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Libraries and their collections have long been intertwined, with the size of one a key indicator of the quality of the other. Browsing open stacks enables the patron to find related books on the shelf – which library users call serendipity, and library staff call the Library of Congress Classification System. But numerous factors -- including the growth of the physical collection combined with the lack of support for new libraries and storage facilities, the development of a sophisticated infrastructure for sharing collections between libraries, the transition to digital as preferred format for most journals and many reference books, the in-roads in some disciplines of the e-book, the presence of mass digitization book projects, and a growing awareness that library space is not “free” necessitate that we re-examine the service of providing access to the collections. The Library’s collections are rich and deep, as befits a major research library. But given the space and staffing constraints, keeping all collections on campus is not possible -- and given the pressures on the libraries to provide additional types of spaces (group studies, instruction areas, comfortable seating) it may no longer be ideal.

Option A: Many Discrete Collections (Current)

Each of the twenty-four libraries that comprise The Library contains a mix of digital and physical formats. In addition to open stacks, most libraries include microforms, course reserves, permanent reserves, reference, rare, and unbound periodicals with a variety of access restrictions. Some also contain DVDs, maps and other non-book formats, and closed stacks or compact storage. Some libraries have an adequate amount of space, including growth, and others do not. For over 20 years items that were low use were sent to offsite storage at the Northern Regional Library Facility (NRLF). The NRLF is a cooperative library storage facility owned and operated by the University of California and is located on the grounds of UC Berkeley's Richmond Field Station. The Facility offers high density; low cost housing for infrequently used library materials belonging to northern California libraries. The estimate that NRLF will be full within 3 years has increased the pressure on storage space on campus.

Pros:

- Familiar – for both staff and patrons.
- Convenient for users if everything they need is in one place.
- Staff become very knowledgeable about local resources, and can assist users with reference and research questions including use of the physical collections.

Cons:
• Not all disciplines are equally well served.
• The Library buys redundant equipment for material such as microforms; staff who infrequently work with the equipment don’t know how to use it.
• Small collections may not have the depth to meet researchers’ needs, users go to multiple locations (a problem which is heightened by the growing interdisciplinary nature of research.)
• The Library cannot look holistically at the space required to “right size” the collections and decide which material should remain on campus across all library owned spaces. Instead, each library is on its own, some have more space than they need, others not nearly enough.
• Since it is staff intensive to provide access to “closed stack” material; having it in more places limits the hours it can be used.
• Smaller collections lack economy of scale, as staff cost per circulation increases.
• Budget cuts have decreased duplication between campus libraries, more patrons may have to visit more libraries to get what they need.
• Not financially sustainable at current or projected future staffing levels.

Option B: Reduced Print Footprint with no consolidation

Reduce the number of physical items across all the libraries and disciplines; reducing the space they require. This would allow for increased space for individual and small group study areas and for instruction and library events. It also allows the library to shift staff from the processing of physical objects to increasing support for digitization (Reserves, for example) and for access to online resources and digital collections.

Features:
• Based on established metrics programmatically determine when material is moved off campus. Assess metrics on a regular basis.
  o print material (including microform) not circulated (within a discipline determined amount of years) moved to storage
  OR
  o regardless of discipline, print material not circulated within a certain time period moved to storage.
• Emphasize electronic content for future and ongoing purchases
• Convert physical content to digital when it is the more desirable format and is allowed under Fair Use (http://www.arl.org/pp/ppcopyright/codefairuse/code/index.shtml) (for example, e-reserves and streaming video) and when it is more desirable format (many reference books and bound journals).
• Improve access to electronic content
  o Reduce turn around for loading electronic batch loads to Millennium/OCLC
  o Implement link checking to be sure URLs in OskiCat are up-to-date
• As NRLF holds a larger percentage of the library’s physical collections
• increase accessibility at NRLF (more frequent deliveries to campus, increased hours, for example.)
• speedy receipt of scanned journal articles and book chapters, and pickup at any library offers patrons convenience, in some case more than on-campus.
• Improve process for requesting items from SRLF (even knowing what is there), and insuring speedier delivery. (Currently items in SRLF only appear in Melvyl and have to be requested via ILL and picked up in the ILL office).
• Allow users to virtually see inside the items in storage to determine which they want to request.

Pros:

• Familiar – for both staff and patrons.
• Right sizes the collection to in demand materials.
• Convenient for users if everything they need is in one place.
• Ensures ready access to the core resources of the discipline by ensuring that they remain on central campus. (This is especially valuable for undergraduates who often don’t have time to request from off-campus, and may not be searching for a known item.).
• Potentially frees space for individual or group study areas as funding becomes available.

Cons:

• Some staff, students and faculty will not want to change access to their collections and/or their library space.
• Users may have to wait for items to be recalled from storage and will not be able to browse the collection as a whole.
• Without enhanced access, some low use material will become no use material if sent to storage (for example, historical encyclopedias or journals that have no index available).
• No staff savings, meaning this model is not financially sustainable.

Option C: Reduced Print Footprint with consolidation

Reduce the number of physical items across all the libraries and disciplines reducing the space and staff they require. This would allow for increased space for individual and small group study areas and for instruction and events. It also allows the library to shift staff from the processing of physical objects to increasing support for digitization (Reserves, for example) and for access to online resources and digital collections.

Features:

• Based on established metrics, programmatically move material off campus. Assess
metrics on a regular basis.
  - by discipline -- print material (including microform) not circulated (within a discipline determined amount of years) moved to storage

  **OR**

  - regardless of discipline, print material not circulated within a certain time period moved to storage.

- Consolidate microforms and videocassettes (and any other formats requiring special equipment) and the equipment necessary to use them.
- Consolidate rare books and manuscripts, regardless of subject matter, to Bancroft, allowing staff knowledgeable in the handling and caretaking of them to manage them, and also alleviating staff demand to supervise the use of these items. This may require additional access hours at Bancroft.
- Consolidate collections based on research synergies, and patterns of use by faculty and students.
- Emphasize electronic content for future and ongoing purchases
- Convert physical content to digital when it is the more desirable format and is allowed under Fair Use ([http://www.arl.org/pp/ppcopyright/codefairuse/code/index.shtml](http://www.arl.org/pp/ppcopyright/codefairuse/code/index.shtml)) (for example, e-reserves and streaming video) and when it is more desirable format (many reference books and bound journals).
- With emphasis on electronic content
  - Reduce turn around for loading electronic batch loads to Millennium/OCLC
  - Implement link checking to be sure URLs in OskiCat are up-to-date
- As NRLF holds a larger percentage of the library’s physical collections
  - increase accessibility at NRLF (more frequent deliveries to campus, increased hours, for example.)
  - speedy receipt of scanned journal articles and book chapters, and pickup at any library offers patrons convenience, in some case more than on-campus.
  - Improve process for requesting items from SRLF (even knowing what is there), and insuring speedier delivery. (Currently items in SRLF only appear in Melvyl and have to be requested via ILL and picked up in the ILL office).
  - Allow users to virtually see inside the items in storage to determine which they want to request.

**Pros:**

- Right sizes the collection to in demand materials.
- Ensures ready access to the core resources of the discipline by ensuring that they remain on central campus. (This is especially valuable for undergraduates who often don’t have time to request from off-campus, and may not be searching for a known item.).
- Emphasis on electronic gives many users what they want where and when they want it.
- Grouping special collections, microforms, and videocassettes will save staff time on providing access and supporting formats and hardware they may not be familiar with.
Fewer locations will result in longer hours at those locations.

Cons:

- Some staff, students and faculty will not want to change access to their collections and/or their library space.
- Moving special formats requiring equipment to use from subject library to centralized would not save a large amount overall space to house the collection.
  - Pros: save money on equipment (and possibly staff time to service it).
  - If can reduce the number of machines, space would be saved.
- Users may have to travel further to access the collection they need.
- Grouping special collections together in Bancroft may require longer hours to provide access.
- Without enhanced access, some low use material will become no use material if sent to storage (for example, historical encyclopedias or journals that have no index available).

**Option D: Mix of Print Intensive and Digital Intensive Libraries**

Develop a campus wide mix of physical format intensive libraries and primarily digital libraries. Determine the value of print versus digital for each Library and focus on appropriate formats. Print libraries would focus on the physical formats with a dense collection. Digital library would have only medium to high circulating physical formats and focus on increasing access to digital content.

Features:

- **Digital**
  - Emphasize electronic content for future and ongoing purchases
  - Convert physical content to digital when it is the more desirable format and is allowed under Fair Use ([http://www.arl.org/pp/ppcopyright/codefairuse/code/index.shtml](http://www.arl.org/pp/ppcopyright/codefairuse/code/index.shtml)) (for example, e-reserves and streaming video) and when it is more desirable format (many reference books and bound journals).
  - Reduce turn around for loading electronic batch loads to Millennium/OCLC
  - Implement link checking to be sure URLs in OskiCat are up-to-date
  - Small high interest circulating collection
  - Processing staff would be redeployed in the digital library
  - Digital library doesn’t need to be in same physical location as previous print library, but close proximity to faculty and graduate students would allow the library to shift its focus from supporting researchers primarily in the resource discovery phase to the “management, curation and preservation of research data, and in scholarly communication and the effective dissemination of research outputs.”

- **Print**
  - print intensive library, lots of stacks and compact shelving
Pros

• Moves away from the one size fits all model,
• Allows for specialization and maximization of customization based on discipline.
• Emphasis on electronic gives many users what they want where they want it.
• The more digital library, freeing staff from some of the physical processing, allows librarians to provide support to faculty, students and researchers in more phases of the research and scholarly communication process.
• Deep print collections allow scholars in some disciplines ready access to the materials that they need.

Cons

• Some staff, students and faculty will not want to change access to their collections and/or their library space.
• Unclear whether there is Library capacity for on-site storage of the material deemed desirable by liaisons, faculty and researchers.

Transcription: Comments from brainstorming session on 2/22/2012

• Some combo of on-campus, storage, and ILL for print
• Electronic access
• How do you minimize requests through storage and ILL by criteria
• Use plays into decisions about consolidating/size of on-campus collections
• Cross tab departmental/affiliation with collection use
• On campus: < 10 years old; circ within the last 10 years, not NRLF, SRLF, UCLA (UCSD criteria)
• Consolidating supervised collections
• E.g., put all rare stuff together
• How do you measure how much damage is done by moving items off-campus
• Automate returning to campus items checked out from NRLF too often
• Browsability is affected by storage
• More TOC/google books links for NRLF records so users can see whether worth requesting
• Weeding
• NRLF actually provides some conveniences (article delivery and paging to any location)
  o Increase NRLF hours, for example, Saturdays – especially if storage is expanded
  o Explore ways to enhance record (add Table of Contents, for example) to make it easier for patrons to tell if they need the item in NRLF
• Make SRLF requests easier
• Expand electronic access
• On-campus storage (additional storage)
• Consolidating formats for easier access, especially when equipment is required.
• Digitize on-demand
• Library use only – in stacks or not?
• One library (physical) collection with paging to service points (future)
  o Question of collocation with selector?
• Right size/baseline collection size (make sure enough collection space for needed collections)
• No unintended duplication?
• Patron-driven acquisition

Acquisitions
Judith Weeks and Lisa Rowlison de Ortiz

Current Landscape:

Acquisitions functions are largely concentrated in a few locations. The majority of the acquisitions functions happen in the Acquisitions Department within Collection Services, and within 3-4 other Subject Specialty Libraries performing their own acquisitions.

Acquisitions includes but is not limited to the following functions:

• Monographic ordering
• Serial ordering
• Mono/serial receiving
• Invoice approval
• E-resource ordering
• E-resource processing
• Serial check-in
• Serial claiming
• Serial binding
• Gift/exchange program
• Fund management
• Vendor correspondence
• Government documents processing
• Post-catalog serial processing
• Record maintenance

Under the direction of the Acquisitions Librarian, the Acquisitions Department functions can be performed by varying levels of staffing depending on function involved. Student Library Assistants can perform basic serials processing, with Library Assistant 3s through Library Professional 4s performing all other functions depending on level of difficulty and expertise needed for the particular Acquisitions function being performed. Also, the acquisition model applied will depend on what types of libraries are implemented. How much can be done in the SSLs depends on distribution and expectations on staff. Current staffing levels in the Acquisitions Department are not adequate; recentralization of any kind could not be implemented without additional staffing for this unit.
**Option A: Partial Centralization**

Features: Centralize receipt and check-in of serials, centralize the ordering and receipt of English language materials from BANC, EAL, MUSI, and MRC. Consider consolidating management of Bancroft approval plans into Collection Services.

Pros:
- More expertise in handling acquisitions tasks.
- SSL staff would have more time to perform other duties in their units.
- Standardization of processes.
- Less duplicative work.
- Streamlining the work.
- Less accidental duplication of materials.
- Greater expertise.

Cons:
- More lag time in SSL receipt of unbound journals if backlogs develop.
- Loss of local control.
- Lose localized subject expertise.
- Movement of materials between receiving/check-in location to shelving location.

**Option B: Centralizing to the Hub level**

Features: Acquisitions could stay as they currently are, but if Hub Libraries are developed and they take smaller SSLs under them, the Hub library could take on any acquisitions functions for their smaller SSLs.

Pros:
- Relieve the smaller SSLs of acquisitions functions.
- Staff redistribution potentially more effective.
- Standardization of processes.

Cons:
- Staff redistribution may not be adequate.
- Loss of local subject expertise.

**Option C: Complete Centralization**

Features: Complete centralization would be a worst case scenario and only recommended if staff becomes decimated and expertise is lost in the Subject Specialty Libraries and they can no longer maintain their decentralized acquisitions. BANC and EAL would be exceptions
to this because of the need for their specialized expertise in their specific types materials and language. Centralization could however be a welcomed option for the smaller SSLs that may desire centralizing all their acquisitions and processing for more truly shelf ready materials.

Pros:

- SSL staff would have more time to perform other essential duties in their units.
- Standardization of processes.
- Less duplicative work.
- Streamlining the work.
- Greater expertise would develop.

Cons:

- More lag time in SSL receipt of materials if backlogs develop.
- Loss of local control.
- Lose localized expertise.
- Increased movement of materials.

Option D: Status Quo - Acquisitions Functions remain the same.

Features: Acquisitions could stay as they currently are with the majority of the acquisitions functions happening in the Acquisitions Department within Collection Services, and within 3-4 other Subject Specialty Libraries performing their own acquisitions. With staff resources dwindling it's not clear how viable this option would be or how long it could be maintained. This option could just put off the inevitable need to centralize more. It's best to consider the option that provides the best services.

Pros:

- Staff could remain in their current locations.
- Additional training would be minimal.

Cons:

- Staffing levels would be inadequate.
- Work would backlog.

Considerations:

- Staffing Library Mail Services adequately is crucial to ensure flow of materials between units.
-Space limitations in 250 Moffitt need to be taken into account in any plan that includes centralizing services.

-Only material that can logistically be handled by Acquisitions Department should be considered for recentralizing. Specialized material such as from BANC or EAL should continue to be handled by their staff. The special nature of the material requires the expertise only they have.

-Centrally trained roving teams to perform processing could be a possible option to go out to the SSLs that become part of Hub Libraries.

Transcriptions

Note: Brainstorming and open meetings on overviews for Acquisitions and Cataloging were done at the same time in two different sessions. The following transcriptions apply to one or both services.

Brainstorm at (CMC)

1. More shelf-ready (not just YBP)
2. Push some staff responsibilities down to students.
3. Centralize cataloging for certain formats.
4. Evaluate which activity directly supports university mission and focus on those.
5. Identify activities that should be going on but aren't' --> record analysis.
6. Expedite processing of high use materials and things with holds.
7. Outsource electronic cataloging to SCP.
8. Reduce or eliminate serials check-in.
10. Investigate other services that are available (OCLC service, etc.)
11. Stop editing OCLC records.
12. Stop using local ILS and move to network level.
13. Stop creating full records.
14. Centralize Cat & Acq management (as apposed to operations).
15. Consolidate vendors to one, two (fewer).
16. Re-centralize serials check-in (no more recd direct).
17. Stop maintenance on existing lower level records and focus on new.
18. Cease creating call numbers for things.
19. Take another look at ERMS.
21. Stop acquiring languages we don't catalog or don't support curriculum.
22. Buy records whenever possible.
23. Stop getting cat. as sep. as S.O. --> get on approval.
24. Outlaw analytics -->all cat as seps.
25. Consolidation of cataloging.
26. Strip URL's that we didn't purchase from PromptCat records.
27. Tax selector for time intensive treatments.
28. Cease analyzing microform sets.
29. Downscale gifts & exchange.
30. Limit OP searching attempts.
31. Roving processing teams.
32. Further alignment of processes (AskTico, standardization).
33. Quit ordering known dups.
34. Simplify procedures/ live with errors.
35. Reduce procedures to national level only (or few local as possible).
36. Investigate in-sourcing from other UC's & institutions.
37. Eliminate local processing / centralize only.
38. Request more transparency from CDL to reduce communication.
39. Partial recentralization.
40. No double checkin of serials.

CENTRALIZING PROS AND CONS FROM BRAINSTORM (Set goals first does centralization meet goals)

Benefits

- In line with OE and other initiatives
- Cover vacancies in self-cataloging units
- Standardization of processes.
- Less duplicate work.
- Centralize management to have more reports/less managers.
- Test material on shelf faster.
- Free up staff faster to do other things.
- Greater bench strength.
- Less customization of procedures.

Drawbacks

- Loss of local control.
- Lose localized expertise.
- Security of materials.
- Need agreement on level of cataloging.
- Movement of materials.
- Space issues.

**Brainstorming (B-Tech): Cataloging, Acquisitions, Processing**

- Reduce print serial subscriptions
- Reduce work of DDP (deep discount pricing) process
- If we own print + online, then don’t check-in the print
- Move standing orders to series on approval and shelf-ready
• Rotate SSL staff into ACQ (and vice versa) to cross train and learn standard processing
• Have all SSLs use current open holdings standard
• Use students more (where appropriate)
• More outsourced cataloging and other services (e.g. serials solutions, services to support open access)
• Collect fewer materials in languages we can’t process and which are not used enough to warrant the expense of processing (e.g. check-in, cataloging, marking, shelving, shelving space, etc.)
• Examine PL480 stuff – don’t select and catalog everything that is received – be selective
• Standardize NRLF holdings to match current open holdings standard
• Be more discerning regarding selecting and cataloging (and binding, marking, shelving, etc.) of single issue, inactive serial titles.
• Use lower bibliographic record standards for original cataloging (e.g. BSR)
• Examine exchange titles and reduce.
• Be more assertive about the number of vendors we use. Limit to the subset of reliable vendors.
• Hire a bunch of catalogers and stop Prompt Cat.
• Join CONSER
• Negotiate doing processing/cataloging/acquisitions for other UC campuses
• Get vendors to supply better SFX records
• Find more efficient ways to handle all aspects of e-resources
• Get CDL to do more of the e-resource work/process for all the campuses

NOTE:
Acquisitions across the library could benefit from some of the suggestions made in the brainstorming sessions. This could be looked at outside of the process of developing new service models. Some suggestions such as those below could be investigated for feasibility at any time:

• Acquire more shelf-ready materials.
• Evaluate which activity directly supports university mission and focus on those.
• Consolidate to fewer more reliable vendors.
• Take another look at ERMS.
• Stop acquiring Library of Congress (PL480), or reduce to just titles actually desired.
• Change purchase call number varies standing orders to approval.
• Downscale gifts & exchange.
• Limit OP searching attempts.
• Request more transparency from CDL to reduce communication.
• Reduce print serial subscriptions for materials available online.
• Reduce work of DDP (deep discount pricing) process.
• Have all SSL’s use simple open holdings standard for 866, stop updating every time a volume is bound.
• Collect fewer materials in languages we can’t process and which are not used enough to warrant the expense of processing (e.g. check-in, cataloging, marking, shelving, shelving space, etc.).
• Be more discerning regarding selecting and cataloging (and binding, marking, shelving, etc.) of single issue, inactive serial titles.
• Get vendors to supply better SFX records.
• Find more efficient ways to handle all aspects of e-resources.

Cataloging
Lisa Rowlison de Ortiz and Judith Weeks

Current Landscape

In addition to Library Collection Services which provides cataloging services to most of the Library, there are 5 additional self-cataloging units (BANC, EAL, EART, MRC, and MUSI). Of the self-cataloging units, one focuses on specific languages, 3 on specific formats, and one is collection area specific.

The work of these units includes one or more of the following categories:

• Original monographic cataloging
• Monographic copy cataloging
• Serials cataloging
• Manuscripts cataloging
• Pictorial & collections processing
• Rare book cataloging
• Electronic resources/collections cataloging
• Recorded and printed music cataloging
• Map cataloging
• Motion picture and video cataloging
• Catalog record maintenance and quality control

This has been the arrangement in the Library for over twenty years. However, unlike the past 20 years, staffing levels, particularly in the Catalog Department, are at an all-time low. Since the 1990s we have seen significant changes in technology, information resources, and the creation and delivery of metadata. While our re-envisioning process may be born from an economic crisis, it is nevertheless a very good time for the Library to engage in self-examination.

The University of California is currently in the third stage of a process to “re-envision” technical service functions on a system-wide level (i.e. Next Generation Technical Services, NGTS). Perhaps the most common theme throughout that process is collaboration. While we do have a few current collaborative cataloging agreements, they are but a fraction of
what could be done with true collaboration and organization on a system-wide level. We can expect to see specific opportunities emerging from the NGTS effort within the next 6-12 months.

Many of the cataloging related recommendations from the brainstorming sessions revolved around centralization, outsourcing, and adjusting workflows that occur prior to material arriving for cataloging (e.g. selection and acquisition).

**OPTION A: Status Quo**

Features:
- Six separate cataloging units across campus
- Redundancy in some functional areas (e.g. PromptCat processing)
- Understaffing in key areas (e.g. Spanish language monographic original cataloger)

Considerations:
- A partial reorganization of “central” technical service functions was done 1-2 years ago

**PROS:**
- Organization chart remains unchanged (familiar)
- Each unit does whatever it wants
- Retains existing efficiencies
- Requires no change

**CONS:**
- Lack of cross-training
- Inconsistent vision and goals across units
- Inconsistent use of national and local cataloging rules/procedures
- Does not address issue of imbalanced staffing
- Retains existing inefficiencies
- Prevents some experts from focusing all their time in their area of expertise (e.g. Manuscript cataloging)

**OPTION B: Some cataloging services are centralized**

Features:
• Similar to the Hub & Cluster service model, where Collection Services serves as a hub, and EART, EAL, and Bancroft are clusters. MUSI and MRC cataloging are physically absorbed into Collection Service’s Catalog Department.
• Consolidates management of most cataloging units into Collection Services.
• Consolidates cataloging of modern trade purchased materials (monographs) as well as active print serials (check-in and cataloging) in English and western European languages from The Bancroft Library into Collection Services.
• Consolidates YBP/PromptCat receipt and processing from all locations into a single location.

Considerations:
• Requires agreement on level and quality of cataloging for material.
• Requires resources to optimize working space in Moffitt 250

PROS:
• Consistent vision and goals across units.
• Combining currently dispersed staff allows for redundancy and cross-training, which is particularly important in areas where retirements have or will soon occur.
• Consistent use and application of Library standards and procedures.
• Standardization of processes.
• Less duplicative work (e.g. PromptCat receipt, etc.).
• Fewer managers
• In line with OE and other initiatives
• Allows Bancroft catalogers to focus on areas unique to Bancroft.

CONS:
• Increase in materials flowing through Mail Room
• Breaks away from traditional UCB approach to technical service operations
• Loss of local customization
• Possible space issues

OPTION B2: Some cataloging services are centralized – Hub, no cluster model

Features:
• Collection Services, EAL, and Bancroft serve as separate hubs
• MUSI, EART, and MRC are physically absorbed into Collection Services
• Semi-consolidation of management (3 managers vs. 6)
• Consolidates cataloging of modern trade purchased materials (monographs) as well as active print serials (check-in and cataloging) in English and western European languages from The Bancroft Library into Collection Services.

Considerations:
• Requires resources to optimize working space in Moffitt 250

PROS:
• May reduce some duplicative work
• Increases consistency and application of Library standards and procedures
• Some local customization retained
• Allows Bancroft catalogers to focus on areas unique to Bancroft.

CONS:
• May not provide enough staff-realignment to address issue of current imbalance
• Possible space issues

OPTION C: Some cataloging services are centralized and use of outsourcing is increased, especially in areas currently lacking expertise

Features:
• Includes features of Option B or Option B2
• Uses shelf-ready services for materials obtained from vendors who offer these services.
• Gives preference to vendors who offer shelf-ready services.
• Uses on-going contract cataloging services to manage materials in languages lacking in-house expertise (e.g. Romanian, Burmese, Malay, Cambodian, etc.)
• Hire short-term in-house contract catalogers to work on database clean-up projects.

Considerations:
• Initial start-up and vendor evaluation will be time-consuming for each new contract.
• Implementation may at first cause a temporary slowing of materials reaching their shelving location.

PROS:
• Allows catalog librarians and staff to focus on original or other complex cataloging services (e.g. catalog maintenance, contributions to the Library of Congress Program for Cooperative Cataloging, etc.)
• Materials in languages lacking in-house expertise are made available to users.
• Cataloging output less affected by retirements, illness, etc.
• May require fewer staff in department.

CONS:
• Vendor cataloging costs (excluding physical processing costs of “shelf ready” services) are often higher than the costs of in-house cataloging.
• Possible increase in the number of record errors caused by outsourced cataloging mismatches, labeling errors, etc.
• Increase record loading work.
• Services may not be available in areas where most needed (e.g. from South American vendors)
• May increase number of SLEs needed in department.

Note: Brainstorming and open meetings on Acquisitions and Cataloging were done at the same time with a fair amount of overlap and inter-related content. The compiled notes for both are above, at the end of Acquisitions.

Circulation and Stack Management
Paul Lynch and Susan Snyder

Circulation and stack management functions are crucial to providing access to library resources. They often represent the “frontline” of library users’ experiences in the library. Core tasks that are undertaken primarily at Circulation desks (or not in the Stacks) are listed under “Circulation tasks” and those that are undertaken primarily in book stacks are listed under “Stacks Maintenance tasks” below. Those tasks that are undertaken in both areas are listed together under the heading “Circulation and Stacks Maintenance tasks.” Circulation and stacks maintenance practices currently vary widely among campus libraries.

Existing essential core tasks

Circulation tasks

• Check in/check out including on the fly record creation and/or barcoding
• Placing holds and searches
• NRLF requests
• Library spaces scheduling and maintenance
• Relabeling

Stacks Maintenance tasks

• Reshelving
• Stack shifts
• New book management
• Shelf-reading

Circulation and Stacks Maintenance tasks

• Performing searches
• Projects (e.g. barcoding, pulling items for exhibition)
• Student and staff hiring, training, scheduling, supervision
• Facilities: building, furniture, equipment, lighting, etc.
• Questions (billing, policy, access, reference, directional)
• Creating and maintaining accurate and informative signage in stacks and other public areas
• Security of collections and people
• NRLF daily shipment coordination and preparation
• Pulling/referring for repair or review
• Public PC/microfilm readers/copiers monitoring and maintenance scheduling
• Library use only and ILL paging and supervision
• Sweeps – collection of items used inside the library

**Status quo/De Facto Service Model: High number of Service Points:**

We have interpreted the “high” category of service points as the status quo. Using the preceding task list as the status quo, the advantages and disadvantages of the existing situation are:

**Pros**

- Specialization/expertise of staff and student employees in particular areas and/or disciplines
- Autonomy of units in setting hours and policies to accommodate specific clientele
- Student workers’ work in one place may lead to greater understanding of library-specific users’ needs
- Large number of access points, study areas
- Larger number of liaison points with faculty and students
- Allows for general initiatives such as universal returns
- Customization based on local understanding of users and discipline-based patterns/cultures leading to potential high user satisfaction
- Promotes the existence of different distinct disciplines

**Cons**

- Too few people doing too many disparate tasks
- Lack of professional staff during all open hours
- Staff losses in random locations, not based on use or demand
- Expense of maintaining current number of service points in widely distributed locations
- Customization of policies and hours / lack of uniform policy and open hours possibly leading to confusion/frustration of users of multiple libraries
- Not sustainable across the board

**Ideas for ameliorating problems with existing service points model:**

- Centralized location for resolving complex questions related to privileges (e.g. billing or access). This would require uniform loan rules and policies; and access to staff with wide knowledge of all library units.
  Pros: Fewer staff required, Uniform policies may lead to less confusion/frustration for patrons
  Cons: Inconvenience to patrons used to resolving issues on the spot, Centralized staff fielding questions may become very busy

- Fully or partially centralized circulation/stacks training for student employees
  Pros: Would allow for reassignment of some staff responsibilities, Standardized best practices developed could lead to better quality control
Cons: Inevitable redundancy of effort on site, Lack of personal interaction with local staff

- Standardization of rules, loan rules, and processes
  Pros: Simplification of programming, Facilitation of centralized fielding of billing/access/privileges questions
  Cons: Reduces flexibility to customize to primary local clientele

- Self check-out
  Pros: Fewer student staff required, Expediency for users
  Cons: New equipment, IT, and maintenance required and staff to monitor it, Better suited to up-to-date, frequently-weeded, tattle-taped collections, Not all items are barcoded, Potential loss of collections

- "Roving teams" for selected duties in multiple units
  Pros: Could possibly save on GA, Possible ability to support smaller service points with “back-up” staff
  Cons: Reduced ability to prioritize local operational needs, Risk of unengaged students and staff, Difficulty in managing quality control

- Staff divided/shared among units. This would require student employees better trained for triage and operational management
  Pros: Fewer staff required, Would provide opportunities for staff who are generalists, Would provide opportunities for staff to gain new subject expertise and professional development
  Cons: Risk of increased stress and pressure from overwork, Half-time appointments usually mean double responsibility rather than 50/50, Potential for reduced staff investment and expertise in subject area, Risk of alienating staff with undesired and overburdening assignments

- Fee-based delivery service from all collections
  Pros: Potential revenue for operations
  Cons: May not be allowable on campus, Possible alienation and dissatisfaction of faculty and students, Possible reduction in library usage, Additional staff required for retrieval, processing of requests, and management of revenue

**Alternative Service Points Model: Fewer service points.**

This would involve consolidation, centralization, and standardization.

- Consolidation of collections by format
- Consolidation of collections by discipline
- Consolidation of collections by loan rule
• Consolidation of collections by campus location
• Card key access to collections unstaffed and closed
• (Free/non-fee-based) paging and returns from collections unstaffed and closed
• Fee-based delivery service from closed collections

Pros

• Possibly less expensive
• Fewer access points/consolidation could mean available professional staffing could cover all service points, providing more expertise and authorization for circ overrides, etc.
• Fewer access points/consolidation could mean increased hours at those remaining
• Possibly fewer staff and student employees required for operations
• More uniformity in procedures and policies
• More staff available to specialize
• Critical mass of users in consolidated locations
• Simplification for user - larger collections, longer hours, uniform policies, more staff available

Cons

• Less flexibility to customize service to specific user groups
• More generalization and uniformity
• Fewer physical interaction points with faculty and students
• Possible loss of library space including stacks, study areas, and other unit spaces
• Possible loss in departmental investment after consolidation
• More difficulty in scheduling larger centralized staff
• Some units could potentially be kept open later but only student employee staffing available
• Potential loss of collections in unstaffed libraries

Instruction
Jennifer Dorner and Susan Edwards

Principles:

Library instruction is powerful method of introducing students to the breadth and depth of library resources as well as orienting them to the research practices of their discipline. Library instruction generally focuses on four main areas: discovery, evaluation, management of information, and scholarly communication.
We are very open to exploring and adopting new technologies for teaching. We believe tools like guides, tip sheets, and web based tutorials can provide a very helpful supplement to in person instruction, and some can even be used on a stand alone to learn to use a particular tool. But at this point we don't feel there is a cost (and time) effective technological substitute for real-time communication and interaction between students and instructor.

While increased access to online content might create the illusion that information is easier to access, the increased number of resources, interfaces and access points makes finding relevant and appropriate information more difficult. Similarly, the complexity, decentralization and non-standardization of Library systems require constant mediation by Library staff. Instructional support will be less crucial when our systems are less complex.

Regardless of the option chosen, there should be a centralized instructional services presence on the Web site which better explains to faculty, staff and students the breadth and depth of the instructional support the Library provides and how to access these services. This site would also serve as a gateway to instructional materials (guides and tutorials) aimed at our user population.

Each option assumes that instruction to graduate students will be provided by subject specialists, but turning to colleagues in related disciplines for support and cross-training is encouraged.

Each option assumes that there will be four ongoing positions that will provide non-course related instruction (e.g. ED98/198, L&S 1, orientations) and library-wide support for instruction. This includes a librarian responsible for library-wide e-learning support; a librarian responsible for instruction and outreach to incoming and transfer students as well as the academic support units that serve them; a library assistant IV position that will assist in all these areas, along with providing centralized instruction scheduling and developing and maintaining a centralized instruction web presence; and an instruction coordinator who will work to ensure instruction goals are set and subsequent plans are being met, as well as represent the Library on appropriate Campus committees and task forces. The Instruction Coordinator will work to ensure that the instruction goals are set and subsequent plans are being met. This grouping is referred to as the “instruction team” throughout the document. Administrative support should be provided where the instruction team is housed.

Each option assumes that instruction can be provided by Library Professional 4s or other appropriate classified staff.

**Considerations:**

Assuming that the Role of the Librarian team agrees that library instruction is a core responsibility and that the revised library services model provides librarians with the time to do instruction, then there needs to be commitment to instruction by all subject librarians. There are many reasons for the current unevenness of library instruction across departments (lack of staff time, lack of academic departmental interest, curricular differences), but after an environmental scan has been done and an instruction plan is put
into place, there should be equitable participation in that plan amongst librarians and the value of that participation should be reflected in the review process.

**OPTION A: Course-related instruction provided by subject specialists; non-course related instruction provided by instruction team and other staff**

**Features:**

- All course-related instruction, including classes in the disciplines with a Reading and Composition or American Cultures designation, will be taught by subject liaisons.
- Instruction will continue to be offered in a variety of locations, both in libraries and classrooms.
- Subject liaisons can use the Subject Councils to explore how to serve emerging interdisciplinary research areas, share knowledge of advanced tools, and plan how best to cover areas without a liaison.
- Non-course specific instruction (ED 98/198, L&S 1) and sessions/orientations for academic support units on campus (Summer Sessions, URAP, Transfer, Student Athletes, Berkeley/DC program) will be provided by a separate instruction team and will include staff positions or will draw on staff from other units.
- Administrative staff will schedule centralized classrooms, check out laptops, gather statistics, etc.
- Administrative support will be provided for all instructors in a disciplinary team through the Subject Councils. This could include creating course specific modules for Library a la Carte, creating brief webcasts to detail how to use a tool, etc.

**Considerations:**

- Lending/maintenance of laptops and projectors for Doe/Moffitt could be moved to public services desk, subject libraries would continue to handle their own equipment.
- Graduate students as student employees could be a tremendous (and affordable) way to develop learning objects, develop peer outreach, and inform librarian practice.
- Area studies subject liaisons will identify for themselves which Subject Council to associate with.

**Pros:**

- Exposes students to the discipline’s approach to research and to in-depth knowledge of the research resources.
• Allows for the development of a programmatic approach to research instruction, from the first class for majors to the methodology classes for doctoral students.

• Provides liaisons a valuable outreach venue to faculty and students.

• Reference, individual research appointments, course based instruction and collection development are interrelated and build on each other.

• Allows for some reassignment of staff currently located in DMIUS unit (depending on how many would serve on the non-course specific instruction team).

Cons:

• Unequal commitment to instruction among subject-specialists may result in uneven provision of service across disciplines or between undergraduate/graduate instruction.

• Some liaisons serve an extremely large number of students and will not be able to provide all the needed instruction. If the other liaisons in that Subject Council can’t (or won’t) cover, some students will not be served.

OPTION B: Teams of librarians in disciplinary groups share responsibility for instruction; instruction team handles non-course specific instruction and instruction in RC program.

This option presumes that subject specialists can be divided into four broad subject groups: humanities, social sciences, physical sciences and life sciences. As in the first option, these groups would work together to establish learning goals for an instruction program, do an environmental scan to identify needs; and target key classes in the undergraduate and graduate programs where learning goals can be met. Within the groups, librarians and classified staff will identify where responsibility for instruction can be shared amongst librarians, so no one person is overburdened with the responsibility for meeting the needs of their department(s). Each subject area should have staff assigned to provide instructional support for undergraduate classes and to help with the development and maintenance of instructional materials.

The instruction team would continue providing instruction for the RC program as well as non-course specific instruction. The team would draw on the subject area groups’ classified staff to help provide instruction for the RC classes. In this option the instruction team would handle administrative functions that support instruction across the Library.

Considerations:

• This option is closest to the current option, though it proposes fewer staff dedicated to an instruction team and more cooperation and collaboration among subject specialists.
Area studies subject liaisons will identify for themselves which subject group to associate with.

Pros:

- Encourages sharing of strategies, tools, and other resources supporting instruction across multiple disciplines.
- Shared responsibility for instruction within a subject grouping would result in more evenness of coverage across disciplines.
- Encourages strategic planning of instruction across disciplines, so as not to waste resources.
- Provides a valuable outreach venue for liaisons to faculty.
- Allows for some reassignment of staff currently located in DMIUS unit (depending on how many would serve on the instruction team).

Cons:

- Unequal commitment to instruction among subject-specialists may result in uneven provision of service across disciplines.
- Requires some staff reassignment to provide support for instruction in each of the subject groups.

OPTION C: A Library Instruction unit is responsible for most undergraduate instruction; graduate instruction done by subject specialists

A group of librarians, supplemented with staff positions, takes over undergraduate instruction for all departments (including the Sciences if the requisite subject expertise could be added to the unit). Exceptions would be instruction provided to research method courses or courses designated as the first in a major, unless the subject specialists abdicated responsibility for those. In cooperation with the subject specialists, the unit’s staff would do an environmental scan of the undergraduate program to determine where instruction would be most effective and would target those classes.

This unit could assume management of additional classroom spaces and would assume administrative functions that supported instruction across the Library.

Subject specialists could choose to provide instruction to undergraduate classes in their discipline, or not. They would continue to provide orientations and course-related instruction for graduate students.

Considerations:
Some course-related instruction in the disciplines (outside of the RC program) is currently done by non-specialist librarians and classified staff.

The bulk of instruction is provided during eight weeks of each term; during less heavy instruction times the unit would focus on web development, outreach activities, providing reference service, etc.

Pros:

- Allows staff and librarians with expertise in instruction to focus on developing their skills in these areas
- Frees up time for subject specialists, possibly allowing for expansion of liaison roles
- Potential to expand instructional program in departments currently underserved because subject specialists don’t have time
- Tools developed by this team support library-wide instruction

Cons:

- Course-related instruction by subject specialist librarian informs collection development and reference practice.
- Course-related instruction by subject specialist librarian builds ties with departments.
- Loss of subject expertise in course-related instruction (although Instruction librarians can consult with subject specialists when planning instruction).
- Requires new hires or transfers from other units.

Reference
Jean McKenzie and Susan Xue

Recent studies show that 90-95% of questions asked at academic reference desks are satisfactorily answered by non-librarians and the remainder need to be referred to a librarian or subject specialist. Coupled with a multi-year decline in reference questions overall, an evaluation of the service is perhaps long overdue. New options need to ensure that librarians are available for questions that require their expertise, while relieving them from front line duty. A tiered information/reference service staffed by trained, non-librarians who can answer most questions and triage/refer the rest to appropriate personnel is used in Options 1 and 2 below. Option 3 assumes a tiered virtual reference service. All options assume the library will be active in exploring existing and emerging technologies that will provide value-added virtual reference services wherever possible.

Current Landscape:
Reference services are largely decentralized across the library system. Information gathered from the Library Hours list indicates that 15 libraries currently offer staffed reference desk services. In general, libraries have different policies, practices and environments. However, all the libraries address all the five types of questions below for different lengths of time when providing reference services. Methods of delivering reference services are similar across the subject libraries (1-6), while Doe/Moffitt employs all the methods (1-8).

Status quo reference services across the library system can be deconstructed as the follows:

Types/methods of delivering reference services and staffing:
1. Circulation desk – SLEs, classified staff
2. Reference desk – librarians, LP4s and LA4s, other classified staff
3. Phone – SLEs, librarians, classified staff
4. E-mail – librarians and LP4s
5. One-to-one research consultation (drop-in or by appointment) – librarians
6. UC-wide 24/7 chat – librarians (Doe/Moffitt & subject specialty librarians)
7. RAS (Research Advisory Service) – librarians (Doe/Moffitt, Ed/Psych)
8. Doe/Moffitt Entrance Desks: beginning 2012, staffed by SLEs trained to provide basic information and directions, answer & refer questions

Types of reference questions:
1. Directional
2. Catalog searching
3. General resource/databases searching
4. Subject related in-depth research questions
5. Group research visit (combination of the above)

Reference hours:
1. Reference Desk hours vary: 10-6, 10-5, 1-4, 1-5, 1-6, 12-1 and 2-4
2. 9-5 by appointment
3. Certain time periods by appointment
4. All open hours, not just during posted hours. Or virtual without time limit

Pros:
- Convenient access to reference service by local users
- Subject knowledge ties with collections/locations
- Physical materials nearby for reference use
- Reference staff familiar with local collections

Cons:
- Mostly directional questions, librarians’ time not well used sitting at a desk
- Not enough personnel to staff a reference desk, short hours at some places
- Referral difficult without knowing all librarians expertise
- Unequal access to reference for all users
- Variation in service hours may be confusing for users
Factors to consider in new options for reference service:

1. Number of librarians and classified staff who possess subject knowledge and could provide type #3, #4 and #5 reference questions
2. Number of classified staff and SLEs who could provide type #2 and #3 reference questions
3. Identify collections that reference service cannot do without
4. Access to collections
5. Number of circulation points
6. All options assume continuation of UC-wide 24/7 chat service
7. Need to develop a knowledge base or FAQ to answer wide-ranging questions
8. Identify criteria for triage of general/high level reference questions
9. Identify criteria for libraries/collections where to set up reference points

Option 1: Consolidate reference into four (4) or more points by discipline; staffed by current staff

Features:
- Reference services available in a smaller number of locations that are carefully chosen to cover all disciplines and campus locations
- Reference points staffed by librarians/classified staff
- Decoupling directional, catalog/database searching and in-depth reference questions
- Consolidated reference points handle general reference/database/resource searching questions
- Circulation points handle directional/informational questions
- Subject related or high level reference questions by appointment with subject librarians, through a highly visible appointment-making system
- Current RAS system could be expanded as such appointment-making system
- Tutorials on basic resource questions through Web presence
- Information Kiosk for the libraries that don’t have reference point
- Integrate 24/7 chat - needs further discussion

Pros:
- Full reference services available for longer hours for users
- Possible savings by reducing reference points to four or more points
- Librarians’ time freed up for more out-reach, high level reference consultation, instructional and liaison responsibilities
- Some directional/informational questions could be addressed by online tutorials and other means of web presence

Cons:
- Fewer locations so users may get lost in finding out where to get help for high level reference questions/consultation
- Possible redeployment of librarians/staff
- More training required for SLEs to handle directional/informational questions about places other than the particular circulation point
• More cross subject training required for librarians and staff to work at reference point
• Reference detaching from physical collections may cause difficulties in service for some subjects/disciplines

Option 2: Consolidate reference into four (4) or more points by discipline and staff with non-librarians at the front line.

Features:
• Reference services available in a smaller number of locations that are carefully chosen to cover all disciplines and campus locations
• Reference desks staffed by non-librarians, for example, by trained library school students, interns, graduate students, etc., as well as classified staff
• Staff trained to answer directional/information questions, general (quick) reference questions, basic catalog and online database questions
• Refer in-depth research questions to subject specialists
• Could be consolidated with circulation desks or not
• Other features similar to Option 1

Pros:
• Full reference services available for longer hours for users
• Well-trained staff can refer questions quickly to a librarian scheduled on call
• Frees librarians for other work
• Taps into a workforce of current library school students & interns (who may want to work here later)
• Provides valuable professional training opportunities to library school students & interns
• Possible savings due to smaller number of service points and pay level of people staffing the desks
• Trained frontline staff could be deployed to other locations, as needed
• Librarians who aren’t naturally drawn to public services can be deployed in areas of work more suited to them

Cons:
• Reference available at fewer locations
• Requires coordinator/scheduler(s) to train & supervise front line staff
• Upfront work required to develop training plans and materials and a robust training program with careful referral procedures
• Training/coordination could be demanding and intensive
• Answers to questions may be adequate and correct, but not as informative as answers from a librarian
• Staff concerns about re-assignments or roving assignments
• High turnover rate when employing library school students, interns and graduate students
Option 3: Eliminate reference desks entirely; maximize value-added virtual services for self-service; provide connection to person to answer questions via video link

Features:
- Circulation staff answer directional questions
- Develop a suite of services that can be delivered via a kiosk to answer most questions
- Kiosks ubiquitous – in libraries, reading rooms, and stacks
- Simple factual questions handled by self-service information pages: library locations, hours, services at those locations, phone numbers, interactive maps & floor plans, etc.
- Chat session to ask questions of a person
  - First contact staff (trained library school students, interns, classified staff, etc.) are in a non-public location equipped with necessary equipment and print materials to answer most questions, then
  - refer research questions to librarian scheduled on call who is available on a video link to do an in-depth reference interview and follow-up, or,
  - make RAS appointments with subject specialists.
- Librarians scheduled to take referrals – could be in their offices or in another non-public location
- Create internships for library school students to develop and/or test value-added virtual services

Pros:
- Three levels of service offered: circulation desks/self-service for general information, in-person chat for quick reference questions, in-person librarian (via video or facetime-type-app) for research and in-depth questions
- Viable for distance students
- May appeal to current generation of students who work more in the digital environment
- Free librarians for other work (expand roles – Team II)
- Possible salary savings

Cons:
- Development costs; hardware, software costs
- Possible reassignment of staff and/or hiring staff with new skills
- May be impersonal for some patrons
- Circulation and security staff must be well trained to answer and refer questions

Transcription of brainstorm – Reference, 2/15

Existing reference service:
- Triage by default or by design
- Very different policies/practices/environments
- Directional questions normally answered by circulation desk/SLEs
- Reference desk staffed by librarians, LP4 and LA4s
- Continuing decrease of questions at reference desk
• Reference by phone
• Reference by e-mail
• One-to-one research consultation, drop-in or by appointment
• Increase of one-to-one research consultations
• Group research visit from other universities/colleges
• UC-wide 24/7 chat
• RAS (Research Advisory Service)
• Reference all the time, not just during posted hours
• Virtual reference without time limit

Types of reference questions:
• Directional/informational
• Catalog searching
• General resource/databases searching
• Subject related in-depth research questions

Considerations for change:
• Fewer or one reference points
• Fewer or one reference points could mean inconvenient access by local users, an
  highly visible/accessible system for research consultation is then required
• Fewer or one reference points means detaching from physical collection which
  sometime is required
• Coordinated Web presence
• More online tutorial instructions
• Skype from Doe stacks
• Integrate 24/7 chat which could address some of the reference service needs
• Decoupling directional question, catalog/database searching question and in-
  depth reference questions
• Circ desk handles directional questions
• Librarian/LP4/LA4 for general reference questions
• Subject librarians for one-to-one research consultation

New:
• More centralized, fewer service points, easier to staff w/ librarians
• Centralized → connect to person who knows the collections
• Centralized → as a service point, as a virtual world, mobile expertise group
• If ref desk is removed, what serves to be the locale for student questions? Circ
  desk.
• Train students when they should be referring questions.
• Reference interview is not a student task
• Print collections are reference tools
• Power of remote reference (new generation of laptop/head sets
• Some reference happens after patrons already have their material
• Consideration on closing desks – if ref desk closed, patrons go to circ desk but
  won’t knock on librarians doors
• Office hours
• Embedded librarian
• Remote:
  o synchronous
  o asynchronous
  o near print
  o remote from print
• Handled by many skill levels vs. only handled by library generalist and lib specialist

Reserves
Matthew Prustman and Judith Weeks

“Reserves” below refers to items put on course reserve for a limited amount of time (usually one semester). In most cases this includes both grad and undergrad reserves. Many libraries also maintain a “permanent reserve” collection which is better understood as a non-circulating collection which is shelved separately and is not within the purview of this document.

For each of the options below the features, pros, and cons are based around these factors:
• Access to reserve materials
• Requesting items for reserve (faculty)
• Processing reserves (library staff)
• Reserve policies

Both options B and C below represent cost savings for the Library by calling for the centralization of processing and policy standardization of reserves. Additionally centralization and standardization of these processes would help the Library attain goals such as more even enforcement of policies, uniform fining policies, and maximum utilization of electronic resources (because a smaller group of more expert staff would be in charge of reserve processing). Option C also calls for centralization (i.e. reduction) of reserve circulation points. Greater centralization of reserve circulation points would mean increased efficiencies for the Library. Centralization of reserve circulation also has the power to increase or decrease patrons’ access to reserve materials. Reserve circulation centralization would likely increase the physical distance between patrons and reserves (a decrease in access) but would also increase the hours reserve items are able to be checked out due to reserve checkout being offered only at larger libraries with longer hours (an increase in access). It is important to keep these two factors in mind for each option below.
Option A: Decentralized reserve checkout, processing, and policies. (CURRENT)

Features:
- Most libraries offer reserves for checkout.
- Faculty request reserves at the library they feel most comfortable putting these items on reserve.
- Items are requested at and processed for reserve locally by staff.
- Wider range of loan periods, policies, and fines.

Pros:
- A larger percentage of reserves are offered for checkout in or close to the building where the course is offered.
- Allows faculty to place items on reserve at their “home library”.
- Work of processing reserves is distributed to many reserve staff members across the libraries.
- Allows for choice of loan periods (within already defined loan periods), policies, and whether or not to fine based on the needs of a library and it’s users.

Cons:
- Items on reserve may be less accessible than if they had been put on reserve at a location with longer hours.
- Students who take classes in multiple disciplines may have to check out reserve items at several locations.
- Some locations may not be able to have a staff member fully comfortable with processing reserves.
- Due to decentralization of processing there are many variations (e.g. inclusion of electronic resources, application of available loan rules, physical processing, etc) which can make it difficult for patrons unfamiliar with reserve policies at all libraries.
- Staffing Required:
  - This option requires roughly the current amount of staffing as is currently provided by the Library for reserve processing.

Option B: Decentralized reserve checkout; Centralized processing and policies.

Features:
- Most libraries offer reserves for checkout.
- Faculty request reserves at either the reserve location or the central reserve processing unit.
- Processing staff work at a limited amount of locations and process reserves for all locations.
- Processing staff do both the Millennium reserves work and the physical processing of items.
- Standardization of loan periods, policies, and fines.
Pros:
- Little change from current Library practices from the patron viewpoint.
- Could make the request process for faculty more coherent.
- Processing staff more expert at processing reserves.
- Unified reserve policies across all libraries is easier for patrons to understand and staff to interpret.

Cons:
- Would require a change in how most faculty are used to reserves being requested and processed.
- Without excellent systems for requesting, processing, and delivery items may take longer to be put on reserve.
- Centralized physical processing is a more complex system that would need to be explored.
- To centralize loan periods, policies, and fines unit specific policies meant to increase access would need to be discontinued.

Staffing Required:
- Due to centralization of processing and policies efficiencies should be realized that would make this option slightly less staff intensive than is currently allocated. It would require less staff time at non-processing units, more staff time at processing units, and the same amount of SLE time at circulation desks.

**Option C: Centralized reserve checkout, processing, and policies.**

Features:
- Only a limited number of libraries offer reserves for checkout.
- Faculty request reserves at a reserve location.
- Processing staff only work at a limited number of locations but page items from all locations.
- Standardization of loan periods, policies, and fines.
- Grad reserves could be offered at more locations but still processed by reserve locations.

Pros:
- Reserves available for checkout longer hours. (Note: this is a pro because the item can circulate to more students but may be a con for an individual student who wants to check it out overnight).
- Process of request streamlined for faculty.
- Smaller units don’t need to process or manage reserves.
- Processing staff and circulation staff at reserve units have a deeper knowledge of reserve policies and procedures.
- Policies and locations are easier for patrons and public service staff to interpret.
Cons:
- Students may have to travel farther to checkout reserves.
- Some one-on-one interaction between faculty and reserves staff and librarians lost.

Staffing Required:
- Due to more centralization and standardization this option is expected to require significantly less staff than current levels. It would require less staff and circulation SLE time at non-processing units (most units), and more staff and circulation SLE time at processing units (a few units).

Transcription: Library Service Options team brainstorm session February 15, 2012

- Current Reserves Practices:
  - Faculty drop off/email reserve lists.
  - Library puts out a call for reserves to faculty.
  - Some textbooks are placed on reserve automatically by SSL.
  - Rush reserve requests.
  - On demand/just in time course reserves from students in class.
  - Some faculty put up E-Reserves.
  - Some centralization of undergraduate reserves.
  - Faculty use same reserve lists each year.
    - No concern for use.
    - Recommended and required.
  - Different loan periods/overnight/weekend use.
  - Permanent graduate reserves collection.
  - Library staff do not provide e-reserves for faculty evenly.
    - Some libraries identify and recommend e-version.
    - Some put e-books on reserve.
  - Not all staff are equally trained to identify e-versions.
  - Problems with personal copies:
    - Lost/stolen.
    - Not picked up at end of semester.
  - Copyright/fair use issues in e-reserves(text, music, DVD)
- Future of Reserves:
  - Limit to only required readings.
  - Maximize e-reserves, limit print/DVD, etc.
  - Fewer service points for reserves / longer hours (undergrad & grad)
  - Feedback to faculty about what's not checked out.
  - Reserves services in locations where no collections are but where the students are.
  - Standardize loan periods & fines.
  - Explore open reserves.
  - Find ways to make it easier for faculty to put things on reserve.
  - Input on textbooks affordability on open access textbooks.
  - Educational campaign on licensed and open access resources. How to contact about helping them with this.
• Reserves staff need to be equally trained in e-versions, fair use, etc.
• Centralized reserves processing for decentralized service points.
  o vice versa: centralized checkout, decentralized processing.
• Self check out open reserves.
• Reserves is a point of contact with faculty and students.
• Cost savings to students because of items on reserve.
• Identify courses that have their textbooks to get them in advance/high use.
• To buy or not to buy textbooks?
• Publishers putting important materials online or CD with single use codes. Can students use? Complicated landscape.
• Centralized undergraduate/decentralized graduate reserves.
• Semi centralized reserves in "big" libraries.
• Location vs. Hours/Access:
  • Location vaguer for undergraduates who have classes all over campus.
  • Depends on circulation policies.
  • Students sometimes prefer overnight/weekend checkout but do fewer students get access? More copies to support need.
• Faculty preference for local reserves/ convenience.
  o Different uses of reserve by discipline.
• What drives decision: Loud voice, student convenience, faculty convenience?

Web Services
Brian Quigley & Lynne Grigsby

Web services are an important and integral component of fulfilling our mission to support teaching and research at the university. As more resources, collections, and services have moved online, our website has become increasingly important in reaching and serving users wherever and whenever they need information. Through our websites and other online tools (such as blogs, wikis, and subject guides), we connect users to resources and services, guide users to recommended resources, and answer informational questions about policies, hours, locations, and contacts. The website also serves as an important marketing, public relations, outreach, and fundraising tool.

Web services overlap with all of our other services: circulation, reserves, reference, collections, instruction, and more. Since overviews about those services already address their online components, we will not address those issues again here. The focus of this overview is the library website.

Our current model both allows and requires individual libraries to maintain and design their own websites. However, staffing and expertise for web design varies across the libraries, leading to inconsistent user experiences. In addition, a cursory review of other UC libraries and our peer group libraries show a significant majority provide a single and consistent web presence across their libraries. Models B and C look to follow this trend to make user
experiences more consistent across our libraries and supply sufficient staffing and expertise to design websites that meet best practices.

Note: Consolidating libraries would help to simplify the overall landscape, but does not negate the benefit of evaluating models.

Option A: Status quo, decentralized web design, separate websites based on locations primarily

Features:
- The Library maintains a home page and several library-wide pages; each library designs and maintains its own website as well and may maintain subject guides
- Librarians and other classified staff within each library are responsible for both web design and content
- The Web Advisory Group (WAG) recommends policies, procedures, standards, and guidelines for the library website and makes decisions about OskiCat interface design; it is responsible for the Library home page and all the top level pages that give the general overview of the library and its services
- The Library Applications & Publishing (LAP) Group provides technical support and infrastructure for servers, content management systems, databases, and tools; expertise and support for user interface design and accessibility are also available
- A separate staff website is maintained by a number of web workers in a variety of designs

Pros:
- Allows units to maintain control over both their website design and content
- Provides branding for individual library units and projects
- Allows individual staff and units to experiment with new and innovative ideas
- Allows service points to use their custom home page as the opening screen on their public computers

Cons:
- Inconsistent user experiences due to range of designs
- Insufficient web staffing, training, and expertise across library units and projects
- Redundant pages and effort across the library
- Varying degrees of usability and accessibility across the library
- Lack of a brand for The Library
- May result in users having to drill down with more clicks to find information that’s wanted

Option B: Centralized web design, decentralized content creation based on locations primarily
Features:
• The Library uses a standard and consistent template (including header, footer, and menus) across all libraries, deployed in a robust content management system such as Drupal to make content creation and management easier; the content management system should support modular content and multiple web applications (blogs, wikis, forms)
• A dedicated team composed of public service, user experience, and web application experts (librarians, LP4s, and/or LAP staff) is responsible for designing, maintaining, and assessing the template; managing permissions and training; ensuring usability and accessibility; and assessing and piloting emerging website tools in coordination with LAP
• Each library continues to have a website within this template, along with subject guides grouped by location or broad disciplines
• Librarians and other classified staff within each library are responsible for developing and maintaining content for their library within the template, and for developing and maintaining subject guides; common content is maintained centrally for reuse
• LAP continues to provide technical support and infrastructure for servers, content management systems, databases, and tools, as well as expertise in user interface design and accessibility
• A staff website is still maintained separately but consolidated into the content management system for easier content creation and management

Pros:
• Develops a consistent look-and-feel (brand) for the library as a whole
• Reduces redundant effort across the library
• A robust content management system allows easier updating and reuse of content across the website; it also may be more efficient and secure than supporting multiple web applications
• Maintains individual library identity
• Possibly increased usability
• Compliance with ADA requirements
• Assured implementation of search engine optimization techniques and web tools, e.g., google analytics
• Allows central team to pilot and deploy new and innovative ideas
• Allows service points to continue to use their home page as the opening screen on their public computers

Cons:
• Less flexibility and control over web design within units
• Possibly less opportunity for staff within units to experiment with new ideas
• Requires significant effort to implement

Option C: Centralized web design, decentralized content creation based on subjects within disciplinary groups
Model C is similar to Model B except that content is organized around subjects within disciplinary groups rather than library locations. This may be understood as a variation on the Doe/Moffitt and Science Libraries websites currently. This does not preclude content around functional and format groups (such as special collections, data, interlibrary services, etc.).

Features:
- The Library uses a standard and consistent template (including header, footer, and menus) across all pages, deployed in a robust content management system such as Drupal to make content creation and management easier; the content management system should support modular content and multiple web applications (blogs, wikis, forms)
- A dedicated team composed of public service, user experience, and web application experts (librarians, LP4s, and/or LAP staff) is responsible for designing, maintaining, and assessing the template; managing permissions and training; insuring usability and accessibility; and assessing and piloting emerging website tools in coordination with LAP
- Librarians and other classified staff are responsible for developing and maintaining subject guides and subject-specific content; this subject content becomes the core of the website, grouped by broad disciplines; common content is maintained centrally for reuse
- LAP continues to provide technical support and infrastructure for servers, content management systems, databases, and tools, as well as expertise in user interface design and accessibility
- A staff website is still maintained separately but consolidated into the content management system for easier content creation and management

Pros:
- Develops a consistent look-and-feel (brand) for the library as a whole
- Reduces redundant effort across the library
- A robust content management system allows easier updating and reuse of content across the website; it also may be more efficient and secure than supporting multiple web applications
- Possibly increased usability
- Compliance with ADA requirements
- Assured implementation of search engine optimization techniques and web tools, e.g., google analytics
- Allows central team to pilot and deploy new and innovative ideas

Cons:
- Less flexibility and control over web design within units
- Loss of individual library identity – may be less familiar to some existing users
- Possibly less opportunity for staff within units to experiment with new ideas
- Requires significant effort to implement

Summary of Feedback & Considerations for Implementation
• One of the primary goals should be to make it easy to update content with little or no training. Any necessary training should be centralized.

• Careful thought needs to be given to proper staffing for web design. It was noted that staffing should include an application programmer, user experience engineer, front-end engineer (graphic design/web coding), and a web services or public services librarian. Staffing should reflect the importance of the website as our most visible presence, public relations tool, and primary point of access.

• Though technology is obviously involved, the website should be viewed as a public services tool.

• Strong support for Drupal was included in the feedback. Reasons to choose Drupal for use across the full website include:
  ▪ Modular and extensible framework – content components such as hours, locations, librarian profiles, and ERF records could be reused throughout the website
  ▪ Support for multiple web applications (blogs, wikis, forms)
  ▪ Strong developer community means there are frequent improvements and innovations
  ▪ Large user community on-campus and among academic libraries means we can learn from their experiences and leverage their expertise
  ▪ A Drupal hosting company such as Pantheon (with which the campus now has a partnership to provide cloud services for Drupal web development and hosting) would ensure and enable best practice Drupal hosting with consistent updates and a clear development, testing, production workflow
    http://inews.berkeley.edu/articles/Jan-Feb2012/Pantheon-workshop

• Concerns mentioned about Drupal include module changes, difficult upgrades, rigid templates, and the effort involved in migration. We would need to think carefully about ways to mitigate these concerns.

• There is a need to assess what other UC Libraries are doing with their websites and their experiences with Drupal in particular. If Drupal is chosen, there is also a need to evaluate whether to host it ourselves or through Pantheon.