



**CSUL MEETING Agenda**  
Thursday, June 11, 2009  
Thomas G. Carpenter Library  
University of North Florida  
12:00 p.m. – 5:00 p.m.

Dinner 6:30 p.m. Mitchell's Fish Market, Saint John's Town Center, 5205 Big Island Drive, Jacksonville, Florida 32246

1. **Welcome and Introductions**
2. **Legislative Update** Janet Owen, UNF Lobbyist
3. **Agreement on Agenda**
4. **Minutes of March 5, 2009** [CSUL Attachment 1]
5. **Schedule of Next Meetings**
  - a. September 10-11, 2009 – UWF
  - b. December 3, 2009 CSUL and FCLA; December 4, 2009 FCLA/CCLA – New College
  - c. March 4-5, 2010 – UF
  - d. June 10-11, 2010 – FIU
  - e. September 2-3, 2010 – FAU
6. **CPC Quarterly Report** Rebecca Donlan [CSUL Attachments 2, 2a]

**Action Items**

- a. CPC requests CSUL's approval of our 2009 action plan, attached.
- b. CPC requests CSUL's approval to hold our annual joint ERS/CPC meeting on August 12-14, to finalize database selections.
- c. CPC requests CSUL's approval of the Guidelines for Review and Negotiation of License Agreements for Electronic Resources (Appendix G).

7. **PSPC Quarterly Report** Dawn Smith [CSUL Attachments 3, 3a]

**Action Item**

Per Barry Baker, UCF Director of Libraries, the ILLiad discount (Action Item 1) does not need CSUL approval. All the SUL ILL Departments will have to do is ask their Acquisition Departments the next time the ILLiad invoice is up for renewal is to tell Solinet (now Lyris) that OCLC has agreed to a 7% discount, the Florida rate. (Kristine Shrauger via email 5/19/2009)

8. **TSPC Quarterly Report** Jeffrey T. Bowen [CSUL Attachments 4, 4a, 4b]

**Action item**

The TSPC requests approval of a face-to-face meeting of catalogers

9. **TAG Quarterly Report** Michael Kucsak [CSUL Attachments 5, 5a, 5b, 5c]

**Action Items**

- a. TAG asks for CSUL's opinion on video conferencing solutions. TAG believes that video conferencing has enhanced communication at the committee level, though it may not be considered appropriate for use at CSUL quarterly meetings. While continued use of free products like Dimdim could suffice in the current economic climate, there have been problems reported with its use that could be eliminated by using a product like Elluminate.
- b. Request to refer discussion of issues related to digital collections in Mango to the PSPC and TSPC (From DISC Report; information only)

10. **Storage Facility Update** Judy Russell [CSUL Attachment 6]

**Establishing a shared collection before the Shared Storage Facility is completed –**  
Barry Baker

11. **Lyrasis Membership/OCLC Services** Jim Corey

12. **Administrative Salary Survey Update** Shirley Hallblade

13. **RDA/FRBR Tutorial** Bill Garrison

14. **Director's Discussion**



## **COUNCIL MEETING MINUTES**

Thursday, March 5, 2009  
 Grace Allen/Florida Studies Center Rooms,  
 4<sup>th</sup> Floor, University Library  
 University of South Florida  
 12:00 p.m. – 5:00 p.m.

Members Present: Lauren Sapp, FAMU (Chair); William Miller, FAU; Bill Garrison, USF; Barry Baker, UCF; Jim Corey, FCLA; John Ingram for Judy Russell, UF; Laurie Probst, FIU; Helen Wigtersma, UWF; Barbara Stites for Kathleen Miller, FGCU; Julia Zimmerman, FSU; Doug Langston, NCF/USFSM; Shirley Hallblade, UNF

Guests: Dawn Smith (FAU, PSPC); Rebecca Donlan (FGCU, CPC); Selma Jaskowski (UCF, TAG); Susan Heron (USF, TSPC); Jean Phillips, FCLA; Michele Newberry, FCLA; Claire Dygert, FCLA; Priscilla Caplan, FCLA; Kathleen Price (UF – Law); Wallace McLendon (UF – Health Sciences)

### **Welcome and Introductions**

The chair welcomed attendees and asked that everyone introduce themselves. The Chair thanked Bill Garrison for hosting the meeting. Bill Garrison provided information about logistics to the group. He also introduced the recorder, Matt Torrence, Assistant Librarian, USF Tampa Library and noted his experience as a court recorder.

### **Agreement on Agenda**

The agenda was approved with the following adjustments. Agenda items 5d and 6e moved to between 7 and 8. Helen reminded the group that Bill Garrison had agreed to give a ½ hour tutorial at the March CSUL meeting on RDA & FRBR. The tutorial will be rescheduled. Items added under Director's discussion included: ILL guidelines; facilitated meeting of CSUL directors; addition of medical and law directors as ex-officio; and reports from directors regarding strategies being used for budget cuts and technology fees.

### **Minutes of December 4, 2008 (Attachment 2)**

The minutes were approved after a motion from Laurie Probst, seconded by Bill Garrison.

### **Schedule of next meetings (Attachment 3)**

- o June 11-12, 2009 – UNF
- o September 10-11, 2009 – UWF
- o December 3, 2009 CSUL and FCLA; December 4, 2009 FCLA/CCLA – New College
- o March 4-5, 2010 - UF
- o June 10-11, 2010 – FIU
- o September 2-3, 2010 – FAU

Meetings have been projected out to 2013 by Raynette Kibbee at UCF. Agreement has already been made on meeting locations through December 2009. Agreement was reached on meeting locations from March 2010 through September 2010, after a motion by John Ingram, seconded by Barry Baker. A question was asked if we have considered not having 4 meetings for budget reasons or to make one a virtual meeting.

### **CPC Quarterly Report and Action Plans (Attachment 4) Rebecca Donlan**

**Action item** – send comments regarding action plans to the CPC through Kathy Miller.

Rebecca Donlan reported for the CPC. She presented for information and comment, the CPC 2-year Janus plan. The plan will be presented for action at the next CSUL meeting. The proposals are basically revenue neutral. Most costs are staff time. Her review of the plan included the tiered concept of e-book collections, basic core, overlap, items for consortia purchase, and unique items. The long-term endeavor will focus on core and unique collections. The basic idea is to get things going with the staff we have. On the issue of centralizing, or decentralizing collection activities, the idea is to move e-journal management (the big deal packages) into a centralized function. Phase one would lay the groundwork and identify potential vendor partners, through June 2010. See report for Phase 1 goals (pgs 7-10). Phase 2 – builds on Phase 1 (pgs 11-12) July 2010 – June 2012. CPC groups have been able to meet people and talents previously unknown, such as Betty Johnson (Stetson). CPC would like to centrally fund the core collection for the university system..

Jim Corey likes the chart on page 5 and requested a list of the core collections for universities. A question was asked about whether there is an SUS list of titles for an e-book package? That is the goal. Helen Wigersma responded that WCA project data may be used for this goal. The CPC decided to use the WCA project data from titles held by at least 5 of the universities, built from 2000-2008. After duplicated titles were removed, 3700 titles were owned by all SUS libraries. We need to include 5+, not just 5 libraries. The project will give a good snapshot. Good initial data should be ready by the June meeting at which time, we may be able to discuss Psych and Business as the first models. The emphasis is who the publishers are, with the idea of writing an approval plan.

The CPC will also be looking at things not FCLA funded that are owned by multiple libraries, as well as, the unmet curriculum needs list, to start bringing this into the core. CPC is on track for defining this. There is no money yet. CPC is starting to profile collections to see the profile differences. What is the popularity of e-books? Do the users want them? This has come up, but we really don't know. There are lots of anecdotal reports. The e-book preconference will address many of these issues. The current system may not be sustainable. Several questions followed. Are there better ways to get people to use e-books? Is there a need for portable technology (Kindle, Sony, etc.)? Are there any data on the types of book genres being used electronically? Are popular literature items driving this switch (like academic journals pushed serials online)? Are there any demographics? Claire Dygert (FCLA) and Melvin Davis (CCLA) are preparing a White Paper which should be ready by the end of April.

The Fund and Object Code Task Force is developing standard ways of coding expenditures for e-resources for easier tracking of the impact on acquisitions. The task force has contacted CPC to get started.

The Collection Valuation Task Force is on task. The task force will make sure we all have a common vision and reasonable valuation methodology. Replacement costs must be standardized by format.

There was a brief discussion of the Electronic Resources Quarterly Report. E-journal packages are still being negotiated. Claire Dygert indicated that the OUP license was unsustainable. She has negotiated a 12% savings, which has been accepted. She will be talking soon to Elsevier, Cambridge, and others. Wiley/Blackwell is starting to produce lists/invoices. There were problems merging the two. Negotiations for 2010 will start soon.

Bill Miller inquired if we are reporting progress to the BOG. Some reporting has been done at the request of R.E. Lemon. Bill indicated that such reports should come from Lauren Sapp, especially the piece about medicine and law.

**PSPC Quarterly Report and Action Plans (Attachments 5, 5a, 5b)** Dawn Smith  
**Action Item**

The ILL/Circ committee recommends that in order to save resources those libraries wishing to purchase ILLiad should consortially join together to purchase as one unit through the ILL/Circ subcommittee with the assistance of FCLA. It is recommended that an invitation be extended to ICUF institutions to join the consortia purchase. **After discussion, this issue was referred back to committee for more information.** Bill Miller is the liaison to the PSPC.

Discussion included issues around ILLIAD, ALEPH, and the pricing for the SUL, the community colleges et al. A consortia price would realize a 7% discount. Is pricing based on FTE? Will there be a discount to Law and Medicine libraries? Will satellites be priced differently? A suggestion was made that if we license ILLiad as a consortium; we may want to change the server from hosted, which would mean even more savings. It was noted that there is minimal stress to host the server (5% of one person's time). UWF is willing to go with a consortia model. We might need to standardize the month of renewal. Do they want a contract? Dawn will find out if we need separate/single contracts and how this will work.

The PSPC Action Plan for 2008-2009 was recently updated. Dawn highlighted several parts of the plan. Action item 2.1 (Increase patron empowerment) is new. To increase patron empowerment, self-checkout units have been or are being installed at several universities. Action item 5.2 deals with consortia assessment and benchmarks. The PSPC will look at current projects and report back to see if it is possible to create any benchmarks from these. An example that came out of the last conference call is that CSUL could consider doing a LIBQUAL with all the SULs in 2010 or 2011. Because of differing schedules for LibQual at the universities and accreditation schedules; however, we may need to look further out. One idea is that the supplementary questions would be designed for comparison across institutions. PSPC is working on reporting what is being done right now at the individual institutions.

#### **TSPC Quarterly Report and Action Plans (Attachments 6, 6a, 6b, 6c, 6d) Susan Heron**

##### **Action items**

TSPC requests approval of the 2009 TSPC action plan. **Approved**

Susan presented highlights of the report. Re-indexing is going well. The liaison to CPC helps to facilitate communication and savings. TSPC is heavy on cataloging when compared to acquisitions in membership. There is a proposal to start a subcommittee for acquisitions. This group might have different insight on how to cut costs. TSPC has sent out a message to the acquisitions list asking for librarian/expert participation. Acquisition librarians have been invited to the next TSPC. There is some interest in establishing a subcommittee. The TSPC will continue to gather ideas. Susan asked if CSUL needed annual reports in addition to quarterly reports. CSUL needs quarterly reports only.

The Action Plan for 2009 outlines projects and what the TSPC needs to continue. One objective (1.3) is to examine the USF OCLC Reclamation Project as a pilot for the other SULs. There was a brief discussion of the USF reclamation project. OCLC matched all 1.7 million of USF's records to make sure they were up to date. There was an 8% non-match, with 1452 things that didn't match at all. Most proprietary items and honors theses (1750) were not in OCLC. The project helped to clean up stuff that was lost and also helped with media and Lakeland symbols. Daniel Cromwell (FCLA) has been very helpful with this project. What was unexpected of the project? The advantage is that it will reduce the number of records in Mango. The project has not been difficult yet, mostly the planning and how to format the records. It took several days to get the file loaded, but they are working to fix this. The project didn't cost anything other than time. Every institution gets one free. Bill Garrison gives kudos to the staff for their efforts and the low number of problems at USF. He said that we had no clue what would pop up! He also noted that FCLA was very helpful. Everyone would like to learn from USF's experience. USF has prepared a draft report. Bill Garrison will provide CSUL members with a copy of the report after it is finalized. Timing on what to send is very important. Michele Newberry indicated that OCLC has 2 scheduling paths: Libraries with WorldCat local and libraries without WorldCat local. USF was on a fast track because their libraries have WorldCat local.

Objective 1.4 concerns the Marcive data loads. Did PSPC make a decision on this? PSPC will need to talk with Nancy Cunningham and Rebecca Bichel. There was going to be a description of the vision they had on how these records would appear. There is a way to have some of these things show up even if you don't have the record. PSPC just wants to see what it will look like. A description of what is needed should be provided. This type of data could overwhelm a smaller catalog (like New College). Maybe records could be loaded to the union catalog, but not the local? It was noted that some of these tasks have resource implications for FCLA staff. This is an ongoing dilemma as we look to save costs. Improving access to Mango (1.1) was really important last year, but now this is quiet. Some of these objectives are placeholders. There was praise for the TSPC report model. There was one comment that putting action plans into standard format might be beneficial. The PSPC plan is very similar. There was agreement that all action plans would follow the TSPC format with the addition of a status column.

Quarterly reports of the Authorities Subcommittee and the Metadata Subcommittee were mentioned as being self explanatory.

**TAG Quarterly Report and Action Plans (Attachment 7, 7a, 7b, 7c)** Selma Jaskowski  
Selma reviewed highlights of the Quarterly Report. The major focus has been on video conferencing. WebEx has gone away. UNF completed their reviews and Elluminate is the top choice. Gail Clement and Michael Kucsak have volunteered to look more deeply. CCLA has been using Elluminate via the FDLC license. It will accommodate 6 simultaneous speakers and hundreds of participants. A new pricing model just came out. The price given by the vendor was \$10,000 for 1,000 FTE, which would cover all SUL librarians and work out to be around \$1,000 per institution. How would this be distributed (based on size and FTE)? There is no final information on this yet. All of these videoconferencing products do almost the same thing, basic meeting software with chat, whiteboard, etc. There was some frustration with Adobe Connect. Audio problems have been observed. What does the group want? Is this to replace face-to-face meetings? Can the committees use these products? Should we be thinking about including bibliographic instruction? Right now, the committee is considering only library faculty. How does this compare to conference call costs? Helen reported that UWF uses Suncom reservationless voice conference services calls at \$50.00 per call. There was general discussion about how the libraries use this as well as university distance learning agencies. Wallace McLendon noted that researchers are also familiar with other projects/considerations such as AccessGrid.

Selma reported that the quarterly report from Digital Initiatives Subcommittee (DISC) concerns various issues related to Digitool. It has been a labor intensive exercise, but everyone is encouraged. Issues with Digitool are ongoing. The committee is starting to create formal and informal communication structures with other committees where there is overlap.

The TAG 2009 Action Plan reflects that the committee is following a plan to examine the technology landscape. The committee is available to other committees when needed. The committee collaborates with the DISC. TAG will add AccessGrid to the list of items under review. The committee will investigate whether or not existing Elluminate licenses will allow us to use the UF service for those libraries that don't have the resource. Wallace indicated that medical libraries are looking at ways to piggyback on technology that will increase security with the rise of electronic patron records and other medical information funding. Awareness of these packages will allow libraries to participate with these projects when applicable.

**Unmediated Borrowing – (Attachment 5c, on agenda at 5c)** Julia Zimmerman  
Julia gave an overview of unmediated borrowing. Most of the ILS systems now have U-Borrow links across a number of systems. Once a user finds the item he wants, he identifies himself and where he wants the book delivered. Behind the scenes, the system routes the request to the lending institution. They get the item, mark it, and put it in a bin/bag for transport. The cost of this transaction is very low compared to typical ILL transactions (\$1 compared to \$14-17, including staff time). It is cheap and convenient. Books available are vastly expanded and the ease of

requests is also very good. It is a huge recruiting tool for faculty, with access to additional library holdings through a very easy process. The task force had unanimous agreement that this is a good thing for FCLA and CSUL to pursue.

Next, Julia reviewed the steps for moving forward. The task force considered the best platform, ILLIAD or ALEPH, but did not reach a consensus on costs of a favorite. Jean Phillips and Jennifer Kuntz (FCLA) have been putting together a chart to use to determine which one might work best. We also need some functional specs for them to use to develop the next step. The task force recommended that we determine policies. It may be very difficult to get everyone to agree on borrowing, fines, etc. This group does not want to have different loan periods. We need to be consistent for this. The task force recommended that we should start soon, if we want to go forward with this. The task force would like more input from libraries of all sizes, particularly the smaller ones. Helen indicated that UWF is willing to help and provide smaller-library input and perspective.

Assessment will be very important and must be planned from the beginning. Good management information is also very important. Usability studies are important. Training on how to get users to the union catalog is important. For simplicity, we could start with a system that just does "returnables." Start simple with the books. Increased courier costs should be built into the RFP. This would definitely increase costs. Presently, FCLA pays the courier for a certain amount. Medical, law, and branch libraries would also have a voice in this. Discussion included fines and fine reconciliation at the end of the year. Concerns about load balancing and the smaller libraries being empty should also been addressed. The system is constructed so that no one is inordinately disadvantaged. It is very popular with users. It has taken off at other places and required no additional staff (students used in some cases).

Further discussion included experiences in other libraries and the agreements and consensus necessary to proceed. What is the student-ILL relationship/expectation now? Shared patron files will allow UF students to make a request at USF and pick it up at UWF, for example. This type of system would make collaborative collection development a possibility. We could use other school records and borrowing records to make collection decisions.

Julia reviewed the first three points on the executive summary. A pilot project is the next step. This will help determine potential costs. It was noted that Community Colleges use ALEPH ILL, but none of the universities use ALEPH for ILL.

#### **Single Bib Task Force Update - (Attachment 6d, on agenda as 6d) Laurie Probst**

Laurie indicated that the report went out two weeks ago. It was a difficult task, but the task force figured out what they needed to do and laid out a potential timetable. The recommendation from the task force is:

...that the state university libraries begin moving in this direction, beginning with an initial discovery phase for the eventual migration of all of the state university libraries to a catalog architecture based on a single bibliographic record for each unique item, to be shared by all libraries containing that item.

Laurie indicated that it is hard to document costs and staff time. The group from TSPC had a good list of timetables, built on this in their report. We need to go try it and see if it's manageable. The problem areas are: 1.) discovery tools; 2.) delivery tools; and 3.) inventory control. Inventory control presents the biggest challenge. In struggling with these, someone from UCLA helped clarify their costs. Inventory control is our biggest problem. U-Borrow will deal with delivery and discovery is for another committee. A draft charge attached for the other committee is included in the report. The timetable is on page 6. It will take at least 15 months (July 2010). It is an aggressive time table, but there's a lot of work. There are several steps. First, is to merge bibliographic records. Secondly, multiple ADMs might require local control. This includes lots of

programming requirements. Then we look at OPAC as part of transition (a third step, if we are going forward). Page 7 has the pieces of the project.

There were lots of comments after the review. Technical services librarians have some concerns. The language was perceived as hostile, but not meant to be that way at all. The task force was looking at a high-level for what we need to do to look forward. We need to be bold, but some concerns were voiced. Some found the wording unfortunate. There was no identification of costs. There was concern that this is not possible yet. There were concerns about the complexities of serials cataloging. Some technical services librarians were complimentary, but know this is a huge project. Helen Wigersma added that current budget and staffing issues are a concern, but this project should benefit us (and any loss of positions) in the long run. Bill Garrison indicated that we will be best served by a single-bib structure in the long run. A concern was voiced that we might not get a huge savings without this type of merge, as we have already cut many costs. Laurie sees massive benefits down the road, but the turmoil will be early and often.

Several questions and issues were asked and discussed. Susan Heron asked if we should be working with CCLA on this. When is the right time to do this? How are multiple formats for the same item treated? Laurie commented that these will be policy choices. There will be more process issues than technical. The report at end of Phase 2 will bring us to the decision point on the other libraries. Single Bib is not critical to unmediated borrowing, but it could help it. Which receives the higher priority? The storage facility is easy to set up under single-bib; otherwise it's much more complicated. CPC and Special Collections groups raised the concern of local holdings, as have medical and law libraries. Laurie indicated that Mesh headings, NLM numbers, etc., can all be preserved. Is single-bib necessary for next ILS? Laurie indicated that it makes migration easier, especially after talking to catalogers. We will be in transition for 3-5 years regardless. Single-bib is more important for this kind of planning.

There was further discussion of this project, vs. unmediated borrowing (big user impact) and single-bib (better for new ILS, etc.). Both are critical, but we need to start one first. The OPAC group probably could look at the discovery aspect. What other systems have tried this? Is the CCLA option the best one seen by the group? Where are other experiences? There are quite a number: Maryland (closest), Minnesota (PALS), Australian group. Other consortia using ILS's have tried this. Maryland shares too much, but the sharing of the bib records has worked well. We will continue with separate ADMs. The AUS model may be closest. The California Bibliographic Task Force Report was also highly recommended reading. This is a path toward the discovery tool and using WorldCat local to create a national catalog. If we go this direction, the error from one library's entry may last forever. Also there will be savings in running tape loads. There is a lot of potential for savings in authority. The California group also planned to set up separate tech services operation (out of state), but this was rejected. We may be able to divide responsibility by subject areas or by other facets.

Several more questions followed. Should we have regional experts by material type, format, or subject? How perfect do we need to be? How do we deal with all the uniqueness? What's worth keeping? How do we keep these little things (donated by, in honor of, etc.)? How do we search? Will the task force help people who don't like the single-bib model to change their mind? What is the case for single-bib? Laurie asked what the issues are if we don't start working on this. You'll continue to invest in authorities. If we don't start working on this, we won't have time to work on our special collections and unique documents (big deal). ILS companies are not putting dollars into current stuff; they are looking at the next generation of systems. All the large consortia are looking at single-bib and the single ILS may be going away, according to Bill Garrison. One change can now efficiently affect all libraries. There was a suggestion that the original task force become the steering committee and that they bring in others for the policy and testing pieces. This must be led by small group, but will require more participants. Two to three libraries will "volunteer" and the staff of these libraries could help work with these groups. A quick poll was taken to see if there are vacancies in technical services departments. Most responses indicated vacancies in technical services. This is a reality for libraries. How is this different from RLIN? Can



we use their expertise? We would definitely go to these groups for advice. Jean Phillips (FCLA) from Maryland could also provide some insight. Do we want a technical services retreat to let them think and collaborate about the priorities? Protect the quality of the catalog, but what do you mean by quality? Buy-in is really important...how do we achieve it, by conference, meetings, etc.? Can we do both pilots (U-Borrow and Single-Bib at the same time)?

Jim Corey provided a draft handout: FCLA ILS Project Scenarios, which was discussed next. The handout provided a comparison of timelines. Other projects, like Marcive, are not even on the list. Much of the work does not involve FCLA, especially the early portions. Specifications won't be perfect on the 1<sup>st</sup> try, but we could learn from Maryland. Technical services needs to do a ton of preliminary work. The UB Task Force did not work out all the steps, so there is more work to develop a second draft model. UB would start in October, or three months later in January. UB implementation may come at the end of the semester (early August) rather than the middle? We can't plan on that yet, so it may be a full year from the completion of V19 of ALEPH. Launch in Dec. /Jan. instead of October? Surely this is a possibility. The handout is a generic view of what gets involved with each cataloging system. Single-bib will help us to do reindexing in 2 weeks rather than 8 months. No more doing stuff 11 times when we can do it once! Can UB be Simultaneous with Reclamation? It would help the merger to single-bib if libraries, like USF, began their catalog reclamations. This requires cataloger time, but not as much as you'd think. Daniel Cromwell and Susan Heron did most of it at USF. Laurie Probst suggested that If 80% of FCLA time is for support, we may need to move things around to give us even more time. If these really are top priorities, the group needs to move forward. The OPAC group already feels they are not a top priority. These two projects are flipped on the chart...3 months for one, 6 months for the other. UB is the bigger bang for our patrons. There are three questions: move forward with UB; move forward with Single-bib; and which takes priority?

### **Action Items**

Shirley Hallblade made a motion to accept the Unmediated Borrowing Task Force Report and to adopt its recommendations. The motion was seconded by John Ingram. It was accepted unanimously by CSUL.

Bill Garrison moved to accept the report of Single-bib Task Force; to accept the recommendation that the state university libraries adopt a catalog architecture based on a single bibliographic record for each unique item, to be shared by all libraries containing that item; and to test the concept in a pilot project with a test catalog database using the ALEPH databases of two or three universities. The motion was seconded by Julia Zimmerman. The motion was approved unanimously.

Shirley Hallblade moved that Unmediated Borrowing project be considered priority #1. The motion was seconded by John Ingram. It was approved unanimously.

Who will follow up with UB recommendations? Julia Zimmerman and Shirley Hallblade will serve as co-chairs for the Unmediated Borrowing project. Doug Langston will also work with this group.

Laurie Probst and the Single Bib Task Force will continue as the steering committee for the single-bib project, bringing in others for policy and testing as necessary.

Projects such as Genload development; Marcive; Archon; OPAC may have lower priority.

### **Storage Facility Update**

#### **Action Items**

The Task Force recommends adhering to the one copy rule for print journals.

The CPC recommends that consideration be given to hiring a state wide preservation coordinator based at the storage facility.

There was no report on this agenda item. There was a question about action item 2. This is not a current CPC recommendation. The agenda item came in an e-mail from Judy. John will take this item back to Judy or clarification.

#### **Administrative Salary Survey Update** (Shirley Hallblade)

Shirley provided a handout to CSUL Directors only. She reviewed the handout. A new method is being used based on ARL salary codes to make comparison a little easier. Things are spread over too many categories, so she grouped them. Footnotes and explanations are included. Directors were asked to review to see if codes are appropriate or if things need to be moved around for the next version. She is also considering grouping the larger libraries, or other ways to make the numbers more meaningful. Chronicle of Higher Ed survey data may also help. Do we need medical and law library information if they don't report to our Deans'? Shirley asked CSUL directors to make notes and return to her. She will also resend the spreadsheet with the codes. She is still trying to figure out systems/digital services jobs. These are all over the place, but do need to be listed together. A brief discussion followed. What about librarians vs. non-librarians...is this important? Helen does not like CUPA data (Median), done by category; it still doesn't always reflect everything.

#### **OCLC Service** (Laurie Probst)

Laurie met with Kate Nevins and OCLC director of sales and Danny Overstreet. They are now direct service providers and will be asking us to revise our contracts and symbols. She is not sure if there will be cooperative or shared contracts. This is something to think about. Are there services and/or benefits to share? Now is the time to begin looking. Overstreet will be visiting locations soon. What types of changes do they want? Kate thinks they'll still be in the picture, but we'll have a choice of where to go for our OCLC services. We should compare notes. There will be no service fee to SOLINET. Will we need to bid for this through the state process as there is no sole-source situation? We must do this in concert. If OCLC starts looking at all these, certain fees paid by SOLINET and discounts (access fee) may go up. **Put this on the agenda for June meeting.**

#### **CSUL Committee Structure and Alternatives** (Unfinished Action Items from November 14, 2008 Meeting Minutes) (**Attachment 8**)

**Action** Postponed to the June 2009 Meeting.

#### **Textbook Affordability** (Laurie Probst)

Laurie suggested institutional analysis on current textbook problems. We could be a partial solution, but there are big differences by level and subject. We could do some analysis of the items already in our reserve collections. Laurie can report from FIU's perspective.

#### **Director's Discussion**

There was a question as to whether directors should sign the ILL Guidelines, as indicated in the March, 2009 Minutes. After discussion, it was decided that guidelines do not need to be signed, just approved by CSUL. PSPC, through Dawn Smith, will make sure that the guidelines indicate approval by CSUL on December 4, 2008 and that the document is in a permanent place and on CSUL website.

Medical and law library directors were invited to the March meeting. We need to decide if they will continue to come to CSUL meetings. Medical directors indicated that they had a phone conference with other directors and would like to share their observations and offer an opinion paper about their inclusion. It is not a burning issue. Medical and Science are very uneven, including people just getting started and cutting edge people. Kathleen Price would like to discuss the issue with law directors. There is interest in sharing data. Communication is a motive of their inclusion, but there is no indication of bad communication as they are represented on standing committees. They are at CSUL's beckon call. It was noted that since Judy Russell came, they are more up to date. They'll leave it up to CSUL to decide the representation and the

invitations. One suggestion is that once a year they could attend formally, but be invited and receive the minutes all the time. Do they need one person for continuity? The Medical and Law directors will share with their colleagues and report back with a group response.

There is no longer a desire for facilitated meeting of CSUL Directors.

Budget cut sharing will be discussed tomorrow along with technology fees.

The meeting was adjourned at 5:08 p.m.

Recorder: Matt Torrence, Assistant Librarian, USF Tampa Library  
Minutes compiled by Lauren Sapp from transcript supplied by recorder

**Council of State University Libraries  
Collections Planning Committee**

Quarterly Report: June 2009

This report includes discussions and activities from committee meetings conducted via conference call on March 10, April 21, and May 12, and via e-mail. Also included are the quarterly report from the Electronic Resources Subcommittee (Appendix A), results of the ERS Database Prioritization Project (Appendix B), the quarterly report from the Health/Medical Libraries Task Force, a letter from the Collection Valuation Task Force (Appendix C), and information from the Health/Medical Libraries Task Force (Appendices D, E, and F). Sent separately are the 2009 CPC action plan and a proposal for central management of e-journal packages.

**Action Items**

1. CPC requests CSUL's approval of our 2009 action plan, attached.
2. CPC requests CSUL's approval to hold our annual joint ERS/CPC meeting on August 12-14, to finalize database selections.
3. CPC requests CSUL's approval of the Guidelines for Review and Negotiation of License Agreements for Electronic Resources (Appendix G).

**Information Items**

**1. Proposal for centralized management of e-journal packages**

One item on CPC's 2009 action plan (Objective 3.2) is to centralize the management process for our shared e-journal packages to the extent that it is possible to do so. Centralizing e-journal package management with a single subscription agent would greatly facilitate FCLA's and the individual libraries' ability to track, analyze, and troubleshoot package content, a process that currently takes hours of staff time at each university. Claire Dygert has researched journal vendors to determine which of them can handle consortia. At present, about half of the SULs are using a subscription agent for some or all of their e-journal packages. Many libraries would save considerably on service charges. A few of the libraries would see an increase in service charges, but none would incur the staff time presently spent on contract negotiation, e-journal package title and holdings checking, access troubleshooting and resolution, and journal activation. CPC and ERS plan to discuss the plan in detail at our annual meeting. Claire's proposal, cost impact analysis, and confidential price quote will be distributed separately.

## **2. Electronic Resources Subcommittee**

ERS's quarterly report is attached (Appendix A). They completed the database prioritization project which will be used in this summer's renewal process. The FCLA databases were reviewed by a group from each university library, led by the local ERS representative, and by the ERS Subject Working Groups. Each database received an institutional ranking of 1-3 (1=cancellation would cause greatest damage to library services, 3=cancellation would cause least damage). Twenty-seven databases were designated as 1, or core resources. The remaining 32 databases were analyzed and ranked in order of importance. The project report is attached. (Appendix B).

FCLA staff are gathering and analyzing e-journal usage statistics to determine whether some high-cost, low-use journals can be dropped from our packages as they come up for re-negotiation.

ERS is considering a proposal from Thomson-Reuters to include non-FCLA funded databases such as Journal Citation Reports into a consortial contract. ISI is stating a potential cost increase higher than those of our other vendors but suggests that a consortial contract would save percentage points on renewal pricing. Claire is investigating the parameters of this deal but all SUL parties agree that this merger would not be feasible unless we can be billed separately.

## **3. Object Code Task Force**

The task force met and determined that all SULs are in favor of homogenizing object codes for e-resources. The Acquisitions subcommittee of TSPC reviewed the task force's list of proposed definitions for e-resource types, which is based on ACRL reporting guidelines for electronic resources, and made some suggestions which have been incorporated into the next version of the document. Claire Dygert, Donna Alsbury, and Ellen Bishop will compile a list of uniform object codes for each e-resource definition, create reports that can search by previously-used object codes (for historic reporting), and assign material type codes based on object codes. These tasks will be completed by June 15, reviewed by the task force members, and forwarded to CPC for discussion.

## **4. Collection Valuation Task Force**

The Task Force chair, Linda Barrette (FAMU-Law), has contacted the law and medical/health libraries (Appendix C) to solicit their opinions about being included in the general valuation pool or separated out based on their higher material costs. To date the task force has had little response. Otherwise, the task force has

determined that the Bowker Annual average academic book price is the generally accepted replacement unit cost for books, but other materials are proving more difficult to define. The task force will continue to discuss these issues over the summer and hope to have more definitive information soon.

#### **5. Health/Medical Libraries Task Force**

The Health/Medical Libraries Task Force quarterly report is attached (Appendix D). To date, they have jointly purchased eight core resources at a savings of 5% to 50%, or a total of \$319,333.72 off list price (Appendix E). They met at the Florida Health Sciences Library Association conference in March and welcomed the University of Miami and Nova Southeastern University to their group. They also decided to pursue a joint e-monograph collection and contacted vendors to determine their interest (Appendix F).

#### **5. Special Collections Subcommittee**

The Special Collections Subcommittee has had monthly conference calls with the primary goal of sharing news and ideas. The group reports that there are problems with sufficient internal resources such that few of them can commit to a major project. The group discussed doing a joint grant to CLIR as part of their Hidden Resources Project (<http://www.clir.org/hiddencollections/index.html>), but only one university responded and there were not enough people to work on the proposal to meet the June 15<sup>th</sup> deadline. Without digitization funds, the SCS is uncertain of its charge and future direction.

Respectfully submitted,  
Rebecca Donlan, FGCU  
Chair, Collections Planning Committee  
June 4, 2009

## Appendix A

### State University Libraries - Electronic Resources Subcommittee Quarterly Report May 20, 2009

This report reflects discussions and activities from conference calls on March 2, 2009, April 6, 2009 and May 4, 2009, plus e-mail activities.

#### Action Items:

There are no action items for this report.

#### Information items:

##### Electronic Journal Packages

1. **Springer and Wiley/Blackwell Cost Reduction Strategy** – FCLA staff is in the process of gathering and analyzing e-journal usage statistics for Springer, Blackwell and Wiley. These statistics will be discussed in future meetings to determine if we can achieve any savings through cancelation of low-use titles from these e-journal packages.

Claire Dygert has commenced talks with several vendors to explain the critical financial situation of our consortial members as a preliminary step in trying to negotiate some savings in e-journal renewals.

2. **Oxford University Press** – Negotiations for the 2009/2010 contract are complete. OUP accepted the alternative model that Claire Dygert proposed, which reduced the overall cost of the package by 12%. In addition, the price cap for 2010 has been reduced.

##### Databases

1. **SciFinder Scholar** – A poll was taken as to when to begin access to the SciFinder Web and how many of our 21 ports should be changed to the new service. The outcome was to change 12 ports as soon as possible. A majority of ERS members expressed a preference to have all except 1-2 ports changed by Fall Semester. Claire contacted CAS. Twelve ports should be changed to Web by May 30 at the latest.
2. **Thomson Reuters (ISI)** – Thomson Reuters representatives recently visited FCLA and several institutions. They are stating a potential increase higher than the majority of our other renewal vendors. Representatives have suggested that combining our renewals of non-FCLA databases, such as Journal Citation Reports, into a consortial contract could “save us percentage points” on our renewal pricing. Claire also had this discussion with Thomson. Both FCLA and individual institutions state this merger would not be feasible unless libraries could be individually billed.

#### E-resource Issues & Initiatives

1. **ERS Database Prioritization Project** – The ERS charged a Database Prioritization Project Steering Committee in March to determine how best to move forward with the task of prioritizing our consortial databases. The project is well underway and a report of progress is attached.

**ERS Organizational Items**

1. **New Members** - The ERS welcomed new members Nancy Dulniak (FAMU-LAW) and Chris Poehlmann (UF) this quarter.
2. **Vacancy in Vice-Chair/Chair-Elect Position** - As Chris Poehlmann joins ERS as the new UF representative, the position of Vice-Chair/Chair-Elect will become vacant. The incumbent will serve as Vice-Chair/Chair-Elect for the remainder of 2009, then assume the position of Chair for a 2-year appointment beginning in January 2010.

The ERS Chair would like to formally thank Michele Crump for both her time on the ERS and for her assistance as Vice-Chair/Chair-Elect.

3. **ERS Participation in CPC Projects** - Members of the ERS assisted in a number of CPC projects such as the helping the CPC Object Codes Task Force define e-resources and Janus roundtables at the Collection Development/Resource Sharing Conference.
4. **ICOLC** – ERS Chair Valerie Boulos, CPC member John Ingram, and FCLA Assistant Director Michele Newberry attended the Annual ICOLC meeting in April. John and Valerie reported on the conference discussions during the May CPC and ERS conference calls.
5. **ERS at FLA** – Athena Hoepper (UCF) presented the ERS report at the State University Library Interest Group meeting at the FLA Annual Conference in May 2009.

Respectfully submitted,  
Valerie Boulos, Chair, Electronic Resources Subcommittee



## Appendix B

### ERS Prioritization Project Report of Progress

Submitted May 20, 2009

At the March ERS Conference Call, a Prioritization Project Steering Committee\* was charged to determine how to proceed with the ERS Database Prioritization Project. The Steering Committee decided to use the following article as a basis for prioritizing the collection:

- Gerri Foudy, Alesia McManus, Using a Decision Grid Process to Build Consensus in Electronic Resources Cancellation Decisions, *The Journal of Academic Librarianship*, Volume 31, Issue 6, November 2005, Pages 533-538, ISSN 0099-1333, DOI: 10.1016/j.acalib.2005.08.005.  
(<http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/B6W50-4HF5KHG-3/2/fff9982332aefdeec8be363686d85e13>)

For Phase One of the project, ERS members and Subject Working Group Chairs were provided with the following documents: (1) article citation and link; (2) SUS ERS Development Policies and Procedures; (3) list of FCLA-funded resources with usage data, cost per search, usage trends, and percentage of increase each year; (4) Board of Governors university data on FTEs per program area. ERS members were asked to use the criteria in the article and the documents as a basis for discussion within their institutions. Members would submit an institutional ranking of 1-3 for each database on the list. The Subject Working Group Chairs were asked to rank a subset of databases relevant to their subject areas and also return a 1-3 ranking. As seen in the Foudy and McManus article, the numerical rankings were defined as follows:

**Priority 3:** These are the resources that... could be canceled with the least damage to library services. A small number of users would be inconvenienced or underserved, other access options may be available, or the resource may be redundant to some extent.

**Priority 2:** The cancellation of these resources would more severely damage library services. A greater number of campus users would be inconvenienced or underserved, other access options may be limited, or the resource is less redundant.

**Priority 1:** The cancellation of these resources would cause the greatest damage to library service. Significant inconvenience for greater numbers of library users would result. The collections would be severely weakened.

Foudy and McManus, p. 536-7.

When all results were returned, the Steering Committee determined Phase Two of the project. This phase consisted of two parts. One part consisted of breaking apart the databases in the OCLC Research Package. This move was based on feedback from the Subject Working Groups, who felt it was difficult to provide one ranking for the myriad of resources in the package.

Phase Two also consisted of providing further ranking information on databases which scored a Median of 2 or 3 in Phase One of the project. Databases which scored a 1 in Phase One were considered to be "core" resources, with no further analysis required. Twenty-five databases were further analyzed by ERS members and their institutions to determine how well they met the following criteria from the Foudy and McManus article: Access, Cost-Effectiveness, Breadth/Audience, and Uniqueness. Consistent with the decision to break apart the OCLC Research Package, ERS members were asked to score those titles as well, for a total of 32 databases prioritized at Priority 2/3.

All rankings from institutions and Subject Working Groups were combined to create a Prioritization List. This Prioritization List will be used in ERS discussions on possible cancellations during our renewal period this summer.

---

\* Prioritization Project Steering Committee membership consists of: Brenda Wright (FAMU), Claire Dygert (FCLA), Eleanor Lomax (FAU), Michele Crump (UF), and Valerie Boulos (FIU).

## **Database Titles and Rankings**

### **1) Databases which were not ranked:**

- MARCIVE
- LCSH / NAF
- CAMIO - although initially included in ranking deliberations, ERS decided CAMIO should not be included in the Prioritization List because it was integrated in the State Library OCLC contract in 2009

### **2) “Core” databases.** These databases were assigned a rank of Priority 1 in Phase One of the Project:

- ACM Digital Collection
- APA PsycInfo
- BIP (with Reviews)
- America: History & Life
- ATLA Religion
- CINAHL (with PreCINAHL)
- EconLit
- Historical Abstracts
- Compendex
- Academic OneFile
- Business & Company Resource Center
- Gale Virtual Reference Library Hosting Fee
- Literature Resource Center
- LexisNexis Academic
- LexisNexis Congressional
- ABI Inform Complete
- Criminal Justice Periodicals Index
- Complete Cambridge Sciences Collection
- CSA RefWorks
- PQ Dissertations & Theses
- PQ National Newspaper Core
- PAIS
- Physical Education Index
- Ulrich’s
- Standard & Poor’s NetAdvantage
- ValueLine
- Wilson Databases (including OmniFile Mega Full Text)

**3) Lowest ranking databases, displayed by Average and Median**

<b>AVERAGE</b>	<b>Vendor</b>	<b>Database</b>	<b>MEDIAN</b>	<b>Vendor</b>	<b>Database</b>
13.64	OCLC	SCIPPIO	14.00	Gale	BCRC Newsletters
13.64	OCLC	Hand Press Books	14.00	OCLC	Index to 19th Century American Art Periodicals
13.36	Gale	BCRC Newsletters	14.00	OCLC	Hand Press Books
13.00	Gale	BCRC PROMPT	13.00	BEP	BEPress (Research Now)
13.00	PQ	AABD	13.00	Gale	BCRC PROMPT
12.94	OCLC	Index to 19th Century American Art Periodicals	13.00	PQ	AABD
12.64	BEP	BEPress (Research Now)	13.00	OCLC	SCIPPIO
12.27	Gale	Contemporary Women's Issues	12.00	Gale	Business & Industry
12.25	PQ	Hoover's KnowledgeBase	12.00	Gale	B&I Tablebase
12.15	OCLC	Chicano Database	12.00	Gale	Contemporary Women's Issues
11.91	Gale	B&I Tablebase	12.00	IEE	INSPEC
11.82	Gale	Business & Industry	12.00	PQ	Hoover's KnowledgeBase
11.33	IEE	INSPEC	11.00	Gale	Biography RC w/Marquis
11.27	Gale	LRC Twayne's	11.00	Gale	History RC
11.27	OCLC	History of Science, Technology & Medicine	11.00	Gale	LRC Scribner's
11.18	Gale	LRC Scribner's	11.00	Gale	LRC Twayne's
11.18	OCLC	FRANCIS	11.00	PQ	Ethnic Newswatch
11.00	PQ	Mechanical & Transportation Engineering	11.00	OCLC	Chicano Database
10.73	Gale	Health & Wellness RC	11.00	OCLC	History of Science, Technology & Medicine
10.73	PQ	AGRICOLA	10.00	Gale	Health & Wellness RC
10.45	PQ	Bibliography of the History of Art	10.00	PQ	AGRICOLA
10.45	PQ	Ethnic Newswatch	10.00	PQ	Bibliography of the History of Art
10.27	PQ	GenderWatch	10.00	PQ	GenderWatch
10.27	PQ	Civil Engineering Abstracts	10.00	PQ	Mechanical & Transportation Engineering
10.18	Gale	Legal Trac	10.00	OCLC	FRANCIS
10.09	Gale	History RC	9.00	Ebsco	RILM
9.91	Gale	Biography RC w/Marquis	9.00	Gale	Gale Directory Library
9.82	PQ	Avery Index to Architectural Periodicals	9.00	Gale	Legal Trac
9.36	PQ	GeoRef	9.00	PQ	Avery Index to Architectural Periodicals
9.27	Ebsco	RILM	9.00	PQ	Civil Engineering Abstracts
8.91	Gale	Gale Directory Library	8.00	PQ	GeoRef
8.61	OCLC	Anthropology Plus	7.00	OCLC	Anthropology Plus

**Appendix C**

CPC, Collection Valuation Task Force  
 Message to Health/Medical and Law Libraries  
 5/14/09

The Collection Valuation Task Force was charged with developing objective criteria and guidelines to ensure consistent valuation and insurance coverage of library materials. One of the issues is whether to value medical/health sciences and law collections separately as their costs/value may not be, accurately, reflected by valuations of general academic collections. The Task Force has been gathering information on valuation issues and would like those of you who have Medical/Health Sciences and/or Law programs to discuss the following information with your Deans, Directors, Department heads or any other interested parties. The Task Force is hoping for feedback on whether the institutions want to combine the valuations of those collections in with their main institutional numbers or have them broken out, separately. The rationale for breaking them out is, of course, that costs associated with those programs are, in most cases, considerably higher than other costs. The question is whether they are high enough to justify separate valuations. Periodicals and loose-leaf type services show the most difference. In the case of law collections, these two groups make up a substantial portion of our holdings. The following pricing information is just to let you see examples of how much more these items cost so that collection management personnel and administration have a little more with which to inform their opinions about the need (or lack thereof) of valuing these collections, separately. It is, strictly, for informational purposes, now. We may use these price guides as part of the standards for our report, later.

We are trying to have a report prepared on these issues by mid-June, so we would appreciate your efforts to provide information to assist with that timeline.

COMMENTS, PLEASE!!

BOOKS

Bowker Annual Average Academic Book prices in 2006 were as follows:

General Works	\$ 72.40
Medicine	\$ 85.21
Law	\$ 87.26

PERIODICALS

*Library Journal Periodicals Price Survey 2008* Average Annual price:

General Works	\$ 122.00
Health Sciences	\$1,330.00
Law	\$ 275.00

PRINT INTEGRATING RESOURCES for loose-leaf services and other updated issues:

Bowker Average Annual Price per title:

General	\$ 663.75
Science and Technology	\$1,108.86
Law	\$ 975.82

Thanks, in advance, for your efforts and valued opinions.

**Appendix D**

MEDICAL/HEALTH LIBRARIES TASK FORCE  
Quarterly report  
02/16/09

Following the directive of the BOG, the task force is currently working on a number of consortium deals which will realize some cost savings for the Universities involved. Following is a summary of those activities:

1. AccessMedicine gave us a 50% discount off the list price for a site license of their product allowing us to move from the simultaneous user model most of us now have. Four libraries decided to participate in this deal FIU, FSU, UCF and UF.
2. We got discounts from New England Journal of Medicine (NEJM) and British Journal of Medicine (BMJ) of 9% and 20% respectively. These discounts were contingent on the publisher being able to send just one invoice. Harrassowitz is the vendor we've chosen to take care of the journals that require the single invoicing. Six universities, including the University of Miami, are participating in the NEJM. Varying renewals dates necessitated a phased in approach with three libraries, FIU, UCF and UF starting this year and FAU, FSU and UM joining in next year. Only four libraries are participating in BMJ FIU, FSU, UCF and UF.

Respectfully submitted by Cecilia Botero- Chair

**Appendix E**  
**Health/Medical Libraries shared collections**

TITLE	TYPE OF ACCESS	LIBRARIES PARTICIPATING	% SAVINGS OFF LIST PRICE	Dollar Savings
Access Medicine	Site wide license			
British Journal of Medicine (package)	Site wide license	FSU UF UCF		
Clinical Evidence (BMJ)	Site wide license	FSU UCF		
Cell Press	Site wide license	UCF UF		
New England Journal of Medicine	Site wide license	FIU UCF UF/IN 2010 FAU FSU UNIV OF MIAMI		
Nature (package)	Site wide license	FAU FIU FIUMED FSU FSUMED UCF UCFMED UF UFHSCL USF USFMED FGCU UNF UWF FAMU	capped price increase at 5%, projected to be 10%, discount of 20% for new purchases	
MD Consult	Site wide license	FIU FSU UCF UF USF		
Thieme Anatomy Collection	Site wide license	FIU UCF UF USF UNIV OF MIAMI	15%; capped increase at 5%	
<b>Total Savings</b>				

**Appendix F**  
**Health/Medical Libraries Task Force**  
**Letter to vendors of e-book collections**

FLORIDA HEALTH SCIENCES LIBRARIES CONSORTIA  
Florida International University Medical Library  
Florida State University Maguire Medical Library  
Nova Southeastern University Health Professions Division Library  
University of Central Florida Harriet F. Ginsburg Health Science Center Library  
University of Florida Health Science Center Libraries  
University of Miami Louis Calder Memorial Library and Biomedical Communications  
University of South Florida Shimberg Health Sciences Library

Dear .....

The Florida Health Sciences Libraries Consortia would like to pursue a model of shared collection building using e-books as the foundation. In its simplest form what we propose is that our libraries purchase and share simultaneously seven different titles instead of each library purchasing one copy of the same title. When considering this proposal please keep in mind that in an effort to maintain electronic journal and database collections many of the above libraries have ceased purchasing monographs over the last few years. In numerous discussions it became clear that given our budgetary situations more libraries will have to opt to cease spending any collection money on monographs. We advance the idea of a shared collection of e-books in an attempt to promote and protect the future of the monograph collection in our libraries.

Expressly, here is what we are asking of each of you:

1. An expression of interest in pursuing this type of partnership with us.
2. An outline of the possible business model you would advance to accomplish the above described model.
3. A list of unique titles (in Excel) that you offer with a column(s) noting those already owned by each of the above libraries and an indication if these titles could be folded into the new arrangement; a column for price; a column for date of publication; a column for edition; a column for author; and a column for publisher.

If you have any questions please don't hesitate to contact me.

Sincerely,

Cecilia Botero  
Assistant Director for Content Management  
University of Florida  
Health Science Center Library

**Appendix G**

**FLORIDA CENTER FOR LIBRARY AUTOMATION (FCLA) AND FLORIDA  
STATE UNIVERSITY LIBRARIES (SUL)  
GUIDELINES FOR  
REVIEW AND NEGOTIATION OF LICENSE AGREEMENTS FOR  
ELECTRONIC RESOURCES**

June 3, 2009

*This document has been reviewed and approved by University of Florida's Office of General Counsel.*

**OBJECTIVE**

These guidelines are meant to provide a framework for review and negotiation of license agreements for electronic resources licensed by the Florida Center for Library Automation (FCLA) and Florida State University Libraries (SUL).

As license agreements typically define authorized users and govern how the subscriber may use the licensed content (i.e., interlibrary loan, e-reserves, etc.) it is imperative that FCLA and SUL maintain the same resource sharing rights in the electronic environment that they enjoy in the print environment. Following these guidelines will facilitate our ability to protect the rights of our user communities.



## Contents

AUTHORIZED USERS .....	15
AUTHORIZED SITE .....	15
AUTHORIZED USES .....	16
Use in accordance with US Copyright Law.....	16
Commercial Use.....	17
Interlibrary Loan .....	17
Course Packs (print and electronic) .....	18
Course Reserves (print and electronic) .....	18
Archival Access/Backup copy .....	18
LICENSOR RESPONSIBILITIES.....	19
Confidentiality .....	19
Quality of Service .....	20
USAGE STATISTICS .....	20
Collection by third party .....	21
Withdrawn Materials .....	21
LICENSEE RESPONSIBILITIES.....	22
Notifying users of authorized uses.....	22
Confidentiality of Licensing Terms .....	22
MUTUAL OBLIGATIONS.....	22
Breach .....	22
Modification to Terms .....	23
LEGAL ISSUES .....	23
Governing Law and Jurisdiction.....	23
Website user agreements.....	24
Indemnification, Hold Harmless & Liability .....	24
RENEWAL AND TERMINATION.....	25
Termination.....	25
Renewal information.....	25

## AUTHORIZED USERS

Authorized users should be defined by their affiliation with the university regardless of their geographic location or campus. Users at all geographic locations and/or campuses that report to the university as their administrative head are considered part of a single site. Each library on a multi-library campus will make every effort to negotiate access for patrons according to this definition. All definitions of authorized users should include “walk-in” or “occasional” users.

### Sample clause for single institution license:

“Authorized users include those persons affiliated with Licensee as full and part time students and employees (including permanent, adjunct, and visiting faculty; administrative and professional employees; all other employees; and researchers employed by the universities) of Licensee and its member institutions, regardless of the physical location of such persons, as well as occasional on-site walk-in users.”

### Sample clause for multiple institution license:

“Authorized Users” shall mean faculty, full-time and part-time students, residents, researchers, employees and independent contractors of Customer affiliated with Customer’s locations listed on Attachment \_\_ (“Participating Institutions”) and individuals using computer terminals within the library facilities at the Participating Institutions permitted by the Customer to access the “Service”.

Note: Individual institutions may elect to negotiate access for special groups (i.e., alumni, Library Friends, etc.)

## AUTHORIZED SITE

The definition of authorized site should not be geographically based. An authorized site should consist of all geographic locations and/or campuses that are identified in the agreement as the Licensee. The authorized site will allow for access to all authorized users who have right of entry to the network regardless of their geographic location or campus.

### Sample clause:

“The authorized site consists of all geographic locations and/or campuses that are identified in the agreement as the Licensee. All authorized users who have right of entry to the network are granted access regardless of their physical location.”

Or

“An academic institution is all parts of an organization that report to the same Chief Academic Officer or Chief Executive Officer. For multi-campus academic institutions, each organization listed in the Directory of Higher Education is considered a separate institution [<http://www.educause.edu>]. Academic law and academic medical libraries may be part of a University if they report either to the same institutional Chief Academic Officer or the Chief Executive Officer.”

## **AUTHORIZED USES**

### **Use in accordance with US Copyright Law**

It is the policy of SULs to maintain the rights to use information according to US copyright law. License agreements should be reviewed carefully to ensure that they do not deny rights granted under current copyright law including fair use, educational, and library exemptions. Acceptable license agreements will recognize these rights, including 17 USC Section 107 – “Limitations on exclusive rights: Fair Use,” and 17 USC Section 108 – “Limitations on exclusive rights: reproduction by library and archives.” Sections 107 and 108 of USC Copyright Law are those that allow libraries to participate in interlibrary loan and to use copyrighted materials according to fair use guidelines. According to copyright law, fair use of a copyrighted work may be made for “purposes such as criticism, comment, news reporting, teaching (including multiple copies for classroom use), scholarship or research”. Many license agreements limit use of licensed content to research, scholarship and teaching. Such agreements should be reworded to include *all uses* according to US Copyright law.

#### Sample clause:

A typical standard clause regarding rights of use might read:

“The Publisher agrees to grant to the Consortium the non-exclusive and non-transferrable right to give Authorized Users access to the Licensed Materials via a Secure Network for the purposes of research, teaching and private study.”

This clause could be modified to read:

“The Publisher agrees to grant to the Consortium the non-exclusive and non-transferrable right to give Authorized Users access to the Licensed Materials via a Secure Network for the purposes of research, teaching, private study, *and other uses in accordance with U.S. Copyright Law.*”

Alternatively, the previous clause can stand as originally written if this additional clause is present in the contact:

*“Nothing in this License shall in any way exclude, modify, or affect any of the Consortium’s or any Member’s statutory rights under national copyright law.”*

### **Notes on U.S. Copyright, ILL and Course Reserves**

Traditionally, libraries have determined that Sections 107 and 108 provides for the use of copyrighted material for course packs and course reserves. If interlibrary loan, course packs, or course reserves are not specifically mentioned elsewhere in the agreement, the inclusion of a clause affirming rights according to United States Copyright Law assumes retention of these rights. If interlibrary loan, course packs and course reserves are addressed specifically in the license agreement, they should be dealt with as detailed below.

(Note: It may not be possible to adhere to this when negotiating international licenses.)

### **Commercial Use**

Most license agreements prohibit the licensee or its users from charging a fee to access the licensed content. As noted on the Yale Liblicense web site, provisions that specifically prohibit the direct resale of licensed content are not controversial; the agreement should make clear that charging administrative fees to cover the costs of making permitted copies is not prohibited. Where restrictions for commercial use appear in a license agreement, they should be supplemented with an additional clarifying clause.

#### **Sample clause:**

“For the avoidance of doubt, charging administrative fees to cover the costs of making permitted copies is not prohibited. Use by the Consortium or a Member or by an Authorized User of the Licensed Materials in the course of research funded by a commercial organization, is not deemed to be Commercial Use.”

### **Interlibrary Loan**

Although interlibrary loan (ILL) falls within copyright law in compliance with Section 108 of the United States Copyright Law (17 USC Section 108, "Limitations on exclusive rights: Reproduction by libraries and archives"), ILL is frequently addressed in an independent clause within the license agreement. ILL is an integral part of library resource sharing activities on a national and global level. It is imperative that libraries retain these rights wherever possible. The right to transfer interlibrary loan materials in electronic format is preferable to that of print. This right is particularly important to preserve for journal and magazine content. In ILL clauses, references to the provision of data or statistics on ILL use, references to type of library, and references to geographic limitations to ILL (e.g. ILL to US only) should be removed.

#### **Explanation to vendor regarding the need to retain electronic ILL rights:**

While we recognize vendor concerns regarding ease of content transmittal in the electronic environment, we do not believe it reasonable to limit interlibrary loan (ILL) lending to the use of print only. Academic libraries are committed to the application of CONTU guidelines in our practice for all formats, and believe they provide adequate protection for the electronic environment as well. We thereby request that the clause for ILL be revised as follows:

#### **Sample clause:**

“Licensee may supply through interlibrary loan a copy of an individual document being part of the Licensed Materials by post, fax or secure electronic transmission for the purposes of non-commercial use. Specifically, copies may be made in compliance with Section 108 of the Copyright Act of the US.”

OR

“Licensee may use licensed content for interlibrary loan in compliance with Section 108 of the United States Copyright Law (17 USC 108, “Limitations on exclusive rights: Reproduction by libraries and archives”). Licensee may fulfill in print or image form interlibrary loan requests from institutions that do not have access to the Licensed Materials. Such requests may be fulfilled by the Institution printing a copy of the item and providing that print copy, or a photocopy or facsimile transmission thereof, to the

requesting party or by using an automated Interlibrary Loan system providing that it supplies digital images only.”

**Course Packs (print and electronic)**

Where course packs are specifically mentioned, terms should be negotiated that allow for the use of licensed materials in course packs. Course packs and course reserves are often addressed in the same clause. If not, and each are specifically mentioned in the agreement, terms should be negotiated that allow for the use of each.

**Sample clause:**

“SUL may incorporate parts of License Materials in print and electronic Course Packs and Electronic Reserves collections for the use of Authorized users in the course of instruction at a Member’s institution. Each such item shall carry appropriate acknowledgement of the source, listing title and author of the extract, title and author of the work, copyright notice, and publisher. Copies of electronic items shall be deleted by the Member when they are no longer used for such purpose. Course packs in non-electronic non-print perceptible form, such as audio or Braille, may also be offered to Authorized Users who, in the reasonable opinion of the Member, are visually impaired.”

OR

“Licensee and Authorized Users may use a reasonable portion of the Licensed Materials in the preparation of Course Packs or other educational materials.”

**Course Reserves (print and electronic)**

Where course reserves are specifically mentioned, terms should be negotiated that allow for the use of licensed materials for both print and electronic reserves.

**Sample clause:**

“Licensee and Authorized Users may use a reasonable portion of the Licensed Materials in print or electronic format in connection with specific courses of instruction offered by Licensee and/or its parent institution.”

**Archival Access/Backup copy**

Long-term considerations are vital and should be given attention in any license agreement. The rights to archival access and the ability to create an archival and back-up copy should be negotiated for all leased and perpetually licensed resources.

**Sample clause:**

“On termination of this License, Licensor shall provide continuing access for Licensee to that part of the Licensed Material which was published or added to the Licensed Material within or prior to the Subscription Period, either from Licensor's servers, from a third party's server, or by supplying electronic files to the Licensee, as mutually agreed. The

terms governing access to this material (for clarification this excludes payment obligations) shall be those in effect at the termination of the license.”

OR

“Licensor hereby grants to Licensee a nonexclusive, royalty-free, perpetual license to use any Licensed Materials that were accessible during the term of this Agreement. Such use shall be in accordance with provisions of this agreement (for clarification this excludes payment obligations) which shall survive any termination of this Agreement. Except in the case of termination for cause, Licensor shall provide the Licensee with access to the Licensed Materials, either from the Server, subject to the payment of such fees as the parties may agree; or by supplying electronic files to the Licensee at no additional charge.”

Sample clause for LOCKSS participation:

"Publisher acknowledges that Florida State University Libraries may participate in the LOCKSS system for archiving digitized publications. Licensee may perpetually use the LOCKSS system to archive and restore the Licensed Materials, so long as Licensee's use is otherwise consistent with this Agreement. Publisher further acknowledges and agrees that, in using the LOCKSS system, Licensed Materials may be made available to other LOCKSS system participants who indicate a right to those Licensed Materials."

OR

“Licensee may make one (1) copy of the Licensed materials, electronically as well as one copy in print from the electronic version of the Licensed Materials to be maintained as a backup or for archival purpose. Use of LOCKSS technology for this purpose is permitted.”

## **LICENSOR RESPONSIBILITIES**

### **Confidentiality**

Licensor must comply with International Coalition of Library Consortia (ICOLC) privacy guidelines established for electronic resource vendors, available at:

<<http://www.library.yale.edu/consortia/webstats06.htm>>. Vendors should be in general compliance with privacy laws, including but not limited to FERPA, available at:

<<http://www.ed.gov/policy/gen/guid/fpco/ferpa/index.html>>. Licenses should specify Licensor must uphold the confidentiality of individual users. Under no circumstances may user data be reused or sold to third parties without permission from the Licensee.

Sample clause:

“Licensor shall not, without the prior written consent of Customer, transfer any personal information of any Authorized Users to any non-affiliated third party or use it for any purpose except as is necessary to perform the Services.”

### **Quality of Service**

It is recommended that licenses have a statement that requires the vendor to compensate the library for significant downtimes. The license should always include contact information for help with problems and requirement of notification of scheduled maintenance.

#### **Sample clause:**

“Licensor shall use reasonable efforts to provide continuous service twenty four (24) hours a day, seven (7) days a week. Scheduled down-time will be performed at a time to minimize inconvenience to Licensee and its Authorized Users. Licensor shall notify Licensee in a timely manner of all instances of system unavailability that occur outside the Licensor’s normal maintenance window and use reasonable effort to provide advance notice of hardware or software changes that may affect system performance.”

OR

“Licensor shall use reasonable efforts to ensure that the Licensor server or servers have sufficient capacity and rate of connectivity to provide the Customer and its Authorized Users with a quality of service comparable to the highest current standard in the on-line information provision industry. If the Services fail to operate in conformance with the terms of this Agreement, the Customer shall immediately notify Licensor, and Licensor shall promptly use reasonable efforts to restore access to the Services as soon as possible. In the event that \_\_\_\_\_ fails to repair the nonconformity in a reasonable time, \_\_\_\_\_ shall reimburse the Customer in an amount that the nonconformity is proportional to the total fees owed by the Customer under this Agreement.”

OR

“Licensor warrants to Customer that the Services and all technical support and maintenance will be delivered and provided in a professional, competent and timely manner and free of material bugs, errors and defects in design, access, use and operation.”

### **USAGE STATISTICS**

Collection and analysis of data on the usage of the licensed Materials assist both the Vendor and the Consortium and its Members to understand the impact of the license. Licensor should provide usage statistics in monthly data reports that consist of both composite use data for the Consortium and itemized data for individual institutions. Licensor should use best efforts to provide the Licensee with COUNTER-compliant usage statistics (<http://www.projectcounter.org>) that adhere to the ICOLC Guidelines for Statistical Measure of usage of Web-Based Information Resources (October 4, 2006).

#### **Sample clause for FCLA licenses:**

“Licensor must provide both composite use data for the system-wide FCLA use and itemized data for individual campuses, on a monthly basis. Use data should be at the

level of detail required for objective evaluation of both product performance and satisfaction of user needs, including title-by-title use of journals. Providers should follow the International Coalition of Library Consortia (ICOLC) “[Guidelines for Statistical Measures of Usage of Web-Based Information Resources](#)” or provide information in compliance with COUNTER or other recognized international standard.”

Sample clause for individual SULs:

“Licensor must provide use data on a monthly basis. Use data should be at the level of detail required for objective evaluation of both product performance and satisfaction of user needs, including title-by-title use of journals. Providers should make usage data available in compliance with COUNTER or other recognized international standard.”

**Collection by third party**

New services are emerging that provide assistance with the collection and management of usage statistics. Use of these services requires that third parties have the right and ability to access and collect usage statistics data.

Sample clause:

“The Publisher shall provide to the Licensee or facilitate the collection and provision to the Licensee and the Publisher by the Licensee [or by the Agent] of such usage data on the number [of titles] [of abstracts and] of articles downloaded, by journal title, on [a monthly] [a quarterly] [an annual] basis for the Publisher’s and the Licensee’s private internal use only. Such usage data shall be compiled in a manner consistent with applicable privacy [and data protection] laws [and as may be agreed between the parties from time to time], and the anonymity of individual users and the confidentiality of their searches shall be fully protected. In the case that the Publisher assigns its rights to another party, the Licensee may at its discretion require the assignee either to keep such usage information confidential or to destroy it.”

OR

“The Publisher and the Licensee shall both be permitted to enable a third party on their behalf to collect and distribute usage data to them. Such usage information shall be compiled in a manner consistent with the applicable privacy laws, and the anonymity of individual users and the confidentiality of their searches shall be fully protected. In the case that either party assigns its rights to another party, the other party may at its discretion require the assignee either to keep such usage information confidential or to destroy it.”

**Withdrawn Materials**

The license should include written notification and pro rata refund in the event that more than a certain percentage of the content is withdrawn and the licensee decides not to continue the subscription.

Sample clause:



“Licensor reserves the right to withdraw from the Licensed Materials any item or part of an item for which it no longer retains the right to publish, or which it has reasonable grounds to believe infringes copyright or is defamatory or unlawful. Licensor shall give written notice to the Licensee of such withdrawal no later than thirty (30) days following the removal of any item pursuant to this section. If such withdrawal renders the Licensed Materials less useful to Licensee or its Authorized Users in Licensee’s sole reasonable discretion, Licensor shall give Licensee an equitable reduction in the total Fees owed by Licensee under this Agreement, and promptly refund any prepaid amounts related to them.”

## **LICENSEE RESPONSIBILITIES**

### **Notifying users of authorized uses**

#### **Discipline**

In general, any and all references to regulating and disciplining authorized users who breach the terms of use should be removed from the license. However, if you are required to include a discipline clause within the license, you may add the following:

#### **Sample clause:**

“Licensee will make reasonable efforts to inform users of the terms of use of this agreement. The licensee will have a disciplinary process to address the misuse of library resources.”

### **Confidentiality of Licensing Terms**

Strike any obligations to keep license terms or fees confidential. If you are not able to strike make sure to have the right to release the agreement if required by law, including Florida public record laws.

## **MUTUAL OBLIGATIONS**

### **Breach**

Many agreements have clauses that state how unauthorized use of or access to licensed content will be handled. These clauses should not require libraries to take on onerous responsibilities to monitor users.

#### **Sample clause:**

“The Licensee will not be held responsible for uses of the subscribed journals that are contrary to the guidelines stated above, provided that such uses are without its express or implied consent, and provided that it promptly notifies the Licensor of any such use of which it becomes aware and takes all reasonable steps to terminate such activity. The Licensee agrees to cooperate with the Licensor in any investigation of unauthorized access or use. The Licensor will not bring an action against an Authorized User without first consulting the Licensee.”

OR

“In the event of any systematic, persistent, or substantial unauthorized use of the Licensed Materials by an Authorized User, either the Licensor or the Licensee may suspend access to the Internet Protocol ('IP') address(es) identified as the one(s) from which the unauthorized use originated from. Once the breach has been cured, if a curable breach, access to the suspended IP address(es) will be restored. In the event that Licensor terminates Licensee access to the service without cause, the Licensor will provide to the Licensee a refund or credit based on the unused portion of the paid subscription period on a pro-rata basis.”

OR

“Customer is responsible for taking reasonable measures to ensure the security and integrity of the Service, ensure that access to and use of the Service is limited to Authorized Users and prevent access by unauthorized persons to the Service. Licensor acknowledges that it is familiar with the measures currently taken by Customer required by the foregoing sentence and such measures are reasonable. Customer shall promptly notify Licensor of any unauthorized access or use of which it becomes aware and cooperate with Licensor in any investigation thereof.”

### **Modification to Terms**

FCLA and SULs believe that it is unreasonable to make modifications to this Agreement without advanced written notice and consent.

#### Sample clause:

“Any changes to this Agreement must be made in writing and must be signed by authorized representatives of both parties.”

## **LEGAL ISSUES**

### **Governing Law and Jurisdiction**

Governing law and venue provisions determine what state's law will govern interpretation of the contract and where suits must be filed. Governing law is particularly relevant in disputes. Because parties (and their lawyers) are more familiar with the laws of their home state, it is desirable to have the home state law to apply to any dispute involving the agreement. For libraries that are part of a state institution, there are often compelling reasons to insist that the institution's state law applies. This is true of Florida. All contracts should be modified to assert Florida as the governing law body. Alternatively, the contract should “remain silent” on the issue.

**Website user agreements**

Occasionally e-resource vendors require the authorized user to agree to terms and conditions when they log on. Many provide an opportunity for users to register so they can customize use of the site. In either case, it is useful to include a clause in the written license that specifies that the signed agreement held with the Licensor supersedes the website user agreement.

Sample clause:

“Customer acknowledges and agrees that Customer and its Authorized Users agree to and are bound by all of the terms and conditions of the Website’s Registered User Agreement at [ \_\_\_\_\_ ] (with the exception of any provisions pertaining solely to individual (non-institutional) subscriptions). Authorized Users may also register individually for the Service online at the Website. In the event of a conflict, ambiguity or inconsistency between a term in the Registered User Agreement and in this Agreement, this Agreement shall control and supersede. Any terms in the Registered User Agreement that materially differ from the terms of this Agreement or that obligate a party to any additional material obligations or subject a party to any material limitations not expressly provided in this Agreement shall be void and of no force or effect.”

**Indemnification, Hold Harmless & Liability**

Licenses often have indemnification and liability clauses. Licensee cannot be required to indemnify because of Florida law. If these clauses are in an agreement that you are working on and you have any reason to be concerned about them, the best course of action is to attach a license agreement addendum that includes standard clauses in adherence with Florida State Law. (See paragraphs 6, 8 and 9 of the attached addendum.)

Liability issues may arise in the case where one institution is signing a license on behalf of a Consortium. In this case, it is prudent to include a clause which details the liability of the contracting body and participating institutions.

Sample clause:

“Licensor acknowledges that \_\_\_\_\_ is entering into this Agreement for the benefit of itself and the State of Florida’s other state universities described on Attachment A (collectively, the “Consortium”). Licensor agrees that while the University is the entity signing this Agreement, the University and each other member of the Consortium will only be liable for their own acts and obligations under this Agreement including, without limitation, their share of the Fee (defined below) as set forth on Attachment A. Licensor agrees that neither the Licensee nor any other member of the Consortium shall be liable for any acts or omissions of the other members of the Consortium and that Licensor shall look solely to each member of the Consortium individually for its obligations and liabilities under this Agreement and for each member’s payment of its share of the Fee . Furthermore, if any member of the Consortium is in default or breach hereunder, the default or breach shall only affect the defaulting member of the Consortium and this Agreement shall continue and remain in full force and effect for all other members of the Consortium as if no default or breach occurred.”

## **RENEWAL AND TERMINATION**

### **Termination**

The licensor should not have a unilateral right to terminate a license without giving adequate notice to the licensee. If termination occurs because of a suspected breach, the licensee should be given adequate time to cure the breach. A pro-rata refund should be given to the licensee when termination is not caused because of a breach by the licensee.

#### Sample clause:

“Either party may terminate this license for substantial or material breach of the agreement by providing the other party with written notice in paper or electronic form. Prior to termination, the offending party will have thirty (30) days to cure breach, if curable. If the [xxxNAME OF COMPANYxxx] is the breaching party and the License is subsequently terminated, [xxxNAME OF COMPANYxxx] shall make a pro rata refund of part of the Fee to the Licensee, taking into account the remaining unexpired portion of the Subscription Period. No refund will be provided to the Licensee if they are the breaching party and termination results.”

### **Renewal information**

Licensor will give ample notice of license term changes that require renegotiation with the Licensee. If the agreement maintains the same terms, the Licensor may renew the product without a signed license agreement.

#### Sample clause:

“This Agreement will automatically renew for an additional one-year term (a “Renewal Term”) unless Customer notifies Licensor in writing of its desire not to renew thirty (30) days prior to the expiration date. Licensor reserves the right to adjust prices upward or downward upon renewal of this Agreement for any Renewal Term (but, if upward, the adjustment shall not exceed \_\_% of the payment payable during the Initial Term). Customer will be notified of price adjustments at least thirty (30) days prior to a Renewal Term. If the notice of price adjustment is not timely delivered within such thirty (30) day period, this Agreement shall renew at the current Fee unless and until such time as notice is delivered and Customer is provided an opportunity to not renew or terminate this Agreement after receipt of the proposed price adjustment.”

**ADDENDUM to LICENSE AGREEMENT**  
**University of Florida Board of Trustees for the benefit of the Florida Center for Library**  
**Automation**  
*(Date)*

This addendum is made part of the attached License Agreement and shall take priority over the License Agreement and over any vendor terms made part of said Agreement. The LICENSEE's purchase order may not be excluded by the LICENSOR's terms.

**1. ANNUAL APPROPRIATION:** The State of Florida's performance and obligation to pay under the Agreement is contingent upon an annual appropriation by the Legislature.

**2. OMBUDSMAN:** A Vendor Ombudsman in the Department of Banking and Finance is available to assist if problems are experienced in obtaining timely payments. The Vendor Ombudsman may be contacted at (850) 488-2924, or by calling the Comptroller's Hotline, 1-800-848-3792.

**3. LOBBYING:** Vendor is prohibited from using funds provided under this Agreement for the purpose of lobbying the Legislature or any official, officer, commission, board, authority, council, committee, or department of the executive branch or the judicial branch of state government.

**4. GOVERNING LAW:** The agreement and Addendum shall be construed in accordance with the laws of the State of Florida and any disputes hereunder shall be resolved in the courts of the State of Florida.

**5. PAYMENT:** Payment shall be made pursuant to Florida Statutes. The LICENSEE shall mail to LICENSOR payment of an invoice within forty (40) days of receipt of a proper invoice and receipt, inspection, and approval of the goods and/or services provided in accordance with the terms and conditions of this license.

**6. COPYRIGHT AND PATENT INFRINGEMENT:** The LICENSOR warrants that the Product(s) furnished by the LICENSOR will not infringe or violate any patent, copyright, trade secret, or any other proprietary right of any third party. The LICENSOR will defend, at its own expense, any claim by a third party against the LICENSEE involving a patent, copyright, trade secret, or proprietary right violation concerning said Product(s). The LICENSOR shall indemnify the LICENSEE against any loss, cost, (including attorney's fees, court costs, and appeals), expenses or liability or any damages finally awarded against the LICENSEE, with respect to such claim. However, the LICENSOR must be notified by the LICENSEE, in writing within a reasonable time after the LICENSEE first receives any notice of such claim. In the event an injunction or order shall be obtained against the LICENSEE's use of any Product(s)

or if in the LICENSOR's opinion the Product(s) is likely to become the subject of a claim of infringement or violation of a copyright, trade secret or other propriety right of a third party, the LICENSOR shall at its expense: a) Procure for the LICENSEE the right to continue using the Product(s); or b.) At no additional cost to the LICENSEE, replace or modify the Product(s) so that it becomes non-infringing, but only if the modification or replacement does not adversely affect the specifications of the Product(s) or its use by the LICENSEE; or c) If neither a) nor b) above is practical, the LICENSOR shall remove the Product(s) from the LICENSEE and shall issue a credit for the Product(s) to the LICENSEE. Thereafter any license involved shall be considered canceled.

**7. TAXES:** The State of Florida is a tax immune sovereign and exempt from the payment of all sales, use, or excise tax.

**8. LIMITATION OF REMEDIES:** LICENSOR shall use reasonable efforts to ensure that the LICENSOR server or servers have sufficient capacity and rate of connectivity to provide the LICENSEE and its Authorized Users with a quality of service comparable to current standards in the on-line information provision industry in the LICENSEE's locale. If the Licensed Materials fail to operate in conformance with the terms of this Agreement, the LICENSEE shall immediately notify the LICENSOR, and the LICENSOR shall promptly use reasonable efforts to restore access to the Licensed Materials as soon as possible. In the event that the LICENSOR fails to repair the nonconformity in a reasonable time, the LICENSOR shall reimburse the LICENSEE in an amount that the nonconformity is proportional to the total fees owed by the LICENSEE under this Agreement.

**9. INDEMNIFICATION:** The LICENSOR shall hold and save the LICENSEE harmless from any and all suits and judgments, including attorney's fees and court costs, against the LICENSEE for personal injury or damage to real or personal property caused by the tortious conduct of the LICENSOR or by the LICENSOR's products, in the performance of this Agreement provided that the LICENSEE has promptly notified the LICENSOR in writing after the LICENSEE receives notice of any claim. The LICENSOR shall have the sole control of the defense, trial and any related settlement negotiations. The LICENSEE is a state agency and cannot enter into indemnification agreements, therefore any clause in the LICENSOR's license agreement or associated documents that require indemnification, by the LICENSEE are hereby deleted.

**A.** The LICENSEE is not liable for the acts of third parties or the consequences of the acts of third parties.

**B.** In no event, however will the LICENSOR be liable pursuant to this Agreement for any damages caused by the LICENSEE's failure to perform the LICENSEE's responsibilities.

**C.** The LICENSEE, as a state agency, warrants and represents that it is self-funded for liability insurance, both public and property, with said protection being applicable to officers, employees, servants, and agents within the scope of their employment by the LICENSEE.

**10. CONFIDENTIAL INFORMATION:** In the event any of the Product(s) is confidential or a trade secret, to the extent permitted by Florida law, the LICENSEE will not disclose to any third party any information it receives from the LICENSOR in writing that is so marked unless otherwise authorized in writing by the LICENSOR. The foregoing does not limit the restrictions on use and disclosure imposed by the Addendum, the License Agreement or copyright law.

**11. NOTICES:** All notices required to be served on the LICENSOR or the LICENSEE shall be served by registered or certified mail, return requested, or electronic with acknowledged receipt to the appropriate address on the purchase order.

**12. AUTHORIZATIONS:**

CSUL Attachment 2 CPC Quarterly Report

A. **SITES:** All campuses and research facilities of the ten universities of the Florida State University System are eligible for inclusion in the license. The license and purchase order will specify which universities are actually included. The eleven universities are:

- |                                  |                               |
|----------------------------------|-------------------------------|
| Florida A & M University         | University of Florida         |
| Florida Atlantic University      | University of Central Florida |
| Florida Gulf Coast University    | University of North Florida   |
| Florida International University | University of South Florida   |
| Florida State University         | University of West Florida    |
| New College of Florida           |                               |

B. **USERS:** The Product(s) shall be available to all members of the following user categories:  
Students, Faculty, Staff and Walk-ins

C. **METHODS OF ACCESS:** The Product(s) shall be available through all reasonable methods of access using current and developing communications technology to authorized users under these circumstances:

- All on-campus facilities including but not limited to:
  - Library workstations
  - Faculty offices
  - Dormitories
  - Computer labs
- Remote access with user authentication process from but not limited to:
  - Dial access
  - Campus Internet services
  - Commercial Internet services

**LICENSEE: University of Florida Board of Trustees  
for the benefit of the Florida Center for Library Automation**

Signed by: \_\_\_\_\_

Name: \_\_\_\_\_

Title: \_\_\_\_\_

Date: \_\_\_\_\_

**LICENSOR:**

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

Signed by:

\_\_\_\_\_

Name: \_\_\_\_\_

Title: \_\_\_\_\_

Date: \_\_\_\_\_



**Collection Planning Committee  
ACTION PLAN for 2009  
June 4, 2009**

**CSUL Core Activity 1.** Acquire, manage, and provide access to scholarly information resources in multiple formats, subjects, and languages in support of academic programs.

<b>CPC Objective</b>	<b>Activity</b>	<b>Timeline</b>	<b>Resources</b>	<b>Assessment</b>	<b>Status</b>
1.1 Analyze areas of high overlap and identify key publishers to supply shared core collections in electronic format, using OCLC WorldCat Collection Analysis business and psychology results.	a) With report data, create Access database to determine high-use, widely-held publishers in these areas. b) Create a process for acquiring shared core collections in business and psychology	March-June, 2009	CPC, support staff at FGCU and UWF	A list of key publishers is identified in business and psychology.	In process
1.2 Begin comprehensive identification of subject collection strengths at the institutional level, starting with WCA business and psychology report results.	a) Using WCA data in Access database, determine individual collection uniqueness and strength.	July-October, 2009	CPC, support staff at FGCU and UWF	A matrix demonstrating subject strengths is created. Institutions will be able to run reports capturing expenditures on specific types of e-resources	Will commence on completion of overlap project.
1.3 Develop and acquire a shared e-book reference collection using funds from existing institutional acquisition commitments.	a) Appoint an object code task force to normalize e-resource object codes across libraries, enabling consistent fund	March-July, 2009	CPC, TSPC, FCLA		Task force is currently meeting and defining types of e-resources.



CPC Objective	Activity	Timeline	Resources	Assessment	Status
(1.3)	<p>reporting for e-resources.</p> <p>b. Appoint task force from CPC and subject specialists to select reference works for joint purchase; cancel local subscriptions</p> <p>c. Identify local funds to be diverted to consortial purchase</p>	<p>August-October, 2009</p> <p>November-January 2010</p>	<p>CPC, subject specialists, Health/Medical Libraries Task Force</p> <p>CPC, local acquisitions staff</p>		

**CSUL Core Activity 2.** Develop and deliver services to facilitate user-centered discovery and understanding of the record of human knowledge and to promote scholarship leading to new knowledge.

CPC Objective	Activity	Timeline	Resources	Assessment	Status
<p>2.1 Explore a common gateway for existing SUL digital collections (PALMM, UFDC, others).</p> <p>2.2. Begin designing a scholarly communications portal that links local IRs with general information about scholarly communications issues.</p>	<p>a) Work with TAG to recommend a product to serve as the common platform for digital collections and for a scholarly communications portal, if feasible, or two separate products if necessary.</p>	<p>June 2009-</p>	<p>TAG, CPC, DISC, FCLA, UFDC</p>	<p>A product is identified and a strategy developed for creating the common gateway for digital collections and/or scholarly communication issues.</p>	

CPC Objective	Activity	Timeline	Resources	Assessment	Status
2.3 Support statewide education about scholarly communication, either through hosting an ARL Scholarly Communication Institute and/or by applying for an IMLS grant to fund education initiatives. (Funds for holding institutes are repaid by participant fees. )	a) Submit a proposal to ARL to host a regional institute for scholarly communication. If proposal is accepted, host the event in late 2009 or early 2010. All CSUL institutions will be expected to send teams.	June-December, 2009	\$40,000 to ARL upfront to pay for promotion and faculty expenses. All funds will be recovered via registration fees. Participation of CPC, Scholarly Communication TF		

**CSUL Core Activity 3.** Collaborate to increase access to content, to create economic efficiencies, and to employ information technology in support of development and delivery of services.

CPC Objective	Activity	Timeline	Resources	Assessment	Status
3.1 Seek CSUL approval for and begin system-wide adoption of licensing principles and best practices for e-books and e-journals as submitted by the Licensing Task Force.	a) Proposal submitted to CSUL and approved. b) Training in implementing these principles will be offered by CPC and FCLA licensing specialist	June 2009  August 2009	CSUL  FCLA licensing specialist, CPC, ERS	Training session will be presented at CPC/ERS annual meeting.	UF General Counsel is reviewing document
3.2 Pursue greater centralization of electronic resource negotiations and	a) Review all CSUL e-journal packages, held consortially or subconsortially, and determine whether they			A single subscription vendor is identified to handle e-journal packages renewal and invoicing, with FCLA E-	

<p>management, starting with the delegation of all consortial e-journal package negotiations and management to FCLA licensing specialist.</p> <p>3.3 Begin drafting RFP specifications for a statewide single vendor print/electronic approval/firm order plan to support continued development of identified areas of specialization within each library. Institutional participation will be voluntary.</p>	<p>are candidates for central management.</p> <p>b) Identify serials vendors that manage consortial packages, request demos and quotes.</p> <p>c) At renewal time, individual libraries will work with the FCLA licensing specialist and the subscription agent to transfer subscriptions to the new subscription service platform.</p> <p>a) Draw from work done at the CDRS preconference on e-books to begin drafting RFP specifications for statewide approval/firm order plan.</p>			<p>Resource Licensing Specialist as the main account manager.</p> <p>Significant savings are recognized in both dollar figures and staff time across the system.</p>	
---	---	--	--	--	--

**CSUL Core Activity 4.** Archive and preserve the scholarly record for use by future members of the communities served by Florida’s state universities.

CPC Objective	Activity	Timeline	Resources	Assessment	Status
4.1 Identify journal and monograph print core collections for placement in the state-wide storage facility.	a) Charge the existing Statewide Storage TF (or other) to create core journal lists and monographic selection criteria for the shared storage facility.	June-December, 2009	Storage TF, Members of CPC, PSPC/ILL?	Core journal lists and monographic selection criteria are created and approved for the shared storage facility.	
4.2 Institute a CSUL Recon team to assess and coordinate current and planned digitization initiatives to achieve best use of existing digitization facilities and expertise.	a) Charge a statewide recon team (Janus Recon TF?) to prepare a "best practices for digitization" manual. Approval from CSUL directors will assume statewide compliance at the institutional level and for the shared storage facility.	June-December, 2009	Janus Recon TF, CPC, FCLA	CSUL recon team is established and “best practices” manual is completed, approved, and widely distributed. Training is developed and undertaken as necessary.	
4.3 Create harmonized policies and procedures for digitization of materials by the CSUL	a) Charge appropriate working group (Janus Recon	June-December, 2009	Janus Recon TF, Storage TF, FCLA		

<b>CPC Objective</b>	<b>Activity</b>	<b>Timeline</b>	<b>Resources</b>	<b>Assessment</b>	<b>Status</b>
Recon team and the Shared Storage Facility.	TF) to develop a statewide collection development policy document that will also prioritize collections for digitization.				

**CSUL Core Activity 5.** Conduct assessments to achieve preferred learning outcomes and continuous service improvement.

<b>CPC Objective</b>	<b>Activity</b>	<b>Timeline</b>	<b>Resources</b>	<b>Assessment</b>	<b>Status</b>
5.1 Complete usage/cost analysis of shared FCLA databases.	a) Rank shared FCLA databases for renewal purposes.	March-June, 2009	ERS, ERS subject groups, FCLA licensing specialist, subject specialists in individual libraries	Ranked list of databases is finalized and approved by CPC/ERS.	Initial review done by subject working groups and individual institutions; ERS will make final rankings by June.
5.2 Begin usage/cost analysis of consortial e-journal packages managed by FCLA and acquired with institutional funds.	a) Review data to set acquisitions priorities.	July-September, 2009		System wide e-journal statistics are posted on FCLA website. Packages are prioritized for review and cancellation decisions made in preparation for new contract negotiations.	

**CSUL Core Activity 6.** Seek sufficient resources to provide superior services, spaces, and infrastructure.

CPC Objective	Activity	Timeline	Resources	Assessment	Status
6.1 Identify grant and other funding sources for digitization projects.			CPC, Special Collections Subcommittee, DISC	A list of potential grant sources is created and one grant identified for application by 2010.	

**Public Services Planning Committee of the SUL  
Quarterly Report to the Council of State University Libraries (Draft)  
Submitted by: Dawn Smith, PSPC Chair, 2009  
May 28, 2009**

The PSPC has had three teleconference call meetings (March 23, April 27, and June 1, 2009 (due to the Memorial Day holiday)) this quarter.

Scott Kass, Head of Reader Services at FIU replaced Sherry Carrillo on PSPC. Sherry Carrillo (FIU) retired in May 2009. She served on the PSPC Committee since its formation in the early 1990's. Members extended their sincere thanks for her many years of service and wished her a happy retirement.

Nancy Allen, University of South Florida, Sarasota-Manatee, is the new chair of the Information Literacy Subcommittee replacing Jacqueline Druash (FSU).

George Pearson (FIU) replaced Melinda Gottesman (UCF) as chair of the OPAC Subcommittee. Barbara Tuck will retain her role as co-chair.

Action Item

Per Barry Baker, UCF Director of Libraries, the ILLiad discount (Action Item 1) does not need CSUL approval. All the SUL ILL Departments will have to do is ask their Acquisition Departments the next time the ILLiad invoice is up for renewal is to tell Solinet (now Lyris) that OCLC has agreed to a 7% discount, the Florida rate. (Kristine Shrauger via email 5/19/2009)

Information Items

This report includes discussions and activities from PSPC and PSPC subcommittees from April through June, 2009

1. Public Services Planning Committee

- Teleconference on 4/2/2009 with Rebecca M. Bichel (FSU), Joshua Greben (FCLA), Michele Newberry (FCLA), Mary Ann O'Daniel (FCLA), Jean Phillips (FCLA), Barbara Stites (FGCU), and Amy Weiss (FSU) to work out a process that will make all egov docs collected from this point forward discoverable via every Mango catalog. (see attached E-Gov Meeting Minutes)
- Presented the PSPC report for the State University Libraries Interest Group at the Florida Library Annual Conference, Orlando, FL, May 5 – 8, 2009.
- Revised the PSPC Action Chart per CSUL request 3/4/2009. Reviewing action chart for future goals as several activities are complete.
- Discussion of SUL practices concerning print versus emailing Overdue Notices via the listserv.
- Charged the ILL Subcommittee to review the pros and cons of RAPID-ILL.

2. Access Services Subcommittee (formally the ILL/Circulation Subcommittee) – Marilyn Burke, Chair

- ILL/Circ committees combined and voted on a new group name, Access Services. The two list-servs were combined in May and now are called the SULAccess-L listserv. The group gave special thanks to Rich Bennett (UF) for assisting in the merger of the two list-servs and the transfer of members.
- TBLC Delivery contracts- Kristine Shrauger (UCF) reported on the issues concerning the delivery company. These included such items as schedules, quality control, and driver training. A new contract was being negotiated during this time frame. Tampa Bay Library Consortium decided to retain Velocity Express for the Statewide Delivery Service.

- Rapid ILL – the possible purchase of Rapid ILL was discussed by the group. There were questions about the costs, the turnaround time, and the ability to staff the appropriate departments to meet the requested turn-around standards. The group discussed further investigation into the product. Webinars were arranged for all the SUL.
- IDS/Alias project – this is a resource-sharing cooperative similar to RAPID ILL sponsored by SUNY that the Access Services committee is investigating. Several libraries have volunteered to do beta testing and there was a webinar on this project from SUNY. (see attached full Access Services report)

### 3. OPAC Subcommittee – George Pearson, Chair

A number of issues garnered the attention of the subcommittee in the previous quarter:

- Perhaps most important is the integration of article searching into the OPAC using Metalib. This initiative, known as Quick Articles, is headed by Josh Greben (FCLA), and is currently being reviewed by the subcommittee. The potential of a single interface for the catalog and various article databases is great, and is the top priority among the target features of the subcommittee.
- FCLA cleared up the two problems relating to government documents. First, Gov Docs records were showing multiple URL links from all SUS libraries; now they show only 1 or 2. Secondly, a problem with the wrong icons showing has been solved by removing icons entirely from problematic records.
- FCLA continues work on a variety of features. Jean Mosies (FCLA) is developing cross references (“Did you mean?”) using Aleph author, title, and subject headings. A Z39.50 interface for a joint CCLA/SUS union catalog is under development. The presentation in Mango of various digital collections has been enhanced. (see attached full OPAC Subcommittee report)

### 4. Information Literacy Subcommittee - Nancy Allen, Chair

The subcommittee has convened monthly. The following is a brief overview of the major discussion items and activities:

- There was a discussion about tutorials that are to be displayed on the PSPC Information Literacy Subcommittee Wiki (<http://infolitflorida.pbwiki.com>). Members agreed to continue to add tutorials.
- Discussion continued on committee members’ tutorial recommendations for the wiki. The focus was on “Suggested Tutorials for SULS”. The committee agreed that tutorials about finding peer review articles would be suitable for this category. There was a brief discussion about the committee’s PSPC assigned activity to create and deliver to online users “electronic content products” and the need to finalize the Endeca tutorial that was drafted. An update from Drew Smith about the Endeca tutorial will be provided in the next meeting.
- The tutorials about finding peer review articles that committee members recommended and posted on the wiki were reviewed. As a means for identifying key points that could be included in a new tutorial for SULS, committee members were asked to add comments about each tutorial content before the next meeting. (see attached full Information Literacy Subcommittee report)

Respectfully submitted,

Dawn Smith  
 Chair, Public Services Planning Committee  
 May 28, 2009



**E-Gov Meeting**  
Thursday April 2, 2009  
11:30 am to Noon

MINUTES

**ATTENDEES**

Rebecca M. Bichel, FSU  
Joshua Greben, FCLA  
Michele Newberry, FCLA  
Mary Ann O'Daniel, FCLA  
Jean Phillips, FCLA  
Dawn M. Smith, FAU  
Barbara Stites, FGCU  
Amy Weiss, FSU

**Notetaker (s):** Dawn M. Smith, Barbara J. Stites

Objective: All of the egov docs collected from this point forward would be discoverable via every Mango catalog.

Process:

- Marcive file of government document records are combined when they are received by FCLA.
- FCLA will have to separate the egov records from the combined Marcive records to load into a test database.
- FCLA will use the URL that comes with the egov record as the URL to be loaded in the eleven different catalogs.

Test Database:

- FCLA will do more analysis and put together a test database; they will let PSPC know when the database is ready.
- FCLA will start the test database with the 500 egov records from the February Marcive load. Initial load will be in the ALEPH test catalog.
- PSPC and TSPC will review how the record looks in the test database and provide feedback to FCLA.

Concerns:

- There is a valid concern that the number of these records will dwarf the local catalog, so some institutions will want to opt out. The records would still be loaded in their catalog but would be suppressed.
- New College which is not a part of the Marcive group has been loading government documents on an ad-hoc basis. A procedure would have to be created if they would like to add random egov records.

Next Steps:

- Dawn Smith will craft the wording for an email to go out to the SUS libraries once the test is completed to find out which libraries want to opt out.

- PSPC will poll the SUS libraries for a date to stop loading egov records. FCLA will start loading records from that date forward.
- Retrospective records may be addressed at a future date in a separate project. This project will look at the following issues: 1). retrospective egov only records, 2). egov records that are combined with microform or print records.

December 2008- May 2009

#### SUL Access Services Subcommittee Report

The joint meeting of the Circulation and Interlibrary Loan groups was held in Orlando in December 2008. The two groups voted to combine the two groups into one, which was renamed as Access Services. The List serves were combined in May and is now the SULAccess-L listserv with special thanks to Rich Bennett.

The group focused on the following items:

1. TBLC Delivery contracts- Kristine Shrauger reported on the issues concerning the delivery company. These included such items as schedules, quality control, and driver training. A new contract was being negotiated during this time frame.
2. Rapid ILL – the possible purchase of Rapid ILL was discussed by the group. There were questions about the costs, the turnaround time, and the ability to staff the appropriate departments to meet the requested turn-around times. The group discussed further investigation into the product. There was a webinar for Rapid ILL
3. IDS/Alias project – this is a SUNY project that has been investigated. This is an ILLIAD based project and does not use Rapid ILL. Several libraries volunteered to do beta testing and there was a webinar on this project from SUNY
4. Self Check- those libraries that has installed their units reported on their experiences.
5. Storage facility – members of the group are on the storage facility which impacts ILL and other components of Access Services, so there is representation on this committee .
6. UBorrow- this is a project that would allow patrons to directly request items from participating libraries and they would be delivered to the requesting patron's library by-passing the traditional ILL units. There is representation on this subcommittee from the Access Services Committee. A report was forwarded to the CSUL by Julia Zimmerman.

Respectfully submitted

May 14, 2009

Marilyn Burke, Chair  
SUL PSPC Access Services Subcommittee

State of the OPAC  
Quarterly Report of the OPAC Subcommittee  
May 24, 2009  
George Pearson, Chair

A number of issues have garnered the attention of the subcommittee in the previous quarter.

Perhaps most important is the integration of article searching into the OPAC using Metalib. This initiative, known as Quick Articles, is headed by Josh Greben, and is currently being reviewed by the subcommittee. The potential of a single interface for the catalog and various article databases is great, and is the top priority among the target features of the subcommittee.

FCLA cleared up the two problems relating to government documents. First, Gov Docs records were showing multiple URL links from all SUS libraries; now they show only 1 or 2. Secondly, a problem with the wrong icons showing has been solved by removing icons entirely from problematic records.

FCLA continues work on a variety of features. Jean Mosies is developing cross references (“Did you mean?”) using Aleph author, title, and subject headings. A Z3950 interface for a joint CCLA/SUS union catalog is under development. The presentation in Mango of various digital collections has been enhanced.

Finally, George Pearson began his tenure as chair at the May meeting. Melinda Gottesman is to be commended for her stellar service as the outgoing chair. Melinda kept the subcommittee focused and on track, while still confronting the larger issue of the OPAC’s place in a library undergoing profound social and technological change.

FCLA has given notice that priorities are shifting to the Aleph V19 upgrade, UBorrow, and the single bib record. The subcommittee will continue to work on improving the OPAC, discussing and suggesting various changes and improvements. However, the pace of OPAC development is expected to slow in the coming months.

**Council of State University Libraries, Florida  
Information Literacy Subcommittee of the  
Public Services Planning Committee  
Quarterly Report**

The subcommittee has convened monthly. The following is a brief overview of the major discussion items and activities:

**March**

There was a discussion about tutorials that are to be displayed on the PSPC Information Literacy Subcommittee Wiki (<http://infolitflorida.pbwiki.com>). Members agreed to continue to add tutorials.

**April**

Discussion continued on committee members' tutorial recommendations for the wiki. The focus was on "Suggested Tutorials for SULLS". The committee agreed that tutorials about finding peer review articles would be suitable for this category. There was a brief discussion about the committee's PSPC assigned activity to create and deliver to online users "electronic content products" and the need to finalize the Endeca tutorial that was drafted. An update from Drew Smith about the Endeca tutorial will be provided in the next meeting.

**May**

The tutorials about finding peer review articles that committee members recommended and posted on the wiki were reviewed. As a means for identifying key points that could be included in a new tutorial for SULLS, committee members were asked to add comments about each tutorial content before the next meeting.

Submitted by Nancy Allen, Chair

**CSUL Public Services Planning Committee  
ACTION PLAN for 2009  
To be submitted to CSUL May 28, 2009**

**Action Items to comply with the core activities established by CSUL. The Action Plan for 2009 basically continues the work of the 2008 plan.**

**CSUL Core Activity 1.** Acquire, manage, and provide access to scholarly information resources in multiple formats, subjects, and languages in support of academic programs.

<b>PSPC Objective</b>	<b>Activity</b>	<b>Timeline</b>	<b>Resources Required</b>	<b>Assessment Measures</b>	<b>Status*</b>
1.1 Collaborate with CPC to establish a voluntary cooperative collection development/management policy for federal government documents (FDLP) profiled for Selective Libraries in SUL; consider Gov Docs data miner reports.	Investigate feasibility of centralized Marcive tapeloads for all electronic documents records in coordination with TSPC.	2009 and ongoing	PSPC and FCLA	Documentation of outcome of the Committees' investigation into the feasibility of loading Marcive records centrally is used to plan	Nancy Cunningham (USF) and Becca Bichel (FSU) – Marcive – Conference call held 4/2/09. FCLA will separate the egov records from the combined records to load into a test database. They will use the URL that comes with the egov record as the URL to be loaded in the different catalogs. FCLA will do more analysis and put together a test database. PSPC and TSPC will review how the record looks in the test database and provide feedback to FCLA. Concern that the number of records will dwarf the local catalog, so some institutions may choose to opt out.

<b>CSUL Core Activity 2.</b> Develop and deliver services to facilitate user-centered discovery and understanding of the record of human knowledge and to promote scholarship leading to new knowledge.					
<b>PSPC Objective</b>	<b>Activity</b>	<b>Timeline</b>	<b>Resources Required</b>	<b>Assessment Measures</b>	<b>Status*</b>
2.1 Increase patron empowerment	a. collaborate on individual implementation of self check-out system	2009 and ongoing	SULs and FCLA	Annual PSPC Report reflects that self check-out systems were installed in SUL Libraries	a. Shelley Arlen (UF) UF has Fall semester plans for initiating a task force to examine SelfCheck issues (marketing, problems, etc.) UF would like to work with other SUL libraries that have SelfCheck .
2.1 Increase patron empowerment	b. advance a proposal for implementing unmediated borrowing functionality	2009 and ongoing	SBTF, PSPC, Acc Svcs UMBTF, FCLA and other committees as required	CSUL moved the project from CSUL to the Unmediated Borrowing Task Force.	b. Marilyn Burke to report the UMBTF progress at PSPC meetings. UCF is working on UMB using ILLiad. There are several libraries: UWF, FAU, USF, and UCF that are in preliminary talks with OCLC to design and beta-test OCLC's UMB system for articles. OCLC hopes to begin discussions in July, beta-test in December and release it in January 2010
2.1 Increase patron empowerment	c. Enhance patron capabilities at remote sites (other than home institution)	2009 and ongoing	PSPC and Acc Svcs	Anecdotal evidence that availability of statewide best practice has had positive impact on local delivery of research services	c. Marilyn Burke (USF) Reviewing the pros/ cons of RAPIDILL and the IDS project to see which would work best for the SUS Libraries. Kristine Shrauger - TBLC Delivery has decided to retain Velocity Express for the Statewide Delivery Service.
2.2 Examine how each institution defines (or may be redefining) and	Collate individual definitions,	2009 and ongoing	PSPC and other committees	Anecdotal evidence that availability of	2.2 Elizabeth Outler (UF-Law), Mary Edwards (UF-Health) -

delivers “research support services” with goal of setting best practice.	how delivered, who participates, usage data collected, etc.		as required	statewide best practice has had positive impact on local delivery of research services.	Feedback was given on the draft survey. Changes are being made to finalize the survey. The next step would be approval of the survey from PSpC.
--	---	--	-------------	---	---

**CSUL Core Activity 3.** Collaborate to increase access to content, to create economic efficiencies, and to employ information technology in support of development and delivery of services.

<b>PSPC Objective</b>	<b>Activity</b>	<b>Timeline</b>	<b>Resources Required</b>	<b>Assessment Measures</b>	<b>Status*</b>
3.1 Collaborate to increase access to content, to create economic efficiencies, and to employ information technology in support of development and delivery of services.	At least 2 electronic content products will be created and delivered to online users; optional/available for any of the SULs e.g. podcast RSS feed Interactive tutorial	1st podcast finished in 2008  2 <sup>nd</sup> by Fall, 2009	PSPC, Info Lit and OPAC Sub-Committee	Members of Information Literacy and Circulation subcommittees to develop one product each; analyze user access data to measure impact of e-delivery of content	3.1 Nancy Allen (USF)– OPAC Subcommittee Online tutorial was created and sent to all PSPC members in December 2008 for review. Feedback to Drew Smith suggested to that the tutorial screen should be enlarged. As of 4/27/09 Drew is making the changes and finalizing the tutorial. The next step would be approval of the tutorial from PSPC
3.2 Work with TSPC on recommendations for next generation OPAC, resulting from the January 2008 Visioning Summit held at UCF	PSPC will identify objectives from the OPAC Visioning Summit Report from which to base further work	2009 and ongoing	PSPC, TSPC, OPAC	Recommendations for a next generation OPAC	3.2 George Pearson (FIU) Melinda Gottesman (UCF), Laurel Crump (UNF) Completed - but ongoing. PSPC members are discussing new action items & recommendations; will also discuss with the new chair, George Pearson



<b>CSUL Core Activity 4.</b> Archive and preserve the scholarly record for use by future members of the communities served by Florida’s state universities.					
<b>PSPC Objective</b>	<b>Activity</b>	<b>Timeline</b>	<b>Resources Required</b>	<b>Assessment Measures</b>	<b>Status*</b>
4.1 Collaborate with CPC on recommendations for guidelines and statement of principles for merged collections for proposed SUL Shared Storage Facility, as part of the CPC goals derived from the Janus principles. (in cooperation with Task Force)	Develop recommended guidelines for access to collections in storage facility	2009 and ongoing (contingent on the specific recommendations included in the final Task Force report)	Statewide Storage Task Force, PSPC, CPC, TSPC, FCLA, staff in the SULs	Successful implementation of the storage facility satisfaction	To be determined

<b>CSUL Core Activity 5.</b> Conduct assessments to achieve preferred learning outcomes and continuous service improvement.					
<b>PSPC Objective</b>	<b>Activity</b>	<b>Timeline</b>	<b>Resources Required</b>	<b>Assessment Measures</b>	<b>Status*</b>
5.1 Establish an Assessment Task Force to conduct and analyze results of an OPAC usability study; share results and recommendations with TSPC and CPC as applicable	<p>Survey designed; IRB approval sought; conduct user survey at 3 institutions (FSU, UF, USF); collate results for analysis. Write study report</p> <p>Recommendations from the OPAC Usability Study will be implemented by SUL's</p>	<p>Spring, 2008</p> <p>Fall 2008</p> <p>2009 and ongoing</p>	PSPC, OPAC	<p>Members of OPAC subcommittee involved will assess usefulness and recommended application of data as part of analysis</p> <p>The OPAC Usability Study Report is shared with CSUL and other appropriate groups and individuals.</p>	<p>George Pearson (FIU)</p> <p>Completed - but ongoing. PSPC members are discussing new action items &amp; recommendations; will also discuss with the new chair, George Pearson</p>
5.2 SUL's will voluntarily participate in application of qualitative or quantitative measures assessing the same service areas so that data can be compared and a possible service benchmark established	PSPC Assessment Task Force will gather possible survey tools for participating SUL libraries; TF will compare data and recommend benchmarks to PSPC	Fall 2009-2010	PSPC, SULs staff, Acc Svcs, Info Literacy	<p>2008-09: Participating SUL's may use various qualitative or quantitative tools but services measured/analyzed will be same across institutions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• ILL Service</li> <li>• Hours of Operation</li> <li>• Library Instruction Program</li> </ul>	<p>5.2 Meg Scharf (UCF), Caroline Reed (NCF) and Marin Dell (FSU-Law) agreed to work with Meg Scharf on assessment. 2009 SULs will report on current assessment projects concerning 3 service points LibQual 2010 is tentative for the SUL libraries; some can't afford it, and it is difficult to administer with fewer staff. PSPC will continue to</p>

					<p>be collaborative in some way and develop a plan in Summer, 2009. At the next meeting, we will determine a small group to work on this work on cooperative assessments.</p>
--	--	--	--	--	---

**CSUL Core Activity 6.** Seek sufficient resources to provide superior services, spaces, and infrastructure.

**TSPC Quarterly Report  
May 28, 2009**

Since the February report, the Technical Services Planning Committee met in conference calls on March 2 & 12, April 9, and May 14. During this period, the TSPC focused on three main topics—the report by CSUL's Single Bibliographic Record Task Force, planning a face-to-face meeting of catalogers and the on-going plans for an Acquisitions Subcommittee. We also continued to keep informed of FCLA's progress in the re-indexing project and the preparations for the version 19 upgrade. We discussed adding the "status" column to our 2009 Action Plan in advance of the June CSUL meeting. Instead we decided to turn that revision into a mid-year review of the plan. It is on our agenda for discussion on our calls of July 23 and Aug. 13, in plenty of time for re-submission to CSUL before the Sept. 10-11 meeting.

**Single Statewide Shared Bibs:**

The report by CSUL's Single Bibliographic Record Task Force was the topic of discussion for the entire March 2 call and for most of the March 12 call. TSPC members are divided in their assessment of the report. A list of positive and negative comments was compiled and attached to the March 2 minutes. An especial concern was the need for more TSPC representation in the earliest stages of piloting this project since the technical aspects involve our particular area of expertise. Another concern was the mixing together of discussion of shared bibs and OPAC functionality when the two topics have nothing to do with each other. Out of the discussion of shared bibliographic records grew our decision to propose a statewide meeting of catalogers.

**Statewide Meeting of Catalogers:**

The Single Bibliographic Record Task Force report identified the need to "develop standardized cataloging practices and policies necessary in a shared catalog environment." (p. 7) As a first step in this process, a task force of the TSPC (Susan Heron (USF), Betsy Simpson (UF) and Sue Wartzok (FIU)) has developed a proposal for a meeting of catalogers (attached) and a draft survey (also attached) that will provide the basis of the discussion at that meeting. We propose to set up a swiki to post preparatory readings and survey results as they become available. By these means, discussion can begin via email in advance of the meeting. Furthermore, by posting the survey on a swiki, it can be augmented as we discover topics that we missed in the draft survey or areas where additional data are needed. We hope that this meeting can be attended not only by cataloging department heads but also by other key members of the departments.

*Action item: The TSPC requests approval of a face-to-face meeting of catalogers.*

**Acquisitions Subcommittee:**

The incipient Acquisitions Subcommittee met by conference call on March 16 with participants from ten state university libraries. As a result of this meeting, Robb Waltner and Vicki Stanton were selected as Co-Chairs and an Object Code Task Force was formed. The group then met in person on March 26 during the Collection Development Conference. There were 21 participants (including CPC members) from eight institutions. Another conference call took place on April 20. During this call a draft charge for the subcommittee was discussed. A revised draft was

presented to the TSPC for discussion during our May 14 call. The TSPC approved the Charge, Status, Membership and Recommendations, Mission, and Initial Activities for them as a subcommittee of the TSPC. The group still has not decided if they should be a subcommittee of both the TSPC and the CPC; discussions with the CPC are continuing.

**Authorities Subcommittee report:**

The Authorities Subcommittee submitted a written report that was presented on May 7, 2009 by Jeanne Piascik (UCF) at the State University Library Interest Group (SULIG) meeting of the Florida Library Association (FLA) in Orlando, Florida. As the re-indexing project neared completion the Subcommittee responded to FCLA's questions of which existing authority reports were being used and which reports were not being used. This information will be used as a starting point in assessing the extent to which existing authority reports meet the needs of authority control activities. The next step will be to determine what additional report capabilities are needed.

The major accomplishment for this quarter was FCLA's completion of the huge re-indexing project. As each institution was re-indexed, the linking to authority records was changed from the old authority file in LCA10 TEST to the newer authority file in LCA10 PROD. The next step is to bring the LCA10 PROD authority file up to date. It is at this point the real testing of authority reports can begin.

In addition the Subcommittee is working on revising relevant sections of the TSPC Action Plan by adding a progress report on Authority Subcommittee activities. During the next quarter we will be working on a recommendation to TSPC that reflects a consensus for the configuration of the ALEPH Search Field and Subfield headings function (scancode.dat table) as well as authority report testing and development.

**Metadata Subcommittee report:**

The DISC/Metadata group working on revising the old CAGER guidelines met most recently on April 27. They are going through the Dublin Core elements, conceptually applying them to MARC elements and discussing how they might be used and assigned for Digitool projects.

**Miscellaneous:**

A prime function of the TSPC conference calls is to share information. During this past quarter the TSPC received reports on USF's OCLC Reclamation Project; the Collection Development Meeting; the March CSUL meeting and the ELUNA conference. The OPAC Subcommittee's liaison to the TSPC, Barbara Tuck, has been supplying us with written reports on developments in Mango, such as CRL records and the "Did you mean" feature. The TSPC liaison to the CPC's Object Code Task Force, Catherine Gardiner, has been keeping us informed on that project. On the out-going side of information sharing, the TSPC prepared a report on our activities during the past year for the SULIG meeting during the May FLA conference.

Respectfully submitted,  
Sue Wartzok (FIU), Chair

**Cataloging in the SUL, 2009-2014**  
**Proposal for a Statewide Meeting of Catalogers**  
**Appendix I: TSPC May 28 Quarterly Report**

**Goal of the meeting:** to begin to standardize cataloging practices and expand collaboration statewide in order to achieve efficiencies and facilitate user access; to begin planning the future of cataloging services for the SUL.

**Date of the meeting:** September or October 2009

**Site of the meeting:** USF with Susan Heron as local arrangements contact

**Preparation for the meeting:** a survey (draft attached); a swiki to share readings and survey results; begin discussion via email

**Possible topics** (subject to revision as planning proceeds & survey results come in):

Changing Cataloging Priorities; Enduring Cataloging Values

- What are the values that catalogers share and how are they best applied in a next generation cataloging environment?
- What are the “core” cataloging functions and services of direct benefit to users?
- What constitutes “good enough” cataloging?

Standard Cataloging Practices

- What are the similarities and differences in cataloging practices across the SUL?
- How can we implement more uniformity?

Authority Control

- Which maintenance functions should be handled by FCLA?
- What is the role of the Florida NACO Funnel?

Batchloads

- What batchloads are individual libraries doing?
- Which batchloads should be handled by FCLA and which locally?

OCLC Services

- Who subscribes to which services?
- Should each SUL do an OCLC reclamation project?
- How would a shared approval plan(s) impact cataloging processes?

Shared Storage Facility

- What is needed vis a vis cataloging related to the shared storage facility?

Future cooperation within the SUL:

- Can the SULs afford to have local cataloging departments in the future?
- In what areas can cataloging expertise be shared (e.g., foreign language)?
- Are there functions that could be centralized at FCLA or at other SULs?
- Are there functions that have to be performed locally?

- Can we develop a model for future cooperative projects?

**Appendix II: TSPC May 28 Quarterly Report** - Draft of a survey of SUL cataloging departments (designed to evolve as data is gathered)

## Overview

Does your department have a mission &/or goals &/or values statement &/or organizational chart? If yes, would you please post them on the swiki?

Approximately how many titles are cataloged by your department per year?

- Copy Cataloging
- Original Cataloging

Do you have local expertise that might possibly be shared across the SULs?

- Arabic language skills
- Chinese language skills
- Japanese language skills
- Other language skills
- Map cataloging skills
- Music cataloging skills
- Other skills \_\_\_\_\_

Please summarize what your library considers the three or four most important aspects of a bibliographic record for user access?

- appropriateness of subject headings
- appropriateness of classification numbers
- authority controlled access points (including series)
- the accuracy of the primary descriptive elements
- if there are hotlinks, that the links work
- other \_\_\_\_\_

Please summarize what your library considers the three or four most important parts of a bibliographic record for staff workflow? Include list?

## Staffing

Faculty

- How many faculty-level catalogers does your cataloging department have?
- Are your faculty-level catalogers responsible for particular formats? Particular languages? Particular subject areas? Please describe.
- Do some of your faculty-level catalogers do work other than cataloging per se—for example, authority control work, database maintenance or batch loading?
- Are there faculty-level catalogers in other library departments? If yes, how many and in which departments?



### Paraprofessionals

- How many paraprofessional catalogers does your cataloging department have?
- Are your paraprofessional catalogers responsible for particular formats? Particular languages? Particular subject areas? Please describe.
- Do some of your paraprofessional catalogers do work other than cataloging per se—for example, authority control work, database maintenance or batch loading?
- Are there paraprofessional catalogers in other library departments? If yes, how many and in which departments?

### Students

Do you employ students? If so, how much FTE per year?

Check the types of work performed by students:

- Distribution/Sorting of material
- Searching/Downloading
- Database maintenance projects
- Item creation
- Holding creation
- Processing (tattletaping, spine label creation)
- Other (please describe)

## Workflow

Some libraries divide up the work based on source of cataloging. If your library does this, who handles materials with records created by LC? PCC?

Are there particular fields that your staff checks in these records? Please list.

Are there fields that you tell your staff not to bother to check? Please list.

What level staff handles materials which have matching member-input records in OCLC and that have both subject headings and the classification designation used by your library.

Are there particular fields that your staff checks in these records? Please list.

Are there fields that you tell your staff not to bother to check? Please list.

Are these materials kept in cataloging for a period of time to see if better copy becomes available? If yes, how long are they kept?

What level staff handles materials which have matching member-input records in OCLC but that lack either subject headings or the classification designation used by your library.

Are there particular fields that your staff checks or adds to these records in addition to subject headings and the classification designation? Please list.

Are these materials kept in cataloging for a period of time to see if better copy becomes available? If yes, how long are they kept?

How many of your catalogers—both faculty catalogers and paraprofessional catalogers—create original-input records in OCLC?

If paraprofessional staff create original records in OCLC, is this work done by a particular class of paraprofessional?

If paraprofessional staff create original records in OCLC, is their work checked by a faculty-level cataloger—Always? Sometimes? Never?

Does your department provide metadata creation for digital collections?

If yes, check all the metadata scheme(s) used:

MARC

Dublin Core

EAD

TEI

VRA

Other (please list)

## **Backlogs**

Please describe your cataloging backlog: approximate size & categories of materials.

Is there an area of your backlog that is increasing? If yes, what area(s) and why.

Is there an area of your backlog that is decreasing? If yes, what area(s) and why.

If you have a backlog of materials awaiting cataloging, are these materials in the catalog and available for “in process requests”?

If yes, do you allow un-cataloged materials to circulate before cataloging?

Do you rush catalog requested items? What is your turnaround?

## **Batchloads**

Are staff in cataloging responsible for any data loads?

If yes, what data loads are done in cataloging?

What levels of staff do particular loads?

If data loads are not done in cataloging or not only done in cataloging, in what department or departments are they done?

Are there batch loads that you do locally now that you think FCLA should do centrally for the SULs?

Are some of your library's data loads done using the Aleph loader? Are some done using GenLoad? And if both are used, why do you use the loader that you use for the particular load that you use them for?

When batch loads are done, does your library add ticklers?

When batch loads are done, does your library add any other particular fields? Please list.

If bibliographic records from PromptCat are loaded, does anyone check to see if the record matches the material received? If yes, is this checking done in cataloging or in acquisitions?

Is your library's chief source of cataloging metadata OCLC?

If no, what is your library's chief source of cataloging metadata?

Does your library use Z39.50 to capture cataloging metadata?

Does your library use the OCLC Bibliographic Notification Services?

If yes, do you load only selected fields or do you load the entire bib record?

Are there other OCLC services that your library uses?

Your library & OCLC Reclamation: 1) Already done; 2) Definite plans to do; 3) Probably will do. 4) Not planning to do at this time

How is your library handling vendor records that don't have OCLC numbers?

Does your library have records that have restrictions on sharing? If yes, what type or types of records are these?

## **Authorities**

Does your library do authority control work? If not, why not?

If yes, do you control series as part of your authority control work?

If yes, are you as up to date as it is possible to be (given the state of our shared LC authority file)?

## **Cooperative Programs**

Does your library participate in the Florida NACO Funnel?

Does your library participate in NACO as an independent contributor?

Does your library participate in BIBCO?

Does your library participate in CONSER?

Does your library participate in SACO?

Does your library participate in OCLC's Expert Community Experiment?

Does your library participate in OCLC's Enhance program?

Are there other cooperative cataloging programs that your library participates in?

### **Miscellaneous questions**

Does your library produce a new book list that is essentially generated by catalogers?

If yes, is it emailed to faculty & staff or is it distributed in some other format?

If yes, what software or service is used to generate the list and how frequently do you publish it?

How does your department communicate with staff in other departments to keep them informed of cataloging-related information that may impact their work?

Do any of you send out a departmental newsletter or use a blog for this purpose?

Has your department automated the gathering of monthly cataloging statistics?

If yes, is your procedure such that you can either post a link to it or post the procedure itself on the swiki?

Does your library use subfield k in 852 of HOL records to display a call number prefix, such as REF, Oversize, etc.? If yes, do you have any feedback from public services staff or users about the usefulness of call number prefixes?

What are your department's biggest challenges? Staffing, training, language expertise, format expertise, management issues, backlog, projects, competing demands, retirements, lack of support from administration, other?

**Members:** Gail Clement (FIU), Bill Covey (UF), Selma Jaskowski (UCF), Michael Kucsak (UNF), Mark Stoffan (FSU)

**Informational:**

TAG met by conference call 9 and 23 March, 6 and 20 April, 4 and 18 May, and 1 June, at 2:00 pm.

**Video conferencing solutions for the SULs :**

Following a request by CSUL at the March meeting for an evaluation of AccessGrid, TAG submitted a review to the CSUL Chair 21 April 2009 as well as an updated pricing scenario for Elluminate.

**TAG response to the UF PALMM proposal:**

TAG submitted the comments of individual members to CSUL on 13 April 2009 after review and discussion of the UF PALMM proposal.

The Digital Initiatives Subcommittee prepared a draft of “Features Desired in a Digital Library System” and “Characteristics and Services Desired in a Digital Library System Provider” that has been reviewed by TAG and returned to DISC with comments. DISC continues to work on the document.

**ILS Solutions**

Bill Covey attended OLE meetings at Duke the week of 24 May, where they are finalizing the specifications which will go into the next grant project which will build Rev. 1. That should be started soon, but tentative start dates have not been released. The group will also finalize the presentations which describe the goals and architecture of OLE, as well as its position relative to more conventional software in the library the automation market.

TAG continues to investigate new innovations in commercial and open source ILS development.

**Digital Initiatives Subcommittee:**

The DISC quarterly report is submitted separately.

**Action Item:**

TAG asks for CSUL's opinion on video conferencing solutions. TAG believes that video conferencing has enhanced communication at the committee level, though it may not be considered appropriate for use at CSUL quarterly meetings. While continued use of free products like Dimdim could suffice in the current economic climate, there have been problems reported with its use that could be eliminated by using a product like Elluminate.

Respectfully submitted by:  
Selma Jaskowski  
Coordinator, TAG

**Digital Initiatives Subcommittee**

Quarterly Report

May 2009

Lee Dotson, Chair

[ddotson@mail.ucf.edu](mailto:ddotson@mail.ucf.edu)

Plato Smith, Vice-Chair

[psmithii@fsu.edu](mailto:psmithii@fsu.edu)

**Summary**

This report reflects DISC activity during March, April and May of 2009. The group met 3 times by conference call to discuss various issues related to DigiTool and the Florida Digital Archive, provide updates on digital collections or other news, and coordinate activities with the Metadata Subcommittee. The minutes of the conference calls are posted on the DISC wiki at <http://swiki.fcla.edu:8000/DISC>.

Action item: Request to refer discussion of issues related to digital collections in Mango to the PSPC and TSPC.

**Progress on priorities**

Recent discussions have provided progress on previously agreed upon priorities of the subcommittee:

**1) Discuss and provide input/decisions on issues related to DigiTool:**

A decision was reached regarding the overall organization of collections and categories. DISC favors an “Items by...” approach so that materials will be grouped by topic, type, media, and contributor. FCLA moved the approved mock-up into production and DISC members have been evaluating the new layout and categories to provide feedback on the arrangement. Specific discussions have focused on customization, branding, browsing, and Mango policies.

**2) Create formal and informal communication structures with committees/subcommittees, such as the Special Collections and Metadata**

**Subcommittees, whose charges overlap with DISC's charge to facilitate cooperation and collaboration with regards to digital collection building and maintenance:**

DISC continues to collaborate with the Metadata Subcommittee on the revision of the CAGER guidelines. The joint working group is currently reviewing the Dublin Core elements and discussing MARC to Dublin Core to DigiTool mapping. A wiki and listserv are available to all members of DISC and Metadata SC for posting their needs and requirements for the revision as well as open discussion.

**Detailed Activities:**

Topics discussed by the DISC members during conference calls in the last quarter include:

- 1) Housekeeping: election of the new vice chair. Plato Smith was elected the new vice-chair for 2009-2010.
- 2) Priscilla Caplan (FCLA) shared a presentation on the overall architecture of DigiTool and resource discovery tools. She emphasized three de facto policies:
  - If a record for local digital content goes to any Mango, it goes to all Mangos: the union Mango and all 11 SUS Mangos;
  - Dublin Core records in PALMM DigiTool collections are sent to Mango by default; a library can choose to "opt out" a collection by request ;
  - Dublin Core records in institutional (non PALMM) DigiTool collections are not sent to Mango by default; a library can choose to "opt in" by request.

FCLA wanted DISC's opinion on these policies, particularly the first, but the subcommittee declined to take on these policy issues. DISC felt that issues related to digital collections in Mango needed involvement by public services, technical services, and special collections staff as well, and that there was no existing group with such broad representation. It was recommended that the question should be transferred to the TSPC and PSPC committees.



- 3) Gail Clement (FIU) and Laurie Taylor (UF) updated the “Features Desired in a Digital Library System to Replace FCLA's Textual Collections and Visual Collections” 2006 document. The newly revised “Features Desired in a Digital Library System” document is intended to reflect current practice as well as anticipate future needs. The document was distributed to DISC and made available for comment at the May meeting. Discussion focused on reporting, statistics, metadata synchronization, definitions, deliverables, and formats. Selected topics will be the focus of DISC’s next few calls.





Florida Center for Library

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]



May 28, 2009  
Quarterly Report  
Statewide Storage Task Force

Over the last six months, the task force has worked on a number of issues, including: circulation of print serial volumes, number of print copies of serial volumes, number of print copies of monographs, level of verification of best copy to retain, and the method of billing and/or membership fees for facility services. Additionally, we have expanded our membership to include representation from the ICF and CCLA. We have gathered data from other large consortial/multi-site remote storage facilities related to billing and management issues. We have also presented an update and an overview of the project at the Collection Development/Resource Sharing Conference, sponsored by FSU and the Panhandle Library Access Network (PLAN).

Based on feedback from the CSUL Deans, the following consensus decisions were made:

- a. Only one copy of each print journal will be retained in the storage facility.
- b. Print journal volumes should be loaned with a restriction to library building use only.

Currently, the task force is examining the issues of number of print monograph copies, level of verification of best copy, and the method of billing for facility services. To assist in these decisions, data was gathered from six remote storage facilities, primarily cooperative/multi-site installations. The task force is reviewing these policies to make initial recommendations to the other committees within CSUL (CPC, TSPC, and PSPC). Final recommendations will then be sent to CSUL for approval. Discussion is ongoing, but a final recommendation will be available for the next scheduled CSUL meeting.

Draft of policies under consideration:

- a. The facility will retain one copy of a monograph when an electronic copy is held by a participating library in a permanently available collection by trusted third parties (like OCA;) if no electronic copy is available, up to 2 monograph copies may be deposited.
- b. Comprehensive issue by issue verification of print serials volumes will not be undertaken. Instead, UF's copy will serve as the default copy to be deposited into the storage facility. If an issue is obviously missing from a bound volume, as determined via missing issue notes in the Aleph holdings or a yellow missing issue sheet tipped into the volume, this copy will not be deposited. Issues with obvious physical damage (e.g., water damage, brittle, overly stained, etc.) will also not be deposited. FSU will be the first institution contacted to fill the gap. If it

is necessary to look beyond UF and FSU, individual institutions will be contacted.

- c. Annual assessments will be billed to participating State University Libraries. These assessments will be based on institutional size (FTE) and will be used to fund daily operating costs of the facility. Special services will require additional fees.

Over the next six months, planned activities for the task force include:

- a. Further investigation of the ILL billing practices at other facilities for those outside the consortium
- b. Consensus decisions from Ib. above will be distributed to CPC, PSPS, and TSPC for further input
- c. Final decisions will be submitted to CSUL for approval

Respectfully submitted,  
Ben Walker  
Chair, Statewide Storage Task Force