Discovery Analysis Task Force
Minutes 12/3/14

Action items in yellow.

Present: Gibeault, Gilbertson, Juhl, Lehman, Parker, Parker-Gibson, Robinson
Guest: Lennertz

Charge and Scope
The group reviewed the charge with Lennertz, who is our administrative liaison. Lennertz pointed out that the group has the options of recommending no discovery tool, or a range of enhancements, in addition to recommending a single discovery solution. She also discussed the scope of our assignment, specifically the topic of services / instruction and outreach as a “discovery” tool and whether or not those should be included in our environmental scan. [The group elected to set those aside due to the short term nature of our charge.] Parker-Gibson asked about the longevity of services and expressed the hope that our choices would be 2nd or next generation and would not need replacing soon.

The group also discussed individual expectations and concerns: goals for a discovery tool, target audience, balance of offerings in instruction, depth of coverage, and criteria for evaluation.

Past Discovery Projects
Juhl, Lehman, Parker-Gibson, and Gilbertson reported on the library’s previous experience with a Discovery Task Force (Innovative Review Committee +) in 2009-2010. After deciding that the products from major vendors were not at that time mature enough to justify the expense, the Libraries opted for the less expensive federated search product from Ebsco. Due to slowness, inaccuracies in retrieval, gaps in coverage, and overall clunkiness, that project was not continued after the first year.

“Environmental Scan”
The group then discussed Juhl’s proposal to conduct a quick review of search / discovery systems already in place in order to identify key gaps or needs. While the draft form was deemed adequate, the group struggled with how to assign reviews of specific tools.

In the end, it was decided that more of a matrix approach was needed: a quick review of the tools in place and then also a review by type of collection. Rather than assign reviews of specific tools to individuals, the group agreed for this first round to take a more wholistic approach, and for everyone to look at as many tools as they could. At Friday’s meeting, we may assign “experts” to complete evaluations.

The group agreed that these tools should be reviewed:

- Library Catalog
- WorldCat
- Main Web page / search tabs
- Find it / Article Finder
- Eresources A-Z List (http://gm3ed7jh6d.search.serialssolutions.com/)
- Digital Collections Site http://digitalcollections.uark.edu/
- Special Collections Site (specifically manuscripts lists: http://libinfo.uark.edu/specialcollections/manuscripts/)
LibGuides (????)

UARKIve / bepress is left off the list due to coming transition. Mention should be made of local databases such as Index Arkansas, faculty publications, patents, etc. but that is not the focus of our work.

Secondly, the group agreed that these **collections or formats** should be reviewed:

- Books and ebooks
- Reference books and reference collections
- Entire journals and journal holdings
- Articles in periodicals
- Theses and dissertations
- Video and audio
- Digital collections
- Manuscripts and archives

If time, other **more specialized** content types might also be addressed:

- Conference proceedings
- Government documents
- Statistical data, including business and financial data
- Maps
- Standards
- Patents

**Methodology**
The group agreed to use a shared Google Drive folder for our work:

https://drive.google.com/folderview?id=0BwXBKWEIUj6iZGsXT1BxRUdsMW8&usp=sharing

Juhl will migrate the MS Word forms there and create copies for each of the tools to be assessed.

Gibeault added a document called “Links” with links to specific articles / sites; everyone can edit.

**Next meeting: Friday 5th at 10:30 in room 372B.**
**Assignment: begin review of at least some of the tools listed above.**

Respectfully submitted,

B. Juhl