FL VC FLORIDA VIRTUAL CAMPUS

Executive Committee of the
Members Council on Library Services (MCLS)
Conference Call
Agenda
Wednesday, July 16, 2014 – 2:00 to 4:00 p.m. EDT

Dial-in Number: **1-888-670-3525**
Participant Passcode: **575 614 9391** followed by the # key

2:00	**Call to Order**	Janice Henderson
2:00 – 2:02	1. **Public Comment**	
2:02 – 2:05	2. **Approve June 24, 2014 Meeting Minutes**	Julia Zimmerman

2:05 – 2:20	3. **Standing Committee Processes**
	    A. Review Committee Applications and Select
	       Replacement Members
	        • Digital Initiatives Standing Committee
	        • User Interfaces Standing Committee
		Janice Henderson

2:20 – 2:35	4. **Debrief from July 10 Transition Planning Meeting**	Don Muccino
2:35 – 3:10	5. **Options for Next-Gen ILS Implementation**	Don Muccino, Lucy Harrison
3:10 – 3:20	6. **E-Resources Update**	Don Muccino, Claire Dygert

3:20 – 3:45	7. **Update from FLVC**
	    A. LBR Strategies
	    B. Organizational Updates
	    C. Project Updates
		Don Muccino,
		Lucy Harrison

3:45 – 3:50	8. **Update from Members Council on Distance Learning and Student Services (MCDLSS)**	Pat DeSalvo, Don Muccino

3:50 – 3:55	9. **Executive Committee Meetings**
	    A. Future Topics
	    B. Next Meeting Date
		Janice Henderson

3:55 – 4:00	10. **New Business**	Janice Henderson
4:00	**Adjournment**	Janice Henderson

July 16, 2014

A regular meeting of the Florida Virtual Campus (FLVC) Executive Committee (ExCom) of the Members Council on Library Services was called to order at 2:00 PM EDT pursuant to notice sent to all committee members.

The following committee members were present: Julia Zimmerman, Pat DeSalvo, Lori Driscoll, Bill Foege, Patricia Profeta, Janice Henderson, Anne Prestamo, and Bob Dugan. The following FLVC staff was also present: Tammy Elliott, Lucy Harrison, Don Muccino, Lauren Sproull, and Linda McCarthy. Guests present included Leona Jones and Valerie Boulos.

Committee Chair Janice Henderson called the meeting to order, and Patricia Profeta recorded the proceedings of the meeting.

Roll was called and the number of voting members present determined.

Public Comment
The Chair called for public comment. No public comment was forthcoming.

Approval of June 24, 2014 Meeting Minutes
Having reviewed the draft minutes distributed prior to the meeting, the committee moved to approval. Lori Driscoll moved to accept the minutes and Julia Zimmerman seconded. The voting members unanimously approved the minutes.

Standing Committee Processes
Review Committee Applications and Select Replacement Members
The Committee received applications to fill two standing committee vacancies. Applications for the vacancies were distributed prior to the meeting for review. Discussion of the applicants took place.

- Digital Initiatives Standing Committee, one college vacancy—The Digital Initiatives Standing Committee has a vacancy due to the resignation of Jeremy Norton. Is there a need for a representative from a small or a medium institution? Jeremy put forth a colleague's name; however, there is an applicant in the file from LSSC and one from PHSC. We are looking for a representative from a small institution on this committee. Chair Henderson said that since we do not currently have a medium representative serving, a representative from either a small or medium institution could be considered. Either of the two applicants fills a need on the committee. Chair Henderson asked for the group to discuss and recommend a representative. Pat DeSalvo moved to appoint Kevin Arms (LSSC). Julia Zimmerman seconded. The voting members unanimously approved his appointment. Lucy Harrison will notify Kevin.

- User Interfaces Standing Committee, one research university vacancy—The original User Interfaces Standing Committee pool did not meet the criteria for a research university representative. It had two university applicants who were not from research institutions and one applicant from USF. Since USF already had a representative on this standing committee, the SUS research institutions were subsequently surveyed in an effort to generate additional applicants to fill the vacancy as per the

Bylaws. Chair Henderson asked for the group to discuss and recommend a representative. Pat DeSalvo moved to appoint Athena Hoeppner (UCF). Bob Dugan seconded. The voting members unanimously approved her appointment. Lucy Harrison will notify Athena.

Debrief from July 10 Transition Planning Meeting
The stakeholders present at the debriefing were arranged by function, e.g., services, technology, legal, human resources, and steering committees (governance). A set of issues and questions were put together and the teams reviewed them. Don Muccino reported that it was a good day with about 35 people present from FLVC, UWF, UF, FCS, and BOG, as well as the Exec Com. Representatives from UWF visited the FLVC offices. Two processes need to be addressed. The political process includes the legislative budget request and the governance issue. The operational process addresses the tasks that need to be performed, e.g., job descriptions, physical move of assets, etc. That detailed plan is being designed now.

Chair Henderson indicated that Florida's Sunshine Law might be set up so it is not a debilitating factor in our discussion. We received that word from lawyers in the room. After the eResources situation, the legislative staff appears understanding of that process. There does seem to be reasonableness about the Legislature funding the Next-Gen ILS system. They will be looking for the FLVC to request funds for it. Questions from the June MCLS meeting regarding this discussion appear to be answered by the fact that the FLVC may be asking for money. Julia Zimmerman asked for further comment. She gave a "shout out" to Janice Gilley who tied the knot with legislative staff to bring them to the status quo.

Legislative staff is oriented to four-year programs. We have seen this with the language in the legislation. They (legislative staff and UWF) are looking to the BOG for support for graduate students and research needs. Bob Dugan indicated that UWF has an internal meeting on Friday morning about how UWF will address some of the mechanics within the institution (other than the eResources) as we move toward the transition. Lucy Harrison said that the small working groups cannot move further until other decisions made, e.g., email. Anne Prestamo asked to go back to an observation that Julia Zimmerman shared among legislative staff that the BOG should be funding those initiatives more in keeping with university functions. This new organization is really designed more for success with four-year programs. A reference made by someone (LBR for STEM resources under discussion) that seemed to be a BOG concern. Through no fault of anyone, the Legislature is looking at this transition as a way to support four-year organizations. The universities will have to create a different method of communication with the BOG, so that the research and graduate students are not eliminated as a concern. Concern exists from the original merger and now this transition that the university needs appears to be getting lost. Those needs are being put aside. A strategy needs to be implemented to get everyone's needs back in the picture. Julia Zimmerman believes that there needs to be a better way to speak to the BOG about the situation. Presidents have other issues besides libraries to address with the BOG. Chair Henderson indicated that it is also true that the legislative staff is noting the impact that these decisions might be having - almost inadvertently. All institutions were affected. We were attempting to work it out so everyone would win something, but fighting the battle of the wording of the legislation. Julia Zimmerman indicated that the legislative staff did not really understand the impact that would be had on the institutions. Janice Gilley's comments made us realize that our groups should be able to make decisions separately.

There were no other questions regarding the Transition Planning Meeting.

Options for Next-Gen ILS Implementation
- Option 1: Upgrade to Alma
- Option 2: Traditional ITN/RFP
- Option 3: Accelerated ITN

Don Muccino said that an option needs to be selected. Points of view were discussed. What are the other ways to move forward listening to all that we heard from the Members Council? Three options resulted. We tried to gather input quickly. We have to get our eResources approved by the Board and the LBR for 2015-2016. There are some time constraints. The last option was to do nothing. Option #2 may take approximately 20 months and Option #3 would take place more quickly. #We have more layers to get things approved now, as well as the timing of the funding. We do not want to ask for money and not spend it. Don Muccino made reference to the loss of funds several months ago. We are expecting the Board to select an option. Please keep in mind both the positive and the negative aspects of the options.

Chair Henderson indicated that she was nervous to open the discussion. We do not want to do anything without having a good requirements document. Lori Driscoll wanted a little more information about what the Board asked during the discussion. What are they interested in hearing? What are their concerns? Lori Driscoll knows what comments were made by the library administrators, but not the Board's. The Board was concerned about making a big decision without really having more information on the affect on UWF. What process would UWF prefer? What about governance? Should we begin the process now or wait until UWF is part of the process? The Board did not think it had enough information. They also talked like there might be more options. The accelerated option was in the list, but the Board did not know much about it. Don Muccino said that the Board wanted a little more due diligence from us. Finance and IT said not to let Option #1 affect the process if we prefer it. Joe Glover indicated that FLVC would go back and flesh out options.

Julia Zimmerman indicated that ALEPH does not work well for some institutions. We need to do something now rather than later. This thinking was also prevalent during the June meeting. The vote of the MCLS was clearly spilt. It was a clear and definitive response from the MCLS. The Board heard the vote so that vote is no longer valid with the addition of Option #3. There appeared to be interest from the MCLS in having a meeting to discuss the options before the Board meeting next week. Lucy Harrison said that there is a group that would like to move faster and a group that would like to move slower. Library administrators indicated that #3 would also be an option even if it were a second choice. Pat DeSalvo's concern with Option #3 is that we would be running two systems (with time and effort and money). Don Muccino indicated that this scenario would occur with all three options.

Chair Henderson asked if we were to look at Option #3, we might also get started on the requirements document. An accelerated requirements development process will serve us well for any of the options. We need a requirements document no matter which option. If we make enough progress on the document before the LBR in order to tell the Legislature that we want the money, what is the time frame (August 4 LBR deadline)? A task force could begin as a preliminary look. Lucy Harrison said that, for the sake of argument, Option 3 is selected, 1) we have a task force begin with the Orbis Cascade requirements document, 2) the initial draft is brought to the September MCLS, and 3) the task force completes its work on the document after September comments. We could have an ITN in October prior to Legislative session. If we have something more definitive by December/January, then we have more information prior to the Legislative session. We would have a better set of numbers for them. If we move quickly to develop the requirements document, the requirements task force can tell us more about the timing and details. If the Board does not lock us into a particular process, we can move in this direction. If we are locked, we can share what we have done to date. Chair Henderson said that the angst with the MCLS is that we are feeling that there is a rush even when we need to focus on the requirements process. We have the expertise part handled. Our original task force from last year got a great start and now we have to move to requirements before we can recommend anything more about the rest of the process. Lucy Harrison said that Chair Henderson is right and we learn from the task force that an expedited process will not work, we can let the legislators know. Legislative session does not end in one month. As long as we communicate, we can let them know as we progress and know.

Pat DeSalvo asked if we want the same task force to follow through with Phase 2. Chair Henderson said that we might want other people involved in the process. Lucy Harrison asked, "Why don't we have a nominee from every institution and the Exec Com selects a core steering group from that group?" The remaining individuals become institutional liaisons or members of a subcommittee. Pat DeSalvo said that these are valid points, but the group becomes quite large and the task force has done quite well to date. The task force has worked well and has been neutral.

Anne Prestamo reminded the group that she was the liaison. Anne Prestamo suggested that Jean Phillips retain chair role. For the most part, the members really stepped up and actively contributed. Some individuals did not have an in-depth understanding with the technical sense needed for the requirements document. Anne Prestamo suggested re-nominating individuals, but we should hear the caution about too large of a group, but broader expertise is needed. We can reach out from the existing standing committee. Because we are under Florida Sunshine Law, we are limited about the conversation one can have with a library administrator. Julia said that she would be happy to "twist" Jean Phillip's arm. Phillips will be on vacation for a couple of weeks. Chair Henderson is also concerned with the largeness of the committee. The liaisons would be appointed and they could be given a useful place to offer feedback without having them at a committee meeting. As long as it is not the library administrator, we can ask for input.

Chair Henderson said there are two things that are important: 1) plan to make sure the Board has our sense of process of MCLS and the Exec Com of the MCLS and 2) communicate to the MCLS. Do we need to go back to MCLS before the Board meeting? Lucy Harrison seemed to infer that all administrators wanted an opportunity to discuss, but not necessarily to vote. Pat DeSalvo said that at some point we need to make a decision. Julia Zimmerman wants a list of comments from the three options. Pat Profeta suggested asking the MCLS to suggest a 4th option if they have one for us to consider. Pat DeSalvo said that we have the full background from the FLVC administrative team. Anne Prestamo said that we have already heard that the MCLS wants a discussion. Based on progress on the requirements, we could suggest an LBR. The money will be the same regardless of which option we ultimately select. Option 2 would likely not have funding for an extra year. We could move forward with an LBR to meet the deadline in August. As we get closer to the session, we could make revisions or change the timeline. August 4 is the deadline to get it to the BOG as a placeholder (4V form – details about the process). Lucy Harrison asked if we are ready to begin to prepare a requirements document. Option 3 could potentially turn into Option 2 if the timeline does not work. The Board needs to put its stamp of approval on it due to the LBR and the magnitude of funding needed.

Exec Com of the MCLS takes to the Board an update that the MCLS will begin on the requirements document.

Anne Prestamo moved that "The EC recommends a process whereby we would begin an immediate and accelerated Requirements development process with a report from the requirements task force to be made to the MCLS at their Sept meeting at which time MC would vote on the procurement options to proceed with." Pat DeSalvo seconded. Anne Prestamo then asked if the motion should say anything with the LBR. Lucy Harrison said no. We still have to get it in by August and can be tweaked later. Lucy Harrison also said that we can take it out and bring it back next year. Lucy Harrison asked about gathering feedback from the rest of the MCLS. What are your thoughts? Chair Henderson said that we want to start the requirements process and we have not selected an option. At our September MCLS meeting, the discussion will be had in light of the work of the task force on the requirements document to see how the timeline is affected. Anne Prestamo said that we can go back to the MCLS and tell them that we are taking some interim steps, but discussion will take place in September. We are positioning ourselves for funding and for the decision we have to make. Pat DeSalvo said that ultimately that the MCLS is an advisory group. Don said that we have new players who have "skin in the game." Chair Henderson called for a vote and all unanimously approved.

Anne Prestamo asked about the formation of the requirements task force. Now that she is a member of the Exec Com, is it appropriate for her to be the liaison to that group? The Exec Com thinks it is fine. At this moment in time, Chair Henderson said that it is not a bad thing. We could replace Anne Prestamo in time, but for now, she can help in getting the task force to the September time frame with her knowledge. She can be a good liaison to both Exec Com and the MCLS. She can be replaced in September, if necessary. Chair Henderson will send to MC listserv, not email, as alternates were not part of the earlier conversation.

E-Resources Update
Don Muccino thanked everyone for the positive comments. This process started with leadership from our Board. Handling too much change, too quickly, affected many students and institutions. We had a positive outcome. We are at status quo as we have the list of eResources that we had last year, as well as a budget amendment that moves the financial figure back to last year's amount. This approach will help with the 2015 calendar. The next problem is defining the eResources going forward that sit beneath the statewide money so we can leverage our resources across both systems and in keeping with the needs of both groups. Claire Dygert added that we also have to deal with inflationary costs, so status quo may not be perfectly achievable. Vendors are aware and are keeping as closely as possible to 0%. A deficit of $193,000 still exists, but Claire Dygert believes we can bring that amount down considerably. Claire Dygert also wanted to give the colleges a "heads up" regarding the group licensing billing process in an effort to address the internal concerns of the finance and accounting departments as the invoicing process may no longer be the process. We are working toward getting it to the SUS incrementally. Ideally, we collect money from the FCS individually and then get the money to the vendors. There is a financial risk with this approach. For those vendors, where cost is not impacted, vendors can bill the colleges directly. We need internal fixes in place to continue to grow group licensing. Chair Henderson said for those eResources where there is a price break when purchased through FLVC, we would continue to pay FLVC directly. If the cost is not affected, direct invoicing will take place. ProQuest, EBSCO, and Gale would bill directly. Smaller vendors will be addressed. Anne Prestamo said that her previous institution had something called Campus Vendor Invoice. Claire said that she would investigate this approach, as she is also new to this process. There is a lot of paper and checks with the current system. FLVC acts like a subscription service. An independent subscription agent would be costly.

Update from FLVC
LBR Strategies
Lucy Harrison indicated next gen including authorities cleanup as a one time cost and ongoing update, database cleanup (dependent on system we choose), eResources (make up money to be restored in addition to inflation with the inclusion of Florida Polytechnic), and for multimedia and STEM resources ($2.5M on a recurring basis).

Organizational Updates
Don Muccino said that the beat goes on. FLVC is losing some staff (5-6). With reduction of staffing during the last two years, the FLVC cannot afford to lose people. We run out of options to back them up. They need to reassure people. He also asked how do we keep people whole during this process? We have to look at everyone's situation individually. Keeping the service going as best you can depends on the people you have in place.

Project Updates
Lucy Harrison sent the sent the Director's monthly update earlier. She asked if we had any questions. Shared ILL reactivated on July 15. Staff will begin to see requests. Florida Polytechnic is live. Katherine Miller said things went smoothly during the institution's first public event. Digital Services Program Review indicated that there were no drastic recommendations with mention of updating for platforms, e.g. Islandora, electronic dissertations, etc. Staffing levels will need to be reviewed if we intend to move further in this direction as it accounts for 10% of resources. The second side of house is moving to the next level.

At this point, Bob Dugan left the meeting for institutional business.

Update from Members Council on Distance Learning and Student Services (MCDLSS)
Pat DeSalvo deferred to Don Muccino. Don Muccino said that a meeting is set for next week. Symposium on Student Success is also next week. Strategies for next generation of advising and student services are under review now that we have more pieces in place.

Executive Committee Meetings
Future Topics
Next-Gen ILS Requirements Task Force should get started first few days in August.

Next Meeting Date
We need to meet sometime soon for the Next-Gen ILS Requirements Task Force details (late July or early August) and then before the MCLS (the first week we are back in class (possibly the week of August 18) to review September meeting). Send Chair Henderson an email with specific problem dates. Chair Henderson asked if there are other topics on the horizon? Lucy Harrison indicated that we would have new topics for the mid-late August meeting.

New Business
Chair Henderson asked if anyone had new business. Pat DeSalvo said that we are in limbo, so we do not have much new to add. FLVC still rolls off the tongue with the acronym FALSC on the horizon. Pat DeSalvo asked about a new acronym. Don Muccino indicated that the FALSC acronym remains, but we have to think about branding our services rather than our name. Complete Florida is a program with an identity. We are under Complete Florida Plus, which may seem like an extension of that program. Brand recognition may bring us more success. Chair Henderson asked for final comments. Pat DeSalvo said, "Great work everyone."

Adjournment
Having completed the agenda, Chair Henderson called for adjournment. The meeting adjourned at 3:53PM.