

# Database Management Minutes

Tuesday, November 2, 2021

## 1. Call to Order by Kate Hall (Northbrook), 9:31 AM

## 2. Roll Call/Introductions

Kate Hall, Northbrook (Chair)

Alex Todd, Prospect Heights

Joel Beverly, Fremont

Arianne Carey, Niles-Maine (joined 9:40 am)

Catherine Eilers, Highland Park

Calah Goehring, Huntley

Sarah Kaminski, Northbrook

Romi Pekarek Smith, Glenview

Anastasia Rachmaciej, Park Ridge

Jessica Thomson, Wilmette

Richard Wozniczka, Niles-Maine

Guests – Debra Wischmeyer (CCS), R. Malinowski (CCS), R. Barth (CCS)

*Absent: Belinda Husak, Algonquin*

## 3. Minutes – Approved by unanimous consent

## 4. Extension of Hold Expiration dates – ACTION

Supply chain issues are impacting publication dates for new titles. CCS asked the group whether expiration dates for new and existing holds should be extended to ensure holds do not expire before a title is released.

K. Hall recommended extending the expiration date for new holds to two years.

**A. Todd moved and R. Wozniczka seconded to extend the holds expiration date for new holds to two years from one year.**

**AYES: K. Hall, A. Todd, J. Beverly, C. Eilers, C. Goehring, S. Kaminski, R. Pekarek Smith, A. Rachmaciej, J. Thomson, R. Wozniczka**

**NAYS: None**

Database Management will revisit the two-year expiration period in 2022.

The group discussed how to manage expiration dates for existing holds. The group recommended adding 365 days onto current expiration dates. This ensures no holds will expire within the next year due to publication delays. CCS will complete this work and include an update in the next CCS News. Libraries can share this information with patrons as needed.

## 5. Holdable Settings for New Materials – DISCUSSION

D. Wischmeyer provided an overview of the holds data requested at the prior meeting. CCS has been gathering holds data on a set of the most popular titles released since August. Titles included in the data set had over 50 holds at the title's first available date.

The group discussed the data and whether it supported a system-wide policy for hold settings. Libraries are currently able to determine whether their new items are holdable to only their patrons or are holdable to any patron (both CCS and reciprocal patrons). Libraries can also determine if hot pick collections can be checked out by only local patrons or by any patrons. After hearing patron feedback on holds and item restrictions, CCS is seeking to determine if we can better serve our patrons by having a unified holds policy.

The group discussed whether CCS should set a limit on what percentage of materials could be non-holdable. Members of the group shared their different practices for hot and new materials:

- Niles-Maine reserves their lucky day collection for their cardholders, but freely shares new materials with all libraries
- Prospect Heights leans towards lending more freely and allows all patrons access to both new and hot collections. They have not received pushback or heard of patron concerns
- Highland Park has reduced their hot picks collections over the past couple years, and limits their new materials to Highland Park patrons to keep more items on the shelf for browsing

J. Beverly asked whether it would be necessary to specify a cap for how many items should be non-holdable, since libraries seem to successfully manage this on their own. The group discussed a potential waterfall effect from enacting a system-wide holds policy.

The group moved into a discussion of patron feedback. A. Rachmaciej noted that the frustrating part of our current practices seems to be that the patron can't place the hold. If there is a way for the patrons to always place a hold successfully, that may help address the biggest part of the issue. C. Eilers shared that Highland Park often receives calls from their patrons who cannot place a hold on a title that Highland Park hasn't ordered yet. It's useful for staff to get the calls so they know to order something. She said that they also receive calls from patrons who see the Highland Park copy on the shelf, but are not able to place a hold or the copy on the shelf isn't filling their hold. She said that patrons see those items in the catalog and do not understand why the copy isn't circulating to them.

D. Wischmeyer asked whether it's helpful to have patrons place holds on new and popular titles, so that selectors can monitor and purchase copies to supply patron holds. R. Pekarek Smith and J. Beverly agreed that it is helpful for selectors to see holds to gauge patron demand. A. Carey noted that it's helpful to be part of a consortia because you don't have to buy all titles. However, if you let the patron place the hold, you set the expectation that the item is coming soon, which may not always be the case.

J. Thomson and C. Eilers provided input on how enacting a holds policy could impact technical services workflow. When processing new items, libraries typically look for items with holds by their patrons to process first. If we allow patrons to place holds on any new titles, libraries may need to modify their workflow when processing items and/or CCS may need to update purchase alerts to reflect changes. C. Eilers noted a consideration that if all items are eligible to fill all holds, libraries that process materials faster will trap holds for other libraries even if that patron's library has an item in-process. This could be inefficient.

A. Rachmaciej shared concerns that Park Ridge's new collection is their browsing collection. They would lose that if they were required to send new materials to other libraries. Others noted that the burden to

fill holds could be shared by all libraries if we had a consistent policy, which could shrink hold wait times across the system.

C. Goehring shared Huntley's practices. They previously shared new materials immediately with all libraries, which meant new items often went out right away to fill other patrons' holds. They have begun using the "days past first available" setting that automatically lifts holds restrictions at 30 days. They've been very happy with how that feature works. D. Wischmeyer said that requiring use of that setting could be a reasonable middle ground for libraries and a good first step towards standardization.

From a director standpoint, A. Todd said he'd like to have as open sharing as possible. K. Hall noted that one of the core library values in the state is resource sharing. She hopes for more uniformity in how we share things. If there is greater resource sharing and access to materials, that helps all libraries. The data shows that right now in CCS, libraries are purchasing appropriately to meet community demands, which makes it easier to make a broad change to things.

The group requested the following data for the next meeting:

- Total percentage of patrons who place holds
- How many are superusers?
- Available feedback from patrons
- What's on shelf at any given moment when it comes to new materials?
- How long are items in transit?

CCS will work to gather for the next meeting.

## **6. Sunsetting of SHARE Illinois – DISCUSSION**

CCS asked the group for feedback to share with Executive Committee on whether CCS should discontinue the practice of allowing non-CCS libraries to place holds directly in the catalog. This was allowed through participation in the RAILS SHARE Illinois program, which was discontinued by RAILS in October 2021. The group did not have strong feelings about discontinuing this service.

**K. Hall adjourned the meeting at 11:19 am.**