

CTS CATALOGING REVIEW

BY CHRISTIAN M. BOISSONNAS (APRIL 1994)



TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. [Introduction](#)

II. [The Current Cataloging Process](#)

[LC Cataloging](#)

[RLIN Member Cataloging](#)

[Original Cataloging](#)

[FASTCAT](#)

[FASTSHELVE](#)

- [The Cost of Cataloging per Title](#)

III. [Goals](#)

IV. [Options for Cataloging](#)

[Contracting Out LC/FASTCAT Authority Work](#)

[Contracting Out RLIN Member Authority Work](#)

[FASTCAT All Titles with LC Copy](#)

[FASTCAT All Titles with RLIN Member Copy](#)

[Catalog at the CCC "Core" Level](#)

[Contracting Cataloging to an Outside Vendor](#)

- [CTS Costs versus Vendor-Supplied Cataloging](#)

[Other Options](#)

- [Summary of Cataloging Options](#)

V. [Backlog Reduction Options](#)

[Using Savings Resulting from Options Listed in Part III](#)

[Using the FASTSHELVE Process](#)

[Contracting with a Vendor](#)

VI. [What Next?](#)

Appendix A: [1991 CTS Cost Study](#)

[Table A-1: Cost of Cataloging by Cataloging Method](#)

[Table A-2: Cost of LC Cataloging](#)

[Table A-3: Cost of RLIN Member Cataloging](#)

[Table A-4: Cost of Original Cataloging](#)

[Table A-5: Cost of FASTCAT Cataloging](#)

[Table A-6: Cost of FASTSHELVE Cataloging](#)

[Table A-7: List and Costs of Cataloging Related Tasks](#)

[Table A-8: Computation of Technical Services Overhead](#)

Appendix B: [Options for Cataloging in CTS](#)

[Table B-1: Contracting Out LC/FASTCAT Authority Work](#)

[Table B-2: Contracting Out RLIN/Member Authority Work](#)



I. INTRODUCTION

On October 30, 1993, Ross Atkinson asked me to undertake a formal review and analysis of cataloging methods and policies in Central Technical Services. Specifically, I was to concentrate on the costs and benefits, in terms of access, of our cataloging effort, present a series of options for both original and copy cataloging, and present a recommendation on how we might reduce the CTS backlog to 50,000 volumes in three to five years.

In this report I will first discuss the economics of the current cataloging process, then I will present a set of goals which we might want to accomplish, the options which are available to us, my specific recommendation for reducing the backlog, and some thoughts to keep in mind as we work toward a decision on what to do next.



II. THE CURRENT CATALOGING PROCESS

Let me first specify what I mean. In CTS it is that group of tasks which are performed in the Searching/FASTCAT, Copy Cataloging, Original Cataloging, and Database Management/ Authorities sections. The data which I will present here deal only with the cost of cataloging from the moment a title arrives in one of the cataloging units until it has been barcoded, labelled, plated, and its security strip has been inserted. The data do not include any of the costs associated with the acquisitions process, storage, or whatever binding may be needed. They also do not include serials.

A book entering the cataloging process in CTS may follow any one of five paths or processes. Which path it follows depends on the source and kind of bibliographic information available for it at the time it is ready for cataloging. The five processes are:

- **LC Cataloging.** There is, in the Online Catalog, a record issued by the Library of Congress. Books for which such records are available meet the standards which we have decided we should follow. They require little tailoring by us and can be processed quickly, that is, in a matter of days or weeks, assuming adequate manpower.
- **RLIN Member Cataloging.** Records for these titles are obtained from the RLIN database. Some meet our standards and some don't. Catalogers need to spend more time reviewing these records to bring those that need it up to standard.
- **Original Cataloging.** The Online Catalog records were keyed locally by staff in the Searching/FASTCAT Section from whatever information was available. They are often brief, lack subjects and call numbers, and do not meet our current standards. They represent books some of which are unique to Cornell. The cataloging records for these, which we send to RLG for

inclusion in the RLIN database, represent our most important contribution to scholarship outside of Cornell.

- **FASTCAT.** A subset of the books for which Library of Congress records are available require so little work that they can bypass catalogers who require the extensive training needed to process the more complex materials. Such books are processed in the Searching/FASTCAT Section.
- **FASTSHELVE.** Books in this category are assigned a local call number as quickly as possible and sent directly to the shelves. The records for them may or may not be standard. They have not gone through authority control so that the access points for them have not been validated, and the call number may not be the most appropriate. The intent with these is to make them available to patrons for browsing and circulating while deferring the completion of the cataloging process until some point in the future. Catalogers, in general, do not feel that it is completely appropriate to describe these books as cataloged in any true sense of the word. The only material difference between these books and those in the backlog is that patrons can find the former on their own in the stacks while they must request the latter from Access Services and come back 24 hours later to pick them up.

The cost of cataloging varies greatly depending on which of the above processes one follows. It is also difficult to establish reliably. Not only are there multiple data streams to contend with, but there also are many variables, not all of which are easily quantifiable. The data which I present below were gathered in the summer of 1991 as part of a general survey of technical services costs. [Appendix A](#) of this report describes the goals of the survey, the methodology used, and the pertinent cataloging data. Table 1 below summarizes the costs of each process.

Table 1
COST OF CATALOGING PER TITLE BY CATALOGING PROCESS
April 1, 1994

CATALOGING PROCESS	% OF ALL TITLES	LABOR COST	RLIN SEARCHING	SUPPLIES, OTHER	TOTAL COST
LC	40%	13.55	.95	.34	14.83
RLIN member	19%	18.92	.97	.34	20.23
Original	22%	33.60	.90	.34	34.84
FASTCAT	19%	6.46	.21	.34	6.97
FASTSHELVE	<1%	2.64		.34	2.98

I computed the labor costs using 1993/94 budgeted salaries of the staff involved in these processes. The amounts include benefits and a percentage for technical services overhead. [Appendix A](#) shows the details of how I computed these numbers. This table shows that we catalog 19% for \$7 per title, 40% for \$15, 19% for \$20, and 22% for \$35. Even though FASTSHELVE is far cheaper than any other process we don't do enough of it to matter.

Two basic assumptions currently govern our cataloging: One, Library of Congress cataloging meets our standards and requires little, if any, modification. Two, both our users and our obligation to RLG require that we provide full records with authenticated access points, or headings. Hence all our headings go through some form of authority control, either manual or by machine. This is one reason why the FASTSHELVE process is thought not to be real cataloging. While the result of our work is the production of valuable records that are widely acknowledged as being of superior quality, we are frustrated by the fact that this is not enough. We catalog between 75,000 and 85,000 titles every year, and yet we have a backlog which keeps growing although, in the past two years, we have managed to catalog slightly more books than we received. The backlog currently stands at about 150,000, and it is clear that we will never manage to reduce it under existing conditions. If we hope to make any progress in this direction we must take a look at what we do and devise some new strategies.

There are also other reasons why we need to do this. We all know by now that electronic publishing, changes in the financing of higher education, and the need to constantly upgrade our automated equipment, are placing libraries under severe financial stress. At the same time as we have less money we must do more. In addition there is an increasing awareness in the library profession that cataloging has become too complicated and expensive at the same time as it must accommodate a host of new publication formats. Cataloging theory is evolving and we must factor that in our thinking and practices. Before I present some of the options that we might consider implementing I would like to suggest the main goals that we should try to reach.



III. GOALS

CTS's main goals should be to maximize access by users to our collection, regardless of format, and to increase the amount of original cataloging which we contribute to scholarship.

Maximizing access means two things: Making more materials available more quickly to more users and adding as much value to the information we process as possible. We accomplish this by putting more books on the shelves where users can get them, by processing first the materials which they are going to be wanting first, and by contributing more original records to a national database (goal number 2 above). We add value by providing correct and pertinent information that facilitates retrieval, keeping in mind that the value to be added depends on local needs, the specific material, and its importance to scholarship. Keeping these goals in front of us, let us now turn to what we might do differently.



IV. OPTIONS FOR CATALOGING

In this section I propose a set of options which describe what we could do in CTS, along with an assessment of their potential benefits and costs to users as well as library staff.

A. Contracting out LC/FASTCAT authority work

This work is currently performed in the Authorities Unit. By paying an outside vendor to do the work and allowing for increased cleanup that would be necessary we could save about \$20,000, or one FTE in labor and \$5,000 in RLIN searches. (See [Appendix B, Table B-1](#) for details.)

There are no access consequences to this since we are doing this work now. This proposal merely changes the way it is done. Consequences for the Authorities Unit staff are somewhat negative since they would have to do more processing of vendor exception reports, a kind of work that is not particularly exciting. Also one staff member would have to be assigned other tasks. There would be some impact on the Library Technology Department resulting from the need to generate tapes on a weekly schedule to send to the authorities vendor as well as to load incoming tapes.

This is something which we are already doing in connection with several retrospective conversion projects.

B. Contracting out RLIN member authority work

This is the same as the option above, but it affects a different class of records, those captured from RLG libraries. Annual savings here would be about \$22,000, or one FTE from the Copy Cataloging Section, and \$6,000 in RLIN searches, even allowing for increase in cleanup work that would result from implementing this change. (See [Appendix B, Table B-2](#) for details.)

There is a slight loss in quality of authority work with this option resulting from the fact that the staff doing cleanup work will not have the book in hand as a cataloger would. While I cannot assess how often this would happen, it is not likely to be frequent.

C. FASTCAT all titles with LC copy

At the present time we FASTCAT, at \$7 a title, approximately 30% of the titles which have Library of Congress cataloging copy. If we cataloged all such titles at \$7 each, we could save about \$21,000, or one FTE in labor costs and \$14,000 in RLIN searching fees.

In addition to cheaper cataloging, benefits would include speedier processing of current titles in a category that happens to be first wanted by patrons, namely new imprints. There would be some loss of access by users resulting from the fact that call numbers assigned by LC would no longer be adjusted. This means that a newer manifestation of a title, if we had assigned a number different from LC's to the earlier one, would not necessarily sit next to it on the shelf. In the case of belles-lettres it might mean that books by an author might be in different locations in the stacks. This option would mean abandoning a long-standing belief that collocation in the stacks is a worthy goal.

It would also mean that, for users or staff doing call number searches in the Online Catalog, they could not expect to find works by an author grouped together. Whereas staff can probably be trained to take this into account, I doubt that this can be explained to users.

D. FASTCAT all titles with RLIN member copy

This option would result in a saving of .5 FTE from the Copy Cataloging Section and \$7,000 in RLIN searching fees per year. It presents all the advantages and the drawbacks of the previous option, and one additional problem: Because the quality of RLIN member records varies, and the essence of the FASTCAT process is to not modify existing records, we would very likely introduce records in our Online Catalog that do not match our current standards. We can diminish this risk somewhat by trying to use records input in RLIN by libraries with excellent cataloging standards, but it cannot be entirely avoided. We cannot, without carrying on a major and expensive study, determine the impact of this option on users. I simply offer, without implying that we should do it because of it, the observation that many large libraries are doing precisely this.

E. Catalog at the CCC "core" level

Last year, the Library of Congress' Cooperative Cataloging Council proposed the adoption of a shorter, less complex, bibliographic record: the core record. Core-level cataloging omits certain notes, but requires at least one subject, a call number, and requires that all access points be under authority control. This is not minimum-level cataloging as implemented a few years ago by the Library of Congress. Many librarians feel that this is a truly promising development in cataloging theory. We are currently testing core-level cataloging in CTS and early results are, indeed, promising. Four original catalogers are involved in this study and the results from two of them on the first 50 titles show a 13% improvement in productivity. Because the sample size is still small we must view this improvement with caution. But, if it holds true, it would mean that, had we done all our original cataloging last year at the core level, we would have saved \$73,000, or 2 FTE from the Original Cataloging Section.

The problem is that core-level cataloging is probably not appropriate for all original cataloging. Indeed, we have no clear idea yet of the subset of our cataloging for which it is appropriate. Another problem is that there is no encoding level yet in RLIN to represent core-level cataloging. If we loaded such records into RLIN, at least for the time being, they would be coded as non-standard records and would appear to other libraries as less than they really are.

F. Contracting cataloging to an outside vendor

Many libraries are talking about this, but no large ones that I know of have yet done this to any extent. Vendors argue that they can catalog for libraries much more cheaply than libraries can because they do not have the enormous overhead of academic institutions. Looking at the price lists of those that offer this service they may have a point. Recalling [Table 1](#) above in which our costs for FASTCAT, LC, RLIN member, and original cataloging ranged from \$7 to \$35, comparable vendor costs range from \$3 to \$15, as the following table shows:

Table 2
CTS COSTS VERSUS VENDOR-SUPPLIED CATALOGING
April 1, 1994

	CTS	VENDOR
FASTCAT	\$7	\$3-5
Library of Congress	\$15	\$3-5
RLIN member copy	\$20	\$6-8
Original	\$35	\$12-15

Assuming that we contracted out some cataloging and all the authority work pertaining to it, and still had to perform database maintenance and physical processing on the titles involved, this would add \$2.60 per title to the vendor charges listed in Table 2. In other words, if last year we had contracted out all of our LC, 3/4 of our RLIN member cataloging, and 1/4 of our original cataloging, we would have paid our contractor \$440,000, but saved \$380,000.

Before we sign a contract, however, let us consider these points. We have no idea of what cataloging quality over time the vendor would provide. It would, in all likelihood, be satisfactory for LC copy since

the vendor would use the same records we would have. It might even be acceptable for member cataloging, but what about for original cataloging? At this point we simply don't know and prudence dictates that we be skeptical.

Of course there is another major potential problem. We must consider, when we have contracted out and found new jobs for our displaced catalogers, that the vendor could go bankrupt, or start charging us an unacceptable price, or simply start producing too much unacceptable work. We would then be in an untenable position.

The problem of relocating displaced catalogers is not trivial. In our example above, the one where we save over \$380,000 per year, we have made redundant 6.5 original catalogers, 10.5 copy catalogers, 5 searchers, and 1.5 authorities staff. With the other options the staff consequences were much milder and, assuming enough time, could be resolved without anyone getting hurt. But with such a profound change as this option entails, no amount of time exists that would allow us to find new jobs or retrain our staff, and the fine cataloging culture and tradition of this Library would have been ended. I doubt that it could ever be re-created.

I have not discussed the impact of this option on access simply because I am unable to visualize it. For answers to this question we must wait for the result of the test of the service of one vendor that we are currently planning. A committee of staff from CTS and other units is currently working on this.

Overall this option presents the greatest savings, but also the greatest problems. Perhaps it has greater value in connection with a backlog reduction program. I will discuss this when I present the options pertaining to the backlog.

G. Other options

I have considered three other options and rejected two of them. The first is to stop cataloging U.S. Federal and New York State documents which have control numbers on the grounds that they were accessible in some other ways. This would mean no longer shelving such documents in the stacks, since they would have no call numbers, and creating a separate documents collection elsewhere for these titles. The access consequences, physical and bibliographic, of this idea were clearly negative, both for users and for Access Services staff who would have to take on the management of yet another special collection. In addition, many of these documents go through the FASTCAT process. They are already cataloged cheaply, compared to many other titles. It is doubtful that the saving accrued from discontinuing this cataloging would be worth the increased access costs.

The second option which I rejected involved CTS creating its own version of a core-level record, possibly more tailored to local needs than the one proposed by the Cooperative Cataloging Council. I realized that the advantages would be marginal and the problems many. At a time when it looks like cooperative cataloging may be acquiring a life of its own, now is not the time for independence.

The third option, which I did not reject, is to buy fewer books. It is rather obvious, but much of the problem that CTS has in keeping up with its work is due to the imbalance between the funds available to buy books and those available for processing. I do not necessarily mean that funds should be transferred from the materials to the processing budget. If more funds from a steady-state budget are used to purchase access to information that does not require much processing by CTS, such as many databases, then it follows that fewer books will be bought. I am well aware that this option will not be viewed kindly by many, but it is as realistic as many of the others.

We are left, then, with six options, five of which are not nearly as problematical as the sixth. They are

summarized in Table 3 below:

Table 3
SUMMARY OF CATALOGING OPTIONS
April 1, 1994

OPTION	ANNUAL STAFF SAVINGS	ANNUAL RLIN SAVINGS
Contract LC/FASTCAT auth. work	\$20,000 (1 FTE)	\$5,000
Contract RLIN member auth. work	\$22,000 (1 FTE)	\$6,000
FASTCAT all LC copy	\$21,000 (1 FTE)	\$14,000
FASTCAT all RLIN member copy	\$10,000 (1.5 FTE)	\$14,000
Core level cataloging		
-- 25% of the titles	\$18,250 (.5 FTE)	
-- 50% of the titles	\$36,500 (1 FTE)	
-- 75% of the titles	\$54,750 (1.5 FTE)	
Contract cataloging to outside vendor		
-- 100% LC and FASTCAT	\$210,000 (12.5 FTE)	
-- 75% RLIN member	\$101,000 (8.5 FTE)	
-- 25% original cataloging	\$72,250 (2.5 FTE)	



V. BACKLOG REDUCTION OPTIONS

The CTS backlog now stands at about 150,000 titles. This includes titles which are waiting for cataloging but are physically located in unit libraries. It includes books from all parts of the world, in many languages, with books in English adding up to maybe a third of the total. To reduce it to 50,000 (which it used to be until the late 1970s) in 5 years would require cataloging about 20,000 additional titles, or 25% more than we do now. To accomplish this in 3 years would require cataloging 34,000 additional titles, or 43% more than we do now. What are the options for accomplishing this?

A. Using savings resulting from options listed in [Part IV](#)

If we were to implement all the options listed above, except for the contracting of cataloging to a vendor, we would free up 5 FTE. Assuming that the 100,000 titles to be cataloged mostly had LC or RLIN member copy, they could go through the FASTCAT process. 100,000 titles to be cataloged in 5 years by 5 staff members means that each catalogs 4,000 annually (6,700 if the job is to be done in 3

years). This cannot be done. The highest FASTCAT producer currently catalogs about 2,800 titles per year. It is not a job which people can do all day long without going stir crazy. They must be given other tasks to stay alert and keep on top of their cataloging. This option, therefore, will not get the job done, at least not by itself.

B. Using the FASTSHELVE process

The books would go to the stacks with whatever cataloging they have now (LC or RLIN member) with a call number which might or might not be appropriate. Many of their headings would not be under authority control, but many would be because they have been previously established. Under the current definition of this process, at some point in the future the cataloging would be completed. This, however, is a chimera. It is extremely unlikely that we would ever have the resources to go back and complete the job according to our current standards.

But, if we used the 5 FTE liberated by the implementation of our options, we can clear the backlog. These positions amount to \$100,000 per year, or \$300,000 in 3 years and this process costs \$3 per title. There are, however, other costs which will be borne by staff outside of CTS. For the duration of the project there would be abnormally high loads of books passed on to the Commercial Binding and the Access Services staffs. It is not unreasonable to assume that their work loads would also increase by 34%. Therefore it is more reasonable to stage the project over 5 years and use some of the saving from the 5 FTE to help these other departments.

The consequences for access of implementing this option would be that these titles would never have the bibliographic access that they have now. However, users would benefit from improved physical access. They would not have to request the books, then come back the next day to pick them up. In today's frenetic world this is a serious inconvenience. The Access Services staff would see this as an improvement as some of them, at least, feel that having to retrieve and circulate an item from the backlog costs more than having the user get the item from the shelf, even if it only has a brief record.

C. Contracting with a vendor to get these books cataloged

If we implement the recommendations listed in [Part IV](#) above we can use the staff savings to finance the contract cataloging of a large subset of the books. It might be a better use of a vendor than that which I proposed above since it would be time- limited and would not commit us to drastically change our structure or fundamentally change our cataloging philosophy. However, compared with the FASTCAT or FASTSHELVE options, it is expensive and will not allow us to get the job completely done. I estimate that we could complete the cataloging of the books with LC copy, or about 80,000 of the 100,000 titles which are to be cataloged. Even with this I have not provided for the extra Commercial Bindery and Access Services costs which I listed with the previous options. These are just as real under this scenario as they were above.

If the job cannot be accomplished using the salary savings I identified which, in any case, may be used elsewhere, then the only other choices depend on the availability of project funds. For a project involving an outside vendor we are talking about \$450,000 to \$650,000 for the expected LC cataloging, and \$170,000 to \$210,000 for the expected member cataloging. For a project involving our own staff to produce FASTCAT-level records only, the amount needed, exclusive of non-CTS departments' needs, would be \$700,000.

It does not appear that the options for reducing the backlog to 50,000 in three to five years are many. The only one that meets the specified condition is the FASTSHELVE option, and only if it is done in 5 years rather than 3, unless rather large sums of money can be found to do the job on a project basis.



VI. WHAT NEXT?

The need for cataloging will not decrease in the foreseeable future, technology notwithstanding. We must continue to contribute to a national database. It is in our interest and in the interest of scholars everywhere. And we must maximize access to information. This means adding enough value to the records in our catalog so that users can find the items described by the records on the shelves, or get clear instructions on where to go to get them. We must also remove existing barriers, some of which we have placed ourselves such as unnecessary headings or overly detailed notes, to the optimal use of existing information.

Our reliance on technology will continue to increase. However we cannot allow the wait for technology to be available to help us to be a reason for deferring decisions about our cataloging processes. The problems described in this report are very current. We need solutions now, not when technology that might help solve them becomes available. In any case not all cataloging problems have a technological solution. Or, to put it another way, technology can only provide part of the solution to some cataloging problems. We need to look at other institutions which have long ago implemented many of the options reviewed here. They were forced into some of these changes because of budget constraints. We are not immune to those and, at the same time, we are called upon to do more. Cataloging is a worthwhile activity and its practitioners are worthy of recognition, but it is an activity that is changing. We must change our practice of it as well.



Appendix A 1991 CTS TECHNICAL SERVICES COST STUDY

Every few years CTS staff go through a period when they gather data about what they do. The main purpose of this exercise is to determine processing costs for two major purposes: so that the Library Administration can know what to charge to the libraries which contract with CTS for processing, and to provide data to be used in grant applications. This was last done in the summer of 1991.

All tasks, from the receipt of packages in the Shipping Room to the point where books are released to Access Services or the unit libraries after processing, were surveyed. For the duration of the study all staff in CTS, Conservation, Shipping, and Budget and Accounting who had anything to do with the processing of new materials were asked to keep track of the time they spent performing the defined tasks and the number of units performed during that time. Costs were determined using the current (1993/94) salaries of staff performing these functions.

304 tasks surveyed yielded 6071 observations. Of these, 74 tasks pertained specifically to the cataloging process and yielded 2337 observations. All told, data were obtained for 71,789 units of cataloging work. Samples, therefore, were more than ample for most tasks. Where they were not is discussed following the presentation of the data. Tables A-1 through A-7 present the results.



Table A-1 shows the straight labor and RLIN searching costs associated with each of the five cataloging processes used in CTS.

Table A-1
COST OF CATALOGING BY CATALOGING METHOD
April 1, 1994

TASK	LABOR COST	RLIN SEARCHING	SUPPLIES, OTHER	TOTAL COST
Cataloging (1)				
-- LC	2.9150	.4596		3.3743
-- RLIN member	4.6911	.4803		5.1714
-- Original	10.7262	.4169		11.1431
-- FASTCAT	1.0169	n/a (2)		1.0169
-- FASTSHELVE (3)	.4851	n/a (2)		.4851

Notes to Table A-1:

- (1) Includes authority work performed by catalogers.
- (2) These were not measured. The costs are, therefore, understated, but it is doubtful that it is by a significant amount. Most of the searching needed for these tasks is, in fact, done as part of the acquisitions and backlog management processes.
- (3) The sample size of 177 for this activity was marginal.

While these are true costs, they are not all the costs. This table is included only to demonstrate the variability in results. These variations account for much of the differences that can be observed in table A-2 through A-7. These tables show all the costs associated with cataloging, one table for each cataloging method. The unit throughout is Cost in dollars per title cataloged.



Table A-2 shows all of the costs associated with cataloging of books with Library of Congress copy.

Table A-2
COST OF LIBRARY OF CONGRESS CATALOGING
April 1, 1994

TASK	LABOR COST	RLIN SEARCHING	SUPPLIES, OTHER	TOTAL COST

Searching/GTO	.8487	.2767		1.1254
Sort & distribute incoming books	.6763			.6763
Cataloging	2.9150	.4596		3.3746
-- Added volume	.0991			.0991
-- Added copies	.0266			.0266
-- Added locations	.0976			.0976
Card sorting & filing	.0877		.1167	.2044
Database maintenance				
-- Update NOTIS record	.0726	.0186		.0912
-- Delete NOTIS record	.0025			.0025
-- Delete RLIN record	.0020			.0020
Physical processing	.5136		.2186	.7322
Authority Maintenance	.2459	.1921		.4380
TOTAL, ALL TASKS	5.5876	.9470	.3353	6.8699
Compensating factor (.617)	3.4475			
TOTAL LABOR COST	9.0351			
Overhead (.1995)	1.7591			
Fringe benefits (.305)	2.7557			
TOTAL COSTS PER TITLE	13.5499	.9470	.3353	14.8322

Notes to Table A2-A7:

- The compensating factor (that amount which must be added to straight salaries to account for time paid for but not worked, e.g. vacation, meals, breaks, committee work, etc.) is the same as used in previous studies. It says that for every \$1 paid for time worked the Library must actually pay \$1.617.
- The overhead rate includes administrative salaries (the CTS Director and Secretary, Unit Heads, and some portions of the salaries of Library Administration as well as Administrative Operations staff,) CIT communication and other computer charges. See Table A-8 for further details.
- Certain tasks (Searching/GTO, Sort & Distribute Incoming Books, Added Volumes, Added Copies, Added Locations, Card Sorting & Filing, Database Maintenance, and Physical Processing) are assumed to cost the same per title regardless of cataloging method. This is almost certainly not true, but they cost something and there is no way of determining more precisely what.
- Authority work has two components: that performed by catalogers while they catalog, and that performed by staff of the Authorities Unit. The former is included in the line labelled "Cataloging," the latter appears separately in the line labelled "Authority Maintenance."

Table A-3 shows the costs associated with the cataloging of books with RLIN member copy.

Table A-3
COST OF RLIN MEMBER CATALOGING
April 1, 1994

TASK	LABOR COST	RLIN SEARCHING	SUPPLIES, OTHER	TOTAL COST
Searching/GTO	.8487	.2767		1.1254
Sort & distribute incoming books	.6763			.6763
Cataloging	4.6911	.4803		5.1714
-- Added volume	.0991			.0991
-- Added copies	.0266			.0266
-- Added locations	.0976			.0976
Card sorting & filing	.0877		.1167	.2044
Database maintenance				
-- Update NOTIS record	.0726	.0186		.0912
-- Delete NOTIS record	.0025			.0025
-- Delete RLIN record	.0020			.0020
Physical processing	.5136		.2186	.7322
Authority Maintenance	.6602	.1921		.8523
TOTAL, ALL TASKS	7.7780	.9677	.3353	9.0810
Compensating factor (.617)	4.7990			
TOTAL LABOR COST	12.5770			
Overhead (.1995)	2.5091			
Fringe benefits (.305)	3.8360			
TOTAL COSTS PER TITLE	18.9221	.9477	.3353	20.2251

Note to Tables A3 and A-4:

Authority maintenance is assumed to be the same for RLIN member and original cataloging. Available data do not allow this to be determined more precisely.

Table A-4 shows the costs for original cataloging.

Table A-4
COST OF ORIGINAL CATALOGING
April 1, 1994

TASK	LABOR COST	RLIN SEARCHING	SUPPLIES, OTHER	TOTAL COST
Searching/GTO	.8487	.2767		1.1254
Sort & distribute incoming books	.6763			.6763
Cataloging	10.7262	.4169		11.1431
-- Added volume	.0991			.0991
-- Added copies	.0266			.0266
-- Added locations	.0976			.0976
Card sorting & filing	.0877		.1167	.2044
Database maintenance				
-- Update NOTIS record	.0726	.0186		.0912
-- Delete NOTIS record	.0025			.0025
-- Delete RLIN record	.0020			.0020
Physical processing	.5136		.2186	.7322
Authority Maintenance	.6602	.1921		.8523
TOTAL, ALL TASKS	13.8131	.9043	.3353	14.7174
Compensating factor (.617)	8.5227			
TOTAL LABOR COST	22.3358			
Overhead (.1995)	4.4560			
Fringe benefits (.305)	6.8124			
TOTAL COSTS PER TITLE	33.6042	.9043	.3353	34.8438



Table A-5 gives the costs associated with FASTCAT cataloging.

Table A-5
COST OF FASTCAT CATALOGING
April 1, 1994

TASK	LABOR COST	RLIN SEARCHING	SUPPLIES, OTHER	TOTAL COST
Cataloging	1.0169			1.0169
-- Added volume	.0991			.0991
-- Added copies	.0266			.0266
-- Added locations	.0976			.0976
Card sorting & filing	.0877		.1167	.2044
Database maintenance				
-- Update NOTIS record	.0726	.0186		.0912
-- Delete NOTIS record	.0025			.0025
-- Delete RLIN record	.0020			.0020
Physical processing	.5136		.2186	.7322
Authority Maintenance	.7377	.1921		.9298
TOTAL, ALL TASKS	2.6563	.2107	.3353	3.2023
Compensating factor (.617)	1.6389			
TOTAL LABOR COST	4.2952			
Overhead (.1995)	.8569			
Fringe benefits (.305)	1.3100			
TOTAL COSTS PER TITLE	6.4621	.2107	.3353	6.9670

 TOP

Table A-6 shows the cost associated with FASTSHELVE.

Table A-6
COST OF FASTSHELVE CATALOGING
April 1, 1994

TASK	LABOR COST	RLIN SEARCHING	SUPPLIES, OTHER	TOTAL COST

Cataloging	.4851			.4851
Card sorting & filing	.0877		.1167	.2044
Physical processing	.5136		.2186	.7322
TOTAL, ALL TASKS	1.0864	.2107	.3353	1.4217
Compensating factor (.617)	.6703			
TOTAL LABOR COST	1.7567			
Overhead (.1995)	.3505			
Fringe benefits (.305)	.5358			
TOTAL COSTS PER TITLE	2.6430	.3353	.3353	2.9783



Table A-7 summarizes the data from Tables A-2 through A-6 and gives an average cost of cataloging per title regardless of process used. In other words, it gives an answer to the question: "How much does it cost to a catalog a book in CTS?" Readers are reminded that this is not the whole cost of processing.

Table A-7
LIST AND COSTS OF CATALOGING-RELATED TASKS
April 1, 1994

TASK	LABOR COST	RLIN SEARCHING	SUPPLIES, OTHER	TOTAL COST
Searching/GTO	.8487	.2767		1.1254
Sort & distribute incoming books	.6763			.6763
Cataloging	10.7262	.4169		11.1431
-- Mean, all methods	4.6114	.4529		5.0643
-- Added volume	.0991			.0991
-- Added copies	.0266			.0266
-- Added locations	.0976			.0976
Card sorting & filing	.0877		.1167	.2044
Database maintenance				
-- Update NOTIS record	.0726	.0186		.0912
-- Delete NOTIS record	.0025			.0025

-- Delete RLIN record	.0020			.0020
Physical processing	.5136		.2186	.7322
Authority Maintenance	1.0779	.1921		1.2700
TOTAL, ALL TASKS	8.1160	.9403	.3353	9.3916
Compensating factor (.617)	5.0076			
TOTAL LABOR COST	13.1236			
Overhead (.1947)	2.6182			
Fringe benefits (.305)	4.0027			
TOTAL COSTS PER TITLE	19.7445	.9423	.3353	21.0221



Table A-8 describes the computation of the technical services overhead percentage used in the above tables.

Table A-8
COMPUTATION OF TECHNICAL SERVICES OVERHEAD
April 1, 1994

Administrative salaries	\$354,120
NOTIS maintenance (1/2 annual charge)	\$23,250
CIT communications charges for Ethernet	\$22,980
CIT communications charges for Sytek	\$11,172
RLG communications charges	\$24,408
RLIN terminal software	\$1,020
RLIN terminals (depreciated over 5 years)	\$4,500
Bookmarking PC (depreciated over 5 years)	\$500
NOTIS PCs (depreciated over 5 years)	\$22,000
Printers (depreciated over 5 years)	\$1,440
TOTAL CHARGES	\$465,390
TOTAL TECHNICAL SERVICES BUDGET	\$2,333,262
TECHNICAL SERVICES OVERHEAD RATE	\$465,390 / 2,333,262 = .1995



**Appendix B
OPTIONS FOR CATALOGING IN CTS**

**Table B-1
CONTRACTING OUT LC/FASTCAT AUTHORITY WORK**

Assume 45,000 records per year

I.	Internal	Contracting
Staff and contract costs		
1.5 FTE	-\$34,746	
Vendor charge		\$4,500
Authorities cleanup	\$7,000	
Supplies	\$830	
LTD cost	\$2,250	
TOTAL	-\$24,666	\$4,500

Net saving: \$24,666 - \$4,500 = \$20,166

II.	Internal	Contracting
RLIN searching costs		
From Copy Cataloging	-\$8,604	
Added to Authorities	\$3,442	
TOTAL	-\$5,162	



**Table B-2
CONTRACTING OUT RLIN MEMBER AUTHORITY WORK**

Assumptions:

- 15,000 records per year

- Proportion of original and copy catalogers' time devoted to authority work while cataloging
 RLIN member copy is 20%

I.	Internal	Contracting
Staff and contract costs		
Catalogers	-\$28,764	
Vendor charge		\$1,500
Authorities cleanup	\$4,438	
Supplies	\$278	
LTD cost	\$750	
TOTAL	-\$23,298	\$1,500

Net saving: \$23,298 - \$1,500 = \$21,798

II.	Internal	Contracting
RLIN searching costs		
From Copy Cataloging	-\$6,978	
Added to Authorities	\$697	
TOTAL	-\$6,281	

5/12/97



Last Updated: 5/21/04 1:51 PM

