



**Executive Committee of the
Members Council on Library Services (MCLS)
Conference Call**

Agenda

Monday, August 25, 2014 – 10:00 a.m. to 12:00 noon EDT

Dial-in Number: **1-888-670-3525**

Participant Passcode: **575 614 9391** followed by the # key

10:00	Call to Order	Janice Henderson
10:00 – 2:02	1. Public Comment	
10:02 – 10:10	2. Approve July 16, 2014 Meeting Minutes	Janice Henderson
10:10 – 10:40	3. Next-Gen ILS Task Force Update	Jean Phillips, Ellen Bishop, Anne Prestamo
10:40 – 10:55	4. Update from Members Council on Distance Learning and Student Services (MCDLSS) A. Joint MCLS and MCDLSS Meeting	Pat DeSalvo Janice Henderson
10:55 – 11:40	5. Update from FLVC A. Transition Update B. LBR Strategies C. Organizational Updates D. Project Updates	Don Muccino, Lucy Harrison
11:40 – 11:50	6. Approve September MCLS Meeting Agenda	Janice Henderson
11:50 – 11:55	7. Executive Committee Meetings A. Future Topics B. Next Meeting Date	Janice Henderson
11:55 – 12:00	8. New Business	Janice Henderson
12:00	Adjournment	Janice Henderson



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

August 25, 2014

A meeting of the Florida Virtual Campus (FLVC) Executive Committee (ExCom) of the Members Council on Library Services to discuss regular business was called to order at 10:07 AM EDT pursuant to notice sent to all committee members.

The following committee members were present: Janice Henderson (Northwest Florida State), Pat DeSalvo (Seminole State), Lori Driscoll (Gulf Coast State), Bill Foege (Polk State), Patricia Profeta (Indian River State), Anne Prestamo (FIU), Barry Baker (UCF), Bob Dugan (UWF), and Julia Zimmerman (FSU). The following FLVC staff was also present: Tammy Elliott, Don Muccino, Lucy Harrison, Laura Sproull, and Ellen Bishop. Guests: Jean Philips

Chair 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

Chair Henderson called for public comment. No public comment was forthcoming.

Approval of July 16, 2014 Minutes and July 28, 2014 Minutes

Having reviewed the draft minutes distributed prior to the meeting the committee moved to approval for the July 16, 2014 minutes. Anne Prestamo moved to accept the minutes and Pat DeSalvo seconded. The minutes were unanimously approved by the voting members.

Having reviewed the draft minutes distributed prior to the meeting the committee moved to approval for revised July 28, 2014 minutes. Pat DeSalvo moved to accept the minutes and Anne Prestamo seconded. The minutes were unanimously approved by the voting members.

Next-Gen ILS Requirements Task Force Process

Jean Phillips indicated that the Next-Gen ILS Requirements Task Force began its work on August 8. The Task Force reviewed the charge, understood the need to act quickly, and agreed to meet for an hour twice per week (Monday and Friday). Utilizing Sections E (systems), F (ILS functions), and G (discovery tool) of the Orbis Cascade RFP, the Task Force has been reviewing the questions herein as a starting point. The Task Force has been editing the document in Google Docs with each member having an assignment. The Orbis Cascade requirements are not really requirements, but questions designed to elicit a response from the vendors so that it can be determined if the response is sufficient. The Task Force has nearly finished the document. They are determining the level of detail needed. They have been in contact with the Orbis Cascade staff at both member institutions and at the systems office. Orbis Cascade personnel from the systems office indicated what they would proceed differently based on what they learned. A couple of sections need to be enhanced (e.g., areas of the RFP which need to be more current like eResources Management integration). A Reports section is also needed. It did not

appear in the Systems section. FLVC personnel contributed to the systems section of the document. Orbis Cascade Consortium operates differently from the FLVC with individual ILS and a central office staff of eight people; therefore, the members do not rely on the central office as extensively as the FCS and SUS rely on FLVC. A solid role with expectations is needed for our group.

Jean Phillips indicated that the Task Force will have a document for the MCLS to review in September to see if it is headed in the right direction. A final draft can be shared with deans, committee members, and other experts in the system after the September meeting to ensure that nothing was missed. The Task Force will also provide a possible timeline for an ITN. Chair Henderson indicated that she joined Friday's call and gave the Task Force context to the work they are doing and thanked them for their time and expertise. If there is more work to be done after September 3, this group will more than likely be asked to do it. Ellen Bishop said that the Task Force is taking the Orbis Cascade RFP as a beginning template with a Reports section and an FLVC Environments section being discussed as additions. Part of the timeline discussion for the August 25 meeting is at least one face to face meeting of the group. Anne Prestamo added that the Task Force appreciated Chair Henderson's participation on Friday in providing important context for the group. Chair Henderson indicated that her primary purpose was to say thank you for their intense attention in a short amount of time. She also said that we should give them some feedback about what they have reported to us. She did not want them to think that they would be stopping their work, but providing us a place to start our review for the September meeting. Chair Henderson asked our group for feedback. No one had questions.

Lucy Harrison offered an FLVC perspective. They are speaking to UWF about its process assuming the September MCLS meeting goes well and that we are going to be moving forward. The FLVC is getting its ducks in a row, so it does not get stalled by process. We will give UWF a heads up and learn its process. Lucy believes that the Task Force will be bringing the timeline to the MCLS meeting. The MCLS can see not only the draft of requirements, but get an idea of the context and what would happen if we are moving forward with a timeline with milestones that shows how all comes together in time to get legislative funding. That is, if everything goes well. Chair Henderson asked if the task force was discussing the timeline at the August 25 meeting and Jean Phillips responded affirmatively. Jean Phillips asked if the Task Force is doing what was expected. Pat DeSalvo said that the group is doing a fantastic job on what we asked of them. Barry Baker said that the Task Force is moving along well. Jean will share this information with the Task Force. She also said that the Google document has color markings and it is quite impressive to see the work of the Task Force members. Jean Phillips indicated that the Task Force will be working on the draft until immediately before the MCLS meets. Chair Henderson said that approach was acceptable and the MCLS members would be seeing more than expected at this stage. Pat DeSalvo suggested that the item be moved on the agenda from Wednesday to Thursday. Lucy Harrison said that the agenda change sounded doable. The item will be discussed when we get to that part of today's agenda. Chair Henderson again thanked the Task Force for the update and the hard work.

Update from Members Council on Distance Learning and Student Services (MCDLSS)

Chair Henderson and Pat DeSalvo provided an update from the MCDLSS about a joint MCLS and MCDLSS meeting. We are trying to work out a time in May to hold a joint meeting. Vicki Westergard and Chair Henderson have discussed this possibility, but they are trying to find a mutual date. One reason attributed to the MCLS scheduled meeting time in conjunction with the CIA/LRSC meeting dates. Due to the date of the MCLS meeting in June, a joint meeting time would be moved to the month of May. There are also concerns with the May date. Chair Henderson is planning to discuss a proposal with the MCLS at the upcoming meeting. Julia Zimmerman asked what results we would like from a joint meeting. Chair Henderson said that a lot had to do with the Legislative Budget Request and coordinating some things differently. Chair Henderson wants to be ready should the opportunity present itself. We should be

reasonably far along in knowing what the Legislative Budget Request will be or have an idea. We also do not know what the MCLS relationship will be at that time or how the groups will be interacting. There are a lot of unknowns at this point. Pat DeSalvo said that we are as close as we have ever been to making scheduling a joint meeting. There is a planning purpose in mind, but she would like to do some programmatic things. It is extremely important for the MCDLSS to realize what the embedded librarian provides, what information resources we provide, and how closely aligned the work of the distance learner is to library services. It used to be very library driven to work with distance learning and now it is not. We have a new generation to bring up to speed on why these groups are so closely aligned. The planning meeting is important regardless of what the future structure looks like. We should meet once per year or once per term. We need to have more of an association with what they are doing. We are the closest we have come since pressing for the meeting for a couple of years now. Don Muccino said that this meeting has been in the planning stages for at least two years, but the timing was not right. We need to plan for it. Pat DeSalvo said that once the meeting occurs, she thinks the MCDLSS will understand why we stressed the need to meet. Don Muccino said that an agenda will show many items in common. We will have governance matters to be discussed. Lucy Harrison said eTexts may be another topic for a joint discussion.

Chair Henderson said that there will be more of a report for the MCLS. Chair Henderson asked if there were other points of information to share. Pat DeSalvo asked Don Muccino to report about the symposium where the library was supposed to have a role, but did not. Don Muccino said that the symposium took place during a slower time during the academic year. About 125 attendees participated. Presentations were practical with speakers sharing what is happening institutionally both in-state and out of state. The evaluations are still being collated, but the report should be a good one. Videos will be uploaded to the website. Keynote speakers will be there for people to view. The library track got lost due to the date change. Another symposium is being planned with timing again a concern. A symposium scheduled for March or April would have to be planned now, but it is not in the cards presently. A fall 2015 symposium is more feasible. Pat DeSalvo also said that there are other events to consider, e.g., UCF, FLA (spring 2016), and ALA in Orlando, FL (summer 2016). Don Muccino said that the library track was affected more by summer breaks.

Update from FLVC

Transition Update

Don Muccino said that the FLVC is working with UWF to get a transition plan in place. There are about 160-170 tasks to be performed for the transition to occur. FLVC is helping UWF realize that it has already undergone a transition and can share both mistakes and best practices. UWF may not have undergone such a transition, so they have more internal organizational work to accomplish to get the process moving. To date, team meetings have taken place on human resources, finance, purchasing, services, and infrastructure. Don Muccino serves on the steering committee. Some work is driven by the legislation. The Steering Committee is working on the transition plan required by the Legislative Budget Committee. The Steering Committee submitted a high level overview transition plan addressing the transfer of assets, contracts, and personnel to UWF. The transition plan itself is an extensive document. The Steering Committee has received positive feedback on the overview. The Legislative Budget Committee (a joint committee) meets sometime in mid-September when it will review and approve the transition plan. UWF will then negotiate with UF for the remainder of the calendar year. The personnel piece is critical as part of the transition is to keep people whole and engaged in an effort to minimize problems with the transition. The objective is to move people on January 1. A new calendar year begins for W-2s, flex spending, etc. Each personnel case is unique and individually driven (e.g., FMLA, DROP, scholarship, retirements, etc.). Job descriptions have to be reclassified under UWF. Direct deposits, benefits, normal open enrollment periods, etc. are all topics that the transition team considers. These

matters can be complex and confusing at times. The objective is to keep things moving in a business as usual manner. UF adds another layer of approval as it reviews contracts and renewals. If Don Muccino had to target a couple of areas, he mentioned communication and coordination as important. Shortly, the organizational form needs to be addressed. Is it a department within UWF, an AISO, or something else? Then, the areas of the governance structure and the organizational structure need to be reviewed. Down the road, the form itself needs to be determined (AISO has aspects affecting governance, MOUs affect the SUS and the FCS), and the state level view of the organization from a policy and input point of view in recognizing that the organization is statewide and not a virtual campus of UWF. Bob Dugan indicated that there UWF is aware about the sensitivity of this distinction. Don Muccino said that the work will get done on time to meet the needs of the staff, UWF, and the legislative requirements. Barry Baker asked whether AISOs were eliminated years ago. Don Muccino referred him to BOG Regulations, Chapters 10 or 14. Barry Baker said that, at one time, there were several AISOs with FCLA being one of them. He further inquired whether these AISOs were moved to another group. Don Muccino said that the AISO is just an option. Institutes and centers are also defined in one of those chapters. The organization might take one of a number of different forms. The Governance part will involve the MCLS officers.

LBR Strategies

Don Muccino said that the LBR strategies were sent to the Executive Committee. They were sent to the BOG as drafts so we have flexibility in the process. Since they were submitted as we see them, the word “draft” can now be removed. There are three different pieces. 1) Next-Gen of Library Services is detailed with a \$4.9M budget. It shows a comprehensive treatment, not just the cost of the system. If the current vendor is not selected, duplicate one-time costs result. Authorities work, in conjunction with the database merge and migration to the next-gen system, is also needed. The costs went higher than expected; however, we can tighten as we move through the process. Feedback was favorable. 2) The STEM resources form details resources differently than what we expected to submit. (Due to duplicated Form pages in the agenda packet, corrected pages will be sent to EC.) It really is broader than STEM resources. Florida Polytechnic University is included. Additional funding will account for the inclusion of FPU in the system. There were modest increases in the current year. The STEM eResources were debated back and forth. We went to discuss eResources with the Legislative staff due to the proposed language about what the eResources package should be. FLVC wants to revisit the discussion about a balanced and sensible needs approach not a displacement of shift of resources and funds that was felt this year. If we are not successful with this strategy (Meet the Needs approach), we can always reposition this request to be more of an impact softener for eResources if they are heavily four year core. It is hard to understand what happened with this piece of legislation. We want to work together with Legislative staff. 3) The next generation of FLVC’s advisory services is addressed. It has retrained 25% of its staff. It is now rebuilding its foundation, website, and the services that underlie it. Legislative staff wants to meet the Complete Florida Plus Program. This piece continues what FLVC has been addressing. FLVC will see how things go. They requested a lot of money, but it is what is needed to be successful and to meet the requirements.

Pat DeSalvo asked if FLVC lost much money in the transition. Holding our own? Gaining? Don Muccino asked if she meant from the standpoint of the appropriation. Pat DeSalvo asked if FLVC is losing or gaining funding. Don Muccino said that \$5M was lost, but gained on reserves. There was a one-time non-recurring cut. He is assuming that it will be restored during the next FY and, depending on the LBR, may more. A cut has not been discussed. The State of Florida is in a favorable revenue spot. Also under discussion is the question about how we account for this new organization within UWF.

Organizational Updates

Don Muccino said that a rebranding effort was started, but is on hold until decisions rendered about service delivery under the new names. Perhaps we can rebrand in a new way so as not to confuse everyone again. Maybe not use names like FLVC or CFPP. Help is being sought from the outside. Don Muccino suggested that we name our services and have the branding be on the services rather than the organizational name. UBorrow is one example of establishing name recognition. That approach may work as we begin to look at different things. The website has multiple audiences, e.g., backroom staff pages, student facing portal, and the corporate site (board). Targeting audiences and functions rather than organizational names might be the approach to take. Discussions are in the early stages. Lucy Harrison is keeping everyone informed with the changes. FLVC is making good on its promises, e.g., UBorrow. UPD Y was requested and is moving forward. FLVC is focusing heavily on the next-gen rather than spending money or resources on current systems is not the prudent thing to do.

Project Updates

- Lucy Harrison provided some project updates. Mango is now available for colleges. Some colleges wanted Primo. Nine of the 28 colleges opted to move to Mango. Four colleges are in production, two are ready to go, and three are working with FLVC. No major issues have been reported yet. FLVC is getting them on UBorrow within Mango and within the shared union catalog as part of the move. It is easy to bring additional colleges upon on Mango, so college timelines and schedules can be accommodated.
- In August, there were two webinars, one on shared ILL and one on customization options with participation from both FCS and SUS employees.
- FLVC is on track to submit annual extracts to Hathi Trust before the end of August. Additional work to do to make brittle, lost, or damaged books discoverable and requestable within Mango. Timeline is being established for this step.
- UPD Y is in production for subjects, testing for series, and testing for names.
- FLVC thought the recommended ALEPH Security Task Force changes would be easy to implement, but that has not been the case. Part of the changes will be implemented in September to bring USF into compliance. Additional recommendations will take longer and will be handled in a Phase 2. Communication will be forthcoming.
- The Helpdesk has been reviewing cases created prior to 2014. If there are older cases that have not yet been resolved, do they still need to be open? Example: In April, FLVC had 242 open cases, but now there are only 106 cases open. The Helpdesk also identified a dramatic reduction in calls when, on April 30, the login barrier was removed.
- The digital services program review done was completed via a contract with ISF. FLVC received recommendations. The results were reviewed internally. Service or program changes will not occur. Internal staffing changes will occur including new positions. Several recommendations included consolidating platforms and updating software. One example is moving Islandora forward by consolidating older platforms and getting them onto Islandora. Lucy Harrison reassured us that nothing will be taken from us.
- Islandora is moving forward through the next two quarters. DigiTool migration is the primary focus. Remove it from its current platform. One college is already using it. UF testing is next.
- Statewide delivery is on track for FLVC to pay for one five-day location for each of the colleges. TBLC is still the contact for other delivery needs.

With regard to eResources, Don Muccino mentioned the legislative language and the opportunity we have to shape the direction moving forward. FLVC proposed bringing a couple of scenarios to the September MCLS meeting. It is our understanding that while Legislative staff is giving us some flexibility with this matter, they are still interested in having a set of resources that support undergraduate

education across both systems. Claire Dygert will bring forth scenarios showing 60% of our budget utilized on a shared collection with the remainder split between the FCS and the SUS, as well as what resources might be feasible with the remaining budget. We will also review scenarios using 80% of our budget. The 100% exercise was addressed during the June 2014 MCLS meeting; however, we will remind the MCLS of how the 100% looks.

We will have a conversation to see what make the MCLS comfortable. Janice Gilley, UWF's government relations person, can then take the idea forward to Legislative staff to make sure they are comfortable with it. The, we can start drafting legislative language that would allow it to happen. Anne Prestamo asked what the timeline is to determine the legislative language. Lucy Harrison said that it would not be put into place until the spring legislative session. Barry Baker said that we still need to be careful with even 60% because it will have a major impact on us. We may have to wait and see what is suggested. Is there going to be funding to pick up for what we lose? Lucy Harrison said that if the 60% impact is still unacceptable, we can still reposition the STEM LBR so it provides some relief. Don Muccino said that anything less than 100% is an improvement with regard to the four-year core. It really depends on the Legislative staff.

Barry Baker suggested a review to the Legislative staff as to what the resources are and which ones are needed for the four-year core. Chair Henderson and Don Muccino reviewed the three percentages to give the MCLS a range of options. Following on Barry Baker's comments, Anne Prestamo said that we are faced with difficulties in that we have different, but concurrent time cycles. We will not know until May about the outcome and which scenario. Many of us will have to make renewal commitments prior to that date without knowing the source of the funding. Don Muccino agreed with Anne Prestamo and indicated that the FLVC is trying to begin the conversation now with the MCLS, so conversations with Legislative staff can occur where we think the process will finish. We can at least have some data and indicators as to where we will be heading into the FCS and SUS budget cycles. Lucy Harrison said that December is the timeframe FLVC is targeting. If FLVC can get a confirmation about the general direction from the MCLS in September, then they can work to see how acceptable it will be to Legislative staff before the December MCLS meeting. FLVC can then update the MCLS about observations from Legislative staff. Lucy Harrison reminded the group that the process may not actually happen this way. Things might also be different once the session begins in 2015. Don Muccino indicated that we have to be aware of the bottom line and we may need to establish benchmarks along the way between the 100% and where we are now that might compromise our position on this matter.

Barry Baker asked for clarification as to how the presentations would be made to the MCLS. Lucy Harrison provided clarification and said that exact determinations will be made later in conjunction with Collection Management and E-Resources Standing Committee and the MCLSEC. Don Muccino would like to hear input on a reasonable way to approach the language to accomplish our agendas. We need to be prepared for scenarios to be presented or discussed. FLVC will count on Janice Gilley to work on our behalf. Lucy Harrison said that Claire Dygert is working on the scenarios. Are the 60, 80, 100% levels acceptable? Anne Prestamo said that it would be interesting to see those levels and then we can go from there. Lucy Harrison initiated the group licensing process discussion. The initial round of indications of interest has been sent to the members. Responses were due on Friday. Scott Schmucker sees which institutions are interested, obtains quotes, and continues with the iterative process. FLVC is targeting final participation by October 30.

For those resources that FLVC will continue to invoice, FLVC is expecting payment prior to November 30 to allow for a January 1 start date. Pat DeSalvo asked if there was a good response to the survey. Lucy Harrison has not heard. Don Muccino indicated that some responses will continue to arrive during the

weekend. He also said that Debbie Robinson raised issues regarding the invoicing process. FLVC is doing its best to minimize the impact. Most institutions have the three largest vendors already in their vendor files. The reason is more about liability and risk, not shifting the workload. Pat DeSalvo asked about the liability and risk. Don Muccino said that FLVC remains responsible if someone does not pay or delays payment. We will be working with a new administration so we must speak to them about this issue.

Bill Foege asked if the prices fluctuate for institutions if one institution does not pay. How will any one member of the group know their portion relative to the other members? Don Muccino indicated that FLVC was ultimately responsible once a commitment was made to a vendor and the contracts were signed. In prior years, FLVC paid the difference. Lucy Harrison said that institutions are given the price at which they will participate. The figure does not change for participating institutions once FLVC commits to the vendor. If an institution changes its mind, FLVC is on the hook to pay the vendor. FLVC is targeting final participation by October 30. Bill Foege asked how a deficiency is addressed. Don Muccino said that if an institution refused to pay or requested a delay in payment, FLVC paid by default. It was reiterated that FLVC is responsible if an institution defaults or delays payment if individual institutions are not invoiced. Bill Foege then questioned whether the price we are quoted is final or could cost fluctuate.

There appeared to be some confusion about the pricing being firm. Chair Henderson indicated that once the invoicing went out, the institution was responsible. FLVC became responsible for the payment prior to the new invoicing system. The liability now moves to the institution that is not paying or paying in a timely manner. It does not become an issue with renegotiating with all participants. Lucy Harrison said the issue would be that if a college could not pay as scheduled, FLVC would pay the invoice from its budget and recoup the costs later. Bill Foege asked if the situation occurred often. Don Muccino indicated that it happened infrequently. Bill Foege asked if it was a big deal. Don Muccino said that FLVC is obligated to pay. The only recourse is chasing down the institution. Don Muccino said that FLVC is obligated to pay. FLVC is not authorized to sign contracts that obligate it for items not in the budget or approved by the board. Lucy Harrison said that the process is enough of a risk that the Chancellors asked them to review. A. These obligations cause the most risk because the amount paid to these top vendors is significant. B. These vendors are more than likely in our institutional vendor files already. C. The price has been negotiated by FLVC, so there is no additional work at the institutional end. Pat DeSalvo commented that if we can get this concern regarding liability and risk into perspective, it will go smoother. The institutions will not be asked to handle anything more than the payment of the invoice.

Anne Prestamo said that comments were made suggesting further discussion at the September meeting. Clear communication is necessary so that the issue is not exacerbated. The invoicing process had been addressed previously. Once we move closer to the invoicing, clear communication is needed about what we are expecting to see from our vendors. Chair Henderson said the contact person for questions should also be included. Pat Profeta said that this invoicing process is no different from the one used by TBLC when the colleges began to pay for delivery. Lucy Harrison said that the pricing will be adjusted when we have a clear list of interested institutions no matter who handles the invoice. Bill Foege said that it is reasonable to go through the invoicing process at least once. Lucy Harrison indicated that Claire Dygert will communicate what local invoicing will look like.

Approve September MCLS Meeting Agenda

- Move the Next-Gen ILS to Thursday morning.
- Move the Standing Committee reports from to Wednesday afternoon. Switch items V and VII.
- IV. B is the eResources discussion which can carry over to Thursday morning, if needed.

Chair Henderson raised a concern about the Bylaws that involve voting, e.g., proxy voting, and weighted voting. Proxy voting and weighted voting need to be addressed; however, we are not in the position to make changes to the current Bylaws. We need to be developing our new Bylaws. In *Roberts' Rules of Order*, when the rules are getting in the way of doing business, one of the things that occurs is that you recognize that they are being set aside to accomplish business. Chair Henderson would like to take this approach with the MCLS to get work done. Chair Henderson asked for comment. The group supported this approach provided the MCLS did. Chair Henderson will consult *Roberts' Rules* in advance. We are in a timeframe where the process of changing Bylaws is in flux. Her objective is to focus on the Bylaws of the future. Lucy Harrison inquired as to whether Chair Henderson wanted to add the topic to the agenda. Chair Henderson confirmed. Julia Zimmerman asked if it should be discussed at the beginning of the meeting. Chair Henderson confirmed. Chair Henderson also discussed where to put the discussion about the role that the LRSC and CSUL have with regard to the new organization. Again, it was suggested that this item might be better at the beginning of the meeting. Pat DeSalvo questioned the proxy vote and the fact that we have an alternate already identified. Chair Henderson does not want to change the current Bylaws to make them work; however, an institution could potentially be without a vote if neither the member nor the alternate is available. We can build our new Bylaws when we have a direction about governance although that timeline is unknown. Pat DeSalvo said that our Bylaws are reviewed or changed on an annual basis. Since the organization is going to change, we will review the Bylaws for change at that time. Bylaws are changed to meet the needs of the times. Chair Henderson said that we do not change Bylaws at the meeting and use that new voting method.

Pat DeSalvo recalls proxy being prevented because someone may not have knowledge of an issue. Pat Profeta said that the proxy is ultimately the institution's decision. We cannot comment about someone's knowledge or lack of knowledge. The institution can make the decision as to who should render a vote on its behalf. Anne Prestamo echoed this sentiment as individual institutional situations are different. There may be situations where the member or alternate cannot attend. There needs to be a mechanism for a proxy as we are entering a period where we may have some important votes in the future. Barry Baker and Anne Prestamo shared examples of how this Bylaw impacted their institutions. Chair Henderson said that we can have a discussion and postpone the vote to email. She does not want to commit to a particular answer right now. What is the best way to follow rules and get our business accomplished? Sometimes that might mean, as *Roberts Rules* allows, letting us set aside the rules to accomplish business in the best way that we can. This item will be placed in spot #2 after the request for public comments. It will be identified as Members' Processes. We may still have other topics for the agenda. Once the deadline passes for agenda topics, time slots will be added and the agenda will be sent to the MCLS. We can always move items on the agenda on the same day as the MLCS meeting.

Executive Committee Meetings Janice Henderson

Future Topics

Don Muccino suggested the eTextbook project. Pat DeSalvo commented that this topic would be great for the two groups to discuss. Anne Prestamo asked if FLVC knows what institutions are doing. Don Muccino said that perhaps a survey of what everyone is doing so as to group the responses into different models. Anne Prestamo then said that it is helpful to know what is happening at other institutions. We are in the process of discussions with internal groups to develop a framework for local efforts. We can be best informed about future prospects at the state level. Don Muccino said that PBSC is working with eTextbooks. A broader identification is a value in itself. It has been studied extensively. Maybe we can get some traction with this item. There are working models in production now. Lucy Harrison said that Claire Dygert asked her to give the MCLS a heads up about a survey she would like to do about eTextbooks, library content, and remixing it into eTexts and open textbooks.

Anne Prestamo asked how this topic might be connected to the LBR coming from the CAVP. A part of that involves eTextbooks. Don Muccino said the university press topic is as much an infrastructure piece as it is a program as to how to do it Henderson asked if we have a copy of their LBR. Don Muccino confirmed that we do have a one page position paper. We will not have the results for the late September call, but results are more likely for October or November. There may be some things that come out of MCLS meeting for a future MCLS EC meeting, e.g., Next-gen ILS, eResources, Bylaws, etc. Tammy Elliott can poll the EC for a date. If there is not a need for the September meeting, we can move the meeting to October.

Next Meeting Date

Chair Henderson indicated that she would like to poll for a date, perhaps in late September.

New Business

Chair Henderson asked the members if there was other business. With no response from the committee, she thanked the group for their patience this morning.

Adjournment

Chair Henderson asked for a motion to adjourn. Julia Zimmerman moved to adjourn and Pat DeSalvo seconded. Chair Henderson adjourned the meeting at 11:54AM.