

CSUL MEETING MINUTES  
Thursday, December 02, 2010 8:30 am – 3:30 pm  
Seminole State College

Members present: Kathleen Miller (FGCU), Chair, Barry Baker (UCF), Cecilia Botero (UF Medical), James Corey (FCLA), Brian Doherty (NCF), Bob Dugan (UWF), William Garrison (USF), Shirley Hallblade (UNF), Faye Jones (FSU Law), William Miller (FAU), Elizabeth Outler (UF Law), Laura Probst (FIU), Judy Russell (UF), Julia Zimmerman (FSU)

Guests: Priscilla Caplan (FCLA), Claire Dygert (FCLA), Carol Hixson (USF St. Pete), Selma Jaskowski (TAG, UCF), Cathy Martyniak (UF, SSTF), Nancy McKee (Board of Governors), Michele Newberry (FCLA), Jean Phillips (FCLA), Barbara Stites (PSPC, FGCU), Amy Weiss (TSPC, FSU), Brenda Wright (FAMU), Roy Ziegler (CPC, FSU)

### **1. Welcome and Introductions**

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

### **2. Agreement on Agenda**

The following Consent Agenda items were approved unanimously:

4. Schedule of Next Meetings  
Mar. 3-4, 2011 FGCU  
June 9-10, 2011 UCF  
Sept. 1-2, 2011 FSU  
Dec. 1-2, 2011 USF, SULs to arrange
5. PSPC Quarterly Report
7. TSPC Quarterly Report
8. TAG Quarterly Report
9. DISC Quarterly Report
10. SSTF Quarterly Report

The following items were pulled from the Consent Agenda for further discussion:

3. Minutes of September 2, 2010 meeting
6. CPC Quarterly Report – the report was distributed at the meeting, with the understanding that it would be discussed at a later time since there were action items to consider.

### **3. Minutes of September 2, 2010**

The minutes of September 2, 2010 were approved unanimously pending the following corrections:

- Pg. 8, item 15, 1<sup>st</sup> line should read "...the budget for 2009-10 and 2010-11."
- Pg. 10 item 20c. should indicate that Julia Zimmerman was elected by acclamation

The chair proposed a discussion item for later, if time allowed, regarding the level of detail in meeting minutes.

### **Discussion/Action Agenda**

#### **23. Mango/Primo Central presentation – Phillips**

Jean Phillips from FCLA presented a PowerPoint to clarify some details from the previous day's Ex Libris session

- Explained differences between Primo and Primo Central
- Explained how Solr is constructed and how Mango would be able to search both Solr (local bibliographic database) and Primo Central (or another discovery tool).
- USF is beta testing Primo Central with Mango, and a sample search was shown using USF test Mango

Three biggest issues to consider are content, usability (or user interface), and cost. These issues were discussed. Assessments of Primo Central and competing products in use at other institutions can be compared at March meeting.

***Action item: USF will give a status report on their investigation of various discovery tools in March.***

### **11.UBorrow Status Report – Zimmerman**

An updated report was distributed at the meeting. The implementation team is working on a plan and sub-plans aiming towards soft launch in early spring. The focus areas were outlined, kickoff sessions are taking place at each institution, and things are going along smoothly.

FCLA proposed they will have the pieces ready in January so it can go into production when ready.

There was a discussion about identification of distance learners and delivery methods for distance learners. These issues will be resolved at the institutional level since each library is unique and has a way of defining the distance learner.

### **13.MARCIVE contract – Russell**

Judy Russell has had discussions with the MARCIVE representative, and is seeking opinion from the UF General Counsel on their right to restrict use of data. Judy Russell expects to hear from him soon, and will report back to the group. Other options were outlined, but no action is recommended yet.

### **12.Cost-sharing models for e-resources – Probst, Ziegler, Zimmerman, Botero, Dygert**

Laura Probst distributed discussion document which outlined the project goals; assumptions; draft principles and models for cost sharing along with institutional data that could be used to draft new model; and examples of cost-share analysis using different data.

The group recommends first identifying how and why we share costs, i.e., the principles for consortial sharing. Second, the factors used to distribute cost must be determined. This can be a straightforward factor, such as FTE, or a more complex formula including multiple factors. Another consideration is vendors, and their acceptance of any new model.

The group agreed that there must be a discussion and definition of the principles for sharing. It was suggested that this group lead the charge but pull in ERS. Several draft principles were presented in the handout and discussed. There was also discussion about the data presented and whether the national norm for calculating FTE would need to be used.

The group hopes to have a preliminary report to CAVP by late January or early February. A more substantial report will be completed by April.

A motion endorse Principle 2 as outlined in draft report was unanimously approved.

Draft principle 2. "Consortial pricing models should be favorable to all participants, overall, giving them lower costs than would be possible [with] individual pricing."

Welcome from Patricia DeSalvo, Dean of Libraries and Learning Technology at Seminole State College

#### **14. ASERL Government Documents project update – Russell**

Judy Russell reported on progress of ASERL project. A Discussion Draft has been presented and input was sought. The next step is to make a Planning Draft, which the group hopes to complete in January, seek broad input, and then present at the ASERL meeting in the spring to be approved as an Implementation Plan.

Software was developed to aid in the disposition of materials. It is a searchable, Web-based database which allows depository libraries to see what's available or upload lists of dispositions for others to claim. Software will be tested for 4-6 weeks and then rolled out across ASERL. Items in the database will first be made available to Centers of Excellence (regardless of state), then open to regional depositories, then everyone in the southeast. The next iteration of the software will be able to handle needs lists and match up needs with offers.

Everyone was encouraged to speak with their government documents staff and identify strong collections for "Centers of Excellence."

#### **15. SSTF – Russell**

Cathy Martyniak gave a PowerPoint presentation from a recent town-hall meeting at UF. The presentation outlined the existing situation at UF and the proposed new storage facility, with timeline for groundbreaking, material processing, and occupying new space.

ASERL will be notified that they can rely upon whatever is put into the storage facility. If the group decides to delete it, then ASERL will have the opportunity to get it. SULs that are not part of ASERL would borrow it through an ASERL member SUL.

a. Confirm policies approved during past 2+ years

Policy document was presented. Discussion ensued about the definition of a "work of art" which is excluded according to policy document.

A recommendation was made that the policy be amended to include stipulation to discard microform that develops vinegar syndrome.

b. JSTOR print titles

SSTF recommended that it was not ideal to store all JSTOR titles. Complete sets already exist elsewhere. A proposal was made to give a list of JSTOR titles to CPC, have them use the ITHAKA print collections decision-support tool, and make recommendation about what JSTOR titles to store. The CPC will start with the titles that are held at one or two SULs, then work their way up the list to those held by all. It was suggested that if institutions have a list of titles they're ready to dispose of CPC can also work on decisions about those titles.

***Action Item: CPC will be charged with making recommendations regarding which JSTOR titles to retain in storage.***

***Action Item: Affirmed policies for SSTF (Version 1.3) that have been approved by CSUL over the past three years.***

**16. TAG Charge – Baker, Hallblade, Jaskowski, K. Miller**

The proposed new charge for TAG was discussed and approved.

Discussion followed on whether DISC should be a full committee rather than a subcommittee and where DISC should report. Issues included the role of DISC, the relationship with the Special Collections group of CPC, and communication with CSUL.

The motion to set DISC up as an independent committee reporting to CSUL for 2011 and see how it works was approved.

***Action Item: DISC should draft a revision of their charge for the March CSUL meeting.***

TAG's membership is down to three people. CSUL members volunteered two people (Will Chaney, UF, and Mario Bernardo, FGCU) from their institutions to bring the membership back up to five members.

**17. DISC analysis of its digitization survey – Jaskowski**

Although a common platform is desired for collaborative projects, institutions may want to use another platform for their own projects. No common platform was chosen, but the number of systems should be reduced and communication between interfaces should be improved. Digital initiatives should provide added value for faculty and follow up on outreach to them. There is a greater need for training, sharing expertise, statewide technology leadership, and collaboration on self-education.

The motion to accept the recommendations from the DISC Analysis report and move forward was approved.

**18. Single Bib Project presentation – Laurie Probst, Amy Weiss**

Stage I merging has resulted in general agreement within participating institutions that they have a good database. The task force is ready to move to Stage II and has a proposed timetable. They will look at other types of records, e.g., proprietary data.

The directors were urged to encourage their technical services groups to do the OCLC reclamation. FCLA is ready to take on another library for this.

The motion that the Single Bib Project should move to Stage II was approved.

**19. OLE Project Update – Judy Russell**

The Functional Council is currently working on de-duping the case stories that were submitted. The original timetable slipped six months while waiting for the money, but the project will run for the full two years of the grant. The first module will focus on the acquisitions process.

There will be a meeting on February 7-8, 2011.

**20. Medical/Health Libraries: challenges for the future – Cecilia Botero**

Florida has the most medical schools of any state. This brings collaboration opportunities, but also a challenge when dealing with licensing and for-profit institutions. NSF's

requirement for a data management plan provides an opportunity for libraries to assist researchers with their data from grant projects.

### **21. Use of Florida Digital Archive by non- SUS libraries – Jim Corey**

If non-SUS libraries were to put content into the Digital Archive, there would be cost and governance issues. Implications need to be explored and a business plan developed.

### **22. bX: Ex Libris article recommender service – Jim Corey**

The bX article recommender service works on the “people who downloaded this also downloaded...” model. The data comes from customer libraries from all over the world that contribute their SFX logs. Use of bX does not require that a subscribing library contribute its own SFX data. Michele Newberry will send out citations on this product.

### **Director’s Discussion items**

#### **a. CSUL Administrative Salary Survey for 2010 -- Hallblade**

The amount from a stipend and a salary should be reported as one total with an explanation.

#### **b. How are universities planning for budget cuts this year and/or next year? – Probst**

### **6. CPC Quarterly Report – Roy Ziegler**

Laila Miletic-Vejzovic is the incoming chair of the Special Collections Subcommittee.

Chris Poehlmann is the incoming chair of the Electronic Resources Subcommittee.

#### **a. University of Chicago Press journals**

Five SULs have subscribed to the University of Chicago Press (UCP) package. Other SULs subscribe to titles individually. The publisher has been allowing all eleven SULs to have full access to the package. The proposed deal for continuing full package access for all SULs would require some institutions to pay more for the package than they would pay if they subscribed separately. Concern was expressed that the data used for the price proposal was inaccurate. Roy Ziegler or Claire Dygert will send an e-mail with pricing options.

After discussion, CSUL decided to send the question of the UCP package back to the ERS. Each institution will be on its own for this year.

*Action Item: The ERS should provide CSUL with a new analysis of the data and recommendations for going forward on a consortial deal for UCP full access package.*

#### **b. Shared E-Book Collection**

A survey of SUL users found that 75% of respondents preferred e-books over print books. There is massive duplication of content with print on campuses. For the same cost to buy 100 print books, 200-300 e-books could be purchased.

CPC recommends that the remaining FCLA funds, \$44,000, along with \$7,000 from each institution be pooled, for a total of \$120,000, to acquire a shared e-book collection. If any institution could not contribute the \$7,000, they would still get access, but the pool total drops.

Selection, duplication avoidance, record location and funding sources were discussed.

The motion that CSUL approve the principle of e-book sharing, but send the issue back for clarification was approved.

Recorders: Rachel Mulvihill & Kim Montgomery, UCF