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

University of Central Florida | Live Oak Event Center | Live Oak Room
4115 Pyxis Lane | Orlando, Florida 32816

Tuesday, May 15, 2018 —1:00-5:00 p.m. ET

11:45-1:00  Lunch

1:00-1:05  Call to Order  Kathy Miller, Chair

1:05-1:15  1. Welcome  Kathy Miller
   A. Member Introductions
   B. Member Retirements

1:15-1:20  2. Consent Items  Kathy Miller
   A. Approve February 20-21, 2018 Meeting Minutes
   B. Accept FALSC Standing Committee Reports
      i. Digital Initiatives (DISC)
      ii. Library Assessment (LASC)
      iii. Technical Services (TSSC)
      iv. Textbook Affordability and OER (TAOERSC)
      v. User Interfaces (UISC)
   C. Information: Future Meeting Dates
      i. September 11-12, 2018 (SCF- Bradenton, FL)
      ii. December 6-7, 2018 (FLVC- Tallahassee, FL)

1:20-1:45  3. MCLS Processes and Procedure
   A. Standing Committee Vacancies: [DISC-9 vacancies, RSSC-5 vacancies,
      TSSC-6 vacancies, UISC-5 vacancies. Applications due May 25, 2018]
   B. Additional Standing Committee Reports
      i. Collection Management and E-Resources (CMESC): Approve
         Recommendations
      ii. Resource Sharing (RSSC): Approve Recommendations

1:45-2:35  4. FALSC Briefings
   A. FALSC New Directors Presentation
      i. Director or Library Training and Support  Brian Erb
      ii. Director of E-Resources  Rachel Erb
      iii. Director of Digital Services and OER  Rebel Cummings-Sauls
   B. Patron Record Scrubbing Update  Wendy Ellis
   C. E-Resources Update  Rachel Erb
2:35-3:00 ***BREAK***

3:00-3:30  5. ILS Update  Ellen Bishop, Dave Whisenant

3:45-5:00  6. ITN Updates
A. Process Update  Elijah Scott
B. ILS Working Group ITN Summary Reports  Ellen Bishop, Dave Whisenant
   i. Acquisitions and Serials
   ii. Cataloging and Authorities
   iii. Circulation and Resource Sharing
   iv. Discovery
   v. E-Resources Management
   vi. Joint-Use
   vii. Systems
   viii. Training
C. ILS Working Groups: Discuss Next Steps  Kathy Miller

4:55-5:00 Wrap Up and Adjournment  Kathy Miller

Wednesday, May 16, 2018 — 8:30 a.m. to Noon ET

7:45-8:30 Breakfast  Kathy Miller

8:30-8:35  7. Call to Order  Kathy Miller


9:35-10:00 ***BREAK***

10:00-11:00  9. Demo: Lyrasis ArchivesSpace  Christine DiBella

11:00-11:30  10. IPEDS Web-Based Collection Statistics  Lori Driscoll

11:30-12:00  11. New Business  Kathy Miller

12:00 Adjournment  Kathy Miller

Thank you for leaving your nametag for future use!
Regular Meeting of the
Members Council on Library Services (MCLS)

Minutes

Tuesday, February 27, 2018 – 1:00 to 5:00 p.m. EST
Wednesday, February 28, 2018 – 8:30 a.m. to 12:00 p.m. EST

University of Florida | Smathers Library | Room 100
1545 West University Avenue | Gainesville, Florida 32611

Members Present: Barry Baker (UCF), LisaMarie Bartusik (PSC), Christine Boatright (FGC), Valerie Boulos (FIU, representing Anne Prestamo), Ray Calvert (PHSC), Mercedes Clement (DSC), Elizabeth Farrell Clifford (FSU Law), Elizabeth Curry (UNF), Akos Delnek (IRSC), Lori Driscoll (GCSC), Robert Dugan (UWF), Tricia Elton (TCC), Teresa Faust (CCF), Christina Fullerton (PSC), Karen Griffin (HCC), Margaret Hawkins (SCF), Janice Henderson (NWFSC), Carol Hixon (FAU), Robert Krull (PBSC), Tom Messner (FSCJ), Kathryn Miller (FPU), Kathleen Miller (FGCU), Lena Phelps (SFC), Jean Phillips (FSU, representing Julia Zimmerman), Judith Russell (UF), Kathleen Sacco (LSSC), William Shuluk (FSSC), Ruth Smith (VC), Jane Stephens (CC), Morgan Tracy (SSFC), Faye Watkins (FAMU), Christina Will (SJRSC), and Lynne Wyche (NFCC).

Guests: Rich Ackerman (BC), Robbie Allen (PBSC), Kevin Arms (LSSC), Tina Buck (UCF), Alexis Carlson (IRSC), Sarah Cohen (FSU), Carol Ann Davis (USF), Rebecca Frank (SPC), Annie Glerum (FSU), Amy Johnson (Florida Division of Library and Information Services), Karen MacArthur (EFSC), Mark Marino (SCF), Jenna Miller (SFC), Kristina Neihouse (FKCC), Hannah Norton (UF/FCALM), Ramona Miller-Ridlon (SFC), Kelly Rowan (FIU), LeEtta Schmidt (USF), Courtlann Thomas (PSC), and Roy Ziegler (FSU).

FLVC/FALSC Staff: Ellen Bishop, Joni Branch, Tammy Elliott, Wendy Ellis, Chase Fiorini, Meredith Montgomery, Lydia Motyka, Brenda Rutten, Susan Rodgers, Scott Schmucker, Elijah Scott, Dave Whisenant, Jay Weise, Matthew Williams, Shawn Wilson, and Amanda Yesilbas.

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

Welcome and Introductions
Miller welcomed everyone to the University of Florida and thanked Judy Russell for hosting the meeting. Members to introduced themselves.
Consent Items
Prior to the meeting a packet was sent out with detailed reports from the standing committees, as well as December’s meeting minutes, and future meeting dates. Miller pulled future meeting dates for discussion. Henderson made a motion to approve consent items; Griffin seconded the motion. Motion passed.

Miller stated the Executive Committee proposed September 11-12 and December 6-7 as future meeting dates. Volunteers are needed to host both meetings. Discussion followed. Hawkins will host September 11-12, 2018 at State College of Florida Manatee-Sarasota. Florida Virtual Campus (FLVC) will host December 7-8, 2018 in the Tallahassee office.

Miller stated Calvert has been working on committee nominations for 2018-2019 year. Calvert presented Judy Russell for Chair Elect, Margaret Hawkins for Secretary, and Brian Doherty for SUS at-Large Representative as the nominees. Calvert asked for additional nominations. Henderson moved to accept the 2018-2019 slate of nominations; Griffin seconded. Motion passed.

E-Resources
Statewide Collections
Schmucker updated the council on the activities of E-Resources and stated the 2018 collection had been finalized and is available. Schmucker stated the State University System (SUS) kept their current collection with the addition of Lexis Nexis Academic. The Florida College System (FCS) members were polled on whether to drop Newsbank or US Newsstream. The vote was split. The CMESC is exploring other options for 2019. The 2019 budget from Legislature will be the same, and products will have to be cut. The CMESC will be working on a recommendation.

Group Licensing Process
Schmucker stated the group licensing process is wrapping up. Commitment letters have been sent in by all participating schools. Invoices are in the process of being sent out and paid. This year there were 38 institutions that participated for a total of 131 products. There were 38 vendors who participated. The total spent was $1.79 million, an increase of about 9 percent from last year.

Journal Packages
Schmucker noted FALSC is working on two more journal package licensing services with Oxford and Sage. This process should wrap up in the next few weeks.

ACRL Metrics
Schmucker presented the ACRL Metrics quote to the council. The cost is $212.50 per school. Two exceptions are four universities have access through ASERL; one has access through LibPASS and one college and one university have subscriptions that would be pro-rated based on the start date. The annual consortia subscription fee for year one is $7,012.50. This does not include members who are part of another group, current subscribers, or LibSat/LibPASS subscribers. The discount requires 11 participants. There is a one-time FALSC portal set-up fee of $3,000. This includes custom filters, templates, etc. Schmucker proposed FALSC will cover the $3,000 set-up fee if the institutions cover the subscription fee of $212.50 per school. Discussion followed. Miller asked for a show of hands that were interested. The majority showed interest. Henderson made a motion to pursue the ACRL quote; Messner seconded. Motion passed. Schmucker will follow up with ACRL.

FALSC Briefings
Hiring Update
Scott updated the council on the hiring activities of FALSC. Brian Erb is the new Director of Library Support and Training, Rachel Erb is the new Director of E-Resources, and Rebel Cummings-Sauls is the new Director of Digital Services and OER. All 3 start on April 2, 2018.
Sierra/Encore Implementation Update

Where We Are

Scott stated on January 9, 2018 FALSC and FLVC representatives met with Innovative (III) to discuss the status of the implementation and the fact that major unresolved issues would prevent us from going live in July 2018. III offered a preview of their new discovery service, and invited FALSC to become a development partner.

On February 5, 2018 after attending the preview, FALSC requested a termination of the contract. A formal agreement will be finalized soon. Scott noted he will notify the council once the agreement is in place. Discussion followed.

A general Collaborate meeting will be held at the beginning of March to discuss the end of this project. All Implementation Team members, ILS Coordinators, and Working Group members will be invited.

Post Innovative

Bishop reviewed possible next steps that include an upgrade to the current and consolidating public interfaces. Discussion followed.

Options for the ILS include upgrading the current hardware, upgrading Aleph to a current version, and merging the SUS and FCS Bibliographic Databases. Discussion followed.

Whisenant reviewed the discovery services provided to the institutions. Services include EBSCO Discovery Service, Mango with EBSCO mega-index Mango with Primo Central Index, Primo with Primo Central Index, and Aleph OPAC).

FALSC Recommendations

Whisenant presented the council with FALSC’s recommendations.

- Discontinue support for Primo by September 30, 2018
- Ask the institutions using the Aleph OPAC to move to Mango
- Discontinue support for Primo Central by September 30, 2018
- Discontinue support for SFX/MetaLib by September 30, 2018
- FALSC will continue to provide access to Curriculum Builder for all institutions for FY 2018/19.

The council discussed the recommendations.

- Henderson moved to discontinue support for Primo by September 30, 2018; Phillips seconded the motion. Motion passed.
- McArthur moved to ask the institutions using the Aleph OPAC to move to Mango; Driscoll seconded the motion. Motion passed.
- Henderson moved to discontinue support for Primo Central by September 30, 2018; Driscoll seconded the motion. Motion passed.
- Driscoll moved to discontinue support for SFX/MetaLib by September 30, 2018; McArthur seconded the motion. Motion passed.
- McArthur moved that FALSC continue to provide access to Curriculum Builder for all institutions for FY 2018/19; Messner seconded the motion. Motion passed.

The council discussed how to restart the process of identifying and a potential new next gen ILS system. Discussion followed.
Scott asked for approval from the council for the working groups to continue to meet to research and identify shortcomings of the III system, and then determine what would be needed for new system. The working groups use the previous ITN to create a summary of questions and information to take in researching a new system. Henderson made a motion to approve Scott’s request; Griffin seconded the motion. Motion passed.

Privacy of Circulation Records
Ellis briefed the council on an incident that involved privacy of circulation records. The council reviewed the current back-up process, Florida Statute 257.261 for Circulation Records, and Florida Department of State, Division of Library and Information Services policy GS 15 on Circulation Records. Ellis stated patron IDs are scrubbed on the same day for the FCS institutions and 48 hours after the transaction for the SUS institutions. Ellis stated the next steps are to get SUS patron ID scrubbing on the same schedule as the FCS, research best practices for circulation transaction back-ups, and create and post online a clearly defined FLVC/FALSC Patron ID Privacy Policy. Curry made a motion that the SUS policy be the same as the FSC policy on scrubbing data; Hixon seconded the motion. Motion passed, Ellis will continue to research best practices for circulation transaction back-ups and report back to council at a later date.

Review the Florida Digital Archive (FDA) Survey Results
Prior to the meeting a packet was sent out with a detailed report and results from the Florida Digital Archive (FDA) survey. Motyk a gave an overview of the Florida Digital Archive (FDA). A current FALSC organizational priority is to stabilize Digital Services, including the Florida Digital Archive, as well as, a strategic initiative to determine and implement a next phase technology plan for the FDA. Currently there is a high risk of Dark Archives in the Sunshine State (DAITSS) experiencing a major hardware failure in the future. In January 2017, FLVC began investigating options to identify a viable way forward. Motyk a updated the council on the options, which include: environmental scan of possible replacement software for DAITSS; adding a cloud storage repository to the current DAITSS system; upgrading DAITSS servers to the most current software; and considering a replacement to DAITSS software. An FDA Survey was performed from May 31-June 21, 2017. The feedback from the survey will be incorporated into preservation system requirements. Motyk a reviewed FDA Affiliate Collaboration and FDA Affiliate Agreements with the council. Discussion followed. Scott stated FALSC will come back to the council, at a later date, with a recommendation on how to move forward.

Archon Migration and Archive Space
Yesilbas gave an overview to the council of the Lyrasis migration of Archon to ArchivesSpace and reviewed benefits of using Lyrasis which include Consortia discount, potential ArchivesSpace and Islandora interoperability, experience support, and Lyrasis is the hub of ArchivesSpace development and community. Yesilbas presented a proposal to the council. FALSC can use one-time money to pay for the setup, migration, and two years of hosting fees for some institutions. After two years, it will be up to the individual intuitions to cover the hosting fee. Discussion followed.

At the request of the council, FALSC will do more research on Lyrasis and bring back the findings.

New Business
There was no new business.

Adjournment
The meeting adjourned at 9:25 a.m. EST.
DIGITAL INITIATIVES STANDING COMMITTEE

Report on Current Activities for the Members Council on Library Services Meeting
May 15-16, 2018

CHAIR: Krystal Thomas
MCLS LIAISON: Carol Hixson

CURRENT ACTIVITIES: This report reflects DISC activity from February 2018 – April 2018. The group met 3 times by conference call to:

- Discuss statewide collaboration on digital initiatives and services, to share research and expertise, and to coordinate activities.
- Discuss issues related to centralized services: common digital library system and companion tools; Florida Digital Archive (FDA); PALMM; Archon/ArchivesSpace; Florida OJ/Open Journal Systems (OJS); metadata standards; digital items and collections discovery in MANGO
- Discuss and stay up to date on work of the Sunshine State Digital Network, the DPLA service hub in Florida.
- Hosted Claire Dygert, consultant for the Division of Library and Information Services, for a discussion about her work in reviewing the digital library landscape of Florida and how her work may affect DISC and also how the group could help.
- Members from Florida International University and University of Central Florida were able to share presentations on recent projects and discuss challenges of the work and share their knowledge with the group.

ISG (Islandora Sub-Group) update: The group met 2 times by conference call during this quarter. Work accomplished by the group in conjunction with FALSC:

- Reporting modifications were discussed for reporting out all parent and children objects in an Islandora site (currently, only parent totals are available).
- Reviewing the current list of Islandora enhancement requests to plan upcoming development work on https://islanddev.flvc.org, looking at small "tweaks" vs. "major projects"
- Began “show and tell” by members to bring new projects or upcoming projects to the group to discuss or troubleshoot any problems encountered on the project and to share knowledge of the system.
- ISG meeting notes can be seen for this time period on its public wiki: https://islandora.pubwiki.fcla.edu/wiki/index.php/ISG_Meeting_Notes_pubwiki
LIBRARY ASSESSMENT STANDING COMMITTEE

Report on Current Activities for the Members Council on Library Services Meeting
May 15-16, 2018

CHAIR: Victoria McGlone
MCLS LIAISON: Katie Sacco

CURRENT ACTIVITIES:

The Library Assessment Standing Committee (LASC) met on April 12, 2018. Prior to the meeting, Chair Victoria McGlone sent citations to journal articles pertinent to our charge, with examples of recent library assessments. Victoria also informed the committee that she had received permission to share completed assessment projects done by five participants in the NEFLIN Assessment Projects. Since these projects involve Florida institutions, they will be especially relevant to our committee’s work.

Joining our meeting for the first time was Brian Erb, Director of Library Support and Training, and Lisa Tatum, Consultant, Library Relations. We also had a very special guest, Dr. Martha Kyrillidou. Dr. Kyrillidou is one of the facilitators for the NEFLIN Assessment Project and, according to her Website, “is a Research Associate at the iSchool at the University of Illinois, Urbana-Champaign, bridging research and practice. She teaches Research Methods at Kent State University and is leading the redesign of this course for the SLIS core curriculum team. She is on the planning committee of the 2016 Library Assessment Conference, a member of the Board of the Northumbria International Conference of Performance Measurement and Metrics in Library and Information Services, and a member of the Advisory Committee of the International Conference on Qualitative and Quantitative Methods in Libraries. She serves as the chair of the NISO Z39.7 Information Services and Use: Metrics & Statistics for Libraries and Information Providers – Data Dictionary. She is a volunteer for the Organization Model Task Force for the Coalition to Advance Learning. Martha is also affiliated with the Library Management Consulting (LMC) practice.”

Martha answered questions submitted by the LASC members during our meeting and has since sent additional resources for the committee’s use.

The LASC will meet next on Thursday, May 10.
TECHNICAL SERVICES STANDING COMMITTEE

Report on Current Activities for the Members Council on Library Services Meeting
May 15-16, 2018

CO-CHAIRS: Jennifer Coddie, Sarah Hess Cohen
MCLS LIAISON: Mercedes Clement

CURRENT ACTIVITIES:

Melissa Stinson (FALSC) has been giving the committee monthly updates on the termination of the contract with III and what steps FALSC and the colleges and universities will be taking going forward in terms of an ILS for the statewide system.

Sarah Cohen (FSU) gave updates on the Cataloging Standards Subcommittee. That group has completed their task of rewriting the LINCC Cataloging Guidelines into a statewide guideline called “Cataloging Guidelines for the Florida State University System and State College System Bibliographic Database”. It will also be used as a quick reference and training manual for catalogers across the state in the future. The draft was submitted to the TSSC for review and recommendations, and a final version will be approved.

Annie Glerum (FSU) gave the committee updates on data remediation projects going on statewide. She shared the URL link to the “Pre-Migration Cleanup Projects” document. A subcommittee will be formed to continue this work in the future.
TEXTBOOK AFFORDABILITY AND OER STANDING COMMITTEE

Report on Current Activities for the Members Council on Library Services Meeting
May 15-16, 2018

CHAIR: Jennifer Gregor
MCLS LIAISON: Todd Chavez

CURRENT ACTIVITIES:

March 29th Online Meeting:

- Committee discussed and supported the effort for a LibGuide of library-licensed content for statewide common courses, like Composition 1.
- Reviewed FLVC Affordability website and discussed plans for adding resources.
- OpenStax applications are open, no one is applying this cycle but shared past experiences with the application process.
- Examined the recently passed Federal Omnibus Spending Bill and what it might mean for Florida institutions.
- Members shared local OER efforts at their institutions and discussed challenges and opportunities.

April 12th Online Meeting:

- Introductions of new FALSC personnel and roles.
- Robin Donaldson provided an overview of the OER Summit and planning for the next Summit in October with a STEM focus.
- Members discussed the lack of Florida-based incentive programs for faculty creating or using OER; the possibility of collaborating with out-of-state co-authors was suggested.
- Report on final steps in the Open Textbook Network contract and training opportunities.
- Next meeting is set for May 10th online.
CURRENT ACTIVITIES:

The UISC began meeting again, now that the Encore/Duet implementation is cancelled. Our meetings were on March 15th and April 19th. We are focusing on the colleges transitions from PRIMO to Mango (with EDS index, full text finder, and publication finder), and resumed development and customization of the Mango interfaces, primarily the local instances for the time being.

Members were introduced to the “Mango Development Priority List” spreadsheet at the April 19th meeting, we will be working off this document as a start to Mango customizations. It contains ideas for new features, tweaking older features, and styling options. The group will be getting familiar with all the listed enhancement items and placing their votes in time for the next meeting mid-May.

FGCU has been using Mango with the EDS mega index and may be providing a demo of the Mango/EDS index/FTF/pub finder interfaces in the near future.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Standing Committee</th>
<th>Vacancies</th>
<th>Membership Guidelines</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>FALSC Standing Committee</strong></td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Digital Initiatives Standing Committee</strong></td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College-Small = 1</td>
<td>SUS: 11 members from any type institution</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College-Large = 2</td>
<td>FCS: 3 members from any sized institution</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University = 3</td>
<td>sus: 3 members from research institutions (including law and medical libraries)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University-Research = 3</td>
<td>sus: 2 members from other institutions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resource Sharing Standing Committee</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College-Medium = 1</td>
<td>SUS: 3 members from research institutions (including law and medical libraries)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College-Large = 2</td>
<td>sus: 2 members from other institutions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University = 1</td>
<td>sus: 2 members with university circulation focus</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University-Research = 1</td>
<td>FCS: 2 members from medium institutions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical Services Standing Committee</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College-Medium = 1</td>
<td>SUS: 3 members from research institutions (including law and medical libraries)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College-Large = 2</td>
<td>sus: 2 members from other institutions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University-Research = 3</td>
<td>FCS: 2 members from medium institutions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>User Interfaces Standing Committee</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College-Small = 1</td>
<td>SUS: 3 members from research institutions (including law and medical libraries)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College-Large = 2</td>
<td>sus: 2 members from other institutions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University = 1</td>
<td>sus: 2 members from small institutions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University-Research = 1</td>
<td>FCS: 2 members from medium institutions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FCS: 1 member from small institutions</td>
<td>FCS: 1 member from small institutions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
COLLECTION MANAGEMENT AND E-RESOURCES STANDING COMMITTEE

Report on Current Activities for the Members Council on Library Services Meeting
May 15-16, 2018

CO-CHAIRS: Valerie Boulos, Mark Marino
MCLS LIAISON: Judy Russell

CURRENT ACTIVITIES:

During this quarter, the FLVC Collection Management and E-Resources Standing Committee held three committee meetings. Below is a summary of activities for this quarter.

Statewide Collection of Electronic Resources Update:

Changes to the 2018 budget have been finalized, and reported to the Committee. The Committee has no firm recommendations for the 2019 collection at this time, pending review of an E-Resources Survey.

E-Resources Survey:

The committee has been reviewing the original 2013 E-Resources Survey document and deciding what changes or updates to make. Based on these discussions, a new survey is currently being drafted with the intention of distribution before the close of the 2018 fiscal year.

E-Licensing Guidelines:

The committee reviewed and discussed a revised draft of the Complete Florida Plus Guidelines for E-Resource License Agreements document. Comments and recommendations were made in several areas, including interlibrary loan, text and dating mining, ADA compliance, and confidentiality of licensing terms.

ACTION ITEMS:

The CMESC recommends updates to the Complete Florida Plus Guidelines for E-Resource License Agreements as seen in the attached document, and requests MCLS recommend adoption of these updated guidelines to FALSC and UWF General Counsel.

Minutes and Meeting Recordings:

The CMESC regularly posts minutes to the wiki site at: https://certf.wiki.flvc.org/wiki/index.php/Main_Page. Due to the sensitive nature of committee discussions, often concerning negotiations and vendor pricing, meeting recordings are not posted.
COMPLETE FLORIDA PLUS
GUIDELINES
FOR E-RESOURCE LICENSE
AGREEMENTS
Last Updated: 4/20/2018
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INTRODUCTION

These guidelines provide a framework for review and negotiation of license agreements for electronic resources licensed by the University of West Florida Board of Trustees on behalf of the Florida Academic Library Services Cooperative and the Complete Florida Plus Program established by Section 1006.73 and 1006.735, Florida Statutes (“UWFCF”) and on behalf of higher education institutions in Florida. Part I details the terms that typically make up the main body of the contract; Part II deals with various schedules and attachments used for laying out terms that do not fit neatly into the main body of the contract; Part III is a standard addendum to be used with all contracts.

As license agreements typically define authorized users and govern how the subscriber may use the licensed content (i.e., interlibrary loan, e-reserves, etc.), it is imperative that agreements negotiated by UWFCF maintain the same resource sharing rights in the electronic environment that they enjoy in the print environment. Following these guidelines will facilitate our ability to protect the rights of our user communities.

The updated guidelines reflect changes in the online licensing environment since their original publication in June 2009. Several additions were made to address the licensing of e-books through packages and demand driven acquisitions programs. Other additions are meant to address the expansion of UWFCF licensing activities from institutions within the State University System (SUS) and the Florida College System (FCS) to other institutions of higher education in Florida, which include the Independent Colleges and Universities of Florida (ICUF).

PART I: Typical clauses in the main body of license agreements

1.1 UWFCF AS LICENSING BODY

The correct way to identify UWFCF in agreements is “the University of West Florida Board of Trustees on behalf of the Florida Academic Library Services Cooperative and the Complete Florida Plus Program established by Section 1006.73 and 1006.735, Florida Statutes.”

For example:

This License Agreement (the “Agreement”) is entered into by and between SAGE Publication, Inc., a Delaware Corporation, located at 2455 Teller Road, Thousand Oaks, California (“Licensor”), and the University of West Florida Board of Trustees, on behalf of the Florida Academic Library Services Cooperative and the Complete Florida Plus Program established by Section 1006.73 and 1006.735, Florida Statutes, with an address at 1753 West Paul Dirac Drive, Tallahassee, FL 32310 (“Licensee”) on behalf of the
participating institutions in [Insert name of appropriate Schedule or Attachment here].

For licenses that extend participation to institutions outside the Florida SUS and FCS, the participating institutions are collectively termed *The Florida Academic Electronic Resource Collaborative*¹. Often, this will be followed by a parenthetical statement such as (“the Consortium”), which will be used throughout the remainder of the contract.

### 1.2 AUTHENTICATION

Authentication to online resources is typically achieved by IP recognition, but other means of authentication may be required or desired.

**Sample clause:**

“Access to the licensed content shall be authenticated by the use of Internet Protocol (IP) addresses indicated by the Subscriber on Schedule [ ] and/or via a federated single sign-on such as Shibboleth.”

### 1.3 AUTHORIZED USERS

Authorized users should be defined by their affiliation with the university regardless of their geographic location or campus. Users at all geographic locations and/or campuses that report to the university as their administrative head are considered part of a single site. Each library on a multi-library campus will make every effort to negotiate access for patrons according to this definition. All definitions of authorized users should include “walk-in” or “occasional” users.

**Sample clause for single institution license:**

“Authorized users include those persons affiliated with Licensee as students, faculty, staff, and independent contractors of Licensee and its participating institutions, regardless of the physical location of such persons, as well as walk-in users.”

**OR**

**Sample clause for multiple institution license:**

“Authorized Users” shall mean faculty, full-time and part-time students, residents, researchers, employees and independent contractors of Customer affiliated with Customer’s institution as listed on Attachment [ ] (“Participating Institutions”) and individuals using computer terminals within the library facilities at the Participating Institutions.

¹ This term was formally adopted by the Collaborative Ventures Steering Committee, a joint body of the Florida
1.4 AUTHORIZED SITE

Authorized sites should be defined at the institutional rather than library level. An authorized site should not be geographically based, and should allow for access to all authorized users who have right of entry to the network regardless of their geographic location or campus.

Sample clause:
“The authorized site consists of all geographic locations and/or campuses of the institutions that are identified in the agreement as Participating Institutions. All authorized users who have right of entry to the network are granted access regardless of their physical location. This definition may include institutions with joint-use facilities that reside on a single network.”

If the licensor will not agree to the above sample clause the following may be used in its place:

“An academic institution is all parts of an organization that report to the same Chief Academic Officer or Chief Executive Officer. For multi-campus academic institutions, each organization listed in the Directory of Higher Education is considered a separate institution. Academic law and academic medical libraries may be part of a University if they report either to the same institutional Chief Academic Officer or the Chief Executive Officer, for example, President or Chancellor.”

1.5 AUTHORIZED USES

1.5.1 U.S. Copyright, ILL and Course Reserves

Traditionally, libraries have determined that Sections 107 and 108 of Title 17 of the United States Code (collectively “U.S. Copyright Law” or “copyright law”) provide for the use of copyrighted material for course packs and course reserves. Specific reference to the rights to use materials for interlibrary loan, course packs and course reserves may or not be mentioned as authorized uses within a license agreement. For clarity, specific mention of these uses is preferred. The use of content in Course Management Systems should also be addressed. If interlibrary loan, course packs, or course reserves are not specifically mentioned elsewhere in the agreement, the inclusion of a clause affirming rights according to U.S. Copyright Law assumes retention of these rights, if the library determines that the statutory requirements for fair use or interlibrary loan have been met.

1.5.2 Use in Accordance with U.S. Copyright Law

Contracts for e-resources should maintain the rights to use information according to U.S. Copyright Law. License agreements should be carefully reviewed to ensure that they do not deny rights granted under current copyright law including fair use, educational, and library exemptions. Acceptable license agreements will recognize these rights, including 17 USC Section 107 – “Limitations on exclusive rights: Fair Use,” and 17 USC Section 108 – “Limitations on exclusive
rights: reproduction by library and archives.” According to copyright law, fair use of a copyrighted work may be made in appropriate situations for “purposes such as criticism, comment, news reporting, teaching (including multiple copies for classroom use), scholarship or research.” Many license agreements limit use of licensed content to research, scholarship and teaching. Such agreements should be reworded to include all uses in compliance with U.S. Copyright Law.

Sample clause:
A typical standard clause regarding rights of use might read:

“The Publisher agrees to grant to the Consortium the non-exclusive and non-transferrable right to give Authorized Users access to the Licensed Materials via a Secure Network for the purposes of research, teaching and private study.”

This clause should be modified to read:

“The Publisher agrees to grant to the Consortium the non-exclusive and non-transferrable right to give Authorized Users access to the Licensed Materials via a Secure Network for the purposes of research, teaching, private study, and other uses in accordance with U.S. Copyright Law, including fair use and library reproduction rights.”

Alternatively, the previous clause can stand as originally written if this additional clause is present in or added to the contract:

“Nothing in this License shall in any way exclude, modify, or affect any of the Consortium’s or any Member’s statutory rights under U.S. Copyright Law.”

1.5.3 Interlibrary Loan
Although interlibrary loan (ILL) falls within copyright law in compliance with 17 USC Section 108, "Limitations on exclusive rights: Reproduction by libraries and archives", ILL is frequently addressed in an independent clause within the license agreement. ILL is an integral part of library resource sharing activities on a national and global level. It is imperative that libraries retain these rights wherever possible. The right to transfer interlibrary loan materials in electronic format is preferable to that of print. This right is particularly important to preserve for journal and magazine content, but is of increasing import as e-books begin to proliferate in libraries.

In ILL clauses, references to the provision of data or statistics on ILL use, references to type of library, and references to geographic limitations to ILL (e.g., ILL to U.S. only) should be removed.

Sample clause:
“Licensee may supply through interlibrary loan a copy of an individual document being part of the Licensed Materials by post, fax or secure electronic transmission for the purposes of non-commercial use. Specifically, copies may be made in compliance with
Section 108 of the U.S. Copyright Act.”
If the licensor will not agree to the above sample clause the following may be used in its place:

“Licensee may use licensed content for interlibrary loan in compliance with Section 108 of the United States Copyright Law (17 USC Section 108, “Limitations on exclusive rights: Reproduction by libraries and archives”). Licensee may fulfill in print or image form interlibrary loan requests from institutions that do not have access to the Licensed Materials. Such requests may be fulfilled by the Institution printing a copy of the item and providing that print copy, or a photocopy or facsimile transmission thereof, to the requesting party or by using an automated Interlibrary Loan system providing that it supplies digital images only.”

1.5.4 ILL and e-books
The loaning of e-book chapters rather than the entire work was the norm for many years, but the trend is slowing shifting to loaning the entire work. Ideally, negotiations should try to secure the broadest sharing rights possible.

Sample clause:
“Participating libraries may supply through Interlibrary Loan (ILL) e-book content, including loans of entire works, by post, fax or secure electronic transmission. Specifically, copies may be made in compliance with Section 108 of the U.S. Copyright Act and the limitation of the [Vendor] system.”

1.5.5 Scholarly Sharing
Clauses addressing scholarly sharing are meant to facilitate the sharing of information between researchers who are doing scholarly work in collaboration with colleagues from different institutions.

Sample Clause:
“Authorized Users may make and transmit single electronic copies of individual items of content to research colleagues located outside the institution of the Participating Institution, solely for the purpose of non-commercial, scholarly collaboration.”

1.5.6 Use of Content in Support of Courses and Instruction
Use of content in support of courses and instruction may be covered in a single clause or by multiple clauses for each separate activity. Often a single clause covers only one or two aspects of use of content for course and instructional support. In this case, clauses can usually be easily modified to cover all necessary uses:

Sample clause:
“Licensee and Authorized Users may use a reasonable portion of the Licensed Materials in the preparation of print or electronic course packs, course reserves or other educational materials as well as within secure course management or other secure educational platforms.”

If the licensor will not agree to the above sample clause the following may be used in its place:

“Participating Institutions may incorporate parts of Licensed Materials in print and electronic course packs, electronic reserves collections, course management systems and other secure platforms for the use of Authorized Users in the course of instruction. Each such item shall carry appropriate acknowledgement of the source. Participating Institutions will make reasonable efforts to ensure that copies of electronic items are deleted when no longer in use for such purpose. Course packs in non-electronic non-print perceptible form, such as, audio or Braille, may also be offered to Authorized Users who, in the reasonable opinion of the Member, are visually impaired.”

1.5.7 Text and Data Mining (TDM)

Text and Data Mining (TDM) is the use of automated tools and techniques to process large amounts of digital content in order to identify relationships. This research technique is of increasing importance in the academic sphere. How authorized users are able to access licensed content for TDM purposes varies by content provider, and the terms of the agreement need to address the method or process of gaining access. Inclusion of TDM rights may not be appropriate for all content types, but should be included in journal and e-book licenses and some database licenses.

Sample clause for copies of licensed materials:

Authorized Users may use the Licensed Materials to perform and engage in text and/or data mining activities for academic research, scholarship, and other educational purposes and may utilize and share the results of text and/or data mining in their scholarly work and make the results available for use by others, so long as the purpose is not to create a product for use by third parties that would substitute for the Licensed Materials. Licensor will, upon receipt of written request, cooperate with Licensee and Authorized Users as reasonably necessary in making the Licensed Materials available in a manner and form most useful to the Authorized User. Licensor shall provide to Licensee, upon request, copies of the Licensed Materials for text and data mining purposes without any extra fees. Requests should be directed to [INSERT CONTACT INFORMATION HERE]

Sample clause for API access to licensed materials:
Authorized Users may access the text and data mining service online via an API [INSERT LINK TO API ACCESS/CONTACT INFORMATION HERE] to continuously and automatically extract and index and/or process information from the Subscribed Products to which the [Subscriber| Licensee] separately subscribes and load and integrate the results (the “TDM Output”) on a [Subscriber| Licensee]’s text-mining system for access and use by Authorized Users; and distribute the TDM Output externally, which may include a few lines of query-dependent text of individual full text articles or book chapters which shall be up to a maximum length of 200 characters surrounding and including the text entity matched (“Snippets”) or bibliographic metadata. Where Snippets and/or bibliographic metadata are distributed, they should be accompanied by a DOI link that points back to the individual full text article or book chapter.

Further the TDM Output should include a Creative Commons proprietary notice in the following form:
“Some rights reserved. This work is distributed under the terms of the CC-BY-NC -Attribution - NonCommercial- 4.0, which permits non-commercial use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original author and source are credited.”

Text and data mining services online may be accessed by vendors or other third parties retained by the Subscriber only with the express written permission of [LICENSOR] and for the index and/or process information purposes of the Subscriber.

1.5.8 Commercial Use

Most license agreements prohibit the licensee or its users from charging a fee to access the licensed content. Provisions that specifically prohibit the direct resale of licensed content are not controversial, but the agreement should make clear that charging administrative fees to cover the costs of making permitted copies is not prohibited. Where restrictions for commercial use appear in a license agreement, they should be supplemented with an additional clarifying clause:

Sample clause:
“For the avoidance of doubt, charging administrative fees to cover the costs of making permitted copies is not prohibited. Use by the Consortium or a Member or by an Authorized User of the Licensed Materials in the course of research funded by a commercial organization, is not Commercial Use.”

1.5.9 Browser Sharing in the Online Reference Environment

Software for providing online or “virtual” reference services often allow the service provider to access the browser of the remote patron and thus the licensed content despite their status an unauthorized user. The clause below permits such access:

Sample clause:
“Staff at non-affiliated libraries who are participating in collaborative digital reference services may access the licensed materials via browser sharing software in order to assist Authorized Users who are legitimately allowed access to the licensed material.”

1.5.10 Perpetual Access

Unless otherwise agreed, subscribing institutions should retain access to the digital version of the subscribed content either from the publisher’s site, from a copy maintained by the subscribing institution, or from a third party archive. Any accompanying fees should be stated in the Fee Schedule.

Sample Clause:
“Perpetual access to the full text will be provided by the Publisher either by continuing online access via the Publisher’s server or by supplying the electronic files to each subscribing Institution in an electronic medium mutually agreed between the parties. Continuing archival access and use is subject to the terms and conditions of the expired License.

1.5.11 Archival Access/Backup copy

Long-term considerations are vital and should be given attention in any license agreement. The rights to archival access, the ability to create an archival and back-up copy, and the methodology by which that might be accomplished should be negotiated for all leased and perpetually licensed resources. Any accompanying fees should be stated in the Fee Schedule.

Sample clause:
“On termination of this License, Licensor shall provide continuing access for Licensee to that part of the Licensed Material which was published or added to the Licensed Material within or prior to the Subscription Period, either from Licensor’s servers, from a third party’s server, or by supplying electronic files to the Licensee, as mutually agreed. The terms governing access to this material (for clarification this excludes payment obligations) shall be those in effect at the termination of the license.”

OR

“If the Licensor ceases to hold the publication rights of any of the Licensed Works and is no longer able to provide access, the Licensor shall ensure that continuing access is provided either: by the new publisher of the relevant Licensed Work; or through Portico, CLOCKSS, or a similar third party archive and in such case the Licensor shall provide all relevant details of the Licensee to the third party in order to enable access to the third party archive by the Licensee. Such access will be subject to Licensee fulfilling the third party’s terms and condition for access; or by providing the Licensee with an electronic copy of the relevant licensed Works for the purpose of local hosting by the Licensee.”
Sample clause for LOCKSS/CLOCKSS/Portico participation:
"Publisher acknowledges that Licensee and Participating Institutions may participate in archiving systems such as LOCKSS, CLOCKSS, and Portico. Licensee may perpetually use these systems to archive and restore the Licensed Materials, so long as Licensee’s use is otherwise consistent with this Agreement.”

If the publisher is not yet a LOCKSS participant:
“Publisher agrees to participate in the LOCKSS Program (www.lockss.org) and will contact the Licensee to enable LOCKSS preservation for Licensed content within the first six months of this contract. Publisher agrees that the Participating Institutions using the LOCKSS system may make Licensed Materials available to other LOCKSS system participants who indicate a right to those Licensed Materials.”

1.6 LICENSOR RESPONSIBILITIES

1.6.1 Privacy
Vendors should be in general compliance with privacy laws, including but not limited to FERPA, available at: <http://www.ed.gov/policy/gen/guid/fpco/ferpa/index.html>. Licenses should specify Licensor must uphold the confidentiality of individual users. Under no circumstances may user data be reused or sold to third parties without permission from the Licensee.

Sample clause:
“Licensor shall not, without the prior written consent of Customer, transfer any personal information of any Authorized Users to any non-affiliated third party or use it for any purpose except as is necessary to perform the Services in compliance with applicable laws and regulations, including, the Health Insurance Portability and Accountability Act (“HIPAA”), the Health Information Technology for Economic and Clinical Health Act (“HITECH”), the Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act (“FERPA”), and Florida Statutes §817.5681.”

1.6.2 Quality of Service
It is recommended that licenses have a statement that requires the vendor to compensate the library for significant downtimes. The license should always include contact information for help with problems and requirement of notification of scheduled maintenance.

Sample clause:
“Licensor shall use reasonable efforts to provide continuous service twenty-four (24) hours a day, seven (7) days a week. Scheduled downtime will be performed at a time to minimize inconvenience to Licensee and its Authorized Users. Licensor shall notify Licensee in a timely manner of all instances of system unavailability that occur outside the Licensor’s normal maintenance window and use reasonable efforts to provide advance notice of hardware or software changes that may affect system performance.”

OR
“Licensor shall use reasonable efforts to ensure that the Licensor server or servers have
sufficient capacity and rate of connectivity to provide the Customer and its Authorized 
Users with a quality of service comparable to the highest current standard in the on-line 
information provision industry. If the Services fail to operate in conformance with the 
terms of this Agreement, the Customer shall immediately notify Licensor, and Licensor 
shall promptly use reasonable efforts to restore access to the Services as soon as possible. 
In the event that the Licensor fails to repair the nonconformity in a reasonable time, the 
Licensor shall reimburse the Customer in an amount that the nonconformity is 
proportional to the total fees owed by the Customer under this Agreement.”

OR

“Licensor warrants to Customer that the Services and all technical support and 
maintenance will be delivered and provided in a professional, competent and timely 
manner and free of material bugs, errors and defects in design, access, use and 
operation.”

1.6.3 Usage Statistics
Collection and analysis of data on the usage of the licensed Materials assist both the Vendor and 
the Consortium and its Members to understand the impact of the license. Licensor should 
provide usage statistics in monthly data reports that consist of both composite use data for the 
Consortium and itemized data for individual institutions. Licensor should use best efforts to 
provide the Licensee with COUNTER-compliant usage statistics (http://www.projectcounter.org). Reject any language that restricts use of usage data reports to 
internal use only.

Sample clause for UWFCF licenses:
“Licensor must provide both composite use data for the system-wide UWFCF use and 
itemized data for individual campuses, on a monthly basis. Use data should be at the 
level of detail required for objective evaluation of both product performance and 
satisfaction of user needs, including title-by-title use of journals and provide information 
in compliance with the most recent release of COUNTER or other recognized 
international standard.”

Sample clause for individual institutions:
“Licensor must provide use data on a monthly basis. Use data should be at the level of 
detail required for objective evaluation of both product performance and satisfaction of 
user needs, including title-by-title use of journals. Providers should make usage data 
available in compliance with COUNTER or other recognized international standard.”

1.6.3a Collection by third party
New services are emerging that provide assistance with the collection and management of usage 
statistics. Use of these services requires that third parties have the right and ability to access and 
collect usage statistics data.
Sample clause:
“The Publisher shall provide to the Licensee or facilitate the collection and provision to the Licensee and the Publisher by the Licensee [or by the Agent] of such usage data on the number [of titles] [of abstracts and] of articles downloaded, by journal title, on [a monthly] [a quarterly] [an annual] basis for the Publisher’s and the Licensee’s private internal use only. Such usage data shall be compiled in a manner consistent with applicable privacy [and data protection] laws [and as may be agreed between the parties from time to time], and the anonymity of individual users and the confidentiality of their searches shall be fully protected. In the case that the Publisher assigns its rights to another party, the Licensee may at its discretion require the assignee either to keep such usage information confidential or to destroy it.”

OR

“The Publisher and the Licensee shall both be permitted to enable a third party on their behalf to collect and distribute usage data to them. Such usage information shall be compiled in a manner consistent with the applicable privacy laws, and the anonymity of individual users and the confidentiality of their searches shall be fully protected. In the case that either party assigns its rights to another party, the other party may at its discretion require the assignee either to keep such usage information confidential or to destroy it.”

1.6.4 Withdrawn Materials

The license should include written notification and pro rata refund in the event that more than a certain percentage of the content is withdrawn.

Sample clause:
“Licensor reserves the right to withdraw from the Licensed Materials any item or part of an item for which it no longer retains the right to publish, or which it has reasonable grounds to believe infringes copyright or is defamatory or unlawful. Licensor shall give written notice to the Licensee of such withdrawal no later than thirty (30) days following the removal of any item pursuant to this section. If such withdrawal renders the Licensed Materials less useful to Licensee or its Authorized Users in Licensee’s sole reasonable discretion, Licensor shall give Licensee an equitable reduction in the total Fees owed by Licensee under this Agreement, and promptly refund any prepaid amounts related to them. In that case, Licensee may terminate this Agreement and Licensor shall refund all prepaid amounts.”

1.6.5 ADA Compliance

Licenses should require the publisher/vendor to present its data in a form designed to comply with the American Disabilities Act.

Sample clauses:
“Licensor shall comply with the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA), by supporting assistive software or devices such as large-print interfaces, text-to-speech output, refreshable braille displays, voice-activated input, and alternate keyboard or pointer interfaces in a manner consistent with the Web Content Accessibility Guidelines (WCAG 2.0 Level AA) published by the World Wide Web Consortium’s Web Accessibility Initiative. Licensor shall provide Licensee current completed Voluntary Product Accessibility Template (VPAT) to detail compliance with the federal Section 508 standards. In the event that the Licensed Materials are not Accessibility compliant, the Licensee may demand that the Licensor promptly make modifications that will make the Licensed Materials Accessibility compliant; in addition, in such an event, the Licensee shall have right to modify or copy the Licensed Materials in order to make it useable for Authorized Users.”

1.7 LICENSEE RESPONSIBILITIES

1.7.1 Notifying users of authorized uses
Licenses often include a clause that requires the Licensee to make reasonable efforts to notify authorized users of conditions or restrictions on use of materials. Licensors request this because authorized users are not parties to the license agreement, and thus may not be aware of permitted or prohibited uses. This is generally acceptable, although language that mandates the Licensee to make authorized users aware without language qualifying that such action be of “reasonable efforts” should be modified to do so.

Sample clause:
“Licensee shall use reasonable efforts to provide Authorized Users with appropriate notice of the terms and conditions under which access to the Licensed Materials is granted under this Agreement including, in particular, any limitations on access or use of the Licensed Materials as set forth in this Agreement.”

1.7.2 Discipline
In general, any references to regulating and disciplining authorized users who breach the terms of use should be removed from the license.

Sample clause:
“Licensee will use reasonable efforts to inform users of the terms of use of this agreement.”

1.7.3 Confidentiality of Licensing Terms
Strike any obligations to keep license terms or fees confidential. If you are not able to strike, make sure to have the right to release the agreement if required by law, including Florida public records laws.

Sample Clause:
“Licensee is subject to Chapter 119 of the Florida Statutes, commonly known as the Florida
Public Records Law. The Agreement, this Addendum, and any related documents and/or correspondence shall also become a public record subject to the Public Records Law, regardless of any confidentiality provision outlined in the Agreement. Licensee may respond to public records requests without providing Vendor any notice.”

1.8 MUTUAL OBLIGATIONS

1.8.1 Breach
Many agreements have clauses that state how unauthorized use of or access to licensed content will be handled. These clauses should not require libraries to take on onerous responsibilities to monitor users.

Sample clause:

“Customer is responsible for taking reasonable measures to ensure the security and integrity of the Service, to ensure that access to and use of the Service is limited to Authorized Users and to prevent access by unauthorized persons to the Service. Customer shall promptly notify Licensor of any unauthorized access or use of which it becomes aware and cooperate with Licensor in any investigation thereof.”

1.8.2 Modification to Terms
Modifications to Agreements without advance written notice and consent is not acceptable. Clauses similar to the one below should be present in all contracts. Beware of cross-references to policies or other terms that are published on licensor web sites. Licensors should not be permitted to modify the terms of those cross-referenced documents without notice and consent.

Sample clause:

“Any changes to this Agreement must be made in writing and must be signed by authorized representatives of both parties.”

1.9 LEGAL ISSUES

1.9.1 Governing Law and Jurisdiction
Governing law and venue provisions determine which state’s law will govern interpretation of the contract and where suits must be filed. Because parties (and their lawyers) are more familiar with the laws of their home state, it is desirable to have the home state law apply to any dispute involving the agreement. Venue is important to avoid the expense of traveling to a foreign jurisdiction and of hiring local counsel in the other jurisdiction. For libraries that are part of a state institution, there are often compelling reasons to insist that the institution’s state law applies. This is true of Florida. All contracts should be modified to assert Florida as the governing law and venue. If a Licensor does not agree, consult with your Office of General
Counsel.

1.9.2 Website user agreements
Occasionally e-resource vendors require the authorized user to agree to terms at the time they log on. Many provide an opportunity for users to register so they can customize use of the site. In either case, it is useful to include a clause in the written license that specifies that the signed agreement held with the Licensor supersedes the website user agreement.

Sample clause:
“Customer acknowledges and agrees that Customer and its Authorized Users agree to and are bound by all of the terms of the Website’s Registered User Agreement dated [_______________] that can be found at [_______________]. Authorized Users may also register individually for the Service online at the Website. The terms of this Agreement supersede any terms of the Registered User Agreement that conflict or are ambiguous or inconsistent. Any terms in the Registered User Agreement that materially differ from the terms of this Agreement or that obligate a party to any additional material obligations or subject a party to any material limitations not expressly provided in this Agreement have no effect.”

1.9.3 Indemnification, Hold Harmless & Liability

1.9.3a: Indemnification
Licenses often have indemnification clauses. The Licensee should not agree to indemnify. If these clauses are in an agreement, the best course of action is to attach a license agreement addendum that includes standard clauses. (See paragraphs 6, 8 and 9 of the standard addendum presented in this document.) If a Licensor does not agree, consult with your Office of General Counsel.

1.9.3b: Limitation of Liability
Liability issues may arise in the case where a licensee is signing an agreement on behalf of multiple participating institutions. In this case, it is prudent to include a clause that details the liability of the contracting body and participating institutions.

Sample Clause:
“Licensee is entering into this Agreement for the benefit of itself and a group of libraries, which are hereinafter referred to as the “Participating Institutions.” Licensor agrees that while the Licensee is the entity signing this Agreement, the Licensee and each Participating Institution will only be liable for their own acts and obligations under this Agreement, including, without limitation, their share of the fees as set forth on Attachment [ ]. Licensor agrees that neither the Licensee nor any of the Participating Institutions is liable for any acts or omissions of each other and that the Licensor shall look solely to each Participating Institution individually for its obligations and liabilities under this Agreement and for each Participating Institution’s payment of its share of fees as set forth on Attachment [ ]. Furthermore, if any one of the Participating Institutions is in default or breach hereunder, the default or breach shall only affect the defaulting
Participating Institution and this Agreement shall remain in full force for all other Participating Institutions as if no default or breach occurred.”

1.10 RENEWAL AND TERMINATION

1.10.1 Termination
The licensor should not have a unilateral right to terminate a license without giving adequate notice to the licensee. If termination occurs because of a suspected breach, the licensee should be given adequate time to cure the breach. A pro-rata refund should be given to the licensee when termination is not caused because of a breach by the licensee.

Sample clause:
“Either party may terminate this license for material breach of the agreement by the other with written notice in paper or electronic form (with verified receipt). Prior to termination, the offending party will have thirty (30) days to cure the breach. If the Licensor is the breaching party and the License is subsequently terminated, Licensor shall make a pro rata refund of the Fee to the Licensee, taking into account the remaining unexpired portion of the Subscription Period.”

1.10.2 Early Termination Due to Insufficient Budgetary Allotment from Parent Institution/Government
Sample Clause:
A Subscriber may terminate its Order upon thirty (30) days notice given by such Subscriber to [Licensor] if sufficient funds are not provided, allocated or allotted in future approved budgets of Subscriber or reasonably available or expected to become available from other sources at the time Subscriber’s payment obligation attaches to permit Subscriber, in the exercise of its reasonable administrative discretion, to continue an Order. Notwithstanding the foregoing, if access to the Subscribed Products was provided but not yet paid for prior to termination, Elsevier will be entitled to receive a pro rata portion of the Fees attributable to the period of time that access was provided. Termination by one Subscriber does not affect the Agreement or an Order(s) with respect to other Subscribers.
PART II: Schedules and Attachments

Schedules and Attachments are useful for laying out terms of the contract that do not fit neatly into the main body of the contract. Common uses in UWFCF contracts include fee schedules, lists of participating libraries, lists of licensed materials, invoicing instructions, and contact information.

Contracts negotiated by FALSC where the participating institutions are financially responsible for any portion of the associated fees should include a schedule for each participating institution. This schedule should include a detailed schedule of fees related to the institution and require each institution’s authorized signatory to agree to the terms of the contract as a whole.

2.1 Referencing Schedules and Attachments
When using schedules and attachments, reference them at the appropriate place in the main body of the contract. For example, the definition of “Licensed Materials” in a contract may be stated with reference to the appropriate schedule:

“‘Licensed Materials’ means the electronic material set forth in Schedule 1 to this License that may be revised by the parties from time to time.”

2.2 Schedule of Licensed Materials
This schedule should provide a detailed list of the content that is licensed and provide terms for licensor to provide updated content listings if/when content is updated or altered.

2.2.1 Schedule of licensed materials for e-journal contracts
For e-journal contracts, the schedule should list all individual journals with, at minimum, their title, ISSN, and accessible years/volumes. If the list will change from year to year, the contract should make some provision for updating the schedule.

The contract should also require that the publisher supply on an annual basis a KBART file or Excel spreadsheet of the journals under contract for that year complete with ISSN, journal title, holdings accessible under the contract including volume number, issue number, and date of first or holdings range for use in Knowledgebase systems.

2.2.2 Schedule of licensed materials for e-book contracts
Many e-books licenses are for a discrete set of content. For e-book contracts, the list of titles purchased should be given with, as a minimum, their title and ISBN.

Defining the licensed content for Demand Driven Acquisitions (DDA), Evidence Based Acquisition (EBA), or other use driven acquisitions plans is problematic, as the final list of purchased titles is unknown at the time the contract is set. One way to handle this is to provide a placeholder schedule. For example:

“Attachment 1: Licensed Content
E-books on the [Provider’s Name] platform selected through a demand driven acquisition process as detailed in this Agreement comprise the licensed content. Lists of purchased titles will be appended to this Agreement monthly/quarterly/yearly (select timeframe that best fits the structure of the plan).”

In some cases, not all the e-books will be published and accessible at the point of licensing, the license should indicate what compensation the licensee is due should the licensor not publish all the titles promised.

Sample clause:

The Fee is based on the inclusion of the estimated number of titles to be published in the eBook Packages. If the total sum of the eBooks in the eBook Packages acquired under this license contains less than 97% of the estimated titles of the eBook Packages in total, Licensor may offer Licensee either (1) a discount on any future acquisition of an eBook package or any other online product in the amount according to the shortfall, or (2) access to an additional online product not presently licensed to Licensee.

2.3 Fee Schedules
Fee schedules should detail all aspects of the terms related to pricing, including whether institutions will be invoiced by their chosen billing agent, directly by the vendor/publisher, or by FALSC. This is essential to understanding how the contract costs were initially established or how they may change over the course of the contract.

2.3.1 Fee schedules for e-journal contracts
For e-journal contracts, the following should be addressed in the fee schedule as appropriate:

Fees due at time contract is set
Annual price cap or price increase
Calculation for base fee
Access fees
Fees for transfer titles
Fees for newly launched journals Deductions for deleted titles
Discounts for other products licensed by individual libraries, including print
Invoice by date
Hosting fees for perpetual access and/or archiving of content
Tokens (number, use of, and limit)
Any additional negotiated fees, products, or benefits of the contract

2.3.2 Fee schedules for database contracts
Fees per product due at the time contract is set
Annual price cap or price increase
Number of simultaneous users able to access content
Hosting fees for perpetual access and/or archiving of content
2.3.3 Fee schedules for e-book contracts
Fee schedules for e-book contracts will differ whether they are for one-time purchase of static collections or ongoing purchases under a DDA program.

2.3.3a: One-time E-book purchases
Fee schedules for one-time purchase of ebook packages should include, as appropriate:

- Price of purchase
- Platform fees
- Fees for MARC records
- Fees for classroom use or course reserves
- Miscellaneous service fees
- Number of simultaneous users able to access content
- Hosting fees for perpetual and/or archiving of content

2.3.3b: Demand/Evidence based e-book purchase Programs
Fee schedules for demand driven or evidence based programs, e.g. DDA & EBA, should include:
- Pricing structure of program
- Access and Selection time frame
- Rights & Restrictions
- Discounts
- Deposit amount
- Materials included or parameters (publishers/publication years/etc..) for inclusion
- Multiplication factors
- Purchase trigger event
- Platform fees
- Fees for MARC records
- Fees for classroom use or course reserves
- Miscellaneous service fees
- Number of simultaneous users able to access content
- Hosting fees for perpetual and/or archiving of content
- Term and termination
- Usage statistics

2.4 Schedule of Participating Institutions
Including a schedule of participating institutions is increasingly important as the SUS based contracts expand to include institutions within the Independent Colleges and Universities of Florida (ICUF) and the Florida College System (FCS). This schedule at a minimum lists the participating institutions and may include contact information and IP ranges for each.
NOTE: This is the original addendum in the 2013 Guidelines. Need official, updated Addendum from FALSC/FLVC

PART III: Standard Addendum
The addendum on the following pages should be attached to all agreements.

ADDENDUM to LICENSE AGREEMENT
Florida Virtual
Campus (UWFCF)
(Date)

This addendum is made part of the attached License Agreement and supersedes any conflicting or similar terms in the License Agreement. The LICENSEE’s purchase order may not be excluded by the LICENSOR’s terms.

1. ANNUAL APPROPRIATION: The [UWFCF’s] [State University System’s] [Florida College System’s] performance and obligation to pay under the Agreement is contingent upon an annual appropriation by the Legislature.

2. OMBUDSMAN: A Vendor Ombudsman, whose duties include acting as an advocate for vendors who may be experiencing problems in obtaining timely payment(s) from UWFCF, may be contacted at 850/474-2636 or . .

3. LOBBYING: Vendor is prohibited from using funds provided under this Agreement for the purpose of lobbying the Legislature or any official, officer, commission, board, authority, council, committee, or department of the executive branch or the judicial branch of state government.

4. GOVERNING LAW: The License Agreement and Addendum shall be construed in accordance with the laws of the State of Florida without regard to conflict of laws provisions and any disputes shall be resolved in the courts of the State of Florida.

5. COPYRIGHT AND PATENT INFRINGEMENT: The LICENSOR warrants that the Product(s) furnished by the LICENSOR do not infringe or violate any patent, copyright, trade secret, or any other proprietary right of any third party. The LICENSOR shall indemnify and defend at its own expense any liability or claim by a third party against the LICENSEE involving a patent, copyright, trade secret, or proprietary right violation concerning the Product(s), including attorneys’ fees, court costs, costs of appeals, expenses and any damages finally awarded against the LICENSEE with respect to the liability or claim. LICENSEE shall notify LICENSOR in writing within a reasonable time after the LICENSEE first receives any notice of the liability or claim. If an injunction or order is obtained against the LICENSEE’s use of any Product(s) or if in the LICENSOR’s opinion the Product(s) is likely to become the subject of a claim of infringement or violation of a copyright, trade secret or other propriety right of a third party, the LICENSOR shall at its expense (a) procure for the LICENSEE the right to continue using the Product(s)
(b) at no additional cost to the LICENSEE, replace or modify the Product(s) so that it becomes non-infringing, but only if the modification or replacement does not adversely affect the specifications of the Product(s) or its use by the LICENSEE; or (c) if neither (a) nor (b) above is practical, the LICENSOR shall remove the Product(s) from the LICENSEE and shall issue a credit for the Product(s) to the LICENSEE. Thereafter any license for the Product(s) involved is canceled.

6. TAXES: The State of Florida is a tax immune sovereign and exempt from the payment of all sales, use, or excise tax.

7. LIMITATION OF REMEDIES: LICENSOR shall ensure that the LICENSOR’s server or servers have sufficient capacity and rate of connectivity to provide the LICENSEE and its Authorized Users with a quality of service comparable to current standards in the on-line information provision industry in the LICENSEE’s locale. If the Licensed Materials fail to operate in conformance with the terms of this Agreement, the LICENSEE shall immediately notify the LICENSOR, and the LICENSOR shall promptly restore access to the Licensed Materials as soon as possible. If LICENSOR fails to repair the nonconformity in a reasonable time, the LICENSOR shall reimburse the LICENSEE in an amount that the nonconformity is proportional to the total fees owed by the LICENSEE under this Agreement.

8. INDEMNIFICATION: The LICENSOR shall hold the LICENSEE harmless from any claims and liabilities, including attorneys’ fees and court costs, against the LICENSEE for personal injury or damage to real or personal property caused by the tortious conduct of the LICENSOR in the performance of this Agreement provided that the LICENSEE has reasonably notified the LICENSOR in writing after the LICENSEE receives notice of any claim or liability. The LICENSOR shall have the sole control of the defense, trial and any related settlement negotiations. The LICENSEE is a state entity and cannot enter into indemnification agreements, therefore any clause in the LICENSOR’s license agreement or associated documents that require indemnification by the LICENSEE are hereby deleted.

A. In no event may the LICENSOR be liable pursuant to this Agreement for any damages caused by the LICENSEE’s failure to perform the LICENSEE’s responsibilities under this Agreement.
B. The LICENSEE as a state entity represents that it is self-funded for liability insurance that is applicable to officers, employees, servants, and agents while acting within the scope of their employment by the LICENSEE.

9. NOTICES: All notices allowed or required to be served on the LICENSOR or the LICENSEE shall be served by registered or certified mail, return receipt requested to the appropriate address on the purchase order.

LICENSEE: The University of West Florida
Signed by: ______________________________

Name: ______________________________
Title: ______________________________
Date: ______________________________

LICENSOR: ______________________________
This page intentionally left blank.
RESOURCE SHARING STANDING COMMITTEE

Report on Current Activities for the Members Council on Library Services Meeting
May 15-16, 2018

CHAIR: Robbie Allen
MCLS LIAISON: Thomas Messner

CURRENT ACTIVITIES:

The Resource Sharing Standing Committee reviewed its charges. We would like to add the following charge:

Provide resource sharing focused training and facilitate opportunities for sharing best practices and expertise statewide.

The committee would like to hold online trainings through FALSC to connect library staff with best practices for resource sharing and to share circulating policies and procedures.
This page intentionally left blank.
NEXT-GEN ILS
ACQUISITIONS/SERIALS WORKING GROUP

Report on Current Activities for the Members Council on Library Services Meeting
May 15-16, 2018

CHAIR: Ernestine Holmes
FALSC LIAISONS: Natalie Henri-Bennett and Jay Wiese

CURRENT ACTIVITIES:
- The committee meet on March 20, 2018
- Reviewed Approved FALSC Recommendations
- A link was distributed for the Working Group Section of ITN and Summary Report to MCLS
- Submit report to Implementation Team
- Discussion
  - Introduce the task to members
  - Review document (ITN)
  - Set dates for the next meeting (April 3; April 17)
  - Review ITN requirements as a group
  - Provide Feedback to Implementation Team by April 20
  - Members will notify chair if they need to resign from the group

Summary Report:

Review the requirements to find areas where we should have been clearer about our needs: These are just a few main points below, the full report was forward to Implementation Team

- Budgets
  - All budget must reflect real time information
  - The naming conventions should be completely customizable, with enough character spaces
- Vendor record
  - Comprehensive vendor file/addresses system
  - Needs specific fields with enough character spaces for institutional codes
- Orders
  - All order log information
  - Solution should have an efficient workflow for ordering and paying
- Invoice/payments
  - All fields must be customizable, according to each institutions’ needs
  - Integration with institutional payment systems
  - Ability to set hard limits on spending
  - Invoices can be edited after being finalized (by permission only)
  - Logs on invoice activity
• Serials records
  o Prediction patterns
  o Information from the Subscription list (check-in notes)
  o Orders with the current unit price or list price
  o Serials Holding records notes
  o TICKERS from Holding records
• Reporting
  o Pre-configured (‘canned’) reports (like Aleph Arrow and LINCC Report Service)
  o Customizable reporting tool; filter on & output any combination of all fields from order, vendor, payment & other records
  o Ability to export report data with data types that can be opened in Excel, Access, other commonly used tools
• Miscellaneous
• General functionality
  o There should be some sort of audit trail where one can see who may edited information within an order or invoice and when the action took place
  o Integration with ERM and other systems
  o Ease of use – uncluttered interface
• Scope:
  o Ability to security system by institution/accounting unit (don’t need to see orders, payments, budgets, locations, and other codes for out-of-scope institutions)
  o Ability to filter out data not specific to my institution
  o Checks on entering order and payment data that are out of scope (location codes, etc.)
Summary:

Usability & performance

- ILS should have a clean and uncluttered interface
- Interface should start up quickly, respond quickly to input, and should facilitate quick information retrieval
- Interface design should reduce the possibility of human error as much as possible, and should offer a way to easily undo errors
- ILS should have an audit log for changes including staff ID, date/time, and action taken
- ILS workflows should be designed as efficiently as possible, and should be customizable to accommodate the needs of different institutions, as well as to accommodate changes in procedures
- ILS should allow enough space in note fields, data fields, and codes to accommodate institutions’ needs

Scope & scalability

- ILS must accommodate the needs of a large consortial environment, including multiple libraries and separate accounting units within institutions, as well as joint and shared use between institutions
- ILS must be able to accommodate future growth without significantly impacting ILS usability and/or performance
- ILS should allow the flexibility to specify which data may be shared between two or more institutions/accounting units, and which data is specific to an institution or accounting unit
- ILS should have the flexibility to manage shared resources such as EBA/PDA plans

Accounting & budget management

- ILS must be able to interface with institutions’ accounting systems, with real-time or at least daily data synchronization
- Budget and payment changes must be reflected across the system in real-time
- ILS must be able to prevent accidental overspending on a budget, but also permit intentional overspending with permission of the budget manager
- ILS should facilitate end-of-fiscal-year rollover, budget appropriations, and encumbrances for open orders (including anticipated price increases for continuing subscriptions
- ILS should allow changes to closed invoices when permitted by the budget manager

Data retrieval & reports

- ILS must be able to offer a variety of reports for library administration, as well as for managing budgets, orders, and collections
- ILS should include a flexible tool for creating reports that can match and combine data from all fields of all record types (order, invoice/payment, bibliographic, holdings & items, etc.)

Data migration from legacy ILS (Aleph)

- ILS should include historical order and payment data from legacy ILS, or should offer a way to link current order and payment data with legacy data in a data warehouse or similar system
- New ILS should be able to import data from legacy ILS, including:
  - Serials prediction patterns
  - Notes from orders, invoices & payments, subscription records, and serials check-in records
  - TKR fields from holdings records
ILS & discovery ITN Appendix A: Acquisitions & Serials WG review & commentary:

https://docs.google.com/document/d/1R-0ZvdKTk0-iC06R0NrherDCAodnBii07-h5mKKO3Y4/edit?usp=sharing

Supplementary report:

Highlighted portion was included in Summary Report for MCLS May Meeting

Budgets:

- All budgets must reflect real time information as orders are being encumbered and payments are being posted.
- Budget naming conventions should be customizable with enough character spaces to accommodate institutions’ needs.
- Tool for predicting budget appropriations for continuations based on past spending (exclude one-time payments, include price adjustments, etc.)
- Tool for finding and claiming past-due invoices
- Firewall out-of-scope budgets, payments from other accounting units
- Facilitate transfer of funds between budgets
- Budgets can be manually set for over expenditure (set by permission level)
- Budgets allow rollover at the new fiscal year
- Hierarchical system for budgets
- Logs on budget activity
- Retain historic and budget payment info
- Summary views for expenditures with totals by budget, invoice, etc.

Vendor record:

- Enough character space for the vendor code and for the different addresses that some vendors might have.
- Includes a field for vendor code from institutions’ financial systems.
- Comprehensive vendor file(addresses system

Orders:

- Orders should be able to display payment information.
  - There should be a link to navigate from the order to the invoice.
- When creating orders, it should be able to display full vendor information.
  - This will streamline information verification when the order is created. No need to deviate from the order to another module in order to see the full information.
- The system should have an alert when the order we want to encumber does not have enough funds.
- It should allow us to have the option of whether or not to encumber Serials orders.
- The encumbrances for all orders should be automatically reflected within the budget specified.
- If possible, all order log information for open orders in Aleph should migrate into the new ILS system.
- Solution should have an efficient workflow for ordering and paying
- Robust order, payment, budget searching

Invoice/Payments:
- Invoice information that the payee will input must have enough character space for the full information to be visible.
- **ALL fields must be customizable, according to each institutions' needs.**
- System should allow editing a closed/paid invoice.
- System should not need to share payment environments in order to be able to pay invoices. For example all libraries within accounting unit should act independently and not be subjected to coordinating with each other in order to pay several invoices within the same day.
  - The ILS should maintain the whole system environments completely separate between individual libraries within the same university to ensure this.
  - Separating the payment environments also allows the department to be able to pay as many invoices as they deem fit without any limitations in the number of invoices they can process within one day.
- **MUST interface with institutional financial system.**
  - **IF POSSIBLE:** FULL integration preferred. Whatever payment is done in a day is fed instantaneously in the institutional Financial system and vice versa.
- **Invoices/payments:**
  - Tools for calculating cost increases for continuations renewals and payments ($ and %) in real-time
  - Ability to set hard limits on spending
  - Invoices can be edited after being finalized (by permission only)
  - Logs on invoice activity

**Serials records:**
- Migrate current information from the SUBSCRIPTION LIST check in note into a new System.
- Migrate current predictions patterns from Serials records.
- Have access to view institution/accounting unit order records.
- If possible, migrate existing orders with the same Aleph orders #s
- Migrate orders with the current unit price or list price, which should encumber the corresponding fund.
- Migrate holding records with all subfield “X” from field 852
- Migrate TICKLERS from holding records.
- If possible, migrate information from order log.
- Have the capacity to create renewals alerts from the orders.

**Reporting:**
- The system should be able to have all information, whether it be ordering or payment, easily accessible through reports.
- The reports should be customizable within the system.
- Robust, flexible, customizable fund, payment, & order reporting (including data warehouse) [list important Aleph reports & others]
  - Run reports from vendor or user-generated lists (load a file of vendor numbers, order/po number/invoice numbers to produce a report of payments, orders, etc.);
  - Pre-configured (“canned”) reports (like Aleph Arrow and LINCC Reports Service), including:
    - Reports for library administration- e.g. amount spent so far this FY; expected expenditures remaining; real-time fund balances
    - Reports for subject selectors & collection managers, e.g.: cost-per-use; list of resources by format for a particular subject area (or for a particular subject selector or set of subject selectors); ability to define these by institution or sublibrary
    - Reports of commitments, items on order, items received, items paid by fund or selector
Customizable reporting tool; filter on & output any combination of all fields from order, vendor, payment & other records

Ability to export report data with data types that can be opened in Excel, Access, other commonly used tools

- annual statistical & collection reports for ARL, ACRL, etc.
- The ILS system should be linked to our Arrow reporting system.
  o Current Arrow (Serials/Acq) specifically need these reports:
    ▪ Current Commitments and Expenditures
    ▪ Invoice Totals by Date Range
    ▪ All Orders For A Vendor and Date Range
    ▪ Encumbered Orders by Vendor
    ▪ Encumbered Titles per Budget
    ▪ Expenditure Totals by Object Code
    ▪ Expenditures by Amount
    ▪ Expenditures By Object Codes - Titles Paid
    ▪ Monograph Orders Created Within A Date Range
    ▪ Orders and Expenditures by Initiator - Acquisitions Version
    ▪ Orders and Expenditures by Initiator - Current Fiscal Year
    ▪ Orders Arrived but not Completely Invoiced
    ▪ Outstanding Orders by Vendor
    ▪ Paid Total Not Equal to Invoice Amount
    ▪ Payment Lists by Vendor and Date Range
    ▪ Payment Summary by Vendor
    ▪ Payments per Budget
    ▪ Payments Without Object Codes or Order Units
    ▪ Unpaid Invoices
    ▪ Unsent and In Process Orders

**Miscellaneous:**

- There should be some sort of audit trail where one can see who may have edited information within an order or invoice and when the action took place.
- It's essential for us to test the different EDI (ordering, invoicing, and claiming) before going live.
- General functionality
  o Integration with ERM and other systems
  o Ease-of-use- uncluttered interface;
  o List views for orders, payments, budgets--show/hide columns; resize columns; filter and sort; totals for payments; include order numbers and bib info (title, author, imprint, standard number); export to .xlsx and retain data types
  o Change logs for orders, payments, etc.--includes userid, date, and specific change made
  o Limitations to field lengths/naming conventions, etc.
  o Ability and flexibility to process PDA or EBA orders
  o Identifiers of material types and format (currently captured in Aleph by three fields: Material type, material format, and object code)

**Scope:**

- Ability to firewall by institution/accounting unit (don't need to see orders, payments, budgets, locations and other codes for out-of-scope institutions)
- Ability to filter out data not specific to my institution
- Checks on entering order and payment data that are out of scope (location codes, etc.)
NEXT-GEN ILS
CATALOGING/AUTHORITY WORKING GROUP

Report on Current Activities for the Members Council on Library Services Meeting
May 15-16, 2018

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

CURRENT ACTIVITIES:

Review of the Requirements Document, Appendix A of the Previous Invitation to Negotiate (ITN):
Summary Report -- Submitted to the FALSC ILS Implementation Team by the Cataloging/Authorities

The members of the Cataloging/Authorities Working Group (CAWG) convened as directed by the
Member’s Council on Library Services to review the Requirements Document in Appendix A of the
NextGen ILS ITN. As requested, we were looking to suggest clarifications and additional questions where
we felt important issues were not covered in the original document.

To benefit from the knowledge that was gained working with the Sierra project, we tried to keep in mind
things that worked well in that system as we conducted the review adding to our document to include
those desired features. Being most closely interested in cataloging, authorities, holdings maintenance,
item management, data loading and other metadata manipulation and extraction, we focused on the
sections most relevant to those issues. We also looked at specific relevant requirement questions that
were in sections that at first seemed outside of our scope but which were related to our area of interest.

As a general statement of our experience with the existing content, we found many instances where we
had trouble following the meaning that was intended to be communicated. A lot of the editing that is
suggested in our review had to do with these clarifications of wording and phrasing that hampered our
understanding of the meaning of the request.

In our summary below, we follow the layout of the original ITN requirements document but only include
areas that we felt pertained to our working group.

Systems (A)
High-level systems requirements
While we did not make many comments or changes in this area of the document, one revision called for
clear emphasis of the importance of system response time while staff are performing their everyday
tasks. This concern stems, at least in part, from experience with the prior project from which we just
emerged.
A.2. Scalability and Performance
While several of the entries in this section seemed to touch on system performance CAWG felt that “response time” for staff working day-to-day in the system should have been included more strongly and more clearly as a specific required condition.

A.6. Integration and Extensibility
For the question in A.6.7, which talks about support of batch loading and batch updating of all types of records, there was a suggested addition of including a request regarding scheduling capabilities of such loads.

A.8. Migration
In this section, there was a general comment that wanted to know exactly how distinct pieces of item and holdings data would migrate. Is it part of the migration or do we have to negotiate to have all of our item data come over in distinct fields and can we migrate all MARC holdings data as MARC holdings records?

Staff Functions (B)
High-level systems requirements
A comment was added within this section that called out the need to insist that the solution has ADA compliant display capabilities for staff with visual impairments.

B.1.1. Collaboration
An add on comment here sought to determine whether there are scenarios where one part of the system adversely limits or impedes other system functionality.

B.1.4. Serials Management
CAWG felt that a new point should be added here specifically asking about the solution’s ability to handle large numbers of items linked to one bibliographic record like is the case in our shared environment for many longstanding serials titles. Additionally, there should be a description given of how item data for distinct institutions are segregated in the interface so that staff can easily find and work with their institutional records.

B.1.5. E-Resource Management
Several revisions were desired in the section of the document to clarify meaning. One comment had to do with the link checking utility asked about in B.1.5.21. as to whether this referred to checking links in the ERM data or in bibliographic records in the library database.

B.2. Description and Metadata
B.2.1. Cataloging
CAWG had many edits and clarifications throughout the section. The group was often not clear on the meaning of the existing text. A lot of editing is needed in this part of the document to use more standard cataloging terminology and phrasing. In addition to the edits there were some additional things CAWG felt needed to be included in this section such as:
In a shared bibliographic record environment, how would an institution's preferred classification be selected and displayed in that institution’s public catalog?
a) Describe how the solution limits display of local data to local users in the discovery tool.
b) Describe how the solution integrates with the RDA Toolkit.
c) Describe how the solution displays FRBR-LRM relationships in the staff interface.
d) Describe the solution's ability to identify records associated with specific data loads.
e) Can the behavior of the solution's batch loader for vendor records be made consistent with specifications used for imports via external loaders, such as those native to bibliographic utilities or with loaders from multiple metadata systems?

Recommendations

*New section covering item records*

CAWG would suggest including the following in this new section on items:

a) Who can control item records in a joint-use-library scenario? Can the joint-use libraries’ main partner run reports on the shared item records?
b) Explain the relationship between bib, holdings and item records. How are item level details held in the system and how does that relate to holdings records?
c) Describe how item data would migrate to the new system? Would all item data be retained? If not, which pieces of data would be lost?
d) Describe how record formats can be validated for bibliographic, holdings, and item records.
e) Describe how the solution stores and displays permanent and temporary locations, material type, circulation parameters, call numbers, and enumeration/chronology data for individual items in the catalog.
f) Describe how item records are moved from one holdings record or bib record to another.
g) Describe how the available list of collections or locations can be limited to your institution. No more gigantic drop down lists please.
h) Describe how the solution enables and limits individual institutional access to only that institution's item records.
i) Describe how item records can be globally updated. Which fields can be updated?
j) Describe how updates to holdings records are reflected in the item records and vice versa.
k) Describe the solution's ability to display numbered volumes and copies in number order within holdings locations, in both the staff interface and the discovery tool.
l) Describe the level of granularity of reports for item records. Can staff run reports pulling data from different tables (i.e. bibliographic, authority, holdings, item data)?
m) Describe how the solution enables creation of multiple item records for a single resource, e.g. serials and multi-volume sets.

*New section covering Electronic Resources (non-ERM)*

a) Describe how the solution supports the special requirements for electronic resources including PDA/EBA collections concerning batch export/import of data, protecting records from overlay, and the ability to find, edit and retrieve specific record sets.

B.2.2. Holdings Management
This section had quite a few extensive edits in our local review document. These changes were mainly trying to clarify things that we found confusing or misleading in the initial wording.

**B.2.3. Authority Control**
Another section with a lot of edits for clarification.

**B.2.4. Quality Control**
An additional question was added here asking for a description of the solution’s standard reports for link maintenance.

**B.2.5. Metadata Import, Export, Sharing, and Discovery**
Move B.2.4.7. here since it asks a question about staff loads of data from multiple sources with any metadata schema.

**B.3. Circulations and Resource Sharing**
**B.3.1. Borrowing & Lending Processing**
An additional question is suggested to ask about the ability to request individual volumes via ILL.
CURRENT ACTIVITIES:

The Circulation and Resource Sharing Working Group reconvened on 3/14 after a hiatus beginning in December when the implementation halt was announced in order to complete the summary report requested by the Implementation team. The Circulation and Resource Sharing Working Group reviewed the 14ITN – 04AI/Invitation to Negotiate Appendix A - Requirements Document with special attention to Section B.3. Circulation and Resource Sharing.

In Section A, under Extensibility, we suggest that the ability to inventory the system be emphasized along with reporting, automation etc. In Section A.6 Integration and Extensibility we suggest that changes be made to emphasize a focus on tracking automated and staff changes, and for allowing two way updating of information from campus systems such as Banner.

In A.8. Migration we would like to add an emphasis to reports provided before and after the migration of data for duplication and error checking as well as mention specific migration issues like serials predictions as examples of data that will need tracking.

Circulation and Resource Sharing input on sections outside of A and B.3 have been shared the working groups who are addressing those areas. These suggestions, as well as details on the suggestions made on section A have been shared with the Implementation Team and the Project Leaders in a complete track changes document.

The working group’s suggestions on changes to B.3 Circulation and Resource Sharing are to further emphasize:

- Issues with multiple time zones
- Permissions, filtering options, and handling of various functions at library, campus, and institutional level
- Automation of reports and notices
- Tracking of staff and system actions/changes on patron, request, and item records
• Tracking and history of notices sent
• Greater sophistication in the detail and hierarchy of staff permissions including view only options
• Greater sophistication of staff search and filtering options for patrons, items, and loan rule tables
• Customization and scheduling of notices

The working group’s suggestions on changes to B.3 follow in track-changes style.

B.3. Circulation and Resource Sharing

B.3.1. Borrowing & Lending Processing
B.3.1.1. Describe the workflow from the point of an item-level request made by a patron on a local item through to delivery of the item to the patron at the patron’s specified pickup location, including distance learners and joint use facilities, and circulation of the item to the patron. Any differences in the workflow for requesting specific volumes of multi-part items should be noted.

B.3.1.2. Describe how the solution handles multiple branches, campuses/locations, joint use facilities, remote storage facilities, multiple time zones, and special collections within a single institution between libraries and institutions with respect to requesting, circulation, and delivery.

B.3.1.3. Describe how your system can support an “any item, any patron, any library” circulation model within a complex consortial environment. Describe the borrowing and lending, and return workflow of an item-level request made by a patron on a consortial item through to any pickup location within the consortium, website (for electronic delivery), or home-delivery for distance learners.

B.3.1.4. Describe how the solution determines due dates and hold priority at the consortial level given numerous global and library-specific shelving locations, categories of patrons, and material formats.

B.3.1.5. Describe the mechanisms for tracking items in transit for delivery from and to their home libraries and how it would work with home delivery for distance learners.
B.3.1.6. Describe the tools available to manage and balance borrowing and lending requests across member libraries, to target outcomes such as workload fairness and speed of delivery, joint use facilities, as well as billing. Include information about how quickly such changes take effect.

B.3.1.7. Describe how the solution manages circulation of and access to licensed and non-licensed (Open Access) electronic materials, including how the solution would circulate eBooks for consortial/ILL borrowing and lending.

B.3.1.8. Describe how migration, if a rolling migration, to the new solution will support current services such as (see Current Environment). The solution must and interoperate with UBorrow until all CFPP members have migrated.

B.3.1.9. Describe how the solution federates with other circulation platforms, including traditional interlibrary loan systems (ILLiad, RapidILL, WorldShare, Odyssey, Docline, and Clio etc.), for the delivery of electronic and physical materials of items not owned by the consortium members.

B.3.1.10. Describe the ability to create temporary circulation records for ILL items coming from a non-CFPP library, including the process for expunging records after use, and how data is maintained for auditing and statistical purposes.

B.3.1.11. Describe any copyright and licensing compliance tracking procedures, and billing of lost items that your system offers.

B.3.1.12. Describe how the solution will interface with third-party shipping companies to provide tracking of shipped materials.

B.3.1.13. Describe how the solution allows individual locations to control lending and availability of items. Examples: 1.) if a library would like to lend an item to a specific branch but not to other libraries in the state, 2.) if a library would like to prevent requests for items currently available at the library, e.g. to provide lending services but not local holds/paging.

B.3.1.14. Describe the mechanisms for tracking requests from patron initiation to return to lender.

B.3.1.15. Describe how transaction notifications will be generated and made available for
staff review.

B.3.2. Circulation
B.3.2.1. Administrative
B.3.2.1.1. Describe how the solution enables distributed responsibility for maintaining permission to specific circulation functions. How do circulation permissions interface with permissions in other functional areas (e.g., cataloging)?

B.3.2.1.2. Describe how permissions can be assigned to groups, as well as to individuals or individuals, and under what hierarchy permissions are organized. Ex. A student worker is restricted to certain tasks, but a staff member can log in to override for the student. Similarly a staff member is restricted to certain tasks, but a supervisor can log in to override.

B.3.2.1.3. Describe the ability to tailor staff screens by workstation, showing only functions needed by staff at that workstation rather than all available functions. Also describe the ability for staff to visually customize their workscreens.

B.3.2.1.4. Describe the ability of the solution to allow for filtering and advanced searching of patron and item records.

B.3.2.1.5. Describe how the solution provides for the coexistence of consortial (UBorrow), and joint-use lending rules and reciprocal borrowing rules and local lending rules.

B.3.2.1.6. Describe how the solution provides the ability to view-only, edit, and manage lending rules, based on library/campus/institution permissions. Ex. In the case of a wholly shared system where all the rules are viewable by everyone, how is the editing of lending rules restricted to each library/campus/institution?

B.3.2.1.7. Describe any ability of the system to filter views of shared tables so that an institution can limit their view and/or sort tables to focus on only those lines that apply to their institution.

B.3.2.1.8. Describe how the solution integrates lending rules with library hours and closures, including over multiple time zones for a single institution. How does the solution handle 24 hour operations?

B.3.2.2. Billing and Payments
B.3.2.2.1. Describe how the solution manually and automatically generates bills and fees for services, fines, and lost items. Does the solution support the customization of bills and notices (adding the institution’s individual branding, alternate wording for students, faculty, and community borrowers)? Describe the process for sending notices in batch, and for sending (or resending) individual notices.

B.3.2.2.2. Describe the history and detail that is kept on bills and fines. Ex. how are staff changes to fine amounts tracked; how are partial payments tracked and shown in the system.

B.3.2.2.3. Describe how the solution allows libraries to accept payment or waive charges for services, fines, and materials at a service desk in a consortial, branch, and/or campus library.

B.3.2.2.4. Describe the types of payments the solution can accommodate (credit card, cash, campus cash cards, etc.). Is the solution PCI compliant?

B.3.2.2.5. Describe how the solution can transmit and receive patron debit and credit information to and from an institutional business office or external service bureau. Does the solution support two way communication with campus financial systems (Banner, PeopleSoft, and other systems)? Elaborate on vendors you have worked with. How often can data be customized and exchanged between systems?

B.3.2.2.6. Describe how the solution facilitates billing for lost items between consortium libraries. Can bills for lost items be sent directly to the patron from reciprocal lending libraries as well as from their home institution?

B.3.2.2.7. Describe the methods of online fine viewing and payment functions available. Ex. can patrons see fines owed in the online ‘My Library Acct’ feature?

B.3.2.3. Bookings / Scheduling

B.3.2.3.1. Describe how the solution provides for the booking and scheduling of equipment, materials, and rooms, as well as how the solution might be used to book appointments with librarians and other staff. Does the solution support booking directly by the end user? Are all users able to see available times/materials? Does the solution support mobile viewing/usage of the booking system?
B.3.2.3.2. Describe how the solution supports booking in varying time blocks, from a half hour to multiple days, and how it interacts with open hours, holidays and scheduled breaks.

B.3.2.3.3. Describe the display of data in the user interface. Include information on display and functionality.

B.3.2.3.4. Describe how the system supports scheduling issues, exceptions, and modifications.

B.3.2.3.5. Describe how the system handles limits to bookings of the same item and/or total bookings per individual patron and by patron status.

B.3.2.3.6. Describe the notification system related to booking. Is the system mobile accessible? Capable of sending notices of multiple types including email, text, rss, etc.?

B.3.2.3.7. Describe formats/API's that are available to transfer booking data to other external systems, such as reservation systems. Give examples of any successful integrations with other software.

**B.3.2.4. Check-in / Check-out**

B.3.2.4.1. Describe how the solution determines due dates, due times, and fines for check-outs, renewals, recalls (local and consortial), holds, and bookings.

B.3.2.4.2. Describe what options are available when exceptions need to be made, for example backdating check-in or overriding/adjusting a due date/time, and how the functions can be restricted to certain staff accounts.

B.3.2.4.3. Describe the ability to support offline circulation transactions when the system is unavailable. If a site loses access to the shared ILS, what kinds of activities (e.g., check-out, check-in, temporary record creation) would the site be able to continue? Describe the process involved in resynchronizing the local site with the shared ILS after the issue has been resolved. Describe how hourly check-outs/ins would be resynchronized. Ex. a reserves item could be checked out and back in several times while using offline circulation. How does the system handle the resynchronization of this data?
B.3.2.4.4. Describe how the solution handles the manual creation of individual patron records and temporary item records.

B.3.2.4.5. Describe what mechanisms are supported to scan or read material and patron identifiers into the system (e.g., barcodes, RFID tags, mag stripes). Describe how this solution interfaces with a virtual ID card. Describe how the solution supports multiple item or kit check-outs on a single RFID scan.

B.3.2.4.6. Describe the hold and hold shelf management capabilities of the solution, including the inventory and expiration of hold requests and how staff members can pull reports of hold shelf items.

B.3.2.4.7. Describe how the solution handles batch changes to due dates (e.g., emergency closings, holidays).

B.3.2.4.8. Describe how the solution tracks in-house and non-circulating usage.

**B.3.2.5. Collection Management**
B.3.2.5.1. Describe the mechanisms you offer for floating collections on both a local and a consortial level.

B.3.2.5.2. Describe the inventory/collection management tools available in the solution. Describe the workflow for performing an inventory of a collection, including the simultaneous inventory of multiple collections. How does the solution support the use of mobile devices in performing the inventory? Describe how the solution supports inventory of shared collections.

**B.3.2.6. Course Reserves**
B.3.2.6.1. Describe the solution’s course reserves functionality (both print and electronic), including the ability to cross-link courses and items and to suppress temporary items, and customization options for batch management processing based on date/time.

B.3.2.6.2. Describe any copyright and licensing agreements, procedures, and compliance tracking that your system offers.
B.3.2.6.3. Describe how the course reserves functionality supports alternative formats such as digital media (streaming video) and linked resources from a variety of database and content providers.

B.3.2.6.4. Describe the system’s ability to integrate with course management systems (CMS) such as Canvas, Blackboard, and D2L. Describe how the solution supports different CMSs at different institutions. Describe how instructors would embed library resources into their course sites.

B.3.2.6.5. Describe how the system would support the workflow of scanning and uploading files for access in the course reserves interface. Describe which file types are supported by the solution. Describe how access to electronic reserves is controlled (for users only in specific courses) and how time limits are specified. Describe how the system handles expunging or reusing course records, and how deletion is handled.

B.3.2.6.6. Describe the system’s ability to migrate course listings and items from legacy systems (e.g., Ares, Docutek, Aleph) so that staff do not have to re-create classes from previous semesters.

B.3.2.6.7. Describe reports for managing end-of-semester work and other course reserves specific reports. Describe how those reports can be scheduled or automated.

B.3.2.6.8. Describe the process for quick cataloging of instructor-owned or supplied materials.

B.3.2.6.9. Describe the system’s ability to batch process item records when changing item status, availability, check-out time, reserve status, and course listing.

B.3.2.6.10. Describe the system’s ability to customize the time frames that material is placed on reserve; for example, items on permanent reserve, on reserve for one semester, or items that are only needed for reserve use for a limited time within a single semester.

B.3.2.6.11. Describe how access to electronic reserves is controlled (for users only in specific courses) and how time limits are specified.

B.3.2.6.12. Describe how reserves items, courses, and faculty can be searched via the staff interface and also the patron interface.

B.3.2.6.13. Describe how staff views of reserves can be scoped/filtered to show only reserves associated with a specific service point, library, or institution.

B.3.2.7. Describe how the system can communicate/update/receive updates from other reserves management systems. Patrons

B.3.2.7.1. Describe the elements and structure of a patron record in the solution and how patron records are created.
B.3.2.7.2. Describe how the solution allows a patron to access services at multiple CFPP institutions while maintaining a primary affiliation. Describe the ability for the creation of consortial global patron records (to be used to facilitate reciprocal borrowing agreements and intra-institutional pickup and dropoff) where only pertinent patron data is shared (name, ID, expiration), as well as full local patron institutional records.

B.3.2.7.3. Describe how the solution handles a patron with two different types of accounts at the same or two different institutions?

B.3.2.7.4. Describe how the solution allows automatic and manual blocks of patrons from borrowing, using interlibrary loan and other services both at the consortial and local level.

B.3.2.7.5. What types of notes and descriptions are available as part of the block process? Is it possible to block a patron only from certain item statuses or types, while allowing use of others? Is it possible to block use of specific libraries (consortially) or branches (locally)?

B.3.2.7.6. Describe the ability to run reports based on patron block type and notes/descriptions?

B.3.2.7.7. Describe how the solution allows management of patrons (e.g., alumni, community borrowers) who have local privileges, but not consortial privileges or remote access to licensed databases.

B.3.2.7.8. Describe how patron data is retrieved and loaded into the solution. What functionality is in place to allow for individual member institutions to load patron data on an “as needed” basis? How can the institutions customize the patron data that is batch loaded?

B.3.2.7.9. Describe the ability to update patron records both individually and globally. How does the system track staff changes to patron information?

B.3.2.7.10. Describe how the solution protects patron data and privacy. Describe the ability for the creation of consortial global patron records where only pertinent patron data is shared (name, ID, expiration). Can staff permissions be tailored to show only certain patron data at the institutional level?

B.3.2.7.11. Describe how the solution handles proxy users and linkages between accounts.

B.3.2.7.12. Describe how the solution handles duplicate patron records, including mechanisms for identifying possible duplicates.

B.3.2.7.13. Describe the solution to extend borrowing privileges for non-enrolled students and temporarily terminated seasonal staff and/or faculty.
**B.3.2.7.11.-B.3.2.7.14.** Describe the solution to purge inactive patron records (e.g., no fee history and inactive 4 years) from the database.

**B.3.2.8. Patron Self-Service**

B.3.2.8.1. Describe the patron self-service features of the solution, including self-service for such activities as holds, bookings, renewals, notice preferences, and self-updates of patron information.

B.3.2.8.2. Describe how the solution integrates with self-checkout systems.

**B.3.3. Statistics and Reporting**

B.3.3.1. Describe the reporting tools available, including use of the collection and its services (e.g., lending/borrowing, logins to e-resources.).

B.3.3.2. Describe the variables reporting tools use to gather statistics, such as locations, sublocations, collections, call numbers, patron categories, and material formats, or owning library. Note any data fields that are not available for reporting.

B.3.3.3. Describe the ability of the solution to generate lists of records and export the record data into various software programs and formats.

B.3.3.4. Describe the ability of the solution to retain transaction-oriented information (without patron-identifiable data) indefinitely for statistical reporting purposes, even if the associated item or patron has been removed from the system.

B.3.3.5. Describe the ability of the solution to allow for editing of reports for usability and actions by different users, and maintaining the totality of the data while moving through a collection maintenance workflow such as inventory or weeding. Describe how the solution reports transaction errors, patron record errors and other errors, so that staff may take action on them. For example, will an unexpected or incomplete barcode scan generate a notice to staff?

B.3.3.6. Describe the ability of the solution to run reports on changes to patron and item records. Ex. the ability to run reports on blocks placed on patron records.

B.3.3.7. Describe the ability of the solution to report on the history of staff actions or change tracking. Ex. Seeing how many times a record was updated, and what kind of update like a barcode change. Ex. Seeing how many times and/or the last time a patron record was altered, who changed it (staff username), and what field was changed.

**B.3.4. Communications and Notifications**
B.3.4.1. Describe the types of notices and print products which the solution provides (receipts, paging slips/lists, book bands, removable book labels, hold shelf tags, hold shelf removable book labels, pickup, overdue notices and invoices).

B.3.4.2. Describe customization options (e.g., ability to produce a single return receipt for multiple items returned at a single time).

B.3.4.3. Describe the ability to customize, design, and brand both print and electronic notices. Describe any limitations in sending notices via a variety of communication methods (e.g., print, email, SMS). Describe how this is done within the staff interface at the library/campus/institution level.

B.3.4.4. Describe the types of automated patron notifications the solution provides (print, e-mail, SMS). Are their preset types of notifications (e.g., overdue, holds) or can institutions generate customized notifications? Does the solution provide for a customized patron email/text notifications that require a patron to securely login to their ILS account to retrieve pertinent information?

B.3.4.5. Describe the ability for staff communication (local and inter-institutional) about individual transactions (e.g., message alerts in records).

B.3.4.6. Describe how the solution tracks and displays communication history (especially electronic) on the patron and item levels.

B.3.4.7. Describe any limits on notifications, e.g. how many courtesy notices can be sent on an overdue item before an overdue notice is sent, how much time must elapse between notices, how much delay between a request on an item and a notice/pull slip job.

B.3.5. Circulation / ILL integration


B.3.5.2. Provide examples of how the solution integrates with RFID and material inventory sorting systems.

B.3.5.3. Describe how the solution supports extra-consortial circulation transactions and resource sharing beyond basic interlibrary loan that might occur between CFPP members and non-member libraries. For example, several CFPP members maintain resource-sharing agreements with non-member libraries. Describe how this connection could be un-mediated.

B.3.5.4. Describe how the solution supports reading room management applications such as Aeon that link collection level records in the catalog to non-circulating but tracked resources.

C.4.1. Describe how your solution enables interoperability with local online reference
services, social networks, external subject guides, and other electronic services for communication between library users and staff.

C.4.2. Describe the branding and customization options available to libraries at the local level, including capabilities for setting default options from the staff interface.
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CURRENT ACTIVITIES:

This report includes the sections and comments from Discovery Working Group members, FALSC staff, and coordinating suggestions from the Circulation/Reserves Group on the Invitation to Negotiate for the Next Gen ILS project.

FALSC staff made the document available on Google Drive and Discovery Working Group members were invited to add their comments to the document. A number of working group members had no suggestions, others had several.

Comments/suggestions are in bolded red font for clarity. <snip> indicates text deleted for space’s sake, but the headings are retained to maintain automatic heading numbering.

Appendix A - Requirements Document

1. Reliability

1. Describe how the solution minimizes business disruption and maximizes system availability, particularly within the context of a geographically large implementation. What percentage of uptime do you typically deliver? How will you notify CFPP and member libraries of expected and unexpected downtime? What are the biggest risks to the solution, in terms of availability (e.g., power outages, network outages, data corruption, software bugs, reliance on external partners), and how are these risks mitigated? Provide any examples of large outages that have occurred, how long they lasted, and how you resolved them. Describe what maintenance procedures require no user activity during the procedure and indicate how long the procedure would be expected to take given the expected record counts and number of sites. JHD
2. Describe how the solution monitors and reports on system reliability and performance, and provides sample reference data or screenshots of monitoring feedback. If your solution is hosted describe how the staff are informed of the monitoring feedback. (This could also go in A.9.1 Vendor Support) JHD

3. <snip>

4. <snip>

5. What functions are available when the system is offline? If your solution is hosted, how do you handle network issues that prevent access? How does the solution handle loading of records (circulation and other) accumulated during outages? If your solution is hosted, how are staff informed of the network issue? JHD

2. Scalability and Performance
   <snip>

3. Architecture
   1. <snip>
   2. <snip>
   3. <snip>
   4. <snip>
   5. <snip>
   6. <snip>
   7. <snip>
   8. <snip>
   9. <snip>
   10. <snip>
11. We want to free our staff up from being "desk bound." Describe how accessible your solution is through mobile devices. Will the solution support a variety of devices, browsers, and operating systems? Is the solution interface optimized for small screens and touch input? Describe which staff functions are available on a mobile device. Does this include the ability to use a device's included camera (or an attached barcode scanner) to scan barcodes and have them read correctly by the NGILS?

12. <snip>

13. Will FLVC staff be able to run jobs via a cron utility? If not, then describe what interface you have for running scheduled jobs. Since we run jobs for institutions throughout the state, we need a flexible mechanism to notify institutions automatically when their jobs are complete. These notifications need to be able to go out to specific institutions, and differentiate job types, e.g. e-resource records, outsourced bibliographic records, patron records, Acquisitions Orders, etc. Do you provide such a mechanism, or provide FLVC staff access to a Linux/Unix mail utility so we can do so? In addition, we will need to have access to job logs to troubleshoot problems with loads. JohnS

4. Data Security and Data Access

1. <snip>

2. <snip>

3. <snip>

4. <snip>

5. <snip>

6. <snip>

7. Describe how the solution tracks changes to different types of records. Is there an audit trail for edits? Is it possible to revert to previous versions of a record? If an audit trail exists, describe how it is viewed and what data it contains. JHD

8. <snip>
5. Authentication, authorization and identity management

Should we separate patron from staff authentication (discovery purposes of logging in versus LMS purposes of logging in)? One commented recommended that they should be separated because many library staff are in multiple roles (e.g., staff and patron).

1. <snip>

2. <snip>

3. <snip>

4. <snip>

5. <snip>

6. <snip>

7. Describe your support for single sign-on authentication and authorization solutions for staff and patrons (e.g., CAS, LDAP, Shibboleth, and Microsoft’s Identity and Access Management solution). Describe how you would implement a consortial system in which the member libraries use different means of single sign on.

6. Integration and Extensibility

1. <snip>

7. Reporting

1. <snip>

2. Describe the types of out-of-the-box analytics and reports provided with your system. How will staff discover these reports, and are descriptions and sample reports be available? What is the expected run-time for any report run for all institutions? What is the expected run time for complicated reports against large data (i.e., the bibliographic file)? Can multiple reports be run simultaneously? JHD

3. <snip>

4. <snip>

5. <snip>
6. <snip>

7. If configuration tables are needed to support specific reports (such as call number reports), describe how these tables are created and maintained. Can they be uploaded from Excel or similar files? JHD

8. Migration
1. <snip>
2. <snip>
3. <snip>
4. Specifically describe your recommended training plan for CFPP staff and member libraries. Do you provide face-to-face training and/or a "train the trainer" approach? Is online training available? Will staff have access to a training database with relevant data? How often will the training and test databases be refreshed to match the production database? What data is refreshed (data, configuration tables, etc.)? {NOTE: this might belong in a different section than migration} JHD

5. <snip>

6. <snip>
7. <snip>
8. <snip>

9. Vendor support
1. <snip>
2. <snip>
3. Describe your customer support model. For example, would you accept support requests from any CFPP staff member or only from designated representatives? How do you prioritize strategies to address reported issues/concerns? Do you provide a primary contact(s) for a given customer account, or do you provide support by geographic region, or by area of specialty (e.g., circulation, cataloging)? Describe your customer support model. For example, would you accept support requests from any FLVC staff member or only from designated representatives? ADD: Would you accept support requests from a staff member at one of our institutions? JHD

4. <snip>
5. <snip>
6. <snip>
7. <snip>
8. <snip>

B. Staff Functions
1. Collections and Resource Management
   1. Collaboration
      <snip>

   2. Integration
      <snip>

3. Acquisitions Management
   1. <snip>

   2. <snip>

   3. <snip>

   4. <snip>

   5. <snip>

6. Describe how the system alerts or produces an error report for orders that do not have sufficient funds. **Reword:** Describe system safeguards to prevent overspending on a fund

   7. <snip>

   8. <snip>

   9. <snip>

   10. <snip>

   11. <snip>

   12. <snip>

13. <snip>

14. <snip>
15. <snip>

16. Describe what records or data are stored in the solution from acquisition processes and for how long. Can individual institutions choose custom retention periods for specific kinds of data? What kind of audit trail is available? Are reports available in print and electronic formats for storage? How long are reports available? **Add/clarify: Describe system capability for archiving and reporting financial data and expenditures for previous fiscal years.**

17. <snip>

18. <snip>

19. <snip>

4. **Serials Management**
   1. <snip>

5. **E-Resource Management**
   1. <snip>

6. **Collection Maintenance**
   1. <snip>

2. **Description and Metadata**
   1. **Cataloging**
      1. <snip>

   **B. 2.1.17** Describe your plans for MARC to BIBFRAME conversion within your system. JohnS

   2. **Holdings Management**
      <snip>

   3. **Authority Control**
      <snip>
4. **Quality Control**
   
   1. <snip>

   B. 2.4.9 Describe how batch deletions work in your system. Is there easy functionality for identifying records for batch deletion? Is there an “intelligent” batch delete, i.e. when items are deleted, holdings without additional items attached will be deleted; when holdings are deleted, bibliographic records without any other holdings, or items, attached will be deleted. Is there way to turn off “intelligent deletion” when desired, e.g. deletion of bibliographic records regardless of attached records? JohnS

5. **Metadata Import, Export, Sharing, and Discovery**

   Comment re B.2.6.1 In most cases, I would assume this would be the discovery layer as with III. The time it took III to initially answer this question was a good indication of the inherent difficulties with the solution.

6.  
   1. Describe how the solution ingests data from different CMS and DAMS, such as CONTENTdm, Digital Commons, DSpace, Islandora, and SobekCM. Are digital collections records harvested into what could be described as the catalog, or are they harvested into the discovery layer? JamieR

   2. <snip>

   3. <snip>

   4. Describe the solution’s harvesting capabilities so that metadata does not need to be imported on a record or collection basis. If there is a harvesting mechanism, what are the harvesting schedules, and what methods are used for de-duping harvested records? Is it compatible with the OAI-PMH protocol? **Does your system provide OAI harvesting of fields beyond the standard Dublin Core format?** JohnS

   5. Describe how the solution integrates digital collections and archival materials into a common interface that the users can access easily. **Specifically address any differences between indexing, retrieval and display of digital collections and bibliographic records.** LydiaM
6. Describe the solution’s capabilities to customize discovery results based on metadata and unique collection characteristics. Describe the system’s ability to display embedded representations such as thumbnails and video. Specifically address facets, limits, and visual presentation. What about audio as well?

7. Describe any differences between the ability to customize digital collection or imported/harvested data indexing, display and discovery results and bibliographic data indexing, display and discovery results. LydiaM

8. Does the solution allow for indexing and facet display of metadata specific to digital collections such as collection name? LydiaM

3. Circulation and Resource Sharing

   1. Borrowing & Lending Processing
      1. <snip>
      2. <snip>
      3. <snip>
      4. <snip>
      5. <snip>
      6. <snip>
      7. <snip>
      8. <snip>
      9. <snip>
      10. <snip>
      11. <snip>
      12. <snip>

   2. Circulation
      1. Administrative
         1. <snip>
4. Describe how the solution provides for the coexistence of consortial, and joint-use lending rules and local/reciprocal lending rules. *Added the word reciprocal* cc

5. <snip>

6. <snip>

2. Billing and Payments
   1. <snip>

3. Bookings / Scheduling
   1. <snip>

4. Check-in / Check-out
   1. <snip>
   2. <snip>
   3. <snip>
   4. <snip>
   5. <snip>
   6. <snip>
   7. <snip>

B.3.2.4.8 Describe how the solution tracks and reports in-house and non-circulating usage.

5. Collection Management
   1. <snip>
   2. Describe the inventory/collection management tools available in the solution. Describe the workflow for performing an inventory of a collection, including the simultaneous inventory of multiple collections. How does the solution support the use of mobile devices in performing the inventory? Describe how the solution supports inventory of shared collections. *How*
does the solution support collection management specifically for both print and electronic monographs, and for both print and electronic serials?

3. Describe how, or if, your system interfaces with collection assessment tools, such as Bowker’s Book Analysis System (BBAS). JohnS

6. Course Reserves
   1. <snip>

11. Describe the reporting system for items on reserve and the circulation of those items within specific time periods (e.g., how many a specific item circulated while on reserve for a given semester).

7. Patrons
   <snip>

8. Patron Self-Service
   1. <snip>

3. Statistics and Reporting
   1. <snip>

4. Communications and Notifications
   1. <snip>
   2. <snip>
   3. <snip>
   4. Describe the ability to customize notice frequency by type of notice and by branch or institution. cc
   5. <snip>
   6. <snip>

5. Circulation / ILL integration
   1. <snip>
C. Discovery and User Experience

Library users expect a Google-like search experience and often do not understand the myriad resource silos and access restrictions that they encounter when searching library collections. CFPP seeks a discovery solution that is capable of supporting a consortium implementation of the scale of CFPP member libraries. This discovery solution must support users' research needs, enabling them to locate and access relevant resources efficiently. We seek a solution that can do this by seamlessly integrating resource silos, providing a more feature-rich search interface than has typically been found in library systems, and facilitating access to resources from multiple data sources. At the same time, the discovery solution should provide search options for experienced researchers who require a greater level of control and specificity in an interface. CFPP’s 40 member institutions include a wide range of academic institutions, from comprehensive research universities to community colleges, from specialized universities granting professional degrees to undergraduate liberal arts colleges. We seek a discovery solution that will serve the widely disparate needs of our diverse population of library users without sacrificing the flexibility to adapt as both user needs and technological requirements develop. We need a discovery system that will include a statewide interface where the holdings and items of all 40 institutions will be represented, but which also offers an interface for each of the 40 institutions so their users can see just what is held at their institution.

High Level User Experience Requirements

Users should have access to all of the content that is available to them. Whether content comes from books and other tangible items or in silos of digital information, it should all be visible and accessible to the user. The solution should show users the resources that are available to them and provide accurate information about accessing those that are not immediately available. Clear pathways should be provided to help connect the user with the resources and context-specific help within the user interface. Users should be able to control search limits and preferences, manage lists, and request, check out, and renew library materials from within the discovery tool. The solution should be available to users with disabilities, with wide ranges of experience as researchers, and who access information from different technology platforms or devices. User credentials from multiple institutions and sources should authenticate seamlessly. As with all user interfaces, the discovery
tool should be constantly updated to include new technologies and new sources of information.

**Note:** Vendors may choose to respond to the requirements in this section with their own discovery interface and associated central index or with a solution from other third-party vendors. If proposing multiple solutions from third-party vendors, repeat this section as necessary. It may be necessary to work with third-party vendors to complete this section.

1. **Discovery**
   1. Describe how the proposed solution provides library users with an intuitive interface that searches disparate resource silos (e.g., local returnable and/or digital collections, vendor-supplied electronic resources, manuscripts and archival material), enables users to create searches in their own words, retrieves relevant items available to them regardless of format or physical location, and displays, organizes, and limits search results in an understandable and logical manner. Describe how the proposed solution provides access to these resource silos both separately and together. *Describe the ability of the solution to normalize differing labels and status language among institutions with slight variations in record fields and icons.* Ex. if an ebook appear in the union catalog for UWF it might say "For off campus access, students can login here" whereas for FSU is might say "To read this book students must be affiliated with the university". It would make the system cleaner AND easier for the patron to read if the language was the same across all institutions.
   2. Describe how records not included in the ILS (e.g., open access journals, digital library records, and sets of records from outside sources) can be included in discovery.
   3. Describe how individual institutions can customize the display to meet the needs of their users (e.g., customization of icons, embargo periods for articles). *Also related to C.1.4 - is there local customization of facets/search criteria? i.e. turn on/off, relabel, -JB*
   4. Describe how your solution enables users to refine the search by criteria such as availability, collection, location, creation or publication date, format, subject, and version or resource type (e.g., magazine vs. academic journal). Include a comprehensive list of all refinement criteria supported by the system.
   5. Describe how your solution facilitates both known-item searches and open-ended searches. Describe how author/title searching, uniform title searching, and subject searching is handled. *Describe the types of searches offered (e.g., keyword, browse, combined, numeric). Describe/ list the fields that can be searched in a numeric type of search.*
   6. Describe browse (left anchored) search options in the discovery tool.. Can subject browse be searched by subdivision? Describe how call number
browse/shelflisting is supported; how are the different call number schema supported for sorting?

7. Describe how your solution facilitates expert searching features for researchers who require more control in formulating search statements and handling results. **For example, describe how one would do a keyword search and narrow the results by subject words/terminology.**

8. Describe how your solution recommends subjects or other terminology, alternate titles, spelling corrections, and other ways to help users identify and use alternate search strategies. **Describe how authority records are used in a search result display to redirect patron searches appropriately.**

9. Describe how your solution manages and enables users to locate course reserve materials. Describe the options available to faculty to request that an item be placed on course reserves.

10. What supplemental and contextual information from outside sources does your solution provide about items such as book covers, tables of contents, indexes, reviews, and other content previews that enrich the user’s understanding of the nature and content of items and collections? Describe how this information is configured and displayed in the discovery tool. List the outside sources (e.g., Syndetics, Google) that are currently in use by institutions that use the discovery tool. What additional sources of linked data are available?

11. Describe how the discovery tool incorporates FRBR recommendations in a consortial environment and at the institutional level.

12. Describe your results ranking given the challenge of integrating traditional catalog materials, local digital collections, and articles in a single interface. Describe the search algorithm and its availability to the consortium.

13. What default sorting/ranking options are available to the user? Describe relevancy ranking results and the solution’s ability to switch from relevancy ranking to date order. Describe how results ranking can be customized at the institution level.

14. Describe the interface for the combined catalog of all 40 institutions. How do users navigate between the individual institution holdings and the combined holdings? Address how users are able to view and navigate between results at the library, campus, institution, and consortial levels. Describe the interface customizations available at the institution level.

15. Describe how the discovery tool interfaces with Web browsers and social media. Are institutional holdings and knowledge bases discoverable? Does the link resolver smoothly interface with Web browsers?

16. Does the system learn from use in the relevancy algorithm? Does it consider how often users explore the item, request it, and/or place it in a folder?

17. **Has the discovery system been implemented in a large, multi-member system (if so describe the implementation that most closely resemble**
the current ITN)? If not, will the system scale or will the system need to be built to accommodate (please describe)? -JB

2. **Licensed Content Management**
   1. Describe how your discovery solution can use other central indexes and link resolvers.
   2. Provide a list of proprietary content that is included in your product (e.g., Web of Science, PsycINFO).
   3. What is the process for negotiating access to content from other content providers to your index? What is the typical length of time to add a new source once the external content provider supplies the data?
   4. Describe how the discovery tool identifies the electronic resource information (e.g., does it clearly provide the database name?).
   5. Describe the process for managing the settings for core central index content for each instance (consortium, institution, campus/library, and joint use facility).
   6. Describe how your system refreshes licensed content. How frequently is content added/updated?
   7. Describe how you provide updates related to new core index data sources and depth of coverage to customers. What is the frequency of this communication?
   8. If multiple resource options are displayed for a search result, can the library prioritize the order of resources displayed? Where is this configured?
   9. How does the discovery platform search content not included in the core index but licensed by an institution?
   10. Describe when user authentication is required to see all results. What resources require this log in for full discovery?
   11. How do you participate in open discovery (e.g., do you provide your content to other vendors for use by subscribers of your content who use other discovery platforms)?
   12. How does your system handle duplication (i.e., the same article from multiple sources within the core index data)? Can the system show or link to all the original records as they appear in their data sources for a set of duplicates?
   13. How does your system handle duplication within locally supplied union catalog data?
   14. How are results from local holdings and the core index blended in the result set?

3. **User/System Interaction**
   1. Describe how your solution will enable users to discover the availability, status, and location of specific resources.
   2. Describe how accessing of materials is offered to the users. Describe retrieval options for the resources. Can eBooks be downloaded directly from the discovery tool?
3. Describe how your solution allows configuration of facets for results. Describe how the solution manages coding of MARC fixed and variable field elements and integrates them into facet categories. Describe configuration options at both the institution and consortial level.

4. How can your solution be customized to accommodate individual library policies? For example, does it allow particular patron groups to place hold requests, or give particular patron groups permission to request items for purchase?

5. How does your solution enable users to borrow or request items from their own institution’s collections, from other institutions in the consortium or from other libraries outside the consortium?

6. How does your solution enable users to borrow or request tangible items from their own institution’s collections, from other institutions in the consortium or from other libraries outside the consortium?

7. Describe the user interface used when updating information, checking a circulation account, or processing a renewal. Can the solution import and display information from external systems (e.g. ILL, reserves) to provide an integrated user dashboard?

8. Describe how your solution enables users to create, mark, save, print, email, text, share, cite or export single items or lists of items to citation management, word processing, or other productivity software. Describe how your solution can employ citation apis for those same functions listed above. Can saved searches be limited in scope to locations, branches or special collections?

9. Describe the help available to users from within your solution’s interface. Does the solution provide tutorials using lay terms for the user rather than library staff?

10. Describe how your solution enables users to set and receive alerts and notifications about the status of specific items or categories of items available to them through an intuitive interface.

11. Describe how users interact with the solution through tagging, recommending, sharing, or writing reviews of resources. Describe options for local tags. How are tags mediated and searched? Describe the system timeout and logout functions are controlled so that users are taken back to their institution’s (not the union discovery or catalog) discovery page.

12. Describe how your solution incorporates item location and mapping either through native functionality or third party tools.

4. Interface Design and Integration

1. Describe how the user interface is accessible to users with disabilities (ADA compliant).

2. What display and navigation language(s) does your discovery tool support?

3. Describe how the solution accommodates the current proliferation of browsers, operating systems, and devices (e.g., is the user experience platform agnostic
and responsive?). Describe how your end-user interface works regardless of access mode.

4. How is user feedback obtained and used to drive system/interface changes? What is your release cycle for system fixes, enhancements, changes, etc.? How is user feedback shared with member institutions and CFPP?

5. Describe your approach to evaluating and improving the usability of your solution.

6. Describe how your solution enables interoperability with local online reference services, social networks, external subject guides, and other electronic services for communication between library users and staff.

7. Describe the branding and customization options available to libraries at the local level, including capabilities for setting default options from the staff interface.

5. **Extendability and User-Contributed Data**
   1. Describe the mechanisms available to CFPP and member institutions to integrate discovery tool information into other interfaces (like websites) or to bring data into the discovery tool (such as Google maps). Are there widgets or APIs for these purposes? What are your use policies for the APIs? What level of technical knowledge is needed to use these APIs? Describe support services available to library staff for using APIs with the discovery tool.
   2. Describe your company’s policies on backing up, recovering, and purging user-supplied data. For example, how might you handle a user who has accidentally deleted a resource list created in your solution, or one who no longer wants information he/she contributed to be available through the solution?

6. **Independent Discovery Tools**

   *Note: All vendors should respond to this section, even if they are proposing their own discovery interface. This section is intended to determine the capability of your ILS to integrate with outside discovery tools.*

   1. <snip>

D. **Joint Use Facilities**
   
   <snip>

   1. **Administration**
      1. <snip>

   2. **Circulation**
      1. <snip>
3. **Holds/ Intra-consortial Loans/ Interlibrary loan**
   1. <snip>

4. **Cataloging and Acquisitions**
   1. <snip>

5. **Billing and Payments**
   1. <snip>

6. **Reports**
   1. <snip>

7. **Discovery Tool**
   1. <snip>
CURRENT ACTIVITIES:

The ERM Working Group completed our suggested updates and additions to the ERM section of the ITN.

I. Describe ERM system functionality in general.
   a. What are the primary capabilities?
   b. What are the most common help desk requests?
   c. What enhancements and fixes are on the road-map for the next 12 months?

II. Resource records
   a. Describe creation, maintenance, and removal of electronic resource records, including representation of packages, and parent/child resources. Describe creation of records via upload from spreadsheet, MARC, .csv, etc.
   b. Describe sharing of records in a consortia.
   c. Describe use of templates.
   d. Describe fields available in resource records, such as title, alternate title, date-based fields, subject terms, URL, access information, etc.
   e. Describe how a library can create a new field (such as a free-text note field, a date field, or a numerical field), i.e., a field that does not already exist within the system. Describe whether this field can be specific to one library or must be shared across consortia or all system users.
   f. Describe searching for resource records. Describe options for limiting by holding library, material type/type of resource, vendor, and other limiters.
   g. Describe navigating from the resource record to associated license(s), contact record(s), statistics, and acquisitions/order data.

III. Acquisitions/cost
   a. How are resource records and order/acquisitions data linked?
   b. How is cost per use generated? Describe options to generate this per fiscal or calendar year. Ability to generate cost per use is required.
   c. Describe management of subscription renewals.
   d. Describe management of DDA/PDA/EBA materials.
IV. Contact records/data
   a. Describe the creation, maintenance, and removal of contact records, including where data comes from. Describe creation of records via upload from spreadsheet.
   b. Describe sharing of contact records in a consortium.
   c. Describe how sensitive data in contact records (such as passwords) can be restricted to authorized individuals.
   d. Describe how resource records and contact records are linked. Can contacts be linked to multiple resources?

V. Licensing
   a. Describe management of licenses and license terms. How do license terms get entered into the system?
   b. Can license documents be attached or uploaded to the system?
   c. Describe option for tracking perpetual access. Describe system options for tracking entitlements automatically from license and/or EDI data.
   d. Can select license terms be displayed to the public, such as public performance rights, interlibrary loan terms, and prohibitions on automated gathering of data?
   e. Describe where license terms can be displayed. Does this include the database list, the journal list, and the catalog? Please detail options for display.
   f. Describe license templates.
   g. Does the system support SERU?
   h. How are resource records and licenses linked? Can licenses be linked to multiple resources?

VI. Workflow
   a. Describe workflow management, assigning of tasks, reminder/tickler systems.
   b. Describe how workflows include acquisitions, collection management, cataloging, and discovery elements.

VII. Batch management/processing
   a. Describe options for adding, changing, and removing data in batch. Describe how both fixed and variable length fields can be managed in batch (i.e., codes and free-text).
   b. Describe use of templates, constant data, or other mechanisms for making manual entry more efficient.

VIII. Reporting and Notifications
   a. Describe reporting options. Describe standard reports and ability to customize. Describe output options such as XML, Excel, email, etc.
   b. Describe output options for groups of records, such as for use in the library website, catalog, or newsletters. If output can be updated automatically via API, describe this as well.
   c. Describe “overlap analysis” reports between packages regardless of whether the packages are subscribed/owned or not. Is analysis at the title or holdings range
level? Describe option for comparisons between existing package and uploaded holdings from a library's collection (such as print holdings).

d. Describe support for common statistical needs such as ACRL reports.

e. Describe how the following reports can be generated:

i. Contact Reports based on specific roles:
   1. Such as sales representatives, support desk for individuals;
   2. Types of agency such as publisher, consortia, and university.
   3. Functionality, such as IP Ranges. Is there a report which can inform all vendors about IP changes via email.

ii. Resource record reports:
   1. Lists of all databases based on various criteria, such as active/cancelled; current and past cost; number of simultaneous users; renewal dates, etc.
   2. Resources Renewals spreadsheet filtered by a specific date

iii. License reports:
   1. All current licenses sorted by start date or end date
   2. License templates
   3. Reports of specific terms for all current licenses, such as all interlibrary loan/resource sharing terms or all copyright terms.

iv. Notes and comments reports: output of all notes and comments entered by staff for selected types of records, such as downtime and problem logs.

v. Statistics metadata report: a report of the URL, user IDs and passwords for obtaining usage statistics

vi. Administrative metadata report: a report of the URL, user IDs and passwords for admin site log-in.

IX. Consortia

a. Describe the functions that support consortia, such as consortia purchases (with varied groups of libraries) and tracking usage of consortia purchases. Ability to support consortia purchases is required.

b. Describe how access to ERM records is handled at the institution versus the consortia level. For example, can portions of the ERM component be limited for viewing/editing at the institutional level, whereas other portions be available at the consortia level?

c. Describe any tables or field options that must be shared by all consortia members, such as lists of subject headings or code lists.

X. API

a. Describe API options and costs. For example, can libraries use APIs to customize interactions between the ILS and other systems, including public facing and back end systems? If yes, does this happen in real time? Are the interactions bi-directional?
XI. Databases list
   a. Describe public-facing database a-z list.
   b. Describe options which support display of consortia purchases at both a
      consortia and individual library list.
   c. Describe options for display or suppression of fields.
   d. Describe options for sorting or listing resources by subject, material type,
      vendor, etc. in the public a-z list.
   e. Describe options to display notification of resource downtime, trials,
      new resources and other temporary alerts.
   f. Describe options for notifying the public of limited use conditions such as
      limited simultaneous uses or limited number of uses per year.
   g. Describe options for individual institutions to customize the display of the
      public a-z list.
   h. Describe how the database list uses resource and/or bibliographic records.
      Describe the connections or relationship with the catalog/discovery layer.

XII. Discovery
   a. Describe how resource records, related bibliographic and license data,
      are represented in the catalog and/or discovery layer.

XIII. Knowledge base
   a. Describe the knowledge base. What is the frequency of updates? What is
      the source of kb information? How do you solicit current information from
      vendors and publishers? Which vendors and publishers do you work with?
      Which do you not work with? What kind of materials are included in the kb?
      (e.g., journals, eBooks, streaming videos, archival collections)?
   b. What kind of holding/coverage dates are supported (e.g., MMDDYYYY,
      annuals, volumes, issues, seasons, embargoes, rolling access)?
   c. Describe the a-z journals list (i.e., searchable list displayed to the public,
      with links to library's holdings). Can an a-z list for eBooks and other
      non-serials content also be created? Ideally, the a-z will be customizable so
      that serial and non-serial a-z lists can be combined or presented separately,
      according to each library’s preference.
   d. Describe options to include print periodicals in a-z journals list.
   e. How do library staff maintain their holdings? Demonstrate selecting and
      deselecting titles and packages. Demonstrate how consortia holdings may
      be managed in this way.
   f. Describe how library staff can upload a KBART spreadsheet for a resource
      not represented in the kb (either a local collection or a purchased one).
   g. Describe how library staff can report kb errors and request that packages
      be added. What is the typical turnaround time for error corrections?
   h. Describe options for selectively downloading from the kb.
i. Describe batch-editing and updating options.

j. Can the kb distinguish OA/Free content? Ideally, OA/Free is an attribute that both staff and the public can search and filter on.

k. Are descriptions of packages/content provided? What descriptive elements are included? Which can be searched or filtered on by staff and public?

XIV. Linking
   a. Describe the link resolver.
   b. Describe support of OpenURL linking. Which version of OpenURL is used? Support of OpenURL is required.
   c. Describe link-checking capabilities. Describe reporting options of link-checker. Describe how the library staff work through these error reports.
   d. Describe the role of DOIs.
   e. Describe support for use of PURLs.

XV. Open access
   a. Describe support for identifying and managing Open Access titles and resources.
   b. Describe support for oaDOI to check for Open Access.

XVI. Proxy
   a. Describe integrated proxy tool or how the system integrates with an external product such as EZproxy.
   b. Describe how system handles proxy strings: does each URL require the proxy to be attached individually or are there universal options? At what levels can the proxy be set: title, package, contact/provider?
   c. How can OA and free resources be managed in light of proxy tools?

XVII. Standards
   a. Describe support of standards, including SUSHI, COUNTER, SERU, OpenURL, and KBART.

XVIII. Usage statistics
   a. Describe support for gathering usage statistics, including use of current COUNTER and SUSHI standards.
   b. Describe manual gathering of statistics.
   c. Describe gathering of non-COUNTER statistics.
   d. Describe storage of usage statistics; how many years can be held?
   e. Describe how to gather usage statistics by calendar year, fiscal year, and monthly.
   f. Describe which of the COUNTER-compliant vendors on the COUNTER site (http://beta.projectcounter.org/compliantvendors.html) you can accept COUNTER data from, and from which you can accept COUNTER data via SUSHI.

XIX. DO NOT INCLUDE
   a. “Support of digitized resources and online archives” was included in the original ERM section of the ITN. However, this isn’t in ERM function. The Discovery
WG was charged with Digital Collections. This element should be in the Discovery section of the ITN rather than ERM.
REPORT ON CURRENT ACTIVITIES FOR THE MEMBERS COUNCIL ON LIBRARY SERVICES MEETING

May 15-16, 2018

CHAIR: Janice Henderson

FALSC LIAISONS: Wendy Ellis and Chrissy Cogar (and Mary Ann O’Daniel)

CURRENT ACTIVITIES:
Reported on the ITN document and impressions of the Working Group Communications and Structure as requested.

The Joint Use Working Group recommends that each MCLS Standing Committee have at least one member that is from a Joint-Use facility (host or joint-use involved partner) and that each of those designated committee members meet regularly as a Joint-Use subcommittee.

The following is a summary of the information on Joint Use and the issues discovered and addressed during the ILS Joint-Use Working Group activities.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Host</th>
<th>Partner</th>
<th>Host</th>
<th>Partner</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Broward College, University/College Library</td>
<td>Florida Atlantic University, Davie</td>
<td>Lake-Sumter State College, Leesburg</td>
<td>University of Central Florida, Leesburg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College of Central Florida, Ocala</td>
<td>University of Central Florida</td>
<td>Lake-Sumter State College, South Lake</td>
<td>University of Central Florida</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daytona State College, Daytona</td>
<td>University of Central Florida</td>
<td>New College of Florida</td>
<td>University of South Florida, Sarasota-Manatee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastern Florida State College, Cocoa</td>
<td>University of Central Florida</td>
<td>Seminole State College, Altamonte Springs</td>
<td>University of Central Florida</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastern Florida State College, Palm Bay</td>
<td>University of Central Florida</td>
<td>Seminole State College, Sanford/Lake Mary</td>
<td>University of Central Florida</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florida Atlantic University, Boca Raton</td>
<td>Palm Beach State College, South</td>
<td>University of West Florida, Emerald Coast Campus, Fort Walton Beach</td>
<td>Northwest Florida State College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florida State University, College of Engineering</td>
<td>Florida A&amp;M University, College of Engineering</td>
<td>Valencia College, Osceola</td>
<td>University of Central Florida</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Joint Use

Joint Use takes different forms between institutions across Florida. There are currently 15 Joint Use Host/Partner pairs. A library is considered a host if they are the library that either physically houses the material for patrons to use or hosts electronic resources through their discovery tool.

Cataloging/Circulation Issues

The most common Joint Use form involves a large institution partner that has a large commuter student population that has MOUs with many small college hosts spread out across the state. The large institution buys physical materials and disperses them for shelving to the smaller colleges for the benefit of both student populations.

- Issues
  - The large institution buys/owns items shelved elsewhere. They want to be able to get statistics on their use, do inventory, but they need to be able to circulate from the smaller college where items are housed to both the large institution and the smaller host college’s students easily.
  - Currently in ALEPH items are silo-ed by institution - the work around for inventory has been to create an item record for the large institution and then to create another item record once it is received at the host institution. It would be nice if only one item record were necessary and staff at both institutions could view/edit the item.
  - Currently in ALEPH patrons are silo-ed by institution. Depending on how the Joint Use items are cataloged either the partner or host’s patrons have to be manually added in order to check items out. It would be nice if staff at any institution could access publically available parts of any patron record to be able to verify that the patron is in good standing, and easily checkout material to them.
  - The large institution’s discovery tool needs to show the items bought by the large institution that are shelved at the smaller institutions and provide a way to request the items that is not consortial borrowing.
  - Big wish: Large institution students should have small institution’s loan policies when walking in to retrieve and check out items, they should have the large institution’s loan policies if they request the item for retrieval from the large institution’s discovery tool, but they should have consortial borrowing policies if that same item is pulled for unmediated consortial borrowing (what we call U Borrow - which we currently use the ALEPH ILL module to accomplish). It would be best for this to be accomplished with one global patron record.
Discovery Tool/Authentication Joint Use Issues

- Joint Use MOUs can sometimes also allow access to eResources. A patron from one institution may have the right to view all or some portion of another institution’s eResources. Being able to authenticate once in a local Discovery Tool and being able to move to another institution’s Discovery Tool without issue depending on the patron’s affiliation would be highly valuable.
- There are instances where a large institution and a small institution have a joint use agreement where each of their students are allowed to freely use each other’s libraries physical resources but can only use their home libraries eResources.
  - Issues
    - When either student population view their local discovery tool they can’t easily see everything that is available to them. For example, UWF Emerald Coast and NWFSC Fort Walton Beach share a physical location on NWFSC’s campus. UWF catalogs all items housed there. Both UWF and NWFSC students need to see all these items in their local discovery tool.
    - While physical items should be viewable in both local discovery tools the eResources should only be viewable and available through the home institution from off campus.
- A host library’s licensed content allows on site use of electronic resources for all patrons including community patrons. However, if a joint use patron logs in to the discovery tool with the home institution’s credentials those students are locked out of the joint use facility’s electronic resources and are only be able to access their home institution’s eResources even when they are onsite in a library.

Staff Account Issues
- Staff at some joint use facilities may work at both the host and the partner’s facilities and may also be a student at one/both/other institutions.

Joint Use Working Group Recommendations on Communication and Structure

Continuation of Working Group/Discussion Group Structure

We recommend maintain the working group as nimble group (on hiatus for now) that can evaluate and respond to new questions/new implementations/new policies as needed. There may be some need to create a limited time window for current members to opt out, and new members to apply, since the mission is shifting a bit, current folks could re-evaluate their participation. The discussion group should stay open and be encouraged to have at least one member from each joint-use facility host and partner to be on the group.
Feedback on Implementation Organizational Structure

The overall structure was good and we seem to have the right working groups, however, there were 3 issues that caused confusion or inefficiency within the working groups.

- Confusion about which groups are doing which aspects of the system when their areas overlapped
- Email overload sometimes lead to deletion
- Confusion with what the liaisons were doing or should be doing and how to balance involvement in multiple working groups

Therefore we suggest as we move forward that:

- the communication structure could be less burdensome. Too many emails with too similar a message were hard to sort through without missing some details.
- more sorting of tasks and information about which group was handling which aspect of the overlapping areas.

We think that we needed more members for the Joint Use Working Group. We did not have a large number of representatives from either the host or the partner institutions. We recommend that the Working Group have one member from each joint-use facility. While it would make the group larger, they could have a better discussion. Please encourage host and partner representatives to be on the discussion group and be prepared to join the Working Group as a new system gets closer.
CURRENT ACTIVITIES: The Systems Working Group has met three times since the last Members Council meeting. Our primary focus has been to review the Invitation to Negotiate Appendix A (System Requirements) document that resulted in the agreement with Innovative, as requested by the Chairs of the Implementation Team. The purpose of this review was to recommend changes to the ITN to make the next-generation ILS procurement and implementation process more likely to succeed in the future. Our working group concentrated on the sections of the document that seemed most relevant to our initial charge, which was “to oversee the overall development and delivery of reports, access and permissions, printing, batch loading, data conversion, and interoperability with enterprise systems.” See below for specific suggestions for additions or clarifications in the sections most closely related to our charge.

A.2 Scalability and performance
No additions or clarifications

A.5 Authentication, authorization and identity management
In section A.5.2:
Can staff at a single institution manage user accounts and permissions for that institution if they choose to do so?
Can both staff at a single institution as well as staff at a central location create/edit/delete accounts for that institution and only that institution?
How can staff view their accounts and permissions without necessarily having permission to edit or delete the account?
In section A.5.4:
Can certain permissions that no staff at an individual institution would have (i.e., only central office and vendor staff would have) be masked or hidden so they are not assigned accidentally?
In section A.5.7:
Is there single sign-on support for Ellucian’s Banner Ethos Identity?

A.6 Integration and extensibility
In section A.6.5:
If both browser-based and locally installed clients exist, are staff workflow automation features available in both? Explain any differences.
In section A.6.10:
How does the systems solution provide access for users with disabilities?
Does the solution incorporate website accessibility standards (e.g., WCAG 2.0) in its design? If so, describe the standard(s) incorporated and how they are used.

A.7 Reporting
In section A.7.1:
Describe how reporting is handled across multiple institutions simultaneously. Are there query size or time restrictions? Is any sharing of resources required across institutions? Are reports visible outside of the institutions that created them?
In section A.7.2:
What is the expected run time for any report encompassing all 40 institutions?
What is the expected run time for complicated reports run against large data sets (e.g., the bibliographic file)?
Can multiple reports be run simultaneously?
Are there limits to the number or types of reports that can be run? If so, do these limits apply to the consortium, to individual institutions, or both?
In section A.7.3:
How does your solution allow read access to the underlying database or a reporting copy of the database?
New section:
If configuration tables are needed to support specific reports (e.g., call number reports), describe how these tables are created and maintained. Can they be uploaded from Excel or similar files?

B.3.3. (Circulation) Statistics and reporting
In section B.3.3.4:
Please describe any limits to the ability of the solution to indefinitely retain transaction-oriented information for statistical purposes.

D.6 (Joint Use) Reports
No additions or clarifications

The SWG also had suggestions for some other sections of the ITN, which are included in the edited copy of Appendix A that accompanied this report.
NEXT-GEN ILS
TRAINING WORKING GROUP

Report on Current Activities for the Members Council on Library Services Meeting
May 15-16, 2018

CHAIR: Sara Alegria
FALSC LIAISONS: Dave Whisenant and Lisa Tatum

CURRENT ACTIVITIES:
The Training Workgroup received positive feedback for its training plan, with a train-the-trainer model that incorporated webinars, a Training Tracks document, and in-person training sessions. The challenges came from scheduling in-person training with Florida expansive geographical distance.

Feedback revealed that online, self-paced instructional modules were very useful for both in-person training preparation and as refreshers/reference, thought they were not available for all the functions. The Training Update webinars were also helpful for staff to understand the process and plan ahead. Moreover, while overall feedback for the in-person training was positive, feedback varied in terms of its quality, with some staff members calling for more hands-on practice and others asking for trainers who are easier to understand.

The committee struggled to develop practice materials for the various functions, partially because to do so required more familiarity with the system than we had. In the end, system testing was found to basically serve the same function. The liaison from the Cataloging Working Group proved to be very valuable. For future training, it would be a good idea to have each of the function working groups liaise as subject matter experts for the Training Working Group.
The following LINCC Reports Data elements are to be used in completing the National Center for Education Statistics (NCES) Academic Library Survey. Please use the appropriate value in the rightmost columns to complete the web-based form.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Academic Libraries Section I</th>
<th>ALS Item Name</th>
<th>LINCC Report Number</th>
<th>LINCC Report Name</th>
<th>[institution] Values</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Library Collections</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Books</td>
<td>T010</td>
<td>Title Count for Sublibrary, 2017-06-30</td>
<td>Physical</td>
<td>Digital/Electronic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Use the Totals for each Material Type at the end of the report. For Physical Count use these types: ARCH, BOOK, CHILD, FORGN, GOVDC, LANG, LEBK, NEWB, NEWRE, ODIS, PAM, PAMPH, PRBK, REFB, RESER, SCORE, SOFTC, VERTF. For Digital/Electronic, use these material types: EBOOK, EGDOC.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Databases</td>
<td>Locally determined</td>
<td>Log in to linccweb.org/eresources using your library staff account. Click on the “Funding sources” link at the top of the page. This list could include individual titles, platforms, alternate views to databases, etc. so you need to be sure to only count the databases.</td>
<td>Includes Statewide EBOOKS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Media</td>
<td>T010</td>
<td>Title Count for Sublibrary, 2017-06-30</td>
<td>Physical</td>
<td>Digital/Electronic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Use the Totals for each Material Type at the end of the report. For Physical Count use these types: ART, ARTRE, AUDBK, AUDCD, AUDIO, AUDTP, BD, BRLAY, BLURY, BONES, CASS, CD, CDLEC, CDMUS, CDROM, CDSPW, DVD, DVDDL, DVDRM, EMMFM, FLASH, FLMLP, FLMST, Flscd, GAME, GLOBE, KIT, LEISA, LESAU, LESDV, LP, MAP, MEDIA, MICCA, MICFC, MICFM, MICRO, MODEL, MP3CD, PICTR, PRINT, REALI, RECRD, SCULP, SDLTP, SLFLM, SLIDE, STMFF, TALKB, TOYS, TRNSP, TVCRS, VCD, VHS, VHSCC, VHSDV, VDDE, VIDDK, VIDEO, VIDTPQ. For Digital/Electronic, use this material type: EAUBK, EMUS, EVID.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Serials</td>
<td>T010</td>
<td>Title Count for Sublibrary, 2017-06-30</td>
<td>Physical</td>
<td>Digital/Electronic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Use the Totals for each Material Type at the end of the report.</td>
<td>Includes statewide evideos</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Library Circulation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Physical</th>
<th>Digital/Electronic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>C999 (for Physical count) and L012 (for eBooks usage), L033 (for accessions)</td>
<td>For Physical, use C999 – Circulation by Material Type and Collection from 07/01/2015 through 06/30/2017 (use the “Mat. Total” line and sum figures in column “Loans” for material types: ARCH, BOOK, CHILD, FORGN, GOVDC, LANG, LESBK, NEWBK, NEWRE, ONDIS, PAM, PAMPH, PPRB, REFBK, RESER, SCORE, SOFTC, VERTF and the media types ART, ARTRE, AUDBK, AUDCD, AUDIO, AUDTP, BD, BLRAY, BLURY, BONES, CASS, CD, CDLEC, CDMUS, CDROM, CDMUS, DVD, DVDLL, DVDRM, EMMFM, FLASH, MLMLP, MLST, MLSCD, GAME, GLOBE, KIT, LEISA, LESAU, LESDV, LP, MAP, MEDIA, MODEL, MP3CD, PICTR, PRINT, REALI, RECRD, SCULP, SLDT, SLFLM, SLIDE, STMMF, TALKB, TOYS, TRNSP, TVCRS, VCD, VHS, VHSCC, VHSDV, VIDBE, VIDDK, VIDEO, VISTQ</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Interlibrary Loan Services

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Interlibrary loans and documents provided to other libraries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>