Regular Meeting of the
Members Council on Library Services (MCLS)

Agenda

Tuesday, February 9, 2016 – 8:30 to 5:00 p.m. ET

College of Central Florida | Ewers Century Center (Building 40, Room 101) | 3001 S.W. College Road | Ocala, Florida 34474-4415

8:00 – 8:30  Continental Breakfast

8:30 – 8:35  Call to Order

8:35 – 10:30
1. “Engaging for the Future”—Next Steps
   10:30 – 10:45  Break

10:45 – 12:30
1:30 – 2:15
3. Updates from FALSC
   A. Legislative Updates
   B. 2017-18 Legislative Budget Requests (LBRs)
   C. Organization Updates
   D. Project Updates

2:15 – 2:45
4. FALSC Strategic Planning

2:45 – 3:00
5. MCLS Processes and Procedures
   A. 2016-17 Nominating Committee
   B. Update on Process for Filling Additional Slots on Resource Sharing Standing Committee
   C. Distributing the Open Educational Resources (OER) Survey

3:00 – 3:15  Break

3:15 – 4:45
6. Next-Gen ILS
   A. Update on Process
   B. Charge and Membership of the Ad Hoc GoLive Criteria Working Group
   C. Updates on Working Groups

4:45 – 4:50
7. Updates from FLVC Standing Committees
   A. Collection Management and E-Resources
   B. Digital Initiatives
   C. Resource Sharing
   D. Technical Services
   E. User Interfaces

4:50 – 4:55
8. Future Meeting Dates and Locations
   • June 14, 2016—St. Petersburg College, Seminole Campus
   • September 8-9, 2016—Florida Atlantic University
   • November 30-December 1, 2016—University of Central Florida

4:55 – 5:00  New Business

5:00  Adjournment
To: Members Council on Library Services (MCLS)  
From: Kate Nevins  
Date: 2/1/2016  
Re: February MCLS Meeting Discussions

Dear Members:

I look forward to our facilitated session in Ocala on the next steps in addressing the priorities you identified at our December meeting. The two identified priorities and the purposes for our discussion are:

1. E-Resources: develop new program approach and language for legislative proposal, work on contingency plans, establish long-term goals for the program, and reach out to other licensing organizations in the state.
   - E-Resources Contingency Planning: support members' budgeting information needs through documentation of the LBR cycle and FALSC budget creation, and development of contingency plans based on possible budget action by the legislature for both FY2017 and FY2018.
   - Educating Stakeholders: frame effective communications to decision makers and constituents about the importance and impact of libraries in general and E-Resources in particular, and develop appropriate communications plans.
   - Reframe the current E-Resources program: develop a “fresh plan” by considering the goals, strategy, messaging, and activities in order to strengthen the program and bring “pizazz” to communications with decision makers.

2. To establish a shared and clear understanding of authority and decision making among the MCLS and FALSC leaderships.
   - Clarify FALSC and MCLS decision authority for categories of topics and/or scope.
   - Develop a philosophy or principles of decision making within MCLS that serves as a framework for decisions and decision follow up, including such potential topics as criticality, accountability, conflict resolution, and the approach to minority needs.
   - Document and share decision making framework, and manage processes transparently.

Thanks,

Kate Nevins  
404.858.7320  
kfnevins53@gmail.com
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ENGAGING FOR THE FUTURE

A Report of FALSC Member Discussions and MCLS Priorities

January 12, 2016

Prepared by Kate Nevins

I. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The establishment of FALSC provides Florida’s academic libraries with a new service organization, and with the opportunity to work with each other in new ways. In order to ensure the effectiveness of this initiative, the FALSC membership and staff undertook a process to identify needed practices, policies, and principles for the new organization. Member input was gathered. The Members Council on Library Services (MCLS) reviewed this input and identified priorities for action. MCLS identified the following as the initial priorities:

1. Decision Making and Authority: develop principles to guide decision making and conflict resolution, document processes, include accountability.

2. E/Resources: develop new program approach and language for legislative proposal, work on contingency plans, establish long term goals for the program, and reach out to other licensing organizations in the state.

The MCLS Executive Committee is determining the methodology to implement these priorities.

II. MEMBER DISCUSSIONS

The Florida Virtual Campus initiated conversations with its Members Council on Library Services and key library staff as a component of the work to establish the Florida Academic Library Services Cooperative (FALSC). Three sessions were held in October 2015, to brainstorm, share, and identify potential steps to ensure an effective organization in service to Florida academic libraries and the students, faculty, researchers and staff that are central to their mission. Two sessions were held face-to-face. One was held virtually. Forty participants attended from 32 institutions: 20 colleges and 12 universities. The objectives of these sessions were to:

1. Create a shared vision for FALSC and its members.

2. Understand the environment and the issues impacting organizational effectiveness.

3. Develop potential strategies for moving forward together.

The participants came to the sessions ready to engage in discussions about the direction of FLVC and how to make FALSC and the membership effective. Many commented on the value of frank discussions and the opportunity to put issues on the table. It was useful to brainstorm about strategies to move forward. Based on these discussions, it is apparent that there is a need to address a number of unresolved topics, some long standing, which contribute to uncertainty, lack of common understanding, and varying levels of trust. Some of these issues are among the members themselves while others involve work with FALSC. Included are such complexities as resource allocation, priorities, and decision
making. There is interest in a strong FALSC, but there is some member fatigue following the last several years of change. Overall, the participants saw these sessions as a good first step in working towards a common organizational culture, developing effective ways of working together, and resolving issues that could become barriers to a strong FALSC.

The richness and detail of the discussions cannot be covered in this summary document. The discussions and meeting flip charts were transcribed and are available to provide invaluable input to those individuals participating in follow up.

This summary includes the initial suggestions for potential follow up. These served as prompts to start the discussion in the Members Council at their December meeting. At that meeting they discussed priorities and needed action.

**Vision and Mission**

Participants brainstormed concepts for the shared FALSC Vision and Mission and were prompted to think about the following questions: “Why FALSC? Who is FALSC serving? What is FALSC providing? How is FALC serving?” Themes are captured here, including some which are somewhat contradictory.

**Why FALSC?**

- Change lives through academic and personal success.
- Make the world a better place through the success of higher education.
- Make communities better places through the success of individuals.
- Give Florida a global impact.
- Ensure strong libraries are effectively serving their constituencies.
- Excel as a service organization for higher education in Florida.

**Who is FALSC serving?**

- Students, faculty, researchers and staff in Florida higher education.
- All Floridians, within higher education and beyond.
  - K-12, ICUF, distance education and public libraries.
- A diverse set of higher education institutions of differing size, constituents, programs, and goals.

**What is FALSC providing?**

- Technology services, infrastructure, and information content.
- Advocacy for higher education, libraries, and library users.
- Forum for innovation and leadership in the field.
- Transformational change of libraries and library staff in service to changing user communities.

**How is FALSC serving?**

- Forward thinking, innovative programs developed with staff and member participation.
- A platform for collaboration between FALSC members.
- Efficiencies and demonstrated benefits of joint action.
• Bridges to important partners: distance education, the state library, public libraries, etc.
• Best practices, sharing and developing expertise, and new opportunities.

Assets and Challenges
Participants were asked to consider assets and challenges for creating FALSC from legacy organizations and initiatives. As is often the case, factors identified as assets are often the flip side of challenges, and vice versa. For this reason, assets and challenges are integrated in this section.

A. People
The first response from all three groups when asked about assets in Florida academic libraries and FALSC was people: smart, committed, connected, collaborative, knowledgeable, and accomplished, to list just a few of the adjectives used. Respondents identified the strength of current relationships among many FALSC members, a history of success in past initiatives, and the depth of expertise within the FALSC and members’ staffs, and a commitment to FLVC library services as they transition to FALSC.

Even with this positive and widely held view, there are some cautions and challenges that merit attention:

1. Many expressed a strong feeling that member staff are not utilized to full advantage and that the potential for increased leverage of members’ expertise is significant. The sharing of best practices, ILS implementation planning, and developing new processes, are examples that could benefit from additional utilization of libraries’ staff expertise. This was discussed both as use of expertise by FLVC and as the sharing of expertise among FLVC members.

2. Some staff of FLVC member libraries feel detached from the organization and do not feel a stake in or responsibility for its programs and progress. Opportunities to build relationships, develop collegiality across the state and with FLVC staff, and keep up to date on FLVC initiatives both would build commitment and begin to create a common culture.

3. The topic of committees was a recurring theme. Much work of FLVC members and the SUS and FCS is done in committees. This commitment of time and resources has done much good work. However, there was discussion about the effectiveness of committees. There were several issues: lack of clarity in committee charges, perceived overlap in SUS/FCS/FLVC committee work, siloed committees in an environment where issues are interrelated, lack of clarity about the authority of specific committees, a need for a single place to find information about committees’ work, and a need for “pop up committees” initiated by staff when they perceive a need.

Initial Suggestions: People
• Consider current and potential ways to utilize staff expertise, build relationships, and create member engagement with FALSC, its staff and membership, as well as across the membership.
• Audit current communications needs and programs; redesign communication program.
• Assess current FALSC, SUS and FCS committees for purpose, overlap, and effectiveness. Redesign as needed.
B. The Legislative Mandate

Participants acknowledged the legislative mandate that led to the move to UWF and the focus on shared e-resource collections. There were two sides to this acknowledgment:

1. Some expressed that the legislature does not have an adequate understanding of libraries, the diversity of academic libraries in the state, or the realities of e-resource licensing. This has led to frustration and some sense of the impossibility of meeting the legislative mandate.

2. There was also acknowledgement of the importance of building legislative support for Florida academic libraries. This included such ideas as: demonstrating success in serving students, providing expanded access to information, and proven success in meeting the mandate. Participants showed support for an effort to frame the academic library story and record, accomplishments of FALSC, and good stewardship into a communication/reporting initiative.

Initial Suggestions: Legislative Mandate

- Develop legislative communication strategy, frame a message, and utilize metrics.
- Commit to public support of the work of FALSC.

C. Decisions/Recommendations/Authority

A range of topics arose about decision and authority. Some were simply questions of process and could be addressed by developing and documenting for clarity. Others, listed below, are central to establishing a transparent, effective, and equitable decision methodology as well as an understanding of authority of both the FALSC membership and the FALSC organization.

1. A frequent topic was the size disparity between the number of universities and colleges and the potential fairness and inequitable impact on decisions or actions. There is concern that one constituency will have an advantage over the other when issues require action. Several interesting points came up during this discussion:

   a. Some participants noted that commonalities on issues do not always align according to FCS/SUS membership. Sometimes the commonalities align by size, with larger colleges having more in common with some of the universities, for example. Or, commonalities align by programs at the various campuses.

   b. It was pointed out that at the Dean/Director level, this has proven to be more a fear than a problem in reality. To date, Members Council votes have not tended to split along FCS/SUS lines.

   c. Others felt that this issue most often comes up in committee discussions where the detail of members’ practices and needs arise.

Whatever the manifestation of this issue at Members Council or in Committees, the perception of one group being privileged over another in decision making prevents development of trust and undermines collaboration. As long as this issue is unresolved this tension will persist, hindering overall organizational effectiveness.

2. Some decisions, such as the selection of specific e-resource licenses, are applicable only to one constituency. This is based in part on legacy resources licensed in the past for which there is still need and for which the funding is centralized.
3. The current role of the Members Council on Library Services is one of fact finding and information gathering, and working through the Executive Advisory Council to make recommendations to the FLVC leadership. With the implementation of FALSC, there may be an opportunity for the Members Council to more directly provide recommendations to the FALSC leadership. In addition, the Members Council has authority to make decisions in certain areas. The differentiation between these two categories is not clear and needs clarification. Overall, there is a desire for increased transparency in, and communications about, the decision making process.

4. Participants discussed the dichotomy of making decisions or recommendations on the basis of the most advantageous option for their own institution vs. the good of the whole. There is a long library tradition of optimizing for the group; however, resource constraints and campus pressures make the persistence of this philosophy uncertain within the FALSC membership.

---

**Initial Suggestions: Decisions/Recommendations/Authority**

- Develop operating principles and philosophy that can guide decision and advisory processes and establish methodology to resolve conflicts.
- Finalize and support voting protocol.
- Clarify processes and authority, and document for consistency and continuity.

---

### D. Programs and Services

FALSC and its members have the difficult challenge of “starting over without stopping.” The complex work of managing libraries, running systems, acquiring and providing information is running full tilt. Neither FALSC members nor staff have the luxury of putting all this aside to consider the most effective way to stand up FALSC and develop a vision and plan for the future. Participants considered directions for programs and services. Highlights of these discussions:

1. **The Next Generation ILS.** This is the major initiative for FALSC and its members for the next eighteen months. As such, there is anticipation about the capabilities it will bring for members and the enhancements to service for students and other users. There is also concern about the adequacy of resources needed at FALSC to both implement the new ILS and maintain the current system through the transition. The ILS is the base upon which libraries’ entire operations and information access rests, so an effective ILS roll-out is high on everyone’s priority list. Participants shared ideas about what will be needed for success, including: an implementation plan with member involvement in its development, extensive training and development of best practices by both FALSC and member staff, the strongest possible technical support, and the appointment of an experienced implementation project manager.

2. **E-Resources.** E-Resources are critical to the effectiveness of all academic libraries, and FALSC members have an impressive legacy of richness in this area on behalf of their users. However, there is upward pressure on prices and downward pressure on available funding. This has resulted in difficult decisions on the part of the e-resources committee about cuts to the list. Participants identified potential initiatives that could enhance the richness of available electronic information: educating stakeholders about e-resource costs; pursuit of open access text books and course packs and other similar innovations; integration with course management systems, and possible partnerships with others in the state, including distance education.
programs, the state library, multi-type cooperatives, K-12 and ICUF. The work of the Open Access Textbook and Educational Resources Task Force is a significant initiative with the potential for a positive impact in innovative expanded access to e-resources by all FALSC members.

3. Services Discontinuation. As FLVC/FALSC moves forward with a variety of initiatives, some participants expressed trepidation about the discontinuation of some current programs. (Some felt certain programs had already been lost.) Other participants saw this as a natural evolution, much as individual libraries discontinue programs when their usefulness is over or resources are needed for other higher priorities. The last systematic review of current programs and survey of member priorities was completed in late 2011. Some participants suggested that it is time to query members about priorities again.

Initial Suggestions: Programs and Services

- ILS roll out is the priority. Plan implementation in close partnership with members.
- Some e-resource alternatives are under investigation within FALSC. Engage with these efforts.
- Assess priorities of current programs.
- Plan legislative communication program.

Conclusions

These sessions provided an opportunity for the membership to engage together on FLVC, a topic of critical importance to their libraries and their users. The absence of this type of opportunity in earlier change iterations has resulted in ongoing issues, which can undermine processes, relationships, decisions, participation, and operations. Development of a shared culture, clarity of decision making and representation, and effective participation of and communications with member and FALSC staff are critical to the success of the organization. The resolution of each of these issues cannot satisfy all parties, but all parties must be satisfied with the resolution of at least some issues. And, the process of resolution must be seen to be in good faith, transparent, and participative. The Members Council has the opportunity to show strong leadership in setting the framework for a FALSC that will be effective for all member libraries and for those whom they serve.

III. FURTHER MCLS DISCUSSION

The MCLS met as a whole on December 9, 2015. Included on the agenda was a discussion of the member input for consideration with the purpose of creating a common understanding, clarifying issues, and determining actions. After a discussion of the member input, the MCLS reviewed the items that fostered discussion and then identified next steps through a prioritization process. The topics discussed and a high level summary of the points raised are as follows:

Mission and Vision

MCLS conducted a vigorous discussion on Mission and Vision statements, with some feeling that the lack of these statements hinders development of FALSC. After some discussion about developing statements for FALSC or the FLVC, the conversation focused on FALSC. The legislative mandate was considered as a possible component of the Mission, though further discussion focused on the work of library services,
serving users, providing value, collaborating, and excellence. Several questions were raised: which comes first: programmatic success or Mission? Which comes first: Mission or Vision? As the discussion progressed, interest in developing a Mission and Vision appeared significant. (One attendee put forward some concepts as a starting point for a Mission statement: Statewide library and information services, seamlessly provided, highly visible and valued, excellent, best possible services, planned and implemented collaboratively.)

People
Some MCLS members commented on the need to build strong relationships among FALSC staff and membership. Attention needs to be given to communications to ensure people are connected and participate fully.

Committees
Initial discussion focused on the need to have a collaborative process for planning and implementing the Next Gen ILS. This view was widely held. The following day after this discussion took place, the MCLS was set to review the proposed Next Gen ILS roll out plan, so this specific conversation was deferred until that time. The conversation about committees turned to the differences between FCS (curricular committees only), SUS (a range of subject and system committees), and FALSC (project and initiative committees). Some suggested that an assessment of the current committees, their purpose and output, might help simplify committee work. Others commented that more could be done to prepare committee members for their work: orientation processes, committee charges, clear reporting expectations and tools, etc. Many members commented on the importance of strengthening communications from, to, and among committees, particularly in light of the magnitude of the upcoming Next Gen ILS project. Communications recipients have responsibilities too: to keep up with communications, to share with colleagues and on campus, etc. Another common theme was the need for committee members to get feedback and to understand decisions which are made about their work. At the end of this discussion the following were agreed upon by members for needed next steps:

- Assessment of committees and how they can be most effective, including assessing committees and setting objectives.
- Need to develop and implement the committee communications process.

Legislative Mandate
The MCLS discussed the legislative mandate for both the Next Gen ILS and E-Resources. While this mandate is important, discussion also focused on the need to define success more broadly by meeting the Mission and effectiveness of services for users. MCLS members discussed the need to tell their story of successes and positive impact, not only to the legislature, but to other stakeholders and decision makers, with the goal of building support and resources for programs and initiatives.

Decision Making and Authority
The MCLS considered and expanded upon the discussions from the member sessions. While affirming the member session input, the MCLS introduced several additional dimensions about MCLS decisions:

- Decisions need to consider impacts on different segments of the membership, where majority voting may not recognize unique needs or opportunities. The “one institution, one vote” can be problematic, and the feeling was that a decision methodology is needed before a serious issue
needs to be dealt with. This methodology needs to include a way for all voices to be heard, even those in the minority.

- “Criticality” needs to be figured in to decisions.
- Communication is particularly important for effective decision making, particularly where committees are involved. Every member cannot have a person on every committee, particularly the colleges which have smaller staffs, making a formula-driven approach to committees difficult. Therefore, people need to be involved through effective communications.

MCLS then turned the conversation to questions of decision making with FLVC:

- Legislation does not specifically require FALSC accountability to the membership. Nonetheless, there is interest in a culture of mutual accountability. One person characterized the discussion as “Is this a top down organization or a collaborative organization?”
- Operating principles are needed with a clear statement about decisions to be made by the membership and those made by FLVC. Who has authority under what circumstances?
- Transparency is needed about what decisions are being made and when.

To summarize, MCLS focused on decision making and division of authority, articulated principles, including consideration of impact and minority interests, which includes a process for conflict resolution and mutual accountability.

**Programs and Services**

The Next Gen ILS discussion was deferred to the following day, and is not included here.

E-Resources goals were discussed earlier at the September MCLS meeting with a focus on how to strengthen licensing, particularly in light of budget constraints. MCLS affirmed the importance of this effort. In addition, additional points were raised:

- Budget timing is problematic for members, as they have to develop budgets before they have FALSC information about changes to the E-Resource collection. Is it possible to receive FALSC information earlier or to undertake some group contingency planning?
- Pam Northrup suggested that it might be time for a fresh plan to revitalize the budget request to the Legislature. Reaction to this was very positive.
- Some felt it was time to do some longer term planning for E-Resources, perhaps a 2-3 year plan.

The group endorsed an approach including two parts:

- Short term, talk about new approach and language in February for legislative submission; do group contingency planning in February.
- Long term: think about the big picture: long term goals and strategy, including outreach to other organizations in the state.

MCLS also discussed a review of current programs and projects:

- Consideration of current projects led first to a discussion of FALSC staffing levels. Pam Northrup reviewed staffing levels and provided some information about a reorganization that is in the
planning stages now. Further discussion of this topic was deferred until the February meeting when the new organization chart will be available.

IV. PRIORITIES

The MCLS determined priorities for action among the topics discussed. The priorities are as follows (number of votes for each are included in parentheses):

1. Decision making and authority: develop principles, conflict resolution, document processes, include accountability (28)
2. E-Resources: develop new approach, do budget contingency planning, develop long terms goals and strategy (26)
3. Mission and Vision: develop mission and vision (13)
4. Assess and strengthen communications processes (11)
5. Tell the story to the Legislature and others: (9)
6. Committees: assess current committees and redesign as needed (3)

The MCLS Executive Committee will determine the next steps, with focus on the top two priorities.

Reported:
Kate Nevins
January 7, 2016
Kate Nevins shared with member discussion group attendees some of her background with bringing together organizations to create a new organization. The creation of LYRASIS from three legacy networks included a number of characteristics which are similar to the creation of FALSC. These include:

- **Impetus for the new organization was external.** This means that a process of merging, getting to know each other, working out processes, etc, needed to happen after the creation of the new organization, rather than through a planning process in advance.
- **Even though the legacy organizations were engaged in the same kinds of programs with the same values and expertise, it was still challenging to put the organizations together.**
- **The creation of LYRASIS was a “merger of equals” in which the history, culture, membership, staff, and programs were respected.** While this was consistent with the legacy organizations’ cultures, it sometimes did make issue resolution and decision making difficult.
- **Geographically distributed staff resulted in challenges in having people feel engaged and, occasionally, in questions of fairness.**
- **Geographically distributed membership resulted in challenges related to building a common culture, engagement with the new organization, and shared priorities, processes and policies.**

She also ran through some lessons learned in the creation of LYRASIS. She recommended keeping the lessons in mind throughout the following discussions.

- **There is no benefit in fighting what can’t be changed.** Rather, efforts should be in moving forward and building the most effective possible organization.
- **It is difficult to put together organizations.** It is necessary to be proactive in creating the culture, programs, processes and policies for the new organization, even when it means setting aside aspects of the legacy organizations. Compromise is needed.
- **Unresolved issues grow worse over time.** Timely resolution and open conversation can prevent this.
- **Transparency in communications is key.** Morale and commitment can be impacted by perceived inequities in access to information.
- **Moving forward is a shared responsibility of the membership, staff, and leadership.**
## Members Council on Library Services
### Executive Committee Elections

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role</th>
<th>15-16 Current</th>
<th>16-17</th>
<th>17-18</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Past Chair</strong></td>
<td>Janice Henderson (FCS) (Year 3 of 3-year term)</td>
<td>Anne Prestamo (SUS) (Year 3 of 3-year term)</td>
<td>Ray Calvert (FCS) (Year 3 of 3-year term)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Current Chair</strong></td>
<td>Anne Prestamo (SUS) (Year 2 of 3-year term)</td>
<td>Ray Calvert (FCS) (Year 2 of 3-year term)</td>
<td>SUS Representative (Year 2 of 3-year term)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Chair-Elect</strong></td>
<td>Ray Calvert (FCS) (Year 1 of 3-year term)</td>
<td><strong>Officer: Elect SUS for 3 year term</strong></td>
<td><strong>Officer: Elect FCS for 3-year term</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Secretary</strong></td>
<td>Kathryn Miller (Year 1 of 1-year term)</td>
<td><strong>Officer: Elect for 1-year term</strong></td>
<td><strong>Officer: Elect for 1-year term</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SUS at-large representative</strong></td>
<td>Bob Dugan (Year 2 of 2-year term)</td>
<td><strong>Officer: Elect for 2-year term</strong></td>
<td><strong>SUS Representative (Year 2 of 2-year term)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>FCS at-large Representative</strong></td>
<td>Tracy Elliott (Year 1 of 2-year term)</td>
<td>Tracy Elliott (Year 2 of 2-year term)</td>
<td><strong>Officer: Elect for 2-year term</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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**

**Executive Committee**

(a) 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.*

(b) Election Process:

- Establish a nominating committee
- Seek candidates
- Conduct election

The Members Council will hold an annual election for its officers. The Chair and Chair Elect shall alternate between members from the State University System and the Florida College System. One representative may not serve concurrently in more than one office. The term of office shall commence on the first day of July each year. Each officer shall serve for one year. Each spring the Members Council shall seek members to serve on a Nominating Committee. The Nominating Committee will seek candidates from the Members Council and recommend a slate of candidates to be voted on at the Annual Member’s Council Meeting in June.
Introduction and Overview

This internal organizational document is designed to explain the proposed organizational framework for implementing the next generation integrated library system for Florida’s 12 public universities and 28 state colleges. While the authority to implement this system lies with the Florida Academic Library Services Cooperative (FALSC), a part of the Florida Virtual Campus (FLVC), successful implementation requires assistance and guidance from representatives from the universities and colleges. The goal of the project and organizational structure outlined in this document is to ensure a smooth transition from the current suite of products and services provided by FALSC to the proposed products and services offered by Innovative Interfaces. Once implemented, these new products will better meet the needs of library staff, and provide the state’s public universities and colleges with a more advanced and comprehensive library system for their students and faculty to use.

The core of this organizational framework outlines an explicit partnership between the library staff of the 40 institutions and the current FALSC staff. Its purpose is to explain how FALSC and its members will organize themselves to effectively accomplish this monumental task. This framework is designed to balance the requirement of allowing the desired amount of library staff participation, but still streamline the decision making process so that the project can move forward with an on schedule switch to production in the summer of 2017. The exact Go Live date will be coordinated with the member libraries’ activities surrounding the fiscal year.

In this structure, the main body responsible for the entire process will be the Implementation Team. It will be assisted by eight (8) Working Groups who will be specifically tasked to advise on various components of the project. These working groups will report their progress to and take guidance from corresponding Discussion Groups as well as to any relevant MCLS Standing Committee. The Implementation Team will ultimately report all progress to the Members Council for Library Services (MCLS) either directly or through the and its Executive Committee. The Steering Committee will provide oversight to ensure all high-level deadlines and milestones are met. Each of these components is explained in detail within this document.

Also included are some preliminary logistical information on how FALSC will carry out this process, including training, communication, and how meetings will be conducted.

Every institution should encourage their staff to participate in this process as much as possible, whether it is on a working group or by tuning in to the various interest discussion groups. FALSC will strive to ensure that all staff stay informed on the progress as we move forward in implementing these new services.

This document is subject to updating and changes as more is learned about the new system.

Decision-Making Structure

Implementation Team

Purpose: To oversee the specific project deliverables, along with the policies and workflows necessary to successfully implement the system.

Membership: Twenty-three (23) members. Project Managers (2), SUS and FCS MCLS representatives (2), select FALSC staff (9), Chair of each Working Group (9), FALSC Executive Director (1)
Meetings: Usually bi-weekly to weekly via Collaborate, face-to-face meetings as necessary.

Governance: Oversees all work done by the working groups and the FALSC Technical Team.

Provides Regular Updates to: Members Council for Library Services and its Executive Committee.

Provides High-Level Recommendations to: Steering Committee

Description: The Implementation Team will be the main decision-making body for specific project deliverables, along with the policies and workflows necessary to successfully implement the system. All activity from the working groups will be reported to discussed with the team by the chairs. The Implementation Team will also recommend any work that may need to be done between the working groups. It will be led by two Project Managers, Ellen Bishop and Dave Whisenant. This group will report all progress to the Executive Committee and the MCLS as the success is mission critical for the member libraries and their users. regularly. Any recommendations significantly affecting requirements for FALSC/FLVC resources, funding, or technical infrastructure, or that may impact the overall timeline or major deliverables that FALSC communicates to the legislature, will need to be brought forward for discussion with the Steering Committee. The Implementation Team will also work with FALSC staff to develop a formal Communication Plan.

Steering Committee

Purpose: To ensure that the expectations of the Implementation Team and statewide stakeholders are in alignment, and that all high-level deadlines and milestones for the project are met in alignment with legislative expectations; to make commitments of FALSC/FLVC resources, funding, or technical infrastructure. Statewide stakeholders include the legislature as well as various high-level groups in academia (e.g., Board of Governors, Council of Presidents, Council of Instructional Affairs, and college and university IT and business affairs councils).

Membership: FLVC Executive Director (1), FALSC Executive Director (1), FLVC IT Director (1), MCLS Chair Representatives (2), Chair of FLVC Executive Advisory Council (1).

Responsibility: Final decision-making authority

Meetings: At least bi-monthly via Collaborate, face-to-face meetings as necessary.

Provides Regular Updates to: The legislature as well as to various high-level groups in academia (e.g., Board of Governors, Council of Presidents, Council of Instructional Affairs, and college and university IT and business affairs councils).

Receives Recommendations from: Implementation Team

Description: The Steering Committee will be the final decision-making authority on issues related to Next-Gen ILS implementation, although most issues are expected to be resolved at the Implementation Team or Working Group level. The Steering Committee will focus on issues significantly affecting requirements for FALSC/FLVC resources, funding, or technical infrastructure or that may impact the overall timeline or major deliverables for which FALSC is responsible to the legislature. This is the primary group communicating with statewide stakeholders about the progress and expectations of this project.

Working Groups

Nine (9) working groups covering the general areas of the system will be formed in order to advise and make decisions on their area. The chair of each working group will sit on the Implementation Team. Most of the working groups are tied to a specific standing committee. Those will have to report regularly to their
Membership to the working groups is preferred to be no more than 8 participants plus a chair, subject to Executive Committee approval. A balance between college and university staff is encouraged, when appropriate. The members will represent the state-wide experts in their specific subject area. A request for participation will be made by FALSC, and staff will be directed to apply via their dean or director. A call for working group volunteers will be put out, with all libraries encouraged to respond. Staff may also be nominated by existing standing committees or the Executive Committee. For the working groups that are tied to a standing committee, the standing committee will make recommendations and encourage those individuals to apply. Because of the overall time commitment, individuals will need approval from their dean or director in order to be considered for any working group. All candidates will be asked to complete an application form signed by their dean or director, with final selection made by the Executive Committee. Committees are encouraged to choose nominate individuals who have the most expertise in each area, and should not consider only current committee members for the working groups. Two Four groups, the Systems Working Group, the Joint Use Working Group, the Discovery Configuration Working Group, and the Training Working Group, are not tied directly to a standing committee. Membership to these working groups will be appointed by the Executive Committee (or by the co-leads of the Implementation Team and the Executive Committee Liaison.) FALSC staff and a MCLS liaison will be assigned to assist each working group in their work.

Working groups will be encouraged to interact with other working groups as needed, especially on services that overlap several groups. Working Group members may be asked to be a liaison to another working group in order to ensure that a particular service is adequately addressed.

All members are expected to be active participants in their Working Group. Expectations will be clearly set at an initial orientation meeting of each group, and members that are not fully participating in the work of the group may be asked to leave so that a replacement can be found.

**Systems Working Group**
- **Membership:** Chair plus 8 members.
- **Affiliation:** None
- **Proposed Charge:** To oversee the overall development and delivery of reports, access and permissions, printing, batchloading, data conversion, and interoperability with enterprise systems (Banner, PeopleSoft, etc.)

**E-Resources Management Working Group**
- **Membership:** Chair plus 8 members
- **Affiliation:** Collection Management and E-Resources Standing Committee
- **Proposed Charge:** To oversee the development of the link resolver, setting up and maintaining the mega-index, and the implementation of the electronic resource management functionality (ERM).

**Circulation/Resource Sharing Working Group**
- **Membership:** Chair plus 8 members
- **Affiliation:** Resource Sharing Standing Committee
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Proposed Charge: To oversee the development of all circulation and interlibrary loan related functionality, including patron data, check out procedures, fines and notices, data conversion and relevant reports.

Joint-Use Working Group
Membership: Chair plus 8 members
Affiliation: Resource Sharing Standing Committee None
Proposed Charge: To oversee the development of services and policies related to joint-use facilities, namely those that involve college and university institutions. It is expected that the group will have expertise in systems, cataloging, circulation, and resource sharing. The group will strive to have a representative from each type of joint-use partnership.

Cataloging/Authorities Working Group
Membership: Chair plus 8 members
Affiliation: Technical Services Standing Committee
Proposed Charge: To oversee the development of all cataloging activities including the merger of college and university databases, all items and holdings data, data conversion and any relevant reports. This working group will also oversee the implementation of authority control and all clean-up work that may be involved.

Acquisitions/Serials Working Group
Membership: Chair plus 8 members
Affiliation: Technical Services Standing Committee
Proposed Charge: To oversee the development of all acquisitions functionality, the conversion of current acquisitions data into the new system and all relevant reports. This working group will also oversee all functionality related to serials including check in and pattern records.

Discovery Interface Working Group
Membership: Chair plus 8 members
Affiliation: User Interfaces Standing Committee
Proposed Charge: To oversee the development of the new discovery tool’s public interface, including the look and feel of the union catalog as well as to make recommendations on how each institution sets up its own local interface. This group will also focus on usability testing and instructional design for the discovery interface.

Discovery Configuration Working Group
Membership: Chair plus 8 members
Affiliation: None
Proposed Charge: To oversee the development of the new discovery tool’s back-end configuration, including bib records, data-mapping for MARC and non-MARC data, OAI-PMH harvesting, knowledge base configuration, link resolution, and authentication.

Training Working Group
Membership: Chair plus 8 members
Affiliation: None
Proposed Charge: To oversee the development and delivery of all training activities associated with this implementation, including the development and distribution of all documentation.

**Institutional Participation**
Because participation in the working groups is limited, library staff will be asked to become involved in this project in several other ways outlined below:

**Interest Groups Discussion Groups**
For every working group, there will be a corresponding **interest discussion group** that is open to interested staff at all institutions. The members of the interest groups will have representation from the member libraries’ local implementation teams. Members of the local libraries’ implementation teams should participate in all Interest Discussion Groups pertinent to their local role(s). A listserv will be created for each **interest discussion** group, and all working groups will be required to post notes from their meetings there as well as to post any questions or concerns on their related topics. It is anticipated that many of the working groups will want to have periodic Collaborate sessions where progress can be reported and live discussion about configuration and workflow decisions can take place. Library staff will be encouraged to participate in these **interest discussion** groups by signing on to the listservs that where they have expertise and actively participate in the discussion.

The corresponding **Interest Discussion Groups** are:
- Acquisitions / Serials **Interest Discussion Group**
- Cataloging / Authorities **Interest Discussion Group**
- Circulation / Resource Sharing **Interest Discussion Group**
- Discovery Interface **Interest Discussion Group**
- Discovery Configuration **Discussion Group**
- E-Resources Management **Interest-Discussion Group**
- Joint Use **Interest Discussion Group**
- Systems **Interest Discussion Group**
- Training **Interest Discussion Group**

**ILS Coordinator**
FALSC is asking that every institution designate one individual as the “ILS Coordinator.” For the smaller libraries, this may be the director or dean. This person, along with the dean or director, will serve as the primary contacts for all information regarding the project. They will act as a conduit for information coming from the Implementation Team to the library staff and can communicate to the team any problems or concerns their institution may have. The coordinator may will facilitate the creation of the local implementation team so that all staff are aware of the progress and implementation decisions. Finally, the ILS Coordinator and/or dean/director should be responsible for communicating with the local institutional leadership (CIO, provost, VP, etc.) about the status of the implementation and any local issues that may need to be addressed.

**FLVC/FALSC Participation**
In addition to representation on the Implementation Team, FALSC/FLVC staff will play a vital part in the success of this project. In many cases, they will work with Innovative staff to ensure that all aspects of the new system
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are successfully converted from the current system and that everything is operational. They will assist in training activities, both in-person and online. They will also coordinate in the disseminating the dissemination of all documentation.

FALSC Technical Team
To organize all staff activities for this project, a FALSC Technical Team will be formed. Its membership will include all relevant FALSC staff in both the Gainesville and Tallahassee offices. All work done by this team will be reported to in conjunction with and guided by the Implementation Team. It will be responsible for much of the daily interaction with Innovative regarding the migration, set up, data loading and all other aspects of implementing the system. This includes assisting with the data conversion, initial setup of all components, reports, hardware and software support, etc. Some staff will also work with members of the Systems Working Group and with institutional IT staff (as identified by the Dean/Director) in order to obtain patron information and begin set up connections to enterprise systems such as Banner and PeopleSoft.

Implementation Logistics

Training
Training will be provided via a combination of online e-learning modules, a mixture of face-to-face library-specific and regional group training, and online webinars. FALSC will work with the Training Working Group to develop a training plan that meets library needs. Initial training of FALSC staff and Working Group members will be done by Innovative staff. FALSC core staff will be trained first by Innovative staff, and then training will be expanded to include the members of the working groups.

After training, the working groups will have early access to a test environment that permits them to evaluate data, full system functionality, and workflows. Training will then be expanded further to front-line library staff who will have several months to access test environments that permit them to evaluate their local library data, full system functionality, and workflows. We FALSC will work with Innovative to provide a robust set of training and consultation services to libraries.

Communication
Communication is essential since this project impacts the day to day activities of staff in all of the 40 libraries. We anticipate using the following methods to let keep staff know what is going on informed:

- FLVC/FALSC website – FALSC has a new website which is at http://libraries.flvc.org. There is already a link on the main page to information about the next-gen ILS Project. It is hoped that this page can be used to give a high-level update on the project.
- ILS Wiki – It is anticipated that a wiki will be created to house any internal documents for the Implementation Team and the various Working Groups. This will include notes from meetings, documentation and specifications from Innovative, etc. The wiki will assist in keeping work from these groups organized and available.
- Interest Discussion Group Listservs – All working groups will have corresponding interest discussion groups which will include active listservs. These lists will be used to show what they are working on and to provoke prompt discussion. Working Group members are expected to actively discuss their work on these listservs, and to encourage feedback from the Interest Discussion Group members.
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- New CRM (Help Desk) Queues – Special queues will be created for library staff to ask data migration and workflow questions in all the functional areas.
- Updates to the Committees – In addition, the working groups are responsible for keeping their respective standing committees up-to-date on all progress.
- Updates to the Members Council – Formal regular updates on all progress will be given to the Executive Committee at every their monthly meetings as well as to the MCLS at their quarterly meetings. In addition, regular announcements will be sent to all Members Council representatives to ensure continuous communication is given about the project.
- FALSC will work with the Implementation Team to draft a formal Communication Plan for the implementation of the new system.

Meetings
We anticipate numerous types of meetings throughout the project. Some examples are initial kick-off meetings, data conversion, working groups, interest discussion groups and the Implementation Team. It is assumed that most of the meetings for the Implementation Team and the working groups will be done virtually using Collaborate. There may be occasions where it will be advantageous to meet in-person to discuss a particular topic or to solve a major issue. Any in-person meetings will be noticed as far in advance as possible and will try to be in a central location. If possible, FLVC’s Scopia equipment can be used to broadcast any meeting for those who cannot attend in person.
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Advisory Groups

MCLS and Executive Committee
- Systems Working Group
- ERM Working Group
- Circ / Resource Sharing Working Group
- Joint Use Working Group
- Cataloging/Authorities Working Group
- Acquisitions/Serials Working Group
- Discovery Interface Working Group
- Discovery Configuration Working Group
- Training Working Group

CMESC
- ERM Working Group

RSSC
- Circ / Resource Sharing Working Group

TSSC
- Cataloging/Authorities Working Group
- Acquisitions/Serials Working Group
- Discovery Interface Working Group
- Discovery Configuration Working Group

UIISC
- Discovery Interface Working Group
- Discovery Configuration Working Group
- Training Working Group

FALSC / FLVC

IMPLEMENTATION TEAM
- Project Managers (2)
- FALSC Exe Dir (1)
- FLVC staff (9)
- Chairs of WG (9)
- FCS and SUS rep (2)

Steering Committee
(FALSC/FLVC/MCLS Leadership)

TECHNICAL TEAM
- All relevant FLVC staff

Institutions

Institutional Leadership (CIO, Provost, VP, Deans/Directors)

40 Local ILS Coordinators

Local Implementation Teams
- Systems Discussion Group
- ERM Discussion Group
- Circ / Resource Sharing Discussion Group
- Joint Use Discussion Group
- Cataloging/Authorities Discussion Group
- Acquisitions/Serials Discussion Group
- Discovery Interface Discussion Group
- Discovery Configuration Discussion Group
- Training Working Group

Local Implementation Teams
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Regular Meeting of the Members Council on Library Services (MCLS)

Minutes

Tuesday, February 9, 2016 – 8:30 to 5:00 p.m. ET

College of Central Florida | Ewers Century Center (Building 40, Room 101)
3001 S.W. College Road | Ocala, Florida 34474-4415

Members Present
Rich Ackerman (BC, representing Sarah Wiggins), Kevin Arms (LSSC, representing Denise English), Barry Baker (UCF), LisaMarie Bartusik (PSC), Christine Boatright (FGC), Cecilia Botero (UF Health Science), Ray Calvert (Pasco-Hernando), Mercedes Clement (DSC), Elizabeth Curry (UNF), Brian Doherty (NCF), Erick Dominicis (MDC), Lori Driscoll (GCSC), Tracy Elliott (SCFMS), Teresa Faust (CF, representing Rayanne Giddis), Karen Griffin (HCC), Janice Henderson (NWFSC), Carol Hixson (FAU), Brian Kelley (PBSC), Lori Kelly (FKCC), Joe Leopold (SPC), Tom Messner (FSCJ), Kathleen Miller (FGCU), Kathryn Miller (POLY), Mary Page (UCF, representing Barry Baker), Lena Phelps (South Florida), Anne Prestamo (FIU), Patricia Profeta (IRSC), Patrick Reakes (UF, representing Judy Russell), Shelly Schmucker (TCC, representing Deborah Robinson), William Shuluk (FSW), Jill Simser (EFSC), Ruth Smith (VC), Jane Stephens (CC), Myra Sterett (SFC), Courtlann Thomas (PSC), Tammi Viviano-Broderick (CCF), Faye Watkins (FAMU), Erika Wayne (SSC), Christina Will (SJRCC), Lynn Wyche (NFCC), Julia Zimmerman (FSU).

Guests: Valerie Boulos, Joanne Connell, Nancy Cunningham, Rebecca Donlan, David Goff, Pamela Herring, Hope Johnson, Jenna Miller, Edith Ramlow, Ramona Miller-Ridlon, and Kate Nevins.

University of West Florida (UWF) Innovation Institute/FLVC/FALSC Staff: Ellen Bishop, Claire Dygert, Tammy Elliott, Brenda Ferris, Lucy Harrison, Linda McCarthy, Pam Northrup, Chance Smith, Scott Schmucker, and Dave Whisenant.

Call to Order
Chair Prestamo called the meeting to order at 8:35 a.m. Members introduced themselves. Chair Prestamo thanked the staff at the college for serving as meeting host and welcomed Kate Nevins, who had been asked to attend the meeting to follow-up on some action items from the December MCLS meeting.

“Engaging for the Future”—Next Steps
Nevins led a lengthy discussion of the two priority action areas that were identified in the “Engaging for the Future: A Report of FALSC Member Discussions and MCLS Priorities” final report: 1) Decision Making and Authority, and 2) Reframing the E-Resources Program. Nevins will prepare an action plan that summarizes the MCLS discussion and includes next steps and timelines.

Updates from FALSC
Legislative Updates
Northrup reported that staff at UWF and FLVC continue to monitor the e-resources and the NGILS LBRs. Currently the ILS is showing up in the House budget, however the e-resources one does not appear in either the House or Senate budget. Janice Gilley will continue to meet with the Government Liaisons at least once a week to keep them apprised of our issues. Northrup encouraged the council to touch base with their government liaisons and urge them to continue to push both issues.
2017-18 Legislative Budget Requests (LBRs)
Northrup presented initial initiatives that it may be beneficial to put forth for the 2017-18 fiscal year. Included was a second year NGILS LBR that will help to fund additional implementation costs that exceed the initial first year request. At this time, there is uncertainty about what those cost could be since negotiations are incomplete and we are unsure of what exactly will be included in the contract. Other priorities are shared e-resources and what that might look like in the future, and efforts to clean up the old student services system, which is 19 years old. Northrup noted that legislative staff have indicated that this is a good opportunity to update bill language. They would need suggestions around September, but we won’t know what will get changed until January. She would also like to leave room for additional LBRs that may need to be submitted later.

Northrup and Harrison also reviewed an LBR calendar and corresponding state requirements and activities. We may need to convene a meeting between now and June to discuss any LBR needs. In April, we will get LBR Policy Guidelines that give criteria and dates for when things need to be submitted. In July, the LBRs are due with the budget and will need to be provided to both chancellors who also decide if the presentation of the LBRs to the State Board of Education in September will be an informational or voting presentation. Elliott noted that their subgroup, the Learning Resources Standing Committee (LRSC), has the opportunity be on the CIA and the COP meeting agendas. It was acknowledged that this is another avenue for engaging staff at a higher level. To that end, Profeta sent a request to the current CIA chair for time on their June meeting agenda. This opportunity will also be added to the master calendar that Northrup and Harrison presented. The group also agreed that having a common set of PowerPoint slides to reference would be beneficial in ensuring that a standard message is conveyed during presentations by members.

Project Updates
Harrison shared additional FLVC updates and Florida Academic Library Services Cooperative (FALSC) updates. FLVC is still set to pay OCLC fees for the FCS effective January 2016. There was a brief discussion on the group licensing process and how to improve that. Dygert and Schmucker from FLVC/FALSC will contact Yankee Book Peddler to see if they are willing to offer consortia pricing which could mean a better discount to the Florida libraries. The council also discussed the IPED survey process and how frequently reminders are sent and to whom they are being sent. There was also some concern about the accuracy of the data being presented. Harrison noted that FALSC would take this under advisement and make any needed improvements to the process. Institutions continue to come up on Islandora and a new software update is in the works. FALSC has contracted with discoverygarden who will be able to give the organization some suggestions on how to improve backend technical work on Islandora.

FALSC Strategic Planning
Harrison led this discussion. She would like to work with the MCLS and other stakeholders to plan how FALSC should look in the future. She suggested a brief action-oriented document with measurable goals be created that possibly uses the Balanced Scorecard approach. Harrison also introduced a proposed vision statement. Discussion followed. She will work with the Executive Committee and FLVC/FALSC leadership to finalize the vision. The council agreed to review a draft strategic plan at their June meeting. The EAC will also need to provide feedback on these plans and statements.

MCLS Processes and Procedures
2016-17 Nominating Committee
Prestamo reported that at their next meeting, the council would need to elect a Chair-Elect, an SUS Representative at-Large, and a Secretary. Ray Calvert is the incoming Chair. Prestamo stated that the Nominating Committee should be a small group and she solicited volunteers. Henderson agreed to serve and Prestamo noted that if no other council members volunteered, the Executive Committee would appoint additional members at their next meeting.
Update on Process for Filling Additional Slots on Resource Sharing Standing Committee (RSSC)
It was reported that additional slots for the RSSC vacancies would be filled during the regular call for committee appointments in the spring. TCC’s Schmucker also noted that having members of their committee, the Collection Management and E-Resources Standing Committee, turnover during the summer is problematic because budgets are just being approved and the committee uses that information to work on e-resource scenarios to present to the council. Therefore, it is best if members with the committee background are able to remain on during that time. The council agreed and noted that they would be willing to allow the committee to decide what their preferences are with regards to the timing of filling their committee slots. Schmucker will follow-up with the committee and then with Prestamo to let her know of their decision.

Distributing the Open Educational Resources (OER) Survey
Dygert reported that the survey has gone to the EAC for their input. The plan is to ask the MCLS to distribute the survey to appropriate groups on their campuses.

Next-Gen ILS
Update on Process
Negotiations continue. Conversations have centered on disaster recovery, the timeline, pricing, hosting, data quality and cleanup, and product functionality. Additional conversations have occurred between FLVC/FALSC and III technical staff. Separate talks between UWF Legal and III are happening in parallel. More updates on training can be given once negotiations are complete.

Bishop and Whisenant reported that all input from the December meeting on the internal framework document has been incorporated. If other changes to the document are desired, council members should send specific comments before the next Executive Committee meeting on February 20. Council members were also reminded to let FLVC/FALSC know who their designated local implementation coordinator will be.

Charge and Membership of the Ad Hoc GoLive Criteria Working Group
The six (6) volunteers were announced. They are Andrea Dufault (Hillsborough Community College), Brian Doherty (New College of Florida), Janice Henderson (Northwest Florida State College), Carol Hixson (Florida Atlantic University), Tom Messner (Florida State College at Jacksonville), and Judy Russell (University of Florida). III has a generic checklist that could serve as a good starting point for this group. This group will begin work once negotiations are complete.

Harrison added that Mike Dieckmann of the Innovation Institute and former CIO at UWF, will be sending a survey to all institutions as he wants to ensure that each of them are aware of the ILS implementation. The survey will ask questions regarding the current enterprise system, the version number, specific customizations to the system, other interfaces that are integrated with the system, an update schedule or plans for upgrading, and who and/or what other units on campus should be involved in this process. Members asked that they be copied on the email when the survey is sent out.

Updates from FLVC Standing Committees
Official standing committee reports were not requested for this meeting, since the council had just met in December and recently came back from the Winter Holidays break.

Future Meeting Dates and Locations
The council confirmed the following dates and locations for upcoming meetings:

- June 14, 2016—St. Petersburg College, Seminole Campus
- September 8-9, 2016—Florida Atlantic University
- November 30-December 1, 2016—University of Central Florida
New Business
There was no new business.

Adjournment
The meeting adjourned at 4:10 p.m.