Council of State University Libraries

COUNCIL MEETING MINUTES
Thursday, March 5, 2009
Grace Allen/Florida Studies Center Rooms,
4ᵗʰ 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 Wigersma, 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)
- June 11-12, 2009 – UNF
- September 10-11, 2009 – UWF
- December 3, 2009 CSUL and FCLA; December 4, 2009 FCLA/CCLA – New College
- March 4-5, 2010 - UF
- June 10-11, 2010 – FIU
- 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,** t**his 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 we 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 1st 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