POT 2-2 Charge

Version Date: September 1, 2011

Charge:
Define UC Cataloging record standards for the full range of collection resources, recommend when/how these practices are to be used, and implement across UC.

Members:
SOPAG Sponsor: Bernie Hurley (UCB)
Lisa Rowlison de Ortiz (UCB)
Linda Barnhart (UCSD)

Summary and Background: Starting with the UC minimal record standard and the BIBCO/CONSER Standard Record define and implement a "good enough" record standard for all original cataloging (including upgrades to OCLC low level records) in all formats of material, based on needs of selectors and users. Determine if one standard would work for all collections both newly received, backlogs and outsourced cataloging. Consider use of pilot projects such as the backlogs of Non-Roman and special collections and archives, as well as the prospective shared print projects to test and evaluate the standard(s). Consult with HOPS and CDC in defining the standards. Provide mechanisms for campus participation, discussion and vetting of proposed standard(s).

Assumptions to be tested:

Libraries will continue to utilize available full level OCLC catalog records. These minimal standards will only apply to original cataloging and updates to low level OCLC records and to requirements for vendor records.

Good enough records will result in a reduction of backlogs throughout the UC. Less average time from acquisition to user availability for all UC materials

Simplified and unified practices, starting with adoption of a record standard, will make UC collections more quickly discoverable. These will also help reduce the barriers to working in a single data file, and will increase efficiency through shared expectations and training.

All "good enough" records will be created in WorldCat, which will ensure upgrades via the OCLC Bibliographic Notification Service (for libraries with this service) as well as upgrades from other libraries

Establishing a "good enough" record standard will free up staff time so they may refocus efforts to other higher priority areas (e.g. unique resources; electronic and digital collections).

Much of original cataloging time is spent creating subject headings and in classification. To save any significant time, these activities will have to be somehow curtailed. Descriptive cataloging will also be reviewed for time savings.

UC collections and public services librarians to be consulted will agree that creating "good-enough" (lower-level) records is acceptable; even in cases where full original catalog records have been created in the past.

'Good enough' records will be made accessible in the larger WorldCat environment and other appropriate expert communities, thus easily accessible for iterative upgrading.

Expected Coordination:

Work with POT 3 to define a "good enough" record standard for all UC original cataloging that includes archives and manuscript collections.
Collection Service Centers recommendations (POT 6-1)
Prospective shared print activities
Shared Cataloging Program recommendations (POT 5)
Shelf-ready recommendations (POT 2-1)
Accelerate the processing of archival and manuscript collections (POT 3)

Expected Deliverables:
Near-Term within 6-12 months:

- Recommendation on UC Minimal Record standard definition and guidelines based on survey of campuses and vendors as to existing minimal record standards and use.
- Discussion paper on the benefits and losses to UC will be for implementing a "good enough" record (confer with HOPS and CDC) (e.g. frees up time so can use staff in other areas, unified practices, material accessible quickly, improvement by others, etc.)
- In conjunction with HOTS and CDC, share experiences or pilot test different levels of cataloging or processing analysis (as deemed necessary) for different types of materials. Assess cataloging and processing times and costs in creating different level records vs. use of the 'good enough' standard. For example, (1) full cataloging, (2) full cataloging limited to one subject heading, (3) cataloging with only subject keywords utilizing acceptable thesauri, (4) cataloging with no subject headings; and (5) cataloging with no subject headings or classification.
- Reduction of backlogs throughout the UC. Less average time from acquisition to user availability for all UC materials.
- Survey campus selectors and/or users to determine minimum needs in a bibliographic record.
- Training plan implemented for UC campuses and archivists.

- Timeline for full implementation

Longer Term:

In collaboration with HOPS, identify and assess impacts of systemwide use of the "good enough" record standard on library users.

References and Suggested Resources:
Enterprise-Level Collections Management Services report:
http://libraries.universityofcalifornia.edu/about/uls/ngts/docs/NGTS2_Enterprise_CS_Final_Report.pdf

UC minimal record standard: http://libraries.universityofcalifornia.edu/hots/minimal_marc_std.doc

BIBCO Standard Record Metadata Application Profiles (MAPS): http://www.loc.gov/catdir/pcc/bibco/BSR-MAPS.html

HOTS Non-Roman Backlog Reduction Task Force
http://libraries.universityofcalifornia.edu/hots/protected/HOTS%20Shelf%20Ready%20TF%20Report%20Final%205-24-10.pdf

Shared Print in Place Task Force Report

Consult with:

- Project Management Work Group (PMWG)
- LTAG as a resource to test technical assumptions
- CAMCIG
- Next Generation Melvyl
- HOPS, CDC for what selectors and users need and for vetting the standard.
- UC Berkeley and UCLA (both use minimal records)
- Vendors

Guidelines on using the Lightning Team structure and Project Management Working Group:

POTs may find the creation and charging of lightning teams useful in completing the deliverables outlined above. Lightning teams may be formed by the POTs as short-term groups charged with conducting pilot projects or other tasks with quick turnaround times. Membership of the teams should reflect the scope of the charge.

The POTs may also engage the Project Management Working Group for help in implementing these recommendations.

Questions involving policy-level issues should be referred to the NGTS Implementation Management Team.

Reporting:

- Submit monthly status reports by posting to the NGTS wiki, include citing any obstacles. See Status Report template.

Recommendation/Decision process:

The POT, having solicited appropriate input and consulted as indicated, makes routine operational decisions including the appointing of Lightning Teams. Recommendations from the Lightning Teams and pilot projects on services to be implemented, staffing models, system-wide policies and standards will be sent to CoUL via SOPAG and NGTSMT for final decision and approval.

Decisions on broad policy issues or issues that are determined to be outside the scope of the POT charge will be referred to SOPAG via NGTSMT for discussion and resolution.

Timeline:

Submit a proposed task list with milestones (delivery dates) and proposed use of Lightning teams by September 2. Include how work connects with other interdependent POTs. Include delivery dates. Include proposed definition of success criteria; should be specific, measurable and achievable.