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Mission of Union Lists of Serials

- Support interlibrary loan activities
- Support collection development activities
- Identify possible locations for patrons willing to travel to resources

Union Lists: When, Why, & Some of the How

Union Lists are nothing new: NUC & other print resources

Union Lists of Serials – Growth 1960s & 1970s

MULS: A Case Study

1972

MULS began - 3 years after beginning of MINITEX "project"

Print editions (1972 – 1983)

Fiche editions (1972-2002)

1988/1989

Went online in OCLC

Available also on MnPALS (1994 - 2006)

Present

Grew to include holdings of MN academic & public libraries as well as libraries in ND & SD

Current Major Examples - SERHOLD

- SERHOLD Component of NLM’s DOCLINE
- OCLC Local Holdings Records

Importance of Standards
Citation Imported into DOCLINE
Routing Instructions Form
DOCLINE Request Record
Request Routing Table
Search Screen
Current Major Examples
OCLC Local Holdings Records
Benefits of ULS Use

- 1995 – OCLC ILL Fulfillment Study:
  Using LDR info. increased fill rates from 57%-86% over relying on institution symbol. (Myers – Serials Review)

- 2000 – OCLC ILL Fulfillment Study
  (Serials Portion redone): Using LDRs brought 74% success rate, compared to 40% for institution symbol.
  (Donohue – OCLC Newsletter)

- 2008 -- Southeastern Louisiana University:
  Dec. 2005, ca. 10,000 records loaded with Summary Holdings
  Fill rate prior to batch load: 37.94% fill rate for serials
  After batch load: serials fill rate 50.95%. (Madarash-Hill, Hill – Journal of Interlibrary Loan, Document Delivery & Electronic Reserve)

- 2008 -- Ohio State University:
  Reports 28% increase in fill rate 1997-2008 with increased Local Holdings Records (Kuehn – E-Mail & Phone)
Current Problems

ULS Creators’ View

- What to union list?
  - Defensive (i.e., focus holdings for most requested titles) vs. comprehensive
  - Types of material (print, microform, electronic)
  - Age of material
  - Level of detail
- UL data often not maintained by ILL staff & others who use it – so full value not appreciated
- Need – in many cases – to keep two holdings info. sources up-to-date. Staff often tend to focus on local catalog.
- Need to get administrative support for activity that doesn’t provide obvious support for “primary” constituency.

Current problems

ILL Users’ View

- Problem of what’s “good enough” – as far as searching is concerned
- Automated systems depending upon holdings that may be out-of-date
- Lack of availability data in ULS

Current problems

How Do We Resolve?

- Automated or Batch Updating seems like logical solution
- SERHOLD updating primarily title-by-title via the Web
- OCLC does, but has found it’s not easy because:
  - Various implementations of MARC 21 Format for Holdings Data
  - Various implementations of Z39.71 & other holding statement standards
  - Various implementations of basic vendor ILSes
  - Problems with linking incoming update to OCLC WorldCat

Current problems

Multiple Demands/Opportunities

- Efforts to repurpose data created for primarily ILL for other uses:
  - Libraries sometimes use this data as basis for serials holdings file for local catalog
  - Initiatives that will use this data for local holdings info. in WorldCat Local and other network-level programs
- Problems moving ILL data among diverse systems

Possible Paths Forward

- Federated searching of local catalogs
- Problems reaching into library catalogs
- Incompatibility of holdings in various catalogs
- Incompatibilities of bibliographic records in various catalogs
- Incompatibilities of retrieval in various catalogs
- Use holdings info. generated elsewhere in publication cycle (e.g., ONIX SOH, ERM Knowledge Bases)
- Access to electronic versions

Importance of Standards

- Potentially, standards are more important now than they have been in the past.
- Eye-readable vs. machine readable
- Need for greater interoperability
Sources

- Also, thanks to Randy Brooks, University of Minnesota, Bio-Medical Library, and Jennifer Hootman, Dave Linton, Kristen Mastel, Carol Nelson, MINITEX.
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