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The landscape around us is ever changing, either with the subtle differences brought by the seasons and gradual climate change, or with our interference.

Our library collections are very much the same; shifted by the changing nature of user interest or the gradual decay of materials or given a damn good shake up by the librarians in charge of them. From mapping, evaluating, prioritising, nurturing, protecting and harvesting: this edition of Taking Stock considers how we can approach altering the nature of our collections and how we can safeguard them for the future.

Jenny Hill
Editor, Taking Stock
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The tenth seminar was a packed day. It kicked off with “Collection Cartography” a fascinating insight into all things data: gathering and usage; how data can help with discovering what you hold and who is actually using it. What was great about the presentation was the honesty; a fantastic project but “Where did it all go wrong?” showed how the best intentions can be thrown off course by the changing priorities of the College senior management; staff leaving; budget constraints and discovering just how long the plan will take compared to the initial timeframe allotted. This seemed to resonate with the audience.

This was followed by “Creating the Teaching Reserve” by the University of Hull on how to refine your holdings to create a collection that matches the needs of the courses you are supporting. Key messages included making sure you maintain the currency of your collection, and using space effectively by assessing your collection at regular intervals through the academic year and adjusting accordingly by moving less used books to a holding section to make your teaching reserve. Guidance was offered on how to involve customer services team members to help with this, and how to upskill more team members in the process. Regular assessment was a core requirement.

Streamlining a journal collection can be a challenge, and Newman University shared their experience. What I took away from their presentation was the heat map they produced to understand what their priorities should be for this project. It was a great way of capturing all their ideas and enabling them to evaluate and identify areas of high importance and low. Their “wobbles” also resonated, the steep learning curves, attempting to gather usage statistics when none seem to exist, and how to keep everyone informed when you are juggling so much. It was a positive experience overall which produced greater staff confidence and expanded skill sets.

Emergency planning came next, with practical advice on how to plan to minimise the impact should the worst happen. The general buzz in the room after Fiona Hughes finished speaking revolved around her use of Briefing Cards. Fiona created these for each member of the Salvage Team, outlining their responsibilities, dependant on role: immediate actions to be completed, what they needed to do as the operation progressed, and what to do when the salvage operation was complete.

Her emergency plan went through 14 iterations, but to know you have a plan in place, and that you have your salvage priorities sorted in advance, would enable a level of peace of mind that should the worst happen you have a plan of action ready to go.

The JISC workshop on “Mainstreaming Open Access ebooks” set our collective brains to the task of identifying the measures we need to take to integrate Open ebooks into our collections. There were three discussion topics, and each table was asked to consider just one. Our table grappled with “How do we rethink how we demonstrate value for money for resources invested in Open Access? With no cost to access open ebooks, cost per use isn’t a factor but could the number of times the ebook is cited show value for money? Open Access has the potential to make the sharing of research so much easier.
and could help make the world a better place.
Food for thought.

“Streamlining Collection Management” brought us back to the nitty gritty of collection management with Chris Senior from Leeds University highlighting his seven lessons learnt from using categorisation to streamline collections. Chris wins my award for the best illustrations in a PowerPoint.

Check out Glisser to see for yourself. From his first lesson, “Other priorities will intrude. Work to KEEP momentum”, to his last, “Don’t underestimate the time and effort required - it can sometimes be an uncomfortable ride”. He started in 2015 and is still working on it - streamlining is an ongoing process.

The final presentation was pre-recorded, as sadly Robin Armstrong-Viner was unable to attend. Robin gave us a comprehensive overview of integrating physical and digital collection management at the University of Kent. He talked us through their journey so far, building on horizon scanning for best practice to make sure they had everything they needed to undertake this challenging task. He described how they pulled together experience, developed champions and grew skills.

Whilst the task is not yet complete, there have been some quick wins and positive collaborative outcomes. Whilst we wished he and his team could have been with us for the event it was still valuable to hear about their experiences.

About the Author:
Diane McCourt is the Collection Development Manager for Library and Archive Service at the Royal College of Nursing. She is part of the team who put together the NAG Collection Development Seminars.

Collection Cartography: Mapping materials, users and research at Royal Holloway

Amy Stubbing and David Morgan

In the summer of 2018, the library team at Royal Holloway, University of London embarked upon their collection mapping project. Inspired by efforts from other institutions who presented at the NAG Collection Development Seminar in 2018, led by Helen Rimmer, this was an intensive 3 month project which aimed to enable us to develop a systematic understanding of the contents and nature of our collection. It examined how they are used and by whom, and the strengths and weaknesses of the collection. The project brought together key members of staff from across the library teams, including Management, Liaison staff, Customer Services, Research and Support, Metadata and Cataloguing, and the Archives.¹

At its core, the purpose of this project was to gain a greater understanding of the strengths and weaknesses of our collection. This was prompted by a recent library highlighting a number of issues in the collection. We wanted to find out what areas of our collection were unique and valuable and which supported our University mission and lined up with the College’s teaching and research focuses. Equally, we wanted to find out what aspects of our collections no longer supported our teaching and research, and what areas were essentially redundant or inadequate.

There were a number of drivers for this project, and to improving our understanding of our collection and its strengths and weaknesses. One was to contribute to the wider upcoming collection mapping project as part of the University of London. Future-proofing our collections was a key driver for us, particularly following the library move. We wanted to ensure that we were not going to run out of space, that...
we knew what aspects of the collection we should be focusing on weeding or growing, and that our collection continued to remain relevant within the University aims. We also wanted to ensure that we could streamline processes and avoid repeating the same work. It would give us a better understanding of the problems in our collection and data so that we could devise proposals to tackle these. The final and perhaps most important (if a little gratuitous) driver, was simply that we love data and love finding new ways to use it!

As with similar projects we wanted to be able to categorise our stock to help us make decisions and understand the collection as a whole. We created the following graphic and categories to map this:

The categories are:

- **Flagship** – areas of high research and/or teaching interest, where collection development is a priority and collections can be expected to grow.
- **Heritage** – areas where stock is of research and/or teaching value but where collection development is not a priority and where collections are expected to remain static.
- **Current** – areas where stock is of present research and/or teaching interest but of limited long-term interest (e.g. text books, reference works).
- **Finite** – areas of low research and/or teaching interest (e.g. subjects previously taught or researched, but not currently), where collection development and maintenance/renewal is of low priority.

While we would have loved to get all information on all of our collections, we knew that this would be an unfeasible amount of work to do in house, so we decided to keep this initial stage of the collection mapping project just to print and rare books, examining stock quantities and proportions of uncatalogued stock, the age of the collections, rarity, how our collections are used, and how our collections reflect our teaching and research outputs.

We had a range of data sources that we needed to tackle to get all of the information we wanted; we used information from Alma, Talis and Pure alongside measurements and information gained from our library move.

Naturally, the issue with collecting data from so many sources was that none of it fit nicely together. We had some serious issues with our data from each individual source that required creating work-arounds and innovative solutions. It’s important to note that using data from all of these systems meant we had to translate the data so it was comparable. This necessitated a lot of data massaging and manipulation to get comparable and useful raw data so we could begin the analysis.

Equally, some of the data that we needed just wasn’t available. One thing we knew we wanted to understand was how our monographs mapped against our research outputs. To be able to make this analysis we needed to classify manually, in Dewey at top line, every article output that had been collected for the current Research Excellence Framework. Needless to say this was a massive piece of work, but it needed to be done to enable us to truly understand our collection in relation to research at the institution.

The analyses stage of the collection mapping project was the move from data to information. That is, connecting our data and context to improve understanding. Due to the size of this project, this was done in stages.

Each member of staff had their own area to collect and then to make initial analyses of their area of data. Once this initial isolated analysis was gained, we then brought together the data and our analysis to cross reference the information we had gathered. We did this by workshopping for a number of afternoons to bring different information and report on individual findings. This allowed us to gain new perspectives on our individual data and to match up and compare the data that we all had.

For this initial report, we decided to analyse our monographs at Dewey top level, drilling down further when it became clear that a particular area was clearly of significance.

The main deliverable for the project was a report for consideration by the management team. We created an extensive, 48 page report which summarised and concluded on all of the areas mentioned above. The report culminated in recommendations and a proposed road map for collection management and projects for the following year. The main outcomes of the report were as follows:

**Usage**
The exercise demonstrated that some areas of stock are used by a much wider cross section of students and researchers than might have been assumed. This has affected our thinking on:

- how stock review consultations need to take place
- how budget is divided
- how we actually analyse our data.

Examining the usage statistics also made us realise the importance of combining our analysis with context. There were instances where we assumed that it was unusual that a certain subject was borrowing from a specific area; however on consultation with the Liaison Team we realised where this fitted with courses and were therefore able to identify any anomalies.
Figure 2: Undergraduate and PGT Loans – Maths

- Computer science, information, general works 31%
- Philosophy and psychology 2%
- Social Sciences 8%
- Natural sciences and mathematics, 2%
- Unknown 12%

Figure 3: Undergraduate and PGT Loans – Italian

- Philosophy and psychology 8%
- The arts, fine and decorative arts 18%
- Religion 1%
- Literature and rhetoric 13%
- Social Sciences 20%
- Natural sciences and mathematics, 2%
- History and geography 1%
- Technology 1%
- Unknown 24%

Figure 4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dewey number</th>
<th>Dewey area</th>
<th>Subject area</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>Computer science, information, general works</td>
<td>Computer Science</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td>Philosophy and psychology</td>
<td>Psychology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>200</td>
<td>Religion</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>300</td>
<td>Social sciences</td>
<td>Economics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>400</td>
<td>Language</td>
<td>French</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500</td>
<td>Natural sciences and mathematics</td>
<td>Biological Sciences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>600</td>
<td>Technology</td>
<td>Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>700</td>
<td>The arts, fine and decorative arts</td>
<td>Drama, Theatre and Dance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>800</td>
<td>Literature and rhetoric</td>
<td>English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>900</td>
<td>History and geography</td>
<td>Classics</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Dewey area: Computer Science, Psychology, Social Sciences, Language, Natural sciences and mathematics, Technology, History and geography, Literature and rhetoric, The arts, fine and decorative arts, Philosophy and psychology, Religion, Literature and rhetoric, Social Sciences, Natural sciences and mathematics, Technology, The arts, fine and decorative arts, Philosophy and psychology, Religion, Literature and rhetoric, Social Sciences, Natural sciences and mathematics, Technology, The arts, fine and decorative arts, Philosophy and psychology, Religion, Literature and rhetoric, Social Sciences, Natural sciences and mathematics, Technology.
How departments use reading lists

Our main findings when examining the use of reading lists was that the approach varies widely depending on department. Some departments had an extremely focused list, while others were very general and long. It raised the question of how we as a library team should approach further and recommended decisions and management (for example purchasing) as there are such disparities between departments. However, as the lists are so new, it’s important that we continue to monitor this as it really is too early to tell how they are actually used and how they will be used in the future. (See Figures 5 and 6).

Decision making

For some areas we did more in depth analysis to understand better some obviously complex aspects of the collection. One such area was the 800s. We ran a report looking at areas supporting teaching (based on reading lists) vs rare/unique stock (according to COPAC), which raised the issue of how easy it is to make assumptions with this kind of work. For the 800s, we found that areas with high potential for weeding based on usage/teaching support were actually high priority for preservation when considering responsible collection management. This is certainly something that modeled our analysis and will be considered in future work (See Figure 7).

The Categorisation

One of the last things we did as part of the analysis was characterise at top level our collection into the finite, current, heritage and flagship categories. This has informed our next steps and future plans for the collection. These initial characterisations are proposed and have not been fully adopted as of yet (See Figure 8).

One of the other key deliverables was the roadmap of tasks created, based on this initial work. Once we had written the report we came up with what we thought were reasonable next steps and timelines. Unfortunately, our initial roadmap did not pan out the way we had hoped. With high staff turnover (particularly in management and senior management roles), changing priorities such as UKRR, and budget restrictions our ambitious roadmap could not be fulfilled.

While we couldn’t complete the roadmap as we had hoped, there were a huge number of positives that we were able to take away from this project:

- There is now an amended and more realistic roadmap based on the changing circumstances at the institution
- The library team is in discussions to relocate sensitively some of the rare but poorly used stock as identified in the project
- A huge variety of skills was gained by staff across teams, which can’t be ignored

![Figure 5](image)

![Figure 6](image)
It brought every team together in an important project.

- We’re actually able to understand the extend of the issues with our data now.
- It reinforced the importance of dealing with the stock issues we have.

Footnotes
1. Helen Rimmer (Associate Director)
   Debbie Phillips (Academic Liaison Librarian)
   Annabel Valentine (Archivist)
   Amy Stubbing (Collections Coordinator)
   David Morgan (Metadata, Discovery, and Analytics)
   Nicola Cockarill (Research Support Manager)
   Chrissie Willis-Phillips (Book Acquisitions Coordinator)
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### Table: Dewey Division

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dewey range</th>
<th>Broad Criteria</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>Current</td>
<td>Some divisions may meet other criteria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td>Current</td>
<td>Some divisions may meet other criteria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>200</td>
<td>Finite</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>300</td>
<td>Majority Current</td>
<td>Unlikely to have much flagship and will fall across other areas with majority being current. Unique items are likely to be a legacy of not weeding older editions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>400</td>
<td>Finite</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500</td>
<td>Current</td>
<td>Likely to have small heritage and flagship collections for niche research areas, especially in earth sciences. Appears to have large areas of uncatalogued stock. Middle priority for stocktake, and need to identify divisions that may be heritage or flagship that should be priority for cataloguing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>600</td>
<td>Current and Finite</td>
<td>May have small flagship and heritage collections, especially in neuroscience and specialist management areas.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>700</td>
<td>Flagship and Heritage</td>
<td>Includes areas of research growth such as media, TV and storytelling, along with areas of established strength in drama and media.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Scores**: Flagship

This is our most unique and rare distinct collection which also supports teaching and research. The highest priority for further examination, stocktake, and cataloguing work.

| 800         | Flagship and Heritage| Whist a large amount of this material appears to fall into flagship or heritage this area needs further exploration as there are also large finite collections such as German literature. The 820s should be the focus of work on cataloguing and stocktaking. |
| 900         | Flagship and Heritage| More work needed on specific sections, but supports areas such crusades, Holocaust, and West Asian studies which have formed what we believe to be flagship or heritage collections. Appears to have large areas of uncatalogued stock. As these are likely to be heritage or flagship, after scores this area should be a for further examination and investment in cataloguing. |
This article details our experience of implementing a journal review process, from initial blue sky thinking through to overcoming challenges and achieving results.

Newman University is a small university with a single site library. Over the years, our journal collection had evolved rather organically. Print subscriptions were upgraded to hybrid print and online subscriptions as these became available or affordable. New subscriptions were taken out to support new and expanding subject areas across the university but no systematic cancellations were made for declining subject areas. Additionally, an increasing number of subscriptions were locked in to publishers’ big deals. The nearest we had come to a journal review was circulating title lists to academics asking if there were any they wished to cancel, which perhaps unsurprisingly was not very successful.

Following a library restructure in 2015, responsibility for both print and online journals was brought into the newly-formed Library Service Support Team. This created the opportunity to tackle the journal collection systematically. In 2016 we embarked on our journal review journey and immediately came up against our first big challenge: working out what we actually wanted to achieve!

It may seem naïve to set out on a process without a clear outcome in mind, but we beg to differ. Rather, starting with a blank canvas gave us the opportunity to consider a variety of options and potential outcomes before embarking on a course of action. We would however offer a word of caution to others who follow this approach: be prepared for some very long meetings as stakeholders discuss the myriad options. We prepared for these meetings by investigating how other libraries had approached journal reviews. Visits to other local university libraries were invaluable here: librarians seem universally willing to share their experiences with others, for which we are very grateful. We also conducted an online literature review.

Our investigations uncovered lots of different ideas and approaches. We arranged all of these ideas on a hot-cold spectrum, indicating how attractive or otherwise they were for our library. Our initial placement of ideas on the spectrum was guided by the following factors:

- Our library is currently not short of space for physical stock
- The net result of any changes needed to be cost neutral
- A desire to prioritise online journals over print, to mirror our existing e-first purchasing policy for books, improving accessibility and offering remote access
- A desire to streamline print journal tasks and reallocate staff time to growing areas of work

Figure1: hot-cold diagram
By early 2017, the aims of our journal review were agreed:

- **Phase 1** – move print and hybrid subscriptions to online only
- **Phase 2** – make cancellations based on usage

Our next challenge was to identify and analyse all the data required to achieve these aims. This was a steep learning curve for staff involved in the review as we needed to develop thorough knowledge of COUNTER usage statistics and cost per use calculations in a relatively short space of time.

In addition to gathering usage statistics for online journals, we were keen to gather usage data relating to our print journals. As our print journal collection is reference only, we had no circulation statistics. We therefore devised a fairly low tech method for recording journals which had been used, by asking library users and shelving staff to return journals to designated trolleys rather than reshelving them.

Details of journals left on these trolleys were then recorded in a spreadsheet. We accept that the results obtained using this methodology cannot be completely accurate, but nonetheless we found this a fascinating exercise and identified several trends which challenged our preconceptions of print journal usage. For example, we were surprised to find that more than a third of the issues consulted were from pre-2010 years, which we also had online access.

Phase 1 of our journal review was completed at the end of 2017 when we moved 60% of our print or hybrid subscriptions to online only. This included all the titles in our big deals as well as individual subscriptions. This was a fantastic result in terms of streamlining, as it means we now have 60% fewer journals going through our print check-in, shelving and claims processes. Staff time saved here has been reallocated to other growing areas of work within the library. As an added bonus we made a slight cost saving with the move to online, though there were a few titles we decided not to switch as the online versions were significantly more expensive.

During phase 2 we faced a new challenge in the form of pressure on library budgets. This encouraged us to make bolder decisions about journal cancellations. For example, when we created our hot-cold spectrum of ideas we had felt that rationalising online access to a single source for each title presented a risk as it relied on embargoed access, in some cases, and titles remaining in databases. Confronted by budgetary pressures, however, the majority of cancellations we made in phase 2 were as a result of rationalising online access to a single source. Our initial blue sky thinking approach enabled us to respond flexibly as circumstances changed.

We made further cancellations to individual subscriptions based on low usage or high cost per use. Our decisions were contextualised by knowledge of subject area growth and decline and consideration of the breadth of journal provision for each subject area. Phase 2 was completed at the end of 2018 when we cancelled 15% of individual subscriptions and reduced our journals expenditure by 19%. These figures exclude big deals as we were not able to make cancellations to individual titles there.

Implementing our journal review in two phases meant that it stretched out over two years due to the nature of the journal renewals cycle. We recommend this phased approach to others: focussing on one aim at a time made it much easier to analyse relevant data and reach decisions. It also made the workload for library staff more manageable. In addition to the data collection and analysis there were numerous administrative tasks associated with every stage of the review process.

While we have now achieved the agreed aims for our journal review, the process does not stop here. Armed with an increasing volume of usage statistics, we are implementing an annual journal review cycle to ensure our subscriptions continue to meet user needs and represent value for money for the university.
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At the University of Hull we face challenges familiar to many HE libraries. Earlier this decade, an extensive refurbishment created beautiful study spaces that are loved by users and staff. This did reduce public access shelving by a third, however. It also created additional space and shelving in the basement. We do not have, nor are likely to acquire, an off-site store so space is finite.

The Collections
There are four main collection spaces in the Brynmor Jones Library (BJL), three of which are actively co-managed in a review cycle:

The High Demand Collection (HDC) is the core undergraduate collection. All new reading list resources are added to it, with active management maintaining the size at 40,000 to 50,000 items. Reading list purchases are determined by formula, then demand is monitored through circulation and reservation data, with loan periods being changed and/or additional copies purchased as required. If usage falls, resources are moved to Subject floors, creating space for new stock.

The six Subject Floors In The Tower are managed by periodic reviews, with long-unused material being moved to the basement. Items subsequently borrowed are returned to the floors. After five years, basement materials are assessed against retention criteria, including the University’s heritage, local and regional interest, and national holdings.

The Basement holds various collections including pamphlets, older reference works, theses and closed journal runs. A 5-year plan for the review of the basement is in development.

Finally, The Cube holds our rare and special collections, and is not a subject of this paper.

Collections Teams
There are two collections-related teams. Collections Administration (7.5 FTE staff) manages purchasing, subscriptions, access, document delivery, digitisation, and finance. Collections Development (5.7 FTE staff) is responsible for managing the library materials grant, performance and usage data, academic engagement, and metadata.

Academic Context
Evolving academic portfolios require libraries to refocus their collection development and management activities. This can result in the ad hoc relegation of older and legacy materials to create space.

We want a proactive, timely approach that supports present and future needs while being respectful of our past.

We are also mindful that changes to teaching activity can be short-lived. In the early 2000s, following the cessation of some subject degrees, we liaised with Faculty and agreed significant stock relegations.

Less than a decade later that teaching was reintroduced, necessitating considerable time and money to rebuild the stock. Although knowledge advances the fundamentals are constant, and much of the stock would have remained relevant.
The “four hows”

“Relevant collections” is a theme in our three-year Strategic Plan, aiming to align to current University needs by maximizing collection usage, delivering value-for-money, and efficiently using spaces. Engaged, flexible staff are at the heart of successful delivery.

Simultaneously, we are preparing to celebrate the University’s centenary in 2027, and want to honour our rich inheritance of collections, and how they reflect the institution’s evolution. In seeking to manage the various, potentially competing, demands we asked four key ‘hows’:

■ How can we help to curate the University’s historical evolution through our collection management activity?
■ How can we future-proof our collections?
■ How do we optimize space without a store?
■ How can this be achieved with the resource constraints, particularly staffing numbers?

The answer is the Teaching Reserve (TR), a discrete, closed-access collection of older material located in the basement and available upon request.

Creating space

Before we could create the Teaching Reserve we needed to identify and release space to house it. We decided to assess our closed-run quarto journals because usage was low. The holdings lists were extracted from Sierra, then we removed titles assessed as relevant to the University, City, or region. Those remaining were matched against national holdings for UKRR Retained status, and only titles held by 10 or more libraries were considered for relegation.

Given the sizes and remits of the Collections teams, success is dependent on collaborative, flexible working. Resilience and additional capacity are provided by the Library Admin. Group (LAG). Instigated in 2015–16, LAG comprises six Customer Services (CS) colleagues who are keen to develop their skills. They undertake a wide range of tasks, including the transfers of stock between collections spaces, and project work. CS colleagues who regularly work in book acquisitions and journals further strengthen collaboration. This provides developmental opportunities, and is a strand of our succession planning.

Managing currency

Previously, old editions were discarded upon receipt of the new, a process mediated by the Metadata Officers during cataloguing. The move to shelf-ready disrupted this workflow, and editions have been accumulating for several years. We needed a process that ensures only the latest editions are openly available, and also honours the ‘four hows’. Ebooks were easily accommodated in the acquisitions workflow. When ordering, staff check holdings for previous editions, and ‘archive’ the oldest. To do this we use a locally customized code to suppress the records in Sierra and remove them from the catalogue. Once a month a list of these ebooks is created so they can be untracked in Serial Solutions and removed from the Summon resource discovery platform. We have not yet deactivated any ebooks on the vendor platforms.

The print workflow was more complex, and we ran a pilot by assessing the law and the health stock. We created a list in Sierra of HDC items with an “edition” field, and then expanded this to include all items, which picked up most of the editions. Having identified titles with more than two editions, a process was created for the Library Admin. Group to fetch the old editions, put the best copy of each into the Teaching Reserve, and discard the rest, updating Sierra as they work. This was time-consuming, and would not have been achieved without LAG’s support.

Here’s How!

Editions checking for the Teaching Reserve is now integrated into our ordering workflow for all subjects. We are also continuing to assess the stock subject-by-subject to ensure currency. As we do so, space is being released on the subject floors, which will allow us to respond to the growth in new areas of the collections.

The Teaching Reserve is Hull’s response to local challenges, and will continue to grow as we evolve. It answers the “four hows” by reducing the depth of the collections while keeping the breadth.
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Towards integrated physical & digital collection management

Jon Allen, Robin Armstrong, Viner and Sarah Field

Information Services (IS), the University of Kent’s converged IT and library service, has set the ambitious target of moving to integrated physical and digital collection management from August 2020. We aim to achieve our vision of collections that continue to reflect our customers’ research and education needs and of maintaining an appropriate balance between collection and study space by:

- Establishing a shared understanding of what we mean by integrated physical and digital collection management
- Identifying our practices to, and enhance our academic Schools’ engagement with, those collections to benefit research, education and engagement
- Ensuring that we have the skills to identify and analyse data to support decision-making and the access to the technologies to generate and manipulate that data
- Building a culture where colleagues, working across teams and at all levels, view the collections holistically and are able to come together to make and action collection management decisions appropriately

Background

The University of Kent is a research-led University, founded in 1965. In 2016-17, we had 18,500 students and 1,200 academic staff, although our numbers have fallen slightly since then. Over the five years to 2016-17, the profile of our collections changed dramatically as we reduced our physical book stock while significantly investing in our digital collections. We added huge numbers of ebooks and transformed our journals provision, mostly through big deals. These trends continue as we focus on digital delivery of education and research resources.

We needed to respond to these and other changes in the landscape around digital and physical collections. We wanted to take the opportunity to review how we managed our collections as a whole, and to enable our academic schools to engage with them as a single, integrated entity. We believed that by looking at our collections holistically, we could:

- Enhance discovery to improve our customers’ experience
- Maximise access to resources
- Provide better value for money and return on investment around our acquisitions

By exploring how we might integrate new acquisition models into our collection management policies, practices and processes, irrespective of format, we felt we would understand how we could sustainably nuance our decision-making.

Recognising that delivering our vision will require different focuses and skillsets, we agreed that we would take a phased approach. Sarah led the first scoping phase, capturing current workflows and identifying best practice. Robin is currently leading the second enabling phase, enhancing data skills, sourcing the data we need and identifying the technologies we should use to source and store data. The third embedding phase will take specific use and provide case studies to demonstrate the impact of that new approach.

Developing our model

Sarah’s initial desk research found little evidence of integration of digital and physical collection management processes in academic libraries, although we did identify a number of valuable approaches. A 2016 paper to the British Library Board (http://vll-minos.bl.uk/aboutus/foi/pubsch/pubsheme4/BLB1606.pdf) described the situation the British Library faced, alongside many libraries with academic and research interests:

“"The life cycle management of physical materials is a mature ecosystem of processes, policies and activities. In contrast, the management of digital content is an emergent discipline, both in terms
of Library processes but also in the sense that the publishing industry itself is in a constant state of flux.” (British Library, 2016 – P2 Paper No: BLB 16/06)

The British Library lifecycle model illustrates the activities that take place after a resource is selected to make it available and accessible. That model describes two distinct but co-dependent processes:

1. Incorporating discovery and access before moving to preservation and conservation
2. Focusing on acquisition and receipt ahead of ingest and metadata capture

We perceived our collections as following a true lifecycle model from acquisition, through discovery and review, to withdrawal or replacement. We also reflected that our criteria for acquisition and retention of a resource are significantly different to the British Library’s and require separate consideration in terms of a lifecycle model.

The TERMs Content Lifecycle Model Digital (TERMs 2.0 – https://library.hud.ac.uk/blogs/terms) begins with “investigate” and continues through “acquire”, “implement”, “evaluation and review” and “cancel or replace” to “preserve”. Each of these steps has detailed criteria and questions that a library should consider, and a number of tools to utilise in developing workflows. Whilst this applies to digital material, the physical lifecycle does follow the same stages. Our view was that our increasing provision of resources in multiple formats demands a single model.

Sarah used these frameworks to develop that model. Her model supports our workflows and integrated collection management:

1. Investigate/ Request
2. Acquire
3. Implement
4. Evaluate/ Review
5. Withdraw/ Cancel/ Replace
6. Preserve

Sarah then mapped our existing practice around all formats in our main collection. This provided an essential overview of what happens where, and prompted us to ask key questions as we undertake certain practices.

Sarah found that:

■ Our practices have developed over time according to how we acquire resources and the format we purchase them in, and lack an overarching model
■ Our teams undertake individual tasks within the lifecycle based on their areas of expertise but without referring to a consistent set of principles or necessarily understanding the need for an integrated approach
■ The level and quality of data available to team members often impedes effective decision making in a resource’s lifecycle
■ There is excellent practice in our existing format-specific workflows that we could develop and apply to other formats

Sarah’s response was to identify the principles that underpin our approach. We agreed that our approach should be:

■ Flexible and responsive to education and research needs guiding the purchase mode and format type of a given resource
■ Connected so teams understand the role the tasks they own play in the lifecycle and develop these within this context
■ Evidenced with the data requirements for each stage understood from the outset
■ Documented with key decisions at each stage of the lifecycle recorded

We need to develop the specific criteria we will use at each stage further before we can implement of this lifecycle model, and plan to do so as part of the next phase of our work.

We are separately reframing our Collection Development Strategy and have identified a number of themes to address:

1. Prioritising digital formats but continuing to support physical provision where comparing use of digital and physical formats shows a clear preference for the physical, or the digital experience is compromised (for example through Digital Rights Management)
2. Making resources available in the most accessible format and ensuring that, where we provide a resource in multiple formats, we group them together for discovery with the most accessible format listed first
3. Investigating innovative supply and purchasing models that allow us to flex to meet demand in a responsive and timely way
4. Identifying the reading list system as the
mechanism for developing learning and teaching collections
5 Stressing the importance of the evaluation and review stage to ensuring value for money, return on investment and confidence in our collection building
6 Applying clear retention, preservation and cancellation criteria to both digital and physical resources
7 Collaborating with other libraries on collection management and considering their holdings as part of our decision making process

We are also looking to take forward the University of Leeds’ collections categorisation. We believe this will help us preserve and retain relevant and important research resources, whilst improving stock management through focused decision making around the most appropriate mode of acquisition based on the rationale for selection and likely lifecycle of a resource.

It would enable a more nuanced approach to stock review than our current circulation-based approach. In short, it allows us to understand why we hold each resource.

**Implementing our model**
Robin characterises the challenge we face as being that we have colleagues:

- With access to data but without the skills to use it
- With data skills but no access to data
- With data skills and access to data but no time

We plan to address the skills issue by bringing our current data experts in that group together to form a community of data champions. They will help us establish a data competencies development programme.

Our first step around data will be to clarify the questions we are trying to answer it. It is obvious that we are not making the most of the data we already have (for example that we gather for the SCONUL return). We will trial the concept of a data catalogue, listing existing collections management datasets and detailing their:

- Source
- Location
- Accuracy
- Comprehensiveness
- Owner
- Expert

Having examined the existing data, we will capture the requirements for additional metrics.

We want to automate the production of data as far as possible. Our champions will define the non-functional requirements which will help us identify which of our existing technologies are the best for the job, support us in conversations with our technology suppliers around their product roadmaps, and assist in the procurement of any new systems.

**Collaborating around our model**
We have engaged many of our partners around our model and are actively exploring how it can support our collaborations. For example, what are the implications for the unique Drill Hall Library, which we share with Canterbury Christ Church University and the University of Greenwich?

Can we improve access to our digital collections for members of the Medway School of Pharmacy (which we share with the University of Greenwich) and members of the Kent & Medway Medical School (which we will open in partnership with Canterbury Christ Church University in September 2020)?

We have a different set of challenges with our European partners, who provide access to physical collections complementing our digital offer to customers at our study centres in Athens, Brussels, Paris and Rome. How can we influence decisions around collections we lease access to? How can they support us when a lack of digital availability or poor licence terms compromise the student experience?

We have always thought of the suppliers of our library technologies as our partners. As such, we seek to influence their development roadmaps and priorities, providing case studies and other evidence to demonstrate why delivering these changes is so important. It will be interesting to see how they respond to integrated digital and physical collection management and the appropriate surfacing of data to support it.

**Conclusions**
We have learned many lessons on our journey so far towards integrated digital and physical collection management. While there are times when our heads ache just thinking about what we are trying to achieve, it has been easier than we had expected.

When we began working on integrated digital and physical collection management, we thought we would have to build a consensus around our vision and the need to work across teams to deliver it. In fact, there was already cross-team understanding and support for it. Colleagues could see the benefits of a holistic approach and were welcoming of the opportunity to engage with it. Everyone who has participated is keen to achieve our desired outcomes, making our work much easier.

Consulting across the teams highlighted that small groups of colleagues are already doing some great work, which gave us some valuable insights. We have already achieved some quick wins and the data champions have emerged, relishing their new role.

Our work has strengthened our collaboration with our partners at Canterbury Christchurch University and the University of Greenwich. We have a shared understanding of the specific issues facing our institutions, particularly around technologies. This will help drive forward the development we need and offers the potential of further partnership working to developing methodologies for integrated digital and physical collection management.

**About the Authors**
Jon Allen, Robin Armstrong Viner and Sarah Field represent the front of house, technical services and subject teams (supervisors, managers and librarians) respectively engaged with scoping, enabling and implementing integrated physical and digital collection management.

With very different backgrounds and length of service within Information Services, they hold different perspectives and insights into how we can achieve a truly flexible approach to collection management driven by customer need.
Mainstreaming open ebooks: Transforming culture, services and practices to open?

Sarah Thompson

Introduction

Libraries have played an important role in facilitating the transition to open scholarship within their institutions. However, much of this support has focussed on subscription publishing and the transition to OA journals. Monographs are still predicated by print, and open for ebooks is less well developed. This is a particular problem for the library supply chain. Open is not embedded into the culture, workflows and practices that are used as part of the book acquisition process.

In 2017, Jisc Collections facilitated a workshop, which brought together experts from library- and academic-led presses, book suppliers and distributors, metadata suppliers, libraries and other experts in OA publishing to discuss the problem statement that “OA publishers have difficulty accessing the channels that library acquisition departments use to buy print and ebook content”. The core aim of the workshop was to allow the experts to share their experiences and knowledge to get a better understanding of the supply chain and to gain insight into the problem statement.

One of the outcomes was to look at the culture of libraries regarding the acquisition of open content. The workshop suggested that less attention is paid to open book content as it is ‘free’ and so perceived as less valuable. Library staff are important advocates for open practice within their academic institutions and are on hand to provide advice and support about open access publishing, research data management and other aspects of open research. Larger libraries have dedicated teams who provide this support to their academic community - but how far is an awareness of open content permeating to other library teams more accustomed to handling paid-for resources? What consideration is given to open content in library collections policies, selection processes and acquisition and discovery workflows? In order to help address these issues, a workshop session, “Mainstreaming open ebooks: transforming culture, services and practices to acquire open?”, was held during the recent NAG Collection Development Seminar for Academic Libraries. This was a well-attended event with over 70 collection/acquisition managers present, plus a number of publishers, book suppliers and intermediaries. Delegates discussed the following topics, which were recorded by the authors:

- If we were to redesign our libraries around the premise of open rather than closed content, how would the library supply chain support open content?
- How do we drive our own ‘transition’ of culture, processes and services so that they are built around open?
- How do we rethink how we demonstrate value for money for resources invested in open?

Open content in the library supply chain

Libraries have well-established and efficient workflows when it comes to acquiring paid-for digital monographs, usually working with the same supply chain partners and technology vendors for both print and ebooks. However, open access monographs are not (usually) surfaced during this process.

Delegates identified a number of themes on the day. Firstly, the lack of a single database that includes OA monographs alongside paid-for books was identified as a key issue during the discussion. Furthermore, libraries reported lacking the time and staff resource to check other, additional sources for OA monographs during the ordering or pre-ordering process. They may be searching for alternative titles to improve reading list provision, not always for a particular title recommended by a lecturer, and currently need to check several databases to get a reasonably complete picture of what’s available. It was also noted that information about OA books can differ considerably between book supplier databases and the knowledgebases that feed into discovery layers, both in terms of coverage and quality. Thirdly, the importance of good quality metadata was identified as another key issue. Finally, delegates noted that there was a concern over the ‘quality’ of open access presses and also the sustainability of URLs and the permanence of the presses themselves.

A number of solutions were also suggested. It was suggested that OCLC WorldCat and Jisc’s National Bibliographic Knowledgebase (NBK) could play a role in surfacing content. Regarding metadata, it is worth noting that the MARC Advisory Committee recently approved a proposal to include information about open and restricted access, as well as licence information, in MARC21 fields: http://www.loc.gov/marc/mac/2019/2019-01.html. Furthermore, the inclusion of many OA e-books on the OAPEN platform should address sustainability issues.

A culture of openness

Delegates identified the need for a more integrated, cross-library approach to open access, particularly around the visibility, availability and importance of OA content. One consequence of having a library team who delivers OA services was observed to be “everyone offloads everything OA to them”. In other words, some library staff may not have engaged with OA very much because it is still regarded as a specialist area rather than something that has become mainstream. There were a number of practical suggestions that could help influence this perspective:

- Incorporate some element of OA provision in the work of existing collections teams, rather than building new structures around it (just as teams dealing with print resources transitioned to work also with ‘e’)
- Dedicate some staff development time to OA, which could include (for example) some training on how to identify bona fide OA content - this could then be cascaded and incorporated into the advice and guidance we give to lecturers about reading list content
- Include OA content in collection development policies, and consider how we can redefine our collections to be about more than the resources we own or purchase.

Some concern was expressed about the wisdom of having discussions with library staff regarding how OA might affect their roles before potential
Planning for what you don’t want to happen: The Library & Special Collections Emergency Management & Salvage Plan at Manchester Metropolitan University

Fiona Hughes & Alison Draper

Introduction
Manchester Metropolitan University Library and Special Collections developed their first emergency management plan in 1994, following the devastating fire at Norwich Central Library which destroyed thousands of historical documents and more than 100,000 books. The library had no emergency plan at the time, so when the Fire Service entered the building to try save material, they inadvertently retrieved items that were easier to replace rather than the rarer documents which had not been prioritised for salvage. This experience highlighted the need for a robust emergency plan, which is now standard requirement for all libraries, museums and archives.

Context
In 1994, the Library was the university’s first department to devise an emergency plan; a wider University Plan was developed subsequently. The University Executive Group approved the current version of the university’s Incident Response and Crisis Management Plan in November 2017, and followed this up with a series of Business Continuity Workshops to roll out the plan to all departments, including the Library.

The original Library plan was maintained and revised on an annual basis to reflect changes such as new floor layouts and updated contact details. However, it did not reflect how the Library service had evolved and the shift in emphasis on what should be salvaged. Training activities did not properly test the plan as they did not develop scenarios to put it into practice.

By 2016, Manchester Metropolitan University Library’s Emergency Plan was in its 14th edition; however, a flood in the archive store in Special Collections then demonstrated that it was no longer fit for purpose.

The flood was caused by blocked toilets on the floor above the store, a scenario that had not been planned for. A key omission from the old plan was a lack of health and safety procedures, and the requirement to undertake a risk assessment prior to embarking on a salvage operation. In the panic of the moment, staff responding to the flood did not carry out a risk assessment before rushing in to remove items from the store. Foul water running through live light fittings and dripping on to the archives put them at risk of electrocution from the lights and infection from contamination. A second failing of the old plan was a lack of a clear line of communication. This caused confusion as to who was contacting whom, with numerous staff trying to ring for help and colleagues in the library unable to make contact when returning calls.

Fortunately, no staff were injured or became ill as a result of the flood and no archives were damaged or destroyed. But another lesson learned was the value of archival-quality boxes. The densely ‘milled’ card ensured that water simply pooled on the surface and did not penetrate, while...
The addition of a Library

The new Library plan was written in the context of the University Incident Response and Crisis Management Plan and Business Continuity Policy. It defines what constitutes an emergency and when it is necessary to call out specialist restoration and salvage services. The plan has been simplified, removing unnecessary information, with clear actions and procedures outlined. Written with reference to other plans and templates, it cherry-picked the elements most suited to our purposes. The current plan now includes a number of new features.

- The addition of a Library Crisis Management Team comprising Emergency Management Officer, Salvage Officer, the Head of Special Collections, Business Continuity Officer and Health and Safety Co-ordinator. These roles may be assumed by any members of the Library Management Team in an emergency situation.
- Each role of the Crisis Management Team has a briefing card with clear instructions as to the responsibilities and actions expected from that role.
- Branded Hi-Vis vests to facilitate quick and easy recognition of Crisis Management Team and Salvage Team members.
- Includes up to date, detailed and specific salvage priorities within Special Collections.
- Space requirements in an emergency (meeting point, control/admin post, a room for triage of items recovered and a rest area)
- A branded ‘Library salvage bag’ kept with University Security to enable the Emergency Management Officer to start the Salvage and Recovery Operation. It contains:
  - Contact details of CMT & Salvage Team members
  - A copy of the Insurance Policy
  - A copy of the Emergency Plan
  - Laminated salvage priority cards
  - First aid kit
  - Clip board and other stationery

Determining Salvage Priorities

Clearly, all items in Special Collections are a salvage priority: however, some of those can be identified as being more vulnerable than others. In a water-based disaster, for example, paper and organic material will develop mould and be permanently damaged within 48 hours, but most ceramics and glass can withstand being wet until there is time to clean and dry them.

Other criteria for salvage priority might be if the items are on loan from another individual or organisation; if the item is unique, has specific significance or is hard to replace. Likewise, salvage priorities in the Library itself are those items most difficult to replace.

The new plan has an extensive table, detailing salvage procedures for each material or format type, while salvage cards are being created for all top priority salvage items. These cards show the location of the item, how it is stored, information on hazards (weight, prone to mould or breakage), handling and salvage information.

Approval and implementation of the Library Plan

The new Library Plan was Equalities Impact Assessed and approved by the university’s Head of Security and Business Continuity in October 2018.

Implementation started with a half-day training event for the Library Management Team and two of the University Security Duty Managers. The training was delivered by the university’s Head of Security and Business Continuity and the Fire Safety Co-ordinator. They covered the nature of emergencies in the 21st century; the University plan, how it relates to the Library plan; how the Fire Service respond and what they expect from Library staff. This provided a very useful alternative perspective on emergency management.
This was followed by a series of emergency planning and salvage priority tours of the Library and Special Collections. These focused on the location of salvage priorities in both areas, and understanding when an incident can be dealt with locally or needs to be escalated. Emergency response equipment boxes were assessed to understand how they could be used to deal with small-scale incidents. The tours were also used to recruit staff on to the salvage team. The Library Management Team, duty managers, customer services teams (including weekend and evening teams) and security staff have all taken the tour, and as a result 59 library and security staff now have detailed knowledge of how to respond to a disaster.

Next steps
Further practical training is planned for the Library Management Team and Salvage Team which will focus on applying the plan to a variety of scenarios. The Library Management Team will meet the University Press Office to generate pre-approved press statements to be issued swiftly in the event of an emergency.

In Special Collections, our Conservators are continuing to create salvage cards for objects and collections, and to purchase conservation-grade boxes for paper archives.

The plan is very much an evolving document and has already been updated just six months after being published. It will be important to continue to consult with key stakeholders such as Health & Safety, Fire Safety, Security and the Legal team as the plan continues to develop.

About the Authors
Fiona Hughes has worked for Manchester Metropolitan University for 28 years in a variety of roles and has been a member of the Library Management Team since 2005. In 2017 she became responsible for delivering library services to the Arts & Humanities Faculty and managing the university’s Special Collections. Her new responsibilities included updating the Library Emergency Management Plan.

Alison Draper is the Decorative Art and Object Conservator for Manchester Metropolitan University Special Collections. This is the University Museum, and includes significant collections of books, objects and archives. She is responsible for all aspects of Collection Care.
Alma Analytics title reports provided collection, publication date (where available), and catalogue number information. Reports required substantial editing due to extraneous data in several fields. The exercise revealed some older titles with no classification, or classified under previous editions of Barnard. Sorting collections by Barnard classification and publication year gave a detailed picture of subject coverage and date range.

Fulfilment reports in Alma Analytics recorded print book circulation. Standardising call number fields allowed grouping of classification data and calculation of loan totals for each subject. Circulation data provided insights into subject usage, although no data was available for books used as reference.

**Ebooks**

The number of ebooks made accessible by LAS is relatively small. Ebook platforms provided title lists, proving easier than Alma portfolios. Due to different acquisition methods involved, Patron Driven Acquisitions (PDA) were analysed separately. Ebook catalogue records have no classification, so for subject analysis each title had a classification assigned. Analysis was at title level, by classification and date published. COUNTBR1 and BR2 reports were complete for 2016-17, but not for 2017-18. ProQuest was unable to provide data for titles transferred from MyLibrary. No meaningful usage comparison was therefore possible between 2016-17 and 2017-18. LAS staff wanted to analyse zero usage titles, but the process of adding ebooks to Alma includes checking access. During 2017-18, no titles recorded zero usage, but this is not an accurate reflection of user behaviour.

**Book expenditure**

Alma Analytics invoice reporting proved incomplete, needing supplementary in-house data. Adding classifications to titles enabled data on expenditure per subject, and titles purchased per subject. This project combined print and eBook expenditure. Future projects could separate print and eBook spending — direct and PDA. Results highlighted subjects where expenditure did not reflect academic-related interests and subjects with zero expenditure.

**Print journals**

The LAS no longer subscribes to print journals, which are located in closed storage areas. Combining and de-duplicating Alma location title lists resulted in 920 unique titles. Each title had a classification added. Date analysis was not possible except by manually checking 866 fields for holdings, complicated by multiple date ranges. Analysis was by subject only. An unforeseen result was the high number of titles in general medicine, which was due to titles published by medical societies. Collating off-site store title requests provided the only available usage metric for print journals.

**Ejournals**

Alma electronic collection portfolio reports provided current and backfile title lists. It was impractical to access ejournals for content, so classification was title-based. Title lists were analysed as current (4,070 titles) and backfile (799 titles), and de-duplicated as a combined collection (4,278 titles). No Open Access titles were included. Subjects were strong where large collections or full text database dominated, and for class level subjects: many titles had broad subject themes rather than specific focus. No expenditure analysis was possible due to most titles being part of a collection or database, with no breakdown of pricing by individual title available.

**COUNTER JR1** supplied usage data. Analysis included zero usage, which meant laborious checking of title lists for publishers excluding zero usage from JR1. Due to several popular titles making usage very high for one Barnard class, the central tendency for each Barnard class was calculated. A significant number of titles had zero usage, especially where subscription was to a large proportion, or all, of a publisher’s titles.

**Inter Library Loans (ILL)**

To enable subject analysis, completed ILL requests made by users needed classifications added. Alma reporting had several limitations: there is no journal title field for articles, for example, and inconsistencies in request fields due to input variations. The 1,033 requests
indicated demand for titles and subjects currently not met by Library collections. User categories showed different demands, but further data is required to identify trends.

**Staff survey**
The LAS sought academic-related staff involvement in the project. However, it proved very challenging to engage staff. Emails were sent to selected staff matching top 20 research interests for each Faculty, asking for top 5 must-have books and/or journals. The response rate was 24%. Results were therefore not statistically significant, though they indicated a high proportion of must-have titles held in the Library collection.

**Copac Collections Management (CCM)**
The selection criteria used for identifying libraries to match holdings with was that they were members of the FCG or that they were libraries that we had compared our holdings with in previous projects. Holding comparison was limited to titles with ISBNs or ISSN.

Importing Alma holdings into CCM was straightforward. However, checking discrepancies in the results was a time-consuming process. Classification comparison was impossible due to CCM search parameters and other libraries not using Barnard. Results showed title overlap and title uniqueness with peer libraries, albeit for more recently published resources.

**Collection mapping**
Mapping collections and staff interests presented significant challenges. For example:

- Staff interests varying in specificity
- Classifications focussing on main subject of a resource
- Resource formats or classifications not suited to all subjects, or subject granularity
- Percentage matching skewed by staff profile options and size of collections
- Resource numbers by themselves not necessarily showing that the Library was meeting, or missing, academic needs
- Numbers not measuring quality, relevance or timeliness of resources

After deliberation and despite many caveats, two mapping exercises were completed, and the average result taken.

The first step calculated each staff interest as a percentage of all interests. For each collection, the percentage of each classification against the whole collection was calculated. The initial exercise mapped interests with exact classification matches. The second exercise mapped interests against broader classification groups.

Results were colour coded according to whether collections missed, matched or exceeded academic interests.

**Recommendations and next steps**

- Faculty engagement to conduct further research on academic interests, especially where mapping indicates that the Library collection is not meeting needs
- Review Library acquisition policies and procedures so they support and align with School research and teaching priorities
- Ensure collections that are subscribed to provide cost-effective access at point of need
- Investigate current cataloguing practices and ways to update Barnard classification scheme, providing metadata-enhancing information retrieval
- Participate in FCG initiatives on collaborative collection management where relevant
- Provide guidance and training to Collection Services team, enabling integration of evaluation into workflows and annual updating of data

**About the Author**
Eloise Carpenter is the Collection Services Manager at the London School of Hygiene & Tropical Medicine, where she has worked for 6 years. Her role includes responsibility for the procurement, acquisition and management of collections, access to and promotion of resources, and management of the Collection Services team.
A new website for NAG is coming soon with a bright new modern look and the functionality to provide online payments options for our members. Members will also be able to set up new logins with their email addresses rather than needing to know their NAG membership ID number, and also create “team” access for nine other members of staff from their institution.

As well as back issues of Taking Stock in the membership area we will also have our new “Learn” section with valuable, specially commissioned learning resources for you and your staff.

Finally, the new site will also provide space to host information about CONARLs membership and rates to support inter-library loans.

We believe our new site will make it easier for members to find information and book for events online whilst also making the administration of events and membership quicker and simpler for us. We felt this was a very worthwhile investment of NAG’s resources and we’re looking forward to launching the site very soon.

Look out for an email from NAG soon welcoming you to our new site and giving the opportunity to create your staff logins.
“The Library’s changing role in the provision of teaching content – positives, pitfalls, perils”

11th Collection Development Seminar for Academic Libraries 20th November 2019, Manchester

With papers including:
- Rebecca Gower and Jayne Kelly (Cambridge University): Is it for teaching, for research, or both?: collaboration on eBooks in Cambridge.
- Olivia Walsby (University of Manchester): Reading List Service overhaul at The University of Manchester Library: Are we nearly there yet…?
- Natalia Gordon (Leeds Beckett): Behind the scenes of an implementation: Fear the change but create the workflow anyways
- Sheila Candelan (Manchester Metropolitan University): ‘This is Manchester, we do things differently here’: the story of a collaborative model to support reading for pleasure
- AJ, Mackenzie (Leeds Beckett): How Libraries are improving their understanding of student and staff needs, and managing expectations
- Chris Harrison (Cambridge University Press): What happens when a publisher tries to publish a new format

Prices frozen from 2016: Members just £160 + VAT. Booking open now

www.nag.org.uk

Seminar Sponsorship opportunities available to NAG Members
Please visit our website for more information

Public Libraries Forum Working with Partners for the Benefit of your Community 21st November 2019, Manchester
A full day of papers and discussion offered at cost price of just £35 (NAG members).

Save the Date: #NAGcd12 and Public Libraries Forum 15th May 2020... Coming to London by popular request!

Other opportunities for promotion or advertising:
Please email the NAG office at nag.office@nag.org.uk for details of other opportunities available – for example, inserts in our seminar delegate packs, or a full- or half-page advert in Taking Stock. In addition, we are always interested in receiving items for the News page on our website.

www.nag.org.uk