MERLIN ILS COORDINATORS Wednesday, December 5, 2001

Members in attendance: Ben Lea (UMR - chair), Richard Amelung (SLU Law), Raleigh Muns (UMSL), Win Shih (SLU), Judy Maseles (MU Engineering), Brenda Dingley (UMKC), Karen Darling (MU), Robin Kespohl (MCO), Gary Harris (MCO), Resa Kerns (MU Law), Nancy Stancel (UMKC Law)

BEN:

Introduction. Thanks to Richard and Robin.

First thing I want to talk about is the need to schedule monthly meetings? I don't think we need to do so.

DISCUSSION

CONCURRENCE WITH NO OBJECTIONS - MONTHLY MEETINGS NOT NEEDED

March, June, September, December proposed as meetings. December important due to the III Enhancements schedule.

Let us schedule a meeting Nov/Dec dependent upon the IUG Enhancement Process.

COMMITTEE AGREES

Next on the agenda is the IUG Enhancement process.

I asked the UMR people to rate items as to "Single most important thing" downward.

We each get our "one vote" for proposed enhancements.

No one is forced to vote for anything.

ROBIN:

http://www.haverford.edu/library/iug/iugenhancements/Ballot2001.html

LSO's choices for enhancements are:

A2
A7
A8
A13
A15

     BRENDA:

A1 (electronic claiming)

     GARY:

Do we decide as a campus, institution, or block.

ROBIN:

Before, we got one vote from the MOBIUS consortium. You now get one vote per institution.

RICHARD:

We used to vote by cataloging center, then we took the top 5 and make one vote out of it.

I will cast my ballot, and if my top 5 don't happen to be this group's top 5, this group can vote. I won't go back and vote THIS group's top 5 on my ballot.

ROBIN:

There isn't a ballot for the GROUP. You can choose to vote independently, or as a block.

This is done by cataloging center. Each member of the IUG gets a vote.

A1   3 votes
A2   6 votes
A3   1 vote
A4
A5   1 vote
A6   1 vote
A7   2 votes
A8   5 votes
A9   0
A10   1
A11   1
A12   0
A13   3
A14   1
A15   3

On database maintenance, MCO's prefs were:

D2 (chron job meaningful to MCO for our maintenance purposes)

GARY:

We do rearrange and update. Updates are automatically done, but NOT rearranged.

Note: D6 is a bug and we shouldn't throw a vote away for what will be a fix.

ROBIN:

When the D6 "bug" was reported. III reports this as "bug" instead of enhancement.

Also desired

D7 (Daily Link Maintenance Program does not work for "bound togethers")
D9 (Database activities)
D10
D15 (item records more than 3000   see Chem Abs)

Show of hands (votes) for

D1   0
D2   3
D3   0
D4   5
D5   0
D6   4
D7   2
D8   0.5
D9   3
D10   2
D11
D12   3
D13   1
D14   2
D15   6

Now, Circulation

JUDY:

We don't have any since this didn't come out soon enough.

ROBIN:

LSO preferences are:

CG3
CG7
CG9
CG14
CG15

The one we here the most about is number 14 (hour glass showing processing). Millenium only.

Votes

CG1   0
CG2   0
CG3   4 (just my defaults, not the whole system's default)
CG4   0
CG5   0
CG6   0
CG7   4
CG8   0
CG9   2
CG10   0
CG11   1
CG12   0
CG13   2
CG14   7
CG15   3

Now for the CC's

LSO's prefs:

CC2
CC5
CC10 (we felt strongly   initials attached to fine waived transaction)
CC11
CC13

Votes

CC1   3
CC2   1
CC3   1
CC4   0
CC5   4
CC6   2
CC7   0
CC8   0
CC9   3
CC10 5
CC11 3
CC12 1
CC13 4
CC14 0
CC15 0

On to Circulation Financial

LSO Prefs:

CF1
CF3
CF4
CF10
CF15

Votes

CF1   1
CF2   2
CF3   3
CF4   2
CF5   1
CF6   0
CF7   2
CF8   0
CF9   0
CF10 3
CF11 0
CF12 0
CF13 1
CF14 2

CF15   3

Holds and recalls

LSO Prefs:

CH3
CH5
CH6
CH8
CH14

Votes

CH1   1
CH2   1
CH3   4
CH4   2
CH5   4
CH6   5
CH7   0
CH8   4
CH9   0
CH10   0
CH11   1
CH12   1
CH13   0
CH14   5
CH15   0

Notices and parameters

LSO Prefs:

CN3
CN7
CN9
CN10
CN14

Votes

CN1   1
CN2   1
CN3   6
CN4   0
CN5   0
CN6   0
CN7   4
CN8   0
CN9   4
CN10   4
CN11   4
CN12   1

CN13 0
CN14 3
CN15 0

Under General Systems Management (important G3)

LSO Prefs:

G2
G3 (option group changes   now we have to call Innovative   not displayed)
G7 (may not have been voted by LSO by accident but is extremely important)
G10
G11

Votes:

G1   0
G2   5
G3   8
G4   1
G5   0
G6   1
G7   5
G8   0
G9   0
G10   4
G11   4
G12   0
G13   2
G14   0
G15   1

ILL Module not voted on because nobody is using it   yet. UMSL & UMR will be
implementing.

Management Information .

LSO Prefs:

MI4
MI7
MI8
MI13
MI14 (most complaints about this)

Votes

MI1   0
MI2   1
MI3   0
MI4   5
MI5   0
MI6   0
MI7   3

MI8   2
MI9   1
MI10 1
MI11 0
MI12 2
MI13 3
MI14 3
MI15 0

Materials Booking   No one using?

LSO Prefs:

MB1
MB4
MB5
MB8
MB10

All votes go to LSO Prefs

Millenium Functionality

LSO Prefs:

ML4
ML6
ML11
ML14 (Unix broadcast)
ML15

Votes

ML1   0
ML2   0
ML3   0
ML4   5
ML5   1
ML6   3
ML7   3
ML8   0
ML9   0
ML10 0
ML11 5
ML12 2
ML13 0
ML14 5
ML15 3

OPAC WebPac Gateway

LSO Prefs:

OP4

OP7
OP8
OP14
OP15

Votes

OP1   3
OP2   2
OP3   1
OP4   2
OP5   1
OP6   4
OP7   3
OP8   3
OP9   0
OP10   2
OP11   3
OP12   1
OP13   0
OP14   2
OP15   2

Reserves

LSO Prefs:

R1
R2
R4
R8
R9 (one we get most requests for)

Votes:

R1   5
R2   3
R3   2
R4   4
R5   0
R6   1
R7   0
R8   4
R9   4
R10   0
R11   0
R12   0
R13   0
R14   0
R15   1

Serials .

LSO Prefs

S1
S5
S7 (lots of complaints here)
S8
S13 (silly they haven't done this one)

Votes

S1   4
S2   0
S3   0
S4   2
S5   5
S6   0
S7   5
S8   5
S9   2
S10   1
S11   2
S12   1
S13   5
S14   1
S15   0

We don't use the WAM product so we are done

        BEN:

Two more things to get to before lunch.

PROXY SERVER

We are all using EZProxy.

We've been talking about 856's. They all point to a URL. This works for all except for remote users. I thought we could point this to a "machine on Hardy's desk." That will be essentially nothing more than a proxy server gateway. It would then ask "what campus are you affiliated with." It would know what each campus's EZProxy server prefix is and jam that in front of the URL and THEN send them to the proxy server.

Point: single URL in OPAC will send users to publication

EXTENSIVE GENERAL DISCUSSION

LUNCH BREAK

    BEN:

Is there interest in pursuing this?

        RALEIGH:

Recommend we give Hardy a "to do" for doing a prototype.

GARY:

I have to see if this can be fitted into Hardy's workflow. I'll have to talk to Kurt.

COMMITTEE: We would like to try this. Gary will ask Kurt if Hardy can start pursuing this.

BEN:

Agenda item is now "education issue."

GARY:

This was resolved yesterday. The head of the Circ Committee who works with Ben, changed this to a Collection Development issue.

BRENDA:

We made a decision based on Collection Development to pursue this.

GARY:

Note that yesterday, no UMKC people were in attendance.

MCDC Conclusion: MCO will reset the YTD Circ numbers to zero, and add to the previous year's data.

The idea yesterday was to ask Innovative to reset everything to zero. But, we'd only be losing information on 34 records.

The unknown is that once this office starts to do the resetting .

RICHARD:

I have a feeling that there was no one there from SLU Law yesterday (Gary: yes, that's so).

The other issue: my distinct memory was that I believe we agreed to put this back to the campus for a decision was not only were there so many records for the entire group, but also different campuses had different reporting periods. Some campuses wanted things on a Jan. 1 and some on a Jul. 1. I report on academic years.

BRENDA:

We are proceeding under the old rules.

GARY:

I won't do anything until I see something from the Collection Development list.

ROBIN:

Consensus was to do this on the calendar year.

JUDY:

What do we do with this data?

> ROBIN:

Reason the CD people were looking at this was "circ activity by call number."

> JUDY:

Can't you get circ activity for any period of time? This is just on a per item basis.

> BRENDA:

Case by case, it's useful to see for a lost item how often it circulated. Also, did it circ 15 years ago and isn't circulating now?

This is ONLY useful item by item.

> GARY:

I'm not sure if the data in those fields is correct.

> ROBIN:

YTD Circ was not originally turned on when the MERLIN OPAC was brought online.

> BRENDA:

I don't think UMKC will have a problem, even though we've got other plans. Maybe a query should go out to MCDC that we'll reset this on Jan. 1.

> JUDY:

I will ask Mary to send this out.

> RICHARD:

I still have a question. This will take a while to update?

> ROBIN:

That's why they asked us to start on the 26th to mitigate the response time issue.

> GARY:

If we collect item records where YTD Circ isn't one, we could have up to a million records we don't have to do those. We don't want to reset everything.

Ask Mary: Does everyone agree that Jan. 1 now and in the future, LSO will reset YTD Circ, and

> ROBIN:

What is now in YTD is the Circ since we turned the system on, and NOT total circ.

JUDY:

1.   Agreed that we will reset the field Year to Date to zero, then replace the previous year's number with the current year.

We will have total circ numbers.

BRENDA:

We'll take what we can get.

GARY:

A lot of CD people and public services have never created a list, aren't authorized to create a list if I do this work, and they don't USE this information

BRENDA:

They will use this when they look at a lost book.

RICHARD:

We're saying "this is the way this is going to be done henceforth."

JUDY:

I'll compose this and send it to the coordinators.

BRENDA:

We'll run this by the MCDC people.

ROBIN:

Before we implement we need each campus to sign off on this.

JUDY:

YTD is 4 years.
Last Year' Circ is 0
Total Circ is last 6 years.

TOT CHKOUT = circ since item record was in MERLIN
YTDCIRC = since we turned this field on (3 or 4 years)
LYRCIRC = Last year's circ data (but we could ADD or REPLACE)

The procedure approved yesterday was to zero both out (Coordinators do not approve).

We propose that starting Jan 1, YTD is zero'ed out; YTD value replaces LYRCIRC. This to be done in perpetuity every Jan. 1.

ROBIN:

Second part of EDUCATION hour. George asked us to look at our budgets as a contingency if the gov asks us to cut.

I looked at the OCLC Downloading service (EMS). I called to your campuses and talked to the people doing this. I recommended to George that we drop this. I am giving this to you first, THEN I will send out to MQCC for their meeting on the 19th.

I'm handing out two pieces of paper. First, the policy (to be changed). And my recommendation.

We would save $8000 on each of your bills.

The EMS service is a download of OCLC records.

We pick up every MU transaction made on the system.

We pay .34 per record (e.g., for a delete).

SEE HANDOUT

About 20 pct of the records we download are discarded.

My proposal is that we terminate this on Jan. 31st. Participating libraries to determine effect.

Be prepared to discuss at MQCC on the 19th.

Costs now to produce/update is .13

Resolution of dupes? We have no idea how much time this takes.

Number of dupes in database will increase.

    RICHARD:

This is significant.

    ROBIN:

When we started this service, MU Law was producing cards. If they had done a produce on cards, then an export, it would have been a double charge to get their records. MU Ellis was doing a lot of retrospective conversion.

I will send this to MQCC this afternoon.

You'll need to figure the cost per campus (see impact on budget).

I'm pushing this as a proactive cut.

This is not a contingency plan. We vote to stop it or not.

I also think that this is an impediment to workflow.

    BRENDA:

I'm concerned about our budget this year. We already have a problem with our OCLC budget

because of ILL.

ROBIN:

Individual libraries could opt out of this, if we decided to continue with this service.

The $8000 figure is what we've paid in the past year for records (thus, an app. cost)

Produce, update, delete, or replaces are .34

BEN:

Next issue: what do we do? Recommend first 2 paragraphs and last. Ignore the MASC "year to date" stuff.

We answer the questions no one else can answer.
We deal with issues that fall on multiple committees.

See committee charge: http://sequoia.lso.missouri.edu/lso/docs/comm_str.htm

BRENDA:

Is there a minimal level of what to specify for local levels? The coordinator on our campus makes sure the various people get together on each campus.

GENERAL DISCUSSION RE: COMMITTEE CHARGE

BEN:

Here's what I've got written down (and I'll send this out   we'll discuss at future meeting)

- we meet with functional reps on each campus before each meeting
- oversight (not supervision) of functional committees ; maintaining awareness
- issues that concern multiple functional committees

Note: Probably no UMR representation at next MQCC meeting.

I'll send out a list of available dates for upcoming meetings.

Are we bound to meet on Wednesdays? (General discussion, leading to Wednesdays are vastly preferable.)