

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

8:30-8:40am Introductions

Mary Laskowski, chair, called the meeting to order.

Member introductions:

Columbia University	Kate Harcourt
Cornell University	Jim LeBlanc
Duke University	Dracine Hodges
Harvard University	Scott Wicks
Indiana University	Mechael Charbonneau
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	Morag Boyd
Pennsylvania State University	Karen Estlund
Princeton University	Joyce Bell
Stanford University	Philip Schreur
Texas A&M University	Paula Sullenger
University of Alberta	Sharon Farnel
University of British Columbia	Adolfo Tarango
University of California at Los Angeles	John Riemer
University of Chicago	Chris Cronin
University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign	Mary Laskowski
University of Michigan	Bryan Skib
University of Minnesota	Betsy Friesen
University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill	Christine Stachowicz
University of Pennsylvania	Beth Picknally Camden
University of Texas at Austin	Robin Fradenburgh
University of Toronto	Marlene Van Ballegooie
University of Washington	Joe Kiegel
University of Wisconsin at Madison	Michael Cohen
Yale University	Marty Kurth

8:40-9:00am Linked Data Update (Phil Schreur)

Phil discussed the various linked data related grants. [LD4P](#), led by Stanford, is a collaboration of six institutions but hoping to become a network of institutions. [LD4L Labs](#), led by Cornell, is a collaboration to develop new tools and approaches that will make it easier for libraries to create and use Linked Open Data. The two projects focus on different domains.

Stanford has two projects for LD4P, an extension to BF for performed music and another called tracer bullets. The tracer bullets projects will convert four dominant workflows to ones rooted in linked data. The projects are copy cataloging, original cataloging, the deposit of a single item to the digital repository, and the deposit of a large collection of resources to the digital repository.

U WA: Focus is on evaluating BF 2.0. Formerly mapped PCC RDA BIBCO standard record to BF 1.0; now looking to map to BF 2.0. This work is documented on a [University of Washington library web page](#).

Columbia: Part of the LD4P grant to evaluate the suitability of the BIBFRAME model and vocabulary for describing art objects. Columbia is also working with the Library of Congress on prints and photographs.

LC: Released BF 2.0. The pilot concluded at the end of March and data was mounted on the LC website. Part of the LD4P grant.

Harvard: Part of the LD4L and LD4P grants. Focus is on creating linked data descriptions for library cartographic resources.

Alberta: A Canadian group was established to examine linked data issues. Focus is on translations, identifiers, BF editor and workflows.

Chicago: Not doing anything now. Interested in technical services workflows and planning to focus on distinctive collections in its new IR.

Cornell: Part of the LD4P grant and leading the LD4L-Labs. Focus is on original metadata creation for approximately 1,000 non-commercial LPs in Cornell's hip-hop collection, as well as the development of an extension ontology for the description of rare materials in BIBFRAME. Feedback between the two grants will be beneficial.

NLM: Continuing to participate on a number of collaborative efforts including the PCC CONSER BIBFRAME Task Group, the Zepheira Alumni Serials Group, the PCC URI Task Group, and in testing OCLC's Person Entity Lookup pilot.

9:00-9:20am 2CUL Update: the 2CUL Technical Services Strategic Alliance (Jim LeBlanc and Kate Harcourt)

The 2CUL Technical Services project was funded by Mellon for three years, 2013-2015. The focus of the project gradually shifted from an integration to an alliance. Functionally based teams worked on workflows and practices, and hoped to foster new working relationships. By the second year of the project, university administrative differences made it difficult to establish true integration. The project became more about an initiative. The two libraries implemented the Intota ERM but by late summer 2015 decided not to pursue a joint ILS. By late 2015 an alliance was established to work on discrete project initiatives of mutual interest and strategic value. A staff survey revealed there has been an increased awareness of the role of collaboration between the two libraries. Columbia and Cornell hope to preserve the 2CUL brand in other forums such as the PCC and LD4P.

9:20-9:50am Space Planning (Betsy Friesen)

U of MN: Space planning has been a big topic - less about collection storage and more about user collaborative space. A collection management committee was established to consider deaccessioning. What criteria are the other Big Heads libraries using for deaccessioning material and transfer to remote storage? Do we have specific policies or does this happen project by project?

U of IL: Have noticed that in the past 5 years materials are being sent to high density storage but also being requested to serve patron needs and for other projects.

Stanford: Materials are sent to storage for a variety of reasons. The Engineering Library sent materials that had digital surrogates. The Science libraries are now being combined to create a smaller footprint. In the Main library the collection is at 80% capacity. What is left on campus doesn't just represent high circulating materials. Determining where to store materials is done in an automated way based on LC classification. Materials are also stored based on fault lines for insurance purposes. Stanford is planning to reorganize the entire library collection to be based on LC classification for browsing purposes. The entire collection will be cleaned as well.

U of WI: We are similar to U MN in that we are consolidating libraries. The Engineering and Medical libraries are going e-only.

U PA: Our current storage facility is on module 2 and planning to build module 3. We try to base storage decisions on use and past circulations. If an item gets used three times, it is transferred back to the main library.

U of IL: We are touching more pieces each year so we are doing many more record enhancements.

OSU: We contracted with a vendor for special collection storage space. We think materials are circulating more frequently as result of record enhancements.

Yale: We are looking to reduce our footprint. Technical Services itself has moved from the library.

U of MI: We consolidated collections from distributed libraries. As a result, the university is leasing more storage across the city that is not very cost effective. The Health Sciences Library was renovated and is now a bookless facility. Other libraries are not maintaining print collections. Since 1980, we moved older, lesser-used materials to a remote storage facility. Technical Services is involved in the project – doing data transformation and record updates in OCLC.

U of IL: We are looking at CIC consortial agreements to try to regain space. We are starting to use digital surrogates.

Columbia: We are reluctant to send serials offsite. The solution seems to be the use of TOC e-surrogates for users. This eliminates retrieval of entire runs. We are finding large numbers of bound-withs and pamphlets. We are using FAST headings.

UCLA: We have projects to weed duplicates.

UBC: We have a high storage facility for 1+ million volumes. Branches were surveyed about criteria for sending items off-site. Medium and low use materials will go to storage. We are concerned about the workload in technical services, as the materials must have adequate bib description before they can be moved.

Stanford: We are concerned about having no metadata for these items. We identified material in the stacks so we didn't have to rely on a massive data cleanup. There was concern about sending out multi-volume sets so we purchased analytics for all the volumes. These can now be browsed in remote storage.

Indiana: With all of our branch closings the material ends up in storage. Items are delivered straight to offices so faculty is pleased. Library storage has also taken in other university items, for example, costumes.

Harvard: Widener sends approximately 80% of its materials to off-site storage. Items are delivered directly to faculty.

U MN: Periodicals are being moved from the main library due to lack of space.

9:50-10:00am Membership Report (All)

The 2016 Big Heads Membership Review Committee (John Riemer, Robin Fradenburgh, Paula Sullenger) reported on its proposed three options.

Mary spoke with ALA and the membership decision is up to our group. There are no time restrictions or procedural issues. We agreed that our review should be timed to the ALCTS review required.

Based on email discussion there seems to be consensus on option 2 (keep the official size of Big Heads at 30 members and keep the current definition) but allow for full membership rather than provisional membership for the two categories of ARL university libraries:

A - those libraries that would no longer be members under Proposal 1

B - those libraries that would be added as members under Proposal 1

We need to decide on criteria for inclusion and revisit the purpose of the group.

Mary will call for volunteers over email to serve on a membership task force. The group will form after this meeting.

10:00-10:15am Break

10:15-10:30am Colleen Shogan, Deputy Director, National and International Outreach, Library of Congress

National and International Outreach is a new division at LC, established within the last year. The division is responsible for coordinating the Library's outreach programs, including scholarly, educational, and interpretive programs, national and international outreach programs and fee-for-service operations. The division is working on a variety of initiatives including hosting a hackathon, developing an exhibit on WWI, and the one hundred year celebration in 2020 of women's suffrage movement.

10:30-11:00am ISNI Membership (Phil Schreur)

As we move towards an increasing need for identifiers, ISNI membership is becoming more alluring. What are institutions thoughts on ISNI membership, especially balanced with ORCID's? Some publishers are using ORCID's. What is the interface between these two identifiers? Where should we focus our energy? How can we use this identifier in our technical services work? (See the report that was recently published - <http://www.oclc.org/research/publications/2016/oclcresearch-organizational-identifiers-and-isni-2016.html>).

Some of our institutions are encouraging faculty and even graduate students to obtain ORCID's and other identifiers to allow for better management of publications. Libraries have played an outreach role in this work, encouraging identifier assignment. Not everyone will use the same identifier system so what is the interoperability between the various identifiers at the national level? How will these IDs interact with our more traditional data? Do we need to create an authority record or can we just use an identifier? All

agreed we need to ensure these identifiers have a place in our systems but we don't want to build overly complex local systems. We should not forget the OCLC entity work being done.

11:00-11:15am Update on the CIC Cooperative Cataloging Program (Chris Cronin)

This successful pilot ran from 2013 through 2014. Eight CIC libraries took part in an effort to share cataloging expertise. See minutes from the ALA Midwinter 2016 Big Heads meeting for pilot details. Since the Midwinter update the pilot group drafted a proposal for formal partnership that was approved by CIC library directors. The formal partnership starts July 1, 2016. Other institutions may want to join the project.

Next steps are to perform assessment and understand sustainability needs. The program could be expanded beyond the CICs to other Big Heads libraries. Chicago will continue to coordinate the program for the next year but a long-term coordination plan will be needed.

11:15-11:30am Election of a new Vice-Chair and Planning for Midwinter (All)

Election result:

Marty Kurth (Yale), following Betsy Friesen.

Possible Midwinter topics:

- Can we coordinate how we are adding data to e-records?
- Update from the PCC and impact of its work on our institutions.
- The CONSER Open Access Journal Project and DOAJ
- Can we coordinate the digitization of government documents? Can we assume these are being added to Hathi?

Minutes submitted by Jennifer Marill, National Library of Medicine