

FINAL
Statewide Storage Task Force (SSTF)
Minutes
Monday, January 10, 2011
10:00 am – 11:30 am
Conference Call

I **Members Attending:** Cathy Martyniak (UF), Rita Cauce (FIU), Robb Waltner (UNF), Marilyn Burke (USF), Dan Schoonover (FSU), Amanda Ziegler (UWF), Maris Hayashi (FAU), John Renaud (Miami), Pat Profeta (Florida College System), Wendy Ellis (FCLA) Jean Philips (FCLA), and Jennifer Kuntz (FCLA), Dan R., Miami

Members Not Attending: Becky Donlan (FGCU), Faye Jones (FSU-LAW), John Martin (UF-HSCL), Jonathan Miller (Rollins College), Frank Allen (UCF), Jennifer Kuntz (FCLA), Pricilla Henry (FAMU), Judy Russell (UF)

II **Review & approve December minutes**

Minutes were approved.

III **Updates**

- a. High Density Facility
UF has \$2 million of planning money for HDF. The paper work to start searching for an architect could start in the spring. At the facility changes have been started with putting tables together and hiring staff. The next staff hire will be the person in charge of the team serials. Because it is construction money, the person cannot be hired as UF staff. A temp agency is being used.
- b. CPC Review of JSTOR Titles
CSUL was going to ask the planning committee to review and try to make some recommendations. CPC has it on their number one topic for their call on Tuesday. Cathy will be on that call answering any questions they have.
- c. CSUL: No report.
- d. S-CAD
Storage Cataloging Access Discovery group has not met in over a month due to the holidays. They are trying to figure out how it will work at OCLC. How the records from ALEPH will go back to OCLC and how they will go back from OCLC to ALEPH. Naomi Young will be at the next S-CAD meeting to discuss cataloging. The goal of S-CAD is to give recommendations to the SSTF about how ALEPH should look and the

standards and qualities the cataloging records should have. Then SSTF can decide if the suggestions are acceptable or not.

IV Feedback from CSUL committees re: new barcode policy

The policy was sent to CPC, PSPC, and TSPC.

- a. CPC - Accepted
- b. PSPC – Chair sent out an email and the responses have been coming in slowly, but so far everyone responding has said yes.
- c. TSPC – Will be having a conference call on January 13th. They want to talk about it live. Cathy will be on that call as well.

Question: Did TSPC have any problems with the policy or do they just want to hear more about it?

Answer: TSPC asked Cathy to join their call.

Hopefully CSUL can approve in March.

V From December call, do we want to add a policy statement that confirms clearly that sending materials to HDF is purely voluntary?

Question: How does everyone else outside this group view the HDF, as voluntary or mandatory?

Answer: Judy responded to this at the last meeting. It is in the December minutes on page 2 first paragraph.

Question: Should voluntarily sending items be a policy?

Answer: We can just leave the policy as is for now. If it is decided to clarify in the future that submission is optional, then section 1. F, i might be a good place to put it.

Idea (Dan): There is no introduction paragraph in the policy. Voluntary could be place in the introduction paragraph. Dan Schoonover (FSU) will draft an introduction paragraph for the policy.

Damaged Books – There is a sentence on damaged books not being deposited at the HDF in the main policy document (1.f.i) This sentence was written before Cathy was on this task force. She has a problem with that sentence. In ALF there are damaged books. What if that damaged book is the only one in the State of Florida? Judy and Cathy were discussing putting a note somewhere on the list so that everyone would know if a book has been damaged and what it is. The participants in the HDF can send damaged books and if someone else has a better copy that they want to send, then they can and the damaged book can be replaced.

Idea: What about flagging the items if they are damaged. Something could be put into the policy about the damage items being replaced.

Question: Would it be easier to swap something out or add a second copy?

Answer: A second copy would defeat the purpose of the no duplication policy.

FCLA and S-CAD is working on how to track deteriorated volumes.

VI Further exploration of draft policy of automatically digitizing out of copyright monographs before a circulation.

- a. Confirm use as the trigger for digitization of out of copyright monographs?
Experts on the HDF staff will be looking at copyrights. Digitizing out of copyright books going into or out of circulation was discussed at the last meeting. CPC recommended scanning a book before it goes into circulation.

Question: How many days would it take to get a book from the HDF to Miami?

Answer: UBorrow has been doing a test on delivery. The HDF might use the same delivery service. The idea is to have the items delivered within a few days. The average, by DILLI courier, at the most is four days. The processing time is not long, but the digitization time depends on the size of the book. Cathy would like to have a scanning system at ALF.

When it is time for UF to remodel ALF, knowing things like, if a group might say they prefer to have the book scanned before going into the HDF, would help Cathy decide on the workflow. Cathy would be able to try and have a cost analysis and would approach UF with it.

Idea: What if scanning is approach on a case by case basis. 1) If someone only needs to look at a chapter, could just that chapter be scanned? 2) Is the book the only one in existence or are there other copies easily to get to.

Catalog of the HDF – Cathy thinks about the paper volumes in the trays, but what also needs to be thought about is the electronic equivalent of it. Something needs to be done to make the electronic equivalent easier to find. Cathy would prefer no one request books if there is an electronic copy. S-CAD will talk about this issue at some point. On ALEPH or the electronic data base some type of flag should be done to let people know there is an electronic copy.

An electronic equivalent could be a book out of copyright or even outside a subscription service. If it is an e-book through a service and people have to pay to get it, than the paper one should be available.

Question: Should someone have a choice to borrow a book if they do not have e-book access?

Answer: Yes

Question: Does it make sense to start the clearance process when books come in as part of the processing process?

Answer: No, that would take too much time.

One of the steps that could be done when a book is requested is to look on safe trusted sites like Hathi Trust or Internet Archive to see if there is an electronic copy. A URL could be sent to the requesting patron if there is an electronic copy. If they really need the actual book then the next steps can be done.

FLCA is working on placing the Hathi link next to the link for Google books in Mango. This gives the patrons a choice if the book is electronic.

Question: Is the Google link full text or snippet?

Answer: Google is not limited to full text because it has reviews, snippets, and other information about the book. Hathi might be full text, but will need to check on it.

The group will continue talking about this at the February meeting.

Question: Copyright is not always clear. More information might be needed to make these determinations. Also, should there be an internal workflow to see if it is a unique copy or not, if it has been scanned, or easily accessible?

Answer: We are protected from the copyright infringement in case it happens by accident. The issue seems to be a preservation issue. Cathy will email the copyright determination flow chart that is being used at ALF for the de-duplication process.

The De-Duplication Process at ALF: There are a million volumes and an unknown number of titles at ALF. A report was run in ALEPH to identify titles with 2 or more copies in ALF. There are 48,000 titles with 125,000 volumes. Staff is taking out the copies. For example, there are three copies. A staff member pulls out all the copies and looks to see which one is the best copy and sets it aside for tray. Now the copyright determination flow chart is looked at and the copyright status is determined. If out of copyright, one copy is sent to the internet archive for scanning after internet archives and Hathi has been looked at to determine if it has already been scanned. If so, the URL is added into a record and is made available at the UF catalog. If it needs to be scanned than money from UF is used for scanning and is made available on the internet. If it is in copyright, it is not sent to be scanned. The third copy is donated to internet archive as well.

The SSTF likes this idea. All the work is done at once and it shows that due diligence was made.

Question: Would a modified version of this be used when other participants send their books to the HDF?

Answer: No. This would be looked at only if the book is requested for circulation. The only reason this is being done with the duplicates is because Judy had funds to establish a contract with Internet Archive.

If the group wants to do scanning for the HDF, then the money to pay for the scanning has to come from a different source.

Tiered preservation approach:

1st Tier – Coming in a deteriorated book would get a cotton tape grip tie.

2nd Tier – When leaving it would get a standard box to keep it stable while in circulation.

3rd Tier – When the book comes back, if it is in copyright, it might get a custom box and then get put back into the tray.

Jonathan Miller– Other storage facilities have had to deal with de-duplication issues. This is an opportunity to take care of this issue at the beginning. We need to remember that we do not want to have to go back later to do something.

There are two ways to determine if a book is deteriorating, if the paper is brittle and the physical structure of the book. With this idea in mind, Judy has agreed to go the extra steps of what needs to be done before the book goes into the HDF since it may not be retrieved or if it is not very often. This step would happen before it is entered into the computer. This workflow would be called the deteriorated workflow. The S-CAD is discussing where a note can be placed to let people know that the book has some kind of deterioration.

Question: Is the option to scan an item part of the deterioration workflow?

Answer: Cathy does not know. There are a lot of items. Circulation could be used as the trigger for scanning.

Question: Would the members prefer the damage note be put on the ALEPH list or on a web database?

Answer: They could be placed on one database as decisions are being made. The ALEPH list could be used with an automated weeding system. It would be easier to have it on one database.

- b. Cost implications
Scanning at the internet archives would cost 10 cents a page so a 200 page book would be \$20.
In house – The cost is unknown
- c. Staff implications
- d. Draft policy language?

VII Continue fees and fines cross over with Uborrow conversation

VIII Prioritization of Shipments: continue

IX Wrap-up, scheduling

- a. Next meeting: February 14th