State University Library Council

Meeting-Minutes
Wednesday, December 4, 1996, 8:00 a.m. to 3:00 p.m.
U. North Florida, Carpenter Library, Second Floor Conference Room
Jacksonville, Florida

Present

Anne Marie Allison- UCF; Dale Canelas- UF; Jim Corey- FCLA; Andrew Farkas- UNF; Sam Fustukjian- USF; Carolyn Gray- FGCU; Charles Miller- FSU; Larry Miller- FIU; William Miller- FAU, Helen Wigersma for Grady Morein- UWF; and Margaret Jones for Lauren Sapp- FAMU

Minutes

1. Agreement on agenda.

    Six items were added to the agenda. See # 10.1 and 17-21 below.

2. Correction to minutes of last meeting - September 11, 1996.

    Three typos were corrected on the Minutes of September 11.

3. Meeting dates for 1997.

    The directors agreed to meet Tuesday, 3/4/97 in Tallahassee; Tuesday, 6/3/97 in Pensacola; and September 17 for SUS Directors, September 18 for FCLA Board and CCLA Board in Tallahassee.

4. FCLA Director's Report

    Jim Corey provided an extensive handout outlining progress since our last meeting. Among his points: the FCLA plan is on the FCLA Web Server. This year, F'97 is the third year of the plan, so F'99 is the last year of the current plan. We need to find a way to involve our staff committees in developing a new plan. (See further discussion under # 10 below.)

    As reported previously, the CAVP approved an amendment to increase Five Year Plan Priority 4, "Databases" by $2.5 million for F '98. This was to be an independent part of the BOR budget request. However, at some point in the process, this was lost as a separate entry and was buried in the $25 million request to "Enhance Undergraduate Education" request. FCLA funding would have to come off the top of that allocation. However, in preparing budget documents, a BOR employee mistakenly allocated out the entire $25 million to each of the universities which left

FCLA with no earmarked funding. Each director was asked to advise their Provost of this dilemma and request support for funding FCLA at the Board level. There was also discussion of the confusion experienced by some Provosts between the $2.5 million for databases requested from the distance learning funds and the $2.5 million requested for FCLA. The two requests are quite different and directors agreed the most desirable is the increase in FCLA funding. Jim went on to update the directors on the complex series of events related to the Distance Education allocation and pointed out that it is a "long shot." Our Distance Education Subcommittee is working closely with Jim Corey and Charles Miller to influence the allocation of these funds. They are currently drafting a more detailed proposal.

Jim confirmed that FCLA has 4 priority queues: 1) production and quasi-production problems, 2) Library Management System (NOTIS) enhancements, 3) Electronic Collections requirements, and 4) Digital Library development. Within these categories, Jim provided a current status report on the progress of priorities in each.

5. Approval of the Joint Meeting '96 Recommendations. (Attachment #5)

The directors were presented the new priorities from the Joint Committee Meeting of 11/96 along with a list of the work that FCLA had carried over from previous years. The Directors approved the list as presented. As a corollary to this discussion, Jim asked that each university provide FCLA a list of the IP addresses of staff at their institutions who should have access to the archives at FCLA. Jim further commented that, from his perspective, the Joint Meeting had been a very good meeting and that he saw a transition toward the SUS committees taking a strong role in managing the meeting, an event that he is happy to see taking place. Several directors concurred that their staffs had also stated that they felt the meeting to have been an effective and interesting one.

6. Discussion/Action on Replacement of LUIS. (Attachment #6)

Discussion was deferred to item 10. b on the agenda.

7. Approval of PSPC/TSP Committee Recommendation (Attachment #7)

a. Approve Government Document Task Force

The directors approved appointment of the Government Document Task Force. This approval, however, occasioned a general discussion of the need to inform directors of the names of staff proposed to serve on new committees. Some directors felt more strongly than others on the issue, but none objected to being informed. To keep the process as easy as possible for the Chairs of the SUS committees, it was agreed that

since each library has a representative on the functional committees (ECPC, PSPC, and TSPC), and new groups will almost always be subgroups of these committees, each institutional representative would check prospective appointees to new task forces and sub committees with his/her own director.

8. Accept Authority Sub-committee Report (Attachment #8)

This report was enthusiastically accepted. Directors went out of their way to praise the quality of the report and to express thanks to the committee that wrote it.

This led several directors to state that the quality of the staff work being done by the committees is excellent and we are pleased about the quality of thoughtful consideration going into their recommendations.

9. Accept Report of the Technical Services Planning Committee (Attachment #9)

a. Approve Appointment of the format Integration Task Force This was approved.
b. Approve Appointment of the Binding Module Specification TF
c. Approve Appointment of the Serials Check-In Specification TF

The directors did not approve items 9.b and 9.c as presented, BUT they did approve the concept. The directors request that the co-chairs of the Tech Services committee read the preliminary report of the Implementation Planning Committee (which they did not have access to at the time they recommended these groups) and that they work with the chair of the Implementation Planning Committee to ensure that they do not create groups that overlap. The directors did approve appointment of 10.b below, therefore, the chairs need to determine how many groups are needed (it may well be the case that the proposed TSPC TF's are so specialized that they need to be done by different staff). We simply ask that each committee (TSPC and IPC) discuss how to get this done in the best way and draft careful charges that distinguish between the responsibilities of each group.

10. Discuss/Accept the Preliminary Report of the Implementation Planning Committee (IPC) and the Suggested Revisions Memo. (Attachment #10)

The report of the IPC was discussed along with a memo to the Directors which recommended some revisions to the recommendations of the IPC. The first issue discussed was a recommendation that the PSPC and the TSPC be combined. After considerable discussion, there was a strong concensus to keep them as they are presently organized. Other issues were discussed with their collateral recommendations, below.

a. Approve Strategic Planning Committee

This proposal was not approved, although the concept of a planning structure is. There was considerable discussion on this recommendation, on its impact on the current structure of the SUS groups (which most of the directors think are working quite effectively), and on the responsibility of the directors for overall planning. One director commented that in mulling over the report, the current structure of SUS library groups and the increasing specialization and interactiveness in research libraries, she got an idea that a steering committee which would include all the standing committee chairs plus a subgroup of the directors (perhaps 2 or 3), and an FCLA representative might increase communication between the groups and allow us to focus all efforts in a more systematic way. It should allow planning for statewide programs in various functional areas to go forward with the groups that have the expertise in that function (ECPC, PSPC, TSPC), but the steering committee could combine all work together, bringing an integrated strategic plan to the full directors' group for approval. The idea was still quite nebulous and needed a lot more thinking and discussion, but all the directors thought it worth following up. Thus, we ask the IPC to consider this proposal and recommend the best alternative to get planning and communication structured among the SUS groups.

b. Approve Integrated Library System Review Task Force

This Task Force was approved. We ask the chair of the IPC to talk with the co-chairs of the TSPC and jointly determine what shall be the responsibilities of whatever groups come out of your discussions. See the minutes under 9.b and 9.c above. In writing your charge(s), please consult with Jim Corey to make sure that it (they) cover(s) all of the requirements that FCLA will need to actually change systems. The overall TF needs to be small enough to get something done, must be widely representative (functional representation is more important than library representation), and must include an FCLA representative. There has to regular communication with the SUS libraries so that none feel left out of the process.

With regard to the future of NOTIS, Jim declared that FCLA is not freezing NOTIS right now because it would not be in our best interest to do so. SUS university systems that interface with NOTIS change regularly, NOTIS issues upgrades, and problems in the libraries crop up from time to time. Even with the best possible circumstances, it would be some years before we could switch to another system. And before we can do so, we need to have a number of requirements in place: 1) system architectural decisions, 2) cost estimates for budget planning, 3) an approved plan, 4) a process for evaluating LMS's,

5) a completed RFP, 6) the money to purchase a new system, 7) and the ability to implement the new system in phases while running NOTIS concurrently. Given this scenario, Jim estimated that it will be at least 1999-2000 before we can replace NOTIS and that in order to make a move by that date we will have to accomplish a considerable amount of work. And somehow, we would like to get user input on a possible new system.

Jim said FCLA staff would like a client-server system, but they don't know of one right now that meets our needs. Object oriented computing is leading in the direction of utilizing any database through direct connections. Some manufacturers are building web front ends on old systems. Others are building innovative new systems, and claim that their next system will give us everything we want, but they can't show it to us right now.

In discussing this issue, it was noted that many large libraries (Harvard among them) had done recent, extensive studies of the alternatives to NOTIS and had determined that at the time of the study, there was no alternative sufficiently stronger overall to justify the trauma of changing from NOTIS. On the other hand, NOTIS has sufficient drawbacks that it is well worth our determining what would be required in a system to meet our needs. The market is currently undergoing far-reaching change, and within a year or two, there may well be viable alternatives.

c. Approve Library System/Networking Committee

A recommendation of the "suggested revisions" memo suggested that the committee should be a discussion group because systems planning is integral to all other committees and should not take place in isolation. It was pointed out that this was the third time SUS staff had recommended the appointment of this committee. The first time was in 1994 when the appointment of PSPC and TSPC was recommend- ed; the second time was a year ago when we were asked to approve a one time meeting of the group for sharing information; this is the third time. Clearly, there are many who have a strongly felt need for the committee. The directors reached consensus that the committee be approved with the addition of an FCLA representative. The directors want the charge to clearly convey, however, that the System/Networking Committee should primarily be responsive to the need of the functional committees or the director's group for expertise in how to accomplish functional goals. It may also serve as a discussion group to share information and assist one another. The name of the committee is to be the System/Networking Committee as recommended; it should be understood that it is not the System/ Networking Planning Committee.

10.1 Approval of EC Committee Recommendation (Attachment #10.1.1)

The directors approved adding the 20 year backfile of Engineering Index to the LUIS databases at an approximate cost of $52,000.

It was noted that there are several other things we need from this group. One, as we have discussed at earlier meetings, is a well defined electronic reference collection to serve local as well as distance education needs. The other, as Jim pointed, out is a $5 million list of electronic collections that can be added to our electronic library. We have all agreed that there are many more needed databases than we currently own and we have asked for additional funds. However, we don't have the prioritized list that would help us make a good case for the additional funds.

11. Faculty input into FCLA and Database Decisions --Charles Miller

Charles Miller reported that there is considerable interest on the FSU campus in contributing to the decisions we make about the databases to add to FCLA. He proposed that we hold a one day workshop in Gainesville at FCLA for each director and one or two faculty from their institution. He would like us to make presentations that demonstrate the complexity involved in reaching these decisions. The directors agreed that a seminar would be useful. Charles will work with FCLA and ECC staff to implement. [Late notice: it is scheduled for April 9, 1997 at the FCLA Conference Room.]

12. Proposal for SUS Librarian Awards. (Attachment 12) --Charles Miller

There was strong support for some method to reward librarians with salary increases for meritorious performance similar to the TIP and PEP programs for academic faculty. At most universities, library faculty are excluded from both programs. There were some misgivings about the proposal actually being funded--several directors believed that the presidents are not nearly as interested in increasing librarian salaries as academic faculty salaries. However, all concurred that we should move forward with a modified proposal. Anne Marie Allison and Sam Fustukjian will assist Charles Miller clarifying and strengthening the proposal for the BOR.

13. FCLA Budget (Preliminary discussion, priority setting)

Because the FCLA is in the middle of a five year plan, a major overhaul of the budget is not in order at this time. However, we must have a much better description of how we would use $5 million effectively to purchase databases to support our students and faculty. Since we have requested $2.5 for FCLA plus the $2.5 from the Distance Education we are being we increasingly asked to justify such a major expenditure. As

a result, we will ask the Electronic Collections Committee in consultation with the Public Services Planning Committee to document a $5 million electronic e collection that includes at least a basic electronic full text reference collection and sets of full text databases, in addition to the electronic indexes already available, that would provide broad academic support in ng. all disciplines to students and faculty. We need this by the next meeting.

14. Discussion of fifth year of rolling Five Year Plan--Approval of new initiatives for discussion with CAVP in spring.

Because of the lengthy agenda and a lack of advance staff work, the directors concluded that a rolling FCLA Five Year Plan needs to be part of an overall SUS library plan and that we need the strategic planning committee (or an alternative recommendation from the IPC, see discussion above) to do a good deal of work before we can effectively deal with this issue.

15. SUS Library Fact Sheet--Discussion/Improvement --Larry Miller

Larry Miller distributed an SUS library fact sheet which is used by FLA lobbyists in working with the Florida Legislature. It had apparently been prepared in the past by the lobbyist. Larry had only a few days to make alterations, and asked each of the directors to read it over and email their comments to him by 12/12/96.

16. SUS Library Relationships with Community Colleges --Bill Miller

Bill Miller requested information on relationships between SUS university libraries and community colleges in which the universities provided access to proprietary databases for community college students. In most libraries, it seems to be limited to on-site use for those who walk into the SUS library.

17. SUS Book Generation Formula--Bill Miller

Bill, in reporting for the director's task force, explained that Sam Gowan had given him Carnegie data for each of the universities. The next step is to figure out what happens if each of the institutions uses these figures to benchmark the amount of funding that ought to be generated for that library. If we do not come up with an increase for the SUS as a whole, this will not work as a generation formula. Bill said that he would send data to each SUS library director and ask each to apply the formula and report the results back to him.

18. Lost Books--Helen Wigersma

Helen wanted to advise the directors that West Florida has received a protest against the flat rate for replacement of library materials and that the involved student may pursue a legal challenge. If so, the libraries may be forced to alter the process for replacing lost materials.

19. Librarian Salaries--Andy Farkas

Andy distributed a draft letter to the Board on the subject of library salaries which as all of know are terribly low and out of line nationally. The letter included statistics about the relative disadvantage of librarians vs. other fauclty on the UNF campus. Andy's argument was that if we provided the Board with statistics for all of the campuses showing similar disadvantage for librarians throughout the SUS, we could get the Board to take some action for librarians. Carolyn said that such data already existed for each university and that she could send this to Andy. There was agreement that this could be gathered and sent to the Board.

20. Letter from Charlie Reed re: Circulation to Community College Students.

The directors shared information on the subject of loaning library materials to community college students. All universities allow CC students to use anything on site; all provide ILL service to CC students. Some universities have reciprocal agreements with the community colleges in their area and do loan to local CC students, with or without limits on the number of volumes that can be circulated at any given time. Others, for a variety of reasons, do not have such agreements. The directors agreed that each university is in a unique position and that the decisions made conform to their particular situation.

21. Web LUIS Interface.

The PSPC has appointed a small TF that includes both librarians and programmers from FCLA to work on a front end to LUIS. Improving Web LUIS was the highest priority to come out of the Joint Meeting in November.