

Library Management Team

Notes from the April 16, 2001 Meeting

Attending: Ross Atkinson, Lee Cartmill, Claire Germain, Tom Hickerson, Jean Poland, Sarah Thomas, Edward Weissman, Karen Calhoun, Philip Herold.

1. **Networked Resources Access Before the ENCompass Era:**

In January, in response to growing concerns about the efficacy of Library Gateway's networked resources catalog, the Library Gateway Committee charged a working group (the Working Group on Networked Resources Access Before the ENCompass Era) to consider the strengths and weaknesses from both the user and staff support perspectives of CUL's current environment for discovering and providing access to networked resources through the Gateway's Networked Resources function and the Library Catalog. The Group was asked to recommend how CUL could best make networked resources available until Endeavor's ENCompass product becomes fully operational. The Group has completed its report which has been endorsed by the Library Gateway Committee. Philip Herold presented the report and recommendations to LMT since Jim LeBlanc, the Working Group chair, was not able to attend. LMT discussed the recommendations and decided to discuss these further at its next meeting. A three page excerpt, containing the executive summary and recommendations, is attached to this message.

2. **Unauthorized Use of Licensed Material:**

Ross reported that, from time to time, CUL is notified about the unauthorized use of licensed resources from a Cornell IP address. Recently we were notified that someone was systematically downloading information from a licensed site. CIT provides assistance in identifying the party involved. Ross said that CUL will develop a procedure which will involve asking for CIT's assistance as needed but which will leave the ultimate resolution of the problem to the Library since the Library is responsible for the license.

3. **Library Budget:**

Lee provided information about the status of the budget allocations for several new items and the source of these funds. He also listed items that would cause pressure in the next several years.

4. **Wireless in the Library:**

Based on information from CIT, the annual cost of maintaining wireless network capabilities throughout the public space in all library unit could amount to \$100,000 per year. Sarah asked Ross to coordinate the development of a plan for the selective installation of wireless, balancing the desire for consistency across the libraries with traffic and need.

Cornell University Library

Memorandum

To: Ed Weissman, Chair, CUL Gateway Committee
From: Working Group on Networked Resources Access Before the ENCompass Era -- Philip Herold, Nan Hyland, Bob Kibbee, Jim LeBlanc (Chair), Tim Lynch
Date: March 30, 2001
Subject: Proposal to provide continued effective discovery of, and access to networked resources over the next 18 or so months, or until Endeavor's ENCompass product becomes fully operational

Charge

Reporting to the Library Gateway Committee and in consultation with Library Technology, Public Services, and Technical Services staff, the Working Group on Networked Resources Access Before the ENCompass Era (WGNRABENCE) will develop a proposal specifying how CUL should provide for the effective discovery of and access to networked resources over the next 18 months, i.e., until Endeavor's ENCompass product becomes fully operational. In this investigation, the Working Group will:

- Consider the strengths and weaknesses from both the user and staff support perspectives of CUL's current environment consisting of the Gateway's Networked Resources browse and search functions and the Library Catalog;
- Reevaluate and build upon Tom Gale's document "Networked Resources Integration Team Proposal" based on CUL's experience with, and expanding knowledge of Voyager and the changing environment at CUL with regard to the bibliographic control of networked resources;
- Take into account the relative development and maintenance costs of the alternatives considered.

Executive Summary

After an extensive review of the scope and structure of the Networked Resources catalog (NR) from the point of view of various stakeholders, including recent feedback from focus groups, the Instruction/Reference Program Committee and the Working Group on Cataloging, WGNRABENCE reached the following basic conclusions regarding NR and its relation to the Voyager OPAC:

- NR is still a highly useful resource for the discovery of, and access to networked resources, especially those of obvious reference and research value (e.g. indexes, abstracts, directories, digests, etc.); the ability to browse by NR subject, to limit searches by genre, and to mount locally-created intermediary help pages and connection-related error messages are especially useful attributes of the NR catalog.
- On the other hand, NR is reaching the limits of its scalability; in many cases, previously concise retrieval sets have become too large and unwieldy to be useful.
- The prominence of important reference and research titles would be greatly enhanced through a reduction in the number of titles available through NR and/or through some type of reorganization of the retrieval set (e.g., if hits could be displayed in terms of importance, not necessarily alphabetically).

- Given that NR does not, and never has represented all of CUL's networked resources, users and staff alike would greatly benefit from a clearly-defined policy of what kind of resources NR contains and what it does not contain.
- The Voyager OPAC provides sufficient access to many networked resources, most notably to electronic journals and e-books, as to make their inclusion in NR somewhat redundant.
- Reducing the scope of NR by excluding e-journals, e-books, and perhaps other categories of non-reference material from that database, would enable more streamlined and timely cataloging of electronic resources and increased access to more resources in all formats for the CUL collection as a whole.
- There is still a need to provide easy access to lists of electronic journals.
- Significant structural changes to NR would not be cost-effective at this time, given CUL's commitment to a timely implementation of ENCompass.

With these criteria in mind, the group found the three options outlined in the document, "Networked Resources Integration Team Proposal," to be inadequate for our current needs. We also chose to examine the idea of simply doing away with the NR catalog altogether and making the current Voyager OPAC interface our single point of entry for the interim period. This option, too, we dismissed as inadequate for our current needs. In the end, we compiled a recommendation that we feel would go the furthest to address the eight basic concerns outlined above. That recommendation is presented in depth below.

...

Recommendation

Redefine the scope of the NR catalog to give more prominence to resources of significant reference or research value by excluding certain genres of material, most notably e-journals and e-books, from the public view of NR. For these excluded categories, only brief, display-suppressed NR records would be needed from which to hang Access Info records (where scripting and authentication information for all Cornell-only resources is recorded). In addition, implement a small technical enhancement to provide for the generation of lists of e-journals either from the Library Gateway home page or from some intermediate "Networked Resources" index page.

Description:

This initiative calls for a redefinition of the scope of NR to include all networked resources of certain types (especially those of significant reference or research value), while excluding all networked resources of other types (especially e-books and e-journals). We are, in any case, sorely in need of a clear policy definition of what is and is not contained in the NR catalog, and such a definition, inscribed prominently on the NR search page or in some other appropriate location, is at the heart of our recommendation. In addition, the need to continue to provide locally-created intermediary help pages and connection-related error messages for all Cornell-only e-resources (even those represented only in the OPAC) can be addressed through a small change in workflow, at a negligible cost (brief NR records including Voyager ID, title, and URL would still need to be created for most Cornell-only resources). Finally, we need to examine how best to organize and present e-journals -- for example, a complete list of e-journals, generated periodically through SQL queries of the Voyager database, could be made available via the Library Gateway home page, again for a minimal technical and development cost.

Pros:

- Would make reference e-resources more prominent in NR through the reduction in size of local subject browse retrieval sets;
- Would preserve NR pathfinders such as "i", "C", and "+/-" icons for those titles of significant reference or research value;
- Would preserve locally-created intermediary help pages and connection-related error messages for all Cornell-only resources;
- Would make it clearer to users and staff alike what NR contains and what it does not contain;
- Would eliminate the need to catalog certain categories of resources in two databases;

- Would facilitate the import of new catalog records by automated means;
- Would give more prominence in the Gateway to the capacity to generate lists of e-journals;
- Would place e-journal holdings in the context of the library's complete journal holdings for all formats.

Cons:

- Would require a certain amount of retraining of users and staff;
- Might be difficult to decide what does and does not belong in NR, outside of broad categories such as e-journals, e-books, indexes, abstracts, aggregator sites, encyclopedias, etc.;
- Access to those e-resources excluded from NR would be limited by Voyager functionality;
- Would eliminate automated selection for MyLinks of those resources no longer available through NR.

Costs:

- For IT: minimal upfront costs to suppress from the NR public interface those existing records for categories of material that will no longer be represented in NR; minimal development costs (a few days of programmer time) for periodically-generated e-journal lists, or whatever approach we take to organizing and presenting e-journals;
- For Public Services: some re-education and public relations expense;
- For Technical Services: significant savings (\$4-\$16 per title^{*}) when processing those e-resources that will not be included in NR; though NR records would still be required such resources (when access to them is Cornell-only), the creation of these records would be extremely straightforward and could probably be accomplished in a more cost-effective manner than it is currently.

WGNRABENCE also recommends:

- A new user study to determine current needs and behavior patterns of NR users before any significant redesign or redefinition is undertaken;
- A re-examination of the NR public interface to provide better visual cues to distinguish between those types of resources that will remain in the NR catalog;
- A re-examination of the NR browsable subject captions to provide more balanced access across disciplines to those types of resources remaining the NR catalog;
- The formation of an implementation team to carry out the terms of this recommendation; this team should include representatives from Reference, Technical Services, Information Technology, and Collection Development.

^{*} *Technical services costs are based on two estimates:*

- *The supplemental cost of cataloging an item for NR, above and beyond the costs of preparing the MARC record for the Voyager OPAC: \$4/\$5 per title; and*
- *The average cost of adding an individual title to the catalog "by hand," rather than by automated means: \$16.*

...