Regular Meeting of the
Members Council on Library Services (MCLS)
Agenda
Monday, June 3, 2013 – 9:30 a.m. to 4:00 p.m. EDT
St. Petersburg College | EpiCenter Collaborative Labs | 13805 58th Street N.
Largo, Florida 33760

9:30 – 9:35 Call to Order
Lori Driscoll

9:35 – 9:40 1. Executive Committee Meeting Update
Lori Driscoll

9:40 – 9:45 2. Update from MCLS Representative to Members Council on Distance Learning and Student Services (MCDLSS)
Debbie Robinson

9:45 – 10:15 3. Reports from Existing Task Forces and Standing Committees
   a. Announcement of Membership for New Standing Committees
      Lori Driscoll
      Troy Christenson
      Zoila De Yurre Fatemian
      Betsy Simpson
      Sue Wartzok
      Lee Dotson
      Katie McCormick
      Judy Born
      Valerie Boulos
      Jeffrey Bowen
   b. Resource Sharing/ILL
   c. Shared Bib
   d. Digital Initiatives
   e. Collections/E-Resource Licensing
   f. Discovery Tool

10:15 – 10:30 4. Discovery Tool Selection Process
Bill Garrison

10:30 – 10:45 Break

10:45 – 11:00 5. Authority Control in the Shared Bib Environment
Bill Garrison

11:00 – 11:15 6. Select Liaisons to Standing Committees
Lori Driscoll

11:15 – 11:20 7. Committee Processes
   a. Face-to-Face-Meetings
   b. Location of Committee Information
   Lori Driscoll

   a. Role of Alternate Representatives
   b. Location of Agendas and Minutes
   c. Future Meetings
   Lori Driscoll

11:30 – 12:00 9. Election of MCLS Officers
Lori Driscoll
12:00 – 1:00  Lunch

1:00 – 1:50  10. Executive Director’s Report  Don Muccino
   a. Legislative and Funding Update
   b. Significant Initiatives/Requirements
   c. Project Priorities and Timing
   d. Planning for FY 2014-15
   e. Ongoing Communication About Priorities/Priority Setting
   f. Review of Related Legislation

1:50 – 2:15  11. Director of Library Services Report  Lucy Harrison
   a. Library Services Current Projects Update
   b. Library Services Survey
   c. Digital Platforms Analysis  Bill Covey

2:15 – 2:30  Break

               Claire Dygert  Scott Schmucker

3:15 – 3:45  13. Input to FLVC Board Meeting on June 12  Lori Driscoll
   a. Strategic Goals from *Unified Library Services Business Plan*
   b. Suggestions for FY 2014-15 LBR

3:45 – 4:00  14. New Business  Judy Russell
   a. Updates from UF

4:00  Adjournment  Lori Driscoll

***************

4:15 – 4:30  2013-14 Executive Committee Meeting with New Representatives  Lori Driscoll
   a. Set Date of Next Meeting
   b. Identify Immediate Topics

*Thank you for leaving your nametag and tent card for future use.*
RESOURCE SHARING/ILL TASK FORCE

Report on Current Activities for the June 3, 2013, Members Council on Library Services Meeting

CO-CHAIRS: Troy Christenson and Zoila De Yurre Fatemian

CURRENT ACTIVITIES:

Meetings and Summary

February 12, 2013, 3:00 – 4:30 p.m. via Elluminate was an orientation and introductory meeting.

Summary:

- Review of collaborative work already done:
- Testing the addition of colleges on supplier strings
- Discussion about shared guidelines between colleges and universities
- Discussion of which existing documents should be reviewed
- Julia Zimmerman – role of the Executive Committee Liaison
- Is looking for shared guidelines and policies regarding resource sharing
- Will give further instruction as role of the Resource Sharing Task Force is developed
- Emphasis on cooperative borrowing programs
- Emphasis on service to distanced learners
- Troy Christenson was nominated and was approved for the University representative co-chair
- LeEtta Schmidt volunteered for position of secretary and was approved
- Zoila De Yurre volunteered and was approved for the College representative co-chair

Action Items:

- Wendy Ellis will get a wiki established
- Brenda Rutten will send pre-existing documentation to group for review
- All will review pre-existing college and university documents on resource sharing
- Co-chairs, Troy Christenson and Zoila De Yurre, will create an agenda for the next meeting

March 6, 2013 via Elluminate.

Summary:

- We can expect bylaws and charges for permanent committees in July
- Wiki is created: https://rsil.wiki.flvc.org
- Suggestions for moving ahead on creating new guidelines:
  - Combine the three main SUL and SCL guidelines documents [LINCC Resource Sharing Guidelines, State University Libraries of Florida Resource Sharing Guidelines, and SUSCLLA Library Borrowing Privileges Agreement] into one document
- Wendy asked and it was verified that outside UBorrow’s temporary no charge for lost books there is no policy in place among the SULs or SCLs for charging for lost books other than ILL code
- Dan suggested demonstrations of UBorrow and LINCCweb to see patron interface and workflow so we are all acquainted with both
- Kristine suggested that distanced learners should be remembered and included in future discussions by the group
- Troy suggested sharing old and gathering new group centric resource sharing statistics and posting them on the wiki
Action Items:
- Kristine will combine the existing guidelines documents and get them into a Google doc
- LeEtta will link the Google doc to the wiki
- Wendy will create a statistics page for the wiki
- Wendy and LeEtta will add existing statistics for the groups to the wiki statistics page

April 3, 2013 via Elluminate.
Summary:
- Troy added a [Comparison of FLVC-RSIL and CSUL-RS Committee Charges](https://docs.google.com/document/d/1dkZV9j1UyxApERjy7SHcpVeG6jbRwTfW1_E0M2kvajs/edit?usp=sharing) to the Documents area of the Wiki
- Who is doing what between the FLVC RSIL and the CSUL Res Share groups?
  - CSUL group is focusing on programs and services already started that are used by the University libraries
    - Trouble shooting for existing services
    - Service improvements
    - Best practices for shared systems
    - Composed of ILL rep from each University library
  - RSIL under FLVC primarily charged with creating a shared set of guidelines for resource sharing
    - Establishing principles of integration of existing services between the two groups
- Per last meeting, Kristine created a new document merged from pre-existing guidelines [LINCC Resource Sharing Guidelines, State University Libraries of Florida Resource Sharing Guidelines, and SUSCCLA Library Borrowing Privileges Agreement]
  - It is on GoogleDocs - [https://docs.google.com/document/d/1dkZV9j1UyxApERjy7SHcpVeG6jbRwTfW1_E0M2kvajs/edit?usp=sharing](https://docs.google.com/document/d/1dkZV9j1UyxApERjy7SHcpVeG6jbRwTfW1_E0M2kvajs/edit?usp=sharing) and linked on the wiki
  - The next step will be to add comments and edit what is there
  - After the group has created a finished set of guidelines it will be sent to the executive committee and then to the members council (made up of the Deans and Directors of all institutions) for approval
- Would it be good to have a single list serve for all member libraries –
  - For resource sharing collaboration and troubleshooting among University and College libraries
  - Include resource sharing stake holders
  - Brenda suggested new list composed of preexisting lists for SUL and SC resource sharing
  - Looking forward at more merged services, a merged communication method will be useful as groundwork

Action Items:
- ALL – read through and comment (or send comments to LeEtta) the guidelines document on GoogleDocs – to be reviewed by the group at next meeting
- Brenda and Wendy – investigate the creation of a new listserv and report back
May 8, 2013 via Elluminate.

Summary:
- Regarding an overall list for all ILL/Resource sharing personnel for the Universities and Colleges (Brenda)
  - We have approval to create an overall list; beginning questions: do we want to prepopulate the new list with members of existing lists? And do we want to establish this list now?
    - Agreed to create the new list now
    - It will be named FLVC-RSIL-ALL
    - It should be prepopulated with the members of FLVC-LINCC-ILL and SULACCESS-L
    - RESHAR-L can be discontinued as the SUL RSTF has been using the SULACCESS-L
- The group reviewed the comments made and edited the guidelines document.
  - Some areas of the document called for future work by the group:
    - Providing ILL service to walk-in patrons from other Universities and Colleges
    - Creating a scanning best practices document
- Zoila suggested a need to talk about options for interlibrary lending e-books
  - Licensing is typically the largest restriction to the ILL of e-books
- Dan suggested that a new document be started to keep track of suggestions for the improvement of resource sharing
  - Troy suggested adding direct to patron service to these suggestions. That is, when the lending library mails materials to the end patron instead of the borrowing library.
  - Troy also brought the ability to place UBorrow requests on behalf of patrons and adding article requesting to UBorrow
    - Wendy reported that we can currently place UBorrow requests on behalf of patrons through the client
    - The original idea for articles through UBorrow was tied to the idea of the get-it button and was put on hold for Shared Bib
    - Does the group want to focus on improvements to UBorrow when we may be rethinking the whole system?
- LeEtta volunteered to create the document for future resource sharing improvements.

Action Items:
- LeEtta – create a google document for suggestions on future enhancements to resource sharing
- All – review guidelines document again and give input on the sections identified as needing more work.
- Brenda – create shared list serv
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SHARED BIB TASK FORCE

Report on Current Activities for the June 3, 2013, Members Council on Library Services Meeting

CO-CHAIRS: Betsy Simpson (UF) and Sue Wartzok (FIU)

CURRENT ACTIVITIES:

Feb. 26, 2013 through May 06, 2013:

Major Task Force successes

- The RDA Task Group studying the impact of RDA on the shared bib catalog submitted their report to the Shared Bib Task Force on April 15, 2013. At the 4/22/13 meeting, the SBTF voted to assign the Aleph/Mango RDA revisions top priority. For the full report see https://sharedbib.pubwiki.fcla.edu/wiki/index.php/RDA_Task_Group
- A list of possible priorities for FLVC has been posted on the wiki for discussion – see https://sharedbib.pubwiki.fcla.edu/wiki/index.php/SBTF_Priority_List.
- A PDA Task Group has been charged to resolve problems caused by patron driven acquisitions records; PDA inputting libraries do not want to share these records but records batch loaded by other SULs sometimes match.

FLVC Activities on Behalf of SBTF

- The loading of Serials Solutions serials records has been regularized and is on-going monthly; the loading of Serials Solutions e-book records is progressing; the e-book replacement file for UF from last fall (ca. 450,000 records) has been loaded and the update files should be caught up soon.
- Approval of GenLoad profiles is no longer backlogged; new requests are approved as RTs are filed.
- GenLoad 2.2.6 is almost ready for release with enhancements that allow updating of item records as well as the creation of multiple item records per 50 library.
- The loading of Marcive shipping list records has been scripted by the Tallahassee group and it now runs smoothly; the loading of the monthly full records was complex but all universities that use Marcive now have their July 2012 data in production; a scripted process has been developed for the monthly loads and will be used shortly for the August 2012 records and on-going.
- Duplicate Record Report Form is no longer managed by UNF, but now maintained by FLVC.
- FLVC has finalized the purchase for all SUS libraries to have access to the YBP enriched records previously purchased by UF. The purchase covers the enriched records delivered to UF through 2012, which include bib records with a publication date through 2011. FLVC staff will be working to remove the $5 FU subfields from the 505 and 970 fields on the records so that the fields will display in all libraries’ discovery tools (Mango and commercial). There is uncertainty about how to arrange for on-going purchases.
- The loading of MARCIt! records full file of 94,987 ejournal records for the master profile has been completed. 64,558 MARCIt! records which were no longer relevant have been removed. Work continues with USF on various areas of related database clean-up including working with USF and UF to acquire the 11,000 records for print journals from OCLC that were replaced by erecords during the shared bib project.
Ongoing Issues

- Extent of duplication in the database
- Labor-intensive workflows associated with EOCR and WCP data loads
- Need for automated authority maintenance solutions
- Lack of approved procedures from the Statewide Storage Task Force for transferring material to FLARE

Questions/Concerns

- How will FLVC be able to address SUL needs sufficiently with a diminishing workforce?
- What is the status of developing a form and process for new project requests?
- How long will the SBTF continue; how will it coordinate its work with the Technical Services Standing Committee?
- Will housing the FLVC servers for the consolidated College and University Aleph in Tallahassee result in slower resolution of system problems?
DIGITAL INITIATIVES STANDING COMMITTEE

Report on Current Activities for the June 3, 2013, Members Council on Library Services Meeting

CO-CHAIRS: Lee Dotson and Katie McCormick

CURRENT ACTIVITIES:

The Executive Committee of the Library Services Members Council approved the charge for DISC at their meeting on 3/28:

DISC provides recommendations to the FLVC Library Services Members Council regarding all technical aspects of digital collection building, digitization, and/or digital production, digital curation, and digital services in support of scholarship. DISC provides a forum for discussion, promotes best practices, explores opportunities for collaboration among interested FLVC libraries, and leverages the collective capacity of the colleges and universities for digital initiatives and services.

The Executive Committee appointed the three new college members at its meeting on April 15. The new members were notified of their appointments by letter on April 19. All existing CSUL DISC members will remain on the committee. Each CSUL DISC institution will have one representative.

The listserv was established. All interested parties were invited to join the listserv. State college and university representatives introduced themselves by email.

The first monthly conference call of the FLVC DISC was held 05/08/2012 to:

• Discuss issues relating to FLVC Islandora implementation
• Discuss issues related to centralized services: common digital library system and companion tools; Florida Digital Archive (FDA); DigiTool/PALMM; Archon; Florida OJ/Open Journal Systems (OJS); metadata standards for ETDs; digital items and collections discovery in MANGO:
  • Requested a change to ETD METS:
    Recommend a change to the way FLVC recommends we encode METS files for ETDs. Associated schemas at http://fclaweb.fcla.edu/node/528 and http://fclaweb.fcla.edu/uploads/metsETDsSpec.pdf
    In the specification PDF above, the METS dmdSEC has a MDTYPE tag of "OTHER", but does not include the recommended "OTHERMDTYPE" tag. Can we replace:
    <METS:mdWrap MIMETYPE="text/xml" MDTYPE="OTHER" LABEL="PALMM Extensions"> with:
    <METS:mdWrap MIMETYPE="text/xml" MDTYPE="OTHER" OTHERMDTYPE="PALMM" LABEL="PALMM Extensions">
    A METS reader/writer should be able to utilize the MDTYPE/OTHERMDTYPE values to determine the appropriate reader for a METS section. Without the OTHERMDTYPE tag, this is not possible.

    FLVC confirmed that they can support this change. No objections on the call or by email.
• Discuss statewide collaboration on digital initiatives and services, and to share research:
  • Gathered feedback from DISC presentation at the FLVC User meetings

Progress on Activities:
1. Common Digital Library System
   Islandora

May: Progress April 10 - May 7
The DISC Islandora work group had four meetings during this reporting period. Islandora v.7 code was installed on the Islandora Test server this month and the server was released to ISG for testing on April 16. The test server now has the following features:
   • A prototype of site, collection, and object branding, with clickable object logo/wordmarks.
   • Search faceting
   • Simple and Full MODS metadata forms
   • An example of the Islandora Books module with IA book reader
   • A "view all objects" option to view/browse the entire repository
   • Solr indexing of MODS metadata, including a prototype of collection-specific searching

A prototype of a structured Table of Contents display was implemented on the FLVC Islandora development server and development for the display is substantially completed. Development of the DigiTool to Islandora conversion programming is underway and will produce data in JSON format to utilize the structured Table of Contents display.

In addition, an FSU test site was set up to continue to work with display/branding customization and for preliminary testing and review of DigiTool conversions. Samples of Basic Image, Large Image, and PDF content types are being tested with the DigiTool to Islandora conversion programming. FSU has agreed to prototype additional display refinements on their Islandora test site.

FLVC and the ISG are reviewing functional requirements and documenting details of required functionality in preparation for additional development work.

2. Centralized Digital Services
   a) Florida Digital Archive (http://fclaweb.fcla.edu/FDA_landing_page)
   Florida Digital Archive production continued as usual during March 2013-May 2013. As of May 15, 2013 the FDA repository contains 342,412 packages comprised of 44,169,165 files, for a total single copy size of 128.6 TB.

   Software enhancements during this period included:
   • Completion of work on a new web service for use with UF’s METS Editor, which is a tool that assists in the creation of information packages for archiving in the FDA repository. The new web service will allow the METS Editor to validate packages against FDA repository account and project codes and will enable users to validate their information packages on local machines prior to submission for archiving, so that only valid packages are transmitted/submitted to the FDA repository and invalid packages can be corrected before transmission.
Florida Digital Archive Statistics for March 2013 through May 2013
Florida Digital Archive repository holdings as of May 31, 2013:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total Packages in Repository</th>
<th>Total Size (TB)</th>
<th>Total Number of Files</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>342,412</td>
<td>128.6</td>
<td>44,169,165</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Submitted, Archived, Disseminated, Refreshed, and Withdrawn Packages:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Total Number of Packages</th>
<th>Total Size (TB)</th>
<th>Total Number of Files</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>submissions</td>
<td>13,340</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>959,282</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ingests</td>
<td>13,340</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>959,282</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>disseminations</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Digital Initiatives & Services Committee (DISC)  
Lee Dotson, Chair, lee.dotson@ucf.edu  
June 2013 Quarterly Report  
Jamie Rogers, Co-Vice/Chair-Elect, rogersj@fiu.edu  
Katie McCormick, Co-Vice Chair, kmccormick@fsu.edu

Summary
This report reflects DISC activity from March 2013 through May 2013. The group met 3 times by conference call to:

- Discuss issues relating to FLVC Islandora implementation
- Discuss issues related to centralized services: common digital library system and companion tools; Florida Digital Archive (FDA); DigiTool/PALMM; Archon; Florida OJ/Open Journal Systems (OJS); metadata standards for ETDs; digital items and collections discovery in MANGO
- Discuss statewide collaboration on digital initiatives and services, and to share research

Meeting minutes are posted on the DISC wiki at https://disc.libwiki.fcla.edu and links to the Elluminate recordings are available with the minutes.

Action Item:

Progress on Activities

1. The Executive Committee of the Library Services Members Council approved the charge for the FLVC Digital Initiatives Standing Committee at their meeting on 3/28:

   DISC provides recommendations to the FLVC Library Services Members Council regarding all technical aspects of digital collection building, digitization, and/or digital production, digital curation, and digital services in support of scholarship. DISC provides a forum for discussion, promotes best practices, explores opportunities for collaboration among interested FLVC libraries, and leverages the collective capacity of the colleges and universities for digital initiatives and services.

   The Executive Committee appointed three new college members at its meeting on April 15. The new members were notified of their appointments by letter on April 19. All existing CSUL DISC members will remain on the committee. Each CSUL DISC institution will have one representative.

   The listserv was established. All interested parties were invited to join the listserv. State college and university representatives introduced themselves by email. A joint meeting between CSUL DISC and FLVC DISC was held on May 8.

2. Common Digital Library System

   Islandora
Digital Initiatives & Services Committee (DISC)  
Lee Dotson, Chair, lee.dotson@ucf.edu  
Jamie Rogers, Co-Vice/Chair-Elect, rogersj@fiu.edu  
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June 2013 Quarterly Report

May: Progress April 10 - May 7
The DISC ISG had four meetings during this reporting period. Islandora v.7 code was installed on the Islandora Test server this month and the server was released to ISG for testing on April 16. The test server now has the following features:

- A prototype of site, collection, and object branding, with clickable object logo/wordmarks.
- Search faceting
- Simple and Full MODS metadata forms
- An example of the Islandora Books module with IA book reader
- A "view all objects" option to view/browse the entire repository
- Solr indexing of MODS metadata, including a prototype of collection-specific searching

A prototype of a structured Table of Contents display was implemented on the FLVC Islandora development server and development for the display is substantially completed. Development of the DigiTool to Islandora conversion programming is underway and will produce data in JSON format to utilize the structured Table of Contents display.

In addition, an FSU test site was set up to continue to work with display/branding customization and for preliminary testing and review of DigiTool conversions. Samples of Basic Image, Large Image, and PDF content types are being tested with the DigiTool to Islandora conversion programming. FSU has agreed to prototype additional display refinements on their Islandora test site.

FLVC and the ISG are reviewing functional requirements and documenting details of required functionality in preparation for additional development work.

April: Progress March 13 - April 9
The DISC ISG had four meetings during this reporting period. During March the Islandora version 7 production code was released. FLVC installed the code on our Islandora development server and tested a number of priority features and modules, including:

- The custom PDF development that allows ingest of existing OCR full-text.
- Drupal permissions features
- The new Books Module

In addition to testing new version 7 code, FLVC staff continued work on Solr indexing, focusing specifically on collection-specific searching. A variety of issues reported by ISG during Islandora Testing Cycle 1 were also addressed on the development server. Examples of Books Content Model were loaded on the development server and discussions of detailed requirements for Books Table of Contents were discussed and some preliminary ideas were mocked up and demonstrated.
Islandora version 7 production code was then installed on the Islandora test server in preparation for ISG Testing Cycle 2, and that cycle is expected to begin within the week. The ISG worked on compiling a list of software requirements for Day 1 of Islandora production and a list of development priorities was created that will be revisited as necessary. Individual requirements are being defined in detail.

March: Progress February to date

Summary: To date FLVC has not received v.7 Islandora production code but we've been working with code for release candidates in order to continue to make progress.

DISC ISG had six meetings during the period of February - March 12. We worked on:

- Finalizing SUL disk requirements for Islandora through June 30, 2014.
- Finalized the requirements for the Full MODS edit form
- Testing of Basic Image, Large Image, single PDF content models and MARCXML support on the Islandora test server and recording and discussing issues.
- Began a review of the Ranked features survey to prioritize features and future development.
- Reviewed Basic Image, Large Image, and single PDF Content Model requirements in preparation for final testing and sign-off
- Viewed a mock-up of branding options by site, collection, and object.

FLVC staff worked on:

- Installation and review of Islandora v.7 release candidates on the Islandora development server and feedback to DGI.
- Work has begun on collection-specific permissions based on available v.7 pre-release code.
- A lot of progress has been made on Solr indexing and faceting, and exploration of collection-specific searching and faceting has begun.
- Installation and review of custom PDF Full Text code.
- Updated and posted requirements for Basic Image, Large Image, and single PDF Content Models. See [https://islandora.pubwiki.fcla.edu/wiki/index.php/Main_Page#Content_Models](https://islandora.pubwiki.fcla.edu/wiki/index.php/Main_Page#Content_Models)
- Exploring branding options and creation of a mock-up of a branded site, collection, and objects for demonstration to DISC
- An inventory of DigiTool materials for migration to Islandora
- A project update was presented by Lydia Motyka to the FLVC Library Services Members Council on February 28.
- An Islandora Milestones historic overview was presented by Bill Covey to CSUL on March 8.

Interim solution: SobekCM @ FLVC

Mark Sullivan gave a presentation of Sobek and shared a SobekCm brochure. Anyone who is interested in using the interim solution was instructed to contact Mark Sullivan and be ready to
provide current space requirements (or an estimate of how many digital resources) and a projection for growth over the next 12 months. The UFDC instance can be seen here: http://lib-ufdcweb3f.ad.ufl.edu (the F is for FLVC).

3. Digital Initiatives & Services

Data Curation: DISC continues to investigate collaborative data curation support within DISC and in collaboration with other groups in terms of data and digital curation more broadly.

Open Access, Scholarly Communication & IRs: DISC continues to discuss ways to collaborate on Scholarly Communication initiatives and Open Access.

Requested a change to ETD METS:

Recommended a change to the way FLVC recommends we encode METS files for ETDs. Associated schemas at http://fclaweb.fcla.edu/node/528 and http://fclaweb.fcla.edu/uploads/metsETDspec.pdf

In the specification PDF above, the METS dmdSEC has a MDTYPE tag of "OTHER", but does not include the recommended "OTHERMDTYPE" tag. Can we replace:

<METS:mdWrap MIMETYPE="text/xml" MDTYPE="OTHER" LABEL="PALMM Extensions"> with:

<METS:mdWrap MIMETYPE="text/xml" MDTYPE="OTHER" OTHERMDTYPE="PALMM" LABEL="PALMM Extensions">

A METS reader/writer should be able to utilize the MDTYPE/OTHERMDTYPE values to determine the appropriate reader for a METS section. Without the OTHERMDTYPE tag, this is not possible. FLVC confirmed that they can support this change. No objections on the call or by email.

4. Centralized Digital Services

a) Florida Digital Archive (http://fclaweb.fcla.edu/FDA_landing_page)

Florida Digital Archive production continued as usual during March 2013-May 2013. As of May 15, 2013 the FDA repository contains 342,412 packages comprised of 44,169,165 files, for a total single copy size of 128.6 TB.

Software enhancements during this period included:

- Completion of work on a new web service for use with UF’s METS Editor, which is a tool that assists in the creation of information packages for archiving in the FDA repository. The new
A web service will allow the METS Editor to validate packages against FDA repository account and project codes and will enable users to validate their information packages on local machines prior to submission for archiving, so that only valid packages are transmitted/submitted to the FDA repository and invalid packages can be corrected before transmission.

Florida Digital Archive Statistics for March 2013 through May 2013

Florida Digital Archive repository holdings as of May 31, 2013:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total Packages in Repository</th>
<th>Total Size (TB)</th>
<th>Total Number of Files</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>342,412</td>
<td>128.6</td>
<td>44,169,165</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Submitted, Archived, Disseminated, Refreshed, and Withdrewn Packages:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Total Number of Packages</th>
<th>Total Size (TB)</th>
<th>Total Number of Files</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>submissions</td>
<td>13,340</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>959,282</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ingests</td>
<td>13,340</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>959,282</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>disseminations</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5. DISC Discussion Items

- Collections and aggregations
- Branding
- FLA sessions of interest to DISC members
- FLVC User Meetings updates
COLLECTIONS/E-RESOURCE LICENSING TASK FORCE

Report on Current Activities for the June 3, 2013, Members Council on Library Services Meeting

CO-CHAIRS: Judy Born and Valerie Boulos

CURRENT ACTIVITIES:

During this quarter, the FLVC Collections E-Resources Licensing Task Force (CERTF) held 8 meetings via Elluminate: March 4, March 21, March 29, April 4, April 18, May 7, May 9, and May 16. The committee also held a hybrid in-person/Elluminate meeting on April 30.

The Task Force has focused its efforts on the following priorities:

1. Survey of Library E-Resource Priorities - CERTF constructed a survey to determine individual institutional e-resource priorities. This data was a key component in determining the needs for a consortial e-resource collection.

2. E-Resources Report to the Members Council - At their March meeting, the Members Council requested a report which would include various scenarios for licensing e-resources, along with explanations of the impact, cost, benefit, and potential timeline for implementation for each scenario. The Members Council will then be able to select which scenario they would like to pursue for the 2014 FLVC E-resource Portfolio. The report will be presented at the June 3 Members Council meeting.

3. Participation in FLVC Regional Meetings - Seven members of the task force participated as presenters in their local regional meetings. The presentation was produced by members of the task force and included information on the CERTF charge, current membership, a review of the CERTF timeline, how the CERTF work is achieved, and a background of the FCS and SUS collections. The presentation included time for attendees to ask questions and provide feedback to the task force.
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DISCOVERY TOOL TASK FORCE

Report on Current Activities for the June 3, 2013, Members Council on Library Services Meeting

CHAIR: Jeffrey T. Bowen

CURRENT ACTIVITIES:

The Discovery Tool Task Force began our work with a project kick-off meeting on March 26, 2013. We have met at least once a week since then in order to achieve the goals set down in the charge. FLVC staff provided communication tools (mailing list, wiki, and Elluminate) for online communications.

In the first weekly meeting, the group confirmed a project scope statement, finalized a project timeline, and reviewed information related to past discovery initiatives in the state provided by task force members. In subsequent meetings, the group finalized the template for the RFI, created a list of topic threads, developed a list of questions related to each topic, and finalized those questions in drafting the RFI document. The draft RFI was submitted to Members Council on May 15, 2013 for comment by May 24, 2013. The Task Force expects to finalize the RFI and release it to University of Florida purchasing on May 28, 2013.

FUTURE ACTIVITIES:

After the RFI is released to purchasing, the Task Force will engage in a process to finalize an evaluation methodology to be applied to the RFI responses. This methodology will allow for a consistent criteria to be applied to all RFI responses. The group will also schedule and announce open demos, expected for the week of July 15, 2013, and determine a methodology for collecting feedback from demo attendees.

The group discussions while drafting the RFI uncovered many important themes that will be folded into the evaluation methodology, including:

- Customization options at state, institution, and campus/library levels
- Ability to ingest and normalize union catalog data from two underlying Aleph databases and effectively display user specific availability and fulfillment options
- Impact on electronic resource management functions for both the core index of the discovery system as well as integration with external OpenUrl and federated search systems (e.g. SFX, Metalib, 360)
- Integration options for unmediated ILL functions currently supported by Aleph ILL module and U-Borrow Systems

After the RFI responses are returned (deadline of July 12, 2013), the consultant, Laura Morse, will prepare evaluation reports for each vendor, using the evaluation methodology defined by the Task Force, and deliver summary reports for each vendor to the Task Force by August 12, 2013. These reports, and feedback from the demo attendees, will inform the final report recommendation, scheduled for delivery to Members Council on August 20, 2013.
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WHITE PAPER ON SHARED BIB AUTHORITY CONTROL

Submitted to the State University Libraries Technical Services Planning Committee
By the Authorities Subcommittee
October 11, 2012

This paper is submitted to the Technical Services Planning Committee in response to their request for information and recommendations regarding authority work in the Shared Bib environment. A copy of the charge is included in Appendix A.

WHAT IS AUTHORITY CONTROL

Authority control is the establishment and maintenance of consistent forms of terms—names, subjects, and titles—to be used as headings in the bibliographic records of the library catalog. Headings must not only be consistent, they must also be unique.

Authority control fulfills two important functions.

1. It enables the disambiguation of items with similar or identical headings. For example, two authors who happen to have published under the same name can be distinguished from each other by adding middle initials, birth and/or death dates. Disambiguation enables researchers to find all the material by and about a given person under one form of name.

2. It enables the collocation of materials that logically belong together, although they present themselves differently. For example, authority records are used to establish uniform titles, which can bring together all versions of a given work even when they are issued under different titles—Hamlet, Shakespeare's Hamlet, Tragicall historie of Hamlet Prince of Denmarke.

THE VALUE OF AUTHORITY WORK TO THE STATE OF FLORIDA

Although somewhat invisible to the average user, authority control enables researchers on academic campuses throughout the state to find specific materials that libraries have paid millions of dollars to purchase. It provides facets in catalogs and databases that help library users drill down into their desired search results. Without authority records, students and researchers would obtain thousands of results in an online search without the ability to sort out all of the information available about a specific topic or author. Indexes built on authorized headings are absolutely essential to finding information in the rich array of resources paid for by taxpayers and institutions in the state of Florida.

In June of 2012, all eleven State University System (SUS) libraries merged catalogs into a single database of bibliographic records colloquially known as the “Shared Bib” database. The number of bibliographic records available after SUS catalogs merged is 10,000,000+. One of the expected primary benefits of the merge was the ability to realize efficiencies in processing data necessary for finding information, including shared authority records. However, shared authority control presents some unique challenges as well as benefits for SUS libraries.
AUTHORITY PROCEDURES AMONG STATE UNIVERSITY LIBRARIES PRE-MERGE

A survey of the existing authorities procedures and priorities was conducted by the Authorities Subcommittee in 2009, prior to the merge of the SUS catalogs in June 2012. Nineteen responses, including those from law, medical, and music libraries were received.

According to the survey responses, 83% said their library did some sort of authority work, either at or after the point of cataloging (question #4). An equal percentage said that authority control had a “high” or “medium” priority in the cataloging workflow (question #3). 78% were of the opinion that “all library users” benefit from authority work.

Most responding libraries had specific staff (professional, para-professional, or both) assigned to perform post-cataloging authority work (question #7). For those libraries that do not do authority work, 67% cited “insufficient staff” and “lack of administrative support” as the reasons why (question #5).

For the libraries that do perform authority work, 100% control name and subject entries. This means headings on bibliographic records are matched to the LC Authority File. 93% also control series and uniform titles (question #6). Many of the responding libraries were up-to-date with their bibliographic file maintenance, but an almost equal number were not (question #10).

82% of responding libraries use ARROW COR and Before and After: Delete reports provided by Florida Virtual Campus (FLVC) staff to identify headings that need updating. 45% use ARROW Before and After: Update, and 18% use ARROW 008 and other reports (question #8).

In October 2008, a group of libraries in Florida joined together to form the Florida NACO Funnel. NACO is the name authority component of the Library of Congress’s (LC) Program for Cooperative Cataloging (PCC). Five of the 11 SUL libraries are participants of this group: FIU, FSU, UF, UNF and USF. Authority records are contributed to the National Authority File (NAF) as part of the cooperative effort to reduce the overall cost of cataloging by increasing the number of authorized access points available for use in the bibliographic record. Several of the survey questions asked about NACO or SACO participation. NACO participation enables SULs to submit names records to the LC Authority File, while SACO participation allows the formulation of new subject headings. Responses were evenly split on whether the library was a current NACO participant (question #14). Only 11 percent of responses indicated that the library was a member of the Florida NACO Funnel (question #15); however, 78% indicated that their library would be interested in a NACO Funnel training session (question #16). 81% agreed that they could become Florida NACO Funnel participants and submit new headings to the national authority file rather than creating a local authority record (question #20). Only 22% indicated that they submitted proposals for new subject authority records to SACO (question #17).

Generally, most respondents agreed that authority work was important and that they were interested in further training. Actual performance of authority work, however, has been uneven due to lack of staff and/or support.
ISSUES AND CHALLENGES FOR AUTHORITY WORK IN THE SHARED BIB ENVIRONMENT

The Library of Congress/National Authority File (LC/NAF) is a very dynamic file. New and revised authority records are contributed and redistributed every 24 hours. The update files are received weekly from the Library of Congress (LC) and loaded into the Shared Bib authority file by staff at the Florida Virtual Campus. Headings on existing bibliographic records in the shared catalog are changed by library staff to match the authority records.

Previous to implementing Shared Bib, authority control processing was the responsibility of the individual SUS library. Manual and semi-automated workflows were used to maintain authority control. These workflows are not sustainable in Shared Bib and cannot sufficiently support the need for ongoing authority control in the SUS shared database of 10 million + bibliographic records. These are the issues and challenges we have identified:

- Lack of past uniform authority control guidelines, policies, and practices across SUS institutions resulting in uncontrolled headings in the shared catalog and the need for substantial back-file clean-up efforts
- The need for adaptation of previous authority control reports or development of new reports for the shared bib environment
- Reduced number of staff available to perform authority control due to unfilled positions of retired staff as well as anticipated vacancies by upcoming retirements
- Loss of expertise in authority work due to staff attrition
- The need to initiate discussions with our colleagues in the Florida College System to develop consistencies in authority practices and prepare for the merging of our databases
- Commitment from only two SUS libraries – UF and FIU – to provide authority maintenance for the shared catalog

LOOKING TO THE FUTURE

Integrated library systems and discovery services are built around nationally recognized standards which catalogers at academic institutions throughout the state of Florida follow when inputting data into the online catalog. On March 31, 2013, the current national content standard will change to Resource Description and Access (RDA). The new RDA rules are necessary to make library data more compatible with other machine readable record formats that will enable the integration of library physical resources into discovery systems with mixed metadata from a variety of sources, such as institutional repositories, journal databases, and web-based search systems.

With the implementation of RDA, at least 4.9% of authorized headings in the Library of
Congress Authority File are expected to be changed. To achieve consistency with incoming bib records for newly acquired materials, these changes must be performed in the existing Aleph catalog used by the SUS libraries. With approximately ten million records in the current catalog, the impact of RDA equals over 490,000 authorized headings that must be edited on multiple catalog records—a job too time-consuming for current SUL staff to perform manually.

Library bibliographic data must be updated to current authority standards in order to prepare for future transitions mandated by the Library of Congress and other international agencies. Already, the Library of Congress is working on a new model for machine readable cataloging records. Most models for future bibliographic record frameworks are built upon theories and standards such as Linked Data for the Semantic Web, and the Resource Description Framework (RDF), to make library data compatible with other web-based systems.

In linked data systems, accurate authority work becomes even more important than it is today. Each name, topic, or other entity is linked by a Uniform Resource Identifier (URI) which replaces eye-readable data and can be more easily processed by machines. Authority record control numbers act as URIs for bibliographic headings. In order for current bibliographic record data to migrate into future linked data library systems, bibliographic headings in the catalog data must accurately link to authority records. To achieve this, linking that was formerly done manually and sporadically among individual SUS libraries must be supported by adequate staffing, centralized processing, or funding for vendor authority services.

OPTIONS FOR AUTHORITY CONTROL IN THE SUS SHARED BIB DATABASE

To contribute to the cost effectiveness of a shared SUS library catalog, the Authorities Subcommittee recommends an initial clean-up of the estimated 10 million records that comprise the back-file of bibliographic records in the Shared Bib database (Option 1). Back-file processing provides libraries with a service to match all headings in bibliographic records in the catalog against the Library of Congress’s Authority File. This would facilitate a less labor intensive workflow for ongoing authority control in Shared Bib and is the preferred method of authority control for academic research catalogs of a comparable size and complexity.

After an initial clean-up of the back-file, libraries will need the support of the FLVC for ongoing authority control. Ideally, the Authorities Subcommittee recommends an ongoing authority control vendor service to help maintain authority work as needed by the SUS Libraries.

Backstage Library Works, Libraries Technologies, Inc. and MARCIVE, Inc. each offer two types of ongoing authority control services to cover the full spectrum of activities needed for an up to date catalog. With ongoing services libraries can continue to keep the database under authority control after an initial cleanup of the backfile.
If this option is cost prohibitive, other options would need to be developed with technical and staffing support from FLVC and library administrators.

**Option 1: Vendor authority outsourcing**

FLVC would send out the entire Shared Bib database to a vendor for authority control cleanup. The vendor would make all the corrections and FLVC would load corrected files. The vendor would send back reports of headings that couldn’t be matched or resolved to facilitate authority work by the libraries. The vendor would provide ongoing authority control services after the initial cleanup. Appendix B provides cost data and references.

**Option 2: Partial vendor back-file processing with ongoing SUS library authority control**

FLVC would send out part of the Shared Bib database back-file (existing records that need authority control) for authority cleanup starting with a selected date of record entry. This would reduce the cost and the number of records to be addressed. The vendor would make all the corrections and FLVC would load corrected files. The vendor would send back reports for headings that couldn’t be matched or resolved. Library staff would do the authority work from these reports. The older part of the Shared Bib database, prior to the selected date of processing, would be corrected as libraries come across errors. Ongoing work could be done by a vendor or locally (see Option 3 and Option 4). This ongoing work would be greater than if Option 1 were chosen because the entire back-file would not be processed, and the SUS would not achieve the benefits of a completely updated catalog.

**Option 3: Combine FLVC global processing with authority control by SUS libraries**

Centralize authority control in the FLVC. Centralized authority control processing in the FLVC is critical to the implementation of UPD Y. UPD Y is an Aleph function in cataloging that supports the automatic updating of headings in bibliographic records to match the authorized form of the LC heading by changing the update code form “N=no” to “Y=yes” in the authority record. A combination of FLVC and SUS library staff might give us the resources to carry out all aspects of post-cataloging authority control.

FLVC would run reports and monitor types of authority records that should not be globally updated. Library staff would make corrections in the database. Since the reports for this process have not yet been tested, it is not known whether the existing SUS library staff would be sufficient. The magnitude of manual changes to the catalog that would be required after the implementation of RDA is unknown.

**Option 4: Continue authority control by SUS libraries**

Pool the existing expertise in the SUS libraries using staff in institutions that have volunteered to do authority control maintenance in Shared Bib (UF and FIU). The decision to pursue this option was made among members of the TSPC Authorities Subcommittee before the merge of the library catalogs. Although we have not had an opportunity to test this option in Shared Bib
due to the unavailability of authority reports from FLVC, we don’t believe Option 4 would be sustainable using the current number of volunteers.
Appendix A

Charge for Shared Bib Authorities White Paper

TSPC charges the Authorities Subcommittee with writing a white paper on Authority Work in the Shared Bib Environment. The purpose of this paper is to provide CSUL with a brief authoritative report giving information and proposals on this issue that could also be shared with the BOG and other government bodies, so the language should be clear to non-librarians and employ bullet points for brevity and clarity. The document should be submitted to TSPC by its September meeting and address the following:

- An explanation of the value of authority work to the State of Florida
- A survey of existing authorities procedures among SUS libraries, including staffing levels and associated costs
- An explanation of issues and challenges for authority work in the shared bib environment including the identification of changes from current practices
- Considerations regarding the changing future and broader environment of authority control such as RDA, linked data, and the increasing use of non-MARC metadata
- Identify options for managing authority control in a shared environment, including but not limited to, options of vendor outsourcing or centralizing the work in the Florida Virtual Campus or within one or more of the libraries. This analysis should include:
  - A survey of potential vendors, including an overview of the services they provide and identifying some of their comparable customers
  - An overview of workflows for each identified option, including staffing needs at the local and centralized level
  - A preliminary comparison of workflows/structures across the SUS/FCS
- Provide a summary of pros and cons for managing authority control in a shared bib environment for each option above and make recommendations for a best case solution to authority management
- Include recommendations for initiating discussions with FLVC and the FCS on managing authority control once we have a shared LMS environment
A competitive bid is needed to select an authority control vendor that meets specific criteria. The Invitation to Negotiate (ITN) document would need to be written according to the guidelines established by Florida state statutes and carried out by a lead SUS institutional purchasing office. The TSPC Authorities Subcommittee would be involved in the drafting of the ITN and would have a majority voice on the negotiating team. In addition to expertise from the lead institution’s purchasing office, an outside consultant may be needed to assist with the preparation of the ITN and specified criteria. The ITN would require that the acceptable vendor:

1. employ Library of Congress and other national-level authority records to ensure adherence to standards,
2. agree to a list of tasks that would increase consistency among records by correcting common spelling and coding errors,
3. replace obsolete MARC tags, indicators, and punctuation,
4. supply updated bibliographic records,
5. supply updated authority records whenever an authorized heading is modified by the responsible agency.

A rating sheet would be developed and points would be assigned for each of the required and desired criteria of the ITN. The most important elements would be assigned the highest number of points. A vendor would be selected and contract awarded. Criteria would need to include what records are included for authority processing; frequency of reports (weekly, monthly, or quarterly) and types of reports (name, subject, and series). It would be highly desirable to have the authority control contract managed by FLVC. It is important to consider that the lowest cost vendor may not be the best choice for providing the required services.

A search for vendors for authority control in North America showed that Backstage Library Works, Library Technologies, Inc., and MARCIVE, Inc. offer the best in scope of services to meet the needs of the SUS libraries. All three vendors offer the basic services of back-file and ongoing authority processing and are prepared to handle the conversion of AACR2 authority records to RDA.

Costs and timelines for back-file and ongoing authority processing services are based on the size of the database. The rate of cost per bibliographic record count varies among vendors.

The subcommittee provides the following cost estimates for your convenience in considering a one-time clean-up and ongoing authority control vendor services for the estimated 10 million + bibliographic records in the SUS Shared Bib database.

Ongoing authority control services for current cataloging is calculated based on the number of new titles added to the database yearly. The new title count in Shared Bib since the June 22, 2012 merge was 125,179. This four month count was rounded to 130,000 and multiplied by 3 to give us an estimated total of 390,000 new titles added annually.

A list of references by size of database for each vendor is included in Appendix B.
**Backstage Library Works**

**BackFile Processing (LC name, title, subjects; MeSH subjects) Cost**

- One time set up fee $500.00
- 10,000,000 bibs @ $0.01 ea. $100,000.00
- **Total backfile processing** $100,500.00

**Ongoing Authority Control Services**

($250.00 set up fee waived with backfile processing)

**Current cataloging services**

(authority control for your new bibliographic records)

- Estimated annual new records added (390,000 @ $0.06 ea) $23,400.00
- (32,500 bibs processed monthly (390,000 divided by 12 mos.)
- **Total current annual cost** $23,400.00

**Authority Notification Service**

(pricing based on database of more than 10,000,000 records)

(checks your bib file; alerts when authority records are changed and supply the updated records)

- Notification service, annual (monthly, $1,540.00 x 12) $18,480.00
- **Total authority notification annual cost** $18,480.00

**Total Annual Ongoing Authority Control Services** $41,880.00

**Total Backfile and Annual Ongoing Authority Control Services** $142,380.00

---

**Library Technologies, Inc.**

**Backfile Processing (LC name, title, subjects; MeSH subjects) Cost**

- 10,000,000 bibs @ $0.035 ea. $350,000.00
- (discounted price; size of database)
- **Total backfile processing** $350,000.00

**Ongoing Authority Control Services**

**Authority Express (AEX)**

(AEX is an FTP-based service that allows the authorization of new bib records added after backfile processing)

AEX is priced at $0.10 per catalog record and $10 per file transmitted.

**Ongoing authority control for new catalog records**

- AEX weekly (52 files per yr @ $10 per file) $520.00
- Estimated annual new records added (390,000 @ $0.10 ea $39,000.00

---

**FLVC MCLS**
(approx. 32,500 records sent for processing weekly (390,000 divided by 52 wks)

**Total estimated AEX annual cost** $39,520.00

**Authority Update Processing (AUP)**
(AUP allows libraries to download from LTI a file of their own bib. records with corrections in place)

**Total AUP Annual cost** $6,000.00
(Recommended: $1500 quarterly for 1,000,000 plus bib records)

**Total Annual Ongoing Services** $45,520.00

**Total Backfile and Ongoing Services** $395,520.00

---

**MARCIVE, Inc.**

**Backfile Processing (LC name, title, subjects; MeSH subjects) Cost**
(discounted unit price, more than 800,000)
10,000,000 bibs @ $0.024 ea) $240,000.00

**Total backfile processing** $240,000.00

**Ongoing Authority Processing**

**Annual Notification Subscription**
(tracks LC authority file changes; notifies and sends authority records to keep the file updated)
Authority notification, Data, and “A” report $1,500.00

**Total Annual Notification Subscription** $1,500.00

**Ongoing Authority Services; Overnight Authority Processing**
(newly created catalog records can be sent for upgrades)
Overnight setup fee (one-time) $90.00
Per record overnight (390,000 x $0.11) $42,900.00

**Total Overnight Processing** $42,990.00

**Total Annual Ongoing Services** $44,490.00

**Total Backfile and Annual Ongoing Services** $284,490.00

---

**LIST OF AUTHORITY CONTROL REFERENCES BY SIZE OF DATABASE**

- **Backstage Library Works**
- New York Public Library
- 8.0M records – Innovative ILS
- Jeffrey Bayer, Assistant Director of Cataloging
- jeffrey.bayer@nypl.org
(917)229-9559

University of California, Los Angeles
5.2M records – Voyager ILS
Sara Layne, Head of Cataloging
slayne@ucla.library.edu
(310)825-3438

Harvard University Library
5.1M records – ALEPH ILS
Allison Powers, Systems Librarian
allisonp@hulmail.harvard.edu
(617)495-3724

Yale University Library
5.0M records – Voyager ILS
Eva Bolkovac, Assistant Head of Cataloging
eva.bolkovac@yale.edu
(203)432-7659

University of Chicago
4.7M records – Sirsi Horizon ILS
Janet Fox, Head of Database Management and Copy Cataloging
j-fox@uchicago.edu
(773)834-9033

Library Technologies, Inc.
Duke University (Academic)
Ex Libris system
3,746,000 records processed on 05/05/2009
Authority Control, Authority Update, Authority Express
Duke University Libraries, Durham, NC, 27708-0190, Telephone: 919-660-5901
General contact: Amy Turner, Cataloger (amy.turner@duke.edu)

Columbia University (Academic)
Voyager system
3,381,000 records processed on 05/31/2001
Authority Control, Authority Update, Authority Express
Room 207A Butler, 535 W. 114th St., New York, NY, 10027, Telephone: 212-854-5585
General contact: Robert Wolven, Director, Bibliographic Control (wolven@columbia.edu)
University of Maryland (Academic)
Ex Libris system
3,000,000 records processed on 06/30/2006
McKeldin Library, College Park, MD, 20742, Telephone: 301-314-0409
General contact: Carlen Ruschoff, Director of Technical Services (ruschoff@umd.edu)

MARCIVE, Inc.
Univ. of California, Berkeley
Back-file authorities processing on 8,657,175 records from an Innovative Interfaces system,
completed July 2012. Now subscribes to Authorities Notification Service with NewMatch, and
sends new bib records for upgrade through Overnight Authorities Service.

University of Virginia
In August 2006 did major back-file de-duplication authorities processing project on 3.6 million
records with complex customization. Has a SirsiDynix Symphony system. Subscribes to
Authorities Notification and sends new bib records for upgrade through Overnight Authorities Service. Authority Award Club Member.

University of New Mexico
Back-file authorities processing on 2,963,954 bib records from an Innovative Interfaces
Millennium system, completed August 2009. Subscribes to Authorities Notification Service with
NewMatch and sends new bib records for upgrade through Overnight Authorities Service. Authorities Award Club member.

Auburn University
Back-file authorities processing on 2,429,413 records from an Ex Libris Voyager system,
completed August 2012. Now subscribes to Authorities Notification Service with NewMatch, and
sends new bib records for processing through Overnight Authorities Processing.

Purdue University
Back-file authorities processing on 2,363,245 records from an Ex Libris Voyager collection,
completed October 2010. Now subscribes to Authorities Notification with NewMatch and
sends records for upgrade through Overnight Authorities processing. Authority Award Club Member.
FLVC Advisory Committee Structure (Library Services)

Executive Committee

Members Council on Library Services

Discovery Tool Selection Task Force

Collection Management and E-Resources Standing Committee**

User Interfaces Standing Committee*

Technical Services Standing Committee*

Resource Sharing Standing Committee**

Digital Initiatives Standing Committee***

Shared Bib Task Force

* Committee will be established by 7/1/2013
** Currently a task force; will transition to permanent committee on 7/1/2013
*** In process of being established
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MEMBERS COUNCIL ON LIBRARY SERVICES
EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE ELECTIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Past Chair</th>
<th>Current</th>
<th>13-14</th>
<th>14-15</th>
<th>15-16</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lori Driscoll (FCS)</td>
<td>Julia Zimmerman (SUS)</td>
<td>Officer: Year 3 of 3 year term</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Current Chair</th>
<th>12-13</th>
<th>13-14</th>
<th>14-15</th>
<th>15-16</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lori Driscoll (FCS)</td>
<td>Julia Zimmerman (SUS)</td>
<td>Officer: Year 2 of 3 year term</td>
<td>Officer: Year 2 of 3 year term</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Chair-Elect</th>
<th>12-13</th>
<th>13-14</th>
<th>14-15</th>
<th>15-16</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Julia Zimmerman (SUS)</td>
<td>Officer: Elect for 3-year term</td>
<td>Officer: Elect for 3-year term</td>
<td>Officer: Elect for 3-year term</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Secretary (notetaker)</th>
<th>12-13</th>
<th>13-14</th>
<th>14-15</th>
<th>15-16</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Elect for one-year term</td>
<td>Elect for one-year term</td>
<td>Elect for one-year term</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SUS at-large representative*</th>
<th>12-13</th>
<th>13-14</th>
<th>14-15</th>
<th>15-16</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(one-year term/two-year term)</td>
<td>If one-year term – need to elect for two year term</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FCS at-large Representative*</th>
<th>12-13</th>
<th>13-14</th>
<th>14-15</th>
<th>15-16</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(one-year term/two-year term)</td>
<td>If one-year term – need to elect for two year term</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Current Executive Committee Members (transition team)**
- Lori Driscoll, Chair (FCS)
- Julia Zimmerman, Chair-Elect (SUS)
- Debbie Robinson (FCS)
- Shirley Hallblade (SUS)
- Brian Kelley (FCS)
- Bill Garrison (SUS)
Excerpts from Operating Procedures:

Article III: Membership of the Board -- The current chair and the chair-elect serve on the Board of Directors by virtue of their offices.

Article VII: Library Services Members Council

Section D. Officers of the Library Services Members Council

Officers. The officers of the Library Services Members Council shall consist of the Chair, the Vice Chair (Chair-Elect), and the Past Chair.

Chair. The Chair shall preside at all meetings of the Members Council and shall have the authority to call any special or emergency meetings of the Board. The Chair shall serve as the official spokesperson of the Members Council.

Vice Chair (Chair-Elect). The Vice Chair shall perform the duties of the Chair and have the same power and authority in the absence or disability of the Chair.

Secretary. The Secretary shall record, prepare and submit minutes of all member council meetings as well as collect and submit minutes of all Library member council Standing Committee meetings.

Section F. Committees

Membership: The Chair, Vice Chair (Chair Elect), and the Past Chair of the Members Council will serve as officers of the Executive Committee for the duration of their terms as officers of the Members Council. In addition, the Members Council shall elect two at-large representatives for two-year terms on the Executive Committee. Terms will be staggered, with a new representative being elected each year. As with the Chair and Vice Chair (Chair Elect), these two additional representatives shall be selected so that one is from the Florida College System and one from the State University System. In the first year of its operation, the Executive Committee of the Members Council on Library Services will consist of the members of the transition team. The 2012 co-chairs of the transition team will serve as the Chair and Vice Chair. The first Chair will be from the FCS while the Vice Chair will be from the SUS. The four at-large members of the Executive Committee will consist of the other two members of the transition team representing FCS and SUS institutions, respectively. After the first year, nominations and elections to the Executive Committee will proceed in the manner described in these bylaws.
June 3rd, 2013

Dear Members of the FLVC Board of Directors:

The Members Council on Library Services (MCLS) submits the following informational materials for the Board’s consideration at its planning retreat.

In July 2010, the Chancellors of the State University System and the Florida College System chartered a 19-member Task Force on the Future of Academic Libraries in Florida. This Task Force was charged to, “Determine a vision and develop a strategic plan for the future of academic library access, resources, and services in Florida that encompasses emerging trends and changing realities in the areas of instruction, research, technology, and public services within the context of the academic mission.” The Task Force’s mission was extended to include developing recommendations for a single unified library organization. When the legislation was finalized, the organization that emerged was Florida Virtual Campus (FLVC).

As MCLS, we believe Section 3 of the Unified Library Services Business Plan, “Strategic Goals for the Future of Academic Libraries,” provides relevant high level strategies the Board of Directors may find helpful to inform planning efforts concerning Florida academic libraries. The two-page overview summarizes what the Task Force adopted for the Vision, Mission, and Values, Goals, and Strategies. The Strategic Plan as detailed in Appendix B and References section are attached for your convenience as well. The document may be found in its entirety at http://www.flbog.edu/about/librarytaskforce/_doc/Unified-Library-Services-Business-Plan-Final-Report-From-the-Chancellors-12-22-11.pdf.

To fulfill our stated mission -- students and faculty will have access to state-of-the-art libraries that support their learning, teaching, and research needs and empower Florida residents to compete and succeed in a 21st century knowledge-based economy – libraries of the 39 institutions of the Florida College System and the State University System rely on FLVC to provide access to content; to provide support to library staff; to maintain the technological infrastructure needed to deliver high-quality and innovative library services; and to model efficiency and effectiveness in the acquisition of resources and deployment of services, leveraging assets through cooperative agreements and collaborative action. We ask the Board to consider these Values, Goals, and Strategies during the development of the FLVC Legislative Budget Request and prioritization of resources.

Sincerely,

Lori Driscoll

Chair, Members Council for Library Services
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3. STRATEGIC GOALS FOR THE FUTURE OF ACADEMIC LIBRARIES

3.1 Overview

The Chancellors originally mandated the Task Force to develop a strategic plan for the future of academic library access, resources, and services in Florida (see Section 2, Background, page 6, for a complete discussion). In response, a group of Task Force members and other leaders created a vision and mission for Florida’s post-secondary academic libraries.

To accomplish this mission, the libraries will:

- Provide access to content including print collections, archival materials, data sets, licensed eResources, and open access publications;
- Attract and retain qualified and innovative library faculty and staff who will facilitate access through the design and delivery of services including discovery tools, instruction, and research assistance;
- Maintain the technological infrastructure needed to deliver high-quality and innovative library services;
- Model efficiency and effectiveness in the acquisition of resources and deployment of services, leveraging those assets through formal and informal cooperative agreements and collaborative action.

The Task Force subsequently adopted the values, goals, and strategies to guide Florida’s post-secondary academic libraries. The values describe why libraries aspire to particular goals. The goals describe a preferred future state of libraries. The strategies are ways libraries will act to move toward fulfilling goals. The following table briefly highlights this plan (see Appendix B, page 89, for the complete Strategic Plan).

3.2 Values, Goals, Strategies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Values</th>
<th>Goals</th>
<th>Strategies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| User needs drive the design of library services. | Florida’s academic libraries have the capacity and agility to respond to emerging technologies and support the promotion of economic development. | • Provide flexibility in products and services to support evolving learning, teaching, and research needs.
• Maintain the technological infrastructure needed to deliver high-quality and innovative library services.
• Identify and inform funding sources to support adequate investment in library technologies.
• Support the incubation of new business startups and creation of a highly skilled workforce through providing resources for degrees in critical need areas. |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Values</th>
<th>Goals</th>
<th>Strategies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Libraries thrive in a culture of collaboration and good will.</td>
<td>Florida’s academic libraries work together to leverage their resources, develop new models for scholarly communication, and create innovative approaches for connecting our users to the world’s knowledge.</td>
<td>• Model efficiency and effectiveness in the acquisition of resources and deployment of services, leveraging those assets.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Build upon existing and seek new opportunities for formal and informal cooperative agreements to foster continuing collaborative action that leverages institutional and statewide resources.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Provide discovery tools and delivery options for students and faculty to access the information resources they need.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Design and deliver instruction that connects students and faculty with the library services and resources they need for academic success.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Libraries preserve our cultural heritage in all of its diversity and forms.</td>
<td>Florida’s academic library collections are rich in content and diverse in format including print collections, archival materials, data sets, licensed eResources, and open access publications.</td>
<td>• Attract and retain qualified and innovative library faculty and staff who will facilitate access to library resources through the design and delivery of services including discovery tools, instruction, and research assistance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Secure funding for acquiring and licensing adequate resources for the express learning, teaching, and research needs of each institution.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Examine and revise collection development practices to reflect the shift from owning materials to licensing content.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Libraries support the open inquiry that is vital to the advancement of knowledge.</td>
<td>Florida’s academic libraries create and support an open, nonproprietary environment for the creation, preservation, and distribution of scholarly work.</td>
<td>• Explore opportunities for incorporating nonproprietary, open resources.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Refine the focus of institutional collections to include curating content (e.g. through institutional repositories and data archiving).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Develop attractive, easy to navigate, well-equipped spaces for individual and collaborative work and study.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florida’s academic libraries serve as protectors and sponsors of intellectual property while fostering fair use.</td>
<td>Florida’s academic libraries become a nexus for the exchange and dissemination of scholarship and research, developing new intellectual property and moving it into the real world through licensing and technology transfer.</td>
<td>• Develop consistent and effective policies and procedures for balancing the protection and appropriate use of intellectual property.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Share strategies for the protection and fair use of intellectual property with all libraries in Florida’s academic community.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Become a clearinghouse for open content developed by faculty, students, and the wider intellectual community.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Form partnerships with university presses in Florida, the United States, and beyond.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Support new models for open access publishing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Build mechanisms for archiving and disseminating documentation from all stages of the research cycle (from data collection to final publications).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Educate the academic community on the need for open access publishing.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3.1 Values, Goals, and Strategies
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APPENDIX B. STRATEGIC PLAN

Strategic Plan: Values, Goals, and Strategies

VISION
Florida’s academic libraries collaborate to develop new models for scholarly communication and create innovative approaches for connecting our users to the world’s knowledge.

MISSION
Students and faculty throughout Florida’s post-secondary education system will have access to state-of-the-art libraries (whether physical or virtual) that support their learning, teaching, and research needs and empower Florida residents to compete and succeed in a 21st century knowledge-based economy.

To accomplish this mission, the libraries will:

- Provide access to content including print collections, archival materials, data sets, licensed eResources, and open access publications;
- Attract and retain qualified and innovative library faculty and staff who will facilitate access through the design and delivery of services including discovery tools, instruction, and research assistance;
- Maintain the technological infrastructure needed to deliver high-quality and innovative library services;
- Model efficiency and effectiveness in the acquisition of resources and deployment of services, leveraging those assets through formal and informal cooperative agreements and collaborative action.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Values</th>
<th>Goals</th>
<th>Strategies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>User needs drive the design of library services.</td>
<td>1. Florida’s academic libraries have the capacity and agility to respond to emerging technologies and support the promotion of economic development.</td>
<td>• Provide flexibility in products and services to support evolving learning, teaching, and research needs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Libraries thrive in a culture of collaboration and good will.</td>
<td>2. Florida’s academic libraries work together to leverage their resources, develop new models for scholarly communication, and create innovative approaches for connecting our users to the world’s knowledge.</td>
<td>• Model efficiency and effectiveness in the acquisition of resources and deployment of services, leveraging those assets.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

To accomplish this mission, the libraries will:

- Provide access to content including print collections, archival materials, data sets, licensed eResources, and open access publications;
- Attract and retain qualified and innovative library faculty and staff who will facilitate access through the design and delivery of services including discovery tools, instruction, and research assistance;
- Maintain the technological infrastructure needed to deliver high-quality and innovative library services;
- Model efficiency and effectiveness in the acquisition of resources and deployment of services, leveraging those assets through formal and informal cooperative agreements and collaborative action.
### Values
Describe why libraries aspire to particular goals.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Libraries preserve our cultural heritage in all of its diversity and forms.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Libraries support the open inquiry that is vital to the advancement of knowledge.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florida’s academic libraries serve as protectors and sponsors of intellectual property while fostering fair use.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Goals
Describe a preferred future state of libraries.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>3. Florida’s academic library collections are rich in content and diverse in format including print collections, archival materials, data sets, licensed eResources, and open access publications.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4. Florida’s academic libraries create and support an open, nonproprietary environment for the creation, preservation, and distribution of scholarly work.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Florida’s academic libraries become a nexus for the exchange and dissemination of scholarship and research, developing new intellectual property and moving it into the real world through licensing and technology transfer.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Strategies
Are ways libraries will act to move toward fulfilling goals.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>for students and faculty to access the information resources they need.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Design and deliver instruction that connects students and faculty with the library services and resources they need for academic success.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Attract and retain qualified and innovative library faculty and staff who will facilitate access to library resources through the design and delivery of services including discovery tools, instruction, and research assistance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Secure funding for acquiring and licensing adequate resources for the express learning, teaching, and research needs of each institution.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Examine and revise collection development practices to reflect the shift from owning materials to licensing content.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Explore opportunities for incorporating non-proprietary, open resources.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Refine the focus of institutional collections to include curating content (e.g. through institutional repositories and data archiving).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Develop attractive, easy to navigate, well-equipped spaces for individual and collaborative work and study.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Develop consistent and effective policies and procedures for balancing the protection and appropriate use of intellectual property.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Share strategies for the protection and fair use of intellectual property with all libraries in Florida’s academic community.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Become a clearinghouse for open content developed by faculty, students, and the wider intellectual community.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Form partnerships with university presses in Florida, the United States, and beyond.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Support new models for open access publishing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Build mechanisms for archiving and disseminating documentation from all stages of the research cycle (from data collection to final publications).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Educate the academic community on the need for open access publishing.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table B.1 Detailed Values, Goals, and Strategies
VALUES

- User needs drive the design of library services.
- Libraries thrive in a culture of collaboration and good will.
- Libraries preserve our cultural heritage in all of its diversity and forms.
- Libraries support the open inquiry that is vital to the advancement of knowledge.
- Florida’s academic libraries serve as protectors and sponsors of intellectual property while fostering fair use.

Goal 1

Florida’s academic libraries have the capacity and agility to respond to emerging technologies and to support the promotion of economic development.

STRATEGIES

1. Provide flexibility in products and services to support evolving learning, teaching, and research needs.
2. Maintain the technological infrastructure needed to deliver high quality and innovative library services.
3. Identify and inform funding sources to support adequate investment in library technologies.
4. Support the incubation of new business startups and creation of a highly skilled workforce through providing resources for degrees in critical need areas.

TRENDS AND ISSUES

Mobile devices, cloud computing, security and authentication, adequate bandwidth, system interoperability, standards.

From The 2011 Horizon Report:

- “The technologies we use are increasingly cloud-based, and our notions of IT support are decentralized. This trend, too, was noted in 2010 and continues to influence decisions about emerging technology adoption at educational institutions. As we turn to mobile applications for immediate access to many resources and tasks that once were performed on desktop computers, it makes sense to move data and services into the cloud. The challenges of privacy and control continue to affect adoption and deployment, but work continues on resolving the issues raised by increasingly networked information” (Johnson et al., 2011, p. 3).
- “Economic pressures and new models of education are presenting unprecedented competition to traditional models of the university. The twin challenges of providing high-quality services and controlling costs continue to impel institutions to seek creative solutions. As a result, innovative institutions are developing new models to serve students, such as streaming survey courses over the network so students can attend from their dorm or other locations to free up lecture space” (Johnson et al., 2011, p. 4).

From the Association of College and Research Libraries (ACRL) (2010):

- “Explosive growth of mobile devices and applications will drive new services. Smart phones, e-book readers, iPads, and other handheld devices will drive user demands and expectations” (p. 288).
- “Budget challenges will continue and libraries will evolve as a result” (p. 287).
- “Demands for accountability and assessment will increase. Increasingly, academic libraries are required to demonstrate the value they provide to their clientele and institutions. This trend is part of a broader accountability movement within higher education, resulting from demands from federal and state governments, accrediting bodies, employers, parents, and taxpayers for institutions to show the value of a college education and results of student learning outcomes” (p. 287).
- “Technology will continue to change services and required skills. Cloud computing, augmented and virtual reality, discovery tools, open content, open source
software, and new social networking tools are some of the most important technological changes affecting academic libraries. As with mobile applications, these developments will affect nearly all library operations” (p. 289).

Goal 2

Florida’s academic libraries work together to leverage resources, develop new models for scholarly communication, and create innovative approaches for connecting our users to the world’s knowledge.

STRATEGIES

1. Model efficiency and effectiveness in the acquisition of resources and deployment of services, leveraging those assets.
2. Build upon existing and seek new opportunities for formal and informal cooperative agreements to foster continuing collaborative action that leverages institutional and statewide resources.
3. Provide discovery tools and delivery options for students and faculty to access the information resources they need.
4. Design and deliver instruction that connects students and faculty with the library services and resources they need for academic success.

TRENDS AND ISSUES

From The 2011 Horizon Report:

- “The abundance of resources and relationships made easily accessible via the Internet is increasingly challenging us to revisit our roles as educators in sense-making, coaching, and credentialing. This multi-year trend was again ranked very highly, indicating its continued influence. With personal access to the Internet from mobile devices on the rise, the growing set of resources available as open content, and a variety of reference and textbooks available electronically, students’ easy and pervasive access to information outside of formal campus resources continues to encourage educators to take a careful look at the ways we can best serve learners” (Johnson et al., 2011, p. 3).
- “People expect to be able to work, learn, and study whenever and wherever they want. This highly-ranked trend, also noted last year, continues to permeate all aspects of daily life. Mobiles contribute to this trend, where increased availability of the Internet feeds the expectation of access. Feelings of frustration are common when it is not available. Companies are starting to respond to consumer demand for access anywhere; in 2010, programs like Google’s Fiber for Communities sought to expand access to underserved communities, and several airlines began offering wireless network access in the air during flights” (Johnson et al., 2011, p. 3).
- “The world of work is increasingly collaborative, giving rise to reflection about the way student projects are structured. This trend continues from 2010 and is being driven by the increasingly global and cooperative nature of business interactions facilitated by Internet technologies. The days of isolated desk jobs are disappearing, giving way to models in which teams work actively together to address issues too far-reaching or complex for a single worker to resolve alone. Market intelligence firm IDC notes that some one billion people fit the definition of mobile workers already, and projects that fully one-third of the global workforce — 1.2 billion workers — will perform their work from multiple locations by 2013” (Johnson et al., 2011, p. 3).
- “Digital media literacy continues its rise in importance as a key skill in every discipline and profession. This challenge, first noted in 2008, reflects universal agreement among those on the Horizon Project Advisory Board. Although there is broad consensus that digital media literacy is vitally important for today’s students, what skills constitute digital literacy are still not well defined nor universally taught. Teacher preparation programs are beginning to include courses
related to digital media literacy, and universities are beginning to fold these literacy skills into coursework for students, but progress continues to be slow. The challenge is exacerbated by the fact that digital technologies morph and change quickly at a rate that generally outpaces curriculum development” (Johnson et al., 2011, pp. 3-4).

- “Keeping pace with the rapid proliferation of information, software tools, and devices is challenging for students and teachers alike. New developments in technology are exciting and their potential for improving quality of life is enticing, but it can be overwhelming to attempt to keep up with even a few of the many new tools that are released. User-created content is exploding, giving rise to information, ideas, and opinions on all sorts of interesting topics, but following even some of the hundreds of available authorities means sifting through a mountain of information on a weekly or daily basis. There is a greater need than ever for effective tools and filters for finding, interpreting, organizing, and retrieving the data that is important to us” (Johnson et al., 2011, p. 4).

From the ACRL (2010):

- “Increased collaboration will expand the role of the library within the institution and beyond. Collaboration efforts will continue to diversify: collaborating with faculty to integrate library resources into the curriculum and to seek out information literacy instruction, and as an embedded librarian; working with scholars to provide access to their data sets, project notes, papers, etc. in virtual research environments and digital repositories; collaborating with information technology experts to develop online tutorials and user-friendly interfaces to local digital collections; collaborating with student support services to provide integrated services to students; and collaborating with librarians at other institutions to improve open source software, share resources, purchase materials, and preserve collections” (p. 288).

**Goal 3**

Florida’s academic library collections are rich in content and diverse in format including print collections, archival materials, data sets, licensed eResources, and open access publications.

**STRATEGIES**

1. Attract and retain qualified and innovative library faculty and staff who will facilitate access to library resources through the design and delivery of services including discovery tools, instruction, and research assistance.
2. Secure funding for acquiring and licensing adequate resources for the express learning, teaching, and research needs of each institution.
3. Examine and revise collection development practices to reflect the shift from owning materials to licensing content.

**TRENDS AND ISSUES**

From the ACRL (2010):

- “Academic library collection growth is driven by patron demand and will include new resource types. Budget reductions, user preferences for electronic access to materials, limited physical space, and the inability to financially sustain comprehensive collections have led many academic libraries to shift from a “just-in-case” to a “just-in-time” philosophy” (p. 286).

- “Changes in higher education will require that librarians possess diverse skill sets. As technological changes continue to impact not only the way libraries are used but also the nature of collections, librarians need to broaden their portfolio of skills to provide services to users. Academic librarians will need ongoing formal training to continue in the profession” (p. 287).
• “Digitization of unique library collections will increase and require a larger share of resources. Digitization projects make hidden and underused special collections available to researchers worldwide” (p. 288).

Goal 4
Florida’s academic libraries create and support an open, non-proprietary environment for the creation, preservation, and distribution of scholarly work.

STRATEGIES
1. Explore opportunities for incorporating non-proprietary open resources.
2. Refine the focus of institutional collections to include curating content (e.g. through institutional repositories and data archiving).
3. Develop attractive, easy to navigate, well-equipped spaces for individual and collaborative work and study.

TRENDS AND ISSUES
From The 2011 Horizon Report:

• “Appropriate metrics of evaluation lag behind the emergence of new scholarly forms of authoring, publishing, and researching. Noted first in 2010, this challenge continues. Electronic books, blogs, multimedia pieces, networked presentations, and other kinds of scholarly work can be difficult to evaluate and classify according to traditional metrics, but faculty members are increasingly experimenting with these alternate forms of expression. At the same time, reconciling new forms of scholarly activity with old standards continues to be difficult, creating tension and raising questions as to where faculty energy is best directed” (Johnson et al., 2011, p. 4).

From the ACRL (2010):

• “Libraries will continue to lead efforts to develop scholarly communication and intellectual property services. Academic libraries have recognized the importance of scholarly communication and intellectual property issues for many years. Recent developments illustrate a trend toward proactive efforts to educate faculty and students about authors’ rights and open access publishing options and to recruit content for institutional repositories (IRs)” (p. 289).

• “The definition of the library will change as physical space is repurposed and virtual space expands. Most academic libraries provide access to more resources than ever before. However, the number of physical items in many libraries is declining, as libraries withdraw journal runs to which they have permanent online archival access and/or move lesser-used materials to off-site or shared storage facilities, thus freeing up areas that are repurposed to provide space for individual student and collaborative work. Libraries are expanding their virtual space, reducing space within the library facility for collections, and re-purposing it for student use. The concept of “Library as Place” is still important to students, researchers, and many faculty members. Some libraries have added writing, tutoring, and media centers to provide multiple academic support services in one convenient location” (pp. 289-290).

Goal 5
Florida’s academic libraries become a nexus for the exchange of scholarship and research, developing new intellectual property and moving it into the real world through licensing and technology transfer.

STRATEGIES
1. Develop consistent and effective policies and procedures for balancing the protection and appropriate use of intellectual property.
2. Share strategies for the protection and fair use of intellectual property with all libraries in Florida’s academic community.
3. Become a clearinghouse for open content developed by faculty, students, and the wider academic community.
4. Form partnerships with university presses in Florida, the United States, and beyond.

TRENDS AND ISSUES

From the ACRL (2010):

- “Libraries will continue to lead efforts to develop scholarly communication and intellectual property services. Academic libraries have recognized the importance of scholarly communication and intellectual property issues for many years. Recent developments illustrate a trend toward proactive efforts to educate faculty and students about authors’ rights and open access publishing options and to recruit content for institutional repositories (IRs). Digital repository project managers report that scholars ‘lacked an understanding of copyright and the issues of copyright compliance’ and that many of them ‘did not understand or could not remember or retrieve the agreements that were signed with publishers for the publication and dissemination of their work.’ Interest in these issues is illustrated by the growth in SPARC membership: more than 200 North American research and academic libraries belong to SPARC; about the same number participated in the Open Access Week in 2009” (p. 289).

- “Recruiting content for IRs provides a natural entrée for conversations about scholarly communication issues. This also illustrates the need for libraries to provide guidance and user education on copyright law, and, in particular, the need to obtain permission to use copyrighted material in one’s work if the use is not covered by the fair use exception. Libraries are addressing the need to provide value-added scholarly communication services in a variety of ways. Some libraries have created scholarly communication librarian or copyright officer positions. Others have taken a more distributed approach. The University of Minnesota, for example, has included scholarly communication responsibilities in the position descriptions of all of its liaison librarians” (p. 289).

- “Other trends, including growing use of open source products, creation of more locally created digital collections, the increasing complexity of licensing issues, and litigation involving the use of materials in course e-reserves and course management systems, reinforce the need for academic libraries to provide value-added intellectual property services” (p. 289).
Regular Meeting of the
Members Council on Library Services (MCLS)

Minutes

Monday, June 3, 2013 – 9:30 a.m. to 4:00 p.m. EDT

Members Present
Barry Baker (UCF), Karen Blondeau (Valencia), Winifred Bradley (Pensacola, virtual), Ray Calvert (Pasco-Hernando), Mercedes Clement (Daytona, virtual), Carmen Cummings (St. Johns River, virtual), Elizabeth Curry (Central Florida), Patricia DeSalvo (Seminole), Brian Doherty (NCF), Lori Driscoll (Gulf Coast), Tracy Elliott (SCF, Manatee-Sarasota), Denise English (Lake-Sumter), Bill Foerge (Polk), Bill Garrison (USF), Karen Griffin (Hillsborough), Shirley Hallblade (UNF), Janice Henderson (Northwest Florida), Jacqueline Henning (Broward), Isabel Hernandez (Miami), Kay Hogan (North Florida, virtual), Renee Hopkins (Chipola), Brian Kelley (Palm Beach), Joe Leopold (St. Pete), Kathleen Miller (FGCU), William Miller (FAU), Lena Phelps (South Florida), Jean Phillips (FSU, representing Julia Zimmerman), Patricia Profeta (Indian River), Deborah Robinson (Tallahassee), Judith Russell (UF), William Shuluk (Edison, virtual), Mem Stahley (Brevard), Ruth Swan (FAMU), Christy Taylor-Pruitt (FSC at Jacksonville).

Guests: Rose Bland, Judy Born, Valerie Boulos, Jeffrey Bowen, Molly Brown, Troy Christenson, Lee Dotson, Rebecca Frank, Christina Fullerton, Charles Gordon, Jean Larsen, Betsy Simpson.

FLVC Staff: Bill Covey, Claire Dygert, Tammy Elliott, Brenda Ferris, Lucy Harrison, Don Muccino, Scott Schmucker, and Ashley Seale.

Call to Order
Committee Chair, Lori Driscoll, called the meeting to order, and Tammy Elliott recorded the proceedings of the meeting.

1. Executive Committee Meeting Update
A report detailing the recent activities of the Executive Committee had been emailed to the council prior to the meeting. There were no comments or questions on the report at the meeting.

2. Update from MCLS Representative to Members Council on Distance Learning and Student Services (MCDLSS)
Robinson reported that the MCDLSS put forward a whitepaper that was accepted by the FLVC Board of Directors, on April 25, 2013. The paper can be found on the FLVC website. Topics of discussion in the paper included leveraging e-resources for distance learning students and seeking statewide funding for a common LMS.

3. Reports from Existing Task Forces and Standing Committees
Resource Sharing/ILL
Christenson reported that the task force has set up a working document and a Wiki for communication purposes. Chair and secretary positions, as well as a standard meeting time, have been established. The task force hopes to have their first set of recommendations drafted within the next 60 days.
**Shared Bib**
Simpson reported that the committee is planning to dissolve mid-July since the Technical Services Standing Committee has begun to take shape and many of the members on the task force are now on that committee. This would allow them to carry over some of those recommendations and direct some of the work.

**Digital Initiatives**
Dotson reported that the committee has submitted their first report to FLVC. They also submitted their final quarterly report to CSUL and sent a draft to FLVC so the organization could get an idea of their background and the work the committee has been doing.

**Collections/E-Resource Licensing**
Born reported that the task force has been meeting regularly to prepare a recommendation for the MCLS on a core set of e-resources. Data from the e-resources survey and feedback from the Regional User Meetings have been incorporated into the recommendations.

**Discovery Tool Selection**
Bowen reported that the task force has been meeting weekly since the end of March. They have sent out a second draft of the RFI that incorporates feedback from the first draft.

4. **Discovery Tool Selection Process**
Garrison encouraged the council to give feedback on the RFI. It was pointed out that there were a few comments posted to the Members Council listserv that were not changes to be made, but concerns about the timing on the RFI. Concerns were also raised in the meeting with regards to moving ahead with the discovery tool RFI if there is a possibility FLVC will not have the funds to acquire it, or decides to hold off on the purchase until a decision on the next generation ILS has been made. Muccino noted that moving forward with the RFI would allow FLVC to receive cost information that would be beneficial to making a purchase decision. A decision to defer the purchase would still require a short-term decision on which of the two in-house tools to use—Mango or Primo—but then the RFI process would need to be revisited. Discussion followed.

It was announced that Pat DeSalvo has agreed to host the system demonstrations and vendor demos on July 24-25, 2013, at Seminole State College. These will be open meetings and the task force plans to have an evaluation form available for members to provide feedback after the demos.

The council also discussed which FTE numbers are to be used in the RFI and e-resources negotiation processes and whether those should be Florida numbers or NCES numbers.

Motion: Moved by Driscoll and seconded that the Executive Committee will draft language to send to the Board that states that FLVC will clearly disclose the formula being used for the SUS FTE calculations. Motion approved.

Muccino will also follow up with Nancy McKee for input from the vice chancellors.

5. **Authority Control in the Shared Bib Environment**
Garrison presented the Shared Bib Task Force’s white paper on authority control. Ongoing maintenance of authority control is becoming more of an issue as FLVC moves into a single shared bib environment. There is interest in having FLVC manage the process and pay for it using central funds. The council discussed next steps and funding options including adding it as a request in the FLVC LBR for next year.
Motion: Moved by Garrison and seconded to move forward with requesting additional funding in the LBR for authority control for FLVC institutions. Motion approved.

6. Select Liaisons to Standing Committees
Council members were given the opportunity to volunteer to serve as liaisons to the FLVC standing committees. All volunteers were approved by unanimous vote. Following are the results:

- Collections Management and E-Resources Standing Committee—Judy Russell, University of Florida
- Digital Initiatives Standing Committee—Brian Kelley, Palm Beach State College
- Resource Sharing Standing Committee—Ray Calvert, Pasco-Hernando Community College
- Technical Services Standing Committee—Renee Hopkins, Chipola College
- User Interfaces Standing Committee—Pat Profeta, Indian River State College

7. Committee Processes
Driscoll reported the following Executive Committee decisions with regards to committee processes:

- **Face-to-Face Meetings**
  Standing committees and task forces should plan to meet virtually. If a committee feels they need to have a face-to-face meeting, the chair will need to petition the Executive Committee with the rationale for doing so, and to discuss the possibility of other accommodations that can be made instead.

- **Location of Committee Information**
  Committee charges, the committee organization chart, and membership listings are now available on the [FLVC.org website](http://FLVC.org).

- Committee listserv memberships will be at the discretion of the committee chair.

- Over the next year, the Executive Committee will begin work on a traditions document where process decisions can be documented.

8. Members Council Processes and Procedures
Driscoll reported the following Executive Committee decisions with regards to MCLS processes:

- **Role of Alternate Representatives**
  Alternates should attend MCLS meetings virtually and should attend in person only if the primary member is not attending. They are also able to serve as a proxy for voting on council matters if they are designated to do so by the primary member. All alternates have been added to the MCLS listserv.

- Members Council meeting agendas and minutes are posted on the [FLVC.org website](http://FLVC.org).

The council discussed recommendations from Robinson and Zimmerman on a standardized MCLS meeting schedule that called for a combination of meetings that would coincide alternately with CSUL and FCS CIA Learning Resources Standing Committee (LRSC), at least for the next two years.

Motion: Moved by Henderson and seconded to accept the proposed schedule of general dates and locations and trying to coordinate MCLS meetings with CSUL and CIA LRSC meetings. Motion approved.
9. **Election of MCLS Officers**
The council held elections for officers for FY 2013-14. Following are the results of the election:

- Chair-Elect—Janice Henderson, Northwest Florida State College
- Secretary—Bill Foege, Polk State College
- FCS at-large Representative (two-year term)—Pat DeSalvo, Seminole State College
- SUS at-large Representative (one-year term)—Barry Baker, University of Central Florida

10. **Executive Director’s Report**
Muccino updated the council on FLVC activities, including progress on new legislative mandates, data center consolidation, the help desk consolidation, FLARE activities, and efforts to implement a common web infrastructure.

Council members worked with staff at the SPC Collaborative Labs in an exercise to rank a list of potential FLVC projects. Council members voiced concern about the projects on the list as well as the timing and pertinence of the exercise. Council members encouraged more inclusion of the institutions and standing committees when making project decisions. Discussion followed.

Muccino agreed to take the list and add information about each project listed, as well as to add any new projects that were suggested during the exercise. He will then send it out to the council using Survey Monkey so the council can discuss it with their staff, and then return the feedback to FLVC.

Updates were also given on the recent listserv migration and other possible initiatives for inclusion in the LBR, such as equity funding. Harrison reviewed Senate Bills 1720 and 1076, and House Bill 7029. She noted FLVC may also be impacted by UWF’s work on the Complete Florida Degree Program and UF’s designation as a preeminent university.

11. **Director of Library Services Report**
Harrison reported that FLVC is working with institutions on bibliographic database quality and will soon assign a staff member to start doing clean-up in the shared bib database. She noted that if all goes well with the help desk consolidation project, FLVC hopes to have a new single support system with staff in place as early as January 2014. Harrison also reviewed the executive summary of the library services survey and noted that as FLVC continues to bring their services together, future surveys will not separate services for the colleges from services for the universities. FLVC will send out another survey before the next meeting in September.

**Digital Platforms Analysis**
Covey reported on activities surrounding the evaluation of the digital platforms—Equella, Sobek CM, and Islandora. He discussed the process and how the products compare to each other. At the request of council members, he also gave some insight into the FTE costs it takes to build and maintain each platform if chosen. They used requirements developed by the Digital Initiatives Steering Committee as a guide for their evaluations. The council discussed the pros and cons of continuing to develop Islandora, since Sobek CM is already up and running and fully functional. Discussion followed. Development work will continue on Islandora and Phillips encouraged the members to explore the beta test version of it on the FSU site. Harrison noted that a link to that test site was included in her recent update.
12. E-Resources Report
Members of the Collections/E-Resource Licensing Task Force presented recommendations for a common core set of e-resources that would be licensed for all colleges and universities in Florida. Four scenarios—5.2, 5.3, 5.4, and 5.5—were presented, but the task force recommended only two: 5.4 and 5.5. They reminded the group that in any scenario there would be tradeoffs and material that would be both lost and gained by the universities and the colleges. They also noted that final pricing would not be known until the actual negotiations begin. Discussion followed.

Council members applauded the hard work of the task force and the information they presented, but voiced concern about not having had adequate time to do a detailed analysis of the impact each scenario would have on their institutions. Therefore, it was proposed that the review time be extended and that an individualized spreadsheet with more of their data be provided to each institution.

Dygert and Schmucker agreed to provide the spreadsheet. The council decided they would meet again via conference call no later than two weeks after the spreadsheet has been sent out. At that meeting they will decide which scenario to pursue.

Boulos noted that two databases, licensed through Lyrasis for the SUS, are up for renewal on July 1. Council members recommended she renew them for six months.

13. Input to FLVC Board Meeting on June 12
Strategic Goals from Unified Library Services Business Plan
The council reviewed a planning document Driscoll drafted based on information in the Unified Library Services Business Plan. Driscoll’s plan was to present the document on behalf of the MCLS to the Board at their retreat on June 12, 2013. Discussion followed and the council expressed a desire to develop a more detailed planning document, maybe including strategic initiatives, going forward for next year.

Motion: Moved by Henderson and seconded to accept the planning document as is and have it presented to the Board at their June retreat.

Suggestions for FY 2014-15 LBR
The council further discussed the FLVC LBR and agreed to the suggestions of adding additional funding for e-resources, for authority control clean up and maintenance, and for equity funding so that FLVC can provide DLLI and OCLC access fees for both the universities and the colleges. The council also agreed to incorporate in the LBR language on the growing importance of STEM initiatives and the importance of making streaming media available to library users.

14. New Business
- Shirley Hallblade, Christy Taylor-Pruitt, and Ruth Swan were acknowledged as members of the council who would be retiring this year. The council also presented Driscoll with a signed plaque in appreciation for her service as Chair of the MCLS during the past year.
- Russell reported that UF has received its first shipment of the “last monograph copy in Florida” items. The HathiTrust survey has been completed and the paperwork for the consortia membership has been signed. She also noted that Internet Archive is interested in setting up a scribe center, so UF will be doing a survey to determine interest from the colleges and universities. She will follow-up with more information in an email to the council.

Adjournment
The meeting was adjourned at 4:06 p.m. EDT.