

# SWAN Board Environmental Scan Task Force Agenda

May 17, 2024 10:30 a.m.

Blue Island Public Library  
2433 York Street  
Blue Island, IL 60406-2011

1. Call to Order, Roll Call
2. Introduction of Visitors/Public Comment

Public comment is allowed at SWAN meetings

3. Discussion— SWAN environmental scan report 2012
4. Discussion—List of potential library consortia/systems to interview
5. Discussion—Access to the Task Force SharePoint portal for task force members
6. Adjournment

The next SWAN Board Environmental Scan Task Force meeting will be held on June 21, 2024 at Midlothian Public Library at 9:30 a.m.

\*All agenda items may be acted upon by the SWAN Board

Task Force Member	Library	Office	Term Expires
Anna Wassenaar	Blue Island Public Library		July 1, 2025
Jesse Blazek	Palos Heights Public Library	Secretary	July 1, 2025
Jennifer Cottrill	Midlothian Public Library	President	July 1, 2026

# SWAN ILS Committee: Report to the SWAN Board

---

April 19, 2013

**Committee Members:** Jeannie Dilger, La Grange Public Library (co-chair); Aaron Skog, SWAN Executive Director (co-chair); Ahren Sievers, Elmwood Park Public Library; Tony Siciliano, SWAN; Mary Lou Coffman, SWAN; Kate Boyle, SWAN; Vickie Totton, Cicero Public Library; Rebecca Teasdale, Oak Park Public Library; Pilar Shaker, Hinsdale Public Library

## Introduction

The following is a report from the ILS Committee to the SWAN Board on its activity to date. The charge of the Board for the Committee requires a presentation and recommendation to the SWAN Board at its April 19, 2013 meeting.

## Committee Recommendations to the SWAN Board

1. Executive Director/Board negotiate a flexible extension to the current Innovative agreement
2. Board hires an RFP consultant & approves funds
3. Board determines composition of the SWAN RFP Committee
4. ILS Search Committee / Consultant conduct focus groups of members
5. RFP Committee / Consultant proceed with a formal request for proposals (RFP) to be completed in 2013

## ILS Committee Report

### Charge of the Committee

The SWAN ILS Committee will be expected to make written recommendations on the following:

- Timeline and goals for ILS Committee;
- The length of time to extend the current contract with Innovative Interfaces Inc.;
- The primary features the next generation platform will require for SWAN for the next 10 years;
- A process for evaluating ILS options which includes SWAN member library feedback from staff at various levels;
- Decide if a request for proposal (RFP) is needed and if so, design and create one.

The goal is to make a presentation and recommendation to SWAN Board in April 2013.

### Timeline & Goals for the Committee: Overview of Work to Date

The ILS Committee was convened for its first meeting on November 18, 2012 and has met 9 times to date. The nine committee members have:

- Conducted research to understand the current ILS software landscape
- Completed interviews with nine ILS software platform representatives
- Conducted interviews with customers of comparable size and make up
- Conducted a membership survey to assist with focus questions
- Completed a preliminary weight scale for ILS software evaluation

### **The Nine ILS Platforms Researched**

1. Sierra, Innovative Interfaces Inc.
2. Virtua, VTLIS
3. Polaris, Polaris
4. Alma, ExLibris
5. WorldShare, OCLC
6. Symphony, SirsiDynix
7. Evergreen (open-source), Equinox Software
8. Koha (open-source), ByWater Solutions
9. Kualii OLE (open-source)

### **Customers Contacted**

1. Bibliomation, CT (Evergreen)
2. North East Kansas Library System, KS (Koha)
3. TRAC, Yellowhead Regional Library System, Alberta, Canada (Polaris)

### **Length of Time to Extend Innovative Interfaces, Inc Contract**

The Committee recommends that SWAN extend the contract beyond the 1 year from May 18, 2013 and negotiate terms that allow SWAN to continue its use of the Millennium ILS software to a date of our own choosing, rather than continually extending the contract 1 year. Appendix A of this report contains excerpts of the existing agreement specific to the term and termination.

### **Primary Features of the Next Generation Platform**

The Committee focused on five areas during our interviews:

1. Consortia “friendliness” of the software and its design
2. Flexibility for further enhancements and development
3. Complex request & holds management for materials
4. Features pertaining to e-books and other electronic content
5. Openness of the software: methods for 3<sup>rd</sup> party integration

Based on the membership survey data and a review of the Illinois Heartland Library System ILS evaluation during its RFI, the SWAN ILS Committee created a preliminary weighting and scoring that could be used during SWAN’s formal RFP process.

## Weighting & Scoring (Preliminary)

### **35 Price**

- 10 Purchase
- 10 Annual
- 5 Adding Libraries
- 5 Migration costs
- 2 Implementation
- 2 Additional licenses - API, SIP, etc.
- 1 Hardware

### **30 Consortia Friendly**

- 15 Resource Sharing (holds, ILL, policies, groupings)
- 5 Number of consortia? Multi-type?
- 5 Ongoing Development on Consortia Features
- 5 Ability to contribute to development

### **25 Functionality**

- 5 OPAC customization, patron's Ease of Use and empowerment
- 5 Administration (Ease, Security, Flexibility, Access to Data, report generation)
- 5 Staff/client side ease of use
- 5 Integration of E-resources
- 5 Plays well with 3<sup>rd</sup> party vendors

### **10 Scalability**

- 5 Architecture can handle size of our consortium
- 3 Customers live with comparable numbers
- 2 Future growth

---

## **100 Total Points**

### **Interviews**

The Committee decided it was important to educate its representatives on the current ILS platforms. Nine ILS platforms were identified for research. The Committee created a set of ten questions to conduct the 1 hour interviews with the ILS vendors. Once the interviews were completed, the

Committee completed phone interviews with several library customers to gauge their satisfaction with their respective vendors.

### **Vendor Interview Questions**

1. We are large consortia. What are your size limits for this system?
2. How open is this system? Talk to us about patron and staff access to manipulate data.
3. Who are your customers? What about consortial customers: who are the largest? What types of libraries are represented? (Is the system premised on a stand-alone model?)
4. What is the programming language?
5. Can the system work with various display and data content in local, group, and system-wide iterations?
6. How customizable and flexible is the system?
7. What are you doing within the company to prepare for the future?
8. What is your 5-year plan for this product? What are your development plans?
9. Tell us about your goals for patron experience.
10. Tell us about third-party access to and integration of the data, to create a unified experience for patrons.

### **Customer Questions**

1. How did do you reach your decision? Describe your selection process (board, members, etc.)
2. What were biggest surprises? positive & negative
3. How was your migration?
4. Was there any fall out within your membership over the choice?
5. What has been your customer services experience with (vendor/company)?
6. How well does it work within a consortial environment?
7. What do you think we should know?

Answers to each set of questions above have been compiled by the Committee.

As a result of the research, the Committee concluded that several ILS platforms could offer a compelling solution for SWAN. While some of the ILS's are not ready for SWAN, others are consortia-ready and could achieve the primary features on which we focused.

## **Process for Evaluating ILS Options**

The Committee recommends that the process for selecting the next ILS include:

- Focus groups from the existing SWAN member libraries
- Achieve member library buy-in & appreciation of the complexity of the next SWAN ILS
- Allow the RFP to accommodate open-source ILS options to be evaluated alongside traditional proprietary ILS

## Decision on Request for Proposal (RFP)

The ILS Committee affirmed with the Board that the choice be narrowed down more before options are brought to members, in demos with small groups. The Board recommended that the Committee conduct demos with the top choices first in order to do this. The Board agreed that more time is needed and estimate that the entire RFP process would be completed in September 2013; they also agreed that a consultant be engaged to create the RFP.

The Committee co-chairs sought clarification with the SWAN attorney on several areas regarding the RFP for SWAN's next ILS software.

### RFP Legal Counsel

#### From attorney:

SWAN is legally required to bid this work. As you note in your email, SWAN is an intergovernmental entity comprised of libraries and library districts and uses public funds to provide its services. Although there is no requirement in the intergovernmental agreement or bylaws, we would not typically address the bid requirements in either of those documents. Those documents are intended to govern the operation of SWAN, power and authority of the Council, etc. As we briefly discussed, it is possible for SWAN to issue two bids at the same time. One bid could be for the open source and the other for a proprietary system. Both bids should clearly state that SWAN reserves the right to reject any and all bids.

#### Follow-up Questions from SWAN Board

- 1. The language you used below specific to "bid" raised concerns among several SWAN Board members. "SWAN is legally required to bid this work," is what you stated. One board member noted that any ranking or scoring within our RFP would not be allowed in a true bid process. Does this mean that based on the RFP responses SWAN must pick the lowest cost bid?**

You are correct that a bid process requires the selection of the lowest responsible bidder. The bid documents, however, could be written to require a certain level of experience and references to allow us to ascertain if the lowest bidder is the lowest responsible bidder. We may be able to eliminate the lowest cost bidder based on set criteria, but it depends on the responses received and how we would set forth the criteria. We could also put in certain optional components of the system (if there are any) as alternate bids and then determine if we want to include them in the contract awarded.

- 2. Is SWAN buying a service or software with this RFP? In the instance of open-source ILS solutions, the software licenses are free but the vendor provides a set of services (annual support, data migration, software enhancement/development, etc.)**

The bid and RFP process will need to be designed together so that services and software purchases allow the proprietary and open-source solutions to bid and be compared side-by-side.

## RFP Consultants

The Committee is willing to engage consultants to create SWAN's RFP and make a recommendation to the SWAN Board. The committee has put out initial feelers for RFP consultants. One consultant has provided a proposal with costs that can serve as a ballpark for the Board's discussion.

## Next Steps

6. Executive Director/Board negotiate a flexible extension to the current Innovative agreement
7. Board hires an RFP consultant & approves funds
8. Board determines composition of the SWAN RFP Committee
9. ILS Search Committee / Consultant conduct focus groups of members
10. RFP Committee / Consultant proceed with a formal request for proposals (RFP) to be completed in 2013

## Appendix A: Innovative Contract Terms

### 14.0 Term

14.1 The term of this Agreement shall be for five (5) years from the effective date of this Agreement, unless sooner terminated in accordance with Article 15.0.

14.2 In the event INNOVATIVE does not desire this Agreement to be extended for an additional five (5) – year term upon the expiration of the term described in Subparagraph 14.1 hereof, INNOVATIVE shall furnish written notice thereof to SUBURBAN no later than January 1, 2002. If such notice is not furnished by INNOVATIVE, SUBURBAN shall have the unilateral right to extend the term of this Agreement for up to an additional five (5) years by furnishing to INNOVATIVE written notice of such extension not less than 90 days prior to January 1, 2003. Whether or not INNOVATIVE shall furnish any such notice, SUBURBAN shall have the right to extend the term described in subparagraph 14.1 hereof for one year by furnishing INNOVATIVE written notice of such extension not less than 90 days prior to January 1, 2003.

14.3 Sections 4.2, 4.3 and 4.4 in Article 4.0 and Article 23.0 shall remain in full force and effect and shall survive beyond any termination or expiration of this Agreement. Upon SUBURBAN's discontinuance of the use of any portion of the Software licensed hereunder, SUBURBAN shall furnish INNOVATIVE with a written notice certifying that SUBURBAN has used its best efforts and to the best of its knowledge, all machine-readable code, user documentation or other related materials provided to SUBURBAN with such licenses software, including any copies thereof, whether in whole or in part, have been destroyed or returned to INNOVATIVE.

### 15.0 Termination

15.1 Commencing three (3) years after the date of this Agreement, SUBURBAN shall have the unilateral right to terminate this Agreement at any time for any reason upon not less than 180 day's prior written notice to INNOVATIVE, provided the INNOVATIVE shall deliver and SUBURBAN, upon acceptance thereof, shall pay for, in accordance with the provisions of this Agreement, all Equipment and Software which is delivered or then on order by SUBURBAN and delivered by INNOVATIVE within 90 days from the date of such order. However, if any of the Equipment and Software so ordered is not delivered by INNOVATIVE to SUBURBAN within 90 days from such order, SUBURBAN shall have no obligation to pay for such Equipment and Software.

15.2 Commencing three (3) years after the date of this Agreement, INNOVATIVE shall have the right to terminate this Agreement upon not less than 180 days prior written notice to SUBURBAN if SUBURBAN shall fail to perform any of its material obligations hereunder for period of ten days after its receipt of a written notice to cure furnished by INNOVATIVE. In the event of a termination pursuant to this Subparagraph 15.2, INNOVATIVE shall have no further obligations hereunder, and SUBURBAN, upon its acceptance thereof, shall pay INNOVATIVE for all Equipment and Software previously delivered or then on order by SUBURBAN. However, if any of the Equipment and Software so ordered is not delivered by INNOVATIVE within 90 days from the date of such order, SUBURBAN shall have no obligation to pay for such Equipment and Software.

## Patron Interface

1. How forgiving is the search function of misspellings and typos?
2. How relevant are results of searches by topic/subject?
3. How effective are the filters?
4. How easy or difficult is it to re-set the filters between searches?
5. How effectively are records of the same title in different formats grouped?
6. Do all items in the record match—e.g., does the cover art and the description match the item?
7. Can staff “masquerade” as a patron to place holds for the patron?
8. How easy or difficult is it to upload cover art?
9. How accurately and clearly do the search results indicate whether an item is owned by or available at a specific library?
10. How easy or difficult is it to create and sort lists?

## Staff interface

1. How easy or difficult is it to see a patron’s spot in a hold queue?
2. How easy or difficult is it to place holds for multiple copies of the same title?
3. How forgiving is the search function of misspellings and typos?
4. How well do filters or dropdowns work for limiting searches?
5. How relevant are results of searches by topic/subject?
6. To what extent is the user interface “intuitive”?
7. Can patron profile information, holds, and checkouts be viewed from one screen?
8. How easy or difficult is it to view recent previous users?
9. When a patron is referred to a recovery service for a non-returned item, is title information on the billed item retained?

## Reports Interface

1. How steep is the learning curve for creating reports with this product?
2. For pre-created report templates, how easy or difficult is it to identify the right report template to use?

## Patron Mobile App

### Staff Mobile Interface

1. How robust is this interface in comparison to the non-mobile staff interface, i.e., how comparable are the features of the mobile to those of the desktop version?
2. How easy or difficult is it to create new library card records using this interface?
3. How accurate are records in the staff mobile interface versus desktop?
- 4.

### Messaging interface

1. Does it offer two-way messaging? Can two-way messaging be turned off?
2. Can users opt out of receiving messages? Is the library informed of this if they do?
3. Do you use this product to notify users of auto-renewals? If not, why not?
4. How customizable is the interface for individual-library branding and featured announcements?

5. Is there an extension of this product available by which libraries can use the product for their own e-newsletters?

Library	Type	ILS	OPAC/Discovery	Metrics	Notes
SWAN	Consortium (multitype)	Symphony	Aspen	100 libraries	
El Paso County Library System	Public	Koha	Aspen	9 libraries	Went live on Aspen in 2024
WYLD	Consortium	Symphony	Aspen		Statewide system, went live on Aspen in 2022
Yavapai Library Network	Consortium (multitype)	Symphony	Aspen	60+ libraries	Went live on Aspen in 2022 and migrating to Koha ILS
MAIN Library Alliance	Consortium	Polaris	Aspen		NJ consortium just moved to Aspen
GMLCS	Consortium	Polaris	Aspen	13 libraries	NH public & academic, pronounced "gee-milks"
CW MARS	Consortium	Evergreen	Aspen		Migrated to Aspen in 2022
SAPLN	Consortium	Symphony	Enterprise		Public libraries in South Australia working towards BLUEcloud Staff
CLEVNET	Consortium	Symphony	Enterprise		Large consortia in Northern Ohio, signed contract with ByWater Solutions with Aspen go-live October 2024
NOBLE	Consortium (multitype)	Evergreen	Evergreen		New consortium leader Kathy Lussier has experience with open source and proprietary platforms
Cuyahoga County Library System	Public	Koha	Aspen	28 library locations	Recently migrated from a proprietary platform to Koha & Aspen
CCS	Consortium (public)	Polaris	PowerPAC	28 library locations	Consideration of a new OPAC is underway
PrairieCat	Consortium (multitype)	Polaris	Vega	100+ libraries	Recently migrated to Vega from the Innovative product Encore
OhioLink	Consortium (Academic)	Alma	Primo		<a href="https://www.ohiolink.edu/press/ohiolink_selects_ex_libris_alma_and_primo_next_library_services_platform">https://www.ohiolink.edu/press/ohiolink_selects_ex_libris_alma_and_primo_next_library_services_platform</a>
CARLI	Consortium (Academic)	Alma	Primo		
SAILS	Consortium	Symphony	Enterprise	70 libraries	
LMxAC	Consortium	Symphony (going to Polaris)	Enterprise (assumed going to Vega)	47 library locations	<a href="https://lmxac.org/news/lmxac-implementing-a-new-catalog-and-library-software-from-innovative/">https://lmxac.org/news/lmxac-implementing-a-new-catalog-and-library-software-from-innovative/</a>
SEO	Consortium				Libraries in Ohio that joined SEO recently moved away from Evergreen

Gold Coast Libraries	Consortium	Polaris	Encore	21 sites	Australia group that migrated away from Sierra ILS to Polaris
Newcastle Libraries in Australia	Consortium	Polaris	Vega		Migrated to Polaris in 2022
Central Coast Council Library Service	Consortium	Polaris	Liberio		Migrated to Polaris in 2023
Queens Public Library	Public library system	Symphony		65 locations	Migrating to Symphony from III Virtua, which the library had been on since 2008. Announced in 2022 Library Systems Report.
SC LENDS	Consortium	Symphony	Enterprise	20 county libraries	Statewide system moved from Evergreen to Symphony in 2023.

# SWAN Board Environmental Task Force Charge

Step 1: Identify comparable consortia to use as points of comparison. Maybe 6 total? *Aaron - Do you have any ideas for which consortia across the country might be comparable to SWAN? Do you know of any that have recently gone through a selection process for a new ILS?*

Step 2: Prepare a script of questions for members of the consortia pertaining their satisfaction/dissatisfaction with different software platforms provided by their current ILS vendor, e.g.

- Public interface
- Staff interface
- Reports
- Patron mobile app
- Staff mobile interface
- Notifications

*Look at our platform survey and draft potential questions in these categories based on our members' top concerns.*

Step 3: Peer-to-Peer Conversations based on question script. (Aaron would ask questions of consortia directors; Jennie/Jesse/Anna would ask questions of select library directors within consortia, members of governing board if possible.)

Step 4: Based on question responses, invite ILS vendors to give demonstrations to SWAN board and administration (and interested members?)

Step 5: Create a written report and presentation to the SWAN Board with recommendations on SirsiDynix renewal and next steps.