

Fishing Upstream:

What Do Libraries Want from Vendors

Leslie Horner Button
Associate Director for Collection Services
UMass Amherst Libraries
NETSL Conference – April 17, 2009

Past as Prologue


- ▶ “We would do well to look at our past for the inspiration we need to create a future that our descendants will look back upon with similar amazement.”
 - Roy Tennant, “Bibliographic Metadata Structure,” Library Hi Tech, 22:2 (2004), p.175–181

It's About Access


- Make resources available to users as quickly as possible
- Easy and convenient
- Conformance to established standards

Records for licensed electronic resources do not always conform to this third principle.


Why Rely on Vendor Records?

- ▶ Increased pressure on technical services staffing budgets
 - ▶ Amount of material to process remains relatively constant
 - ▶ E-resources purchasing has skyrocketed
 - ▶ E-resources frequently acquired in bundled aggregations.
- 

UMass Amherst & Vendor Records for Textual Materials

- ▶ 1990s – WorldCat record sets for microfilm sets
 - ▶ 2002 – PromptCat for approval books
 - ▶ 2004 – Brief YBP records for book orders
- 

And for E-Resources


- ▶ 1999 – Netlibrary set from NELINET
 - ▶ 2000+ Vendor-supplied records where available
 - ▶ 2008 – SFX MARCIt!
- 

What Works Well


- ▶ Brief Records supplied by YBP
 - YBP staff provided metadata based on piece in hand
- ▶ PromptCat Records
 - 85–90% have complete access points
- ▶ SFX MARCIt! records
 - CONSER records derived from print equivalent

These records all integrate fairly well into local catalog because they are homogenous – that is, MARC–standards based.

So Why Fish Upstream?

- ▶ Book production changed
 - ▶ Ability to capture metadata during production process
 - ▶ Libraries do not have capacity to catalog e-book or e-journal bundles
 - ▶ Provides ability to batch-load hundreds or thousands of records quickly
 - ▶ Most vendor records provided basic elements for discovery
- 

Challenges to Reusing Vendor Created Metadata

- ▶ ONIX
 - ▶ Subject analysis and authority control
 - ▶ For leased packages, notifications regarding changing content
 - ▶ Record availability on OCLC
 - ▶ Insufficient understanding about how supplied metadata functions in networked environment
- 

Similarities between Vendor and Library

- ▶ Make resource discoverable/accessible/marketing
- ▶ Common target audience
- ▶ Need to contain costs and take advantage of efficiencies offered
- ▶ What gets in the way:
 - Standards are new and evolving
 - Technical environment radically changed since MARC invented

Taking It to the Network Level

- ▶ Catalog no longer the only (or necessarily preferred) discovery tool
- ▶ Tools for adding fields that may be missing in vendor records
 - FAST (Faceted Application of Subject Terminology)
 - SKOS (Simple Knowledge Organization System)
 - Web 2.0
 - Social tagging
- ▶ Virtual International Authority File

Questions

▶ Further reading:

- Calhoun, Karen. Changing Nature of the Catalog and Its Integration with Other Discovery Tools. <http://www.loc.gov/catdir/calhoun-report-final.pdf>
- Calhoun, Karen. “Economics and Organization of Bibliographic Data” <http://www.loc.gov/bibliographic-future/meetings/docs/ecoandorgofbibdata-final.pdf>
- Calhoun, Karen and Janet Hawk. “Online catalogs: What Users and Librarians Want.” <http://www.slideshare.net/amarintha/online-catalogs-what-users-and-librarians-want-presentation>
- Product Metadata Best Practices. for Data Recipients. <http://www.bisg.org/docs/RecipientBestPracticesV1.0FINAL.pdf>.
- Provider-Neutral E-Monograph Record Task Group Report. <http://www.loc.gov/catdir/pcc/bibco/PN-Final-Report.pdf>

▶ Questions?

- ▶ Leslie Horner Button
- ▶ button@library.umass.edu