

## MOBIUS Coordinators Advisory Group

*Meeting Minutes, Wed. July 14, 2004*

Chair: Per Almquist, Bridges

Minutes: Jason Stirnaman, Arthur

### Open

- Arthur Cluster responsible for meeting minutes (per rotation)
- Introductions
- Attendees: Per Almquist, Bridges; Eileen Condon, Bridges; Cathye Dierberg, Archway; Judy Fox, WashU; Renee Gorrell, Lance; Gary Harris, MCO; Resa Kerns, MERLIN; Les Lynam, Quest; Ted Ostaszewski, WILO; George Rickerson, MCO; Jean Rose, Bridges; Kathy Schlump, Archway; Mary Sims, Lance; Jason Stirnaman, Arthur; Terry Weaver, Towers.
- Swan did not attend.
- Additions to agenda?
  - Open discussion session requested.
- Agenda adopted with addition of open discussion session.

### Agenda

#### **Elect new chair**

Judy Fox volunteered to serve as next chair. Unanimously accepted. Judy will serve as chair effective upon conclusion of meeting.

#### **Our Purpose/Role**

Reviewed the committee's charge () as given by MOBIUS Executive Committee.

Per noted the 4 major assignments of the charge and offered some questions and comments:

1. Recommendations of new products
2. Overall aspects of catalog/reciprocal borrowing.
3. Standards. – What's our role vs. that of other MOBIUS committees?
4. Recommendations of new functionality. – We have yet to serve in this capacity.

Per suggested we address MCAG's relationship and interaction with other committees and with MCO.

Concerning where product recommendations typically arise from, Gary (MCO) stated that recommendations have been initiated by the Executive Committee (EC) and occasionally by MCO.

Question: How do we address the standards charge? Should we make decisions about Acquisitions/Serials standards (where none currently exist)?

We generally agreed that MCAG should not and cannot legislate libraries' local practice. It was suggested that MCAG might provide oversight of standards.

George (MCO) sees MCAG's core task to be product review and recommendations of products to be acquired on state-wide basis. Concerns about budget limitations should not be a major factor in MCAG's recommendations. EC has responsibility to consider recommendations and how to pay for them.

MCAG may consult with Innovative representatives and request demonstrations, etc.

MCAG should be mindful of the budget process. Recommendations must be submitted by late Summer – early Fall to be considered for the next fiscal year's budget.

Regarding interaction with other committees and consideration of their work:

MCAG is only committee that may recommend consortia-wide purchases. MCAG should maintain a broad perspective. Other functional committees should make their recommendations of such products to MCAG. MCAG will be responsible for assessing impact of products on the consortium and its members.

MERAC may evaluate and recommend third-party or additional Innovative products. MCAG should be responsible for further evaluating recommended consortial purchases that impact Innovative system functionality.

Concerning overall responsibility of the central catalog, reciprocal borrowing, and standards, George replied that: MCAG should function as the top-level "overseer" to identify and address any broad potential problems or shortcomings where standards are concerned.

MCAG is better positioned to consider the technical and functional issues in these situations.

MCAG will be responsible for high-level oversight of CLP functionality, making sure there is sufficiently broad review of implications. MCAG might possibly review the agendas of the functional MOBIUS committees in order to stay abreast of issues.

Concerning whether other committees should bring problems or issues to MCAG for resolution, George replied not necessarily for resolution, but possibly for advice or recommendations. Regarding standards, MCAG should recognize where standards are needed and advise on the choosing of standards.

Per suggested an additional, more detailed document might be needed that states the responsibilities previously described.

Cathye (Archway) suggested that the EC revise the MCAG charge to provide clarification of responsibilities and MCAG's relationship to other committees.

Concerning whether MCAG might play a role in the Innovative enhancements process, such as advising clusters on proposed enhancements, Gary agreed that might be a helpful and appropriate task for MCAG. MCAG could offer recommendations and pooled voting on IUG enhancements on behalf of members. MCAG could play a similar role in the Inn-Reach enhancement process.

Decisions:

- George and Gary were extremely helpful in clarifying MCAG's role within the consortium and governance structure. MCAG participants agreed we have a much better understanding of the committee's priorities and role.
- Cathye will draft a revised charge that reflects our discussion. MCAG will review the charge for ultimate submission to the Executive Committee.
- Per will draft guidelines document for the purpose of providing additional clarification of the charge and how to practically fulfill it.
- MCAG members will solicit recommendations and suggestions from other Coordinators and staff regarding MCAG's role. MCAG members will communicate recommendations via MCAG-L. Judy will compile recommendations.

### **InnReach Agency Software**

Agency is a new software product from Innovative. Sandy Westfall (III) presented Agency to OhioLink and to MOBIUS earlier in the year. Response to the MOBIUS presentation has been positive overall.

George stressed that the implementation of Agency in MOBIUS would be a very important change and decision, but it would not be financially difficult. Purchase of Agency could be recommended for the FY 2006 budget (beginning next summer).

Agency provides the system framework for recognizing distinct institutions on the same server.

Agency grew out of early changes proposed to Innovative by MOBIUS. Innovative's first response to the proposed changes was the introduction of the "Agency" data element. Development of the Agency product has now surpassed the utility of that data element. Agency was developed for C/W MARS, another large InnReach system where it has been in use for about 2 years. The SUMMIT consortium is also using Agency.

Agency affects InnReach transactions only. It would have no effect on cataloging practice, the functionality of Millennium, or same-server transactions, and would have minimal effect on staff activities.

The most noticeable effects of the software would be on the Union Catalog Web OPAC and the request process. Options allow:

- Holdings display by library instead of by cluster,
- For patron requests:
  - verification to prompt for patron's library instead of cluster (no need for patron to recognize "clusters" when performing InnReach transactions),
  - patron to request from all libraries, or from patron's home library only.
- Other possibilities include designation of:
  - Special patron groups, eg. distance education students
  - Special collections or housing of materials, eg. storage facility
- Load balancing to be determined by individual libraries or groups of libraries.

- Additonal impact on members:
  - Cooperating partners would not be required to participate.
  - Would require revisions to bibliographic instruction.

Agency requires a significant amount of profiling. Mapping tables for codes are stored on each local server.

MOBIUS already owns the necessary licenses for Agency, but would have to pay conversion costs:

$((\$6500/\text{per server}) - (\$1500/\text{per server discount for one-time implementation}))(12 \text{ servers}) = \$60,000 + \text{maintenance}$

Cost for each additional Agency = \$8500 + maintenance. George noted that adding more Agencies after initial implementation would have many implications.

Other requirements: Millennium Silver, Millennium Circulation module.

Judy asked what the downsides to Agency are. No one could think of any. George replied that the Common Library Platform was originally conceived to work this way.

The group discussed whether or not the character limit in the patron verification drop-down menu would sufficiently accommodate institution names. The limit appears to be approx. 25 characters. There was general agreement that this was probably sufficient.

Decisions:

- Gary will send the .PPT presentation to MCAG-L
- Representatives will communicate with their libraries and clusters and respond with recommendations by September 1.

## Output Vouchers

Pat Seavey (MCO) had suggested that MCAG might consider recommending purchase of the Output Vouchers software. Ted Fons (III) presented Output Vouchers at IUG 12. His presentation is available on CSDirect under IUG 12 > Financial Reporting Section.

There was some open discussion about the software. Judy (WashU) and Mary(Lance) conveyed that their represented clusters were not interested in using Output Vouchers. Several members felt that the funds limit (9) would likely be too restrictive for most institutions. Cathye (Archway) thought Archway libraries might be interested. Other representatives were unsure whether or not their clusters would be interested.

There was some discussion about judging consensus of the clusters when considering consortium-wide purchases.

Some representatives wondered if the suggestion originated with Pat or from an interested library.

The cost of the Output Vouchers software is unknown.

Decisions:

- Gary will request a quote from Innovative and forward the quote to Judy.

- Gary will inquire of Pat to determine where the suggestion originated.
- Representatives will solicit opinions and recommendations of their cluster members and report by September 1.

Per offered the possibility that future meetings might be conducted via video conferencing. Video conferencing is now available at several regional locations throughout the state. Other MOBIUS committees have met successfully by video.

## **Cooperating Partners**

### **Should CP's have participation in MCAG?**

The CP policy can be found on the MCO web site under Policies > Documents.

CPs currently have voting membership in certain committees, but not in others. There was general discussion on relationships between CPs and committees, voting rights, and the implications of CP involvement in the committees.

The current CP policy specifies what committees CPs are allowed to vote in and what committees they are allowed to "participate in", but does not mention MCAG. Gary suggested that the CP agreement be clarified to address CP committee involvement.

Decision:

- MCAG recommends inviting Springfield GC to participate in MCAG.
- MCAG requests Exec. Committee clarify the current CP policy to specify the level (voting or non-voting) at which CPs may participate in MCAG and other committees.

## **Adherence to standards**

Library staff have noticed some outdated headings, specifically LC Subject Headings, coming from Springfield GC records and appearing in the Union Web OPAC.

CPs are not mandated to uphold the same cataloging standards as Members. There was some discussion about whether they should be required to uphold the same standards, are CPs responsible to the Memorandum of Understanding for Members, what agreements exist between CPs and MOBIUS, and what standards are required for the Union Catalog?

Judy noted that the MOBIUS policy on Authority Control states that the quality of the Union Catalog is dependent upon the uniformity of headings among local catalogs.

George noted that although CPs agree to the same memorandum, MOBIUS has initiated the invitation to become CPs and thus is not in a position to demand they adhere to standards or alter their practices.

Decisions:

- MCAG recommends that MCDAC consider Cooperating Partners' adherence to standards and to what degree standards should apply to the Union Catalog.
- Judy will communicate the recommendation to MCDAC.

## **Open Discussion Session**

### **Table of Contents Enrichment**

Merlin and Archway have individually pursued TOC enrichment. There was general agreement that the service adds significant value to the catalog. MCAG recognizes that it should make recommendations informed by the budget process, but not bound by the current financial outlook.

Decision:

- Recommend to Executive Committee that consortium-wide TOC enrichment resume.

### **My Millennium**

Cathye was interested in who is currently using My Millennium, how, and if it has been successful. Various clusters are using it in varying ways and with varying restrictions.

### **OpenURL Link Resolvers**

Jason inquired who is currently using, or plans to purchase, a link resolver or resolver service, which ones, if anyone was concerned with the Web OPAC not being OpenURL compliant without WebBridge, and if there might be value or interest in revisiting a consortial purchase of WebBridge

Multiple libraries are subscribing to Serials Solutions Article Linker service. CMSU is currently evaluating SFX and Serials Solutions. Les noted that SFX, upon receiving a standard number (ISBN, ISSN) query from an Innovative Web OPAC, is now able to requery the WebOPAC via Z39.50 to retrieve additional metadata for the resolver.

### **Next Meeting**

The next meeting is scheduled for Friday, September 10.