

MINUTES OF THE COUNCIL OF STATE UNIVERSITY LIBRARIES MEETING
Thursday, June 4, 2015

Attending in person: Barry Baker (UCF); Elizabeth Curry (UNF); Brian Doherty (NCF); Bob Dugan (UWF); Bill Garrison (USF); Kathy Miller (FGCU); Rita Pellen (FAU); Anne Prestamo (FIU); Judy Russell (UF); Julia Zimmerman (USF)

On conference call: Faye Watkins (FAMU)

Guests in person: Michael Arthur (UCF); Cecilia Botero (UF); Shari Johnson (UWF); Misty Swain (UF)

1. Welcome and Introductions

Chair Judy Russell convened the meeting at 12:45 pm. Members present in person introduced themselves to Faye Watkins (FAMU) who was participating remotely

2. Agreement on Agenda

Motion to approve, motion 2nd, no objections noted. The June 4/5, 2015 agenda was approved as drafted.

3. Minutes of March 5 and 6, 2015 held, Florida Polytech in Lakeland

- Approve minutes from March 5/6, 2014 - Misspelled names were noted, Pellan to Pellen and Kaye to Faye. Garrison motioned to approve the minutes with the necessary changes identified. Motion 2nd by Baker. Motion approved by voice vote. [Attachment 3]
- **Review Action/Decision items from March 5/6, 2015 [Attachment 3A]**

Item #5 (Cataloging, Authorities and Metadata Committee and record cleanup):

Russell reported on follow-up to the database cleanup project. FLVC had sent out a helpful update, and more will be reported to CSUL on Friday. CSUL's intent with offering help from some of the SUS institutions is to provide additional expertise to FLVC and to advance progress supporting this project.

Item #6A (PDA e-book project):

This topics was tabled until the CAC report is given on Friday, June 5.

Item #7 (Resource Sharing Committee, media and U Borrow):

A discussion centered on lending media material through U Borrow. Issues discussed included lending DVDs through U Borrow when public performance licenses were acquired with the DVD. DVD acquisition restrictions may be aligned with specific courses or classes. DVD acquisition was frequently a result of a faculty request rather than a collection development decision. Another was that the media may have been acquired by another library on campus with differing

permissions to lend. Issues concerning shipping DVDs through the delivery systems (e.g., bending of DVD cases) were identified.

Options discussed included a survey and/or holding this discussion at the next CSUL meeting pending the receipt of additional information. It was generally thought that lending media was a policy decision that should not be made by ILL staff. It was suggested that the focus should be on media staff to let them know what can be “UBorrowed” or not. Another suggestion was to leave it as an ILL decision rather than as an UBorrow activity.

ACTION ITEM: It was suggested that the Resource Sharing Committee be given the following guidance: 1) wait for the results of the FLVC survey; 2) agree that CSUL will lend media in general with restrictions as institutionally-required; and 3) provide a recommendation for the September CSUL meeting.

Item #8 (Statewide Storage Facility):

This topic was tabled until Friday, June 5th.

Item #10B (FLVC roles in HathiTrust):

Russell discussed ADA rights and the HathiTrust. ADA is validated through campus-mediation; therefore the campus could approve the download from HathiTrust. FLVC is linking this issue to the migration to the next ILS. This appears to be a coding issue and could be problematic in the migration from Ex Libris to Innovative Interfaces Inc. (III).

Russell also pointed out the HathiTrust issue with fragile materials. HathiTrust is taking a narrow view, requiring access through Shibboleth and on a wired connection in the library only. Wireless connections even within the library are not permissible. A question arose about what happens at branch campuses with no library? And, that faculty cannot use it in their offices even if on a wired connection.

Discussion then transitioned back to the bibliographic and holdings databases. The bibliographic migration to the next ILS could overwhelm staff. Second, there is a need for training and a review/revision of policies before migrating so that we do not harm the new system. It was pointed out that the system architecture for Ex Libris is different than III's. This needs to be coordinated through FLVC and, because it is not a trivial matter, we need to get started. FLVC proposes to undertake much of this activity just before migration rather than now. Common codes must be reviewed now.

Another concern expressed was FLVC's lack of experience with III. FLVC needs to plan the process before it gets so far along that planning is too late.

Item #11 (Pam Northrup and Legislation/Budget):

This topic was tabled until the Friday, June 5th meeting.

Item #13 (*Allocation of CFPP/FLVC Funding for E-Resources Based on General Education Core Courses*):

Russell reported that the Provosts at USF and UF are concerned about the potential loss of FLVC-funded e-resources content and the subsequent impact on collections, especially STEM. It may be brought to the next CAVP meeting later this month. All were reminded that we do not control FLVC decision making since members are only advisory outside of the Sunshine.

Members of the Library Members Council Executive Committee reported on their recent conference call which included a report from Janice Gilley. The \$5 million may be restored to the FLVC budget and that a reprieve for e-resources for calendar 2016 may be an outcome.

CSUL members discussed the issue that the 60% ratio of shared resources as proposed by FLVC is not sustainable or necessary. Many attending identified the potential financial impacts at their local institutions of the potential loss of FLVC e-resource funding.

It was also stated that high school students are not using the databases as planned because the school librarians have no access.

Janice Gilley is already looking at LBRs for the next legislative session in 2016. The Library Members Council Executive Committee has recommended seeking additional funds to reach about \$11 million for FLVC e-resources (a delta over current funding of about \$4 million). It was asked why FLVC did not put this total forward, and the FLVC response during the conference call was that the timing was not good because of the Next-Gen ILS and other 2015 LBRs.

Item #14 (*Supporting the LBRs for 2015 Legislative Session*):

It was noted that this effort was unsuccessful.

Item #15 (*Discussion with Pam Northrup on instructions to ITN evaluators*):

Implemented

Item #16 (*Interest Groups*):

This item was not discussed.

Item #17A (*Discussion of draft Library Security Policy Survey*):

Discussion for this topic was tabled until later in the meeting.

Item #17B (*Discussion of open access publishing activities*):

A brief discussion led to a statement that CSUL needs to make time for this topic and there was a general invitation for others to become involve with the existing group members (Garrison, Russell and Zimmerman). **ACTION ITEM:** This will be a topic at the September CSUL Meeting.

Item #17D (Revisit discussion of CSUL/LRSC/FLVC comparison table):

This item was tabled until the Friday, June 5th meeting.

Off Agenda: Angie Jones from UWF Procurement was introduced to the members. She talked about the ITN process concerning the Next-Gen ILS and about the future process concerning the acquisition. CSUL expressed its thanks to her for her effort managing the ITN process.

4. Schedule of next meetings

September 2-3 FLVC / September 3-4 CSUL	FAMU, Tallahassee
December 8-9 CSUL / December 9-10 FLVC	UNF, Jacksonville
March 10-11, 2016	FAU, Boca Raton

Judy Russell noted she would not be able to attend the December 2015 meeting; Brian Doherty will chair this specific meeting as past CSUL chair. **NOTE: Since this meeting the CSUL December dates where changes and Judy Russell will be able to attend.**

It was also noted that the March 3-4, 2016 meeting was a conflict. FLA is February 29 - March 3 in Daytona Beach FL. As a result, the March CSUL meeting will be held the following week (March 10-11) at FAU, Boca Raton.

STANDING COMMITTEE & TASK FORCE REPORTS

5. Cataloging, Authorities, and Metadata Committee *[Attachment 5]* (written report only – no attendance)

It was explained that FLVC was asked to be more specific as to a date to complete this project. The deadline for codes form institutions is set for next week. Authorities need to be cleaned up; they were included in the Next-gen ILS ITN. **ACTION ITEM:** It was decided to present FLVC with two options at the Library Members Council meeting: 1) a need for a comprehensive list of codes and 2) take the codes under advisement.

6. Collections Advisory Committee (reporting in person) *[Attachment 6]*

Michael Arthur noted that there were no action items but the CAC is seeking direction.

A. *Proposed Shared Monographs Initiative and Acquisitions Plan*
(update only – no written report)

The funding for the DDA project is expected to last through November 2015. The consensus from the CAC is that the acquisition plan currently used is not the right plan.

A face-to-face meeting of CAC was held in Gainesville. There was considerable communications with the vendors.

Survey went out to CSUL members about Cambridge and Oxford presses. E-books only, and a shared monograph initiate plan list five goals, including cost effectiveness and reducing duplication.

Institutional purchasing of e-books for institutional use only negatively impacts ILL if e-books cannot be shared. It was asked if there could be a retroactive sharing of e-books already purchased.

The CAC plan is not ready yet; it will get more attention at the end of FY2015 when institutional expenditures close and attention can be refocused.

The plan may seek to share the SUS annual expenditures for e-books. The duplication study to be conducted will help with the decision concerning recurring costs. It was suggested that CSUL should determine what it already spends individually to help vendors see the value of working with us.

It was also noted that there may be other collections to share including streaming media.

ACTION ITEM: CAC will pull together a plan for consideration at the September 2015 CSUL meeting.

B. *Shared Resources Information Task Force [Attachment 6B]*

The survey (attachment 6.b) results were discussed.

CAC is unsure about when FLVC negotiates on CSUL's behalf. Members stated that Dygert needs to be reminded that she is using CSUL's funds and that members are not comfortable with the lack of information she is providing. More information is needed especially about pricing.

It was also stated that Dygert's priority is FLVC and that CSUL is a lower priority. Members stated that they cannot wait until November for pricing. It was suggested that if negotiations involves CSUL's funds, that SUS members should designate an institution in charge of conducting each negotiation in place of FLVC.

Dygert is already negotiating. In most instances CSUL members are not involved in the negotiations. Further, what impact does ICUF and the state colleges have on CSUL's e-resources needs? It was suggested that CSUL needs an MOU with FLVC/Dygert when SUS institutional funds are involved.

It was pointed out that an MOU may be too late for this year as we are already into June. It was suggested that we need to develop an MOU for next year.

Another question arose as to the purchasing agent for SUS-only negotiations. Using Elsevier as an example, the contract is with UF and then UF has agreements with the SUS institutions.

CAC stated that they cannot do anything about the negotiations. CAC members are in favor of e Dygert negotiating for CSUL but guidelines are needed including requiring more information from her. Another suggestion was for individual institutional service level agreements.

It was suggested that CSUL request Lucy Harrison to get information from Claire Dygert as to when, with whom, and for what she is currently negotiating on behalf of CSUL.

ACTION ITEM: It was decided to ask CAC to create a list of bullet points for an MOU for presentation at the September 2015 CSUL meeting.

C. *Microfilm Deterioration Survey Task Force [Attachment 6C]*

This Task Force is still working, compiling a list by the end of August 2015 of what is being lost. The work includes identifying digital copies and the costs. Almost half of the titles tested have deteriorated.

It was pointed out that FLARE does not yet have the proper environment to handle deteriorated film. A preservation expert may be needed for consultation.

It was also noted that cost-benefit analysis will be needed. What are the trade-offs from creating an environment at FLARE to handle the microfilm versus spending the funds for digital copies? Additionally, it may be that a title on microfilm has deteriorated at one library but not at another. This comparison also needs attention.

ACTION ITEM: In August when the report comes in the list will be reviewed and a determination made on how to move forward.

7. Resource Sharing Committee (written report only) [Attachment 7]

This topic was discussed earlier in the meeting and was not revisited at this time.

8. Statewide Storage Task Force (SSTF) *[Attachment 8]*

The FLARE proposal was included in the House budget but health care funding has taken precedent. The Senate did not. It will likely be involved in the budget discussions.

Russell and Zimmerman met with legislative staff about the facility. It is a difficult budget situation because of the acrimony between the chambers this year.

Russell brought up that it was time to think about the current facility's future capacity. It may be able to accommodate another 400,000 volumes. This will pose a problem if the construction of the new facility does not begin in August 2015.

The current storage facility and its processing of materials continues well.

GovDocs are being shelved in SuDocs order. The question was asked if GovDocs can be discarded at the institutional level. There is a process for a Selective to contact the Regional before discarding materials. Russell reminded all about UF's last copy policy for GovDocs.

9. UPDATES

A. Health/Medical Librarians Task Force **(in person)** *[Attachment 9A]*

Botero presented the written report.

A question arose about the handling of resources for affiliates. The response was if the affiliate is serving as an agent of the institution, they can get access to the resources. If the institution puts you into the system, then you are OK to access the resources.

Botero also pointed out that the publishers are becoming more active in directly informing academic department about turnaways. Vendors are missing the point that departments have no funds for collections.

In responding to a question about e-books, it was noted that many of the textbooks are in electronic format.

B. Law Librarians Interest Group **(calling in - no written report)**

This topics was not discussed.

C. Information Literacy & Instruction Group **(no update)**

ACTION ITEM: Russell follow up with Kathryn Miller at FPU to learn what is happening.

D. Scholarly Communications Interest Group **(no update)**

It was pointed out that this is an active group.

CSUL may want to do a survey about open access resources through this interest group, and to include other campuses and non-libraries.

E. Special Collections Interest Group **(no update)**

This topics was not discussed.

Off Agenda:

The Chair asked if there are issues we need to talk about on Friday? She went down the list of issues to discuss with FLVC's Lucy Harrison:

- coding questions and single bib;
- ADA access to HathiTrust and can that be done prior to migrating to the new ILS;
- Next Gen ILS preparations - will FLVC hire an outside project manager?
- common discovery tool -- FLVC says we have one, but Primo is not adequate for most CSUL members. Prestamo pointed out that Lucy Harrison's monthly update was not correct concerning the use of discovery and index as III's. Also, if funding comes through, should we approach EBSCO to move faster for the discovery index? What can EBSCO do for us?
- is FLVC doing what we need for them to do, or is FLVC doing what they want to do?

It was proposed that we need to talk with Northrup as to how she envisions FLVC as a service provider.

Off-off agenda:

It was stated that if one SUS institution has a contract, another SUS institution can piggy-back on it.

CSUL adjourned for the day at 4:55p.

MINUTES OF THE COUNCIL OF STATE UNIVERSITY LIBRARIES MEETING
Friday, June 5, 2015

Attending in person: Barry Baker (UCF); Elizabeth Curry (UNF); Brian Doherty (NCF); Bob Dugan (UWF); Bill Garrison (USF); Kathy Miller (FGCU); Rita Pellen (FAU); Anne Prestamo (FIU); Judy Russell (UF); Julia Zimmerman (USF)

On conference call: Lucy Harrison (FLVC); Don Muccino (FLVC)

Guests in person: Michael Arthur (UCF); Cecilia Botero (UF); Pam Northrup (UWF; CFPP); Misty Swain (UF)

Chair Judy Russell convened the meeting at 8:32a.

10. FLVC Updates via teleconference at 8:30a

Harrison and Muccino were on a conference call line.

The below topics were discussed:

- Single Bib Cleanup
 - Harrison talked about the cleanup so far as stated in her monthly report.
 - Russell asked about time frame for completion, the last estimate being 61 weeks. Lucy Harrison said no, but need to identify all of the problems before it is understood how to complete the cleanup. Don Muccino stated that database quality is ongoing.
 - Harrison thanked CSUL members that could volunteer staff. Still brainstorming and should begin work soon. When work begins volunteers will start with their own records.

ACTION ITEM: Lucy Harrison will check to see what information she can get and report at Members Council.

- Coding for Brittle, Damaged and Lost books before the HathiTrust Record Pull
 - Russell stated that CAM is working on the list and expects to get codes to FLVC by June.
 - Harrison stated that once the information is received she thinks they will submit a new file by the end of June and then do actual clean up later. She indicated they may be able to do something with the free text in the fields.
- ADA Access in MANGO/OPACs for HathiTrust Records
 - Harrison stated that the mechanics is not difficult. Should be able to do for the local SUS libraries by Fall 2015. The problem will be if this is to be in the catalog shared by all 40 institutions. The User Interface Committee will be helpful here because the colleges are not in the HathiTrust.

- Russell stated that we do not know if the colleges have a unique set to affect user interface. This is an example of how the SUS is unique. Other examples are the CRL membership and the PDA project.
- Russell asked how the PDA records show up statewide. Harrison responded that the PDA shows up statewide. Russell then asked what happens when the state colleges try to access the PDA records. **ACTION ITEM: Harrison did not know and said she will follow up.**
- Russell pointed out that this is an example of the necessary planning before the new discovery and catalog are implemented.
- Harrison pointed out that the colleges see a drop down menu while the SUS has a unified view; there is no single union catalog.
- Russell restated that issues like this need to surface. If ADA access is important to the colleges, then colleges need to join HathiTrust.
- It was asked if the change in governance to UWF affects HathiTrust? Russell responded that HathiTrust looked at common governance; for the SUS, that was the BOG.
- OhioLink has a consortial membership to CRL. It may be that FLVC should ask CRL about state college membership. That would solve some technical issues. **ACTION ITEM: Russell will check with CRL. ACTION ITEM: Julia Zimmerman volunteered to ask the state colleges about memberships.**
- Proposed Changes in FLVC Licensed E-Resources
 - Harrison relayed Janice Gilley's positive report to the Library Members Council Executive Committee. Bulk of non-recurring funding to come in 2016-2017 for ILS. Plan for a two year implementation. Use FLVC reserves and base budget to do the first year of implementation. Then, year 2 would be an overlap budget for the current and new systems.
 - Northrup is holding that the \$5 million will be restored, but the LBRs are at risk. The \$5 million can be used for cleanup. Build a plan depending upon the funding available. The state budget is not finalized yet.
 - Russell asked if the \$5 million is restored, 1) what can FLVC afford to do? 2) how do we meet the legislative language to comply about e-resources? and 3) what are the options?
 - Northrup replied that the 60% for the e-resources was the worst case scenario, not a mandate. UWF has confirmed this with the legislative staff. Legislature is interested in sharing, but there is no ratio or percentage. Back to the funding; would it be 60% or maintain status quo? Northrup asked Harrison to explain. Northrup stated that we need to get to shared resources, and leaning towards status quo.
 - Harrison stated that FLVC supports status quo even though it violates legislative intent.
 - Muccino stated that to get to 60% would probably happen in 2017. Need to look at 60%. And, inflation affects status quo.
 - Russell asked if FLVC can handle status quo with the \$5 million. Muccino replied that the \$5 million is not recurring. Don't want to handle it as recurring.
 - Northrup stated that we need to keep it whole as much as possible. What do we all do together? Fund that and get on with it. OhioLink has two tiers; shared, and then for type of institution. We need to try to hold harmless on e-resources.
 - Russell talked about Provost Glover's reaction to possible e-resources cuts, especially STEM.

- Doherty asked if this provides an opportunity to educate the legislative staff? All this funding for e-resources is coming from a variety of state sources such as universities and colleges.
- Northrup stated that Legislature not looking at “all for all.” Legislature never stated a percentage. Legislature wants us to think about shared resources.
- Prestamo stated that in the 60% scenario, there is a lot of funding spent twice. That cannot be desirable in the perception of the Legislature.
- Northrup added that the Legislature thinks that performance funding is solving this problem.
- All: the performance funding is not going to the libraries. Doherty added that we need to look at the full costs for FL public higher education.
- Northrup added that OhioLink talks about the value of the dollars received. “We have _____ and _____ but not _____ because we do not have the resources.” She thinks this is a good approach.
- Curry stated that we need to show that students are losing. We need to relate what the libraries are losing to the students. Northrup agreed that we need to focus on the students. How do we share resources to benefit students?
- Curry added that whatever scenario is realized, there will still be a loss for students.
- All: discussion of the approach -- ratio or build from the bottom, what is needed to satisfy the legislature.
- Arthur spoke from the collections perspective. Who decided 60-40%? How many shared resources are needed? We do not know. Don’t make us do something with e-resources that is not needed.
- Russell - can we stop the 60%?
- Northrup says we can stop until the budget is decided. If we get the \$5 million we can maintain the status quo. Are we sharing through the status quo? Yes.
- Harrison stated that resource sharing is not supporting the common core. Northrup asked if she meant the common general education core? Harrison said no, the shared resources are not supporting the general education core. Northrup asked Harrison about what is being shared and how does it support the core?
- Arthur asked how much would using EBSCO Premier or Complete meet the core? May not need Premier -- Complete would do it.
- Northrup asked what is essential for the state colleges, the universities, and for both? That becomes the story. Baker replied that some e-resources come from the State Library. Zimmerman pointed out that JSTOR is an example of shared resources that FLVC funds for the state colleges that the universities fund locally. Doherty agreed that JSTOR should be counted as sharing for the story because the SUS are using state funds. Curry stated that this is what students get because we share.
- Russell stated that the current FLVC approach just slides the burden to the institutions.
- Garrison pointed out that the cuts are coming to the attention of the CAVP and we need to know ASAP if we can get this off their agenda.
- **ACTION ITEM:** Russell stated that we need to build the story over the summer. CSUL’s task for summer will be to work on “our” story making sure to focus on what students are getting.
- Northrup stated that this is part of strategic planning. It’s not all about the ILS. Engage the state colleges in the e-resources discussion. Take this conversation a bit further, and talk

about the benefits for students even though the SUS and state colleges have differing missions. Then that we need to move off the status quo. We want to get to a better place.

- Preparation for the Next Gen ILS (standardizing code, policies and procedures)
 - Russell stated that the new ILS is a lot of work, and will FLVC hire a project manager who knows ILL to work on the structure? How does FLVC plan to proceed?
 - Harrison stated that with the caveat that we have not yet entered into negotiations. If it would make sense to do hire a project manager they could look into it; however, at this time we do not know. FLVC has migrated a system before and we are thinking we can do it with the expertise we have on staff and with the vendor.
 - Russell stated that we do not want to create chaos when we migrate. Do cleanup and identify problems now, not wait for the new system.
 - Prestamo stated that the FLVC staff is tasked to the maximum. She asked if the restored funding would help to hire a project manager and coordinate with ILL and local staff to plan for the workflow changes we expect. Cultural changes are meant to not do things in the same way.
 - Harrison agreed. A fresh start with new processes. We have an existing FLVC staff and can bring on who we need. But we have not started on negotiations.
 - Russell stated we need to do cleanup. Harrison stated that FLVC is doing cleanup. Authorities need to happen at migration. Russell disagreed stating that it needed to happen before migration. Harrison replied that a vendor stated that it is not possible at this time. Russell asked who told Harrison that. Harrison stated that FLVC had talked with a vendor about authorities and duplication and vendor said to do it at migration and not before. Russell replied that we need to review that assertion; UF staff state it should be done before. Harrison stated that as long as you end up in the same place it is all good. Russell disagreed. Authorities is preparation for migration. We need to start this process. With FLVC staff tapped out, you may need to expand FLVC's labor pool to get it done. Harrison reiterated that FLVC can make this work with existing staff.
- Common Discovery Tool
 - Russell began by stating that 2 years ago the task force's recommendation was to use Mango and a comprehensive database. However, 1 year ago FLVC recommended using Primo Central and limited EBSCO. She states that FLVC is expending resources to do it their way, overlooking about 40% of SUS institutional resources. She continues saying that libraries need a robust discovery tool and comprehensive database. We keep coming back to this -- how will FLVC improve services? Prestamo added that depending upon our migration strategy, can't we move to EBSCO with Mango?
 - Harrison stated that this is part of negotiations. It has to go through negotiations.
 - Russell pointed out that the ILS may take 2-3 years for implementation. Why do we need to wait?
 - Harrison again stated that it is part of negotiations and based upon the legality of the ITN.

Russell asked if Harrison needed anything from CSUL? Harrison replied no.

Conference call ended.

11. Pam Northrup

Clarify the scope and intent of the legislation concerning FLVC/CFPP and continue discussion about the transition of FLVC into the CFPP

- Russell started the discussion with the observation that there is continuing frustration. Baker added that FLVC is not on the ground (day-to-day practitioners).
- Zimmerman stated that she had talked with Jean Phillips who stated that we can do cleanup during migration. Prestamo stated that we need to identify cleanup issues so that we can ask for implementation costs in negotiations. Russell stated that we need to know what needs to be done before migration and what we can do during migration. Garrison stated that authorities needs to be done before migration, not during. Baker added that authorities had come up years ago and has been deferred. Zimmerman asked why. There was money available, and it was discussed a couple of years ago at a CSUL meeting at UNF. Baker replied it did not happen and that we need to go back and review the Authorities report from the Cataloging committee. Garrison stated that he migrated a system before dealing with authorities and it created a mess. If authorities are done before migration, that will help. He recommends not migrating until authorities are done.
- Russell asked Northrup who has the authority to make a decision about merging the state colleges and universities records? She pointed out that FLVC made a unilateral decision with the discovery tool -- "we have a mandate for discovery and we did it." The result was a poor service.
 - + Northrup noted that part of what she has been doing this year is observing the culture of FLVC. She feels it is an engine that should support the students and the institution, rather than "you follow us." Legislature has given Northrup 18 months to get it right. Serve the needs of the state. Decisions will not be made without input from the institutions.
 - + Russell stated that if decisions are made by FLVC, we need to know the rationale and the impact. How do we influence decisions?
 - + Northrup replied that we need an implementation planning model. We want to ask in negotiations for building out an implementation plan. Plans need to be shared. We cannot go into the implementation without knowing how this will be pulled off.
 - + Prestamo stated that Angie Jones had visited with CSUL the day before. Angie stated that if we do not get the funding we would have to start over again with another ITN. We need to start the clock on implementation. Northrup replied that we can extend the ITN.
 - + Prestamo also stated that if EBSCO knows they may be the solution, they may give us a good deal to start now. Northrup stated that we need to get started with something. The vendor wants to get this contract so that we do not release a new ITN.
 - + Russell asked if the negotiating team can/will have access to expertise. Northrup replied yes. The negotiation team has not be finalized. Russell also pointed out that Angie Jones handled the ITN process well.

- Legislation and Governance
 - + Northrup was asked if there was anything more she could share about governance. She pointed out that UWF had taken responsibility in January 2015. Staff and desk audits have been completed. They are seeing duplication of efforts.
 - + Learning about similar organizations was broadened to a national level. Looked for governance models in other states.
 - + She has talked with student affairs, library, provost, and distance education in FL public institutions to learn their strategic views. We need to be the solution to higher education problems in FL.
 - + Technology is not set up correctly at FLVC. Looked at scalability, affordability and service. This is a result of the 2012 merger of the four organizations. She is looking at business sector IT models.
 - + She has been holding “insight” meetings about the strategic IT roadmap. ISF involved; they have compiled a document. Recommendations are forthcoming. There was no IT plan at FLVC.
 - + What does this all mean to libraries? The need to improve customer service training and workflow. Will serve the customers -- students and the institutions.

- Open Access
 - + there was a discussion of open access resources. Northrup explained that the governor and legislature is asking us “to tell us what to do” about e-textbook affordability.
 - + Curry stated that we need to incentivize the faculty. We also need to tie in our existing licensed e-resources. Prestamo stated that we keep delivering the message to distance education but that we cannot get that faculty to integrate our e-resources. Garrison stated that their LibGuides pop up on the LMS. Librarians help faculty locate OA resources already in the library’s collections. FGCU uses Canvas.

- Communications Plan
 - + Northrup stated that FLVC is working on a communications plan.
 - + Changes at FLVC will take place in August or September. What does FALSC look like? Change the culture of this vertical. A lot is happening about IT and customer service that will be communicated.
 - + Russell asked about the name -- FALSC or FLVC? The name does not convey what we do. Northrup replies that a name change will occur in 2016; they have been given a year to suggest a new name. The legislature will not accept “Virtual Campus” as the name.
 - + Russell stated that FLVC is telling libraries that resources are being diverted to distance education and are therefore not able to help the libraries. Northrup replied that she is tired of hearing this. There is only one person working on distance education. Doherty asked what 110 people do? Baker replied that he saw an organizational chart. Staff is generalized and not working on a focus as they should. Northrup stated that staff need to understand the criticality of the mission. Not there yet, but close. Russell

stated that the infrastructure must be fixed to work; a plan is needed to move forward. Northrup agreed.

- + Communications is key; there is much about the organization librarians do not know about. Northrup replied that we must create the culture.

Chair Russell summarized: CSUL wants to help, we understand it takes time, and contact us if you need us.

12. Review of CSUL key policy decisions (Ben via teleconference at 11a) [Attachment 12]

A. FLARE policies

It was decided to pass on this agenda item at this meeting. **ACTION ITEM: review of this will be conducted via email.**

13. Library Security Policy Survey Results

ACTION ITEM: Zimmerman stated that a survey will go out in June about security.

14. CSUL Mission [Attachment 14]

Russell recognized Doherty for pulling this together. Look at the bullets about what we do collectively. Discussion? Send emails to Brian?

Doherty stated that this is important because we need to define ourselves and not let anyone else define us. It's a bit long, but OK. Russell added that people are questioning the need for CSUL.

Zimmerman suggested we move ahead with a project not related to FLVC. Examples included: scholarly publishing and the storage facility. A project that demonstrates our collaboration.

Miller suggested removing the reference to CFPP because they are a service bureau. Curry pointed out that we collaborate with others. Russell agreed, saying that maybe this is not the right way to include CFPP.

Curry stated that we need only one or two phrases more beyond content.

ACTION ITEM: Russell asked all to review the draft and send comments via email to her and Doherty. Russell will then send the revised document back out to solicit additional input.

15. Open access publishing activities

This topic was not discussed.

16. Old Business



This topic was not discussed.

17. New Business

This topic was not discussed.

18. Executive Session (if necessary)

An executive session was not necessary.

The meeting was adjourned by proclamation at 12:25 pm.