# Executive Summary and Recommendations: Melvyl Configuration and Electronic Resources Project Team

August 28, 2015 Prepared by Lena Zentall (CDL, task force chair) and the project team: Holly Eggleston (CDL), Lynne Grigsby (SAG2 liaison, UCB), Cynthia Johnson (UCI), Adriana Moran (nominated by CLS, UCSD), Patrick Shannon (UCB). The team recruited Margery Tibbetts (CDL) as a consultant.

The changes we are proposing to Melvyl will transform it from a union catalog of resources to which all campuses have UC-wide access, to a discovery platform that is unique to each campus. Each campus will experience different search results depending on the resources they license. We have heard from library staff that for the most part, they are ready to embrace the addition of Tier 2 and Tier 3 resources in the Central Index.

The team reviewed the six "areas to consider" from the charge (see Appendix A) and briefly summarized our findings in each area. Supporting evidence and further details are available in the appendix documents.

### General Recommendations

The team identified two viable models. These options can be combined. At minimum, we recommend model A. Model B can be added to Model A.

1. **Continue centralized model with the addition of CDL-managed Tier 2's.** CDL would manage Tier 1 and 2 databases for each Melvyl instance for CDL-managed licenses. Campus-managed Tier 2 and 3 databases would not be added.
2. **Switch to a distributed model**. CDL would manage Tier 1 and 2 databases for each Melvyl instance for CDL managed licenses. And, campuses would manage Tier 2 and 3 databases for campus-managed licenses.

**We recommend Model A.**

We recommend CDL take on the additional work of adding CDL-managed Tier 2 databases to campus Melvyl instances. This is already part of CDL's workflow so would represent only a small increase in workload. Adding Tier 2's would increase Central Index databases available to campuses by 24% (using April 2015 data; varies depending on what each campus licenses.)

Currently, CDL has activated 89 (Tier 1) databases in Central Index out of 116 that could be activated if CDL added Tier 2's. A growing trend is the blurring of the line between tier 1 and 2: fewer campuses are participating in tier 1 licenses with all 10 campuses, and more are participating in tier 2 licenses with 4 or more campuses. This means more databases will continue to be available for campuses in Central Index if we expand our activation model to include CDL-managed Tier 2's.

Timing: The team proposes activating the CDL-managed Tier 2's after the Melvyl Operations Team completes the migration of WorldCat Local and FirstSearch to the new WorldCat Discovery platform (no sooner than December 2015). Why wait? It would complicate acceptance testing if the databases were in flux. Some of the testing relies on comparing search results over time. And currently the Melvyl Operations Team does not have the bandwidth to take on this work.

**Model B is possible if four or more campuses are willing to participate. It would be done in addition to Model A, rather than replace it.**

For Tier 3's, it's negotiable whether it would be worth the effort to add these databases in Melvyl, since very few of them (about 6%) are available at this time in Central Index. OCLC adds content continually, so the amount of available content will increase over time. OCLC formally announces Central Index changes monthly along with the WorldCat Discovery releases notes. There would be substantial effort for both CDL and campuses to set up administrators to manage campus instances, establish procedures and best practices, redo existing policies and documentation, and plan for outreach.

One option is for campuses to wait until OCLC has reached a certain threshold for the percentage of Tier 3 databases available in Central Index, e.g., 10%, 20%, 25%, etc. The challenge would be to find a balance to ensure the level of effort to monitor wouldn't outweigh the effort of doing the set up work. We would also need to determine who is responsible for monitoring. It's possible the threshold would never get higher than 10% for some campuses. The bulk of the effort is in setting up and documenting the new process and workflows, not in the ongoing work of identifying and adding the databases in Central Index. See Area 3 below for further discussion of support and maintenance issues.

If model B is deemed worthwhile, we recommend SAG2 (or equivalent) determine if four or more campuses are willing to participate, and if so, to then coordinate with the CDL Melvyl Operations Team on how to operationalize the work.

## Summary of Findings

### Area 1: Tier 2, 3 resources at UC

The team created a comprehensive summary of the databases available in Central Index indicating the CDL-managed Tier 2's and the campus Tier 3's. See Appendix D.

We determined the number of Tier 3 resources at campuses using the 2012 Collection Licensing Subcommittee (CLS) survey. While there's clearly a benefit in adding CDL-managed Tier 2 resources in Melvyl, there is a large gap between what the individual campuses license (i.e., Tier 3's) and what is currently available in the OCLC Central Index. Of a total of 1050 campus databases, only 72 are available in Central Index -- an average of 6%. With such a small percentages of databases available in Central Index at this time, it does not warrant the substantial effort of doing a gap analysis to determine what's changed since 2012.

Table: Campus-licensed databases (Tier 3) from 2012 Collections Licensing Subcommittee (CLS) survey that are available in OCLC Central Index.

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Campus** | **Databases in 2012 survey** | **Available in Central Index** | **% Available** |
| UCB | 216 | 13 | 6% |
| UCD | 44 | 3 | 6% |
| UCI | 282 | 19 | 6% |
| UCLA | 171 | 18 | 10% |
| UCM | 17 | 0 | 0% |
| UCR | 39 | 2 | 5% |
| UCSB | 35 | 2 | 5% |
| UCSC | 48 | 4 | 8% |
| UCSD | 184 | 10 | 5% |
| UCSF | 14 | 1 | 7% |
| **Total** | **1050** | **72** | **6%** |

### Area 2: Technical limitations

The team did not find any significant technical limitations that would prevent model B from proceeding. We directly responded to the questions raised in the charge (1 & 2 below) and identified one other issue.

Some technical limitations and risks:

1. There's no limitation on the number of resources that can be activated. An institution must license a resource before it can be activated.
2. Remote access and timeouts are related: A remote access resource requires accessing the indexing metadata from the resource’s server, rather than being loaded internally at OCLC. If you activate Central Index databases that are remote access, they have a slower response time, and this can cause timeouts. CDL is currently not activating any remote access databases. Periodically, CDL does testing to see if response time has improved. So far, it has not.
3. Some databases negatively affect search results and would be better excluded from the default set of databases (e.g., Scipio). Users can still search these databases individually using advanced search.

### Area 3: Support and maintenance

**End-user support**

* CDL should continue to provide frontline end-user support.
* For model B: CDL should redirect problem reports concerning locally licensed resources to campus contacts.
* Public services librarians will be most affected by the addition of Tier 2 and 3's to Melvyl. Extensive outreach is needed to explain why the campus instances will have different search results.

**Maintenance for Model A:** Nothing changes. CDL adds WorldCat Central Index as an additional access point configuration task for CDL-managed Tier 2 resources, making the process consistent with current Tier 1 lifecycle tasks.

**Maintenance for Model B:**

For the distributed maintenance of Central Index, we need best practices and a clear division of responsibilities for campus account managers and the CDL Melvyl Operations Team. Currently, OCLC cannot limit access to only the Central Index database management area of an account. OCLC WorldCat account privileges allow access to *all* areas of service configuration for a Melvyl instance. This could have a significant impact for support if an account holder made changes beyond the scope of managing Central Index databases. The team started a list of recommendations and tasks for supporting Model B. See Appendix D.

Timing: At the point when the minimum number of campuses has agreed to participate, CDL will work with campuses to revise existing documentation and draft recommendations and best practices for managing campus Melvyl instances.

The Melvyl Central Index Procedures document would need substantial revisions: http://www.cdlib.org/services/d2d/melvyl/policies/melvyl\_central\_index\_procedures.pdf

### Area 4: Single interface

This option is not feasible. It violates OCLC's contract with vendors that specifies an institution must license the content to include it in the search.

### Area 5: legal or contractual issues?

Our WorldCat Local/Discovery license allows for customized instances. CDL discussed the team's proposed models with OCLC and confirmed that OCLC supports creating custom instances for each campus and supports a distributed maintenance model.

### Area 6: end user impact

To understand how the proposed models would impact the end user experience, the team developed some end-user impact scenarios (see Appendix E) and Cynthia Johnson and Patrick Shannon solicited feedback from library staff including the Digital Reference Operations Team who manage "Ask a Librarian" chat in Melvyl, the Reference CKG, and the ILL CKG.

Overall, the team recognized these scenarios already exist today in Melvyl, and in most cases would not worsen significantly.

Some databases require users to be authenticated before they see search results. We've indicated which databases require authentication in Appendix C. This shouldn't be a substantial barrier since Melvyl prompts users to login when they are outside the UC IP range.

Key concerns:

* The amount of material discovered will be too much and it will be hard to sort. There was overall consensus that this is probably not a major issue. It has the potential to be frustrating yes, but Melvyl already often retrieves large set results. Relevancy will not change with additional databases.
* Managing the user expectation that EVERYTHING will be in Melvyl. We need to do a better job educating our users about limitations of Melvyl, rather than trying to resolve potential issues by limiting the information available in Melvyl.
* If the recommendation to include additional content is approved, it would be beneficial to include in the implementation process an extensive outreach plan to help public services staff understand how Melvyl will change from a union discovery layer to a discovery layer that is unique to each campus.

See Appendix F for a detailed report on end user impact from Cynthia Johnson and Patrick Shannon.
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