

SILS Harmonization Investigation - Shared Print Retention Reason

CDL Shared Print Team

Resource Management Ops Subteam chairs

CDL SILS Operations Center

- Background and overall goals
 - AGUA 2022 Alma release included new functionalities to mark item records as committed for retention (with option to include a Retention Reason and retention notes), which prevents withdrawal of the item record.
 - Alma August release notes:
https://knowledge.exlibrisgroup.com/Alma/Release_Notes/2022/August_2022/August_Release_Highlights
 - Alma Highlights video overview:
https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=Udck_vitgdY
 - In addition to the protections this offers, the Shared Print team sees an opportunity to leverage the Retention Reason field to support centralized preparation of annual shared print statistics by defining a controlled vocabulary for use on shared print item records. The CDL Shared Print team has discussed this with various shared print stakeholders and is moving forward with defining this list.
 - Implementation will require a project to configure the Retention Reasons in each IZ and update item records for existing shared print commitments.
 - Currently we are investigating different implementation options and how much work each would involve. This will help inform the final decision about whether to move forward with a project to harmonize use of the Retention Reason field for shared print materials or to leave this as a local decision.
- Implementation options being investigated
 - *CDL-managed project*: The Shared Print team and the SILS Operations Center have had initial discussions on whether it would be possible for CDL to implement this project (should it be approved). This may be possible, but requires additional investigation. If this is possible, the timeline for implementation would be dependent on the SILS Ops Center's schedule.
 - This would require working with campuses to identify which records need to be updated with which Retention Reason. Campuses would still need to configure the Retention Reasons locally before CDL could implement.
 - *Campus-managed project*: If the SILS Ops Team is not able to find a solution to implement this centrally, or if the timeline is not aligned with campus needs, campuses

may be asked to implement locally. Campuses may also decide that local implementation is preferable to CDL-managed implementation.

- Questions for Resource Management team
 - Are there any general or specific concerns with implementing a harmonized Retention Reason for shared print materials?
 - Not a replacement for the 583, a supplement
 - Campuses would probably be very interested in getting a list of which Retention Reasons to configure and to implement - would likely appreciate the clarity of the ask
 - Are there other options we should be considering that do not involve the Retention Reason (leveraging retention data recorded in the 583, for example)?
 - 583 is not ideal - extremely limited number of Local Params, campuses are very protective of what gets indexed; also the 583's program names are not as granular as what is required for annual statistics
 - SRLF uses item policies to regulate access to materials committed to different programs
 - What level of effort would it take for the campuses to implement this locally, versus providing information to CDL to be able to identify the records?
 - Anticipate low effort - if CDL is able to provide the list of Retention Reasons the campus should configure, they can implement fairly easily
 - Note that not all sp commitments have item records - this is something we may be able to address through updating the Disclosure Policy; in the meantime, statistics will be *prepared* centrally and reviewed/confirmed/updated by the campuses before final submission
 - The larger campuses are likely able to (and more comfortable with) implementing locally, but the smaller campuses may be more interested in passing the project off to CDL if CDL can implement
 - If the campuses are able and willing to give IZ access to CDL staff we may be able to implement in the IZ on behalf of the campuses - campuses may not mind doing this but they would want access to the NZ for their campus
 - Are there any known limits on the number of Retention Reasons that can be configured in an IZ?
 - None known
 - Given the potential effort of this project and other projects that might be scheduled, is it likely the campuses could have capacity to implement the project, and if so on what timeline?
 - Most of the work will have to be done in the RLF host campuses
 - If we already have ways to identify the items by program, it should be fairly easy. There may be complication if there are multiple copies on a holdings record where only one item needs to be updated but this feels like an edge case.

- The sense is that there are a few projects already on the books, but no big or long or critical projects that are looming
- Concerns about ongoing updating/maintenance work?
 - No, something they should probably do anyway, larger campuses are probably already doing this and the smaller campuses will have fewer items that they'll need to worry about

Notes

- CDL SILS Ops is very unclear if this is something that CDL can handle from the NZ - NZ does not have access to item records
- Discussion with SILS Operations Committee
 - UCSC implemented a project to update Has Committed to Retain and Retention Reason - noted that this was a fairly lightweight project for them, would be happy to share their documentation
 - This resonates with Hermine and Liz
- If info is already in the 583 it would be easy enough to set up a job to update the item records
- 583 data isn't considered super
- Consideration: if there are multiple copies of a title and each is committed to a different program, this could introduce additional complexity into updating and maintaining disclosure notes and commitment notes/Retention Reasons