

**Appendix H. Workflow Analysis report**

## ReCAP Discovery to Delivery Project Description and Analysis of Current Workflows

### I. Introduction

In March 2012, Ruth Fischer and Rick Lugg of Sustainable Collection Services (SCS) were engaged by NYPL to serve as the Workflow Consultant on the ReCAP Discovery and Delivery Project, reporting to the Workflow/Technology Committee. This narrative and the accompanying grid comprise a functional comparison of the ReCAP-related workflows currently in place at New York Public Library (NYPL), Princeton University Libraries (PUL), and Columbia University Libraries (CUL). This includes:

- 'Pre-facility' tasks (Identifying and processing materials for storage)
- 'In-facility' tasks (Accessioning, inventory management, picking & refilling at ReCAP)
- 'Post-facility' tasks (Processing user requests, notifications, receipt & return of requested items)

This first deliverable is intended to be descriptive rather than prescriptive. In our experience, it is important to understand current workflow practice before suggesting changes. This is especially important in this instance, which involves four complex operations that have evolved independently. This report will serve as the foundation for the second SCS deliverable: a series of recommendations for adapting workflows to support a "shared ReCAP collection". Those recommendations will be submitted in September, and will be based on reconciliation of our work with that of the Technology Consultant and the Planning Consultant.

In April 2012, SCS visited the ReCAP facility and each of the three libraries, to observe various aspects of current workflows and to interview key personnel in each location. These visits were preceded by a questionnaire, a request for procedural and policy documents, and multiple individual and conference calls. Overall, SCS interviewed approximately 20 people and gathered hundreds of pages of related documentation. To a person, those we met were fully engaged in our discovery process and generous with their time and feedback. We thank them for their patience and forbearance as we verified details.

In June 2012, SCS compiled a four-column workflow grid, which outlined ReCAP workflows of the three partner libraries, as well as the steps performed at ReCAP itself. This grid was reviewed and corrected by knowledgeable staff and administrators at all four locations. The full comparison accompanies this report as a separate spreadsheet, and serves as the basis of our analysis. Although each accomplishes a version of the same basic tasks, these workflows are complex and subject to a good deal of variability. This shouldn't be surprising, since they were designed by each library independently, in the context of its individual practices and systems. In short, these workflows were not designed with sharing in mind, and we should remember that as we wrestle with the variations and complexity. Although SCS, the libraries and ReCAP have all worked hard to assure accuracy, corrections and/or clarifications are probably needed and are still most welcome.

Our understanding of project goals is as follows:

- To identify those materials currently housed in ReCAP that could be considered ‘shareable’. As noted in Lizanne’s Planning Report, this ‘shareable’ collection is understood to be a subset of what is currently housed there or may be transferred there in future.
- To ensure availability of real-time item status information on shared ReCAP holdings – usable by all three library systems and discovery layers.
- To reduce or eliminate the accessioning of any “new duplicates” into the ReCAP facility. That is, to design workflows such that none of the libraries will send volumes to ReCAP that are already held there.
- To consistently achieve promised delivery times for patrons at all three institutions (no degradation of service) regardless of which library owns the requested material.

With regard to this final point, SCS is compelled to note that administrators at two of the three partner libraries find current service levels to be in need of improvement, especially since increasingly higher-use materials may be housed there. Although it is not explicitly a goal of this project, SCS recommends establishing an expectation for improved delivery times as new workflows are designed.

This report summarizes our current understanding of existing circumstances, and poses number of questions for project managers. Some of these will need to be answered before new workflows can be effectively designed. In addition to the separate workflow grid, our observations are organized into six short sections, as follows:

- II. Notable policy differences (p. 3)
- III. Notable workflow differences (p. 5)
- IV. Theoretical best-case and worst-case user experiences (p. 8)
- V. Potentially ‘shareable’ ReCAP customer codes (p. 10)
- VI. GFA/LAS workflow related functions and features (p. 11)
- VII. Workflow support for a shared ReCAP collection

## II. Notable policy differences

The first two sections of the workflow grid highlight various attributes of the three libraries that have bearing on this project. Again, we've done our best to accurately record details, and key contacts in each library have reviewed this information, but there may still be errors or omissions. We welcome corrections. Following are some observations derived from the grid, organized along the same lines.

### Circulation policies

Perhaps the most significant policy difference among the three libraries relates to circulation. While Columbia and Princeton allow their unrestricted materials to be checked out to users, NYPL policy stipulates that research materials are for in-library use only. (If we understand correctly, the one systematic exception to this rule is for MaRLI patrons. That is, Columbia and NYU patrons with a MaRLI card are allowed to take NYPL books out of the library.) In order to assure consistency in both the user experience and materials handling, some adjustment or policy reconciliation may be necessary.

For example, to maximize speed of delivery to the patron, 'shared' ReCAP materials will be delivered to the location specified in the user's request. If a Columbia patron requests an item from the ReCAP shared collection that is owned by NYPL, it would be delivered to a Columbia location. But whose circulation rules would apply? Would that item be checked out to the user (Columbia's policy) or would it be offered for in-house use only (NYPL's policy)? The reverse question also arises. If a Columbia item is requested by an NYPL researcher, will that researcher be required to use it in a reading room, or will that patron have the privilege of taking it home?

### Delivery benchmarks

Each of the three libraries now has its own delivery benchmark:

- Columbia University Libraries advertise delivery of ReCAP requests "within two business days". The 'business' day is defined according to the last file transfer time (2:45 pm, Monday through Friday). In this model, 48% of requests are filled in one business day and the rest are filled in two business days. This is considered satisfactory.
- The expectation at Princeton is that ReCAP requests are ready for patron pick-up by 5:00 pm on the business day following placement of the request. This is of prime importance to Princeton stakeholders. 90% of requests are currently delivered according to this specification. The remaining 10% take an additional day, which at present is not accounted for. It is of utmost importance to eliminate this 10% and achieve 100% next day delivery.
- At NYPL, all weekday requests made by 2:30 pm arrive the next day. Given the high level of public attention being paid the library renovation and related collection moves, it is very important to administrators that service improvements be realized as part of the next phase of the ReCAP

project. One aspect of improved service will be to ensure 24 hour delivery of *all* requested items. This implies a 7-day week, though that needs to be confirmed.

Since coordination of individual ReCAP workflows has not been necessary to date, it is not surprising that delivery expectations differ and are expressed differently. In future, if some collections and related workflows are to be shared, more consistency will likely be needed.

### **Consortial/Cooperative affiliations**

As depicted on the second page of the workflow grid, each library has its own unique set of borrowing partners. Or, as Lizanne Payne puts it in her Planning Report, “there is no common resource-sharing consortium among ReCAP partners.” SCS understands that the scope of this project does not include the development of any new sharing agreements. We interpret this to mean that when (for example), a Rapid ILL request is received by Columbia, the request will only be forwarded to ReCAP if the “shared ReCAP copy” belongs to Columbia. If this is correct, we should seek to confirm that discoverability of the “shared collection” will be restricted to Columbia, Princeton, and NYPL patrons. Perhaps this is already the expectation.

### **Fair Use**

During the course of our interviews, SCS was informed that the fair use guidelines at ReCAP are not entirely consistent with fair use guidelines followed at the campuses of the partner institutions. The partners will need to agree on guidelines for fair use that will satisfy patrons’ needs as well as the desire of all three institutions’ offices of general counsel.

### **III. Notable workflow differences**

Based on our understanding of current workflows, there are several notable differences among the three libraries, both for accessioning materials to ReCAP and retrieval of items for patrons. The workflow at the ReCAP facility itself does not vary, other than the use of different couriers to move materials. SCS encourages readers to spend some time reviewing the workflow grid that accompanies this report, and from which these highlights are drawn. Notable differences are summarized below. Please note that SCS makes no judgment on these workflows. They were designed to support local needs, not shared processes. While some will affect a common workflow more than others—and may therefore ultimately need to change—they have served well for many years.

#### **Selection for off-site storage/De-duplication**

Item- or title-specific decisions are made by selectors at Columbia and Princeton, aided by system-generated candidate lists. Both libraries attempt to prevent duplicates of circulating copies from their own collections from being sent to ReCAP; these are instead withdrawn. At present, no consideration is given to potential duplication with titles from the other ReCAP libraries.

At NYPL, selection for off-site storage currently operates at massive scale. Decisions involve entire ranges or locations. These are identified and prioritized for relocation by the Collection Strategy Department. Duplicates within the NYPL collections are sent off-site along with other materials. No titles are withdrawn. Until the new ReCAP modules are ready, NYPL materials are being sent to the Tri-States Depository in upstate New York, which is variously referred to as TSD, Clancy, Brewster, or Patterson.

#### **Physical preparation**

Columbia uses “smart” barcodes for many (but not all) ReCAP materials. The ReCAP customer code doubles as the barcode prefix. Each code has a corresponding color strip. Princeton and NYPL use standard barcodes.

Princeton uses Mylar bags for fragile and multipart items, whereas Columbia and NYPL use Tyvek.

At Columbia the call number is transcribed onto the verso of the title page, preceded by the word “Offsite”. At NYPL, special ReCAP call numbers (format 12-xxx) are written inside the book and printed on spine labels. At Princeton, no manual transcription occurs.

Princeton places a pink ReCAP sticker on the spine prior to initial accessioning. Columbia places a pink ReCAP sticker on the spine when the item is retrieved for a patron. NYPL places a yellow ReCAP sticker on the spine when the item is retrieved for a patron. (NYPL/Brewster materials have a pink sticker.)

#### **Pre-accessioning record maintenance for ReCAP accessions**

Princeton changes the Voyager location code to one that corresponds to the ReCAP customer code. This is the mechanism that allows the offsite request form as well as appropriate borrowing rules to display in the catalog. Princeton's materials continue to have an "available" status throughout the transport and accessioning processes.

At NYPL, each item is checked-out to a pseudo patron which changes the status to "unavailable".

At Columbia, the CLIO location code is changed to a transitional location (*like glx4off*) for small-scale recon projects and for processing new acquisitions directly to ReCAP. For large scale projects (like the current 12<sup>th</sup> Tier move) location codes remain unchanged until after accessioning (described below). If we understand correctly, Columbia's materials continue to have an "available" status throughout the transport and ReCAP accessioning processes.

#### **Pick-up schedule for new ReCAP accessions**

Columbia is currently sending batches of 4,500 items 3-5 times per month. Because these deliveries arrive in such large volume, there can be up to a week of lag time before materials are sized at ReCAP.

Princeton is currently sending batches of up to 1,500 items per day.

NYPL is currently sending batches of about 65,000 items per week (to TSD/Brewster).

As materials arrive at ReCAP, they are sized, verified, and put into trays. Accession reports are generated daily and made available to the libraries for retrieval.

#### **Post-accessioning record maintenance in library catalog**

At Columbia, lists of newly accessioned barcodes (generated daily by ReCAP) are retrieved on a weekly basis. In a batch process, the location code in Voyager is updated to one of many offsite locations (off,glx). This causes the "Request Button" to appear in the CLIO (Columbia's catalog) and in Blacklight (its discovery layer).

At NYPL, lists of items accessioned (currently at Brewster) are used to drive a daily batch check-in process in the library's Millennium system. This changes the status back to "available" and updates the location, the OPAC message, and the Item Agency fields. The location reflects both its current offsite location AND the originating library building/collection; the Agency field reflects the ReCAP customer code; and the OPAC message = "ADV REQUEST".

No post-accessioning record maintenance is performed at Princeton. (The Voyager location code was changed to the ReCAP customer code before items were sent.)

#### **Discovery**

Except for system/platform differences, discovery processes are similar in all three libraries.

### **Patron request of ReCAP item**

All three libraries have a locally-developed request form for retrieval of items from ReCAP linked to their discovery tools. (At NYPL the form is only implemented in their WebPac – to be integrated in BiblioCommons within the next 6-8 months.) These forms display automatically when an item is held offsite, triggered by various versions of offsite location codes.

Columbia maintains a separate local indicator of status for items that have been requested from ReCAP but not yet retrieved. Among other purposes, this enables Columbia to prevent display of an item that is currently checked out to another user, or is in some stage of processing. This is understood to be a cumbersome workaround, designed to compensate for the lack of real-time status information from ReCAP's GFA/LAS system. Princeton and NYPL have elected to live with the information gap.

### **Requests transmitted to ReCAP**

All three libraries collect requests into batches that are sent to ReCAP in a specified format 3 times every weekday. Columbia and Princeton transfer requests at 7:15 am, 11:45 am, and 2:45 pm. NYPL transfers ReCAP requests at 8 am, 12 pm, and 2:30 pm. In a separate data flow, NYPL also transfers requests to TSD/Brewster at 1 and 5 pm.

Requests that error out (and cannot be filled) are communicated to patrons more or less manually at all three libraries.

### **'In Process' notifications**

Some additional clarification is needed in this area. For NYPL, it is reported that an in-process delivery notice is generated by ReCAP and delivered to the patron. As far as we can tell, ReCAP is not generating such notices for Princeton or for Columbia patrons—and it seems unlikely that ReCAP would have the patron's email address. Therefore, we think that this in-process notice must actually be generated from Millennium upon NYPL's import of the ReCAP picking report?

Princeton's system shows as 'available' throughout the request, retrieval, and delivery process. Is there mechanism for notifying patrons of their request's status?

Columbia?

So we need to find out more about how, when, and if this step occurs at each institution. We also need to determine how important this may be, given that most requests are filled within 24-48 hours—is an interim status report really needed, other than for unfillable requests?

### **Transport of ReCAP requests**

Columbia's requests are picked up at ReCAP at 4:00 AM (Monday – Friday) and delivered to the central library before opening.



NYPL's requests are picked up at ReCAP at 4:00 AM (Tuesday – Saturday) and delivered to the central library before opening – routed to other research locations by 9:00 AM.

Princeton ReCAP requests are picked up at 12:30 pm (Monday – Friday) and delivered to all campus stops, reaching the central library last (by 2:00 PM).

#### **Patron notification upon delivery**

Princeton and NYPL use the circulation 'hold' feature of their respective Voyager systems to generate an email notification telling the patron that his/her request is available. SCS notes that each library's schedule for generating patron notifications is different, and that the timing of notice generation can significantly impact the patron's experience of delivery time. In addition, the notice generation cycles do not necessarily coincide with the arrival of material at the library from ReCAP.

Columbia uses their in-house system *rus* to generate an email to the patron.

#### **Patron pick-up at library**

All three libraries use their ILS circulation modules to charge ReCAP materials out to patrons. As noted previously, NYPL items are used only in designated research locations, while Columbia's and Princeton's circulate outside the library.

#### **ReCAP items returned to library**

At Columbia and Princeton, items are discharged manually by circulation staff. These items are not re-requestable until they are re-filed at ReCAP.

At NYPL, the status is set to "in transit" at the time of the return, but check-in (discharge) is accomplished in batch the next day prompted by the re-filing report generated by ReCAP. During this batch check-in, the status is set back to "available."

These examples serve to illustrate a few of the differences in timing and procedures among the three libraries. Some differences clearly matter more than others, but overall it seems obvious that some reconciliation and a greater degree of consistency will be needed to support a shared ReCAP collection in a manner that maintains or improves service to users. As mentioned in the introduction, SCS recommendations related to changed/enhanced workflows will be the focus of our September report.

#### **IV. Theoretical best-case and worst-case user experiences**

Given the differences in practice and policy just outlined, it's not surprising that patron experiences may vary. At present, however, patrons remain largely unaware of any variation because each patron works through a single institution. The most critical aspects of good customer service include consistency and predictability. At present, SCS suggests that many patrons would find it difficult to predict with any certainty when their request would be fulfilled, even when working through a single institution.

It may also be helpful to consider how much research is conducted outside of standard business hours, especially now that Web-based request forms are in place at all three libraries. SCS recommends additional investigation into the timing of ReCAP requests at each library: when are requests submitted? It might be quite informative to examine the pattern of requests across the day. From a workflow perspective, user requests are the starting point, and ideally their frequency pattern and volume would shape the supporting processes. This may or may not be fully practicable, but we believe the data should be collected and examined. From the user's point of view, the fulfillment clock starts at the moment an item is requested.

Because transmission of requests, confirmations, and deliveries from ReCAP occur on relatively fixed schedules, the period between request and delivery is the most predictable. Research at Columbia suggests that 48% of ReCAP requests are available to the requestor on the following business day. This implies that just 48% of requests are submitted before 2:45 pm, Monday through Friday. As we see it, information like this about specific user behaviors should be carefully incorporated into the design of new workflows, staffing models, and possibly hours of operation.

Given the fact that Columbia and NYPL share the same transport company and delivery schedule, and despite the operational differences noted above, delivery timeframes are very similar. The best-case scenario for NYPL and for Columbia patrons is to be notified that their material is available approximately 24 hours after the request was submitted. (These would be items requested between 8:00 AM and 2:45 PM on Day One, transmitted to ReCAP by 3:00, picked by end of day, picked up at 4:00 AM Day Two, delivered to the library by 8:00, with patron notification by 12:00 PM.) Again, this occurs about 48% of the time for Columbia patrons. We do not know the best-case percentage for NYPL.

For Princeton, the best-case scenario is somewhat better, due to proximity to the ReCAP facility and Princeton's mid-day pick-up. In an absolute best case, a Princeton patron is notified of availability 10-16 hours after request submission—though that is only if their request submission occurs between 1:00 AM and 7:00 AM. (These are captured in the 7:00 AM transmission and can be ready for the 12:30 PM pick-up.) While this may seem unlikely to some of us, it's conceivable that this may be common at some points in the semester. Here again, we don't know the percentage that fit this scenario, but this could be learned in quantifying activity around the clock. The following chart details the three theoretical best-case scenarios.

Theoretical Best-Case Scenarios	Columbia	Princeton	NYPL
Day and time of request	8 am – 2:45 pm Monday - Friday	1 am -7 am Monday - Friday	9 am – 2:30 pm Monday – Friday
Day and time of delivery to the library	Before 8 am on the following day (Monday – Friday)	At 2:00 pm on the same day (Monday – Friday)	Before 9 am on the following day (Tuesday – Saturday)
Day and time of patron notification	Before noon on the day following the request  <b>22 - 26 hours after the request was submitted</b>	By 5:00 pm on the day requested – 5 pm is when the Voyager ‘hold’ notices are generated  <b>10 – 16 hours after the request was submitted</b>	Before noon on the day following the request  <b>22 – 26 hours after the request was submitted</b>

Worst-case scenarios (exclusive of errors) are actually quite similar across the group, insofar as Friday afternoon requests (those submitted after 2:30 or 2:45) will not be delivered to the library until the following Monday afternoon (Princeton) or Tuesday morning (NYPL and Columbia). The following chart details the three theoretical worst-case scenarios.

Theoretical Worst-Case Scenarios	Columbia	Princeton	NYPL
Day and time of request	2:46 pm (or later) on Friday afternoon	2:46 pm (or later) on Friday afternoon	2:31 pm (or later) on Friday afternoon
Day and time of delivery to the library	Before 8 am on the following Tuesday morning.	At 2 pm on the following Monday.	Before 9 am on the following Tuesday morning.
Day and time of patron notification	<p>Before noon on the following Tuesday</p> <p><b>69 hours after the request was submitted</b></p> <p>Note that during the initial accessioning process, staff expect a 2-4 week gap between physical transfer and requestability in the OPAC.</p>	<p>By 5:00 pm on Monday</p> <p><b>72 hours after the request was submitted</b></p> <p>Note that Mondays with exceptionally large numbers of ReCAP receipts can sometimes roll into Tuesday for patron notification.</p>	<p>Before noon on the following Tuesday</p> <p><b>68 hours after the request was submitted</b></p>

While best and worst cases can help set the parameters for delivery, they do not reflect typical service. But they help make our overall point: the patron experience of timeliness depends on a combination of:

- Time of request
- Request transmission cycles
- ReCAP picking cycles / hours of operation
- Delivery cycles
- Check-in workload at receiving library
- Patron notification cycles

No single entity controls (or can control) the process from beginning to end. To achieve more consistent delivery within specified windows will require coordination across all of these functions.

## V. Potentially 'shareable' ReCAP customer codes

In contemplating workflows for a shared ReCAP collection, we thought it would be useful to gauge the approximate size of that collection—or at least its initial size. The agreed definition, drawn from Lizanne Payne's Planning Report: "materials housed at the ReCAP facility (or transferred there in the future) that meet certain selection criteria and are placed under a retention agreement or joint ownership agreement." While, in the categories made immortal by Donald Rumsfeld, there are several "known unknowns" in this definition, we can look at materials housed in the facility now. As a starting point, SCS identified the existing customer codes that could conceivably be 'shared'—i.e., those that are currently unrestricted. We then tallied the total number of items accessioned by ReCAP into these codes to date. As an estimate of likely transaction activity, we incorporated the number of items retrieved during the last fiscal year (7/1/10 – 6/30/11). The table below gives us a preliminary view of the workload that may be involved in creating and supporting a shared collection.

Note that these numbers do not count titles with unrestricted customer codes that are currently awaiting transfer to ReCAP, the biggest group of which is the NYPL titles now going to TSD/Brewster. Nor does this include a count of the retrievals from Brewster. Note also that while all of these customer codes are listed on the ReCAP website with no request or delivery restrictions, four have no holdings either. As we understand it, those with 0 holdings are simply stop (or delivery) codes.

Customer Code	Customer Name	Total items	Retrieved during the last fiscal year
CJ	Journalism Library (Columbia)	0	0
CU	Columbia Standard (Columbia)	2,576,788	45,196
EV	East Asian Vernacular (Columbia)	336,581	7,919
GC	Government Documents (Columbia)	33,422	264
HS	Health Science Library (Columbia)	48,447	700
JC	JSTOR Standard (Columbia)	0	0
SW	Social Work Library (Columbia)	0	0
PA	Unrestricted (Princeton)	1,807,683	19,479
QK	Mendel Sound & Video (Princeton)	32,093	219
GP	Government Documents (Princeton)	18,183	273 (?)
JP	JSTOR Standard (Princeton)	0	0
NA	NYPL Standard	2,677,484	27,736
	<b>Totals</b>	<b>7,512,498</b>	<b>102,665</b>

A few observations:

These **7,512,498** items represent the full universe of items that could be shared given current definitions and current ReCAP holdings. Additional selection criteria are likely to be applied to identify a subset for sharing.

These **7,512,498** potentially shareable items represent approximately 78% of all items currently stored at ReCAP. During the last few years, between 1% and 2% of items accessioned under these customer codes have been retrieved annually. That translates to approximately 8,500 per month or 425 per week day.

If predictions are accurate about anticipated transfers to ReCAP, the size of the shared collection will increase by some 2 million volumes as soon as the NYPL Brewster materials are transferred in, and growth of the shared collection will likely continue at a pace of more than 500,000 volumes per year. That suggests an eventual shared collection of 9-10 million items, and an annual retrieval volume of 180,000-200,000 (using a 2% rate).

These are raw numbers, of course, and do not reflect the “certain selection criteria” that will be set. They may not fully reflect future retrieval levels either, which seem likely to increase (especially for NYPL), as a greater proportion of the print collections are stored at ReCAP. But this does give us an idea of potential overall size and activity, and suggests the scale of operation that may be needed to support the shared collection.

## VI. GFA/LAS workflow support

As the core system at the ReCAP facility, Generation Fifth's Library and Archive System (LAS) affects every aspect of those workflows. When we begin to consider possible adjustments to workflows in support of a shared ReCAP collection, it will be important to understand LAS functionality, limitations, and potential for modification. While interoperability with the respective discovery layers and library management systems is covered in the Technology Consultant's report, SCS's observations relate to the relationship between LAS and work processes. The following factors seem most likely to influence workflow redesign, and we will continue to explore the related possibilities and limitations as we prepare recommendations for our September report.

### Customer codes

- The customer code, more than anything else, serves to communicate ownership of the volume.
- Customer codes also serve as the primary payment construct.
- Customer codes are directly associated with delivery locations.
- In the case of ReCAP, customer codes are also associated with specific circulation rules/parameters. These associations are apparently not typical in other LAS implementations, and, as we understand it, were established against the recommendation of GFA.
- Trays and shelves are always associated with a single customer code.
- There is no way to change a customer code in LAS. New permissions to support batch changes could potentially be developed but at present, items must be withdrawn and re-accessioned under a different code.
- Changing customer codes in batch is something that can be done only by GFA staff and even then, only if all items bearing that customer code are changed. That is, items within customer codes cannot be changed selectively.

**It may be possible to accession entire trays into ReCAP.** This is potentially good news for the NYPL materials currently stored at TSD/Brewster. Rather than accessioning individual items, GFA reports that transfer to ReCAP could be handled by tray (with some modification to LAS). This strategy could reduce the transfer costs significantly, and GFA has enabled this approach in other facilities. This will work only if the tray numbers assigned in TSD/Brewster do not overlap with those in use at ReCAP. NYPL is aware of this feature and has chosen customer codes (and tray numbers?) accordingly. See additional notes on this topic in the workflow grid.

**It is practically impossible to fill 'holes' in ReCAP trays.** While a standard LAS 'location analysis report' provides information on partially filled shelves, it cannot be used to identify partially-filled trays. This is primarily because there are no depth measurements taken on accessioned items. So when an item is removed from a tray, there is no systematic way to estimate how much space was freed. This makes it impossible for the system to assign another item to that tray. This makes de-duplication of items already in ReCAP unattractive and probably not cost-effective, since there is no good way to fill the spaces created by de-duplication. One possible exception: contiguous journal runs. Also, LAS provides reports can identify space created by 'permanent withdrawals' – the utility of this should be explored further.

**ReCAP picklists can be customer-code specific or not.** It will be critical to understand the operational effects of changes to customer codes. Whether the ReCAP shared collection is eventually based on a single shared customer code or an amalgamation of the current unrestricted customer codes, the ultimate decision will affect how picklists are generated and organized. It is useful to know that LAS has some flexibility in this regard. Especially if retrieval volume increases, it is essential that picking and re-filing are not negatively impacted by any changes in the customer codes.



## VII. Workflow support for a Shared ReCAP Collection: Topics for final report

While this report only hints at potential changes or improvements, SCS has ideas on several topics, which will be fully developed in our September report. Some of our ideas are summarized here:

**No new duplicates at ReCAP:** Given the difficulty of removing duplicates once they are in the ReCAP facility, a goal of preventing new duplicates being accessioned seems wise. But this raises some difficult questions. How to define a duplicate? Is a duplicate to be defined only within the ‘shared ReCAP collection’? Are ‘non-shareable’ collections exempt? What will this require in terms of workflow adjustments? Will the NYPL Deaccessioning policy be reconsidered as part of this project—i.e., if NYPL chooses not to de-accession anything, how does that affect this policy?

**How to manage ReCAP customer codes:** Conversations about defining and servicing the ReCAP shared collection have already begun. One approach might be to merge all ‘shareable’ customer codes into a single new ReCAP shared collection code, supporting all relevant delivery locations. This strategy raises questions about cost accounting and customer code maintenance. Another strategy might be to retain existing codes but to assign new attributes (delivery locations, etc.) to those that are intended for sharing. Customer code maintenance would still be required, but de-accessioning and re-accessioning would not be necessary. These and other strategies will be explored.

**Higher-use items in ReCAP:** Over time, increasingly higher use items have been sent to ReCAP. These include newly acquired monographs, for which it is difficult to predict use. At Columbia, request rates measured by LC class indicate that recent requests in Science and Technology far outstrip other classes. Is there benefit in exploring this further? For NYPL, higher request rates are expected as a greater portion of the collections reside offsite. What are the workflow implications of higher levels of recall activity over the next 5 –10 years? In some respects, higher transaction volume may reduce the cost-per-volume, as fixed costs such as transportation are amortized over more items. It may be useful to model scenarios at transaction volumes of 1%-5%.

**Improved delivery to patrons:** Although the workflow charge for this project is to consistently reach promised service levels, NYPL’s situation suggests that consistent 24-hour delivery may warrant exploration. Further, it may be worth considering expansion to six or even seven-days-a-week service, to help patrons accept the idea that the majority of collections are stored offsite. Cost considerations may prevent the most expansive version of this, but at minimum we will examine the interaction of request, picking, delivery, and notification cycles. And, if available, it would be useful to view the distribution of patron requests across the day/week.

**Newly acquired items going directly to ReCAP:** At present, newly acquired materials cannot be accessioned directly at ReCAP, but must first be “received” into the ILS by the owning library. Should libraries consider “receiving” materials via electronic invoice ---and allowing the books to be shipped

directly to ReCAP? What are the possible risks and/or rewards? To what degree are these likely to be part of the shared ReCAP collection?

## ReCAP: Current Workflows (July 2012)

Collections	Columbia	Princeton	NYPL
Items at ReCAP	3.7 million	2.1 million	3.5 million
Potentially 'shareable' customer codes	CJ, CU, EV, GC, HS, JC, SW (50 customer codes in all)	PA, QK, GP, JP (30 customer codes in all)	NA (30 customer codes at present)
Anticipated transfers to ReCAP	175,000/year. Columbia is actually holding off sending some stuff (like large business serials), assuming that they will duplicate the NYPL collections destined for ReCAP. These materials are currently staged in the Lehman Social Sciences Library. Materials are also staged in the Butler basement as part of the routine ReCAP workflows.	200,000/year through 2020, of which, ca. 140,000 eclectically selected from campus collections and ca. 60,000 from local remote books storage, the Forrestral Annex. Forrestral Annex contains ca. 500,000 volumes, all of which are targeted for transfer to ReCAP, but as a secondary priority to campus collection space management needs.	2.3 million asap - many of these are being transported to the Tri-State Depository (also referred to as TSD, Brewster Facility, and/or Patterson facility) until the new ReCAP modules are completed.
Volumes in various campus locations	4 million	5 million	The goal is to keep 1.5 million books onsite in BPSE. Special Collections will stay onsite.
Circulating versus non-circulating	Columbia	Princeton	NYPL
How to reconcile these differences with regard to a "shared" collection?	For the vast majority of resources, users are allowed to check them out. Columbia offers a Faculty Document Delivery Service that allows faculty affiliated with the Morningside Heights Campus, Barnard College, and Union Theological Seminary to request Butler resources to be delivered electronically.	Users are allowed to check out the vast majority of resources.	In general, research collection materials do not circulate; are used in its reading rooms only. One current exception relates to MaRLI patrons. Perhaps this exception would be extended to Princeton patrons?
Delivery benchmarks	Columbia	Princeton	NYPL
What are the requirements/expectations for the request to delivery time frame?	CUL advertises delivery "within two business days". ReCAP's 'business' day is defined according to the file transfer times. Business day is 6 am - 2:45 pm, Monday through Friday. In this model, 48% of requests are filled in one business day and the rest are filled in two business days. This is considered satisfactory.	The clear and firm expectation is that requests are ready for patron pick-up by 5:00 pm on the business day following placement of the request. This is of prime importance to Princeton stakeholders. 90% of requests are currently delivered according to this specification. The remaining 10% take an additional day, which at present is not accounted for. It is of utmost importance to eliminate this 10% and achieve 100% next day delivery.	All weekday requests made by 2:30 pm will arrive the next day. Given the very high level of public attention being paid the library renovation, it is very important to administrators that service improvements be realized as part of the next phase of the ReCAP project. One aspect of improved service will be to ensure 24 hour delivery of ALL requested items.

## ReCAP: Current Workflows (July 2012)

Installed systems	Columbia	Princeton	NYPL
Integrated Library System	<b>Voyager</b> (called CLIO) with potential to move to Alma in coordination with Cornell. The Columbia Law Library uses <b>Millennium</b> .	<b>Voyager</b> - tentative plans to migrate to Alma but not until the new software is seen to be ready for general release (2013?). The library has not yet contracted to purchase Alma.	<b>Millennium</b> - possible interest in moving to Sierra at some point in future.
Discovery Tools (Note that all three discovery environment are based on SOLR.)	<b>WebVoyage</b> ; <b>CLIO Blacklight</b> ; and ( <b>Summon</b> for e-resources but not for ReCAP resources)	<b>WebVoyage</b> - online catalog; <b>Primo</b> - for Voyager content; and ( <b>Summon</b> - for e-journal articles but not for ReCAP resources).	<b>WebPAC PRO</b> and <b>Bibliocommons</b>
E-Document Delivery	<b>RapidILL</b> for article sharing (although ReCAP items are not eligible for RapidILL). The Avery Architectural Library is planning to use <b>ILLiad</b> for EDD.	<b>RapidILL</b> for article sharing. <b>ILLiad</b> for other EDD (called "Article Express").	<b>Ariel</b> for ReCAP materials; <b>email attachment</b> for TSD.
Interlibrary Loan	<b>ILLiad</b> ; and <b>Relais</b> for Borrow Direct.	<b>ILLiad</b> ; and <b>Relais</b> for Borrow Direct	<b>ILLiad</b>
Link Resolver	<b>360 Link</b>	<b>SFX</b>	<b>360 Link</b>
Authentication	Columbia University maintains a central authentication service(PAM) which the libraries use in conjunction with EZ Proxy.	Voyager login credentials (barcode number and pin); IP range; VPN access; or proxy service.	Millennium and/or Bibliocommons login credentials: Barcode and PIN. No Shibboleth.
Consortial/cooperative affiliations	Columbia	Princeton	NYPL
Borrow Direct (Brown, Columbia, Cornell, Dartmouth, Univ of Penn, Princeton, and Yale)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
Rapid ILL	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
MaRLI (Manhattan Research Library Initiative) NYU is the third partner.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> This gives selected faculty and grad students access to NYPL research collections.		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
IDS (Information Delivery Service in NY State)			<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
2CUL (Columbia and Cornell)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		
Google Book mass digitization program	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Hathi Trust	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

## ReCAP: Current Workflows (July 2012)

Workflow task	Columbia	Princeton	NYPL
Library identifies ReCAP materials ( <u>note de-duplication policies</u> )	Columbia uses system generated lists - based on pub year and circulation history (like: published prior to 2003 and no circ since 2003). Selectors review and "rescue" items they think should remain on campus. Projects are underway in Music, Business and Butler - where the 12th Tier is being cleared. <u>No circulating duplicates are intentionally sent to ReCAP. They are withdrawn instead.</u> For many librarians, a scanned ToC increases the acceptability of sending materials to ReCAP. Pre 1830 materials are always assigned to the Rare Books and Manuscripts customer code (RS) or similar restricted codes for other special collections.	A Voyager report of holdings (by title, arranged by call number) is output by Tech Services for review by selectors. The lists always concentrate on a particular subject area and limited by predetermined criteria - set in consultation with that subject's primary selector. Typical criteria might be " <u>acquired more than [10] years ago and titles which have not circulated since [2000].</u> " These criteria are influenced by the target number of volumes required for relocation - and for serials, whether or not an online surrogate is available for all or part of a title's volumes. Once the report is run, selectors interact with the list via a locally developed (Access based) review tool. Selectors choose "ReCAP", "Withdraw" or "Keep" - with ReCAP being the default decision. <u>Princeton's policy is that no circulating internal duplicates are sent to ReCAP.</u>	There are some item specific decisions - but more typically, whole ranges/sections of the collection are consigned to offsite storage. Example: New non-English titles. <u>Internal duplicates DO get sent to ReCAP (Brewster). The Library's Deaccessioning Procedures are quite complex but for practical purposes, nothing can be withdrawn unless it can be agreed that it has no useful life and no artifactual value.</u> Note that the customer code QJ is currently being used for selected second and third copies of SIBL journals (materials that NYPL would like to de-duplicate eventually.)
ReCAP decisions communicated to stacks or project managers	Smart bar-codes are generated for material consigned to ReCAP. The ReCAP customer code is the barcode prefix and a color strip also correlates with the customer code. The biggest customer code problem at present is CR insofar as it comprises too many different kinds of restrictions.	Picklists are generated from the Access file - one for transfers and one for withdrawals. Note that branch libraries work without benefit of this system - but manually apply whatever criteria they determine to be appropriate.	A decision must be made about which customer code will be assigned to each part of the collection - Collection Strategy makes these decisions. Some legacy decisions are in place for ongoing transfer to ReCAP of some classes.
ReCAP materials picked and verified	Some materials have an existing Item record with a local barcode. If an Item record doesn't exist during smart barcoding, one is automatically created. If extent the smart barcode is automatically activated. Processing sets and serials requires dumb barcodes assigned volume by volume. Item records are created anew and old ones deleted as appropriate.	Items are loaded onto books carts for shipment to ReCAP on a daily basis. These materials continue to have an "available" status throughout the transport and accessioning process.	A bar code for each item is scanned and an item/bib record match is confirmed. Note that only about 50% of NYPL holdings have barcodes. There are additional steps for items without. NYPL has only been barcoding for about 10 years.
Record maintenance	Staff verifies a bibliographic match and completes the record structure (holdings and items) as necessary. For small scale recon projects, the CLIO location is changed to a transitional location (like <i>glx4off</i> ).	ReCAP processing of older holdings usually requires item level catalog maintenance and barcoding. Princeton has a Voyager location code for each ReCAP customer code - which allows them to display accurate borrowing rules in the catalog.	Each item is checked out to a pseudo patron.

## ReCAP: Current Workflows (July 2012)

Workflow task	Columbia	Princeton	NYPL
ReCAP materials marked and prepared for ReCAP	An offsite (smart) barcode is applied to the top left corner of front cover. These barcodes have the appropriate ReCAP customer code as the prefix. For new acquisitions, the verso of the title page is marked with "Offsite" above the call number. Tyvek envelopes are used to house fragile material. These envelopes are printed with the crown logo and "Columbia University Libraries Off-Site". They close with button and string fasteners. Acid free cardboard is added for flimsy objects. Cotton tape/string is used to secure damaged volumes with separate hinges or badly damaged bindings. Fragile books are staged and prepped separately. Smart barcodes are replaced with dumb barcodes for these materials. Transportation usually occurs shortly after preparation. If delays are expected, prepared books may be staged for retrieval by staff in response to patron requests.	The items's local barcode is already positioned on the top left corner of the front cover, which matches the ReCAP requirement. A pink ReCAP sticker is placed on the spine. Mylar bags are used to house fragile and multipart items - through which the items can be seen and the barcodes can be read. This obviates the need for barcoding the housing separately from the object itself. Princeton no longer writes the call number in the book.	For items with existing barcodes, a duplicate barcode is created and applied to the top left corner of the front cover. For those without, a new one is applied there and scanned into the item record. ReCAP call numbers (that look like this: 12-xxxx) are written inside the book and printed on spine labels. Pamphlets (<50 pages) are put into acid free envelopes. Fragile materials are housed in Tyvek envelopes, tied with acid free boards and archival tying tape; or housed in custom enclosures. Eight different sizes of custom Tyvek envelopes are imprinted with the NYPL logo.
Materials transported to ReCAP	Materials bound for ReCAP are transported by Clancy-Cullen. Books are loaded onto wooden transfer carts - each one labeled with a blue tag indicating the ReCAP customer code and the delivery date. Truck loads are sent to ReCAP 3-5 times per month. (Approximately 4,500 items per truck load.) New acquisitions processed for ReCAP are sent daily via the Bohrens courier.	Princeton's ReCAP quota is 12 carts per day (carts hold approximately 125 volumes). Carts are labeled with the appropriate ReCAP customer code and delivery date. These are transported to ReCAP by Princeton Shipping once a day at around 2 pm. Shipping makes a daily run around the library system picking up new accessions from the branches - some of whom only send a load once or twice a week as they do not always process enough items to fill a cart each day. No ReCAP requests are picked up on this run.	At present, most of NYPL's processed materials are going to the Brewster facility - to be transferred at a later date to ReCAP. As many as possible are accessioned under the customer code XA. Approximately 65,000 items per week are transported (by Clancy-Cullen.) NYPL has replicated ReCAP customer codes except when NYPL/ReCAP customer codes are already assigned in the Brewster GFA system - notably: NA. Additional customer codes have been needed for billing purposes (QA, QJ for SIBL). QAs will likely need to be re-trayed and accessioned into NA when relocated to ReCAP. When XAs are transferred to ReCAP, whole trays should be able to be accessioned at ReCAP (GFA has precedent for this). XA is not currently assigned at ReCAP and should be reserved for eventual NYPL use.
Rejects returned to the libraries approximately once a week. These may be too badly damaged, missing barcodes, dirty, moldy, etc.	There is no pre-set schedule for rejects - are simply sent whenever they are encountered by ReCAP. Approximately 400 during 2012.	Approximately 250 in 2012.	"Barcode not in ILS" items are requested daily from TSD for correction. TSD sends missing or duplicate barcodes or other rejects weekly. Approximately 100 problems surface each week.
Materials sized by ReCAP - and located in trays.	Because these deliveries arrive in large volume (by the truckload) there can be up to a week of lag time before materials are sized.	Princeton materials are sized daily with no lag time.	Again, this is now happening for the most part at Brewster. At present there is no backlog. Brewster provides same/next day accessioning for 12,000 - 13,000 items daily.

## ReCAP: Current Workflows (July 2012)

Workflow task	Columbia	Princeton	NYPL
Materials are accessioned by ReCAP. This involves scanning the barcode for each (previously sized) tray and for each item in the tray. The system assigns an aisle and shelf location. A work order number is assigned to each batch and item counts are recorded on work order slips. This is currently happening at a rate of 3,000 items per day. At peak load, the facility was accessioning approximately 8,000 items per day (with double the current staff). The full capacity of this function depends on the projected accessions - ReCAP hires accordingly.	Columbia staff expect a 2-4 week timeline between physical transfer and requestability by patrons in the OPAC.		Accessioning by tray could significantly increase ReCAP's ability to ingest NYPL materials currently in the Brewster facility (see note above).
Accessions are "verified" - which basically means that the accession step is repeated and the work order is 'closed' before shelving.			
Reports of newly accessioned items (barcodes) are delivered via ftp to libraries daily.	Newly accessioned barcodes are retrieved weekly (on Fridays).	Nothing is currently done with these lists at Princeton.	Daily list of barcodes received from Brewster.
Record maintenance	As a batch process, the location code for accessioned items is flipped to an offsite location ( <i>off,glx</i> ). The second part of the code is the owning library. This causes the Request Button to appear in the OPAC and in Blacklight. Selected categories of the Accession report ("to be discharged"; "temp location"; etc.) are emailed to staff for adjustment. MRP staff resolve problems and complete CLIO updates.	Princeton has not implemented any routines to check the ReCAP accessions lists against Voyager.	The list of items accessioned at Brewster is used to drive a daily batch "check-in" process - which changes the status back to "available" and updates the Location, the OPAC message, and the Item Agency fields. The Location reflects offsite + originating library building/collection; Agency reflects customer code; and OPAC Message = "ADV REQUEST".

## ReCAP: Current Workflows (July 2012)

Workflow task	Columbia	Princeton	NYPL
ReCAP materials discovered	ReCAP materials can be discovered in the OPAC or in Blacklight.	ReCAP materials can be discovered in either WebVoyage or Primo.	At present, there are two different discovery environments - Bibliocommons is the default (and most heavily used) view, but the classic catalog interface (WebPac PRO) is also available. As of May 2012, ReCAP materials are displayed in the WebPac as "requestable". Note that the ReCAP customer code does not reside in Millennium, so it is not currently possible to inform the patron correctly about non-standard access options. If we understand correctly, the ILS office is doing an audit that will update all items with an Agency code reflecting the Customer Code under which the barcode was accessioned. This process will also update the location code to reflect any delivery restrictions, allowing the patron request form to display the allowed pickup locations.
ReCAP materials requested	An online request form for ReCAP materials has been integrated in both Blacklight and the OPAC. Columbia maintains a local indicator of status for items that have been requested from ReCAP, but have not yet been retrieved. This is understood to be a cumbersome work-around, because there is currently no way to systematically retrieve LAS statuses in real-time.	Princeton has integrated an online form in both environments. (The underlying script for the form was developed at Columbia.) This form is displayed to patrons for materials coded with ReCAP locations. The form collects patron and item information and lists the valid pick-up locations. The form does not make direct updates to the Voyager item status or patron record.	An online request form has been implemented in the WebPac environment. This is an unmediated service (referred to as 'patron-initiated') that will be extended to Bibliocommons within the next 6-8 months. At present, however, hand written request forms are still in use for the majority of requests. These are sent downstairs by conveyor and hand carried to room 50 where they are keyed into the online request form by SASB supervisors. Also note that the ReCAP request process is just one of several retrieval workflows including onsite materials, offsite materials, call-ahead service, patron-initiated requests, and staff-only requests.
Requests are transmitted to ReCAP in comma delimited files, with quotes surrounding each data element. Required data elements include: a request code, the item barcode, the pick-up location, the default pick-up location, and the type of delivery.) Many other data elements are optional.	Requests are aggregated into a text file (in a format specified by ReCAP) that is transmitted to ReCAP 3 times each day, at 7:15 am, 11:45 am, and 2:45 pm. The data sent relates to the item (or article) being requested as well as the person placing the request.	The PUL System empties the 'request basket' and transmits contents to the ReCAP server 3 times per day, at 7:15 am, 11:45 am, and 2:45 pm. Note that the request process does not automatically update Voyager. We assume that the requests transmitted to ReCAP must include patron ID - since there is enough information printed on the ReCAP slip to place the item on hold. (See below.)	A file of requests are sent to ReCAP 3 times per day, at 8 am, 12 pm and 2:30 pm. (TSD requests are transmitted at 1 and 5 pm.) Requests are "rejected" if the item is already checked out (just a handful a day), but the patron is "blind" to the rejection (The fact of a reject is communicated to the patron on the next day - see below.) There are typically a couple hundred request per day.



## ReCAP: Current Workflows (July 2012)

Workflow task	Columbia	Princeton	NYPL
<p>ReCAP uploads requests. The GFA system is updated - requested items are set to 'RET' for retrieval. Rejected items (errors) are removed from the list and are reported to each library at the end of the day along with other status updates. This request activity report includes successful requests, rejects, and EDD links. This report is sent daily to the owning institution and includes any request of its items, including those made by other institutions or through ILL.</p>	<p>Error reports are processed to notify the requesting patron that a request is not being filled. Other statuses are not acted upon. Columbia weeds the local tracking files daily based on current GFA item status. Columbia staff note that very few requests fail. Usually failures are for EDD and relate to poor physical condition or bad citation.</p>	<p>Error reports are reviewed by library staff. Problem categories include: requested items that are not actually available to the specific patron; requested pick up location is invalid (for items from restricted locations (eg. Rare Books) that must be delivered to those original locations); item number does not exist at ReCAP; or the item has already been requested or loaned. Princeton receives 5-6 errors each day - and nearly all can eventually be found in-house.</p>	<p>When NYPL receives the daily request activity reports from ReCAP and TSD, the following automated message is sent to the patron's email address: <i>"You must contact your library delivery location to confirm delivery and to set up an appointment to view your requested material/s. Failure to schedule an appointment before your arrival may result in your material being unavailable due to delivery processing and librarian availability."</i> (Is this still true?) If a request is "rejected" by ReCAP or by Brewster, and an email address exists for the patron, a rejection notice is sent.</p>
<p>Requests are picked at a rate of 65/hour/staff and are processed 3 times per day - at 7:30 am, 12:00 pm, and 3:00 pm. Each period will have a different number of staff pulling requested items, depending on the volume of requests. <u>All requested materials are retrieved during the next period.</u> Retrieved books are sorted for either courier service or electronic document delivery.</p>			
<p>Items are sorted and scanned into barcoded totes for shipment. A manifest is printed and included for all the items in the tote. All manifests (for all three libraries) include the same data. Totes are tracked in the system to help ReCAP know which totes are at each library.</p>	<p>CUL Shipping keeps a local file of the barcodes and destinations of all incoming totes. (Every ReCAP tote has it's own barcode assigned, using a symbology completely different from the shared collections). Plastic totes, metal carts, wooden carts, "suitcases" and bubble wrap are used for various types and sizes of collection.</p>		<p>An 'En Route" delivery notice is generated by ReCAP and delivered to the patron. Currently, this automated email reads "In Process" which may be confusing to patrons. Perhaps the language should be changed to "En Route."</p>

## ReCAP: Current Workflows (July 2012)

Workflow task	Columbia	Princeton	NYPL
ReCAP requests are transported to libraries by courier either once or twice a day.	Bohrens Moving and Storage provides a 4 am transport service Monday through Friday. Tuesday is the highest-volume delivery day - as all the Friday afternoon and weekend requests are delivered on Tuesday. ReCAP requests are delivered to CUL before opening, except for university holidays and weather emergencies. (ReCAP returns are picked-up and delivered back to ReCAP during this same transport cycle.)	Princeton Shipping picks up requests from ReCAP once every week day at 12:30 pm. These are delivered around the branch circuit, theoretically delivering all requests by 2:00 pm, ending with Firestone.	Bohrens Moving and Storage provides a 4 am ReCAP transport service Monday through Friday and Clancy-Cullen performs the Saturday morning transport. ReCAP requests are dropped off at the library Tuesday through Saturday and delivered to four research locations by 9 am. Note that the Saturday morning delivery of Friday's ReCAP requests means that there is nothing to deliver on Monday morning. (ReCAP returns are picked-up and delivered back to ReCAP during this same transport cycle.) Clancy-Cullen performs this service for materials at the Brewster facility.
Requested items are received by libraries	There are various circulation desks throughout the Columbia library system. Many of them process ReCAP materials. After verifying contents of the tote with the printed manifest, a pink 'ReCAP' sticker is applied to the spine.	When totes are received from ReCAP, circulation desk staff manually place the items on hold for the patron - based on information on the printed ReCAP slip. Is there a way for the ILS "hold" to be placed automatically?	Deliveries for GRD/Main Reading Room go to Room 50 for processing. Totes delivered to other stops are processed by those departments. Items arrive in plastic totes with a packing slip in each, which includes item barcode, patron name, and item call number. Items that arrive from TSD will arrive with pink TSD label, to distinguish them from ReCAP materials that (for the most part) have no label. A yellow ReCAP label is then applied to ReCAP items. Items are matched against the packing slip; staff check in each item; the status of each item is manually updated to 'on holdshelf'; and a date-stamped slip - with the patron's last name - is inserted in each item. Placing the item on 'hold' changes the status to 'not available'. These items are then shelved on the Hold Shelf alphabetically by patron name. The Hold Shelf is in the RMRR Enclosure (service desk).
Patron notification	An email notification is sent to the patron (using <b>rus*</b> ), and a patron/date slip is inserted in the piece. The email notification explains that the item will be held for two weeks. These items are then charged to the ReCAP Hold Shelf status patron. Items are shelved alphabetically by patron name. The hold shelf is weeded daily - for items that have been there for two weeks.	Once the item is placed on hold for the patron, an automatically generated "item available" notice is sent to the patron. Notices are generated twice daily - once in the morning and once at 4:30 or 5:00 pm. Again, the goal is that all email notices have a time-stamp no later than 5:00 pm on the first business day after the request was placed.	If there is an email address on file for the requesting patron, a detailed email notification is sent that looks like this: <i>"The item(s) you've requested is available and has been reserved for your use on [date]. This item will be held for you at the Delivery Desk in the Rose Main Reading Room (Room 315) of the Stephen A. Schwarzman Building on 5th Ave. &amp; 42nd Street until [date]. Please bring this confirmation at the time of pick-up."</i> (At present, these are created manually.) If there is a phone number and no email, a phone call is placed with a similar message.

## ReCAP: Current Workflows (July 2012)

Workflow task	Columbia	Princeton	NYPL
Patron pick-up	Any patron with a UNI can place a physical delivery request. Patrons with borrowing privileges may charge circulating ReCAP collections. Staff charge within a happening location in Voyager, typically Butler Circulation.	ReCAP items are charged via normal circulation processes.	Items are checked out to the patron's library card. With the exception of MaRLI items borrowed by MaRLI patrons, these materials are for in-house use. Items must be returned and checked in by the end of the business day, using Millennium check-in. If materials are needed for another day, the status is changed back to "on holdshelf" and reshelfed on the Research Reserve Shelf in the RMRR Enclosure. (Other divisions and buildings may not use the same procedure.)
Patron returns the ReCAP item to the library	Items are discharged ONLY at the Butler Circulation Desk or the owning library for restricted locations (Avery, some Music locations, etc.). Staff verify that there is a pink RecAP sticker on every return. Any holds/recalls are immediately routed to the destination circ desk. Notifications are typically sent to patrons on the day following the original discharge. Books are packed with green foam to prevent shifting, and tote lids are secured with a cable tie. The blue destination card is flipped to display 'ReCAP'.	Patrons return ReCAP items to the Circulation Desk - which are recognized by their pink ReCAP labels. Items are then discharged. The 'discharge' must occur under a ReCAP login. Items are not requestable again until they are "refiled" at ReCAP.	ReCAP and Brewster returns are distinguishable via their yellow and pink labels. The item status is set to 'in transit' at the time of the return but the check-in is accomplished in batch the next day - prompted by the re-filing report from ReCAP/Brewster.
ReCAP items are returned to ReCAP in gray ReCAP totes.	Returns are picked up daily from the Shipping Room by Bohren's Moving and Storage - Monday through Friday at around 4 am.	Princeton Shipping picks up ReCAP returns once every week day at approximately 10:30 am. No pick-up of ReCAP requests is made on this run.	Staff in RM 50 pack ReCAP and Brewster returns in their respective totes. Totes await pick-up around 4 am the next morning on the loading dock.
ReCAP items are re-filed into ReCAP modules- to their exact tray and shelf location. Confirmation of re-filing is sent to libraries nightly. Re-filing can be accomplished at a rate of 50/hour/staff member.	LITO staff run a weekly reconcillation to clear the item status of returned ReCAP items. All "charged" and "in transit" statuses are corrected in CLIO once ReCAP confirms that the items have been re-filed.	Nothing is done with the report of re-filing confirmation generated at ReCAP from GFA (LAS).	NYPL receives daily via FTP, a list of all barcodes re-filed the previous day at ReCAP (and Brewster). ILS staff creates list(s) of re-filed barcodes and performs a batch check-in during which the item status is flipped back to "available".
A significant number of volumes may be backlogged in the re-file queue. However, appropriate status updates have been sent to libraries and recent modifications to the GFA software have been made to support retrieval from the queue. Books might remain in this backlog up to a week, but again, their status has been set to 'IN' and they are available for re-request on the day following their arrival. Every week, there are a few retrieval requests for these items.	Not everyone knows about the LAS system upgrade.	Not everyone knows about the LAS system upgrade.	There is no apparent re-file backlog at TSD.

## ReCAP: Current Workflows (July 2012)

Workflow task	Columbia	Princeton	NYPL
<b>Newly acquired materials to ReCAP</b>	<b>Columbia</b>	<b>Princeton</b>	<b>NYPL</b>
Profile established	Selected by bibliographers. Approximately 30,000 new acquisitions per year are sent directly to ReCAP. Can we eliminate the (local) campus barcode when items are sent directly to ReCAP?	Approximately 15,000 items per year based on title-by-title selector decisions. The ReCAP location is established/assigned at point of order or during post-receipt approval review.	"Shelf-ready" foreign language monographs go offsite after being received and 'processed' at the Library Services Center in Queens. Any chance that these could go directly to ReCAP in future? (50 -100,000 items per year.

## ReCAP: Current Workflows (July 2012)

Workflow task	Columbia	Princeton	NYPL
<b>ILL</b>			
In 2007, ReCAP started receiving ILL requests. Each library forwards ILL requests to ReCAP where staff act as members of each library's ILL department - with access to their ILLiad queue for ReCAP material. ReCAP staff identify and retrieve materials and send them to the requesting library. Approximately 11% of all ReCAP usage is for ILL.	ILL, in contrast to ReCAP workflows, is a centralized service at Columbia. "Users don't know and shouldn't have to know the difference between ILL, Borrow Direct, ReCAP, etc." How to simplify the request process for patrons?	ILLiad requests are transferred to the ReCAP queue and for the most part, items are returned directly to ReCAP. The ReCAP sticker helps to identify these so that they can be visually sorted. There is a weakness in the Relais relay of information to GFA. A Z39.50 request is transmitted, which includes the item ID but not the barcode on the printing slip. (ReCAP is set up as a printing location.) The barcode must be attached manually, or sent in a separate email. Any way to remedy this? (Princeton just switched from URSA to Relais last year. URSA used to include the barcode in the request transmission.) Communication with patrons about unfilled requests could be more streamlined.	ILL requests from ReCAP are processed at ReCAP. ILL requests from TSD are shipped to the ILL department for processing.
<b>Electronic Document Delivery</b>	<b>Columbia</b>	<b>Princeton</b>	<b>NYPL</b>
When book chapters or journal articles are requested, ReCAP staff pull the items, scan the requested content and deliver it directly to the requestor via <b>Ariel</b> . These scans are made available for 2 weeks and are not retained.	There is a weakness in the Relais relay. A Z39.50 request is transmitted, which includes the item ID but not the barcode on the printing slip. (ReCAP is set up as a printing location.) The barcode must be attached manually, or sent in a separate email. Any way to remedy this?	Fair use guidelines at ReCAP are not entirely consistent with fair use guidelines at the campuses of the partner institutions. The partners will need to agree on guidelines for fair use that will satisfy the patrons needs as well as the desire of the institutions' offices of general counsel.	If the ReCAP or TSD request resulted in an electronic document scan, the daily request activity report indicates such. On the same day, the EDD's are created and links are emailed directly to the patron.
Permanent deaccession from ReCAP	At present - no policies are in place for doing this except in cases of one-off accessioning errors. Selectors or administrators have requested de-accession in very low quantity. A policy framework is being considered for high-use items.	Will de-accession upon request from selectors and for correcting errors in customer code accessioning, etc. There is no systematic de-accessioning workflow in place at present.	A workflow is in place for permanent withdrawal from ReCAP of single items. This is not a scalable process.
<b>Other notes</b>	<b>Columbia</b>	<b>Princeton</b>	<b>NYPL</b>
	* <b>rus</b> is a locally developed program for notifying patrons that ReCAP requests have arrived and are available for pick-up. It can be used to retrieve information about the barcode's requesting user ID and delivery location. It does not function as a tracking system. (In theory this mean that the request transmission to ReCAP does not need to include patron name or other patron information.)	"GFA and the ReCAP shelving system is in general too rigid and mono-functional. For example, making changes to an accessioned item is time-consuming and costly. For individual items, the only way to change a customer code is to withdraw and re-accession it. Changes to blocks of material, from one customer code to another, is very expensive especially when GFA has to be involved."	The workflow described here is for the most routine process. There are some variations for RMRR, staff-only requests, when items are needed for more than one day, etc. The process may vary in other departments, other buildings.