<div align="center">

POT 5
Report and Recommendations on Deliverable 1:

Assess the Benefits and Risks of Stopping the Distribution of
Bibliographic Records to the Ten Campuses for their Local OPACs

</div>

POT5 Membership
Julia Kochi (UCSF, SOPAG Sponsor)
Armanda Barone (UCB)
Adolfo R. Tarango (UCSD/CDL)

Project Manager
Lucia Orlando (UCSC)

1. Executive Summary

POT 5's first deliverable was to **"**[a]ssess the benefits and risks of stopping the distribution of [Shared Cataloging Program] bibliographic records to the ten campuses for their local OPACs."

In order to accomplish this, two Lightning Teams were charged. Lightning Team 1 (LT1) was charged with investigating the possible effects on the UC system libraries if SCP discontinued its procedure of replicating records and distributing them to the campuses. CAMCIG (Lightning Team 1A) was charged with determining the cost to both SCP and campuses to handle SCP records as well as determining if there were alternative methods for ingesting those records and, if so, the cost.

The following report provides detailed finding by both groups. Based on those findings, **POT 5's recommendation is to continue the distribution of SCP records to campuses.**

This recommendation is supported by the following findings:

1. Halting distribution of SCP records to campuses would create redundant work for campus Technical Services departments and would have a detrimental impact on the ability of users to find resources quickly and reduce the ability of libraries to make resources easily discoverable. (LT1)
2. There are significant negative consequences to public and technical services operations, if bibliographic records for CDL- licensed electronic resources are not present in campuses OPACs. (LT1)
3. Campuses derive revenues through ILL operations that are tied to the presence of SCP records in their OPACs. The most significant example noted is the revenue generated by UC Davis' Carlson Health Science Library. They feed the SCP records into DOCLINE and generate revenue that would be lost without the SCP records. (LT1)

4. Requires ILL staff to search 2 catalogs or run the risk of increased costs due to unnecessary borrowing (LT1)
5. Distribution of SCP records is an extremely cost effective service: it costs slightly less than $0.50 per record, the system-wide cost of the current distribution method is approximately $32,000 and involves 0.642 FTE. (LT1A)
6. Currently there is no alternative viable mechanism for campuses to acquire bibliographic records for UC-selected resources if campuses chose to add them to local OPACs if SCP stopped distributing them. (LT1A)

Furthermore, POT 5 recommends:

• CAMCIG and/or the SCP Advisory Committee should follow-up on sharing workflow procedures to explore how current campus processes may be streamlined.
• CAMCIG should be tasked to follow-up with OCLC in a year to ascertain if OCLC database improvements have been added that would support acquisition of records from them.

An unexpected outcome of LT1's work was a fair amount of feedback from library staff on the four surveyed campuses about what changes to Melvyl would be necessary before it would be an acceptable alternative to campus OPACs. A separate report that summarizes these comments as well as provides them in their raw form is available. **POT 5 recommends that this report be shared with the Melvyl Advisory Group.**

2. Background

The Shared Cataloging Program (SCP) currently catalogs UC-selected electronic resources for the UC campuses. Bibliographic records for these resources are distributed on a weekly basis to the campuses. The distribution process represents a defined workload for the SCP and the campuses. SCP is facing increasing workloads that currently must be absorbed by existing staff. The question is raised whether elimination of the record distribution workload would result in SCP/campus cost and/or staffing savings sufficient to offset, if any, negative impacts of SCP not distributing the records to the campuses. Deliverable 1 was formulated to address this question and assigned to NGTS Power of Three 5 (POT5).

SCP was established at the UCSD Libraries in February 2000. SCP uses OCLC WorldCat as its cataloging utility, and either by creating original records or by availing themselves of copy, does cataloging for UC-selected resources. After cataloging a resource and attaching the appropriate SCP OCLC holding symbols to the OCLC record, the record is exported from WorldCat into UCSD's ILS. During the cataloging process, coding is added so that SCP can determine which campuses should receive a copy of this record.

In addition to new cataloging, SCP catalogers perform bibliographic maintenance on existing records. This maintenance ranges from tasks related to serial title changes and

updating coverage data, to correcting URLs and handling titles transfers and deletes. The updated records are coded for identification and gathered along with the records for newly cataloged titles. Once gathered, separate files are generated for serials and for monographs and posted on a server for pick-up by the campuses. The campuses then load those files into their ILSs.

For fiscal year 2010/2011, the average number of records distributed weekly to each campus was 1,181, which on average 780 were for monographs, and 401 were for serials. Collectively, for FY 2010/2011, 736,657 records were sent of which 486,674 were monographs, 249,983 were serials.

3. Methodology

POT 5 charged two lightning teams to address this deliverable. The POT 5 LT1 was charged with investigating the possible effects on the UC system libraries if the SCP discontinued its procedure of replicating records and distributing them to the campuses. LT1 used a survey instrument to gather data from four campus library service departments identified as representative of campus size and ILS: UCD, UCR, UCSD, and UCLA.

LT1A (i.e. CAMCIG) was charged by POT 5 to ascertain the monetary and staffing costs of record distribution to SCP and campuses, both current-state and if campuses chose to add the records themselves should SCP not distribute them. For the first part of the charge, ascertain current-state cost, LT1A compiled data provided by each member (all campuses are represented). Each member conducted an inventory of all staffing currently involved with processing of the records and reported respective itemized staffing levels and staffing cost. For the second part of the charge, ascertain cost of procuring records from another source, LT1A constituted two subgroups that investigated the only two viable alternate sources of records, OCLC and UCSD. Additionally, another subgroup investigated the cost of cleaning up the local OPACs if no records were to be provided at all.

4. Findings

The final reports for each Lightning Team are posted on the POT 5 section of the NGTS wiki and are appended here as Appendix A (LT1 report) and Appendix B (LT1A). The following is a listing of their outcomes and conclusions.

4.1 LT1 Outcomes (Effect on UC Libraries):

- SCP records in the local catalogs are heavily used in reference and instruction activities:
  - o   Links in the catalog records for LibGuides and other instruction materials

- Use of e-resources, and workloads would be "significantly" affected for the worse if the records were no longer in the local catalog
- Melvyl is not considered an acceptable substitute as a discovery tool (e.g. inadequate handling of government documents, corporate authors, and multiple format records, a "poor" or "imprecise" search capability; poor retrieval that indicated that holdings existed where they did not)

- SCP records in the local catalogs are heavily used by bibliographers/collection development/subject librarians:
  - Search SCP records in the OPAC to troubleshoot access problems, locate the PID or URL for linking to instructional materials, to check if items are owned before placing orders, and to make preservation decisions about withdrawing print copies
  - Use the 793s, SCP title hooks for each package, for new book lists, to promote collections (xx #'s of e-books…), and to track progress made by SCP on a particular collection
  - Concerns that campuses would provide different levels of service to patrons based on budgets (assuming their library chose not to load the SCP records themselves)
  - Concerns about forcing users to search in two catalogs (e.g. local catalogs include resources that are not in Melvyl, such as our patron-driven acquisition collections)

- SCP records in the local catalogs are heavily used by interlibrary loan:
  - Having SCP records in the local catalogs reduces staff time and workloads as well as unnecessary requests
  - The records are critical to both the borrowing and lending operations
  - Loss of SCP records would have very important detrimental effects on ILL revenue, staff time and workload, additional costs for unnecessary orders from borrowing libraries and unnecessary orders from outside UC

- SCP records in the local catalogs are heavily used in acquisitions activities:
  - SCP records used for creating lists to track titles moving in and out of CDL packages, creating lists to identify print titles for cancellation, and generating lists for statistical reports such as for ARL

- SCP records in the local catalogs are heavily used in cataloging activities:
  - One-stop shopping possible through the local catalog enables more effective discovery
  - Greater efficiency for ordering and check-in as a result of loading enhanced/accurate records into the local ILS
  - New-title lists can be built on the records

- SCP records in the local catalogs are heavily used in circulation activities:
  - SCP records used to check holdings for patrons and linking e-resources to Reserves

o   Removal of the SCP records would result in the inability to advise patrons about local holdings; more use of print books; reduction in linking of e-resources and increase in staff workload.

4.2 LT1A Outcomes (Costs of Eliminating Distribution):

• Total cost of distributing a record to the 10 campuses is slightly less than 50 cents per record—or an average of less than 5 cents per record for each campus

• Total costs of the current method of distribution and processing of SCP records to all campuses is $31,887 (SCP cost is $5,162 and the remaining $26,725 is distributed amongst the campuses)

• Total FTE involved in the process from all campuses is .642 FTE

• Acquisition of records from UCSD is not an acceptable alternative to the current state of SCP distributing records
    o   An option wherein campuses would pull the records from UCSD's ILS specifically increases costs and lessens efficiencies as potentially up to ten separate parallel processes would need to be run where currently one exists.
    o   There are significant, and some insurmountable, technical obstacles to pulling records from UCSD's ILS.
    o   An option of UCSD distributing the records instead of SCP only shifts the workload and cost to UCSD and complicates the workflow by adding another party to the distribution process.

• Getting SCP records from OCLC currently is not a feasible option
    o   At the present time, it is not possible for campuses to pull from or for OCLC to push out three critical SCP-supplied MARC fields: 599, 793, and 856.
    o   Some SCP record sets such as EEBO are not included in OCLC at this time.
    o   However, the group confirmed with OCLC that there would not be an additional charge to campuses to get records, either to pull the records themselves or for OCLC to deliver them, if they have a cataloging subscription.

• If SCP record distribution were to be discontinued and SCP records were to be available only in MELVYL, there would be significant clean-up costs associated with removing the SCP records from the individual campus ILS systems

5.   Conclusions

Ending SCP record distribution to local library catalogs would have strong-to-significant negative impacts on library services, both public and technical, which directly and indirectly affect the libraries' ability to deliver quality services to patrons.

- These impacts include:
  - Significant loss of income generated by ILL lending units, and increased costs due to unnecessary borrowing.
  - Reduction in discovery (and access) to the Tier 1/Tier 2 electronic resources, which as some respondents pointed out now make up the majority of their collections expenditures.
  - Requiring users to search 2 catalogs, because neither one would be a complete catalog of their library holdings. The elimination of a "one-stop shop" for patrons negatively impacts their user experience and will also create efficiency and workload issues for library personnel.
  - Limit ability of librarians to deliver quality reference and instruction services because of the current limits and challenges of Melvyl.
  - Limit ability of librarians involved in collection development, acquisitions, and cataloging to leverage the Tier 1/Tier 2 records (including the 793 fields) for their work, including:
    - running lists
    - troubleshooting problems with electronic resources
    - making purchase, preservation or weeding decisions
  - Additional training and workload issues for departments like ILL and Circulation/Reserves, who will need to follow up on patron requests and searches by "double-checking" holdings in Melvyl.

- Given the relatively low costs and excellent product associated with SCP's current method of record distribution, recommend that the current state of SCP be continued. Examination of alternate methods of distribution of retrieval showed no cost benefit or work efficiencies associated with switching to any of them.

6. Next Steps

As a follow up to this report, POT 5 recommends:

  - CAMCIG be charged to revisit getting records from OCLC in a year or so when OCLC will have functionalities in place that will allow campuses to pull the three MARC fields along with the associated OCLC master records or simply have OCLC do the work.

  - CAMCIG be charged to review the procedures of those campuses with lower costs to see if any of the lower cost methods can be adopted system-wide.

Appendix A removed

Appendix B

TO: Pot 5, via Armanda Baronne, Liaison to Pot 5
FROM: CAMCIG Lightning Team, via Wanda Jazayeri, CAMCIG chair
SUBJECT: Request for Assistance, CAMCIG (Recommendation on whether to
        continue or stop record distribution to campuses**)**
Date: March 16, 2012

CAMCIG was charged by Pot 5 to *"ascertain the monetary and staffing costs of record distribution to SPC and campuses, both current state and if campuses choose to add the records themselves [should SCP not distribute them]."* In this scenario, it was understood that SCP would continue to catalog and add the records to OCLC with the appropriate campus holdings symbols.   If SCP record distribution were to stop, would campuses choose to add the records themselves and what would the related costs be?

 Part 1: Costs of Current State
CAMCIG members formulated a set of questions designed to identify all costs associated with record processing by each of the 10 campuses and SCP. CAMCIG representatives consulted with other campus staff to complete the responses. These questions and the responses are available as appendices to this report. In addition CAMCIG asked each campus to provide the procedures that each currently uses to prepare and process SCP records into their local catalog.
CAMCIG determined that the total costs of the current method of distribution and processing of SCP records is to all campuses is **$31,887**. To put this in perspective, this amount is less than the annual salary of a Library Assistant II at step 1. SCP's costs are $**5,162 a**nd the remaining **$26,725** is distributed amongst the campuses. The breakdown of the costs is detailed in the following table. Note that the total cost of distributing a record to the 10 campuses is slightly less than 50 cents per record—*or an average of less than 5 cents per record for each campus.*

Current Distribution Costs Table 1 - Total Costs and Cost Per Record
(From Survey Elements No. 1 & No. 4)

Campus	No. records 2010/2011 (Survey element no. 1)	Current Cost (Survey element no. 4)	Per record cost for campus
UCB	77,952	$4,876	$.069
UCD	68,695	$2,028	$.030
UCI	77,952	$3,560	$.046
UCLA	76,947	$3,079	$.040
UCM	74,488	$2,100	$.028
UCR	72,906	$2,449	$.034

UCSB	74,758	$2,065	$.028
UCSC	72,432	$665	$.009
UCSD	76,463	$1,394	$.018
UCSF	50,259	$5,357	$.107
TOTAL per record cost for all campuses	**n/a**	**$26,725**	**$.409**
AVERAGE per record cost for each campus			*$.041*
SCP	77,952	$5,162	$.066
Total per record cost including SCP	**n/a**	**$31,887**	**$.475**
AVERAGE per record cost for each campus including SCP costs			*$.048*

Based on the survey results, CAMCIG also determined that the total FTE involved in the process from all campuses is **.642 FTE.** (This figure does not differentiate between staff level—all levels of participating staff are grouped together). The per campus FTE costs are presented in the table below. A table giving the breakdown of FTE by staff level per campus is available in appendices to this report.

Current Distribution Costs Table 2 – Total FTE Per Campus
(Compiled from responses to Survey Element no. 2 (rounded to 3 decimal places).

Campus	FTE
UCB	.064
UCD	.061
UCI	.058
UCLA	.061
UCM	.050
UCR	.050
UCSB	.026
UCSC	.016
UCSD	.038
UCSF	.105
Campus TOTAL FTE	**.529**
SCP	.113

Total FTE including SCP staff	**.642**

CAMCIG observed that the range of costs can vary significantly between campuses. Although not part of their charge, CAMCIG thinks that at some point in the future campuses review the procedures of those campuses with lower costs to see if any of the lower cost methods can be adopted.

Part. 2: Costs If Campuses Acquire Records Themselves
CAMCIG identified two alternate ways for campuses to acquire SCP records if SCP was no longer distributing them.
   a. Acquire records from UCSD
   b. Acquire records from OCLC

Two subgroups were formed to investigate and make a recommendation regarding the feasibility and costs related to each method.
Part 2a: Acquiring records from UCSD:

The subgroup discussed two different options for acquiring records from UCSD:

   • Option 1: Each Campus retrieves records from UCSD's catalog via Z39.50
   • Option 2: USCD distributes the records to campus

The subgroup determined that the acquisition of records from UCSD is not an acceptable alternative to the current state of SCP distributing records. In examining the possible scenarios for doing so, acquiring records from UCSD would NOT result in achieving NGTS goals of promoting collaboration, increasing efficiencies, or reducing cost. Option one above would specifically increase costs and lessen efficiencies as potentially up to ten separate parallel processes would need to be run where currently one exists. There would also be some, and objectively significant, negative impacts on UCSD's users and systems. Lastly, there are unacceptable retrieval limits on Z39.50 searches which UCSD would not likely be able to change. Option two, while close in costs to current process, would not provide added benefits and is less efficient as new processes would need to be developed and employed to manage the records moving from SCP to UCSD.

Part 2b: Acquiring Records from OCLC

The subgroup determined that getting SCP records from OCLC currently is NOT a feasible option. At the present time, it is not possible for campuses to pull from or for OCLC to push out three critical SCP-supplied MARC fields: 599, 793, and 856. In addition, some SCP record sets such as EEBO are not included in OCLC at this time.

The subgroup recommended this option be revisited in a year or so when OCLC will have functionalities in place that will allow campuses to pull the three MARC fields along with the associated OCLC master records or simply have OCLC do the work. The group confirmed with OCLC that there would not be an additional charge to campuses to get records, either to pull the records themselves or ask OCLC to deliver them, if they have a cataloging subscription.

Part2c: SCP records only in MELVYL

CAMCIG would also like to comment that if SCP record distribution were to be discontinued and SCP records were to be available only in MELVYL, there would be clean-up costs associated with removing the SCP records from the individual campus ILS systems. Due to local print and net holdings being attached to some SCP records, SCP records could not just be suppressed or deleted from local systems. Depending on local handling practices, clean-up costs would be dependent on local processing of SCP records. At the very least, SCP 856 fields would need to be removed from the bibliographic records. (The exception to this would be UC Merced.)

Conclusion and Recommendation:

Given the relatively low costs and excellent product associated with SCP's current method of record distribution, CAMCIG recommends that it be continued. Our examination of alternate methods of distribution or retrieval showed no cost benefit or work efficiencies associated with switching to any of them.