

Copac Collection Management Tools Project

Case Studies: University of Sheffield Report

Introduction:

At the CCM2 Project Workshop on 5th December 2011, it was agreed that the University of Sheffield would focus on Use case 1: Identifying last copies among titles considered for withdrawal. Between then and the time of writing (June 2012) two trials have been undertaken using the CCM Tool to investigate this.

Trial 1:

The CCM Tool ,via the Alpha test CCM Web Interface, was trialled and used within an actual stock withdrawal workflow, developed to withdraw over a thousand items from two monograph stores within the Western Bank Library of the University of Sheffield, between December 2011 and February 2012. Items were in need of being withdrawn from these stores in order to create shelf space for items being relegated from other collections of the Library.

The stock withdrawal workflow developed for trialling the CCM tool consisted of six steps. Each of these steps will now be looked at in turn:

1. *Use the LMS to generate lists of potential items for withdrawal, using locally defined criteria.*

It was decided that lists generated by the LMS and produced previously for the White Rose British Library Collaborative Collection Management Project and not acted upon, would provide ideal lists for testing with the CCM Tool. Locally defined criteria had been developed including: subject matter, no loans recorded, ISBN/BNB identifiers present, multiple edition works, not first editions and not pre 1900 publications. A LMS report had been run in late November 2010 (Grade 7 staff, 0.5 hr) and some items removed following further consultation with academic liaison librarians and Special Collections staff in December 2010 (Grade 6 staff, 0.5 hr). Two lists had been produced, one with items with BNB identifiers (1238 records), the other with ISBN identifiers (1721records). For the purpose of this trial these two lists were edited to produce csv files of local control numbers suitable for entering into the tool (Grade 6 staff, 0.5 hr).

2. *Enter a file of control numbers into the CCM Tool, using 'Search by uploading a file of standard numbers', to obtain a display of the search results.*

The two files were entered into the CCM Tool on 18th Oct 2011, using the 'record number', 'all libraries' and 'deduplicate records with a shared ISBN' search options. A display of the search results was available within a minute (16 seconds for the BNB file, 19 seconds for the ISBN file). 1174 records were found for the BNB file and 1663 records were found for the ISBN file (Grade 6 staff, 0.06 hr).

3. *Visualisation of search results by the CCM Tool graphs and map.*

Visualisation took less than a minute to display for each file, which consisted of two graphs and a map. One graph showed number of records by number of collections (contributors to the Copac database) in which each document was held and the other showed number of records by number of documents held by each contributor. From the graphs it could be seen that using the agreed withdrawal criteria (i.e. items held at more than eight collections) about half of the records would be suitable for withdrawal. It also showed that there were unique items held only in Sheffield (104 for the BNB file and 237 for the ISBN file), which could potentially be made part of a future 'national collection' (Grade 6 staff, 0.1 hr).

4. *Export graph data using the CCM Tool.*

The graph data took less than a minute to be exported as csv files. These were then saved in Excel format and filtered by number of locations (Grade 6 staff, 0.1 hr).

5. Refine data using withdrawal criteria i.e. removing items from the list where the number of holding libraries is eight or less.

Each of the Excel files was edited. All items held at eight or less locations were removed from the lists. This left 580 records for the BNB file and 758 records for the ISBN file. All columns of data, apart from the column of record numbers, were then removed, to aid step 6 below. (Grade 6 staff, 0.5 hr)

6. Import refined data into the LMS to generate lists with key bibliographical data e.g. Bib id, author, title, volume, publication date, classmark, barcode etc., to aid withdrawal of items from shelves.

The record numbers of the items of the edited Excel files were then imported into the LMS and two Excel spreadsheets produced containing the key bibliographical data necessary to enable the items to be identified on the shelves and withdrawn from the collection (Grade 7 staff, 0.5 hr). These spreadsheets were then converted into various work packs (Grade 3 staff, 1 hr) and worked on using standard withdrawal procedures at the University of Sheffield Library (Grade 3 staff, 80 hrs).

Trial 2:

The CCM Tool, via the Beta interface, was used as part of a stock withdrawal workflow developed to withdraw items from another monograph store within the Western Bank Library during February and March 2012. The store was due to be weeded and then interfiled into a larger store as part of a reconfiguration programme to make the library easier to use by reducing the number of sequences.

The stock withdrawal workflow trialling the CCM tool followed the same steps as for Trial 1:

1 Use the LMS to generate lists of potential items for withdrawal, using locally defined criteria

A list of items within the store that had never been loaned was produced using the LMS (Grade 7 staff, 0.5 hr). As for Trial 1 this list was then edited to produce a csv file of local control numbers suitable for entering into the tool (Grade 6 staff, 0.5 hr).

2 Enter a file of control numbers into CCM Tool, using 'Search by uploading a file of standard numbers', to obtain a display of the search results.

The file of 3,877 local control numbers was entered into the tool on 16th Feb 2012, using the 'local record number', 'all libraries' and 'deduplicate records with a shared ISBN' option, but no records were found. Various checks were carried out on the data and various new searches carried out but no results could be obtained (Grade 6 staff, 0.5 hr). Copac was then contacted and the matter investigated. It was found that the underscores within the title of the file were the cause of the problem. Copac then put a fix in place so that this would not be an issue for future submissions. The file was then re submitted on 20th Feb 2012, using the same search options as above. A display of the search results was available within four minutes. 3,858 records were found (Grade 6 staff, 0.1 hr).

3 Visualisation of search results by the CCM Tool graphs and map.

Visualisation took about two minutes to display and consisted of two graphs and a map. One graph showed number of records by number of collections (contributors to the Copac database) in which each document was held and the other showed number of records by number of documents held by each contributor. From the graphs it could be seen that using the agreed withdrawal criteria (i.e. items held at more than eight collections) less than half of the records would be suitable for withdrawal. It also showed that there were a large number of unique items held in Sheffield (1,163), which could potentially be made part of a future 'national collection' (Grade 6 staff, 0.1 hr).

4 Export graph data using the CCM Tool.

The graph data took about one minute to be exported as a csv file. This file was then saved in Excel format and filtered by number of locations (Grade 6 staff, 0.1 hr).

5 Refine data using withdrawal criteria i.e. removing items from the list where the number of holding libraries is eight or less.

The Excel file was then edited to remove all items held at eight or less locations. This left a total of 1165 records. All columns of data apart from the column of control numbers were then removed to aid step 6 below. (Grade 6 staff, 0.5 hr)

6 Import refined data into the LMS to generate lists with key bibliographical data e.g. Bib id, author, title, volume, publication date, class mark, barcode etc., to aid withdrawal of items from shelves.

Unfortunately the control numbers of the items of the edited Excel file were found to be different from the control numbers submitted and so could not be uploaded into the LMS. Copac was contacted about this, the matter investigated and sorted so that this would not happen again in the future. Steps 4 and 5 were then repeated (Grade 6 staff, 0.6 hr), and the refined data imported into LMS and an Excel spreadsheet produced containing the key bibliographical data necessary to enable the items to be identified on the shelves and withdrawn from the collection(Grade 7 staff, 0.5 hr). This spreadsheet was then converted into various work packs (Grade 3 staff, 0.5 hr) and worked on using standard withdrawal procedures at the University of Sheffield Library (Grade 3 staff, 70 hrs).

Findings:

Positives:

- The use of the CCM Tool in the two trials enabled the withdrawal of over 2,500 low use monographs and the freeing up of over 70 linear metres of shelving in the Western Bank Library of the University of Sheffield, in a total of 150 staff hours.
- The CCM Tool was found to be quick and easy to use. In both trials the search results and visualisation of the search results were available within a few minutes and the export of the graph data only took about one minute. Overall, the actual use of the Tool took just over an hour of staff time, for each of the trials. Without the Tool, and to use similar withdrawal criteria as above, the online Copac database would have to have been searched for each of the 6,836 items initially submitted. Based on previous experience of an average of 3 minutes a search, this would have taken about 342 hours just to do the search.
- The graphs and map, in the visualisation of the search results part of the process, were found to be very useful for identifying the number of locations holding copies of each of the items and correspondingly, in identifying unique or last copies.
- Exporting the graph data as a csv file was also very useful, in that it could be quickly converted into an Excel file and filtered and refined as needed.
- In general, the communication between the CCM Tool and the LMS worked well. The LMS at the University of Sheffield is Talis and further testing will be needed to see if the steps trialled here would work with a different LMS.

Issues:

- The total number of items withdrawn would have been much higher had it not been for the Tool erroneously identifying a number of items as unique i.e. last copies. In the first trial 341 items were identified as last copies and in the second trial over one thousand were identified. Further investigations by manual checking a sample of the items on the online Copac database showed that about two thirds of the items were in fact not last copies. There were other copies of the

item, but the records had not been linked together due to slight differences in the bibliographical record information e.g. worker's instead of workers' in the author statement, outlin instead of outline in the title statement. If these records had been linked together, up to half of them in the sample investigated, would have met the criteria for withdrawal i.e. held at more than eight locations. This issue of the deduplication of records is being investigated by Copac/ Mimas.

- Related to the deduplication issue above, in step 2 of Trial 2 the 'deduplicate records with a shared ISBN' option was chosen, rather than the 'detailed deduplication' option. On running the same file, but with the 'detailed deduplication' option, it was found that the number of suitable items for withdrawal was reduced from 1165 to 348 i.e. a drop of 70%. Institutions will therefore need to carefully consider and/ or trial the Tool's deduplication options when using it in the withdrawal of stock and take into account the extra staff time/ resources involved.
- In step 2 of Trial 2 there was an issue entering the csv file of control numbers into the Tool due to the file title having underscores. This has been resolved following investigations by Copac staff.
- In step 6 of Trial 2 there was an issue importing the correct local record numbers back into the LMS. This has also been resolved by follow up work by Copac staff.

Conclusion:

The trials at Sheffield have shown that, subject to deduplication issues being resolved, the CCM Tool can be used effectively to identify last copies among titles considered for withdrawal and that it can be of great assistance in the withdrawal of low use monographs and the freeing up of shelf space for other purposes. We would be confident that the stock withdrawal workflow used at Sheffield could be tailored to suit other institutions and library management systems in the future.