

OKULS

Oklahoma Union List of Serials
Membership Meeting
December 4, 2001
OUHSC Bird Library Auditorium
Minutes

1. Welcome

The meeting was opened at 9:35 A.M. by Dana Belcher, chair of the OKULS Advisory Council. Dana welcomed those attending from Tulsa via satellite.

2. Introduction of OKULS Advisory Council

Dana introduced the current members of the Advisory Council: Dana Belcher, East Central University, chair; Co-Ming Chan, Oklahoma State University; Ila Grice Coffman, University of Oklahoma; Ron Curtis, University of Central Oklahoma; Kitty Pittman, Oklahoma Department of Libraries; Pauline Boyer Rodriguez, Metropolitan Library System; Cheryl Suttles, Integris Health; Judy Wilkerson, OU Health Sciences Center.

Dana mentioned that the minutes of the June 4, 2001, membership meeting have been posted on the OKULS website for some time. She asked for corrections to the minutes. There being none, the minutes were approved.

3. ODL Financial/Membership Report

Dana called on Kitty Pittman to present the ODL report. Kitty reported that there are currently 44 OKULS members; of these, 39 have paid for the current fiscal year. She stated that ODL had sent letters to all current and past OKULS members, encouraging them to rejoin and inviting them to today's meeting. These letters have resulted in one new OKULS member and one prospective member.

Kitty referenced the OKULS financial report, shown below.

If all members are paid in full, income from membership is \$16,590.00	
We carried over from last year \$13,000.00.	
OKULS funds for 2001/2002	29,590.00
OKULS Coordinating Lib expenditures	23,650.00
Amigos/OCLC charges	
Agent fee	650.00
Actual record charges	477.40

Balance	4,812.00

Kitty stated that part of the surplus of \$4,812.00 is contained in the OKULS Amigos deposit account, from which record charges are deducted. \$3,316.00 was deposited into the account at the beginning of the fiscal year. Since record charges so far this year total \$477.40, there is a balance of \$2,838.60 in the deposit account. This leaves an available balance remaining of \$1,873.70.

In answer to a question, Kitty stated that ODL covers the cost of all mailings and of loading the AutoGraphics database.

4. OUHSC report

Dana mentioned that Colleen Ward, OKULS coordinator, was unable to attend the meeting due to illness. In her absence, Dana called on Judy Wilkerson to present OUHSC's report as the maintenance agent for OKULS. Judy apologized for being unable to provide current statistics regarding union listing activity for member libraries. She stated that statistics will be distributed via e-mail after December 31, when six months of the fiscal year has elapsed. Judy referenced a

handout listing the year of last union listing activity for OKULS members. She thanked those libraries who are doing their own LDR work and reporting statistics to OKULS. Judy stated that Colleen is doing considerable one-on-one training with various libraries, to assist them in sending holdings information in an appropriate manner, or in learning to do their own union list work.

In view of the fact that the coordinator position will no longer exist after June 30, 2002, Judy encouraged OKULS members to send union list updates to Colleen as soon as possible. This will allow Colleen to perform the updates before the coordinator's contract expires.

5. Webpage updates

Dana announced the address of the OKULS webpage, <http://www.ecok.edu/library/okuls/index.htm>. She stated that she has been unable to update the page as often as she would like. However, the OKULS manual available via the webpage has been updated to include the Advisory Council's decisions regarding listing of electronic holdings. Links to OCLC union list updates have been added, and a membership directory is now included.

6. Survey results

Dana referenced handout showing the numeric results of the OKULS survey conducted in September and October, 2001. Of 42 libraries surveyed, 30 responded; one responded after the deadline and was not included on the handout. This is a response rate of 69%, an excellent rate. The survey indicated that most member libraries perform fewer than 50 union list adds, deletes, or changes per year. Therefore, it may not be a major burden for most OKULS members to assume responsibility for their own LDR work.

16 libraries indicated that they would require training in order to perform their own LDR work. 4 libraries are willing to perform LDR work for other member libraries; 4 libraries stated that they would be unable to perform their own work (these 4 libraries are not OCLC members).

Dana explained that if a library commits to performing LDR work for another member, the library performing the work would assume only staff costs for performing such work. All Amigos and OCLC fees would be assumed by OKULS, since work would be done using the OKULS logon. She asked if, given this information, any other libraries would be willing to volunteer to perform LDR work. There were no volunteers.

Most survey respondents indicated a desire to keep OKULS operational, and stated that the loss of OKULS would have a major negative impact on library activities. In fact, one member library pays membership fees, but does not have any holdings in OKULS.

A question was raised as to why a non-OCLC member would want to be an OKULS member, if holdings are accessible only through OCLC. Judy Wilkerson responded that holdings are available through the ODL online catalog and through FirstSearch.

7. Fee proposals

Dana mentioned that at the membership meeting on June 4, 2001, it was determined that the current dues structure would not generate enough income to continue funding the coordinator's contract beyond the current fiscal year. The contract was funded for this fiscal year by using carryover funds; these funds have now been exhausted. At the June meeting, a call was issued for proposals for an alternate dues structure.

The Advisory Council has met three times since the June meeting. The Council has determined that continuing to fund the coordinator's contract is not feasible. OKULS member libraries have indicated that they are not willing to absorb the costs required to raise the funds needed to continue the coordinator's contract. Therefore, the contract will not be renewed and will expire at the end of the fiscal year, June 30, 2002.

In view of this, an alternate dues structure must be established. Dana explained that the membership must decide on a structure at this meeting, so that members have time to make necessary budget adjustments.

Dana called on two members to present their proposals for a new dues structure. Before the presentations, Judy Wilkerson suggested that the continuing the current dues structure be considered as an option. Unless the membership votes to select an alternate structure, the

current structure will remain in effect. The proposal to retain the current dues structure was designated **Proposal 1**.

a. Proposal 2 – Ron Curtis, UCO

Ron Curtis presented the idea for a two-level dues structure. The two levels would consist of a base fee and a service fee.

All members would pay the base fee. The funds generated would be applied to OCLC and Amigos costs, ODL administrative costs, and training costs, including training materials and travel reimbursement for trainers. The suggested amount for the base fee is \$100.00 per member library.

The service fee would be charged to libraries not doing their own LDR work. This would be a three-tiered fee, based on either number of serial titles in a library's collection or on the number of LDR changes performed for that library. The tiers would be established as follows:

0-300 titles or changes – No charge

301-1000 titles –

1001 or more titles –

No amounts were suggested for the service fees.

Several questions, not all relating directly to the proposal, were raised and answered by various members present.

Q: What are OCLC's current LDR charges?

A: OCLC issues a \$0.4235 credit for adding, deleting, or updating an LDR. This credit corresponds to OCLC's charge for a search. If only one search is needed to locate a record, the transaction is in effect free. If more than one search is needed, the total cost is \$0.4235 per search, after the first one.

Q: How is OKULS OCLC access paid?

A: Currently, OKULS pays for OCLC access on a per-hour basis. Colleen Ward does preliminary searching on FirstSearch to reduce the amount of time spent logged onto OCLC and to reduce the number of searches.

Q: What libraries are willing to take on LDR work for other libraries?

A: East Central Oklahoma University, Cameron University, OSU, OSU-Oklahoma City.

Q: Will these libraries charge for staff time spent doing LDR work?

A: This is not clear from the proposal. All preliminary discussion has been based on the assumption that libraries would donate staff time.

Q: Would the service fee be paid directly from the library for whom work is done to the library doing the work?

A: Again, not clear from the proposal. The service fee would probably not generate considerable income in any case. It appears that most of the libraries that are unable to do LDR work would fall into the no-charge category.

Pat Weaver-Meyers, OU, mentioned that the original fee structure was based on the idea that large libraries, with larger budgets and more resources, should pay more in fees in order to subsidize the membership of smaller libraries. She proposed that any fee structure adopted should maintain that relationship.

A suggestion was made that the base fee be waived for libraries doing LDR work for others.

OU-Tulsa volunteered to help with LDR work for the Tulsa hospital libraries.

It appears that all the non-OCLC members of OKULS are medical libraries. There are only four of these, but there are more than four OKULS members who are unable to do LDR work. Marty Thompson, OUHSC, stated that medical libraries are not an issue; the medical school libraries will help them.

b. Proposal 3 – Co-Ming Chan, OSU

Co-Ming Chan presented her fee proposal, outlined below. She noted that the numbers of member libraries and of libraries willing to do LDR work are incorrect based on numbers presented at the current meeting.

1. The Oklahoma Department of Libraries should continue to serve as a coordinating office for the Oklahoma Union List of Serials Project.
2. All participating libraries (there are currently 43) will pay an annual dues of \$50 per library. (Assuming no change in membership, this would result in a total annual income of \$2,150.)
3. Income will be used as follows:
 - Pay annual Union List Agent Fee to OCLC (\$650)
 - Cover miscellaneous costs related to training or other administrative expenses
4. All participating libraries will be expected to input their own holdings records and to cover any costs involved in that process, with the following exceptions:
 - Six libraries have indicated they are **not** able to input their own holdings to the Union List. Two are OCLC members and four are hospital libraries that are not OCLC members but would like to remain a part of the Union List project. (Holdings changes for each of these libraries will probably not exceed fifty per year.)
 - Three of the participating libraries have indicated a willingness to input records for those libraries that need such assistance.
 - Any OCLC costs incurred in this process, excluding staff time and telecommunications charges, should be paid by the libraries needing the work done to those libraries that have agreed to provide the service. The work done for other libraries can be tracked as follows:
 - Libraries requesting LDR input
 - Submit LDR data with a total number of records
 - Billed for 1 OCLC search for each record (\$0.4235)
 - Libraries doing LDR Input Work
 - Search OCLC on Agent's Authorization number

Co-Ming further explained that the proposal's OCLC cost plan would allow for two searches for each LDR updated. As explained previously, the credit received for LDR update, creation, or delete cancels out the cost of one search.

There was discussion as to whether two searches would be sufficient for selection of a record for a title. There are frequently multiple records for a title in OCLC, and selecting the correct one can take some time. It was pointed out that this is a cataloging issue; the individual cataloging the serial should select the correct record. If the person cataloging is not responsible for maintaining LDRs, that person should be notified of the correct record to use. However, it was pointed out that several libraries do not actually catalog serials; the record is selected at the time the LDR is created.

Co-Ming's proposal does not allow for cleanup or retrospective work, only for ongoing maintenance.

As with the previous proposal, several questions, not all having to do with the proposal, were raised.

Q: Will the library doing the LDR work incur OCLC costs?

A: The library should incur no costs; all fees should accrue to OKULS if the OKULS logon is used.

It was suggested that multiple agent (OKULS) logons be acquired, so all libraries doing LDR work are not using the same logon. This would make it easier to track the work done by each library.

Q: Under this plan, will the OKULS website be maintained, so that there will be a source for answers to questions?

A: The website will continue to be hosted by ECU, and Dana Belcher, as webmaster, will refer questions to appropriate members of the Advisory Council.

Q: Will money actually be changing hands, directly between libraries?

A: As the proposal is written, yes. The proposal could be modified to allow monies to pass through ODL. In this way, libraries performing LDR work would receive payment, but better statistics could be kept.

It was pointed out that there are unknowns in both proposals.

c. Proposal 4 – Pat Weaver-Meyers, OU

Pat Weaver-Meyers suggested a new proposal, outlined below:

- Maintain the existing dues structure, based on size of library budget.
- Reduce all membership dues by one-half. This will result in approximately \$8,000 in income.
- Waive membership dues for libraries doing LDR work for other libraries.
- ODL will continue as the fiscal agent and administrator for OKULS.
- After one year, evaluate the budget. If a surplus exists, decisions can be made about its use at that time; and dues can be reduced further if desired.

There was considerable discussion about the proposal to waive dues for libraries performing LDR work. One concern was that the libraries for whom fees would be waived would be the ones that contribute most to the budget. This is not the case; of four libraries at the highest level in the dues structure, three have not volunteered to perform LDR work.

Co-Ming Chan described her research into the funding of union lists in other states. Most do not charge dues; however, the list is usually subsidized by the state library. This is not a feasible option for OKULS.

Judy Wilkerson moved to modify Proposal 4 to remove the fee waiver, to adopt Proposal 4, and to table the other proposals for one year. Pauline Boyer Rodriguez seconded. The motion failed. Dana called for a vote on all proposals. The membership voted to adopt Proposal 4 as originally presented.

Per the vote of the membership, beginning July 1, 2002, dues will be one-half of the current rate. Dues will be waived for those libraries performing LDR work for other libraries.

The modified dues schedule appears below.

Library Income (Operating Budget*)	Membership Fee
\$2,000,000 and above	\$900
\$1,500,000-1,999,999	\$600
\$1,000,000-1,499,999	\$480
\$800,000-999,999	\$420
\$600,000-799,999	\$300
\$400,000-599,999	\$180
\$200,000-399,999	\$60
\$100,000-199,999	\$45
Below \$100,000	\$30

*Operating Budget is defined as all budgetary items except personnel and physical plant, as voted by the OKULS membership on December 3, 1996.

8. Other business

Dana stressed that libraries volunteering to assist with LDR work will not be able to perform retrospective work. She urged all members to send retrospective projects to the coordinator as soon as possible, so that they can be completed before the contract expires. Such work needs to begin within the next month.

A member asked what the coordinator requires for retrospective work. Judy Wilkerson responded that the coordinator will work with the library and will accept information in the library's internal format. If necessary, the coordinator will contact the library with questions.

Dana explained that the Advisory Council will be meeting shortly and will discuss planning training. Training tools will also be available via the website.

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 11:40 AM.