

# ULMS Enhancement Process Summary from 2019

For 2019, we changed our strategies for NERS consortial voting, per a [summary report written in December 2018](#) by the At-Large Members and Brandon Dudley. Rather than put out a call to functional teams to submit enhancements, Brandon Dudley asked the various listservs to submit enhancements. No enhancements were submitted using the Chancellor's Office NERS account.

Once requests had been compiled, the next stage involved voting on the enhancements to move forward. For each of the voting rounds, we created a Qualtrics survey that included basic instructions and collected campus, email address, and ratings for enhancements by functional area (if applicable). Links to descriptions of the enhancements were included. We used a ranking function for each area of enhancements: participants could rank their top five enhancements from "1" to "5" with "1" having the most weight. Participants could rank anywhere from zero to five enhancements. Rankings had to be entered in numeric order, i.e. you could not enter a "1" and a "3" without entering a "2."

Both Alma and Primo enhancement votes for the first round were submitted in April 2018. We received 222 responses for this round from all 23 campuses. Before reviewing results, we removed duplicate responses from individuals. Then, we reviewed the method to determine which enhancements would be assigned votes. We calculated how many "1", "2", "3", etc. votes an enhancement had. Then we changed the weight to give a "1" a weight of "5." So if 20 survey responses gave an enhancement a "1" ranking, this enhancement would have a score of 100 (5\*20). After these results were compiled, there were natural breaks within the enhancements where the At-Large Members and ULMS Project Manager could weight votes for the enhancements with the most interest. For the Alma Enhancement voting, 8 enhancements were selected by the Chancellor's Office to move forward based on the results of the votes (See Alma Results table below). Two were assigned 20 votes, three assigned 15 and three assigned 5. Similarly, 6 enhancements were selected for Primo to move forward (see Primo Results table below); one was assigned 40 votes, one assigned 20 and the remaining 4 assigned 10 votes each. By splitting votes out in this manner, we hoped to have more impact with our consortial voting.

Second round votes were collected in June using the same Qualtrics approach except, we switched ranking from "5" as most important to "1" as least important in order to make the normalization process easier. We received 122 responses for round 2 voting from 22 campuses.

Based on these voting results, we've summarized the final status of the 8 enhancements sent forward in the first round. Only 1 enhancement made the second round of voting and the one enhancement that was sent forward was not selected for development. It ranked 12th out of 17

potential enhancements. Had it not had so many complexity points (100), it might have made the list for development. Even if the CSU had put all 100 votes toward this enhancement, it would not have made the development cut.

## Alma Results

3792: Portfolio management: simplify process to remove, relink, and delete portfolios in electronic collections (20 points)	Didn't make 2nd round
4610: Improve Encumbrance, Disencumbrance and Expenditure functionality (20 points)	2nd round; didn't make development
5241: Improve cross-functional navigation (15 points)	Didn't make 2nd round
5595: Analytics: Add indicator for Course Reserves Loans (15 points)	Didn't make 2nd round
6304: Create and implement an NZ Analytics instance that can reasonably accommodate consortia level data is required (15 points)	Didn't make 2nd round
5246: Add a "Back to Results" button that removes the current need to back out of a record multiple times to get to a logical continuation point in the original list (5 points)	Didn't make 2nd round
5276: Improve display of Electronic Collections, Services, and Portfolios (5 points)	Didn't make 2nd round
5792: Customize User Role Privileges (5 points)	Didn't make 2nd round

## Primo Results

Collection of votes for Primo enhancements were conducted in the same survey (last year they were collected in a separate survey). Based on these voting results, we've summarized the final status of the six enhancements sent forward in the first round. Two made top 5 ranking for development and Ex Libris agreed to develop a sixth enhancement, rounding out the total enhancements voted on by the Chancellor's Office to three developed enhancements.

Therefore, enhancements submitted for Primo were ultimately more successful than those submitted for Alma.

6125: Sticky facets by default (40 points)	Sent to ExL; ranked #1
4457: Fix indexing of words with hyphens (e.g. hand-book, etc.) (20 points)	
4462: My Favorites: while pinning item, allow user to choose label (10 points)	
6126: sticky sort order (10 points)	
6190: Export search results to Excel/csv (10 points)	Sent to ExL; ranked #3
6341: Set automatically the cursor in the search box (10 points)	Sent to ExL (ExL agreed to develop)

## Comparison to Orbis Cascade

In order to assess whether our process was effective in moving our enhancements forward, last year we asked Orbis Cascade for a summary of their process. During the first two weeks of the review period (when the enhancement list has gone out but voting has not yet begun), the Alliance forms a team that will review the full list of enhancement requests to determine which ones are important for the Alliance to move forward. These are enhancements that impact all or most Alliance libraries, so they reflect shared needs. A survey is sent out to all member institutions. Institutions are asked to prioritize Alliance-identified enhancement requests. The survey provides a text-entry opportunity for institutions to identify any enhancement requests that didn't make the Alliance list but are a high priority for that institution. This allows the Alliance team to identify any areas where votes might cancel each other out and handle those on a case-by-case basis. The Alliance analyzes the resulting data and provides Alliance libraries with a list of enhancements to vote on, and a recommendation on how to distribute the 70 points allotted to the Alliance vote. Institutions are free to use the remaining 30 vote points for either institutional needs or to further support the Alliance-identified shared interests. Upon conclusion of the Annual Alma Enhancements cycle, the chair of the working group, in collaboration with the other members of the group, provides a debriefing report to share with the Alliance community, summarizing the activities of the group for the year, and may also make recommendations regarding the work of future iterations of the Alma Enhancements Working Group.

After reviewing the enhancements sent through by Orbis this last year, we attempted to gauge if their strategy was more effective than the CSU approach for forwarding **enhancements we author**. It does not appear to be. Orbis submitted 14 enhancements for Alma and zero for Primo in 2019. None of the 14 enhancements made it to round 2. There was, however, one enhancement that appeared to be submitted with Orbis Cascade (#5054), which made it to the second round of voting and was ultimately green lit for development. It should be mentioned that we are assuming Orbis Cascade chooses to vote on their own enhancements - we were not able to follow their specific voting strategies for the final lists of enhancements. Perhaps if we could follow this, we would be better able to gauge if their model is successful as they may, once the enhancements are published, cast more points toward enhancements authored by other institutions.

## Recommendations for 2020

After following the enhancements process for two years, we conclude that neither approach (voting on more vs. less enhancements) was ultimately more successful for advancing our enhancements (whether authored by us or not). The 100 votes the CSU's Chancellor's Office assigned would not have swayed votes regardless of how we had used them as the margins between our choices and the chosen enhancements were too large in both Alma and Primo voting rounds. Theoretically, if all CSUs with IGeLU memberships were to pool votes and concentrate on very few enhancements (1-2), we could guarantee some enhancements. The governing body needed to accomplish that, however, is not currently in existence.

The at-large members and ULMS Project Manager are recommending that we continue the same voting approach with ranking enhancements from "1" (least important) to "5" (most important) as this approach is the least time intensive for the Chancellor's Office staff submitting votes. As the CSU participates in more enhancement rounds, the ULMS Steering Committee may wish to reassess in 1-2 years to see if strategies should be modified, or if a governing body should be convened.