**WACTCLC Member Meeting Minutes**

**Date: October 22, 2018**

**Location: Moses Lake, Big Bend Community College.**

Attendees: Christie Flynn (chair), Tim Fuhrman, Howard Fuller, Andrew Hersh-Tudor, Aryana Bates, Mindy Coslor, Tammy Siebenberg, Erica Coe, Leslie Potter-Henderson, Jesus Mota, Melinda Harbaugh.

Zoom attendees: Wade Guidry, Amy Herman, Greg Bem, Shellie Whittaker, Cheyenne Roduin, Dan Moore, Gerie Ventura, Jennifer Patterson, Stan Horton, Samantha Hines, Candice Watkins, MaryAnn Goodwin.

**Call to order: Christie Flynn called the meeting to order at 8:32 AM**

1. Introductions—everybody in the room and on Zoom introduced them self.
2. Life after ExLibris Implementation
   1. Adding-expanding a new library or branch to an existing contract.

As it were, Yakima Community College is adding the records from its Grandview campus to ALMA. Is this a data migration or new instance? And how does the consortium add libraries?

1. Currently all Grandview students are Yakima students and already included in the current Yakima instance, they are adding no new student FTEs.
2. From a governance perspective, all Grandview buildings, computing infrastructure and physical library holdings are owned by Yakima CC. It functions as a satellite branch of the main library and serves the general public too. It currently has about 6000 community patrons in the ILS – of which not all are active.
3. Current students at Grandview have separate library accounts and use an ILS that is separate from Yakima CC ALMA instance. The two ILS systems—Yakima CC and Grandview—do not currently speak to each other.
4. Questions | conversation points:
   * What’s the process for this kind of migration (governance and technical)? Is this a migration or an implementation? How do we account for the extra 6000 user records being added to one library/instance (the adding and deleting of 1000’s of records occurs every year at every CC as new students enroll and student complete/drop). Are consortia support costs adjusted for this kind of migration?
   * How does this work impact WACTCLC staff workload?
5. A task force will be called to work through these questions and those that arise during the Yakima migration. The task force will consist of: Mindy Coslor; Jennifer Dysart; Wade Guidry; Tammy Siebenberg ; Andrew Hersh-Tudor.
6. The Consortium (Wade) will contact ExLibris. After which Wade will loop-back with Tammy and share any new information. This will be completed within the next week.
7. The next WACTCLC executive committee meeting is Monday, Nov. 4th to which Tammy and Jennifer will be invited for a status update.
8. The Leganto Question
   1. After conversations with Mark Jenkins and Steve from the State Board it was determined Leganto lives in LLC not eLC.
   2. Pierce College is moving forward to purchase the tool.
      1. The California Community College system is purchasing the tool therefore providing a community college model for its use.
      2. Pierce College believes the product is needed to further incorporate OER into the larger curriculum. Pierce see’s open education as incorporating Library resources into the curriculum in a much more seamless fashion, i.e., resources that are free to the student.
   3. At this time there is no additional SBCTC funding to purchase Leganto therefore college’s will need to use existing funds for it’s purchase.
   4. Question 1: are there other libraries ready to move forward and purchase the tool? ...not seemingly at this time.
      1. Pierce College will function as a Leganto beta project for the system.
   5. Question 2: Should we present the tool to eLC? Perhaps at the Summer 2019 Joint eLC|LLC meeting.
   6. Question 3: Are there copyright issues with Leganto use? How is copyright costs managed in regards to Leganto’s use? It is believed any copyright costs are passed through to the student via workflow rules.
9. Electronic Resources Report

(see also report linked to in the meeting Agenda)

* 1. Report highlights:
     1. Content needs vary widely among WACTLC institutions
     2. No clear and obvious opportunities or “winners,” in terms of identifying a single content subject need, or eResource format need, that could be addressed with a single group purchase. The best, though not obviously, candidate might be streaming media, because of interest, price, and lack of sources.
     3. The average annual electronic resources spent per state-funded student FTE is roughly $20, and varies institutionally from $2 to $40, based on survey results.
     4. Only 50% of WACTCLC institutions currently take advantage of available group purchasing programs.
     5. Spending on electronic resources is roughly double that of spending on physical resources.
  2. If the Consortium wants to get into database purchasing it should consider the following next steps, i.e., to develop an in-house licensing program, the effort requires:
     1. A founding charter;
     2. Financial, time, and other resource commitments from participating institutions;
     3. A formal organization or structure for implementing the charter, to support::
        1. An executive or governing function
        2. Mechanism for institutional representation into the process
        3. Process for content selection
        4. Process for contractual / content maintenance
        5. Ongoing program evaluation / auditing
        6. A model for ongoing funding if the effort requires central staffing, e.g., a percent of the license contract dollars.
  3. Questions / conversation generated from the report:
     1. How do we want to move forward with consortia purchasing?
        1. Do we want to move forward with this line of work?
        2. Do we need to further investigate those other consortia that are already available to use, e.g., Orbis-Cascade, WALDO, California Community College Consortium? Will using these/other consortia meet our needs as well as, or better, then our own?
     2. An emerging contracting/licensing model is *license for relevant users*. This model has institutions license content only for those student who will use it, e.g., nursing.
     3. Perhaps we should focus on licensing content other groups are not focusing, e.g., streaming media such as Films on Demand or Kanopy. This issue was raised in the recent DB Survey.
        1. Regarding FoD: which packages/disciplines within FoD are campuses purchasing? Are 10 schools interested in streaming media or 34? The conversation is very different depending on how many schools are involved in the actual negotiation and purchase.
     4. Perhaps the executive committee should meet with Mark Jenkins about our current content ‘state of affairs’ and discuss how we might implement our ideas. Mark has system knowledge needed to better align our needs to larger State governance issues, needs, and priorities.
        1. Is the Electronic Database Working Group transitioning to an unfunded project? If so, what’s its scope, charge, and deliverables?
        2. Is there an LLC Work Plan goal (perhaps 3.2?) that speaks to moving library issues forward to the SBCTC? And, if so, is this informed by data?
     5. Andrew will develop a charge and scope-of-work that addresses the unsustainable who-ha that is purchasing streaming media.
        1. The Charge of this working group is to develop a data-informed narrative regarding streaming media purchasing through both a systemic and systematic lens.
        2. Working with Andrew are: Leslie, Christie, Candice, Aryana, and Howard.

1. Shared/Common Catalog
   1. The purpose of this exercise is to develop a short list of business requirements as we explore inter-institutional discovery. As this list is to only develop business requirements topics such as technology and costs are not included.
   2. The shared/common catalog (or discovery layer) shall….
      1. Display local institutional results first/separate
      2. Display regional college’s results separate
      3. Display all WACTC library results separate, i.e., include all 34 schools
      4. Allow the user (student-staff-faculty) to initiated borrowing an item from another institution
      5. Include various borrowing options (for example, community borrowers may have difference privileges than students or employees)
      6. Include both a simple and advanced search interface
      7. Include a “very simplified” interface
      8. Include an interactive – decision tree type of search feature to help guide novice users
      9. Include all physical holdings
      10. Include all licensed holdings
      11. Allow for the filtering and facet sorting of search results
      12. Have common institutional settings that are controlled centrally through WACTCLC staff, which have been subject to mutually agreed upon and configured settings, that enable institution-to-institution loans and fees
   3. Howard will share these results with Wade.

**Action Items**:

* Item 2.v: A task force will be called to work through these questions and those that arise during the Yakima migration. The task force will consist of: Mindy Coslor; Jennifer Dysart; Wade Guidry; Tammy Siebenberg ; Andrew Hersh-Tudor.
* Item 2.vi: The Consortium (Wade) will contact ExLibris. After which Wade will loop-back with Tammy and share any new information. This will be completed by within the next week.
* 2.vii: The next WACTCLC executive committee meeting is Monday, Nov. 4th to which Tammy and Jennifer will be invited for a status update.
* Item 4.v Andrew will develop a charge and scope-of-work that addresses the unsustainable who-ha that is purchasing streaming media.
  + 1. The Charge of this working group is to develop a data-informed narrative regarding streaming media purchasing through both a systemic and systematic lens.
    2. Working with Andrew are: Leslie, Christie, Candice, Aryana, and Howard.