

**REVISED and Approved 9-5-02**  
**Minutes of the**  
**State University Libraries Council**  
**Directors Meeting**  
**Thursday June 6, 2002 -- 12:30 to 5:30 p.m.**  
**Florida State University**  
**Strozier Library, Suite 305**

---

1. The **agenda** was approved with the addition of 2 discussion items (see #11). Rita Pellen represented FAU; John Ingram represented UF; Joan Pelland (NCF) could not attend.
2. **Minutes of the meeting of 3/7/2002** were accepted. Andy suggested and the group concurred that the minutes should be posted on the website. Derrie will get with Dale and Jim to get the minutes posted.
3. **Schedule next meetings**  
**June 6-7, 2003 in Pensacola at UWF** was in conflict with the 2003 ACURIL meeting. Barry asked for reconsideration of dates. Grady will check on June 12-13 and email us if those dates are clear for UWF. [Grady confirmed this meeting time.]

#### **4. Report of the ECC**

John Ingram led a general discussion regarding Elsevier. They will be able to provide institution-specific usage data under new arrangements with each institution in place of single agreement with a consortium. There will be changes in our agreements, but the scope of the changes and the costs are uncertain. John also gave an update on Kluwer.

*a) Subscribe to Vanderbilt Archive? \$10,000*

Interest was expressed. The ECC should continue to monitor the development of the project and investigate options for participating if costs are nominal. The ECC should consult with the Journalism Subcommittee to evaluate the Archive's importance relative to other resources.

*b) Refer search interface for the Official Index to the Times to PSPC OPAC*  
FCLA will investigate what options exist, if any, to modify the search interface.

Otherwise, the ECC report was accepted.

## 5. Report of the PSPC

*Support Joint chat reference service? If not, do we have any thoughts or comments on this proposal or advice for PSPC? They did do this proposal at our request. We should clarify our needs if this is not suitable.*

There was general discussion about what some of the SUL are doing now. Concern expressed included 1)that we need to find our own niche in this arena, 2)that ASERL in particular has reported that such services are not used extensively enough to warrant scarce funds, 3)that if this becomes a cooperative project that we might have to drop it during tight budgets, 4)that we are facing different budget challenges now than just a few months ago, and 5)that others are beginning to report usage and effectiveness data that will help us make a decision. The SULC thanks the PSPC for their work to date and asks that they continue monitoring the development of chat services and consider options, advising the directors of new directions.

Part of the PSPC report was the Distance Learning report from Geraldine Collins (UNF). That Subcommittee indicated that they would like to hear from the directors on whether or not, or how, the SULC would be kept as a viable working group. The consensus of the SULC directors is that they intend to continue to be a collaborative working council and to participate in all manner of cooperative endeavors, including those we are now engaged in, and any others that we may agree to engage in in the future. Derrie will ask Dale to relay this sentiment to all the working groups of the SULC.

## 6. Report of the TSPC was accepted.

## 7. Report of the DSPC was accepted.

## 8. Report of the CMC

John reported discussions held at the inaugural CMC meeting and reiterated the importance of timely posting of SULC meeting minutes. John asked about the purpose of the CMC; the directors see it more as a working group than an oversight group. Continued review and refinement will be needed to clarify the relative roles of the CMC, PSPC, ECC, and subject-specific ECC subcommittees. For example, is it appropriate to use ECC subcommittees as state bibliographers? The directors noted that their intent in creating the CMC was to create a collections group with a broader focus than e-resources, for example, cooperative collection development issues that supercede format. One suggestion was that perhaps the CMC chair should sit on the SULC. It was also noted that the SULC should be more directive with the CMC – give them a vision. Also accreditation issues need to be addressed. Directors are looking to the CMC for new ideas, like distributed responsibility for remote storage for instance.

Althea asked that the CMC collect collection development decision-making models in use on our campuses.

The CMC will meet by conference call in July and will bring issues, questions, and additional thoughts back to the SULC in September.

#### **9. Report of the Rosetta Committee**

*Discuss the FAQ Document for distribution to all SU Libraries and provide PSPC any additional advice that we may have.*

The FAQ was intended to be descriptive for library staff. It was recommended that the FAQ be sent to the PSPC to retool, and that the OPAC Task Force develop a model/proposal for the portal and send it to the SULC for their September meeting. The SULC agreed.

#### **10. Florida Virtual Library Plan**

There was lengthy discussion regarding the role of the SU Libraries within the state's Virtual Library Plan. Discussion centered on the benefits to and responsibilities of the SU Libraries, as well as the appropriate leadership role of SU Libraries and the various issues confronting participation. Barry and Jim gave a report of FLNC meeting.

#### **11. Directors Discussion (30 minutes)**

**Book Budgets** Derrie indicated the USF cuts amounted to 30% with the cuts and lack of "non recurring" funds. Most libraries are expecting to receive a base that reflects the 2001/02 cuts. FCLA budget is not final; but they did get \$1M non-recurring for ALEPH. After the SULC September meeting, there will be discussion regarding FCLA equipment money and guidelines.

**ARL Scholars Portal** Jim indicated that FCLA is investigating portal products from different vendors. The Ex Libris product can be purchased off the existing contract. He noted that ARL is going with a different product. There was agreement to go with the Ex Libris product.

**+Library Fines** Grady noted that the UWF Provost indicated that fine money would be going to institutions now. The fines information is in the rewritten Code.

**+Staff Salaries at Law Libraries** Larry noted that he is seeing about a \$5000 difference in staff salaries between the general library and the law library; all agreed that this has been observed in both law and medical libraries.

#### **12. There was no other business.**

**SUS Library Directors Meeting**  
**Thursday June 6, 2002 -- 12:00 noon to 5:00 p.m.**  
**Florida State University**  
**Strozier Library, Suite 305**

-----  
*Dinner 6:30 pm Thursday evening at Chez Pierre*  
*2215 Thomasville Rd.*

- 1. Agreement on agenda.** [Approval—5 minutes]
- 2. Minutes of the meeting of 3/7/2002.** [Approval – 5 minutes]  
(Background #2, p. 2 )
- 3. Schedule next meetings** [Action—5 minutes]  
September 5-6, 2002 in Jacksonville  
December 5-6, 2002 at the Davie Campus of Broward Community College in Ft. Lauderdale  
March 6-7, 2003 in Boca Raton at FAU  
**June 6-7, 2003 in Pensacola at UWF**
- 4. Report of the ECC** [Action] (Background #4, p. 4)
  - c) Subscribe to Vanderbilt Archive? \$10,000
  - d) Refer search interface to PSPC OPAC
- 5. Report of the PSPC** [Action] (Background #5, p. 7)

Support Joint chat reference service? If not, do we have any thoughts or comments on this proposal or advice for PSSC? They did do this proposal at our request. We should clarify our needs if this is not suitable.
- 6. Report of the TSPC** [No Action] (Background # 6, p. 14)
- 7. Report of the DSPC** [No Action] (Background #7 and 7.1, p. 15)
- 8. Report of the CMC** [No Action] (Background # 8, p. 17)
- 9. Report of the Rosetta Committee** [Action] (Background # 9, p. 19)

Discuss the FAQ Document for distribution to all SU Libraries and provide PSSC any additional advice that we may have.
- 10. Florida Virtual Library Plan** [Discussion--60 minutes] (Background # 10, p. 22)

Barry  
Discussion of the plan, the place of the SU Libraries in such an undertaking, etc.

**11. Directors Discussion (30 minutes)**  
**Book Budgets** Derrie

**12. Other business**

**SUS Library Directors Meeting**

Thursday, March 7, 2003 – noon to 5:00 pm  
University of Central Florida  
Library Conference Room 512M

1. The **agenda** was approved as submitted. Grady Morein (UWF) was unable to attend.
2. The **minutes** of the meeting of December 6, 2001, were approved as corrected. There was a typo in item 4. 2): from “produce” to “product.”
3. A **meeting scheduled for March 6-7, 2003, at FAU** was approved.
4. The **report of the ECC** was accepted. Jim Corey clarified FirstSearch “subscriptions” (flat fee) versus “per search.” FS discontinued subscription access, but RILM still provides subscriptions although at a higher cost. We converted to RILM in order to have a subscription.
5. The **PSPS report** requested action on two items.
  - A. The Directors approved changing the name of the WebLuis Task Force to OPAC Subcommittee of the PSPC; they approved membership. However, the Directors asked that a charge be brought to the Directors for approval.
  - B. The Directors **clarified the role of the new Collection Management Committee**. The charge to the committee was accepted. The perspective of the CMC is to be overarching. Therefore, the ECC will become a subcommittee of both the CMC and the PSPC, effective immediately. The CMC is a Standing Committee and reports to the Directors. The membership is as follows:
    - 1) John Ingram, **UF**, Associate Director for Collections, CMC CHAIR
    - 2) Larry Heilos, **USF**, Director of Collections
    - 3) Rita Pellen, **FAU**, Associate Director
    - 4) Vivian Royster, **FAMU**, Assistant Director for Collection Management
    - 5) Tony Schwartz, **FIU**, Associate Director for Collection Management
    - 6) Roy Ziegler, **FSU**, Head of Collection Management
    - 7) Jeannette Ward, **UCF**, Head of Acquisitions Services
    - 8) Kitti Canepi, **FGCU**, Resource Management Librarian
    - 9) Kathleen Cohen, **UNF**, Assistant Director/Collection Development Librarian
    - 10) Judy Kelly, **NCF**, Director of Technical Services and Collection Management
    - 11) Helen Wigersma, Associate Director, UWF

6. The **report of the TSPC** was accepted.
7. The **DSPC report** requested action on one item, a name change. The Directors found that the suggested name could encompass many other library activities for which this committee has no responsibility. Therefore, they rejected this specific request. However, they are very willing to consider other names for the committee and ask the committee to consider other possibilities
8. The **report of the Rosetta Committee** was accepted. The committee will work on a web page that will answer a lot of questions that continue to circulate about what "Rosetta" will be. In discussion it was noted that, from the outset, the intention had been that Rosetta would contain our catalogs and all of our jointly purchased e-books, journals, indexes, etc. The concept seems difficult for many staff.
9. There was discussion of an **Electronic Book Consortium** and relationships with the University Presses. Dale gave a background on the current situation in Florida. The Directors would like more information from the CIC about their project. This will be assigned to the new CMC. One comment was that perhaps the state university libraries could work with some of the smaller presses in Florida.
10. There were **seven questions for Richard Stevens and DCU staff**. However, they were not discussed in order, but rather an overall discussion of the topics took place. Richard and R.E. LeMon joined the Directors.
  - The main priority of the Legislature seems to be the School Code. There was little knowledge as to the status of Book OCO and how it would be handled in the future. They are working on broad reorganization questions for now; library issues would be probably be considered later.
  - There seems to be no initiative at this time to do joint programming with the public libraries.
  - On the question of how the SUS libraries might continue to work together, it was clarified that DCU includes both public and private institutions of higher education, e.g., all the institutions of higher education in the state. The SUS libraries cannot really be called DCU libraries, since they do not represent all of the institutions included in DCU responsibility. It was clarified that the libraries will have to work with their own Boards of Trustees; they cannot work

directly with the DCU without the presidents, provosts, and boards. It was suggested that we just continue working together as we have been, and to enter into dialog with the private institution libraries.

- The DCU does make policy; but does need approval from the FBOE to do so.
- There does not appear to be a “third” tier for colleges being considered for now.
- Regarding Type I Centers, there was no clear picture on what will happen.
- Finally, it is going to be a tough year.

11. There was **Directors Discussion**

- Dale Canelas suggested that we change our name to State University Libraries Council, SULC. All agreed.
- Andy Farkas will handle the Salary Survey; he reviewed the format. It is due on April 15<sup>th</sup>.
- Kathy Hoeth reminded us of the “Information Strategies Conference.” Solinet will partner with them for promotion. It will be November 20-22, 2002. Kathy said it was still useful to partner with the universities if that was acceptable to us. We agreed.
- Jim Corey led a discussion of DLLI. The Distance Learning label is almost passé. We should consider moving away from it. There is concern on how we will be able to pay for FirstSearch in the year ahead. Working with the State Library and/or the independents was discussed; the directors believe there is interest in such discussion.
- Kathy and Jim discussed the Implementation Committee meeting.

12. There was **no other business**



**SUS-Electronic Collections Committee Report to the SUS Board**

**10 May 2002**

**Submitted by Athena Hoepfner, Chair, ECC**

**Action Items.**

1. ***Vanderbilt Television News Archive.*** The Vanderbilt Library has created a unique video collection, capturing 30 years of ABC, CBS and NBC news broadcasts. They have also created an online index, complete with abstracts, and they will loan the tapes to requesting libraries. In the past, Vanderbilt subsidized the creation and maintenance of the archive. The library has now been told to make the service self-supporting. Paul Gherman of Vanderbilt is looking for expressions of interest/support to show that this resource has value beyond Vanderbilt. They are considering selling subscriptions to the online index, and have suggested a consortial price of \$10,000. The index does not provide online retrieval of the broadcasts, but they hope to offer this capability when copyright issues are resolved.

The ECC urges the directors to support the TV News Archive, both monetarily, through a subscription, and conceptually, through letters. The URL for the archive is: <http://lib14.library.vanderbilt.edu:8080/>

Paul Gherman's email address is: [gberman@library.vanderbilt.edu](mailto:gberman@library.vanderbilt.edu)

2. ***Official Index to the Times.*** The Official Index to the Times was purchased last year with one-time funds, giving the SUL perpetual access. FCLA loaded it into the full-text software that supports other SUL Digital Library Services full-text content. Unlike our other purchased databases, this index does not use the WebLUIIS search interface. The current interface, while functional, is exceedingly sparse and in need of refinement. The ECC recommends that the PSPC OPAC Subcommittee (formerly the WebLUIIS Task Force) consider interface design issues for this index and makes concrete suggestions to FCLA.

**New Products.**

1. In the absence of budget information, we are not seriously considering new products.

**Existing Products.**

1. **ISI Web of Knowledge.** Under our Web of Science contract, universities in consortia were required to share ports. With the advent of the Web of Knowledge, each university has its own ports. Monica Metz-Wiseman, of USF, worked with Lolly Madden, from ISI, to distribute our ports fairly. Each institution received a minimum of 5 ports, and additional ports were assigned based on JCR and backfile subscriptions. The final distribution is as follows:

<b><u>UF</u></b>	<b>FAU</b>	
	-	1
	<u>2</u>	3
	<b>6</b>	<b>FAMU</b>
<b><u>USF</u></b>		
	-	6
	<u>2</u>	<b>FGCU</b>
	<b>0</b>	
<b>FIU</b>	<b>6</b>	
	<b>UNF</b>	
21		
<b>FSU</b>	<b>5</b>	
	<b>UWF</b>	
19		
<b>UCF</b>	<b>5</b>	
17		

2. **FirstSearch.** OCLC FirstSearch is increasing the price for per-search databases from 67¢ to 85¢, effective 1 July 2002. We will examine usage statistics to predict how this will impact our costs for the databases.
3. **Elsevier Science Direct.** Several changes are underway for Elsevier. Firstly, they have purchased Academic Press IDEAL. We subscribed to IDEAL through a SOLINET offer, which provided access based on print subscriptions by ASERL libraries – in effect, giving us access to the entire collection. Because Elsevier is unwilling to cross state lines with consortial licenses, we expect to lose access to titles not currently subscribed to by an SUL. Secondly, Elsevier is changing the nature of its licenses. They plan to offer several subscription models, but will no longer sell tokens for accessing unsubscribed journals. We have not been given specific prices for the subscription options. Each institution will have its own license, though we expect to maintain a consortial relationship with Elsevier. John Ingram is working with Elsevier to resolve these issues.

## Other Items.

1. **ICOLC.** Michele Newberry and Athena Hoepfner attended the International Coalition of Library Consortia meeting in Portland, OR in April.
2. **ECC Report to the SUS Interest Group at FLA.** Athena Hoepfner wrote and delivered a report summarizing the ECC's activities to a small, but receptive, audience at the FLA annual meeting.
3. **Meetings.** ECC held monthly conference calls to discuss issues and products. We await 2002-2003 budget information before making decisions about new electronic resources.
4. **Committee Membership.** There has been some turnover in our ranks. Our current members are: Brenda Wright (FAMU); Rita Pellen (FAU); Michele Newberry (FCLA); Kitti Canepi (FGCU); Valerie Edwards (FIU); Roy Ziegler (FSU); Anne Bardolph (FSU-Law); Athena Hoepfner (UCF); John Ingram (UF); Peggy Hsu (UF-Health); Christopher Vallandingham (UF-Law); Sarah M. Philips (UNF); Monica Metz-Wiseman (USF); Danny O'Neal (USF-Health); Peggy Toifel (UWF).
5. **Subcommittees.** We have successfully bolstered subcommittee membership, and combined Sciences and Health Sciences subcommittees
6. **Individually Purchased Databases.** In response to the idea of developing a list of likely candidates for consortial purchase, FCLA has prepared an Excel file of the non-FCLA/non-DLLI/non-SUS-wide titles. We are further refining the list and will ask the subcommittees to organize the databases into subject groupings. See accompanying spreadsheet.
7. **CMC Meeting.** Athena Hoepfner and Peggy Toifel attended the first CMC meeting on May 10<sup>th</sup>. At this time we expect that the CMC may provide a broad collection development framework and guidelines, but will not be involved in setting the budget or approving specific purchases. We hope that the speed of payment and purchase decisions will not be hindered by the CMC. We are still unsure how communication and reporting will work. Overlapping membership currently facilitates communications between the CMC and the ECC. If that changes, the ECC would like to have a formal liaison to report on CMC activities during ECC meetings. The ECC subcommittees might be useful to the CMC, and provide a further link between the CMC and ECC.

**Public Services Planning Committee Report  
May 10, 2002**

Since the committee's last report to the directors, there have been three monthly conference call meetings: February 25, 2002, March 25, 2002, and April 22, 2002. The PSPC is pleased to welcome two new members: Brenda Wright, representing FAMU, and David Clendinning, representing FSU. They replace Ann Hinson, who represented FAMU, and retired at the end of April, and Alberto Herrera, who represented FSU, and has taken a job in Minnesota. Daniel Liestman, who represents FGCU, has agreed to serve as Vice Chair/Incoming Chair of the PSPC during the Summer Semester, 2002. At the start of the Fall Semester, 2002, Daniel will begin serving as Chair of the PSPC.

**Information Items:** The PSPC has had discussions on the new Eureka interface, and the need for public services librarians to publicize the wide array of resources available through PALMM. The Rosetta FAQ was sent out to the PSPC and reviewed. The WebLUIIS Task Force has notified its members of the change to the OPAC Subcommittee, and will be formulating a charge.

SUBCOMMITTEE REPORTS

**CIRCULATION** has spent a great deal of time discussing the impact of the new LMS. The committee did discuss issues concerning summer use by non-registered students. Each library will deal with that issue on an individual basis. A student who is visiting another campus but is not active during the summer can contact his or her home library for activation (if that is the home library's policy), and then his or her card will be accepted at the non-home library.

Rush requests were discussed, and the issue of having a form through FCLA was debated. Many of the SUS libraries already have a form online, and the issue of having an FCLA generated form has been sent to the membership.

In addition, a survey has been sent out to the membership, and once everyone responds, the information will be tabulated and sent to all members. We are trying to plan a joint meeting of the SUS-ILL and SUS-CIRC group for our next meeting. We would like to have a face-to-face meeting but with budget constraints, we will have to evaluate that possibility carefully.

Chair: Marilyn Burke, USF

**DISTANCE LEARNING.** The SUS **Distance Learning Task Force's** activity centered around the dissolution of the Reference and Referral Center and how we could best continue the work that the RRC had started. It was agreed that the cooperation among the SUS libraries is even more important now that the RRC is no longer available to assist Distance Learning participants. It is only through each library's cooperation that support for distance learning students and faculty within the university system and the community colleges will continue, and succeed.

The **RRC Web Site** has been preserved for the sake of history, at the FCLA Web Site. USF Library staff provided copies of the site via CD to each of the SUS libraries also and volunteered to maintain the valuable Florida Libraries Locator resource started by the RRC.

We would like to hear that the Director's will in some tangible way reiterate their commitment to continued cooperation among the SUS libraries, particularly in areas of resource sharing, support of distance learning programs and direct borrowing etc. regardless of the new governance structure that is now upon us. It would be nice if this commitment was somehow communicated to the staffs of the libraries.

Chair: Geraldine Collins, UNF

### **Florida Digital Reference Subcommittee---Jana Ronan**

**Chat or real-time reference assistance.** This is a revised statement of the costs needed to establish a shared chat reference service, with service hours of 8 p.m. – 1 a.m. Monday through Friday and 6-10 p.m. on Sunday. The consensus of the committee is that a shared chat service during evening hours would fill a gap in user services, but public services staffs are operating at their peak at the various institutions. In addition, it would be hard to recruit existing staff to cover the late night hours; we strongly recommend hiring special staff to support chat reference. The approaches to providing chat reference service are summarized below.

#### **Hosted at UF on the existing NetAgent server**

##### ***One time costs:***

*Software, hardware and infrastructure expenses:*

2 NetAgent seats: \$5,000.00 estimated<sup>1</sup>  
Laptop computer with Ethernet, fax/modem cards<sup>2</sup>: \$4,000.00  
Office space and furniture at Library West: gratis  
Office computer with local printer, ethernet, modem, and fax card, sound card and speakers: \$2,000.00  
Scanner: \$199.00

*Local administrative costs:* \$6,350.00 the first year (this should decrease substantially after the first year)

For designing and implementing a shared FDR chat website, with help pages, links to resources, manual  
For programming NetAgent for a separate service line, and scheduling  
Supervision of FDR personnel

### ***Ongoing costs:***

#### *Software, hardware and infrastructure expenses:*

Office supplies: \$100.00 per year  
Local clerical support: gratis equivalent to \$500.00  
Telephone or data line<sup>3</sup> per FDR Librarian: \$100 per month or \$1,200.00 per year  
UF Office phone line: gratis

*Personnel:* The committee recommends two options for staffing the service with reference professionals.

*Option 1:* 2 part-time hourly employees recruited from FSU or USF library school students (no benefits):

Salary per employee: \$21,500.00 per year (Calculated based on a starting librarian's salary at \$34,000 + \$1,000 (late hours, lack of benefits) at 5/8 time).

---

<sup>1</sup> Two seats are recommended for smooth shift transitions, if two part-time employees are covering the service hours. With only one seat, one librarian must log off completely, and the service is untended until the second librarian logs on.

<sup>2</sup> A laptop computer would allow the FDR librarian to work at home or locations outside the walls of the UF Libraries. It would also help the librarian participate in conferences or off-campus instructional opportunities.

<sup>3</sup> This expense is to provide the FDR librarian a paid dial-up account or a cable modem account to be able to work late night hours at home or other locations. It is essential to offer the perk of working at home to interest talented library science students or entry-level librarians in applying to be the FDR librarian. It would also cover long distance charges.

*Option 2:* One full-time entry-level librarian position with benefits and backup personnel for coverage during any sick-time, vacation or travel

Entry-level librarian salary (including benefits): \$44,000. per year (Approx. 35,000 plus standard 27% for benefits)

Travel expenses: \$1000.00

Back-up OPS personnel salary: \$10,000.00

*Publicity:*

Printing budget: \$500.00

Training for full-time position: gratis

Training for library science students in part-time positions: \$2000.00 in UF staff time (because of turnover)

### **Hosted service with QuestionPoint or with SOLINET**

We may wish to investigate a hosted service using the new Collaborative Digital Reference Service software developed with OCLC called QuestionPoint. QuestionPoint will include a chat component for delivering reference services directly to end-users. SUS librarians that attended early focus groups report that the costs will be very high, but I heard a more reasonable figure last month from CDRS Director Diane Kresh who estimated an annual cost of \$2,000.00 a year. More information will be forthcoming at ALA, Atlanta in June. I don't have the figures, but SOLINET is proposing a chat reference cooperative too.

#### ***One time costs:***

*Software, hardware and infrastructure expenses:*

Laptop computer with Ethernet, fax/modem cards: \$4,000.00

Office space and furniture at Library West: gratis

Office computer with local printer, ethernet, modem, and fax card, sound card and speakers: \$2,000.00

Scanner: \$199.00

*Local administrative costs:* \$5,350.00 the first year (this should decrease substantially after the first year)

Design and implementation of a shared FDR chat website, with help pages, links to resources, manual

Programming the chat software and scheduling

Supervision of FDR personnel

#### ***Ongoing costs:***

*Software, hardware and infrastructure expenses:*

QuestionPoint: \$2,000.00 per institution yearly  
SOLINET: n/a  
Office supplies: \$100.00 per year  
Local UF clerical support: gratis equivalent to \$500.00  
Telephone or data line per FDR Librarian: \$100 per month or  
\$1,200.00 per year  
UF Office phone line: gratis

*Personnel:* The committee recommends two options for staffing the service with reference professionals

*Option 1:* 2 part-time hourly employees recruited from FSU or USF library school students (no benefits):

Salary per employee: \$21,500.00 per year (Calculated based on a starting librarian's salary at \$34,000 + \$1,000 (late hours, lack of benefits) at 5/8 time.

*Option 2:* One full-time entry-level librarian position with benefits and backup personnel for coverage during any sick-time, vacation or travel

Entry-level librarian salary (including benefits): \$44,000. per year (Approx. 35,000 plus standard 27% for benefits)

Travel expenses: \$1000.00

Back-up OPS personnel salary: \$10,000.00

Publicity:

Printing budget: \$500.00

Training for full-time position: gratis

Training for library science students in part-time positions: \$2000.00 in UF staff time (because of turnover)

## **Outsourcing**

Another way to extend reference hours to distance learners might be to outsource the questions to librarians at another academic library or a commercial library service. There is still much talk of cooperative time-sharing of reference services across academic institutions, but these efforts are in the early stages yet.

Regarding opportunities with commercial vendors, I talked to a QuestionPoint representative, and it seems that they are not planning to offer outsourced reference services, though they were intrigued with the idea.



It is possible to contract for reference services from LSSI. The initial costs of outsourcing the questions alone seem to range around \$250.00 monthly for a volume of calls up to 100. The KnowItNow 24X7 consortium of 30 libraries in Ohio does route late night reference questions to the LSSI librarians at the Germantown Maryland Reference Center, and are happy with the quality of the service. I've been trying to get a figure for the number of hours that they actually outsource to LSSI, but haven't received an answer as yet. But this would not be the only cost involved in using the service. We would need to purchase at least one seat at \$6,000.00 each, and pay maintenance and training fees. (The local coordinator would need a seat to be able to test the service, to connect and run statistics, etc.) KnowItNow pays 30,000.00 a year for 5 seats, and 14,400.00 for service<sup>4</sup> each year. They also paid a one-time 8,000.00 charge for training and installation. Other costs are estimated below:

*One time costs:*

Software, hardware and infrastructure expenses:

- Laptop computer with Ethernet, fax/modem cards: \$4,000.00
- Office space and furniture at UF: gratis
- Office computer with local printer, ethernet, modem, and fax card, sound card and speakers: \$2,000.00
- Scanner: \$199.00

*Ongoing costs:*

Software, hardware and infrastructure expenses:

- Office supplies: \$100.00 per year
- Local UF clerical support: gratis equivalent to \$500.00
- Telephone or data line per FDR Librarian: \$100 per month or \$1,200. per year
- UF Office phone line: gratis

*Personnel:*

- Full-time entry-level librarian<sup>5</sup> position with benefits and backup personnel for coverage during any sick-time, vacation or travel
- Entry-level librarian salary (including benefits): \$44,000. per year (Approx. 35,000 plus standard 27% for benefits)

---

<sup>4</sup> What is meant by service is unclear. I got this data from a presentation detailing the project at: <http://www.vrd.org/conferences/VRD2001/proceedings/carterette.shtml>.

<sup>5</sup> This position could be half-time FDR librarian, half-time reference librarian/webmaster at the library hosting the FDR Office. FDR duties: Design and maintain a shared FDR chat website, with help pages, procedure manual, reference sources, etc. (like the old RRC website), program the chat software, monitor quality of service, run statistical reports, train member libraries, publicity and promotion

Travel expenses: \$1000.00  
Back-up OPS personnel salary: \$10,000.00

*Publicity:*

Printing budget: \$500.00

Training for full-time position: gratis

Training for library science students in part-time positions: \$2000.00 in UF staff time (because of turnover)

Respectfully submitted,  
Meg Scharf, Chair



## Background # 7

TO: Dale Canelas  
Director, University Libraries, University of Florida

FROM: Lucy Patrick  
Chair, Digitization Services Planning Committee

DATE: May 7, 2002

RE: **Quarterly Report of the Digitization Services Planning Committee**

Among our activities this quarter:

The EAD (Encoded Archival Description) training has been done, draft guidelines and templates for required elements have been developed, software has been distributed to participants, and the actual coding of finding aids is beginning. Everything is going according to our projected schedule to have the pilot online by the end of the year.

The LSTA cataloger has begun visits to libraries outside of Gainesville. During his two-week visit to FSU, he was able to catalog almost 100 previously uncataloged manuscript collections.

Three new specimen collections have been added to Linking Florida's Natural Heritage in PALMM: ichthyology specimens from the Florida Marine Research Institute; mammalogy and herbarium specimens from the Florida Museum of Natural History.

19 volumes of the Florida Historical Quarterly were added to the Florida Heritage full text collection. There are now over 206 issues available, and only 25 more volumes to go. According to the Florida Virtual Library project list, this is one of the top 225 serial titles wanted online by public libraries in Florida.

See <http://purl.fcla.edu/fcla/fulltext>

The full text collections have been moved to the new FCLA Sun server. Users will notice that searching is faster.

One new title has been added to the Psychoanalytic Study of Art collection.

All participating libraries are now using the new Metadata Exchange Format (MXF) in place of the old dataset.toc. The PALMM Guidelines and Procedures have been updated to reflect this change.

See <http://palmm.fcla.edu/strucmeta/standres.html#strucmet>

Interesting statistics on the usage of items contributed to the PALMM collections by your institution are available at:

<http://www.fcla.edu/FCLAinfo/stats/dlcnt/index.html>

The Committee will meet in Gainesville on June 3 to hear reports on current projects and be updated on technical changes underway. In addition, we will discuss possible future developments. Please encourage technical and special collections staff members to attend.

**Date:** May 14, 2002  
**To:** Collection Management Committee  
**From:** John Ingram  
**Subject:** Minutes of Meeting of 11 May 2002

Committee Members present:

John Ingram, chair, Anne Bardolph, Kitty Canepi, Kathleen Cohen, Larry Heilos, Judy Kelly (speaker phone), Rita Pellen, Lenny Rhine, Vivian Royster, Tony Schwartz, Jeannette Ward, Helen Wigersma, Roy Ziegler

Committee Chairs present:

Athena Hoepner (ECC), Meg Scharf (PSPC), Peggy Toifel (ECC)

Meeting commenced at 9:15 a.m., in the Director's conference room, University of Central Florida Library. Meeting adjourned at 3:15 p.m.

Members provided brief introductory comments on experience and current responsibilities within respective institutional libraries as well as service on other SUL committees.

Meg Scharf, current chair of the PSPC, Athena Hoepner, current chair of the ECC, and Peggy Toifel, former chair of the ECC, shared their perspectives on successful committee procedures, including functional scheduling (monthly conference calls, and annual face-to-face meetings), information sharing among all standing committees and the SUL directors. All three advanced suggestions for correlating the work of the CMC with the other SUL standing committees. Major concerns included maintenance of expeditious turnaround times for work of the ECC; accessibility by our clientele to the collections, irrespective of format and including physical and virtual access; relationship with our extended public institutional clientele, including community colleges and the K-20 learning groups.

During the course of discussions, several themes recurred which will represent where this committee should spend its initiative and energy. In many ways, these action items reiterate - from different perspectives - the general charge of the SUL directors. In summary terms these areas include:

- multiple format duplication especially regarding print and electronic

### journals

- archival copies of print journals and other resources for the SUL
- assessment of collections for strengths and weaknesses
- consideration of collections and their management in light of institutional accreditation requirements
- document delivery (Ariel, et al) and its impact on collection management
- impact of e-books, e.g., vision-challenged need alternate access to the info
- collaborative collection development: subdivide by subject; reciprocal arrangement
- central facility and/or regional depositories.

To inform these discussions, several points should be considered: where are there useful redundancies in our SUL collection building? Should we limit duplication of materials for the sake of the exercise or rather base actual cuts on enlightened management of the collections for the group of institutions? How will what we do collegially and in concord NOW change when/if we become eleven individual corporations rather than eleven members of the state university system? What can we legitimately empower our current subject sub-committees for the ECC to do on a comprehensive bibliographical base? I.e., extend their purview to include all formats within subject areas?

General statement of action:

CMC should develop a mission statement; set goals and objectives; define outcomes; maintain broad perspective (as much as feasible in our changing organizational environment);

CMC should act as an oversight - large picture - advisory body to the SUL directors rather than concern itself with details;

CMC should develop policies that relate to funding and support of individual institutional as well as SUL constituencies

CMC should be proactively engaged in communication (perhaps through liaison members) with the other SUL standing committees (DSPC, ECC, PSPC) that manage collection resources AS WELL AS with the SUL directors.

Committee members to review these minutes prior to submission to SUL directors

**Rosetta Public Relations and Marketing committee**

Quarterly Report

May 10, 2002

Submitted by: Barbara Hood, Chair

Committee Members:

Teresa Brown, USF

Barbara Hood, UF

Advisory Members:

Meg Scharf, UCF

Jana Ronan, UF

Mimi Pappas, UF

Alice Primack, UF

The "Frequently Asked Questions" document (see Attached) was sent to Meg Scharf at the end of February for her to distribute to the Public Services Committee for their input. One committee member made edits that help to clarify the message and provide accuracy. The text will now be forwarded to Dale Canelas to send to the directors for their input. Once the directors have approved the final copy it will be sent to all state university libraries' staff.

The Rosetta web page is continuing to be designed by committee members.



## ROSETTA FAQ

With all of the changes in the Florida educational system, and in the State University Libraries, it's sometimes difficult to place all of these changes in their proper context. The State University System (SUS) has been disbanded and is now part of the Division of Colleges and Universities (DCU); a new library management system (Aleph) is replacing LUIS/WebLUIS; and Rosetta will be the name of the total of all networked electronic resources. If you are confused about how all of these changes relate and what they mean to the libraries' staff and users, we hope to clarify some of the issues for you.

**Q** What exactly is Rosetta?

**A** Rosetta is the sum total of the networked electronic resources provided by the State University Libraries (SUL) for their students, faculty and staff. Included are catalogs, proprietary databases such as First Search, e-journals, e-books, and services such as the digital resources in PALMM. The name was chosen by the library directors from a list of finalists submitted by the Public Services Committee chosen from an SUS-wide contest in April, 2000. The name will be introduced at each of the eleven colleges and universities to coincide with the implementation of the new library management system, Aleph.

**Q** What does the name Rosetta mean?

**A** Rosetta represents the Rosetta Stone, which provided scholars with the means to decode Egyptian hieroglyphics. It is hoped that our new system, which incorporates electronic indexes, abstracting services, journals, proceedings, and books, will serve as a "key" to knowledge.

**Q** How does Rosetta relate to LUIS?

**A** LUIS, the Library User Information Service, is a library management system powered by NOTIS software. LUIS and it's Web interface called WebLUIS contain the catalogs of the State University Libraries (SUL), locally loaded databases such as PALMM, Books In Print, and Ulrich's Periodical Directory and many periodical indexes (Business Index, Academic Index, PsycInfo, etc.). It also provides acquisition and circulation functions for the libraries. This system will soon be replaced by a new library management system called Aleph, from the Ex Libris company. The State University Libraries, however, share many more information sources that are not accessed through our library management system, but through commercial vendors such as FirstSearch, GaleNet and Academic Universe. In addition, each institution has unique programs that have required separate licensing of needed resources to meet its users needs. Rosetta is the name given to this consortial information system that consolidates access to

services and databases from WebLUIIS, as well as databases accessed through other software at any institution. Therefore Rosetta offers a broader range of resources than are available from LUIS/WebLUIIS alone.

**Q** How does Rosetta relate to Aleph?

**A** Because Aleph is one of the components of Rosetta, as the new system is introduced in each library, the umbrella name and concept of Rosetta will be introduced at the same time.

**Q** What will Rosetta do for the libraries' staff?

**A** Provide a name for the entire suite of digital resources and services available through a central portal for the State University Libraries consortium, as managed by FCLA, the Florida Center for Library Automation.

**Q** How will Rosetta make life easier on the reference desk?

**A** The Rosetta Website will pull together in one place the wide and rich array of online resources available to State University students, staff, and faculty for librarians and distance learners to access.

**Q** How does Rosetta encompass the community colleges?

**A** Community colleges do not participate in the SUL consortium, therefore they don't have access to the full suite of resources that are included under the umbrella of Rosetta. The libraries of the SUL and the community colleges will all use the new Aleph based library management system to maintain their library catalogs, as well as locally available databases.

For further information on the new library management system implementation please see FCLA's Website at: <http://www.fcla.edu/FCLAinfo/lmsimp/imppg.html>

## Background # 10