

FINAL
Statewide Storage Task Force (SSTF)
Minutes
Monday, December 13, 2010
10:00 am – 11:30 am
Conference Call

- I **Members Attending:** Cathy Martyniak (UF), Rita Cauce (FIU), Robb Waltner (UNF), Marilyn Burke (USF), Judy Russell (UF), Dan Schoonover (FSU), Amanda Ziegler (UWF), Maris Hayashi (FAU), John Renaud (Miami), Pat Profeta (Florida College System), Wendy Ellis (FCLA) filling in for Jean Philips and Jennifer Kuntz

Members Not Attending: Becky Donlan (FGCU), Faye Jones (FSU-LAW), John Martin (UF-HSCL), Jonathan Miller (Rollins College), Frank Allen (UCF), Jennifer Kuntz (FCLA), Pricilla Henry (FAMU), Jean Philips (FCLA)

II **Review & approve November minutes**

Minutes were approved.

III **Updates**

a. **High Density Facility**

Hired 2nd student for de-duplication and will be hiring a 3rd one soon. Around February and March Cathy will be hiring more people. The equipment is starting to arrive. Cathy is still trying to get heat in ALF for the people working there.

b. **JSTOR/CSUL**

CSUL had a detailed discussion about process for print inventory; and the decisions about it at their meeting. CSUL has changed its view regarding JSTOR. They will do a title by title review on JSTOR. The agreement was to charge CPC with reviewing JSTOR titles and making recommendations back to CSUL. CPC will begin with the least held materials. CPC will use the spreadsheet Cathy created. They will decide if the items that are held uniquely by UF in ALF will be trayed. Next, uniquely held titles will be looked at. Then, the ones held in ALF, by UF, by at least one other institution and ones not in ALF, but held by at least one other institution. By addressing the ALF materials first Cathy can start sorting, traying, and inventorying them. CSUL has sent a chart for CPC to review the first two categories of ALF only and those held by CSUL, but not in ALF. They are being asked to review 20% of the whole JSTOR list by the end of January and by June reviewed the rest of the list.

Comment: Was there an Implication that another library in the system held a JSTOR title and the CPC recommended retention of that JSTOR title that the institution was obligated to send it to storage?

Judy's Response: The institution may submit the JSTOR, but it is not a requirement. They might be asked to commit to sending it to the HDF when they are ready to get rid of the item. Cathy will look over the policies to make sure it is clear.

Question (Dan): What is the motivation for not building a state wide JSTOR collection? Is it the issue of space or something else?

Answer (Judy): There is a pro and con to building a JSTOR collection at the HDF.

Pro – Level of assurance people could remove JSTOR print from their own collection

Con – There is an enormous amount of material and it is probably better covered in other places. When you look at other HDF who have run out of space, many of them are going back through their inventory to get rid of duplicates, so we need to be careful with the JSTOR. Cathy and Judy talked about storing any JSTOR in one part of the facility in case it may need to be removed some time in the future.

Judy contacted other ASERL library facilities to see how far they are along with JSTOR. Duke seems to be further along and have a list ready to commit to the ASERL agreement. This means they agree to keep them for around 25 years.

A comment by one CSUL dean was: There is no lack of comfort of retaining it in Gainesville. It would be easier to send a van to Gainesville to get multiple items, then to somewhere else like Duke who may not be willing to let them take them out of the facility.

Question: What is the feeling of this committee?

Answer: People may not want to give up the JSTOR yet for many reasons. Economy, security, or even afraid someone might harass them and ask, "Why did we spend money on them if we are only going to get rid of them?"

Question/Hypothesis (Judy): CPC recommends 10 titles in science not to keep. Only one member on the CSUL team wants to keep it. Do the other members out vote the one on the decision?

Response: Judy wants the group to think about this and have a recommendation.

Question: Is there a criterion on items going into storage if someone questions it? What are other places doing?

Answer: Not sure there is an answer to this. It might become a test case. The deans want to do a title by title review of JSTOR.

Alternative: If the journal is only valuable to one school, then it might be better if they keep it.

CSUL did approve the transformation of the policy by date document to policy by topic. Cathy demonstrated the trying process at their December meeting.

c. **S-CAD**

- a. The group continues to meet.

IV Policy 3.d continue and possibly finish discussion on duplicate barcodes
(See Meeting Agenda for policy language)

Cathy took the old language off and included the new language on the agenda. Judy and Cathy put the word out to other schools on the placement of the bar code in case they want to prepare the item for storage in the future.

The group approved the new language.

We will vet the new language to TSPC, PSPC, and CPC. Cathy will send out an e-mail with an attachment to the committees.

V Potential policy of automatically digitizing out of copyright monographs AFTER a circulation? Or should it be BEFORE the circulation, as suggested by CPC?
(Rescheduled from October)

This came up at UF. UF does some projects that scan, and post on the Internet out of copyright monographs.

Question: Would it be checked for other digitization?

Answer: Already in the workflow for digitization. If it is already scanned by a reliable source, then the link is added into the record.

The concept would be to have a monograph that is **out of copyright** digitized either after or possibly in lieu of a physical circulation. Cathy would like to know if the concept is agreeable.

Since it is the last copy some members like this idea.

Idea: Do we have to do this to every item especially, if you can find it from another source? Maybe there should be some criteria before deciding to scan.

Question: How long does it take to scan a monograph?

Answer: The UF library sends its monographs to outside company called Internet Archive.

Question: After scanning a book do you get rid of the print?

Answer: No. It would go back into the tray it came out of.

Question: Would the group like to have this topic as a standing topic or have a smaller group discuss it and report back to the main group?

Cathy wants to discuss what are the implications on the assessment charged back to MOU participants on the next few calls.

Idea: This is something that could benefit the state. If it is in-state borrowing, then there would be no charge. If it is out-of-state borrowing, then a fee could be charged for digitization.

VI Policy 2.c. discussion

a. Current Language (See Meeting Agenda for policy language)

The HDF policy was written two years ago. On December 13th, Cathy e-mailed out the latest Uborrow policies to everyone on the task force to review. Dan and Wendy will be able to give their input regarding Uborrow. The language between policy 2.c and the Uborrow policy is different.

b. Questions

i. Are we still OK with this policy?

Question: Would the Uborrow policy override the HDF policy for example the time frame monographs are on loan?

Answer: No. The policy could be different for the HDF since the types of patrons are different.

Question: Would this upset the Uborrow people having different language for the loan time frame?

Answer: Not sure. It may need to be discussed with them.

Question: For the members who started on this committee in the beginning was the idea for the two months for books and two weeks for journals decided on quickly or did it take a while?

Answer: There was a lot of discussion on it. Uborrow picked the 30 day loan time so that it would be close to the average interlibrary loan.

Question: Is the transit time counted in the loan time frame?

Answer: No. It starts when the book is picked up by the patron.

For the HDF an issue to consider is the low usage of the materials and the users requesting the materials would be researchers or faculty.

The lengths of time between the two policies are almost the same. The only difference is that the Uborrow has a 30 day check out time with a renewal for another 30 days which comes out to be 60 days like the HDSF policy.

Wendy will talk to the Uborrow group about it and give the feedback to the task force.

ii. Fees and fines money back to SUSSC?

The fines being charged at the borrowing institution will keep the money and not the facility. In the Uborrow policy, the library in charge of the borrowing will be in charge of getting the fine fee and will keep the money. At the end of the year the cost will balance itself out. Some constituents' are billing each other at the end of the year and others are billing their own patrons.

Question: What is Uborrow doing about replacing lost items?

Answer: It would still fall on the borrowing library. It will be reviewed every six month to make sure they are on the right track.

iii. If a SUSSC book is declared lost by the borrowing library, should it be replaced? How?

If it is out of copyright, the HDSF could borrow one and digitize it. The lost book fee should be used to replace the book either by the borrowing library or the HDF.

Some institutions lost book fees go into a centralized pot of money instead of staying with the library. This happened at UF and Judy was able to change this policy to have the lost book fee apply to the replacement of the book.

Comment: The HDF should be seen differently since it is a research facility. The same rules for Uborrow may not apply. It might be better if the HDF follows the interlibrary library loan standards.

Comment: Some institutions would wait until the end of the year and then do reconciliation. The patron will be charged for the lost item. The library would

reimburse the facility for the lost item. At the end of the year, the facility would bill the campus that had the lost item.

If the HDF bill for lost books at the end of the year, will the UF acquisitions help with this. There would not be an acquisitions person at the HDF.

VII Prioritization of Shipments: continue

Will be discussed at January's meeting.

IX Wrap-up, scheduling

- a. Next meeting: January 10th