RAILS CONSORTIAL MODEL WORKING GROUP
June 20, 2017 at 1:00 p.m. CDT
RAILS Bolingbrook
1000 W. Crossroads Parkway, Suite A
Bolingbrook, IL 60490 (630.734.5000)
Videoconference Sites and Conference Call

Draft Minutes

1. **Welcome**
   Ms. Bochenski called the meeting to order at 1:00 p.m.

2. **Designation of Minute Taker**
   Margae Bizzotti (RAILS Administrative Assistant) was designated minute taker.

3. **Roll Call of Working Group Members**
   RAILS Bolingbrook:
   - Su Bochenski, chair (Library Director, Lincolnwood Public Library District)—CCS
   - Dee Brennan (Executive Director, RAILS)—ex officio
   - Jane Plass (Associate Executive Director, RAILS)—ex officio
   - Aaron Skog (Executive Director, SWAN)—SWAN
   - Anne Slaughter (Director of Technology Services, RAILS)—ex officio
   RAILS Rockford:
   - Emily Porter (Director, Byron Public Library District)—PrairieCat
   IHLS-Carbondale:
   - Leslie Bednar (Executive Director, Illinois Heartland Library System)—ex officio
   Phone:
   - Pat Boze (Construction Grant Consultant, Illinois State Library)—ex officio
   Absent:
   - Debbie Bloom (Director, Ida Public Library)—NIC
   - Kendal Orrison (RSA NFP LLSAP Services Manager/RSA NFP Director)—RSA

4. **Recognition and Introductions of Guests**
   Margae Bizzotti (RAILS Administrative Assistant) and Carolyn Coulter (PrairieCat LLSAP Services Manager/PrairieCat Director) attended as guests.

5. **Announcements**
   There were no announcements.

6. **Public Comments**
   There were no public comments.

7. **Adoption of the Agenda**
   Mr. Skog moved, and Ms. Porter seconded, that:

   > THE AGENDA BE ADOPTED.

   The motion carried.

8. **Approval of Minutes of the May 25, 2017 Consortial Model Working Group Meeting**
Ms. Porter moved, and Mr. Skog seconded, that:

> THE MINUTES OF THE MAY 25, 2017 MEETING OF THE RAILS CONSORTIAL
> MODEL WORKING GROUP BE APPROVED AS PRESENTED.

The motion carried.

9. **Old Business**
   a. **Tax revenue based fee structure concept**
      This topic was tabled for possible later discussion.

   b. **Review of consortial models**
      The working group members summarized their written reports.
      i. **No resource sharing—Su Bochenski**
         Without resource sharing, libraries would become "small dark islands of despair." There would be greater reliance on reciprocal access. Because no resource sharing would be terrible for all libraries, the group agreed this is not a viable option. (No written report.)
      ii. **"Small scrappy" model—Debbie Bloom**
         No report
      iii. **Merging consortia—Leslie Bednar, Aaron Skog**
         Merging consortia entails many complications and risks. One unified database is great for member libraries and patrons, but does not result in less work overall. Savings on vendor maintenance costs may or may not be available; the opportunity for savings is greater if the merger also involves a procurement process with a request for proposals. Ms. Bednar discussed the SHARE fee structure, which works well for their members.
      iv. **Colorado—Emily Porter**
         Ms. Porter spoke with Jim Duncan, Executive Director of the Colorado Library Consortium (CLiC). CLiC uses a "pay to play" model for its services to libraries; some services are subsidized, but CLiC also derives revenue from services. Services include group purchases of electronic resources, such as EBSCO. Ms. Coulter noted that CLiC also runs a heavily subsidized implementation of Koha for its small libraries.
      v. **Maine—Jane Plass**
         Like Illinois, Maine has several shared catalog consortia for historical reasons. Two of these consortia are self-governing. MILS is the newest and fastest growing consortium and is run by Maine InfoNet. MILS is designed specifically for small libraries and has a sliding scale for fees. MaineCat is the consortial borrowing (overlay) system; it uses Innovative Interfaces' INN-Reach software and is limited to libraries using Innovative's ILSs.
      vi. **Massachusetts—Dee Brennan**
         MassCat runs on Koha and is a statewide shared ILS for small libraries. It is run by the Massachusetts Library System. MassLNC is a consortium of consortia that focuses on Evergreen development.
      vii. **Ohio—Kendal Orrison**
         Mr. Orrison was absent but had provided a written report. It was noted that libraries in SEO (Serving Every Ohioan) share one OCLC symbol.

    viii. **Follett's ILS and its consortial functionality—Anne Slaughter**
Follett's hosted Destiny system works well for school consortia and is not expensive. Its use is not widely recognized, however.

    ix. **zILLANE study recommendations—Anne Slaughter**
Many of the issues identified in the 2002 zILLANE report are still relevant. Some have been addressed, such as more standardized reporting of expenses and revenues by the LLSAPs as part of the systems' annual reports. Ms. Plass noted that one important change in the environment since the report was issued was the 2010/2011 move by MAGIC, PrairieCat, RSA-NFP, and SWAN to become legally independent agencies.

    x. **Overlay (consortial borrowing) software—Jane Plass.**
Patrons and libraries place a high value on interlibrary loan. The overlay project would have an added cost but would expand resource sharing.

    xi. **OCLC costs—Dee Brennan**
OCLC costs were discussed at the RAILS member update on June 15, 2017. RAILS staff compiled some statistics on pricing and WorldShare ILL activity and will make the spreadsheet available on the RAILS website. L:ibraries need alternatives to dependence on OCLC

10. **New Business**
   a. **Short-term goals**
The group discussed the remaining discussion questions presented at the May 25 meeting.

What services should the RAILS LLSAP support model focus on? Supporting basic ILS services (online catalog, circulation, cataloging)? Or should it also support more advanced functionality, such as serials, acquisitions, integration of third-party services, etc.?
Ms. Brennan and Ms. Plass stated that RAILS support should focus on basic ILS services. Ms. Porter stated that there is a fine line between RAILS supporting small libraries that otherwise could not afford to join a consortium and taking away from existing consortia. Ms. Bochenski spoke in favor of libraries supporting basic consortial ILS services on their own and using any RAILS support for more advanced functionality.

How might the RAILS LLSAP support model best enable participation by libraries that could not otherwise belong to an LLSAP because of limited budget?
Changing LLSAP support from a contractual model to a grant program would allow RAILS to set priorities and adjust support allocations accordingly. A grant program would also provide more flexibility from year to year to meet changing needs. The definition of a small library might vary based on the type of library.

Should there be a separate LLSAP specifically designed for small libraries that only need basic ILS services and limited configuration options?
A separate LLSAP just for small libraries could enable participation by libraries that otherwise could not be automated. However, starting a new LLSAP is not a desirable option either. Ms. Coulter commented that PrairieCat libraries like having school libraries among their members.

Should libraries be allowed to join a consortium that's not in their library system?
Libraries are allowed to do this in Illinois. It would, however, raise delivery issues, so

more discussion among the regional library systems and the Illinois State Library would be needed.

Would overall library resource sharing in Illinois be better served by RAILS support of the overlay project for connecting both consortia and standalone libraries, rather than encouraging libraries to join LLSAPs?
Working group members agreed that libraries need to be automated. The overlay project would expand resource sharing but depends in large part upon libraries being automated.

How might OCLC issues be addressed in relation to the Illinois library consortial environment?
One goal of the overlay project is to provide an alternative to OCLC WorldShare ILL. Other possibilities to investigate include:
- A single OCLC symbol for an entire consortium rather than every library having its own symbol. This would also mean that WorldShare interlibrary loan requests would need to be mediated at the consortium level.
- Cataloging alternatives, including but not limited to SkyRiver

Are there other opportunities for collaboration that would improve resource sharing and/or reduce overall costs?
- The Cataloging Maintenance Center operated by Illinois Heartland Library System is funded by a grant from the Illinois State Library. Its primary goals include handling records that cannot be automatically batchloaded to update OCLC holdings and to upgrade these records in the LLSAP databases. Original or copy cataloging for eligible collections (genealogy, local history, and special collections) can also be done. There may be opportunities for increased collaboration on cataloging services.
- Open source software projects are another possibility.

b. **Next steps**
Ms. Bochenski asked all working group members to review the charge and to come up with ideas for each point. Be prepared to discuss ideas at the next meeting. Written reports may be submitted in advance but are not required.

11. **Next Meeting**
July 5, 2017 at 1:00 p.m.

12. **Adjournment**
Ms. Porter moved, and Mr. Skog seconded, that:

THE RAILS CONSORTIAL MODEL WORKING GROUP MEETING BE ADJOURNED.

The motion carried. The meeting adjourned at 3:07 p.m.