TSPC Conference Call Minutes, Thursday, March 2, 2009

Attendance:

FAMU -	Emmett Denny
FGCU -	Catherine Gardiner
FIU -	Sue Wartzok
	Elaine Winske
FSU -	Amy Weiss
	Ruth Ziegler
	Tamara Weatherholt
	Michael Luesebrink
FSU Law -	Pat Bingham-Harper
NCF	Tom Tharrington
UNF -	Jeffrey Bowen
USF -	Susan Heron
USF-Health	Allison Howard
UF -	Betsy Simpson
	Naomi Young
	Priscilla Williams
UF-Law	Susy Potter
UWF -	Dan North
	Esmer Brown
	Shari Johnson
FCLA -	Ellen Bishop
	Daniel Cromwell
	Mary Ann O'Daniel
	Jean Phillips

There was only one agenda item: Does the TSPC wish to prepare a response to the Report and Recommendation of the Single Bibliographic Record Task Force.

We decided that we would not prepare a reply. However, for the convenience of our representative at the CSUL meeting later this week [Susan Heron (USF)], we decided to make a list of some of the comments from the discussion on the listserv. [Attached]

During our discussion today, we agreed that we wished to emphasize that the TSPC needs to work with the Task Force on testing the plan. It is unfortunate that task force members with technical expertise were out-numbered by members with only public services expertise. We think future discussions should include stronger technical services representation.

We have a strong record of collaboration with our public services colleagues—for example our liaisons to the OPAC Subcommittee and our recently appointed liaisons to both the CPC and to one of their task forces—but this is our area of responsibility and expertise. The TSPC has already prepared a well-received report on the topic of shared bibliographic records and we expect to take a leadership role in the future.

Minutes submitted by Sue Wartzok, FIU

TSPC summary of listserv comments on the Report and Recommendation of the Single Bibliographic Record Task Force: March 3, 2009

Positive comments:
- The task force emphasizes usability and centralization. Neither theme is revolutionary or surprising.
- Actually, I found the report to be forward thinking, looking at the long term big picture for all our libraries.
- It seems unrealistic to expect that a task force with such a short turnaround time would have been able to provide detailed cost data. As the report states, such information will be gathered during the pilot, which in Phase 2 builds in acquisitions and circulation testing. I also think it is wise of the task force to present the single bib transition within the context of a 3-5 year time frame for migrating from our current ILS, and I'm pleased to see that TSPC is included in the recommended Discovery Tools Task Force.
- Everyone has to be on the right page; not an easy task when one considers the local practices, staffing levels, and the financial resources of eleven separate academic libraries.
- If the Directors make the decision to move forward on the shared bib model despite the reservations of some I would hope that the TSPC can come up with some constructive ideas that fall somewhere in between the big picture of staff savings and a better base for discovery tools and turf wars over local practice.
- I do agree that librarians must adapt to what the users desire in a catalog rather than continuing the futile attempt to sell users a nomenclature ridden system that is intimidating and unfriendly to navigate.
- Moving to a single bib record is a protean challenge, one that should be accomplished in a spirit of collegiality, tempered with open and honest dialogue concerning the realities of the task ahead. It seems as if we have already taken the first step.
- I also agree with the recommendation from this report to continue working towards a single bib record. It offers a shared work environment with the chance to catalog more regional and local resources. It will take some time to adjust and we are capable. It will benefit us and our users.
- I prefer to take it as a wake-up call to CSUL that, particularly with shrinking staffs and budgets, we need to take bold action to minimize redundant work ("to develop new models for sharing work and expertise"). The task force explains that the reason for doing so is to "focus attention on bibliographic control of unique materials and digital collections.
- I know from some of the preliminary environmental scan we've done ... our users do not like the library catalog and they actively pursue research methods that bypass the catalog altogether. That tells me it's time for us to change. We're going to be doing more studies trying to understand how our clients do their research and then try to adapt what we do to meet their needs.   The real cost in my personal opinion is that if we don't provide our clientele with what they really want and need they might decided they can bypass us all together and I don't want to see that happen.
- I agree with the essential recommendation from this report to continue working towards a single bibliographic record. I think that will benefit us significantly in the long run. I also expect it will require a great deal of intelligent effort to achieve and am very confident of the capabilities of my SUL cataloging colleagues to make it go well.

Negative comments:
- The critical need "to regain control of our cataloging processes" was seen as an unfortunate choice of wording by some.
- The report dwelt on benefits; did not address costs.
- Tired of tired phrases: Doing more with less and good enough cataloging.

- Saying that our cataloging processes are out of control is not a fair statement and is alienating to the very staff that have made and will continue to make changes based on changing priorities, reduced budgets and reduced staff.
- The first sentence is not constructive and doesn't reflect the complexity of present circumstances.
- Poor bibliographic control does not serve the end user well.
- The list of things that we "must" do implies that we're not already doing those things … when we are; this applies to both catalogers and the OPAC subcommittee.
- The statement that we "need to adapt our internal cultures and values to the changing environment, and this effort might be a bigger challenge than adapting our technology and operations" assumes that we are resistant to change; there is no recognition of the major changes that we have made over the past few years.
- It's normal to be resistant to change but it is imprudent to say so in an official report because it has the effect of entrenching those that are resistant rather than getting them on board.
- The report does not present the results of a study as it was asked to do. There is no attempt at "cost/benefit" study. No Cons are offered.
- There is a disconnect between the time line of the proposed study period in relation to the "Pressing Need" of immediately solving the unmediated use need. To say nothing of the COST of doing the study.
- Whether librarians "know best" or not, CSUL needs to take advantage of our expertise and our proven ability to collaborate.
- Is it appropriate to use the word "inevitable" when CSUL has not voted yet?
- As the UBorrow report makes clear, unmediated borrowing and the storage facility can be accomplished without single bib.
- What I find disturbing about this report is the collective belief that moving to a single bibliographic is the panacea to all of the challenges we face.
- I am concerned about the *reality* of the process of moving to a single bib record during a time when both financial resources and staffing are shrinking.
- Implementation would require a concerted statewide project to reload or add linking ISSNs to serial records.
- "Serials are different" and separate discussion and separate policies may be needed.
- Naomi Young's excellent commentary on the complexity of serials cataloging should be required reading for all Directors and members of the Single Bib Task Force.
- It seems to me that problems with the delivery system might only be moderately improved by having a single bib … the report comes across as "blaming" the existence of multiple bibs and the time needed to maintain them for all of the perceived shortcomings of the discovery tool.
- There is nothing in the TSPC discussion so far that leaves me with the impression that "in principle we support the idea of a single bib." The gracelessness of the report may easily be perceived. The remarks offered so far should not be construed as merely a problem of the format of the report.
- The assumption that the single bib is "inevitable" appears to be a manifestation of the theory that if it is said often enough, it will be assumed to be true. I have no sense that the members of TSPC are universally supportive of the single bib prototype.
- Any reluctance is due to the amount of work involved in an environment that has been doing more with less for a number of years with more budget and staff constraints in the future. It is precisely for that reason I hoped this report would make a better case for moving to a single bib. Such a huge undertaking requires buy-in from all involved. I didn't feel this report accomplished that.