

State University Library Council

Meeting-Minutes

January 17, 1995

Meeting held at the Flamingo Room, Orlando Airport

Present

Anne Marie Allison- (UCF), Dale Canelas- (UF), Jim Corey -(FCLA), Andrew Farcas - (UNF), Sam Fustukian- (USF), Nick Gaymon -(FAMU), Bill Miller- (FAU), Larry Miller- (FIU), and Grady Morein (UWF)

Board staff present was: Mike Armstrong.

Absent were: Carolyn Gray (FGCU), and Charles Miller (FSU).

Action Items

1. Agreement on agenda.
2. Corrections to the minutes.
3. Set next quarterly meeting time. (Bring your calendars.)
4. Review of charges for the Public Services Planning Committee (Sherry Carrillo) and the Technical Services Planning Committee (Janice Donahue).
5. Report on determining an annual library inflation rate. (Dale Canelas)
6. Status of efforts on each campus to gain faculty input on the Five Recommendations from the Circulation Committee (All).
7. Accountability Report Results. (Mike Armstrong)
8. Review of Fact Book - Book Inventory Data (Mike Armstrong)
9. Status report on Library LANs. (Jim Corey)
10. Allocating funds to cover FCLA maintenance costs. (Jim Corey)
11. Prioritization of Management Reports from FCLA. (Dale Canelas)

Discussion Items

12. Variable Average Replacement Costs, Local Options (Andrew Farkas)
13. IBM collaboration -- Journal Article Delivery (Jim Corey)
14. Overnight delivery contract. (Larry Miller)
15. Plans for a fall CRL Workshop in Gainesville in the fall to be held just prior to the Joint Public/Technical Services Committee meeting.

Minutes

1. Agreement on agenda. Larry Miller added a report on the Expedited ILL Committee. Sam Fustukian added discussion of a LUIS gateway to Nexis Lexis. The group agreed and the agenda was renumbered to accommodate the additions.
2. The Minutes of the meeting of September 29, 1994 were approved with a single correction. The correct address of the FCLA gopher is SALLY.FCLA.UFL.EDU. < N.B. AS OF 11/95 THE GOPHER IS OBSOLETE. PLEASE REFER TO THIS FCLA WEB SITE FOR MINUTES AND REPORTS. >
3. The SUS Directors agreed to hold their next quarterly meeting on April 20, 1995 in Tallahassee. Charles Miller will be asked to reserve space for the meeting. The directors will assemble for dinner the evening before on April 19, 1995 at 6 pm at Andrews Second Act. Reservations made by Dale. Charles to check in March.
4. The charges for the Public Services Planning Committee and the Technical Services Planning Committee were approved as distributed by email. The PSPC charge is attached to these minutes. Sherry Carrillo has already convened a meeting of the PSPC for February 17, 1995; the TSPC awaited approval of the charge before convening a meeting.
5. Dale Canelas handed out two chapters and a set of charts from publications on the Library Price Index. They were: 1) the "Introduction" taken from Higher Education Revenues and Expenditures: Institutional Data (Washington D.C., 1992), which describes the cost study; 2) the "Academic Library Price Index" chapter taken from Inflation Measures for Schools, Colleges, and Libraries, 1994 Update (Washington. D.C., 1994), which describes the index; and 3) the spreadsheets which contain the Academic Library Price Index with its major sub components for FY 74-94. She was unable to distribute this data to the directors in advance of the meeting because UF was unable to obtain the publications and accompanying disks until mid-December and Sam Gowan, Director for Collection Management at UF, had to spend some time analyzing them for our use. Her conclusion is that determining an annual library inflation rate seems doable, but it is somewhat complicated.

After reading the publications, Sam Gowan contacted the economist (Kent Halstead) who

developed the Library Price Index and discussed the process with him. Sam feels that it warrants serious investigation. He pointed out that "the design for conducting the cost study..." uses expenditure data "...from the National Center for Education Statistics and his Halstead's peer groupings are based on 1994 Carnegie classifications..." thus "the study can provide base comparable figures against which we can assess the SUS Libraries overall expenditures in relation to peer institutions." Dale agrees. It seems a particular strength that the Index is based on NCES and Carnegie data. But, she also feels that it will be a considerable commitment of staff effort to obtain all of the necessary data so that each library can analyze its own operations.

Since this is a complicated issue that requires greater knowledge of the staff requirements, the directors deferred discussion of it to the April meeting. In the meantime, each would read the handouts and discuss them with library staff involved in collecting statistics on each campus. Some directors requested complete bibliographic information for the publications which Dale agreed to send. *Sent by email 1/18/95. This issue will be on the April agenda.*

6. The directors discussed the status of efforts on each of their campuses to gain faculty input on the five recommendations from the Circulation Committee. UCF's and USF's committees have approved the increased fines. UF and UNF have no problem from their respective VP's. FIU's faculty committee chair supports the change. FAU will discuss with VP--no problem anticipated. FAMU and UWF have yet to go to their committees--neither have met yet this academic year--both have new committees. No report from FSU or FGCU. The Directors asked Mike Armstrong if fines and lost book revenue could be made exempt from the revenue cap. He said that the Joint Legislative Management Committee was currently working on draft legislation which will specify what is or is not under the revenue cap. Unfortunately, nothing is resolved at this time. He believes that fines have never been thought of in this context and "off the top of his head" he wondered if it were possible to include them since there was no way to know in advance how many students might keep books overdue.

7. Mike Armstrong reported on BOR reaction to the accountability reports. He said that the "individual reports were excellent and that they were universally liked by BOR staff, Legislative staff, Regents, Vice Presidents, etc. He said that one regent, Julian Bennett from Lake City, wanted to reconsider all of the SUS Accountability reports but that he wanted to leave the library reports alone. In the end, it was a "bang up job" by the libraries

Bill Miller raised the issue of the biennial distribution of the ACRL Statistics. These statistics mirror ARL statistics and so help to make SUS statistics comparable across institutions, but unlike ARL statistics, they are distributed biennially rather than annually. The Board requires the accountability reports annually and this leaves several institutions without up to date comparisons. One director wondered if there was any likelihood that ACRL might increase collection and distribution to annual? Bill promised to talk with ACRL staff and report back. It was suggested that once having identified the ten comparable

institutions, each director could ask those institutions for the data on an annual basis. It seems clear that any institution collecting the ACRL data for the biennial report is also collecting it on the off years.

Another director asked where to find the E&G expenditures of comparable universities. That data is collected by the National Center for Education Statistics (NCES) on an annual basis but some years usually pass before publication. However, each university has an office of institutional research that can usually get the data from comparable universities. NACUBO (National Association of College and University Business Officers) and other professional administrators collect such data and regularly help each other out.

Dale Canelas agreed to provide the directors with information about which line of the NCES IPEDS (Integrated Postsecondary Education Data Systems) form gives comparable E&G Expenditure data. They are: University characteristics are copied from the IPEDS Finance Form, ED (CS) Form G50-14P-f, part C. University E&G Expenditures are as reported on NCES IPEDS Finance Form, Part B, line 12, column 3. As an aside, the university characteristics that show up on the ARL comparison charts are: g-includes agricultural stations; l-includes law school; m-includes medical school; e-excludes some E&G expenditures paid from other sources.

8. Mike Armstrong said that in reviewing the contents of the SUS Fact Book, Ron Stubbs pointed out that there was only book inventory data for the libraries. In view of the fact that Libraries are changing rapidly and the Accountability Measures are much strengthened, he asked if we wished to change the way libraries are represented in the Fact Book. Dale Canelas said that she had reviewed the Library's portion of the UF Fact Book and felt that it was very unrevealing of what the Library actually contributed to the university community so she had substantially expanded it. Sam Fustukian had sent a memo to the SUS Directors in early January recommending that a number of service measurements be added to the Fact Book. The BOR would like a recommendation from the SUS Directors soon as they are currently putting the Fact Book together.

Larry Miller, Sam Fustukian, and Dale Canelas volunteered to form a subcommittee and make recommendations back to the entire group.

Mike was asked about the outlook for next year's budget. He replied that it will be a difficult year. The Senate president is looking for \$150 million to keep prisoners in jail for 85% of their terms. It is estimated that there will be \$800,000,000 in new money available but the increases required to staff the new prisons that are being built plus the funds needed to take care of the K-12 increased student population, and the Medicaid program and other entitlement programs means that there is little if any funding for higher education. At present it is believed that most of the shortfall may be made up by HRS and the BOR budgets.

9. Jim Corey reported on progress toward 1) completion of the projects prioritized in the PS/TS Joint List, 2) Client Server Architecture, and 3) hiring for the new staff positions (librarian for documentation and six programmers).

9.1) Jim provided a handout listing active tasks and projects with assignments of programmer and librarian for each. Most of the PS/TS priorities are in the active listing; one (keyword searching in tech mode) has been completed. Jim estimated that the additional databases we purchased this year would be mounted within 30 days (by mid-February). Dale voiced a concern that we had paid for a full year but had lost a good deal of use of the databases because of the late access to them. Jim clarified he believed that the databases were purchased with an effective date of 1/1995 and our contracts will not expire until December 30, 1995. Confirmed by email. He also said that he could check with the vendors to see if they would extend the date to Mid February since we will not have access until then.

9.2) Jim stated that one of the new programmers has been assigned to work on the Client Server architecture necessary for us to reach our goals. His estimate is that it will be a two year project. The programmer has begun some rough prototyping of Mosaic for a front end. This announcement generated an air of happy expectancy to which Jim emphasized that this is just a beginning. He prefers setting realistic goals to following the Gates' model of setting release dates and regularly pushing them back.

9.3) FCLA staff has been busy interviewing. They have filled four positions with three internal and one external candidate. Four additional positions are posted and will close 1/19/95. They expect another flurry of interviews to mid-February and hope to have four more people hired by March. The search for the documentation librarian will close March 15 and there is also a resignation that will have to be replaced. Jim believes that it will be close to summer before all the positions are filled.

10. Jim Corey passed out a handout reporting on progress toward wiring for Library LANs. All universities are moving along. The most important point to be made is that given the dismal funding scenario articulated by Mike Armstrong and local university officials, there may be no legislative funding for the equipment that was to be allocated in fiscal '96.

If funds granted this year were used for equipment, (they were projected to be used almost entirely for wiring thus they are one-time), there are no on-going maintenance funds available. Jim noted that each institution can consider its specialized needs and reach its own conclusion as to how it wants to expend its share of funding, however, he asked the directors to consider the issues carefully. The Directors decided that Jim should not worry about maintenance costs of possible equipment, that it will be the responsibility of each library to spend the funds wisely for the purposes granted and to live with their decisions.

Jim then presented a decision regarding router ownership. It was decided that FCLA would

purchase and own the routers to ensure maximum compatibility and consistency with both the campus and SUS-wide library network. Jim will deduct router funds from each university's allocation.

Each university needs to advise Jim shortly how they want to receive their funds: amount to Expense, Equipment, etc.

11. Jim Corey presented a handout regarding allocation of funds to cover the maintenance costs of FCLA equipment. Most of the equipment was transferred from FCLA to the individual universities, but the maintenance funds are still in the FCLA budget. FCLA suspects that many older machines may have been surveyed but FCLA was not advised--for example they are still paying \$300 per year for elderly IBM PC XT's which are badly out of date. The directors agree that some older equipment may not be in the libraries any longer.

This issue was deferred to the next agenda for lack of time. A final decision has to be reached by May.

12. Dale Canelas handed out a memo outlining ten reports that can be provided by information in the NOTIS system. They seem to UF library staff to be basic to responding to external requests for statistical information or to providing managers necessary information about their operations. She requested that they be forwarded to the appropriate committees (PS & TS) for prioritization with other FCLA projects. The directors agreed.

13. Sam Fustukjian asked that FCLA provide a gateway to Lexis Nexis through LUIS. Dale asked if that were possible given the restrictions Lexis Nexis has placed on users of the data. Sam stated that the only restrictions placed on USF were number of simultaneous users (not more than 12) and time (not 2-4 pm). Jim said that when UF requested this two years ago, FCLA would have had to create software to show that only appropriate students were using the database. The directors referred the issue to the Electronic Collections Committee. They want the Committee to consider this in the light of other databases it may be appropriate to access through this means.

14. Andrew Farkas asked that the Directors agree to the concept of having local options for variable average replacement costs. He has found difficulty with the set costs we agreed to (the average cost of a book in the current Bowker Annual) because there are occasions when a patron seems to be systematically "losing" library materials and paying for them at grossly lower prices than it would cost to purchase in-print books of the same quality. Andy suggested that it be our policy to take the latest Bowker Annual average cost for the field in question. If the lost books were art books or engineering books, the current average cost for materials in those disciplines would be used. The directors decided that each library director has authority to deal with such a situation in their own manner. The standard cost that we all agreed to assess is for run-of-the-mill book destruction and loss, not for systematic actions

that seem to border on fraud.

15. Jim Corey reported briefly on the status of a collaborative project with IBM that will provide us with new options for the electronic delivery of journal articles (priority 3 from the master plan) and for electronic reserves. The collaboration includes UF, NERDC and FCLA. The first step is acquisition by NERDC of an IBM SP2 computer, which is a parallel processing version of IBM's largest UNIX processor. The version purchased by NERDC has seven processors and will be installed this month. The first application will be numerically intensive research computing. In the second quarter of 1995, NERDC will install 150 gigabytes of RAID (disk) on the SP2 for use by FCLA for storing electronic documents. Also in the second quarter, IBM is scheduled to supply FCLA and NERDC with a free copy of a software product called Visual Info (VI) to be used for electronic document creation, storage and retrieval. FCLA will be the first user of VI at NERDC with a free copy of a software product called Visual Info (VI) to be used for electronic document creation, storage and retrieval. FCLA will be the first user of VI at NERDC and will begin a pilot project using journal article data from IAC (and UMI if UMI ever agrees). VI also permits decentralized creation and storage of electronic documents so, for example, electronic reserve collections could be created locally and linked to LUIS using the facilities of VI. Jim added that he needed to explain the potential of the SP2 and VI to the Electronic Collections Committee the next time they meet.

16. Larry Miller reported that the only overnight delivery contract that we currently have is the one with Pony Express that charges \$6.95 per package. He said that many universities pay their courier charges to the BOR from university overhead while others charge back to individual departments. We need to contact our own campus mail rooms to see what the situation is on our campus. In a very brief discussion it was decided to refer the contract to the Expedited ILL Committee and ask them to develop a written program with a budget for expected costs that we can submit to the BOR for funding. Larry will so advise the committee.

17. Dale said that plans for a fall CRL workshop in Gainesville to be held just prior to the Joint Public/Technical Services Committee meeting have been made. All the directors have received email confirmation of the date, time, and number of participants expected from their institution. Dale will send out information about local motels in the near future. *Done, Jan. 1995 on email to directors.*

18. Larry reported very briefly that the Expedited ILL Committee has determined their recommendations for the final format for an electronic version of ILL on LUIS. They are keeping a close eye on the developments in Ohio which is leading the country in decentralized ILL. They are also gathering statistics on our mutual ILL traffic. Larry will send us the report by email and we will put it on the agenda for the next meeting.