Content Access Policy and Technology Committee

One-year Review

Introduction

Approximately eighteen months ago, the Library's Executive Committee (EC) recommended that the Library investigate methods to revise and reinvigorate the Content Access Policy and Technology (CAPT) Committee. The co-chairs of CAPT took on this task, working with the existing CAPT membership, with members of EC and other individuals in the University Library. The recommendations resulted in a slimmed down parent committee that sought to take advantage of the University Library's historic model of decentralization and matrixed management. Building its membership from a core of six working groups that consisted of those individuals most intimately involved in day-to-day operational decision-making associated with (a) Cataloging and Metadata; (b) Digital Production; (c) Electronic Resources; (d) Search, Discovery, and Delivery; (e) Repositories, Preservation, and Access; and (f) Web Content, the committee was reorganized with a revised membership and charge. At the end of one year, CAPT was committed to complete a light-weight, one-year review of the successes and failures of the new model.

CAPT is charged with developing a forward-looking and overarching vision for effective and innovative user access to Library collections and resources. Its activities are concentrated in these distinct areas:

- Articulating Library-wide content access priorities,
- Defining integrated technology-based services and programs that facilitate access to Library collections and resources of all formats,
- Promoting the use of standard software tools, metadata schema, object formats, data exchange protocols, and preservation strategies to ensure that Illinois' information resources are sustainable over the long term,
- Prioritizing, evaluating, and vetting requests for technology design and development projects that facilitate content access and management and which affect multiple units or which require significant support from central units such as IT or CAM, and
- Appointing, coordinating, and overseeing work groups for specific content access related projects.

Method of Review

Following the recommendation of the CAPT membership, the Library's Executive Committee agreed that CAPT's co-chairs would seek input from the working groups' chairs and membership, keep the University Library apprised of progress on the review, and submit a report to the Library's Executive Committee for broader comment and discussion. This report represents the document submitted to the Library's Executive Committee. It consists of a summary of findings and the reports submitted by the leads of the six working groups.

Findings

Drawing from the (four) reports submitted and appended to this document, informal discussions with both CAPT members and members of the six working groups, observations of CAPT's co-chairs, and a

follow-up discussion during the December 2016 CAPT meeting, the co-chairs have outlined the following findings:

Findings – Regarding Working Groups

- By and large, the working group structure has been successful. The consensus opinion is that the formation of the work groups themselves has been very effective – especially for improving communications and empowering decision-making among individuals and units that are engaged in said work. This is especially notable in areas in which there had been no extant working group structure such as the E-Resources Working Group.

- While most of the working groups managed to consistently meet, it appears as though at least one of the working groups has been very inconsistent in meeting. The co-chairs recommend that we meet with the leads from that group, review the expectations for working groups and working group chairs, and discuss what actions can be taken in order to ensure that this be rectified in the coming year given the importance of this area to facilitating the discovery and delivery of library resources, the upcoming ILS migration, etc….

- One of the working groups developed their own group goals and conducted a year-end wrap up themselves. This was largely viewed as being good in terms of helping that group to review progress that had been made over the year, and helped that working group to develop a sense of accomplishment.

- There are conflicting opinions about the size of some of the working groups. Some seem to be a little large, and, in discussions at the December 2016 CAPT meeting, the membership felt as though we might want to revisit membership for some of the working groups in the coming year.

- From the perspective of working group members, there was a feeling that the working groups would benefit if the working group chairs took a more active role in connecting the working groups themselves into the CAPT activities. Specifically, it was circle back after the CAPT meetings to the working groups to ensure that the working group members are apprised of discussions, cognizant of the CAPT minutes, given notes from the working group chair, etc….

Findings – Regarding CAPT Organization and Structure

- The consensus is that CAPT works well as an information exchange channel, as a sounding board or vetting mechanism for decisions and ideas, and as an idea generator. During the December 2016 meeting, CAPT's value was emphasized by several of the attendees, and the new structure was generally commented on as being a vast improvement.

- One report suggested that, even in its trimmed down form, CAPT seemed too unwieldy for strategic planning or making decisions. This input was countered by feedback in other working group reports indicating that the work groups appreciate the autonomy this affords them in being nimble and making their own decisions – in many respects fulfilling what the reorganization sought to do in putting day-to-day decision-making into the hands of those most closely associated with it. This speaks both to the tension that many feel in wanting

both autonomy and direction. For CAPT, this means that the co-chairs and membership should consider further discussions about how to reconcile this.

- One report suggested that CAPT could improve how the regular meetings are organized with less time for reporting and more time for active discussion. As it stands, reports are supposed to be limited to no more than twenty minutes (including all questions), but the reality is often different. One solution might be to require reports prior to the meeting in order to promote more active discussion.

- One report suggested that CAPT should make more time for longer-term planning.

- CAPT's ability to adapt its membership as individuals change within the Library has been a benefit. Given the significant staff turn-over in the last year, CAPT and the working groups were able to adapt their membership fairly fluidly, promoting continuity of work and avoiding fallow periods associated with waiting to appointment replacement members.

- Feedback received in discussions indicated that CAPT's meeting would be improved by requiring Working Groups to submit their written reports to the membership in advance of the meeting. This would serve to promote the face-to-face time as an effective Q&A/discussion session and minimize the time spent on "reporting-out". By and large, this was viewed as a positive recommendation during the December 2016 meeting.

Appraisal and Recommendations of the CAPT Co-Chairs

With just over one year of the new model in place, the CAPT co-chairs believe that the changes have, by and large, been successful. As noted in the findings related to the working groups and the organization and structure of CAPT itself, there is room for improvement. However, the feeling conveyed during the December 2016 CAPT meeting was that the changed model has improved communications, given the working groups latitude to work independently within a matrixed organization while keeping communications open, and resulted in improved communications across the Library.

It is our opinion that CAPT should continue in its current form, tweaking its operational model and that of the working groups as appropriate in order to improve both the communications and the deliberateness with which we engaged both the working groups and the Library at large.

Assessment of CAPT Committee meeting its charge
Michael Norman
Chair, Cataloging and Metadata Work Group
November 30, 2016

From the prospectus of Chair of the Cataloging and Metadata Work Group, I do feel CAPT did meet the defined charge given us by the Executive Committee. Over a year ago, the CAPT charge was created to develop a forward-looking and overarching vision for effective and innovative user access to Library. This is well stated. This is critical for our continued success as a Library. To make all our collections as accessible as possible to the Library's user community is the most important thing we do. It is not an easy thing to accomplish with all the collections the Library hold or create or want to make available to all from digitization projects past and present. We still have many resources that are not easy to discover or utilize, whether it is in tangible, electronic, or digitized formats. In previous iterations of CAPT, we did not have much information about our digitization efforts, digital preservation of these resources, or the Library's web presence in the discussions of the Committee. We talked a lot about search and discovery previously, but not really in context to all the Library's content.

Charging these six new CAPT work groups has brought about the ability to have more of this information in front of us when discussing overall access. That was not really possible in the past. Having the revolving updates every two months keps us up-to-date on what is going on in the Library in each of these individual areas and conveys to the other individuals on CAPT how that might impact work that is occurring in others areas and how to discuss with these other groups what is the optimum working environment to get this work completed. It also gives the opportunity to report back to the individual work groups changes that need happen because of activity occurring in other areas of the Library. Having these affinity appointments to the work groups has increased communication in areas that needed overlapping input when making decisions about access to content, the integrated technologies we use, or even the web pages users travel to use our services.

The updates from the individual work groups have helped me think through decisions I've needed to make regarding access to our digitized resources but also how to make other freely digital content from other libraries and cultural institutions available to our users. The work that the Digital Production and the Repositories, Preservation and Access teams have done over the past year and given me a direction to make these resources available through our existing search and discovery systems. The work that the Electronic Resources Work Group did on enhancing access to purchased e-serial and e-book content in the online catalog and Easy Search helped determine the best way to provide the metadata for these resources. From the Search, Discovery, and Delivery Work Group, we have determined better ways to optimize one-click access to our electronic resources and how to better utilize usage data in our access decisions.

I think we had a successful year and did meet our ultimate goals in the reconstituted CAPT Committee. We made good progress in providing better access to the Library's collections. More of the Library's content is easier to discover for use. There is much more work to do because we still have not made all our content accessible. That is probably were the overarching CAPT Committee needs to put more attention to in our discussions this next year. We have been concentrating on the individual components of the access to the Library's collection and content. It was important we do this. Many of these voices were not there in the past. But, we do need to put a little more attention to look not just at the present access environment we have now but continue putting thought and planning into where we want to be

in 5 year out. I think that will occur in the next year for the individual work groups but the overall CAPT Committee as well.

DIGITAL PRODUCTION WORKING GROUP: 2016 EVALUATION OF EFFECTIVENESS OF WORKING GROUP AND OF CAPT

submitted by Kyle Rimkus, 11/28/2016

Digital Production Working Group: Josh Harris, Tracy Popp, William Schlaack, Jennifer Hain Teper, Jon Gorman, Patricia Lampron, Henry Borchers, Kyle Rimkus (chair)

The Digital Production Working Group has primarily focused on sharing information among its members, and when possible deploying common services for the efficient digitization and metadata description of collections of digitized books, manuscripts, audiovisual media, and computer media. To date, this has involved the integration of the Medusa preservation repository and suite of access services into digital production workflows. It has also involved sharing information on policies that affect all members, such as library-wide reproduction guidelines, and state rules on the use of vendors.

Members of the CAPT Digital Production Working Group have discussed the efficacy of their own group, and of CAPT in general. The group members, which include representatives from Preservation, IT, and CAM, are unanimous in appreciating how the Working Group allows them to share information. Indeed, the group finds its ability to know what other members are working on, and to discuss strategic approaches to common problems, as a primary benefit to membership.

The flow of information from the big CAPT to the Working Group has occurred on an as-needed basis from me, the group chair, to the Working Group, but members are still confused about what goes on in CAPT itself. I have let the group know of the location of CAPT meeting notes on the web and in Library Office Notes, and have told them I will work to better distill and share pertinent updates from the big CAPT in a more effective manner in the coming year.

Members of the Working Group do not see CAPT as having a clear decision-making authority--but we do not see this as an entirely bad thing. I understand it as a committee to which I have brought certain proposals from the Working Group that could have impact on people in other areas (deploying the Kaltura media player comes to mind), in order to gain a high-level committee's buy-in and stamp of approval. From my perspective, CAPT is much too large a group to conduct effective strategic planning and decision-making. Rather, much like the Working Groups, the big CAPT is a useful forum for the exchange of information within somewhat isolated groups of library staff. It provides counsel on proposed decisions, but is not a lean, strategic decision-making body, and contains too many members from too broad a variety of functional areas for such a role to be realistic. This is a statement and not a critique. That is, the Working Group finds that the current CAPT model of giving the Working Groups a certain amount of autonomy vis-a-vis CAPT itself seems to work well.

CAPT Anniversary Assessment

E-Resources – Lynn Wiley

CAPT is charged with developing a forward-looking and overarching vision for effective and innovative user access to Library collections and resources. Its activities are concentrated in these distinct areas:

- Articulating Library-wide content access priorities,
- Defining integrated technology-based services and programs that facilitate access to Library collections and resources of all formats,
- Promoting the use of standard software tools, metadata schema, object formats, data exchange protocols, and preservation strategies to ensure that Illinois' information resources are sustainable over the long term,
- Prioritizing, evaluating, and vetting requests for technology design and development projects that facilitate content access and management and which affect multiple units or which require significant support from central units such as IT or CAM, and
- Appointing, coordinating, and overseeing work groups for specific content access related projects.

In the first full year of its newly reconstituted membership and charge, CAPT is already having good impact from my perspective. The appropriate stakeholders are at the table to provide updates and solicit input on projects or processes as well as foster new partnerships. The routine reporting done by each working group serves to keep all groups on task and CAPT well informed. Chairs are charged to meet on a regular basis and then report back on activities. This is imperative as CAPT serves as one of the few arenas to work across the AULs areas to foster shared information and developing work or to identify new levels of collaboration needed. CAPT can then weigh in on new initiatives and provide support and suggest alliances. The CAPT Working Groups should bring to CAPT clearly articulated projects with examples of their benefits. Other Working Groups at CAPT get to hear of new plans and can ask to be a part or for more information to bring back to their groups. What this means is that more of those staff who are on the front lines of the daily work activities get to hear and be a part of important work. CAPT can help make this consistent with asking that the chairs set regular meetings with their members with agendas and feedback or notes. There may need to be a minimum number per year but CAPT can discuss that. In lieu of that the working groups could do a short annual report. Membership of the groups should be confirmed annually as well. The communications, updates and discussions across all members are always helpful. This stimulates ideas, provides for input from diverse perspectives and keeps all the members on top of new trends.

The Library is a large organization but CAPT allows for more nimbleness in proceeding on work that meets the CAPT charge. This year for example with the reports back from Michael Norman of the progress towards a CARLI new ILS RFP, CAPT took charge of thinking about what happens after CARLI picks a system and provides for a time line to implement. CAPT also provides shared work across the WGs and across units. For example ERWG petitioned to widen membership to include Jamie Carlstone,the CAM serials cataloger hired this past year. She now works within ERWG to enhance access to online serials and has been refreshing all the MARC records for the package titles to import in an online only record labeled by collection name and with links to SFX to provide the user access to the full text. She is tracking each title record set and will be updating them annually. Her work also crosses into the Cataloging and Metadata work as best practice for online only records were reviewed there first. This type of synergy would only happen with a governing body like CAPT. the ERWG report of the many

tested and now implemented options for SFX A-Z search results display prompted interest from other stakeholders as well and will result in a review of those options and priorities for how to utilize those options to best order that display. These are but a few examples of work fostered by CAPT.

I think that it is remarkable how much has already happened in one short year under this new structure. I have gotten many ideas from those reporting out and have thought of opportunities to tag on work happening in other groups. I think we will discover even more potential for the "new" CAPT and am delighted to be a part of it.

Submitted LWiley November 29, 2016

Repository, Access, and Preservation Work Group Report for Calendar Year 2016

Prepared by Bill Ingram (Chair), with Ayla Stein, Chris Prom, Heidi Imker, Helenmary Sheridan, Kyle Rimkus, and Robert Manaster (members)

The Repository, Access, and Preservation Work Group met monthly to discuss sustainable policies, procedures, technical systems, and staffing to collect, manage, preserve, and make digital library content accessible for long term use. What follows is commentary on the effectiveness of the Work Group and the reorganization of CAPT itself.

By far the greatest accomplishment of the revised CAPT has been the formation of the various work groups. Our group is charged with managing and coordinating the staffing and resource needs required to effectively develop and sustain repository services, which constitute a highly-integrated infrastructure platform, digital preservation management suite, research data, digital publishing, and scholarly communication deposit and access environment. Effective management of these services requires strategic thinking, close collaboration between team members, and rigorous project management. In the interest of maintaining a more effective program, the Work Group has aimed to align project resources and address inefficiencies, repetitions of effort, and redundancies. Meeting regularly has strengthened trust, cooperation, and communication among group members. The group has been a source of stability and continuity resulting in successful achievement of organizational goals, despite the unusually-high and potentially-disruptive faculty and staff turnover.

Building on the integrated approach initiated by the Repository Management Team, the Repository, Access, and Preservation Work Group has been successful in fostering collaboration over policies, resources, and technologies in service of the strategic objectives directly related to the services within its purview. But there is some uncertainty among the members as to the effectiveness of the larger CAPT as a strategy for "developing a forward-looking and overarching vision for effective and innovative user access to Library collections and resources," as charged in the revised committee charter. So far, the larger CAPT has had some early success in cultivating an overarching vision, but it could take on a more active role toward rearranging organizational processes to optimize resource usage and managing transformation and change.

Monthly CAPT meetings are dominated by reports from representatives on the activities of their respective work groups, leaving little time for much else. While this information sharing is useful, it is fairly passive; more time could be spent actively developing an ongoing, systematic process for coordinating content access policy and technology. CAPT has the potential to be used effectively to identify and target areas most amenable to improvement that cut across the various work groups and consider the degree to which changes in one area have the potential to improve others. But we believe its potential has not yet been fully tapped.