



MINUTES OF THE COUNCIL OF STATE UNIVERSITY LIBRARIES MEETING
Thursday, September 4, 2014

Present: Brian Doherty, Chair (NCF), Barry Baker (UCF); William Garrison, (USF); Kathy Miller (FGCU); William Miller (FAU); Anne Prestamo (FIU); Julia Zimmerman (FSU); Robert Dugan [UWF]; Faye Watkins (FAMU); Kathryn Miller (Poly); Elizabeth Curry (UNF); Patrick Reakes (UF)

Visitors: Jean Phillips (FSU), Martin Wood (FSU-Medical Library), Pam Northrup (UWF)

1. Welcome and Introductions

Brian Doherty (NCF), Chair

Chair Brian Doherty called the meeting to order at 12:50 pm.

2. Agreement on Agenda

All in agreement to proceed with agenda as is

3. Minutes of June 5 and 6, 2014 Meeting held at FIU Miami

[Attachment 3]

The minutes were approved with one correction: Kathleen Miller is listed twice as member present. One needs to be changed to Kathryn Miller.

4. Schedule of Next Meetings

December 4/5, 2014	New College, Sarasota (joint CSUL/FLVC meeting)
March 5/6, 2015	Florida Polytechnic, Lakeland
June 4/5, 2015	UWF, Pensacola
September 3/4, 2015	FAMU, Tallahassee

5. FLVC/FALSC Transition

Pam Northrup, Executive Director of the Innovation Institute at UWF, attended the meeting to discuss the transition.

Pam asked about the needs of the SUS libraries in the context of the transition from FLVC to FALSC. She indicated that she and FLVC leaders were focusing primarily on staff transition at FLVC right now with many internal conversations going on. CSUL members expressed that there is a need to figure out what CSUL, LRSC and FLVC's roles are, now that FLVC Library Services side is changing to FALSC. The needs of CSUL are very different than LRSC, as CSUL must focus on needs of graduate students and faculty as well as undergraduates.

FLVC will become the Complete Florida Plus program as of September 10, 2014 and transition over to UWF by January 1, 2015. They'll be under UF until then. It is hoped that organizational structure will be figured out by January 1st. After that, the focus will shift on what the new organization actually does. LRSC, CSUL and FLVC need to be ready to identify shared issues and move forward.

The FLVC Board may change somewhat in the interim. Should CSUL and LRSC's chairs sit on FLVC's board? It would be helpful to have a seat at the table.

What exactly is Complete Florida Plus (CFP)? CFP will be a part of FLVC and is operated on the same CRM. The old FACTS.org, Distance Learning Consortium and Innovation Institute are part of this. When



CFP was created it was charged with four main tasks: streamline admissions; get people into school; get them jobs; and investigate how to reduce the cost of education. CFP has 11 partner institutions which include state colleges, universities and private institutions. They put together 53 degree programs designed to get and keep people in school. 85% of FLVC is IT operations so the emphasis at CFP needs to echo that.

In response to the question about one-time funding and recurring funding, Pam clarified that \$6 million is going to a new tool for K-12 students that FALSC will be implementing. \$3 million is recurring and \$3 million isn't. There is concern is that FLVC does not have people specializing in K-12, which may require them to hire someone with that expertise.

Members talked about the difficulty of working under the Sunshine Law. In regard to Sunshine, a decision must be made as to whether Members Council is to be a voting organization. CSUL can form a consensus on issues and vote or use other tools such as surveys to reach a consensus on issues. This depends on what body CSUL is advising.

CSUL members feel they need to be exempt from the Sunshine Law because the law prohibits members from talking to one another. We also have to be careful of naming our group. If we call CSUL a board, then we're in the "sunshine." There is a concern that sometimes what comes from the Member's Council is not exactly what the FLVC board hears. Minutes could help address this issue.

When the FLVC governance structure was created, it was originally recommended that four library people be on the Board. The chancellors only allowed for two. This is problematic because libraries aren't a homogenous group. For clarification it was noted that the FLVC Board only deals with certain types of issues: the Board's primary role is to approve high-cost purchases and projects, and hire and evaluate the FLVC Executive Director. The board is divorced from operational decisions.

One important question is how the Member's Council communicates with the "uber director." Also with 28 state colleges and 12 SULs, we could easily get outvoted on issues. Being out of the sunshine helps us communicate. Can we have an ad hoc group to move in and out of the sunshine as needed?

FCLA focused on the needs of university libraries. FLVC does not. How do we close this gap? If FLVC only focuses on the 4-year core, and we form our own group, then we could get in trouble with the legislature. Our fear is that FLVC could focus on the lowest common denominator and our needs would not be met. To some extent, this has happened. We need to educate legislative staff on our needs so that we're not this "lowest common denominator." CSUL should clearly define how its needs are different from 4-year core needs.

Legislators or staff may think that since universities are eligible for preeminence or performance funding, the libraries don't need extra funding. However, Libraries are not receiving a portion of this funding.

Pricing models for information resources are a problem. Libraries spend less each year on books and materials for other disciplines just to keep paying for the "big deal" packages.

ACTION ITEM

Julia Zimmerman will distill this conversation down to talking points to initiate discussion.
Pam Northrup will get the exact terminology.

6. Discussion of CSUL/LRSC/FLVC comparison table

Brian Doherty (NCF)

[Attachment 6]

CSUL needs a new mission statement. There may be categories we need to add to articulate our mission and needs. One such category might be the mix of students we serve, which can be different among universities. Some university libraries serve research institutes and other such enterprises.

A historic mission of university libraries is to collectively gather and preserve materials that document society, research and intellectual pursuits, and cultural heritage for posterity. This is not generally the mission of college libraries.

The NSF now requires data management plans as part of grant proposals. Brian volunteered to list what each university library does and separate it out. The FCS lists everything possible.

Bill Garrison asked if we could broaden our list of partnerships and affiliations, such as ASERL, CRL, CNI, ACURIL, Educause, CLIR, FACRL, and IFLA. Acronyms need to be spelled out and explained.

This table will be visionary, defining our vision as major projects and listing them. The audience for this document is the transition team. It defines what different groups are, what they do, above and beyond the relationship with FLVC. It may be opportune to note our diversity.

CSUL as a group should strengthen its connection and seek more support from the BOG or other organizations to help fill the gap left by FCLA's demise.

The document needs to look forward, not backward. Our mission can be rewritten to include those outside the SUL community. A one-page summary is suggested. Our driving force is: improve services and efficiency through collaboration and cooperation. External funders need to understand what we do. We should use more proactive language. We must keep in mind the needs of faculty as well as students. At BOG meetings, faculty needs have taken a back seat. Anne Prestamo referred to a U of Iowa study on whether faculty research was valuable even if the results of the research weren't obviously 'useful.' Supporting faculty publishing is expensive but essential.

Kathy Miller suggested that in the Mission Statement, the Cooperation bullet could be moved higher. Elizabeth Curry suggested making sure there is a distinction between CSUL & FLVC. Brian suggested highlighting the audiences we serve in contrast to the colleges. CSUL/FCLA developed U Borrow and PALMM, both innovative services. We build unique collections for the human record, and we support research which drives economic development in Florida.

Brian reminded us that the document will be seen by the BOG, the Transition Team, and the Chancellors. We invest in our projects, unlike the colleges. We have a different scope and work at a different level. We conceive and implement more projects. We provide expertise and staff. For example, both the Shared Bib Task Group and DISC migrated from CSUL. We have diverse and complex collections; one reason Aleph was selected was because it could handle materials in CJK.



ACTION ITEM – Brian will post the documents on GoogleDocs. The report is due on the 15th.

The meeting was adjourned at 4:33 p.m.



Friday, September 5, 2014

8:30 a.m. -Noon

Present: Brian Doherty, Chair (NCF), Barry Baker (UCF); Kathy Miller (FGCU); William Miller (FAU); Anne Prestamo (FIU); Julia Zimmerman (FSU); Robert Dugan [UWF]; Faye Watkins (FAMU); Kathryn Miller (Poly); Elizabeth Curry (UNF); Patrick Reakes (UF); Judy Russell (UF-conference phone)

Absent: Bill Garrison (USF)

Guests: Jean Phillips (FSU), Martin Wood (FSU-Medical Library); Shari Johnson (UWF), Dan Schoonover (FSU)

Brian Doherty (Chair) called meeting to order 9:00 AM.

The group discussed implementing a "light" agenda to make the CSUL a 1 day meeting instead of 2 days. Since CSUL is separate from FLVC, there are fewer items to discuss. Judy Russell (UF) and Barry Baker (UCF) suggested getting updates from FLVC meetings and having the CSUL meetings after FLVC to address issues arising in the FLVC meetings. Brian summarized to keep status quo regarding meeting times/dates.

STANDING COMMITTEE AND TASK FORCE REPORTS

Collections Access Committee

Shari Johnson (UWF)
[Attachment 7, 7A]

The CAC recommends renewing Coutts contract. Shari reported that the shared PDA with Coutts has been a successful one with \$10,000/month spent during semester months and \$5,000/month during non-semester months and the recommendation of the CAC (not unanimous) to continue using Coutts.

Discussion over Coutts contract: Anne moved to approve the renewal (6 to 9 month extension). Patrick Reakes (UF) seconded. CSUL members voted to approve the extension of the contract. Barry Baker mentioned that all SULs are going to YBP (except UF) and recommends a peer group to allow each university to see what each is purchasing to reduce duplication and increase use of U Borrow. Patrick reminded us that UF wants access via YBP but it won't be its primary book vendor.

No final decisions by the CAC until finished with all aspects of YBP but appears the way to go. FLVC has all the information regarding Coutts and YBP but has not provided input into the discussion.

ACTION ITEM

The Statewide Shared PDA Monitoring & Assessment Task Force Report recommends continuing the Shared PDA Program by replenishing funds in the account held at Coutts. The Task Force recommends the cost be apportioned according to the following model:

- 50% of the cost apportioned equally across the 11 contributing members
- 50% of the cost apportioned according to the institutions' percentage of total FTE.

8. Shared Bib Problems and Issues Task Force

Sarah Norris (NCF), Trey Shelton (UF)
[Available by phone] [Attachment 8]

The TF provided a report which gives a good overview of the problems we have at this point and directions we should take; a plan for implementing the solutions is needed. Anne mentioned that Marianne O'Donnell is the liaison/contact for FLVC and we should talk with her.

It will be important to collect documentation, share best practices, and continually train staff. Otherwise issues will still arise. Who has authority to create best practices/standards – FLVC or the people working with Bib records? CSUL needs to know when records are loaded and know when OCLC and FLVC are loading to know which vendor is being loaded, or if university staff are loading Bib records. Most of the problems have come from automated loading.

These issues are for the Cataloging, Authority and Metadata committee. Should CSUL disband its Shared Bib group and create a new group? There was some agreement that CAM should continue and report to CSUL.

Anne stated that Lucy Harrison reported that PDA01 was set up to prevent issues, but priority was loading only new records and none of the old records. Anne also suggested that CAM should focus on issues related to batch loading first, not best practices, and Kathy Miller agreed.

ACTION ITEM

Barry Baker: refer this issue to CAM; move forward to form another group to work with FLVC to focus on batch loading/move all records into PDA01.

RESOURCE SHARING COMMITTEE

Dan Schoonover (FSU)
For Kristine Shrauger (UCF) [Attachment 9]

ACTION ITEM - UBorrow Lost Books (see report)

Dan Schoonover said that the RSC has been investigating concerns about providing books to distance learners. Each institution defines distance learners differently. They are considering a contract with Federal Express to deliver materials to students' homes.

Ben Walker suggested having FLARE at the top of lending page/screen to show political goodwill by displaying the institution an item comes from. FLARE would be independent of ILL/UBorrow by not routing to main campus.

Lost books in UBorrow: the committee asked for feedback from CSUL regarding recouping costs of lost books. Currently libraries do not charge each other for lost books; they charge their own patrons for lost material, but money does not go back to the owning institution. Last year there were 126 lost items out of 29,500 UBorrow transactions.

Possible approaches:

1. Continue the current practice (not charging each other)
2. Use local (Institutional) policies as CSUL uses with Illiad to charge each other
3. Create a unified book charging policy across the CSUL's

The losses are such a small percentage of transactions that a unified policy should be considered.

Julia described how the OhioLink unmediated borrowing system counts lost books at the end of the year, with each institution depositing money for lost books into a central pot. Then the funds are distributed according to which institutions lost the most. Since college Libraries are now included in UBorrow they must be included decisions about loss policies. As a Member's Council issue it should be discussed with FLVC to share with the MC's Resource Sharing Committee.

Kathy Miller warned against creating a system for accounting and/or reimbursement that results in more work than reimbursement is worth. A suggestion was made to consider instituting a uniform amount for lost books – the Bowker index for example. It was noted that, currently, charges for book replacement vary across institutions. BOT approval will be required for any fee changes.

We should get data from each college & policies on lost books to study.

Dan suggested that the Next Gen ILS be required to have internal invoicing since Aleph doesn't have that ability.

ACTION ITEM

Dan Schoonover: we will look at options and compile a report for CSUL.

10. Florida Collaboration of Academic Libraries of Medicine (FCALM)

Martin Wood (FSU)
for Rose Bland (USF)
& Nadine Dexter (UCF)

[Attachment 10]

Martin Wood (FSU) discussed the group's report. FCALM met in June in Orlando. They discussed transition as a result of the introduction of College Libraries into the processes of acquiring resources. They discussed the usual vendor issues – rising e-resource costs, pending contracts with vendors, and a push to get Medical Librarians on the Boards of vendor companies to enlighten vendors about what's going on in libraries regarding needs and costs and keep us apprised of vendor strategies. The next meeting of FCALM is in September 2014.

UCF's Medical School is testing Google Glass in a clinical setting – medical students can be “working” away from instructor and still see what the instructor is “doing” and vice versa – an “eye view” of procedures being done.

Martin and FCALM were able to get Nature to back down on price increases. Martin mentioned trying to “gain control” of licenses to fit what institutions need. Nature was telling different institutions different things. CSUL needs to communicate about such issues to avoid being taken advantage of by vendors. Demand consortial deals or at least transparency in contracts with different institutions. Anne recommended that those responsible for collections and negotiating with vendors should share their experiences with other institutions.

SYNOPSIS OF THE DISCUSSION ABOUT FLVC'S TRANSITION

Janice Gilley, UWF lobbyist, has been instrumental in advocating for libraries, specifically getting the "all for all" provision removed for this year. UWF recognizes the importance of moving from student experiences to student success.

CSUL appears as a "shadow organization" and adding people from Member's Council to committee to make sure the work gets done during transition and information about what is going on is shared and how specifically to follow the legislation for creating/transitioning FLVC. It would also allow SUL to be able to fix things with FLVC.

11. Cataloging Authorities & Metadata Committee

No report submitted.

12. Kualo OLE Discussion

Judy reported that Kualo is setting up a commercial entity to assist institutions with implementation of Kualo products and to provide support. Timeframe is uncertain. Chicago and Lehigh are live; British consortial group is coming up. Kualo has learned a lot in bringing up Chicago and Lehigh. Judy has requested additional documentation on how other universities have implemented the procurement process. Dugan stated that the ITN can be sent to vendors, including Kualo OLE.

ACTION ITEM

Judy will send out the schedule of institutions that will implement Kualo OLE.

Ann expressed concerns about staff time commitment. According to information Valerie Boulos brought back from a meeting, each individual would need to commit minimum of 10 hours/week; need to build knowledge base.

Judy said that the e-resources work can be shared; effort may help with preparation for other products, if Florida goes in a different direction.

13. Discussion of Legislative Budget Requests (LBRs) prepared by FLVC and CAVP

[Attachments 13, 13A, 13B]

The three CAVP LBRs are:

- (1) Operating funds for interim FLARE storage facility so individual institutions wouldn't have to pay (not all have been paying). Want to keep the need for statewide storage in the forefront;
- (2) Funds for University Press of Florida to modernize the Press, including an open access (OA) initiative in which OA journals being taken over/begun by university presses to try to break the stranglehold of commercial publishers. This would include seed money for journals in various disciplines.
- (3) Funds to address the "big deal" e-journal cost distribution problem in the SUS.

Because the Provosts are behind these requests, it should get more attention than a library request.

The FLVC LBRs include:

- (1) \$2.25M for additional e-resources
- (2) \$4.5M funds for a next-generation ILS. (It was noted that if the ITN is issued before Dec. 31, will come from UF; UF & UWF will have to work together on process.)

(3) \$2.2M for a student-centered online services & information environment for Complete Florida Plus

14. Nature license (Already discussed)

15. Storage

Judy reminded everyone that FLARE holdings records are in OCLC, but are grayed out so they're unavailable for ILL. They are moving forward on making them available for ILL.

16. HathiTrust

The SUS Libraries are now a consortial member of HathiTrust. All SULs that have shibboleth should be up and running. Judy reminded the group that for users with disabilities, the option is available to download and digitize material needed. We should inform student services on our campuses about this capability.

Anne recommended virtual meeting of representatives from individual libraries.

Judy reminded the group that Cliff Richmond is UF representative for technical questions.

More documents are being considered to be in public domain (i.e. books published after 1923 with no discernable copyright and not available for purchase). We can propose books that libraries want to be available. May want to put brittle books in FLARE and mark for HathiTrust.

ACTION ITEM

Judy Russell will set up the virtual meeting.

17. Other Items

Elizabeth mentioned that the UNF provost is surveying faculty for their opinions about a uniform Learning Management System in the SUS. It's also being discussed by the MCDLSS.

Anne announced that FIU has discovered that much of its microfilm collection is deteriorating or has vinegar syndrome. They've discarded many reels. Some boxes test positive, but film is okay. Judy suggested that if we would all survey our microfilm collections, we can coordinate what we keep or toss. Some could be digitized or store good copies in FLARE. Anne recommended a task force to look into surveying microfilm collections

ACTION ITEM

Brian will send out call for microfilm task force participants.

Meeting adjourned at 11:55 am.