Technical Services Workflows Redesign for UVM Libraries
Final Report

February 11, 2008

Prepared by the Technical Services Workflow Redesign Working Group

Sandy Aldrich   Larry Dubois
Toni Fortini   Albert Joy
Tina Kussey   Jeanene Light

Table of Contents

Executive Summary

Following the report by R2 Consultants and the Libraries retreat this past summer, the Technical Services Working Group was formed to examine technical services activities of Bailey/Howe and Dana Libraries and the workflows common to both in order to determine their necessity in meeting the demands of the Libraries' constituents in the current environment.

The group was charged at the end of September 2007 to investigate the following areas: cataloging, binding, book repairs/preservation, book ordering, invoices and payments, print check-in/receiving, and e-resource troubleshooting. The group was encouraged to conduct a data-driven investigation and to look for ways to improve patron services.

After many hours of group meetings, gathering statistics, meetings with technical services staff, and documenting our findings, it became necessary to expand the scope of the charge to include: the involvement of collection development in acquisitions; e-resource management; and some serials acquisitions. The investigation uncovered redundant workflows, inefficiencies, and outdated practices, as well as opportunities for collaboration.

Following are the critical points of the plan:

- Create a University Libraries Collection Management Services division (UVL CMS) serving the needs of all UVM library constituents
- Form a Serials Access Management department within UVL CMS
- Refocus staff on emerging needs without adding additional staff
- Enhance courier service to ensure seamless user access of collections

Central recommendations to achieve this plan are:

- Allocate 3 FTE faculty and 4 FTE staff positions to cataloging
- Focus on electronic and hidden/unique collections (R2, p.5)
- Centralize materials processing
- Merge periodicals with serials (R2, p. 33)

Technical Services Workflows Redesign for UVM Libraries Working Group Charge

Purpose: The group is formed with the purpose of examining Technical Services activities and workflows common to both Bailey/Howe and Dana Libraries in order to determine their necessity in the current environment, and the most efficient/effective means of doing the activity to meet the demands of user constituents in both libraries. The work group will focus on the following areas:

- Cataloging (can include monographs, AV/media, serials, special/unique/hidden collections, vendor loads, etc.)
- Binding processes
- Book repairs / Preservation
- Book ordering (monographs, shelf ready processes)
- Invoices and payments (esp. around shared e-resources)
- Print check-in / receiving printed periodicals
- E-Resource troubleshooting (problem resolution + related issues)

For each of the areas or related subsets, the group will address the following:

1. Gather facts and information about the current processes in each of the libraries such as production statistics, FTE engaged in the process, associated systems and contracts, and costs associated with them.

2. Analyze data and environmental information to develop recommendations in each area that will improve efficiency and effectiveness and possibly increase the capacity of library staff and faculty to contribute in these and other areas.

   The group should take into account similarities and differences in the libraries and consider how they figure in overall tech services workflow between each of the libraries. The group should also consult with interested and expert colleagues in the libraries as fact of its information gathering.

3. Present analysis, findings and recommendations in each area. Recommendations could include a revised process that would be used in both libraries, consolidation of work that would be performed in one location, etc. Consider advantages and disadvantages of recommendations and develop alternative scenarios as appropriate.

Other Considerations: Meetings should be kept and communications on progress posted to Libraries blog would be appreciated.

Timeframe: A preliminary report (with some areas possibly completed) to the Dean by November 28.[1] Final report and recommendations to the Dean by December 14.[2]

---

[1] Thanksgiving break is Nov. 22-23.
[2] Dean's Council is scheduled to meet Tuesday, December 18 – the last scheduled DC meeting before the holidays.

Binding/End Processing/Preservations Data

Bailey Howe Library

	FY 03	FY 04	FY 05	FY 06	FY 07	Average	Current Levels
Journal Items Bound	6486	5776	3825	3962	2415		
Cost per Journal							$8.60
Yearly Expenditures for Journal Binding	$55,780	$49,673	$32,895	$34,073	$20,769		
# of Staff Performing Task							5 + 1 faculty supervisor
Binder - Turn Around Time (from pickup to return)							2 weeks
Overall Turn Around Time (pulled from shelf to reshelving)							4 weeks

B/H Staff	FTE
Katie	0.95
Kathy B (.8 FTE)	0.8
Linda	1
Wendy (preservation)	0.05
Bonnie	0.03
Total FTE	**2.83**

Dana Staff	FTE
Helen	0.45
Shirley	0.02
Circ Staff	0.05
Total FTE	**0.52**

Dana Library

	FY 03	FY 04	FY 05	FY 06	FY 07	Average	Current Levels
Journal Items Bound	1935	1872	1481	1673*	1765*		
Cost per Journal							$10.50
Yearly Expenditures for Journal Binding	$20,000	$19,000	$15,000	$17,000	$18,000		$15,000
# of Staff Performing Task							2 + 1 faculty supervisor
Binder - Turn Around Time (from pickup to return)							2 weeks
Overall Turn Around Time (pulled from shelf to reshelving)							4 weeks

* Binding Items & $ was increased for FY06-07 to catch up from move to new library.

Notes on Workflow

Bailey Howe Library
- Uses Bridgeport Bindery
- Indicates item is at bindery by adding notes in the holdings record. Removes upon return from Bindery
- Does not create item records, does not add date due slips
- Does not circulate bound periodicals routinely, but by request "on the fly"
- Binds in-house and other materials/formats (books, theses, maps, etc.)
    o In FY07, B/H bound 2,065 books
    o In FY07, B/H "pegged" 562 serials and paperbacks in-house
- Does end process journals (property stamping & tattle taping)
- Cuts windows in dust jackets for call #

- Should consider:
    o Request binder to insert tattle tapes and stamping
    o Compare time savings if B/H creates item records for all bound volumes (as Dana does) vs. current process
    o Discontinue cutting windows in dust jackets. Consider the following:
        ▪ Discard dust jackets (possibly adding link to jacket content in catalog)
        ▪ Create 2 labels – one for the spine and one for the jacket

Dana Library
- Uses Ridley (considered Bridgeport a number of years ago, but quality was poor; no over sewing. This has changed.)
- Creates item records – item record status indicates that item is at bindery. Updates status when returned from bindery, inserts date due slips. Item record is also uses for usage data and inventory purposes
- Circulates bound journals
- Does not bind in-house or do significant binding of other formats
- Preservation is minimal and performed by Circulation staff
- Currently stamps property stamp in 7 places
- Tattle tapes added by binder
- End processing is done by Circulation staff

- Should consider:
    o Reduce number of times stamped
    o Adding date due slips only at the point of patron checkout OR follow B/H's practice of printing out date due slips when patron checks out the volume
    o Eliminate slips in stacks to indicate when bound volume will return (this info is in Voyager)
    o Request binder to stamp

Binding - Opportunities for Collaboration

Scenario I – All commercial binding for the University Libraries would be done at the Bailey Howe Library. One binding company would be used (Ridley or Bridgeport) and procedures standardized between the Libraries. Two variations:
- Staff from B/H go to Dana and perform binding processes at this location (pulling materials and Voyager work). Binder would make separate pickup/delivery at each library
- Materials are delivered to B/H and Voyager work is done at B/H

Advantages:
- University Libraries gain .5 FTE in capacity from Dana to reallocate to other tasks
- Opportunity to unify the binding budget
- Standardized procedures would be more efficient and cost-effective

Disadvantages:
- One of the above options would require a regular courier service
- Turn around times could be adversely affected

Scenario II – Bindery operations would be performed at their current locations and with current staffing #s.
- Standardize procedures so that later consolidation would be easier
- Choose one binding company to do University Libraries binding

Advantages:
- Standardized procedures would be more efficient and cost-effective
- Cross training & backup between the libraries would be possible
- University Libraries would be positioned for future events (workforce changes)

Disadvantages:
- No capacity would be gained in this model

Recommendation

The TSWG recommends scenario I. We feel this should be the first area to be implemented based upon upcoming staff retirement at Dana (Feb. 29th). We recommend establishing an implementation group that would address the following, though not inclusive, list of issues:
- Which binding company to use? Will the binder tattletape and/or stamp bound volumes? (Ridley currently tattletapes for Dana.) Will we oversew all titles? Some?
- Ensure turn-around time for the entire binding process is not negatively impacted by consolidation of processes.
- Enhance courier service to include regular transport of materials preparing to be bound and/or have returned from the bindery. (Will depend on where binder picks up/delivers materials.) Enhancing current courier services is also key to successfully consolidating any UVL technical services processes.

- Budget issues: consolidate the binding budget? Maintain separate funds? If consolidating, what is the best way to do this? (Before or after the UVL Acquisitions monies are divided between the libraries?)
- Standardizing procedures would including deciding if Dana stops barcoding bound journals, or B/H starts barcoding bound journals. Would there be any recon where procedures are changed? (e.g., barcoding volumes that aren't barcoded?) Would circulation policies also be standardized? End-processing? (e.g., date due slips or not? Where & how often to stamp?)

Acquisitions (not serials)

Bailey Howe Library

	FY 03	FY 04	FY 05	FY 06	FY 07
# of Non-YBP PO's Created	1210	1324	1073	1130	965
# of YBP Gobi Orders Created*		1010	968		1552
# of Items Ordered	2113	2580	1972	2051	1977
# of Gifts added (calendar yr.)	468	372	397	651	552 (so far)
# of Invoices Created	905	1273	984	882	1037
# of Books Ordered	1087	1154	1033	1080	1024
# of Media Items Ordered	875	1171	750	766	829
Total Expenditures	$743,160.79	$759,816.72	$679,276.97	$716,826.98	$770,305.14

* Currently done by Collection Development staff

B/H Staff	FTE
Albert	0.4
Chris	0.65
Jane	0.12
Michael	0.15
Wendy	0.6
Zhanna	0.5
Total FTE (staff)	**2.02**
Total FTE (fac/staff)	**2.42**

Dana Staff	FTE
Sandy	0.3
Tina	0.05
Total FTE (fac/staff)	**0.35**

Dana Library

	FY 03	FY 04	FY 05	FY 06	FY 07
# of Non-YBP PO's Created	1036	709	626	613	710
# of YBP Gobi Orders Created	0	0	0	0	0
# of Items Ordered	1036	709	626	613	710
# of Gifts Added	491	113	286	200	322
# of Invoices Created	455	358	249	229	190
# of Books Ordered	1020	700	618	610	710
# of Media Items Ordered	16	9	8	3	0
Total Expenditures	$91,898.40	$85,201.24	$53,015.65	$46,001.02	$51,837.09

Notes on Workflow

Bailey Howe Library
- Uses YBP's Gobi
- Often batches several items on purchase order
- Vendors used: YBP (shelf ready & firm orders), Coutts, individual publishers & foreign agents (e.g., Harrassowitz, Casalini Libri)

- Pays by invoice (UVM cuts a check) and credit card (finds invoices more efficient; less reconciling of the department credit card)
- Separate receiving staff (additional staff – Jane in SMCV)
- Gifts not processed in Acquisitions
- Voyager records are activated in system once the books are on the shelf. No temporary locations codes are used to say an item is in Acquisitions or Cataloging, etc.

Dana Library
- Does not use YBP Gobi
- Order are placed the same day received
- Create a separate purchase order for each item
- Vendors used: Matthews (contract cataloging; NOT shelf ready), Rittenhouse, Barnes & Noble, Amazon, and individual publishers, including foreign publishers.
- Pays by invoice and credit card (finds credit card purchases more efficient) Note: per Holly LaBlanc in procurement, UVM's preferred method for payment is via credit card. The University costs for cutting a check is nearly $75 (includes labor costs)
- Acquisitions staff also receive & process invoices
- Gift processing is done by acquisitions staff
- Voyager records are activated after materials are received. Temporary location codes are used to assist patrons/staff tracking down materials
- Dana systems staff don't have access to the Voyager server so can't load vendor records into Voyager. Dana relies on B/H systems staff to download vendor records as time permits. Often times, materials are received before records are in Voyager, and so Acquisitions staff search OCLC & download records. This defeats the purpose of acquiring vendor records

Backlogs

Dana Library
- 3.5 linear ft. of gifts accepted, but not added to Voyager
- 10.5 linear ft. of gifts that need Collection Development/Acquisitions attention

Acquisitions (not serials) - Opportunities for Collaboration

- Consider downloading only one bibliographic record per title, rather than a separate record for Dana and a separate record for Bailey Howe. Create separate holdings records and P.O.s for each library on the same bibliographic record. This would have major implications on the structure of the library OPAC and how work is done in the Voyager modules. Systems staff would need to be consulted to see if this is a viable option. (Note: When Tina asked Lyman a few months ago, he thought it might be possible in the next Voyager upgrade.)
- Develop and implement Electronic Data Interchange (EDI) procedure for purchasing and receiving.

Scenario 1 – All "one time" acquisitions will be done at the Bailey Howe Library.
- Staffing proposal: 1 faculty + 3.0 FTE staff dedicated to Acquisitions (not serials)
- Receiving:
    o All materials received at B/H and Dana materials are transported via courier.
    o Non-serial bibliographic verification moves from SMCV to Acquisitions.
    o Receipt of Dana gifts will need to be fleshed out (currently received by Dana acquisitions where Coll. Dev. is also done at the point of receipt).
- Materials will be ordered shelf ready whenever possible. (Dana currently does not receive shelf ready monographs from Matthews as some records, about 1/3, are edited [call #] so that new editions will be shelved next to previous editions.)
- YBP (and Gobi) will be used for all orders when possible.
- Consider a gradual shift of most Gobi ordering responsibilities from Collection Development staff to Acquisitions staff.
- Payments made centrally.
    o Consolidate Dana and B/H book budgets, keeping separate fund accounts?

    Advantages:
    - Gain capacity with no additional hires.
    - Gain efficiency by consolidating functions, decrease "fragmentation" of B/H staff (e.g., restore cataloging staff to cataloging unit).
    - Gobi records for Dana titles may appear in Voyager quicker as they would be loaded with the B/H titles – no additional time needed for B/H systems staff to load those records.
    - All acquisitions (not serials) tasks would be united in one place (shipping, receiving, communication with vendors, etc.)

    Concerns
    - Possible negative impact for Dana services. Perception of slower response time on ordering, less personal contact between liaisons and acquisitions staff/perceived lack of contact, any transporting of materials could slow down the process of receiving them.
    - Dana's acquisitions staff has 70% duties outside of acquisitions (not serials)
        o How will this work get done if the position is transferred to B/H? The working group will revisit after examining other areas.

- Medical acquisitions staff is separated from the collection and collection development staff/faculty.
- Trends in receiving physical pieces by acquisitions may be downward in volume as more items are acquired electronically. Increasing capacity in non-serial acquisitions <u>might</u> be a step in the wrong direction.
- Based on the yearly average # of items ordered and the FTE staff in this area, B/H processes 1426 items per FTE, while Dana process 2463 items per FTE. Based on the yearly average # of invoices created and the FTE staff in this area, B/H processes 406 invoices per FTE while Dana processes 986 invoices per FTE. Is there capacity to consolidate this work? It might be beneficial to consider having R2 revisit UVM to closely examine this area in both libraries.

<u>Scenario II</u> – Acquisitions (not serials) will remain in their current locations for the near future, but would work towards positioning the units for possible integration. This could be accomplished through the following:
- Standardize procedures.
- Both libraries will use YBP and Gobi whenever possible.
- Consider implementation EDI processes at both libraries.

<u>Advantages</u>
- Order on Demand pilot will be well underway, and changing workflow/staff issues should be known in the near future.
- The new Director of CMS would be in place and can provide input into procedures and changes.
- Two Dana staff retirements will occur by March 1, 2008, with the potential for reclassification/restructuring.

<u>Disadvantages</u>
- B/H does not immediately regain lost capacity in Acquisitions resulting from staff retirement/1% give back to the University.
- B/H does not regain capacity for other units that are assisting the Acquisitions unit in the interim, assuming that current staffing remains in place.

<u>Recommendation</u>

The TSWG is evenly split on moving to scenario 1 at this time. Half of the TSWG felt that it would be more prudent to start with scenario II, with the goal of working toward scenario 1. Some issues that need to be addressed:
- Each library has a different primary way of ordering and paying invoices. (e.g., Dana does not produce hard copies of P.O.s to order materials.)
- The libraries prioritize their ordering differently – Bailey Howe tends to process in batches, while Dana processes orders as received.
- There continues to be a difference of opinion between Bailey Howe and Dana acquisitions regarding whether credit card or invoice reconciliation is the more efficient process. Consider test increase in credit card orders at Bailey Howe.

- It may be easier to determine staffing needs in this area after processes are standardized. Looking at the differences in production per FTE at each library, it's difficult to establish staffing needs at this time.
- As the Libraries continue to integrate PeopleSoft into the Voyager workflow, we can't predict how this will impact staffing needs; there isn't a timeframe for the next stage of PeopleSoft/Voyager integration.
- Would the budget/funds for acquisitions (not serials) be consolidated?
- If UVL chooses to implement a one-bib record approach, what impact will this have as each library uses separate OCLC symbols to indicate ownership? If UVL doesn't implement a one-bib record approach, will acquisitions staff have separate profiles to add holdings to OCLC or download records to Voyager? How would this impact DD/ILL?
- If UVL consolidates acquisitions (not serials) processes, how will Dana's gift materials be processed? B/H acquisitions does not process gifts, however, Dana acquisitions does.
- Dana uses temporary location codes in the item record to indicate when material is received in acquisitions and is housed in technical services. Patrons can request rush processing at this time. B/H doesn't indicate that material is in the library until after end-processing and ready to be shelved. There is no need to update the item location. How will this be standardized?
- If UVL does not implement scenario 1 at this time, what is the best way to get acquisitions work done at B/H, without having a negative impact on other units? The current arrangement of parceling the work out to 5 staff members was meant to be a short-term solution.
  - For example, collection development is unable to keep up with the following tasks: Cook Library closing planning, Dewey conversion, Order on Demand backfill, approval plan publisher review, JSTOR journal project, and other tasks.

Cataloging

Bailey Howe Library

		FY 03	FY 04	FY 05	FY 06	FY 07	Average
Print Books							
	Titles	8132	8260	7739	7518	7538	7837
	Volumes	8998	9359	8482	8965	8260	8813
Serials/Periodicals							
	Titles	405	269	349	792	186	400
	Volumes	9175	9075	6940	6822	4970	7396
Non-print Media							
	Titles	889	1528	995	792	865	1014
	Volumes	1156	2182	1201	1035	1094	1334
Microfilm							
	Titles	241	96	127	41	41	109
	Pieces	31322	27251	14632	10794	9689	18738
Misc. formats - Maps							
	Titles	0	3	1	0	0	1
	Volumes	47	29	67	19	29	38
E-books							
	Titles	0	0	436	101	39	115
Withdraws							
	Titles	2423	3503	3681	4420	4046	3615
	Volumes	8441	7026	5353	6603	5204	6525
Transfers							
	Titles	399	169	198	230	484	296
	Volumes	2093	1299	1069	1581	1351	1479

Staff	FTE	Formats
Birdie	0.75	Wilbur serials, original monographs, serials & Western European Languages
Wichada	0.8	original monographs, databases, media, metadata
Vacant Fac. Pos.	1	unfilled; currently funding CDI position
Larry	1	all formats, primarily monographs (1% original)
Mary	1	all formats, primarily monographs
Michael	0.85	all formats, primarily media (60%) print serials (5%) - interim .15 Acquisitions
Toni	0	should be .5

Format	FTE Staff	Total FTE	Titles cataloged per FTE
Print	Birdie=.75, Larry=1, Mary=1, Michael=.4	3.15	2615
Non-print	Michael=.6	0.6	1872
All formats	Birdie=.75, Larry=1, Mary=1, Michael=1	3.75	2469

- These statistics cover the time when Michael was 1 FTE in cataloging and not during the interim as he assists the Acquisitions Unit.
- Statistics were not provided for databases or metadata
- Sharon and Brenda do not add titles, only volumes.

Dana Library

	FY 03	FY 04	FY 05	FY 06	FY 07	Average
Print Books						
Titles	1265	908	851	375	1427	965
Volumes			1297	540	1726	1181
Serials/Periodicals						
Titles		14	0	11	14	10
Non-print Media						
Titles	40	105	86	12	36	56
Volumes			96	12	41	50
E-books						
Titles	13	55	47	20	28	33
Withdraws						
Titles	428	757	502	78	282	409
Volumes			664	604	765	678
Transfers*						
Titles						
Volumes						

*Dana does not keep track of transfers. FTE is included in Sandy's cataloging FTE

Staff	FTE	Formats
Sandy	0.4	monographs, includes withdraw & transfer work, dbase maintenance, some authority work
Tina	0.1	Original in all formats, non-print, revise copy cataloging, authority work, supervision
Helen	0.01	Serial withdraws
Shirley	0.01	Serial withdraws

Format	FTE Staff	Total FTE	Titles cataloged per FTE
All	Tina=.07, Sandy=.33	0.4	2578

Notes on Workflow

Bailey Howe Library
- DLC arrives shelf ready
- Mostly member copy for which we:
  - Search & download record
  - Enhance descriptive cataloging/fixed fields
  - Add classification, subject headings and added entries
  - Authority work
  - Database maintenance
- Materials cataloged
  - Canadian documents, English and French
  - Coutts, includes French & French literature
  - Firm orders, all languages
  - Media
  - Microfilm
  - Monographic standing orders, all languages
    - Classed together series
    - Conference proceedings
    - Scores
  - YBP orphans
  - Serials
  - Special Collections
    - Rare, includes private presses
    - Wilbur
    - Special Collections Reference
    - Provide metadata/subject access for UVM digital collections (CDI)
  - Vermont theses and theses on demand
- Vermont theses, have separate workflow
- Work not getting done
  - See backlogs listed below
  - Able to keep up with current materials, but many hidden collections remain uncataloged
  - Transfers and withdraws - .16 FTE (CK & WG) are using this time to assist in the Acquisitions Unit

Dana Library
- Sets aside withdrawn titles to send to Africa. Covers don't need to be removed as we do with other withdrawn titles.
- Sets aside withdrawn titles from the reference collection to offer to other New England health science libraries. Make list at time of withdrawing. Admin. Asst. contacts libraries and ships, not Tech Services staff. (Consider discontinuing?)
- Outsource cataloging via Matthews (Only titles purchases via Matthews come with MARC records.) Not shelf ready, but do have barcodes/item records attached.
- NLM records
  - Accept as is. Exception is if call number does not match previous edition. (~180 titles per year are new editions)
- DLC records

- Accept descriptive cataloging as is, exception may be monographic series tracings
- Add MeSH and NLM classification
- Member records
  - Analyze full record, check authorities, add authority record if conflict possible, create if needed for series
  - Add MeSH and NLM classification
- AV materials tend to be gifts & locally produced. (e.g., Community Medical School, etc.)
- Work not getting done
  - See backlogs listed below
  - Authority work
    - Subject files split and not updated
    - Series authority work
    - MeSH authority changes
  - In general, little time is available for projects (e.g., withdraws & transfers of reference collection project)
  - Database maintenance, particularly in serials and monographic series
  - Reclass of AV materials from accession #s to NLM classification
  - Relocation of Med History boxes in Dana storage room to LRA or Williston

Backlogs (*some backlogs may need collection development before going to Cataloging*)

Bailey Howe Library
- Vermontiana – TBD in Special Collections
- TR collection – TBD in Special Collections
- Rare books – 12+ linear ft. (near Michael & Larry)
- Serials – 27 linear ft. (SMCV)
- Monographs – 9+ linear ft. (near Kor)
- Chinese and Japanese books – 52.5 linear ft. (in B/H mailroom)
- Jazz records – 35 linear ft. (in B/H mailroom)
- Dewey collection – 1,992 linear ft. (LRA)
- MacAllister photographs – collaboration w/ CDI
- Gifts & orphans – 13+ linear ft. in Collection Development
- Other (Hebrew, Spanish, Biology) – 41 linear ft. (in B/H mailroom)

Dana Library
- AV cataloging – 1 linear ft. (.51 ft. need CD)
- Med History – 102 linear ft. (Sandy's area, LRA & Williston) Monographs – 1.5 linear ft.
- Loose leaf filing - .75 linear ft.
- Serials (title changes/ceased) – minimal

Cataloging - Opportunities for Collaboration
- Consider outsourcing authority work – exception would be Vermontiana-type materials.
- There is potential for ~ 1/3 of Dana's materials to arrive shelf ready if willing to not have all editions of a title shelved together.
- If Libraries share a bib record for a title, there is potential to save time on descriptive cataloging for titles that both libraries own.
- The TSWG was not able to gather any cataloging data from the metadata/authorities librarian. There may be capacity for this position to assist with cataloging hidden collections, but this group wasn't able to make that determination at this time.
- There does not currently appear to be enough capacity in B/H Cataloging to absorb Dana's Cataloging AND address hidden collection backlogs in a substantive way.

Scenario 1 – All University Libraries Cataloging will be processed at the Bailey Howe Library, including transfers and withdraws. The vacant faculty position should be filled and a staff position redefined to be 100% cataloging. One faculty member will serve as the unit coordinator. In addition, the TSWG recommends that B/H address backlogs and hidden/unique collections as per R2's recommendations. If UVM Libraries does choose to outsource most authority work, there is potential to free up some cataloging time to address more of the Libraries' backlogs. End processing could still be done by Dana Circulation – material is usually processed the same day it's cataloged and there are different end processing procedures at each library.

The vacant 1.0 FTE faculty position is needed to catalog unique and special Vermont collections. This cataloger should *actively* participate in NACO (in collaboration with the Metadata/Authorities Catalog Librarian) to establish name authorities for unique Vermont materials. UVM Libraries do not contribute to this body of work, however, other Vermont libraries do. This would also enhance patron access to these collections.

Currently one staff position (Toni) is split between cataloging and e-resource management duties, but in reality, 100% effort is spent on e-resource management at B/H. The position should be 100% cataloging. In addition, Michael should no longer have acquisitions responsibilities and his position would return to 100% cataloging.

    Advantages
- Catalogers located in one area – makes for easier communication.
- Gain nearly .5 FTE capacity from Dana Faculty/Staff.

    Disadvantages
- Cataloger for Dana's materials isn't conveniently located near the medical collection.
- Transport of cataloged materials to Dana could slow the process of getting materials to the shelves quickly - depends on how often a courier transports materials.
- Dana reference librarians browse incoming materials on occasion – sometimes for personal knowledge, sometimes to pull materials to be housed in the reference collection. How could this concern be addressed?

Scenario II – All University Libraries Cataloging will be processed at the Bailey Howe Library, including transfers and withdraws. However, in this scenario we recommend that only 1.0 FTE faculty and 0.5 FTE staff are dedicated to cataloging duties. (Toni's position moves back to the workload stated in her PD.) This would still allow for catalogers at Bailey Howe to absorb Dana's cataloging needs. In addition, Michael should no longer have acquisitions responsibilities and his position would return to 100% cataloging. The University Libraries would still be able to work on some unique collections and backlogs, albeit, not as quickly. If the Libraries choose to outsource most authority work, there is potential to free up some cataloging time to put more effort into backlogs and hidden collections.

Advantages
- Catalogers located in one area – makes for easier communication.
- Gain nearly .5 FTE capacity from Dana Faculty/Staff.

Disadvantages
- A 0.5 FTE staff position can be awkward in terms of setting priorities, attending staff meetings, maintaining a knowledge base, etc.
- Backlogs aren't addressed as quickly.
- Cataloger for Dana's materials isn't conveniently located near the medical collection.
- Transport of cataloged materials to Dana could slow the process of getting materials to the shelves quickly - depends on how often a courier transports materials.
- Dana reference librarians browse incoming materials on occasion – sometimes for personal knowledge, sometimes to pull materials to be housed in the reference collection. How could this concern be addressed?

Scenario III – Delay the transfer of cataloging to Bailey Howe Library for the time being. Investigate outsourcing of authority work. Consider prioritizing the work of the Metadata/Authorities Librarian so that it includes some cataloging of hidden collections.

Advantages
- Dana cataloging staff has ready access to the medical collection.
- Dana reference and collections librarians have ready access to newly received materials.
- No courier/transport required.

Disadvantages
- No capacity for e-resources management, or other tasks, is gained.
- Catalogers aren't centrally located and collaboration is more difficult.
- UVL isn't addressing redundant processes.

Recommendation

Most of the Work Group recommends scenario I. Some felt it would be more prudent to start with scenario II, with the goal of working toward scenario I. Some issues that need to be addressed:

- Training staff to assign NLM classification and MeSH. Does one cataloger become the "NLM expert" in the unit or is this work divided amongst the catalogers?
- If UVL chooses to implement a one bib record approach, what impact will this have as each library uses separate OCLC symbols to indicate holdings? If UVL doesn't implement a one bib record approach, will catalogers have separate profiles to add holdings to OCLC or download records to Voyager? How would this impact DD/ILL?
- Dana's transfers and discards are processes by Dana's cataloging/acquisitions staff. This work is not done by the cataloging unit at B/H, but rather in SMCV, CD and Reference. Where will this work be done if moved to B/H? Consider streamlining this work so that it isn't handled by multiple units.
- Courier service will be needed - both for sending newly cataloged materials to Dana, or to send cataloging problems to Bailey Howe.

Serials Check-In

Bailey Howe Library

	FY 03	FY 04	FY 05	FY 06	FY 07
Pieces Checked In	20018	17501	15619	13179	9912
# of Print Subscriptions*					
Issues Claimed+					

*B/H does not keep track of number of print subscriptions
+B/H does not keep track of # of claims made

Staff	FTE Serials Check In
Jane	0.3
Juliet	0.8
Sue	Backup only
Brenda	0.05
Total FTE	**1.15**

Staff	FTE Serials Check In
Shirley	.1 total
shelving	0.02
end processing	0.01
Voyager work	0.07
Helen	.2 total
shelving	0.03
end processing	0.01
Voyager work	0.14
claiming	0.02
Total FTE	**0.3**

Dana Library

	FY 03	FY 04	FY 05	FY 06	FY 07
Pieces Checked In	10533	9249	8331	7708	6612
# of Print Subscriptions	1063	1077	1072	797	755
Issues Claimed*			382	433	352

*Dana did not keep track of # of claims for FY03 – FY04

Notes on Workflow

Bailey Howe Library
- Average turn-around time from point of mail in SMCV to getting materials to students for end processing in Periodicals = 4-5 hours depending on the amount of mail on a given day
- Mailroom staff unwraps periodicals & delivers to SMCV
- Use pop up notes similar to Dana
- End processing includes underlining title & placing title translation sticker on cover of foreign language titles
- B/H does not route journal issues
- End processing is done in Periodicals
- Periodicals also assists in Bindery
- Periodicals reports to Access Services at Bailey Howe
- Only Canadiana shelving is done by serials unit (students)
- Jane
  - o Checks in current issues, special formats (CD, microform/fiche)
  - o E-resources: checks for online access to gratis print

- - - Acq. Receiving: single orders (monographs, DVDs), standing orders with definite end date (e.g. Papers of x)
- Juliet
  - Checks in current issues, opens & sorts first class mail when students aren't available, dispose & handles the rest, collecting e-access related mail for someone to deal with
  - Student supervision: train, coordinate
  - Canadiana
  - Wilbur: check in, set up standing orders (provisional or OCLC records)
- Brenda
  - Checks in reference materials (shelved by ref. staff)
  - Serials (all but Wilbur, which is done by Birdie): new titles, title changes, authority work
  - Training: transfer/discard (serials, few monographs)
  - Problem solving: majority of her work
- Students
  - Open & sort first class mail, discard/recycle w/ds, projects assigned by Juliet

Dana Library
- Average turn-around time from point of receiving mail to getting material on the shelf = 1-3 hours depending on the amount of mail on a given day
- Check-in requires staff to pay attention to pop-up notes (routing, notification, etc.)
- End processing includes underlining title and indicating latest issue on unbound cover with "**L**"
- Shelving includes crossing out "**L**" on previous current issue in display area
- Update holdings for titles that come bound (monographic series shelved with journals)
- Routing lists/notifications (routing lists are for library literature that is routing to library faculty & staff)
- Consider:
  - Student workers opening mail, end processing, shelving, and check-in. They could pass on exceptions to predictive check-in or other complications to staff.
  - Discontinue marking current issue with "**L**"
  - Discontinue routing materials to library faculty/staff

Backlogs

Bailey Howe Library
- First class mail relating to electronic access – no one is dealing with this (piling up)
- Monographic series titles changes

Serials check-in - Opportunities for Collaboration

<u>Scenario I</u> – All print serials for UVL will be checked in at Bailey Howe in the current SMCV model (under cataloging). Current staff levels should be able to absorb Dana's check-in needs based on decreasing volume of print journals. Workflow will need to be reprioritized to expedite all current issues as is presently practiced at Dana.

> <u>Advantages</u>
> - Gain .3 FTE capacity from Dana
> - The work is done by one unit, thus eliminating redundancies
>
> <u>Disadvantages</u>
> - Requires increased courier services
> - Concern that this will have a negative impact on getting new serial issues on the shelves at Dana
> - Many publishers will need to be notified of a change in address

<u>Scenario II</u> – Print serials will be checked in by the proposed Serials Access and Management unit. Current staffing levels should be able to absorb all UVL check-in based on decreasing volume of print journals. Workflow will need to be reprioritized to expedite all current issues as is presently practiced at Dana.

> <u>Advantages</u>
> - Gain .3 FTE capacity from Dana
> - The work is done by one unit, thus eliminating redundancies
>
> <u>Disadvantages</u>
> - Requires increased courier services
> - Concern that this will have a negative impact on getting new serial issues on the shelves at Dana if this unit is not located at Dana
> - Many publishers will need to be notified of a change in address

<u>Scenario III</u> – Each library continues to check-in journals at separate locations.

> <u>Advantages</u>
> - No changes to courier service
>
> <u>Disadvantages</u>
> - No gain in capacity or elimination of redundancies

<u>Recommendation</u>

The Working Group does not offer a recommendation for serials check-in at this time. We feel our vote would depend on the implementation of the e-resources workflow. We do make the following observations:
> - Most of the WG agree that print serials check-in should be a part of a new Serials Access and Management unit.

- As different phases of the timeline are implemented, UVL should avoid moving this group back and forth between libraries. For example, move check-in to Bailey Howe as a first step in an implementation plan, and then move it to Dana as part of a Serials Access and Management unit. It would not be efficient to change addresses multiple times.
- We are not sure if the Serials Library Professional (Brenda) would be more appropriately placed in Cataloging or as part of a Serials Access and Management unit.

E-Resource Management Data

- Both B/H and Dana collect some data for e-resources management, but it isn't comparable.

Current Staffing

B/H Staff	FTE
Albert	0.25
Toni	1
Jane	0.01
Zhanna	0.05
Peter	0.1
Total FTE (staff)	**1.06**
Total FTE (fac/staff)	**1.41**

Dana Staff	FTE
Helen	0.1
Sandy	0.2
Shirley	0.25
Tina	0.3
Total FTE (staff)	**0.55**
Total FTE (fac/staff)	**0.85**

Some differences between the Libraries
- Dana uses a web form which staff or patrons can fill out to resolve e-resource problems. This form is forwarded to an internal listserv. Bailey Howe also uses an internal listserv to report problems, but does not have a web form for patrons to use. Patrons report their access issues to public services staff. Library staff forward problems to the list or by directly contacting Toni.
- Dana divides the troubleshooting of e-resources among 3 people. B/H has one primary staff member doing this work.
- Bailey Howe uses multiple spreadsheets and EBSCO administrative tools as an ERM system. Dana uses a combination of spreadsheets and a web-based SQL database.
- Bailey Howe is discarding some print issues for titles received in e-format. Dana does not.

Backlogs and other concerns
- Electronic resources at Bailey/Howe are currently building an immeasurable backlog. For example, registering/activating purchased titles - B/H still has titles from 2006 and 2007 to register and activate. These are titles paid for, but patrons don't have access to the titles online.
- Bailey Howe's return on investment for journal subscriptions is not realized when patrons can't access them. Bailey/Howe's method for switching to online access based on cost alone should be revised. Parameters for IP authentication only (vs. username/password) and site license/access (vs. limited IPs or users) should be set as this will allow access to paid subscriptions (see bullet 2 and 3 below).
- Coordination (at both libraries):
  o Prioritizing the work of ERM
  o Subscriptions that have online access, but authenticate via password rather than IP – updating/ removing these in A-Z and EbscoHost EJS (and possibly Voyager)
  o Subscriptions that are IP authenticated, but only for a limited number of users rather than a site license - updating/ removing these in A-Z and EbscoHost EJS (and possibly Voyager)

- o Discarding print issues – deciding which ones
- o Troubleshooting
- o Maintenance (A-Z, PubMed, DocLine, EJS, special projects, etc.)
- Statistic gathering and analysis
- Update local ERMA at Dana

E-Resource Management (Serials Access Management) - Opportunities for Collaboration

Scenario I – In R2's vision, Dana Library evolves beyond traditional library functions to incorporate those of a "Medical Informatics" commons. A UVL Serials Access and Management Unit is formed to address electronic journal subscriptions' registration, troubleshooting, maintenance, ERM maintenance, and gathering and analysis of usage data. The Unit is located in Bailey/Howe where all traditional library technical services are centered and where similarity and overlap of staff functions with Acquisitions are sorted out and efficiently coordinated.

Advantages

- The Serials Access and Management Unit is located in Bailey/Howe where all traditional library technical services are located.
- The Serials Access and Management Unit is in the same proximity as the Acquisitions Unit with which similarity and overlap of some staff functions are shared.
- Similarity and overlap of certain staff functions are efficiently coordinated and redundancies eliminated.
- The scope and tasks of the Serials Access and Management Unit and the Acquisitions Unit are balanced.

Disadvantages

- Bailey/Howe space is limited.
- Dana, still structured to function on the traditional library model, has not yet evolved into its "Medical Informatics commons" configuration.
- There is abundant, new, recently constructed space at Dana that would go empty.
- If print journals are checked in at one library, it could create delays for the other.

Scenario II - A UVL Serials Access and Management Unit is formed to address all print and electronic journal acquisitions, subscriptions' registration, troubleshooting, maintenance, ERM maintenance, and gathering and analysis of usage data. This unit would address all e-resources troubleshooting. The UVL Serials Access and Management Unit would be located at Dana. Database management, with the exception of troubleshooting, would be located in the acquisitions unit.

Advantages

- Staff members who perform serials acquisitions are very familiar with the different serial packages, vendors, platforms and terms of access. Having these individuals take part in e-journal troubleshooting will improve the response time of reported problems and will increase the number of people having expertise in this area. This will spread the trouble-shooting workload

and coverage to more people without it becoming too much of a burden for a single individual.
- Dana Library has abundant, new space while there are space constraints at Bailey/Howe Library.
- Dana Library has been primarily journal and serial driven, and has early on developed expertise dealing with e-journals.
- By making the unit a separate unit instead of a component of cataloging, the faculty head of each unit will be able to completely focus on coordinating workflows and projects of their units without having to split their attention with other duties.
- Including serials check-in within the Serials Access and Management group, will increase capacity for e-resource maintenance. As print journal check-in decreases, staff will be available to shift their attention to the electronic format and to participate in department-wide projects.

Disadvantages

- The UVL Serials Access and Management Unit is separate from the rest of UVL technical services/CMS.
- Similarities and overlap of functions with the Acquisitions Unit might involve duplication of effort, which could have a negative impact on workflow efficiencies.
- If print journals are checked in at one library, it could create delays for the other.

Scenario III – Create a new Serials Access and Management Unit composed of SMCV and Dana serials acquisitions and journal check-in as proposed in the R2 report. This new unit would be headed by a faculty librarian who coordinates activities of the unit which would include all workflows associated with continuing resources. The UVL Serials Access and Management Unit would be located at Dana. The major difference between this scenario and scenario II, is that databases are included as part of the Serials Access and Management Unit.

Advantages

- By making the unit a separate unit instead of a component of cataloging, the faculty head of each unit will be able to completely focus on coordinating workflows and projects of their units without having to split their attention with other duties.
- Staff members who perform serials acquisitions are very familiar with the different serial packages, vendors, platforms and terms of access. Having these individuals take part in e-journal troubleshooting will improve the response time of reported problems and will increase the number of people having expertise in this area. This will spread the trouble-shooting workload and coverage to more people without it becoming too much of a burden for a single individual.
- Including serials check-in within the Serials Access and Management group, will increase capacity for e-resource maintenance. As print journal check-in

decreases, staff will be available to shift their attention to the electronic format and to participate in department-wide projects.
- Dana Library has abundant, new space while there are space constraints at Bailey/Howe Library.
- Dana Library has been primarily journal and serial driven, and has early on developed expertise dealing with e-journals.

Disadvantages

- If print journals are checked in at one library, it could create delays for the other.
- Concern has been expressed that the scope of responsibility for the unit head might be too broad and perhaps doesn't utilize expertise of other units.
- Unit responsibilities would include databases, e-journals, e-books, and print serials. Acquisitions/Post-acquisitions functions are linked and difficult to separate out into two separate units. Similarities and overlap of functions with the Acquisitions Unit might involve duplication of effort, which could have a negative impact on workflow efficiencies.
- There is concern that if all e-resource acquisitions are located in the new serials management unit, there will be an imbalance between the workloads of the serials management faculty and the acquisitions faculty. According to data in this report (p.9), the acquisitions unit head will have duties that will equal 0.72 FTE. (This includes 7% from the Dana Faculty in Binding and Acquisitions (not serials) as the work moves to this unit.)

Recommendation

The Working Group was split on a recommendation in this area, with more leaning toward scenario III. Some felt beginning with scenario II would be a good starting point and move to either scenario I or scenario III, and one member felt the Libraries could move directly to scenario I.

Acknowledging that we have differing viewpoints on how the electronic resources workflow is accomplished, we would like to focus on the areas we do agree upon:

- Managing and providing timely access to electronic resources should be a priority of the University Libraries. At best, UVL is barely keeping up in this area. At worst, there are titles that were purchased in 2006 that have yet to be been activated.
- Shift the focus of some staff from print to electronic, or a combination thereof.
- Create a UVL Serials and Access Management Unit to address the needs of managing e-resources.
- Gather and analyze statistical usage data to make informed collection development decisions. A UVL Serials and Access Management Unit could play a key role in this area.
- Space at Bailey Howe is limited and probably could not accommodate this unit without moving another department – possibly Systems. Having all of CMS/Technical Services in one location would foster team-building and

collaboration. This would allow Dana the space to grow a "bioinformatics area" some time in the future.

It is a bold recommendation to change the structure of the organization. The creation of a new department within the Libraries takes a lot of work, and we recommend that a group be charged with further exploring the scenarios offered by the TSWG.

Current FTE Data

	Bind/Pres/End Processing	Acq/Not Serial	% of time spent on tasks	Check-in	E-resources & Serials Acq	Other	Total
			Cataloging				
Dana							
Helen	45%		1%	20%	10%	24%	100%
Sandy		30%	40%		25%	5%	100%
Shirley			1%	10%	89%		100%
Tina	2%	5%	10%		38%	45%	100%
Andrea					15%	85%	100%
Circulation Staff	5%					95%	100%
Bailey Howe							
Albert	5%	40%			35%	20%	100%
Birdie			75%			25%	100%
Brenda				5%	95%		100%
Katie	95%		1%			4%	100%
Chris		65%				35%	100%
Jane		12%		29%	41%	18%	100%
Juliet				80%	20%		100%
Kathy B. (.8 FTE)	80%						80%
Larry			100%				100%
Linda	100%						100%
Mary			100%				100%
Michael		15%	85%				100%
Peter					10%	90%	100%
Susan					100%		100%
Toni					100%		100%
Wendy	5%	60%				35%	100%
Wichada			80%			20%	100%
Zhanna		50%			50%		100%
Bonnie (.8 FTE)	3%				40%	37%	80%
Students	43%	26%		100%			169%
# of staff performing this task (Not incl. fac/students)	7	6	7	5	11		
Total FTE currently performing task (not incl. fac/students)	3.33	2.52	3.28	1.45	5.85		
Desired # of staff to perform task	5	3	4	2			
Desired FTE to perform task	2.83	3	4	1	6		
FTE over desired amount	0.50			0.45			
FTE under desired amount		0.48	0.72		.15		

Additional Considerations

- Reporting structure of Director of CMS - should this position be on the same line with the other directors, or above them to show CMS as a University Libraries division?

- Dana Library reports a variety of statistics to AAHSL. Any processes that are consolidated between the Libraries would need to accommodate the gathering of separate statistical data.

- Although the Working Group was not charged to focus on Collection Development, we would like to offer some observations in this area:

  o Create a UVL Collection Development Team.
  o Clarify Collection Development's relationship within technical services.
  o Work towards consolidating materials budget for UVL – additional focus on what resources all constituents need and are using, rather than what building it goes in or belongs to.
  o Standardize data gathering and analysis to determine what patrons are using to aid in collection development and budgeting/strategic planning. Consider purchasing a commercial statistics package such as Scholarly Stats.
  o Consider a gradual shift of most Gobi ordering responsibilities from Collection Development staff to Acquisitions staff.
  o Centralize processing of UVL transfers and discards. Currently this is done by B/H CD staff, SMCV, B/H Reference staff and Dana Acquisitions/CD staff.

- The Working Group has noted some changes for Serials Acquisitions and Collection Development in this document (see previous bullet and org. charts) even though we have not gathered data in these areas. Statistics gathering in these units may become necessary at some point to determine capacity and staffing in order for implementation to proceed.

- Adjust Voyager permissions to allow staff to update all records. Some Dana staff can't correct B/H records. All vendor e-records have B/H ownership.

- Survey and prioritize cataloging backlogs – identify which are hidden collections vs. "acceptable" backlogs. Findings may impact staffing needs.

- Some options for placement of the vacant .5 FTE support generalist position in SMCV
  o Move to Access Services to replace duties in current Library Professional line.
  o Move to Acquisitions to help allow reallocated staff to resume their previous duties.
  o Courier duties (or can this be done by a student).

Conclusions and Final Recommendations

<u>Binding</u>

The Technical Services Working Group (TSWG) recommends that all commercial binding for the University Libraries be done at the Bailey Howe Library. One binding company should be utilized and all procedures standardized between the Libraries. Within this recommendation, there are two variations: 1) staff from B/H perform Dana binding processes at Dana and the binder makes a separate pickup/delivery at each library, or 2) that materials all be delivered to B/H and all Voyager work be done at B/H.

Implementation issues include: deciding which binder to use, whether binders "tattletape" and/or stamp bound volumes, enhancing courier service to include regular transport of materials, considering whether to consolidate the binding budget, and deciding whether other procedures (such as barcoding bound volumes) should be standardized.

The TSWG recommends this be the first Technical Services area to be consolidated.

<u>Acquisition (not Serials)</u>

This area is one in which The TSWG could not reach agreement. There remain significant work-flow differences between the Libraries as well as issues of concern related to prioritizing work. It may be the final recommendation on any decision needs to follow other technical services processes, or requires more study.

<u>Cataloging</u>

The TSWG recommends that all Universities Libraries Cataloging be processed at the Bailey Howe Library. The vacant faculty position should be filled and a staff position redefined to be 100% cataloging. One faculty member should serve as the unit coordinator to aid in setting priorities for cataloging work. In addition, the TSWG recommends that B/H address backlogs and hidden/unique collections strategically (as per R2's recommendation). There does not appear to be sufficient capacity with existing staffing levels for Bailey Howe to absorb Dana's cataloging and increase patron access to collections.

Some implementation issues identified are: outsourcing of authority work, end processing workflow, NACO participation, and others.

<u>Serials Check-In</u>

The TSWG does not offer a recommendation for serials check-in at this time. We feel our vote would depend on the implementation of the e-resources workflow. Most of the TSWG agree that print serials check-in should be a part of a new Serials Access and Management unit, but there is some disagreement on whether the serials professional at Bailey Howe belongs more appropriately in cataloging, or as part of the Serials Access Management Group.

E-Resources Management

The TSWG was split on a recommendation in this area, with more leaning toward scenario III. Some felt beginning with scenario II would be a good starting point and move towards either scenario I or scenario III, and one member felt the Libraries could move directly to scenario I.

Acknowledging that we have differing viewpoints on how the electronic resources workflow is accomplished, we would like to focus on the areas we do agree upon:

- Managing and providing timely access to electronic resources should be a priority of the University Libraries. At best, UVL is barely keeping up in this area. At worst, there are titles that were purchased in 2006 that have yet to been activated.
- Shift the focus of some staff from print to electronic, or a combination thereof.
- Create a UVL Serials and Access Management Unit to address the needs of managing e-resources.
- Gather and analyze statistical usage data to make informed collection development decisions. A UVL Serials and Access Management Unit could play a key role in this area.
- Space at Bailey Howe is limited and probably could not accommodate this unit without moving another department – possibly Systems. Having all of CMS/Technical Services in one location would foster team-building and collaboration. This would allow Dana the space to grow a "bioinformatics area" some time in the future.

It is a bold recommendation to change the structure of the organization. The creation of a new department within the Libraries takes a lot of work, and we recommend that a group be charged with further exploring the scenarios offered by the TSWG.

Proposed Timeline

1. First phase
   a. Bindery
      i. Recommend scenario I
      ii. Create implementation team
   b. Serials check-in
      i. Recommend scenario I or II
      ii. Create implementation team
   c. E-resources
      i. Recommend scenario ▨▨▨
      ii. Create implementation team

2. Second Phase
   a. Bindery
      i. Continue progression toward scenario I
   b. Serials check-in
      i. Continue progression toward scenario I or II
   c. Cataloging
      i. Recommend scenario II as a progression toward scenario I
   d. E-Resources
      i. Continue progression toward scenario ▨▨▨

3. Third Phase
   a. Bindery
      i. Attain scenario I
   b. Serials check-in
      i. Attain scenario I or II
   c. Acquisitions (not serials)
      i. Recommend scenario II as a progression toward scenario I
      ii. Create implementation team
   d. Cataloging
      i. Continue progression toward scenario I
   e. E-Resources
      i. Continue progression toward scenario ▨▨▨

4. Forth Phase
   a. Acquisitions (not serials)
      i. Attain scenario I
   b. Cataloging
      i. Attain scenario I
   c. E-Resources
      i. Attain scenario ▨▨▨