

**Orbis Cascade Alliance**  
**Collaborative Technical Services Team (CTST)**

**Final Report to the Orbis Cascade Alliance Council**

**September 29, 2011**

**CTST Membership:**

Susan Hinken, UP (Chair)  
Erica Findley, Pacific University  
Jan Hartley, Seattle University  
Joseph Kiegel, UW  
Kelley McGrath, UO  
Maria Wagner, PCC  
Scot Harrison, SMU (Council liaison)  
Tom Larsen, PSU  
Elizabeth Duell, Orbis Cascade Alliance (staff liaison)

## **Collaborative Technical Services Team 2011**

### **Charge**

The Collaborative Technical Services Team was charged with building on the work of the previous CTS Team by:

1. Refining and implementing the recommendations of the Bibliographic Standards Best Practices Working Group (BP1)
2. Working with Alliance staff to create an inventory of automated cataloging/acquisitions practices (BP2)
3. Overseeing two pilot projects
  - a. EBooks: cataloging consortial purchases associated with the EBook Pilot pursued by the Collection Development and Management Committee (EB1)
  - b. Cataloging monographs in Arabic, Chinese, Japanese, and Korean languages (FL2)
4. Investigate member need for specialized cataloging expertise (e.g. maps cataloging) and provide recommendations concerning an appropriate financial and organizational model.
5. Organizing a Collaborative Technical Services Symposium to discuss current thinking in the profession, learn about the status of similar collaborative technical services efforts undertaken by other consortia, and discuss the results of Alliance pilots.

The CTST also took on the task of sketching strategies for collaborative technical services with the goal of helping the Alliance define what collaboration would look like in an environment where member libraries share a single ILS.

The CTST began its work in February 2011 with a meeting at the University of Portland and followed up with numerous conference calls and an additional face-to-face meeting at the Alliance Summer Meeting. The minutes and interim reports of the group are available on the CTST web page:

<http://www.orbiscascade.org/index/collaborative-technical-services-team-2011>

### **Conclusions:**

The team is pleased to report significant progress in meeting several of the goals outlined above.

As the final report of the previous iteration of CTST noted, several barriers to collaborative technical services within the Alliance make the realization of true collaborative technical services a formidable undertaking. As the team addressed its charges over the year, we gave consideration to the difficulties.

The most serious barrier, as outlined by the previous report, is the absence of a shared system. The Alliance is making significant progress toward addressing this obstacle. In the current

environment, this development can offer the Alliance an opportunity to rethink technical services as it moves to select and implement a shared system.

Another barrier, as the previous report noted, is staffing. Technical services staff are often responsible for a number of tasks rather than one or two, which offers challenges to consolidation. Apprehension about changing roles and job security provide additional challenges. In the process of moving forward we must consider staffing implications and those affected. Council members should take a lead role in communicating to staff their intended changes in job duties and personnel within their own libraries.

As Betsy Wilson observed at the Alliance Summer meeting, the stand-alone model of the university [or college] library is obsolete and now is the time for radical collaboration. She also noted, among other things, that we must invest in people, sustain the effort, and create a future together. In that spirit, the CTST offers the following recommendations for Council's consideration.

### **Recommendations:**

#### **CTST Strategies for Collaborative Technical Services:**

- TS1.:** Replace CTST with a Collaborative Collection Services Committee (CCSC) to work collaboratively with other Alliance teams and committees, notably the Shared ILS Team and the Collection Development and Management Committee in order to sustain the work done by previous teams.
- TS2.:** Adopt the time table for developing a general strategy for collaborative technical services by March 1, 2011.
- TS3.:** Appoint teams, under the auspices of CCSC to develop general principles for acquisitions, serials, and holding records by March 1, 2012 so that these principles are available to the Shared ILS Team as they prepare to make the final recommendation to Council in summer 2012.
- TS4:** CCSC should create a common methodology to compile a cost study and then apply the methodology to a study among members to gather relevant data on the cost of technical services activity among member libraries. The design phase should be completed by May 31, 2012 and the study by December 31, 2012.

#### **Bibliographic Standards Best Practices:**

- BP1.:** Create a Catalog Policy Group, under the auspices of the CCSC, which will be responsible for the development and maintenance of cataloging policies in the context of a shared ILS and shared technical services.
- BP1.:** Enact 7 mandates by March 1, 2012 (prior to implementation of the shared ILS) as outlined in the working group report along with the implementation plans for each mandate.
- BP2.:** Adopt the general principles for additional mandates to be implemented after a shared ILS is selected.

### **Automated Cataloging & Acquisitions Working Group (AC&C)**

**AC1.:** CTST should continue the work through the end of October to compile the survey and publish the results to be made available on the Alliance website.

**AC2.:** Additional work on acquisitions and cataloging workflows for other types of materials (i.e. multimedia) or order types (i.e. standing orders) should be folded into the efforts of the working groups developing general principles for acquisitions, serials and holdings records as outlined in TS3.

### **DDA/CTST eBook Cataloging Group:**

Recommendations from this group will come as part of the DDAPIT report to be issued at a later time.

### **Foreign Language Cataloging Group:**

**FLCG1.:** Council should explore and implement ways to transfer value back to cataloging libraries to ensure that the relationship between providers and clients is not one-sided and is one of mutual cooperation.

Much of the team's work was done within several working groups. The working group reports are included in this document as appendices. The team as a whole worked on organizing the Alliance's Symposium on Collaborative Technical Services, (to be designated as the Alliance's Symposium Collaborative Collection Services) to be held on December 8 in Portland. After some discussion the team decided to focus the Symposium on work being done within the Alliance rather than inviting a keynote or outside speakers. This is an exciting and crucial time for the Alliance and it was felt that the symposium could offer attendees an opportunity to gain perspective on how collaborative efforts were playing out within organization and help frame the discussion on charting a course for the future.

The team also worked on the *Collaborative Technical Services: Strategies for Alliance Cooperation* document included in the appendix. The team drafted this document as a way to stimulate conversation among both the Council and staff in member libraries in order to help sketch out a plan outlining a way forward for collaborative collection services. As part of this discussion it was suggested that the Alliance could realize greater value from the shared ILS if the organization had a clearer understanding of the strategies it would employ to move collaborative collection services forward, and if the discussion took place prior to the selection and implementation of the ILS. Since it was not known where a shared cataloger position would fit within a plan, the Team tabled the discussion in favor of developing the strategies document.

### **Team Recommendations as a Whole and Rationale:**

**TS1.:** The Collaborative Technical Service Team recommends the Team be replaced with a Collaborative Collection Services Committee (CCSC), with a structure similar to other Alliance standing committees. The committee would be comprised of a member from each Alliance library and led by a steering team of 7 members plus a council liaison. The

CCSC would build upon the efforts of earlier CTS teams and work closely with other Alliance teams and committees, notably the Shared ILS Team and the Collection Development and Management Committee. This change would go into effect with an affirmative Council vote on the recommendation.

**Rationale:** With the proposed implementation of the shared ILS and the need to develop collaborative collection services in conjunction with its adoption and then sustain these services into the future, the present team structure, with a sunrise and sunset every year, works against continuous collaborative efforts. A committee representing all member libraries could help foster communication and buy-in during development and implementation of these collaborative efforts and serve to move the process forward in a more informed manner. Several current team activities, including work on the Demand Driven Pilot Project, are ongoing and interruption of the work on these efforts is problematic. Also, as we point out elsewhere, technical services is greatly affected by collection development, and greater collaboration in technical services will require an equal level of increased collaboration in collection development and thus collaboration between these two Alliance entities will be integral to the work of the new CCSC.

**TS2.:** Adopt the time table for developing a general strategy for collaborative collection services by March 1, 2011.

**Rationale:** As mentioned above, the CTST had considerable discussions about how to move collaborative collection services forward. We concluded that the Alliance might realize greater value from the shared ILS if the organization had a clearer understanding of the strategies it would employ to move collaboration forward, and if the discussion took place prior to the selection and implementation of the ILS. Venues to hold discussions include Council meetings, committee meetings and the upcoming symposium. Such conversations and the outlining of strategies would also serve to help develop staff buy-in, sustain the efforts of early CST teams, and suggest the direction of training and staff development.

**TS3.:** Appoint working groups, under the auspices of CCSC, to develop general principles for acquisitions, serials, and holding records by July 1, 2012 when the shared ILS may be selected.

**Rationale:** CTST has made significant progress toward implementing shared practices for bibliographic records in a shared ILS, with a view toward greater collaboration in technical services. The Team sees, however, that corresponding progress has not been made in other areas. It is also evident that, with an RFP underway for a shared ILS, the time left to develop practices in these areas is much shorter than that spent on bibliographic records.

The Team recommends action on acquisitions, serials and holdings records, with a goal of having general principles in place by March 1, 2012, to be available to the Shared ILS team as they make their final recommendation to Council. It is also best to have agreed on principles of acquisitions, serials and holdings before the detailed work of implementing a new system begins. Of course, much depends on the specific system chosen, and many details will need to wait until then, but work on broad outlines should begin now.

**TS4.:** CCSC should create a common methodology to compile a cost study and then apply the methodology to a study among members to gather relevant data on the cost of technical services activity among member libraries. The design phase should be completed by May 30, 2012 and the study by December 31, 2012.

**Rationale:** To adequately plan and move collaborative collection services forward, the Alliance will need to know the cost of such activities currently performed in member libraries. A study with a common methodology will give the Alliance the most accurate picture of costs as it moves forward on collaboration and its implications for cost sharing or transfer.

#### **Appendices:**

**Bibliographic Standards Best Practices Final Report**  
**Automated Cataloging & Acquisitions Working Group (AC&C)**  
**DDA/CTS eBook Cataloging Group Interim Report**  
**Foreign Languages Cataloging Group Final Report**  
**CTST strategies document**  
**Proposed symposium agenda**

**Orbis Cascade Alliance  
Bibliographic Standards Best Practices Working Group (BSBP) report to the  
Collaborative Technical Services Team (CTST)  
September 13, 2011**

**Bibliographic Shared Practices Mandates and Implementation Plans**

**Bibliographic Standards Best Practices Working Group (BSBP):**

Erica Findley, Pacific University, CTST liaison

Scot Harrison, St. Martin's University, Council liaison

Rick Block, Seattle University

Maggie Dull, University of Portland

Joe Kiegel, University of Washington

Tom Larsen, Portland State University

Kirsti Thomas, St. Martin's University

In November, 2010, the Alliance Council created the Collaborative Technical Services Team (CTST) and charged it with refining and implementing the recommendations of a previous Bibliographic Standards Best Practices Working Group. In 2011, CTST formed a new Bibliographic Standards Best Practices Working Group as a subcommittee. This document is the report of the working group to CTST.

This document recommends shared practices around the creation of bibliographic records in a shared database. In August 2011, a draft of the report was circulated among catalogers and Council members for comment. After receiving feedback from these groups, the working group finalized the report for inclusion in the CTST report to the Board and then Council approval in November 2011.

## **Executive Summary**

This report recommends seven mandates to be enacted by March 1st, 2012 (before the shared ILS is implemented). These seven mandates will improve the discoverability of library resources in the Summit catalog, both for the current WorldCat Local interface and possible future systems. These mandates also provide an opportunity for Alliance members to examine areas of collaboration in the process of creating and maintaining bibliographic records. Following the seven pre-ILS mandates is a summary of additional general principles regarding bibliographic record practices that will need to be implemented after the shared ILS system is known. All mandates were designed to meet national standards and best practices while facilitating workflows in a shared ILS environment

The rationale for each mandate is detailed in each section. Each mandate includes a cost analysis section in which the potential cost savings are detailed. Implementing these mandates is likely to result in a net cost savings to all Alliance members.

Implementing these mandates will impact local practices. However, the benefits of shared practices outweigh the costs. Shared practices eliminate duplicate work. Following national standards ensures that the shared catalog is up to date and meets user expectations. Library directors and department heads are strongly encouraged to discuss this document with their technical services departments to realize the full impact it may have on local practices. After initial training, local workflows will become streamlined.

The working group has made recommendations on the timing of the adoption of shared bibliographic practices, dividing them into ones that should be adopted before the selection of

a shared ILS and those that must be determined after an ILS is known. Several institutions may be considering or planning a date for the implementation of RDA to be adopted by the Library of Congress and other national libraries in January of 2013. After the implementation of RDA these mandates should be re-examined and updated as necessary.

Following is a summary of the seven mandates that should be enacted by March 1st, 2012 (before the shared ILS). There is no particular order in which the mandates need to be enacted.

**Bibliographic Utility:** Every Alliance member institution must use OCLC as its primary bibliographic utility and must attach holdings for its materials in the OCLC WorldCat database, unless prohibited by license agreements.

**Floor Bibliographic Standards:** All bibliographic records contributed to the Summit catalog must contain specific mandatory elements and meet a minimum level of completeness.

**Single vs. Separate Records:** Alliance member libraries must use separate bibliographic records for each format of a single title.

**Provider Neutral Records:** Alliance libraries must use Provider-Neutral records without additional local bibliographic fields.

**Network Level Cataloging:** Alliance member libraries must commit to providing adequate and appropriate cataloging of materials at the network (e.g. WorldCat) level.

**Level of PCC Contribution:** Alliance member libraries must maintain their current level of contribution to the Program for Cooperative Cataloging.

**Outsourcing:** Vendor records added to the shared catalog must, whenever possible, meet Alliance Bibliographic Standards and Best practices.

Further next steps are identified along with each mandate, labeled as “Implementation Plan”. The implementation plans will need to take place after Council approval and before the suggested enacting date of March 1st, 2012.

In addition, the working group recommends that a number of general principles be adopted for areas of shared practice that cannot be enacted before the selection of a shared ILS: Local Information, Local Inventory Control, Authority Work, Batch Loading, and Database Management. Further details on these principles are found at the end of the Report.

It is also recommended that the following steps be completed as soon as possible as they are in areas that affect the implementation of all mandates. Planning should begin for the creation of an ongoing group (Cataloging Policy Group) responsible for developing and maintaining cataloging policies in the context of a shared ILS and shared technical services. As training will be required throughout the Alliance to support the implementation of the mandates, we also recommend that planning for cataloging training should begin soon, especially at the level of identifying needs and resources.

## Timing

Some areas of shared practice should be implemented before a shared ILS is acquired, while others are best done closer to the implementation of the ILS. In this section CTST makes recommendations on the time frame for each area of practice. Early implementation of some shared practices will address current problems in Summit. For example, a policy on single vs. separate records, and to a lesser extent a policy on provider neutral records, addresses the problem of Summit holdings on separate OCLC records. A policy on network level cataloging addresses the problem of some local cataloging information not appearing in Summit.

- Work in these areas should begin immediately.
  - Cataloging Policy Group
  - Training
- Implementation should begin before a shared ILS is in place. Recommended enactment date is March 1st 2012.
  - Bibliographic Utility
  - Floor Bibliographic Standards
  - Single vs. Separate Records
  - Provider Neutral Records
  - Network Level Cataloging

Level of PCC Contribution

Outsourcing

- Cannot be implemented until a shared ILS is chosen or in place.

Local Information

Local Inventory Control

Authority Work

Batch Loading

Database Management

## **Mandates To Be Implemented Immediately**

### **Cataloging Policy Group**

In order to sustain shared bibliographic practices over time, the Alliance must have a group responsible for developing and maintaining cataloging policy. This group should represent interests of all library types in the Alliance. Perhaps, if there is a central group for database management, it could play an important role in policy development.

*Recommendation:* Planning should begin for an ongoing group responsible for developing and maintaining cataloging policies in the context of a shared ILS and shared technical services. The work of such a group must be coordinated with an ILS implementation team.

### **Training**

The Alliance must have a plan and support for cataloging training. A move to shared bibliographic practices will mean changes for all Alliance libraries, and many will need help making these changes. In addition, some libraries will experience staff turnover, and loss of expertise, or may lack the resources to train new staff members.

*Recommendation:* Planning for cataloging training should begin soon, in particular, at the level of identifying needs and resources.

## **Mandates To Be Enacted By March 1st, 2012 (Before a Shared ILS)**

### **Bibliographic Utility**

#### **Mandate**

Every Alliance member institution must use OCLC as its primary bibliographic utility. Every member must attach holdings for its materials in the OCLC WorldCat database, unless prohibited by license agreements. Members must also have OCLC WorldCat record numbers for these materials in their local bibliographic records. While members are free to share their records with other institutions and utilities, this must be done in addition to, not as a replacement for, participation in OCLC. Future decisions regarding this policy must be undertaken by the Alliance as a whole.

#### **Rationale for Implementation**

WorldCat Local is the current interface for Summit, the consortial catalog for Alliance member libraries. Because WorldCat Local draws ownership information from the OCLC WorldCat database rather than local systems, materials which do not have holdings attached in the WorldCat database will not display in Summit. Materials which do not display in Summit are then undiscoverable for use and borrowing. The Orbis Cascade Alliance *Membership Criteria, Expectations, and Obligations* state that “full members must demonstrate a commitment to ... Include holdings in the Summit catalog and participate in Summit borrowing.” Member libraries must include holdings in WorldCat or their materials will not be available for use or borrowing via the Summit catalog.

Having OCLC WorldCat record numbers in local bibliographic records makes it possible to match records for materials owned by multiple members in the Summit catalog and in any future shared ILS. The OCLC WorldCat record number provides a match point that greatly simplifies record loading, record maintenance, and other technical operations, in addition to simplifying the display and requesting of materials available for borrowing.

Requiring use of a common bibliographic utility allows catalogers at member institutions to share a single database for sources of authorized headings and usage.

## **Cost Analysis**

The use of a single bibliographic utility will have the lowest operating cost for the Alliance over the long term. If multiple bibliographic utilities were allowed, individual institutions could lower their cataloging costs. However, an environment with multiple utilities would significantly increase the complexity and thus the cost of operating a shared ILS, particularly in regard to record matching and overlay. Also, as long as the Summit catalog is based on WorldCat Local, records without OCLC holdings would not show and workarounds would be complex, if possible at all.

## **Implementation Plan**

1. This mandate must be enacted before the Alliance shared ILS is in place. Recommended date is by March 1st, 2012.
2. CTST needs to identify how out of compliance institutions may be with this mandate. For example, institutions may not have OCLC numbers or holdings for their electronic resources or eBooks. The identification of collections that are out of compliance will be performed by the individual institutions within the Alliance. Implementation of the shared ILS will affect how the holdings of Electronic Resources may be handled. Treatment of these types of records in relation to the bibliographic utility will need to be determined after the shared ILS has been determined.
3. Once the level of compliance for all institutions is determined, CTST can investigate potential points of collaboration among institutions that need to achieve compliance on similar collections in order to prevent redundant effort. For example, there is the potential to share OCLC record sets for eBook packages among institutions.
4. While CTST can provide assistance to institutions seeking compliance as outlined above, much of the work towards compliance will have to be undertaken by individual institutions.

## **Floor Bibliographic Standards**

### **Mandate**

All bibliographic records contributed to the Summit catalog must contain specific mandatory elements and meet a minimum level of completeness (or “floor”). Minimum descriptive standards for the Alliance are the CONSER Standard Record (CSR) for serials and the BIBCO Standard Record (BSR) for all other bibliographic formats. Catalogers may go above this minimum level as judgment dictates for particular titles in hand. Upon implementation of the Resource Description & Access (RDA) cataloging standard, Alliance member libraries may need to revise this policy to enact RDA minimum standards.

Exceptions may be made in the case of large record sets provided by vendors, but Alliance members must make a commitment to using the available records that most closely adhere to the floor standards in such cases. See Outsourcing mandate for more information on how exceptions may apply to vendor records.

### **Rationale for Implementation**

The use of a “floor” bibliographic record has widespread support among major cataloging agencies in the U.S. The purpose of a floor standard for bibliographic records is to specify minimum standards for completeness and content designation. Catalogers must make certain that every record adheres to at least this floor level; however, they may exceed the floor when judgment indicates additional data elements are needed for a particular piece in hand. That is, no one may go below the floor, but they may go above it. A related concept is the idea that records grow over time as different institutions upgrade them according to their needs.

Floor bibliographic records have been implemented by the Program for Cooperative Cataloging. These are the CONSER Standard Record (CSR; <http://www.loc.gov/acq/conser/CSR.html>) for serials, and the BIBCO Standard Record (BSR; <http://www.loc.gov/catdir/pcc/bibco/BSR-MAPS.html>) for all other bibliographic formats. Adoption of these standards is widespread, and in fact, a great number of copy cataloging records used by Alliance members are at this standard. Also, the BSR is very close to the former PCC Core level, which was used by the Library of Congress for many years.

The benefits to the Alliance of a floor standard in a shared environment are significant. A shared ILS must use a single, shared bibliographic record in order to promote cost savings (as opposed to separate copies of the same record for each holding library). A floor standard gives all Alliance members shared expectations on quality and reduces the need for editing and re-editing of records.

The rationale for choosing the BIBCO Standard Record and the CONSER Standard Record, over the OCLC Full standard in each case, is to help meet Alliance goals for cost savings. The BSR and CSR have been designed to improve access for users and strike a good balance between fullness and cost. The CSR was subjected to national testing before implementation, and the BSR was tested at the University of Washington (<http://staffweb.lib.washington.edu/committees/CPC/bsr>). Some Alliance members may decide to continue cataloging at the Full level, which surpasses the Alliance floor standard.

There may be a question about how the BSR and the CSR can be used by libraries that are not members of the Program for Cooperative Cataloging (PCC). The BSR and CSR are cataloging standards that may be used independently of the PCC. When created by non-PCC libraries, records cataloged as BSR or CSR are coded as Level I in OCLC and do not carry PCC authentication codes. Also, name headings on non-authenticated records do not need to be supported by authority records. While all Alliance libraries are encouraged to participate in the PCC to the extent possible, it is not necessary for libraries to join PCC in order to use these standards.

Ideally the floor standards should apply to bibliographic records for all cataloged titles. In many cases, however, large record sets provided by vendors do not meet these standards. If possible libraries who use such records should upgrade them to at least the BSR or CSR standards; however, sometimes this is just not feasible given the staffing level and workload at the library. Nevertheless, Alliance libraries must make a commitment to using the best records available in cases where they are not able to upgrade them.

Additionally, the floor standards are intended for “cataloged” titles, that is, ones where a permanent bibliographic record has been prepared for library materials, and do not cover temporary bibliographic records created for ordering purposes, in-process control, personal-copy course reserves, titles borrowed on ILL, inventory control of equipment, etc.

### **Cost Analysis**

The recommendation to use the BSR and CSR is the most cost effective option among existing national standards. Other standards, such as OCLC Level I, are fuller and require more data elements, and thus more time. The option of creating a unique Alliance standard does not seem cost effective; on the face of it, we could have a more minimal, and thus cheaper, record, but we must still operate within national systems and the staff time of maintaining separate standards adds up. The option of not having floor standards is costly because it invites staff to continually analyze and upgrade records, rather than trusting that they can be accepted as is.

### **Implementation Plan**

1. This mandate must be enacted before the Alliance shared ILS is in place. Recommended date is by March 1st, 2012.
2. CTST must prepare a web page explaining the BSR and CSR, in particular, how to code them for libraries that are not members of the Program for Cooperative Cataloging.

3. CTST must investigate bibliographic records held by member libraries to determine the extent to which they are in compliance with this mandate.

## **Single vs. Separate Records**

### **Mandate**

Alliance member libraries must use separate bibliographic records for each format of a single title (e.g. print, microform, electronic, DVD, streaming video, etc.). This policy should be enacted by March 1st, 2012. Given the widespread and longtime practice of using a single bibliographic record to track all formats of a given title, Alliance members are not required to convert older records entered into local systems unless the implementation of shared ILS requires the conversion of some records to be separate.

### **Rationale for Implementation**

The traditional national practice has been to catalog every manifestation of a title on its own bibliographic record (“separate records”), and this is still done for the great majority of materials. Exceptions, however, have been made for electronic resources, first for serials and then for monographs. In this case, an electronic version of a title is added to the same bibliographic record for a print resource (“single record”). At the current time, separate records are the dominant approach, but single records are allowed as a variant. Some limited single records may need to remain due to established national practice: for example, print and microform records for the U.S. Newspaper Project.

Different libraries have taken different approaches in their cataloging. Separate records provide for simpler maintenance, particularly in a batch load environment, but may require more effort to create new bibliographic records for electronic resources. Single records provide a simplified user experience in some catalogs and may save time in the creation of records, but are very difficult and expensive to maintain when batch loading is involved. In fact, a number of libraries deliberately have a mixed environment, where they use single records for titles cataloged manually and separate records for titles loaded in batches (e.g. from vendors).

Looking across the Alliance, we have a mixed environment, where some libraries use separate records and others use single records for the same title. It seems to be a fundamental principle that in a shared catalog each title should be treated only one way; that is, it does not make sense to have both separate records and a single record for one title. We must choose one way. In a shared catalog, where records come from many sources and many staff work on

them, separate records for all electronic resources seems the only workable alternative. If we were to use single records, problems with batch load conflicts would be very difficult, if not insoluble. Institutions moving to the separate record practice may need to re-examine workflows in the selection of WorldCat records to ensure that a record for the proper format is chosen.

Recent and upcoming changes to library systems and metadata make this change in practice more manageable from the user perspective as well. The current WorldCat Local interface of Summit allows for faceted browsing of titles based on format. With a few clicks, users can fairly easily limit searches to specific formats (e.g. electronic journal) or expand searches to include all library-owned formats. WorldCat Local's faceted searching is predicated on ideas laid out in the International Federation of Library Associations and Institutions (IFLA)'s Functional Requirements for Bibliographic Records (FRBR). In order for Alliance members to make use of the FRBR data model in the future, we must ensure that existing data provide appropriate levels of specificity, which requires separate bibliographic records for existing material formats.

Dealing with legacy records will pose challenges, especially when records are merged to create a shared Alliance ILS. In an ideal world, all members with single records would undo them and create separate records. However, the cost of this effort would be great; instead we must accept the fact that some single records will remain. It is likely, though, that other single records will need to be undone to facilitate merging when a shared ILS is created.

### **Cost Analysis**

The use of separate records is overall the least expensive option. In a shared environment with batch loading, it provides the greatest flexibility and reduces maintenance costs. Single records would overall be more expensive, chiefly due to high maintenance costs of manual editing, although some cataloging costs would be saved, particularly for free Web resources where records for print already exist (e.g. some government documents, technical reports, etc.).

### **Implementation Plan**

1. This mandate must be enacted before the Alliance shared ILS is in place. Recommended date is by March 1st, 2012.

## **Provider-Neutral Records**

### **Mandate**

Alliance libraries must use Provider-Neutral records without additional local bibliographic fields, in accordance with national standards developed by the Program for Cooperative Cataloging (PCC). These standards are revised from time to time and Alliance practice must be updated to incorporate changes. Current standards are found in the PCC's *Provider-Neutral E-Monograph MARC Record Guide* (<http://www.loc.gov/catdir/pcc/bibco/PN-Guide.pdf>) and *CONSER Aggregator-Neutral Records* (<http://www.loc.gov/acq/conser/agg-neutral-recs.html>).

### **Rationale for Implementation**

The use of Provider-Neutral records, for electronic resources, eliminates a proliferation of records describing essentially the same content. It reduces the need for maintenance of bibliographic records, especially for serials. The use of Provider-Neutral records also reduces user confusion over multiple instances of a title in the catalog and leads to better discoverability.

The Provider-Neutral record is a national standard judged to provide adequate description and access. While some libraries add further data elements locally, these elements are not required and they complicate procedures for cataloging and maintenance. In an Alliance shared ILS, it will be difficult to coordinate and accommodate local desires from a number of institutions. Using the national standard without local additions will save time and money.

### **Cost Analysis**

Using Provider-Neutral records without additional fields is the lowest cost option. If the Alliance were to add local fields to Provider-Neutral records, the fields would require additional staff time and training. If the Alliance chose to implement multiple records for each online title in the shared ILS, a good deal of extra time would be spent on cataloging. That said, Provider-Neutral records themselves are not without costs, and maintenance of a single record for many institutions in a batch load environment will be difficult.

### **Implementation Plan**

1. This mandate must be enacted before the Alliance shared ILS is in place. Recommended date is by March 1st, 2012.

2. Individual institutions must identify areas of non-compliance and change ongoing cataloging procedures. Compliance means that records created from some point forward are Provider Neutral. National standards provide guidance on fields that should not be added locally.
3. At this time, institutions are not expected to change existing records in their local databases. However, there may be some work needed to clean up records during and after the migration to the new ILS.
4. CTST should be available for consultation if institutions have questions about this change or about solutions to specific problems.

## **Network Level Cataloging**

### **Mandate**

In order to support the vision of developing a single shared collection, Alliance member libraries must commit to providing adequate and appropriate cataloging of materials at the network (e.g. WorldCat) level. Corrections and changes to bibliographic records which enhance and increase record retrieval are of primary importance and must be made visible in the Summit catalog. Changes to network-level records which do not affect record retrieval and identification are a lower priority. Alliance members must work with system vendors, such as OCLC, to ensure that Alliance staff have the appropriate training, authorizations, and system permissions to allow editing of bibliographic records in any network catalog used by Alliance member libraries.

See the Local Data Mandate for more information about data added to bibliographic records in the local system only.

### **Rationale for Implementation**

Network level cataloging is a term used to mean performing cataloging activities in a bibliographic utility (“network”) rather than exclusively in a local library system. Traditionally, many libraries have used the OCLC WorldCat database as a source of copy cataloging but have made additions and changes to these records only in their local systems. Likewise, not all original records have been contributed to the OCLC WorldCat database. Under network level cataloging, all or virtually all new records and cataloging edits are made in the OCLC WorldCat database.

Network level cataloging is highly beneficial to the Alliance. Since the Summit catalog uses master records in the OCLC WorldCat database, it is important that edits to bibliographic records appear in the in the OCLC WorldCat database. By cataloging at the network level, Alliance members improve discoverability for Summit users, as well as for users in WorldCat Local libraries. Also, original cataloging not contributed to WorldCat is invisible, in Summit, to other Alliance members and is an obstacle to borrowing.

Cataloging at the network level is also beneficial to the entire OCLC cooperative. Contributing record edits, enhancements, and original cataloging to the OCLC WorldCat database provides for a richer shared database. All OCLC members are committed to contributing to this database. Doing so also enhances discoverability for all OCLC member libraries.

Despite the importance of network level cataloging, not all Alliance members are able to do it for all materials. The rules governing OCLC authorizations and record editing are complex, and some members will not be able to change records in every bibliographic format. Thus the goal of this mandate is to increase cataloging activity at the network level, with the realization that we may never achieve complete adherence. However, there may be ways to circumvent limitations by working with OCLC, using funnel projects, or creating networks within the Alliance.

### **Cost Analysis**

It is difficult to perform a cost/benefit analysis of network level cataloging. The costs are easy to measure, and amount to additional training and an initial loss of productivity as catalogers accustom themselves to a new environment. It is more difficult to measure the benefit we derive from the work contributed by other libraries because the records we want are simply there in OCLC: we do not readily see the cost of the contributions of others. Depending on local work flow, network level cataloging may be no more expensive than editing in the local catalog.

### **Implementation Plan**

1. This mandate must be enacted before the Alliance shared ILS is in place. Recommended date is by March 1st, 2012.
2. CTST must create a web page that explains network level cataloging is and what can be accomplished with different levels of OCLC authorization.
3. CTST must create guidelines for what types of edits and enhancements must be done at the network level.

4. CTST must compile a list of barriers to network level cataloging. For example, some institutions currently may not be able to perform enhancements on all OCLC records, but CTST will work with OCLC where possible to eliminate these barriers.
5. After the list of barriers has been created CTST must identify the need for assistance to libraries that are not able to do the level of network cataloging needed.
6. CTST should investigate whether a cataloging funnel or other arrangement would be useful, particularly for bibliographic formats that are little used or where OCLC authorizations or expertise within the Alliance are limited.

## **Level of PCC Contribution**

### **Mandate**

Alliance member libraries must maintain their current level of contribution to the Program for Cooperative Cataloging. The Alliance should also establish ways by which member libraries not currently contributing to the Program for Cooperative Cataloging can do so.

### **Rationale for Implementation**

The Program for Cooperative Cataloging (PCC) was founded in 1995 as “an international cooperative effort aimed at expanding access to library collections by providing useful, timely, and cost-effective cataloging that meets mutually-accepted standards.” It consists of four components: CONSER (serial cataloging), BIBCO (monographic cataloging), NACO (name authority records), and SACO (subject authority records). PCC is active in setting standards for its members, training, and improving automated support for cataloging.

The cooperative approach of the PCC compliments that of collaborative technical services within the Alliance. PCC is a successful collaborative cataloging venture, and such ventures are about gaining efficiencies and developing new models for cataloging. The greatest advantage accrues to each individual member of a cooperative when all of its members contribute. As the Alliance is part of the larger cooperative that is the PCC, we collectively must contribute to it as we build a shared catalog.

Six Alliance member libraries already participate in one or more components of the PCC and have incorporated this activity into their normal workflow. Thus, continuing the Alliance’s current level of contribution will have little impact. Over time, the Alliance should look at ways to increase its contributions as opportunities arise. PCC training is an excellent way to raise the

skills of staff in member libraries and to provide them with information that supports other mandates, such as network level cataloging and floor bibliographic standards.

### **Cost Analysis**

Contribution to the PCC incurs costs, including training and additional cataloging time spent on some titles. Alliance members have seen fit to bear this cost at the current level because they value the contributions they make and the benefit they receive from the contributions of other PCC libraries. Our recommendation to continue at current levels does not increase costs to member libraries. If participation is expanded over time, there will be costs for training and cataloging time. The chief benefit received in return will be an increase in the skill and qualifications of Alliance catalogers. This will have a positive impact in a shared environment.

### **Implementation Plan**

1. This mandate must be enacted before the Alliance shared ILS is in place. Recommended date is by March 1st, 2012.
2. CTST must survey interest in PCC participation amongst Alliance member libraries that do not currently participate in PCC level cataloging activity.
3. CTST must facilitate PCC training for interested Alliance member libraries. PCC provides trainers; the only cost to the Alliance is travel expenses for the trainer. Training could be provided regionally or with sessions in both Oregon and Washington.
4. CTST should investigate the possibility of using funnel programs to increase PCC participation. A funnel project is a group of libraries or catalogers from various libraries that have joined together to contribute records to the PCC. Funnel projects have been successful in increasing PCC participation. A funnel project would remove barriers to PCC participation for smaller Alliance member libraries. One example of a benefit to smaller libraries is the opportunity to contribute headings of local significance to the name authority file, headings which likely would not be contributed by any other NACO member.

### **Outsourcing**

#### **Mandate**

While Alliance libraries are free to choose outsourcing vendors according to their needs, vendor records added to the shared catalog must, whenever possible, meet Alliance Bibliographic Standards and Best Practices.

## **Rationale for Implementation**

Outsourcing is used in this document to mean the procurement of permanent cataloging records from third-party sources. These sources includes vendors who specialize in cataloging (e.g., OCLC Contract Cataloging) as well as those who supply cataloging as an adjunct to other services, such as book vendors (e.g. YBP, Casalini Libri, etc.) and publishers. This term does not apply to bibliographic records provided as temporary or brief records, such as those that may be used as part of the acquisitions process.

When feasible, outsourcing vendors should be required to provide record sets that meet the Alliance Bibliographic Standards and Best Practices. Member libraries should advocate for this and, when possible, make this requirement part of the contract with the vendor.

The intent of this mandate is not to limit member institutions to specific vendors or record sources, nor is there a need for an Alliance-wide outsourcing vendor as long as above minimum standards are met. The purpose of this mandate is to allow for consistency across sources of records. As elaborated in other mandates in this document, the Alliance adopts standards for records created by its members. Similarly, these standards must apply to records created by outside sources. The application of these standards will not impact the time-saving benefits of outsourcing. If vendor-supplied records meet Alliances standards no, or less, time will be spent by member institutions editing records before adding them to the shared catalog.

## **Cost Analysis**

This mandate is an extension of the mandate for floor standards to records created by vendors and suppliers. It has the same cost analysis: over the long term it is less expensive for the Alliance as a whole. The flexibility that libraries have to choose a supplier is not impaired.

## **Implementation Plan**

1. This mandate must be enacted before the Alliance shared ILS is in place. Recommended date is by March 1st, 2012.

## **Mandates To Be Implemented After Choosing an ILS**

The working group considered that additional areas of shared practices could not be finalized until a specific ILS is selected. However, since time is short, the group chose to see what progress could be made now by looking for general principles in each area. That is, we recommend these general principles be formally adopted at this time and included in the planning and creation of the shared ILS. The specific details of implementation must be postponed until after an ILS is chosen.

The descriptions of the areas were drawn from the 2010 CTST report.

### **Local Information**

The Alliance must decide what to do with information local to an individual library. Much of it is driven by bibliographic requirements (e.g. notes on missing pages, or bindings for materials in special collections) or by requirements coming from outside technical services (e.g. donor information). An example of legitimate local information is a processing note, often stored in field 910 (or another 9XX field), which allows record sets to be gathered using Create Lists. Another example is coding needed to compile statistics, e.g. ARL statistics, or statistical information used for accreditation reviews. Local variation in call number schemes is allowable, as long as call numbers are stored in the same field (e.g. an item record).

*General principle:* Establish one way of handling each type of local information across all institutions. In a shared ILS, and particularly in an environment of shared technical services, it is more cost effective to handle each type of information one way rather than in multiple ways.

### **Local Inventory Control**

Policies must be determined on how to handle local inventory of non-bibliographic materials (e.g., room keys, laptops, and other things that are controlled and circulated through the ILS).

*General principle:* Establish one way of handling each type of local non-bibliographic material across all institutions. In a shared ILS, and particularly in an environment of shared technical services, it is more cost effective to handle each type of non-bibliographic material in one way rather than in multiple ways.

## Authority Work

Alliance libraries must decide on a strategy for authority control in a shared ILS. Whatever level of authority control is maintained, all libraries should follow the same practices. That is, it makes no sense to continue the mix of approaches in practice now, where some libraries perform authority control entirely in-house and others send records to one or another vendor.

Alliance libraries must choose which of these broad options that they wish to adopt:

- Do no systematic authority control:  
Even if there is no authority control in the shared ILS, a good deal of authority work must be done in original cataloging and copy cataloging contributed at the national level (Enhance) in order to meet national standards.
- Do authority control exclusively in house:  
In this case, Alliance catalogers and maintenance staff perform all aspects of authority control.
- Use a third-party vendor to support authority control:  
In this scenario, a vendor supplies services that are used in conjunction with authority checking during cataloging and maintenance procedures in the ILS database. Clearly, a single vendor must be used, and the sending of records should be centralized so that it is done for all Alliance libraries together.

*General principle:* Authority control should be done consistently across member institutions. A more detailed discussion needs to be undertaken after we have chosen an ILS.

## Batch Loading

Batch loading of bibliographic records and associated holdings must be coordinated in a shared ILS. That is, creating duplicate bibliographic records when multiple libraries purchase the same set is not a good practice. Another area for coordination is the use of OCLC WorldCat Cataloging Partners (PromptCat) as well as vendor bibliographic files as part of the acquisitions process. There may be a need to coordinate approval plans or other acquisitions policies to make these loads workable. Another aspect of this topic is bibliographic records supplied by holding maintenance services such as Serials Solutions. In a shared ILS, it makes sense to use a single vendor.

*General principle:* A bibliographic record for any given title should be loaded as few times as possible, and ideally only once. Collection development decisions and acquisitions practices

should be coordinated and in some cases combined (e.g. approval plans) to reduce duplicate loading of identical records.

## **Database Management**

There must be a plan for managing and maintaining the shared bibliographic file. This includes apportioning responsibilities (e.g. central vs. distributed), establishing channels of communication, and coordinating maintenance activities with policies for new title cataloging. Uniform practices are needed for such things as withdrawn titles, suppressed records, etc.

*General principle:* Policies and procedures for database management must be the same across the units or institutions that carry it out.

## **Conclusion**

This document illustrates a big step toward cooperative technical services within the Alliance. Shared practices across institutions will allow for the implementation of a shared bibliographic database and a singular patron experience when discovering items in the Alliance collections. Shared practices also will result in cost savings and allow the Alliance to further pursue a vision of sharing resources.

Should the Council Approve each of the mandates, the next steps would be to follow each of the implementation plans detailed in the report. Additional discussion will be needed to identify the group responsible group for completing some of the recommended steps.

**Orbis Cascade Alliance  
Automated Cataloging & Acquisitions Working Group (AC&C)**

**Report to  
Collaborative Technical Services Team (CTST)**

**September 16, 2011**

**Final Report and Recommendations**

**Automated Cataloging & Acquisitions Working Group:**

Jan Hartley, Seattle University, Chair, CTST Liaison  
Maria Wagner, Portland Community College  
Elizabeth Duell, Alliance Staff  
Carol Drost, Willamette University  
Peggy Firman, University of Puget Sound  
Alex Rolfe, George Fox University  
Debra Spidal, Washington State University

The Automated Cataloging & Acquisitions Working Group spent considerable time creating a survey to collect information regarding automated cataloging and acquisition practices among member libraries. The survey was distributed to members in on September 12, 2011 with a response deadline of October 3, 2011 . This survey is composed of approximately 75 questions and covers the general areas of selection process, ordering, invoicing/payment, cataloging (including WorldCat cataloging partners) and end processing. The focus of the survey was 1 time purchases (i.e. firm orders) of print monographs in English language, unless approval books were specified.”

The results of this environmental scan of acquisitions and cataloging practices in Alliance institutions will be compiled in October and will serve multiple purposes:

- A listing of current institutional practices (i.e. WorldCat partners, shelf-ready) and contacts that can be drawn upon by member libraries thinking about implementing or changing current acquisition or cataloging workflows.
- A tool to begin to identify areas and patterns in the acquisition and cataloging workflow towards the planning of a Collaborative Technical Services. The survey results may indicate areas (the low hanging fruit) that may be relatively easy to implement as well as areas that will need more attention.

### **Recommendations:**

The existing working group should continue through the end of October to compile the survey and publish the results.

Additional work on acquisitions and cataloging workflows for other types of materials (i.e. multimedia) or order types (i.e. standing orders) should be folded into the efforts of the working groups developing general principles for acquisitions, serials and holdings records as outlined in TS3 of the CTST final report.

**Orbis Cascade Alliance**

**DDA/CTST eBook Cataloging Group:**

**Interim Report to  
Collaborative Technical Services Team (CTST)  
(Final report to be part of final DDAPIT report)**

**September 16, 2011**

**Working Group Members:**

Tom Larsen, Portland State University, Chair  
Joe Kiegel, University of Washington  
Kelley McGrath, University of Oregon  
Maria Wagner, Portland Community College  
Shelley Swelland, TESC  
Bob Thomas, Western Washington University  
Susan Hinken, University of Portland  
Anya Arnold, Alliance Staff

The DDA Ebook working Group of the Collaborative Technical Services Team was charged with working out the procedures for making discovery records available to member libraries for the Demand Driven Acquisitions Pilot Project. The Working Group worked together with EBL and OCLC to figure out how to make the records available in both Summit and also in member libraries' local catalogs for those libraries that desired this. It was decided to use MARC records from EBL for the DDA titles because they appeared, for the most part, to meet minimum quality standards and included OCLC numbers, which facilitated the holdings display in Summit as well as in WorldCat Local.

Because of the potential display problems in Summit, it was decided to make use of a new OCLC service, the WorldCat Knowledge Base, to provide links to the ebooks from Summit. In this way, a single link to an ebook could be provided in lieu of having 36 different links screen scraped from all of the member libraries' ILSs. Since the WorldCat Knowledge Base could also be implemented in a member library's instance of WorldCat Local, this was provided as an option to the member libraries in addition to or instead of loading MARC records into the local catalog. The KB is in beta and implementation of it for this project has created significant issues for the DDAPIT. Most pressing is OCLC's lack of a consistent schedule for updating the KB. This has slowed the process of making new titles EBL has identified for inclusion in the pilot available to our users via Summit and has created additional work by EBL staff to facilitate the process.

In order to deal with WorldCat holdings in an efficient manner, two new Alliance-wide OCLC symbols were established, OCADD for the unpurchased DDA titles, and OCACL for purchased titles. These two symbols were set up such that holdings on these two symbols would count as holdings at each of the member libraries. For those libraries that opted to load MARC records into their local ILSs, a set of procedures was developed whereby those records, provided by EBL through WorldCat Cataloging Partners, could be downloaded from OCLC Product Services and loaded into the local catalogs.

A number of documents were produced to explain these procedures to the member libraries. The document "[Supporting Patron Discovery of eBooks in the EBL DDA Pilot](#)" outlines the decisions that each participating library needs to make before the pilot goes live depending on whether the library provides access via Summit only or also wants to provide access through the local catalog. It also describes in general terms the procedures that must be followed once those decisions are made. The document "Preparing to Load MARC Records" provides more detailed instructions for loading MARC records at those libraries which, based on the decisions made after reading the first document, have decided to load records for the DDA Pilot ebook titles into their local ILS. It describes the kinds of preprocessing and other preparations that a library must do in order to load these records.

In addition, in order to facilitate the loading of MARC records, a MarcEdit script was developed which automates much of the preprocessing that needs to be done to the MARC records. A document entitled Instructions for Using the Alliance DDA MarcEdit Script was written explaining how to use the script.

The Working Group also participated in a number of training sessions to explain these and other procedures to the member libraries. One training session was done as an interactive Webinar, and two other in-person training sessions were done, one in Portland and one in Seattle. An expanded version of the Working Group's portion of the Webinar was posted as a set of PowerPoint slides with recorded sound for use by those may not have been able to attend one of the training sessions.

So far, three sets of records have been made available, and the corresponding three WorldCat Knowledge Base loads have been done. It appears that the member libraries have been successful at making the DDA titles accessible to their patrons. In the meantime, the Working Group has established procedures for dealing with cases where DDA titles suddenly become unavailable, necessitating the removal of those MARC records from the local catalogs as well as the removal of the OCLC holdings. Yet to be fully worked out are the procedures for dealing with those titles which have triggered a purchase. These procedures will be worked out once that happens.

The overall evaluation and recommendations by the Working Group will be made later as part of the larger DDAPIT effort.

**Orbis Cascade Alliance**  
**Collaborative Technical Services Team (CTST)**

**Foreign Language Cataloging Pilot Assessment**  
**Foreign Language Cataloging Working Group**

**Final Report**

**September 15, 2011**

**Working Group Members:**

Ann Miller, University of Oregon, Coordinator  
Diana Brooking, University of Washington  
Joe Kiegel, University of Washington  
Lori Robare, University of Oregon  
Mary St. Germain, University of Washington  
Daphne Wang, University of Oregon  
Mark Watson, University of Oregon

**Also participating:**

Michiyo Goble, University of Oregon;  
Xiaotong Wang, University of Oregon  
Vincent Wilhite, University of Washington.

## **Background/Charge**

Report of the Collaborative Technical Services Task Force in Oct. 2009 identified lack of expertise in cataloging of “difficult languages and non-Roman scripts” as an area where a collaborative approach would provide benefits to Alliance libraries. Initially the plan was to gather information on expertise and cataloging capacity and share the availability via a webpage. This approach proved unworkable for little excess cataloging capacity was identified and what there was did not match with perceived needs.

However, a small pilot focusing on a few needed languages (Arabic, Chinese and Japanese) seemed to provide a better opportunity for assessing the issues and challenges in implementing a broader program of collaborative cataloging. The University of Washington agreed to provide copy cataloging of monographs in Arabic and the University of Oregon agreed to provide both copy and original cataloging of monographs in Chinese and Japanese.

## **Preparation and Planning**

The Working Group held its only face-to-face meeting in Seattle on January 25, 2011. The group established initial cataloging parameters for the pilot:

- Monographs only
- UW copy only for Arabic
- UO copy and original for Chinese, Japanese
- Use partner institutions OCLC Authorization (established specifically for pilot)
  - o Allows saving record to partners online save file for later import
  - o Allows partner institution to add holdings and import as need
  - o Allows partner institution to track statistics for that authorization to reveal work done for them.
- UW would catalog from piece in hand. Initially UO planned on cataloging from surrogates, established early on that this would not work well, particularly with East Asian materials.
- Committed to cataloging at least 10 items per month and would ask for batches of 10 in shipments.

In addition, the group addressed the process of managing shipping materials to and from institutions and expectations of preliminary processing of materials, item slips and packing slips. As most cataloging units have little experience with the Alliance courier service these expectations needed to be spelled out. Documents on cataloging and shipping expectations were sent to client libraries once they were identified (see Appendix A and B).

In February, Alliance libraries were notified of the pilot and invited to submit a survey to determine the amount of monographic material in Arabic, Chinese and Japanese needing cataloging and become partners in the pilot.

Eight libraries submitted full responses.

<b>Alliance Arabic, Chinese and Japanese ataloging requests</b>				
<b>Submitting Library</b>	<b>Language Needs</b>	<b>Number (Arabic)</b>	<b>Number (Chinese)</b>	<b>Number (Japanese)</b>
University of Oregon	Arabic	50		
Washington State University	Arabic & Japanese	20		20+
Reed College	Chinese		20-40	
University of Puget Sound	Arabic & Chinese	1	>5	
Oregon State University	Arabic & Japanese	5	>5	>5
Western Washington University	Chinese & Japanese		50+	50+
Pacific University	Chinese & Japanese		40-50	10-20
Linfield College	Chinese & Japanese		>5	>5

The number of titles needing cataloging ranged from less than 5 to over 50 and, in the end, the number was rather different than initial estimates indicated.

### **Implementation**

The pilot started as of March 1, 2011 with the first shipments arriving at the UO and UW on March 17. The Alliance courier service worked well, though some shipments took longer than initially anticipated. Staff in mailrooms and receiving areas (in client libraries and cataloging libraries) needed to be alerted to this new use of the courier in order to ensure that materials were routed properly.

During the group's first conference call on May 3, 2011 several Initial challenges became apparent. These included how to handle returning Arabic items when original cataloging was required, working with volumes in sets and issues of OCLC authorization levels.

In the case of returning items when copy was not found, UW provided a romanization of the title page to allow the client library to continue to search for copy. As the UO was providing original cataloging this wasn't an issue for Chinese and Japanese materials.

Both libraries received items which were in languages out of scope for the pilot. These were returned to the client library with an explanation that the items were out of scope.

Volumes of monographic sets were sent to each library. For the pilot, both libraries updated the master record to be as complete as possible, but recognized that the continuing effort needed to maintain set records would add cataloging costs. This issue would need to be revisited in any continuing program of distributed cataloging efforts.

Client libraries also sent some serials. The working group understood that if staff at the client libraries couldn't read the language they could not necessarily recognize that the item was a serial. In these cases the item was returned to the client library noting that it was a serial. However, in one case the client library asked that the cataloging library create a monographic record for the serial issue. Guidelines for such situations would need to be developed in any continuing program of distributed cataloging efforts.

The client library's authorization was used in order to generate statistics for that library. Both the UO and UW ran into the issue of the client library not having the authorization to enhance a PCC level record. Although enhancing the record using the UO or UW authorization was straightforward, that work would not be reflected in the information generated under the client library's authorization.

The pilot ended as of August 31, 2011.

## **Responses and Evaluation**

### **Partner Responses**

At the end of the pilot a brief set of three questions covering the communication and shipping of library materials, the quality of cataloging and download process and whether workflow and procedures could be improved were sent to the four client libraries. All responded to the questions.

Regarding communication, shipping and returning materials and use of the courier services all the libraries were, by and large, satisfied. In one instance, a shipment was misdirected at the client library though it isn't entirely clear why. In another, the materials were oversized and, therefore, difficult if not impossible to ship. This caused some initial confusion.

All partners thought the cataloging quality was very good. The method of saving records to the partners online save file for export worked very well. There was no indication that client libraries experienced issues importing the records into their own systems.

The workflow and procedures worked well for the client libraries. A few suggestions for the future included expanding the pilot to other formats, "provide a fixed list of services", and make provision for handling of oversize and rare materials. All the client libraries expressed an appreciation for the pilot and the hope that the service could continue.

## **Statistics**

Overall the pilot saw the shipment of 186 titles, of those 21 were returned to the client libraries as being out of scope due to language or being a cataloging type other than monograph. Of the 165 titles cataloged, 130 were copy cataloging and 35 original. 65 Arabic titles were copy cataloged while the Chinese total was 34 (18 copy/16 original) and Japanese 66 (47 copy/19 original). The average cost per title for cataloging ranged from \$12.74 for Arabic copy to \$49.27 for Chinese original. That cost is very much tied to the level of cataloging and the level of cataloging staff required.

These costs pertain only to the actual cost of cataloging. Administrative and other support (courier costs, mail room and distribution costs) have not been factored in. The cataloging costs were derived using Sheila Intner's formula in *Technicalities* (vol. 25 no.4, Summer 2005) and include salary, benefit package and 15% overhead.

Detailed statistics regarding the pilot project are found in Appendix C.

## **Evaluation**

The pilot was conceived as a way to gain real-life experience with shared cataloging in the Alliance, and it was successful at doing that. We hoped to find out what would be easy and what would be difficult, and we have learned about both of these areas.

We found it easy to share bibliographic records when they are cataloged to national standards. The transportation of books through the courier service was relatively straightforward once some experience was gained. We were able to avoid some difficulties altogether. For instance, the problem of training cataloging centers in the local holdings and shelf preparation procedures of each client was retained in the client libraries.

Among the difficulties, the greatest was the imbalance of contributions to the process. That is, cataloging libraries put out a fair amount of effort and did not receive anything tangible in return. For a small number of items and in a pilot this is acceptable, but as a long term commitment, it is not. The model as used in the pilot is not sustainable and it would not scale equitably. A different economic basis is needed for this to become an ongoing service.

Although not tested in the pilot, it did demonstrate that a shared ILS and shared practices for cataloging and holdings would make the process simpler. For example, if all Alliance libraries used the same procedures for recording holdings in one ILS, it would be easy to integrate these activities into the cataloging process, which is more efficient than splitting it between libraries.

**Recommendation**

Council should explore and implement ways to transfer value back to cataloging libraries to ensure that the relationship between providers and clients is not one-sided and is one of mutual cooperation.

## Appendix A

### Alliance Foreign Language Cataloging Project

Welcome to the pilot of the Orbis Cascade Alliance Foreign Language Cataloging Project. We look forward to working with you! This document lays out the processes and procedures that the partners in the pilot will use during the project.

#### Client Library

##### Cataloging setup

- Establish a dedicated OCLC authorization for “Alliance Cataloging” and tell the cataloging library what that authorization is. Conveying this information via the phone or paper mail is advised to ensure security.
- Determine how to manage the export of records if non-Roman fields are desired from OCLC into their own databases (if desired).

##### Sending items to be cataloged

- Barcode and property-stamp all volumes.
- Complete an Item Slip (attached) for each volume and insert it in the book.
- Make two photocopies of the title page of each volume shipped. Keep one set and send one set as a packing list for the shipment. Use the Packing List attached as a cover sheet.
- Use Alliance courier service (<http://www.orbiscascade.org/index/procedures-and-instructions>) and follow their instructions regarding size and weight.
  - Boxes to weigh no more than 35 pounds.
  - Box size not to exceed: 13 x 11 x11 (length x width x height in inches).
- Labels must be Alliance courier labels (<http://www.orbiscascade.org/index/shipping-labels>) and must include an attention statement:
  - University of Oregon – Attn: Lori Robare, Metadata Services & Acquisitions (541-346-1848)
  - University of Washington – Attn: Diana Brooking, Monographic Services (206-685-0389)

##### Receiving items after cataloging complete.

- Update holdings and export records.
- Do not delete elements from the master record; edit locally if desired.

## Cataloging Library

### Cataloging

- UW and UO will use the dedicated authorization to log into OCLC and perform cataloging on behalf of the client library. UW and UO commit to using the login only to perform said cataloging and save catalog records to an online save file for use by the client library, and to collect statistics from the use of the authorization to use in evaluating the pilot project.
- UO and UW will correct or upgrade the master record as appropriate.
- Copy and original cataloging will generally be:
  - UO – Chinese, Japanese – full level (Encoding Level I)
  - UW – BIBCO Standard Record, but unauthenticated records will not be upgraded to PCC (copy only)

### Returning items after cataloging

- Return with packing slip
- Indicate save file number or OCLC # for the item on the item slip

## Appendix B

### Shipping Materials Using the Alliance Courier Service

The libraries participating in the Alliance collaborative cataloging pilot project will use the Alliance Courier service to ship and return materials. Both cataloging and client libraries are expected to follow the general guidelines set out by the Alliance Courier program. The instructions in this document are intended to be reminders; participating libraries are advised to check the website of the Alliance Courier service for more detailed information.

<http://www.orbiscascade.org/index/courier>

1. Libraries must use the Alliance courier shipping labels that can be printed off online to transport materials. Shipping labels should have the name of a sender or a recipient at each library. The cataloging libraries' contact persons for the Alliance collaborative cataloging pilot project are as follows, and please include their department names on the shipping labels.

Lori Robare  
Metadata Services & Acquisitions  
Knight Library  
University of Oregon  
[lrobare@uoregon.edu](mailto:lrobare@uoregon.edu)  
(541) 346-1848

Diana Brooking  
Monographic Services  
Suzzallo Library  
University of Washington  
[dbrookin@u.washington.edu](mailto:dbrookin@u.washington.edu)  
(206) 685-0389

2. Please use smaller cardboard boxes to ship and return books, the contents of each book box should weigh under 35 lbs. The dimensions of the box is approximately 13 x 11 x11 (length x width x height in inches).

3. To prevent potential mix-up of materials, please do not use Alliance color bags to ship books for the collaborative cataloging pilot project, as the colors book bags have been designated for exchanging different types of materials among the Alliance libraries in a timely fashion. To ensure that materials for the pilot project are promptly delivered to and returned from participating libraries, it would be best to use smaller cardboard shipping boxes.

4. The client libraries are encouraged to communicate with the cataloging libraries individually to discuss any issues and concerns related to shipment of materials for the pilot project.

## Appendix C

### Statistics

<b>Arabic</b>					
	Cataloged	Returned	Average time per title (min)	Total cataloging time	Average cost per title
Washington State U.	65	20	24	26 hr 16 min	\$ 12.72

<b>Japanese</b>					
	Cataloged	Returned	Average time per title (min)	Total cataloging time	Average cost per title
<b>Copy Cataloging</b>					
Washington State U.	43		25	17 hr 40 min	\$ 15.88
Pacific U.					
Reed C.					
Western Washington U.	4		40	2 hr 40 min	\$ 25.76
<b>Original Cataloging</b>					
Washington State U.	14		37	8 hr 40 min	\$ 23.92
Pacific U.					
Reed C.					
Western Washington U.	5		62	5 hr 10 min	\$ 39.93

<b>Chinese</b>					
	Cataloged	Returned	Average time per title (min)	Total cataloging time	Average cost per title
<b>Copy Cataloging</b>					
Washington State U.					
Pacific U.	6		39	3 hr 55 min	\$ 27.81

Reed C.	3	1	32	1 hr 35 min	\$ 22.82
Western Washington U.	9		39	5 hr 50 min	\$ 27.81
<b>Original Cataloging</b>					
Washington State U.					
Pacific U.	2		58	1 hr 55 min	\$ 41.35
Reed C.	5		60	5 hr	\$ 42.78
Western Washington U.	9		63	5 hr 25 min	\$ 49.27

**Orbis Cascade Alliance**  
**Collaborative Technical Services Team (CTST)**

**Report on Collaborative Technical Services:  
Strategies for Alliance Cooperation**

**September 29, 2011**

**CTST Membership:**

Susan Hinken, UP (Chair)  
Erica Findley, Pacific University  
Jan Hartley, Seattle University  
Joseph Kiegel, UW  
Kelley McGrath, UO  
Maria Wagner, PCC  
Scot Harrison, SMU (Council liaison)  
Tom Larsen, PSU  
Elizabeth Duell, Orbis Cascade Alliance (staff liaison)

## **Collaborative Technical Services: Strategies for Alliance Cooperation**

The Collaborative Technical Services Team has drafted the following statement on strategies for cooperative technical services in order to foster conversation among Council members and member libraries. Our goals are to stimulate thinking and to help the Alliance move forward on defining key elements of collaborative technical services within the organization and its member libraries.

Collaborative technical services is a shared set of practices and staffing for acquisitions, cataloging, serials and related functions that maximizes the collective efficiency of these operations within Alliance libraries. The goal is to bring a sense of oneness to Alliance collections while creating efficiencies which enable libraries and their staff to focus on expanding and improving library services and discovery.

The analogy of a pipeline is often used to describe technical services operations: orders enter at one end and pass along sequentially until they emerge at the other end as cataloged and marked volumes or accessible resources. Thus the Alliance strategic focus on collaborative technical services can be framed as an effort to increase efficiency in the technical services pipeline. For the Alliance to increase efficiency by collaborating on technical services, it must also expect to collaborate on aspects of collection development and to see impacts on circulation. It is impossible to maintain the current variety of collection development practices at the beginning of the technical services pipeline and output at the end and achieve significant savings in the middle of this pipeline. Necessarily, the Alliance must make coordinated changes throughout the larger pipeline to achieve efficiencies and savings. To be successful, collaborative technical services must be approached as collaborative collection services.

### **Shared Expectations**

A critical prerequisite for successful shared technical services is a clear set of shared expectations among the libraries involved. This goes beyond simple procedures, such as how to place an order, and includes expectations for turnaround time, training, support, problem solving, and scalability along with the range of activities inherent in building and maintaining collections including database maintenance, authority control, and transfers and withdrawals of resources. It touches on every aspect of this relationship between member libraries.

Another important area is expectations concerning costs and how they are shared: a clearly understood cost agreement is essential to cooperation. The Alliance has an opportunity to experiment with different cost models to see how they work in practice. Even with a chance to experiment, determination of a cost model will not be easy. Work should begin on costing technical service operations using a common methodology so that cost data may be reliably compared across the Alliance. Costs studies themselves incur costs but are necessary to developing a workable model.

Foundational to the development of collaborative collection services are efficiency and standardization. What is standardized can be shared easily; non-standardized resources and practices cannot be shared as easily. The adoption and use of Alliance-wide practices across 36 individual libraries are central to planning for the shared ILS and other aspects of collaborative collection services, and may provide significant savings in the long run. For example, the Alliance currently supports collaborative efforts such as the collection development print threshold and the development of best bibliographic practices.

### **Previous Alliance Work**

The library landscape has changed radically over the past several years, and the Alliance recognizes that collaboration is a key element to foster strong services within member libraries and develop a healthy environment in which the organization can thrive. Since 2009, the Alliance has identified shared staffing as a key area for collaboration, and technical services were chosen as the initial area for investigation. To foster discussion at the Council meeting in February of 2009, a paper was prepared for the Alliance by Rick Lugg of R2 Consulting.

The paper for Council discussion was entitled “[The Extended Library Enterprise : Collaborative Technical Services & Shared Staffing](#)”. It contains an introduction, a review of technical services and related collection development workflows for print and electronic materials, prerequisites and targets for collaborative technical services, and two possible models for collaboration.

According to the report, prerequisites for shared technical services include elements such as a common ILS/ERM infrastructure, a shared catalog with a single bibliographic record, shared vendors, standardized cataloging and processing, a commitment to minimizing duplication, and a shared budget. The Alliance has taken steps in each of these areas, but much remains to be done before these elements are fully in place to support shared collection services in a cost-effective way.

### **Collaborative Collection Services for Online Electronic Resources**

The case for collaborative management of online resources is strong and will only become stronger with a shared ILS and if cooperative purchasing and licensing of online resources, such as the Demand Driven Acquisitions of e-books pilot, increase. In addition, the current aggregator-neutral model for online serials and provider-neutral model for online monographic materials mean that many records will require ongoing cooperative maintenance and safeguards against loss of data. Sharing the responsibility consortia-wide for updating URLs and troubleshooting access problems would reduce the burden on individual libraries. The logistical challenges and temporal and financial costs of moving physical materials around in a collaborative environment are irrelevant when dealing with remote access resources.

Successful examples of collaborative cataloging and maintenance of electronic resources already exist, for instance OhioLink, as described in *Cataloging and Classification Quarterly* at <http://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/01639374.2011.571147>, and among a number of German libraries at

The Alliance should move toward more collaborative collection services for online resources following one of the models described below for implementation or some combination of these models.

### **Collaborative Collection Services for Tangible Resources**

The R2 paper does not set out a clear model for collaborative acquisitions, cataloging and maintenance of tangible resources. However, it does mention both a central processing unit located at a shared repository and the use of temporary distributed warehouses. It also notes a conflict between the savings of centralized receipt of physical materials and the costs of redistribution of these materials to member libraries. Redistribution of materials has implications not only for the processing libraries but also for their parent institutions. Centralized receipt may not realize a savings when distribution costs are considered. The R2 paper does not outline a path forward to consolidate processing centers, nor does it address the challenges and risks of these changes.

### **Models for Implementation of Collaborative Collection Services**

CTST suggests several models for consolidating the processing of tangible and electronic resources that would allow for experimentation and evaluation, and recommends that the next CTST develop a final report for the Alliance Council's March 2012 meeting, taking into account this draft document and feedback from the Council, the CTS symposium in December 2011, and member librarians. While it is important to recognize that collection services dealing with tangible materials differ from those involving electronic resources, there are important commonalities and any approach should consider both formats. Each of these models could be an end point for collaborative collection services, or the first two could serve as steps toward a consolidated model as defined in the third option depending upon the success of early steps and the desirability of moving forward.

#### **The following are some options for consolidation:**

- Distributed collection services
- Regional consolidation of collection services
- Centralized collection services

### **Distributed Collection Services**

One possible model for distributed collection services would be akin to the approach taken when the Alliance used Inn-Reach as its union catalog and direct borrowing system.

Requirements existed for records but not for internal processes and collection development. An obvious drawback of this approach is that there is too much duplication of effort, e.g. for core titles that several libraries acquire. But clearly in those days we were not operating in a shared ILS. We had a shared union catalog based on what was in each member library's local ILS.

Certainly with a shared ILS and effective workflows in place, much duplication could be eliminated. There will be a single bibliographic record in the shared ILS for any title owned by any Alliance library. For example, when a new title is acquired, the first library receiving it will be responsible for cataloging that item. Other libraries receiving that title would attach their holdings to that single bibliographic record and also presumably attach any local information they deem necessary. In some cases individual member libraries may choose to upgrade existing bibliographic records according to well-established Alliance guidelines.

Such a model would certainly eliminate much duplicated effort in cataloging. However, it probably would not create any efficiencies in other areas of technical services since each library would still be doing its own ordering, receiving, and handling of the materials to be cataloged. Another possible model for distributed collection services may be for each member library to take responsibility for the acquisition, cataloging, and processing of materials in selected subject areas or selected formats, allowing other libraries to forgo the expense and effort of processing these materials. This would have the advantage of playing to different member libraries' strengths and expertise in dealing with different formats, languages, etc. It could also have the advantage of working hand in hand with shared approval plans.

Yet another possible model for distributed collection services would be to centralize (or regionally distribute) all collection service activities resulting from shared approval plans, while leaving each individual member library responsible for the acquisition and cataloging of their firm orders and specialized approval plans. In such a way, perhaps, an Alliance-wide core collection could be built and processed in a more centralized way while supplements to that core collection would be handled locally. It is not totally clear to what extent such a model may result in actual savings for member libraries; however, it is likely that something like this will have to be done at least to a limited extent. For example, it is somewhat difficult to imagine that the acquisition, cataloging, and processing of rare books and other special collections materials could be handled centrally without incurring undue risks and difficulties. It may also be the case that donations would be best handled locally rather than centrally to avoid having to ship the donated materials back and forth between the receiving library and the processing library.

### **Regional Collection Services**

The core idea of regional consolidation is to move technical services activities to large libraries, e.g. the ARL libraries. The size of Alliance libraries varies greatly, from small community colleges to some of the largest universities in the nation. This approach makes use of existing economies of scale. The marginal cost of adding to large workflows is relatively low, as

increased size offers opportunities for greater economy of scale.

To serve the full range of needs represented by member institutions requires very specialized skills such as language and format expertise. A model of consolidating to the large libraries would take advantage of existing expertise. Most of the needed expertise is already in place, and it makes sense to use it for the advantage of the Alliance as a whole.

For tangible resources, it may be possible to reduce the costs of moving materials by consolidating services at high-volume sites, so that redistribution occurs only for materials going to low-volume sites.

A regional approach reduces travel costs over centralized consolidation. Shared technical services cannot take place without a good deal of communication between processing centers and the libraries they serve. Much can be done electronically, but in-person meetings are a necessity. If processing centers are located relatively close to client libraries, travel costs are reduced and occasional face-to-face contact certainly will increase the communication and trust that are essential for long-term success.

### **Centralized Collection Services**

Under this approach, all collection services would move to a single processing center within each state or to one center, probably co-located with a regional storage facility. Economies of scale increase, as do the costs of redistribution, travel, and the like. As the percentage of material available in electronic format increases, the physical component of Alliance purchases will be reduced, and is likely to remain predominantly in exotic languages and scripts and specialized formats. Redistribution costs to smaller libraries may approach zero and cease to be an issue.

The challenges of implementing this model are greater due to the need to create the central processing center and to coordinate changes at all member libraries at once. The size of such a combined unit would be quite large, on the order of a top-20 ARL technical services division. All existing units like this have grown organically over time; a number of risks are inherent in creating such a unit from scratch on a short timeline.

Elements to be considered include location, staffing, and consolidation of OCLC symbols. Without the establishment of an Alliance remote storage facility, consolidation into a single site seems less likely.

### **Potential Costs to Consolidation of Technical Services**

Although consolidating technical services has great potential for reducing redundant effort and freeing Alliance resources to contribute to other activities, there are possible costs to be considered. These include loss of institutional flexibility and local expertise in technical services areas. Librarians with a solid understanding of technical services functions have an important

role to play in the long standing dynamic within libraries, which have often relied upon librarians with public and technical services expertise to work in concert to provide quality services to end users. If no one at a library has grounding in technical services, this perspective and the ability to foster communication about these issues within the library may be lost.

### **Collection Development and Shared Technical Services**

As the R2 paper notes: “Although collection development activities are not strictly ‘technical services’, they represent the origin of technical services workflow, and exert enormous influence downstream” (p. 4). Thus, any serious consideration of technical services consolidation for the purpose of cost savings must include changes in collection development.

Alliance members have already taken steps to consolidate collection development and acquisitions processes for scholarly materials in English using YBP and the acquisition of electronic resources through the Alliance ER program. The opportunities for further consolidation focusing on foreign language materials, media (videos, sound recordings) and scores should be explored. Also, given the range of institutions in the Alliance, members purchase many items in English that are outside the scope of YBP (e.g. children’s literature, popular titles) and opportunities for consolidation, perhaps through YBP’s parent company, Baker & Taylor, should be investigated.

Individual and overlapping approval plans for separate member libraries are highly duplicative and expensive. Were all approval plans with Alliance vendors consolidated, considerable savings might be realized in staff time and reduced duplication of resources.

Currently member libraries pay invoices individually, duplicating effort and resources. Opportunities may exist to develop a central pool that makes purchases on behalf of the Alliance using shared funds, as currently modeled by the DDA pilot. Exceptions may be made to this approach, e.g. for rare books and manuscripts that are held by a single institution and are not lent. Any plan to streamline invoice payments and share funds must address issues of governance within individual institutions and statewide accounting requirements.

### **Circulation and Shared Technical Services**

Technical services also interact with library functions downstream. As technical services are consolidated, some standardization of the materials that is passed to shelving units should occur. In particular, barcode placement and shelf preparation should be standardized, so that a central processing unit can handle all materials identically. Standardized processing also has the potential to streamline circulation processes.

Joint ownership of materials may open the door for other cost saving measures, such as shelving at the point of last circulation, which saves courier costs, since there is no “home” library to which titles must be returned.

**Recommendation # 1:**

To foster conversation and define key elements of cooperative collection services within the Alliance, the CTST makes the following recommendation:

In addition to sending the document to Council for review and comment at their November meeting, CTST will distribute it to librarians within the Alliance in anticipation of the Collaborative Technical Services Symposium to be held in December 2011.

At the Symposium, CCSC will seek feedback asking for input on:

- Benefits
- Drawbacks
- Opportunities
- Roadblocks

CCSC will take this feedback and this draft document and craft a final version for presentation to Council at their March meeting with a recommendation on how to proceed.

**Recommendation #2:**

CCSC should create a common methodology to compile a cost study and then apply the methodology to a study among members to gather relevant data on the cost of technical services activity among member libraries. The design phase should be completed by May 31, 2012 and the study by December 31, 2012.

**DRAFT**  
**Agenda for Collaborative Collections Services Symposium**  
**December 8, 2011**  
**UO Portland, White Stag Building**

**8 :30 to 9 am**            *Registration and Continental Breakfast*

**9 to 10:15 am**        *Welcome and Key Note Speaker*

Alliance introduction: John Helmer?

Someone within the Alliance to give high end history/overview

**10:15 to 10:30 am**    *Break – Coffee only*

**10:30 to 11:45 am**    *Discussion of Collaborative Technical Services*

Discussion of Alliance strategic agenda and implications for collaborative technical services focusing on a conversation of the CTST strategies document seeking input on to help inform the development of collaborative technical services within the Alliance

- Benefits
- Drawbacks
- Opportunities
- Roadblocks

**11:45 am to 12:30 pm**        *Lunch – Boxed lunches*

**12:30 to 1:30 pm**        *Practical collaborative steps so far and CTST recommendations for the next team*

- Bibliographic Standards and Best Practices
- Changing the boundaries: Sharing Cataloging of foreign languages

Include time for questions

**1:30 to -2:30 pm**        *Demand Driven Implementation*

- What we have learned
- Future
- Implications for Technical Services in a collaborative environment

Include time for questions

**2:00 to 2:15 pm**            *Break*

**2:15 to 3:45 pm**            *Shared ILS and its implications for TS and CTS*

Maybe brainstorming around TS issues and how to resolve in a collaborative environment

Include time for questions

**3:45 to 4 pm**            *Closing remarks and adjourn*