



CSUL MEETING MINUTES  
Thursday, December 3, 2009  
New College of Florida  
8:30am – 4pm

Members present: Lauren Sapp, Chair; Brian Doherty (NCF); William Garrison (USF); Barry Baker (UCF); Bill Miller (FAU); Helen Wigersma (UWF); Judy Russell (UF); Julia Zimmerman (FSU); Laurie Probst (FIU); Shirley Hallblade (UNF); Jim Corey (FCLA).

Guests: Carole Hayes (Board of Governors); Lisandra Carmichael (UWF); Rebecca Donlan (CPC Chair / FGCU); Roy Ziegler (CPC Representative / FSU); Dawn Smith (PSPC Chair / FAU); Cecilia Botero (Medical Libraries/ UF Health Sciences); Susan Heron (TSPC Representative / USF); Selma Jaskowski (TAG Coordinator/UCF); Michelle Newberry (FCLA); Claire Dygert (FCLA); Jean Phillips (FCLA); Jennifer Kuntz (FCLA); Lucy Carroll (NCF); Ralph Janotti (NCF)

The meeting was called to order at 8:45am.

Charlene Callahan, Provost of New College welcomed members and guests to New College of Florida.

**Agreement on Agenda**

No items were added to agenda and it was approved as distributed.

**Minutes of September 10, 2009 meetings were approved.**

**Schedule of next meetings revised as follows:**

March 4-5, 2010 -- UF  
June 3-4, 2010 -- FIU (revised dates)  
September 2-3, 2010 -- FAU  
December 2-3, 2010 -- CCLA

**CPC Quarterly Report:** Rebecca Donlan

Action Items

- Motion was made to accept the ERS recommendation to purchase the ProQuest African American Biographical Database. Motion passed.

- Motion was made to accept the ERS recommendation to reduce the number of ports in the OCLC Research Package databases to one port per database, with the exception of Anthropology Plus, which will stay at 10 ports. Motion passed.

CPC requested permission to hold a meeting in February 2010 to discuss contracts in negotiation and the 2010 CPC Action Plan. Since there were other similar requests for face-to-face meetings, this request for a meeting in February was tabled for CSUL discussion of all such committee requests and to determine whether it is possible to save on travel costs by asking CSUL committees to meet at the same time in the same location.

- CSUL continued with a discussion of the Wiley/Blackwell contract process. Fees for this contract are considerably more than other similar contracts. A motion was made to send a counter proposal to Wiley/Blackwell and write a letter from CSUL supporting the position of CPC. Motion passed.

- CPC proposal for a single bid contract for academic books was discussed and put on hold, pending further information and development. This would not be mandatory, but rather an option. There was some concern expressed that purchasing officers in the universities might see it as desirable merely from a fiscal standpoint without regard to other considerations. Other topics for further consideration include:
  - Examining what USF is doing with WorldCat Selection to see if this tool has relevance to the project; and
  - The relevance of the merger of Blackwell with YBP under Baker and Taylor.

CPC and the Acquisitions subcommittee were directed to have one or more conference calls and on site meetings along with additional CSUL member input prior to the next quarterly meeting. The CPC was directed to draft a discussion document that explores different models for reduction of duplication with an increase in unique content. They are asked to return with a bulleted list of advantages of a single vendor and if this process is necessary. This would provide CSUL with a better idea of its book acquisitions development options, not just a rationale for a statewide primary vendor.

### **PSPC Quarterly Report:** Dawn Smith

#### Action Items

PSPC request for Access Services Subcommittee to hold a face to face meeting in December has been tabled pending discussion regarding joint meeting times/dates for all CSUL committees.

- A motion was made to reject the proposed Government Document Subcommittee. Instead, issues to be dealt within existing PSPC

subcommittees. Motion passed, with one dissenting vote from the University of West Florida.

- The 2010 Action Plan was presented as a work in progress. The committee will work with other assessment librarians to review guidelines and processes to have specific information.

**TSPC Quarterly Report:** Susan Heron

Action item:

- Cecelia Botero, as the former incoming chair nominee of TSPC has taken the position of Director of Health Sciences Library. TSPC requested approval of Amy Weiss as the incoming chair for 2011. A motion was made for approval. Motion passed.
- The committee reported that the Cataloging summit was a success. A report was included in distributed packet.

**TAG Quarterly Report:** Selma Jaskowski

- Request for a face-to-face meeting in February was tabled pending discussion regarding joint meeting times/dates for all CSUL committees.
- Action item regarding Elluminate was presented and discussed. A motion was made to accept the comprehensive quote for Elluminate (Contract # EL-22045). FCLA will administer the license and software. Costs will be distributed equally among all CSUL institutions. Motion passed.
- DISC Action Item: Request to refer discussion of digital collections appearing in Mango, along with thumbnails, to the OPAC subcommittee of PSPC was approved.

**Additional discussion** revolved around dissertations and Proquest. UCF will be talking to other universities that do not use Proquest to determine if there are any issues or concerns and will convene a conference call with interested CSUL members.

**Face to face meetings of CPC, PSPC Access Services Subcommittee, & TAG:**

Discussion to charge committee chairs to co-ordinate with other committees to reduce costs of face to face meetings. A motion was made that the 3 committees strive to meet simultaneously in February. Motion passed.

Directors were instructed to use forms on CSUL website to add new committee members. Nancy Spaid was recommended as the New College CPC committee member.

**RDA/FRBR Tutorial** – Bill Garrison

Bill presented a tutorial on new RDA/FRBR cataloging standards. The current version of RDA is not complete and implementation is approximately 1-2 years out.

### **Unmediated Borrowing** – Julia Zimmerman

Testing and training are in place for the UBorrow system. Jennifer Kuntz presented a test version in Aleph of the UBorrow process. Jennifer gave a demonstration of transactions of borrowing institution to lending institution and back again to close the transaction. A request was made to CSUL to approve the process in spring 2010, have a soft launch in summer 2010, and all institutions go live fall 2010. Reporting and statistics are areas for development. There will also be a test of ILLIAD as both systems are being considered. No decision has been made as to which system will be implemented.

### **Single Bib:** Laurie Probst

The Single Bib project is proceeding with the three beta institutions. There was discussion regarding how to do the merge and save local information. The committee is looking at the Endeca merge logic in order to decide what to do differently for merging in Aleph. Special collections and general collections need to be dealt with separately. Each institution is encouraged to think about how to deal with the issue of those different collections. The TSPC representative reported that the project coordinators of the three schools are meeting (with FCLA) and reporting back to Laura Probst.

### **Storage Facility:** Judy Russell

The new storage facility will be completed in about four years. A survey will be sent to institutions about what print JSTOR holdings are to be considered for storage. There is a need to determine the size of a storage facility that will accommodate these materials for now and up to 10 years. This survey needs to be ready in January so that the size and cost of a facility can be sent to the Board of Governors by March 2010 for PECO funding. There will be some interim space available until the new building is completed. Institutions were asked to determine if the level of security or materials in storage as presented is sufficient. Storage costs are to be shared on an FTE basis. Circulation of bound journals to faculty should not present a problem and this recommendation will be included in the directive. These journals will not be included in the general circulating collection. There will be a need to create a separate code to indicate non-circulating titles. Ben Walker, director of the storage facility task force committee, is leaving for another position. Kathy Martyniac will be the new director of the task force. Consider items that can be put on pallets until the storage facility is built. A list of titles currently in storage will be sent to all institutions to assist in determining what materials may be sent. As was discussed at the last meeting, a formal agreement will be completed and sent to all.

### **OSTI Records:** Judy Russell

OSTI records are available to institutions for addition to local catalogs. Each institution can determine if it is enough that these records are on the union list, or if they want to add them to their catalog.

The meeting was adjourned to be followed by the FCLA Board Meeting.

Recorders: Lucy Carroll and Ralph Janotti

December 3, 2009

## **Statewide Primary Academic Book Vendor Task Force**

Prepared by Michael Arthur (UCF), Brenda Wright (FAMU), Michael Luesebrink (FSU and TSPC Acquisitions Subcommittee representative), Roy Ziegler (FSU)

### **CSUL Action Item**

At the September 2009 CSUL meeting, the Collection Planning Committee's action plan was approved. The plan included an initiative to establish a Statewide Primary Academic Book Vendor. The initiative would focus on two areas: 1. Draft a report that would present the rationale for the project and 2. Develop a Request for Information (RFI) document. The assumption from the start is that such a project would be inclusive to meet the needs of all non-profit academic libraries in Florida. In the spirit of greater cooperation among the State University System, the Florida College System and the Independent Colleges and Universities of Florida, the goal was to make a significant contribution that would benefit the students, faculty and staff at these institutions but would also benefit the citizens of Florida. Please accept the following report along with a rough draft of the competitive solicitation document.

### **Statewide Book Contracts: Background and History**

In 1998 Ohio was the first state to recognize the value of implementing a statewide resource sharing contract for the purchase of academic books. Based on collection analysis that Dr. Anna Perrault from USF's School of Library and Information Science conducted, they found that their collections were very similar (high levels of duplication) and that significant amounts of unique content were not being acquired at all (weak collections). Their response was to establish a working relationship with an academic book vendor (in this instance YBP), to develop an interface so that participating institutions could see both their individual book ordering history and the similar history for all participating institutions. They also created the Not Bought in Ohio (NBIO) report that identified the books that were not acquired. The list is used to purchase materials that had been missed during the regular ordering cycle. OhioLINK's primary goal

was to achieve stronger and more diverse collections statewide. Along the way they also realized greater discounts due to the volume of sales tied to the multi-institutional contract.

A number of other states (Colorado, Illinois, Missouri, Oregon, Washington, Wisconsin) have voluntary statewide contracts for a primary domestic academic book vendor. As with Ohio, most contracts include community colleges and both public and private non-profit colleges and universities. The contracts include the typical range of service options available to individual institutions, including approval plans, title-by-title selection, cataloging services, shelf-ready processing, online ordering and electronic invoicing. But the key feature necessary to facilitate collaborative collection development is access to a robust online database that provides a real-time shared view of the book ordering history for all participating libraries. This powerful tool opens the vendor's database to the membership so that genuine shared collection development can take place.

### **Rationale for Building Collaborative Print Book Collections**

1. Reduce duplication and increase the amount of unique content
2. Purchase more materials because of greater volume discounts
3. Reduce costs for processing and cataloging services
4. Demonstrate a strong commitment to creating a statewide resource that is more than the sum of individual institutional collections
5. Promote enhanced stewardship of statewide assets

### **Florida Context**

- In 2008, Dr. Anna Perrault analyzed the SUL libraries' book holdings using OCLC's WorldCat Collection Analysis product. In specific subject areas, she examined the overlapping print book coverage among the 11 institutions in the system. When the most recent eight years of Psychology book holdings were examined, seven of the 11 institutions held 40% of the books in common. This is similar to what Ohio found 10 years earlier.

- In two years when unmediated borrowing is established among SUS institutions and later when the FCS and ICUF schools are incorporated, a mechanism to gauge the number of copies needed to meet the system-wide demands for undergraduate study should be in place. At the same time, the system will have to provide access to highly specialized material in support of graduate student and faculty research. With limited print runs for many academic books, availability is short lived and the scholarly content can become difficult to obtain. With a systematic plan, unique material is more likely to be acquired before publisher inventories are depleted. Vendors who have been granted statewide contracts have the productivity tools that make shared collection development possible and easy to manage.
- There is a need for a statewide contract that meets the specific needs of academic libraries. Currently there is a statewide contract for Library Materials which includes some academic book vendors (Midwest, Baker & Taylor, Ingram) but none of these companies provide the online order history required for shared collection development. The University of South Florida has a book contract with YBP that allows other SUS institutions to participate but the contract would soon have to be renegotiated to incorporate FCS and ICUF schools. A new competitive solicitation process would leverage the anticipated statewide spend to obtain greater services and increased discounts than those that might currently be in effect.
- After discussion with Florida State University's Chief Purchasing Officer, Marcie Doolittle, the task force has determined that the type of competitive solicitation that will yield the best result is an Invitation to Negotiate (ITN). The ITN allows the libraries to use their knowledge of existing services and discounts as well as those extended to other libraries. See the *Models of Competitive Solicitation* addendum for more information.

- Even though participation will be voluntary, the advantages of building unique, distributed collections in a systematic cost-effective manner are clear.

### Potential for Savings

The University Libraries at FSU currently receives a 15% discount with a 1.5% S&H surcharge from its primary academic book vendor. This is a typical discount nationally. The University of Florida has an agreement with the same vendor for an 18% discount with no S&H charges. Wisconsin receives a 21½ % discount and no S&H on \$2.5M sales from their statewide contract. Ohio gets an 18% discount based on annual sales of \$10M although they have been willing to compromise on discount for what they believe to be value-added services. For purposes of illustration, increasing Florida’s statewide discounts by 3½ to 8% above typical discounts would save an additional \$300-350K based on \$3.5M to \$4.5M annual spend. When the FCS and ICUF libraries are included the savings increase to \$600K based on \$7.5M in sales. \$7.5M is conservative compared to Ohio’s current spend of \$10M. If the Florida contract was able to reach the \$10M threshold and the discounts reached 21½%, the statewide savings would be \$800K.

### Potential Annual Savings (based on estimated expenditures)

Known deals	Discount/ S&H	\$3.5M	\$4.5M	\$7.5M	\$10M
		SUS only	SUS only	SUS/CS/ICUF	SUS/CS/ICUF
University Libraries FSU					
savings over retail	15% / -1.5%	\$447,500	\$607,500	\$1,012,500	\$1,350,000
Univ. of Florida					
savings over retail	18% / 0%	\$630,000	\$810,000	\$1,350,000	\$1,800,000
savings above 13.5%		\$182,500	\$202,500	\$337,500	\$450,000
Wisconsin Plan					
savings over retail	21.5% / 0%	\$752,500	\$967,500	\$1,642,500	\$2,150,000
savings above 13.5%		\$305,000	\$360,000	\$600,000	\$800,000

## Potential Areas for Concern

- Currently there is no centralized authority for this kind of contract management. The long-term sustainability of this collective enterprise requires coordination by an individual institution or management by long-term steering committee.
- There is a fear that individual institutions will lose control over their collections and will lose their institutional identity. It is perceived that collections will become homogenized and their quality will diminish. In Ohio these concerns were reduced with the annual NBIO acquisitions.
- Psychological barriers have the potential to limit participation: change, loss of institutional control, indifference, concerns with the proposed partners. These are real issues that will be dispelled over time. It is important to start gradually with a few institutions that will champion the concept. If the model proves to be successful, others will become interested more likely to participate. There is nothing wrong with being cautious. It is a voluntary program.

## Potential for Positive Impact

- The Board of Governors and the institutional Purchasing Officers Group of the SUS have identified this project as one of four statewide initiatives that can save money and can demonstrate greater cooperation by sharing resources.
- The significant increases in savings due to volume discounts should translate into additional funds for books or other resources.
- Due to shrinking budgets, it is critical that SUS, FCS, and ICUF academic libraries implement strategies that will help all of the participating institutions to be more efficient.