BIBLIOGRAPHIC SERVICES TASK FORCE REPORT

COMMENTS FROM UCR

1. WHICH 3-5 MAJOR HEADINGS DO YOU THINK ARE MOST IMPORTANT FOR UC TO ADDRESS?

WHICH SUB-RECOMMENDATIONS SHOULD BE GIVEN HIGHEST PRIORITY?

1.5   Offer better navigation of large sets of search results

    I.5a   Implement FRBR concepts to present works hierarchically
    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

    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
        (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

3.3   Manually enrich metadata in important areas

    III3b: Implement structured serials holdings format

3.4   Automate metadata creation

    III.4a: Encourage the creation of metadata by vendors, and its ingestion into our catalog as early as possible

    III4b: Import enhanced metadata whenever possible

RECOMMENDATION TO CREATE A SINGLE PUBLIC CATALOG INTERFACE

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.

RECOMMENDATION TO RE-ARCHITECT THE CATALOGING WORKFLOW TO VIEW UC CATALOGING AS A SINGLE ENTERPRISE

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 an 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 to grow in ARL ranking.

We 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 without. General discussion of whether cooperative efforts could succeed followed.

WHICH OF THE THREE ARCHITECTURE OPTIONS WOULD YOU RECOMMEND

Adopt a single ILS for the entire system.

This recommendation was far from unanimous. Discussion included comments that it we already have Melvyl, will this be better? Is this really a service to patrons? If they find that UCB has a title they need tonight, that will be only frustrating. It might become just too massive.