

# **Library Management Team Notes from the March 9, 1999 Meeting**

Attending: Ross Atkinson, Lee Cartmill, David Corson, Tom Hickerson, Janet McCue, Jean Poland, Sarah Thomas, Edward Weissman (recorder), Holly Mistlebauer

## **Announcements**

Sarah announced that the Mellon Foundation had approved a six month planning grant for a study of electronic publishing in the field of mathematics. The Library will collaborate with scholarly societies and other universities to assess the feasibility of creating a portal to electronic resources in mathematics and of facilitating the transformation of scholarly publications, particularly those of smaller publishers, to electronic form. One of the goals is to develop a workable business model for this venture. Sarah will call a meeting of the stakeholders and will decide who to assign to coordinate this activity.

## **Recommended Actions From the Library Gateway Focus Groups Report**

Ed and Holly described the work that is either in progress or under consideration in the Library Gateway Committee and the Personalized Electronic Services Working Group responding to the recommendations in the Library Gateway Focus Groups Report. (This was summarized in the notes from the [February 23 meeting of the Library Gateway Committee](#)) While several initiatives to enhance user awareness and understanding of the Gateway and other library services are underway, we agreed that an effort should be made to better publicize library training programs among faculty and students. One suggestion was that more attention be focused on TA's. Ross will discuss this issue with the IRPC Steering Committee. The need for a web interface to the Catalog was discussed and Sarah said she will raise with CIT the issue of CIT support for this enhancement.

## **Progress Report from the Personalized Electronic Services Working Group (PESWG)**

Holly reported that the Working Group has been meeting weekly for around a month and has been "brainstorming." Because the group is charged with having "something" in place by Fall, it has decided to concentrate on developing the Virtual Carrel and the Current Awareness services. It intends to form two implementation groups in early April to work on these but until then it will continue to work out the details of what these two groups will be charged to do. PESWG has set a deadline of April 2nd to complete this work and it will, at that point, present its proposed plan to the LMT. After the implementation groups are formed and start working on their charge, the PESWG will go back to brainstorming other electronic services ideas.

## **Life After Library Bear Access**

Ed presented a short document he created with Karen Calhoun, Tom Hickerson, Zsuzsa Koltay, and Marty Schlabach at LMT's request outlining three options for what could appear as the entry

screen on the library's public access work stations. Currently Library Bear Access appears as the entry screen in most library units. The document is appended below.

LMT's preference was option 3. This would allow units to use their own home pages as the default entry screen provided that criteria were in place requiring that critical links (i.e., to the Library Catalog and Networked Resources) appear in a consistent and prominent way on these screens. Ed will bring back to LMT images of the various unit home pages along with some suggestions about these criteria.

---

*Life After Library Bear Access: Options and Issues* , Karen Calhoun, Tom Hickerson, Zsuzsa Koltay, Marty Schlabach, Ed Weissman

- Background
  1. Most endowed units are using Library Bear Access
  2. There are no significant savings to be gained by eliminating Library Bear Access as entry screen and using an alternative. We need two basic services that are now provided through Library Bear Access (not by Standard Bear Access): version control and security. D-LIT anticipates that both version control and security will be at least as expensive to support, whether or not we continue to use Library Bear Access. Essentially, the choice of entry screen is not a factor in the resources required to support version control and security. From the technical side we need to look at the most efficient way to provide these services, but this can't be used as a rationale to either keep or do away with Library Bear Access.
  3. Library Bear Access is based on mandarin technology which is no longer supported by CIT. If we choose to use Library Bear Access, D-LIT recommends that we migrate to the new version which is based on Java technology.
  4. This relates only to the entry screen of library public access work stations. Standard Bear Access will continue to be distributed by CIT, and users outside the Library will continue to have the options of selecting either the Library Catalog PLUS or the Library Gateway.
- Options
  1. Use Library Bear Access as the entry screen. This will involve migrating to the newer CIT Java based version of Bear Access.
  2. Use the Cornell University Library home page that is now under development as the entry screen. This will provide equal prominence for the Library Catalog and Networked Resources and equivalent convenience (i.e., both will be one click away.)
  3. Use the Cornell University Library home page that is now under development as the entry screen with a prominent customizable IP-based link to the home page of the unit that the work station is located. This will provide equal prominence for the Library Catalog and Networked Resources and equivalent convenience (i.e., both will be one click away.) It will also give special prominence to the home page of the unit that the work station is located in.

4. Every tub on it's own bottom or let the unit decide what to use as the entry screen. This option could include criteria about links that must appear prominently on the entry screens (e.g., the Library Catalog, Networked Resources, the Library Home Page.) C. Issue 1) What is best for the users and what best meets the overall needs of the Library: a common entry screen or a tailored entry screen?