

Report on Streamlining the Management of Physical Materials – Part 1

Submitted to: Associate Directors for Public Services and Collection Services

December 18, 2006

Submitted By:

Jennifer Banks, Collection Management Services

Charlene Follett, Acquisitions and Licensing Services

Millicent Gaskell, Dewey Library, Chair

Marlene Manoff, Humanities Library

Kim Maxwell, Acquisitions and Licensing Services

Maria Rodrigues, Engineering and Science Libraries

Table of Contents

1. Introduction
2. Reducing the Volume of Incoming Print Journals and Serials
3. Handling of New Print Receipts
4. Barcode Placement
5. Check-in of Monographs in Local Units
6. Check-in and Claiming of Print Journals and Serials
7. Binding Standard Print Formats
8. Missing Issue Backordering and Binding
9. Record Maintenance Authority of Local Processing
10. Summary of Recommendations

Appendices

1. Print Equivalent Journals Cancellation Review Timeline
2. Guidelines for Maintaining Titles in Electronic and Print Formats
3. Short Guide for Processing New Material
4. Barcoding Guidelines for Book Formats
5. Process for Streamlining Journal and Serial Check-in
6. Process for Reducing and Streamlining Journal and Serial Claiming
7. Guidelines for Binding Standard Print Formats
8. Procedures for Backordering and Binding Incomplete
9. Expanded Local Record Maintenance Authority Guidelines
10. Inventory of Stamps...Used by Divisional Libraries and Branches *(this is an Excel spreadsheet and is included as separate attachment)*

1. Introduction

R2 Consulting, an outside consulting firm, was hired in the spring of 2006 by the MIT Libraries to analyze our workflows for handling print materials and to make recommendations on how we could reduce staff effort in these areas. In June, R2 Consulting issued their report, *Print Workflows: MIT Libraries Observations and Recommendations*, which provided recommendations on how to change print workflows and identified other work practices that would benefit from more analysis. Their recommendations were based on their interviews at MIT as well as their knowledge of profession-wide best practices.

In August 2006, six library staff members from different units in Public and Collections Services were asked to form the R2 Implementation Team (the Team). The Team was charged to significantly reduce both the staff effort spent managing print collections across the MIT Libraries, and the time it takes to get material to the shelf. Specific tasks were assigned with deadlines of December 2006 and March 2007. This report covers the items in the charge due in December, specifically:

- Reduce the incoming volume of print journals and serials
 - Implement e-only for the titles received in dual format when a trusted digital archive, e.g. Portico, exists
 - Develop an aggressive yet realistic timeline for implementation
 - Define criteria for maintaining dual format
- Reduce and make more efficient the maintenance steps for all printed materials
 - Define criteria for titles that will not be bound, both serials and monographs
 - Stop check-in and routine claiming of all serial titles that meet the criteria defined above
 - Reduce efforts to locate missing journal issues – bind incomplete
 - Develop binding policies for titles with electronic equivalents to reduce staff effort
 - Expand local record maintenance authority and holdings maintenance in processing
 - Review and eliminate non-critical labels, stamps, marks
 - Adopt barcode placement on front cover, top left corner
 - Determine if check-in of YBP monographs in local units can be eliminated

2. Reducing the Volume of Print Journals and Serials

The MIT Libraries subscribed to almost 8700 print serials and journals at the end of FY06. This number has decreased by almost 1200 subscriptions since the end of FY03, largely due to the efforts of the Engineering and Science Libraries (ESL) to cancel print equivalents of electronic resources. While electronic equivalents are not available for a large portion of our subscriptions, there are many opportunities to reduce the total further. In FY07, the MIT Libraries made notable progress towards this goal by cancelling over 400 print Elsevier journal titles.

Serial and Journal Titles Committed for All Physical Formats

Library	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007 (as of 061212)	# decreased 2003-2007	% chg 2003-2007
Barker	1,748	1,681	1,740	1,358	1,226	522	-29.86%
Dewey	3,326	3,296	3,164	3,099	2,966	360	-10.82%
Hum	1,174	1,143	1,130	1,167	1,140	34	-2.90%
Rotch	1,090	1,085	1,045	975	954	136	-12.48%
Science	1,758	1,623	1,454	1,375	1,200	558	-31.74%
Aero	188	182	178	172	162	26	-13.83%
Lindgren	308	290	272	268	245	63	-20.45%
Music	293	284	280	282	278	15	-5.12%
All Libraries	9885	9584	9,263	8,696	8,171	1,714	-17.34%

The Team was charged to create a timeline for cancellation of print equivalent journal subscriptions and to develop guidelines for maintaining subscriptions in dual formats, both parts of an overarching goal to implement e-only for the titles when a trusted digital archive (TDR), e.g., Portico, exists.

Process

Jennifer and Marlene met with Ellen Duranceau to examine the Portico and JSTOR licenses in detail and learn about the “business risk” of using these services as TDRs. Kim developed publisher profile templates to show key information that the Collection Management Group (CMG) will need to make decisions on Portico publishers. CMG developed a set of guidelines for maintaining electronic and print subscriptions. The draft was sent to subject selectors for comment and then revised. The FY07 “an aggressive yet realistic” timeline for the review of about 500 titles for e-only implementation was developed by CMG with comment from subject specialists, processing supervisors, and Serials Acquisitions (SerAcq).

Findings

Portico is a subscription that we must pay annually to maintain access to this repository; we have no “persistent” rights to the Portico content if we cancel. New publishers are joining the Portico project, increasing our opportunities to move to e-only. Staff expressed some concerns about the viability of Portico since it is not yet fully functional or proven as a TDR.

JSTOR involves two payments for each collection: 1) persistent rights to the content; and 2) an annual access fee. If we stop subscribing, we retain rights to the content, but we would have to load the content locally and provide our own interface. The “moving wall” precludes access to the most recent five or six years for most of the JSTOR titles. Since titles come from a variety of publishers with whom we have a variety of current subscriptions and licenses, it will be somewhat more complicated to make print cancellation decisions.

For the print equivalents journal cancellation timeline for the spring, CMG looked for publishers that would provide subscription savings as well as a range of subjects so that all libraries could participate in FY07 decisions. CMG also made recommendations on where to distribute recovered savings from cancellations.

The document with guidelines for maintaining both electronic and print subscriptions was generally well received and feedback was used to direct edits with one notable exception. A few staff members recommended that we maintain dual format subscriptions when we are leaders in a field where the primary journal(s) are produced by a scholarly society. These staff members believe our print subscription could serve as an archive for those society journals. The Team did not have time to pursue this idea to determine how many titles would be involved, to gauge commitment from the MIT Libraries’ leadership, or to investigate how other universities or the scholarly societies feel about this responsibility.

With the increasing importance of electronic subscriptions, staff will need to become proactive in verifying that e-only content is actually available for use rather than simply relying on problem reports from users. DigProb and ILB should be prepared for more inquiries as we move toward greater reliance on e-only.

Recommendations

- Inform the MIT Community via an email from a member of Steering Committee about our plans to move to e-only subscriptions when titles reside in a TDR
- Review about 500 print subscriptions from Wiley, Taylor & Francis, Sage and Oxford. Consult with faculty during the spring semester. Complete the cancellation decisions by summer 2007 for implementation in fall 2007.
- Adopt the Guidelines for Maintaining Electronic and Print Subscriptions and use them to make dual format cancellation and subscription decisions
- When a cancellation project with a particular publisher yields savings of \$10,000 or more, the savings should be moved to M-TEC-BKFL for backfile purchases. Savings below \$10,000 should be recovered in the ZNEW funds of the appropriate libraries.

Next Steps

- Implement the Journal Cancellation Review Timeline – winter 2007
- Develop a communication plan to explain to users that more journals are available only in electronic format. Communication should begin early in 2007 as the final Elsevier issues arrive – winter 2007

3. Handling of New Print Receipts

The MIT Libraries acquire thousands of volumes a year through subscriptions, individual purchases, federal depository program, and gifts from the community. These items are handled by staff in different units as they make their way to the shelves. Staff uses a variety of methods to communicate with each other and patrons about how to handle these items. The Team was charged to review these methods and eliminate all non-critical labels, stamps, and marks. The Team expanded the charge to include paper flags and date due slips.

Process

Charlene compiled a system-wide inventory of labels, stamps, marks, flags, and date due slips for newly acquired material. She began with processes in Acquisitions and Licensing Services (ALS) and included all departments that handle new material: Cataloging and Metadata Services (CAMS), Preservation Services, local processing and circulation units and the Library Storage Annex (LSA). The inventory, divided by unit, included a description of each item. It was distributed to contributors and each was asked to indicate if an item was critical or not.

Charlene then met with the staffs of ALS, CAMS, Preservation Services, Christie Moore from the Music Library and the Access Support Group (ASG) to gather their input. CMG was consulted on our book plating practices.

The inventory was also shared with DLG/TSAC who recommended that the list be restructured so that like processes could be reviewed for potential standardization across the system. A reorganized abbreviated inventory for local public service units and a short guide to streamlined processing in central technical services are the result of this recommendation and can be found in the appendix.

Findings

During the inventorying process, the Team discovered there are a large number of stamps, labels, etc. being used across the system. Due to the tight deadline for this project, recommendations were not made on all items. The Team compiled the total number of monographs and serials that were handled in central units in FY 2006 to determine where to focus their attention:

Unit	Monographs	Serials	Total
Monograph Acquisitions	18,715	155	18,870
Serials Acquisitions	3,628	2,895	6,523
Government Documents	267	1,009	1,276
Gifts	2,973	357	3,300

These numbers convinced the Team to concentrate on stamps, labels, etc. that are affixed centrally and that will thus provide the greatest impact on books and serials. Processes that are

recommended for elimination will not have a critical impact on units further along in the workflow.

The “Inventory of stamps...used by Divisional Libraries and Branches” clearly indicates that the use of stamps, labels, etc. is not consistent across the Libraries. Local units will need to review these with the goal of eliminating non-critical items and standardizing markings across the system, not only to free staff time, but also to reduce patron confusion.

Based on findings, some streamlined processes have already been implemented:

- The ATTN slip was revised, eliminating non-essential information on the slip
- The Arrival slip for RUSH books received in Monograph Acquisitions was revised, with the aid of Christine Moulen, so that the rush status is clearly indicated and the separate rush flag was eliminated
- Monograph Acquisitions and Gifts are now affixing bookplates upon receipt, eliminating the need for printing arrival slips with bookplate notes and then clipping the plates to the slip for Preservation Services to affix

Recommendations

- Adopt changes as suggested in the Short Guide for Processing New Materials including:
 - Eliminate date due slips/stamps and replace with email notification
 - Eliminate use of round property stamp
- Follow-up on other high impact items needing further review
 - Possible elimination of the “new book” flag
 - Possible elimination of the penciled in call numbers
- Charge a group with reviewing the Inventory of Stamps...Used by Divisional Libraries and Branches for the purpose of streamlining and standardizing processes in all Public Service departments
- As changes are implemented, staff, patrons and donors need to be notified, as appropriate, about the replacement of the date due slip with email notification and the cessation of the use of generic “Gift to the MIT Libraries” bookplates

Next Steps

- Implement changes in Short Guide for Processing New Materials – winter /spring 2007
- BAG should follow up on and implement Mat Willmott’s preliminary findings regarding patron notification of receipt slips via email. This should be followed immediately by elimination of date due slips in books – winter/spring 2007.
- Complete all recommended follow-up on high impact items – winter/spring 2007
 - Attempt to eliminate “new book” slip (Charlene and Processing Supervisors)
 - Attempt to eliminate penciled-in call #'s (Preservation Services)
 - Attempt to eliminate printout of bib. slips for SERMS (Kim and Rebecca)
- Revise all outdated forms by appropriate staff in SerAcq, CAMS, GovDocs and LSA, as noted on the master inventory – winter/spring 2007

- Preservation Services should complete an investigation and make recommendations for types of labels, tape, dots, reserve flags to be used system-wide and provide documentation and training to staff – spring 2007
- PSLG should review the “Inventory of Stamps...Used by Divisional Libraries and Branches” and develop a strategy for streamlining and standardizing their use in local units – winter/spring 2007

4. Barcode Placement

Currently we use three different types of barcodes: single, piggyback and duplicate. We also use two styles of barcodes: plain barcodes for monographs and red-lined barcodes for serials (when serials are received through Monograph Acquisitions a red line is drawn by Serials Cataloging on a plain barcode). Barcodes are currently placed on the inside of the back cover of monographs, serials, and bound journals. The location varies slightly depending on binding, type of material or ultimate shelving location. This placement requires circulation staff (and patrons using self-checkout machines) to open the cover to locate the barcode for scanning. When titles are sent to storage, local processing staff must use duplicate barcodes to cover the existing one and add one to the outside front cover as required by the Harvard Depository (HD) storage facility.

The Team was charged to investigate and adopt barcode placement on the front cover, top left corner for all book formats. Special formats were not considered in this investigation. This new location would assist patrons with self-checkout, would be faster and more ergonomic for staff, and would eliminate the need to move or replace barcodes during storage projects.

Process

Initial comments and concerns were solicited via email. Charlene met with the staff of ALS, CAMS, Preservation Services, Christie Moore from the Music Library, and ASG to gather further input. The different kinds of barcodes and the various issues surrounding barcode placement were discussed. Guidelines were drafted, reviewed and accepted by the groups involved.

Findings

The adhesiveness of the current generation of barcodes is strong enough to withstand front cover placement. Compelling reasons emerged for retaining each of the different types and styles of barcodes we currently use. Duplicate barcodes are not required by Harvard Depository and we will stop using them for this purpose; however, special circumstances do exist where duplicate barcodes will continue to be used. An alternative for placement, the back cover, was considered and rejected.

Recommendations

- All units should begin using the proposed Barcoding Guidelines for Book Formats including:
 - Placing barcodes on the front cover, upper left corner
 - Placing call number labels (that had previously been affixed to the upper left corner, front cover) on the front cover, lower left corner
 - Piggyback barcodes for paperbacks will be moved to the recommended standard location once the book reaches the local unit
- Investigate costs and feasibility of barcode duplicators
- Review different types and styles of barcodes and uses

Next Steps

- Implement new barcode guidelines system-wide – winter/spring 2007
- ASG should discuss the variety of barcodes and their uses to determine if we can eliminate any categories. They should also create a document inventorying of the types of barcodes, when to use them and where to order them – spring 2007
- Preservation Services should investigate costs and feasibility of barcode duplicators and report findings to DLG/TSAC, spring 2007
- ASG should review the implementation of the guidelines and recommend changes if needed – fall 2008

5. Check-in of Monographs in Local Units

The Team was charged to conduct a review of the check-in process for new monographs in local units. The focus was on whether there was any duplication of functions between the central and local units, whether there was any work done by the local units that could be eliminated and whether any of the work could be automated. The Team was directed to review YBP monographs, but since these are difficult to distinguish in the current workflow, the Team decided to look instead at the broader monograph picture.

Process

Marlene met with monograph assistants and processing supervisors from the Divisional Libraries as well as processing staff from the Branches. They sought to identify any functions that duplicated work done in centralized technical services. The groups discussed the implications of eliminating local updating of monograph receipt status. They identified categories of monograph work that must continue to be done in the local units, including:

- Handling patron requests
- Processing reference material
- Processing reserve material

The possibility of automating the change of Aleph status “received/not yet available” to “in library” was investigated. This would be accomplished by having a script written that would run against the OCLC loader that uploads our new catalog records every weeknight. It would start a time clock on every record for a newly cataloged monograph to change its status to “in library” in a certain number of days. Marlene spoke to Christine Moulen and others about the feasibility of implementing this change. She also met with staff from cataloging and acquisitions to determine the impact on centralized technical services of implementing an automated status change in Aleph.

Findings

There is no appreciable duplication of work between the central and local units and current processes were not considered time-consuming. Staff had many concerns about creating an automated process that changed the status of monographs from “received/not yet available” to “in library”:

- Some patrons would see an inaccurate availability status in Barton
- Local book searches would increase due to unreliability of availability status
- Errors in labeling, binding, cataloging, etc. would not be caught
- Some patron requests would slip through the cracks
- Changes would, at least initially, create additional work for other units without any significant time savings in local units
- Automating the change of status would require us to also set up a system to run lists of new monographs sent to Acme Bookbinding against Aleph to delay an automatic change of status of materials at the bindery to “in library.” This would be necessary because otherwise Aleph would indicate that new books at Acme were “in library” long before they actually were.

Centralizing and automating the change of status of new monographs does not seem advisable because of the difficulty of creating a fully automated system that would not compromise our ability to identify the location of large numbers of new books. A simple automation of the process could not account for the wide variations in the amount of time it takes for books to be shipped to the various units from Building 14. Additionally, books sent to Acme to be bound would require establishing a whole new routine in order to prevent them from appearing to be “in library.” Since new books are in high demand, we advise against allowing them to enter into a kind of limbo that would result from a simple automated change of receipt status. As the current change of status of new books in local units takes only a few moments and is susceptible to further simplification, there is no net gain in substituting a centralized automated process.

Recommendations

- Continue monographic check-in in local units
- If we do decide to receive shelf-ready books from YBP, we will need to look again at our monograph workflow

6. Check-in and Claiming of Journals and Serials

The Team was directed to stop check-in and routine claiming of all serial titles that will not be bound. We broadened the scope of the charge to explicitly include journals. In addition, we decided to look at check-in and claiming of all serials and journals rather than just those that won't be bound.

Process

Kim conducted a literature search on the topics of check-in and claiming to determine how other libraries accomplish these tasks. She also met with all staff in both local processing and SerAcq who perform check-in and/or claiming to discuss the following questions:

- Why do we do check-in at all? What purposes does check-in serve?
- How can we streamline our current check-in procedures and make the process go more quickly?
- Why do we claim things? Is there a difference between claiming a single missed issue and claiming an entire subscription that seems to have gone awry? (Short answer: yes!)
- How can we streamline our current claiming procedures?
- When could we not check-in and/or claim? Are there categories of materials that do not benefit from either check-in or claiming or both?

Kim took the answers to these questions, along with the information from the literature search, and wrote the attached recommendations to changes in our current procedures.

Findings

The literature search indicated that most libraries still perform both check-in and claiming for the majority of their collection. Rick Anderson at the University of Nevada, Reno is a strong advocate for stopping both functions, and has done so with great success at his library. After considering the implementation at the University of Nevada it looked as if it would not scale well in our distributed library system.

Staff did not find enough value in discontinuing check-in to warrant further elimination beyond our current practice of not checking-in certain daily newspapers. Staff did recognize some

justification in stopping claiming under certain circumstances, as well as streamlining the claiming process in general. Check-in allows us to know exactly which pieces we have received, and claiming gives us a mechanism to obtain those pieces we have not received. Both functions are seen as essential to performing excellent customer service.

If we were to stop check-in and/or claiming for the subset of titles not to be bound, it would include approximately 339 (or 7%) of our 4,538 print journal subscriptions and 373 (or 11%) of our 3,448 print serial standing orders (see section below on Binding Standards for Print Formats for more details). There were concerns about having separate check-in and claiming procedures for this small portion of our titles. While we could potentially train staff to understand how to tell which titles will receive check-in and claiming and which won't, it would be impossible to impart this information cohesively to our users. This would result in a confusing service environment. Instead, the Team opted to focus on reducing these activities, rather than eliminating them. The Team felt this was in keeping with our charge to "reduce and make more efficient the maintenance steps for all printed materials."

We will be saving a great deal of time on check-in and claiming as a result of the print subscriptions and standing orders we cancel. For 2007, we cancelled 400+ Elsevier print journals, representing thousands of issues that will not need to be checked-in or claimed. CMG is looking to review another 500 titles for 2008, which will further reduce the number of issues for claiming and check-in.

Recommendations

- Streamline check-in as detailed in Process for Streamlining Journal and Serial Check-in
- Reduce and streamline claiming as detailed in Process for Reducing and Streamlining Journal and Serial Claiming, including:
 - Do not claim individual issues of titles that are not bound
 - Do not claim a title once the decision to cancel is made

Next Steps

- Implement the new procedures and update existing documentation for check-in and claiming – winter 2007

- Kim Maxwell and Lisa Harrington should meet with all staff who perform check-in and/or claiming to discuss the changes to our procedures and implement them – winter 2007

7. Binding Standard Print Formats

The Team was charged to create guidelines governing when journals, serials and monographs should or should not be bound. The Team was also charged to determine binding policies for print titles with electronic equivalents that are included in a TDR. The intent was to reduce staff effort spent on binding.

Process

The Team drafted binding guidelines and met with ASG, CMG, LSA and Preservation staff to discuss the document and receive comments. Based on the comments, the document was edited and the revised draft distributed to these same groups via email. This draft was also shared with DLG-TSAC. The final version was created after making minor changes to the revised draft.

Findings

Many of the staff involved felt strongly that the titles we choose to maintain in print must be bound in order to preserve them. The damaged state of many older unbound materials at LSA was cited as proof that binding is needed. There was not enough time to explore alternative enclosures to commercial binding; however, this possibility is worth exploring in the future.

CMG determined that there is commitment among selectors to cancel print when titles are available electronically and included in a TDR. This will reduce the number of volumes to be bound substantially over the next several years and with it the staff effort spent on binding. With the completed cancellation of 400+ Elsevier titles this year and the upcoming review of just over 500 titles from Wiley, Sage, Oxford University Press, and Taylor & Francis for 2008, the MIT Libraries should reduce the number of journal volumes bound in FY2008 by about 1000. With journal binding costing approximately \$10.70 per volume this represents a potential savings of \$10,700.

There was also support from staff to not bind print titles with limited retention periods or those received in duplicate physical formats. Also, only one copy of a title with multiple print subscriptions should be bound. The chart below details the counts for titles that fall into these categories:

Journals

	Journal is retained for a limited time period*	Journal is also received in microform**	We receive more than one copy of the journal	Total***
Aero/Astro	7	0	2	9
Archives	0	1	2	3
CAMS	0	0	1	1
Dev. Office	0	0	1	1
Dewey	89	17	20	126
Engineering	19	0	7	26
Humanities	81	30	17	128
Lindgren	0	0	2	2
LSA	0	0	0	0
Music	2	0	0	2

Report on Streamlining the Management of Physical Materials – Part 1

Rotch	14	1	17	32
Rotch Visual	0	0	0	0
Science	3	0	6	9
Total	215	49	75 subs / 35 titles	339 / 299

Serials

	Serial is retained for a limited time period*	Serial is cataloged directly for storage	We receive more than one copy of the serial	Total***
Aero/Astro	8	0	3	11
Archives	0	0	0	0
CAMS	0	0	1	1
Dev. Office	0	0	0	0
Dewey	101	0	13	114
Engineering	26	0	11	37
Humanities	82	0	13	95
Lindgren	3	0	2	5
LSA	2	24	0	26
Music	6	0	0	6
Rotch	37	0	19	56
Rotch Visual	0	0	0	0
Science	18	0	4	22
Total	283	24	66 stos / 27 titles	373 / 334

*Numbers for journals and serials retained for a limited time period are estimates.

** Journals titles received in microform duplicate some titles counted in the limited retention figures. Due to time constraints the titles were not de-duplicated and counts adjusted.

***Note that a portion of the titles in the total count are currently not bound. The number of titles not bound is expected to decrease by a lesser number.

A question was raised about the financial benefits of acquiring monographs in paperback instead of hardback. YBP provided data on monographs that were published simultaneously in both paper and cloth bindings. Of the titles purchased by the MIT Libraries in the first 5 months of FY07, the average YBP discounted price of the paperback was \$32.81 vs. \$71.21 for hardback, though specific savings will vary by discipline. Research published in the *Journal of Economic Education* in fall 2003 stated the average cost of an economics hardback was \$78.53 and a paperback was \$25.85, representing an even greater price differential of over \$50. With

the cost of monograph binding averaging \$8.90 and due to the fact that we do not need to bind all paperback monographs, it is more economical to continue to buy paperbacks and bind selectively.

With the commitment from the Libraries to greatly decrease print journal subscriptions when there is an electronic equivalent and a TDR, the amount spent on journal binding is expected to decrease significantly. The recommendations of the e-theses investigation may decrease thesis binding expenditures as well.

These changes provide a great opportunity to redirect resources to better preserve the collection by binding more new monographs as well as repairing older items in active use. Many items in the divisional and branch libraries as well as in the Library Storage Annex are in need of rebinding. Repairing these items in-house and/or sending them to a commercial bindery will not only preserve more of the collection for future scholars, but also the improved appearance of the collection will better reflect its value and the care given by staff to its maintenance.

Recommendations

- Adopt the Guidelines for Binding Standard Print Formats which apply to all titles regardless of their electronic availability. Reasons for titles not to be bound include:
 - Limited print retention
 - Also received in microform
 - Received in more than one library – only library of record should bind

- Reinvest binding savings from print cancellations to bind more new print monographs and repair older items in active use

Next Steps

- Local processing should determine where to store binding decision at the title level (database and field) – winter 2007

- Using the lists of duplicate print journal and serial subscriptions from Kim Maxwell, CMG should determine the library of record for binding responsibility and determine limited retention policy for others – winter 2007

- Local processing should record binding decisions for all titles (using CMG decisions as well as a list of print journal and print serial subscriptions that are also received in microform from Kim Maxwell) in the appropriate database – spring 2007
- Charge a group to investigate alternatives to commercial binding and to create guidelines for when to use various types of preservation techniques – FY2008

8. Missing Issue Backordering and Binding

The current process of backordering missing journal issues can be very lengthy. Depending on practices in local units, volumes either are held in the processing office or remain on the shelves while staff waits for backorders to be filled. During the weeks or months it takes to fill a backorder, the remaining issues are either not immediately available to patrons or they remain on the shelves increasing the risk of additional issues to be lost.

The Team was charged to look at reducing efforts to locate missing journal issues and to bind incomplete.

Process

Maria met with Elke Piontek-Ma, Jonah Jenkins, and Lisa Harrington who reviewed current procedures. A draft procedure was created and shared with the processing supervisors, Lisa Harrington, and all subject specialists. The draft was revised to reflect the comments received.

Findings

Due to the increasing availability of electronic journals and taking into account the decreasing reliance on print, the Team used the dual format policies as a model for when to backorder and bind incomplete. In this new environment, we should not be backordering titles for which we have electronic subscriptions (unless they are only available through aggregators). These titles should be bound incomplete.

Local units perceived a long time lag between when items are backordered and when the orders are filled. A review of backordering statistics showed that in fact more than 80% of our backorder requests are filled within 60 days. However, a small percentage of journal backorders take longer than expected. There are numerous reasons why this can occur: ordering from foreign countries, growing demands on the dwindling number of backorder dealers, limited stock, or difficulty locating publishers. Charlene and her team are reviewing their process as well as reviewing some of the predetermined settings that trigger next steps in pending orders in order to make improvements.

Some local units do extensive upfront research to locate a source for a missing issue in order to expedite the process. These sources often do not fit with the current centralized backordering process. The confusion among the staff about the backordering procedures causes some inefficiency. Staff from Monograph Acquisitions and local units should meet to discuss how to streamline the workflow in conjunction with current backordering practices.

Recommendations

- Adopt the Procedures for Backordering and Binding Incomplete, including:
 - Do not backorder issues of journal titles that are available electronically to MIT (excluding aggregators); bind them incomplete instead
 - Do not backorder issues of journal titles that are not bound
- Monograph Acquisitions and the local units should discuss the status of long outstanding backorders
- In most cases, bind incomplete volumes three months after backorder has been placed. Rebind volume if backorder is eventually successful

Next Steps

- Monograph Acquisitions should continue its review of the backorder process and meet with the local units to see if the process can be further improved. These groups should also meet to discuss communication methods, specifically in relation to older pending backorders – spring 2007

- All local processing and SerAcq staff should be in communication about the plan so that every individual who does backordering or binding is aware of and understands the new procedure and the new limits – spring 2007
- These new procedures should be incorporated into existing documentation. A partial list of pages that will need to be updated includes:

<http://macfadden.mit.edu:9500/colserv/monoacq/policies/jrbckissueor.html>

<http://macfadden.mit.edu:9500/proc/procdoc/16/16bindinginleph.html>

<http://libraries.mit.edu/preservation/acmedoc.html>

9. Record Maintenance Authority of Local Processing

It has been many years since the MIT Libraries began using Aleph to manage our bibliographic records. Over time and software upgrades, some record maintenance procedures that were once necessary are now cumbersome. For example, when withdrawing the 5th copy of a book, local processing must copy and paste the barcode number on a list which they send to 14E-210 for central staff to delete.

The Team was charged to look at ways in which local processing might play an expanded role in maintaining holdings information in Aleph. The intent was to reduce the flow of repetitive updates between cataloging and the local units and reduce the time it takes to make these updates.

Process

A procedure was drafted outlining three potential tasks for local processing to assume. This document was shared with Serials Cataloging, Monograph Cataloging, Processing Supervisors, and the LSA Supervisor via email and/or meetings. The document was edited and revised based on comments received.

Findings

For every change made to monograph barcodes and to journals and serials holdings statements, local processing staff currently has to make printouts of existing records, note the changes, and send them to 14E-210 to be fixed in Aleph and then wait for the changes to appear.

There was agreement among staff to change procedures to allow local processing to delete duplicate monograph/theses barcodes, delete holdings records in specific situations, and update summary holding statements for serial records.

These changes will make significant improvements in existing procedures. For example, using one of the proposed processes means that local processing staff can delete the monograph barcodes as they withdraw a book, reducing unnecessary effort. This ability will greatly speed

the work in storage projects because changes can be made as they are encountered and not days to weeks later. Last year there were 4864 monograph or thesis barcodes deleted which would now fall under the proposed procedure. The other proposed processes will also allow local units to quickly respond to selectors' requests for holdings changes which are needed to allow users greater self-sufficiency.

Recommendations

- Adopt Expanded Local Records Maintenance Authority Guidelines

Next Steps

- Consult with Rebecca Lubas and Beth Brennan to determine earliest possible date for implementation – winter 2007
- Communicate with all local processing staff and all central technical staff who will be affected by them – winter 2007
- Update current procedures to reflect this new policy. If procedures are missing, new ones must be written and added to the staff web so staff can easily refer to them. A partial list of pages that will need to be updated includes:
 - <http://macfadden.mit.edu:9500/proc/procdoc/16/16edithols.html>
 - <http://macfadden.mit.edu:9500/proc/procdoc/16/16deletehols.html>
 - <http://macfadden.mit.edu:9500/proc/procdoc/16/16deletebarcodes.html>
 - http://macfadden.mit.edu/colserv/seracq/hol_create.html
 - http://macfadden.mit.edu/colserv/seracq/hol_delete.html
 - http://macfadden.mit.edu/colserv/seracq/hol_edit.html
 - <http://macfadden.mit.edu/colserv/seracq/NISOcheatsheet.doc>
- Serials Cataloging must set up a training plan for updating local processing skills in creating NISO compliant holding statements – spring 2007

- Rebecca Lubas and Beth Brennan should evaluate the revised responsibilities to determine if additional changes are needed. If so, Rebecca and Beth will communicate with staff and determine if a longer review period is needed – spring 2007

10. Summary of Recommendations

Reducing the Volume of Incoming Print Journals and Serials

- Inform the MIT Community via an email from a member of Steering Committee about our plans to move to e-only subscriptions when titles reside in a TDR
- Review about 500 print subscriptions from Wiley, Taylor & Francis, Sage and Oxford. Consult with faculty during the spring semester. Complete the cancellation decisions by summer 2007 for implementation in fall 2007.
- Adopt the Guidelines for Maintaining Electronic and Print Subscriptions and use them to make dual format cancellation and subscription decisions
- When a cancellation project with a particular publisher yields savings of \$10,000 or more, the savings should be moved to M-TEC-BKFL for backfile purchases. Savings below \$10,000 should be recovered in the ZNEW funds of the appropriate libraries.

Handling of New Print Receipts

- Adopt changes as suggested in the Short Guide for Processing New Materials including:
 - Eliminate date due stamps and replace with email notification
 - Eliminate use of round property stamp
- Follow-up on other high impact items needing further review
 - Possible elimination of the “new book” flag
 - Possible elimination of the penciled in call numbers
- Charge a group with reviewing the Inventory of Stamps...Used by Divisional Libraries and Branches for the purpose of streamlining and standardizing processes in all Public Service departments

- As changes are implemented, staff, patrons and donors need to be notified, as appropriate, about the replacement of the date due slip with email notification and the cessation of the use of generic “Gift to the MIT Libraries” bookplates

Barcode Placement

- All units should begin using the proposed Barcoding Guidelines for Book Formats including:
 - Placing barcodes on the front cover, upper left corner
 - Placing call number labels (that had previously been affixed to the upper left corner, front cover) on the front cover, lower left corner
 - Piggyback barcodes for paperbacks will be moved to the recommended standard location once the book reached the local unit
- Investigate costs and feasibility of barcode duplicators
- Review different types and styles of barcodes and uses

Check-in of Monographs

- Continue monographic check-in in local units
- If we do decide to receive shelf-ready books from YBP, we will need to look again at our monograph workflow

Check-in and Claiming of Print Journals and Serials

- Streamline check-in as detailed in Process for Streamlining Journal and Serial Check-in
- Reduce and streamline claiming as detailed in Process for Reducing and Streamlining Journal and Serial Claiming, including:
 - Do not claim individual issues of titles that are not bound
 - Do not claim a title once the decision to cancel is made

Binding Standard Print Formats

- Adopt the Guidelines for Binding Standard Print Formats which apply to all titles regardless of their electronic availability. Reasons for titles not to be bound include:
 - Limited print retention
 - Also received in microform
 - Received in more than one library – only library of record should bind

- Reinvest binding savings from print cancellations to bind more new print monographs and repair older items in active use

Missing Issue Backordering and Binding

- Adopt the Procedures for Backordering and Binding Incomplete, including:
 - Do not backorder issues of journal titles that are available electronically to MIT (excluding aggregators); bind them incomplete instead
 - Do not backorder issues of journal titles that are not bound

- Monograph Acquisitions and the local units should discuss the status of long outstanding backorders

- In most cases, bind incomplete volumes three months after backorder has been placed. Rebind volume if backorder is eventually successful

Record Maintenance Authority of Local Processing

- Adopt Expanded Local Records Maintenance Authority Guidelines