Enhancing Unique Collections in the SILS: Issue and Source(s) Identification

January 13, 2017
Updated February 17, 2017

Unique Collections in the SILS Working Group
Rose Krause, Eastern Washington University, and Elizabeth Joffrion, Western Washington University (co-chairs)
Ruth Steele, Western Washington University
Hilary Robbeloth, University of Puget Sound
Suzanne James-Bacon, Washington State University
Anne Bahde, Oregon State University
Jodi Allison-Bunnell, Staff Liaison

Introduction

The Unique Collections in the SILS working group is part of the Content Creation & Dissemination Team. This report forms a portion of one of the working group's projects this year: ***Study and characterize issues with unique collections in the SILS, with the goals of identifying practices that work well and proposing solutions in collaboration with Technical Services, Systems, Discovery and Delivery, and Normalization Rules.*** See our full charge here*: https://www.orbiscascade.org/unique-collections-in-the-sils-working-group*.

For the purposes of this inquiry, "unique collections" are physical items represented in the SILS with MARC records including, but not limited to, rare books, oral histories, and newspapers. The issues are by no means only concerns of large institutions with discrete special collections programs; **every Alliance institution has responsibility for some type of unique materials.**

The working group realizes that these objectives impact all areas of Alliance work, including workflow and practice at the organizational and institutional levels. Thus, our efforts have required that we regularly communicate, consult, and solicit feedback from Alliance teams and working groups, as well as institutional representatives.   In October and November 2016, we engaged in a process of discovering and gathering information regarding issues associated with

metadata, display, and discovery of unique collections in the SILS. We gathered this feedback through attendance at meetings, open calls, and by hosting three webinar forums for CCD Representatives and other interested colleagues. We also conducted a detailed survey to further identify and solicit feedback on issues regarding unique materials in the SILS.

This report represents the compilation and analysis of the group's findings**.** Overall, the UC SILS group found these issues to be a relatively small set of problems that should be feasible to prioritize and address effectively. With the assistance of a range of Alliance working groups, teams and institutional partners, this information will figure substantially into solutions that may include changes in metadata practices, infrastructure, as well as the identification and submission of specific concerns to Ex Libris for resolution. We anticipate that these recommended solutions will inform the FY18 planning process.

Report Structure

This document is divided into five broad issue categories that emerged during our evaluation phase:
>   1) Access
>   2) Discovery
>   3) Local Data
>   4) Best Practices/Metadata
>   5) Other

Each section includes a summary and description of the category, and a list of specific issues. Each issue is described in detail, and where relevant is linked to further information and examples. Each section also include suggestions for the source of the issue and references which OCA teams or groups might be able to solve the problem. Based on the next steps outlined below, we seek the input of each working group to determine if the proposed solutions are feasible and can be accomplished by the team identified.

A matrix of issues organized by team/working group has been provided to give quick visual access to the issues most relevant to each team/working group. A substantial number of issues may require attention from multiple teams; in addition, *UCSILS has not been able to identify relevant teams/working groups for all issues, so we encourage working groups and teams to review the entire report, if possible, to identify where additional input is needed.*

Issue Matrix

	Systems	Discovery & Delivery	Norm Rules	Technical Services	Ex Libris	Individual institutions	Content Creation & Disseminatio

							n
Access #1	x	x			x	x	
Access #2	x	x	x				
Access #3			x	x			x
Access #4				x		x	
Access #5 (combined under Discovery #5)	x		x			x	
Discovery #1	x		x		x		
Discovery #2	x		x				
Discovery #3			x			x	
Discovery #4			x			x	
Discovery #5	x		x			x	
Discovery #6	x				x		
Local Data #1				x			
Local Data #2	x		x		x		
Local Data #3				x		x	
Local Data #4 (combined under Discovery #5)	x		x			x	
Best Practices /Metadata #1				x			
Best Practices /Metadata #2 (combined under Access #3)			x	x			x
Best Practices /Metadata #3				x			

Other #1	x	x	x		x		

Next Steps

January-February 2017: Work with teams/WGs to determine sources of issues and feasibility of addressing issues in FY17. Incorporate activities into team initiatives for FY18
- Meet with teams/working groups to discuss timing of responses and how to work together going forward:
    - NRWG, Jan. 31, 9 a.m.
    - Systems, Jan. 24, 11 a.m.
    - TSWG, Jan. 24, 2 p.m.
    - D&D, Jan. 31, 2 p.m.
- February 28: Response to report findings from teams/working groups (what can they do in FY17 and what needs to be planned for in FY18?)

January-April 2017: Work with teams/WGs to implement best practices and/or near-term changes that are possible this FY

Category 1: Access

Summary

This category relates to how records in the SILS display the physical availability of unique collections at the institutional level and across institutions.

Description

There is no standard way of describing physical access to unique collections in the SILS. These inconsistencies are confusing to the user and result in misinformation regarding availability, use, restrictions, and methods for requesting access. In some instances, collections may appear to be under the stewardship of another institution. In others, unique collections may seem available for loan or fully digitized and available online.

Specific Issues

1. *"Availability" statements lack granularity for physical access restrictions*: "Green dot" availability indicator can give incorrect impression that the material is physically available in the same way as general library materials. Users must click into "Find in a Library" tab to see if material is actually loanable. Users must dig deeper to find specific hours and locations of materials.
   a. Specific examples: [Powerpoint presentation](#) slides 15, 27; [Issues Spreadsheet](#) numbers 1, 8, 62
   b. Problem Source: Unknown
   c. Alliance partners needed for resolution
      i. Systems Team communicate with Ex Libris? Availability is hard-coded in the system? Are there any alternatives to the currently small amount of availability statements?
      ii. Individual institutions: If materials that are non-loanable are displaying a "policy" of loanable, institutions should be able to change these locations to a "non-loanable" or "closed" policy; confirm with Systems and Discovery & Delivery teams that this is correct

2. *Unique collections "Available" in other institutions' Primo interfaces*: Users at non-holding institutions have the option to "Place a Summit request" for non-loanable materials
   a. Specific examples: [Powerpoint presentation](#) slides 27, 28
   b. Problem Source: A contributing factor seems to be that the holding institution's loanable/non-loanable policy does not seem to affect whether the Summit link appears or not

    c.   Alliance partners needed for resolution
        i.   Feedback from NRWG ([Issues Spreadsheet](#) numbers 70 and 71) indicates that there are limitations with Primo and Alma; explore further with NRWG and Systems to see what can be done within the systems and what might be possible with normalization rules based on locations

3.   *Treatment of links to finding aids impacts Primo display*: Individual institution's choices to use either 1) an Alma "portfolio" or 2) the 856 link in the PNX record to provide a link to an electronic finding aid impacts access information displayed in Primo. When institutions attach a portfolio to direct users to an electronic finding aid available on a website (such as Archives West), the availability statement changes from "Available at [LOCATION] [Call number]" to "Online access. The library also has physical copies." This statement is misleading, giving the impression that the entire collection is available online, not just the finding aid. Institutions can alternatively use the 856 link in the PNX record to display in the "Details" tab; this, however, has implications for unwanted 856 links for collections of electronic resources. Institutions may also add a 555 ("Other finding aid") field to display in the "Details" tab, however this data then becomes part of the jumble of data in the "Details" tab. Links to finding aids from library catalogs represent one-third of the referrals to the Archives West finding aid database. Finding aids are the primary descriptive record for many archival collections; the MARC record serves as a "condensed" version of the finding aid that directs users to fuller information in the the finding aid.

    a. Specific examples: [Powerpoint presentation](#) slides 20-23; [Issues Spreadsheet](#) numbers 13, 14, 45, 46, 47, 59, 61, 63, 66, 68
    b. Problem Sources:
        i.   Using a portfolio to show a finding aid link;
        ii.   Institutions could use the 856 in the "Details" tab, but this also has issues because right now all 856 will show for all records, which creates problems with electronic resource records such as Kanopy (see [Powerpoint presentation](#) slide 22)
        iii.   Lack of OCA best practice for treatment of finding aid links (portfolio, 856, 555, etc.)
    c. Related issue: [Best Practices/Metadata Issue #2](#)
    d. Alliance partners needed for resolution
        i.   Technical Services Working Group: Establish best practice across institutions for use of "portfolio" or 856 link and/or 555 in "Details" tab for finding aids
        ii.   Norm Rules Working Group: Continue current work to write a norm rule to filter out non-relevant 856 links?
        iii.   UCSILS will be investigating piping finding aid metadata from Archives West into Primo in spring 2017; piping metadata may or may not solve this issue; investigation into other options is necessary

4. *'Request through InterLibrary Loan' option displays in "Availability and Requestability"/"Get It" tab when a portfolio is attached to a record* (See issue #3 above for contributing issue)
    a. Specific examples: Powerpoint presentation slides 25 and 26
    b. Problem Source: Using a portfolio for a finding aid link makes the system "think" the collection is available electronically?
    c. Alliance partners needed for resolution
        i. Technical Services Working Group: establish best practice for use of "portfolio" or 856 link for finding aids
        ii. Individual institutions? Is there a way to not display the ILL link using Alma display logic?

5. *Access restrictions buried in "Details"*: Primary description of this issue, its sources, and ideas for resolution is found in Discovery Issue #5

Category 2: Discovery

Summary

This category relates to how records enable users to discover unique collections across the SILS.

Description

There are several issues related to how dates are displayed and how they can be faceted for unique collections. The absence of labels in the records can lead to user confusion about what unique elements actually apply to holdings at their institutions, as opposed to other institutions. Further, the citation potential in the SILS is limited when applied to unique collections.

Specific Issues

1. *Display issues for date ranges*: Date range expressions display correctly in Title Statements (245$f and g) but elsewhere Primo displays truncated "Creation Date" information.
   a. Specific examples: [Powerpoint presentation](#) slide 31; [Issues Spreadsheet](#) numbers 3, 57, 60
   b. Problem source: UCSILS group believes the truncated information is drawn from single YYYY (partial) date information in the fixed fields. Is there a way to draw upon start and end YYYY information when a date range is appropriate?
   c. Alliance partners needed for resolution
      i. NRWG and Systems?
      ii. May require Ex Libris enhancement requests?

2. *Lack of functionality with date-filters (facets) for date ranges*: Note: Although Primo advanced search does function with date ranges, there may be a larger issue here, if the advanced search returns results for materials that are not held by Alliance institutions (#s 64-65 on spreadsheet). This may be connected to the use of fixed fields to capture different types of date information (e.g. dates issued, as well as dates of creation).
   a. Specific examples: [Powerpoint presentation](#) slide 32; [Issues Spreadsheet](#) numbers 4, 80, 81
   b. Alliance partners needed for resolution
      i. NRWG and Systems?

3. *Advanced Search Format delimiters:* Advanced Search Format drop-down menu does not include terms specific to rare and unique materials.

a. Specific examples: [Powerpoint presentation](#) slide 33; [Issues Spreadsheet](#) number 10
   b. Potential solutions: See numbers 73 and 76 on [Issues Spreadsheet](#) for feedback from NRWG regarding potential approaches and challenges
   c. Alliance partners needed for resolution
      i. NRWG?
      ii. Individual institutions?

4. *1xx and 7xx display*: Absence of labels to clarify the differences between, nature and role of 1xx and 7xx entities.
   a. Specific examples: [Powerpoint presentation](#) slide 34; [Issues Spreadsheet](#) number 10
   b. Alliance partners needed for resolution
      i. NRWG?
      ii. Local institution Primo settings?

5. *5xx field display*: Absence of labels to allow users to identify and interpret information in 5xx fields. Critical information on access restrictions is buried in the "Details" tab. Important local data, such as the donor note, is being "buried" in the "Details" tab.
   a. Related issues: [Access Issue #5](#); [Local Data Issue #4](#)
   b. Specific examples: [Powerpoint presentation](#) slides 17, 18, 35; [Issues Spreadsheet](#) numbers 5, 19, 54, 74
   c. Problem Source: See description of problem sources for [Local Data Issues](#) for in-depth information
   d. Alliance partners needed for resolution
      i. Normalization Rules Working Group: Could the working group provide guidance to institutions for which groups of data in the "Details" tab can be labeled?
      ii. Individual institutions: Institutions can configure some display of fields in the "Details" tab, such as labels; however we don't know if particular MARC fields, such as 541, 561, and 59x, can be individually labelled
      iii. Systems: Is there a way to make access restrictions more apparent without having to click into the "Details" tab? See [Access Issue #1](#) for related functionality regarding "availability" statements.

6. *Citation Builder*: Defaults draw and present 700 contributor entries as if "Creators" (but omit 110 corporate and organizational names). Defaults for single YYYY "Creation Date" and format type of "print" often inappropriate for unique and special collections materials.
   a. Specific examples: [Powerpoint presentation](#) slide 36; [Issues Spreadsheet](#) number 25
   b. Alliance partners needed for resolution
      i. Systems?
      ii. Ex Libris?

Category 3: Local Data

Summary

This category relates to fields in the record containing information particular to a specific item or collection of items.

Description

The local data for each institution are lumped together in one record, and due to the lack of labels (see above), it is difficult to ascertain what information actually applies to a specific institutional copy. This not only has an impact on user understanding, but has larger implications such as institutional donor relations.

Specific Issues

1. *An individual institution's local information shows in all Alliance institutions Primo instances.*
   a. Specific examples: Issues Spreadsheet numbers 21, 26-34, 58, 74
   b. Problem source: See list below
   c. Alliance partners needed for resolution
      i. Technical Services Working Group and Technical Services community: revisit decision to display all local data?

2. *The local information is not easily identified as local and may not say which institution it applies to.*
   a. Specific examples: Issues Spreadsheet numbers 21, 26-34, 58, 74, 84, 87
   b. Problem source: See list below
   c. Alliance partners needed for resolution
      i. Systems Team and Ex Libris: Outstanding salesforce case # 00217673 documents that the Alliance is unable to use institution symbols to indicate which institution the local data applies to; addressing this issue with Ex Libris would help the Alliance understand what is recommended by the system developers
      ii. Norm Rules Working Group: Any possible way to use norm rules to help distinguish the local data?

3. *Institution specific local information has been added to the OCLC master record inappropriately.*
   a. Specific examples: Issues Spreadsheet number 23
   b. Problem source: See list below

     c. Alliance partners needed for resolution
        i. Individual institutions need to clean up their data
        ii. Technical Services Working Group? Could we get some assistance from Kyle Banerjee to help identify the problem records?

4. *Important local information, such as the donor note, is being "buried" in the record making it hard to find*: Primary description of this issue, its sources, and ideas for resolution is found in [Discovery Issue #5](#)

Potential Sources of Problems

The sources to all these problems seem to be a combination of factors, including, but probably not limited to:

- In Primo, all Alliance institution's local notes display to all Alliance institutions.
    - This was on the recommendation of the Local Fields Review Group, who were given the local notes display options "Display to all", "Display to none", or "Display only to institution" by the NRWG.
- The Alliance Local Fields Best Practices, https://www.orbiscascade.org/local-fields, do not seem to be being followed consistently by, at least, some institutions.
    - This may be because of lack of awareness of these Best Practices, confusion in what these Best Practices are, and/or a lack of training and/or resources at Alliance institutions to put the Best Practices into production.
- When Alliance institutions migrated to Alma, some local notes were not correctly transferred into Alma local fields.
    - Alliance institutions may not have the training and/or resources to clean these up.
- Local subject headings, even with the correct identifying subfields, may not display those subfields which say which institution created the subject heading and who it applies to.
    - This causes the local subject headings to look exactly like normal subject headings in Primo.
    - There is no way to see all institutions' local subject headings and/or local notes for a specific bibliographic record; instead, anyone investigating local heading/note issues must request bibliographic records from each institution with holdings on the record.
    - This may be related to Sales Force Case # 00217673.

Category 4: Best Practices/Metadata

Summary

This category focuses on areas where Alliance-wide best practices could provide greater metadata consistency.

Description

There are several areas where Alliance-wide best practices could alleviate display issues for records representing unique collections in the SILS. These include greater consistency in how data from EAD finding aids is used, developing an Alliance-wide practice for entering finding aid links, and the impact of legacy metadata. Alliance institutions are generally in favor of developing best practices (see Issues Spreadsheet numbers 77 and 78) and the UC SILS working groups sees this as an area where the Alliance could make strides in streamlining workflows across institutions.

Specific Issues

1. *Opportunities for further and closer alignment of MARC with EAD Finding Aids*: There is potential for devising Alliance-wide best practices for EAD finding aid data in MARC records; for example, entering the 099 call number in the Alma holdings record
   a. Specific examples: Issues Spreadsheet numbers 6 and 69
   b. Problem source: Lack of Alliance-wide best practice for this type of data
   c. Alliance partners needed for resolution
      i. Technical Services Working Group? Could establish best practice for how and where to enter collection identifiers (holdings records).
      ii. See the Archives West Best Practices for Encoded Archival Description for an example of existing guidelines

2. *Alliance-wide consistency for finding aid links*: Primary description of this issue, its sources, and ideas for resolution is found in Access Issue #3

3. *Legacy metadata*: Use of "Records" or "Papers" in 245 with added 246 with full collection name, ie "John Smith Papers" which was compliant with APPM, but is not compliant with DACS; records coded as "books" instead of "mixed materials"
   a. Specific examples: Issues Spreadsheet number 20 and 86
   b. Problem source: Lack of institutional resources to retroactively clean up metadata
   c. Alliance partners needed for resolution

i. Individual institutions. Is there any possibility of getting some assistance from Tech Services Working Group, particularly Kyle Banerjee, to help identify these records?

Category 5: Other

Summary

This category refers to issues that fall outside the scope of the previous four categories.

Description

The issue described here falls outside the scope of the other categories, but is an issue that should be addressed as it is a roadblock to maximizing use of the shared ILS for unique collections.

Specific Issues

1. *Collections feature in Alma does not work*: this new feature has the potential for creating browsable "collections" in Alma and Primo
   a. Specific examples: Issues Spreadsheet number 11
   b. Source of problem: Primo Front End?
   c. Alliance partners needed for resolution
      i. Systems? Discovery? NRWG? Ideally would like to see some documentation so that individual institutions don't have to spend a lot of time trying to get this feature to function; Ex Libris documentation is poor.