Cornell Law Librarians' Publications

4-2016

Serials Spoken Here: Reports of Conferences, Institutes, and Seminars

Valerie Bross
University of California, Los Angeles

Jacqueline Magagnosc
Cornell Law Library, jkm95@cornell.edu

Routledge
Taylor & Francis Group

SERIALS SPOKEN HERE—REPORTS OF CONFERENCES, INSTITUTES, AND SEMINARS: KURT BLYTHE, COLUMN EDITOR

Valerie Bross and Jacqueline Magagnosc, Contributors

ABSTRACT

This quarter's column offers coverage of multiple sessions from the 2016 American Library Association (ALA) Midwinter Meeting, held January 8–12, in Boston, Massachusetts. The sessions detailed herein are two from the Program for Cooperative Cataloging (PCC): Program Training and PCC-At-Large; three from the Association for Library Collections & Technical Services (ALCTS) Continuing Resources Section (CRS): the Cataloging Forum, Standards Forum, and Holdings Information Forum; the ALCTS/Library Information Technology Association (LITA) Electronics Resources Management Interest Group; and the ALCTS Role of the Professional in Technical Services Interest Group.

Valerie Bross
Team Leader, ERM/Continuing Resources
University of California, Los Angeles
Los Angeles, California
E-mail: vbross@library.ucla.edu

Program for Cooperative Cataloging (PCC)

PCC training

Presenters for this training session included George Prager, Robert Maxwell (ancient languages and special collections librarian, Brigham Young University), Paul Frank (acting coordinator, NACO and SACO programs, Library of Congress), and Judith Cannan (chief, Cooperative and Instructional Programs Division [COIN], Library of Congress).

Robert Maxwell and Paul Frank reviewed the accomplishments and training materials developed and revised by the PCC Standing Committee on Standards and by the Library of Congress (LC) COIN. Catalogers not already familiar with the PCC website will want to review and bookmark the following pages related to Resource Description and Access (RDA) and LC's linked-data vocabulary, BIBFRAME:

1. RDA record sets: http://www.loc.gov/catworkshop/RDA%20training%20materials/SCT%20RDA%20Records%20TG/index.html, updated December 2015;
2. RDA NACO training: http://www.loc.gov/catworkshop/courses/naco-RDA/index.html, updated November 2015;
3. RDA Series training: http://www.loc.gov/catworkshop/courses/naco-full%20series-RDA/course%20table.html, sections 10–11, updated January 2016;
4. RDA Refresher training: http://www.loc.gov/catworkshop/RDA%20training%20materials/rda-refreshers.html, (November 2014–November 2015), most recently offering "Publication, Distribution, and Manufacture Statements, and Copyright Date";
5. BIBFRAME training: During summer 2015, LC COIN staff developed and delivered training on semantic web concepts and BIBFRAME Editor use. The training materials have all been posted to the LC website. Beginning fall 2015, following the training, 40 catalogers at LC entered 891 records in MARC (through LC's Voyager system or OCLC) and in BIBFRAME (using the BIBFRAME Editor). The resources described covered all forms of issuance and a range of formats: text monographs, text serials, music, cartographic resources, and audiovisual resources, http://www.loc.gov/catworkshop/bibframe/, updated November 2015.

Following these segments, Judith Cannan opened the discussion topic for the evening: How should we prepare the PCC community for working in a linked-data/BIBFRAME environment? Cannan noted the success of the ALA preconferences using the MARC of Quality's RIMMF software (RDA in Many Metadata Formats)—the Jane-athons, Thing-athons, and so forth. The lively discussion that followed raised questions as to the best way to reach people; the different levels of understanding needed within each institution; and the topics/tools to cover. In conclusion, Cannan found support for planning two RIMMF/BIBFRAME workshops

for the upcoming PCC Operations Committee meeting in May.

PCC-At-Large Meeting

Presenters for the meeting included Jackie Shieh (resource description coordinator, George Washington University), Les Hawkins (CONSER coordinator, Library of Congress), Gary L. Strawn (authorities librarian, Northwestern University Library), Paul Frank (acting coordinator, NACO and SACO programs, Library of Congress), and Janis L. Young (cataloging specialist, Policy and Standards Division, Library of Congress).

This year, PCC experimented with a new format. Rather than separate program-specific segments for CONSER, BIBCO, SACO, and NACO, the organizers scheduled three issue-based presentations of general interest.

The program was preceded by a brief tribute to Naomi Young (principal serials cataloger, University of Florida), a leader within the serials community.

Jackie Shieh gave the opening presentation, summarizing the work of the committee that she chairs, the Task Group on uniform resource identifiers (URIs) in MARC. This group has as its charge the identification of policy issues related to the use of URIs in MARC records to make MARC records "linked data ready." The group is also charged with development of guidelines for including identifiers in MARC records and best practices for subfields containing URIs. The first report of the group came out in October 2015; the final report is due September 2016. So far, the group has surfaced a number of concerns regarding URIs (or, according to current W3C specifications, International Resource Identifiers or IRIs). How should the coding distinguish between identifiers for a resource as opposed to those IRIs about a resource? Should the IRIs be repeatable? What should be the syntax of the coded IRIs? How should a work-level identifier be coded?

Beginning in January 2016 (after ALA Midwinter), the group planned to run a pilot to test the various proposals that the group had developed. The group cumulated a MARC record set representing a wide variety of resources/cataloging communities, including vernacular scripts, music, rare books, and archival records. Participants in the pilot will get the set of records and tools such as Terry Reese's newly enhanced MARCEdit. After enhancing records both individually and through batch conversion, the participants will analyze the results and contribute to development of guidelines and best practices.

The second speaker, Les Hawkins, summarized the work of the CONSER BIBFRAME Task Group. This group has six charges, the first three of which have been distributed to three task groups within the larger group.

- Task Group 1: Monitor and formulate responses to BIBFRAME vocabulary draft specifications as posted (http://www.loc.gov/bibframe/docs/), especially those that concern continuing resources and PCC issues. Monitor questions and issues.
- Task Group 2: Collaborate on refining existing CONSER Standard Record (CSR) mappings to BIBFRAME.
- Task Group 3: Explore other vocabularies to enhance CSR/BIBFRAME, beginning with PRESSoo. The group should also consider the relationship of CSR/BIBFRAME to the schema.org extensions.

A fourth task group, inspired by the discussion facilitated by Judith Cannan at the PCC Program Training Meeting, may be charged with developing an educational plan for building linked-data/BIBFRAME-related skills and understanding within the CONSER community. One resource to be used in this activity could be the Linked Data for Professional Education (LD4PE) Competency Index demonstrated at an earlier session by Mike Lauruhn (disruptive technology director, Elsevier Labs) and available at: http://explore.dublincore.net/linked-data-learning-resources.

Shifting gears from linked data, Gary L. Strawn presented a new Authority Toolkit that he developed to assist with a present-day cataloging task: creating and modifying name authority records. The tool kit may be used either in conjunction with OCLC Connexion (as a macrobook) or independently. Strawn demonstrated this high-power aid to much applause, showing how undifferentiated name authority records could be parsed, how data could be pulled from multiple sources (including Wikimedia), and how the final record can be written back to the OCLC save file. Strawn reminded the audience that, despite the many time-saving features of the Strawn Authority Toolkit, the cataloger is responsible for the content of the record. For more information about the Strawn Authority Toolkit, see http://files.library.northwestern.edu/public/oclc.

The final speaker, Janis L. Young, came to the meeting to ask for help with a thorny problem. Young has been developing a new vocabulary for demographic terms. Her goal is to establish consistent, sustainable policies with few or no exceptions for construction of terms and a straightforward research protocol. In the first phase of development, she created a manual and established a set of about 400 terms, including what are known as demonyms. Demonyms are the words or phrases used to describe residents or inhabitants of a place; examples of demonyms include: "Europeans," "Bavarians," and "New Englanders." During the first phase, demonyms were created only for

continental, national, and regional levels. Now Young has turned her attention to demonyms for cities and local areas, and here is where her work got complicated. The problem she faced was how to resolve conflicts. In looking at local demonyms, she found 30 places named "Hollywood," 15 named "Manhattan," and 30 named "Moscow." If some, or possibly all, of the inhabitants of the various cities named "Moscow" are referred to as "Moscovites," then what should be done? Should demonyms be disambiguated from the beginning, or should they be disambiguated only in case of conflict within the vocabulary? In either case, how should they be disambiguated? For example, "Californians" refers to residents of the state of California but also to residents of California, Pennsylvania. If the term for the residents of Pennsylvania happened to be established first (or if the policy were to disambiguate all potential conflicts), would that leave the state residents with the odd-looking term "Californians (Americans)" or "Californians (State of California, United States)" … or should one term be used for all the residents of all the places: "Californians"?

After much discussion, Adam Schiff (principal cataloger, University of Washington) suggested another way of looking at the problem: to create separate authority records with unique identifiers (IRIs) but nonunique strings. This solution looks forward to a linked-data future where our index displays can include faceted choices or can show contextual clues.

ALCTS CRS

ALCTS CRS Cataloging Forum

Presenters for the forum included Steve Kelly (head of continuing resources and database management, Wake Forest University), Les Hawkins (CONSER coordinator, Library of Congress), Regina Reynolds (director of the US ISSN Center and head of the ISSN publisher liaison section, Library of Congress), Ed Jones (associate director, assessment and technical services, National University), and Mavis Molto (serials cataloger/librarian, Utah State University).

Steve Kelly reported on Committee on Cataloging: Description & Access (CC:DA) serials-related issues—in short: not much. The main discussion concerned changes in governance of the new RDA Steering Committee (RSC) to a six-region system with a 3-year transitional plan and a presentation by Gordon Dunsire (chair, RDA Steering Committee) of the Functional Requirements for Bibliographic Records (FRBR) Library Reference Model.

Les Hawkins summarized the work of the CONSER BIBFRAME Task Group, which has been engaged in commenting on the LC BIBFRAME 2.0 proposals and creating a mapping of the CONSER Standard Record to the BIBFRAME vocabulary.

Regina Reynolds praised the positive direction of the RSC in working with ISSN representatives on an RDA review group to consider the PRESSoo model for describing serial relationships. Reynolds noted that ISSN is considering revision of the ISSN standard for greater granularity and for alignment with the ONIX standard. Also under discussion is the role of ISSN in a linked-data environment. ISSN is well positioned to continue to play an important role in this emerging area. Revenue streams are another issue under consideration by ISSN. ISSN agencies in some countries may need to charge for ISSN services, though the US ISSN Center has no such mandate. Finally, Reynolds touched on two large-scale projects of the US ISSN Center currently underway: ISSN assignment for titles in Independent Voices (an open access collection of digitized alternative press titles) and a project to mint ISSNs for over 1,000 IEEE conference publications.

The two main presenters of the afternoon were Ed Jones and Mavis Molto. Ed Jones led with a humorous and informative historical review of the treatment of title changes called "What Were They Thinking?: Dealing with Title Changes through the Ages." He began by touching on the donor-organized scheme of the Library Company of Philadelphia (1765), the Harvard Law School Library (1826), Anthony Panizzi's Ninety-One Cataloging Rules (1841) developed for the British Library, and Charles Ammi Cutter's Rules for a Printed Dictionary Catalogue (1876). Cutter offered two options to library organizers: to keep all segments of a serial under the earliest title (known as earliest-entry cataloging) or to split serial segments into successive-entry runs. In either case, use of a compressed title eliminated many minor changes of title. With the 1908 Catalog Rules, Author and Title Entries, American libraries shifted to organizing serial runs under latest entry, while British libraries preferred to continue earliest-entry cataloging. The 1949 ALA Catalog Rules for Author and Title Entries ("red book") and Rules for Descriptive Cataloging in the Library of Congress ("green book") continued the latest-entry convention, extending the convention to include changes in corporate body names.

In 1953, Seymour Lubetzky argued for the use of successive-entry cataloging, and the 1961 Paris Principles concurred with this approach. The subsequent 1967 Anglo-American Cataloging Rules reflected the change to successive-entry cataloging (with description based on the most recently received issue). However, at the request of the American Library Association, Anglo-American Cataloging Rules (AACR) also included a footnote (footnote 4), which provided the option of retaining the latest-entry convention. Pressure to change from the latest-entry approach came with the International

Standard Description for Serials (ISDS), later the International Standard for Bibliographic Description (ISBD), in 1974. However, it was not until the publication of the 1978 Anglo-American Cataloging Rules, 2nd edition (AACR2), that American libraries moved to earliest-issue cataloging with successive entry for title changes. At the same time, the use of title compression was abandoned. This led to a need for frequent new descriptions and the development of Library of Congress Rule Interpretations to reduce that need by distinguishing minor title changes. Finally, the 2002 revision of AACR2 incorporated library practice of distinguishing major from minor title changes. At the same time, the revision reintroduced the approach of cataloging based on latest iteration—this time for the newly defined category of integrating resources.

Jacqueline Magagnosc
Continuations Management Librarian
Cornell Law Library
Ithaca, New York
E-mail: jkm95@cornell.edu

ALCTS CRS Standards Forum

Three speakers addressed their systems migration experiences, sharing tips and strategies for successful serials data migration.

Migrating to OCLC Worldshare

Beth Bernhardt (assistant dean for Collection Management and Scholarly Communications, University of North Carolina at Greensboro (UNCG)) discussed her library's migration to OCLC WorldShare.

At the time of migration, UNCG, a midsize university, was the biggest institution to migrate to OCLC World-Share. The decision to work with WorldShare was driven by factors including: UNC Greensboro's integrated library system (ILS) no longer being developed or supported; needing a system that would last more than 5 to 10 years; the university heading into difficult budget times; experiencing $2 million in cuts from 2013–2016; wanting to move to an architecture rather than a project; and liking the idea of a cloud-based system and collaboration, even though all knew that there would be problems. Bernhardt listed some of the challenges UNCG experienced in the migration process. MFHD holdings data formats were incompatible; they had to add summary data to bibliographic records in Sirsi for current subscriptions before migration; summary notes were incomplete, and all were not done in Sirsi before migration; loss of predictive patterns; lost formats when multiple formats had been managed on the same record; and loss of all purchase and management notes. To help minimize information loss, UNCG created an access database to store the information.

There were additional challenges with the A–Z list. At the time of migration there was no mechanism to add print holdings to the list, a situation that did not make reference librarians happy. OCLC helped create a method to add print holdings via Knowledge Bases and Related Tools (KBART) including call number, location, and holdings information; subsequently, a procedure was developed to add hyperlinking to WorldCat Local records.

According to Bernhardt, there were some challenges with electronic serials. The WorldShare knowledgebase (KB) is a work in progress; as of summer 2012, UNCG was the first large library to populate the KB. An example problem was zero titles populated for Cambridge University Press. Many collections were not available, and holdings were wrong in collections, e.g., all Sage titles started in 1888. UNCG had to add many collections themselves, which remains a continuing issue. The knowledgebase does not use MARC records but instead relies on KBART files; vendors do not know what KBART files are. Additionally, the KB matches with WorldCat Local via OCLC number. If there is no OCLC number for a resource, there is no match, and therefore, no public display. Bernhardt reported many issues with vendors: There were no OCLC numbers associated with any Alexander Street Press collection; EBSCO EDI was not quite ready, and the last test failed; and ProQuest had continuing issues with Congressional record sets. The solution was generally to find the correct person at OCLC.

There were many successes with electronic serials. The KB support team was helpful; OCLC is making changes quickly; their link resolver works well; and they are adding more options to edit items.

Tips for cataloging included emphasis on the importance of cleaning up your data. UNCG ran many reports ahead of migration including items with blank locations, bibliographic records without items, mismatched items, and shadowed items. The devil is in the details, so it is important to test, test, test.

Millennium to alma migration: The serials experience

Presenter Sion Romaine (acquisitions librarian from the University of Washington) began his presentation with some background on the University of Washington's (UW) migration process. At the point of migration UW had approximately 750,000 check-in records—375,000 in MARC format and around 330,000 order records, approximately 10,500 of which were for continuations. In July 2012, technical services reorganized from a format-based

to a function-based model. Prior to migration, the university was running Innovative Interfaces Millennium, the III OPAC, and WorldCat Local for discovery. They also employed Serials Solutions 360 link resolver and 360 MARC records service. As part of the migration process, the UW and Gallagher Law libraries merged two separate III systems. UW migrated to Alma as part of the first cohort of libraries doing so as part of the ORBIS Cascade alliance.

A key issue in this migration was the differences between Millennium and ExLibris Alma's record structures. In Millennium's record structure, an order record must be attached to a bibliographic record, the check-in record is key for both print and electronic serials, and print publication pattern information is on the check-in card. If a library has implemented Millennium's electronic resource management (ERM) system, there are also resource, contact, and license records. Alma's record structure is quite different. Bibliographic records can potentially be found in three "zones." Purchase order (PO) lines can be attached to bibliographic records, but they can also exist by themselves in a separate index. Purchase order line items are contained within a purchase order; item records are contained in bibliographic records. ERM functionality is integrated into Alma via collection records, portfolios, vendor, and license records.

Romaine continued with an outline of UW's migration timeline. Sample records were sent to ExLibris for review. Millennium fields were mapped to Alma fields, and configuration forms were completed. Millennium test records were exported and sent to ExLibris while training and certification took place. A "sandbox" was loaded with the test record set; these migrated records were reviewed and corrections were requested. Final Millennium record cleanup was completed, and the system was frozen when the database was exported to ExLibris. After Alma's "go live" moment, postmigration cleanup began.

Records for print migrated as expected with MARC coded holdings 85x/86x pairs and clean migration of all MARC fields; electronic serials did not migrate as cleanly as print. Use of both single and separate record approaches generated issues with the location of purchase orders for electronic serials. Resources managed via Serials Solutions were mapped to the Alma knowledgebase but did not map as cleanly as they had hoped, meaning packages had to be checked for accuracy and reprofiled in the KB. Manually cataloged titles migrated based on a tag in the bibliographic record 927 field (portfolio, database, package) and presence of MARC field 856uz$m; manually cataloged packages were converted after migration.

Expected migration problems included types of records that did not migrate, such as resource records, contact records, check-in cards with pattern information and current issues, and check-in records receiving notes and routing instructions. Duplication of bibliographic records between the institution zone and the network zone was expected, but the scope of the issue was not realized until after migration.

There were a number of unexpected migration problems. For order records/purchase order lines (POLs), problems included the following: POLs attached to the wrong holdings record; POLs migrated with incorrect purchase order types, which necessitated closing then reopening the POL in Alma; POLs migrated with the PO owner empty; and split funds did not migrate to POLs. Finally, it took much longer to learn how to function in Alma and understand Alma workflows.

Romaine presented a number of "tips and tricks" for libraries embarking on systems migration. He recommended that before migration, the following steps be taken:

- standardize and simplify as much as possible in the current, familiar system;
- take only what is needed in order to start with a clean database;
- take the time to understand order record data and how it will map to the new system;
- use separate records for print and electronic versions of titles instead of single records; and
- use single-line invoicing for large packages on a POL for vendor in order to migrate fewer records.

After migration, it is advisable to keep your old system up as view-only if possible and take the time to document new workflows. Final lessons mentioned by the speaker include the allowance of one to two years for database cleanup for large libraries, the understanding that in new/beta systems change is constant, and the realization that migration may not be simply a move from one system to another but a change of culture and workflows.

Migrating serials to Kuali OLE: Questions, choices, decisions

Sharon Wiles-Young (director of library access services, Library and Technology Services, Lehigh University) discussed her library's serials migration to Kuali OLE.

Lehigh University is a midsize institution with around 4,000 undergraduate and 2,000 graduate students. The libraries are part of a larger organization, Library and Technology Services, and have three library facilities organized by subject area. The university also has a shared storage facility housing historical print collections of serials and monographs plus Lehigh's government documents collection. The libraries have been aggressively weeding their print journal volumes, accelerating the rate of withdrawal to make room for student space, and replacing print back runs with purchased online back files.

Lehigh has undertaken a number of systems migrations since the 1980s, moving from OCLC's SC 350 serials system through GEAC to a SirsiDynix system featuring full control of serials and MARC holdings. They wanted to migrate data, not recreate it. It was helpful that Lehigh was maintaining the same front-end discovery layer across the migration. Lehigh was an early adopter of Kuali OLE, along with the University of Chicago. They went into the migration process knowing that not all functionality would be complete.

Kuali's serials check-in module is part of the OLE serials receiving module, and the OLE project had decided not to build a predictive serials control module. Lehigh decided to migrate serials control information and current receipts; publication pattern information was placed in receiving notes. The MARC holding format was not available in Kuali OLE at the time of migration, so holdings needed to migrate to the OLE holdings format. Kuali has an option to bring over item-level information if a system had it, but Lehigh did not have item-level holdings. They instead brought over 853/863 field data into the holdings record as nonpublic notes retaining inventory level information such as missing issues. Bindery information was migrated as item-level, inventory information. Kuali OLE holdings allow for both print and electronic e-holdings. Lehigh migrated e-holdings records for all 63,205 electronic/serials journals cataloged in their ILS plus 392,000 monograph records including ebooks, 3,485 serial orders for subscriptions/continuations, and 3,104 serials receiving records.

Wiles-Young shared a screen from one of Lehigh's discovery records. They employ a single-record approach because that is what collections librarians wanted. Only summary holdings are displayed with no current issues displaying; URLs are displayed in the holdings records. Lehigh did not clean out historical SIRSI and GEAC data, retaining it in bibliographic record MARC 599, 949, and 999 fields so that the data would be available for cleanup purposes post migration. In holdings records, Lehigh put historical information in nonpublic notes. E-holdings fields allow for input of start/end data for each vendor/platform and entry of administrative data as well as an access URL.

A further slide showed an example serials receiving record. Lehigh's systems analysts pulled out SIRSI Symphony receiving data with code and put it in an SQL database. These data were then loaded into OLE. The code used is available on GitHub (https://github.com/ccc2lu/LU_OLEBibLoadDocuments/blob/directdb/LU_OLEBibLoadDocuments/src/edu/lu/oleconvert/LU_BuildInstance.java#L1475). Librarians helped with data mapping, choosing which data points they wanted to bring over. The match point was BIB ID, providing a link to the serial bib record to populate title, ISSN, and publisher; call number and location came from the OLE holding record, and a link was made to the OLE holding record. For the holdings record, they brought over location, call number, and current receipts. Publication cycle information from the predictive SIRSI serial control record was migrated and placed in a general receiving note; enumeration/chronology information was mapped to provide one year of historical data to document publication patterns. In retrospect, they should have migrated historical receipt dates. Enumeration/chronology labels were migrated where they could be.

Wiley-Young outlined a number of opportunities before migration. If a library has undergone previous migrations, look in the bibliographic records for serials data from earlier migrations that can be cleaned up, e.g., MARC fields 930 and 949. Look for other legacy serials data that are no longer needed, such as locations. Think carefully about how much data are really needed to migrate and only bring what is needed. Systems migration provides an opportunity to review institutional goals and philosophy. What are library user needs? How are current issues being used by library patrons? Are fully predictive serials systems still needed? What kind of inventory of collections or missing print materials are needed? Consult with collection development and interlibrary loan librarians to determine how they use ILS serials records for detailed holdings information. How is the system used to manage library collections, including print and electronic serials? Consider how both the old and new systems interact with the discovery layer. How are users using the holdings display to find journals now?

ALCTS Lita Electronic Resources Management Interest Group

Organized as a lightning-round panel, seven speakers presented tools for electronic resources management: addressing the tool's name, creator, cost to implement, what unmet need led to the adoption of the tool, how it works, how difficult it was to implement, and how well the tool meets the identified need.

CORAL workflows for new acquisitions and renewals

Christine Turner (electronic resources librarian, University of Massachusetts at Amherst) discussed how Coral (http://coral-erm.org/) is an open source e-resource management system running on PHP 5 and MySQL 5 and available for download on GitHub (https://github.com/ndlibersa). The rationale for adopting CORAL was a need for integrated ERM modules for organizations, resources, licenses, and usage data that

provided a centralized repository for interrelated data previously distributed widely among files and platforms.

UMass Amherst decided to focus on workflows to manage the opaque, disjointed processes for acquiring and renewing resources, scattered responsibilities for tasks across a four-person acquisitions staff, a need for better support for renewal decisions, and inconsistency in providing access to new resources.

CORAL is an open source product, so the cost was "free." The technical side was reportedly easy, and CORAL has a good support network. For personnel, implementation of CORAL posed conceptual challenges; staff were forced to think about the different types of electronic resources and the steps involved in their management. Customization of processes was easy, but processes cannot be customized at the resource level. As a practical approach, CORAL forced staff to change the way they do their jobs. There is more transparency in processes, but staff must use alerts and queues to find what they need to do.

Does CORAL meet UMass Amherst's needs? As a central repository, yes. It is mostly successful in creating transparent workflows that trigger completion of tasks in a timely manner. More data are needed to evaluate CORAL's support of renewal decisions; implementation of CORAL is still a work in progress.

Electronic resources management with Trello

Jessica Brangiel (electronic resources management librarian, Swarthmore College) discussed how Swarthmore College is a small liberal arts college with robust e-resource collections. Five years ago, the library implemented a commercial ERM product that was quickly abandoned when it consumed too much staff time. Currently 1.5 FTE staff work in electronic resources management. At Swarthmore, the problem was information kept in many different places, wasting staff time. They needed a lightweight tool that did not require IT support and that worked in real time. They hoped to find a tool that would allow setup of basic workflows, queuing tasks, as they wanted to get away from reminders in personal email accounts.

Trello is a free visual project management tool. It is a web-based simple download and only requires a Trello or Google account. No IT support is required. Trello is accessible from mobile devices, and it integrates with Google Apps. Trello organizes information using "boards" and "cards." An initial screen shows a user's boards at the top and team boards at the bottom. Each board can have differing permissions. Brangiel showed the "database" board, which organizes databases by provider. Super-simple color coding and drag-and-drop editing are used to format cards. Trello offers a lightweight workflow option that maintains history, and the use of hashtags makes terms searchable across all boards. Users can attach documents within Trello boards, and these documents can be referenced within the application. Swarthmore is currently adding license data to their Trello boards. Finally, Trello integrates with Google Apps. Since Swarthmore is a Google campus, this feature will soon provide seamless interaction with Gmail and Google Calendar. Brangiel stated that Trello will not be their last ERM, but it is a great flexible tool, meeting Swarthmore's needs at this point in time.

Using Google Apps as an ERM

Elsa Anderson (deputy director of collections, Icahn School of Medicine at Mount Sinai) described how the Icahn School of Medicine at Mount Sinai is currently an OCLC WorldShare Management Services (WMS) library. They use Serials Solutions 360 link resolver, Libguides 2.0, and a shared drive for management of documents and title lists. Additionally, they record ERM administrative notes in a wiki. The library has a primarily electronic collection managed by four staff members and one librarian. Anderson stated that their one major weakness was communication. The library had never implemented task management or alerts in their ERM to track new packages and title updates in the catalog and link resolver. Therefore, the workflow to update titles and new packages was poorly defined, resulting in inconsistent assignment and follow-up on package and title updates.

Google Sheets were used to create to-do lists from a template. An ERM admin list was also created tracking administrative information for resources. The library uses OCLC WMS for licenses but was not happy with this product for basic "what is the admin username/password" tracking. Google Sheets also spreads out license contact information and helps manage a complicated licensing landscape. Additional sheets manage monthly statistics (database searching, link-outs, etc.) and invoice tracking (did something get paid, who should follow up). Use of Google Sheets has eliminated versioning problems, and Google Calendar helps with annual reminders to schedule yearly tasks and provide reminders of upcoming projects. Additionally, the calendar documents a year in the life of technical services, a tool to educate the library director.

Anderson listed advantages of Google Apps as an ERM, which included availability off campus, support for multiple simultaneous editors, elimination of versioning problems, password protection, and easy control of access to sensitive information. Implementation costs were zero dollars to the library with some costs to the institution. Personnel learned the system quickly, as it was technically

simple to implement by their small department, and the staff were excited. Does it work? So far, yes. Anderson stated that it is great as a manager to be able to easily add surprise tasks as they come in. The department is more efficient, and staff are not waiting for Anderson to set up projects, delegate, and train for tasks and follow-up. In the future, Anderson plans to explore Google Sheets' budget analysis tools in greater detail, expand statistics collection and tracking, and schedule monthly projects to make workflow processes clearer. A final slide gave a brief list of articles discussing other libraries employing Google as an ERM tool.

Visio and JIVE with ERM

Lenore England (assistant director, Electronic Resources Management, University of Maryland University College Library) introduced the University of Maryland University College as a nontraditional university. Visio is a brainstorming tool used for business process management and project planning, and JIVE is a tool for organizing projects. Visio is part of Microsoft Office 2010 professional version and is paid for by UMUC; thus, there is no cost or maintenance required by the library. Electronic resources management staff needed an online tool to track brainstorming and project planning using a distilled version of Six Sigma. Visio enables a very macro view of a process; staff members find it easy to use, and it works well as a planning tool.

JIVE is a product of JIVE software (https://www.jivesoftware.com/) and was designed as a social networking tool aimed at businesses and libraries. As is the case with Visio, product costs are paid by UMUC, and there is no maintenance required of the library. JIVE is used to organize ERM workflows and communicate with UMUC. It is harder to use than Visio, but there is lots of support and help available. It works well repurposed as an organizational tool.

LibAnswers w/LibChat: A solution for E-Resource ticketing and workflow management

Kelly Smith (coordinator of collections and discovery, Eastern Kentucky University Libraries [EKU]) presented LibAnswers/LibChat as a product of Springshare (http://springshare.com/libanswers/). The product was created by Springshare to answer questions and track analytics about questions. Consortial cost is $2,400/year plus $99 per additional queue. EKU chose this tool to improve their cumbersome and confusing system of tracking problems using a shared email account. LibAnswers w/LibChat provides a dashboard with tabs for answers, statistics, analytics, and LibChat, the chat

service provided with LibAnswers. The answers area is where the user receives and answers tickets: Problems or questions submitted are via web-form, email, Twitter, etc. Public facing FAQs can be generated from tickets or manually entered by staff. Stats includes basic data about numbers of questions answered. Analytics provides more customized analysis based on locally defined metrics. The dashboard is similar to Libguides and is based on the rights assigned to a staff member. Current open tickets show on the dashboard; closed tickets go into a historical file. EKU uses local tagging to track where a ticket is in the workflow: reported, awaiting vendor reply, etc. Staff can create tickets and then assign the ticket to someone else. LibChat chats can be turned into tickets, preserving chat history and response. The system can generate a list of potential responses based on key words in a ticket; macros can be created providing answers to commonly asked questions. Smith shared several screenshots showing details of the ticket function.

EKU uses the Analytics function to analyze topics using assigned tags and keywords. This function was a little confusing at first, but it can be customize to fit local needs. Statistics are based on local tags, and problems can be tracked by day and/or time, allowing the department to plan for staffing. A resources status update widget can push out to LibGuides to show known problems to patrons. Twitter integration allows students to report problems via Twitter, automatically creating tickets.

For EKU, the benefits of LibAnswers w/LibChat included ease of implementation, customizability, integration with existing Libguides, an intuitive interface, the ability to transfer tickets and assign ownership, the ability to merge tickets, centralized management of the ERM, and unique FAQ functionality.

ALCTS CRS Holdings Information Forum: Knowledgebase strategies

Three speakers addressed strategies for keeping library knowledgebase holdings accurate.

PIE-J: Help with holdings

Regina Reynolds (director, U.S. ISSN Center, Library of Congress) started her presentation with the observation that citations are the primary way students and researchers look for articles. The format of the citation title is likely to be from the time of publication; the researcher may not find that title because the publisher has decided to list content under the current title.

PIE-J is an acronym for Presentation and Identification of E-Journals. It is a best practices document for content providers developed by a National Information Standards

Organization (NISO) working group. Published in 2013, the "meat of the pie" is to ensure that all outputs by a publisher or provider use the journal title and other identifying citation information under which the content was originally published. Key recommendations include presentation of all content under the original title, inclusion of title histories, and use of accurate and complete ISSNs.

The presentation continued with an exploration of "dos and don'ts." In the case of former titles, it is recommended to present all content using the journal title and other identifying information under which the content was originally published. When contemplating a title change, ensure that a change to an existing title is based on a change in content or scope; refrain from cosmetic title changes that often result in a loss of branding and confusion. If a title change is planned, consult with the appropriate ISSN center and implement the change at the start of a volume or year. Title histories should be presented including title, publication date range and ISSN for the current title, and at least the immediately preceding and/or succeeding titles. Reynolds presented several example slides of electronic journal presentations aligned with PIE-J. Another recommendation of PIE-J is that journal titles be consistent across formats, maintaining the same numbering and a simple parallel presentation. Each title over time needs a separate ISSN, as does each format; publishers should apply to the correct ISSN center and display all appropriate ISSNs on each format. A related standard is ISO 8, which sets out rules intended to enable editors and publishers to present periodicals in a format that will facilitate their use. This standard was last updated in 1977, and an update is planned for 2016 to revise the standard in terms of PIE-J.

Where's my link?

Steve Shadle (serials access librarian, University of Washington [UW]) discussed how UW employs Alma as their back-end ILS, which includes an ERM, Primo as their front-end discovery system, and Primo Central as their citation source. They have just under 400 collections profiled, resulting in approximately 400 million citations. Most citations are for journal articles, but some are for books, streaming media, conference proceedings, etc. Alma includes an OpenURL link resolver that is incorporated into the Primo display. Shadle shared screenshots from UW's Primo discovery service illustrating a search result and how the user would go about accessing the online content.

What can a user do to find content? To get to an article, start at the current title and drill down. How can a library fix the problem? They could locally add an entry to the KB, but it is better to contact the KB provider and publisher to correct problem. PIE-J provides a sample letter template to send publishers/providers reporting this kind of title problem. Shadle recommends describing the scope of problem and why it matters, e.g., 10,000 articles not being shown as available to patrons.

The quick fix vs. the precise fix and how to keep moving forward

Shannon Regan (acquisitions coordinator of e-resources and serials, New York Public Library) began by describing the New York Public Library's and Brooklyn Public Library's shared library technical services organization, BookOps. BookOps manages acquisitions for both systems. Serials are delivered directly to departments; standing orders go to BookOps. The New York and Brooklyn public libraries are large, complicated institutions with libraries serving both research and public library needs. They are an Innovative Interfaces Sierra shop and use Serials Solutions for e-resources as a point of discovery. The III Encore catalog is used as the branch discovery catalog with serials records pointing users to a "classic catalog."

Regan shared examples of the complicated holdings display issues they manage. The *Jerusalem Post* is a daily newspaper with a weekly overseas edition. The library has some online access; the print is superseded by microfilm as the film is received. Most branches have a subscription to *Vogue*, which circulates heavily, but the title is also held as part of research collections, so holdings display varies widely by branch needs.

When problems arise, it is important to stop, collaborate, and listen to feedback. There is a tendency to try and fix the immediate issue for the patron and get back to other work, but what is the root of the issue? Is it a one-off issue, or a symptom of problem with a workflow? Is it something that is beyond our control, such as MARC records from a vendor? How does the issue affect the user experience? Who is best suited to manage this issue? In the case of problems associated with issues going directly to the branches/libraries, is this something that needs to be managed centrally or at the branch level?

Regan described examples of problems from the past six months and how they were resolved. Two to three times per year, branch library staff check in a series on the research record. Since this is a recurrent problem, it should be managed with more training for branch library staff.

Open Access (OA) ejournals are another source of problems. BookOps makes good effort to track OA journals in Serials Solutions; negotiating remote access for ejournals is not something they are focused on, but they want to be sure users can get OA content. This was used as

an opportunity to train a new staff member in using Serials Solutions, gaining another individual able to use the tool and able to fix immediate problems.

A recurrent question is whether they should have onsite and remote access to a title. These questions can be answered by looking at acquisitions records, recording payment, and keeping notes for these titles. They hope to start tracking this information in their ERM system. Another question is whether they have perpetual access to a title. With cancellations, they have to negotiate for perpetual access, keeping records of what they should have. Workflows should be adjusted so when questions come up in the future, the answer is available.

An audience member asked Shadle, "Why don't publishers want to comply with PIE-J? Why do they want to list content under the most recent title?" Shadle responded that convincing the people responsible for web pages to do the work is a problem, and publishers do not always know a title's history. Some platforms group everything under the current title because the providers have the idea that people are thinking of a title in terms of current, not historical citations. Librarians think of journals in chunks, while publishers think of them as one thing. PIE-J provides examples that address journal history, even if all titles are on the same page. Reynolds emphasized the importance of making former titles searchable even if the user is going to a page under the current title.

ALCTS Role of the Professional in Technical Services Interest Group

Speakers addressed the roles librarians play in managing change processes in technical services departments.

Prior to the prepared presentations, audience members were asked to think about the following questions: What one thing do you think can help staff accept change and collaboration? How have you encouraged colleagues to self-identify by skills and abilities rather than job title? What are obstacles and opportunities in creating a learning environment focused on growth?

Solutions creators: Enabling innovation in technical services departments

Sally Gibson (head of cataloging, acquisitions, and processing, Illinois State University) talked about how the work of technical services departments takes place in a changing landscape featuring reduction of silos, campus collaboration, and outsourcing of routine tasks to take advantage of what can vendors do for us. Learning outcomes have changed to producing content rather than consuming information, as exemplified by the makerspace movement. Students are focused on finding and evaluating information. For technical services the focus has shifted to making information available and enabling the leap to content creation; so how do we help students with this?

Gibson focused on the differing traits of problem solvers and solution creators. Problem solvers focus on individual issues and actions, see a direct relationship from question to answer, place emphasis on roles and procedures, and prefer clearly defined categories. Solution creators recognize patterns, provide meaning, and emphasize skill sets and abilities instead of job titles.

Our soft skill sets are our character traits, attitudes, and behaviors as well as our personal qualities (such as time management and organizational skills) and our people skills (including interpersonal attributes and relationships with coworkers). Career attributes include communication, teamwork, and customer services. As managers, we should hire on ability, potential, character traits, and attributes.

Value creators are high-concept and high-touch individuals. They are meaning makers; function and roles are replaced by possibilities and ideas. Value creators provide a bridge between understanding how tools work and how to utilize them. They share responsibility and teamwork.

Gibson used an illustration of a red fish swimming in the opposite direction of a blue fish as a visual cue for other ways of doing things. We generally have a comfort level with traditional roles and modes, and moving against the tide can be uncomfortable. Librarians are characterized as risk adverse as a group, so change is challenging. To facilitate change in technical services departments, it is important to focus on employee strengths. This includes abstract versus concrete thinking, comfort level with the unknown, dissemination of information and discussion, creation of a "trust environment," and active learning techniques. Team roles affect departmental change. Role assignment can hinder flexibility because staff can lose sight of purpose and become caught up in procedures, resulting in an emphasis on how something is done rather than why. Often management or procedures do not encourage experimentation. Some departments feature a "pseudoteam" with specified roles lacking independence.

In order to foster an environment of innovation, Gibson emphasized the importance of creating a learning environment that encourages exploration and open exchange of ideas and discourages "groupthink." It is important to embrace a growth mind-set based on the following assumptions: Intelligence can be developed, the desire to embrace challenges can be fostered, inspiration can be found in the success of others, and the belief in potential is critical. In an environment of innovation, understanding the bigger picture is a prerequisite

for systemwide change. It is important to move from production-oriented to long-term solutions and recognize that change can occur at all levels.

Gibson discussed some of the barriers to creation of a learning environment, including fear of failure, fear of being wrong, fear of sharing, and fear of risk. She cited the assumption that "only the librarians can … " but reminded the audience that people doing the tasks are the experts in those areas. How can they be encouraged/allowed to think about and propose change? Gibson recommended a *Harvard Business Review* article on why organizations don't learn (Gino & Staats, [2015]).

Gibson concluded her presentation with an exploration of learning environment requirements and the characteristics of innovative departments. A learning environment values curiosity, engagement, and open and honest discussion; it cultivates strengths and empowers employees to initiate change. We should continuously be examining why and how we are doing things. In innovative departments, solution creators recognize patterns, everyone has a voice, open discussion is valued, and there are opportunities for discussion. All staff have an understanding of desired outcomes, and there are rewards for questioning practice and procedure. The department values individuals for their skill sets and abilities.

Technical services librarian as factotum: The reality in a small academic library

Denise A. Garofalo (associate librarian, systems and catalog services, Kaplan Family Library and Learning Center, Mount Saint Mary College) began her presentation with background information about Mount Saint Mary College and the Kaplan Family Library. Mount Saint Mary is a small liberal arts college with 1,943 FTE students. The Kaplan Family Library is located in a dual-use building; the bottom two floors house the library, and the upper three floors are dormitory space. The library is smaller, holding under 90,000 volumes with an annual circulation of 16,343 and 68 subscription databases. The library has an instruction program, delivering mostly one-shot sessions that are well attended on campus. Many faculty request information literacy instruction in classes. Recent projects have included reclassifying the collection from the Dewey Decimal System to Library of Congress call numbers, moving the library into a new space, and including personal librarians as part of first-year experience.

Garofalo continued with a sketch of library staffing, reminding the audience of the definition of "factotum" as an employee who does all kinds of work. The Kaplan Family Library has five librarians, all tenure track, with heavy instruction loads. Additionally the library had to cope with the loss of a part-time processing position, while

still receiving materials. The problems were both how to survive short term and what to do long term. Additional library staffing factors include the need to keep the building open and staff service points. They have some reliance on student workers, but they are viewed as unreliable. The question then emerged: Where on the organizational chart could technical services find help?

The operating equation is: "Workload + reality = necessity." How can the library keep work flowing in an environment where work-study students are unreliable and not available during intersessions and breaks? The library tried to use students to fill gaps. Training was not a problem, but getting them to actually show up and work was an issue because the work was "boring." An additional factor was lack of funding for either a part-time worker or a student worker.

Garofilo used a recent reorganization as an opportunity; it turned out that the night supervisor needed more tasks. The solution to the technical services staffing problem was interdepartmental collaboration built on past history, including an inventory project shared with Access Services. Technical services staff assessed the tasks involved in processing, then developed procedures and training materials for the night supervisor, including lots of photos. With good documentation, implementation was smooth and without problems. The outcome was that processing continued during breaks, repairs were kept up to date, and a rolling inventory continues. In wrapping up her presentation, Garofilo stated that it is important to reflect and review. If there is a problem, ask or demonstrate. Be flexible and open and consider nontraditional solutions.

At the close of the second presentation, the floor opened for comments and discussion, starting with the questions the audience was asked to think about at the start of the session. The following ideas were mentioned in answer to the question, "What one thing do you think can help staff accept change and collaboration?"

- Take an optimistic view of the future.
- Feed staff information. Staff can't necessarily see the big picture, so we need to explain and show. What would happen if we didn't do something? Maybe we don't need to be doing all these things. Help with buy-in by listening and talking, by putting everything on the table.
- If something is successful, the supervisor needs to have sincerely accepted and promoted the change in a positive way.
- Flexibility is critical. If a change is made, it can be evaluated and changed again, leading to an environment of trust.
- One attendee volunteered an example of a small department where they are meeting on a weekly

basis to examine all workflows. The department consists of an acquisitions librarian, a metadata and e-resource librarian, a serials assistant, and an acquisitions assistant.

- Involve everyone at the whole-library level.
- It is important to keep in mind that not everyone is the same; some people want to be empowered, but other people are intimidated by empowerment.
- Consider Lean Process Improvement.
- Skills and ability can be an issue. A union shop where staff are locked into job titles is harder to change, so it is important to look at skills within the job titles.

The audience also addressed the question, "What are obstacles and opportunities in creating a learning environment focused on growth?"

One audience member raised the issue of a staff person "warming a seat" until retirement, i.e., an individual disinterested in trying anything new. How do you deal? How do you move that person along? One approach is to accept that you're not going to change the person and work with them on how you want to get things done. Meet with the person more often, involve them in the process, state why the process needed to go that way. Involve the person in what can/should be changed. Try to get information from the individual for institutional knowledge.

Another audience member described staff who are trying "retirement in place." Managers were not allowed to give quotas, but they can compare work outputs with similar individuals. The manager distributed statistics each month with highest, lowest, and average numbers. The message must be that every employee is valued; we are chronically short staffed and cannot afford people not working.

Reference

Gino, F., & Staats, B. (2015). Why organizations don't learn. *Harvard Business Review*, *93*(11), 110–118.