Why?

• Small institution with limited metadata capacity
• WHELF collaboration proved instructive
• Improved discovery as a new aggregated service
  but also enable metadata enhancement
• If...we all get involved
Overall Objective
To inform the development of the National Bibliographic Knowledgebase with comprehensive feedback from existing and potential contributors.

Core Research Objectives
» Understand the requirements of the library community, and any difference in experience by library;
» Explore rationale for contributing and the potential benefits of the NBK;
» Understand the use of data suppliers;
» Explore approaches to data and metadata, including data sharing;
» Test the attractiveness of potential support mechanisms for the NBK.

Phase 1: the survey
30 minute online survey with institutional responses requested

Survey In Field:
4th June – 19th July 2018

99 responses
Some headline results

1. Barriers to contributing data to the NBK
2. Updating records based on automated error reports
3. Record supply systems
4. Library Management System support
5. Working with metadata
6. Quality of metadata – last five years

Support & Guidance Group*

• Jisc NBK Community Discussion List – Please join & Use!
  NBK-COMMUNITY-DISCUSSION@JISCMAIL.AC.UK

• NBK Peer Support Network
  - Contributor case studies – U of York (Alma) is on its way
  - How-to-guides for specific LMSs
  - Phone & webinar support from members
  - Longer term focus on good practice
  - NBK website architecture
  - Volunteers for peer support?!

*thanks to Ruth Elder & Lee Blyth
Libraries intend to use the NBK for:

- Upgraded brief records, new master records, enhanced records, enhance additional fields, AACR2-RDA

Toolkit can help with:

- *Pushed* in records after reclamation project or regular update:
  - Error reports
  - Selective enhancements e.g. RDA/LCSH
- *Pulled* in records during a project or dealing with individual or groups of records:
  - New records from trusted source
  - Custom record from selected fields
  - Cleaning up diacritics
  - Amending records in DCRM
  - Other custom enhancements
- Shared templates and customised jobs

Areas for development:

- Authority work – encourage linking out
- Ebook packages – create trusted collection level metadata

*thanks to Eileen Crawley & Martin Kelleher*
1. the deduplication process is openly shared...
2. clear guidance shared
3. collaboratively lobby vendors for good ebook records
4. collaborate to build new business model around library needs
5. NBK becomes a central data creation resource?
6. micro surveys used to find out more
7. make the survey data open access
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Community data groups: phase 2

Medium Term (by July 2019):
› Interface and search functionality developments
› Test options for e-book data enhancements
› Further pulse surveys?

Longer Term (post July 2019)
› Sample data error reports
› Enhance contributor dashboard
› Data : input on best record selection & deduplication

PLUS: Facilitate community discussion about national policies for minimum record standards, controlled vocabularies and authority data...