Overview

The Copyright Review Management System (CRMS) project is currently proceeding in accordance with the Schedule of Completion submitted with the grant proposal. We have just entered Phase Three of the project, which is scheduled to run from June 2010 through May 2011. As of June 28, 2010, Technical Services staff at University of Michigan (UM) have reviewed 21,152 volumes in the HathiTrust Digital Library using the CRMS. Of those volumes, over 12,501¹ (approximately 59%) have been determined to be in the public domain. Those volumes can now be discovered publicly via Mirlyn (Michigan’s OPAC - http://mirlyn.lib.umich.edu) as well as in the HathiTrust Digital Library (http://catalog.hathitrust.org/). Two reviewers review each volume, and an expert arbitrator makes a final determination on all conflicting reviews.

We have spent the past six months putting in place enhancements to the system and revising our guidelines and processes in hopes of improving efficiency in our copyright determination work. As of June 2010, as planned, we also released Version 2.0 of the CRMS, which includes enhanced interface, navigation, and documentation, and incorporates functionality intended to assist us as we train and integrate the reviewers from outside institutions. The CRMS project manager and another CRMS “expert” recently trained the first set of new reviewers at Indiana University. Training will take place at the University of Wisconsin in July and at the University of Minnesota in August.

Goals and Accomplishments to Date for the Reporting Period – January through June 2010

1. Staff use CRMS to perform copyright status review work
   
   Accomplishments: Staff at the University of Michigan continue to rely solely on the CRMS to perform and manage copyright review work. We have implemented the “double-blind” review process, store all reviews in the CRMS database, and export rights determinations automatically to the HathiTrust rights database on a nightly basis. For the period from January through mid-June 2010, staff at University of Michigan reviewed close to 12,000 volumes, and approximately 7400 were determined to be in the public domain.

2. Project Manager works with Technical Services Staff to monitor issues; Project Manager works with Programmer to resolve system-related issues

¹ This number does not include the volumes reviewed during the grant period prior to the release of the CRMS Version 1.0. From December 2008 through June 2009, staff “manually” reviewed 26,741 volumes and 12,703 volumes were determined to be in the public domain. Therefore, project totals to date are 47,893 volumes reviewed and 25,204 now available as full text.
Accomplishments: Project Manager continuously tracked issues and worked with Electronic Access (EA) Unit Administrator and Programmer to introduce enhancements to the functionality of the CRMS, which were incorporated into major and minor updates to version 1.0 of the system, culminating in the “release” of version 2.0 of the CRMS in May 2010 (see #4 below for details).

3. Develop methods to share findings on copyright status (scheduled September 2009-February 2010)
   Accomplishments: This was addressed in the December 2009 Interim Narrative Report.

4. Define requirements, Develop, Test, Refine and Release CRMS 2.0
   Accomplishments: Starting in January 2010, defined requirements and developed implementation plan for version 2.0 of the CRMS (released as of end of May 2010). Features of version 2.0 now implemented (many specifically in preparation for bringing on new reviewers from outside institutions) include:
   o User interface and navigation improvements, including reviewer and administrative views (see CRMS-home-screenshot; CRMS-review-screenshot; CRMS-documentation-navigation-screenshot²)
   o Direct links to documentation related to determinations process and system functionality from “home” page and within review interface
   o Mechanism(s) to accommodate reviewer questions/feedback
   o Improvements for use of HathiTrust pageturner to view page images (resulting in reducing time to load page images, effectively decreasing time required to review each volume)
   o System now accommodates several experts reviewing at once
   o Option for neutral expert reviews that do not invalidate existing non-expert reviews
   o Ability to delay processing on a review when the reviewer has a question
   o Analyzed volumes most likely to be reviewed and designated “undetermined” and took steps to filter such volumes from the CRMS review queue (e.g., foreign, translations, non-English language, dissertations) based on additional information in the volume’s MARC record. Segregated these volumes by category for possible future review projects. This has helped to increase efficiency and produce a higher number of public domain determinations.
   o Added support for making system partially/fully unavailable (in the event of system outages or planned updates/maintenance)
   o Added testing mechanisms for development site to facilitate automated system testing prior to introducing changes to the system
   o Created a “training” instance of the CRMS with all the functionality of the “production” CRMS for training purposes and so that experts can subsequently monitor and provide feedback to the new reviewers. Determinations made by new reviewers in the training site will not be exported to the rights database.

² Note: screenshots of the interface and copies of documentation are included on the CD submitted along with this report
New reviewers will work in the training site until such time they exhibit the necessary consistency and accuracy, then they will be authorized to switch over to review in the “production” CRMS.

5. Publicity – website; updates, etc.
   Accomplishments:
   o Continue to maintain project website that includes Interim Performance reports, project updates, presentations (http://www.lib.umich.edu/copyright-review-management-system)
   o Continue to send out performance reports and project updates to relevant library staff, CIC partners and colleagues at other institutions who have expressed interest in the project
   o Project manager was invited to present an overview of the CRMS Project for all staff at the Indiana University Library on June 14, 2010 in conjunction with training of new reviewers at that institution.

6. Central Coordinator will monitor productivity and take steps to evaluate improvements in accuracy as described in the evaluation plan and refine processes as needed. Efforts in this area include continuous monitoring of conflicts and conflict rates, revising and clarifying determination guidelines, process and documentation as needed for reviewers to ensure that productivity goals for the CRMS are being met.
   Accomplishments:
   o Project manager continues to work closely with EA Unit Head and EA Unit Administrator to monitor productivity and takes steps to reduce conflict rate
   o Trained two existing CRMS reviewers as well as Electronic Access Unit Head to serve as expert reviewers
   o Streamlined determinations process to allow reviewers to more quickly make “undetermined” determinations (to reduce time spent on works unlikely to be determined to be in the public domain).
   o Created a “Decision Tree” document incorporating the previous determinations guidelines as set forth in the Use Cases to establish an order for applying decision making criteria for copyright determinations (again, in order to reduce conflicts) (see DecisionTree.pdf)
   o Revised and refined the Decision Tree based on reviewer testing and feedback
   o Created extensive Decision Tree Help document including descriptions, explanations, detailed instructions and examples for each step of the Decision Tree (see DecisionTreeHelp.pdf)

7. Prepare to engage in collaborative reviewing with CIC institutions (Indiana University, University of Minnesota, University of Wisconsin) beginning as of Phase Three
   Accomplishments: Project Manager has been in ongoing contact with the appropriate parties at each of the three CIC institutions regarding staffing, scheduling and training activities. Efforts to prepare for training included:
Defined 2-day long training agenda for new reviewers to be held on-site at each institution

Created and compiled additional documentation and materials needed for training new reviewers

Worked with relevant Library Information Technology staff at University of Michigan to set up and test access to CRMS and HathiTrust pageturner for external participants.

Created CRMS training site (see CRMS 2.0 development above)

8. Contract with United States Copyright Office (USCO) to evaluate CRMS determinations

Accomplishments:

Project manager and University of Michigan Finance staff corresponded extensively with Copyright Office staff to determine procedures for engaging USCO services and determining the number of searches Copyright Office could accommodate for the budgeted amount. Project Manager worked with Programmer to compile set of volumes for which renewals were not found. Volumes were randomly chosen, with steps taken to ensure that determinations were spread evenly over the months since we started work in the CRMS, publication dates of volumes covered the range of 1923-1963, and that all reviewers were evenly represented in determinations for the volumes in the sample set.

Copyright Office confirmed (as of June 2010) that payment has been processed and comparison searches for approximately 90 volumes will be conducted over the next 2-3 months, after which a report will be prepared with findings for each title.

Evaluation of Issues/Efforts for Current Reporting Period – January through June 2010

Over the past six months we have continued to identify and work through factors that have constrained our productivity (numbers of determinations, and consequently, number of volumes determined to be PD) since introduction of the CRMS and the “double blind” review process. The percentage of reviews requiring expert input (three people reviewing per volume) has remained high (up to almost 35% of determinations at one point). Project staff have identified the constraint created by the amount of time experts have to review conflicts and provide consistent feedback to reviewers. This has limited our ability to review and open up the number of volumes we were able to prior to the introduction of the CRMS, when every volume only required one person to review it in order for it to become a final determination.

In response, we have taken many additional steps over the past six months to adjust and clarify guidelines for making determinations (e.g., creating the Decision Tree) and to simplify the process by eliminating volumes in categories likely to be time consuming and unlikely to get public domain determinations (e.g., foreign volumes). However, the increased productivity we hoped to see from taking these steps seems to have been obscured by (1) veteran reviewers struggling to adjust to changes in the process, and (2)
the increasing sophistication of some veteran reviewers in identifying potential (rather than necessarily real) problems. In response, we have worked to articulate a consistent methodology for reviewers to employ when it comes to problems such as embedded works, and recently came up with an approach that we believe balances effort with the amount of risk presented by these issues and the benefit of broader access. We are hopeful that if reviewers can consistently follow this approach, we will see more public domain determinations and fewer conflicts in this area. In addition, we anticipate that the remaining veteran reviewers (as well as the experts) are now adjusting to the new guidelines, and that the changes we have made will ultimately make it easier for new reviewers to learn how to do determinations work effectively and start contributing determinations to the project.

Next Steps

Our main priority in Phase Three will be to train Technical Services staff from three outside institutions to participate as CRMS reviewers. The CRMS project manager and another CRMS “expert” trained 5 staff at Indiana University in mid-June. They are currently working in the CRMS Training site under the close supervision of UM experts until such time as they exhibit the necessary consistency and accuracy; after this, they will be switched over to review in the “production” CRMS.

From the previously submitted Interim Narrative Report (12/31/2009):

In the grant proposal, we state that our goal is to open up on average 1700 volumes per month. The average percentage of volumes reviewed that are likely to be in the public domain is currently around 56%. Therefore we essentially need to double our current review rates (bringing them back up to pre-CRMS levels, with the double review process in place) to achieve our stated goals. We believe that this is not an insurmountable task in the long term, especially as we bring on more reviewers. However in the short term, new reviewers will require even more expert time for guidance, supervision and feedback.

---

3 We have seen a corresponding increase in the rate of undetermined status as the percentage of public domain determinations has decreased. Historically this rate has been around 7-8%; however, for volumes reviewed using the CRMS, the undetermined rate is close to 17%. We attribute this to the fact that our reviewers have over time become more sophisticated over time and are better able to recognize when a condition exists that would prevent them from making an accurate and valid determination based on our process. Examples of problematic cases include when a work was previously published outside the US; the work includes a play, speech, collection of poems or artwork that would not be included in the Stanford Renewal Database; the work is a reprint of a work that was previously published in, for example, a periodical; and the digitized volume is missing pages that might contain pertinent copyright information. So while this could be seen as a loss insofar as productivity is concerned, it also indicates a general increase in reliability and accuracy of our copyright determinations.
We have devoted our efforts to providing this guidance over the past six months, and will continue to do so with the new reviewers from outside institutions. Now that we have an increased pool of experts and what we hope is a more consistent and well-defined approach to reviewing, we are optimistic that we will be able to train the pool of outside reviewers and ultimately increase the number of determinations being done in the CRMS on a monthly basis. We will continue to push towards our goal of opening up 60,000 volumes throughout the course of the project.