

ALCTS Technical Services Directors of Large Research Libraries Interest Group, ALA Midwinter 2016

8:30-8:40am Introductions

Mary Laskowski, chair, called the meeting to order.

Member introductions:

Columbia University, Bob Wolven; Cornell University, Xin Li; Duke University, Robert Byrd; Harvard University, Scott Wicks; Library of Congress, Beacher Wiggins; National Library of Medicine, Jennifer Marill; New York Public, Heide Miklitz; New York University, Daniel Lovins and Nina Servizzi; Ohio State University, Karla Strieb; Pennsylvania State University, Christopher Walker; Stanford University, Philip Schreur; Texas A&M University Libraries, Paula Sullenger; University of Alberta, Sharon Farnel; University of California at Los Angeles, John Riemer; University of Chicago, Chris Cronin; University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, Mary Laskowski; University of Minnesota, Betsy Friesen; University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, Andrew Hart; University of Pennsylvania, Beth Picknally Camden; University of Texas at Austin, Robin Fradenburgh; University of Toronto, Marlene Van Ballegooie; University of Washington, Joe Kiegel; Yale University, Marty Kurth.

8:40-9:00am The future of physical processing and the disposition of materials in relation to shared print repositories (Paula Sullenger)

At Texas A&M incoming print journals are no longer getting a receipt stamp or security strip. Print books are getting stamped and receive bar codes and security strips. What decisions have others around the table made regarding processing for off-site storage?

U of IL: Some categories of new books, such as many gift materials, are sent directly to storage and receive no classification. Gradually shifting in recent years from largely Dewey classification to new materials to LC.

U of PA: Physical processing is not done for gift collections.

Chicago: Bibliographers want call number browse capability for high density storage material and e-material. Classification is provided for e-books.

LC: Items going to storage are fully processed.

Stanford: Faculty want call number browse as well. Classification is provided for e-books; it is pulled from the print.

Harvard: For the largest collection (Widener), items going to off-site storage receive no classification as part of original cataloging. 80% of new material for Widener goes off-site. Much has copy so call numbers are available, facilitating the virtual browse available in Harvard's Primo implementation. Harvard stopped adding security strips and doesn't label for the Widener new materials being sent to off-site storage. Virtual browse is supported both by class numbers as well as subject terms for titles that lack class numbers.

Texas A&M: We are still putting mylar covers on books.

Columbia: We are doing less physical processing. How has this changed workflows for others?

UNC: We receive shelf ready processing for most items except for more unique materials. UNC takes into consideration the value of these items. Dust jackets are sometimes used in place of more expensive closures.

There was general discussion about the value of security stripping. Many libraries have decided to place strips on all materials or none at all. In some cases strips are only added where there is direct patron access to the materials. Some may be evaluating the long-term economics of adding security strips.

OH State: New material stays on site as it tends to circulate more. Older material is sent to high density storage. OH State differs from private institutions as it is accessed by the public.

Stanford: Shifted much to high density storage. Physical processing is being pushed to vendors, esp. for Western Europe. Are others doing this?

UNC: Binding in India is cheaper and done for lower use items.

Cornell: Tend to use students more than vendors. Conducting a pilot with Columbia U. on Chinese materials.

Chicago: Generally still cheaper to do processing in-house.

U of MN: Shelf ready used to be cheaper but not sure now that is the case. Benefit of shelf ready has been speed of processing items.

Texas A&M: We are moving a lot of materials off site but may just withdraw them. It appears that many libraries are withdrawing using criteria such as e- available for the print (e.g., backfiles).

9:00-9:20am Off-site Technical Services (Karla Strieb)

How many technical services operations are off-site? Currently OH State, UCLA, Texas A&M, Duke, NYU, Harvard, NYPL, and U of IL. It appears no other Big Heads libraries are planning to move off-site. At OH State, it has worked well. The area is free of campus congestion and staff can get to the main campus when needed. Most staff were apprehensive but are now happy with the move. Information technology (IT) staff like it as well. The downside is that there is travel time and the transit of special collections materials can be challenging. But most of the materials are 20th century so this is not a huge concern. What are other experiences?

Stanford: It's complicated. Conservation and preservation staff have been moved to the north campus but it's far. There is poor mass transit and the university doesn't provide transport. It fails to understand the needs of library operations, such as the synergies between metadata and the digital library. Technical services should not be isolated.

Duke: IT and other university departments are moving. There are staff meetings in both locations and these meetings are encouraged. But have we sacrificed synergies?

U of IL: Moving to a hybrid model. Cataloging and acquisitions will work together in the basement once remodeling is completed.

Yale: There are plans to move technical services and some are anxious. What will be the impact on workflow? Transportation is the biggest issue with concerns about safety getting to and from work. We have healthy relationships but also some unhealthy workflows such as our review shelf. Beinecke, preservation, reformatting are already off-site. The upside of moving is that Technical Services will be brought together in new ways.

Stanford: Our work is changing dramatically. Processing traditional materials is already outsourced. Our work is mostly project based and dependent on us being on campus together.

Cornell: Traditional processing will decline as electronic resources grow. Technical services is luckily not moving offsite and hope that technical services will have more of a public facing role.

OH State: Department heads and those engaged with project planning are going back and forth between the campuses. We have found our e-resources staff manage virtual interactions well.

Columbia: Functions that don't require a physical presence are moving but perhaps it is physical processing that can move.

NYPL: Technical services moved to Long Island City. The advantage is a designed renovation from the ground up. Some staff were reluctant to move due to commuting issues, but the new facility has the best HVAC and better supports the workflows. Acquisitions and cataloging are together there near the loading dock; preservation/conservation lab is there too.

9:20-9:35am How are we sharing data in a new, distributed, collaborative environment? (Philip Schreur)

At Stanford we are thinking about this topic as we consider the shift to linked data. In the past we created MARC data and utilized OCLC. We are now creating metadata for resources that are not represented in OCLC, such as for our repository. We also need to provide access to all the data the university creates. This data wouldn't be shared in a traditional way via OCLC. We now have SPARQL endpoints. Zepheira is working on a service which will elevate metadata out to the broader web. How do we share linked open data and what is the new model within a distributed environment? How does this affect the PCC? Concerns or other thoughts?

Columbia: The question is not just how we share our data but why. The purposes for sharing our data should affect the why. We share for local management of resources, for discovery and analysis, such as for SEO (search engine optimization).

U of WA: If you publicly store data (e.g., OCLC) is it not automatically shared? We would like to see a shared Works database of linked data that would be available to all. The goal is to move away from locally stored data to a more networked environment.

Stanford: It has been helpful for metadata staff to sit next to digital library staff. Perhaps the PCC would govern metadata for commonly held resources. We should share local identifiers.

U of WA: We don't want a local workspace. We want to store holdings locally but all the other metadata would be shared at the networked level. The data doesn't need to be in one physical space.

Texas A&M: ILL reports to me, head of Technical Services. How is this being considered?

Stanford: The advantage of having data locally stored is that we can make local assertions about it, such as for ILL.

Yale: The other consideration is whether there is going to be a way to level the playing field so more institutions can participate in this networked environment. For example, can the Mellon proposal be expanded to other types of libraries? What role will vendors play; can they help with this?

9:35-9:55am What are the impacts on technical services of collaborative collection development?

(Beth Picknally Camden)

The University of Pennsylvania has been collaborating to expand the acquisition of Brazilian materials. We are getting materials others are not collecting but we have no Portuguese language original cataloging expertise so the materials are not being made available quickly. Technical services has engaged a vendor to provide cataloging but access is not that timely. Through Borrow Direct unprocessed materials are visible but can't be requested. In process items can be made available to partners and will trigger faster cataloging. We haven't come to terms though with the lack of cataloging expertise. We have multiple collaborative collection arrangements with Pennsylvania academic libraries including distributed print archive, journals, music, etc. Is there a collective way to share agreements so others can make decisions about their collections?

UCLA: 583 fields are a way to share at the network level what you are committed to keep.

Chicago: Need to ensure this information is available when MARC is no longer here. Bibliographers of the future need to know. What about using \$5 institutional designations in OCLC?

Columbia: It just so happens the Print Archive Network (PAN) group is meeting at the same time we are. Sharing retention decisions needs to happen.

OH State: We are not always doing a good job of sharing preservation commitments. Smaller Ohio libraries are running large scale de-duping operations, making assumptions about what the research library is doing. I'm worried that the preservation focus may be limited to shared print projects; this is only a small subset of print journals. I also hear that there is little use of the 583 field.

U of WA: We have criteria for a good agreement but need to look regularly at commitments as institutions change. A review process must be built in.

Chicago: The bigger issue is the metadata we are sharing. We are cataloging for the broader community (e.g., other CIC libraries). Collaborations don't stop with acquisitions.

UNC: Cooperative collecting really rests with the depth of materials collected. Research libraries are cautious about withdrawing what is scarce. If we make commitments to get these materials that indicates the agreements are sound.

Stanford: What does it mean to provide access in the future? There is a difference between semantic retention and physical retention. As materials go digital we may have more flexibility. We may not need to physically retain something.

10:10-10:30am Staff morale and the structure of Technical Services work? (Philip Schreur)

In an effort to be more open, Stanford University has decided to publicly post salary ranges but this has led to considerable library assistant staff turnover to other campus jobs. There are other reasons why so many are leaving. Part of the issue may be due to the cost of living in the Bay area. There are two other issues at play. The Library is losing many of its paraprofessional staff who traditionally have been less well compensated but have been attracted by the unique work libraries offer. Much of the work, however, has been streamlined and doesn't hold staff interest as it formerly did. The jobs remaining are fairly narrow in scope. The work is becoming more project based and flexibility more limited. The second issue is the technical nature of the professional work today. Libraries need staff with more programming and scripting skills. This staff is typically classified as technologists and receive higher pay than traditional librarians. Cataloging is a demanding job and we need to retain this library expertise but catalogers can't compete in the job market as programmers can with their technical skills.

Staff morale has been an issue in the acquisitions area as well. Some staff have spent their careers receiving and paying for materials. As the work shifts and often falls outside standard workflows it has been difficult to retrain these employees.

U of IL: We have a different experience. Project skills can be readily transferred.

U of PA: Agree, acquisitions skills have been narrowly focused.

UNC: We try to use projects as a way to engage staff who have more mundane jobs. We also let technical services staff work at a service desk so they gain a sense of connection with patrons.

U of MN: We see many of the same issues, particularly with our paraprofessionals who have been trained to do just a few things.

UCLA: We've asked MARC based copy catalogers to work on Dublin core metadata for digital library project work to build on something they already are familiar with.

LC: We have had success in revamping position descriptions. Our technical services positions handle both cataloging and acquisitions activities. We've ramped up training programs including for processing digital materials. This also provides more flexibility for management when staff need to be redeployed. That said we acknowledge it doesn't help a paraprofessional at the top of his/her ladder.

Columbia: There are other factors affecting retention, such as tuition exemption. This is a less attractive factor now. We almost have the opposite situation. Officers of the libraries are entitled to university housing while those with technical jobs are not. Technical services has some of the most highly classified positions.

U of PA: There are other benefits of working in libraries, such as flexibility.

Cornell: Staff are cross trained and have many different tasks. We also allow them to work from home. People need blocks of time to concentrate on certain tasks.

10:30-10:50am A sustainable/consistent model for vendor records (Bob Wolven)

Cornell's spreadsheet demonstrates the diverse set of sources of shelf-ready records, varying costs and quality. We are treating these as cataloging records even though they need classification, subject analysis, headings. They may not be under authority control. Should we try to be more consistent in either direction, that is obtain full records or just focus on the savings? Should we encourage more vendors to supply? There are workflow and cost implications. Costs differ around the world. Sometimes we take what we can from vendors, sometimes we take copy from OCLC.

Harvard: What has been the impact from our newer discovery tools?

Stanford: We are pushed to load all kinds of materials into our discovery interface and this is good. Yet the interface highlights peculiarities of MARC coding. We are working both ends and it is becoming harder to reconcile.

Harvard: We are exposing disparate content through discovery. Users are already navigating a large pool of content.

U of WA: We have problems at the consortial level. Every library does not upgrade all their records. You try to meet standards when you can.

UCLA: We are fans of fuller level metadata when it is possible to obtain it. We live with the "cognitive dissonance" but we upgrade vendor records when we can. A practical way to get better metadata is to arrange to put the vendor records in shared files, so that if any subsequent human or batch actions improve the records we are in a position to automatically benefit from the upgrades, without having to make special efforts to get the metadata again.

Columbia: Even though it's hard can we come up with common standards for our vendor records?
Cornell's list offers us a way but it is a good deal of effort. Do the results justify the level of effort?

Stanford: It is unclear what we want. Stanford is interested in identifiers for all creators. Is there common consensus now around the table?

U of MN: CIC came up with recommendations for e-book vendor records. This specific data needs to be part of the agreement. This group could have that clout.

Harvard: We first need a better understanding of our user behavior. Are users using our metadata or finding content elsewhere? A panel of graduate students at Harvard pointed out how, for them, initial discovery happens outside the library. But if they find something in our system they want to find related things.

Yale: This is not entirely a technical services question. It also depends on collection building component. What is the collective spend for this and what are we getting? It goes back to what Phil (Stanford) said – we don't need to think so much about preserving the physical object rather the semantic meaning. How are we acquiring content as a whole? Think about Hathi and reverse that flow – spending could be different.

Chicago: Vendors don't allow us to share these records. Could OCLC help? Is the fear of losing money real or not?

10:50-11:05am BIBFRAME update and Linked Data for Production grant (Philip Schreur)

Stanford: Focus is on the Linked Data for Production grant application to the Mellon Foundation. This proposal grew from the Linked Data for Libraries project which was primarily focused on converting MARC records to BIBFRAME (BF). The goal now is to create metadata directly in BF rather than converting it. Mellon will let Stanford know of a final decision soon. Cornell, LC, Harvard, Stanford, Princeton, and Columbia are project participants. Two project activities will produce linked data from our collections:

- In collaboration with the PCC and Music Library Association a music extension to BF will be created. Focus will be on performed music and how it is represented in BF.
- Called Tracer Bullets, a workflow from acquisitions to discovery will be developed, without worrying about complexities of the work. Original cataloging will be done as linked data. Emphasis later on in the project will be on working with non-MARC data for our repository, such as an item self-deposited by a patron or the conversion to BF of a complete deposited collection.

Harvard: We are on the Linked Data for Production grant proposal to be managed by Stanford as well as the Linked Data for Libraries (LD4L) Lab grant proposal to be managed by Cornell. The LD4L Labs project is about converting and reconciling data and using tools in a production environment. Harvard will focus on two domains: geospatial data and moving image.

LC: Will be testing all formats and domains and our pilot is open ended as we continue learning. Forty catalogers since September have created native BF metadata. Our BF data should be available. There will be a BF update Sunday morning.

Cornell: We are looking at the whole production flow but also trying to determine what the demand side is.

NLM: We are participating in the PCC URI Task Group and on the PCC CONSER BF Task Group. We are also co-chairing the Zepheira Alumni Serials Working Group. We meet about quarterly with LC and plan to submit comments to LC on its BF 2.0 papers. Also want to mention we published a new beta version of MeSH RDF. A lookup of MeSH RDF is now included in these tools: MarcNext, MarcEdit and Zepheira's Scribe Linked Data Editor.

Canadian universities: Five top Canadian libraries have agreed to work together on linked data projects. It is just at the beginning stages. Included are Toronto, Alberta, UBC, McGill, and Library and Archives Canada.

Stanford: Production work is also dependent on what vendors can do and supply.

U of WA: We are converting different resources to BF and developed a form for RDA input.

11:05-11:15am Update on the CIC Cooperative Cataloging Pilot (Chris Cronin and Mary Laskowski)

The pilot is done but the final report has not been distributed outside of CIC. CIC directors plan to discuss it in May. There are plans to publish the report given the long history of cooperative cataloging. Eight institutions cataloged 768 titles: 663 monographs, 96 maps, 2 serials, 37 DVDs/CDs.

Costs:

- Average of \$25.81/item across all formats. Costs are broken down by copy, original, AACR2, RDA, format, Roman/non-Roman scripts. Monographs: \$9.45/copy and \$18.87/original. Other formats cost more.
- Roman scripts: \$19.56/title. Non roman: \$30.77/title with huge variations depending on whether macros were used for paired fields (\$14.65 when paired fields added by macro; \$42.87 when paired fields added manually).
- No big cost differences between AACR2 and RDA cataloging.

Cataloging was done mostly with piece in hand; not a lot of scanning was done. The methodology was not perfect and was difficult to analyze shipping costs, which is not critical as they propose to utilize the CIC ILL structure for shipping going forward. The pilot was really about supporting cooperative collection development and filling gaps across institutions – not really about costs. The pilot institutions want to continue some cooperation and operationalize. Challenges include:

- Need more institutions for pilot to become more robust. Gaps and expertise are not 1 to 1 across libraries.
- Need director support. What are the hurdles for other CIC libraries to join?
- Are MOUs needed between institutions? Is a coordinator needed? Want to avoid exchanging money.
- Need to centralize documentation.

- Can we expand this beyond the CIC? CIC benefit is CIC libraries can use the ILL structure to ship material – a Fedex operation isn't needed.

The pilot has much promise and we should know our directors' thoughts by ALA Annual.

11:15-11:25am 3-year membership review (All)

This group has a defined membership based on ARL statistics and there are occasional changes. The ARL index should be reviewed. Volunteers to do so are: Robin Fradenburgh, John Riemer (chair), and Paula Sullenger

The group decided to keep the Thursday evening OCLC meeting time.

The group discussed lunch options and dollar thresholds and decided we should make two reservations, preferably at same restaurant.

11:25-11:30am Agenda building for Annual (All)

- Changing workflows from physical processing to online
- Hear from shared print group?
- CIC cooperative cataloging pilot
- Cost and/or time to process a book (from acquisitions to cataloging). Should Big Heads address the bibliographic data study?
- Workflows between cataloging and metadata. Should our staff have a collective understanding of ontologies and linked data?

Minutes submitted by Jennifer Marill, National Library of Medicine