

**POT2.1 Report to the NGTS Management Team**  
**June 4, 2012**

POT2 (Bernie Hurley, Linda Barnhart, Lisa Rowilson de Ortiz, Adrian Petrisor, and Gary Johnson) is pleased to present its final report to the NGTS Management Team.

Our original plan, designed last summer, envisioned submitting an interim report at this time, followed by a final report later. Because our two Lightning Teams worked so well and gathered so much information, we present instead a final report, with recommendations for how UC should move forward with shelfready processing.

In its original charge, POT2 was tasked to do a pilot project to study potential cost savings; discussion in the early days with the NGTS Management Team removed this assignment (although some evidence of it lingers in various spots on the wiki). POT2 confirms that we do not see the need to do a pilot. Our recommendation (below) is that UC should move straight into implementation.

We acknowledge here the stellar work done by Lightning Team 1 in assessing the Current Shelfready Environment (Shirley Higgins, Susan Boone and Germaine Wadeborn) and Lightning Team 2 on Collecting and Analyzing UC Physical Processing Specifications (Wanda Jayazeri, Robin Gustafson and Yi-Yen Hayford). The reports and supporting documentation for both these groups can be found in the POT2 part of the NGTS wiki.

We prepared this report with a broadened definition in mind of shelfready services, to include prospective collections in all formats, including electronic monographs acquired on a title-by-title basis, as well as retrospective processing of existing collections.

This report comprises:

- Four recommendations
- Appendix 1: Recommended Service Standards
- Appendix 2: Best Practice Recommendations
- Appendix 3: Recommended Elements for a Shelfready Physical Processing Standard
- Appendix 4: Capturing the Value of Efficiency

**Recommendations:**

1. The basic elements are in place to assist in preparing a systemwide RFI for shelfready processing (see Appendices 1-3, plus the UC-wide bibliographic standard under systemwide discussion, prepared by POT2.2.) We have included the Management Team's "Capturing the Value of Efficiency" document as Appendix 4 simply so all the information needed is at hand for follow-up work.

2. For non-shared print shelf-ready agreements, POT2 envisions an outcome where a centralized contract is negotiated for UC consortial pricing. The campuses then would independently pay for the services that they used. We recommend issuing an RFI, targeting vendors with the most potential for a collaborative shelfready program. POT2 notes that most campuses are already

using the YBP basic shelfready service. Investigating a UC consortial license for the YPB basic service, or better yet, to their premium service may be the best place to start. Part of the RFI preparation would necessitate identifying a skilled negotiator to work with the vendor on behalf of UC. Identifying this person will require the help of the NGTS MT or others across UC.

3. We recommend the formation of a Shelfready Program Management Team, a permanent and formal subgroup to HOTS, to establish shared shelfready expertise across the campuses and to manage consortial projects. Shelfready, especially defined broadly, will be with us for a long time. The initial setup and ongoing management of a shelfready workflow requires expertise and analysis typically expected of higher level employees. This subgroup should be staffed by acquisitions, cataloging, collection management, IT, and business services managers. The group would become our in-house experts, and would enable shared experience. They would monitor and document processes, procedures, successes, and lessons learned. Some of the immediate assignments to this group could include:

- Writing and managing the RFI, leading to a shared print consortial program, starting with YBP. It is appropriate that people with real expertise in this area should prepare and guide an RFI, and it is appropriate to be under the direction of HOTS.
- Assisting with implementing new shelfready programs on a single campus
- Establishing and maintaining a home for shared documentation (including the reports and supporting materials from the two POT2 lightning teams) so that all campuses can benefit
- Monitoring the pilot project under development by the UC East Asian Bibliographers with the vendor CIBTC
- Creating a UC-wide physical processing standard that can be used with a consortial shelfready contract from the common physical processing techniques (see Appendix 2)
- Updating the campus shelfready survey (or a streamlined version of it) annually

4. For monographic shared-print proposals, POT2 recommends that shelfready processing should be considered from the very beginning of any new initiative. Processes should be designed with shelfready workflows in mind. POT2 believes that one of the promises of savings is in the central coordination of such projects as far upstream as possible, and the easiest foothold will be with new projects rather than changing existing workflows. We recognize that the number of these new, shared-print projects will be small and the scope will likely not be large, but mindfulness about shelfready as a key option is crucial.

## **Appendix 1: Recommended Service Standards**

With thanks to Lightning Team 1: Susan Boone, Shirley Higgins, Germaine Wadeborn

### **Vendors**

- Domestic, in-print titles are supplied within four weeks of order
- Foreign, in-print titles are supplied within eight weeks of order
- Foreign, in-print titles for CJK materials are supplied within six months of order
- Fully implemented EDIFACT ordering, order status reports, and invoices to facilitate batch processing and order maintenance.
- Provisional records are supplied in the standard MARC21 format for bib records with a minimum of the main title entry and its appropriate subfields, series title where present, ISBN, and imprint to maximize automated (system) duplication control and order tracking.
- Rate of accuracy for physical processing and bib records will be at minimum 95% (meaning that a 5% error rate would be acceptable).
- Library-specific data (collection barcode, URL) are included in record transfer

### **Minimum level cataloging (UCLA)**

- level of cataloging equivalent to OCLC I-level or better
- Description AACR2 as applied by the Library of Congress
- Access points for names use in the form established in the LCNAF if there is an authority record in the LCNAF for the entity; otherwise access points are established following AACR2 as applied by the Library of Congress
- Subject analysis as appropriate (e.g. no subject analysis for most individual works of belles-lettres) using LCSH for non-medical books; call number using NLF for medical books.
- For non-OCLC vendors: OCLC record number (in 035, \$a with prefix (OCoLC) that matches an English language OCLC/WorldCat record for item
- For OCLC vendors: OCLC record number (in 001, \$1 with prefix (ocn) and an 003 \$a OCoLC) that matches an English-language OCLC/WorldCat record for the item

### **Library (workflow) standards**

- Outsourced cataloging is at the greatest extent possible. Local modifications are limited to corrections to bib records solely for the purposes of discoverability.
- Physical processing is to the greatest extent possible. This is designed to radically reduce staff time dedicated to in-house physical processing and the costs involved in maintaining an inventory of processing supplies.
- Receiving and invoice processing is simultaneous.
- Where possible, invoice data is electronically submitted to the campuses' paying agency or invoices are paid against a deposit account.
- Items are made available within one week of receipt. Items are minimally reviewed before release for expedited availability.

## **Appendix 2: Best Practice Recommendations**

With thanks to Lightning Team 1: Susan Boone, Shirley Higgins, Germaine Wadeborn

1. The Shelf Ready website will contain a wealth of information about vendors and individual campus experiences and procedures. Consult the website before initiating new shelf ready workflows or projects and contribute documentation from all new workflows and projects to the website.
2. Before contracting with a new vendor, do a pilot project with a sample of materials or for a set period of time. Pilot projects are excellent ways to test new vendors and workflows. UCB piloted with YBP for 6 months. UCSD piloted 120 popular music CDs with Backstage Library Works.
3. Use shelf ready for mainstream (easy) cataloging and free-up staff for more challenging work. Also, use shelf ready for the hard stuff—formats that require special workflows; languages for which there is no in-house expertise; or subject areas that require special expertise.
4. Funding sources. To date, funding sources used by UC campuses for shelf ready workflows and projects have been fairly evenly split between collections funds, staff salaries (vacant positions and student GA), and operations budgets. One-time or limited funds like salary savings and GA make an excellent funding source for pilots or small projects.
5. Compressed workflow. Copy Cataloging, verification of records is simultaneous with receiving. Outsourced cataloging is at the greatest extent possible. Local modifications are limited to corrections to bib records solely for the purposes of discoverability. Items are minimally reviewed and verified before release for expedited availability. In-house cataloging is only done for items with incomplete or missing call numbers or no subject headings (if required).
6. Require vendors to adhere to a specified standard for bib records (BSR or UC standard record). Do away with as many local processing requirements as possible: heading verification (outsource to an authorities vendor or require shelf ready vendor to meet a specification); local notes, subject terms, or classification; shelflisting.
7. Require that vendors supply library-specific data (invoice data, barcode numbers, and title-level URLs that reference the library's content) in the most streamlined way possible. Optimal vendor services are where the provisional ("on order") records and the subsequent full bibliographic records which overlay them are supplied in a single file for import into the ILS with all necessary data elements for title-level access (e.g. barcodes for print, URLs for electronic), and payment processing.
8. Have OCLC set holdings automatically for PromptCat records. UCSD created a semi-automated process to set holdings on all new cataloging weekly to ensure that UCSD's holdings remained in sync with WorldCat post-reclamation.

9. Use OCLC Bib Notification to upgrade bib records via an automated process. This will allow campuses to accept less than full copy, knowing that it will likely be upgraded by the library community.
10. Ensure that there is adequate and appropriate technical support and programming resources available at the campuses to facilitate establishing pilots and ongoing shelf ready services.

### Appendix 3: Recommended elements for a Shelfready Physical Processing Standard

With thanks to Lightning Team 2: Robin Gustafson, Wanda Jazayeri, Yi-Yen Hayford

In addition to making specifications for a UC wide shelf ready standard as uniform as possible, we recommend that the standard be simplified as much as possible using the most cost effective choices. Elements of such a model could include:

- Barcode: Apply one barcode—same location for all; on cover, front or back to be determined
- Ownership stamp:
  - Number of impressions: Apply one impression whenever possible.
  - Location: Recommended location would be on the top book block because it is easy to apply there and very visible. (Although a vendor like YBP may charge same amount for two stamps as for one, if similarity/uniformity between in-house and shelf ready processing is desired, it is cheaper just to apply one stamp.)
- Tattle-tape:
  - Adopt only one method of tattle tape application—gutter application. No real advantage to spine application and most books, including hardbound are not suited to spine insertion.
  - Restrict to as few types (single sided vs. double sided) and lengths as possible to reduce material costs associated with ordering wide varieties of sizes and types. If only gutter application is implemented, only double sided tattle tape will need to be ordered.
- Call number label:
  - Choose one standard for call number label: font, size, and position.
  - Consider current preservation standards, when choosing label type, not just current majority usage.
  -

In order to determine the most cost effective choices, additional consultation with vendors is needed. We recommend that a vendor be selected, perhaps YBP, since so many campuses already contract with them, and ask which physical processing choices would help them offer UC the best rates possible for a consortial program. Specifically, additional information would be desirable for the following elements:

- Ownership stamp: Ask the vendor which of the following options would increase or decrease costs:
  - Requesting use of a completely different stamp for each campus—format and size doesn't matter as long as it fits in the agreed upon stamp location.
  - Requesting use of the same UC system wide stamp for all campuses (This means we would rely on the barcode text to identify the campus. Would this be sufficient for us?)
  - Would there be any advantage to selecting the same size font and style for all stamps?
  - Requesting use of one UC system wide stamp plus a campus specific subordinate stamp

- Are there different costs associated with location of stamp? For example, does it cost more for stamping on t.p. or inside book than on book block?
- Does stamping cost depend on the number of impressions applied?
- Call number labels: Does printing locations on labels increase cost of label? (This seems to be handled by data in the file. Campuses that currently have shelf ready contracts print locations seem to have locations printed on a selective basis.)
- Barcodes: Which placement areas if any are most cost effective?

Although not currently needed in order to develop a shelf ready system wide standard, we believe that the in-house practices that merit investigation include the application of stamps and slips that indicate circulation status. Are these needed now that we have ILS systems that control circulation and retain our circulation statistics? We need to consider the physical maintenance required to remove these in response to location shifts and changes in circulation policies. Examples include: “library use only” stamps and circulations slips

## **Appendix 4: Capturing the Value of Efficiency**

Apply these guidelines when planning the implementation of a new process, policy and or system.

### **Preferred methodology**

To capture the value of efficiencies introduced by new processes, policies and or systems, follow these steps:

1. In advance of the implementation of a new process, policy and/or system, identify one or more site(s) that is practicing the current process, is following the current policy or is using the current system.
2. Measure or sample? one (or more) of the following:
  - a. Staff time expended to achieve the work product/outcome.
  - b. Actual expenditures involved in achieving the work product/outcome.
3. In addition, for the implementation itself, estimate expected results in the same categories as tracked in 2:
  - a. Staff time expended to implement the new processes, policies and or system.
  - b. Actual expenditures involved in implementing new processes, policies and or system.
4. Implement the new process, policy or system.
5. Return to the same site as (1 & 2) and take re-measurements of what is now needed to achieve the work product/outcome.

### **Methodology adaptations**

Certain situations may occur that prevent the use of the preferred methodology, including:

- No Baseline Site—there is no site which has not adapted all or part of the new solution;
- Baseline and Implementation Sites are not the same—the site where the “pre-“ measure was taken is not available for a “post-“ assessment.

In situations like these, the recommended technique is to use a combination of three tools:

- Comparables—sites that are similar to the department or operation to be measured. Look for institutions that are undergoing “next-generation” transformations and that may be interested in information exchanges.
- Estimates—use the information from the site to make the best estimate possible, based on prior experience or statistical reports, based on what is known about similar situations, and based on industry norms.
- Adjustments—make changes to the information as necessary to scale up or down to UC requirements. In other words, if the comparable site is half as big as the subject site, consider doubling the numbers from the comparable.