

December 2, 2004  
Arthur Public Services Committee Meeting Minutes

The Public Services Committee met at Westminster College Library in Fulton. Attending this meeting were Tena Barratt – William Woods, Lois Marshall -- Lincoln University, Lucia D'Agostino – Columbia College, Waheedah Bilal -- Westminster College, Cindy Bassett -- Missouri State Library, and Nina Stawski – Stephens.

Cindy Bassett noted that the ability to search by OCLC# has disappeared in the new Arthur OPAC. The committee will ask the MCO office to reinstate that feature in the new catalog. Cindy will contact the MCO office. After speaking with Lynne Edgar about the OCLC# search feature, Cindy asked to have the feature added to the Missouri State Library's scoped OPAC but did not do so for the other Arthur Libraries. If the other Arthur libraries wish to do so they may send a request through the MCO helpdesk.

There was some discussion about including new sections in the Arthur FAQ that address questions about whether non-book items are "requestable" through the Arthur catalog. This further led to discussion about whether there should be a status called "not requestable" (or perhaps another preferred term), for items that can be used in-house at a library but are not available for online requests. The FAQ should answer questions about what formats may be requested online or checked out in-person as a visiting patron. The FAQ will be updated to answer questions about the "requestability" of certain formats. This issue led to the broader question, should there be policies available that can be viewed online by patrons. These policies would address issues dealing with access to library materials as exemplified by the following three questions. Is a visiting patron able to view videos or DVDs or listen to CDs at another library? Can a visiting patron use the online databases at another institution? Does a patron need to call in advance? Should these kinds of access policies be posted on participating libraries web pages? Is this something that the MAAC, MOBIUS Access Advisory Committee should review?

The Arthur Public Services committee worked on issues relating to the renewal and recall of books. Corinne Caputo, Westminster College, had provided a chart to the Arthur Cluster Coordinators to show the extent of the differences between the Arthur cluster members in regard to the Time Frame settings that each Library has chosen. Ideally it was felt that all of the Arthur cluster members might be able to conform to the same time frame settings. The Arthur Public Services committee realized that we may have to go back to our Technical Services Departments to try to understand why certain settings may have been chosen when the Arthur cluster was formed, and then talk to the Directors to see what settings are appropriate now. However, the committee was able to set some initial parameters to recommend. The committee felt that generous access was important. The 30-day loan period for Arthur members should remain. It was felt that the 30-day initial loan might persuade our patrons to choose an Arthur book over a MOBIUS book with its limited 21-day initial loan period. The committee agreed to recommend 7 days for time remaining between renewals. This gives the patron a 7-day window in which to renew their book before it will become overdue. The length of time for a first renewal was 21 days, which is in line with the MOBIUS books. The additional

renewal period was also suggested to be set for 21 days. Arthur library staff members will only need to remember that all renewals, whether the first renewal or an additional one, are all 21 days each. The maximum number of renewals is set at 2. Minimum Use is the length of checkout for a book that has two or more holds on it. With the exception of the Missouri State Library all the Arthur members are currently set to 21 days. Arthur committee members will speak with their Director's to see if the time periods above will be agreeable to each library. Committee members will communicate with each other through e-mail to see if they can come to a consensus about the settings.

Some Arthur libraries wish to be able to recall books for their patrons, including faculty, and some Arthur libraries are adamant about blocking the eligibility to recall so that books are not automatically recalled by the MOBIUS system. (Those libraries not wishing to use the feature enter the code 999 as an eligible for recall setting. This insures that the book will not be recalled by the system for nine hundred and ninety nine days—in other words, unlikely to ever happen). This recall feature, then, may differ library to library. Most Arthur cluster libraries seem to have a preference for manual recall. For those libraries, if any, wishing to use the automatic recall feature, the committee recommends leaving the Time Return Recall to 7 days, and setting the Time to Pickup at 7 days as well. The latter change would only affect the Missouri State Library currently.

The MCDAC or MOBIUS Catalog Design Advisory Committee is asking the Arthur Public Services committee to make a cluster recommendation for features that are not available for the MOBIUS main catalog. It is possible that these options may also be considered for the MOBIUS catalog in the future as well. There were two options presented. The first option is whether the request button in the OPAC will be suppressed or “grayed out” when the only items appearing in the results list of a search are items that do not circulate or should not be available for request. The Arthur Public Services committee had some hesitant members who felt that there were pros and cons to the issue and that patrons might feel a strong frustration level if unable to use the “Request button,” especially if the patron does not comprehend the fact the book is unavailable and in instances where they may be running their search from a remote location where seeking assistance may be a problem. The committee did, however, recommend that the request button be suppressed when there are no “requestable” items available. Some committee members asked that if the request button is eventually suppressed, then there ought to be an easier way for the patron to get back to their list (in addition to the “Back” button of the browser) when nothing is available to request. Perhaps something like a link or button for “Return to Browse” or “Return to Results List” could be added to the OPAC? The committee would like to see what these options might look like before a final decision is made. The second option, called a “Limit to Available” option, (currently used at Washington University), allows a search which is run in the OPAC to be limited, or pre-limited, to items which are available for check out only. It is to be stressed that this is a feature that one chooses to use by checking a box—it need not be used at all if the person performing the search does not desire the feature. The committee recommended this feature be implemented as well.

The Arthur Public Services committee addressed the “Featured lists” function at the last meeting. We were notified that “Featured lists” as an all-encompassing Arthur cluster function, would not be implemented at this point in time. If any individual Arthur library wishes to post a new book list, or video or DVD list, for example, they may post their lists to their own individual Library’s Arthur search pages. It is possible that “Featured lists” may be reexamined at some point in the future.

## **FUTURE PROJECTS**

The Directors have asked the Public Services committee to review software for electronic reserves. Several questions immediately arose. Does our participation and use of Millennium already provide an Electronic Reserve package? Have we all already paid for the electronic reserve module in Millennium? Is it just a matter of activating that module if we wish to use it or will it cost more to activate it? If it is found that all Arthur members have already paid for Electronic Reserves through Millennium then delving further into electronic reserve software seems far less fruitful. If, however, it is found that we need to start from scratch to evaluate electronic reserve software packages then the initial research should include a search of the library literature to see if others have already compared software packages for electronic reserves. The Copyright and Intellectual Property Rights Conference at the University of Missouri, in March 2004, offered a session discussing the differences between electronic reserves and software packages such as Blackboard where documents may also be posted. There are important distinctions in regard to copyright issues about when to post to an electronic reserve and when to post to Blackboard or any other course management system software. The University of Missouri, Columbia, and Ellis Library may still use the Millennium Electronic Reserve module and may be a most valuable resource in our research. Also MLINK may be consulted in regard to consortial licensing of software.

The next meeting of this Committee is scheduled for Thursday, March 10, 2005, 2-4 pm. at William Woods University Library.

Respectfully submitted,  
Nina Stawski  
Hugh Stephens Library, Stephens College