

Special Collections Subcommittee of CPC Committee, CSUL
Telephone Conference Call, October 20, 2006, 1-2:00 p.m. EST.

Attending: Zita Cael (FAU), Vicki Silvera (FIU), Lucy Patrick (FSU), Carla Summers (UCF), Elizabeth Konzak (UCF), Florence Turcotte (UF), Eileen Brady (UNF), Mark Greenberg (USF), Dean DeBolt (UWF)

Not able to attend were: Gail Novak (NCF), Joseph Ravelli (FGCU)

Mark opened the meeting by welcoming everyone. There was some discussion of membership vis-à-vis that this committee replaced the former Special Collections Task Force, and how to update the membership list on the FCLA website. Details and some instruction in using the SWIKI were provided. Dean agreed to provide minutes.

The distributed agenda had five items on it: 1. Implement minimum standards for Special Collections and University Archives programs (item proposed by Carla) 2. "ARL Survey: Special Collections in Academic Research Libraries" (item proposed by Carla) 3. FHP funding for 2007-2008 (item proposed by Carla) 4. Update and share with other SULs Spec Coll collection development policies (item proposed by Mark) 5. Evaluate/develop workshops and other desired staff support tools across the SUL (item proposed by Mark). However the meeting was primarily devoted to the issues of the purpose of the committee, its organizational structure vis-à-vis the CPC and the Directors, as well as how to proceed. These discussions formed the following questions.

Does the committee have a charge? Mark reported that John Nemmers [Ingram] is writing a charge for the committee, and in discussions with John, there was encouragement for the committee to have input in the development of the charge. Mark uploaded three former reports of the older SCTF, and Dean agreed to forward/add the SCTF's final report. Committee members should review these for our future meeting. Other suggestions for the charge included statewide special collections issues of preservation and endangerment issues of collections and staff in building renovations and problems (crisis management). Other questions on "charge" included the committee's role within CPC and CSUL, as well as relationship with the to-be-named "technology" committee. There were some suggestions that we should explore liaison or representative relationships with these bodies. We are unsure how soon John will need our input and whether this issue is set for the CSUL agenda in December but all agreed on the importance of our input now.

Revision of the Florida Heritage funds distribution. There was discussion why the Directors placed this responsibility with the committee and what they intended by doing so. Suggestions included developing a new funding and distribution plan, the goal of funding over-reaching digitization projects that took in multi-institutional subject/type collections, whether we still include non-SUS institutions in such projects, etc. We agreed that we will still need some guidance from CSUL and CPC but that we should take a leadership role in developing new programs and plans for the distribution.

Although we did not reach the formal agenda, all agreed this was a good first "acquaintance" meeting to air some of these issues and talk about how to handle them. Mark proposed that we will need a face-to-face meeting, possibly in the Spring, and he offered USF as a meeting site as did Vicki for FIU. In the meantime, we agreed that we should meet by phone again, soon, even before our scheduled November meeting on November 17th. Mark will send out some dates and times.

Carla agreed to look at "draft 3" of the old SCTF charge, and we should be ready to have more substantive discussion of this at our phone meeting in early November.

Respectfully submitted,
Dean DeBolt