

**AUTOMATED SERVICES COMMITTEE  
MINUTES**

October 28, 2003

**PRESENT:** Tim Burke/Marcia Middleton (APLM), Nancy Pieri (BETH), Joe Makowiec (BRUN), Richard Naylor (COLN), Pat Nonamaker (EGRN), Barbara Nichols Randall (GUIL), Paul Hicok (TROY), Phil Ritter (UHLS)

(Non-voting): Geoffrey Kirkpatrick, Carol Reppard, Mary Trev Thomas, Rob Carle, Mary Ellen Bena, Jonathan Koppel, Peter Kowalski

9:00 a.m. – Meeting called to order

**I. MINUTES**

Minutes of the September 23, 2003 meeting accepted as presented.

**II. TECHNOLOGY SERVICES REPORT**

R. Cheng's report was sent out in advance of the meeting. P. Ritter asked if there were any questions about items in the report?

P. Nonamaker noted that, in relation to the NYS Annual Report, it had been recommended a long time ago that the circ. stats should be broken down by call# I-stats. R. Naylor, G. Kirkpatrick and P. Nonamaker will meet with R. Cheng next week to discuss this.

**III. REMOTE PATRON AUTHENTICATION**

Report by P. Kowalski. The Adult Services Advisory Council met to decide what interface they would like the best. The Council wanted to wait for the new Automation Services Manager. Consensus that the ASC should make the decision. The choices were no-frames (as it is currently) or frames. The frames method could include the individual libraries' online databases. The no-frames method cannot do this.

M. Middleton noted that she prefers the no-frames method because she wants to maintain her own database and wants users to go back to the APLM homepage. The no-frames method allows more freedom for the individual libraries.

**MOTION:** T. Burke moved to continue with the no-frames method. J. Makowiec seconded. Unanimous.

**IV. TELECIRC**

Report by J. Koppel. He reported that telecirc seems to be working for holds. He noted that the problem with the "ê" character, which causes the titles to be a little garbled, won't be fixed until iPac release 2.2.

Discussion regarding any confidentiality issues when the title is mentioned in the telephone call. It was noted that titles are listed in the mailed notices which could be opened by anyone in a household.

R. Naylor noted that COLN wants to turn on this feature for its patrons in November.

P. Hicok asked about email notifications? Is the system able to send these? J. Koppel will check with Dynix to see how this can be activated, if it is included in the current release.

**MOTION:** R. Naylor moved to allow COLN to go ahead and turn on the telecirc feature at a time they select. COLN will experiment with this feature and will report at the next ASC meeting. J. Makowiec seconded. Unanimous.

**V. HORIZON 7.3 ENHANCEMENTS**

Report by R. Carle. He noted that several libraries have been involved in testing Horizon 7.3. They tested the normal functions as well as checking those features that were supposed to be corrected in this release. The tests showed that everything that was supposed to be corrected has been done. In addition, the circulation and request parameters that had been developed under 7.2 carried over to 7.3. There were suggestions about some further enhancements and R. Carle sent the information to Brian Hutchings at Dynix.

M. Bena noted that in relation to the functionality of Z39.50, both the "show details" problems and the merging records problems that were experienced under 7.2 have been corrected in 7.3.

J. Makowiec had some suggestions regarding the sorting feature in 7.3. He will put this explanation in an email to R. Carle for forwarding to Dynix.

Discussion regarding the 7.3 enhancements list that was distributed at the meeting. Consensus that it should be sent to the Resource Sharing Advisory Council for discussion and recommendations.

Some discussion regarding the self-registration feature listed in the enhancements. There seemed to be a consensus that no one wanted it at this time.

#### **VI. RIDER E #2 - PRINT NOTICE FOR UNAVAILABLE ITEMS**

R. Cheng had asked the ASC to consider how the notice should be worded and how often they should be printed.

Consensus to table this issue since it isn't working properly; it only prints the titles when a specific item has been requested.

M. Middleton asked if the return address on the notice could be from the library from whom the item was requested - not from UHLS. Could it work like the existing notices?

Consensus to table this issue.

#### **VII. HORIZON IMPLEMENTATION STAGE**

P. Ritter reported that Dynix wanted UHLS out of the implementation phase and into the normal support phase. He suspects that when 7.3 is implemented, Dynix will claim that the system can be considered as implemented and UHLS will be moved onto support.

R. Naylor noted that if Dynix wants to move UHLS out of implementation and on to support, there should be a letter noting that Rider E is not complete.

P. Ritter will contact the company to ask how they deal with acquisitions and serials in other Horizon users once they have been moved out of the implementation phase.

M. Middleton noted that APLM can get the SAM software free from Dynix, while UHLS is still considered as being in the implementation phase. Dynix is offering it free to APLM in consideration of the problems with the Horizon system. (see further discussion regarding this under **OTHER BUSINESS**).

#### **VIII. MANAGER OF AUTOMATION SERVICES**

P. Ritter reported that the Search Committee selected a candidate. He is now negotiating the salary with that individual.

#### **IX. SECURITY SUB-COMMITTEE**

Report by R. Carle and M. Middleton. They noted that the sub-committee is creating templates for user accounts. They are creating

these templates with just the right amount of access needed by staff members for their particular positions. For example - for circulation work they have created three templates:

- 1) very light circulation
- 2) medium circulation (a level above #1 and including access to Item Group Editor)
- 3) circulation supervisor

for cataloging, they are working on the following:

- 1) very light cataloging - i.e. linking
- 2) medium cataloging (this level would be customized per library)
- 3) original cataloging (would include the ability to edit MARC records)

R. Carle noted that once these templates are set up in each library, they would be identifiable for specific users. For example, if someone performed unacceptable cataloging, they could be identified and given one-on-one training to bring them to the level required by their position. User names will be attached to any of the records that are being created.

G. Kirkpatrick noted that due to the more generalized jobs in the smaller libraries, they are developing templates/accounts that will combine light circulation and light cataloging. R. Carle is currently working with Berlin and Altamont on the security levels that should be programmed into each account.

They are also working on creating interlibrary loan templates but these would require even more customization for each library.

R. Carle noted that the sub-committee is developing standards for the way in which the templates are developed, named, and set-up. The security access given to each level is very detailed and is a multi-step process.

B. Nichols Randall asked what type of documentation was there so that when the system is upgraded, and the programming is wiped out, it can be re-entered/re-duplicated.

Both M. Middleton and R. Carle responded that documentation has been ongoing from the very beginning. ReportSmith can be used to produce reports showing the work.

The sub-committee is also working on a project to create a Patron barcode look-up similar to the item barcode look-up.

R. Carle noted that any libraries that would like to be experimental sites for the new security templates, should contact him. R. Naylor immediately volunteered COLN.

#### **X. DATABASE MAINTENANCE ADVISORY COUNCIL**

R. Carle presented two recommendations from the Council:

*1) investigate alternative methods and sources for good MARC records*

R. Carle noted that Z39.50 has been unsatisfactory. Catalogers cannot find good MARC records to import and Z39.50 is slow and staff-intensive.

P. Ritter noted that new sources for MARC records (such as OCLC or Bibliofile) will require an annual subscription cost. He noted that UHLS is investigating these in order to give the libraries the opportunity to do their own cataloging. At this time, some of the libraries are sending high numbers of items to UHLS for cataloging. Many of these are sent on to the cataloging department at CDLC.

**MOTION:** B. Nichols Randall moved that R. Carle should investigate other vendors and costs for sources for MARC records. N. Pieri seconded. Unanimous.

*2) authority file cleanup needs to be done as soon as possible*

Discussion. P. Ritter noted that the authority file cleanup should probably be done on an annual basis and will require a subscription or contract fee with the vendor who performs the cleanup.

M. Bena noted that the Database Maintenance Advisory Council is developing a manual and establishing standards for entering items into the database. The manual will include guidelines for copying records and/or new cats. One-on-one training will also be an important part of familiarizing the libraries with the information in the manual.

**MOTION:** P. Hicok moved that R. Carle should be authorized to investigate sources for authority control and cleanup. The possibility of doing this in tandem with the vendor supplying the MARC records should be considered. R. Carle should

report back as soon as reasonably possible with prices and vendors. B. Nichols Randall seconded. Unanimous.

#### **XI. RESOURCE SHARING ADVISORY COUNCIL**

Discussion regarding the recommendations from this Council:

1) *There is no need to retain the paper patron registration cards.*

G. Kirkpatrick noted that with both paper cards and the online database, some libraries are not able to keep both sources updated and accurate.

It was noted that signing the registration card is like signing a contract for library services and the card should be retained as a legal document.

Consensus that R. Naylor will ask the COLN attorney to look into this issue.

No action taken.

2) *Is there a continued need for the UHLAN cards? Are they really necessary, or do they just cause confusion?*

Discussion. G. Kirkpatrick noted that this topic grew out of the discussion regarding access and authentication for use of the online databases.

No action taken.

3) *Change the word "block" to "Messages" in the iPAC.*

**MOTION:** J. Makowiec moved to change the word "block" to "Messages" in the iPAC. M. Middleton seconded. Unanimous.

4) *Change the wording in the message regarding the maximum number of requests per patron and*

5) *Change the wording in the message regarding no-requestable items.*

P. Kowalski noted that Dynix cannot make these changes.

No action taken.

**XII. ADULT SERVICES ADVISORY COUNCIL**

Discussion regarding the recommendations from this Council:

1) *Wait for the new Manager of Automation Services before making any decisions regarding the Patron Authentication screen option.*

This was already handled under **III REMOTE PATRON AUTHENTICATION** (page 1)

2) *Item specific requests are being placed too frequently.*

Discussion. Allowing item specific requests for the majority of items leads to poor customer service because patrons might be forced to wait a longer amount of time for that certain item than if they had selected "request first available item".

**MOTION:** N. Pieri moved to remove the item specific requests button and capabilities from the iPAC screen. This function would still be available in the StaffPac. The Adult Services Advisory Council should develop the wording for the changed button. R. Naylor seconded. Unanimous.

Discussion regarding the fact that there might be some cataloging changes required if patrons can no longer request specific items. For example: if there are 5 DVDs in a collection, should these be given individual bib records in order to allow a single item in the collection to be requested via the OPAC?

3) *Make "Basic Search" through all libraries the first iPAC screen.*

Discussion regarding the fact that when patrons are searching through just one library and don't find an item, they might not realize that it is available in another UHLS library. Make the default search "all libraries".

Discussion about the way in which the search results for "all libraries" might then be searched for those items available in a specific library.

**MOTION:** P. Nonamaker moved that "search X library" and "select another library" should be moved to the search results screen, and enlarged, if possible. R. Naylor second. Unanimous.

P. Kowalski can make these changes.

**XIII. OTHER BUSINESS**

M. Middleton reported that APLM would like access to the patron database, via the SIP2 protocol, in order to use 3<sup>rd</sup> party software such as S.A.M. or self-checkout. APLM wants to purchase and install S.A.M. and needs access to the patron database for authentication. There will be no cost to UHLS and no UHLS staff time required for this. She noted that the first use of this protocol will be free from Dynix (for APLM). Any subsequent libraries using this will pay a fee to Dynix.

**MOTION:** M. Middleton moved to allow access to the patron database using the SIP2 protocol for 3<sup>rd</sup> party vendors. R. Naylor seconded. Motion passed with one abstention (N. Pieri).

**NEXT MEETING: December 9, 2003 at 9:00 AM at UHLS**

(Note: no November meeting. This will serve as both the November and December meetings).

Heidi A. Fuge  
10/28/03

(Technology Services Report - October 2003 - see following pages)

## Technology Services Report

October 28, 2003

### Horizon 7.3

We upgraded the test database to 7.3 on September 24<sup>th</sup>. A group of testers from 6 member libraries convened on the 25<sup>th</sup> and spent 5 hours testing the functionalities in 7.3. The test has been ongoing since that day. We are very pleased to find that we are not experiencing any of the problems reported by other Dynix customers when they performed their upgrades.

I would like to thank all of the testers for taking time from their busy schedules to help us. With their support and assistance, the testing was very thorough. I would also like to thank all of the Directors who allowed their staff to participate.

Tests have been done in the following areas:

- ? Checkout/in items from their own location. Loan period exceptions are functioning correctly.
- ? Existing Holds are retained.
- ? Horizon views and user security are retained.
- ? Enhancements claimed by Dynix (see end of this document\*) are working.
- ? Placing requests can be done using existing parameters.
- ? Bib merge does not cause any crashes as it does in the current version.

We also worked on Cluster Holds, a new feature in 7.3. It allows us to set up groups of itypes to simplify request processing. It is a potential solution to make local requests possible without a long wait.

Phase III will come up very soon, probably in the first week in November. I will announce it through an email.

Go Live on 7.3 (Phase IV) date has not been set. The test database took 4 hours to upgrade. I assume it will take around the same amount of time to do the production database. During that time, libraries will not have access to the database. Libraries should prepare for some downtime.

I asked for a vote on the day of the week. This is the voting result:

M: 1.3  
Tu: 0.3  
W: 3.5  
Th: 1.8  
F: 12

If a library picked more than one day, each day received a portion of that vote. A few libraries expressed their opinion strongly against Friday because if there were problems, their weekend staff would have to deal with it. It is a good point. I have asked Dynix to set us up during the middle of the week. Once I have a firm date, I will let members know.

**Remote Patron Authentication**

Peter will present different options in RPA at the ASC meeting.

**Telecirc**

Telecirc is moving along. We have determined why patrons get calls and receive printed notices at the same time. The custom program we use does not take Telecirc into consideration. We have modified the programs, and they are being tested. The next step will be the policy issues in using Telecirc. Jonathan will discuss this at the meeting.

**NYS Annual Report**

Dynix will supply necessary programs to give us figures to fill in the annual report. Collection codes will be used to tally the circulation statistics. When I was reviewing the existing collection codes, I found out there are quite a few collections having no item. Also, many collections have very few items. I have posted an email to the ASC addressing this issue. A copy of the email is attached at the end of this report.

We should clean up the collection codes as soon as possible for the following reasons:

1) it will aid Dynix programmer to do their programming, 2) the program will run faster if the collections are named consistently, 3) consistent names will reduce duplication. Also, we may reuse the program for future annual reports or use it as a monthly report.

At this time we do not know what the delivered product from Dynix will look like. Dynix has yet to assign a programmer to work with me. Conceptually, it will be similar to the 3-column report we requested Dynix to write.

Members are welcome to express ideas about what to expect from this report.

**Rider E #2 (notify patrons when requested items are not available)**

Dynix has delivered the program, and it has been tested. Libraries will have a choice of having those notices printed on 3-part mailers or emailed to a library email account. A sample copy of the print notice is attached at the end of this document.

Decisions are needed on the following:

1. Language that appears on the printed notice - I highly recommend a standard language for all libraries using the print option.
2. How often to run the notices. On average, there are around 30-40 unfillable requests per month among all libraries.

Note: Because it is a custom program, Telecirc does not have the capability to call patrons.

**Implementation Stage**

In the last bi-weekly conference call, Dynix brought up how long UHLS would like to stay in the implementation stage. The number of open issues on the list has dwindled, and most of them have nothing to do with implementation. The advantage of staying in the implementation stage is having a dedicated staff to work with us, but we are limited to asking questions of only those staff. If we become a regular customer, we will have access to a larger pool of resource people. Collectively, their support team has better knowledge than the smaller group of implementation staff.

Please note that we still do not have the Acquisitions and Serials modules implemented. If we move out of the implementation stage, we should negotiate with Dynix the level of support that we would expect when we implement those modules.

### **Internet Service**

On Oct. 8 we dropped RoadRunner and moved over to AT&T as our primary ISP. We will continue to use Time Warner Telecom as our secondary carrier that provides dedicated connection to the Horizon server.

### **Copy of email I sent to ASC on Oct 16**

I am working on the NYS Annual Reports and am the liaison between UHLS and Dynix. As stated in the contract, Dynix will write a program to obtain the information that we all need for the Reports.

The circulation numbers will be drawn from our collection codes. At this time, we have 3,108 collection codes. I did some further research on the collection codes and these are my findings:

- among the 3,108 codes there are 1,228 that have no holdings.
- there are 375 unique codes with holdings. Within these, 214 are used by only one library.
- some collections have only 1 item;
- collection codes are not named consistently (e.g. FANT and FAN are used for fantasy; NJFIC and JFICN for New Juv FIC).

When Dynix writes the program, the inconsistency in the codes will cause the programming to take longer. It will use a great deal of the system resources to run and can slow down other processes. In addition, there is no reason to write a program that uses empty collection codes.

I have discussed this issue with Phil Ritter and he agrees that we should do the following:

1. Eliminate the collection codes with no items. Should a library need one of these codes in the future, they can be added but will be consistent with those used by everyone else.
2. Libraries should re-examine their collections with very few or single items. Can these be cataloged under another code? For a list of your existing collection codes, go to the Reports sections on the Intranet, look for a file labeled Collection Codes items.txt . It lists all your collection codes and number of items in each collection.
3. We will develop some basic rules for establishing collection codes. We have 120+ codes which are used by nearly all members. These should be uniform.
4. We will probably maintain the status quo for the unique collections.

I want to complete #1 and #2 within the next two weeks.

In order to send the information to Dynix so that they can get the programming that we need, we will undertake #1 (eliminate the empty collection codes) immediately.

I ask the libraries to undertake #2, and review their collections now and make any changes as soon as possible.

The basic rules for the collection codes will be a topic for discussion at the ASC meeting.

### Horizon 7.3 Enhancements Circulation

1. Display borrower address1 or phone on borrower search results screen. This allows the library to determine the correct patron more quickly.

3. Borrower Type code and description will be displayed after the borrower name on the checkout screen.

4. Item Group Editor - Status Only. Copy of Item Group Editor accessed through a separate menu option and whose mq\_views for display/edit were constrained to item status only. This will be an option from the launcher that will allow status change only through the Item Group Editor.

5. Confirmation keystroke on item received at home location message removed. This removes the required keystroke when a transit item is received.

6. Duplicate Borrower records. Staff must have the ability to copy an existing borrower record and retain certain fields.

! User will be able to duplicate records from within the borrower record

! User will be able to duplicate the borrower record from the borrower pull down menu.

7. Patron self-registration via the web. This is the server side code. The user interface will be available in Horizon Information Portal 3.0.

! The library would set up a Btype with limited privileges.

! That temporary Btype would automatically be assigned to web generated borrower records.

! The patron would fill out a short borrower record via Horizon Information Portal and then submit the record.

! When the user comes to the circ desk staff could do a name search and bring up the self-registration record and assign a barcode to the user. Staff would then follow their regular steps for borrower registration. A new Btype would be assigned at that time.

! All request made on the self-registration record would have to be merged onto the new borrower record.

8. The ability to clear borrower and CKO/CKI information from the CKI/CKO screens.

9. Staff should be able to click on a accelerator key sequence to clear the information from the CKO screen if that screen is active or the CKI screen if that screen is active.

10. Remove the icon on the CKO screen that is next to the barcode entry box.

11. A new CKI mode that allow the library to renew items from the CKI screen.

! If the library chooses the Renew mode all items checked in, until a different mode is chosen, will be renewed for the borrower they are currently CKO to.

! There will be a visual queue on the CKI screen to alert staff that they are not in the normal CKI mode.

! Staff will be notified if there is a problem renewing the item. They will have the ability to override the block and continue with the renewal or not.

12. Provide use count information on Titles by location.

! Circulation information provided for CKO, Renewal, Phone Renewal, In-house use for current period and past years.

13. The ability to remove Lost and Claim Return items from the list of items out. This is a system parameter.

! Staff will have the ability to determine if the Lost & CR item are removed from the list of items out, to avoid them being counted as CKO.

! So once an item is marked as CR or Lost it is no longer counted as an item that the borrower has on loan but it is kept on the BURB so that the link between borrower and item is retained.

14. A separate Pass Key option will be added to restrict deletions from the Pull List.

15. A new "Pull List Uses Location Priority" option. This looks for request/item candidates that have the same item location and request pickup location. If items have the same circulation and pickup location those items do not appear on the pull list for any other location. This reduces the items that are put "in transit".

16. Allow the library to determine what happens to a lost item. One of these 2 options.

! Suppress the items with a lost status so they don't show up in PAC

! The items remain visible in the catalogue with the status of lost.

17. The library should be able to have message blocks always appear at the top of the BURB screen.

! The library should be able to prioritize the order of the message blocks. For example the Address Correction Block should always be first, and the Special Message should be second etc.

18. The ability to transfer holds queue's from one BIB record to another BIB record.

19. Correct display of items checked out when renewing in CKO. Only print on the CKO receipt those items that were actually CKO or renewed during the current CKO session.

\*[Note: this document is extracted from Dynix release and is unedited. UHLS does not implement all features in 7.3. This document will be available on the intranet]