Council of State University Libraries

Thursday, December 1, 2011
8:30 a.m. – 3:00 p.m.
Tampa Palms Golf & Country Club
Ballroom A

Members present: Lauren Sapp (FAMU), Bill Miller (FAU), Kathy Miller (FGCU), Laurie Probst (FIU), Julia Zimmerman (FSU), Brian Doherty (NC), Barry Baker (UCF), Judy Russell (UF), Shirley Hallblade (UNF), Bill Garrison (USF), Jim Corey (FCLA), Cecilia Botero (UF-HSC).

Absent: Bob Dugan (UWF), Nancy McKee (BOG), Faye Jones (FSU-Law).

Guests: Roy Ziegler (FSU); Laurie Taylor, Lois Widmer (UF); Beverly Caggiano, Nancy Cunningham, Susan Heron, Matt Torrence (USF); Priscilla Caplan, Claire Dygert, Michelle Newberry; Jean Phillips (FCLA).

Meeting called to order by CSUL Chair, Shirley Hallblade.

Summary and Action Items:

- Welcome and Introductions
- Agreement on Agenda
- Minutes of September 1 meeting:
  Complete minutes not available, but list of action items provided in their stead. Correction noted for Item 8 – Name/title listed for FSU should be Bob Bradley (FSU Vice President). Action items approved with noted correction.
- Schedule of next meetings
March 1-2, 2012	UWF, Pensacola
May 31–June 1, 2012	UNF, Jacksonville
Sept. 6-7, 2012	FAMU, Tallahassee
Dec. ??, 2012	TBD (Joint meeting; CCLA determines location)
- Chair/Vice-Chair for 2012
  Julia Zimmerman will take over as chair. Bill Garrison selected as Vice-Chair by acclamation.

- Motion to move forward with aggressive June, 2012 timetable (Scenario 1) for Shared Bib implementation.
  - Motion to have face-to-face meeting and training session in early January, 2012 to start training process. Discussion of number of reps for each group (at least 1). FCLA volunteered to host.

- Motion to authorize FCLA to slow-down/defer other projects at their discretion to manage this priority (in communication with Deans and Directors).

- Common Digital Library Platform: Further investigation into this item showed desire for more information on Islandora and SobekCM. Ten of eleven directors indicated they wanted to learn more via a working group.

- Elsevier contract: Motion that CSUL recognizes that this is mission critical and we need to move forward with the negotiating team to get them the data points necessary for meeting at ALA Midwinter.

- Motion to ask PSPC to investigate expanding U-Borrow to the colleges and report at March meeting on the inclusion of colleges and community colleges into the U-Borrow system

- Discovery Tool RFI/Needs Assessment
  - New charge needs to be written for committee that agreed to work on the Discovery Tool. The three (Bill Garrison, Judy Russell, and Laurie Probst) from CSUL will join three others from CCLA group.
  - Not clear who will charge this group and how it will report back out.

- CPC Report
  - Motion to adopt CPC action plan with the amendment that more information about the Scholarly Communication Institute first comes CSUL.
- Motion to direct all committees to arrive at standardized and common best practices.   Deans and directors need to know if there are issues impeding progress; non-participation also needs to be identified, in case it is necessary to replace participants.
- TSPC Report
  - They will redo their Action Plan in January and submit to the group
  - Single Bib Pilot Project (SBPP)
    - Working on reducing the number of ticklers in the file (already cut in half) and metadata group looking at how people use their ticklers. Some are still useful and should be retained
- DISC Report
  - A working group has been formed that will proceed under a charge drafted by Julia Zimmerman to help better understand Islandora and SobekDM. They will consult with other DISC and CSUL members.
  - UF soon plans to survey information about datasets kept by faculty and researchers at the individual level (format, volume, etc.), mimicking a process initiated at Georgia Tech. It may be beneficial to repeat this effort with a common instrument.

- o Motion to approve new DISC officers
- Motion: Toward the collective development and implementation of best practices and procedures statewide, CSUL committee chairs are empowered by CSUL Deans and Directors to use, when feasible and expedient, the committee structure to reach agreement on practicing a common set of procedures and practices during the course of any project, service and/or system implementation. If agreement on a common practice or procedure cannot be reached, the chair should refer the matter to CSUL for discussion and decision.

- ARL and ASERL have both endorsed the Berlin Declaration. It may be worthwhile to think about a CSUL statement of support.

Detailed Notes

- Single Bib Priority - Laurie Probst & Jean Phillips
    a. Single bib is a high priority but we're at a decision point.
    b. Do we want to move to single bib environment?
        i. Many advantages, but would be hard to return to individual lists after the merger (the only real disadvantage). Small loss of autonomy
        ii. Discussion of scenarios on document. Getting it done by July 1 has advantages
        iii. Could also do a split, or have everyone migrate in December. Once July 1 arrives, there may be other complications (budget, other priorities, etc.)
        iv. If there is a single bib environment, it will be easier to integrate CCLA database into the SUL database; if we go the other way, we could lose content and add complication. Would be good to say it's already done and it will help U-borrow and shared storage and other centralized tasks
        v. We can then do authority control centrally, as well as data loading. Potential impact on staffing
        vi. Support for scenario 1 from pilot sites (at USF and elsewhere). Looking at new models to share expertise (or outsource) to avoid redundancies. The work and efforts of these pilot sites have been greatly appreciated.
            1. RDA tags already in some catalogs. Big push at the end of next year
            2. TSPC pushing to share knowledge of RDA. Susan Heron reported that LOC has committed to beginning next year. TSPC will push for training at all the libraries and not have to do it all individually (or through FCLA). UF has piloted some good training and this would be easier with single bib

vii. Discussion of workload differences: Jean reported that there will need to be cleanup of the database, but you can bring it all into single bib (the cleaner the better, but doesn't have to happen all up front). FLCA is trying to come up with a test database by January (if possible) for all institutions. Current representative group will soon be charged with taking his forward

1. (Susan) How statistics are gathered at different institutions and how this affects the catalog, data loading, etc. Many parts of the record will still belong to the individual libraries and will not be shared. Once we get through bib loading issues, we'll be in a better place

2. Discussion. Barry Baker asked several questions about the timeline which were addressed by the group. FLCA is working to make sure that talent is available to help complete this effort and that would suggest getting things set and started as soon as possible, as well as making sure to set our own time windows for to minimize downtime for hardware and other upgrades that may temporarily affect service provision. May be down only 2-5 days (with a slightly longer period with viewing, but no editing or data loading)

3. May be better to do this before summer than during summer classes. Further discussion of previous major mergers and pricing structure. Reduction of number of records will not change maintenance costs, as these charges are based on simultaneous users

4. Support from Bill Garrison and others to look at aggressive June calendar target for maximum advantage. The legislature may not provide the 3-year transition and this group needs to be on the right path

5. The three pilots will agree to provide guidance and share expertise with the other SULs during the transition

6. Have a face-to-face meeting for single bib with representatives from each library? Support for this idea as a discussion, training, and education session. The three pilots could serve as a panel, along with the leaders from FCLA, to lead the workshop.

7. Susan Heron, Jean Phillips, and others will help set up some information sharing processes
   a. Meeting needs to be scheduled for January, 2012
   b. FCLA will complete timetable to help plan training for early or mid-January. This also needs to be worked with the other priorities, many of which will need to slow down, or be temporarily put on hold/

8. Discussion about whether this group needs to decide on priorities. Much may be left to FCLA to delegate and if this group needs to vote on all small projects, it could delay implementation. As long as communication is good and current, things will go smoothly. Any substantial projects or changes will come back to CSUL.

9. Discussion of the effect this will have on discovery service acquisitions. Jean Phillips reported that it takes the longest for each first time vendor. EBSCO has already been worked out for UNF. Summon has also been worked in various iterations. Each new version will still require some work, especially if there is customization

10. (Bill Garrison) Motion to move forward with aggressive June, 2012 timetable (Scenario 1)
    a. Seconded and approved by unanimous vote

11. (Laurie Probst) Motion to have face-to-face meeting and training session in early January, 2012 to start training process
    a. Seconded. Discussion of number of reps for each group (at least 1). Approved by unanimous vote
    b. FCLA will volunteer to host

12. (Laurie Probst) Motion to authorize FCLA to slow-down/defer other projects at their discretion to manage this priority (in communication with Deans and Directors)
    a. Seconded and approved by unanimous vote

- Common Digital Library Platform - Julia Zimmerman
    a. Investigation into this item showed that people wanted additional information on Islandora and SobekCM. Ten of eleven indicated they wanted to learn more about this via a working group (not to dismiss earlier efforts)
        i. Julia indicated the original DISC subcommittee had asked for more time to evaluate the two systems
        ii. We have two new people in the system with high-level experience in looking at these platforms, including fresh perspective from other institutions. New work group to evaluate pros and cons.
        iii. (Bill Miller) A request to have someone from FCLA on this group to help advise the participants. Discussion
            1. FCLA will serve as consultants and be available for questions
            2. Julia is working on a charge. Target time for a report is by mid-February for discussion at March meeting
            3. FCLA has projects ready once a decision is made

- E-Resource Cost Sharing/CAVP Update - Laurie Probst, Bill Garrison & Judy Russell
    a. (Laurie Probst) At the last meeting options, data, and recommendations were made for cost sharing. Data may have some problems, but to be discussed later. Questions as to how to take this forward in the new environment. May need to go to the Chancellor's level.
    b. UF and USF provosts want a recommendation to take this to CAVP. A few provosts have now been charged with looking at this.
    c. CAVP took it as an issue to be studied, but have not yet made a decision. There is acknowledgement that this cannot be addressed by individual budgets
    d. Many in the group commented that they had discussed this with their individual provosts. All models seem to require resolution at higher level, but it's a good sign that there's awareness and concern
        i. If this group could recommend a solution, it might very well be taken given the reliance on the combined expertise of this assembly of leadership
        ii. Best solution is more/central funding but not likely
        iii. Long-term, centralization seems to be the best choice, but what are the short-term solution(s) with the colleges coming into negotiation and the cost-sharing structure
        iv. How can we be helpful? Discussion ensued. Seems logical that this group would want to be proactive in proposing a solution, or at least consultation
    e. (Bill Garrison) Indicated that some of us have been directed by our provosts to be leaders in this endeavor. Concerns about budget may require saying "no" to centralized deals until a decision is made on any increase to recurring or one-time funds
        i. Any one "no" puts other SULs in jeopardy
        ii. (Shirley Hallblade) Need to be aware of other models and would be great to have cost/use data for on-demand articles, etc.
    f. Concentrated FTE growth of regional campus locations without increased library budgets is an area of concern
    g. (Laurie Probst) First issue on the table needs to be 2012 and we need CAVP advice on balancing these costs and how they can help. We have three factors (FTE, usage, and research dollars) on the table, but this group needs to think more about these matters
    h. Discussion of OhioLink formula (Julia Zimmerman). Discussion about trying to apply this to a single resource. It's a sophisticated spreadsheet that looked at what each institution was paying per download (for Elsevier, etc.). Helped determine where to apply funds to solve problems, or acquire more resources and help distribute costs. Not a quick fix, but can be presented to Provosts. (Judy Russell) There is an understanding that everyone needs to compute FTEs in the same way

     i. Barry Baker will work with his Provost and the existing CSUL group will also continue to serve as a resource for background consultation

     j. (Bill Garrison) We need to be clear on what data is pulled, as well as when it is pulled (to stay consistent and match data)

          i. Some data at the BOG level is inconsistent. Discussion

- Elsevier Negotiation and Contract - Bill Garrison & Claire Dygert
    a. (Bill Garrison) Document distributed on Elsevier data gathering analysis
    b. Working group from ERS and CPC is looking at this data
    c. (Claire Dygert) First summary available now
        i. Discussion of the available data (much of this is raw) and how much should be immediately distributed
    d. ERS and CPC is looking at theoretical cancellations and what is being used at various places without active subscriptions
        i. Also the freedom list
        ii. Putting this all together to see if it can be determined what will best meet the needs of each institution
        iii. More work being done on the data to make it digestible
    e. (Bill Garrison) We need the data as soon as possible to begin making decisions. Discussion of timeline and work group activities
        i. Discussion of concerns and what the proposal will be to Elsevier
        ii. Had hoped to meet with Elsevier in September
    f. Discussion of the role of steering and negotiation activities
    g. Discussion of basic and summary data that is needed by each SUS as soon as possible
    h. (Bill Garrison) If the committee is having trouble getting data, the members of this group need to know as soon as possible to help procure this information
        i. Discussion of how the larger data points this will affect group individual subscriptions and decisions
    i. (Claire Dygert) Cancellations data is done and available. CPC and ERS should be able to provide possible directions/scenarios with other collected data (three possible directions). Discussion
    j. (Bill Garrison) A deadline must be set to help move this forward. Discussion
    k. Further discussion of the availability of the data and what can be used to make decisions
    l. (Barry Baker) Part of the issue is the communication between the three groups (steering & oversight, information gathering, and negotiation teams). We need to more efficiently transfer information between these groups and make sure all necessary people are in attendance at meetings
    m. Bill Garrison and Claire Dygert will decide a direction and come up with decisions about what data is important for this negotiation and what are

the essential data points for this group. Needs to get done before Midwinter so that some discussion may begin with Elsevier

n. (Laurie Probst) Motion that CSUL recognizes that this is mission critical and we need to move with the negotiating team to get them the data points necessary for meeting at ALA Midwinter (providing data to negotiating team by end of 1st week in January)
   i. Seconded and approved unanimously

- U-Borrow Project - Julia Zimmerman
  a. Things going very well. A press release about U-Borrow will be drafted by Julia to spread the word about all the good efforts, increased use, cost savings, etc.
  b. (Jean Phillips) If there's any interest in the statistics, the U-Borrow committee can make this available as a future presentation (about who's using it and when)
  c. (Judy Russell) Many thanks to FCLA and their team for putting this together. Very popular with users and a great way to balance our resources and spread the value of our collections. A great accomplishment that deserves credit and notice from the legislature
  d. (Brian Doherty) The word does seem to have moved beyond our walls
  e. Strong support from all participants for FCLA and their work on this matter
  f. (Bill Garrison) How will U-Borrow work with discovery tools and other new implementations? Discussion
   i. Many problems already solved, or being investigated
  g. (Laurie Probst) There is ongoing work for U-Borrow and this will need to be prioritized with the single bib and other efforts. (Michelle Newberry) U-Borrow needs to be tested in this single bib environment
   i. Other enhancements maybe deferred until this has been accomplished
  h. (Laurie Probst) Need a discussion about the policy issue of expanding U-Borrow to the colleges. To be discussed this afternoon with these groups on the technical level, but other items need to be addressed. May be better to give some direction to committees that deal with this and get their input as early as possible
   i. (Julia Zimmerman) We know of consortia that do serve small colleges and large universities. Some data may be available for review. Discussion of possible borrowing parameters and other items
  i. (Laurie Probst) Motion to ask PSPC to investigate expanding U-Borrow to the colleges and report at March meeting on the inclusion of colleges and community colleges into the U-Borrow system
   i. Seconded and approved by vote

- Collaborative Ventures Steering Committee Report - Shirley Hallblade
    a. Described the activities of the task force and their work with legislative efforts

- Task Force Report/Transitioning to the New Organization
    a. Discussion

- Discovery Tool RFI/Needs Assessment
    a. (Shirley Hallblade) New charge needs to be drafted. Three (Bill Garrison, Judy Russell, and Laurie Probst) CSUL will join three others from CCLA.
    b. Not clear who charges this group and how it will report back out to the broader organizations.
    c. (Laurie Probst) Talk about the transition and selecting leadership for the executive committee. Hopefully the legislature will let this group work out the details, but CSUL needs to take leadership and push this conversation forward
        i. We have good diversity in size and function and are representative of the system
        ii. How can we define the unique assets and how can we help the organization evolve
    d. (Judy Russell) How does CSUL fit in? Do we want to continue as a separate organization for mutual benefit, or could this be misconstrued in a possible new environment? May need to be organized differently to avoid any appearance of holding on to the past
    e. (Shirley Hallblade) Need to clarify if 11 universities need to come together to streamline services if FCLA/CCLA is replaced
        i. LRSC and CSUL may continue to exist, but CSUL doesn't have a true status…it is self-organized
    f. (Julia Zimmerman) Many issues, such as storage, Elsevier, and others, do affect all SUS libraries and we need this group to manage collaborative needs and goals
    g. (Barry Baker) We are creating a new organization that will replace FCLA and CCLA. We also have other issues that this group discusses that relate to the service organization
        i. There is definitely an ongoing need to have CSUL in its informal status through this transition period and beyond
    h. (Shirley Hallblade) Agree that we need to leverage this organization to ensure the best possibility of taking a leadership role
        i. (Judy Russell) Map out new committees and which ones will need more transition and new members
    i. (Jim Corey) Could be like the SUS caucus and comment on technological and other issues alike. We have more meetings to nail down this role, but the basic elements will certainly remain (storage, e-journals, etc.)

j. (Brian Doherty) How does this group map into any new organizations, as well as CCLA. We may need some formality
   i. Florida is unusual because some community colleges are becoming 4-year baccalaureate institutions
k. (Kathy Miller) This group needs to make sure that it exerts as much information and influence as possible on the transition period and transition group
l. (Shirley Hallblade) Seize the opportunity to help with the composition of this group and be proactive about the role of CSUL
m. Recommend that CSUL officers function as part of the transition group to represent the SUS libraries
n. (Jim Corey) Much of this is now in the hands of the legislature, but they are not likely to focus on all the small details
   i. Now is the opportunity for this group to communicate (via Provost or Chancellor) their ideas up the chain in a unified way

- Role of CSUL and Committees
   a. Group discussion
   b. Consensus that there is real need to continue and there remains a unified goal to represent the SUS libraries
   c. Feel strongly that the contracting institution needs to be able to support the robust needs of higher education (especially in the legal environment and other key areas, like intellectual property and legislative support)
   d. Some discussion of recommendation on location, but consideration of telecommuting is an option that should be on the table for some staff and situations
   e. Some services may be consolidated at one location, but satellite or branch offices may be considered
      i. Also helps with continuity of staff and existing expertise
   f. To maintain what is unique and good about each individual university and library

Committee and Task Force Quarterly Reports and Action Items

- CPC Report - Roy Ziegler (FSU)
   a. Action Plan
      i. E-book contract has been issued to Coutts. Mary Paige from UCF will chair implementation group
      ii. Possibility of a Scholarly Communication Institute, but ARL charges quite a bit of money. There is interest in having an institution/consortia to host this and thanks to other circumstances, the costs might be subsidized
         1. A year likely necessary to plan and organize

2. The cost would just be to get people there, as ARL would pay for all other facets (featured speakers, etc.)

    iii. Request for more information on curriculum and costs, as well as examples of charges and programs from previous years

    iv. Some costs may be recovered through participation fees from those attending outside the consortia

    v. Discussion of the contract with Coutts (one-time and recurring issues), which may be rolled over as many times as desired (Claire Dygert)

1. Three uses trigger a purchase (perpetual use) and there can be up to 12 simultaneous users
2. Discussion of other details

    vi. (Laurie Probst) What are the plans for assessment and measuring success?

1. The group that Mary Paige will chair will handle implementation and assessment. This information will be provided in December 2012

    vii. Motion to adopt the CPC action plan with the amendment that more information about the Scholarly Communication Institute first comes to this group (CSUL)

1. Seconded and approved by vote

  b. Special Collections Subcommittee Report

- PSPC Report - Nancy Cunningham for Elizabeth Outler
  a. Access Services subcommittee continues to work with U-Borrow to integrate with organizational processes and procedures (ILL, etc.). Sharing of best practices
  b. There was a proposal by the Resource Sharing Task Force to standardize 6 day loan period
  c. OPAC subcommittee - lots of requests to do further granular evaluation, but much of these requests may be on hold due to priority projects
  d. Information Literacy - Continue to meet and work on tutorials for universal use by as many groups as possible
  e. Doing an internal survey on the future of the role of PSPC. In the new environment, where can we collaborate (especially with Community Colleges and State Colleges) to be more productive in terms of possible shared services
  f. (Laurie Probst) Some frustration expressed over not having consistent adoption of policies and standards. As we go forward, we must agree to common, best practices

g. ((Judy Russell) When the group expands from 11 to 39, we're going to need more uniformity

h. (Kathy Miller) Motion to direct all committees to arrive at a standardized and common (preferred) practice

    i. If issues are impeding progress, the Deans and Directors need to know

    ii. Non-production may also need to be identified, in case it is necessary to replace participants

i. (Judy Russell) A more detailed motion may be developed from a statement to be developed following this meeting

- TSPC Report - Susan Heron (USF)
  - a. Action Plan
    - i. Standardization has been the focus following the face-to-face in 2009
      1. Approaching authorities in the standard bib environment. Many libraries agreeing to start fresh with OCLC name authorities
      2. Many libraries now NACO participants and we can submit via this body to become a part of the OCLC authority
         - a. (Jean Phillips) Authority group has done a great job and FIU helped greatly to move this along
      3. Metadata group also moving towards standardization
      4. Cooperative training to deal with reductions in expertise (at local and group levels)
      5. Acquisitions group working closely with CPC to move things along
    - ii. (Laurie Probst) Training has been a great initiative
    - iii. They will redo their Action Plan in January and submit to the group
  - b. Single Bib Pilot Project (SBPP)
    - i. Working on reducing the number of ticklers in the file (already cut in half) and metadata group looking at how people use their ticklers. Some are still useful and should be retained
    - ii. Also working on statistics to see how they are being used and what people need in terms of numbers and data. Only one meeting on this issue so far. Difficult to be clean in gathering these numbers, but starting to take a deeper look. Will start with the three represented by the group, then poll the other eight SUS libraries

- TAG Report - Beverly Caggiano (USF)
  - a. Emerging Technologies Report
    - i. A few additions in report (see document for details)

ii. Also a few additions to data management plans
b. Executive Summary

- DISC Report - Laurie Taylor (UF)
  a. (Shirley Hallblade) A working group has been formed that will proceed under a charge drafted by Julia Zimmerman. They will help us to better understand Islandora, etc. They will consult with other DISC and CSUL members
  b. (Laurie Taylor) Update on succession of chairs
  c. Fully functional version of SobekCM at FCLA and they are working on implementation. Have been able to load items and it is up and running
  d. (Priscilla) Had talked about porting it to LINUX, but decided it would be better to run it under Windows. Looking into training opportunities that will help with programming and management
    i. SobekCM system does need to be converted from MS Sequel Server
    ii. Mark Sullivan (at UF) helping to work on some of the database elements
    iii. Working out a test plan now, but have tried one of every major type of function
    iv. Put out a call for examples from current DigiTool users for things that have been loaded and have features that must be retained. Also comparing features in both products. Questions will go out to the SULs via their DISC representatives
  e. (Laurie Taylor) Summary of other activities
  f. (Judy Russell) Need to look at the items that are not standard and evaluate their importance and continuance (and value to individual and state entities)
  g. (Laurie Probst) Discussion of data curation would be helpful sometime soon. Provosts are increasingly aware of this and related issues
    i. Topic for future meeting
  h. Discussion on understanding by faculty of open access and other practices
    i. (Judy Russell) UF is about (early part of 2012) to survey information about datasets kept by faculty and researchers at the individual level (format, volume, etc.), mimicking a process initiated at Georgia Tech. May be benefit to repeating this effort with a common instrument

      i.   (Priscilla) Quick study of ARL Libraries regarding data services/curation. Twenty-eight of the American academic libraries had this listed as an available service

      j.   (Bill Garrison) Motion to approve the officers

           i.   Seconded and approved by vote

- (Nancy Cunningham & Laurie Probst) Motion: Toward the collective development and implementation of best practices and procedures statewide, CSUL committee chairs are empowered by CSUL Deans and Directors to use, when feasible and expedient, the committee structure to reach agreement on practicing a common set of procedures and practices during the course of any project, service and/or system implementation. If agreement on a common practice or procedure cannot be reached, the chair should refer the matter to CSUL for discussion and decision.
  a. Seconded and approved by vote

- Statewide Storage Task Force (SSTF) and Storage Facility/Shared Collection - Cathy Martyniak (UF)
  a. (Judy Russell for Cathy) Report is in the collection of handouts. Group continues to meet monthly and they are using some planning monies to process some of the materials for high density storage application
  b. Have the planning task force ready that will put out the request for proposals for the structure and to get "shovel ready"
  c. May be able to plan the project year by year, using available funds to build and expand when possible
  d. May be a direct legislative appropriation if PECO funds continue to wane, given the high level of need by the SUS libraries and institutions
     i. Target for mid-December to contract an interim facility to request some of the immediate issues
     ii. University of Miami is willing to buy in to the process and contribute to the shared collection. Has been approved in principle by their provost and they will contribute cash initially, then participate like the other SULs
  e. Identified some JSTOR titles that may be ready for disposal, but requests came to retain many of these on the initial list
     i. Process does appear to be working, but not much readiness to get rid of too much as of yet
     ii. Next list will include IEEE and other science-related titles

        iii. Working with software development staff to show missing volumes, location codes, etc.

        iv. Let them know if there are titles/publishers that should be added to the list for review and triage

f. Pushing OCLC for information on pricing in the single bib universe

g. Looking at getting a name/acronym to define holdings for each group/project

h. Last-copy policy is circulating, but it still in draft and not yet ready for CSUL review

        i. Do we want this policy? Question to be considered at future meeting

i. Facility should be under contract soon (former airplane repair hangar) and will need some incremental upgrades and changes

        i. Will start filling the facility almost immediately

        ii. (Bill Garrison) Some questions from USF Provost regarding the project following discussion with UF Provost. Discussion by the group of various concerns and ways of moving forward

j. (Judy Russell) Internet Archive interested in co-locating at the new facility

        i. Opens up new possibilities and further discussion on the boundaries of fair use

        ii. UF may also co-locate their own camera and digital efforts at this facility

        iii. Implications with regard to HATHI trust. Discussion of two related initiatives:

            1. Initiative to set up a parallel print storage for everything available in HATHI

            2. Resolution to plan for a comprehensive set of digitized federal documents and policies

        iv. Discussion of naming process Judy will send out the list of those names and acronyms proposed so far, but nothing has yet been decided

- Resource Sharing Task Force (RSTF) - Kristine Shrauger (UCF)

a. (Barry Baker) Working on best practices and doing a lot of surveying to see what's out there in terms of standardization

        i. Other non-CSUL libraries have also been participating

b. (Laurie Probst) It has been reported that this is a great and helpful group

Directors' Discussion Topics – Other Items

- Interim storage and establishing the shared collection: journal retention review - Judy Russell
    a. Covered in previous discussion

- Update on the FDLP and distributed print journal archive projects - Judy Russell

    a. Continued dispute with GPO over ASERL project. Has not stopped the group from continuing, but have not been responsive to meeting about their objections

    b. Still interest outside our area in this project (as a model for others)

    c. Judy will soon be writing a letter to the Florida Congressional Delegation to raise some issues and she will share this letter (or others are welcome to provide parallel communications)

        i. Had been preparing for an updated grant, but trying to get complications resolved to continue this effort

        ii. Software is working well and no major problems reported

    d. Discussion of issues and concerns

- Open Access/Berlin Declaration - Judy Russell
    a. Judy attended event in Berlin with the head of the UF Faculty Senate
    b. Needs to be both a faculty and a library initiative
    c. ARL and ASERL have both endorsed the Berlin Declaration
    d. Because other groups are endorsing this as groups, it may be worthwhile to think about a CSUL statement of support
    e. UF is taking the issue to the Faculty Senate and will ask the university to endorse the declaration and request that the University Library Committee draft a policy and bring it back for discussion