WEST and the OCLC Shared Print Second Symbol

Report to OCC on WEST member attitudes and applications, with a recommendation for WEST action

Introduction

In early 2020, the WEST Disclosure and Validation Standards (DVS) and the Resource Sharing (RS) Working Groups were charged to evaluate and submit a recommendation to the WEST Operations and Collections Council (OCC) outlining a unified approach to the ongoing role of the OCLC shared print second symbol in WEST operations. The two working groups began their evaluations of the second symbol separately, assessing the impact of migrating away from, or maintaining the second symbol as an integral part of WEST operations and workflows. Beginning in July 2020, the working groups have met jointly on a bimonthly basis, shared initial findings, and developed an informal survey for the membership to ensure that the final conceptual recommendation to the OCC is made with the fullest possible understanding of likely operational impacts and needs.

The members of the working groups are:

Name	Institution	Working Group
Alison Wohlers	WEST project team	Resource Sharing (convener)
Anna Striker	WEST project team	Disclosure & Validation Standards (convener); Resource Sharing
Cathy Martyniak	UC SRLF	Disclosure & Validation Standards
Corrie Hutchinson	University of Missouri	Disclosure & Validation Standards
Debra Spidal	Washington State University	Disclosure & Validation Standards; Resource Sharing
John de La Fontaine	Occidental College	Resource Sharing
Tim Converse	UC NRLF	Disclosure & Validation Standards; Resource Sharing

After reviewing the results of the 18 responses to the informal survey and combining those findings with previously gathered information, the DVS and RS Working Groups submit the following recommendations and summary report to the OCC.

Recommendations

The second shared print symbol has not effectively fulfilled its original purpose to facilitate shared print resource sharing and the gathering of lending statistics. In some cases, it has proven a barrier to participation in the WEST program and has possibly encumbered discovery and delivery of WEST archived titles.

Primary Recommendation: Moving forward, WEST libraries should disclose their commitments on their primary OCLC symbol. WEST should, with the assistance of OCLC, coordinate the migration of historical commitments associated with the second shared print symbols to primary institution symbols.

Considerations and Additional Recommendations

The primary recommendation should be considered a "recommendation of concept." After weighing the costs and benefits of continuing to leverage the OCLC second symbol this group is recommending that disclosure via the primary symbol is preferable. However, there remain operational questions that must be addressed through further planning and testing to successfully facilitate the implementation of the primary recommendation.

While operational details will impact the process and timeline for migration, the Working Group recommends establishing an aspirational timeline.

● **Recommendation:** Migrate all WEST materials to the archiving institution's main symbol by Spring 2021 in time for Cycle 10 disclosure.

All 18 respondents to WEST's survey report using at least one OCLC resource sharing product. However, the shared print flag that OCLC sets on records through the new service is not yet actionable in its resource sharing systems, either for lending and borrowing purposes or to gather lending statistics specific to shared print. Given the likelihood that WEST members will continue to use OCLC resource sharing tools and services, it is essential shared print access is facilitated and trackable in OCLC tools and services.

● **Recommendation:** The Resource Sharing Working Group should remain connected to advocacy (currently facilitated by the Rosemont Alliance) to integrate shared print (including the new registration flag) into OCLC's resource sharing tools and services.

Overall benefits and considerations of OCLC's new shared print registration service

Benefits	Considerations
- Simplified local workflows for disclosure, discovery, and requesting via interlibrary loan - Robust search/discovery capabilities - Option for third party registration of shared print commitments, reducing burden on local resources - Plain language indicator of shared print status ("shared print commitment" - "committed to retain") rather than expectation of familiarity with cryptic codes - Regular reconciliation of WorldCat registrations and PAPR disclosures - Standardized workflows across the shared print community for registration and disclosure - Potential long-term cost reduction for member institutions who no longer need to maintain multiple OCLC symbols	- One-time project to migrate disclosures from second symbol to main symbol (and possible need to modify local workflows and documentation for new workflows) may require member institution staff and time investment - Outstanding questions regarding merging holdings from multiple symbols into a single symbol - Outstanding questions regarding use of shared print flag in OCLC interlibrary lending workflows

Report on Working Group Findings

Data inputs

1. WEST survey to members on resource sharing and the second shared print symbol (distributed August 2020)
2. OCLC responses to working group inquiries around resource sharing and statistics capabilities in their systems for shared print (gathered during spring and summer 2020)
3. OCLC survey to shared print libraries on their use of the second shared print symbol (distributed September 2019)

WEST Survey to Members

This light-weight survey was sent over email to WEST Primary and Technical Contacts. The full text of the email request and questions is available in Appendix A. 18 WEST members responded to the email survey. In terms of the total membership, this is a response rate of approximately 26.5%. The vast majority of respondents were archive holders or builders. One non-archive holder responded, as did one consortial representative.

Key survey findings

- The second symbol is specific to shared print workflows as defined by WEST
  - No respondent reported using the second shared print symbol for any reports or workflows locally beyond disclosing WEST commitments and gathering lending statistics on those commitments (Q6)
- The operationalization of the second symbol and WEST resource sharing guidelines is inconsistent
  - A significant number of respondents are not lending from their second shared print symbol (9 institutions). In addition, while several other respondents report being set up to lend from the second shared print symbol, they have received no requests (Q11)
  - Respondents reported resource sharing staff at their institutions being anywhere from "not familiar" to "very familiar" with shared print and collective collections (Q9)
  - Depending on the institution, resource sharing staff may be aware that shared print commitments in WEST are associated with a second symbol, but in some cases they are not and familiarity is generally on the lending side and is not leveraged on the borrowing side of resource sharing (Q10 and Q12).
  - Generally, respondents report *not* incorporating of the WEST lending/borrowing workflows into your resource sharing work (e.g. utilizing the WEST Group Access Capability (GAC), constant data in address book identifying WEST institutions, second symbol, looking for 583 MARC notes, etc.) (Q13).
  - "We use the GAC constant data and we have a second symbol, but we had difficulty in accessing the OCLC Policies directory with our second symbol, so we have continued to receive requests on our main symbol."
- "Group affiliation" is a compelling means of facilitating shared print resource sharing for respondents
  - When asked, "What means of identifying shared print program members / holdings would best facilitate borrowing / lending of shared print collections? (e.g. directory information, flags on holdings, defined groups of institutions; functionalities might already exist or need development)", respondents provided the following suggestions:
    - Not sure/ n/a (4)
    - Flags on holdings (3)
    - Group affiliation (5)
    - Single symbol (2)
    - Program OCLC symbol (1)
    - "We would be more interested in tracking the shared print program members if there were agreed upon terms for lending within certain time frames such as we see with RapidILL."

OCLC Responses to WEST / Rosemont Concerns

WEST and its partner programs in the Rosemont Shared Print Alliance have been in regular communication with OCLC representatives regarding questions and concerns that project staff and member institution representatives have raised. Topics that project staff and member representatives have voiced questions and concerns about include the following major areas.

Support for holdings migration and registration

With over 40 archiving members, the WEST project team has been mindful of potential impacts that managing and executing any large-scale migration might have on member institution staff. OCLC has been receptive to these concerns, and offers several points of support for institutions, including completing collection profiles and establishing DataSync collections in WorldShare Collection Manager and offering assistance with managing the holdings migration process.

Discovery of shared print commitments

With the indexing available through the new shared print registration service, OCLC offers several enhancements to discovery of shared print commitments. Among the tools where OCLC has made shared print information visible are

- **FirstSearch**. Under the current second symbol system it is already possible to search for shared print retentions in our program via the Group Access Capability (GAC) called "WEST," a grouping of all WEST member libraries' institution symbols. The new "indexing" of registered commitments and improvements to the FirstSearch interface will facilitate the following:
  - Advanced search limit to *Shared print commitments only*.
  - Brief records in search results indicate the number of libraries that have committed to retain an item.
  - Detailed records in search results indicate the number of libraries that have committed to retain an item.
  - A new *Shared Print Commitment* column displays on the list of all libraries that own the item and indicates which libraries have committed to retain it. Selecting the *Committed to Retain* link from the new column results in the display of local holdings details related to shared print from the associated MARC record.
  - [Screenshots and examples of the above.](#)
- **Connexxion** and **Record Manager**. The new "indexing" will allow for similar display of shared print flags in the Connexxion and Record Manager interfaces.
- **OCLC Metadata API**. Shared print-specific information will be available to institutions with OCLC Cataloging subscriptions via the recently updated OCLC Metadata API. The updates allow users to view local and group holdings and identify shared print holdings.
- [Additional details are available at OCLC.org](#)

WEST and other shared print proponents are also strongly encouraging OCLC to make the shared print flag visible in WorldCat.org. This is a topic of ongoing discussion, and WEST is committed to advocating for open data regarding shared print commitments that is accessible not only to OCLC subscribing members, but also institutions that do not have OCLC Discovery subscriptions and to end users who do not have access to staff-oriented subscription services.

Resource sharing and shared print

A major function of the shared print second symbol is to facilitate resource sharing of shared print materials and provide flexibility for archiving institutions to apply lending policies that are distinct from those governing their main collections. Additionally, by keeping shared print materials separate from an institution's main collection, the second symbol was intended to facilitate statistics reporting for lending activity. While these functions were ultimately far from perfect, it is unclear at this time how or if the new shared print flag can be leveraged to solve these issues. WEST and other shared print proponents have discussed these issues with OCLC, and are engaging in ongoing discussions with OCLC representatives regarding the needs of the community and the shortcomings of the second symbol in these arenas. Archiving institutions and program staff anticipate collaborating with OCLC resource sharing staff to identify solutions to these issues.

OCLC Second Symbol Survey

In the fall of 2019, OCLC issued a survey to gather feedback about how libraries make use of second symbols in their local workflows. This survey was issued to help OCLC gather information about use of the second symbol and gauge receptiveness to a new shared print registration service that would allow for migration away from the second symbol, the responses from WEST members were ultimately a useful starting point for discussions within the governance groups regarding how to approach these anticipated changes. Major findings included:
- Respondents were not likely to have local reports, processes, and/or workflows that rely on the shared print second symbol;
- Respondents were largely receptive to the idea of having shared print commitments indexed and discoverable through their institution's main OCLC symbol (rather than remaining on the second symbol);
- Respondents had detailed and specific logistical questions regarding migrating holdings from a second symbol to their main symbol, and operational questions about registering commitments in the (at that time) forthcoming system.

The text of the OCLC Second Symbol Survey can be found in Appendix B. The anonymized responses from WEST members are available for detailed review: https://docs.google.com/spreadsheets/d/19bz8fSUSEeHOx0015ppipebTcMP_soXEKxvEWuqGDVc/edit#gid=0

Appendix A - WEST Second Symbol Survey Questions and Email Text

Dear WEST Primary and Technical contacts,

The WEST program is in the process of evaluating the effectiveness of the OCLC shared print second symbol in supporting program and member institution shared print goals. One possible outcome of this evaluation is that WEST will transition away from using the OCLC shared print second symbol. Your input will help us make an informed recommendation. If you feel transitioning away from the shared print second symbol will negatively impact your institution, we would especially like to understand your concerns. We appreciate your time!

Please provide any responses you have by EOD, Wednesday, August 12, 2020. Thank you!

Not familiar with the second symbol or need a refresher? Check out the description below my signature line.

We are hoping that a selection of WEST Primary and/or Technical contacts can reach out to local resource sharing experts and others as needed to answer a few questions about the use of the shared print second symbol. Please answer what you can.

WEST Primary/Technical contact questions
1. Has your institution retained titles locally on behalf of WEST?
2. Beyond the need to disclose committed materials as required by the [WEST Disclosure Policy](#) and report annual resource sharing statistics to WEST, are there local reports, processes, and/or workflows that rely on your OCLC second shared print symbol?
3. If you have multiple OCLC second shared print symbols (e.g. one for in place and one for storage), will it negatively impact your institution to lose that distinction?
4. Would the potential cost savings of not having to maintain multiple symbols/interlibrary loan queues offset any potential negative effects your institution might see?

Resource sharing staff questions

5. How familiar are resource-sharing staff at your institution with shared print and collective collections?
6. Are resource sharing staff at your institution aware that WEST members who hold shared print titles for the collaboration have an OCLC shared print second symbol?
7. Does your institution lend materials on your OCLC shared print second symbol?
8. Does your institution borrow materials specifically from other WEST participants based on their membership in WEST?

9. Does your institution incorporate any of the WEST lending/borrowing workflows into your resource sharing work - e.g. utilizing the WEST Group Access Capability (GAC), constant data in address book identifying WEST institutions, second symbol, looking for 583 MARC notes, etc.
10. What resource sharing system(s) does your library use?
11. Is your institution likely to continue using the same resource sharing system(s) in the next 3 years?
12. Are there other resource sharing systems your institution is considering?
13. What means of identifying shared print program members / holdings would best facilitate borrowing / lending of shared print collections? (e.g. directory information, flags on holdings, defined groups of institutions; functionalities might already exist or need development)

Please send replies to Anna Striker, WEST Analyst, at anna.striker@ucop.edu. If you have any questions or additional feedback about the shared print second symbol please reach out to Anna at the same email address.

 Many thanks and warm regards,

 Alison Wohlers

WEST Program Manager
On behalf of the Disclosure and Validation Standards and Resource Sharing Working Groups

About the Shared Print Second Symbol

In 2010 and 2011, WEST institution and program staff participated in an OCLC pilot study to determine a means of effectively identifying shared print collections in metadata and facilitate resource sharing. The recommendation, which WEST followed at the time and continues to follow, stipulated that institutions retaining shared print materials establish a second, specifically shared print symbol (e.g. ABC → ABCSP) and attach local holdings to that symbol. This second symbol was meant to facilitate ready identification of shared print commitments at the title level, aggregation of shared print collections in union catalogs, and integration of shared print agreements into resource sharing infrastructure and practices.

 OCLC has now released a new registration process that allows individual LHRs to be indexed and "flagged" as shared print. With this new process in place, OCLC recommends transitioning away from using the shared print second symbol for identification of and sharing of shared print collections.

 Two WEST working groups (Disclosure and Validations Standards, and Resource Sharing) are working on a recommendation to the WEST Operations and Collections Council regarding the use of

the second symbol in our program and in order to make an informed recommendation, these two groups invite member resource sharing and shared print experts to weigh in on potential benefits and considerations of the second symbol.

Appendix B - OCLC Second Symbol Survey (distributed fall 2019)

Second Symbol Feedback

As part of a grant provided by the Andrew W. Mellon Foundation, OCLC is enhancing the underlying infrastructure of the WorldCat database to accommodate and make accessible actionable data for shared print serials management. OCLC is seeking feedback about how your institution has utilized the second symbol method for registering shared print commitments. This information will help OCLC to determine an efficient path forward for records originally registered using the second symbol approach. The goal is to create consistency in registering shared print commitments using the CSV registration process, which will in turn, optimize discoverability of all shared print records. To provide a quick review of the distinction between the second symbol process and the CSV registration process; in the second symbol option, the library supplies MARC data and retention commitments are assumed for all LHRs under the second symbol. In the CSV registration process, the library supplies CSV data enabling each LHR to be indexed for discovery (not symbol driven). To learn more about the existing CSV registration process, please see OCLC support documentation. Please submit your responses as soon as possible, but no later than Friday, September 27th. Thank you in advance for your input.

Section 1

1. Are you actively registering retention commitments under a second shared print symbol in WorldCat?

    Yes

    No

2. If you are actively registering retention commitments under a second symbol, what bib types are you registering under the second symbol in WorldCat? (select all that apply)

    u- Unknown

    v- Multi-part item holdings

    x- Single-part item holdings

    y- Serial item holdings

3.Are the commitments you have registered under your second shared print symbol still valid?

Yes

No

Not sure

4.Do any of the WorldCat LHRs added under the second shared print symbol contain additional information? (Beyond registering your commitment in a 583 action note field, examples may include; the addition of holdings fields, item fields, other local notes, etc.)

Yes

No

5.Are there local reports, processes, and/or workflows that rely on your second shared print symbol in WorldCat?

Yes

No

Not sure

6.Would you like to see OCLC provide an option where MARC LHR records can be used to make retention commitments that are indexed and discoverable?

Yes

No

7.To the best of your knowledge, would transitioning your retention commitments to the CSV driven registration process be problematic for your institution?

Yes

No

Not sure

8.Can your institution supply CSV data for the commitments you want to make in the future?

Yes

No

Not sure

9.Which of the following choices would be best for your situation: I would like my existing commitments…

indexed and discoverable under my second symbol.

indexed and discoverable under my main symbol

removed from WorldCat (I want to use the new process to reload my commitments).

10.After successfully transferring your commitments to the new registration process, would eliminating your second shared print symbol be acceptable?

Yes

No

11.Please use this space to communicate any concerns or considerations regarding the above questions.

Section 2

Contact Information

12.What is the name of your institution?

13.Which Shared Print Program are you affiliated with?

14.If you would like to be contacted regarding your responses, please provide your name and contact information