

# **Report on Streamlining the Management of Physical Materials – Part 2**

**Submitted to: Associate Directors for Public Services and Collection Services**

**May, 2007**

**Submitted By:**

Jennifer Banks, Collection Management Services

Charlene Follett, Acquisitions and Licensing Services

Millicent Gaskell, Dewey Library, Chair

Rebecca Lubas, Cataloging and Metadata Services

Marlene Manoff, Humanities Library

Maria Rodrigues, Engineering and Science Libraries

## Table of Contents

1. Introduction .....	5
2. Improve/Expand YBP Approval Plan and Determine Impact of Eliminating Approval Returns.	6
3. Eliminate Receipt of Paper Slips from YBP .....	15
4. Reduce the Number of Special Locations and Develop Criteria for Approving Them .....	18
5. Eliminate PreCats .....	25
6. Rules-Based Management for Print Monograph Storage/Disposal .....	31
7. Summary of Recommendations and Next Steps .....	41

## Appendices (in separate document)

### Improve/Expand YBP Approval Plan and Determine Impact of Eliminating Approval Returns

- A1. Summary of Feedback from Meetings with Selectors on Electronic Ordering, Expanding the YBP Approval Plan, and Eliminating Returns
- A2. Some Tips for Re-profiling your Approval Plan
- A3. Edited Comments from the 2005 Library Survey about Books and Collections
- A4. Approval Expenditures by Subject Classification
- A5. Approval Activity by Subject Classification

### Eliminate Receipt of Paper Slips from YBP

- B1. Advantages of Electronic Selection in GOBI for YBP and L&C Purchases
- B2. Slips Ordered by Fund Code March 1, 2006 to March 1, 2007

### Reduce the Number of Special Locations and Develop Criteria for Approving Them

- C1. Guidelines for Creating/Retaining Special Locations
- C2. Circulation Counts by Library by Location for 2006
- C3. Special Location Inventory and Recommendations

### Eliminate PreCats

- D1. Current PreCat Process and Timeline for Monographs
- D2. PreCat Workflow Options

Rules-Based Management for Print Monograph Storage/Disposal

E1. Rules-Based Management for Print Monograph Storage/Disposal by Subject Discipline

## 1. Introduction

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

Six library staff members from different units in Public and Collections Services were asked to form the R2 Implementation Team (R2IT/the Team). The Team was charged to significantly reduce the time spent managing print collections across the MIT Libraries by simplifying and making more efficient a number of selection, ordering, receipt, cataloging and storage procedures. Specific tasks were assigned with deadlines of December 2006 and April 2007.

In December 2006 the Team completed its first report and began work on the second piece of its charge. At that time, the Team membership was changed slightly when Kim Maxwell, who completed her tenure, was replaced by Rebecca Lubas. This report covers the specific items in the charge due in April 2007:

- Adopt additional changes for monographs workflow by making more vigorous use of approval plans, refining the GOBI workflow, reducing special locations, and setting quantitative parameters for storage decisions
  - Improve/Expand the use of the YBP plan and determine impact of eliminating approval returns
  - Eliminate receipt of paper slips from YBP
  - With the goal of reducing their number, review the number of special locations currently in use and develop criteria for approving them
  - Recommend new workflow to eliminate PreCats
  - Adopt rules-based management for print monograph storage/disposal that reflects the needs of different subject disciplines

For each specific item, the Team assigned two shepherds. The results of their investigations are detailed below.

## **2. Improve/Expand YBP Approval Plan and Determine Impact of Eliminating Approval Returns**

The R2 consultants urged us to make “more vigorous use” of our approval plan in order to reduce the time spent on monograph selection. The consultants stated “it is typical for large academic libraries to receive at least 50% of their mainstream English language monographs on approval.” Currently, the MIT Libraries are below this benchmark at approximately 38%. The R2 Implementation Team was charged to investigate expanding and refining the YBP approval plan as well as the possibility of eliminating approval returns.

Although many minor adjustments have been made to our YBP approval plan, no comprehensive review has been undertaken for five years. Within the MIT Libraries there is widespread agreement that one should be conducted. Once the Libraries have re-profiled and assessed the results, it will become clearer whether we can eliminate approval returns.

## **Process**

The R2IT shepherds for this item of the charge, Marlene Manoff and Charlene Follett, arranged a conference call with YBP representatives Stephen Hyndman and Irina Castelot to determine what support they might provide for our profile review. YBP agreed to send several reports and gave advice about others that might be run locally. They also offered suggestions about re-profiling. Marlene and Charlene then compiled lists of reports that could be run in GOBI (YBP's web interface for searching, selecting, ordering and reporting) in support of re-profiling and produced several examples. Meetings were held with subject selectors in each divisional library. The shepherds explained the goal of improving and expanding the approval plan and possibly eliminating approval returns. R2IT distributed reports to the selectors to help with re-profiling as well as a list of re-profiling tips (see A2 in the Appendices). The shepherds suggested other reports that selectors or collection managers might run themselves and took notes on selector concerns and issues.

A document was created summarizing the issues raised by subject selectors in the series of local meetings. It included input on both electronic selection and YBP profiling. The draft was sent out for review to subspec-lib (see A1 in the Appendices). The document did not occasion any additional comments. Major issues were then discussed with Collection Management Group (CMG) and R2IT. Data from both internal and external sources regarding monograph acquisitions were gathered to see if the data would confirm the problems and issues identified by selectors and collection managers.

## **Findings**

### **A) Improve/Expand the YBP Approval Plan**

The Libraries should undertake a comprehensive review of its YBP approval plan. This will require a significant time investment on the part of selectors and collection managers. Since we haven't re-profiled in five years, this will give us the opportunity to update the profiles to reflect new and current trends in MIT teaching and research as well as new patterns in academic publishing. YBP, for example, has been adding new publishers and we have not looked at the publisher list in any systematic way. For some time, many selectors have been aware of

improvements that could be made to the profiles which they haven't had the time to implement. Generally speaking, selectors have established the broadest and most successful approval book profiles for the most well-funded accounts. Challenges arise, however, in subject areas where financial constraints make it difficult to profile for books instead of slips. Selection in these areas is more labor intensive because selectors must choose the few titles they can afford from slips representing large numbers of desirable and relevant books. Fortunately, most selectors have the subject expertise in knowledge of MIT teaching and research to make these difficult decisions.

The number of books we purchase from YBP represents only a small subset of the material available in many of the disciplines we collect. This can be seen by comparing the volume of titles ordered to the number of slips sent and to the Approval Universe.

**Approval Activity March 1, 2006 to March 1, 2007**

Books Received on Approval	5,389
Slips Received	34,906
Books Ordered via Slips	7,379
Percentage of Slips Ordered	21%
Total Acquired via Slips or Approval Plan	12,311
YBP Approval Universe	57,008
Percentage of Universe Profiled for MIT	71%
Percentage of Universe Acquired	22%

While the full table (breaking down our approval plan activity by subject classification) is in the Appendices (see A5), the summary above indicates that we are buying roughly 22% of YBP's Approval Universe, which consists of all titles profiled by the company. Perhaps more striking is the fact that of the 34,906 slips MIT received between March 1, 2006 and March 1, 2007, we only ordered 7,379 titles, or roughly 21% of the titles sent to us as slips (and thus considered to be of potential interest). We did purchase about another 2500 titles from YBP, but they were firm orders (outside the approval plan) generated in response to such things as suggested purchases or book reviews.

An increase of about 2000 approval books a year would be required to reach a 50% benchmark for mainstream English language titles as recommended by the R2 consultants. This would mean that half our YBP titles would be received as approval books. While selectors agreed that the overall number of books received through the approval plan could be increased, given our current budgets and the fact that re-profiling tools are imperfect, it is unlikely we could achieve the 50% benchmark.

The primary way to refine an approval plan is limiting by LC call number or limiting by publisher. Other criteria such as content level, language and format provide additional filtering. For many accounts, none of these options provides fine enough distinctions to sift out the tremendous amount of material we cannot afford from the items that are extremely relevant to MIT and which we simply must have. The most significant obstacle is that despite the detailed call number breakdowns provided by LC, there are disciplines in which call number ranges do not

allow selectors to differentiate among the multiple books published in particular subfields. We can undoubtedly improve and expand our profiles, but there may be some disciplines in which we will not be able to significantly increase the number of approval books. R2IT anticipates that we will be able to reduce the number of slips we receive although there will still be a few accounts where selectors will need to see slips for a much broader range of titles than we can purchase. Reducing the volume of slips will help ease the transition to electronic ordering by decreasing the number of titles selectors need to review online.

Data collected from Association of Research Libraries (ARL) statistics illustrate the challenges posed by our limited monograph budgets. According to the latest (2004/2005) ARL statistics (<http://www.arl.org/stats/annualsurveys/arlstats/>), MIT ranks 84<sup>th</sup> out of 112 libraries in expenditures for monographs. The data are fairly consistent for the period 1999 to 2005. MIT has moved up and down in the ARL rankings from a high of 83<sup>rd</sup> in 2002/03 to a low of 94<sup>th</sup> in 2003/04, but we have acquired roughly the same number of monographs per year. These numbers are significant because it is much easier to dispense with title-by-title selection when there are sufficient funds to receive core titles as approval books. Below is a summary of the six years of data available on the ARL website.

#### MIT's ARL Ranking for Monograph Expenditures

Year	Rank
1999/2000	89 out of 112
2000/2001	92 out of 113
2001/2002	92 out of 114
2002/2003	83 out of 113
2003/2004	94 out of 113
2004/2005	84 out of 112

In 2004/05, we purchased 19,207 monographs, spending \$1,282,263. In that same year, more than 50 ARL institutions spent over \$2 million on monographs and 24 spent over \$3 million. More than a dozen institutions spent over \$4 million. The top six institutions spent between \$5 and \$11 million on monographs. Of the seven "tech" schools listed in 2004/05, MIT ranked somewhere in the middle for monograph expenditures. Texas A&M (\$4 million more than MIT),

Texas Tech (\$1 million more) and Purdue (\$100,000 more) surpassed us in the rankings. We surpassed Virginia Tech by just \$40,000 and also outranked Rochester and Georgia Tech.

Selectors deal with extremely high expectations from faculty and students; since this is, after all, MIT, users assume we will have the books that they need and they expect that our collections will compare favorably to the other institutions presumed to be in our class. The 2005 MIT Libraries User Survey highlights this fact. As one user commented, "the libraries should strive to maintain a collection of material commensurate with the caliber of this Institute and its community." R2IT examined data from the user survey to gain insight into community perceptions. Over 330 users (see A3 in the Appendices) addressed the need for expanding the book collections. These comments came from users in all schools. Included in these comments were scores that specifically mention the need to expand our holdings in the humanities and social sciences. The Humanities Library is most frequently mentioned as needing to strengthen its book collections with Dewey as a close second, but comments about limited monograph holdings referred to every divisional library. Many users commented on the need to increase book collections in specific fields. Some of those fields mentioned by name include biology, philosophy, literature, cognitive science, linguistics, physics, psychology, political science, anthropology, history of science, mathematics, and human-computer interaction.

Other relevant data from the user survey: 45.6% declared themselves very satisfied with our electronic collections, whereas only 30% declared themselves very satisfied with our print collections. While 80.8% declared electronic journals and books essential, 67.9% declared print essential. The numbers are even closer if you combine the top two categories: 93.3% declared electronic resources essential or very important, whereas 89.4% declared print essential or very important.

This places us in the difficult position of needing to transition to a more digitally intensive environment while also maintaining print monograph collections that faculty and students will continue to require for some yet-to-be determined period. We can clearly improve our YBP profile, increase the number of books received on approval, reduce the number of slips received in some accounts and possibly find ways to reduce or eliminate returns. YBP provides a great deal of data to support re-profiling. Tutorials on the top level page in GOBI will assist selectors

in running relevant reports. However, adjusting our approval plan will only give us marginal improvements due to the limitations of our budget.

**B) Determine the Impact of Eliminating Approval Returns**

If we completely eliminated approval returns as well as the process of reviewing books at the approval shelves, Monograph Acquisitions would save about five hours per week shelving, pulling, emailing and returning books. This would translate to savings of less than \$5200 per year. A few selectors said it would save them time if they didn't have to come to 14E-210 to review books. Others stated they are in Building 14 for meetings at least once a week and so do not consider it an inconvenience. The majority of selectors said that if they don't review their new books in 14E-210, they will review the books when they arrive in their local units. This is how selectors monitor their approval profile and determine whether it needs to be adjusted. Reviewing new books also helps selectors remain knowledgeable about what is coming into their collection, keep abreast of new developments in their fields and identify titles about which to tell their faculty.

In the calendar year January 1, 2006 to December 31, 2006, we returned 406 titles to YBP worth \$28,485.76. This represents an 8% return rate. Eliminating the ability to reject books would impact some accounts more than others. Accounts with more limited budgets or more expensive titles would be most negatively affected by automatic acceptance of every book YBP ships on approval. The table below shows the distribution and total price of returned books by library.

**Returned YBP Approval Books January 1, 2006 to December 31, 2006**

Library	# of Titles	Cost	Return Rate
Rotch	86	\$3,744.53	9%
Dewey	148	\$10,645.94	8%
Humanities	64	\$3,231.34	7%
ESL	108	\$10,863.95	6%
<b>Total</b>	<b>406</b>	<b>\$28,485.76</b>	<b>8%</b>

In order to determine the full impact of eliminating the review of books at the approval shelves, R2IT also measured the number of titles that were not returned but were either offered to and accepted by another MIT Library or assigned to a different account within the library to which they were sent. All the library and fund reassignment activity occurs at the approval shelves and would presumably not be possible if returns were eliminated.

In the two month period that was surveyed, 59 books were offered to and accepted by libraries other than the one to which they were sent. In addition, selectors altered the accounts on 177 books that were kept within the library to which they were sent. This means that a total of 236 books were re-assigned to accounts other than those originally assigned by YBP. This extrapolates to 1,416 books per year. Adding the 406 titles rejected in the last fiscal year, the total number of books that would be charged annually to accounts where they were not wanted would be 1,822, if we eliminated reviewing books on approval. In FY 2005/06 we purchased 18,715 monographs. This means that about 9.7% of our monograph funds would be spent on books that were either not wanted or that should have been assigned to a different account.

There are two related concerns. One is the loss to the overall book budget of having to pay for that 8% of titles that we don't want and won't be able to return. The other concern is that roughly 1,400 books per year might be charged to the wrong library or account. That could also have substantial financial impact on some accounts.

R2IT therefore urges selectors to make the accounts we assign on our approval profiles a more accurate representation of where we would like the funds to be spent. A few selectors were unaware that they could assign parts of the approval plan to endowed accounts and so they have been using the review of approval books as an opportunity to change account assignments. We could also try to simplify our fund structure. This possibility, which was suggested by the consultants, came up in our meetings with selectors in ESL. Since ESL is the library with the highest number of local fund reassignments, combining accounts in ESL to decrease their number could substantially reduce this problem.

The only other library that does a significant amount of internal fund reassignment is Dewey. A simplification of the fund structure in ESL and Dewey would mitigate some of the effects of eliminating selectors' ability to review books at the approval shelves. In that case, the major

obstacle to eliminating returns would be the fact that selectors would lose access to funds they would otherwise gain by returning unwanted books. This would be most damaging to small accounts with expensive books. Several selectors have asked whether accounts might receive some financial compensation for funds that would be lost if returns were no longer possible. This is worth considering as a way to make selectors less conservative in their re-profiling.

Selectors will try to make the approval plan as accurate as possible while attempting to expand the number of books received. Once the revised plan has been in place for a while, the return rate can be reevaluated to determine if eliminating returns is cost effective.

### **Recommendations**

1. The MIT Libraries will review the YBP profiles to increase the number of books received and reduce the number of unwanted slips when possible
2. Each divisional library will review their monograph account structure to determine if it is advantageous to simplify it
3. Steering Committee will look for opportunities to increase the monograph budget so as to allow us to expand our approval plan

### **Next Steps**

- CMG will look at how the current divisional library profiles overlap and identify any gaps – summer 2007
- CMG will lead the re-profiling project and assess the results – summer 2007 to winter 2007
- Divisional libraries will review the monographic account structure – summer 2007 to fall 2007
- Each selector will review his or her relevant YBP profiles. Each divisional library will review its profiles as a whole and recommend changes to increase books and reduce slips when possible – summer 2007 to winter 2007
- Charlene Follett, in consultation with CMG, will set up re-profiling sessions. YBP reps will conduct re-profiling sessions with selectors and collection managers – fall 2007

- Once the profiles have been in place six months, CMG will assess the effects of the changes and determine the cost effectiveness of eliminating returns – summer/fall 2008

### 3. Eliminate Receipt of Paper Slips from YBP

R2IT was charged with refining the GOBI workflow, specifically to eliminate receipt of paper slips from YBP. As part of the framework for understanding the issues, the shepherds, Charlene Follett and Marlene Manoff, questioned the major benefits of eliminating slips:

- Will books arrive more quickly if they are ordered electronically through GOBI?
- Will electronic ordering save time and work in Monograph Acquisitions?
- Will electronic ordering improve the speed of selection work?

The answer to the first two questions is yes. Books will arrive more quickly and electronic ordering will save time in Monograph Acquisitions. The indications are less clear for the third question, as addressed in the Findings below.

#### **Process**

The shepherds' first step was to survey the selectors via email to determine the current use of GOBI and electronic selection. Twenty-six of the 30 selectors sent the following responses:

Never use GOBI	7
Use GOBI for searching and running reports only	9
Use GOBI for viewing slips only	1
Use GOBI to view and submit electronic selections	8
Use paper slips/catalogs to make selection decision, then search in GOBI and submit electronically	1

Charlene and Marlene then met with Erja Kajosallo and Michelle Baildon, who are enthusiastic long-time users of GOBI, to compile a list of the advantages of electronic selection. A copy of this list, "Advantages of Electronic Selection in GOBI for YBP and L&C [Lindsay & Croft] Purchases," can be found in the Appendices (see B1).

The shepherds met with divisional library selectors and the list of advantages was shared with them during discussions about electronic selection, refining approval plans and eliminating approval returns. Either Erja or Michelle, who served as “GOBI Cheerleaders,” attended each of the meetings. They proved to be an excellent resource for answering selectors’ questions, since they both use electronic selection exclusively for their YBP and L&C selections.

Charlene and Marlene then spoke with the Processing Supervisors (Elke Piontek-Ma, Jonah Jenkins and Diana Daigle, who filled in for Maria Rodrigues during her maternity leave) and determined it is primarily Humanities and Music selectors who are using their Processing Assistants to help with electronic selection. As a result, the shepherds also met with Laura Andersen and Christie Moore to discuss their experience working with GOBI.

In the midst of our meetings, and quite coincidentally, MIT Libraries received word from YBP that they were allowing GOBI beta testers, of which we were one, the option to migrate to their new cart design before the general rollout to all their customers. R2IT polled the selectors via email and received an overwhelming response to make the switch immediately. Charlene tested loading some live orders selected by Michelle Baildon, and then asked YBP to switch us to the new cart design, going live on February 16<sup>th</sup>. Michelle Baildon and Carol Robinson agreed to assist Charlene with a drop-in session for selectors and processing staff, attended by several participants, held the following week. Additionally, YBP provided a web orientation and updated their tutorial on GOBI, and Charlene updated our internal documentation to reflect the changes brought about by the new cart design for electronic selection (see “Electronic Selection on GOBI,” <http://libstaff.mit.edu/colserv/monoacq/policies/policies.html>) and distributed to subject selectors.

## **Findings**

MIT began using electronic selection via GOBI in 2004, on an optional basis. At that time, Erja Kajosalu volunteered to be our pioneering e-selector. Until recently, most of our selectors have preferred to continue receiving notification via paper slips for such reasons as the portability of slips and the perceived inefficiencies of GOBI. With the arrival of new selectors, within the past year or so, interest in e-selection has expanded and Monograph Acquisitions has seen an

increase in selections submitted electronically. Moving towards electronic selection will eliminate the handling by local processing and/or selectors of over 34,000 paper slips that are sent annually by YBP and almost 4,000 slips from L&C.

For many selectors, especially those who do not have to deal with a large volume of slips, electronic ordering seems to improve efficiency. For selectors who receive a high volume of slips (over 1000 per year) for one or more funds, electronic ordering can be more cumbersome. As illustrated in the report titled "Slips Ordered by Fund Code" (see B2 in the Appendices), the libraries receiving the highest volume of slips are Dewey and Humanities. Few Dewey selectors have tried electronic selection. Most Humanities selectors have experimented with electronic selecting but a few question whether it will be more efficient. With forthcoming improvements to GOBI, some of the obstacles may diminish for selectors with a high volume of slips.

Selections that are placed electronically via GOBI have a shorter turn-around time than paper ones. Electronic selections are ordered either the same day or the next day, depending on what time the email notification is sent to Monograph Acquisitions. Once the order is completed in GOBI, order records are loaded into ALEPH the next morning and funds are encumbered, and YBP/L&C begins filling orders. Selections that come to Monograph Acquisitions in paper form are dated upon receipt and put into a queue to be ordered by a student. Depending on interdepartmental mail and the student's schedule, paper selections can take anywhere from a day to over a week to complete the order process.

Since the selector meetings held in February, Monograph Acquisitions has received electronic selections from eight first-time users and Charlene and Marlene have heard favorable comments from long-term users about improvements in the new cart design. To date, a total of 21 of our selectors plus two local processing staff have submitted selections electronically for at least some of their GOBI purchases. Only nine selectors remain who have not yet experimented with online selection, although we have heard some express a willingness to do so.

As a result of the increase in electronic selections, Charlene created a new email group, [eselect@mit.edu](mailto:eselect@mit.edu), which consists of Charlene, Julie McNeely and Garry Ziegler. Julie has recently been assigned primary responsibility for ordering these e-selections when email notification is received.

YBP has announced that they plan to release new enhancements to GOBI in June 2007 which should improve speed, reliability and functionality, and to offer other new features. We hope this will address many of the concerns and frustrations that selectors have pointed out in the current version of GOBI.

## Recommendations

1. All currently non-participating selectors will transition to electronic selection in GOBI for YBP/L&C profiled titles, after the new enhancements are released by YBP. This will give local units the option to print out selected slips to ease this transition. Selectors will be encouraged to do the bulk of their GOBI selection online, but Monograph Acquisitions will continue to accept paper slips until the transition is completed.
2. Eliminate receipt of YBP/L&C paper slips. Selectors will continue to have the option to submit non-slip selections and all non-YBP/L&C selections via paper, email or fax.

## Next Steps

- Charlene Follett will schedule additional training, with the help of an experienced e-selector, for those selectors who need training or would like a refresher – summer 2007
- CMG will assess the impact of e-selection – fall 2007
- Charlene Follett will notify YBP/L&C to eliminate paper slips – fall 2007

## 4. Reduce the Number of Special Locations and Develop Criteria for Approving Them

The R2 Consulting report recommended that the MIT Libraries review various collection locations throughout the system and reduce the number of special locations where possible. There are over 180 locations throughout the MIT Libraries. Any location that is not “Stacks” is defined as special.

Library	# of ALEPH	# Non-	Total # of
---------	------------	--------	------------

	Locations	ALEPH Locations	Locations
Aero/Astro	6	15	21
Dewey	19	9	28
Barker	15	2	17
Humanities	21	4	25
Lindgren	15	4	19
Music	15	2	17
Hayden Desk (RBR)	3	0	3
Rotch	24	1	25
RVC	6	0	6
Science	18	2	20
Schering-Plough	1	0	1

While there have been many good reasons to segment our collections over the years, not all continue to be valid. The consultants recommended conducting a review to determine whether the value of each special location was justified by the effort required to maintain it as well as the potential confusion caused to patrons searching out these special locations. R2IT was charged to review special locations with the goal of reducing their number and to develop criteria for establishing new ones.

This review focused only on locations of cataloged material in Public Service units. Uncataloged collections and other “libraries” that are listed in ALEPH were excluded from the scope of this review: Archives (ARC), Bibliographic Access Services (BAS), Cataloging (CAT), Director’s Office (DIR), Document Services (DOC), Inter-Library Borrowing (ILB), Library Storage Annex (LSA), Not Available (N/A), Networked Resources (NET), Physics Reading Room (PHY), Serials and Acquisition Services (SAS), and Space Center Reading Room (SPC).

## Process

The R2IT shepherds gathered data from ALEPH about collection locations for each library including what types of items were in each location (using call number prefix as a guide), the number of items (that were not suppressed) in each, and 2006 circulation statistics for each.

The shepherds met with members of each divisional and branch library to share and discuss the ALEPH data, identify locations not listed in ALEPH, and learn about processing procedures for and the value of various locations. After completing these meetings, R2IT created an inventory of special locations including draft recommendations about retention for each and guidelines for creating/retaining special locations. These documents were shared with the CMG, Divisional Librarians Group (DLG), Access Services Group (ASG), and Barton Advisory Group (BAG). Based on additional data and comments provided, the documents were revised (see C3 and C1 in the Appendices).

## Findings

The Stacks location is not appropriate for all library holdings. There are many valid reasons for distributing the collection among different locations within a library building. One of the most obvious reasons is that some material does not receive LC classification. While anything with a Stacks location throughout the divisional and branch libraries is classed in Library of Congress, there are special collections such as the theses and journals which do not. The theses are actually part of the Stacks location in ALEPH (distinguished with the Thesis call number prefix), and are classified by program, degree, name and year. There are two "classification schemes" used for Journal locations within the divisions and branches: half-classed LC and alphabetical title sort. Alphabetical journal collections require significantly more staff time to maintain, due to title changes, than classified collections. It is worth noting that all journals are assigned full LC classification when they are sent to Harvard Depository.

Another clear reason for needing a special location for material is format related, i.e., items that cannot be easily shelved in the Stacks. There are several types of items which, due to their size, shape or material, continue to need their own location. Oversize print books, flat or rolled maps, and microforms are all examples of resources that are not easily accommodated by Stacks shelving. These items are better stored on special shelves or in special cabinets. Ideally, similar formats should be held in one location: microfiche and microfilm; all CD-ROMs; all maps, etc. Having consistent locations throughout the system for particular formats would also make it easier for patrons to find the materials they need. However, due to space issues, it is unlikely that all units can implement locations in a uniform way, such as having all the oversize books in each unit at the end of the Stacks run.

Some of our special locations were created to benefit the user community. Locations for small browsing collections of new books or specific subject matter exist in all of the divisions and branches, although not all of these locations are reflected in ALEPH. Most of these locations do not require more work than the Stacks location to maintain, and in one instance, the special location actually reduced staff effort. However, their existence does require users to find yet another physical area separate from the Stacks. According to ALEPH data, most of these special locations are quite popular (see C2 in the Appendices for circulation details for all locations). All of the “Browsery” type locations in the divisional libraries, as well as two of the subject-oriented collections in Humanities item (as indicated in the chart below with an asterisk), had higher than 1:1 ratios of circulations per.

#### Locations with the Highest Ratio of Loans per Item

Library	Collection Location	# of Loans in 2006	# of Items in Location	Average # of Loans per Item
SCI	Circulation Desk	541	32	16.91
RBR	Circulation Desk	59	5	11.80
MUS	Circulation Desk	2,057	176	11.69
MUS	Media	154,614	24,757	6.25
ENG	Reserve Stacks	1,083	319	3.39
HUM	Travel Collection*	441	139	3.17
RBR	Reserve Stacks	4,230	1,406	3.01
HUM	Graphic Novel Collection*	1,613	656	2.46
RTC	Reserve Stacks	3,146	1,293	2.43
HUM	Media	1,667	730	2.28
AER	Reserve Stacks	314	143	2.20
DEW	Impulse Borrowing Display*	1,278	586	2.18
HUM	Browsery*	2,919	1,431	2.04
ENG	Browsery*	218	115	1.90
DEW	Reserve Stacks	2,921	1,604	1.82
MUS	Reserve Stacks	1,276	717	1.78

RTC	Browsery*	384	296	1.30
LIN	Reserve Stacks	26	21	1.24
SCI	Serendipity Shelves*	185	174	1.06
DEW	Circulation Desk	312	306	1.02

While the New Books locations are not in ALEPH and therefore statistics are not available from the system, Barker did study the traffic at their New Book display in March 2007. They counted 528 people who browsed the collection (some of whom borrowed items) over a four-week period. This averages about 17 browsers a day. These “perceived benefit” locations continue to be valued by the community; yet, this may not always be the case. Divisions and branches should regularly assess the use of these locations to determine if they are still needed. One example of a location that should be assessed is the Women’s Studies Research Room. The average number of loans per item for this location is 0.15, which is lower than the Humanities collection in the Stacks. Libraries should also be aware of the effort it takes to maintain these locations and keep it to a minimum. Libraries that maintain more than one of these locations should be especially vigilant.

The changes that have been made to the service model in the public units within the past decade are not reflected in the ALEPH locations. For example, there are no longer separate reserve desks. With the closing of the reference desks, ready reference collections are no longer required. Since the Reserve Book Room has been eliminated, the items in the RBR library should be changed to Humanities or Science as appropriate; the records would continue to display to the public as Hayden. Both the Circulation Desk and Reserve Stacks locations could benefit from renaming.

Since the Science and Humanities Libraries share the same building, the closing of the separate reference desks begs the question of whether or not the reference collections should be combined into a single Reference location. The Humanities and Science Stacks are already interfiled so patrons are used to the idea of “Hayden” locations. The separate Theses locations could potentially be combined as well.

There are many examples of items that are not actually shelved in the location that is indicated in ALEPH. While there are reasoned exceptions, the general rule should be that items are

properly interfiled by call number in their designated ALEPH location. Examples of valid exceptions include: indexes with a "Reference" location which are housed in special built-in shelves, rather than interfiled in the reference collection; and recent unbound journal issues with the location "Journals" which are on display shelves instead of interfiled in the journal collection. For these exceptions, there needs to be an indication on the ALEPH record (preferably a holdings note) clarifying where the item is actually shelved and, whenever possible, this information should be viewable to the public in Barton.

The more consistency in and among our locations that we can provide, the easier it will be for our patrons to understand how our collections are organized. To that end, there is also value in having consistent circulation policies for a location. Ideally, all items in the Stacks locations throughout the libraries should circulate for the same time period. There are examples of inconsistent circulation policies within the same location in a library as well as among locations of the same name in different units. Again, there are good reasons for some of these exceptions but they should be weighed against the benefits of consistent patron expectations.

The branch libraries have many more locations relative to the size of their collections than the divisional libraries. Some reasons for this trend are that branches tend to be more format intensive (music, maps); they rely more on student workers and therefore need more collection definition behind the circulation desk; and the smaller size of their facilities means there are fewer square feet for patrons to look through. However, branches still need to take a hard look at locations.

After reviewing the relevant ALEPH data, it became apparent that significant clean-up of locations is required. There are libraries and locations that no longer exist as well as mistakenly assigned locations. One example is an item in one of the divisional libraries which has an "off-campus collection" location. There is the potential for further clean-up by looking at the remaining "libraries" in ALEPH.

## **Recommendations**

1. Accept the Guidelines for Creating/Retaining Special Locations (see C1 in the Appendices)

2. Accept the Special Location Inventory and Recommendations (see C3 in the Appendices) which will reduce the existing 182 locations by 38%
  - o Completely eliminate 69 locations
  - o Investigate eliminating 1 additional location
  - o Consolidate 4 locations into 1 location
  - o Investigate consolidating 4 locations into 2 locations
  - o Keep 75 locations as they are
  - o Keep 29 locations with some modifications (which may include renaming)
3. Develop and implement a clean-up project for those libraries in ALEPH not reviewed in this report
4. Assess the feasibility of using full LC classification in the Journals location throughout the Libraries to reduce staff maintenance efforts and establish consistency

### **Next Steps**

- Each divisional and branch library will follow the Guidelines for Creating/Retaining Special Locations when reassessing the need for an existing location or when determining if a new location is needed – begin summer 2007
- BAG should discuss system implications of changing from a call number prefix to creating an ALEPH location for Theses to determine if this recommendation can be implemented. Archives staff should be consulted as this change will effect them as well – June/July 2007
- BAG will review the recommendations in the Special Location Inventory and Recommendations, notify divisional and branch libraries which system-wide changes they will handle, and coordinate appropriate timing of changes – summer 2007
- DLG/TSAC will charge BAG to coordinate the project to review and clean-up the remaining ALEPH libraries – summer 2007
- Science and Humanities staff should investigate the feasibility of combining their individual Reference and Theses locations as well as assessing the need for the WSRR location – summer/fall 2007

- Each divisional and branch library will implement the remaining changes in Special Location Inventory and Recommendations (those not centrally implemented by BAG) – fall 2007 to summer 2008
- ASG should review the loan periods for the various locations to determine if more consistency can be achieved for specific locations across the system – spring 2008
- DLG/TSAC will charge a group of Collections Services and Public Services staff to look at the feasibility of full LC classification of all journals. The group should be asked to examine the implications of the print journal cancellation projects on implementation timing as these cancellations will impact the return on investment of journal reclassification – spring 2008

## **5. Eliminate PreCats**

The PreCat process was developed almost 20 years ago for items that do not have acceptable catalog copy available when they are handled by the Monograph Cataloging Unit (MCU). Acceptable copy can be from any source but must have an LC call number and LC subject headings in English. Over time, the number of PreCats identified each year has decreased. Three years ago, there were about 1000 PreCats. In 2006, approximately 750 books went out as PreCats. R2IT was charged to review the process and recommend a new workflow to eliminate PreCats.

### PreCats Added by Month by Library in 2006

Library	Jan	Feb	Mar	Apr	May	Jun	Jul	Aug	Sep	Oct	Nov	Dec	Total	% of Total
Aero	1	0	2	0	1	0	1	1	1	2	0	6	15	2%
Barker	7	5	11	20	10	4	5	6	10	4	6	6	94	12%
Dewey	9	5	15	7	13	5	18	2	3	10	4	4	95	13%
Humanities	18	7	19	8	4	3	7	17	2	2	3	6	96	13%
Lindgren	1	0	1	2	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	1	7	1%
Rotch	48	24	57	19	24	44	18	14	3	19	40	48	358	47%
Science	13	8	10	7	11	9	13	3	5	3	3	4	89	12%
<b>Total</b>	<b>97</b>	<b>49</b>	<b>115</b>	<b>63</b>	<b>63</b>	<b>65</b>	<b>62</b>	<b>45</b>	<b>24</b>	<b>40</b>	<b>56</b>	<b>75</b>	<b>754</b>	

#### Process

To begin the review, Rebecca Lubas and Millicent Gaskell set up meetings with MCU, Cataloging and Metadata Services (CAMS) management group, and local processing supervisors. The shepherds drafted a brief overview and timeline of the current PreCat process and collected data about the timeframe in which acceptable copy becomes available. At the meetings, Rebecca and Millicent shared this data and solicited comments about the current PreCat process as well as ideas for a new process to eliminate PreCats. The participants had many creative ideas but also expressed concerns about some of the possible changes.

Afterwards, the "Current PreCat Process and Timeline for Monographs" document was finalized (see D1 in the Appendices). Based on input from the meetings, the Team developed many possible alternatives to the existing PreCat process. The shepherds shared these options with MCU, DLG, CMG and the rest of R2IT. The options were revised and are included in the Appendices (see D2).

#### Findings

Data collected by the shepherds show that 66% of PreCats have acceptable copy after the 12-month waiting period. The remaining 34% without copy are added to the original cataloging workflow.

## PreCat Copy Availability Stats, sample from Dec 2006 to Feb 2007

Library	No useable copy	copy in 0-3 months	copy in 4-6 months	copy in 7-9 months	copy in 10-12 months	Total
Rotch	20	5	6	8	13	52
Humanities	5	3	0	1	5	14
Dewey	1	0	0	1	2	4
Science	0	1	0	1	1	3
Barker	5	0	5	6	3	19
Lindgren	0	0	0	0	0	0
Aero	0	0	0	0	0	0
<b>Total</b>	<b>31</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>17</b>	<b>24</b>	<b>92</b>
	<b>34%</b>	<b>22%</b>		<b>44%</b>		

The MIT Libraries has only one original cataloger who classifies an average of 700-800 titles per year. However, we receive about 950 print titles and 300 non-print titles each year requiring original cataloging. Of the 950 print titles, about 250 are monographs that do not have acceptable copy after going through the PreCat process. The other 700 titles without acceptable copy are excluded from the PreCat process and put immediately into the original cataloging backlog and fall into the following categories:

- Title was published more than 10 years ago
- Title has accompanying material
- Format is delicate including pamphlet-type items and titles needing binding reinforcement

Simply eliminating the PreCat process, placing an additional 500 books per year (the 66% that receive copy in the PreCat process) into the original cataloging workflow, is not a feasible solution with our current staffing. This would cause the books to sit in 14E-210 for a period of roughly two years waiting for cataloging. That would not be an improvement since the books are currently available to the public for part of that waiting period. R2IT therefore explored alternatives.

The current PreCat process is an effective method for gathering as much full-level copy as possible without adding to the original cataloging workload. The year-long waiting period allows us to maximize the chance for good copy. While there is some acceptable copy in three to six months (22%), an additional 44% have acceptable copy in the seven to 12 month period. However, it does make for a lengthy period (15 months to two-and-half years) in which books have minimal catalog records that are poor for discovery, and a shorter period in which they are inaccessible to patrons. This process also creates an undesirable special location.

Rotch has roughly 50% of all PreCats (358 out of 754), as well as the highest percentage of titles that do not have copy after the one-year period. Rotch also has the majority of non-Roman language titles. All other divisions average fewer than 100 PreCat titles each year. The possibility of hiring an Aga Khan Cataloger is being explored separately from the R2IT review; such a position would catalog approximately 20% of Rotch's PreCats, reducing the number that need to be outsourced.

The Team considered four options that would be an improvement over the existing PreCat process (see D2 in the Appendices for details and costs):

- Option 1: Outsource PreCat cataloging
- Option 2: Outsource a selection of PreCat cataloging
- Option 3: Modify the existing PreCat process
- Option 4: Hire a temporary original cataloger

The Team recommends option 1. The real saving for this option is time – option 1 gets the material fully cataloged more quickly than the current PreCat process. The items would be turned around in a two to three month period. By comparison, it can take 15 months to two-and-a-half years for a book to receive full cataloging with the current PreCat process.

Considering this option meant exploring a new cataloging vendor. Our current vendor, OCLC Techpro, is not a fiscally responsible choice. Techpro is about the same cost as in-house cataloging but has lower quality, creating in-house clean-up work in addition to the vendor fees. We conducted a test with a new vendor, Donohue Group, Inc., using a sample of PreCat books

from all divisional libraries. The quality of the catalog records was high and the vendor was very responsive to our processes. Also, we will earn credit towards our OCLC subscription for each original record Donohue creates for MIT.

Funding for outsourcing could come from the Libraries' existing budget line for bibliographic products. These funds are used for outsourcing foreign language titles to OCLC Techpro and for one-time projects such as the industrial relations card project. Since Donohue's rates are lower than OCLC Techpro, this money would stretch farther. Also, if Aga Khan funds can be used for some of these titles, more funds will be available for other projects.

CAMS support staff would like to be given higher level cataloging responsibility. However, due to limited resources this is not currently an option for solving the PreCat problem. It might become an option after implementing other initiatives that may reduce the cataloging workload, such as outsourcing mainstream materials from YBP.

There are also some important issues regarding levels of cataloging standards and authority work that need to be addressed. This must be done soon, and in the context of assessing the new series authority policy, implementation of ALEPH authority functionality, and an examination of the vendor landscape. Questions to be answered include: Should we resolve conflicted/split headings in-house if vendors are not performing such tasks? And: what level cataloging is needed for incoming items? The answers to these questions could impact our in-house capacity.

CAMS, in consultation with the Divisional Librarians, should also make recommendations for alternative practices for classed-together series to speed the cataloging of titles with partial copy. One option might be a decision not to create subject headings. There are currently several examples of this type of compromise, such as Barker's IEEE electronic conference proceedings and Dewey's NBER working paper series. Such practices would reduce the number of PreCats.

While outsourcing PreCats is currently the best option, this decision should be reassessed in two years. Factors such as the impact of adding an Aga Khan Cataloger, assessment of cataloging policies, and other vendor options may affect CAMS workload capacity within this

timeframe. It is possible that two years from now CAMS will have the ability to process former PreCat items in-house by repositioning staff responsibilities.

### **Recommendations**

1. Outsource PreCat cataloging with Donohue for a two-year period
2. Evaluate alternative means of cataloging and processing mainstream print materials, such as shelf-ready book vendors
3. Review authority policies
4. Determine needed levels of cataloging for different types of items
5. Assess the cataloging workload near the end of the two-year trial to determine impact of eliminating PreCats

## Next Steps

- Rebecca will contract with Donohue for a monthly pickup of any items that would have been sent PreCat – June 2007
- BAG will create an “at vendor” status in ALEPH – June 2007
- CAMS will cease sending out books PreCat – June 30, 2007
- CAMS will recall the remaining PreCats on the usual monthly schedule until they are gone – June 2007 to June 2008
- CAMS will send PreCats to Donohue on a monthly basis – July 2007 to June 2009
- Rebecca will continue to explore alternatives to Techpro for Arabic cataloging, with the aim of saving dollars that could go to PreCat outsourcing – summer 2007
- CAMS will analyze existing authority policies, including assessing the current landscape and impacts of ALEPH implementation, treatment of headings from vendors, and the series policy. This analysis should be ready for discussion with the new Associate Director for Collection Services upon or soon after his/her arrival – summer 2007
- DLG-TSAC will charge a group to evaluate alternative means of cataloging and processing mainstream print materials, such as shelf-ready book vendors – summer 2007
- DLG-TSAC will charge a group of Collections Services and Public Services staff to determine the needed levels of cataloging – spring 2008
- Near the completion of the two-year outsourcing period, CAMS will assess its cataloging workload to determine if the former PreCats can be absorbed into their regular workload – spring 2009

## 6. Rules-Based Management for Print Monograph Storage/Disposal

R2IT was charged to adopt rules-based management for print monograph storage/disposal that reflects the needs of different subject disciplines. The Team’s work focused on monographs, but storage of monographs also involves serials since they are inter-shelved with monographs in LC classification. Whether a library intends to avoid or include serials, this is a factor when planning for monograph storage projects.

Over many years, storage of journals and some serials has been made more efficient by setting up schedules for routine moves. In contrast, monograph storage usually involves large projects of title by title decisions, with different criteria for each subject as appropriate to the “half life” of that literature and the use pattern. The policy of storing monographs in Harvard Depository rather than the Library Storage Annex means that a monograph storage decision has greater consequences for users: no option for same-day access by going to the Annex; an extra 24 hours or more before the volume is delivered; no intuitive way for a browser to know how much of the subject has been stored, etc.

**Monographs Stored FY2002 - FY2006**

<b>Library</b>	<b>2002</b>	<b>2003</b>	<b>2004</b>	<b>2005</b>	<b>2006</b>	<b>Total</b>
Aero	161	168	3	17	99	<b>448</b>
Barker	4,965	1,355	272	479	4,385	<b>11,456</b>
Dewey	475	722	5,973	14,483	17,977	<b>39,630</b>
Humanities	1,174	2,054	9,146	9,122	888	<b>22,384</b>
Lewis Music	0	3	58	0	1	<b>62</b>
Lindgren	583	164	1,571	721	335	<b>3,374</b>
Rotch	2,733	3,720	1,966	1,872	5,432	<b>15,723</b>
Science	170	1,960	8,030	494	341	<b>10,995</b>
<b>Total</b>	<b>10,261</b>	<b>10,146</b>	<b>27,019</b>	<b>27,188</b>	<b>29,458</b>	<b>104,072</b>

**Process**

The shepherds, Jennifer Banks and Millicent Gaskell, met with Christine Moulen and Nina Davis-Millis to brief them on the project and the anticipated need for new and better data reports. Also, Christine provided immediate assistance with Brio reports to gather data.

The shepherds gathered monograph data for each library:

- Number of monographs
- Number added and withdrawn per year for past five years
- Number stored per year for past five years
- Sample of circulation reports showing low use and high use

The shepherds then conducted on-site interviews in the divisional libraries with the Collection Manager, Processing Supervisor and Circulation Supervisor, and in the branches with the Branch Librarian and Assistant. Jennifer and Millicent collected information about shelf capacity/fullness for the LC-classed ranges. The shepherds also asked questions about monograph storage practices and criteria, time-saving procedures, and how technology could be used to improve the process.

A draft of "Rules-based Management for Print Monograph Storage/Disposal" was prepared and sent to the Collection Managers for local discussions. After review in CMG, the draft was revised with R2IT. A new draft was sent to Subject Specialists, ASG, CMG, and Systems and Technology Services (STS) staff for comment.

## **Findings**

The idea of storage criteria is familiar to library staff because we traditionally use different types of information to make storage decisions. In particular, circulation staff provides highly detailed, hands-on knowledge of shelf-fullness and growth rates throughout their libraries. These staff members understand the complexities of shifting sections to manage the stacks between storage projects, as well as after volumes have been pulled for storage.

### Current Shelf-Fullness by Library

Library	% Full in LC-classed Section
Aero	80%
Barker	82%
Dewey	88%
Humanities	76%
Lewis Music	85%
Lindgren	84%
Rotch	82%
Science	77-80%

Staff was interested in seeing more data and experimenting with the use of data in lieu of hands-on selection for some types of storage projects. Stacks management information gathered by circulation staff is part of the data, along with the reports we can produce through manual and computer-assisted means.

The impact of storage on users remains a central concern because storage levels are already considered too high in most subject areas, based on the users' comments from the 2005 survey. A sample of the comments include: a graduate student in Architecture asked the Libraries to "find more space for books, bringing them back [from storage] is frustrating"; a faculty member in SHASS urged us to have "more books and journals located on campus, not in storage"; an engineering graduate student who wrote that "too much stuff seems to be getting sent [to storage]"; and a staff member in SHASS who stated "the number of basic books held in storage is ridiculous."

### Percent of Monograph Collection in Storage by Library

Library	Stored monographs
Aero	41%
Barker	31%

Dewey	36%
Humanities	37%
Lewis Music	6%
Lindgren	19%
Rotch	28%
Science	79%
<b>Total</b>	<b>39%</b>

R2IT developed a small number of “rules” for monograph storage accompanied by strategies for applying the rules (see E1 in the Appendices). Reversing storage of high use monographs in the OCC is included in the rules. The rules-based approach requires greater reliance on gathering data and investing time in producing reports. Much of the data is already being collected somewhere in the library system, but isn’t integrated in a report structure that supports storage. Additional data may be obtainable but would require time and effort to produce. Subject level data would be particularly useful.

### Monographs Collection Data for Divisional and Branch Libraries

	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006
On-site	681,252	696,153	690,180	676,145	675,613
% on-site	67%	66%	64%	62%	60%
In storage	342,959	353,276	381,198	408,091	441,723
% in storage	33%	34%	36%	38%	40%
<b>Total</b>	<b>1,024,21</b>	<b>1,049,42</b>	<b>1,071,37</b>	<b>1,084,23</b>	<b>1,117,33</b>
	<b>1</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>6</b>

The chart below was created using a possible example of criteria for storage. The shepherds ran reports for all monographs and monographic series located in the Stacks that were 25 years old or more and which had no circulation in ALEPH. The numbers below show the potential for rules based storage but the shepherds are not suggesting these items are the ones that should be stored. In particular, the inability to separate monographs from classed-together monographic series is troubling for rules-based storage decisions.

#### Sample Report for Monographs

(includes monographic series)

Library	#of Pre-1982 "Books" with no circulation in ALEPH
Aero	1,275
Barker	7,491
Dewey	6,513
Humanities	13,345
Lewis	2,303
Music	
Lindgren	3,285
Rotch	23,867
Science	6,751

Staff agreed that in large-scale projects, projects affecting high traffic subjects, and when testing new strategies, hands-on selection and report data are both appropriate. Once a new strategy has been tested and evaluated, the workflow would be streamlined. In subsequent and smaller moves, staff could more often rely on data from reports as the primary selection tool for most subject areas.

Macros are used in many of the libraries to process record changes in ALEPH, but not all libraries use the same ones. A suggestion was made to review the macros and deploy “best practices” to all units. Libraries that haven’t had to store many monographs in recent years have the least familiarity with these tools.

The potential of using more data in managing stack space and planning monograph storage projects is compelling. Libraries work with data in monitoring shelf-fullness and use levels. Low-use reports serve as a starting point for selecting monographs to store, but all of these data could become more powerful by putting them into context with other storage-oriented data for each subject: growth rate, shelf-fullness, storage history, use patterns, user demographics, overall size and age span of the subject area, etc. Creating a structured way to assemble and integrate the data would take time, but once established it would be useful for purposes beyond storage, such as collection evaluation, fundraising, budget reallocation, space planning, etc.

Some of the data are easily produced from ALEPH and Data Warehouse reports, but the skill level of staff varies in running reports or even knowing what data are available in each of these systems. The Annual Collections Statistics Report is currently distributed to Library Council and CMG mainly in paper (although a goal has been set to give password access to Libraries staff). Subject-level data can be harder to produce, although the data likely can be found if the staff member has the access and skill to extract what is needed. Information about shelf capacity and shelf-fullness comes from daily shelving work, but formal data must be gathered and updated through hands-on surveys. Some libraries have been collecting data on in-house use, either by tally sheets or with wireless barcode scanners. As noted above, serials are interfiled with monographs, and reports may not easily exclude them.

To offset the potential that we might make more storage errors by relying on data (thereby missing tangible clues), our recommended rules include systematic review of use data for the

stored collections. Setting a regular schedule for checking for higher use titles and reversing those storage decisions, as warranted, will provide a good safety net.

**Stored Monographs and Monographic Series Volumes  
with more than two loans within a year**  
(derived from a prototype for a new Data Warehouse report)

# of Loans	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006
3 or 4	131	137	102	104	98
5 or more	46	31	25	23	24

The Team discussed “disposal” as part of the charge, and agreed this applies mainly to identifying and withdrawing unneeded duplicates. The R2IT Part 1 report recommended that processing units be allowed “to delete duplicate monograph/thesis barcodes, delete holdings records in specific situations....” CAMS is managing the roll-out for this item which is moving forward this spring (2007).

**Recommendations**

1. Adopt “Rules-Based Management for Print Monograph Storage/Disposal by Subject Discipline” (see E1 in the Appendices), including greater use of data, to improve the management of monograph storage overall and reflect the needs of different subject specialties
2. Implement use of wireless barcode scanners in all libraries to collect data on in-library use so this data will be extractable in reports
3. Invite staff to explore “blue sky” ideas for applying technology to the storage process
4. Create central location for linking to storage data

## Next Steps

- Each library and the Annex will implement the rules, strategies and data to achieve significant workflow efficiencies – begin June 2007
- STS will arrange Brio Query training – begin summer 2007
- DLG-TSAC will charge a group to develop a structure for assembling and integrating data into a storage-oriented report(s) that can be produced on demand and updated routinely – summer 2007
- BAG will create an indicator in ALEPH to identify monographic series – summer 2007
- ASG will review the macros that are used in storage processing and make the best solutions available across the library system – summer 2007
- Divisional Librarians will submit requests for wireless barcode scanners in the next Computer Capital Equipment round and use them to collect in-house use statistics – fall 2007
- CMG will host a brown bag lunch to explore ideas for using technology in the storage process – fall/winter 2007
- DLG-TSAC will assess the success of the storage rules – July 2009

## **7. Summary of Recommendations and Next Steps**

### **Improve/Expand YBP Approval Plan and Determine Impact of Eliminating Approval Returns Recommendations**

1. The MIT Libraries will review the YBP profiles to increase the number of books received and reduce the number of unwanted slips when possible
2. Each divisional library will review their monograph account structure to determine if it is advantageous to simplify it
3. Steering Committee will look for opportunities to increase the monograph budget so as to allow us to expand our approval plan

### **Next Steps**

- CMG will look at how the current divisional library profiles overlap and identify any gaps – summer 2007
- CMG will lead the re-profiling project and assess the results – summer 2007 to winter 2007
- Divisional libraries will review the monographic account structure – summer 2007 to fall 2007
- Each selector will review his or her relevant YBP profiles. Each divisional library will review its profiles as a whole and recommend changes to increase books and reduce slips when possible – summer 2007 to winter 2007
- Charlene Follett, in consultation with CMG, will set up re-profiling sessions. YBP reps will conduct re-profiling sessions with selectors and collection managers – fall 2007
- Once the profiles have been in place six months, CMG will assess the effects of the changes and determine the cost effectiveness of eliminating returns – summer/fall 2008

### **Eliminate Receipt of Paper Slips from YBP**

#### **Recommendations**

1. All currently non-participating selectors will transition to electronic selection in GOBI for YBP/L&C profiled titles, after the new enhancements are released by YBP. This will give local units the option to print out selected slips to ease this transition. Selectors will be encouraged to do the bulk of their GOBI selection online, but Monograph Acquisitions will continue to accept paper slips until the transition is completed.

2. Eliminate receipt of YBP/L&C paper slips. Selectors will continue to have the option to submit non-slip selections and all non-YBP/L&C selections via paper, email or fax.

#### Next Steps

- Charlene Follett will schedule additional training, with the help of an experienced e-selector, for the remaining selectors who still need training or would like a refresher - summer 2007
- CMG will assess the impact of e-selection - fall 2007
- Charlene Follett will notify YBP/L&C to eliminate paper slips - fall 2007

### **Reduce the Number of Special Locations and Develop Criteria for Approving Them**

#### Recommendations

1. Accept the Guidelines for Creating/Retaining Special Locations (see C1 in the Appendices)
2. Accept the Special Location Inventory and Recommendations (see C3 in the Appendices) which will reduce the existing 182 locations by 38%
  - Completely eliminate 69 locations
  - Investigate eliminating 1 additional location
  - Consolidate 4 locations into 1 location
  - Investigate consolidating 4 locations into 2 locations
  - Keep 75 locations as they are
  - Keep 29 locations with some modifications (which may include renaming)
3. Develop and implement a clean-up project for those libraries in ALEPH not reviewed in this report
4. Assess the feasibility of using full LC classification in the Journals location throughout the Libraries to reduce staff maintenance efforts and establish consistency

#### Next Steps

- Each divisional and branch library will follow the Guidelines for Creating/Retaining Special Locations when reassessing the need for an existing location or when determining if a new location is needed – begin summer 2007
- BAG should discuss system implications of changing from a call number prefix to creating an ALEPH location for Theses to determine if this recommendation can be implemented. Archives staff should be consulted as this change will effect them as well – June/July 2007

- BAG will review the recommendations in the Special Location Inventory and Recommendations, notify divisional and branch libraries which system-wide changes they will handle, and coordinate appropriate timing of changes – summer 2007
- DLG/TSAC will charge BAG to coordinate the project to review and clean-up the remaining ALEPH libraries – summer 2007
- Science and Humanities staff should investigate the feasibility of combining their individual Reference and Theses locations as well as assessing the need for the WSRR location – summer/fall 2007
- Each divisional and branch library will implement the remaining changes in Special Location Inventory and Recommendations (those not centrally implemented by BAG) – fall 2007 to summer 2008
- ASG should review the loan periods for the various locations to determine if more consistency can be achieved for specific locations across the system – spring 2008
- DLG/TSAC will charge a group of Collections Services and Public Services staff to look at the feasibility of full LC classification of all journals. The group should be asked to examine the implications of the print journal cancellation projects on implementation timing as these cancellations will impact the return on investment of journal reclassification – spring 2008

### **Eliminate PreCats**

#### Recommendations

1. Outsource PreCat cataloging with Donohue for a two-year period
2. Evaluate alternative means of cataloging and processing mainstream print materials, such as shelf-ready book vendors
3. Review authority policies
4. Determine needed levels of cataloging for different types of items
5. Assess the cataloging workload near the end of the two-year trial to determine impact of eliminating PreCats

#### Next Steps

- Rebecca will contract with Donohue for a monthly pickup of any items that would have been sent PreCat – June 2007
- BAG will create an “at vendor” status in ALEPH – June 2007
- CAMS will cease sending out books PreCat – June 30, 2007

- CAMS will recall the remaining PreCats on the usual monthly schedule until they are gone – June 2007 to June 2008
- CAMS will send PreCats to Donohue on a monthly basis – July 2007 to June 2009
- Rebecca will continue to explore alternatives to Techpro for Arabic cataloging, with the aim of saving dollars that could go to PreCat outsourcing – summer 2007
- CAMS will analyze existing authority policies, including assessing the current landscape and impacts of ALEPH implementation, treatment of headings from vendors, and the series policy. This analysis should be ready for discussion with the new Associate Director for Collection Services upon or soon after his/her arrival – summer 2007
- DLG-TSAC will charge a group to evaluate alternative means of cataloging and processing mainstream print materials, such as shelf-ready book vendors – summer 2007
- DLG-TSAC will charge a group of Collections Services and Public Services staff to determine the needed levels of cataloging – spring 2008
- Near the completion of the two-year outsourcing period, CAMS will assess its cataloging workload to determine if the former PreCats can be absorbed into their regular workload – spring 2009

### **Rules-Based Management for Print Monograph Storage/Disposal**

#### Recommendations

1. Adopt “Rules-Based Management for Print Monograph Storage/Disposal by Subject Discipline” (see E1 in the Appendices), including greater use of data, to improve the management of monograph storage overall and reflect the needs of different subject specialties
2. Implement use of wireless barcode scanners in all libraries to collect data on in-library use so this data will be extractable in reports
3. Invite staff to explore “blue sky” ideas for applying technology to the storage process
4. Create central location for linking to storage data

#### Next Steps

- Each library and the Annex will implement the rules, strategies and data to achieve significant workflow efficiencies – begin June 2007
- STS will arrange Brio Query training – begin summer 2007

- DLG-TSAC will charge a group to develop a structure for assembling and integrating data into a storage-oriented report(s) that can be produced on demand and updated routinely – summer 2007
- BAG will create an indicator in ALEPH to identify monographic series – summer 2007
- ASG will review the macros that are used in storage processing and make the best solutions available across the library system – summer 2007
- Divisional Librarians will submit requests for wireless barcode scanners in the next Computer Capital Equipment round and use them to collect in-house use statistics – fall 2007
- CMG will host a brown bag lunch to explore ideas for using technology in the storage process – fall/winter 2007
- DLG-TSAC will assess the success of the storage rules – July 2009