Heads of Special Collections

HOSC Annual Report – 2011-2012

September 5, 2012

Submitted by Daryl Morrison HOSC Chair 2011-12, and Head of Special Collections, University of California, Davis

The 2011/12 Heads of Special Collections were represented by:

Daryl Morrison (Davis; chair); Peter Hanff followed by Elaine Tennant (Berkeley); Michelle Light (Irvine), Tom Hyry (Los Angeles), Emily Lin (Merced), Melissa Conway (Riverside), Lynda Claassen (San Diego), Josue Hurtado followed by Polina Ilieva (San Francisco), David Seubert (Santa Barbara), Christine Bunting (Santa Cruz), Adrian Turner, ex officio (CDL)

For a detailed description of our activities see the HOSC meeting minutes at:

http://libraries.universityofcalifornia.edu/cdc/hosc/

HOSC Statement of Purpose and Objectives:

The principal goal of HOSC is to ensure the continued excellence of UC systemwide special collections holdings, striving to avoid unnecessary overlap among collections and to make effective use of limited resources.

To accomplish this, we collaborate and coordinate efforts in acquiring, managing, preserving, and providing access to special collections materials in the UC system.
Our objectives include:

1. Collection development: Develop collaborative collection development and collection management strategies, based on collection strengths and programmatic needs of the individual campuses.

2. Resource sharing: Develop guidelines and procedures for sharing special collections resources among campuses.

3. Access: Coordinate efforts to enhance access to special collections materials.

4. Administration: Share information about policies and procedures in day-to-day operations, including areas such as patron registration, reading room service, acquisition of in-kind gifts, confidentiality issues regarding use of certain materials, and fee structures for use and reproduction of materials.

5. Preservation: Identify preservation needs and coordinate preservation efforts relating to materials of various formats in special collections.

6. Security: Share concerns and information about security issues, including access of staff and patrons to special collections materials, security features in facilities design and maintenance, and rapid communication among UC campuses regarding security alerts.

2011-2012 HOSC Goals & Objectives:

Continue to meet regularly (in person or otherwise) to discuss UC-wide Special Collections issues, as addressed in the HOSC Charge and Statement of Purpose, and explore ways to address them.

Telephone conference calls attended by members were held on October 10, 2011, February 6, 2012, and May 14, 2012. A round-robin of reporting from each UC provided information about staffing, grants, new collections, buildings, special programs, and exhibits. The major discussions this year focused on the surveys, reports, and recommendations of the POT Lightning Teams relating to Special Collections activities.

Objective: Resource sharing: Develop guidelines and procedures for sharing special collections resources among campuses.

--Model efficient use of resources by close engagement in UC partnerships and collaborations to build and provide ready access to digital special collections.

Objective: Access: Coordinate efforts to enhance access to special collections materials.

--Continue to comment and provide user assessment on development of Next Generation Melvyl and on the efforts of the Next Generation Technical Services New Modes for Access Task Group.

The Next Generation Technical Services Report (NGTS) was submitted to the University Librarians September 10, 2011 and the emphasis on special collections and archival processing was noted and became the main focus of our discussions for 2011/12.   Throughout the year there was discussion on long-term strategies for eliminating our processing backlogs through cooperative approaches and funding strategies.

Adrian Turner and Michelle Light reported on the NGTS Power of Three group 1 and 3 initiatives (POT 1 and POT 3). POT 3's objective, in particular, was to "accelerate processing of archival and manuscript collections. POT 3 assessed the current implementation of Archivists' Toolkit (AT) and More Product Less Process (MPLP). Three Lightning Teams were developed to 1) facilitate system-wide deployment of the AT; 2) define a minimal collection record specification; and 3)implement MPLP practices UC-wide. HOSC was consulted throughout the year as the agent of implementation .

NGTS POT 3 Lightning Team 1 (Archivists' Toolkit Implementation) survey and summary of results were reported on by Adrian Turner. UC Special Collections were surveyed for their current and potential AT

use, in order to assess the present implementation of the software and/or needs to implement it. A number of primary points for effective implementation of AT emerged from the survey results. HOSC reviewed, discussed, and made recommendations to the Lightning Team's proposal throughout the year and endorsed the efforts to facilitate the systemwide use of AT, namely, 1) the development of an expert users group, which would serve as a cross-campus knowledge base and also maintain an online clearinghouse for documentation, best practices, and other resources pertaining to AT usage within the UC Libraries, and 2) a "train the trainers" series of workshops. The official HOSC endorsement of the recommendations occurred in the following year July 2012.

NGTS POT 3 Lightning Team 2 (More Product Less Process (MPLP) Implementation Manual) was reviewed by Michelle Light. A survey was sent to both department heads and processors to gain more perspective and understanding on the MPLP approach. The Heads of Special Collections were supportive of the MPLP approach to clear out backlogs and provide processing metrics. MPLP was generally seen as a useful philosophy. It was decided not to call the document an "implementation manual" but rather "Guidelines." There was also discussion about the need for the MPLP guidelines to be described as a philosophy versus a processing manual and that a wiki would be a helpful approach for additional examples and case studies. By the end of the year the team had outlined five possible processing levels ranging from a preliminary record (such as a MARC catalog record) to collection level record through minimal, moderate, and traditional approaches. Examples of the various approaches were provided in the Guidelines. An additional Lightning Team (2B) prepared recommendations for tracking of archival processing rates; their recommendations were also reviewed by HOSC. The metric document became a part of the Guidelines. The draft of the Guidelines was given to HOSC by the end of June and comments were solicited in July of 2012 for comment. The formal release was scheduled for August 2012. ***The Guidelines for Efficient Archival Processing in the University of California Libraries*** will be mounted on the HOSC website.

NGTS POT 3 Lightning Team 3 (Minimal Collection Record Specification) was reported on by Adrian Turner. The team created recommendations for a baseline descriptive record, for collections described using archival control. The specifications are useful in establishing a minimal MARC or EAD descriptive record for unprocessed collections, backlogs, new accessions, and materials that would not otherwise be described. The recommendations are wholly based on the US national standard for archival description ("Describing Archives, a Content Standard's" (DACS) single-level minimum specification). These particular recommendations were included within a broader spectrum of recommendations created by POT 2.2, which focused on baseline bibliographic records. HOSC and the UC Archivists reviewed the recommendations.

NGTS POT 1A (Digital Assets Management Requirements Gathering) work was reported on by Adrian Turner. The Lightning Team conducted a cross-campus needs assessment for digital asset management systems. The team was in contact with many of the HOSC members and digital content managers, as part of a series of interviews that they conducted at each UC campus library.

Adrian Turner provided information on CDL services, initiatives and partnerships. HOSC members were invited to participate in the various offerings. Adrian Turner (CDL) provided a detailed update of

CDL's plans for Digital Special Collections. Campuses were asked to volunteer for a pilot project to submit MARC records for archival collections directly to OAC, rather than use automated harvesting of records from Melvyl. CDL is also developing a mechanism to allow campus's to indicate on the OAC Contributor Dashboard whether they wish to share finding aids with OCLC ArchiveGrid. Adrian Turner also updated HOSC on OAC efforts to create a Metadata Editor and a Calisphere Slideshow Widget.

OCLC invited CDL to endorse its "Well-intentioned Practice for Putting Digitized Collections of Unpublished Materials Online" document. Adrian circulated the OCLC document for our review, which is still under review by HOSC for endorsement. .

There was an invitation to share MARC collection data, for testing, for the **Digital Public Library of America (DPLA).** DPLA representatives asked if they can harvest our EAD and MARC records in OAC, for the purpose of testing and developing their harvesting infrastructure. HOSC members reported separately if they were interested in participating.

 Google Analytics usage stats for OAC/Calisphere collections: testing update

CDL implemented Google Analytics, which contributors can use to track usage of their OAC/Calisphere collections.   CDL intends to migrate contributors completely to Google Analytics over the course of 2012-2013, and anticipates that it would stop running AWstats after December 2013. Information was sent out on how to apply a Google Analytics tracking code. It was recommended we get started by June, so we can get your usage statistics for a full fiscal year starting July 1 for the 2012/2013 fiscal year.

OAC RecordEXPRESS tool was released by CDL, and is available through the OAC Contributor Dashboard. It is a simple, web-based template for creating collection-level descriptions, with a baseline level of descriptive elements (based on DACS, and also compliant with the POT3 Lightning Team 3 recommendations); users can simply fill out the form, and hit a button for the description to be published in OAC.   It can be used to create a single-level minimal record description. It is also a vehicle to make accessible searchable PDF finding aids on OAC; users can attach one or more PDFs to a record created using the tool. It is a mechanism to expose finding aids that can't be encoded into EAD, but still make them accessible through OAC. This will lead to providing a framework to host PDF files. For the longer term, they are interested in supporting the ability to attach searchable PDFs to existing MARC21 and EAD records.

 Social Networks and Archival Context (SNAC) project update

The SNAC research and demonstration project is planning to secure next phase grant funding from the Mellon Foundation. CDL will continue on the project to enhance the prototype access system. A key goal is to demonstrate the use of EAC-CPF within a discovery context. It may also be used as a reference model, as part of ongoing work to develop a national archival authority collaborative (http://socialarchive.iath.virginia.edu/NAAC_index.html).

An update on the Social Networks and Archival Context (SNAC) project may be found at: http://socialarchive.iath.virginia.edu/

Calisphere Planning was reported on by invitee Catherine Mitchell, Director of CDL's Access & Publishing Group.

CDL has combined Digital Special Collections Group and Publishing Group to think strategically about the platforms and look at their services. Catherine Mitchell and Sherri Berger have done several surveys to see who is using Calisphere, see the level of success and see how to improve the services. Catherine Mitchell reviewed the detailed findings of the surveys. The Calisphere user types are much broader than initially expected going far beyond the K-12 audience. The lesson learned is that they should not get too focused on the needs of any one community group. The research on usage indicates that there are often first time users. Most are accessing through Wikipedia, Google and key word searches. There is a significant group of "power users" especially archivists. The contributor needs assessment survey looked at access needs for digital objects and perceptions and awareness of OAC and Calisphere services. It was determined that if contributors had a robust local system for their digital images, OAC was seen as an added benefit, if the local system was not available, OAC was the primary access to the content. Discussed were barriers for contributors including resources for digitization, ingest concerns and the need for simpler workflows, turnaround was considered slow for "scan on demand" models. CDL continues to address issues and hopes to report in six months that they have made improvements. Catherine Mitchell made the full findings and recommendations available in a report to HOSC.

Objective: Resource sharing: Develop guidelines and procedures for sharing special collections resources among campuses. (continued)

Interlibrary Loan Services (ILL) for UC Special Collections. There was a request for information from HOPS as reported by Lynda Claassen and Emily Lin. HOPS has asked for information on how the Special Collections Interlibrary Service is working. What are the current policies for loaning, creating surrogates and the infrastructure involved? There was a general feeling that the service is working fine. A recommendation was made to update the website so that the Special Collections ILL contacts are current. Claassen offered to gather and organize our responses to questions asked about the ILL service.

Web Archiving Service use for campus websites. Daryl Morrison brought up a discussion about the use of Web Archiving Service to capture University websites as was being undertaken by UC Davis. The general consensus was that the Web Archiving Service was being used by the campuses and the support for funding was most often coming from the library administration. Tracy Seneca of CDL provided webinar training to encourage website captures.

Objective: Administration: Share information about policies and procedures in day-to-day operations, including areas such as **patron registration, reading room service**, acquisition of in-kind gifts, confidentiality issues regarding use of certain materials, and fee structures for use and reproduction of materials.

Most of the UC Special Collections had demonstrations or online demonstrations and quotes for the **Aeon system**, an automated, commercial circulation system to track in-house circulation and duplication requests in special collections. The system would be a labor saving tool, enhance the user experience, make operations more scalable (for staffing), assist in expediting work flow, expedite reproduction requests, and assist in gathering statistics. In the general discussion, there was positive interest in the product, but the cost was seen as a major factor. In discussion about what was liked about the product-- mentioned were the patron empowerment, streamlining of circulation steps, and greater security control. The Claremont Colleges have recently brought up Aeon.   Adrian Turner reported that Claremont is currently licensing Aeon, and will serve as an initial use case for linking from their OAC finding aids to Aeon.

HOSC concluded that a proposal needs to be prepared, and presented to appropriate systemwide groups and CDL, for a systemwide consideration of licensing options and costs. Deployment models were discussed and consideration for a consortia approach. A campus sharing of a common user database would require a standard patron record scheme and would help to keep the licensing cost down. A common user database would also provide a more seamless user experience (a user would only need to register once, to interact with multiple UC campuses). A sub-group was formed to work on a proposal.

Daryl Morrison, Head of Special Collections, at the University of California, Davis will continue as chair in 2012/2013

Goals for 2012/2013

Besides our standard goals and objectives as stated above, HOSC will:

- Continuing discussions on how to implement POT 3 recommendations and make recommendation for resources needed to meet those goals.
- Proposal for a systemwide circulation system. (Aeon).
- Consider the possibility of a once a year on-site meeting at a UC Special Collections for a continuing understanding of holdings and services.