

# TUG Annex Collection Management Project

Final Report , May 7, 2008

Prepared by the TUG Annex Collection Management Group:

Scott Gillies, Jennifer Haas, Bill Halahan, Heather Martin, Shabiran Rahman, Kirk Sprague, Matt Tales

## Executive Summary

Consisting of relevant staff from each TUG library, the TUG Annex Collection Management Group was formed in May 2006 and charged with weeding the Annex collections in order to provide bridging time for the development of longer-term strategies for access to low-use materials. It was hoped that by maximizing the current space, the lifetime of the Annex facility could be extended by five to seven years. As well, the group was to develop collection management policies to guide future use of the Annex facilities and facilitate future decision-making by individual TUG libraries.

The group worked on a number of strategies simultaneously. In order to reduce the size of the Annex collections and make more space available for future growth, multiple weeding projects were initiated. At the same time, in an effort to preserve existing free space for as long as possible, policies for managing future relocations to the Annex were put in place. Free space areas created through weeding were measured and back-filled, and limits were placed on annual relocation amounts. As well, the group continued to revise and expand the TUG Last Copy agreement, in order to facilitate its effective implementation at each of the TUG libraries.

While the work initiated by this project is far from being completed, there have been a number of important accomplishments. To date, more than 38,000 volumes have been withdrawn from the Annex, representing more than a year's worth of additional growth space. Another 40,000 items have been identified as TUG duplicates, and are scheduled to be withdrawn in the near future. Procedures and best practices were established for identifying duplicates, generating reports, weeding, backfilling, updating cataloguing records, transferring new materials to the Annex, and retaining TUG last copies.

However, the project was not without its challenges. The process of designing and producing reports to identify TUG duplicates was time-consuming and resource-intensive. The first withdrawal projects proceeded using a trial and error basis, and many errors were uncovered along the way. Issues arose with the application of the TUG Last Copy agreement: government publications could not be weeded because of Guelph and Waterloo's status as full depository libraries, materials from certain locations at each institution could not be considered as TUG last copies due to ownership and jurisdiction issues. Coordinating the Annex weeding projects with similar projects being worked on independently at the other TUG libraries caused many difficulties.

As a result of these challenges, a number of sets of guidelines and procedures were established, many of which appear in the Appendices to this report. Additionally, a number of key recommendations evolved out of our accumulated experiences working on this project:

## Recommendations

1. [Continue with identified Annex withdrawal projects.](#)
2. [Complete a free space assessment.](#)
3. [Continue backfilling to utilize vacated space.](#)
4. [Consider the cost-effectiveness of de-duplication efforts.](#)
5. [Proceed with implementing the TUG Preservation of Last Copy agreement.](#)
6. [Establish a standing TUG committee to continue to manage ongoing Annex collections and space issues.](#)
7. [Develop a collaborative, systematic approach to TUG Collections Management.](#)
8. [Consider developing a TUG approach to the stewardship of specific subject collections.](#)
9. [Develop a comprehensive TUG Communications Strategy to keep our stakeholders informed.](#)
10. [Revise Annex staff job descriptions to reflect the changes in the nature of their work.](#)
11. [Continue to enforce annual flow rates for the TUG libraries, to ensure the judicious use of remaining Annex space.](#)
12. [Actively pursue longer-term solutions to TUG storage needs](#)

These recommendations are described in full on page 19 of the report, below.

# TUG Annex Collection Management Project

Final Report, April 29, 2008

## A. Introduction

As early as the year 2000 it was evident that the TUG Annex storage facility was being filled at a much faster rate than had been originally anticipated. Several review processes took place to consider possible solutions to the problem, such as purchasing a new facility, or putting an addition on the existing building. However, these options were prohibitively expensive and did not offer immediate relief to TUG's shorter-term storage space problem.

By May of 2005, the remaining Annex capacity was estimated to be as little as one year's worth of growth if TUG continued to fill it at the rate of 40 to 50,000 volumes per year. Consequently a temporary "freeze" was placed on transferring materials from the TUG libraries to the Annex, to remain in effect for at least a year, in order to allow time for the planning and implementation of a number of collection management initiatives. This led to the formation of the TUG Annex Collection Management group in early 2006. Consisting of relevant staff from each TUG library, the group was charged with weeding the Annex collections in order to provide bridging time for the development of longer-term strategies for access to low-use materials, such as digitization, compact shelving, and a potential OCUL cooperative storage solution. It was hoped that by maximizing the current space, the lifetime of the facility could be extended by five to seven years, to approximately 2010-2012.

The group was also mandated to develop collection management policies to guide future use of the Annex facilities and facilitate future collections decision-making by individual TUG libraries. This work included development of the TUG Last Copy Agreement, a policy on the maximum annual flow rate from campus libraries to the Annex, and long-term planning for compacting the Annex collections in the most efficient way possible. Another priority was to establish criteria to be used to identify titles for withdrawal from the Annex; also to develop a method for retaining a permanent record of Annex withdrawn materials.

## **B. Work Group and Methodology**

The TUG Annex Collections Management Group includes members from each of the TUG libraries, bringing together a range of skills and expertise reflective of the diversity of the issues being addressed - from physical space to report generation to cataloguing policies. Members are: Scott Gillies, Information Resources & Collections (UG); Jennifer Haas, Information Services and Resources, Davis Centre Library (UW); Bill Halahan, Information Technology Services (UG); Heather Martin (Chair), E-Learning, Reserve and TUG Annex Services (UG); Shabiran Rahman, Information Services and Resources, Dana Porter Library(UW); Kirk Sprague, Facilities Services (UG) and Matt Tales, Cataloguing Librarian (WLU). Additionally, Susan Routliffe (AUL, Information Resources and Services, UW) worked with the group until February 2007.

The group met approximately once per month from May 2006 until July of 2007, including a site visit to the Annex. Meeting notes, policies, and other relevant documents were maintained in a working group space on Insite, the UG library intranet. Communiqués about the project's progress were sent out to TUG staff at regular intervals.

The group worked on a number of strategies simultaneously. In order to reduce the size of the Annex collections and make more space available for future growth, multiple weeding projects were initiated. At the same time, in an effort to preserve existing free space for as long as possible, policies for managing future relocations to the Annex were put in place. Free space areas created through weeding were measured and back-filled, and limits were placed on annual relocation amounts. As well, the group continued to revise and expand the TUG Last Copy agreement, in order to facilitate its effective implementation at each of the TUG libraries.

## **C. TUG Preservation of Last Copy Agreement**

### **Background**

The TUG Last Copy agreement was originally drafted in the summer of 2005 in response to the Annex “freeze”, when it became evident that a TUG-wide approach to managing the Annex collections was urgently needed. While in the past, each library had been free to send material to the Annex without regard for what was already there, or what was already owned by another TUG library, the agreement recognized that in order to “balance the needs of current and future

users with the financial resources available for space” it was necessary to “use the Annex, and any future space available for low-use material, as a ‘last copy’ repository” (TUG Preservation of Last Copy Agreement – see *Appendix i*). In other words, going forward the Annex would now be used to store only items that were not available elsewhere in the collections of the other TUG libraries.

In order to accomplish this goal, the Last Copy Agreement set out two primary strategies – to reduce the footprint of the existing Annex collections in order to reclaim space, and to limit future Annex growth by allowing libraries to place only TUG last copies there.

### **Implementation Issues**

While the agreement had been approved in principle by all of the TUG libraries, the policies outlined within it had not yet been applied at the operational level. The TUG Annex Collection Management group, in using it as the guiding document for its work, found that there were practical issues that needed to be addressed in order for the agreement to be used to manage collection withdrawals and relocations on a TUG-wide basis. For example, the agreement indicated that no library could discard a last copy without first checking with the other TUG partners, but unfortunately no library had any mechanisms in place to enable such consultation. A significant amount of time was spent by the group to design new processes and tools in order to enable the agreement’s principles to be realized in practice.

One of the first tasks was to develop a “decision matrix” for each institution to use when withdrawing materials (see Weeding Decision Matrix, *Appendix iv*). The matrix laid out the workflow and decision-making processes for weeding materials, as outlined in the TUG Last Copy agreement. In general, if the item is not a unique copy, the institution is free to discard it (and in fact, cannot locate it at the Annex). Unique copies, on the other hand, may be relocated to the Annex or if the home library wishes to discard them, must be placed on a list which is posted in an accessible location on the web for the other TUG partners to review. Any item on the list can be retained by one of the TUG partners as long as they are prepared to relocate it at their home library.

A separate weeding matrix was eventually created for each site to reflect differences in local practices. Waterloo already had a process in place to tag and generate lists of TUG last copies designated to be weeded. Guelph and Laurier had to each develop local procedures from

scratch to accommodate new weeding policies as a result of the implementation of the TUG Last Copy Agreement.

There was also no easily accessible web location where TUG last copy lists could be placed for librarians to review and comment on. After initially setting up a site on the TUG Staff Web, the location was eventually changed to the TUGwiki, where a generic login and password could be used for all TUG staff who needed to access it.

## **Appendix A: Exclusions**

As a result of the practical experience gained during the course of this project, two appendices were added to the Last Copy agreement in order to provide clarification and additional detail. Appendix A outlined a number of necessary exceptions to the last copy policy, while Appendix B provided clarification on the issue of perpetual access for electronic journals.

One of the first issues the group dealt with was whether or not it might be possible to weed government publications down to a single TUG copy. Both Waterloo and Guelph are full repository libraries, and are therefore expected to retain indefinitely any materials received through the Government of Canada's Depository Services Program. Scott Gillies contacted the Depository Services Program to ask about the possibility of weeding all but one consortial copy of government publications; while they agreed to consider a future review of the policy, DSP indicated that currently, depository libraries may not dispose of anything even when duplicated within a joint storage facility (although, as a selective depository; it is possible for Wilfrid Laurier to withdraw materials older than 5 years). Consequently, an exception was added to Appendix A of the agreement to allow duplicate copies of items received on deposit to be located in the Annex. However, the project team and the TUG Exec group believe that TUG should continue to work with contacts in the federal government in order to develop a more forward-looking and flexible approach to stewardship and retention/preservation of this category of information resources.

Provincial government publications were a different matter as there is a requirement to retain them for five years only. There is also an OCUL IR plan to digitize all provincial government publications at some point. It may therefore be possible to weed all print copies of provincial government documents older than five years, many of which are housed at the Annex.

Other types of materials were added to Appendix A over time, as it became clear that they needed to be “excluded” from the TUG Last Copy rules: Special Collections, because of their unique nature and value to each library; damaged materials (so that each TUG library can make replacement/withdrawal decisions without consulting with the other partners); also media formats, and maps. As well, a lengthy list of specific locations at each institution were added to the exclusions list. Most of these were affiliated libraries or campus departments whose collections appeared in TRELIS, yet could not be considered as TUG last copies due to ownership and jurisdiction issues. These included UW’s church colleges and Career Services department; Laurier’s Brantford Education collection, Waterloo Lutheran Seminary, and Women’s Centre; and Guelph’s regional colleges, OPIRG, and Guelph-Humber locations (for a complete list, see TUG Preservation of Last Copy Agreement, *Appendix i*). Materials originally from these locations would only be subject to the terms of the agreement should they ever be placed in the Annex, at which point they would be considered to be owned by the parent institution.

## **Appendix B: Paper and Electronic Journals**

Appendix B of the TUG Last Copy agreement was added late in the project, in response to the need for clear criteria that could be used to weed print volumes of journals. Several periodical weeding initiatives had been undertaken during the course of this project, and in each case all print copies were discarded because perpetual electronic access was felt to be secure. However, a clear definition of “secure perpetual access” was needed, along with guidelines for applying the definition to TUG periodical collections. The TUG Information Resources group therefore developed an Electronic and Paper Journals policy which eventually became Appendix B of the agreement.

According to the policy, an electronic journal can be considered the TUG last copy when there is local loading and archiving of all issues on the Ontario Scholars Portal; when the content of the electronic copies does not materially differ from the print versions; and when the publisher guarantees perpetual access to all pertinent content on the publisher’s server. When a journal meets this definition for all three libraries, all three may weed the paper copies from their collections at the institution’s discretion. Ideally, no further print copies of the journal can be relocated to the Annex in this case, as the electronic copies located on the Ontario Scholars Portal are considered to be the TUG last copy.

In addition to the electronic depository solution, the TUG Libraries have begun exploring a Last Print copy approach to weeding of paper journal holdings (see *“Withdrawal Report: JSTOR”*, below). The TUG Libraries have been coordinating its weeding efforts in this area with the larger Ontario-wide project sponsored by OCUL.

## **Next Steps**

It is likely that the TUG Preservation of Last Copy agreement will require additional revisions over time as it becomes an established part of libraries’ collection management practices. A number of major philosophical and practical issues concerning reference items still need to be worked through by TUG Information Resources; these include issues such as high duplication rates, restricted circulation status and questions around future ownership. The policies developed as a result of TUG IR’s work will also eventually be reflected in the agreement.

It is also essential that full implementation of the agreement takes place at each of the TUG Libraries. While policies and procedures have now been established, not all of the TUG Libraries have put the agreement into practice in a significant way outside of its use in guiding the Annex withdrawal projects. Librarians, cataloguers and other library staff involved in collection management tasks need to continue to be knowledgeable about the details of the agreement, aware of its implications for withdrawal and relocation decisions, and prepared to make changes to local practices to facilitate its implementation. Ongoing training and information sessions may be required for relevant TUG staff.

After the agreement has been in use for a period of time, it should be evaluated to ensure that it continues to be a relevant and effective tool for managing TUG collections.

## **D. Weeding and De-duplication Projects**

In addition to managing the amount of material being moved into the Annex facility, the group was also charged with creating additional growth space through the withdrawal of materials.

Weeding the Annex collections had been discussed for many years, but was seen to be a formidable task which would require a huge investment of time and resources. The TUG Annex Collection Management group focused on two specific, manageable approaches to reducing the size of the existing Annex collections: identifying and withdrawing TUG duplicate monographs, and identifying and withdrawing TUG periodical holdings whenever there is secure perpetual electronic access.

Some experience with periodical weeding had already been gained previous to this project, as the purchase of journal backfiles (e.g., Elsevier) had enabled the withdrawal of a significant number of print volumes from the Annex. However, deduplication of TUG collections on a large scale had not been attempted before, and presented a number of challenges. It quickly became clear that multiple approaches would be required in order to identify as many duplicates as possible, and that each of these approaches had drawbacks. The group developed a list of reports designed to uncover potential duplicates, and initially estimated that 50,000 items might be able to be withdrawn from the Annex as a result. Over time the expectations as to total withdrawals fluctuated as some reports proved too difficult to produce, while others yielded more duplicates than expected (see TUG Annex Weeding Reports Summary – *Appendix v*).

### **Identifying Materials to be Weeded (Withdrawn)**

The bulk of the duplicate items that were ultimately weeded from the Annex were identified in a few key reports which are listed below. The remainder of the reports identified smaller numbers of items, but were felt to be worthwhile as the items to be withdrawn could be identified with little effort. In general, the Group's approach was to begin working on the reports which were straightforward, relatively easy to develop, and which were likely to yield a significant number of withdrawals. Eventually some reports were dropped completely because the effort to either a) produce the report, or b) isolate a significant number of volumes to be withdrawn, was deemed too great given the modest gains in space that would result.

Each of the reports that were eventually used to withdraw materials from the Annex represents a significant input of effort on the part of several members of the group. Generating the reports was often a trial-and-error-process that resulted in imperfect sets of data requiring further modification. Materials such as government publications and items from locations excluded from the TUG Last Copy agreement had to be stripped out. Additionally, most of the lists required at least some manual clean-up before they could be used by Annex staff to actually pull materials from the shelves. As well, some libraries chose to review the lists prior to withdrawing any materials, in order to have the option of recalling to the home library any items that were designated to be discarded. As some of the lists contained upwards of 30,000 items, any kind of manual checking or clean-up was a labour-intensive and time-consuming process.

## **Withdrawal Report: Duplicates by ISBN**

This report was one of the first to attempt to identify TUG duplicates on a large scale. The ISBN number was used to match duplicate copies of monographs at the Annex as well as at each of the TUG libraries. The results were then sorted into two sections – one for Annex items which were duplicated elsewhere in TUG, and one for duplicates where all copies were located in the Annex. The plan was to use the first section to withdraw any items located in the Annex for which other TUG copies existed, and to use the second section to weed Annex-to-Annex duplicates down to one copy.

The list was only partially successful in determining TUG duplicates. Many older records in the catalogue do not include ISBNs, so it was not possible to match them with duplicates elsewhere in TUG. Many records with the same ISBN turned out not to be duplicates (e.g. monographic series) and had to be manually removed from the list, or in some cases were not discovered until the cataloguing records were updated. Of the 38,000 potential duplicates on the report, about 12,400 items were actually weeded.

Other problems included items which were not on the shelf because they were charged out to patrons, items on the list with no Storage Location numbers, the absence of barcodes on the report, and cataloguing updates being done well after the items in question had already been removed from the shelves and discarded. However, addressing these issues allowed the TUG Annex Collection Management group to develop sound withdrawal procedures as well as identify best practices which would be applied to subsequent deduplication initiatives.

## **Withdrawal Report: Annex Duplicate Items on Bibs**

This report evolved out of the experience gained with the Duplicate ISBN project. When it became clear that ISBN matching had been problematic, there was considerable concern that a similar report based on matching by LCCN would not be effective, at least not for identifying monograph duplicates. An alternative was suggested by TUG cataloguing staff – identifying duplicates by running a report of monographs with more than one holdings record, one of which was located in the Annex. This report returned about 60,000 potential duplicates, resulting in approximately 40,000 withdrawals from the Annex (still in progress).

But this list was not without its complications either. Items from locations and collections excluded from the TUG Last Copy agreement proved difficult to isolate and remove from the list. Items which were not actual duplicates had to be manually deleted. The list, while divided according to institution, was lengthy and complex for sites to review, and this significantly delayed the start of the actual process of withdrawing duplicates.

### **Withdrawal Reports: Elsevier, Wiley and Springer Backfiles**

While the primary focus of Annex withdrawal projects was on monograph deduplication, several periodical weeding projects were also undertaken, generally as a result of the purchase of electronic backfiles. In cases where the electronic copy for all libraries meets the criteria outlined in the TUG Last Copy agreement with respect to secure perpetual access, print holdings may be withdrawn. The project to withdraw print volumes of Elsevier journals from the Annex actually pre-dated the start of the TUG Annex Collection Management project; however the same approach was subsequently used to withdraw Wiley periodicals belonging to all the TUG libraries, and later Springer materials belonging to Guelph. A number of Waterloo's Royal Society of Chemistry journals are also designated to be withdrawn based on these criteria. The process for generating lists of periodical holdings that can be weeded is outlined in *Appendix vii*.

### **Withdrawal Report: JSTOR**

Unlike Elsevier, Wiley and Springer collections, weeding all JSTOR print copies was not possible due to the lack of local loading/archiving rights for digital copies on Scholar's Portal. However, five of the TUG JStor collections can be weeded to one print copy. Weeding reports for relevant titles have been run, but much manual work is required in order to compare the holdings at each TUG location, and decide which should be withdrawn. Eventually we expect to weed about 6300 volumes from the Annex as a result of this project.

OCUL's Collaborative Collection Continuity Committee (CCCC) also initiated a JSTOR pilot project in November of 2007, to establish policies and procedures for retaining last print copy holdings of JSTOR periodicals for all of OCUL (see OCUL Collection Rationalization, *Appendix viii*) The work being done at the TUG level will prepare us well for participation in the OCUL initiative.

## Development of Best Practices: Reports

Experience gained with the generation and use of withdrawal reports led to the development of some standard practices and procedures which can be used for future weeding initiatives. A withdrawal procedure (see *Appendix vi*, TUG Annex Withdrawal Procedure) was developed which took into account the shortcomings of the various reports and compensated for some of the inaccuracies that they contained. The methods used to create some of the reports were documented (see *Appendix vii*) so that similar reports could be rerun for future projects as required (in particular with respect to the weeding of periodical holdings for which electronic backfiles had been purchased).

As the production and review of reports turned out to be a resource-intensive step in the process, the Group also considered ways to streamline and reduce the amount of effort involved. When running future reports, it may be expeditious to include only the six or seven primary locations which include the majority of TUG's collections. This would eliminate some of the difficulties that were experienced with trying to filter out excluded locations and material types from reports after they had been generated. Another concern was that reports were designed primarily to identify duplicates and therefore did not necessarily lend themselves well to pulling volumes from the shelves, or to updating of the affected cataloguing records. Reports required manual modification and reorganization on the part of librarians, Annex staff, and cataloguing staff at each site, in order to make them usable for these purposes. In some cases, additional fields were added to the reports to facilitate these tasks.

Overall, the production of reports for this project involved the creation of 10 Access databases, 63 hotfiles, 83 Impromptu report extracts, 27 Excel reports and 25 Title keyword extracts.

While most of the problems experienced were associated with individual reports, there were also issues with the timing and coordination of the reporting process. Due to differences in cataloguing methods at each of the TUG sites, as well as changes to cataloguing procedures over the years, identifying duplicate items across all the TUG libraries proved to be challenging. Multiple approaches were developed in an attempt to locate as many duplicate records as possible, however the resulting reports contained data which overlapped with previous reports, making some of the content of subsequent reports redundant. A number of reports remaining on the Weeding Reports Summary will need to be rerun before they can be used, in order to

eliminate items that have already been withdrawn using earlier lists. This could be avoided in future by more careful planning and a tiered approach to scheduling the production of reports.

## **Withdrawal Procedures**

The physical removal of materials from the Annex shelves was carried out by Annex full time and part time staff. Since the start of this project in May 2006, Annex staff have spent about 500 hours to withdraw approximately 26,000 volumes.

A weeding procedure (see *Appendix iv*) was developed with the input of the TUG Information Resources group, as well as cataloguing staff at each of the TUG libraries. It addresses specific issues such as sorting the content of reports, retaining TUG last copies, and dealing with anomalies such as missing and charged-out items. The procedure is updated regularly to include instructions specific to particular weeding projects, and to reflect experience gained through working on previous projects.

The weeding procedure also includes criteria for deciding which copy to retain when there is more than one Annex copy. When two or more copies of an identical volume are located at the Annex, the staff must retain a last TUG copy and discard the rest. The copy to be kept should be the one with the barcode, or if both/all are barcoded, the one in best physical condition. (The idea of keeping the copy with the best cataloguing record was also considered, however there was concern that this would be too labour-intensive given the large numbers of materials). If there is no visible difference between the copies, Annex staff alternate between discarding a Guelph, Waterloo and Laurier copy so as not to deplete any one institution's holdings more than another.

One problem that arose during the first monograph weeding project was that of synchronizing the removal of volumes from the shelves with the updating of the relevant cataloguing records. Due to the nature of this particular project (and some that followed), cataloguing updates could not be completed until after the materials had been withdrawn (as weeding involved making a choice as to which copy would be retained), and tracking the exact item pulled in order to match it with the cataloguing record was difficult. The decision was made to purchase three handheld scanning units, which enabled Annex staff to capture the barcodes of items as they were being pulled from the shelves. The files of barcodes could then be uploaded on a regular basis, enabling reports to be generated, records to be globally updated, and items moved to a de-accessioning location. In

addition to streamlining the process of pulling materials, the scanners also helped to ensure accuracy and significantly reduced the amount of time spent on updating records in TRELIS.

Another concern was that simultaneous weeding projects at the main libraries continued to take place independently of the work being done at the Annex. This caused a number of problems – withdrawal lists being used at the Annex were superseded by weeding lists created at the home libraries, and materials being withdrawn from the Annex were in some cases no longer duplicates (as the remaining TUG duplicate was scheduled to be weeded in a separate weeding project at one of the main libraries). As a number of different weeding initiatives were underway at multiple sites before this problem was recognized, it was addressed on a temporary basis by having Annex staff check to ensure that Annex withdrawals were not in fact TUG last copies prior to discarding them. Most importantly, this pointed to the need for weeding initiatives at all TUG libraries, including the Annex, to be planned and co-ordinated on a TUG-wide basis. With the implementation of the TUG Last Copy agreement, TUG libraries can no longer withdraw materials from their own libraries without full knowledge of weeding projects underway at other TUG sites.

## **Disposal**

The group considered the options available for disposing of, or redistributing the withdrawn materials. While each library had some experience with sending materials to the Canadian Book Exchange (CBEC) in the past, recent experiences indicated that only a small percentage of materials being withdrawn were of interest to CBEC. Another option the group considered was to utilize a service called B-Logistics, which advertises that it assists libraries in getting rid of surplus inventory by selling books to online retailers such as Amazon and Barnes & Noble, and returning a percentage of the resulting sales to the library. However, this option was not pursued due to B-Logistics' guidelines on the types of materials they would accept (eg. only monographs in their original binding), and the limited revenue that would likely be generated for the effort involved. It was decided that each TUG site could choose how to dispose of its own materials; subsequently Guelph and Laurier's material was discarded and eventually recycled into pet bedding, while Waterloo opted to have materials returned to the main library for distribution to CBEC whenever possible (note that CBEC will be closing effective June 30 2008, so will no longer be an option for disposing of withdrawn materials).

Upon the completion of each weeding project, a full list of all of the Annex items withdrawn will be posted on the TUGwiki, where it can be accessed by all TUG staff. This site will be used to maintain a permanent record of Annex withdrawals.

## **E. Space Management**

### **Annual flow rate**

At the same time as efforts were taking place to reduce the footprint of the Annex collections, the group was working to preserve the limited free space remaining in the Annex for as long as possible. To achieve that, the group developed policies to help manage future relocations to the Annex.

Given that it was unclear how long it might be before alternative off-site storage options would be available, and as there was a need to ensure adequate growth space for the next 5 or 6 years, it was decided to implement a maximum annual flow rate for materials being relocated in the facility. In other words, each institution would be limited to transferring a pre-determined number of volumes each year. The “freeze” on transferring any materials to the Annex, which had been in effect since May 2005, was lifted in September 2006, and while each library could then resume sending materials to the Annex, the amount that could be sent was restricted.

The maximum number of items that the TUG libraries could send to the Annex annually was set at 30,000 volumes, or approximately 3000 linear feet. This figure was arrived at by dividing the approximate amount of growth space remaining in the facility at that time (approximately 180,000 volumes) and dividing it by the approximate number of years that it was hoped that space would last (six). The annual number of volumes was then divided proportionately among the three institutions – 12,000 volumes for Waterloo, 10,500 for Guelph, and 7500 for Laurier. Similar maximums will be set in future years, although there will be an annual review process to evaluate the effectiveness of the flow rate limits, and to adjust them as necessary.

During the first year that the flow rate was implemented, very little (70 linear feet) of the allocated amount of space was used. This was partly due to the fact that the libraries were slow to resume relocating materials after the freeze was lifted, but also because incoming materials were being

backfilled into spaces vacated by weeding, rather than being added to the end of the existing collection as they had been in the past (backfilling is a more labour-intensive and time consuming process, but ensures that all available space in the facility is utilized effectively). The unused allocations for that year were subsequently carried over and added to the allocations for the following year (see Annual Space Allocation Summary, *Appendix ii*).

However, in 2007-2008 TUG libraries resumed relocating materials to the Annex on a larger scale. Waterloo embarked on a weeding project which would see the relocation to the Annex of 38,000 volumes (approximately 3800 linear feet). As this amount will exceed the space allocated to UW for the current year, additional space will be “borrowed” from future years’ allocations. These kinds of annual adjustments are to be expected, and it will be necessary to be flexible when administering the annual flow rate in order to accommodate special circumstances at each library. In future, it may be desirable to redistribute allocated space if any institution is regularly under-utilizing or exceeding its allocation.

### **Free Space Assessment**

The project charter for the TUG Annex Collection management group indicated that a free space assessment should be completed both at the start and the end of the project. However, once the project was underway, it became evident that a free space assessment had to be timed carefully to avoid inaccuracies in the measurement of available space. As a couple of weeding projects were already underway, and these could not be carried out at the same time as the free space assessment, it was decided to delay the completion of an assessment until the end of the project.

Unfortunately, though, the weeding initiatives being carried out at the Annex are still in progress, and are likely to become ongoing work for the Annex staff. As a free space assessment will be a labour-intensive task, the preferred time for completing it will be during a summer term when regular Annex business is reduced. It is therefore hoped that an assessment can be completed at the end of the current round of weeding, ie. in the summer of 2008. The survey should enable us to identify exactly how much available space remains in the Annex, and will provide an important baseline for future planning.

Some groundwork for a space assessment was done early in the project. Rows and stacks were assigned numbers, and spreadsheets were created to track the amount of vacant vs. used space

in each stack. A trial run consisting of several short rows was conducted; this was sufficient to indicate that the process would involve a significant investment of staffing resources to complete for the entire facility. It may be necessary to hire some additional part time staff to assist with the assessment when the time comes.

## **F. Resources and Costs**

Resources used, and associated costs, are detailed in the Project Costs spreadsheet, *Appendix ix*. These figures represent only the costs generated to date; as materials continue to be withdrawn from the Annex, the related staffing and disposal costs will also continue. For the most part, all of the work completed to date on this project has been done using existing staffing resources.

The management time logged is specific to the work done during this project – in particular for the establishment of policies, procedures and best practices which will continue to be used for future weeding work. Subsequently the management hours required to manage this work on an ongoing basis should be significantly less in future. Time spent on updates to catalogue records should also be less in future as it is hoped that global change software can be used for the majority of the updates required.

Time spent on report generation was also significant. This was a particularly resource-intensive part of the process because of the trial and error approach that was necessary, as well as the complexity of the reports that were produced.

## **G. Continuing to Manage Annex Space**

In order to ensure that the Annex remains a viable storage option for the next five years, at least some of the strategies introduced during the TUG Annex Collection Management project will need to be continued.

Much work was put into the task of identifying TUG duplicates and designing reports that would enable de-duplication of the Annex collections. Having invested significant resources in producing these reports it would make sense to complete the withdrawal of materials already identified. It is estimated that approximately one year of additional growth space can be

reclaimed through completing the bulk of the weeding projects remaining on the Weeding Reports summary.

There are a couple of reports on the summary which still require development work, and potentially additional reports that may be designed in future to continue the process of de-duplicating the Annex collections. However, consideration needs to be given as to whether the achievable gains in space are worth the time and effort involved. This may vary from report to report. However, the weeding of print periodicals from the Annex whenever possible as electronic access becomes available is something that should be relatively easy and worthwhile continuing.

Backfilling of the vacated spaces in the collection must also continue in order to take advantage of the space gains achieved by weeding. This involves tracking and measuring the vacant spaces scattered throughout the Annex collections, and measuring and numbering incoming materials to fit into those spaces. The work is time-consuming and slows down the process of relocating materials to the Annex, but must be a priority if the remaining Annex space is to be maximized. One possible exception to this is when large collections of material are relocated to the Annex, such as the recent transfer of 38,000 items from Porter. As there was some urgency to relocate the material, and as the total amount of vacated space in the collection was less than would be required to accommodate the entire move, it was decided not to backfill in this case. At the moment, sufficient rows of empty stacks still exist, enabling large moves to be placed at the end of collection; however, as the Annex fills this option will eventually disappear. It is therefore imperative that backfilling continue whenever feasible in order to preserve for as long as possible the large vacant space at the end of the collection. This space is also currently utilized for staging incoming materials.

Efforts also need to be continued to reduce the amount of material being transferred to the Annex. The TUG Last Copy agreement should ensure that only unique copies are moved to the Annex, but it is too early to tell what kind of impact this may have on the amount of material being sent.

However, it is hoped that by applying the agreement, as well as limiting the annual amounts that can be relocated, we will see a significant reduction in the transfer of materials in comparison to

recent years. The TUG libraries should also note that while “[the] agreement focuses on the preservation of last copies, it also recognizes that there may be items in the Annex that are no longer needed to support teaching, learning or research at any of the TUG institutions and that are not likely to be needed in future” (TUG Preservation of Last Copy Agreement – see *Appendix i*) . Withdrawing such materials from the Annex over the next few years should also become a priority.

### **Future TUG Collection Management Strategies**

While this group’s focus has been on managing Annex space in the short-term, ie. to extend the life of the facility for the next five years, a longer-term strategy is needed in order to address TUG’s future storage needs. The Annex will be essentially full in only a few years, so alternative storage solutions must be actively sought in the meantime.

As with the short-term issues, more than one solution will likely be required in order to address long term storage needs. Digitization of collections may help to reduce the need to retain physical copies of some materials. Compact shelving may be a partial solution also, by increasing the amount of collections space available in the TUG libraries and thereby reducing the need to store materials off-site. However, the most promising solution for the long term is the proposed OCUL Print Repository, which by rationalizing print collections at all OCUL institutions to a few regional preservation copies, hopes to ensure long-term preservation of print materials while sharing costs and reducing the need for physical collections space in OCUL libraries.

## **H. Recommendations**

### **Recommendation 1: Continue with identified Annex withdrawal projects.**

Of the multiple weeding projects that were identified during this project, only a handful to date have been carried through to completion, ie. materials have been withdrawn from the Annex shelves and cataloguing records brought up to date. A number of reports remain on the Weeding Reports summary (*Appendix v.*) in various stages of development.

These reports identify another 40 – 50,000 volumes that can potentially be withdrawn from the Annex, freeing up a significant amount of additional space for future growth. As the costs associated with carrying out the actual withdrawal of the items from the shelves are

not excessive, it would be worthwhile to carry on with this work in order to continue reclaiming Annex space.

**Recommendation 2: Complete a free space assessment.**

The free space assessment which was mandated in the project charter should be completed at the end of the next round of weeding, in order to obtain accurate measures of the amount of free space remaining in the Annex. It is important to do this to establish a baseline which can be used for future space planning. In the past, while additions to, and withdrawals from the Annex have been tracked carefully, the estimated size of the original collection was based on data from a number of sources, including collection sizes from previous storage facilities, and is not necessarily reliable.

**Recommendation 3: Continue backfilling to utilize vacated space.**

Withdrawing materials from the Annex is only worthwhile if the space made available can be utilized for future growth. Now that a number of weeding projects have been undertaken, there are thousands of “pockets” of space scattered throughout the Annex collections which can be used to relocate incoming materials. While this work is time consuming and slows down the process of relocating materials, it ensures that the limited Annex space is used as effectively as possible.

**Recommendation 4: Consider the cost-effectiveness of de-duplication efforts.**

While the Annex de-duplication projects have been very effective in increasing the amount of available space, the cost in terms of the resources required has not been insignificant. An enormous amount of effort is required to complete the entire withdrawal process from the identification of duplicates through to cataloguing updates and disposal. If this work is to become an ongoing part of TUG collection management practices, then consideration should be given to streamlining current processes whenever possible to minimize the effort required, particularly in the areas of report generation and review, and updating cataloguing records. Recognizing the major effort involved in carrying out de-duplication projects, it is recommended that the cost/benefit of undertaking them in the future be re-visited after the major weeding projects and a free space assessment scheduled for

summer 2008 are completed. The relative urgency of space pressures in the main TUG libraries will also be a major determinant as to whether or not future de-duplication projects involving the Annex are justified.

**Recommendation 5: Proceed with implementing the TUG Preservation of Last Copy agreement.**

While the agreement has been used to enable Annex weeding projects, its implementation at the home libraries has been limited to date. The TUG Information Resources group will be administering and maintaining the agreement to ensure currency, consistent application and relevancy; however if the agreement is to be implemented successfully it needs to continue to be broadly communicated to all relevant TUG staff. Librarians, cataloguers and other library staff involved in collection management tasks need to be knowledgeable about the details of the agreement, aware of its implications for withdrawal and relocation decisions, and prepared to make changes to local practices to facilitate its implementation. Ongoing training and information sessions for relevant staff are highly recommended.

**Recommendation 6: Establish a standing TUG committee to continue to manage Annex collections and space issues.**

Now that TUG-wide policies and procedures have been established, much of the work initiated by the TUG Annex Collection Management group can continue under the direction of relevant managers. However, there will still be a need to co-ordinate collection management activities from a TUG perspective. It is recommended that the current TUG Annex Collection Management project team be re-constituted as a standing committee which would specifically address Annex collections and space issues. This committee would be populated by and would receive strategic direction from the TUG Executive committee, and would initiate with TUG Exec the establishment of specialized task groups or TUG-wide projects as appropriate. The membership of this committee should be as follows:

- The TUG Annex Services manager (chair)

- Three or more members representing TUG Information Resources (at least one from each TUG Library), to provide strategic as well as operational direction and guidance, including context for issues at the local, TUG, OCUL and national levels
- One member from the TUG Cataloguing group
- One member from the TUG Stats & Report group

### **Recommendation 7: Develop a collaborative, systematic approach to TUG Collections Management.**

One key concern that emerged during this project was the difficulty of coordinating Annex weeding initiatives with similar projects being worked on independently at the TUG libraries. With the implementation of the TUG Last Copy agreement, TUG libraries can no longer withdraw materials from their own libraries in isolation. Scheduling and coordination of collections-related projects on a TUG-wide basis is essential, and should be the joint responsibility of the newly formed TUG Annex Collections Management group (see 6. above) and the TUG IR group. These groups should be mandated to develop a collaborative and systematic approach to managing TUG collections that will address such issues as conducting an annual review of planned weeding projects, coordinating simultaneous weeding projects, developing effective communication templates and shared workspaces (e.g. TUGwiki), and the organization of relevant workflows.

### **Recommendation 8: Consider developing a TUG approach to stewardship of specific subject collections.**

This issue has been touched on before, but more thorough discussion is needed in order to tackle the issue of stewardship of materials, either in print or digital format. There are potential benefits to the notion of individual TUG Libraries taking responsibility for maintaining or preserving (through retention of print and/or digitization) parts of the collection that are of most importance to its users and represent unique content at the provincial or national level. For example, Guelph might maintain agriculture and veterinary science materials; Waterloo, engineering and computer science; and Laurier, music and business. This issue will be referred to the TUG IR Committee for future consideration and discussion.

**Recommendation 9: Develop a co-ordinated TUG Communications Strategy to keep our stakeholders informed.**

A well-thought out and coordinated communications strategy should be developed to keep various stakeholder groups informed about policies and decisions which have an impact on collections and user access. This would help to address questions about such issues as the disposition of weeded materials and the implications of the TUG Last Copy agreement. The strategy might include an intranet web site with a set of FAQ's, a list of contact names and details, and materials which will support the work of the TUG Annex Collections Management Group and help to educate library staff to respond effectively to concerns that are raised.

**Recommendation 10: Revise Annex staff job descriptions to reflect the changes in the nature of their work.**

One significant outcome of the TUG Annex Collection Management project is that it resulted in changes to the nature of the work performed by the Annex staff. They have been integral to the success of the extensive weeding and backfilling projects, and as a result the focus of their day to day work has shifted. While retrieving and processing requests for Annex materials continues to be a major responsibility, the integration of tasks such as weeding, report maintenance, creation of barcode files, backfilling, space measurement and book disposal have changed the way Annex staff do their jobs. Job descriptions for these positions need to be revised appropriately.

**Recommendation 11: Continue to enforce annual flow rates for the TUG libraries, to ensure the judicious use of remaining Annex space.**

Key to preserving what little space remains are the controls on how much material each library may relocate to the Annex each year. While it is important to monitor and adjust the current limits in a flexible and collaborative way (e.g. enabling any TUG library to "borrow" from future years' allocations), annual flow rate restrictions will likely continue to

be needed in order to ensure responsible use of the remaining Annex space and to serve as a framework for initiating consultations regarding this limited shared resource.

### **Recommendation 12: Actively pursue longer-term solutions to TUG storage needs**

While the TUG Annex Collection Management project has been concerned primarily with managing Annex space in the short-term, a longer-term strategy is needed in order to address TUG's future storage needs. The Annex will be essentially full in only a few years, so alternative storage solutions must be actively sought in the meantime. Avenues which are currently being explored by TUG include:

- A proposal being developed by the OCUL Collaborative Collection Continuity Committee for a shared storage repository for low-use print materials
- Development of a shared strategy for weeding and retention of low-use print materials received as part of the federal Depository Services Program
- Use of compact storage shelving for print collections (where feasible in structural terms)
- A variety of digitization strategies which will allow TUG to minimize retention of print collections in order to gain space. Where cost-effective, such strategies might include the purchase of backfiles, digitization of local and unique collections, and participation in digitization projects undertaken by other libraries and organizations.

## **Appendices**

- i. [TUG Preservation of Last Copy Agreement](#)
- ii. [Annual Space Allocation summary](#)
- iii. [Annex Space Utilization and Future Capacity summary](#)
- iv. [Weeding decision matrix](#)
- v. [Weeding Reports Summary](#)
- vi. [TUG Annex Withdrawal Procedure](#)
- vii. [Sample of report generation instructions](#)
- viii. [OCUL Collection Rationalization \(November 2007\)](#)
- ix. [Project costs spreadsheet](#)