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Outline

Context:
- why a shared repository - a shared collection?
- profile of the partners
- initial planning for the LSC - Library Service Center

How, what and who
- formal PMO process
- development of policies and agreements
- collections preparation

Planning for on-site services
- inventory control
- facilitating discovery between collections and at LSC
- building electronic collections
Why a shared repository? Context

Profile of Tech and Emory
- private v. public
- engineering and sciences v. liberal arts & medicine
- students
- faculty
- funding sources

Common areas of interest
- Neurosciences
- Biomedicine
Role of the Georgia Research Alliance

Established partnerships between Tech and Emory

- BME - Biomedical Engineering
- Biomedical Imaging Technology Center
- Biomedical Nanotechnology
- Regenerative Medicine
- TI:GER Program (partnership with the Law School)
- Predictive Health Institute
- Atlanta Clinical & Translational Science Institute
- High speed computing
Library collections - library partnerships

➔ Library collections
  ● overlap between collections is 17%
  ● common interest in the sciences
  ● GALILEO
  ● GETS and GETSM

➔ Library collaborations
  ● ASERL, Arche, GOLD, GETSM and recently GETS
  ● Discussions between the library leaders 2010-2012 (looking at 2CUL as a model)
Why a shared repository?
Divergent motivations

Emory: critical need for space for print storage
• at Emory collections were growing 5,000 LF a year (for the campus)
• Continued growth of special collections

GT: Need for a better facility
• Need for a better conditioned facility
• Pre-rethinking library view
Initial planning for a shared repository

Formal planning process started - fall 2012
- plan to build a Harvard style facility
- selection of a site - importance of a site that was between Emory and GT

Selection of an architect
- selection of KSS - fall of 2013
- plan for 4 modules: each holding 3.75M volumes
Initial planning for a shared repository

➔ Formation of planning groups
  ● series of meetings
  ● foundation for working groups under the project
LSC Location

Map showing the location of Emory University and Georgia Tech in Atlanta with a marked Briarcliff Property.

Library Service Center
of Emory University and Georgia Tech
Proposed site plan - Briarcliff campus
Governance & Funding

EmTech Corporation

Planning

- Library Service Center Steering Group
  - ULs + Others
  - MOUs
  - Design oversight
  - Policies for collections and future services

Operations

- Library Service Center Steering Group
  - ULs + Others
  - Policies
  - Services
  - Budget
  - Reporting
Governance & Funding

• Lease of building and grounds from EmTech
• Capital Expenditures
  – 50/50 for capital expenditures
• Service Operations Cost Model - TBD
  – What are some others doing?
    • Harvard and ReCAP, for example
LSC Project Life Cycle

- Project Initiation
  - PM Assignment
  - Charter
- Project Planning
  - Budget
  - Detailed Schedule
  - Go/No-Go
  - Decision
- Project Execution
  - Implementation
  - Change Orders
  - Go-Live
- Project Closeout
  - Acceptance
  - Resources Released

Project Manager & PMI Standards and Guidelines
Project Organization

Library Service Center Program

- Construction
- Collections Prep
- Systems and Inventory Control
- Prospective Collections

Working Groups
Policy Development and Approval

- Steering Group
- High Level Outcomes
- Working Groups
- Policies
Documentation--Box

Library Service Center project pages - review the LSC Box folders document in this folder

**Program Management Files**
Updated today by Felicia Bianchi • 23
LSC - Project documents - Charter, Scope statements, Scope Change Management, Risk and Issues logs, Project and Program schedules

**Decisions and Policies**
Updated yesterday by Felicia Bianchi • 61
Final draft decisions policies ready for review and approval by the steering committee or for escalation to Executive Project oversight.

**Working Groups**
Updated yesterday by Lars Meyer • 657
All working group folders for cross institution collaboration. Policy and decision draft documents, scope drafts, and other items required by the working groups.

**Steering Committee**
Updated Apr 22, 2015 by Andrea Goldson-Barrett • 34
Steering Committee Minutes and agendas, Other items for the full committee

**Vision & Objectives**
Updated Jun 16, 2014 by Felicia Bianchi • 2
Overall vision statement, Key guiding principles, other overarching objectives

**LSC Policy Template (1).docx**
Uploaded Dec 11, 2014 by Felicia Bianchi • 92.0 KB • 19

**BOX How to doc.pdf**

Library Service Center
of Emory University and Georgia Tech
Example Policy Document
(Environmental Conditions)

POLICY DECISION DOCUMENT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Name:</th>
<th>EmTech Library Service Center</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Project Number:</td>
<td>PRL000435</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prepared by:</td>
<td>Charles Forrest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date:</td>
<td>March 11, 2014 REVISED</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Customer: Emory University and Georgia Institute of Technology Libraries

Reported Use: LITS and GaTech Library

Contact Name/Details: Rich Mendoza, Catherine Murray-Rust/Yolanda Cooper

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Type:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>□Mini □Standard □Complex</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

INTRODUCTION

This document makes a recommendation regarding the target set point for the collection storage modules at the EmTech Library Service Center.

Recommendation: Purchase equipment to achieve a set point of 50°F/30%RH. The equipment could also operate at higher set points if deemed necessary and appropriate.

This set point provides a very slow aging rate, with a preservation index 283 years.

DECISION

The set point 50°F/30%RH is in use at Arizona State, Cornell, IU Bloomington, Johns Hopkins, Rice, UGA Russell Library, UCSC, and Yale.

This set point prevents the growth of mold, achieves a preservation index of well over two centuries, and provides cost effective, stable, high-quality long-term environmental conditions for EmTech Library Service Center collections.

ASSUMPTIONS

- “Very slow aging rate” is required.
- “Slow,” “Moderate,” or “Fast” aging rates are not desirable.
- A set point that prevents mold growth is required.
- Calculator data for Preservation Index is accurate.
- Utility cost analysis provides reasonable differential comparisons.
- In choosing set points, Emory and Georgia Tech want to emulate best practices of peer institutions with similar facilities.

- The initial HVAC equipment installed can efficiently accommodate adjustment to a range of less stringent set points that may be considered as we monitor actual operating costs.
- Ongoing research in the preservation of materials will inform future audits (e.g., reconsideration of set points) including the possibility of appropriate seasonal (winter/summer) adjustments of set points to improve operating efficiency without compromising preservation requirements.

- Explore research that has recently been completed (awaiting final recommendations) that investigated a method for libraries to achieve significant reductions in energy use without compromising the preservation-quantity of collection environments (i.e., no change in the set points) through a carefully monitored and risk-managed ramp down or shutdown of air handling units outside of regular hours of operation.

- Any impact of approved set points on the storage capacity of the modules is acceptable to meet initial audit expectations.

- The purchased equipment can deliver a set point of 50°F/30%RH as well as higher set points if deemed necessary and appropriate.

RISKS ACCEPTED

- Image Permanence Institute of Rochester calculator data for Preservation Index could be in error.
- Utility cost analysis could be in error.
- Future adjustments of set points are not effective to lower operating costs.
- Future adjustments of set points lower operating costs compromise expectation requirements.

ALTERNATIVES CONSIDERED

- 45°F/45%RH (very slow aging rate, preservation index 185 years)
- 45°F/40%RH (very slow aging rate, preservation index 273 years)
- 50°F/35%RH (very slow aging rate, preservation index 244 years)
- 50°F/45%RH (slow aging rate, preservation index 185 years)
- 55°F/45%RH (slow aging rate, preservation index 123 years)
- 60°F/35%RH (slow aging rate, preservation index 110 years)
- 65°F/35%RH (slow aging rate, preservation index 85 years)
- 65°F/40%RH (slow aging rate, preservation index 75 years)
Example Policy Document

Two components that factor into the usable life of library collections in storage are temperature and relative humidity. The image Permanence Institute in Rochester, New York offers a calculator that shows the expected usable life of objects at different temperature and relative humidity set points. Precise Engineering recommends a set point of 50°F and 35% relative humidity based on proven real-world examples of comparable archival-based systems. 50°F/35%RH is the least expensive operating option in the "Very Slow" aging category. Precise does not recommend operating conditions that result in moderate or fast aging rates.

Precise has also run an HVAC annual utility cost analysis. A computerized simulation was performed for one of the air-handling units (AHU) for the storage module. All of the simulations used the same volume of air based on achieving two air changes per hour (ACH) in the space. The simulation was performed at three different set points: the recommended 50°F/35%RH, 50°F/40%RH, and 60°F/30%RH. Utility costs were assumed to be $0.50/Therm for natural gas, $0.11/ton of refrigeration, and $0.005/KWh for electricity. These results were then plotted, trended, and projected on other set points to predict operating costs.

The following table summarizes the set point and utility cost data compiled by the project team:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indoor condition/Year</th>
<th>Humidity (%)</th>
<th>Temperature (F)</th>
<th>Annual Utility Cost (Therm)</th>
<th>Annual Utility Cost compared to Original HVAC (Therm)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Precise Engineering</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>$42,500</td>
<td>$42,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emory</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>$42,500</td>
<td>$42,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emory</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>$42,500</td>
<td>$42,500</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

By approving the Policy you are in agreement with the policy as described herein.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STAKEHOLDER</th>
<th>NAME</th>
<th>SIGNATURE</th>
<th>DATE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Enterprise CIO and Senior Vice Provost for Library Services and Digital Scholarship (Emory)</td>
<td>Rich Mendala</td>
<td>Not Responsible</td>
<td>3/1/14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vice Provost, Learning Excellence and Dean of Libraries (GT)</td>
<td>Catherine Murray-Rust</td>
<td>Not Responsible</td>
<td>3/1/14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emory University Librarian</td>
<td>Yolanda Cooper</td>
<td>Not Responsible</td>
<td>3/1/14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program Manager – Emory</td>
<td>Felicia Bianchi</td>
<td>Not Responsible</td>
<td>3/1/14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Manager – Ga Tech</td>
<td>Vanessa Payne</td>
<td>Not Responsible</td>
<td>3/1/14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Board Real Estate, EVP Office (Emory)</td>
<td>Jack Tillman</td>
<td>Not Responsible</td>
<td>3/1/14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Manager - Programming, Design &amp; Construction.</td>
<td>Jo Lamb</td>
<td>Not Responsible</td>
<td>3/1/14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate Director</td>
<td>Linda Daniels</td>
<td>Not Responsible</td>
<td>3/1/14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Director, Capital and Space Management (GT)</td>
<td>Howard Warther</td>
<td>Not Responsible</td>
<td>If Linda Daniels is not available</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Director, Library Facilities (Emory)</td>
<td>Charles Forrest</td>
<td>Not Responsible</td>
<td>3/1/14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For all other items add for Emory</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Head, Access Services (Emory)</td>
<td>Amy Boucher</td>
<td>Not Responsible</td>
<td>3/1/14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate Director, MARBL (Emory)</td>
<td>Jennifer Meehan</td>
<td>Not Responsible</td>
<td>3/1/14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Director, Content Division (Emory)</td>
<td>Lars Meyer</td>
<td>Not Responsible</td>
<td>3/1/14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Director, Services Division (Emory)</td>
<td>Chuck Sporrnick</td>
<td>Not Responsible</td>
<td>3/1/14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Library Service Center
of Emory University and Georgia Tech
Example Policy Document (MOU Shared Collections)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Name:</th>
<th>Project Number:</th>
<th>Prepared by:</th>
<th>Effective Date:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Library Service Center</td>
<td>PRJ000435</td>
<td>Chris Palazzolo/Lori Criz/Elizabeth Winter/Chuck Spornick</td>
<td>2/28/2015</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Customer:</th>
<th>Business Unit:</th>
<th>Contact Name:</th>
<th>Project Type:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Emory University and Georgia Institute of Technology Libraries</td>
<td>LITS and GeTech Library</td>
<td>Catherine Murray-Rust/Yolanda Cooper</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

INTRODUCTION

This document outlines the scope and general policies related to the shared collection of Georgia Tech and Emory. It includes the definition of the shared collection, potential electronic resource and technical collaboration, access to the collection, and lost/replacement policies.

**Emory/GT MOU – Shared Collection**

I.

a. DEFINITION OF SHARED PRINT COLLECTION

i. The shared collection includes physical materials housed at the Library Service Center, Emory University’s Woodruff Library, Health Sciences Library, and Pitts Theology Library (all of these libraries referred to in this agreement as the Emory Libraries), and at Georgia Institute of Technology Libraries (Georgia Tech Libraries), unless otherwise specified.

ii. Collaboration on electronic materials/resources are addressed in a separate section.

iii. Special Collections from both institutions are excluded from the shared collection.

iv. Media collections from both institutions are excluded from the shared collection.
# Example Policy Document (Ownership)

## Introduction
Through the Library Service Center Georgia Tech and Emory will provide our respective faculty, students, and staff with the benefit of a shared offsite collection. This document describes our approach to the ownership of library materials housed at the Library Service Center and how these materials will be managed.

## Policy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DECISIONS</th>
<th>Ownership and management of library materials in the LSC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

1. **Ownership:** All library materials housed in the Library Service Center will continue to remain the property of the university that acquired the item, either Emory University or the Georgia Institute of Technology. This approach is consistent with Georgia state law regarding the management of property purchased by a state institution.

2. **Management:** All materials housed at the LSC will be managed by LSC policies and procedures. The LSC will develop policies regarding:
   - Shelving of materials
Joint Working Groups

1. Collection Preparation and Shared Collections
2. Logistics and Planograph
3. Operations and Management & Service Planning
4. Communications / Public Relations
5. Systems and Inventory Control
6. Facilities Planning, Design and Construction
Emory—Internal Working Groups

- **Challenge:** Managing policies and workflows across Emory libraries (Oxford, Theology, Woodruff [Main], Health Sciences, Law and Business) while respecting differences
Policies

**Completed**
- Materials ownership
- Deduplication and Best Copy of a Volume
- Environmental Set Points
- Communications
- Logos/Branding
- Floor Plan Preservation
- Planograph
- Shared Collection (MOU)

**In Progress**
- Barcodes and Marking
Collaborative Working Groups

1. Collection Preparation and Shared Collections: Retrospective
2. Logistics & Planograph
3. Operations and Management & Services
4. Communications / Public Relations
5. Systems & Inventory Control
6. Facilities Planning, Design & Construction
7. Shared Collections: Prospective
Each WG developed a Scope Statement to direct their work.
Shared Collections WG: Prospective

DELIBERABLES:
• Develop an MOU for shared collections
• Develop collection development policies for shared collections, including physical collections and (potential) shared electronic resources
• Uncover opportunities for joint license of electronic resources
• Determine how to deal with electronic licenses as a continuum
• Explore shared Demand Driven Acquisitions (DDA), books-on-demand
• Audit current resources
• Implement shared collection development policies & collections
Shared Collections WG: Prospective

ISSUES & CHALLENGES:

• Collection development budgets/funds
• Authentication - providing appropriate access
• Legal issues (e.g. licenses) for electronic purchases
  • Existing collections/licenses difficult to modify
  • More hopeful avenues with new collections
  • Role-based authentication (e.g. Shibbolith) could help
• Vendor restrictions
• Staff issues - who & what
Shared Collections WG: Prospective

PROGRESS TOWARD SHARED COLLECTION:

• GT Non-Duplication Collection Development Policy
  – Deduping by comparison to Emory’s entire collection (except Special Collections, Law Library, and “In-Library Use Only” Collections)

• GT Monograph Collection Development Policy
  – Monitoring of Emory’s Approval Plan (via YBP’s GOBI) to determine the upcoming programmed purchases

• Emory’s commitment to a joint management process for withdrawals from the Emory stacks

• Developed Shared Collections MOU

• Investigating joint electronic purchases (e.g. e-book collections)
Challenges in Planning On-site Services

• Emory University Library
  – More “traditional” academic library
  – Print-based collections
  – Almost a mile of print collections added to shelves every year
  – Service desired at LSC similar to service at current storage facilities = maintain the status quo
Challenges in Planning On-site Services

• Georgia Tech Library – Re-Imagined Library (renewal.library.gatech.edu)
  – Most print materials to LSC
  – Georgia Tech is print stable – no growth
  – Print materials = low use (10,000 checkouts/year)
  – Electronic collections = high use (2.5 million articles accessed/year)
  – Make up for loss of print collection in (re-imagined) buildings by providing high level of service to collections in LSC
EmTech LSC Organization

– Executive Director reporting to EmTech and both universities

– Three mid-management employees (potential)
  • Librarians (or similar) in charge of segments of services
  • Faculty appointments

– Six workers for warehouse and service duties
  • Everyone can do everything
  • Based on need

– Emory or Georgia Tech materials – makes no difference as far as level of service or who does what
Planned On-site Services

• Delivery of documents: physical and electronic
  – InterLibrary Loan (of materials stored at the LSC)
  – RAPID (both Emory and Georgia Tech are members)
  – LENDS (Georgia Tech - based delivery to Faculty Offices)
  – GIL Express (Georgia print book sharing service)
  – Scanning and email delivery – preferred method of content transfer
  – Delivery of physical items to both campuses
    » Delivery vehicle located at LSC – two scheduled deliveries a day and possible deliveries “as needed”
  – Services need to be in place on “Day One”
Planned On-site Services

• Walk-up usage and the LSC reading room
  – Patrons requiring large numbers of materials
  – Likely low usage
  – Still necessary
  – Limited to Emory and Georgia Tech users

• Special Collections and Archives
  – Materials stored at LSC under optimal conditions
  – Returned to respective Library as requests only handled by SCA staff at either Library
Discovery and Inventory Systems

• Discovery System(s)
  – Short and long term solutions
    • Emory = Aleph and Primo
    • Georgia Tech = Voyager and VuFind
  – Integrating both collections into one
    • Homogenous experience for all Emory/Tech users
    • Shared collection is ultimate goal – not just LSC

• Inventory control for the LSC
  – Small pool of solutions – none ideal
  – Critical that it works with long term discovery solution
Next Steps for Planned Services

– Alma implementation
  • Just started
  • Complex because of statewide obligations
– Inventory system
  • Needs the ILS to function
– Hiring and training LSC staff
  • Executive Director position advertised
  • Other positions after director in place
– Planning ingest of materials – prep underway
  • Library moving companies
  • Trucks and equipment
Next Steps for Planned Services (cont)

– Building a shared prospective collection:
  • GT’s collection policy to de-dupe against Emory’s holdings in the Woodruff stacks
  • Cooperative collection development by use of YPB’s GOBI for monograph purchases
  • Emory’s commitment to a joint management process for withdrawals from the Emory stacks

– Building a joint electronic collection
  • Collections already in place difficult to “share”
  • New purchases likely candidates
  • Role-based users/authentication would help immensely
Questions???

Jeff Carrico, Associate Dean for Scholarly Communication and Access
Georgia Tech Library

Lori Critz, Head, Faculty Engagement Dept.
Georgia Tech Library

Chuck Spornick, Director, Services Division
Woodruff Library
Emory University

Chris Palazzolo, Head Collection Management
Woodruff Library
Emory University