Summary Points 12/31/14

Purpose of a South Dakota statewide network: “Establishing a South Dakota ‘network’ for South Dakotans to view and use South Dakota resources.”

The Facts:

- The SDLN ‘s statewide system/network is going away as of June 30, 2016
- One important service SDLN provided was a statewide network (a unified/shared catalog of resources) of 60 major libraries’ resources for the purposes of discovery, research and inter-library loan facilitation
- State statute does point to the state’s responsibility to provide an overarching “network” for greater efficiency of shared SD community resources SDCL 14-1-49.

Two possible ILL/network creation models proposed:

Model A- Similar to Nebraska

✓ One-half of Nebraska’s public libraries (267 public libraries to SD 111) currently have OCLC subscriptions compared to only 19 South Dakota institutions (only six public libraries; the rest are academic).
✓ Nebraska State Library Commission does ILLs for smaller non-OCLC public libraries
✓ ‘Net lending’ libraries are reimbursed $2.45 per loan quarterly which pays for most of the OCLC per book fee/approximately $78,000 per year from legislature appropriation.
✓ South Dakota currently only has 6 public libraries with OCLC cataloging/ILL membership/participation
✓ To establish a statewide network, SD legislature would have to fund a SDSL group OCLC ‘Cat Express’/ILL membership (including retrospective conversion) for up to 28 public libraries (largest/most active/best collections.) OCLC recently submitted a cost proposal of an annual SDSL group, total cost of $131,146.41. Additionally, the State Library would have to factor in on-going training costs and potentially a vendor contract with Minitex for “out of state” hard-to-locate materials. (see estimated costs below based on current SDLN annual costs)
✓ This model most likely will require additional State Library personnel (one FTE) for on-going cataloging/ILL training and technical support.
✓ Greatest strengths of plan: A total of 41 of our largest and most active academic and public libraries (1/3) would be networked with their holdings permanently within the international OCLC WorldCat network. OCLC membership raises the bar of professionalism among our largest libraries holding the lion’s share of our state’s current resources. Local libraries can have their own ILS systems.
✓ Weaknesses of plan: If funding is not on-going and individual reimbursements to “net lenders” are not sufficient to cover annual costs, some of the original libraries may be tempted to drop out in future years diminishing the effectiveness of the combined “network’s resources.” Schools are not included. There would be no way for the SDSL staff to intervene in real time to correct mistakes being made locally. Individual libraries must contribute/catalog their books and materials according to detailed international rules or they could be dropped from the OCLC network. There is no foreseeable future savings in this model; in fact OCLC subscription costs have consistently gone up annually 3.5 to 4.0%. This plan would involve the DOE’s division of Finance and the library “net lenders”’ ILL reimbursements may take legislative action. These reimbursements could be decreased, marginalize or completely defunded during any legislative session.

Potential annual costs: $131,146 OCLC group ILL/cataloging
60,000 Cost of an additional FTE SDSL ILL staff person
Model B- Overlay or Discovery Layer

(9 states including Kansas have overlay technology currently in place; Pennsylvania went with overlay/discovery technology in 2014)

✓ Estimated cost: $298,000 annually (one vendor’s proposal)
✓ Currently working on RFP to be released in January 2015
✓ Includes simultaneous “federated searching” of our SDSL’s 39 statewide databases (Assumption: greater access to current full text reference and magazine resources means less need, esp. among students for ILL of book/print materials saving time and money)
✓ Libraries can have differing ILS systems and still “view” other catalogs simultaneously creating a fluid and viewable “network” of South Dakota resources instantly
✓ 100 public South Dakota libraries can participate and do their own ILLs
✓ State Library would continue to do ILLs for smaller school and public libraries with no ILS
✓ Additional public library OCLC membership would not be necessary, saving funds and catalog training and not requiring the cataloging expertise necessary to maintain membership in OCLC
✓ Managed by the State Library with current personnel (no additional personnel needed)
✓ State Library would have the ability to monitor ILL requests thus intervening at “teachable” moments to eliminate waste and encourage best practices in interlibrary loan and with local collection development policies.
✓ Well established technology with new “2nd generation” functionality currently emerging.
✓ Greatest Strengths of this model: Highly flexible with no commitment of additional hardware or personnel staff commitments/expenditures. Less demand on the SDSL to facilitate ILLs due to more of the smaller libraries (including the schools) doing their own ILLs. Eventually the system would involve 100 academic, public and school libraries. There will be foreseeable savings both within the State Library’s operational budget and statewide with many of the larger participating ‘net lenders.’
✓ Greatest Weakness of this model: The state of South Dakota would still have a very limited number of libraries which catalog their resources within the international OCLC WorldCat network. This model could easily be defunded leaving the state instantly without a ‘shared network.’ It will take several years to capture and show savings within the SDSL’s operational budget or to gather local savings data.

Total cost: $298,000

Summary:

In a nutshell, if we have no capacity to see a unified collection of our libraries’ books, etc., we will be bypassing South Dakota resources (i.e. titles, CDs, articles, DVDs, etc.) to find the identical materials out of state. (i.e. We would be paying to purchase, house and catalog locally. However, if not “discoverable,” eventually we would be paying through the State Library via an out-of-state vendor/contractor to borrow/interlibrary loan the same materials from another library in a distant state.) Besides the economy of it and inefficiencies, that just doesn’t make sense. A ‘network’ allows librarians and patrons doing self-initiated ILLs, to search multiple catalogs simultaneously while seamlessly launching the interlibrary request online. Networked searching capacity is both efficient and cost-effective.