Orbis Cascade Alliance
CTST Symposium
December 8, 2011
UO Portland, White Stage Building

Opening Session Notes, Erica Findley, note taker

Betsy Wilson, Chair of the Board and Council gave the keynote

- The Alliance is in a good position to be examining areas for collaboration. There is already a strong sense of collaboration.
- Collaborate or die. Collaboration is necessary if we want to remain competitive and offer our users the services they expect.
- The work itself should be the reward for collaboration.
- Library Technical Services staff have collaboration in their DNA. There are already many standards that govern what we do. We have been collaborating since the automation of cataloging.
- Collaboration means that we need to have a high tolerance for ambiguity.
- New article "Parabiosis and Particularism" by Jim Neal. The same author who wrote about feral librarians.
- Collaboration is an opportunity to create new capacity. To do things we were unable to do before.
- Within the Alliance we should think of ourselves as accelerant to other collaborative efforts in libraries. People will be watching what we do.
- Scale matters. We need to offer our services on the web scale.
- Questions for the day:
    - How might we prepare for a shared environment?
    - How might we nurture the spirit of collaboration?
    - How might we harmonize all of our practices while maintaining the local touch?
    - How will we make decisions and govern in a shared environment?
- We need to invest in people.
- Collaboration is all about relationships with other people.
- Shared practices require attention so that we do not revert to old ways.
- No one is unchanged by collaboration. No one can go home and be untouched.
- Lead on to fortune!

John F. Helmer, Executive Director and Chair of Shared ILS Team

- The Shared ILS is a game changer. It will make collaboration in other areas more attainable.
- The migration process to the Shared ILS will be a lot like the process experienced when automating cataloging.
- We will all go through a lengthy process of having to get used to doing things in a new way.
- We should encourage experimentation and collaboration during this process.

Breakout session reports, CTS Symposium, Maria Wagner, note taker

Acquisitions:

- Workflows: what's good to share, what's not? Breakout acq. tasks along the lines of copy cataloging – what can be standardized, what are routine tasks vs. higher-level tasks. We need to identify routine acq. tasks that lend themselves to centralization.
- Service demands: short turnaround for rush orders - might be best kept local. Longer turnaround or more routine orders could potentially be centralized.
- There is interest in some areas like foreign language acq. being turned over to a central unit.
- Fiscal and legal requirements: It is not clear what we really can share in this area – we span three states and different legal requirements of institutions (public/private).
- Another way to get a service perspective from Alliance – we imagine the Alliance as vendor-like in some things it could do for members. YBP consolidates publisher relations, vendors consolidate invoicing, Alliance could bring us vendor-like advantages.
- This is really the beginning of the conversation – the next step is working through various acq. workflows, drill down levels of detail. Areas where we can collaborate will come through.
- We discussed individual fears of change – what does collaboration mean for all of us locally? It was helpful to talk about things before this change becomes more concrete. It became less scary once we talked about real effects.

Cataloging:

- Discussed different types of workflows in each of three different models of collaboration. How would we deal with a firm order monograph in each of the collaborative models? How would we deal with an e-resource? What about special collections?
- Difficult to know right now what will be possible in the shared ILS. How will holdings work in OCLC? Will we have one holding symbol or will each institution retain their own? How will we go between the ILS and WorldCat?
- Bulk loading questions – batch
- Among the different models, some sort of hybrid is most realistic. There are advantages to the different models. Many advantages to consolidation with e-resources, authority control, and database maintenance – a virtual centralized model for these things would create efficiencies.
- Model 3 – the centralized model seems too radical; it is difficult to imagine catalogers away from physical collections because they bring local expertise. Transit time is an issue. Classification is local and tied to user needs. It is more helpful to not spend a lot of time to imagine fully centralized environment.
- First steps – think about what we mean by local practices. Gain efficiencies: we probably need to give up some local practices. Public service staff and administration needs to understand our local practice and what makes sense to consolidate.
- Getting the Bibliographic Standards and Best Practices document more visible on the Alliance website would be great.
- We need more data on what it costs right now to order and catalog a book.
- Special collections bring particular needs. Physical and tangible collections can be special and unique to an institution.
- Recommend creation of a permanent cataloging policy committee sooner rather than later.

E-resources/serials:

- Serials: with the electronic environment, print is going away – efforts reduced in terms of serials processing and maintenance.
- Talked about ERM and management of e-serials in a way that flows together.
- Reduce duplication of effort around electronic resource packages. Discussed some issues we are facing now and the services provided by the E-Resources program and Greg Doyle.
- Standardization of display in the shared ILS. A record comes up in a results list and users can't tell if they have access. We need to standardize data in serials, licensing and licensing management. Single journals – can we collaborate as a clearinghouse for license negotiation?
- ILL – recordkeeping. Acquisitions interfaces with ILL a lot now. ILL rights for packages are an issue. How do we standardize those local practices?
- Statistics – a centralized stats area would be nice. Having a central expert for data analysis would be great.
- Unified discovery interface is critical for serials and e-resources.
- Collaborative negotiation for service fees, subscription costs, access across consortium, and licensing would be very beneficial.
- Because we already collaborate on big packages via the Alliance's ER program, we can see there are more efficient ways to do this sort of work. This is a good place to start working collaboratively.
- ERMs – Serials Solutions is common throughout the Alliance. We are duplicating effort by maintaining this many different ERM systems.

Generalist:

- Acquisitions – what makes sense? Beyond the physical, let's look at web-scale. How do we share or not share money is a particular challenge.
- Should acquisitions be coupled with cataloging? Can we build on already-done Alliance work?
- Remember the end user
- Purchasing as a service. De-accession is a critical component. DDA is bold – continue to push, don't go backwards. How do we consolidate over the years? Central person? Single knowledgebase?
- The local touch = control. Can selectors give local up to central?
- Serials – can we share records and subscription management? What might it look like? License data needs to be on single platform. Work with vendor to develop? Beta testing new systems? How will that impact local libraries?
- Some Alliance libraries are still having problems with DDA record loading – keep this in mind.
- Staff workflows – who is point person at each institution?
- Do we want to spend time on beta? How much time on ERM?
- Confidentiality issues.
- Shared policies
- Would institutions be willing to ILL e-resources?
- Ebooks need to work at all institutions: can we share ebooks?
- Cataloging: the Alliance is host to a massive amount of expertise, how do we work to leverage that? Is anyone interested in the ability to tag videos? How will we de-dupe collaboratively?
- Imagining centers of excellence for collaboration – foreign languages, particular institutional strengths.
- Local work can then be in nonstandard cataloging
- Permissions would be an issue – we need to establish trusted catalogers.

- Eliminating redundancy – there is value in cataloging only once. Outsourcing – maybe we outsource within the Alliance (this is a mental model shift)
- Data controls – OCLC is not efficient
- Game changes – upstream vendor cataloging. Investment in subject headings lessening.
- RDA – timeline – focus on this in order to provide guidance to all libraries
- Alliance should find opportunities for mentors and mentoring
- What does it take to get to the next level – more advanced metadata, cataloging policy?
- Outside the library there is lots of information – space of library more of use.

DDA presentation at CTS Symposium on 12/8/11, Kelley McGrath, note taker

Tom Larsen, member of the Demand Drive Acquisitions Pilot Implementation Team and the Collaborative Technical Services Team 2011, reviewed some of the implementation decisions made, as well as the current status of the project. He also discussed some remaining problems.

Tom explained the decision to use OCLC's KnowledgeBase product to provide access to the DDA ebooks in Summit. Although KnowledgeBase is a work in progress, it eliminates the need for all Alliance libraries to load records locally in order for their URLs to show up in Summit. It is also easier for patrons, since they are presented with a single URL and don't have to look for their institution's name in a list.

Tom provided an overview of the four potential sources of MARC records for the DDA ebooks and explained that EBL records received via WorldCat Cataloging Partners were selected because they contain OCLC numbers and would be available for the first and ongoing batch loads.

Tom also summarized some of the problems and quality concerns with the EBL records. Many of the records to do not have LCSH or even any subject headings. A small number lack OCLC numbers. There were some problems with multivolume records where we were sent multiple copies of the same record with the URL for a different volume on each. We are not always getting the best OCLC record or a provider-neutral record when one is available. There seems to be a problem with matching EBL's and OCLC's data and they are investigating this.

There have been questions about whether these records should be upgraded, but it is not clear who would do this or how they would be compensated.

The project has been extended, but there are still questions about sustainability.

The FAQ for the DDA pilot will be updated within a week on the Alliance website at http://www.orbiscascade.org/index/demand-driven-acquisitions-pilot.

Practical collaborative steps: Susan Hinken, note taker

Erica Finley gave a presentation on Bibliographic Standards and Best Practices

Background on the work of the group. A previous iteration identified 14 areas of practice, which fell into three categories:
- Ones that could be done now

- Those needing more info before undertaking
- Those to be accomplished in an shared ILS environment

Current group focused on those 14 areas and developed the 7 mandates with the goal of improving discoverability in Summit Catalog.

In order to effectively implement the shared ILS Alliance libraries should have common bibliographic practices. The word mandate was chosen to emphasis the need to implement these common practices; they will impact local practice. Alliance libraries should be thinking about how the mandates and the shared ILS will affect our work as a whole.

March 1, 2012, the date the mandates should be implemented is coming up fast. Wanted to make sure libraries were adopting common practice before we adopted shared ILS. Mandates are for work moving forward and not to be applied retroactively.

Review of mandates:
- Bibliographic utility
- Floor bibliographic standards
- Single vs. separate records
- Provider neutral records
- Network level cataloging
- Level of PCC cooperation
- Outsourcing/vendor records

The working group also outlined general principles that will need to address but cannot without knowledge of shared ILS. They are:
- Local information
- Local Inventory control
- Authority control
- Batch loading
- Database management

Next steps:
- Follow implementation plans for the mandates
- Convene the Shared ILS preparation team
- Gather feedback from review of this report in August

Discussion and questions from those in attendance:
- Is any library implementing
- How will Alliance assess the mandates—this will be in the charge for next team
- Single record—why did the working group recommend? It's the emerging practice and more clearly will identify to users what is available.
- Can ILS vendor handle a dual record approach? None does this at current time
- Why provider neutral records? There are some issues with maintenance, but it's seen easier for the user as it more clearly identifies what is actually available
- Can these mandates be used to help us improve record quality from vendors? We should attempt to leverage our mandates and collective power.

Joe Kiegel gave a report on the Foreign Language cataloging project
- Very concrete pilot
- Test shared cataloging of print monographs
- Small area: few foreign languages in non-Roman scripts
- Two cataloging libraries: UO and UW
- Four libraries participated: received cataloging
- Ann Miller of UO took the lead in getting the group going, with great encouragement to Mark Watson
- Used the courier to transport materials
- Owning libraries provided cataloging authorizations in OCLC
- Cataloging libraries cataloged and used the OCLC save file to provide the copy to the owning library
- Owning libraries polished off process
- Every book had to be handled twice
- Little over 100 cataloged

Lessons:
- Communicate well about what is being shipped via courier, which has size and weight limitations
- Owning libraries sometimes didn't know whether materials met the pilot criteria

Conclusions:
- Successful: gained experience
- Easy to share when materials are processed according to nat'l standards
- More difficult to share local tasks
- Pilot does not scale, all the work is done on one side
- Council should explore and implement methods to exchange value among member libraries

Remaining issues:
- Compensation/exchange: does this mean money?
- Are there other needs that need to be addressed: might be in earlier survey
- Ann Miller is using a methodology for analyzing costs
- Map cataloging? Is there an Alliance wide need.
- Looked at backlog and see where greatest need? Not that anyone is aware

Shared ILS: Anya Arnold, note taker

Members of the Shared ILS team gave some background about major aspects of the RFP. They envision that the shared ILS will be a tool that will allow us to be collaborative, rethink and revisit workflows.

RFP Process-John Helmer reported :
- Going over the website and how to find information
- How the team is organized, and the working groups, representative, feedback methods.

Motivation and the process:
- Limitations of the present - lack of flexibility - innovation is not there - cost of ownership - old systems - cant deliver what we want or attract developers to work on the systems
- Opportunities for the future- collection dev, tech services, new system- we can be a part of it- cutting edge chance to form it
- Cost of in action- competitive environment, risky without staff, want to be ahead of the curve

Process:
Language has be released - web meetings – RFP – demonstrations – negotiations - decisions by council - profiling - migration

Bill Jordan reported on the systems portion of the RFP
Address items that are common- up time - scale - records and transactions - regulatory requirements - data privacy - patron privacy- authentication - leveraging already existing systems- new member changes - peaks and spikes - experience and migration - end to end - staff functions - end user systems - Flexibility pick and choose or all for one- not just picking a product we are picking a partner

Bill Klem on circ/summit
Each library needs to come up with a MSCW spreadsheets. Integration of systems for patron ease of use- nre compatibility - sister consortia - libraries still need to do local things

Dena Hutto- user services
Discovery and interaction with the system, and everything else in the local libraries. Expecting to see a googlebox, but they want more - entry level and expert level -silos of information - would like to not run WCL and local catalog database, contends e vs. p......want to show all resources available to the right patron access.... Search everything or only local information

Anne Miller-Technical Services
 So many different things that go into this - cradle to grave
Challenge - what can a vendor do now or how do they thing they are going to do....like duplication

RFP language sets view and is inclusive. What are the drop dead aspects of the system that we have to have? What do we have to have in the RFP and forward thinking questions, future ways of communications between all parties involved? Libraries should develop a list of details or requirements each considers essential in the new ILS whether or not it is currently part of their existing system. This should help libraries participate in the demos and evaluation/feedback portions of the RFP process.

Comments from the floor.

Q-how will presentations developed and who will be present?
        A. scoring mechanism will be developed, and then a subset those submitting proposals will be asked to demo - language is written
 Q. What about self booking?
        A. Sometimes you will have to change, what is mandatory and what is acceptable- what can we provide in another way
 Q. Video conferencing as part of a shared system.
        A. We do have goto meeting ....that really doesn't need to be in the ILS
 Q. Why the delineation between end to end or staff functions or end user

A. We have many discovery layers ... Our stated preferences is to have one system

Q. In the RFP it talks about additional members, does it talk about how many different members?

A. No, natural slow growth, and new limits - what are the hard and soft limits. However no upper limit on how many members

Q. Why isn't the language together?

A. The only thing left out is scoring and references, we are trying to be very open for our members

Q. Scoring is where the rubber meets the road - we want say in the scoring.

A. Input on product demos, it is not set, just the team will score the RFP

Q. Lists that we are creating will vendors see these? How we ask vendors to answer questions.

A. Demos and negations - or other methods ... There is not a deadline to do this... If it is not right it is not right.

Q. Wonder what people think about seeing vendor demos quickly and in succession wouldn't that be a hindrance

A. They will be recorded and it needs to be fast so that there's momentum it needs to timely

Q. Is the idea to a partnership expressed in RFP or should it be Ad to what extent.

A. Yes and no, we want them to show us how to get us where we want to go.

Q. how much r&d are we willing to do

A. As a team we need to judge how much we need to do...or want to do. No matter how well developed it is we are still going to be on that vendor. There are degrees of r&d . There're sections about what needs to be working day one

Q. paying for two systems at once

A. our approach has been we are not willing to pay for it we are going to redirect funds- amortize funds if a long term relationships ...still a lot of work but hopefully not a lot of costs

Q. What about acquisitions systems- this system will stand or fall ...how do we avoid that?

A. We need the people in this room to give us must haves in the systems. We need the libraries to talk about the do or die processes

Q. language needs to be constant

A. Agreed

Q. In addition to demos can we have trials?

A. Yes but it will be fixed. We need to talk to the libraries that already have it in place

Q. Service level. We need to know what the historic service levels/reputations of each vendor. Kelly - history function

A. We are looking into that

Q. Indexing and re-indexing I did not see it...

A. It is there, but we might need to tighten the language

Q. Are there going to limits on the fund fields and other places

A. What level do we want to get at? Limitations and extent of the records Ad fields

Q. reporting and lists customization and use of reports ...librarians are able to run the reports

A. create lists is wonderful and so we need a good reporting usage

Q. It training and implementation the systems in the RFP

A. It is

Q. Demonstrate the ability to automate staff tasks

A. Yes

Q. Local notes to be displayed language is limiting in the RFP

A. That is a good suggestion

Q. Workflow overlaps. Systems does not support copy cat within acq.

A. Just because the breakdowns are written does not mean that we that. We did not ask for integrated workflows....

Q. what if no one answered or nothing meets our needs

A. We will cross that bridge when we get that

Q. Are digital collections added?

A. We could make reference to it

Q. Do you have a list of things that does not need to be in the system? Or drag along cause it's in the current system .i.e. create lists

A. the active is listed but not the name...

Q. End user searches and scoping

A. Yes