

# Discovery of WEST Collections

## Discussion Document

*What are your discovery needs for shared print?*

*Example use cases:*

*Collection managers:* More immediate comparison of local collections against the WEST collection

*Librarians and library administrators:* Ability to demonstrate that locally deaccessioned titles remain available to faculty and students

*End users (faculty, researchers, students):* Streamlined discovery of available collections

Add yours!

Interlibrary Loan system identification of shared print commitments to more easily gather statistics on resource sharing of retention commitments.

---

*Do any of the possible solutions resonate with you? Do any raise concerns?*

- 1. Offer extracts of WEST records to load into local ILS (individual institution catalogs or union catalogs)*
- 2. Develop a shared index of WEST records that members can display or turn on in local discovery layers*
- 3. Build a WEST union catalog*

Leave your comments and/or questions here!

The extract to load into a local ILS is an interesting idea but would probably be confusing for everyone in our system so we wouldn't use it - not sure if others would. Also Alma Analytics never forgets so those records would be confusing in our system forever

---

I am writing as a librarian from a smaller library (not an Archive Builder) that is a member through a consortium. We have not been identified as an Archive Holder for any titles but have felt more confident withdrawing some bound journal back runs because they are archived in WEST. We have an ambivalent relationship to weeding - we experience the same pressure from University administration to free up space in the physical library building that most of you probably also feel, but we are also concerned about the long term implications of heavily weeding the physical collection - we are trying to meet students' expressed needs for study space while at the same time communicating to administration that the library - and its physical collections - are still relevant and valuable. We want to avoid a "free for all" where other departments rush to claim the library as open space for offices, storage, etc. The second use case speaks to this situation - it seems to be about justifying deselection projects to library users (such as faculty) who may be concerned about the library losing control of its physical environment. However, advocating for the continued value of local collections with university administrators is also a concern, entangled with the politics behind deselection and shared resources.

---

I would be concerned with overloading local ILSs with records for titles not owned locally, but maybe the mindset needs to change (non-WEST member comment)

---

A separate union catalog might be beneficial, but it would be yet another place to look for commitments (non-WEST member comment)

---

I like the idea of an index to be loaded into a discovery system or a separate union catalog that could be integrated into discovery systems are good idea; though whether it can be done depends on the details. I think a key is integration into resource sharing systems. (+1 on the details. We'd want to make sure that any incoming records matched on our existing records so users weren't requesting items that were actually held by us. And we'd probably want the option of having any incoming records load to our ILS - rather than just the discovery layer - so that we could use the collection analysis tools available from within the ILS.)

---

I am trying to understand the use case of displaying WEST availability directly to end users (e.g. students and faculty using a discovery service or library catalog to find information related to their research topic). If the item is not held locally they will probably try to obtain it by

interlibrary loan. ILL system development seems to be focused on developing algorithms to optimize lending across very large (nationwide) networks of libraries rather than relying on smaller consortia or groups of lenders (large and small groups of lenders aren't necessarily incompatible but it seems like the benefit of algorithm-driven ILL increases proportional to the size of the network, as long as users are not requesting physical items). As an example, our library joined RapidILL recently but when we also went live with Tipasa, OCLC invited us to participate in pilot testing an improved algorithm for creating lending strings as an alternative to RapidILL. This makes me wonder whether a good place to discover WEST holdings might be in ILL systems, perhaps as a custom group? (here's a screenshot to show what this looks like in Tipasa)

Custom Holdings Groups

LVIS

Custom Holdings Groups

\* Custom Holdings Groups Name: LVIS

Description: All

This group assigned as: *Assign as a lending priority, proven sender, or both in your [Advanced Workflows](#).*

OCLC Symbol(s)  
Symbols currently in the group: 2778

Select All Clear All

- A2A ANNE ARUNDEL CNTY PUB LIBR
- A3E PRESCOTT COL LIBR
- A5Q ATTICA TOWNSHIP LIBR

The screenshot shows a group for Libraries Very Interested in Sharing (LVIS), a group of libraries that have agreed to lend to each other at no cost. Could WEST holdings be expressed in this way?

---

I would not like the idea of loading into the ILS itself. We already have to pick and choose what we put in the ILS as opposed to our discovery layer since it is close to full (yes, we are looking at a new system). A shared index is an interesting idea and would possibly provide members with local discoverability that is currently missing. A union catalog could work, but as a standalone catalog risks being “forgotten”.