

0. Definition of domain.

A monograph is a bibliographic resource that is complete in one part or intended to be completed within a finite number of parts. Examples include a book, a multi-volume set (such as an encyclopedia), or a volume of a series (or, occasionally, a journal issue or an article/chapter in a book/journal) that is cataloged separately due to a volume-specific title, distinct content, and/or special request.

While a monograph can appear in any format, for purposes of this report monographs include:

- A. Printed books
- B. Multi-volume sets
- C. Individually-cataloged volumes of series/journals
- D. Microform versions of #1-3
- E. Electronic versions of #1-3
- F. Scores [information to be provided by Music Librarian]

They do not include:

- A. Audio versions of #1-3
- B. Student theses
- C. Material in the Departmental Collections catalog

1. Existing practices, including the number of people involved in the practice, the technologies/systems involved in managing the process, budget for materials in that area, and the budget for systems/personnel in that area.

- A. Library selects, acquires, catalogs, physically processes, shelves, binds, and preserves material. Some of the cataloging and physical processing is outsourced.
- B. Number of people involved: [How detailed to get? All library staff are involved.]
- C. Technologies/systems involved:
 - i) Voyager integrated library system
 - ii) YBP (Yankee Book Peddler) GOBI internet system for ordering about 1/2 of library materials
 - iii) YBP physical processing service so that books ordered on certain GOBI accounts come fully processed
 - iv) OCLC PromptCat service to catalog books ordered through certain GOBI accounts
 - v) LTI (Library Technologies Inc.) to provide authority control in the library database; authority control matches headings (names, uniform titles, series, subjects) against authorized forms, changes them in bibliographic as needed, and provides associated authority records with cross-
 - vi) OCLC TechPro service to catalog selected materials beyond the library's ability to catalog, e.g. difficult foreign languages
 - vii) OCLC Bibliographic Notification service to update bibliographic records that have been upgraded in the OCLC database
 - viii) Purchased sets of MARC records, e.g. OCLC WorldCat Collection Sets for large microfilm sets, EEBO records for Early English Books Online
 - ix) Programs created by other Voyager libraries that utilize Voyager data, e.g. VgerSpin spine label program, VgerSelect bib record selection program, MarcEdit
 - x) Macro Express macros created inhouse to facilitate work in Voyager
 - xi) Access reports created inhouse to facilitate work in Voyager
 - xii) Able commercial bindery software
 - xiii) Se-Lin spine labeling system plus printer
- D. Budget for materials in area:
 - i) Materials: \$1,002,598 which excludes audio and scores, but includes some of our e-resources
 - ii) Acquisitions and cataloging tools, e.g. manuals, subscription to online LC classification and subject headings, etc.

- iii) Supplies: Inhouse processing materials including spine labels, bookplates, barcodes (YBP as well as inhouse), security strips, date-due slips, media containers, pockets for backs of volumes, pam binding, jacket/cover protectors, various kinds of slips
- E. Budget for systems/personnel in area:
 - i) YBP GOBI ordering costs
 - ii) OCLC cataloging subscription
 - iii) OCLC telecommunication costs
 - iv) YBP PromptCat costs (actual cost, plus \$.15 per line item)
 - v) OCLC TechPro costs
 - vi) MARC record sets costs
 - vii) YBP physical processing costs
 - viii) LTI authority processing
 - ix) Commercial binding
 - x) Training
 - xi) Personnel [Exactly what info is needed?]

2. Strengths: What is good about the existing practice?

- A. Supports university programs and research
- B. Has carefully evolved over time and works well
- C. Staff are skilled and experienced; some paraprofessionals do what would be professional-level work in other libraries
- D. Student workers are used to the max, which is both good and bad
- E. Adheres to national standards: systems, acquisitions practice, cataloging practice, librarianship
- F. Outsourcing vendors are top-notch; outsourcing saves some staff costs

3. Weaknesses: What could be improved?

- A. Wesleyan is an awkward size. It is challenging to support the needs of both undergraduate and graduate programs.
- B. New faculty, faculty with new research interests, or new programs do not translate into additional library funds
- C. While we have experienced selectors and YBP selection profiles, we lack a written collection development policy. For specialized areas consultants might assist, e.g. the recent East Asian Collection Review (the library and the Center for East Asian Studies) by Sharon Domier.
- D. Materials are not always used, because they not discovered or do not meet users' needs
- E. Over 100 separate locations in the Caleb make it hard to find items, but the structure of the buildings impedes consolidation
- F. Media accompanying volumes are often separated from the volumes due to fragility, security concerns, and/or no playback equipment on site. Media are disbursed to various locations.
- G. Gifts are often inappropriate to the collection. We are picky about accepting gifts and it takes time to go through what is being offered. We lack a written gift policy.
- H. We are unsure of the collateral costs of a new item in the collection: cataloging, processing, shelving, circulating, repairing. This is called the stewardship model or, borrowing from technology and business, TCO (Total Cost of Ownership).
- I. Wesleyan's online catalog is not complete. Older cataloging is not entirely converted to online. "Hidden collections" including some of our unique and most valuable items have never been cataloged.
- J. Staffing is too thin to handle certain cataloging, e.g. non-Roman languages or the deluge of electronic resources, and we do not have as much outsourcing money as we used to
- K. Outsourcing costs continue to rise, but we are dependent upon their services
- L. Staffing is too thin to make corrections to the database to the extent we would like, e.g. cleaning up messes from our last conversion or authority "non-matches" following monthly and quarterly LTI processing
- M. No link-checker for the catalog--if we could even keep up with the errors reported--or the library webpages

- N. Voyager catalog identifies an item well, which is great for library staff but not always adequate for other users. Even though Voyager offers controlled vocabulary/cross-references plus keyword searching, the MARC format is limited to bibliographic description and limited additional access points such as other names and titles, subjects, classification and, to a lesser extent, genre terms, tables of contents and other notes.
- O. Our current CTW catalog, which brings together our three separate databases virtually, does not function satisfactorily. Users fondly remember our previous Sirsi catalog with its single database. One of our consortium members is uncooperative in its circulation policies.
- P. Even when searching Wesleyan only, results are not always clear and options for manipulation are limited. Personal customization for searching, display, and notification are almost nonexistent. Serials with title changes do not necessarily display together. Overall, users find the catalog difficult to use, considering that they are used to Google.
- Q. Users must search several interfaces to find information, the catalog being just one of them
- R. While everyone on staff works with systems, we need additional systems support. Especially important with the retirement of the CTW Systems Librarian, whose replacement will most likely do more coordinating and less hands-on.
- S. CTW cooperation is less than it could be

4. Opportunities: What are things that other schools or institutions do that we might emulate? What trends are emerging from other sectors that we could use to our advantage?

- A. Wesleyan is behind other institutions in completing its online catalog and barcoding its holdings. While staffing is tight, and so long as there are no staff cuts in Cataloging, we should establish priorities and a workflow for retrospective conversion. A paraprofessional cataloger is already assigned to Special Collections one morning a week to do copy and original cataloging. Internal money for outsourcing is doubtful; external funds may be available for certain of our special/archival collections. Our outsourcing dollars are spent primarily on current cataloging, which seems to make sense as it is more routine than cataloging of older materials.
- B. Except for Reference collections and the Art Library, there has been no inventory of the library collections for decades. Much is missing or misplaced. The online catalog is inaccurate. It makes weeding and transfers to storage difficult.
- C. CTW libraries might be able to share cataloging expertise, e.g. an Asian languages cataloger, or just temp help to clear out backlogs and finish projects
- D. Exploit print resources by "enriching" basic MARC records with tables of contents, back-of-book indexes, jacket information, reviews, etc. To do so in our catalog is costly. Loading this data into Voyager may not make sense anyway if we can somehow link to it. This enriched data should be searchable. The ultimate enriched data is, of course, searchable electronic versions of the complete text, but in most cases we still need intermediate descriptions (e.g. bibliographic records) and controlled vocabulary.
- E. The CTW catalog needs to be more of a union catalog, actually or virtually. The CTW Steering Committee is looking at the Voyager "Universal Catalog," a fourth database into which we could load our individual holdings nightly. Even though we may offer the public a more comprehensive front-end as alternative, library staff need to search for and control CTW resources in a sophisticated manner.
- F. The CTW Library Consortium is restructuring and hopes to work more cooperatively. The Tri-College Library Consortium (Bryn Mawr, Haverford, Swarthmore) and others are good models.
- G. We are considering joining the Boston Library Consortium to facilitate resource sharing
- H. The newer catalogs exploit MARC records and relationships between records better, but require the costly services of Endeca, TLC AquaBrowser Library, etc. to accomplish this. One hopes the library system vendors take notice.
- I. Each manifestation of a work is cataloged on a separate bibliographic record. Not only is this redundant work, but all versions and editions of a work do not readily display together. Bibliographic records, or least their display, need to be "FRBRized" according to *Functional Requirements for Bibliographic Records*:
 - i) FIND a work = a distinct intellectual or artistic creation, e.g. *Moby Dick*
 - ii) IDENTIFY an expression = the intellectual realization of a work in the form of alphanumeric, musical, or choreographic notation, sound image, object, movement, etc. or any combination of

such forms, e.g. versions of *Moby Dick* including revised, abridged, illustrated, or translated print versions, film versions, sound recordings, dramatic performances, etc.

- iii) SELECT a manifestation = the physical embodiment of an expression of a work that bears the same characteristics in respect to both intellectual content and physical form, e.g. the original first ed. of *Moby Dick*, or the one published by University of California Press in 1981, or a film version. MARC cataloging is done at this level.
 - iv) OBTAIN an item = e.g. my library's copy of the University of California 1981 ed.
- New cataloging rules and library system improvements may facilitate the FRBR approach. OCLC FirstSearch and RLG's RedLightGreen return results in a loosely FRBR manner.
- J. How can we link serials with title changes? One way is to link them in Voyager so that they are more easily brought together. This would require significant manual intervention to check and enter linking data, primarily ISSNs, in the MARC 78x linking fields.
 - K. Need a unified front end--some sort of meta-searching--to find all recommended information resources, so that users may use a uniform search methodology, relevance rating, minimal duplication and jargon, help with alternative spelling, "faceted browsing" of the results set (by classification, subject heading subdivision, etc., and recommendations of possible interest (never no results). This could be outsourced (OCLC, RLG, Google, vendor).
 - L. Enable library content to be integrated within campus virtual learning environments/course management systems (e.g. Blackboard) and institutional portals, rather than a separate "silo"
 - M. There is the opportunity to maximize Google/Yahoo hits (via OCLC's Open WorldCat project) on our holdings
 - N. We need to identify what kinds of system support we need, at what level, and who could provide it.

5. Threats: What bad things could happen if we keep doing what we are doing? What bad things could happen if we change the way we are doing? What is happening in the environment that we are unprepared for now and would suggest that we need to change our ways?

- A. Experienced library staff will be retiring. Some may not be replaced. High-level paraprofessionals take years to train.
- B. It is hard maintain the current level of work, never mind additional work. Aside from outsourcing, we have not identified ways to stop doing anything major.
- C. We are hampered by lack of imagination at the national level, e.g. OCLC could function as a national library catalog but it doesn't. That means each library is doing redundant work for its own catalog, and efforts to search universally are thwarted by inconsistent records.
- D. The library system largely determines how we do our work and how efficient we can be. Vendors encourage enhancement requests, but only do so much and often have their own agenda.
- E. Must balance the purchase of monographs with serials, and electronic resources
- F. Out of space
- G. Accelerated faculty retirements mean more faculty collections will be offered as gifts

6. Short-term recommendations: What are some short-term (next six months a year) things we could do to address issues and opportunities identified in this report? What would be some concrete next steps towards making this happen? What would it cost?

- A. Purchase paperbacks, with or without reinforcement, instead of hardbacks
- B. Increase purchase of e-books appropriate to the collection
- C. Continue initial efforts at CTW collaborative collection development and collection evaluation:
 - i) CTW Task Force continues to meet and report
 - ii) Create Voyager reports beyond the usual holdings and circulation reports, e.g. what books have been searched, read online, considered but ignored
 - iii) Study results of Conn College's OCLC WorldCat Collection Sets Service analysis
- D. Purchase an ERMS (Electronic Resources Management System)
- E. Determine usage statistics needed
- F. Determine systems support
- G. Determine TCO (Total Cost of Ownership) of our collections
- H. Consider Boston Library Consortium

- I. Complete compact storage in Science Library
- J. Continue weeding the collection
- K. Maximize Google/Yahoo hits in our catalog (via OCLC's Open WorldCat project) by running our database against OCLC. This is a one-time free service to make our "holding symbols" in OCLC accurate.

7. Long-term recommendations: What are some longer-term (two-five year) things we could do?

- A. Further collaborative collection development and analysis:
 - i) CTW Task Force continues to meet and report
 - ii) Utilize OCLC WorldCat Collection Analysis Service
- B. Write a collection development policy
- C. Write a gifts policy
- D. Share CTW staff if appropriate
- E. Complete the catalog
- F. Inventory the collection, perhaps incorporating barcoding. Begin by determining goals and a schedule.
- G. Continue weeding the collection
- H. Reduce the number of locations in the libraries
- I. Examine and possibly adjust policy for separating/scattering non-book media
- J. Consider off-site storage options in addition to JSTOR
- K. Implement record enrichment
- L. Improve the online catalog by taking advantage of Voyager enhancements and suggesting enhancements, applying Endeca/TLS-type improvements, purchasing a new catalog, or outsourcing the catalog if that makes sense
- M. Implement new cataloging rules: RDA (Resource Description and Access) due out in 2008 and will replace AACR2 (Anglo-American Cataloguing Rules, 2nd ed.). This could require reformatting the database or having a vendor do so.
- N. Implement aspects of FRBR. Also a possible reformatting issue.
- O. Implement meta-searching. Pre-harvesting of metadata (sophisticated processing of metadata to improve retrieval and display, like Google's) to overcome disparities among resources and descriptions of resources. Faceting browsing of results.
- P. Reduce or contain TCO (Total Cost of Ownership)
- Q. A truly book-like e-book reader would make e-books much more viable

8. Readings and links: What are the key readings in this area that would help others become informed about this area? What are some examples of technologies and applications of those technologies that would help us think through how to approach content management in this particular domain?

- A. Collection development and analysis and evaluating current collections
 - i) OCLC. WorldCat Collection Analysis Service <http://www.oclc.org/collectionanalysis/>
- B. Cooperative collection development:
 - i) Boston Library Consortium webpage <http://www.blc.org/>
 - ii) Center for Research Libraries Working Group to Map Cooperative Collection Development Projects. *Survey Results, 2002-*. <http://www.crl.edu/awcc2002/ccdsurveyresults.htm>
 - iii) Consort Colleges Cooperative Collection Development website (Denison University, Kenyon College, Ohio Wesleyan University, The College of Wooster) http://www.wooster.edu/library/oh5/cccd/CCCD_Purpose.html
 - iv) Illinois Cooperative Collection Management Program consortium website <http://www.niulib.niu.edu/ccm/>
 - v) Luther, Judy, et al. *Library Buildings and the Building of a Collaborative Research Collection at the Tri-College Library Consortium: Report to the Mellon Foundation*. Washington, D.C., Council on Library and Information Resources, April 2003. 45 p. <http://www.clir.org/pubs/reports/pub115/contents.html>
 - vi) Orbis Cascade Alliance website (Oregon and Washington libraries) <http://www.orbiscascade.org/>

- C. New online catalogs:
 - i) North Carolina State University's Endeca catalog information page <http://www.lib.ncsu.edu/endeca/> and online catalog <http://www.lib.ncsu.edu/catalog/>
 - ii) Research Library Group's RedLightGreen catalog <http://www.redlightgreen.com/ucwprod/web/workspace.jsp>
 - iii) TLC's (The Library Company) AquaBrowser Library <http://www.tlcdelivers.com/aquabrowser/> and Queens (N.Y.) Public Library site <http://qlindex.medialab.nl/>
- D. Cataloging:
 - i) RDA (Resource Description and Access):
 - a) Joint Steering Committee for Revision of Anglo-American Cataloging Rules website <http://www.collectionscanada.ca/jsc/rda.html>
 - ii) FRBR:
 - a) Childress, Eric. *What's FRBR?* COASIS&T Program 2005-07-21, OCLC. Slide show <http://www.oclc.org/research/presentations/childress/20050721-coasis&t.ppt>
 - b) IFLA Study Group on the Functional Requirements for Bibliographic Records. *Functional Requirements for Bibliographic Records, Final Report*. Munchen, K.G. Saur, 1998, 136 p. <http://www.ifla.org/VII/s13/frbr/frbr.pdf>
 - c) OCLC. *OCLC Research Activities and IFLA's Functional Requirements for Bibliographic Records* <http://www.oclc.org/research/projects/frbr/>
 - d) Tillet, Barbara. *What is FRBR?: A Conceptual Model for the Bibliographic Universe*. Washington, D.C., Library of Congress Cataloging Distribution Service, 2003. 8 p. <http://www.loc.gov/cds/downloads/FRBR.PDF>
- E. Serial bibliographic record linking:
 - i) University of Adelaide Libraries catalog <http://www.adelaide.edu.au/library/guide/gen/catalogs/>
- F. Meta-searching:
 - i) Google Print <http://print.google.com/googleprint/library.html>
 - ii) Lavoie, Brian, *et al.* "Anatomy of Aggregate Collections: the Example of Google Print for Libraries." *D-Lib Magazine*, vol. 11, no. 9, (Sept. 2005), 15 p. (authors are from the OCLC Office of Research) <http://www.dlib.org/dlib/september05/lavoie/09lavoie.html>
- G. Other:
 - i) University of California Libraries, Bibliographic Services Task Force. *Rethinking How We Provide Bibliographic Services for the University of California: Final Report, December 2005*. 79 p. <http://libraries.universityofcalifornia.edu/sopag/BSTF/Final.pdf>
 - **Highly recommended. Includes enhancing information search and retrieval, rearchitcting the OPAC, and adopting new cataloging practices. References and annotated bibliography.**