

December 5, 2006

To: Lucia Snowhill, Chair, UC Collection Development Committee  
From: CDC Task Force on RLF De-Duplication  
Martha Ramirez, Chair  
Ivy Anderson  
Chuck Eckman  
Cindy Shelton  
Colleen Carlton  
Scott Miller

## **CDC Task Force on RLF De-Duplication Report**

### **Background**

At the request of UCOP, the Office of Systemwide Library Planning is developing a de-duplication plan for the two RLF's. The January 30, 2006 meeting of the University Librarians focused on RLF issues, including review of the RLF de-duplication briefing document. An April 27<sup>th</sup>, 2006 SLP draft document, *Reducing Duplication and Enhancing Research Value at UC Regional Library Facilities: Recommendations* was discussed at the May joint University Librarians and SOPAG meeting. One outcome of the discussion was the charge to the RLF directors to analyze the duplication of monographs within and across the RLFs, identify potential costs to withdraw the duplicates, and propose procedures and policies to govern the project. Another was SOPAG's agreement to charge CDC to consider whether any policy changes should be proposed to the ULs, to restrict the nature of ongoing deposits to the RLFs.<sup>1</sup>

This task force was charged to review current RLF policies and recommend any policy changes needed to restrict future, unwanted RLF deposits, including reducing unintended duplication and the deposit of materials not appropriate for the RLFs. As such, we have reviewed "B. Recommended policy changes" of the SLP draft document.

### **B.1. Explore whether there is a more systematic way for NRLF to check for duplicates at the point of deposit.**

The RLFs currently present different characteristics in their holdings displays because of differences in how the records are sent to Melvyl. At the SRLF, staff process all materials regardless of campus using the UCLA Voyager system, and the UCLA Catalog includes complete SRLF holdings on the Voyager records that are sent to Melvyl. At the NRLF, staff process all materials using the UCB Gladis system. The system allows holdings for only one campus per record. UCB holdings are attached to existing UCB records. Holdings for the other northern campuses are attached to separate inventory records created by NRLF. Each of the Northern campuses submits its own NRLF holdings to MELVYL. The use of multiple records in Gladis masks the existence of

---

<sup>1</sup> University Librarians and SOPAG Meeting (May 5-6, 2006) Minutes. Available at <http://libraries.universityofcalifornia.edu/sopag/min050406.pdf>

duplicates at the NRLF, and the responsibility for possible duplication checks remains with the campuses. A complete re-check at the point of accession into the NRLF is untenable. Given that the depositing libraries are already searching Melvyl for NRLF holdings, a final call number Melvyl search for incoming serials by NRLF staff may provide a manageable safety check.

Searched: Call Number= "L11.C26" [UCSC Call #]

Collection: Entire Collection

Result:

No. Regional Library Facility

NRLF L11 .C25      Circ status      V.1-26, JAN.1950-OCT.1975

NRLF LB1028.A1 C3      Circ status      v.1-22, v.25-26

NRLF W1 CA 373      Circ status      8-26, 1957-75

Adoption of a single, integrated system across RLFs which would provide merged records to Melvyl would be a preferable long-term solution. The SLP draft document recommended that SOPAG study the costs and benefits of an integrated system for the Regional Library Facilities.

Unintentional duplication also results from the poor quality of some NRLF records, e.g., 20-character title limit. Users are currently directed to use Pathfinder to “see listings for some items in the Northern Regional Library Facility (NRLF) that are not included in Melvyl.”<sup>2</sup> Opportunities to upgrade existing records, such as that provided by digitization processes, should be seized.

**B.1.2. Another practice that yields space savings at SRLF is the routine screening and questioning of non-circulating, "special collections" deposits, to ensure that this special status is not used as a way to circumvent duplication (and persistence) policies.**

The screening takes place at the SRLF when there already exists circulating copy. This screening is applied to serials and monographic sets but not to single volume monographs, and it is used by the SRLF to ensure that previously non-circulating non-Special Collections deposits were correctly coded under the new Persistence Policy. Persistent deposits must have one of two circulation statuses: a) Circulate without restriction, or b) Building Use Only. We found no evidence that materials were being “moved” into Special Collections as a means of circumventing proscribed duplication.

**B.2.1. Develop a policy that allows RLFs NOT to accept the following: textbooks, handbooks, or other reference sources that have been superseded by more current editions or that are available online. Exceptions for material of demonstrated historical value could be made.**

---

<sup>2</sup> Guide to Library Catalogs-The Library-University of California, Berkeley, <http://www.lib.berkeley.edu/Catalogs/guide.html>

The character of UC Collection Development efforts and nature of RLF deposits have not changed appreciably since the *Regional Library Facilities Planning Task Force Final Report to the University Librarians (corrected version December 10, 2004)* was submitted. As the report states “It is important to remember that the campus library collections are systematically and carefully developed by skilled and knowledgeable specialist librarians; initially for inclusion in the collection, and subsequently for retention and deposit in the RLF. Both steps are done in consultation with faculty, at faculty request, or as a result of a librarian’s comprehensive and detailed knowledge of the academic programs and the research and instructional needs of the campus. The collections of the UC Libraries are skillfully and actively managed, and material without enduring value is routinely identified and weeded from the collections... Only material with enduring research value is considered for deposit in the RLFs.”<sup>3</sup> The Council on Library and Information Resources study *Developing Print Repositories* found that “Each participating library generally decides which of its materials will be placed in the repository ... All repositories require that materials accepted be under at least minimal intellectual control... [But] repositories impose few absolute embargoes.”<sup>4</sup> Repository policies restricted to bibliographic control, physical properties, and pragmatic factors such as usage, acknowledge that the intellectual labor of selection for content is occurring at the campus library. UC collection managers routinely weed textbooks, handbooks, obsolete formats and superseded ready-reference sources. Exceptions for material of demonstrated historical value are already being made.

**B.2.2. Develop a policy that allows RLFs NOT to accept the following: archival material not described to a box-list level and cataloged (i.e.: not accessible to users).**

Receipt of particularly large gifts has sometimes taxed the storage capacity and processing priorities of Special Collections units resulting in the temporary deposit of uncataloged materials. Given the increased visibility of the RLF collections and the growing demand for source materials, it is reasonable to expect that all materials deposited at the RLFs be at least minimally described and cataloged.

**B.2.3. Develop a policy that allows RLFs NOT to accept the following: runs of serials titles where a shared copy exists, either retrospectively or prospectively.**

Among the factors that have changed since the RLF Planning Task Force Report, are the adoption of the new policy on persistent deposits in the RLFs; the experience gained from the UCL-JSTOR Project; the launch of the OCA and Google digitization projects, and the advancement of prospective shared print collections.

---

<sup>3</sup> Regional Library Facilities Planning Task Force. Final Report to the University Librarians. Corrected Version, December 10, 2004, pp. 3-4 (Available at [http://www.slp.ucop.edu/documents/RLF-TF\\_Final\\_Report.pdf](http://www.slp.ucop.edu/documents/RLF-TF_Final_Report.pdf)).

<sup>4</sup> Reilly, Bernard F. Jr. *Developing Print Repositories: Models for Shared Preservation and Access*. Washington, D.C.: Council on Library and Information Resources, pp. 20. Available at <http://www.clir.org/PUBS/reports/pub117/pub117.pdf>

Our experience with the JSTOR validation process supports a cautious approach when developing policies that heighten reliance on a single shared print copy for retrospective collections. The age of the UC Shared Copy serial holdings is very short when compared to the expected life-span of research materials. While we support and promote the development of shared collections, it is too early to determine that a single UC persistent copy is sufficient for future research needs. Further experience with digitization and purchase of digital content will yield opportunities for elimination of duplication, but we aren't there yet. The economies of a single shared copy are best exploited where a prospective print copy is held in conjunction with a prospective shared digital copy.

#### **B.2.4. Develop a policy that allows RLFs NOT to accept the following: retrospective serial titles that are in very poor condition or very incomplete.**

The existing RLF Operating Principles already address very poor condition :

“Materials in an advanced state of deterioration are not ordinarily accepted.”  
Collection managers already include condition, availability with the UC system, CRL holdings, and the existence of a microfilm copy among the factors to be considered when making a decision to deposit at an RLF. Exceptions are made for unique holdings of ongoing value for research and instruction.

#### **Merged RLF Operating Principles (November 27, 2006) – recommended changes**

[http://libraries.universityofcalifornia.edu/planning/RLF\\_operating\\_principles\\_2006.pdf](http://libraries.universityofcalifornia.edu/planning/RLF_operating_principles_2006.pdf)

### **2.1 Material Eligible and Not Eligible for Deposit**

Materials may be in any physical form normally considered appropriate for library collections with the following exceptions:

- Materials that duplicate items already in storage at the destination RLF are proscribed except where justified by an approved UC Libraries collection management plan for selective systemwide retention for duplicate copies. **Runs of serial titles where a shared prospective copy exists are proscribed.** Exceptions to the general policy may be made by the Board. Special Collections material is exempted from this policy.
- Materials in an advanced state of deterioration are not ordinarily accepted.
- Highly flammable or potentially explosive items (e.g., nitrate films) are prohibited, as are items infested by mold, insects, or other vermin.

### **2.2 Records**

#### **2.2.1 Book and Book-Like Material**

Each depositing library is responsible for providing a machine-readable bibliographic record for all book and book-like items deposited. The record standards, and the format must be compatible with the UC Union catalog. Because the primary means of retrieving material on deposit is the facilities is the facility inventory control number, the records must also be capable of accommodating that number.

All UC holdings at a Facility must be listed in the UC Union Catalog. Inclusion of non-UC materials in the UC Union Catalog is a policy matter determined by the UC Office of the President in consultation with the Shared Library Facilities Board. Contact the Facility for more information.

### **2.2.2 Non-Book Material**

Depositing libraries must provide a machine readable minimum storage record for non-book material, the content of the record to be specified by the Board.

**Archival materials should be described to a box-list level and cataloged.**