

Members Council
Preservation/Electronic Collections Interest Group Meeting
May 19, 2003

In attendance: Meg Bellinger, OCLC; Mark Bendig, OCLC; Betty Bengtson, Guest; Barbara Berg, OCLC Western; Michael Butler, OHIONET; Lynn Silipigni Connaway, netLibrary and OCLC; Bruce Crocco, OCLC; Susan Fifer Canby, CAPCON; Rich Doyle, BCR; Maggie Farrell, BCR; Joe Harris, ILLINET; Eileen Hitchingham, SOLINET; Ernie Ingles, OCLC Canada; Jan Ison, ILLINET; Lydia Kegler, OCLC; Amy Lytle, OCLC; Gladys Maharem, PALINET; Wendy McGinnis, OCLC; Larry Olszewski, OCLC; Emma Bradford Perry, SOLINET; Judith Sessions, OHIONET; Betsy Wilson, OCLC Board of Trustees; Marie Zimmermanns, OCLC Western.

The meeting centered on a presentation about a prototype collection management tool, currently under consideration for development. The Collection Management Committee provided background on the prototype development and asked for input from the group. Committee members include Lydia Kegler, Product Portfolio Manager, Business and Product Development, Mark Bendig, Consulting Software Engineer, OCLC Office of Research, Lynn Silipigni Connaway, netLibrary and OCLC Office of Research, and Larry Olszewski, Manager, OCLC Library.

OCLC's TLC (the Life Cycle) product development plan allows for thorough testing of products before their release through a series of well-defined stages. The collection management prototype is currently in the "Fitness Stage," which is the last stage before a formal business plan is developed. It is hoped that this tool will serve the greater OCLC constituency, building on WorldCat, and pulling together scattered resources to make OCLC's core services easier to use.

Current collection analysis and management tools include the Lacey, Washington based ACAS (Automated Collection Assessment and Analysis), netLibrary's Library Resource Center, OCLC's ILL management statistics, and statistics derived from FirstSearch.

The development team has conducted focus groups with ACRL and other groups to get input on several issues, including determining a comprehensive definition of the term "collection management." The Preservation/Electronic Collections Interest Group defined collection management as including:

- Looking at ILL requests and doing usage pattern analysis
- Using automated records to analyze collections for deaccession
 - Finite size of physical space drives this
 - A sidelight is that it seems the more you throw away, the more books get used
 - FirstSearch statistics are not commonly used for this purpose
- Collection development is sometimes something of a misnomer
 - Centralized holdings are sometimes used to determine what to discard
 - Reference was made to the common statistic that in many collections, only 60% of books are circulated. There is concern that serials are even less widely used. One library's goal is 80/20 – so they would like to see what patrons are actually using.
- ILL statistics generally show a curve, and provide useful data for determining
 - What patrons want
 - How to build collections
 - Preservation decisions
- For special libraries, one important piece of information is what is available, and in what format it is provided, i.e., digitally vs. hard copy
- A primary need is the ability to compare one's own library collection to other institutions or standards, including
 - Core lists
 - Benchmark libraries' collections
 - Collections belonging to institutions of similar size
 - ILL request lists

The second question was "What needs to be included in the ideal collection management tool?" Responses included

- Interoperability with the institution's OPAC to get usage statistics
 - Need to be able to look at the "40%" of items that are not circulating to see if they are being used by others outside the immediate community, especially if they are older items.

- Also need to look in the other direction to see what institutional holdings are unique. This is important in making preservation decisions.
- It is important to be able to look at the turn-over rate for items, as well as what percentage of the materials budget is allocated for books, for serials, for DVDs, etc.
 - The ideal tool would be able to look at circulation and turnover data and normalize this information by the type of format, since that affects the length of the borrowing period.
- Another useful algorithm would look at basic facts about items in the collection, such as
 - Determining probable condition from usage rates
- To be useful for decisions about deaccession/preservation, the tool should have some refinements that include some historical information including
 - Price paid
 - Reason for purchase (especially useful for movies)
 - How the purchase was funded (is it a gift from a donor?)
 - Locale of publishing/publisher information
- The tool should enable libraries to create their own comparison base using locally developed criteria
- It should also allow for aggregation of all reports from various vendors
- The tool would be useful in more fully involving faculty in collection management by getting their input; ideally by having them use the tool, not reports from the library.
 - This would be especially useful for special collections, and for special academic certifications
 - Through comparisons with other collections/institutions, the tool could serve as a best collection practices model, with the institution able to select various criteria including
 - Proximity (what do other near-by institutions have?)
 - Benchmark institutions/collections
 - For faculty teaching infrequently offered courses, to help them target the most appropriate resources to obtain through ILL
- The tool should demonstrate that the value of the collection is worth more than just the “money spent.”
 - It would be useful to be able to run a report that shows all the potential cross-departmental users of an item in the collection – purchased for one user group, but useful and/or used by many others.

The final question was “how do you use WorldCat for collection management?” Most did not think of WorldCat as a front-line collection management tool. Reasons included:

- There are too many record variations in WorldCat, which means multiple searches
- WorldCat is static and too big – for local searches, the shared cataloging platform is more useful.
- Others felt WorldCat would be useful for finding out how many libraries own an item, and who they are.

Other internal electronic tools being used for collection management include

- Blackwell’s Collection Manager
 - This has helped expedite one institution’s acquisition process

Connaway and Kegler, along with Olszewski, explained the prototype tool. It is based on the RLG/WLN conspectus, with 24 Divisions, 500 Categories, and 5,000 – 7,000 subjects, organized by either the LCC or DDC. The test collection is the OCLC library collection, with MARC records retrieved from WorldCat. The tool worked well; all items in the exception report were able to be explained. Overall, the Interest Group was pleased with the tool’s capabilities to date.

The Interest Group listed a few more “Must Haves” after looking at the prototype. These included

- The ability to look at smaller pieces of the collection – the micro view is more crucial than the macro view.
- The ability to interact with the institution’s ILS system – interoperability is key.
- The inclusion of public and school librarians in the development process to integrate their needs into the product plan.
- The ability to provide budget support, to show how one dollar can be spent multiple times.

The group felt that a product along these lines would have value at the consortial level, as well as at the institutional level.

As the Collection Management Committee proceeds, next steps include

- A visit to Lacey, Washington
- Creation of a straw man plan as preparation for the actual creation of a business plan
- By the end of September 2003, presentation of a draft business plan for the OCLC Strategic Leadership Team to evaluate
- An update to this interest group (and others) at the October 2003 Members Council meeting.

Action Items

- Members of the Preservation/Electronic Collections Interest Group should send ideas/suggestions for this prototype to:
Lydia Kegler (Lydia_Kegler@oclc.org)
Lynn Connaway (lynnc@netLibrary.com)

Preservation/Electronic Collections Interest Group Meeting Tuesday, May 20, 2003

In attendance: Sue Barclay, OCLC; Meg Bellinger, OCLC; Betty Bengtson, OCLC; Barbara Berg, OCLC Western; Susan Fifer Canby, CAPCON; Tony Chirakos, OCLC; Tom Claerson, OCLC; Rich Doyle, BCR; Linda Evers, OCLC; Maggie Farrell, BCR; Joe Harris, ILLINET; Eileen Hitchingham, SOLINET; Ernie Ingles, OCLC Canada; Jan Ison, ILLINET; Amy Lytle, OCLC; Gladys Maharam, PALINET; Emma Bradford Perry, SOLINET; Judith Sessions, OHIONET; Dirk Raderstorf, OCLC; Patrick Wilkinson, WiLS; Marie Zimmermann, OCLC Western

Tom Claerson, Manager, DPR Outreach Services, opened the session with a presentation on the DPR Cooperative Vision. He outlined the reasons for the transition from a fee-based cooperative to making services available on a fee-for-service basis to both OCLC members and non-members. OCLC's goals are to be responsive to budgetary concerns expressed by all types of cultural heritage institutions, to remove access barriers to information on basic digitization and preservation information and activities, and to facilitate supporting cooperative projects in all sectors of cultural heritage institutions.

DPR Outreach Services is expanding its information services, workshops and education offerings, and consulting services. Outreach Services will continue to work closely with DPR Participants to develop new products and services, and will use the Participants as a resource for advice on desirable directions to pursue. Outreach Services is also continuing its focus on providing grants assistance, and has a growing focus on national initiatives for digitization and preservation.

The Working Groups established in May 2002 continue to evolve. Coordination of these Working Groups is now shared with OCLC's Member Services. There are five Working Groups sponsored by DPR, including: Audiovisual Preservation, Content, Digital Preservation, Historic Newspaper, and Digital Registry Working Groups. In addition, there are three User Groups: Olive, Digital Archive, and CONTENTdm.

One of the highlights of the transition is that the DPR Extranet has changed from being a password-protected site to one that is freely available on the OCLC Web. The URL for the Online Resource Center is <http://digitalcooperative.oclc.org>. The Digital Dispatch weekly e-newsletter is continuing. This resource focuses on news related to digitization and preservation. Contact Judith_cobb@oclc.org to subscribe. The content of the Online Resource Center web site will migrate into the new OCLC Web structure beginning late this spring.

DPR Outreach Services has a long list of workshops, many available now, and some being developed for spring and fall 2003. The Consulting Services focus on five areas: organizational vision/mission for digitization and preservation projects; strategy and program development; grantwriting and fundraising; digital and preservation project implementation; and operational review.

Grants assistance is available on many levels. Basic information is available through the Online Resource Center Web site. Outreach Services offers workshops on grantwriting, provides consulting on grant proposal development, offers grant reviews, and provides matchmaking services to assist in locating potential funders as well as to build cooperative projects between institutions.

Bob Harriman's goals in the new Digital Focus area of Member Services is to provide:

- Help to institutions wishing to emphasize staff development activities
- Assistance in bridging the gap between the research and practice communities
- Training, information services, and continued involvement in the development of standards and best practices
- User and usability studies

Throughout all these activities, the goal is to provide focus on the purpose of education in digital issues for practicing librarians and information workers.

Next on the agenda was a presentation by Tony Chirakos, Product Manager for CONTENTdm. Tony provided an update on new features, focusing on version 3.5. The highlights include Web templates to facilitate professional website appearance with minimal customization for smaller users, full customization for those who desire that functionality, including site translation to local languages (right now French and Spanish), and templates that can be changed to suit organizational needs.

Enhanced viewers for documents and images allow users to display search results in grid, bibliographic, thumbnail, and titles only views.

CONTENTdm's ability to link to WorldCat was of great interest to the group. Interoperability and integration are key needs. Tony explained how CONTENTdm integrates with both local systems and WorldCat.

During the discussion portion of the meeting, several questions and suggestions were raised. One concern centered on the number of working groups that have been formed. For a library with a small staff, that is too many. Tom Clareson explained that these Working Groups will conduct most meetings virtually, either via conference call or online, with face-to-face meetings at ALA to minimize expenses. Outcomes of these Working Groups will be Web-based for wider dissemination. In addition, not all Working Groups are envisioned as being permanent. The plan is for them to be project-based, which gives them a natural ending point.

The suggestion was made that DPR include in the Digital Dispatches definitions and scopes for new developments. An example of a useful comparison is MIT's Dspace vs. OCLC's Digital Archive – Dspace being an institutional repository that requires 1 – 5 IT staff; the Digital Archive serving a similar purpose, but requiring no institutional IT support. This kind of comparison will help members put new tools, concepts, and/or services into perspective.

As the Interest Group discussed Dspace and the Digital Archive, the suggestion was made that the next Members Council meeting include a speaker on Institutional Repositories.

Another suggestion was that DPR use Webcasts to provide information on the basics of digitization and preservation issues. There is a real need for cost- and time-efficient education; half-hour or one-hour Webcasts with time for questions at the end would meet this need.

The last session of the meeting involved identifying significant issues the group would like communicated to the Members Council Executive Committee and to OCLC.

1. At the October Members Council Meeting, there should be an update on the collection management tool development
2. Two presentations are needed: one on Institutional Repositories and the other on the Digital Registry
3. Discussion/decisions on what constitutes contribution to membership in the digital arena needs to occur. The group recommends a joint meeting with Member Services and DPR staff in October 2003
4. OCLC needs to organize Webcasts on basic information, especially in the digitization and preservation arena. Webcasts allow for maximum participation by institutions that have limited travel and/or staff development budgets.
5. At the October meeting, there should be discussion of integration/interoperability issues for digital tools. This is a rapidly changing environment; it is difficulty to keep up with all the changes. Pre-readings would help bring delegates up to speed; also a one-hour Webcast to before the next meeting would be useful.

Action Item: Send topic suggestions for the Webcast to Tom Clareson and Rich Doyle.