DRAFT CSUL MEETING MINUTES
Thursday, June 3, 2010
Florida International University
12:00pm – 5:00pm

Members present: Kathleen Miller (FGCU), Chair, Barry Baker (UCF), Cecilia Botero (UF Health Sciences), Lisandra Carmichael (UWF), Todd Chavez (representing William Garrison) (USF), Jim Corey (FCLA), Brian Doherty (NCF), Shirley Hallblade (UNF), William Miller (FAU), Laura Probst (FIU), Judy Russell (UF), Lauren Sapp (FAMU), Julia Zimmerman (FSU)

Guests: David Boilard (FIU Medical), Claire Dygert (FCLA), Michele Newberry (FCLA), Jean Phillips (FCLA), Janet Reinke (FIU Law), Barbara Stites (PSPC, FGCU), Roy Ziegler (CPC, FSU), Amy Weiss (TSPC, FSU)

1. Welcome and Introductions

Kathleen Miller called the meeting to order and introductions were made.

2. Agreement on Agenda

The VIVO presentation was moved earlier in the agenda to accommodate the schedule of the presenters.

3. Minutes for March 4, 2010

Minutes for March 4, 2010 were approved unanimously with the following corrections:

Lisandra Carmichael's first name is misspelled.

Corrections to attendee list: Dawn Smith, Judy Bentley, and Don Muccino were not at the meeting. Carole Hayes attended in person. Barbara Stites attended as a guest.

Item 8 (p.7)
Laurie Probst asked for clarification whether a documents subgroup would be created. Kathleen Miller clarified that they will not create a subcommittee, but will create task forces. Judith Russell suggested it become the basis for looking at common collection development and collection management policies. Barbara Stites stated the purpose is to take government documents issues and move over to other committees as appropriate. Some issues are cross committee issues. Minutes were left as is.

Item 11 (p.7)
Barry Baker, Shirley Hallblade, and Kathleen Miller are working on a revision of the TAG charge.

Item 13 (p.10)
Under Report of the FCLA Director: Jim Corey asked to insert the word "hardware" after FCLA and after CCLA.
Under New Law Schools…: Correct typo to read "tradition of *providing* services to other libraries"

4. Schedule of Next Meetings - Revised as follows:

1. Sept. 2-3, 2010   FAU
2. Dec. 2-3, 2010   St. Petersburg College, CCLA to arrange
3. Mar. 3-4, 2011   FGCU
4. June 9-10, 2011   UCF (dates changed to avoid conflict with ACURIL meeting)

5. CPC Quarterly Report – Roy Ziegler

Todd Chavez asked about the future of the Special Collections Subcommittee. Roy responded that CPC had not received input from Special Collections Subcommittee, but that the chair of committee was unsure of their ongoing role. Roy suggested that the CPC action plan will pull them into the mix dependent upon funding. Barry Baker reported that he had a conversation about their activities, but he didn't have his notes to report on any specifics.

Judy Russell asked about the evaluation of new funding distribution models for shared journal packages and suggested that CSUL should be more involved in discussions with CAVP beyond just providing data. See further discussion below.

Roy Ziegler reviewed the various informational items in the CPC quarterly report.

Cecilia Botero gave an update on the Medical Library Task Force. They will be submitting a planning grant to NN/LM to work toward more effective collaboration. Their grant proposal to the Florida Consumer Health Information Network grant was not funded. Laura Probst suggested LSTA as a possible funding source.

Wiley-Blackwell contract negotiations
Claire Dygert reported on the status of the Wiley-Blackwell contract negotiations. There is concern that Wiley-Blackwell is back peddling on the final deal Claire negotiated at the meeting in January with Wiley-Blackwell and representatives of CSUL. The title lists that Wiley-Blackwell included with what was supposed to be the final copy of the contract are problematic, and appear to exclude titles beyond just society titles. Some institutions have already made their payment, but others are still withholding. Several directors suggested exploring legal action as ways to finally resolve the negotiations. Claire will be doing a full review of the titles lists with ERS and will follow up with Reed Elfenbein with a copy to the CSUL members who attended the January meeting. If necessary a meeting will be scheduled with Wiley-Blackwell at ALA.

ACTION ITEM: Claire Dygert will work with ERS to review title lists. She will follow up with higher management at Wiley-Blackwell at ALA to attempt resolution of remaining contract issues.   Claire will set-up a meeting with Wiley-Blackwell and members of CSUL at ALA if necessary.

Distribution models for shared journal packages
Roy Ziegler reviewed the data that he compiled on past, present, and projected future cost distributions for the major journal packages based on the FTE model currently in use. The

costs and trends over time are dramatic and don't reflect the changes in the SUS over the past ten years. William Miller commented that in the current budget environment where we are looking at cutting resource budgets, we don't have the flexibility to accommodate any cost shifts that would come with other models. Judy Russell stated that we need to bring the provosts into this discussion.

Lauren Sapp asked if CPC had looked at weighted FTE Models. Julia Zimmerman said they had begun to look at other models, that this analysis was a starting point. Judy Russell reported that UF uses weighted system for students, but perhaps there needs to be a weighting of research faculty and staff who also use these resources.

Kathleen Miller asked what CAVP was doing in regards to this issue (resource sharing models). Judy Russell replied that this issue is on the agenda of the next meeting of the CAVP with the BOG. She suggested that if we start shifting costs and prices go up for some institutions, the provosts at those institutions need to be on board. This is a good sign that there is discussion among provosts. The discussion continued, focusing on next steps, including the sense that we need to work together to determine what we can afford, perhaps reducing content if necessary or negotiating with publishers for lower prices.

ACTION ITEM: Claire Dygert, Roy Ziegler, and Kathleen Miller will put together narrative descriptions of possible cost sharing models for discussion at the September meeting. Once finalized, CSUL will share the narratives with the provosts for their input and discussion.

MOTION: CPC Action Plan was approved with the exception of item 3.2, which will be deferred pending discussion of the cost sharing models at the September meeting.

6. **VIVO Grant Project – Judy Russell**

Valrie Davis (UF) and Sara Russell Gonzalez (UF) gave a web-based presentation on the UF/Cornell VIVO project (http://www.vivoweb.org). They discussed how it has been implemented at the local level, and how it fosters collaborative work across university department and institutions. RDF is a key technology component.

After the presentation, the directors discussed VIVO as a potential tool to facilitate partnerships across universities in a number of areas, including the Everglades Digital Library and with those working on the recent oil spill. Its advantage is that contributors can enter data in one place and have it populate various websites and databases.

7. **PSPC Quarterly Report – Barbara Stites**

Barbara Stites summarized activities from the quarterly report.
- UBorrow: Committee is discussing check out periods, recalls, how to handle fines/fees, and process to transfer funds among universities.
- The committee has been using Elluminate and, while cost savings from phone calls may not be realized, Elluminate does increase productivity.
- PSPC endorsed the shared storage facility document.
- At each meeting, the committee spends time discussing services to graduate and undergraduate students, data collected by each library, and best practices related to those topics.
- The OPAC Subcommittee will be focusing on discovery tools over their next few meetings.

8. UBorrow Discussion – Julia Zimmerman

Work on UBorrow is at a critical point. Progress has slowed, with the September 2010 soft launch postponed to December 2010. Staff working on the implementation need more time to be comfortable. They also need more time to give ILLiad a fair review. They will work with OCLC/Atlas on things like getting patron load into ILLiad. Judy Russell commented that the investment in setting up ILLiad may or may not be worth it, but that having the discussion with OCLC/Atlas will be productive. All agreed this was a good idea. Julia talked about what the long term issues are related to OCLC resource sharing fees with an Aleph/UBorrow solution. FSU librarians are analyzing workflows between the two systems (UBorrow/Aleph vs. UBorrow/ILLiad) and on the potential impact on staffing. By September, the assessment will be complete. At the September meeting, a decision can be made on which platform to move forward with, in consultation with FCLA. Judy Russell praised FSU and FCLA staff and the work being done on this. Jean Phillips described some of the testing, including the Delivery (was DLLI) system. Their next steps in testing will be in a controlled environment to allow testing requests in the production system. The OPAC subcommittee is working on the website and will be looking into how to get people to use the union catalog.

Barbara Stites provided an overview of the draft policy document for UBorrow. The document is still being developed, but the directors were asked to approve statements 1,2,4,5,6,8, and 11. These are the statements needed to get started, others will be reviewed as implementation continues. Questions and discussion included: issues with delivery times, balancing requests across libraries, taking individual library calendars into account, and the need for flexibility. Brian Doherty asked if items could be shipped to distance learners where they are (rather than to their home library, which may be a distance away). Lisandra Carmichael asked if patrons could return items to any location.

MOTION: Statements 1, 2, 4, 5, 6, 8, and 11 were approved unanimously, with revision of #1 to read "State of Florida University System" rather than University Libraries.

9. TSPC Quarterly Report – Amy Weiss

The committee has been using Elluminate longer than other committees. When it isn't working well, conducting the meeting can be very difficult, but the majority of committee members are pleased with the functionality.

Amy Weiss described the new charge and action plan for the Metadata Subcommittee. A question was asked about whether they should be disbanded. Amy responded that the new charge broadens what they have done while focusing on cataloging, not necessarily digital initiatives, which has been a problem in the past. The will be looking at metadata in a broad way. Shirley Hallblade asked how the subcommittee relates to the statewide taskforce on standards. Amy responded that the statewide group has a different focus and that their work does not now come back to the subcommittee. Shirley then asked about the relationship with CAGER. Amy responded that CAGER is no longer active in the same areas and is focused on digital initiatives only. DISC/CAGER does not affect Metadata Subcommittee work. In response to the comment that these seem to be overlapping activities, Amy thought the ad hoc committees will be disbanding at some point.

MOTION to approve the new charge and work plan was approved unanimously.

After little discussion, the **MOTION to approve the action plan for the Acquisitions Subcommittee was approved unanimously.**

Amy provided a summary of the results from a survey by the Authorities Subcommittee. The survey was sent to TSPC and Authorities Subcommittee members. There were 19 respondents, with 14 of them from main libraries.

The group discussed the request from TSPC to have representation on functional committees that would be established as work on the statewide storage facility expanded. Amy commented that the action item is more of a request. TSPC has a perspective in the evolving policies, for example, in the requirement in the MOU that everything is cataloged, and should be included so they can participate in relevant discussions. Judy Russell commented that the Shared Storage Task Force will be expected to vet recommendations through the proper committees whenever necessary. **Kathleen Miller asked the group for a show of agreement and the action item was approved by acclamation.**

Amy informed the group that TSPC has been working on the organization of their action plan to more clearly identify priorities to FCLA (MARC updates in Aleph primary, then the GenLoad program). A revised action plan will be submitted to the directors in September.

10. Single Bib Project – Amy Weiss and Laura Probst

Amy Weiss reported that the 0.2 version of the database has just been released. When the working group is satisfied that they can't find any more issues, they will bring in Serials and Special Collections representatives to begin their review. Laurie reported that Amy's group is doing the lion's share of the work to create the merge database. The original task force had a conference call last week and they will continue as a coordinating body. Whenever a working group finds items beyond their narrow focus the task force will assign the work to another group, and will be responsible for keeping the project moving forward.   The work is not following the order outlined in the original timetable. The working group has found that they are engaged in putting together building blocks, starting with the merge of bibliographic data. They have not yet begun to deal with what happens with the other record types. Documentation from the project is available on an FCLA swiki.

Laura and Amy shared two sets of data (from the three pilot institutions) describing duplication of special collections titles. The first set of data showed little overlap across special collections, with 98% of titles held only by one library. The second set of data showed the occurrence of special collections titles that also have a circulation copy, with only 16% of special collections titles having circulating copies. This is good news in that the magnitude of the problem of retaining local information is smaller than we might have expected. Once the database is cleaned up, the Special Collections folks will be brought in to examine the data. Amy described an example, where a library has two copies of a first edition. The circulating copy came first, and then the Special Collections signed edition. They may be on the same bibliographic records. There could be special collection notes on the record from more than one institution, as well as notes on the circulating copy for multiple institutions. Michele Newberry commented that a connection between the note and the copy may not always exist, but for local records it is not a serious issue. The concern is greater with shared records.

The next issue to be addressed is proprietary records, both in terms of sharing records that may have been licensed by one institution and in terms of vendor concerns that other institutions might harvest a proprietary record for their own cataloging purposes. A second

working group will be established to investigate. The list of identified proprietary record sets is on the swiki. Judy Russell mentioned MARCIVE as one example of vendor records. Our approach to vendors may need to change, and vendor business models for these records may also need to change. In the case of MARCIVE, we have an alternative.

ACTION ITEM: The task force recommends that all institutions initiate reclamation projects. Using clean databases will make the single bib project much easier. Institutions should contact FCLA to get started.

ACTION ITEM: Laura Probst will contact Judy Russell and Julia Zimmerman to identify institutional representatives to work on issues with proprietary records.

11. TAG Quarterly Report/Future of TAG – Kathleen Miller, Shirley Hallblade, Barry Baker

Discussion of the report and the future of the committee began with the question of naming an individual to replace Bill Covey, who has retired. The feeling of the group was that we should make decisions on a revised charge for the group before appointing any new members. It might be an option to having a rotating membership based on projects rather than having standing members.

The discussion included these ideas:

- Need better integration of TAG with the directors and the other committees. The TAG members didn't always feel they were in the communication loop. One option would be to add an FCLA representative. Another would be asking TAG to assign their members as liaisons to other committees. One member of TAG has commented that they weren't sure they had the authority to lend their expertise when they heard of projects where they might have a role, for example the Acquisitions Subcommittee looking at open source ERMs.

- The size of TAG is a question. Is five members enough? If we want them to function as advisory to the committees, we may need to expand the group.

- Barry Baker suggested that TAG should look at emerging technologies, as an investigative and developmental arm of CSUL, perhaps advising FCLA as well.

ACTION ITEM: Nomination of individual to replace Bill Covey postponed pending revision of charge.

ACTION ITEM: Barry Baker, Shirley Hallblade, and Kathleen Miller will draft a revised charge for the committee and send it out to CSUL via email for approval. Nomination for new committee members will also be done by email.

NOTE: Discussion of the Digital Initiatives Subcommittee was postponed until Friday morning (pending distribution of paper copies of their report). The summary of that discussion is inserted here in the minutes for continuity.

In April, the University of Miami contacted DISC about the possibility of joining the DISC group. The directors understood that Miami was primarily interested in participating as a way to share information and discuss common problems. Kathleen Miller questioned what direction the group would take on digital initiatives and wondered if Miami or another non-CSUL member would have voting status.

MOTION: Approve inviting the University of Miami to participate in DISC as a guest, postponing discussion of approving non-CSUL membership in the group. Passed unanimously.

MOTION: Direct DISC to prepare for the September meeting an analysis of their survey and any implications for setting future directions. The analysis should include a description of the landscape and options for our next technology platforms. Approved unanimously.

12. Storage Facility – Judy Russell

University of Florida has received $2 million in planning money and will use this year to work with the architect to get blueprints done. The project will be shovel ready at the beginning of the next fiscal year. UF expects to begin loading materials into the facility before the end of that year. Judy has not heard from any other institution about needing interim storage.

The memorandum of understanding has been reviewed and approved by all committees and is now at UF legal counsel for review. There is one change in language, negotiated with ASERL to bring this document into agreement with the ASERL Collaborative Journal Retention Program Agreement. The main change is in the clause related to access to bound journals and when exceptions may be granted to allow sending volumes to individual libraries for building use only. Once the MOU is finalized individual institutions will need to determine who has signatory authority. Some institutions may prefer that provosts review and/or sign based on their support of the funding.

Laura Probst commented that the provosts will want to know about costs for the facility. Judy responded that knowing we have PECO funding, UF can actually ascertain costs, and they hope to have an idea of staff size and operational costs in the next few months. She is hoping to find a donor to create an endowment for operational costs. Judy also reported that the University of Miami is interested in signing the MOU by the end of the summer. Bill Walker has offered to contribute thirty years of Wiley, Springer, and Blackwell journal already boxed in storage. The addition of this content, and the prospect of further spreading costs is attractive.

MOTION: No microfilm exhibiting symptoms of vinegar syndrome shall be accepted into the facility. Approved unanimously.

MOTION: Approve MOU in concept (incorporating language to harmonize CSUL document with ASERL language), pending review by UF Counsel. Approved unanimously.

Judy showed a series of slides including renderings and drawing of the building. They are working with a local architect who identified a few other ideas that were added to the proposal, including the concept of adding a green roof (to extend the life of the roof and decrease utility costs). The anticipated construction cost is eighteen million, including funding to move 1.5 to 2 million volumes into the building. Judy expects that we should not have to pick up operating costs until year four (2013/2014). She expects that utilities will be an issue. UF anticipates that it will take two-three additional people (above current ALF staff) once it is loaded. The initial load will take many more staff.

13. **Director's Discussion -** No discussion.

Meeting adjourned at 5:08 pm.