**FINAL**
**Statewide Storage Task Force (SSTF)**
**Minutes**
**Monday, November 8, 2010**
**10:00 am – 11:30 am**
**Conference Call**


I        **Members Attending**:  Cathy Martyniak (UF), Jennifer Kuntz (FCLA), Rita Cauce (FIU), Frank Allen (UCF), Robb Waltner (UNF), Merilyn Burke (USF), Jean Philips (FCLA), Judy Russell (UF), Pricilla Henry (FAMU), Dan Schoonover (FSU), Amanda Ziegler (UNF), Maris Hayashi (FAU),

         **Members Not Attending**:  John Renaud (Miami), Becky Donlan (FGCU), Faye Jones (FSU-LAW), John Martin (UF-HSCL), Pat Profeta (Florida College System), Jonathan Miller (Rollins College)

         **Guest:**  Naomi Young (UF - Cataloging)

II       **Review & approve October minutes**

         Minutes were approved.

III      **Holdings Accuracy (New Agenda Item)**

   a.   Naomi and Cathy were meeting to work on a procedure for retrieving serials from the ALF stacks and updating their bibs, HOLS and item records. There is a complexity to HOL accuracy that needed to be discussed.

   b.   Judy suggested giving some background information to the group since there are some new members.  In the beginning when planning the storage facility the group talked about putting journal volumes in.  One of the things that were looked at was what other facilities did about the level of verification.  Page by page verification like the one being done at Harvard and the University of California, paid by JSTOR, was impossible.  There was no time and money to do that.  Rare materials are not being put into the HDF.  If they knew through an existing holding statement, by observation that the volume was damaged in some way or noticeably incomplete that the HDF would take action accordingly.

   c.   Policies for the Statewide Shared Collection at the High Density Storage Facility, Version 1.3, §1.f.i:

       1.  Completeness of Collection:

Comprehensive issue by issue verification of print serial volumes will not be undertaken. Instead, UF's copy will serve as the default copy to be deposited into the storage facility. If an issue is obviously missing from a bound volume, as determined via missing issue notes in the Aleph holdings or a yellow missing issue sheet tipped into the volume, this copy will not be deposited. Issues with obvious physical damage (e.g., water damage, brittle, overly stained, etc.) will also not be deposited. FSU will be the first institution contacted to fill the gap. If it is necessary to look beyond UF and FSU, individual institutions will be contacted. (CSUL approved in July 2009)

d. Naomi noticed that the above wording is different from what she is going to talk about. The MARC records in the ALEPH system are coded at a number of different levels including the level in the leader field which is one of the long character strings in ALEPH.

1. Level three is a summary statement which only gives the statement at the highest level possible which would be the volume level. It is theoretically possible if only **one** issue of a volume is present a summary statement would facilitate that the volume is present.
2. Level four is a default when a new journal is being checked in because it is the level specifically required for check in. It gives all the information down to the issue level.

e. Level four has a lot of detail. The wording on the above policy states, "If an issue is obviously missing from a bound volume, as determined via missing issue notes in the Aleph holdings or a yellow missing issue sheet tipped into the volume, this copy will not be deposited." It is possible to code a record as having mixed levels which means you have been as specific as you can and that you are not guaranteeing everything is present. This is another option for the wording.

Question: The above policy applies to the first million from UF, but does it also apply to other volumes coming in?
Answer: Yes, Judy thinks the libraries who will be sending collections might discover that their collection is not complete and they would either need to notify the HDF people or try to contact the other partner libraries to see if it could be completed. If it does stay incomplete then there needs to be a system where the collection is flagged. Not every volume will be looked at just the ones that issues are discovered during the process.

Idea: Naomi suggested using mixed coding as a way to identify incomplete volumes.

<u>Question</u>:  Are we going to store the JSTOR at all?

<u>Answer</u>:  Judy does not know yet.  There have been many discussions on JSTOR.  The history of the usage would play a role in determine what happens to the JSTOR.  As the JSTOR got to the point of being put into the HDF, they would be reviewed on a title by title base to see how the group collectively feels.  Some JSTOR might be put into the HDF, but it would have to be recommended by the taskforce, agreed to by the collection management, and agreed to by the dean.

f.  Cathy informed the group that currently UF has 39,000 volumes in trays focusing on government documents and monographs.  Currently there are no journals or JSTOR in those trays.  Anything that is JSTOR will be put to the side for now.  The inventory will happen as everything is being trayed.


**IV      Updates**

a.  High Density Facility
   1.  Ordered more book trucks, tables, high top stand up tables for the sorting and traying.
   2.  Will be hiring six people to do the traying and four people to do the bibliographic ALEPH work. The deduplication coordinator has been hired. There still is not an architect yet, but we are getting close to having one.
   3.  There was a town hall meeting last Friday and Cathy emailed the link of the slide presentation to everyone.

b.  JSTOR

   1.  Refer to Judy's emails.

c.  S-CAD (Storage Cataloging Access and Discovery)

   1.  Rita and Cathy are the SSTF representatives for this task force.  It also has people from UCF, FSU, New College, FCLA, and there has been a request to add someone from UWF.

   2.  S-CAD is working on:
      i.   How to get OCLC symbols.
      ii.  What is the work flow?  Some FCLA people went to ALF to talk about the workflow system.  There is already a drafted workflow for the 'production' work.  Statewide storage will get recommendations together and alert CSUL.  Then CSUL will do the vetting.   Cathy will keep everyone updated monthly during these calls.

**V      Policy by document review**

a.  The semester long course reserve policy document and the physical condition policy document were both approved by email with CSUL before the next face to face.

b.  See the Policies for the Statewide Shared Collection at the High Density Storage Facility, Version 1.3, November 2010.

1.  Cathy added 1.e.i.1
2.  Reviewing 1.f.i.  Talked about it earlier in the meeting.
3.  Re-reviewing the bar code policy on 3.d

c.  Cathy is working on the SSTF quarterly report for Judy.


**VI      Duplicate Barcoding: discuss policy revision (3.d on policy by topic)**

a.  A draft of the barcode placement policy was sent out last week by Cathy.  If an item has a barcode on it, then it can be on the inside or outside of it.  Last week the question was raised, "Do we want to have barcoding done at each institution or at HDF?"

b.  See the draft of the barcode placement policy


Question:  Have we already started working with the vendors and internally to help prepare for the future [suggest all CSUL libraries begin putting barcodes on the outside now]?  This might be something other libraries might want to think about for the future.

Question:   Is the duplicate bar code going to be done if there is already a bar code on it?
Answer:  It depends on where the bar code is at.  Will try not to obscure the text on the book so the bar code might be put a little below it or even put into an envelope.

c.  Cathy wants to have an official vote in December on this policy.  After it is approved at the December meeting, it will be vetted.  Once TSPC, PSPC, and CPC have vetted and approved it, then it will go to CSUL for approval.

**VII      Prioritization of Shipments: discuss revised transfer request sheet**

a.  Cathy emailed a new transfer request sheet with changes.  It is more of a procedural level.  The group needs to keep talking about the policy.

b. Because the originating library will do the deduplication step, it will need to let everyone else know what it will be sending. Cathy would like some ideas from the group about this.

Suggestion 1: The library that will be sending materials could create some kind of list.
Suggestion 2: There could be some kind of sub library code or TKR that can be changed to indicate the item is going to be shipped. Then those items could be moved to a separate list. At this point the library could look at a HDF storage catalog with their list to see if there are any duplicates. In ALEPH everything can be seen, but not in Mango.

Suggestion 3: A pending file can be used until the item has been trayed and is ready to go. The library can check their list against the HDF storage catalog and make sure there are no duplicates. If not, then the item can be placed on the HDF storage catalog list with pending by it until it is time to place the tray on the shelving.

c. It takes a while to get a shipment ready. Need to know if there is a time laps from pulling off shelves to when they will be sent.

Question: Should the waiting library look at what a requesting library will be sending?
Answer: The transfer request sheets could help with this. This group will have to decide when and how each library will send a list out of what they will be sending so that the other libraries will know.

d. For the other HDFs the other libraries pull what they want and tell the facility how many feet they need and then send the items. Our HDF is the only one enforcing a deduplicate policy in which makes libraries list what they will be sending. The libraries might be processing one at a time, although the goal is not to have libraries wait.

Question: How do libraries with more complete sets of volumes approach this if there are volumes that are not complete, but are sent to the HDF?
Answer: Have the second library with the complete set send the volume that is needed.

Question: What if two schools were processing materials at the same time and that night duplicates were discovered?
Answer: Not sure how to notify the sending libraries yet.

Question: If we need to process one school at a time, do we need to have a window of time?
Answer: If the information is in the pending file, then everyone will know what is being sent. There is an inventory software program that would use the bar codes to move the item from pending to active when checked into the HDF. Could also go to the original catalog and change the information there.

e. The group will talk more on this agenda at the next meeting.

**VIII    Potential policy of automatically digitizing out of copyright monographs AFTER a circulation? Or should it be BEFORE the circulation, as suggested by CPC? (Rescheduled from October)**

a. This topic will be address before Prioritization of Shipments during the next meeting in December.

**IX     Wrap-up, scheduling**

a. Next Meeting, December 13th
b. Elluminate - No one sees the need for it at this time.