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

Agenda

Thursday, September 8, 2016 – 1:00 to 5:00 p.m. EDT
Friday, September 9, 2016 – 8:30 a.m. to 12:00 p.m. EDT

Florida Atlantic University (FAU) | Boca Raton Campus | S.E. Wimberly Library, Building 3, Fifth Floor | 777 Glades Road | Boca Raton, Florida 33431

Thursday, September 8, 2016

11:30 – 12:55 Lunch

1:00 – 1:05 Call to Order

1:05 – 1:20 1. MCLS Processes and Procedures
A. Solicit MCLS Liaisons for Resource Sharing and User Interfaces Standing Committees

1:20 – 1:50 2. FLVC Briefings and Discussions
A. Update on FALSC Executive Director Search Process

1:50 – 2:30 3. Updates from FALSC Committees
A. Standing Committee Reports: Questions and Answers
   I. Collection and E-Resources
   II. Digital Initiatives
   III. Resource Sharing
   IV. Technical Services
   V. User Interfaces

2:30 – 3:00 Break

3:00 – 3:30 4. Updates from FALSC Committees, Cont.
B. Decision Making and Authority Working Group
C. E-Resources Framing Working Group
D. Other Groups

3:30 – 4:55 5. FALSC Briefings and Discussion
A. E-Resources
B. FALSC Digital Framework
C. OATER Task Force Discussion

4:55 – 5:00 Adjournment
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Speaker(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8:00 – 8:25</td>
<td>Continental Breakfast</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8:30 – 8:35</td>
<td>Call to Order</td>
<td>Ray Calvert</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8:35 – 10:15</td>
<td>6. Updates and Discussion on Sierra / Encore Duet Implementation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A. General Updates</td>
<td>Ellen Bishop, Dave Whisenant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B. Working Group Reports: Questions and Answers</td>
<td>Ernestine Holmes, Annie Glerum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I. Acquisitions and Serials</td>
<td>LeEtta Schmidt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>II. Cataloging and Authorities</td>
<td>Alexis Carlson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>III. Circulation and Resource Sharing</td>
<td>Tina Buck</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>IV. Discovery Configuration</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>V. Discovery Interfaces</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>VI. E-Resource Management</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>VII. Joint Use</td>
<td>Janice Henderson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>VIII. Systems</td>
<td>Parker Fruhan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>IX. Training</td>
<td>Sara Alegria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:15 – 10:45</td>
<td>Break</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:45 – 11:45</td>
<td>Updates and Discussion on Sierra / Encore Duet Implementation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C. Feedback on FALSC Communications Plan</td>
<td>Ellen Bishop, Dave Whisenant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>D. Branding the NGILS: Discuss Branding Process and</td>
<td>Linda McCarthy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Brainstorm Institutional Rollout Process and Needs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:45 – 11:50</td>
<td>7. Confirm Future Meeting Dates and Locations</td>
<td>Ray Calvert</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A. November 30 – December 1 – University of Central Florida</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B. February 2017 – TBD</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C. June 2017 – TBD</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:55 – 12:00</td>
<td>9. New Business</td>
<td>Ray Calvert</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12:00</td>
<td>Adjournment</td>
<td>Ray Calvert</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
COLLECTION MANAGEMENT AND E-RESOURCES STANDING COMMITTEE

Report on Current Activities for the Members Council on Library Services Meeting
September 8-9, 2016

CO-CHAIRS: Rebecca Donlan and Jenna Miller
MCLS LIAISON: Judy Russell

CURRENT ACTIVITIES:
During this quarter the FLVC Collection Management and E-Resources Standing Committee (CMESC) held four full committee meetings, and several system (FCS and SUS) sub-committee meetings. Below is a summary of activities this quarter.

Recommendations for the 2017 Statewide Collection of Electronic Resources

The CMESC co-chairs presented the 2017 Statewide E-Resource Collection Recommendations report at the June Members Council of Library Services meeting. Following this meeting, the FLVC administration identified approximately $101k in one-time funding to supplement the statewide e-resources budget for 2017. Based on these new amounts, CMESC proposed revised recommendations for the 2017 statewide collection. These recommendations were sent to the Members Council of Library Services for system-level voting on August 5. Members Council approved the following recommendations:

- SUS: cancel Oxford’s Grove Music
- FCS: cancel Associate’s Programs Source Plus and Health Source Nursing Academic; add ProQuest’s U.S. Newsstream

Cancelled products will be added to the FLVC Group Licensing process.

Next Steps

- The FCS CMESC members will research one-time eBook purchase options to spend out remaining funds.
- CMESC will determine recommendations for the 2018 statewide e-resource collection. These recommendations will be presented at the December MCLS meeting.

Call for Members

In December, committee terms are ending for three SUS members and one FCS member. The committee requests the MCLS call for applicants to serve from January 2017 – December 2019.
DIGITAL INITIATIVES STANDING COMMITTEE

Report on Current Activities for the Members Council on Library Services Meeting
September 8-9, 2016

CO-CHAIRS: Jamie Rogers and Melissa VandeBurgt
MCLS LIAISON: Carol Hixson

CURRENT ACTIVITIES: This report reflects DISC activity from June 2016 – September 2016. The group met 2 times by conference call to:

- Discuss statewide collaboration on digital initiatives and services, to share research and expertise, and to coordinate activities.
- Report back from FALSC Regional Meetings, provided by DISC Regional Representatives
- Discuss issues related to centralized services: common digital library system and companion tools; Florida Digital Archive (FDA); PALMM; Archon; Florida OJ/Open Journal Systems (OJS); metadata standards; digital items and collections discovery in MANGO
- Discuss tools and services in use or considered for future use by member institutions: Archive-It; Omeka
- Welcome new DISC members and elect new Co-Chair and Secretary:
  - Co-Chair (incumbent) – Jamie Rogers (FIU)
  - Co-Chair (elected) – Kevin Arms (LSSC)
  - Secretary (elected) – Krystal Thomas (FSU)
- Share IR Camp and IR Working Group updates
- Report on ILS Discovery Configuration Working Group activities regarding Digital Collections metadata ingesting into Encore

ISG update: The group met one time by conference call during this quarter. Work accomplished by the group in conjunction with FALSC:

- News from the NextGen ILS Discovery Configuration Working Group re: inclusion of digital collections
- FL-Islandora PALMM statistics
- FL-Islandora “IR Camp”

Other FALSC Digital Services Updates:

• An FL-Islandora “IR Camp” was held July 25-26 at FLVC offices in Gainesville as a kick-off for a project to enhance Institutional Repository functionality in FL-Islandora. Collaborating institutions FSU, FAU and FGCU attended, along with UCF. The project wiki can be found at: https://fliirt.wiki.flvc.org/https://fliirt.wiki.flvc.org/
• FALSC staff made site visits to Hillsborough Community College, on June 13, and St. Petersburg College on June 29, to assist with Islandora site set-up and use.
• Valencia College has requested an FL-Islandora site. FALSC staff are in the process of setting up a test site for them, and will be providing training and a subsequent site visit.
• FLVC/FALSC staff are in the process of implementing a number of recommendations for improving FL-Islandora system performance, based on an assessment from the Discoverygarden company. Key among them is the replacement of the Mulgara triplestore database with the Blazegraph triplestore which will also be used with subsequent versions of Islandora software.
• A test instance of ArchivesSpace is being set up as part of a pilot project to migrate Archon materials to ArchivesSpace. FAU has volunteered to be a testing partner for the new software and migration process, and St. Petersbug College has volunteered to help establish processes and procedures for new users.
• Work continues on a feasibility project to migrate all issues of a newspaper from the Sobek-hosted Florida Digital Newspaper Library to an FL-Islandora FDNL test site.
• An upgrade of Florida Online Journals OJS software to the latest released version, 2.4.8, is underway.
• FALSC Digital Services hosted a table at the Panhandle Library Access Network (PLAN) Digitization conference, August 18-19, at the Florida State University Panama City Campus.
• The Florida Digital Archive (FDA) currently contains 238.69 TB of data, 557,165 total packages/AIPs, and 67,089,590 data files.
RESOURCESHARINGSTANDINGCOMMITTEE

ReportonCurrentActivitiesfortheMembersCouncilonLibraryServicesMeeting
September8-9,2016

CHAIR:PeggyGlatthaar
MCLS LIAISON: Vacant

CURRENTACTIVITIES:


At the June 14th, 2016, meeting of the FALSC Members Council, the FALSC Resource Sharing Committee was directed to investigate four questions. The results are detailed below.

1. **How do other iii consortia handle LOST items in their “Uborrow” type systems?**
   Of the five library consortia we surveyed, three bill for lost books and two do not.

2. **How frequently do other consortia libraries bill libraries for LOST items?**
   Of the five libraries we surveyed, three libraries charge each other, 2 reconcile their billing once a year, and one reconciles every 6 months.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Consortia</th>
<th>Bill for Lost items?</th>
<th>How often do they bill?</th>
<th>How much do they charge?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GIL Express (Georgia)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Bill in September &amp; balance is due end of December</td>
<td>Varies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohiolink (Ohio)</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prospector (Colorado)</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orbis Cascade Alliance (Oregon &amp; Washington)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Bill once a year &amp; balance is due in September</td>
<td>Flat rate of $90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MOBIUS (Missouri)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Every six months</td>
<td>Flat rate - negotiated</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3. How much money was billed over the last two years – or could have been billed over the last two years?

The colleges billed $3,734.15 over the past two years for lost items. The universities could have billed $19,285.84 over the past two years.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FCS Institution</th>
<th>FY 2016 Count</th>
<th>Replacement Cost</th>
<th>Total Cost</th>
<th>FY 2015 Count</th>
<th>Replacement Cost</th>
<th>Total Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BEC</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$20.00</td>
<td>$20.00</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$20.00</td>
<td>$20.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BOC</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>$60.35</td>
<td>$241.40</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DBC</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>$40.00</td>
<td>$160.00</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FJC</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>$48.00</td>
<td>$336.00</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FK C</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>$30.00</td>
<td>$60.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GCC</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$50.00</td>
<td>$50.00</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$50.00</td>
<td>$50.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HCC</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>$25.00</td>
<td>$50.00</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>$25.00</td>
<td>$75.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IRC</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>$51.15</td>
<td>$102.30</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>$51.15</td>
<td>$153.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$35.00</td>
<td>$35.00</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MDC</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>$40.00</td>
<td>$480.00</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$40.00</td>
<td>$40.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OWC</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>$25.00</td>
<td>$25.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PCC</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>$25.00</td>
<td>$100.00</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PHC</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$35.00</td>
<td>$35.00</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>$35.00</td>
<td>$140.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PKC</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>$58.00</td>
<td>$116.00</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCC</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>$50.00</td>
<td>$150.00</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>$50.00</td>
<td>$100.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPC</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>$50.00</td>
<td>$300.00</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>$50.00</td>
<td>$150.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SSC</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>$50.00</td>
<td>$100.00</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>$50.00</td>
<td>$150.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VCC</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>$45.00</td>
<td>$360.00</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>$45.00</td>
<td>$135.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td><strong>60</strong></td>
<td><strong>$2,635.70</strong></td>
<td><strong>27</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>$1,098.45</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4. What are FLVC libraries’ local practices for handling LOST items?
SUS libraries vary on the replacement cost and processing fee.
State College Libraries – Local Practices Replacement Cost/Processing Fee

22 of the 28 colleges charge the price that is in the item record. Six colleges bypass the price in the item record and charge a default price: the average price for a replacement for the colleges is $44.23.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Colleges Bypassing Actual Price</th>
<th>Default Replacement Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Broward College</td>
<td>$60.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florida SouthWestern State College</td>
<td>$42.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lake Sumter State College</td>
<td>$35.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State College of Florida, Manatee-Sarasota</td>
<td>$50.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Florida Community College</td>
<td>$20.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Polk State College</td>
<td>$58.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Average</strong></td>
<td><strong>$44.23</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5. Which FLVC libraries have flexibility to change billing procedures (i.e., would they have to ask permission from BOT, accounting departments, other?)

**SUS libraries** all need Board of Trustees approval to change billing procedures.
**State colleges** – Of the colleges who responded, 11 need Board of Trustees approval, 1 needed their college finance/accounting office approval, or 4 need their library administration’s approval.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State College</th>
<th>BOT</th>
<th>Accounts Payable</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Broward College</td>
<td>y</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Chipola College</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. College of Central Florida</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Daytona State College</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Eastern Florida State College</td>
<td>y</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Florida Gateway College</td>
<td>y</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Florida Keys Community College</td>
<td>y</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Florida SouthWestern State College</td>
<td>y</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Florida State College at Jacksonville</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Gulf Coast State College</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Hillsborough Community College</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Indian River State College</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Lake Sumter State College</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Miami Dade College</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. North Florida Community College</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Dean and Dean of Administrative Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Northwest Florida State</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State College</td>
<td>BOT</td>
<td>Accounts Payable</td>
<td>Other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Palm Beach State College</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Pasco-Hernando State College</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. Pensacola State College</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. Polk State College</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Determined by Library Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. Santa Fe College</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Determined by Library</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. Seminole State College</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. South Florida State College</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. St. Johns River State College</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. St. Petersburg College</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26. State College of Florida, Manatee-Sarasota</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27. Tallahassee Community College</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Determined by Library</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28. Valencia College</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Counts</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State University</th>
<th>BOT</th>
<th>Accounts Payable</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Florida A&amp;M University</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Florida Atlantic University</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Florida Gulf Coast University</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Florida International University</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Florida Polytechnic University</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Florida State University</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Florida State University (Law)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Florida State University (Health Science)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. New College of Florida</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. University of Central Florida</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. University of Florida</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. University of North Florida</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. University of South Florida</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. University of West Florida</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Counts</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Committee Recommendation:

FALSC libraries begin billing one another for UBorrow lost items beginning January 2017.

Four important reasons to support the Committee’s recommendation:

- University libraries who have been audited recently have had to send bills for older lost material.
- Resource Sharing lost book policies between colleges and universities need to be in place prior to the new ILS system.
- To reduce confusion on which libraries bill and which ones do not. We will all be billing.
- Once a year reconciliations of lost material will confirm we all follow up.

At minimum, the following practices will be followed when a UBorrow item is declared lost or billed as lost:

- FALSC will run reports in January and July of lost items that are over 6 months overdue.
- Lending libraries generate bills to invoice borrowing libraries.
- Institutions will reimburse one another according to their individual procedures.
- At minimum, institutions will bill twice a year, in January and in June.
- Libraries may accept replacement copies per suppliers/biller approval.
- The replacement cost is determined by the owning library.
- FCS institutions will continue to bill at the point when an item becomes lost, using their local policies.
TECHNICAL SERVICES STANDING COMMITTEE

Report on Current Activities for the Members Council on Library Services Meeting
September 8-9, 2016

CO-CHAIRS: Jennifer Codding and Kristine J. Shrauger
MCLS LIAISON: Mercedes Clement

CURRENT ACTIVITIES:

- Jody Hewitt will be the secretary for the coming year.
- Mary Ann O’Daniel reports monthly on the progress of the Implementation Framework and migration of Sierra.
- Reports from various institutions sharing information about their respective Technical Services departments include:
  - July – Rita Cauce – Florida International University
- Received a request from CAM to accept and move forward a motion to discontinue the use of the e-icon in Mango for bibliographic records with an 856 41 field, excluding Marcive government document records prior to 2008. It was accepted. The motion was forwarded to UISC.
USER INTERFACES STANDING COMMITTEE

Report on Current Activities for the Members Council on Library Services Meeting
September 8-9, 2016

CHAIR: Kristin Heathcock
MCLS LIAISON: Vacant

CURRENT ACTIVITIES:

Accessibility

- The committee discussed accessibility related to discovery interfaces and other public facing products. FALSC obtained the VPAT for Encore Duet. Of note, the Innovative currently adheres to the World Wide Web Consortium (W3C) Web Accessibility Initiative (WAI) Web Content Accessibility Guidelines 1.0. Most UISC members indicated they are required to adhere to the 2.0 guidelines. In the VPAT, Innovative has an accessibility roadmap for Encore Duet. The committee will follow up with this issue and will work with the Discovery Interface Working Group as needed.
This document contains selected results from the OATER survey conducted from February 29 through March 25 of 2016. The survey results in their entirety will be published in the forthcoming final OATER report. This document is meant to help drive discussion at the upcoming MCLS meeting.

As you read through the survey results, some questions to consider are:

1) How can libraries and librarians help address the challenges faculty are experiencing from a content perspective when incorporating library resources into their course?

2) How can libraries and librarians help address the challenges faculty are experiencing from a technological perspective when incorporating library resources into their course?

3) How can libraries and librarians help address the challenges faculty are experiencing from a content perspective when incorporating OER into their course?

4) How can libraries and librarians help address the challenges faculty are experiencing from a technological perspective when incorporating OER into their course?

5) What role can FLVC/FALSC play in providing support on a statewide basis?
Use of Licensed Library Resources

- Of the 817 responses to the survey, 134 respondents said they have incorporated library resources into their courses. E-journal articles were used most frequently (75.4%), with streaming videos (62.3%) and reference databases (60.8%) following. Subject specific LibGuides (50.8%) and E-books (50.0%) were used nearly equally. 3.8% of respondents reported using print course packs, and 0.8% said they were using none of the types of content listed. Of the 10% who said “other”, half of the responses were related to the involvement of librarians or use of some library related component.

- The majority of respondents reported using the institution’s Learning Management System (60.8%) to present library materials to students. However, the use of LibGuides was reported by 16.2% as the presentation platform, and websites by 11.5%.

Challenges faced in using library resources in courses

- **Content Perspective:** nearly half (46.9%) reported experiencing no challenges. As with OER materials, concern about the availability of content over time (24.6%) was fairly substantial, as was the level of uncertainty about licensing and copyright issues (20%). Challenges rated almost equally were that insufficient content was available on their topic (16.9%) and difficulty in finding materials (16.2%). Those who responded with “other” (15.4%) cited issues of the time required to locate resources, poor information literacy skills on the part of students, and limitations of the online library resources themselves (e.g. e-books limited to one reader at a time.)

- **Technological Perspective:** 53.1% of respondents reported facing no challenges. Over a quarter of respondents expressed concern that not every student has access to the equipment/bandwidth to support use of online library resources (25.4%). Lack of technological support (13.1%) and the lack of technological skills or training to incorporate library resources (12.3%) rate very closely to one another as challenges, with the lack of a good platform in which to “remix” disparate content 10.8%) coming fairly close behind. A relatively small number of respondents (6.9%) felt it was too difficult to integrate library resources into the Learning Management System. The responses of those who said “other” were mixed, without any one theme standing out.
Use of OER

- Of those who reported using OER, the most commonly used format was by far streaming video, with 72% of respondents reporting having used it. Next in frequency of use was open-access journal articles (56.6%); textbooks (47.3%); images (45.7%), homework exercises (34.1%); and audio podcasts (25.6%). The use of entire courses and tests were reported with an equal amount of use (18.6%) with “other” (14%) and “none of the above” (2.3%) rounding out the reporting.

- By far the platform used most frequently to present OER content to students is the institution’s Learning Management System (80.6%). Next in frequency was a website (27.9%) and via LibGuides (18.8%). The responses “other” (9.3%) and “none of the above” (6.2%), followed, with “other” a mixture of responses that included mention of pdfs and use of the institutional repository.

Challenges faced incorporating OER into courses

- **Content perspective:** The greatest challenge reported was the concern about the availability of these materials over time (32.6%), followed closely by the issue of insufficient content being available in their topic area (31.8%) and the fact that material is difficult to find (28.7%). Ranked next as a challenge was an uncertainty about licensing and copyright issues (26.4%) and that OER materials do not include the ancillaries provided by traditional publishers (25.6%). Concern about the accuracy of content (22.5%) and currency of content (18.6%) also garnered a good number of responses.

- **Technological perspective:** The greatest challenge reported was concern about the accessibility of materials (25.6%). The remaining challenges listed clustered fairly closely together in response rate, with lack of technological support (17.1%), difficulty in changing or editing content (14.7%), lack of a good platform in which to “remix” disparate content (14%), and lack of technological skills required to incorporate the open resources (13.2%). 9.3% reported that it was difficult to integrate content into their Learning Management System.
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NEXT-GEN ILS
ACQUISITIONS/SERIALS WORKING GROUP

Report on Current Activities for the Members Council on Library Services Meeting
September 8-9, 2016

CHAIR: Ernestine Holmes
FALSC LIAISONS: Donna Alsbury and Natalie Henri-Bennett

CURRENT ACTIVITIES:

- Cindy Campbell will be the recorder/secretary for this group.
- Biweekly meeting on Tuesdays at 11a.m.
- Reviewed current Acquisitions/Serials reports currently in Aleph services, ARROW and LRS. Donna Alsbury created a Google Docs spreadsheet of existing ARROW and LRS reports. The Working group members added the Aleph services they currently use to the spreadsheet.
- Vendor cleanup – FALSC compile a list of unused vendors for the Colleges and Universities. The list will go to the ILS-ACQ-SER –DISCUSSION and the ILS-COORDINATORS lists. The list can be found in the Unused Vendors folder on Google Drive. A link to the folder is also available under Acquisitions/Serials Discussion Group Documents on the Implementation Wiki.
- A subcommittee is looking at the material types for orders. They are looking at coding. Coding for the Form_code and Code 1. Any recommendations from the group will be sent to the discussion list for feedback.
- Reviewing Order Status value list and migrating orders-What orders should be migrated
- Creating Q&A page in Google Docs.
NEXT-GEN ILS
CATALOGING/AUTHORITIES WORKING GROUP

Report on Current Activities for the Members Council on Library Services Meeting
September 8-9, 2016

CHAIR: Annie Glerum
FALSC LIAISONS: Daniel Cromwell and Melissa Stinson

CURRENT ACTIVITIES:


The Working Group has begun reviewing and discussing the Backstage Library Works Duplicate Removal Reports. On June 12, Mary Ann O’Daniel joined our meeting to provide an overview of the profiles and post-processing reports for the Backstage Library Works database deduplication. She returned on August 23 to further explain the process and answer questions from the Group. A Google form is being developed to gather feedback from the Cataloging/Authority Working Group as well as the broader Cataloging/Authority community.

On August 9, Dave Whisenant joined our meeting to provide an overview of the Location profile spreadsheet that crosswalks Aleph Sublibrary and Collection code combinations to Sierra’s 5-character Location codes. Given that Sublibrary and Collection codes are locally specific, the Working Group intends to collaborate with the ILS Coordinators in soliciting feedback for refining these new Location codes.

The Working Group appointed a Data Loading Subgroup to survey all institutions on MARC records batch loading processes. Our liaison to the Systems Working Group’s Batchloading Subgroup will consult and collaborate with that Subgroup in creating the survey.

Another action item is compiling a list of fields with hard length limits to identify any that might require a request to allow for more characters or values. The Working Group has also been compiling questions from our communities regarding Sierra and the implementation. Currently, these questions are contained in a list, but we are developing a spreadsheet which will separate these questions into categories. Thanks to the Circulation/Resource Sharing Working Group for providing a template for question spreadsheets.
NEXT-GEN ILS  
CIRCULATION/RESOURCE SHARING WORKING GROUP  

Report on Current Activities for the Members Council on Library Services Meeting  
September 8-9, 2016  

CHAIR: LeEtta Schmidt  
FALSC liaisons: Wendy Ellis and Brenda Rutten  

CURRENT ACTIVITIES:  

The Next-Gen ILS Circulation/Resource Sharing Working Group has recommended that all libraries use  
the home library field if it can be populated by institutional IT departments during the patron upload.  
This is useful for joint use libraries and statistics, but may not have any appreciable difference on patron  
or staff interface with the system.  

The Circ/Resource Sharing Working group is now working with liaisons from both the Systems working  
group and the Joint Use working group. The working group is drafting a recommendation for the patron  
database set-up, creating instructions to all libraries on how to consolidate collection codes, and  
formulating a plan to consolidate material types.  

Continuing work:  
• Investigation into any libraries that currently use both Sierra/Encore Duet and ILLiad to  
discover how the two systems may be connected.  
• Gathering questions about the implementation from college and university staff to guide  
group work  
• Investigating what data and reports will be available in the new system  
• Looking at making recommendations for removing or consolidating data fields such as  
patron statuses and item statuses, especially where there are only a few per field.
NEXT-GEN ILS
DISCOVERY CONFIGURATION WORKING GROUP

Report on Current Activities for the Members Council on Library Services Meeting
September 8-9, 2016

CHAIR: Allison Jai O’Dell
FALSC LIAISONS: Elaine Henjum and John Sandstrum

CURRENT ACTIVITIES:

The Discovery Configuration Working Group (DCWG) has reviewed documentation on Sierra and Encore Duet, and developed a list of questions pertaining to configuration of discovery interfaces. These can be reviewed on the Implementation Wiki at: https://ilsimp.wiki.flvc.org/wiki/index.php/Discovery_Configuration_Working_Group_Notes

In collaboration with FALSC, the DCWG is currently seeking answers to these questions about set-up and configuration of Encore Duet and EBSCO Discovery Service (EDS). So far, we have learned that:

- OAI-PMH enabled collections can be harvested for Encore Duet
- Institutions who have already set up their EDS Profiles will not have to do this again

The DCWG participated in a variety of training sessions on EDS (including topics on Profiles, Full Text Finder, Holdings Management, Publication Finder, and Databases Profiles).

The DCWG conducted a survey of digital collections to facilitate planning for storage space in the new system. Results are posted on the Wiki at the above URL, and resulted in more storage than originally expected.
CURRENT ACTIVITIES: The Discovery Interfaces Working Group has set-up regular meetings twice a month on the first and third Mondays of each month from 2-3 pm. If we have a training the same week as a regularly scheduled meeting we usually do not meet, but attend the training instead. Our next regular meeting will be held on September 19th due to the Labor Day holiday. We have attended many trainings during the month of July. Including:

- Working Group Orientation Webinar
- Introduction to Sierra and Encore Duet Documentation
- Meeting with EBSCO (EDS profiles)
- Overview of Sierra and Encore Duet for Working Groups
- Meeting with EBSCO (Full Text Finder, Holdings Management, and Publication Finder)
- Overview/Help Session for completing the EBSCO questionnaire
- Overview of Encore Duet for Working Groups
- Athena Hoeppner’s presentation: EDS Databases Profiles Overview
- Meeting with EBSCO (Full Text Finder, Holdings Management, and Publication Finder)
- Meeting with EBSCO (EDS profiles)

The Working group has had clarification made for a number of questions.

1. The interface chosen for all colleges and universities is Encore Duet. The EBSCO products include the mega-index and the Full Text Finder. There was confusion over this as III and EBSCO refer to their discovery services as EDS.

2. At this time individuals at the college or university level will not have access to develop APIs. From the Implementation Team minutes, “Bishop stressed that the integration of APIs will be a continual process as FALSC will continue to work with each institution to implement whatever pieces they’d like to when they’re ready.”

   a. “Parker Fruehan from the Systems Working Group suggested that as working groups they think of ideas for "cool" development and that they send those ideas to the Systems Working Group. They will keep a running list and as the opportunity presents itself, they can help prioritize so FALSC can assign appropriate resources.”

3. Although the Joint Use Working Group is focused on integration between college and college, university and university, and college and university libraries they are aware of all the college/university and county library partnerships that exist and will keep integration in mind as we move past the Go Live date.
4. The differences in using the Encore Duet interface versus the EBSCO Discovery interface was discussed as EBSCO representatives have made clear that there are no extra charges for going with their discovery product. The functionality of using U Borrow and having access to all the colleges and university holdings within one public interface is what will be affected if colleges or universities go with the EBSCO interface. It is still not clear if the Florida legislative mandate to have one single search interface that searches all colleges and universities holdings will be satisfied through the union catalog. It was asked if institutions went with EBSCO, “would [DIWG or UIISC] have to make some recommendations to them based on our recommendations for ED functionality and design?”

[A DIWG member asks] “I’d like to hear about their [institutions that choose the EBSCO interface] decision making process to help us make ours and I just thought it may be helpful to share that information among the group. I’m not pushing for EDS at all, we are leaning towards E/D. But again, information is a bit cloudy, and we may learn from others (and others from us) about the differences.”
NEXT-GEN ILS
E-RESOURCES MANAGEMENT WORKING GROUP

Report on Current Activities for the Members Council on Library Services Meeting
September 8-9, 2016

CHAIR: Tina Buck
FALSC LIAISONS: Scott Schmucker and Cherie McCraw

CURRENT ACTIVITIES:

- The ERM Working Group has had the initial overview training session of the ERM module from III. With the Discovery Interface Working Group and the Discovery Configuration Working Group, we have also participated in training from EBSCO on the functionality of Encore with the EDS index, the setup of the institutional profiles inside EBSCO administration, and general use of EBSCOadmin.
- Working on a list of questions in preparation for future training sessions. The Google Doc with these questions is posted on our wiki page and the ERM Discussion Group has been invited to participate in its evolution.
- Sharing an overview of e-resource management activities at our respective institutions, which informs our questions and expectations of the new ERM. Participation from the Discussion Group will be invited on this topic, as well.
- Designated liaisons to the Discovery Interface Working Group and the Discovery Configuration Working Group, since the activities and interests of these groups are so closely interwoven.
- Began examining the fields in Sierra ERM record types that all institutions will share so that recordkeeping, statistical, and descriptive needs will be satisfied for all.
NEXT-GEN ILS
JOINT USE WORKING GROUP

Report on Current Activities for the Members Council on Library Services Meeting
September 8-9, 2016

CHAIR: Janice Henderson
FALSC LIAISONS: Wendy Ellis and Mary Ann O’Daniel

CURRENT ACTIVITIES:

The Joint Use Working Group oversees the development of services and policies related to joint-use facilities involving the public colleges and universities and has been meeting regularly on Tuesday mornings since June 7. Liaisons have been appointed and are working with the other working groups to plan for joint-use needs. A spreadsheet about our joint use facility operations was developed and is being reviewed by the Joint Use Discussion Group. Anyone involved with college or university joint use facilities or with an interest in them needs to join the Joint Use Discussion Group list (ils-joint-use-discussion) and visit the Joint Use wiki to review documents for local information accuracy.
CURRENT ACTIVITIES:

The Systems Working Group has been reviewing Sierra access and permissions. The group has been developing a schema to deal with staff usernames, as these have to be unique across the entire system. We have also been developing permissions and Sierra workflows for the various functional areas and the level of access needed. We will be developing a generic user template for supervisor, staff, and student in each functional area, with the appropriate access to functions and workflows that are appropriate for the user’s work.

The working group has also been reviewing the ERP Integrations in place now with ALEPH. The working group is keeping a list of third-party systems integrations that are desired by the other working groups. We will evaluate which integrations are necessary for day-one functionality, and enhancements that can wait until a later date.
NEXT-GEN ILS
TRAINING WORKING GROUP

Report on Current Activities for the Members Council on Library Services Meeting
September 8-9, 2016

CHAIR: Sara Alegria
FALSC LIAISONS: Brenda Rutten and Lisa Tatum

CURRENT ACTIVITIES:

The Training WG created a survey to determine training needs and available training facilities in each region. The survey went out to ILS coordinators and all 40 institutions responded. FALSC staff helped aggregate the results, and the WG began analyzing them. Next, they will work with Schlomit Schwarzer, Innovative’s Lead Trainer, to determine the dates, locations and agendas for in-person training sessions. The plan is to have participants view self-paced online modules, if available, prior to attending the hands-on sessions and then provide them with a Quick Start Guide for each functionality.

The working group is also reviewing existing documentation and online training to determine which topics need additional documentation.
FALSC Communications Plan  
August 2016

Next-Generation Integrated Library System (ILS) Implementation:  
Innovative Interfaces Inc.’s Sierra ILS, Encore Duet Discovery Interface, and EDS Index

Overview

In 2013, a Next-Gen ILS Task Force, including representatives from FALSC and college and university libraries, was established by the FALSC Members Council on Library Services (MCLS) to evaluate and recommend a vendor-supplied “next-generation” integrated library system (ILS). In 2014, the group participated in vendor demonstrations, set up a Requirements Task Force, and received vendor responses to an Invitation to Negotiate. In 2015, Innovative Interfaces, Inc. was selected to be the next-gen ILS vendor. In early 2016, FALSC completed negotiations signed a contract with Innovative Interfaces, Inc. for the implementation of its Sierra ILS, Encore Duet discovery interface, and EDS Index. Final implementation is planned for July 2017. This multi-year effort marks the largest transition to an integrated academic library catalog/discovery system in Florida’s history and impacts all 40 public higher education institutions.

This communications plan defines how and what FALSC will communicate to external audiences surrounding implementation of the new, next-generation ILS. This plan identifies stakeholder groups and their information needs, significant milestones, and the tools and processes, and workflows that will be used to ensure that information is shared in a timely, accurate, and effective manner. It also establishes a formal comprehensive plan as required of the Next-Gen Implementation Team by the Next-Gen ILS Planning and Implementation Framework document.

Scope

This plan addresses communication from FALSC/FLVC to its external stakeholders regarding implementation of the new ILS.

Key Priorities

All communications will be aligned with the following priorities:

- **Customer Information and Involvement:** Ensure that stakeholders at all levels receive appropriate, accurate, and timely information about the transition to the new ILS. It is critical that stakeholders remain informed and involved, and that our communication (both what we communicate, and how we communicate it) helps build their confidence in the next-gen ILS implementation process as well as in FALSC’s ability to meet their needs.

- **Community Building:** Although the legacy college and university library organizations are now combined, the customers of each legacy organization developed different expectations, traditions, and relationships. Effective communication with stakeholders will help users adjust to a new, broader organization and the expanded user community that we now support. Effective communication will continue to build confidence in FALSC and foster effective collaboration.

- **Organizational Identity/Branding:** Communicating to stakeholders throughout the next-gen ILS implementation process provides an opportunity to establish and grow FALSC’s organizational
identity through branding and other means. Strategy and implementation of FALSC marketing activities will be coordinated by FLVC’s marketing department.

Communication to Date / Existing Channels

FALSC has communicated next-gen ILS status information through a variety of established channels including:

- MCLS, Advisory meetings, Executive Committee, Standing Committees
- Discussion lists
- Monthly updates from FALSC’s interim Executive Director
- FALSC website
- Online and in-person training and meetings
- Presentations and presence at library-related events
- Phone, email, and in-person consultation

Stakeholders

Primary stakeholders, those most directly impacted by the transition, will receive specific, targeted, time-sensitive information with everything that requires a response by the target stakeholders highlighted in the communication.

- Library Administrators
- Library Staff
- Information Technology Staff (i.e., those staff in addition to traditional library staff who may be required to assist in installation of the new ILS or in related system enhancements)
- End users (communication needs for this group will be identified in the next phase of the communications plan with input from the Next-Gen ILS Implementation Team)

Secondary stakeholders, members of the broader college/university or library environments who have an interest in the scope and impact of the project, will receive communication of a general, informative nature.

- Funding Sources
- College and University Administrators
- General Public
- Library and Higher Education Community

Goals / Objectives

Communication surrounding all aspects of next-gen ILS implementation should be designed to meet following objectives:

- Ensure stakeholders at all levels receive accurate, timely, and useful information about the process and outcomes
- Ensure that the information library and IT staff receive correctly shapes their understanding of and preparation for implementation at their institution; Ensure appropriate lead time for local preparation.

- Ensure stakeholders’ expectations are realistic by shaping Day 1 and long-term vision (focusing on a shared statewide system developed with best practices, quality, and efficiency in mind).

- Build acceptance of the new ILS by reinforcing benefits, flexibility, and thoughtful planning – and by underlining that the driving force in making decisions is based on the needs, preferences, and habits of students and staff, and on usability, statistics, and emerging technologies.

- Ensure FALSC staff are consistent in what they communicate to stakeholders (talking points, naming conventions, shaping expectations).

- Promote established and new processes for gathering and managing customer feedback.

- Provide timely information regarding meetings, training, documentation, and go-to resources to allow libraries to test the new environment, plan internal workflow, and prepare relevant instruction.

- Emphasize opportunities for involvement (discussion groups, working groups, local implementation teams, system testing, general feedback).

- Respond to concerns or problem areas with appropriate communication in a timely manner.

- Relay accurate, useful, and timely information regarding expectations for legacy systems, applications, data, documentation, and reports.

- Respond to opportunities to promote FALSC as an organization that listens to and communicates with its stakeholders.

**Communication Tools and Channels**

FALSC will continue to provide updates through established channels including recurring, ongoing opportunities (e.g., email, established meetings) as well as event-driven opportunities (e.g., specific training events, Regional User Meetings). New or improved methods of communication will be incorporated when identified.

The following resources will be utilized for external communication:

- MCLS, Advisory meetings, Executive Committee, Standing Committees
- Listservs (discussion lists/email)
- FALSC website, particularly the new Next-Gen ILS section
- Wikis
- Regional User Meetings
- Training events, webinars, and consultation
- Library and higher education conferences and publications
- Formal letters and in-person updates, where appropriate

FALSC also has an opportunity to assist internal staff in communicating externally about the implementation by developing “talking points” which will allow FALSC staff to speak with consistency.
regarding naming conventions, expectations about system functionality, and the process for managing user feedback.

**Key Milestones and Activities**

Following are a several key communications-related milestones and activities. Additional milestones and delivery methods will be established as system development progresses and as communication needs are identified by FALSC and the Next-Gen ILS Implementation Team.

March 2016
- Negotiations complete, contract with vendor signed
- Call for volunteers to participate in nine specialized Working Groups

April – May 2016
- Development of Next-Gen ILS section on FALSC website
- Working Groups begin to meet and collaborate virtually
- Development of discussion lists for topic areas
- FALSC Regional User Meetings

May – June 2016:
- FALSC staff training

July – December 2016:
- Training for Working Groups
- Develop training for library staff

January – May 2017:
- Training for library staff provided by vendor
- Webinars on ILS topics provided by FALSC

March 2017:
- Training server built, configured, and made available to libraries

July 2017
- Go-live at all 40 public college and universities

August 2017
- Post-implementation communication/follow-up
- Post-implementation consultation and site visits

To Be Determined
- Legacy products “decommissioned” (timing and details TBD)
Recommendations

The following is a summary of communication recommendations that should occur. A more detailed chart, grouped by stakeholder and including an approximate timeline, follows.

- Initial communication to stakeholder groups with high-level summary information
  - College and university administration
  - IT staff (plan for follow-up communication as needed closer to implementation)
  - Library staff and administrators (plan for ongoing status updates)
  - General public and/or library and higher education publications

- Initial communication to stakeholder groups to include (where appropriate):
  - Announcement of signed contract
  - Overview/scope of project and process
  - Description of contract terms / what to expect
  - Anticipated timeline
  - Call for volunteers for working groups
  - Information about the “Framework” document and Next-Gen ILS Implementation Team
  - Information on ways to be involved and provide input (working groups, discussion lists, local implementation teams, system testing opportunities)
  - Impact on and preparation required of local resources
  - Methods for communicating updates and information about the process
  - Contact information for any questions or concerns
  - Information/training on accessing documentation from the vendor

- Complete development of a Next-Gen ILS section on the FALSC website that will provide easy access to recent status updates, system progress, and events. This will be a source of relevant, current information as well as serve as an access point to the working environment for various teams.

- Develop template, schedule, and method for distributing regular updates to library staff and administrators. The current recommendation is to develop a bi-weekly (or monthly, at a minimum) update in the form of a “newsletter” to be emailed to the MCLS and the LIBS_ALL discussion list, providing a summary of current progress and updates from the Working Groups, along with updates on implementation milestones/timeline, training opportunities, feedback/testing opportunities, and a clear path for users to submit feedback and ask questions. This information will also be made available on the Next-Gen ILS section of the FALSC website.

- Prepare a draft communications plan (an expanded version of this plan) for distribution to the Next-Gen ILS Implementation team for review and input once that team is established

- Prepare a press release upon contract signing (already developed by FLVC Communications)
• Prepare a press release upon system implementation or shortly prior to implementation (through FLVC Communications)
• Identify opportunities to leverage existing, or develop new, social media messaging platforms and campaigns
• Develop a list of library and higher education publications and conferences in which it may be appropriate to include information about implementation either during the process or upon completion; Prepare material for distribution in print or in person for these avenues
• Customize communications and requests for action to be most relevant to stakeholder groups, ex. highlight areas of releases where the target audience needs to take action.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stakeholders</th>
<th>Information Needs</th>
<th>Method</th>
<th>From / Developed By</th>
<th>Timing / Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Funding Sources / Legislature</td>
<td>High-level summary/scope, status, timeline, benefits, cost savings.</td>
<td></td>
<td>CEO, Innovation Institute</td>
<td>As needed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College/University Administrators</td>
<td>High-level summary/scope, timeline, local responsibilities and impact on resources, contact information. Note that more specific information will follow closer to implementation.</td>
<td>Letter</td>
<td>CEO, Innovation Institute</td>
<td>Week of April 11 (post contract signing)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College/University IT Staff</td>
<td>Initially: High-level summary/scope, timeline, local IT staff responsibilities, contact information. Note that more specific information will follow closer to implementation.</td>
<td>Established email list or letter</td>
<td>Chief IT Strategist, Innovation Institute</td>
<td>Week of April 11 (post contract signing)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Follow-up: Summary recap, status update, timeline, specific technical details and information about local impact on resources closer to implementation. Point of contact for questions/concerns.</td>
<td>cc MCLS email</td>
<td></td>
<td>Follow-up date TBD as project progresses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library Administrators and Library Staff</td>
<td>Initially: More detailed summary/scope, timeline, information about local responsibilities and impact on resources, contact information. Information on specifics covered by the contract once it is signed. Information on how communication will occur, reassurance of regular communication, and channels for feedback/questions/concerns.</td>
<td>MCLS email, LIBS_ALL email, Status update to MCLS, LIBS_ALL, and shared on Next-Gen ILS section of FALSC website, Regional User</td>
<td>Executive Director, FALSC, Implementation Project Co-leads FALSC Communications Coordinator</td>
<td>Week of April 11 (post contract signing)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Follow-up: Regular, scheduled communication to include</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Ongoing, routinely as the project moves forward (bi-weekly status updates / monthly)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stakeholders</td>
<td>Information Needs</td>
<td>Method</td>
<td>From / Developed By</td>
<td>Timing / Frequency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FALSC Staff (internal)</td>
<td>Current updates on process/progress, talking points, naming conventions, timeline, how questions/feedback will be handled, and setting expectations.</td>
<td>Meetings, Email</td>
<td>Executive Director, FALSC, Implementation Project Co-leads; FALSC Communications Coordinator</td>
<td>TBD, varies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>System End Users</td>
<td>Will be informed by library staff. Library staff may request handouts or specific documentation to be shared. This will be incorporated in the plan, as needed, with input from the Next-Gen ILS Implementation Team.</td>
<td>Handouts or general information for library staff, Pass-through information</td>
<td>Implementation Project Co-leads; FALSC Implementation Team; Communications Coordinator</td>
<td>TBD, varies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Public</td>
<td>High-level summary/scope, status, timeline, benefits.</td>
<td>Press release</td>
<td>Director Marketing/Communication s, Innovation Institute</td>
<td>After signing and upon implementation or just prior</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library and Higher Education Community (conferences, publications)</td>
<td>High-level summary/scope, status, timeline, benefits.</td>
<td>Article/content, Presence at events</td>
<td>Executive Director, FALSC, Implementation Project Co-leads; FALSC Communications Coordinator</td>
<td>TBD, varies</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Regular Meeting of the
Members Council on Library Services (MCLS)

Minutes

Thursday, September 8, 2016 – 1:00 to 5:00 p.m. EDT
Friday, September 9, 2016 – 8:30 a.m. to 12:00 p.m. EDT
Florida Atlantic University (FAU) | Boca Raton Campus | S.E. Wimberly Library, Building 3, Fifth Floor | 777 Glades Road | Boca Raton, Florida 33431

Members Present: Rich Ackerman (BC), Kevin Arms (LSSC, representing Denise English), Barry Baker (UCF), LisaMarie Bartusik (PSC), Christine Boatright (FGC), Ray Calvert (Pasco-Hernando), Mercedes Clement (DSC), Elizabeth Curry (UNF), Erick Dominics (MDC), Lori Driscoll (GCSC), Teresa Faust (CCF), Rebecca Frank (SPC), Karen Griffin (HCC), Meg Hawkins (SCFMS), Janice Henderson (NWFSC), Carol Hixon (FAU), Rob Krull (PBSC, representing Brian Kelley), Tom Messner (FSCJ), Lena Phelps (South Florida), Anne Prestamo (FIU), Patricia Profeta (IRSC), Deborah Robinson (TCC), Judy Russell (UF), William Shuluk (FSW), Jill Simser (EFSC), Ruth Smith (VC), Myra Sterett (SFC), Barbara Stites (FGCU, representing Kathy Miller), Courtlann Thomas (PSC), Lisa Valentino (SSCF), Faye Watkins (FAMU), Christina Will (SJRCC), Lynn Wyche (NFCC), Julia Zimmerman (FSU).

Guests: Rebecca Donlan, Wendy Dover, Ramona Miller-Ridlon, Shelly Schmucker, Ernestine Holmes (FAMU), Annie Glerum (FSU), LeEtta Schmidt, Allison O’Dell, Alexis Carlson, Tina Buck, Janice Henderson, Parker Fruehan, Sara Alegria


Call to Order
The meeting was called to order at 1:00.

MCLS Processes and Procedures
Messner volunteered to be the MCLS Liaison to the Resource Sharing Standing Committee (RSSC) and Hawkins volunteered to serve in this capacity for the User Interfaces Standing Committee (USIC).

FLVC Briefings and Discussions
Northrup gave this update. Interviews for the FALSC Executive Director Search position are now complete and she anticipates making a decision soon. Once a candidate has been selected, she will let the MCLS know if they made a successful offer or if other candidates will need to be interviewed.
Updates from FALSC Committees

Standing Committee Reports: Questions and Answers

- Collection and E-Resources—Russell represented the committee. Prior to the meeting, a detailed report of the committee’s activities was distributed. The council briefly discussed the possible availability of the Miami Herald historical files at some point for the Florida College System (FCS). Schmucker from FALSC has requested pricing information. It was noted that some of the State University System (SUS) institutions are involved in a pilot project with Newsbank, who is currently digitizing the collection.
- Digital Initiatives—Rogers represented the committee. Prior to the meeting, a detailed report of the committee’s activities was distributed. There were no questions or comments from the council on the report.
- Resource Sharing—Glatthaar represented the committee. There was some discussion about recommendations coming from the committee regarding lost book billing. Motion: Miller motioned to accept the committee’s recommendation and Henderson seconded the motion. Motion approved

The Executive Committee will communicate the recommendations to our library community.

- Technical Services—Prior to the meeting, a detailed report of the committee’s activities was distributed. There were no questions or comments from the council on the report.
- User Interfaces—Heathcock represented the committee. Prior to the meeting, a detailed report of the committee’s activities was distributed. There were no questions or comments from the council on the report.

Decision Making and Authority Working Group

Griffin reported that the group is acephalous. They are currently reviewing other mission statements in an effort to frame their statement and working to flesh out the information that was reported at the June 14, 2016 meeting.

E-Resources Framing Working Group

Driscoll gave this update. This group is currently without a leader and several members have resigned from the group. However, they are still working and would like talk with any institution or FALSC communications staff who can help the group formulate a communications plan and who can assist in identifying stakeholders and planning what information needs to be given to them. Northrup added that some of this information has been given to the Online Affordability Committee and Board of Governors (BOG) staff to aid in their discussions about affordable education and shared e-resources.

There was discussion on how the timing for allowing the findings of this group to direct the work of the Collection and E-Resource Management Standing Committee (CMESC) as they work on their 2018 recommendations. Nevins suggested the CMESC put it on their agenda and explore its applicability to their work. Driscoll added they will get a copy of the document to this group so they can get their feedback on it.

FALSC Briefings and Discussion

Nevins took this opportunity to applaud the council and FALSC staff on their efforts to bridge the communication gaps and their commitment to make this Sierra Encore Duet implementation a successful one for everyone at our institutions.
**E-Resources**

Schmucker from FALSC led this discussion. He reported that the SUS has voted to drop Oxford’s Grove Music and that the FCS has voted to drop EBSCO Health Source: Nursing/Academic and the Associates Programs Source Plus, but they have added ProQuest US Newsstream. Options for how to use the remaining funds leftover from these cuts was discuss and how they could factor into the 2018 recommendations. The SUS may have to make additional cuts unless more funding becomes available to them.

Schmucker also reported that he has gotten pricing information for acquiring international or Canadian newspapers but will need to delve more deeply into it and bring it forward to the CMESC.

Responses to the Group Licensing survey are due in September. Members were encouraged to submit those so that the process of getting letters of intent and invoices can be completed before the December winter break. The resources will become available on January 1.

For the purposes of identifying FTE for each institution, FLVC has always used the FTE-3 numbers published by the Florida College System and the SUS Board of Governors.

**FALSC Digital Services**

Nevins gave an update on the digital services program being developed at FALSC. They are progressing with their work on the recommendations in the ISF report that was published back in 2014. Staffing needs are being addressed and current staff are attending training and being reassigned while some services have been contracted out. Progress has also been made on the implementation of DAITSS and software changes have been made to Islandora. Archon is also being replaced with ArchivesSpace, and the upgrade to the Open Journal software is in progress.

Nevins reviewed the two phases of their approach to enhance the digital program for the state: an assessment of the current environment and a development of a vision, framework and plan for continued implementation. Deliverables from phase one will include an inventory of current member initiatives via survey, a summary of members’ goals and plans, and a report on models in other states and/or groups. Members encouraged Nevins to capture the many overlapping responsibilities for digital services in the survey. The timeframe is under development and the target date for a report back to the MCLS is January 2017. Nevins noted that she expects the Digital Initiatives Standing Committee to be involved.

Members requested an overview of Digital Services via a FALSC Talking Tech and suggested that it would be a good idea for members of the Members Council on Distance Learning and Student Services (MCDLSS) to be invited as well. Nevins noted this as an action item and offered to post more information on the MCLS listserv summarizing the input we received today and soliciting additional information. Iterative process and recommendations come on how to proceed.

**OATER Task Force Discussion**

Dygert reported that the task force meeting on Tuesday and reviewed information from a previous ISF. They discussed ways to make the report actionable and how the report findings could be dispersed to the campuses and then steps for identifying how FALSC/FLVC can assist institutions with their efforts in this area. Northrup noted that the FLVC Members Council on Distance Learning is having similar conversations on this topic and others like
quality, access, and affordability and encouraged joint conversations between the two councils, maybe as a small subset of the OATER Task Force. It was also suggested that the council partner and hosting regional sessions and having early adopters talk about what they have done.

The council a number of ideas related to this issue and how they might move forward collectively and find ways to harness those ideas and have conversations with among themselves with other entities and if this topic could actually be one that could be used as a base for an LBR initiative or an one the council could take on themselves.

**Updates and Discussion on Sierra / Encore Duet Implementation**

**General Updates**
Bishop and Whisenant updated the council on recent activities surrounding the implementation of the Sierra/Encore Duet system. Major milestone on the timeline were discussed including server building, an update on the migration of records from Aleph to Sierra, past and future training for FALSC staff and the individual working groups. FALSC staff and working group members continue to work on profile sheets that assist them with mapping the data from one system to the other.

Other major discussion topics included the following:

- Options for discovery tool interfaces and how much flexibility the institutions will have in customizing theirs. Encore Duet is the III discovery interface with the EDS mega-index back end, which is the duet part. In addition, EBSCO has EDS which is the EBSCO Discovery Service, which includes both their front-end (Discovery interface) and their back-end (the MegaIndex). FALSC will implement Encore Duet—institutional view and the union catalog. Prestamo requested a comparison document prepared jointly by III, EBSCO, and FALSC showing the pros and cons of the public interface and of the workflows that will impact the staff.
- Full-Text Finder, which is the EBSCO link resolver and contains the EBSCO A-Z List, will be implemented in the new system.
- FALSC can help you configure institutional settings for EBSCO profiles.
- FALSC will continue to send regular communications in the form of a monthly newsletter, updates to the wikis, content updated daily the FALSC website.
- A member also suggested FALSC conduct webinars for IT contacts that describe more information about this implementation and understand more about what an ILS is.
- During discussion, FALSC staff and council members continued to iron out the process for notifying institution staff about the implementation.
- Other issues like table and field sizes, duplicate patron ID barcodes, and how the system will operate in multiple time zones were discussed.
- At members’ request, freeze dates that were presented at the regional meetings will be sent as a refresher to the library community in some form periodically.
- A user-friendly version of the III contract language will be given to the Go-Live Ad Hoc Standing Committee.
- The day that FALSC goes live on Sierra Encore, Aleph will be frozen and put into a read-only mode.
- The Training Working Group is coordinating massive spring training for the library community. Trainings are by subject areas. If the need arises, FALSC will ensure that there are trainings reserved for after Go-Live questions.
- FALSC and III are working to ensure that there is a smooth integration with the new system and current institution enterprise systems like Banner and PeopleSoft.
Institutions who want to maintain status quo, really will not have to change anything. However, they do want to give their campus IT departments as much of a heads up as possible on the implementation and what it might entail. All members would like to have this implementation on the radars of their IT departments. It was suggested that a timeline for integration activities be produced.

- FALSC staff along with staff from their Division of Information Technology have started working on authentication. Their desire is to put in place an authentication system that will work for all 40 institutions. The council would like regular updates on this topic.

**Working Group Reports: Questions and Answers**

- Acquisitions and Serials—Holmes represented the working group. Prior to the meeting, a detailed report of the group’s activities was distributed. There were no questions or comments from the council on the report.
- Cataloging and Authorities—Glerum represented the working group. Prior to the meeting, a detailed report of the group’s activities was distributed. There were no questions or comments from the council on the report.
- Circulation and Resource Sharing—Schmidt represented the working group. Prior to the meeting, a detailed report of the group’s activities was distributed. There were questions and discussion about the home library field information mentioned in the report.
- Discovery Configuration—O’Dell represented the working group. Prior to the meeting, a detailed report of the group’s activities was distributed. There were no questions or comments from the council on the report.
- Discovery Interfaces—Carlson represented the working group. Prior to the meeting, a detailed report of the group’s activities was distributed. There were no questions or comments from the council on the report.
- E-Resource Management—Buck represented the working group. Prior to the meeting, a detailed report of the group’s activities was distributed. There were no questions or comments from the council on the report.
- Joint Use—Henderson represented the working group. Prior to the meeting, a detailed report of the group’s activities was distributed. There was some discussion about the relationships and how those will be affecting by any work the joint use group is doing. Schmidt added that we their working group is recommending a global patron database that will be beneficial for reciprocal patrons in other libraries and for resource sharing.
- Systems—Fruehan represented the working group. Prior to the meeting, a detailed report of the group’s activities was distributed. There were no questions or comments from the council on the report.
- Training—Alegira represented the working group. Prior to the meeting, a detailed report of the group’s activities was distributed. There were no questions or comments from the council on the report.

**Feedback on FALSC Communications Plan**

Bishop and Whisenant. There were no questions or comments on the communications plan, and the council approved it. Bishop will post it to the Implementation wiki.

**Branding the NGILS: Discuss Branding Process and Brainstorm Institutional Rollout Process and Needs**

McCarthy reported that FALSC staff want to start branding the new system. At a recent Executive Committee it was decided that a small group of the that group will meeting with branding professionals to see what type of image and message the new brand should
portray. Discussion followed. Once the materials are produced, FALSC will ensure that members also get information electronically. This will make it is easy to distribute on the campuses.

**Confirm Future Meeting Dates and Locations**
Calvert confirmed November 30 – December 1 at UCF as the next date and location for the next MCLS meeting. June and February dates and locations are not available yet. Henderson wondered if we need to continue to meet in conjunction with the LRSC as they typically don’t set their meeting schedule in the way that CSUL does. They will discuss at their next meeting in October.

**General Information Session (If Needed)**
No information was presented during this session.

**New Business**
There was no new business

**Adjournment**
The meeting adjourned at noon.