overall direction of the Bibliographic Services Task Force Report and recommendations. We appreciate the Task Force members' vision in outlining many of the issues that the UC Libraries as a system needs to grapple with in terms of providing improved and enhanced bibliographic services to UC users. We also strongly endorse the Task Force's approach in keeping the needs and expectations of users as the focus of all the recommendations within the report.

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

UCI response: There were numerous discussions about the BSTF Report within the UCI Libraries, including an initial library-wide discussion where one of the BSTF TF members (Luc Declerck) was invited to participate as a resource. Acknowledging that some of the TF recommendations were related to each other, these were the top 5 recommendations that UCI felt were most important for UC to address.

I.1 Provide direct access to item

I.5 Offer better navigation of large sets

II.1 Create single catalog interface for UCs

II.2 Support search across entire bib info space

III.1 Re-architect cataloging workflow

And these were the reasons why they were our top picks:

Provide users with direct access to item:

- Users want direct access to full-text content with as few clicks as possible
- From the user's perspective, most similar to Google searching
- Addresses the final and most direct action and satisfaction for the user
- Provide the best match to users needs
- Should include all formats
- This is why users search – to get the item

Offer better navigation of large sets of search results

- Direct access and a single catalog interface will result in a huge retrieval so we will need to offer a method for users to navigate large sets of results.

Create a single catalog interface for all of UC

- Everything flowing from a single catalog interface would create one-stop shopping from which everything else flows
- But we should analyze the challenges faced when Melvyl was created and learn from past experience
- If the single catalog interface is constructed correctly, it will address the other two recommendations: direct access and better navigation of large sets.
- Robust metadata will allow the single catalog to search multiple information spaces and return meaningful results

Support search across entire bib info space

- Currently we have content in numerous silos; this will address our users desire to search and retrieve different types of content on their subject
- Metadata will be the key to successful and effective searching
- Controlled vocabularies will still be important
- Need new discovery tools
- Does not matter whether content is from a single data store or several data stores, we need a tool that will allow users to harvest from all data stores

Re-architect cataloging workflow

- Seek efficiencies and economics of scale; minimize duplication of effort
- Be willing to accept shared/standard policies and reduction of local variability
- Spend less time on materials owned by several campuses and deploy energy on cataloging unique materials for the benefit of the system.

2. 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?

For I.1 – Provide users with direct access to users. There was a split of opinion between whether I.1a UC elinks or I.1b “I-want-this” button was more important. Both are important. What is essential to both options is the “artificial intelligence” to know what our users want and to make those direct connections to the content.

For I.5 – Better navigation of large sets of search results. Again there were varying opinions amongst the sub-recommendations. All have merits and all will be needed since I.5.a FRBR is especially relevant for monographs; I.5.b addresses links between serials records; and I.5.c faceted browsing will enhance user searching.

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

- 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

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

- Eliminating controlled vocabularies is a controversial issue that warrants wide discussion:
 - Should not pursue recommendation to remove controlled vocabulary especially with MESH vocabularies
 - Pro’s: added value for user
 - Con’s: arcane, labor intensive, does not reflect current vernacular
 - Discipline specific vocabulary can be extremely helpful or hindrance
 - Considerations of the pros and cons of keyword searching

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

- UC wants more than what is available in the market place; will need to prioritize which features/functionality are most important if a system can't do it all
- Building our own OPAC will keep legacy cataloging intact. We need to recognize and maintain the intellectual input originally behind these records. At the same time, 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
- Possibly better able to capture unique aspects, especially in terms of individual campus identity
- Concern expressed about sustainability to create and maintain our own OPAC
- We understand that there are at least two approaches that can be taken; we can build on top of the existing "catalog" or we can build an infrastructure without the "catalog"

Outsourcing the UC OPAC (to OCLC, RedLightGreen, Google, etc)

- We need to understand the implication for local cataloging practice and understand what we would need to let go in terms of localized expectations or practices
- Are there other consortia that have been successful in using a single OPAC, such as OHIOlink?
- There is concern about legacy records data. Although these records may be messy, a one-size-fits-all catalog will lose unique and special data; there may be exceptions
- If we outsource to commercial vendors, we need to know if the vendor can come through with the end product
- Need mechanisms for ensuring performance and quality control

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?

- We agree that users want a single point of entry; they want things to be simple and direct, but if that does not work they want to know the array of choices
- There were many suggestions for hybridization with some home-grown features to design and manage the OPAC; we agree that it would be good to outsource some of the more commercial aspects
- Need to think globally and holistically about bibliographic services
- How does this plan relate to efforts to build institutional repositories?
- We should use our (UC) influence to change commercial/business models

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?

- Many respondents want a combination of all three, depending on type of cataloging
- Centralization may not mean physical centralization, but virtual centralization through better coordination
- Will need better coordination of UC-wide workflow
- Centralization as a business model has produced substantial savings
- It is important to ensure that centralization does not result in bottlenecks
- We hope that 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
- Eliminate duplicate effort
- 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.

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.* For this option, concern was expressed about local notes especially for Special Collections. They are very important for research in providing provenance and ownership. Local cataloging is specific to research needs on the local level though we acknowledge that the single record does not necessarily prevent local notes
- *Adopt a single ILS for the entire University of California system.*
- *Rely on OCLC as the single UC database of record for bibliographic data.* May have limitations. This needs further investigation.

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?

- Need to understand more fully what our users want
- Pursue research into realistic user expectations
- Need to do detailed inventory of what we have and how we function
- Also assessment of collection needs over time and a better understanding of collection delivery models
- Institutional repository – explore how IRs will be mined for content by users via-a-vis other content sources
- Take a holistic systems analysis approach in analyzing what we expect to get out of new library system
- Consider what librarians want. How do we use these tools?
- Use current real student and faculty for usability studies
- Take into account all workflows (acquisitions, access services, etc.) not just cataloging workflow

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

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

- We need to keep as the central goal—connecting users to the content
- We are at the mercy of commercial vendors such as interfaces and data to databases; we need to demand more usable interfaces or have them develop interfaces that we need/can use; we need to lobby vendors for better products
- Continue to identify and maintain local collections
- We need to develop and use robust assessment tools, and create cross campus collaborations where effective.
- If the single catalog interface is pursued, we want to see a prototype
- UCs need to explore and make accessible more remote information resources. It is their responsibility as repositories of historical records to also maintain the past and access to it.
- We need to articulate the next steps in the process. Will the process be transparent? What will be the level of sharing during the next processes?
- 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.
- We think this is a great start and hope many of the report recommendations will come to fruition