

REPORT FROM POT6 LIGHTNING TEAM 1A:

A STUDY OF SHARED COLLECTION SERVICES PROJECTS

March 9, 2012

Team members:

Xiaoli Li, University of California, Davis (Convener)

James Soe Nyun, University of California, San Diego

Manuel Urrizola, University of California, Riverside

INTRODUCTION

Our team was charged to identify and collect information for current and past arrangements that have involved shared technical services across multiple UC campuses. We were also asked to find noteworthy examples of such arrangements outside of UC. (See **Appendix A** for the complete charge).

In order to accomplish our charge, we first contacted HOTS members who we believe have good knowledge of the existing shared services/projects engaged by their campuses. To select an example in the shared licensing area, we consulted the Excel spreadsheet *CDL Managed Resources [XLS]* which was posted on the CDL website: <http://www.cdlib.org/services/collections/licensed/index.html>. To find notable shared projects outside of UC, we did a quick literature review and were able to identify four libraries/consortia that have implemented cooperative arrangements that may be of interest to POT6.

Appendix B lists all 39 shared service arrangements we have identified. A few things about the list we'd like to point out:

- Shared services provided by CDL, such as SCP, were excluded per our discussion with POT6;
- We felt that shared training is an important area and decided to include a few examples of such activities though we were not asked for them;
- Two proposed shared services were suggested by HOTS members.

To obtain more information for each arrangement, we designed a set of interview questions. Draft questions were reviewed by POT6 and the Assessment Analyst at CDL. Based on the feedback received, we revised the questions and tested them on three people who are involved in their campuses' shared service projects. The finalized survey questions (**Appendix C**), which incorporated the comments from the testers, were emailed to one or two key contacts of each project listed in **Appendix B** except the ones under Training, Shared Services under Development, and Proposed Shared Services. We also excluded Ontario Council of University Libraries from our distribution list because their project is similar to the one by Orbis Cascade Alliance.

We then followed up with a phone interview with each person we contacted via email. (Three shared cataloging projects were dropped from our interview list because no activities beyond planning have happened yet.) For most of the shared service arrangements within UC, we interviewed two people for each project – one from the library providing the service and one from the library receiving the service. Each of those interviews was conducted by a single committee member for the sake of efficiency. For interviews of non-UC projects, the committee members worked in pairs. We were unable to talk to 2CUL people due to difficulty with scheduling, but they responded to our survey via email. Our report is based on interviews conducted for over 30 projects. The summaries of interviews for each project follow immediately below, and following that are the common themes we have observed. Finally we present a collection of our recommendations and ideas for POT6's consideration.

THE PROJECTS SURVEYED

The scope of 21 projects examined by the Lightning Team fell into several large categories within collection services. Below, we've organized the projects by overall purpose, provided a brief synopsis, and listed some basic strengths and weaknesses uncovered in the survey.

CATALOGING Projects

UC-wide:

- UC CONSER Funnel Project (Status: Ongoing)

A UC-wide cooperative agreement that facilitates contributions to the national CONSER database for institutions that are not full CONSER members. Demonstrates strengths in training, communications, and ongoing support; also makes good use of existing expertise and promotes collaboration. Problematic areas involve software and uneven participation due to shifting staffing and priorities, as well as local organizational changes.

- Electronic California documents cataloging pilot: CAMCIG initiative (Status: On Hold)

Five campuses performed original cataloging for documents issued by 28 California agencies; cataloging records were harvested and distributed by SCP. Identified strengths were fostered collaboration among the campuses and exposed important documents in campus. Choice of state agencies and archiving services should be agreed upon and documented. Currently only one campus is continuing with the effort.

Additional information about the project

Electronic California Documents Pilot Project (Final Report):

<http://libraries.universityofcalifornia.edu/hots/camcig/CalDocsFinalReport-2A.pdf>

CAMCIG Annual Report (2009/2010)

<http://libraries.universityofcalifornia.edu/hots/camcig/CAMCIGAnnualReport0910.pdf>

Language-specific:

- German language monograph cataloging: UCB for UCSD (Status: On Hold)

One cataloger at Berkeley cataloged German monographs for San Diego. Project was successful in sharing cataloging and language skills, and in creating functional cataloging surrogates. Identified weaknesses in process of distributing surrogates and the effort required to create and manage them.

- Thai language cataloging: UCR for UCB and UCSB (Status: Ongoing)

One cataloger at Riverside provides regular cataloging of Thai language materials for Santa

Barbara and Berkeley. Overall, a successful, ongoing workflow, financed by the institution hosting the cataloger.

- Orbis Cascade Foreign Language Cataloging Pilot (Status: Concluded)

In this non-UC pilot project, six members of the Orbis Cascade Alliance explored centralizing the cataloging of books in Chinese and Japanese at University of Oregon and those in Arabic at University of Washington. It involved shipment of items to be cataloged and showed that it was logistically possible and actually easier than imagined. It concluded with the determination that cataloging without compensation cannot be sustained, even when other facets are a success. The specialized nature of the materials also kept many Alliance members from participating.

Focus on format or content:

- Music CD copy cataloging: UCSD for UCSB (Status: Ongoing)

Catalogers at San Diego copy catalog compact discs for Santa Barbara. This successful process involves the creation and shipping of cataloging surrogates consisting of photocopies and accompanying material. Currently UCSD bears the costs of cataloging—the bulk of the expense—while UCSB covers costs on their side of the workflow, primarily creating surrogates and handling the materials. Long-term funding remains a question.

- Ohio State University, Columbus Law Library/Main Library Collaborative Cataloging Project (Status: Concluded)

The main library contracted out its cataloging services to the law library, a completely different administrative unit; process involved sending some catalogers on-site to the library being served (which was on the same campus). Considered very successful overall, it delivered cataloging at \$1.50 to \$3.00 per title, even with some local customization. Project saw a few initial problems with remote management, problems which were rectified.

CONSERVATION, PRESERVATION and DIGITIZATION projects

Conservation

- UCLA Conservation Lab repairs damaged items for UCSB (Status: Concluded)

A tiny (1-book) project with one campus providing mold removal services for another. Actual work performed went well, but process was hindered by a link in the chain of communications.

- SILDRN [San Diego and Imperial County Libraries Disaster Recovery Network] (Status: Ongoing)

In the area of disaster preparedness, UC San Diego is the lead institution in the 16 member organization. This group maintains a mutual aid agreement in case of disasters affecting library and museum collections, as well as commonly accessible and maintained caches of emergency response supplies. Partly member-supported, SILDRN enjoys broad local participation from local

libraries, museums and cultural institutions. However, it lacks formal governance and controls, concentrating most responsibilities in the lead institution, a lack which will likely be worked on soon. Also, no large emergencies have tested the core aid agreement.

Reformatting (for preservation purposes)

- Preservation microfilming service: UCB for UCD (paid) (Status: Ongoing)

In this ongoing arrangement Berkeley provides preservation microfilming services to Davis for various serials including Sacramento newspapers and journals focusing on viticulture and enology. It was noted that quality was superior to working with a traditional vendor, resulting in less need for oversight and quality control. Titles are sent when funds are available, and some past batches have been funded consortially or through agency funding. UCD reimburses UCB by recharge. Lack of funding cited as main impediment to doing more work through this channel.

- Preservation imaging service: SRLF for southern campuses (Status: Ongoing)

Begun as a microfilming service for the southern campuses, SRLF now has broadened its offerings to include digitization. Current workload focuses on newspapers and dissertations, and list of customers includes some non-UC institutions. High quality of service is noted. Project nature of work creates fluctuating workloads, and estimating timeframes can be difficult.

Digitization

- Digital preservation for the UCSD Libraries' Digital Asset Management System (DAMS) content (Status: Ongoing)

The preservation of DAMS contents is realized through a partnership with the San Diego Super Computer Center's Chronopolis Digital Preservation Repository. Chronopolis is a large, grant-funded project to explore distributed backup strategies for digital assets; resulting strategy was then used for library's DAMS. The process for mirroring library content at SDSCC and bagging and ingesting into Chronopolis work well. Areas to be worked out include what to do with in the event of local data loss and better dealing with event management.

- Digitizing special collections: UCM for UCSF (Status: Concluded)

A fee-for-service project where Merced digitized approximately 200 cholera-related pamphlets for San Francisco. Early planning and evaluation foresaw many of the potential problems and helped project proceed smoothly. Merced explored use of project management software.

- California Audio Visual Preservation Project (Status: Concluded)

Nineteen institutions participated in this grant-funded project where Berkeley digitized and managed the digitization of AV resources. A second year of the project—with entirely separate funding—is proceeding. Project management went well but a search for usable software turned up nothing that fit the purpose.

Project website: <http://www.calpreservation.org/services/cavpp.html>

SHARED LICENSING, SHARED PRINT and SHARED PURCHASING Projects

Shared licensing:

- UCD negotiates license for several UC campuses (Status: Concluded)

Davis negotiated licensing for over 200 engineering titles in McGraw-Hill Access Engineering, a Tier 2 resource. Internal UC collaboration and decision-making went well, and concentrating the special negotiation skills proved successful. However the process revealed the challenges in handling perpetual access.

Special note: all Tier 2s are licensed at the campus leading the Tier 2. Licensing expertise and willingness to undertake this activity varies from campus to campus. The willingness to negotiate on certain license issues varies from campus to campus.

Shared print:

- Elsevier/ACM pilot: UCSD and UCLA cataloging for the ten campuses (Status: Concluded)

A large planning effort in 2002-2003 developed workflows to process single print items received in conjunction with CDL license agreements for Elsevier journals and various physical formats for ACM Print Archive monographs. UCLA did Elsevier and UCSD did ACM titles as part of the pilot to compare the cataloging experiences at different institutions and to compare the effectiveness of cataloging at a more distant institution that didn't have the same ILS as SRLF. Survey interview of UCSD side and review of the project assessment report (http://libraries.universityofcalifornia.edu/cdc/taskforces/elsevier_acm_assessment.doc) show some parts of the process have worked well, though UCSD experienced far more problems than UCLA did, with major issues related to operating remote cataloging, using an ILS other than SRLF's and the low volume of materials for the test. Pilot led to excellent report (<http://libraries.universityofcalifornia.edu/cdc/taskforces/ucsharedcoll-pilot-rpt.pdf>). SRLF has mainstreamed processing with help from UCLA to deal with special problems.

Special note: this pilot was the precursor of the project "Management of UC shared print journal archives" below.

- Management of UC shared print journal archives (Status: Ongoing)

UCLA maintains cataloging records, checks in, and processes issues of single copy of shared print journals acquired as a Tier 1 resource. Licensing arrangements include that this copy will be provided. Inter-campus communications were cited as being excellent, but the amount of funding from the campuses was seen as insufficient. There were not enough policies in place at the beginning of the project.

- Canadian Literature Project: UCLA and SRLF for the ten campuses (Status: Concluded)

Anglophone Canadian materials were acquired and cataloged centrally to avoid duplication and provide access to the materials. The project generally went well, but reliance on donated cataloging time kept it from being sustainable.

- Management of Springer e-books shared print copies (Status: Ongoing)

Merced receives, processes and houses shelf-ready print versions of Tier 1 Springer e-books on behalf of UC. Springer finances shelf-ready physical processing through YBP while Merced covers incidental local processing costs. Processing mirrors local workflows and is totally successful. Questions about the need for print copies will shape whether the process continues.

Shared purchasing:

- Orbis Cascade demand-driven acquisition e-book pilot (Status: Concluded)

A successful non-UC project looked at consortial patron-driven acquisitions over the entire consortium so that the titles could be shared with all members; the pilot is morphing into an ongoing workflow. Used EBL and YBP as vendors. Adjusted trigger to initiate a purchase (to fewer short-term loans). Experienced some issues related to OCLC updating their knowledge base only monthly.

Project website: <http://www.orbiscascade.org/index/demand-driven-acquisitions-pilot>

MULTI-FACETED EXTERNAL PROJECT

- 2CUL (Status: Ongoing)

Initially supported by a grant (\$385,000) from The Andrew W. Mellon Foundation, the libraries at Cornell and Columbia started to collaborate in the following areas: 1) Technical services (acquisitions, cataloging, e-resource management); 2) Collection development/global resources collecting; 3) Technology infrastructure/digital preservation. Mutual trust and understanding of each other's local culture built over the time have enabled the two library systems to work toward their common goals and established more concrete activities. Ithaka was hired to be the project consultant that developed agenda with the university librarians, facilitated meetings, and ensured the work was done on schedule. The project is still in its early stages, with early successes in sharing cataloging language expertise. Currently, a shared ILS is being investigated in order to really effectively integrate the workflow. Responder indicated difficulties with communication to staff when the project specifics are still evolving.

Project website: <http://2cul.org/>

COMMON THEMES

Numerous themes emerged as we began to compare the effectiveness of the various projects. Some of the predominant ones may seem like common sense, but ignoring the obvious led to less-than-ideal results more than once. Below we restate a few of the obvious themes, but in addition found numerous other details that can contribute to constructing a successful project.

IMPORTANCE OF PLANNING. Nobody complained about **TOO MUCH** planning. As might be predicted, large and complex projects typically required more planning than small, more straightforward ones. Planning often centered on logistics and on drafting standards and procedures to be used in the project. Some typical success stories involved creating a scope-of-work document—essentially a contract outlining what cataloging would be done on material to be cataloged; preparing a careful inventory of materials to be digitized; and constructing a complex set of guidelines for an early attempt at handling shared print, a process that involved representatives from several campuses generating a report that they felt would “set the precedent for future shared print collections.” (UCSD/UCSB CD Cataloging and California AV Preservation Project; UC San Francisco/UC Merced Special Collections Digitization; Elsevier/ACM Print Archive Pilot)

COMMUNICATIONS, good and bad, shaped many outcomes. In most situations communication went well or was considered outstanding. Modes of communications relied heaviest on e-mail, with occasional use of phone and conference calls. Because of distance between institutions face-to-face meetings were limited.

Poor communications, however, along with a deficit of early planning were cited as problems in at least one case. (Chronopolis) A single unresponsive participant held up progress of another small project. (UCLA/UCSB Conservation) Communicating the chain of managerial oversight and responsibilities of all participants is important when setting up a new process. One project encountered a problem with this, but quickly corrected it through normal communication channels. (Ohio State project)

STANDARDS play a major part in any process. Establishing a clear set of expectations up front as part of the planning process is critical to success. While cataloging projects use the same basic national standards, local variations will complicate processing, even where variations are slight. (UCSD/UCSB CD Copy Cataloging) Even though it may add complexity, a slight difference in standards may be justified in some situations.

SUFFICIENT SCALING should be kept in mind. Some processes that combined specialized workflows or standards with few materials required those working on the project to spend much time re-familiarizing themselves with the requirements of the project materials—not a situation conducive to timeliness or high quality of work. (Elsevier/ACM Print Archive Pilot) Variations in standards (see above) can contribute to problems with scaling if staff need to juggle multiple standards quickly.

PAY ATTENTION TO PROJECT MANAGEMENT. Several responders commented on excellent project management (e.g., California AV Preservation). One project had one of the parties using the open-source RedMine project management software to track progress and hours worked. (UCM, in their collaboration with UCSF to digitize Special Collections pamphlets). UC CONSER Funnel uses listserv and website to disseminate information and facilitate communication.

BUILD ON EXISTING SUCCESSFUL MODELS. Projects modeled after existing workflows were easiest to start up and tended to be successful. UCB microfilming for UCD built on services Berkeley had rendered others. UCM’s shared print program mirrored a similar shelf-ready process in place for Merced’s regular collection.

It makes sense to **SHARE EXPERTISE** within the University. This can take the form of a single expert in a relatively rare language (e.g., Thai) or a concentration of a specialized skill (microfilming); it can also take the form of a shortage at an institution of a skill that may not be that uncommon (e.g., music cataloging or cataloging German language materials).

It also makes sense to **SHARE SPECIALIZED EQUIPMENT** with the University (e.g., scanners at Merced).

UC DOES GOOD WORK, a fact that was mentioned directly and indirectly (e.g., California AV Preservation). Comments suggested that this good work can come at a lower price and higher level of service compared to outside vendors. In the case of cataloging the situation might be different if the service were not provided “for free” at another campus. Still this serves to distribute resources that the University has invested in. We didn’t ask questions to determine whether it was less costly to process the materials as a University versus relying on outside vendors. The Ohio State project did look at the costs closely, however, and produced their cataloging product at a small fraction of the price of comparable outsourcing.

THE NEED TO PHYSICALLY HANDLE MATERIALS PRESENTED PROBLEMS but also resulted in some interesting solutions.

- Items to be digitized need to be transported. Some successes came from using existing transport methods (Tricor or other existing item delivery service)
- Creating whole or partial surrogates of items to be cataloged: sometimes tangible products, other times entirely scanned (i.e. digitized). This might be considered duplicate work in light of digitization efforts. Something to be said for digitizing first, cataloging later
- Need to pay close attention in project workflows to the preparation of surrogates and other physical handling of resources

STAFFING LEVELS AFFECT PROJECT OUTCOMES. E.g., involving students in projects can subject the outcome to cycles in the school year (UCSF/UCM Special Collections Digitization), and dedicating small part of a position to a sporadic workload can make the outcome subject to less predictable timetables. (Elsevier/ACM Print Archive Pilot)

FUNDING WILL AFFECT OUTCOME. Some projects fizzled because they relied on an unsustainable financial model, even though the project may have proven that there was interesting work to do.” (Canadian Literature Project, Orbis Foreign Language Cataloging Pilot) Still, some smaller (and at least one middle-sized) initiatives deliver reasonable outcomes without official supplemental funding; in these cases support from management at partnering institutions helps to give the projects a chance to succeed. (Thai Language Cataloging, German language cataloging, Music CD Copy Cataloging) Subjectively, institutions receiving the gratis services seemed to be appreciative of the assistance, but there was a sense of unease that this might not be a permanent arrangement that could be depended on long-term. Also, “gratis” is relative, as there are always costs to manage materials for remote cataloging.

Small financial detail: Many cataloging projects involved one campus using OCLC logins of another. This resulted in situations where the institution receiving a service received cataloging credits on OCLC, further adding to the funding imbalance.

GRANT FUNDING contributed to two surveyed UC projects, Chronopolis, and California AV Preservation. The scope of Chronopolis was more aligned toward the more “cutting edge” initiatives that attract grantors; and the scope of the preservation was in line with other areas where preservation funds may be more commonly available. Grant funding to carry out traditional technical services, however, is a rare commodity.

Although heavily tied to technical services, Columbia's and Cornell's 2CUL attracted significant funding from the Mellon Foundation. So far the initiative differs from UC's projects in packaging together into one large project many of the types of projects UC has taken on piecemeal. Also its model to partner with another institution was less unusual. Perhaps this could be incentive to think big in what UC might attempt, or at least in presenting its initiatives to the outside world.

SOME PROJECTS AND PARTS OF OTHERS WERE FAILURES, but they may have been approached as experiments to see if an idea could be translated into a real-world process.] (E.g., Electronic California Documents Cataloging Pilot) We need to learn from the mistakes and difficulties, and pay attention to any reports that may have been prepared summarizing the projects. (E.g., ACM Print Archive Pilot evaluation report)

Some projects experienced technical difficulties, but what was difficult or [led to] a failure might be less of an issue as technology advances. One example was the difficulty of sharing of digital surrogates for the UCB/UCSD German Language Cataloging project, a problem that might now have a solution with the availability of more cloud services.

RECHARGING ANOTHER ORGANIZATIONAL UNIT was initially a fairly complex hurdle at Ohio State once the library offered its services to others. UC has now figured this out in several locations and situations. (SRLF Preservation Imaging Service, Chronopolis, etc.)

RECOMMENDATIONS

WHAT HAVE WE LEARNED FROM INTERVIEWING KEY CONTACTS FOR THESE SHARED SERVICES?

Success depends on attention to these critical factors:

- planning
- communication
- funding
- management

Sufficient planning early-on is often key to a successful shared service; lack of planning usually led to pitfalls and hurdles to overcome. Timely communication kept providers and recipients of shared services on the same page and helped to clarify reporting mechanisms; lack of communication slowed down services or brought the service to a halt. Stable funding is necessary to the viability of any shared service, especially ongoing services; many of the shared services lacked stable funding. Ultimately, the successful management of a shared service depends on supportive library administrations—not just economic support, but moral, cultural, and political support as well.

RECOMMENDATIONS AND IDEAS FOR POT6 TO CONSIDER:

FUNDING AND ADMINISTRATION

- Establish stable funding models for existing services (such as the Management of UC Shared Print Journal Archives).
- Actively seek outside funding (such as grants) for new shared services when appropriate.
- Encourage more projects—particularly the large ones—to issue final reports when they conclude (to provide a source of research for future operations).
- Post the ongoing shared technical services within UC to HOTS website and keep the list up-to-date. In addition, maintain a list of past services and projects with links to all important documentation related to a project.
- Support new projects and workflows at all scales so that projects of interest to only a few can get recognition and support. This would also permit proceeding with complex initiatives where logistics cannot be worked out, or where uniform standards cannot be formulated across all interested institutions. Not every project needs to be “Tier 1.”

CATALOGING AND TRAINING

- Cataloging seems to be an area that is relatively easier to collaborate because of the requirements of national and OCLC standards.
- Consider in-sourcing shared services within UC when it could be done as easily and economically as outsourcing. (See Ohio State University, Columbus Law Library/Main Library Collaborative Cataloging Project in-sourcing example, pg. 4 above.)
- Look at how models such as the UC CONSER Funnel might be used to increase UC participation in national cataloging programs, thus sharing high-level expertise among the campuses and reducing the overhead to participate.

- Add the format and subject expertise that each campus possesses into the HOTS document “Cataloging Expertise spreadsheet” and keep it up-to-date to facilitate shared cataloging of materials in foreign languages, special formats, or subject areas.
- Compare the list of backlogs exposed during current NGTS surveys against resources UC-wide available to process them. Consider these resources to be staffed with the required expertise, regardless of campus, as well as shared services or projects that may already be in place.
- Support shared training. Shared training saves money and promotes standardization as evidenced by shared CONSER training and as needed in the very near future for training for RDA (Resource Description and Access, the new rules to replace AACR2 in 2013).

ACQUISITIONS, COLLECTIONS, AND SYSTEMS

- Support a proposed shared project which is designed to provide ISBN’s/ISSN’s for resources in the CABI database (see Appendix B. Shared Services under Development).
- Build on the current model of utilizing licensing experts at CDL and several campuses.
- Explore consolidating UC under a shared ILS to maximize efficiency across the UC. (See 2CUL project, pg. 7 above.)

DIGITIZATION, CONSERVATION, AND PRESERVATION

- Promote UC shared digitization services (working with POT1) - digitizing and cataloging digital objects for the California Coastal Conservancy can be used as a pilot project. (see Appendix B. Shared Services under Development)
- Consider the idea of having UC Book Bindery serve as a focal point for expertise related to print material repair and work closely with the Preservation Unit at UC Berkeley to advise on repair and conservation work. This would be an addition to the bindery services that the Bindery provides to the 10 campuses.
- Establish UC Preservation Center or Centers (one in north and the other in south). Preservation work requires special expertise and equipment; it makes sense to centralize the function across the UC.

WHAT SHOULD THE UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA AVOID DOING?

- Creating new institutions or bureaucracies to manage shared services. Instead use existing institutions (CDL, SCP, individual UC libraries and RLFS) to provide shared services (similar to the way SCP was created).
- Insisting that all shared services be of the same level of formality. Instead encourage different levels of formality to suit particular services and institutions.

APPENDIX A: LT 1A CHARGE 20111004

To: Xiaoli Li, UCD; Manuel Urrizola, UCR; Jim Soe Nyun, UCSD

From: Vicki Grahame, SOPAG sponsor for POT 6

Subject: Request for Assistance (Charge): Cooperative Arrangements

POT 6, Lightning Team 1A

As you know, Next-Generation Technical Services (NGTS) is an initiative developed by the University Librarians and SOPAG to redesign technical services workflows across the full range of library formats in order to take advantage of new system-wide capabilities and tools, minimize redundant activities, improve efficiency, and foster innovation in collection development and management to the benefit of UC library users.

The Power of Three groups have been empowered to form short-term groups charged with conducting pilot projects or other specific, well-defined tasks that will assist the POT in completing the deliverables outlined in its charge. Composition of the Lightning Teams will depend on the scope of the task. The POT can tap any appropriate experts from within the UC system with consideration of UC location/geography, campus size and decision-making authority.

As recognized experts in the field, you have been selected to serve on a POT6 Lightning Team to develop and conduct a survey of existing UC shared collection services operations. The data collected from this survey will help determine the next steps and pilot projects proposed for UC Collections Services Centers.

Your convener will be Xiaoli Li. John Riemer will be your POT 6 liaison to facilitate communication and filter questions and concerns. The details of the tasks and the charge may change, and new tasks may arise that need to be addressed.

CHARGE

For this team, the project tasks we've identified so far are listed below with target completion dates.

(1) Identify the all existing/recently-concluded arrangements that have involved shared collection services across multiple UC campuses, falling within any of the technical services functions cited in the [POT 6 charge summary](#). Collect a short scope statement and a contact person that can be used for possible follow up interviewing. Identify noteworthy examples of such arrangements outside of UC and collect the same information for them.

(2) Develop a survey (set of interview questions) for review by POT 6 that can be used to elicit information from managers or participants in the shared collection service. Pilot test the set of questions.

(3) Conduct interviews with 1 or 2 contact persons for each cooperative arrangement, compile results, look for common features and strengths/weaknesses and submit report to POT 6.

TIMEFRAME AND TARGET DATES

October 26 – Start work

November 15 – Complete (1). Submit set of interview questions in (2) for POT 6 review.

November 29 – Complete pilot test of set of interview questions

December 16 – Deadline for completing interviews

January 31 – Submit report to POT 6

Thank you for your willingness to serve UC Libraries in what we believe will be an important step toward improving technical services operations across the campuses.

REVISED 10/26/11

APPENDIX B: LIST OF SHARED SERVICES

SHARED SERVICES AT UC'S

CATALOGING

* (ongoing) UC CONSER Funnel Project: UCLA provides training to other UC libraries to maintain CONSER records. Valerie Bross vbross@library.ucla.edu, UCLA; Sarah Gardner sjohn@lib.ucdavis.edu, UCD.

* (ongoing) Thai language cataloging: UCR for UCB and UCSB. Manuel Urrizola manuelu@ucr.edu, Sompratana Creighton somprata@ucr.edu, UCR; Armanda Barone abarone@library.berkeley.edu, UCB; Anna DeVore devore@library.ucsb.edu, Susan Moon smoon@library.ucsb.edu, UCSB.

* (inactive) Nepali language/Devanagari script romanization for tete-beche books: UCB for UCSB. Contacts: Armanda Barone abarone@library.berkeley.edu, Adnan Malik amalik@library.berkeley.edu, UCB; Anna DeVore devore@library.ucsb.edu, Karen Peters kpeters@library.ucsb.edu, UCSB.

* (inactive) Tibetan language romanization for CD-ROMs: UCB for UCSB. Contacts: Armanda Barone abarone@library.berkeley.edu, Bruce William bwilliam@library.berkeley.edu, UCB; Anna DeVore devore@library.ucsb.edu, Karen Peters kpeters@library.ucsb.edu, UCSB.

* (ongoing) Music CD copy cataloging: UCSD for UCSB. Contacts: Linda Barnhart lbarnhart@ucsd.edu, Jim Soe Nyun jsoenyun@ucsd.edu, UCSD; Eunice Schroeder Schroeder@library.ucsb.edu, Temmo Korisheli Korisheli@library.ucsb.edu, UCSB.

* (inactive) Czech language cholera pamphlet cataloging: UCLA for UCSF. Contacts: John Riemer jriemer@library.ucla.edu, UCLA; Bea Mallek Beatrice.mallek@ucsf.edu, UCSF.

* (on hold) California government e-document cataloging: CAMCIG initiative - five volunteer campuses cataloged for the ten campuses with records distributed by SCP. Contacts: Xiaoli Li xlli@ucdavis.edu, then CAMCIG chair; Adolfo Tarango atarango@ucsd.edu, SCP. The project is on hold because of the unresolved preservation issues.

* (on hold) German Language monograph cataloging: UCB cataloging for UCSD. Contacts: Armanda Barone abarone@library.berkeley.edu, Kai Stoeckenius kstoecke@library.berkeley.edu, UCB; Marilu Vallejo mvallejo@ucsd.edu, UCSD.

CONSERVATION AND PRESERVATION

* (ongoing) Conservation: UCLA Conservation Lab repairs damaged items for UCSB. Contacts: Jake Nadal jnadal@library.ucla.edu, Kristen St. John kstjohn@library.ucla.edu, UCLA; Catherine Nelson nelson@library.ucsb.edu, UCSB.

* (ongoing) California Audio Visual Preservation Project: UCB for UCSF. Contacts: Barclay Ogden bogden@library.berkeley.edu, UCB; Kathleen Cameron kathleen.cameron@ucsf.edu, UCSF.

* (ongoing) Digital preservation for the UCSD Libraries' DAMS content is realized through a partnership with the San Diego Super Computer Center's Chronopolis Digital Preservation Repository. Contact: Roger Smith ros001@ucsd.edu, UCSD.

* (ongoing) In the area of disaster preparedness, UC San Diego is the lead institution in the 16 member SILDRN organization [San Diego and Imperial County Libraries Disaster Recovery Network]. This group maintains a mutual aid agreement in case of disasters affecting library and museum collections, as well as commonly accessible and maintained caches of emergency response supplies. Contact: Roger Smith ros001@ucsd.edu, UCSD.

* (ongoing) Preservation microfilming service: UCB for UCD (paid). Contacts: Robert Byler rbyler@library.berkeley.edu, UCB; Charlotte Payne clpayne@lib.ucdavis.edu, UCD.

* (ongoing) Preservation microfilming service: SRLF for southern campuses. Contact: Pete Lacson placson@library.ucla.edu, SRLF

LICENSING

* (completed) UCD negotiates license for several CDL packages (ongoing). Contact: Karl Kocher kakocher@lib.ucdavis.edu, UCD.

* (completed) Licensing the Informa Healthcare (completed): UCSF, UCB, UCD, and CDL for the rest of the UC campuses. Contacts: Anneliese Taylor, anneliese.taylor@ucsf.edu, UCSF; Dana Jemison djemison@library.berkeley.edu, UCB; Karl Kocher kakocher@lib.ucdavis.edu, UCD; Curtis Lavery Curtis.Lavery@ucop.edu, CDL.

DIGITIZATION

* (Completed) Digitization of special collections: UCM for UCSF Contacts: Emily Lin elin@ucmerced.edu, UCM; Kathleen Cameron kathleen.cameron@ucsf.edu, UCSF.

MANAGEMENT OF UC SHARED COLLECTIONS

* (ongoing) Management of UC shared print journal archives: UCLA maintains cataloging records, checks in, and processes issues. Contact: John Riemer jriemer@library.ucla.edu, UCLA.

* (ongoing) Management of Springer e-books shared print copies. UCM receives shared print archival copies. Contact: Jim Dooley jdooley@ucmerced.edu, UCM.

* (completed) Canadian Literature Project: UCLA for the ten campuses. Contact: John Riemer jriemer@library.ucla.edu, UCLA.

* (completed) ACM print archive pilot: UCSD cataloging for the ten campuses. Contact: Linda Barnhart lbarnhart@ucsd.edu, UCSD. It was part of a CDC pilot project to assess workflow and expense for shared print cataloging.

TRAINING (NO INTERVIEW CONDUCTED)

* (ongoing) UCR provides training, cataloging tools, processing supplies, and technical services facilities for the California Museum of Photography's library of books. Contacts: Manuel Urrizola manuelu@ucr.edu, Leigh Gleason leigh.gleason@ucr.edu, UCR.

* (ongoing) UCR provides training for catalogers at Center for Bibliographical Studies and Research (CBSR); catalogers at CBSR create a microfilm record (as part of California Newspaper Microfilm Archive) for UCR. Contacts: Manuel Urrizola manuelu@ucr.edu, Christine Straitt christine.straitt@ucr.edu, UCR.

* (completed) Conservation training: UCLA and UCB (separately) for UCR. Contact: Patricia Smith-Hunt patricsh@ucr.edu, UCR.

* (ongoing) PID shared services: UCSD manages other UC campus's access to/use of the PID server (primarily training). Contact: Adolfo Tarango atarango@ucsd.edu, UCSD

* (completed) Web-based RDA training: Two CAMCIG members conducted a webinar for the entire UC catalogers. Contacts: Manuel Urrizola manuelu@ucr.edu, UCR; Sara Shatford Layne slayne@library.ucla.edu, UCLA.

* (completed) Subject analysis training: UCR for UCSD. Contacts: Manuel Urrizola manuelu@ucr.edu, UCR; Linda Barnhart lbarnhart@ucsd.edu, UCSD.

* (completed) Basic serials cataloging training: UCR and UCSD for UCB. Contacts: Manuel Urrizola manuelu@ucr.edu, UCR; Adolfo Tarango atarango@ucsd.edu, UCSD; Carole McEwan cmcewan@uci.edu, UCI (then at UCB).

* (ongoing) UC CONSER Funnel Project. Contacts: Valerie Bross mvbross@library.ucla.edu, Melissa Beck beck@law.ucla.edu for UCLA; Sarah Gardner sjohn@lib.ucdavis.edu, UCD.

SHARED SERVICES UNDER DEVELOPMENT (NO INTERVIEW CONDUCTED)

* Ebook shared cataloging: SCP is in discussion with the University of Maryland to share responsibility for cataloging e-packages common to the two systems. Contact: Adolfo Tarango atarango@ucsd.edu, UCSD.

* Digitizing and cataloging digital objects for the California Coastal Conservancy using ContentDM and create persistent URLs. Institutions involved: UCR, WRCA, California Coastal Conservancy. Contacts: Linda Vida linda.vida@ucr.edu, WRCA; Manuel Urrizola manuelu@ucr.edu, Jim Clark phoenix@ucr.edu, UCR; Clare O'Reilly coreilly@scc.ca.gov, Conservancy.

* Providing OCLC records with ISBN's for full text journals available in the CABI database. Institutions involved: UCB has CAB Abstracts (ISI); UCD has CAB Abstracts (Ovid, plus CAB e-books); UCI has CAB e-books; UCLA has CAB Reviews; UCR has CAB Abstracts (CABI). Cooperative possibilities: CAB Abstracts: UCB, UCD, UCR. Contact: Margaret Hogarth margaret@ucr.edu, UCR.

PROPOSED SHARED SERVICES (NO INTERVIEW CONDUCTED)

* UC shared digitization services

* UC Book Bindery serves as a centralized function where bindery work is carried out for the 10 campuses. The Bindery also serves as a focal point for expertise related to print material repair and works closely with the Preservation Unit at UC Berkeley to advise on repair and conservation work.

SHARED SERVICES OUTSIDE OF UC

2CUL (<http://2cul.org/>)

Joint initiative of Columbia and Cornell to "pool resources to provide content, expertise, and services that are impossible to accomplish acting alone," including such areas as "cataloging, e-resource management, collaborative collection development, and digital preservation." Program was announced 2009, with goal to "achieve significant integration of operations, services, collections, and resources within three years." Thus some significant parts of the initiative are likely still under development.

Contacts for technical services: Columbia: Bob Wolven; Cornell: Xin Li, xl49@cornell.edu

Ontario Council of University Libraries

Its consortial patron-driven acquisitions pilot project was presented at 2011 Acquisitions Institute at Timberline Lodge. PPTs are available at:

<https://docs.google.com/presentation/view?id=0AQz2gOFBtGKVZGdqY243OXFfMTlyZnJxZ21uY3g&hl=en&authkey=Cl3Wp60L>

Contacts: Tony Horava, University of Ottawa, thorava@uottawa.ca; Catherine Davidson, York University, cdavids@yorku.ca

Orbis Cascade Alliance

- Orbis Cascade Demand-Driven Acquisition E-book Pilot

Orbis Cascade Alliance has partnered with YBP and EBL to pilot a collaborative demand-driven e-book program that is fully integrated with Alliance members' approval and firm order purchase from YBP and offers the flexibility of EBL's On Demand acquisition platform.

Contacts: Greg Doyle, Electronic Resources Program Manager, Orbis Cascade Alliance, gdoyle@uoregon.edu; Joseph Kiegel, University of Washington, kiegel@u.washington.edu

- Orbis Cascade Foreign Language Cataloging Pilot

University of Oregon and University of Washington cataloged Chinese/Japanese and Arabic respectively for six Alliance members.

Contact: Joseph Kiegel, University of Washington, kiegel@u.washington.edu

Ohio State University, Columbus

Has several smaller collaborative arrangements, including some for-fee or gratis cataloging arrangements, current and recent, fairly formal and informal. Also provides services of authority control librarian to train on NACO, and coordinates NACO funnel for contributions. [Information from contact below, not from published article cited here.]

Related literature: Magda El-Sherbini (2010): Sharing Cataloging Expertise: Options for Libraries to Share Their Skilled Catalogers with Other Libraries, *Cataloging & Classification Quarterly*, 48:6-7, 525-540 (<http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/01639374.2010.495694>)

Contact: Magda El-Sherbini (el-sherbini.1@osu.edu)

APPENDIX C: INTERVIEW QUESTIONS

A. General Project Information

1. What is/was the scope of the project? (Please specify function areas, types of materials, total volumes, timetables, etc.)
2. What factors motivated undertaking this project?
3. What institutions or campuses are/were involved?
4. Status of the project

ongoing

completed

on hold (please explain)

other (please explain)

5. How is/was this project funded?

by the institution providing the service (i.e. using existing staff)

by the institution(s) receiving the service

jointly by participating institutions

other (please explain)

6. Is/was the institution providing the service compensated in any way? If so, how?

B. Project Planning & Operations

1. a. How much planning and preparation did your institution do?

substantial (more than a month)

moderate (more than a week but less than a month)

very little (less than a week)

- b. Was it sufficient?

- c. What kind of planning and preparation was done?

2. How many and what kind of staff in your institution are/were involved in the project? What role(s) do/did each play?

- a. senior administrators (i.e., university librarian, associate university librarians, or department heads)
Number:
Role(s):
 - b. librarians
Number:
Role(s):
 - c. staff (please specify level)
Number:
Role(s):
 - d. student assistants
Number:
Role(s):
 - e. other, e.g. analysts
Number:
Role(s):
3. During the project, how is/was information shared? How are/were progress (stats) and problems reported?
- ___ in-person meetings
 - ___ conference calls
 - ___ e-mail
 - ___ other (please explain)
4. Are/were any kind of special skills required to carry out the project?
5. How much training did staff working on the project require?
- ___ extensive training (more than a month)
 - ___ moderate training (more than a week but less than a month)
 - ___ minimal training (a week or less)
 - ___ no additional training needed

6. What is/was the workflow of the project? (Please specify whether it involves shipment of materials, turnaround time, etc.)
7. Are/were there special physical needs for equipment, software, access to online systems or access to another campus' subscriptions?

C. Project Evaluation (please answer the following questions even if the project is still ongoing)

1. How did you assess how the project was going/how it went?
2. What parts of the project worked well?
3. What parts were challenging and how did you address them?
4. What parts of the project were unsuccessful?
5. Were there aspects of the cooperative arrangement that changed along the way? (Why?)
6. Based on what you have learned (so far), if you were planning this project now, what would you do differently?
7. Has it been worth the effort? E.g., have you been satisfied with the results and the costs?

___ Yes, definitely

___ Yes, somewhat

___ Not really