

# NGTS ENTERPRISE-LEVEL COLLECTION MANAGEMENT SERVICES TASK FORCE

## FINAL REPORT revised September 16, 2010 corrected September 22, 2010<sup>1</sup>

### Introduction (from the chair)

To say that the charge of this task force was overwhelming, daunting, challenging, and time-consuming would be an understatement. For all of the members, it has been a busy and thought-provoking three months, filled with many conference calls, insightful discussions, and interesting interviews with both UC and other professional colleagues. Since the beginning of June 2010, the task force has had at least twice-weekly conference calls, and our wiki site contains excellent documentation with meeting minutes, reference and working documents, and vision statements by various task force members.

As chair, I would like to say that I appreciate the excellent participation and work of those who were part of this task force. We had many challenges, not the least of which were summer vacations and ALA Annual, as well as the eventual absence of one task force member who started a new job outside of the UC system on August 1. As chair, I want to thank both the NGTS Executive and Steering Committees for their selection of an outstanding group of task force members.

---

This task force has come up with twelve recommendations. We have grouped them into five categories (see Appendix I):

- Provide new tools for enterprise-level collection services
  - Cloud-based Systemwide Integrated Library System (ILS)
  - Electronic Resource Management Systems (ERMS)
  - Database of Record
- Transform collection development practices
  - System-wide and multi-campus collection development activities
- Transform cataloging practices
  - System-wide Shelf-Ready
  - “Good enough” record standard for all UC
- Transform organizational structures
  - System-wide Collection Services Centers
  - Shared Cataloging Program
  - System-wide historical federal government documents repository
  - Non-Roman Backlogs
  - Serials Management
- Transform human resources
  - System-wide Model for Collection Services Staffing and Expertise

---

<sup>1</sup> Bulleted recommendations on p. 1 re-ordered to agree with their order in App. I.

Appendix I is an “at a glance” table of the twelve recommendations in the above categories, and includes key data about timelines, potential cost savings, and transformative impact. One of the interesting challenges in prioritizing these recommendations was that many of them fit together into what can be described as a “suite” of recommendations, i.e., a group of two or more recommendations that are so intertwined and/or linked together in terms of successful implementation of a final transformative move that they really need to be implemented together. As the task force began to prioritize the recommendations, it became quite clear that there was not going to be overall consensus on what single recommendations should be given top priority; in fact, it became clear that some recommendations could be defined as “big hairy ideas” or overarching goals, while other recommendations were quite specific in their focus and could be considered “pilot” projects towards the implementation of the “big hairy ideas.” Before presenting our recommendations, therefore, the task force thought it important to consider the lists below.

### **List of things to STOP doing and to BE doing**

One of the challenges presented by the NGTS Executive and Steering Committees to this task force was to consider things that UC Libraries needed to stop doing. This list assisted the task force with consideration of what recommendations were the most transformative. Without further ado, here is that list:

- Stop checking in print serials; but one campus should track carefully to ensure receipt for UC. This speaks to a centralized model for serials (see Rick Anderson's recent writings).
- Stop binding print journals.
- More centralized serials record maintenance (both the record and the process); too much redundancy in serials work across the campuses.
- Stop local customization of bibliographic records (catalog at the network level).
- Stop having SCP distribute bibliographic records for downloading into local OPACs.
- Stop having the concept of full records for everything. Need a more trimmed-down, “good enough” record standard.
- Stop having separate local ILSs and rely on NGM as the UC Libraries union catalog.

In addition to this list, the task force also felt that it was important to list the things that we need to **BE** doing:

- Spending more time on collections that are currently uncataloged, undescribed, and have little to no bibliographic access whatsoever: special collections, digitization and digital projects, data sets, etc.
- Share responsibility across UC for eliminating cataloging backlogs.
- Redeployment/retooling of scarce human resources, especially technical services staff, away from description/organization of print, to description/organization of digital/unique resources. Training in and assistance with digitization and digital projects scanning would also be appropriate at many campuses. The implementation of a “good enough” bibliographic record standard for all resources is critical to this redeployment of personnel.
- Doing all bibliographic work at the network rather than the local level.

- Considering the life cycle of all resources and formats, from research to creation to access to preservation.

The task force spent some time ranking the recommendations from various perspectives, along with what each task force member thought was high, medium, and low priority. In each instance, it was clear that no overall consensus emerged within the task force; however, when considering the questions regarding which recommendations were the **most transformative** and the most **cost savings**, these three stood out:

**Cloud-based Systemwide Integrated Library System (ILS)  
System-wide Shelf-Ready  
Electronic Resources Management System (ERMS)**

These three recommendations should be kept in mind, when considering the overall task force report.

With these considerations in mind, here are the recommendations of the task force:

1. Short-term: Implementation of the **Non-Roman Backlogs**, the **System-wide Shelf-Ready**, and the **“Good Enough” Record Standard for all of UC** recommendations. These three recommendations provide guidelines for moving forward in the short-term.
2. Medium-term: Implementation of the **System-wide Collection Services Centers** recommendation. There are a number of “pilot” projects attached to this recommendation, encompassing a few of the other task forces’ recommendations. Once the **Non-Roman backlogs** are completed, a Collection Services Center model should be implemented for these resources. In the short term, the **Serials Management**, **System-wide Federal Government Documents**, and **Shared Cataloging Program** recommendations should be implemented immediately under this model, and NGTS should reference the results of the Shared Monographs Planning Group during planning stages. In tandem with the above implementations, the **System-wide and Multi-Campus Collection Development Activities** and the **System-wide model for collection services staffing and expertise** recommendations should begin planning for medium-term implementation.
3. Medium- to Long-Term: Finally, both the **Cloud-based Systemwide Integrated Library System (ILS)** and the **Electronic Resources Management System (ERMS)** recommendations are somewhat intertwined. The UC Libraries also need a single **“Database of Record”** to move away from duplicative local databases, so that we can move towards a systemwide integrated library system in the near future. Such a system could become our ERMS as well, with some added functionality, but in the short term, there needs to be some coordination for all UC Libraries being able to see and share information related to their electronic resources.

The UC Libraries cannot move forward with the description and organization of unique and digital resources, without the implementation of the Non-Roman, System-wide Shelf-Ready, and “Good Enough” record standard recommendations. Scarce human resources will become even scarcer in the future, and this is why setting up system-wide shelf -ready for English language purchased print materials (and other materials if possible), immediately dealing with/getting rid of and not continuing the non-Roman backlogs that are holding us back from new initiatives, and implementing a “good enough” record standard are crucial towards immediate culture change as well as system-wide cost savings.

### **Final comments**

For many of these recommendations, it is apparent and unavoidable that there will be upfront costs in order to implement them. This should not be considered an impediment or a reason to not proceed on them. In many cases, upfront investment costs (especially with the System-wide Shelf-Ready recommendation) can be significant, but overall cost savings in the short- and long-term become immediately apparent from the analysis. We think that the Cloud-based Systemwide Integrated Library System (ILS) recommendation will also have this effect. Not only this, but the ability to move scarce human resources from the traditional print model to focus on new modes/undescribed resources contained in the UC Libraries is as significant as the cost savings. It has become apparent that the UC Office of the President is willing to invest in projects that deliver significant cost savings to the system (i.e., 0% loans for implementation), in order to demonstrate to the public its commitment to short- and long-term efficiencies. Please keep this in mind as decisions are made regarding this report’s recommendations

Respectfully submitted by:

Brad Eden, Chair

Marcus Banks (through July 30)

Linda Barnhart

Carlo Medina

Adrian Petrisor

Nick Robinson

Lisa Rowlison de Ortiz

Armanda Barone (liaison)

Emily Stambaugh (liaison)

**(Appendix I is a separate attachment to this report)**

## 12 RECOMMENDATIONS OF TASK FORCE (UNPRIORITIZED)

September 10, 2010

### **Eliminate Non-Roman Backlogs.**

#### *a. Proposed action (high priority)*

The NGTS-Enterprise Team endorses the following general recommendations laid out by the HOTS Non-Roman Backlog Reduction Task Force report:

- “Good enough” level of cataloging (“**Implement a “good enough” record standard for all of UC**”);
- Collection Services Centers (“**Define and implement UC-wide Collection Services Centers**”);
- Strategies for processing the backlogs (addressed here)

The three recommendations above are very closely linked and dependent on each other. It is important that we move all three into place in order to achieve success in any one.

1) We recommend that materials in some languages be designated for “automatic outsourcing” (e.g., no language expertise in system, low priority language(s), etc.) HOTS and CDC should jointly create this “languages list” to simplify decision-making both for selection and for processing; suggestions for a starting point are made below (numbers shown reflect current backlogs). In all cases, the standards for this “automatic outsourced” cataloging will be a minimal level record to keep prices low and allow a greater number of titles to move forward. See “**Implement a “good enough” record standard for all of UC**” for details about this standard and its application. We recommend that HOTS pull together a team to coordinate and develop a system-wide “automatic outsourcing” process for non-Roman backlogs. It is recommended that the team consist of people who have dealt with vendors for at least the following areas: Southeast Asia, the Middle East, South Asia and Africa. (Immediate Action)

- Burmese (709)
- Central Asian languages in former Soviet republics (180)
- Judeo-Arabic (20)
- Khmer (44)
- Kurdish (1,012)
- Laotian (393)
- Malayalam (1)
- Marathi (1700)
- Modern Greek (9)
- Other Asian languages (except CJK) (11,858)
- Syriac (50)
- Tamil (15)
- Tibetan (835)

Estimated outsourcing backlog: 16,826

Estimated per book cost range to outsource: \$20-50

Estimated total cost range to outsource: \$336,520-\$841,300

2) We recommend that UC use the non-Roman backlogs for the implementation of several “Collection Services Centers” (see “*Define and implement UC-wide Collection Services Centers*” for a detailed description). This idea is modeled after the Shared Cataloging Program (SCP), a very successful example that provides the cataloging of shared electronic resources for the UC system, removing the burden and expectations from single campuses. We recommend campuses self-identify as designated “Collection Services Centers” for non-Roman language material based on the skills of their staff. (Near-term Action)

“Collection Services Centers” for non-Roman cataloging should be designated and coordinated through HOTS. Over time, HOTS and UC will need to confront larger questions about ongoing operations (staffing commitments, governance, funding, priorities) but we suggest that UC simply “get on with it” so we can explore and learn. In the future, Centers in niche languages or formats could coordinate with the Shared Cataloging Program for electronic resources cataloging. Also, and for the foreseeable future, these Centers should be open to UC only and not be available as outsourcing options for non-UC institutions.

Some of the languages suitable for Centers—languages where we know UC has existing expertise in the system—are shown below. Estimated total backlog counts are in parenthesis:

- Arabic (8,024)
- Armenian (1,410)
- Bulgarian (54)
- Chinese (17,848)
- Farsi (264)
- Greek (262)
- Ancient Greek (17)
- Hebrew UCB (572)
- Hindi (31)
- Japanese (7,682)
- Korean (4,932)
- Russian (742)
- Slavic (4,201)
- Thai (15,247)
- Urdu (15)
- Vietnamese (3,836)
- Yiddish (15)

Estimated backlog: 65,152

Estimated cost range:

Per book to outsource: \$20-50

Per book to insource: \$10-35

Estimated range total:

To outsource (if decide to pursue): \$1,303,040-\$3,257,600

To insource: \$651,520-\$2,280,320

TOTAL Non-Roman backlog: 81,979

55% original cataloging

45% copy cataloging

4% special collections

If a campus chooses not to participate as a designated “Collection Services Center,” we recommend those language backlogs be outsourced to eliminate the current backlogs. It is important to stress that the goal here is to completely eliminate non-Roman backlogs on each campus. Choosing to not participate in the proposed model will mean outsourcing as the only alternative. As with outsourced cataloging above, volunteering to serve as a “Collection Services Center” means also adopting a system-wide defined minimal standard for cataloging that is “good enough” rather than full and comprehensive to expedite cataloging of non-Roman material (see “**Implement a “good enough” record standard for all of UC**” for more details). There will be no exceptions to this minimal standard.

Additional recommendations:

- All cataloging, whether onsite or outsourced, be done in WorldCat so campuses could accept records contributed there by the “Center,” as well as move us in the direction of a single system-wide enterprise
- No local customization of records
- Track material, statistics and problems
- As a system, push vendors to “ramp up” their capacity to do more
- Market success stories across system
- Make clear these actions are necessary for us to move forward and supported by ULs

*b. Benefits*

- Promotes the view of UC as a single system-wide enterprise
- Free resources so can refocus efforts and HR to other higher priority work at campuses
- Provide access to these materials in a timely manner
- Eliminate redundant work at all campuses
- Eliminate local practices and variations at each campus
- Make the UC Collections easy to find and use for our users
- Leverages the investment that UC has already made in developing expert catalogers with language and format specialties
- Better positions UC for handling shared electronic resource packages in special languages and formats
- Simplifies cataloging decision-making at each campus when special languages materials are received

*c. Near-term and mid-range actions that will lead to the longer-term solution*

Near term:



Defining a minimum standard, outsourcing and piloting the non-Roman language “Centers” are near-term actions that will lead to the longer-term goal of making the UC Collective Collection more accessible to users.

Actions beyond this near-term include potentially:

- Elimination of non-Roman backlogs
- Expanding to include other languages and/or formats
- Expanding beyond cataloging to consolidate collections
- Creating centers of excellence for other collection services areas (e.g. selection, acquisitions, preservation, conservation, digitization)
- Scans be sent for cataloging (like the UCSD/UCB model). We don’t recommend shipping the actual materials only for cataloging purposes.
- For the longer-term, we recommend that UC develop a plan to consolidate particular languages or formats at particular Centers. This would mean the permanent transfer of materials. Cataloging could be done from the physical piece under this model.

#### *d. Cost analysis*

From the system-wide perspective, setting up “Centers” is relatively cost-neutral; UC libraries are realigning their internal resources to support system-wide collections needs and priorities. From the campus perspective, there is a cost to supporting the UC Collective Collection instead of the local campus collection. The ULs will certainly have concerns about equity/parity between campuses in supporting the UC Collective Collection. We believe, however, that not all campuses are equal in terms of resources or expertise, and contributions toward UC’s collective needs will depend on available staff.

For example, there are 572 Hebrew books backlogged across UC. Sending them to a Collection Services Center would allow UC to avoid the cost of outsourcing them (approx. \$22,880). Books in other languages could be sent from that center to other centers, also offsetting outsourcing costs.

Cost of insourcing versus outsourcing (estimations above) involves many variables (level of staffing, vendor pricing varies, etc.) Outsourcing prices alone can range from \$20-50 per book depending on the vendor pricing. The Non-Roman Backlog Reduction Task Force Report outlined a range from \$10 a book for copy cataloging to \$35 a book for original cataloging. Recommend that HOTS and CAMCIG collect this information as part of their pilots.

#### *e. Barriers*

- Initial total cost involved for outsourcing will mean an investment of funds to reduce system-wide non-Roman backlogs
- Process may initially be labor intensive (scanning, sending books, review process, work flow management) to tackle initial backlogs
- Permanent movement of books/collections could prove difficult
- Will require the “Centers” to ramp up staff and operations to tackle additional work
- Increase need for ILL



- Concerns some non-Roman vendors are expressing about ability to ramp up new clients and/or work
- Do not have an existing process to follow, so will take some time to achieve a process that is balanced and sustainable

*f. What UC will not continue doing*

- Hiring language catalogers at every campus
- Collecting language materials at multiple campuses
- Cataloging specific languages at more than two campuses
- Continuing to build backlogs in non-Roman languages
- Continuing to create inaccessible collections

*g. Timetable and/or next steps*

- HOTS determines the languages that should be cataloged in “Centers,” and the languages for automatic outsourcing (1-2 months)
- HOTS asks campuses to self-nominate if they want to serve as a “Center” and for which language(s) (1 month)
- HOTS charges CAMCIG to define a system-wide standard minimal record for non-Roman to be followed by all campus catalogers and vendors (2 months)
- HOTS forms a subgroup to investigate and prepare outsourcing contracts for the automatic outsourcing group of materials (FY10-11)
- HOTS, working with CDC, determines the model and process to follow (1-2 months)
- HOTS and CDC establish and then assess “Centers” (FY 10-11)

## System-Wide Shelf-Ready recommendation

### *a. Proposed action (and long-term goal)*

This group recommends that the HOTS System-wide Shelf-Ready recommendations be implemented. According to this report, six campuses currently have shelf-ready in place to some degree, and four campuses currently do not have any shelf-ready services (UCD, UCI, UCR, and UCSC). The report indicates that 64,324 books are currently received shelf-ready by the six campuses, and that an additional 220,725 books from the other four campuses would need to be included (see Appendix B of the HOTS report for approximate figures). This group also recommends that the OCLC Plus Silver Option 1 plan be implemented for all shelf-ready books (see p. 6 of the HOTS report).

This plan, of course, would need the approval of the four ULs at those campuses that do not currently participate, but if overall system-wide savings are to be achieved, this would need to be mandated. There would also need to be some major retooling and redirection of technical services staff from the four campuses currently not involved in shelf-ready from these redundant cataloging operations to new directions (digitization scanning, digitization and digital projects metadata, Special Collections/unique collections original cataloging, etc.), but this is exactly where we need current operations strategically engaged.

### *b. Benefits*

- Technical services staff moved away from local customization of bibliographic records
- Retooling/redirection of technical services staff to more critical needs (see above)
- Purchased print would be automated from time of ordering to placement on shelf; no touching of these items except for occasional checking for errors and to tweak profile with vendor; 5% error rate is acceptable. This group recommends that either the Acquisitions or the Circulation Department at the local level receive all shelf-ready books for placement on shelves; otherwise, catalogers will still continue traditional and redundant checking and tweaking of print records.

### *c. Near-term and mid-range actions that will lead to the longer-term solution*

Appendix B of the HOTS report indicates the investment needed to move the UC Libraries to system-wide shelf-ready. The \$1.5 million upfront investment will yield an immediate savings in the second year of operation of \$4.7 million, which will continue for every year thereafter. In addition, a major relocation of technical services operations from redundant print record tweaking to original cataloging of non-accessible unique collections (both digital and print) will yield a substantial benefit beyond cost savings, as this will effectively change the UC Libraries' organizational culture in a most transformational way.

### *d. Cost analysis*

Implement for the 2012/2013 fiscal year. Charge a small task force to construct profile, RFP for vendor, etc.

### *e. Barriers*

- Substantial pushback from four campuses not currently doing shelf-ready

- Fear, misinformation, and union challenges from all UC Library staff
- Fiscal, operational, logistical and perhaps legal obstacles from UC system and/or local campuses' coordination

*f. What UC will not continue doing*

10 campuses all cataloging the exact same materials, using scarce human resources to touch every print book and every print bibliographic record

*g. Timetable and/or next steps*

- See d. above
- Some coordination of effort with Shared Print in Place task force needs to be accomplished in order to minimize duplication of effort and examine new models for ordering, receiving, and distribution of said shelf-ready from either a centralized, decentralized, or hybrid model

*h. Impact on users*

- Much faster access to purchased print materials
- Much more access to unique resources not currently accessible to users

Report submitted Sept. 10, 2010 for review by the Council of University Librarians. See report for priority decisions.

## Implement a “good enough” record standard for all of UC

### *a. Proposed action (high priority)*

The NGTS-Enterprise Team endorses the following general recommendations laid out by the HOTS Non-Roman Backlog Reduction Task Force report:

- “Good enough” level of cataloging (addressed here);
- Collection Services Centers (**System-wide Collection Services Centers**);
- Strategies for processing the backlogs (**Non-Roman Backlogs**)

The three recommendations above are very closely linked and dependent on each other. It is important that we move all three into place in order to achieve success in any one.

With explicit and strong direction from the University Librarians, we recommend that HOTS charge CAMCIG to define, agree upon, provide training for, and implement a “good enough” bibliographic record standard at all ten campuses as a UC-wide standard for all formats of material. CAMCIG will need to include other campus groups such as HOPS, CDC, and NGM in vetting the standard. This “good enough” record standard has the potential to be a system-wide cataloging standard powerful enough to transform campus practices into system-wide practices, thus moving UC toward the long-held goal of unified cataloging practices. For backlog cataloging, there should be no exceptions to this standard. We also recommend that this standard be applied to newly-received material, special collections and digital materials.

An earlier UC minimal record standard might be a useful starting point ([http://libraries.universityofcalifornia.edu/hots/minimal\\_marc\\_std.doc](http://libraries.universityofcalifornia.edu/hots/minimal_marc_std.doc)). It might also be useful to consider whether UC should simply adopt the BIBCO/CONSER Standard Record as a “good enough” standard. Both UCLA and UCB are already providing less-than-full records for categories of both Roman and non-Roman material. CAMCIG could engage these two campuses to learn more about their experiences and their use of briefer records. CAMCIG will also want to investigate the minimum record standard(s) vendors use.

Unified practices, starting with adoption of a record standard, will help UC reduce the barriers to working in a single data file, and will increase efficiency through shared expectations and training.

This recommendation is integral to **Non-Roman Backlogs**, where the goal is to eliminate backlogs and to catalog incoming materials as quickly as possible so we can redirect staff resources to other priority areas. The creation and use of a “good enough” record standard for these materials is critical for campuses to move these materials on to shelves so they are accessible to users as quickly as possible. This “good enough” standard could also apply to vendors for outsourced material, however, UC might find it more cost effective to utilize the vendor’s own minimal record to avoid costly customization. It is important to stress that the goal here is to completely eliminate non-Roman backlogs on each campus and create efficiencies in many other collection areas.

In connection with **System-wide Collection Services Centers**, we also recommend that Collection Services Centers adopt the “good enough” standard.

All “good enough” records should be created in WorldCat, which will ensure upgrades via the OCLC Bibliographic Notification Service (for libraries with this service) as well as upgrades from other libraries.

*b. Benefits*

- Speed processing
- Free up resources in order to refocus efforts to other metadata description and unique resources
- Start with existing basic metadata
- Allow for continuous improvements to basic metadata from the world beyond the UC Libraries
- View as a single system-wide standard
- Foster the notion of working at the enterprise level

*c. Near-term and mid-range actions that will lead to the longer-term solution*

- Buy-in to the concept of UC Collective Collections and that one campus’s backlog is everybody’s backlog
- Harness the shared power of catalogers across ten campuses through Collection Services Centers, as well as shared standards and practices
- Reduce the attention to the description of print resources in order to free up staffing to pay more attention to electronic and digital resources

*d. Cost analysis*

Cost estimates for creating brief records originally will vary depending on level of staff used to create the records and level of detail of the brief record (e.g. include LC classification, subject headings, etc.) Estimates for **brief record** creation can run:

- \$15-35 per insourced original cataloging record
- \$10-40 per outsourced original cataloging record
- \$1 for physical processing per record

Compared to **full record** creation:

- \$35-50 per insourced original cataloging record
- \$20-60 per outsourced original cataloging record
- \$1 for physical processing per record

Recommend we ask CAMCIG to provide more accurate metrics.

*e. Barriers*

- Will be difficult for all library staff to accept this change of mindset
- Cannot implement without top down support and direction from the University Librarians
- Catalogers may resist doing a less than full record, and public services may push for fuller records

*f. What UC will not continue doing*

- Creating full MARC21 records for everything
- Local customization of bibliographic records
- Cataloging redundancy
- Creating cataloging backlogs

*g. Timetable and/or next steps*

- NGTS charges HOTS (HOTS charges CAMCIG) to develop standard, to discuss what it applies to, and to formulate an implementation and training plan. CAMCIG consults with NGM team (CAMCIG deadline: March 31, 2011)
- HOTS discusses and approves and submits to NGTS (April-May 2011)
- NGTS discusses and approves (by July 2011)
- ULs discuss and approves (by August 2011)
- NGTS Executive/Steering communicates new standard to all constituents (August 2011)

*h. Impact on users*

- Material accessible and on the shelves sooner



## Define and implement UC-wide Collection Services Centers

### *a. Proposed action (and long-term goal)*

We recommend that UC establish “Collection Services Centers” with a long-term vision of the majority of UC’s Collections eventually processed at particular service centers. The UC-wide Collection Services Centers would encompass and be responsible for multiple collections and technical services functions (selection, acquisitions, cataloging, preservation, digitization, etc.) on behalf of the system.

We suggest that HOTS, CDC, and CDL have conversations to better define the role and scope of such centers, to identify areas/collections as possible candidates and to outline a phased approach to position collection development and management responsibilities for these centers. Such conversations would also shape shared expectations, as well as develop an understanding of the nature of such a commitment.

A call should be made for campuses to volunteer as an experimental site for a major area, collection or type of collection. Such experiments have a greater likelihood of being successful if the “centers” self-identify (and, we have no way of knowing where there may be spare capacity matched with niche expertise). We think there would be much to learn from having multiple projects of varying scale and intensity, and that best practices might emerge from the combined experiences.

Some fundamental components of a commitment to be an experimental site would include:

- Agreement to simultaneously work on 1) some collections commonly desired by multiple campuses, 2) some collections that are unique to a campus, 3) some collections not currently managed by any campus
- Definition of a minimum size of collection to warrant collaborative action
- Agreement by the Center to self-fund most costs and monitor them over time. We hope that this can be a “quid pro quo” activity across UC. Perhaps it should be an expectation that each campus can find a way to make a contribution to the greater UC good
- Agreement by the other campuses to delegate authority, accountability and effort for those collections to the Center, demonstrably reducing their own commitments in the same area
- A sustainability plan that outlines the proposed Center’s commitment to system-wide activities during the experimental phase, and defines when the experiment would end and when campuses would agree to rely upon the Center permanently. The experimental phase should not last more than two years. This plan should also outline support, if needed, for continuous improvement at the Center once it moves from experiment to permanence.

While some centers of cataloging expertise have been proposed through the **Non-Roman Backlogs** recommendation, we hope through this recommendation to encourage Collection Service Centers in other areas: Roman language materials, collection development in specific areas, acquisitions, preservation, conservation, or digitization.

Over time, UC will need to confront larger questions about ongoing operations (staffing commitments, governance, funding, priorities) but we suggest that these experiments simply “get on with it” in a low-barrier way so we can explore and learn.

This recommendation is linked to **Non-Roman Backlogs** but broadens the concept so it not only addresses cataloging backlogs. This recommendation is also linked to “**Good enough**” **record standard** because the kinds of centralized operations proposed here must use more efficient and system-wide standards in order to succeed. Finally, this recommendation is conceptually linked to **System-wide and multi-campus collection development activities**.

*b. Benefits*

- UC leverages the expertise that is already developed at one campus location, saving other campuses from having to develop expertise or dilute staff.
- Eliminates redundant work.
- Exploits economies of scale.
- More of the UC Collective Collection is made accessible to all users.
- We are promoting the idea of the UC Collective Collection and getting buy-in from staff. Making it real.
- Fosters the concept of working at the enterprise level

*c. Near-term and mid-range actions that will lead to the longer-term solution*

A positive experience from several short-term experimental centers could inspire other campuses to identify their strengths and volunteer, gathering momentum within UC.

We recommend three to six simultaneous experiments overseen by HOTS, CDC, or another appropriate system-wide group. Proposals for experiments should include the above mentioned components.

Per **Non-Roman Backlogs**, we recommend beginning this piloting with non-Roman language backlogs of a certain size. These pilots will provide useful information (e.g. more centralization of functions to eliminate redundant work, to exploit economies of scale, and to leverage the expertise of existing UC staff).

We also recommend beginning this piloting with the recommendations of the CDC Shared Monographs Planning Group.

A mid-term effort might include evaluation of the experimental centers and identification of areas in which the library system needs greater support beyond self-identification and volunteerism.

*d. Cost analysis*

We expect that this can be a “quid pro quo” activity across UC at least initially until we can better understand where there are real needs for support. Perhaps it should be an expectation that each campus can find a way to make a contribution to the greater UC good.

From the system-wide perspective, setting up Collection Services Centers are relatively cost-neutral; UC libraries are realigning their internal resources to support system-wide collections needs and priorities.

From the campus perspective, there is a cost to supporting the UC Collective Collection instead of the local campus collection. As campuses become more interdependent customer service expectations (accountability, reporting, response time) increase.

The ULs will certainly have concerns about equity/parity between campuses in supporting the UC Collective Collection. We believe, however, that not all campuses are equal in terms of resources or expertise, and contributions toward UC's collective needs will depend on available staff.

*e. Barriers*

- Financial: campuses may not volunteer because dramatic downsizing has left them with little or no spare cataloging, acquisitions, preservation or digitization capacity.
- Self-interest: campuses may not wish to participate without assurances that they will receive as much as they give.
- Prioritizing System-wide Service: campuses who do volunteer for an experiment may have a very difficult time setting priorities on system-wide and local activities (especially if there are large workloads).
- HR: Campuses may not wish to overwhelm their staff expert(s), and thus may not volunteer.
- Collections: campuses may see this as weakening their collection services

*f. What UC will not continue doing*

- UC will not continue letting each campus “fend for itself” in terms of the full range of collection services functions; this is one way of “making real” the UC Collective Collection
- The full range of collection services for every format, language, etc. may no longer exist at each campus

*g. Timetable and/or next steps*

- Charge HOTS to develop a specific description/definition of Collection Services Centers for UC with input from CDC and CDL, and to propose 3-6 experimental centers using the non-Roman backlog materials and shared monographs (deadline: December 31, 2010)
- Have each of the sites put out a call for information to the campuses to determine potential workloads, priorities, and issues (deadline: January 31, 2011)
- Each site will need to determine its own workflows and processes based on the information from the survey but adhere to some standard practices (to be defined) to ensure accountability and transparency to the system. It might be useful to have the project managers share their approaches/ideas via conference calls (deadline: March 31, 2011)
- Work collaboratively with other UC campuses, noting both successes and challenges, until December 31, 2011. Maintain a regular feedback/information loop with HOTS, CDC, CDL.

- Evaluate each center in January 2012. Ask HOTS, CDC, CDL to determine lessons learned, best practices, and (presumably) encourage expansion into new areas. Ask HOTS, CDC, CDL to prepare proposals to the NGTS leadership team to move from experiment to permanence.

*h. Impact on users*

- Positive impact on users, who will see materials more quickly in library discovery tools.
- Allow campuses to focus scarce resources on what is considered high priority activities for the system
- Provide access to special and/or unique material, so patrons have access to these rich collections.
- Allow campuses to focus resources on the 21<sup>st</sup> century emerging resources which are often high demand resources.
- Thinking as an enterprise makes discovery seamless for user (e.g. fewer places to look, fewer systems to search, etc.)

Report submitted Sept. 10, 2010 for review by the Council of University Librarians. See footer for priority decisions.

## Serials Management

### a. *Proposed action (and long-term goals)*

Serials management, including purchasing, check-in, claiming, binding, and storage of serials is an expensive endeavor. While individual UC campus active serial subscriptions vary widely in number - from 12 at UC Merced to approximately 36,517 at UC Berkeley – every campus engages in these primary serials management activities, and in many cases, more than one campus engages in these activities for the same titles. Obviously, there is a significant amount of redundant serials management work performed across the UC System.

A combined reduction in check-in, claiming, binding costs, staff processing time, and a reduction in required storage space have the potential to save hundreds of thousands of dollars annually across the UC System. This recommendation seeks to identify and implement savings in serials management across UC libraries.

### b. *Benefits*

- Reduce redundant work
- Reduce binding costs
- Reduce labor costs
- Reduce required storage space of bound serial volumes, and the effort that is a prerequisite to depositing serial volumes
- Maintain archival access to valuable print serial resources

### c. *Near-term and mid-range actions that will lead to the longer-term solution*

#### 1. System-wide print serials review/overlap study

- how many titles are received at 2 or more campuses?
- which of these titles are also purchased online by 2 or more campuses – and is perpetual access part of these contracts?
- which campuses are binding these titles?
- which campuses are wanting to store or retain these titles for long term access?

A proposal on behalf of CDC titled Current Print Journal Subscription Coordination for UC Libraries in tandem with WEST: Use Cases for the Ulrich's Serials Analysis System and XML Data Feed for (CDC) recommends a survey to provide an aggregate characterization of the UC print serial collection. With a few added information points (such as the four bullets above and the "Other Information Needed" section at end), the CDC/WEST/Ulrich's study could suffice for NGTS information gathering needs. However, timeliness is essential to further NGTS goals, thus the survey should be completed by December 2010.

- #### 2. Reduce number of duplicative serial titles that campuses check-in, claim, bind, and archive. Serial binding budgets across UC have decreased greatly, and in some cases by as much as 40-60%, over the past five years. While further reduction in these budgets cannot provide for additional significant savings, the staff time associated with check-in,

claiming, binding preparation, binding, and storage can collectively produce significant savings.

With the results of the serials overlap survey (see 1 above):

- identify duplicate titles (those held at 2 or more campuses)
- identify which campus will take responsibility for check-in, claiming, binding, and storing of each title
- eliminate duplicative work at other campuses also holding the title

3. Eliminate purchase and to the extent possible, receipt and check-in of print titles that UC also licenses online with perpetual access. Some publishers provide “free print” with online access because perpetual access is not available. Unfortunately, while access is greatly enhanced, the technical services required to manage these “free” print subscriptions continue to cost the University, in effect raising the cost of online access. Some publishers send “free print” along with online access, for no reason that is apparent, despite efforts by campus serialists to have publishers cease sending these materials. Again, their receipt among purposefully subscribed titles creates unnecessary and duplicative work.

*d. Cost analysis*

- Cost of survey (none). The subscription cost to the USAS has already been paid for by CDL through December 2010 is \$5,000. It wouldn't be passed on to campuses.
- Cost to analyze survey. Depending upon available staff perhaps 1-3 months to analyze data and prepare recommendations.

*e. Barriers*

- For campuses which retain but do not check-in the identified duplicate print serial titles, shelving the unbound issues by call number (as many libraries do) will require the title be looked up and a label printed. This in itself is a time consuming effort, which is just short of checking-in the issue.
- Checking-in some titles but not those that are received in print and online, is not necessarily time-saving, since to discover whether a title is to be checked-in will require a look-up in the serials module. Again, this in itself is a time consuming effort, which is just short of checking-in the issue.
- ***One solution to both issues would be to have entire campuses cease serials management processes if 75%-100% of their collection is duplicated at campuses where check-in, claiming, etc. would continue.***

*f. What UC will not continue doing*

- Perform duplicate serials management work
- Check-in serials, claim, bind, store serials at all campuses

*g. Timetable and/or next steps*

- Arrange and perform print serial survey: October-December 2010
- Follow with print serial survey analysis: January-March 2011



- Present findings and recommendations to appropriate decision-making group: April 2011
- Develop implementation plan based on selected recommendations May-July 2011
- Implement Serials Management Reduction August-December 2011

*h. Impact on users*

- If a campus does not check-in print serials, missing issues cannot be claimed and replaced. This may make some material unavailable to users. However, given the quick turn-around of intra-UC Interlibrary Loan for article photocopies, this may not pose a significant access problem for users - particularly if users are more apt to use online resources, versus similar print titles.

Other Information needed:

- Obtain, if possible, a clear statement/understanding on perpetual access for CDL licensed resources; if we cancel print in lieu of online access, do we retain access to previously licensed online volumes in perpetuity if online is later canceled?
- Are the print issues that come with online access supposed to take care of archival access in few/some/most cases?
- Curious: over the last 5 years, how many titles/packages have been subscribed to and then cancelled by CDL? How has this effected print subscriptions? Did campuses re-subscript to print? What happened to archival access for the term covered by online?

**UC Serial Subscription, Binding Budget, and FTE Data as of August 2010**

	<b>Number of Active Print Serial Subscriptions</b>	<b>Annual Serials Binding Budget</b>	<b>FTE doing serials check-in, claiming, binding prep</b>
Berkeley	36,517	200,000	6.73
Davis	11,973	60,000	4
Irvine	6,800	24,904	4
Merced	12	0	0
Los Angeles	38,975	250,000	4.5
Riverside	6,102	30,850	3.5
San Diego	5,700	57,000	1.6
San Francisco	477	\$20,906	1
Sana Barbara	11,211	60,000	4.25
Santa Cruz	3,081	32,600	1.16
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>120,848 print subscriptions</b>	<b>\$736,260</b>	<b>30.74 FTE</b>

## System-wide historical federal government documents repository

### *a. Proposed action (and long-term goal)*

The NGTS-Enterprise Team endorses a long-term goal of creating a single federal government documents collection in UC by establishing shared print in place agreements for legislative, executive, judicial and statistical information sources. We reference two recent reports:

- [NGTS-1 Phase 1 Report](#), Issue 6: Create a system-wide collaborative and comprehensive government documents collection
- November 9, 2005

From: University of California Government Information Librarians

To: Nancy Kushigian, Director, Shared Print Collections

[Proposal to develop a University of California Shared Print Collection of Federal Government Publications](#)

Each UC selective depository receives about 70-80% of GPO publications and holds an approximate 300,000-600,000 items in each collection. Very few titles (perhaps as few as 300 titles) are held uniquely. There is significant duplication in legacy print and microform collections and significant duplication of incoming receipts (current publications).

Furthermore, more than 90% of current publications are published digitally. And a significant number of backfiles are or will soon be available electronically, through system-wide licensing or Hathi Trust. The digital preservation marketplace has matured and there are now several digital preservation options to ensure the long term preservation of digital content (for both backfiles and current publications).

UC Libraries can no longer afford to preserve and service 2-3 formats of the same content at such a large scale.

NGTS's recommendation would move the UC Libraries away from a decentralized model in which campuses currently collect duplicate resources to a hybrid model in which certain campuses would assume responsibility on behalf of the system to continue to collect current resources and to retain historical components of the legacy collections (prospective and retrospective solution).

The model would incorporate risk management principles which would

- acknowledge the State Library as the collection of record for the region thereby reducing the overall risk of loss of content in the region
- define when to transition to e-only and focus efforts and resources on preserving the digital content (in lieu of maintaining shared print or shared microform within UC)
- define when to maintain dual print and electronic formats, when to maintain dual microform and electronic formats, and when to retain dual print and microform formats. Maintenance of 3 formats is strongly discouraged.

Because the State Library is the library of record for the region, no effort and investment would be placed on verifying completeness of the historical collections in physical formats (similar to the Bronze Archive Type for WEST.) But effort would be made to disclose holdings and retention commitments to physical formats in keeping with disclosure standards similar to those being defined for WEST.

Federal documents would remain in the locations where they currently reside (in storage or at the designated library) lessening the burden on UC's storage facilities. No effort will be placed on de-duplicating existing collections in UC storage facilities but effort will be placed on de-duplicating campus collections.

This recommendation assumes that UC does not require extramural partners to support this transformation in the collections. It assumes that UC Libraries would engage the State Library and Superintendent of documents in limited ways: to identify a path for filling gaps in the State Library collection and to review and solicit procedural guidance from the Superintendent of Documents on planned deaccessioning of duplicates.

#### *b. Benefits*

With local and system storage costs and locations filling up, having campuses designate themselves as the system depository for different parts of the UC federal documents collection will allow other UC Libraries to deaccession their copies, freeing up local space while having a trusted system-wide location for those items. Colorado and other states have already experimented with this concept. Indiana has worked with the Superintendent of Documents to facilitate a similar "light archive" effort.

Anticipated benefits include

- Significant space savings in campus libraries
- Resources dedicated to redundant historical federal documents collections would be freed up for other priorities.

#### *c. Near-term and mid-range actions that will lead to the longer-term solution*

Establish a collections task force to

- Evaluate State Library collection of record for completeness and develop scenarios to supplement with UC holdings
- Identify candidate collections for U.S. federal legislative, executive, judicial and statistical information sources
- Designate managing campuses for each candidate collection
- Define a risk management model, leveraging some WEST principles
- Define a retention policy and time horizon for review
- Define a governance structure for collection development and management decision-making for the shared print collections
- Identify digital preservation and access approach and costs for the components of the collection that may be retained only in digital form and for access services.

Establish an implementation task force to

- Define disclosure standards, leveraging emerging standards for WEST

- Conduct reclamation projects to disclose shared print holdings in OCLC
- Develop a timeline and procedures for deaccessioning campus duplicates, review these with the Superintendent of Documents.
- Common access policy to ensure equitable and predictable access among/between campus libraries and users

*d. Cost analysis*

Assuming a Bronze-like archiving solution for the shared print in place collections (the least costly option for a shared print in place archive of this nature), costs would include:

- Reclamation costs for disclosure of shared print collections
- Digital preservation and/or digitization costs for the components of the collections recommended for e-only
- Digitization-on-demand services to support public access

These costs would be absorbed by the managing campuses and RLFs where the designated collections currently reside.

As a result of the above investments, benefits that accrue to UC libraries include

- Significant space savings in campus libraries (space reclamation, capital savings)
- Reduction of effort on federal documents processing at each campus (human resource reallocation to other activities and government document collections.)

*e. Barriers*

Possible barriers which may be mitigated with appropriate leadership include:

- Approval of campus deselections by Superintendent of Documents
- Campus dissatisfaction with collection assignments resulting in retention of duplicates
- Bibliographer acceptance of e-only and digital preservation solution for some components of the collections

*f. What UC will not continue doing*

Redundant and local practices related to providing access to multiple copies of historical federal government documents would be eliminated, freeing up more physical space.

*g. Timetable and/or next steps*

Appoint/Charge the Collections Task Force

November 2010 – April 2011

Appoint/Charge the Implementation Task Force

January 2011 – July 2011

*h. Impact on users*

Components of the historical and current federal documents collections would be located at different campuses and RLFs. Specialized reference service and digitization on demand services may be needed to facilitate discovery and access to localized collections by users at any location in the state.

## Shared Cataloging Program

### *a. Proposed action (and long-term goal)*

The Shared Cataloging Program has been one of the UC Libraries' most successful collaborative programs. We recommend here six short-term actions and one medium-term action which will make this Program even more effective. There are several long-term goals for UC with SCP: to "scale up" the program in terms of content; to maximize the program's effectiveness; to ensure long-term funding stability; and to develop appropriate governance models so that campuses have sufficient input and controls about standards and services.

#### Short-term actions:

- (1) Reduce redundant work, and redundant data, by identifying one "database of record" in which to maintain accurate holdings data, and leveraging that data where needed. SCP, in consultation with other stakeholders, should make a decision between the SFX KB, the Serials Solutions ERMS, 856 fields in bibliographic records, and local holdings records and find solutions for better sharing of coverage data. UC should not maintain the same holdings data in four separate places.
- (2) Stop the distribution of bibliographic records to the ten campuses for their local OPACs. This would effectively mean that Next Generation Melvyl is the discovery tool for electronic resources. If records for electronic resources are desired for local OPACs, campuses could arrange (and pay) for record delivery by OCLC when institutional symbols are set. This would free up SCP resources to take on new workloads, such as:
- (3) Expand SCP to include more cataloging of electronic California documents and open access resources.
- (4) Expand SCP to include the cataloging of electronic federal documents, thereby saving the campuses from separate contracts with Marcive for Documents without Shelves.
- (5) Monitor the "Collection Services Centers" and "Non-Roman Backlogs" developments (see other recommendations in this report) and work with appropriate new centers to apprise them of workloads in Tier One and Tier Two electronic packages and to train them in SCP practices and expectations.
- (6) Find a permanent source of funding for the Chinese language SCP cataloger. This is a temporary position (ends November 2011) with an ongoing workload.

#### Medium-term action:

- (7) A stable funding model and, concomitantly, a governance model that provides accountability to the funders, needs to be developed for the Shared Cataloging Program. Should this program continue on UCOP Resource Sharing funds, administered by CDL, or should some other campus-managed model be developed? We recommend that a subgroup be charged to develop



alternatives to recommend to the University Librarians, considering in particular the suggestions from the Financial Infrastructure group. In addition, we recommend that this subgroup also consider the role of the SCP Advisory Committee, as well as CAMCIG's role in setting UC-wide cataloging policy.

*b. Benefits*

- Reducing redundant work
- Re-purposing existing SCP staff from infrastructure work (record distribution) to increased cataloging
- More access to shared and open access electronic resources through NGM by users
- More access to Chinese and other language and format electronic resources by users
- A clearer model for future development of shared cataloging within UC

*c. Near-term and mid-range actions that will lead to the longer-term solution*

The first two recommendations above (eliminating redundant holdings data and stopping record distribution) will have immediate and dramatic impacts on both the Program and on the campuses. These are a necessary first step to freeing up SCP staff time so that they can take on other cataloging assignments (such as the third and fourth recommendations).

Recommendations 5-7 are necessary for longer-term changes in SCP. SCP does not (and cannot) have expertise in every language or format, and UC must leverage its internal experts. The current funding and governance models have caused problems in the past and new approaches must be developed.

Long-term goals for SCP could include expansion into other areas, such as shared print collections. Further expansion of the Program will not be possible, though, without a different funding model and further operational efficiencies.

*d. Cost analysis*

The first four recommendations offset each other financially; gaining efficiencies from 1-2 give room for the expanded cataloging of 3-4. Recommendation 4 has the potential to save UC approx. \$15,250 (\$1,525 per campus for the annual Marcive Documents without Shelves subscription).

Recommendation 5 leverages the expertise it has developed in languages and formats at specific campuses so that the entire system will benefit for its shared electronic resources.

Recommendation 6 will require ongoing funding, starting at approx. \$70K and increasing every two years to match performance review cycles. For three years of this temporary position, funding has been from a campus co-share model. The Financial Infrastructure Group may have a better idea for funding sources and ongoing models.

Recommendation 7 will also require a modest and ongoing increase in funds. The UCOP Resource Sharing line is a fixed amount; as salaries increase, the number of FTE must go down because the line is fixed. Over time, this will be disastrous. If a major programmatic expansion is desired, special or ongoing funding must also be arranged.

*e. Barriers*

- The redundant holdings data problem is not trivial, and much work will be required of staff no matter which decision is reached. Each database/technique has its purpose, its value, and its champion, and making a decision will be difficult.
- Stopping record distribution will require campuses to accept a re-defined role for its local OPAC, and will necessitate changes in public services and instruction to utilize NGM for electronic resource discovery.
- Campuses who feel they need electronic resource records in their local OPACs will need to find local funding to get those records from OCLC, and will have to adjust work processes.
- Campuses may not be able to find sufficient ongoing funds to contribute to sustain SCP.

*f. What UC will not continue doing*

- The redundant maintenance of the same holdings data in four different places
- The ongoing work of synchronizing twelve (10 campuses plus NGM plus SCP) different databases of bibliographic information for electronic resources
- Making California documents and other open access resources a lower priority for user access
- Backlogging licensed shared electronic resources in various languages and formats for which SCP has no expertise

*g. Timetable and/or next steps*

- Assign Recommendation 1 to SCP with a short (3 month?) deadline.
- Assign Recommendation 2 to SCP. They should prepare a written proposal describing a transition away from record distribution as well as information about getting records (if needed) from OCLC, for discussion by HOTS by the end of 2010.
- Ask HOTS to keep SCP informed about developments with Collection Services Centers.
- In their review of the Financial Infrastructure Group's report, NGTS Steering and Executive Teams should be mindful of Recommendation 6, and find an avenue to pursue permanent funding for the SCP Chinese language electronic resources cataloger.
- Either the NGTS Steering Team or HOTS should establish a subgroup of high-level stakeholders to make recommendations to the University Librarians about a permanent funding and governance structure for SCP.

*h. Impact on users*

- More materials accessible more quickly
- Shared electronic resource records no longer maintained in local OPACs

## System-wide and Multi-campus Collection Development Activities

### *a. Proposed action (and long-term goal)*

The NGTS-Enterprise Team endorses the long-term goal of “developing a system-wide view of collections [that] allows the Libraries to develop richer services, leverage resources to increase collection diversity, expose hidden resources, and take full advantage of library expertise on the individual campuses.” (The University of California Library Collection, CDC, 2009)

We recommend building on existing multi-campus collection development activities and exploring new methods of involving faculty and graduate students in selection.

CDC should charge a working group to develop scenarios to increase centralized and multi-campus collection development activities, including the following:

- Increase the number of individual bibliographers who select for more than one campus.
- Increase programs to facilitate faculty and graduate student involvement in selection (for example, UCLA patron choice project)
- Expand the responsibilities of UC Bibliographer Groups to include:
  - Selection of shared monographs approval plans
  - Selection of Ebook resources that are relatively discipline-specific
  - Selection of open access born-digital content
  - Selection of UC produced content
  - Prioritization of cataloging backlogs within language or subject areas
  - Prioritization of proposals for digitizing various components of the UC collection

### *b. Benefits*

- Build upon existing successful system-wide collaborations and use those successes as models for new collaborations
- Leverage scarce staff expertise within UC
- Build capacity to pursue UC-wide selection
- “Patron choice” initiatives can inform selector decisions and relieve selector workload

### *c. Near-term and mid-range actions that will lead to the longer-term solution*

CDC should charge a working group to recommend near-term and mid-term actions that will lead to the following:

- Increase the number of individual bibliographers who select for more than one campus.
  - Initiate small group conversations including technical services staff, collection development officers, individual bibliographers who have experience with multi-campus selection.
  - Start with non-core areas such as area studies and smaller humanities fields.
  - Build towards core collections.
  - Could evolve to support shared print mono approval plans.

- Increase programs to facilitate faculty and graduate student involvement in selection
  - Model on UCLA patron choice project
- Expand the responsibilities of UC Bibliographer Groups
  - Model on the process of the Shared Monographs Planning Group to explore the capacity of UC Bibliographer Groups to take on new selection duties

*d. Cost analysis*

Increasing the number of bibliographers who select for more than one campus may require some funding for campus visits. Expanding the selection activities of bibliographer groups would be cost-neutral. Starting up new patron recommendation projects may require some funding for start-up and outreach materials.

*e. Barriers*

- Campuses may be concerned about losing local control of collection development.
- Campuses may be concerned about the increased workload on bibliographers who take on selection for another campus.
- Selection by one campus for another will require procedures for managing funds from multiple campuses.
- Faculty on campuses who receive selection services from another campus may react negatively, with possible consequences for campus funding for collections.
- Need to develop and implement outreach to show the benefits of collaborative selection: more expert selection, quicker access to materials including improved ILL services.

*f. What UC will not continue doing*

UC will not continue to have a bibliographer at each campus for each discipline.

*g. Timetable and/or next steps*

Near-term:

- CDC should charge a working group to develop scenarios to increase centralized and multi-campus collection development activities.
- CDC and HOTS should discuss coordination between system-wide acquisitions and selection activities.

*h. Impact on users*

These recommendations will help UC build integrated collections that best meet the needs of UC students and faculty in the 21<sup>st</sup> century and beyond.

## Develop a System-wide Model for Collection Services Staffing and Expertise

### *a. Proposed action (and long-term goal)*

Using the HOTS System-wide Shelf-Ready Report Appendix 1 as a starting point, this recommendation moves the UC Libraries away from a decentralized technical services personnel emphasis towards a hybrid/centralized technical services personnel emphasis. As local/campus technical services personnel retire or leave, each position is evaluated for strategic positioning and/or hiring from a system-wide perspective. In this way, medium- and long-range efficiencies in technical services workflows can be managed, manipulated, and transformed towards recommendations such as system-wide serials management, SCP needs, Collection Services Centers, system-wide collection development, system-wide acquisitions workflows, and other strategic and cost-effective solutions.

As positions are moved from a local to a system-wide operation, the management of such positions needs to be determined/discussed as well.

### *b. Benefits*

See above.

Should be initiated in combination with the **System-wide and multi-campus collection development activities** and the **UC-wide Collection Services Centers** recommendations.

### *c. Near-term and mid-range actions that will lead to the longer-term solution*

Have HOTS monitor and update Appendix 1 information from the Shelfready Report on a monthly basis.

Near term: as positions become open, have the local campus in consultation with appropriate ACGs discuss repositioning expertise and operations from local to system-wide.

Long term: as positions become open, have ACGs/AULs discuss repositioning expertise and operations from local to system-wide.

### *d. Cost analysis*

Looking at system-wide technical services personnel from a system rather than a local perspective will eventually yield cost savings by reducing the number of redundant positions system-wide, as well as help to move UC Libraries forward towards system-wide solutions.

### *e. Barriers*

Trying to do this type of redirection and prioritization of personnel system-wide quickly and efficiently (i.e., getting “teams” to work together and make decisions quickly).

Envisioning/moving collection management personnel expenses and resources from a campus to a system-wide centralized/hybrid model (would perhaps mean moving monies for personnel around the system: need Financial task group input).

### *f. What UC will not continue doing*

Having 10 redundant technical services operations, all doing similar if not redundant operations.

## Cloud-based Systemwide Integrated Library System (ILS)

**Implement a cloud-based systemwide ILS. Linked to Next Generation Melvyl, begin migration of data to make this the UC systemwide ILS for the future.**

*a. Proposed action (and long-term goal).*

It is apparent to the task force that many of the recommendations for the UC Libraries in enterprise-level collection management services must be linked to the adoption of a single, systemwide ILS. There are a number of features that would need to be present for this to happen: it must be cloud-based, as this is the future of computing; it must be open-source, as it is apparent that proprietary ILS products have not provided the kinds of services, shared data management, or statistical reports that are needed for large consortias to interact and cooperate at a macro level; it must have modules that focus on specific functions in the library, such as circulation, acquisitions, ereserves, and advanced serial management; it must allow for both MARC and non-MARC metadata, so that the UC Libraries do not need two data products to describe and provide access to print and digital objects; and it must be able to be a “database of record” as described in that recommendation of this task force. This open-source platform would allow the UC Libraries to fully integrate and manipulate all of our combined bibliographic and other data for all formats and materials.

*b. Benefits*

It just makes long-term sense to move to some type of cloud-based systemwide ILS. Currently, the UC Libraries cannot operate at the network level, nor have a systemwide bibliographic database of record, because of our reliance on separate proprietary local ILSs. Moving to an open-source and cloud-based platform is strategically advantageous. This would also allow all ten campuses to work in the same platform and the same bibliographic database of record, so that movement towards centralized and/or hybrid models in format lifecycles becomes much easier. It will also make decentralized local workflows much more manageable and coordinated from a systems perspective. Using an open-source platform is more strategic and makes more common sense than moving all ten campuses to one proprietary ILS, in that huge up-front costs would not be incurred, customization of the interface and features would be built on a community level rather than controlled by a company or user group, and this cloud-based type of platform is the future of information management.

Moving to a cloud-based systemwide ILS would also allow the UC Libraries a smoother transition to systemwide collection management. Every campus, when ordering, would see what every other campus already has, thus allowing for advanced collection management and tools to move towards shared print-in-place, systemwide shelf-ready, and other initiatives.

Moving to a cloud-based systemwide ILS would also allow for systemwide acquisitions control using a centralized or hybrid model.



For the two campuses who currently have 3.5 systems FTE dedicated to a proprietary ILS product that requires extensive local systems support, a cloud-based systemwide ILS would enable moving those systems personnel/expertise towards other technologies and library directions.

Moving to a cloud-based systemwide ILS would also allow UC to coordinate shared print archiving through consortiums like WEST. In short, being able to disclose retention commitments for shared print journals, and analyze library holdings and holdings with retention commitments in a decision-support system like Ithaka S+R has developed, is very important in the future. Working on a special holdings location code for this information is especially crucial for success in this endeavor, and moving to a cloud-based systemwide ILS would facilitate that process.

*c. Near-term and mid-range actions that will lead to the longer-term solution*

An extensive examination of the current marketplace indicates that there are a number of products which could meet the criteria of a cloud-based systemwide ILS. The first step would be to convene a task group that would iterate the requirements for such an ILS, and then issue an RFP.

Implementation could be scaled. Those UC campuses ready to migrate and give up their proprietary ILS systems could do so first, allowing those who are not ready or wish to “wait and see” that opportunity; however, there would need to be some timeline up front when everyone would migrate their platform and services to the chosen cloud-base systemwide ILS. Other NGTS initiatives would not be able to move forward quickly or efficiently without full system implementation of this product.

*d. Cost analysis*

Currently, the UC Libraries pay approximately 1.2 million dollars a year in subscription/maintenance fees for their ten separate ILSs. If this money could be repurposed to pay for a cloud-based systemwide ILS, it would enable a number of systemwide recommendations of this task force, as well as others linked to NGTS and the Shared Print-in-Place task force.

*e. Barriers*

Pull back from UC library staff, who are invested in proprietary ILSs and the quirks and workflows associated with same.

There may also need to be up-front manipulation of non-bibliographic records (holdings, patrons, etc.) into new data types/XSD format.

May cost more than our 10 current proprietary ILS systems, but the long-term benefits outweigh the upfront investment.

*f. What UC will not continue doing*

UC will no longer pay for proprietary local ILSs. The cloud-based systemwide ILS investment will be paid for through discontinuation of subscriptions for proprietary ILSs.

Investment in monies/personnel resources to maintain and manage local hardware/software dedicated to proprietary ILSs.



*g. Timetable and/or next steps*

This task force recommends formation of a task force that would construct the requirements necessary for a UC cloud-based systemwide ILS, and issue an RFP into the marketplace. One or more campuses who feel ready and willing to move forward into this new frontier would work to launch this cloud-based systemwide ILS as a pilot project, with the understanding that all UC Libraries would eventually migrate within a reasonable time frame, ideally three years maximum.

*h. Impact on users*

Will be able to access all UC collections from one platform.

All UC library staff users will be working on the same platform.

No patron disruption during implementation or continual/annual downtime for versioning because this service is back-end and invisible.

Report submitted Sept. 10, 2010 for review by the Council of University Librarians. See chapter for priority decisions.

## Electronic Resource Management Systems

### *a. Proposed action (and long-term goals)*

The NGTS-E Team recommends implementing a hybrid Electronic Resource Management System for consortial use across all U.C. campuses. The proposed hybrid model would utilize a single, UC-wide ERMS, with decentralized staff across UC managing and maintaining the data contained therein. CDL staff would continue to manage Tier 1 resources, and we recommend they being to fully manage Tier 2, which currently is a shared duty between CDL and staff at the various campuses. Tier 3 and 4 resources would continue to be managed at the local campus and department level. Stricter oversight would be needed, and a set of unified rules and principles would need to be developed and enforced in order to ensure that data is gathered and input consistently into the ERMS, and to ensure that license negotiations are handled in a uniform way across UC.

### *b. Benefits*

- All electronic resource information is kept in one consortial database, and is viewable and accessible across UC (as appropriate).
- Leverages existing staff at CDL and UC who already perform the work.
- Keeps Tier 1 management in CDL, where the expertise resides, and brings uniformity in the handling of Tier 2 resources by transitioning them to CDL management.
- Tier 3 and 4 will continue to be input by local campus and/or department staff, but with clear guidelines as to what data to capture and how to input it into the ERMS.
- Will allow for uniformity in the capturing and display of e-resource description, licensing, and acquisitions data.
- Reduces confusion by creating a clear delineation of which staff (CDL/campus) are responsible for handling the various Tiers of e-resources.
- Enables all UCs to have access to, and use, an ERMS. Currently only three UC campuses and CDL have an ERMS.
- Reduces duplication of effort, if a resource is described once in the central database, additional licensees only need to input their license and acquisitions data.
- Increases discoverability of resources for other staff in the UC system, making it easier to identify when a Tier 3 or 4 resource has met the requirement for becoming a Tier 2 resource. This may allow CDL to (re)negotiate a better cost or license agreement on behalf of several UC campuses.

### *c. Near-term and mid-range actions that will lead to the longer-term solution*

Charge a task force with the investigation and implementation of an ERMS that can scale up to the size needed to host all of the e-resources for all ten UC campuses and CDL. This system should also allow for staff at all campuses and CDL to input data, and should have the necessary safeguards in place to protect confidential data from unauthorized viewing.

NGTS-E sees this recommendation in conjunction with the Cloud-based systemwide ILS recommendation for use at a consortial level. This would result in a hardware and systems-

support savings, as UC would not have to host or support a cloud-based ILS as it currently does with ten ILS and several ERM systems.

*d. Cost analysis*

Cost data for current ERMS implementations across all UC campuses was not available due to the fact that various campuses were at different stages of implementations. But it is very likely that licensing a consortial ERMS would result in a cost savings, as vendors would be willing to negotiate lower prices in order to garner all of UC's business.

If the Cloud-based systemwide ILS recommendation were implemented, further cost savings may be realized due to the fact that both ILS and ERMS functions would be cloud-based, and would not require licensing of two separate systems across all ten campuses.

*e. Barriers*

- There will be an initial start up costs for campuses that currently do not have an ERMS (and thus no costs associated with that function).
- Investment in staff time and training for campuses that currently do not have an ERMS.
- Investment in staff time for retraining, since it is likely that a consortial ERMS or cloud-based ILS will be a new system for most (or all) UC campuses.
- ERMS integration with local ILS acquisitions clients was mentioned as being of paramount importance by campus staff who have implemented a local ERMS. A consortial ERMS would have to be programmed to interface with ten different instances of campus acquisitions clients (from three vendor systems). Implementing a cloud-based ILS would negate this barrier.

*f. What UC will not continue doing*

- UC will not implement different ERMS across all campuses, which would require dedicated staff at each campus to host and maintain the system, and present the possibility of decentralized and non-uniform inputting of e-resource data.

*g. Timetable and/or next steps*

- Task force investigates consortial ERMS solutions and cloud-based ILS.
- If a cloud-based ILS product is considered a viable alternative for UC, do not pursue a separate consortial ERMS.

*h. Impact on users*

- For patrons and staff, an increased discoverability of e-resources by creating a “one stop shop” for all UC e-resource information. If a cloud-based ILS is implemented, there would be tighter integration with the consortial OPAC and the systemwide ILS as well.
- Uniform, consistent display of all UC e-resources. With the current implementation of multiple ERMS from different vendors, the public is faced with several different displays when they view e-resources.

i. Appendix – Current state of ERMS implementations in U.C.

Table 1 – Current state of ERMS implementations in U.C.

<b>Campus</b>	<b>ERMS Vendor</b>	<b>Implementation Completed</b>	<b>Stage of Implementation</b>
<b>UCB</b>	Innovative Interfaces	No	No time frame given for implementation
<b>UCSD</b>	Innovative Interfaces	Yes	Used only for workflow management
<b>UCI</b>	Innovative Interfaces	Yes	
<b>UCSF</b>	None	N/A	
<b>UCSC</b>	Innovative Interfaces	No	In testing phase
<b>UCM</b>	None	N/A	
<b>UCD</b>	None	N/A	
<b>UCLA</b>	Serial Solutions	No	Deploying internally by the end of September with the goal of having a public interface up by Fall 2010
<b>UCR</b>	None	N/A	
<b>UCSB</b>	Serial Solutions	No	Recently purchased
<b>CDL</b>	Serial Solutions	Yes	

## Database of Record

The “database of record” is a crucial concept to managing effectively UC’s metadata. The database of record is the one place that staff can rely upon to answer the question “Do we own (or have access to) this item?” It provides the basis for determining statistical data, collection data, and other metadata used to determine value for insurance purposes. It also reliably records details (which branch library holds this, was that order received, which volumes of a print serial are held, etc.) The database of record must be accurate and complete, and there must be only one. If there is more than one, conflicts can be almost impossible to resolve.

Currently, the database that underlies each campus’s local ILS is that campus’s database of record. It became clear in NGTS-E discussions that an enterprise-level database of record is needed; that database would be the foundation for managing UC’s collective collection and the eliminated redundancy alone would net significant cost savings. This is not a new idea; in the BSTF Report, this was called a single (backend) data file. A system-wide ILS also would provide a single database of record. In our discussions, though, NGTS-E recognized that the system-wide ILS solution would be problematic, because it would still mean copying and managing records from, and synchronizing records with, the WorldCat database—not an ideal workflow. (Copying once, as opposed to ten times, but nonetheless it is still copying.) To completely eliminate redundancy, and with WorldCat Local as UC’s discovery tool, would it be possible to use WorldCat as UC’s single, system-wide database of record?

We posed this question to CAMCIG in July 2010, and the responses strongly indicated that WorldCat is not now in a position to fulfill this role. One could argue that with campus and RLF reclamation (and subsequently keeping current), UC had achieved a database of record within WorldCat. However, there is a layer of detail and reporting functionality beneath the “OCLC holding symbol” layer that is needed. Despite OCLC’s long history and strength in the cataloging arena, the critical pieces of functionality (and some data elements) to support this role do not exist, and it is unclear whether OCLC is aware of the scope and magnitude of what would need to be developed. If UC gets seriously interested in developing or purchasing a Cloud-based System-wide ILS, we should prepare to have a detailed conversation with the developers/vendor about our needs in this area. The Task Force has had a preliminary discussion of this with CAMCIG, the results of which we are happy to share with the ULs if they decide this is a direction they wish to pursue.

### *a. Proposed action (and long-term goal)*

Ask the ULs to confirm that it is a long-term goal for UC to have a single database of record to effectively manage the collective collection.

### *b. Benefits*

- Improves support for cooperative collection development activity
- Improves efficiency and eliminates redundant work
- Record enrichment benefits all users of that record
- Eliminates need for record copying and distribution by SCP

- Eliminates duplicate data across multiple systems
- Reduces complex data flows across multiple systems
- Improved user services through shared standards, processes, and decision-making

*c. Near-term and mid-range actions that will lead to the longer-term solution*

Ask the ULs to charge HOTS (or some other group) to present a report outlining options to move UC in this direction.

*d. Cost analysis*

If UC truly supports the notion of “UC’s collective collection,” then we cannot afford NOT to have a single database of record. Without one, we are saddled with the high cost of multiple systems (yearly maintenance costs) and the even more enormous cost of staff using them (training, redundant searching, difficulty in information gathering and decision-making). We perpetuate the complex and difficult processes in place now.

*e. Barriers*

- In a sense, this continues the futile “single system-wide ILS” discussion under a new name, with all its concomitant political and financial ramifications
- Potential conflict with campus needs to integrate their local metadata with other campus-level resources (campus financial systems, course management systems, customizable student interfaces, etc.)
- An inadequate substitute for the current databases of record would result in band-aid systems and duplication
- Concern about UC putting “all of its eggs into the OCLC basket” and our need for a back-up strategy

*f. What UC will not continue doing*

- Separate (and often redundant) work in ten separate databases
- Difficult and ineffective information-gathering through multiple databases

*g. Timetable and/or next steps*

- Ask the ULs to confirm that it is a long-term goal for UC to have a single database of record to effectively manage the collective collection (Fall 2010)
- Ask the ULs to charge HOTS (or some other group) to present a report outlining options to move UC in this direction (Fall 2010)
- Report from charged group due in Spring 2011

*h. Impact on users*

Subtle but positive impact. If WorldCat could fulfill this function, then there would be no need to “link out” to a local system for metadata, presumably speeding up response time. Users would be positively impacted by faster processing and quicker collection decisions by library staff.