

**Survey Results for State Universities  
October 23, 2009**

**Question 1 - State Universities - 8 responses**

**Question 2**

Have you found any statements in the report that are incorrect?		
Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Yes	12.5%	1
No	87.5%	7
<i>answered question</i>		<b>8</b>
<i>skipped question</i>		<b>0</b>

**Question 3**

If yes, specify the page number where the inaccuracy is found, the inaccuracy, a suggested correction, and a source where the	
Answer Options	Response Count
	2
<i>answered question</i>	<b>2</b>
<i>skipped question</i>	<b>6</b>

Number	Response Text
1	did not read the whole report
2	<p>Page 13: K-12 Libraries section. I don't know if the number is accurate or not but 85,000 ILL transactions looks really high to me. The section is unclear to me. Were all those transactions through OCLC? It is unclear how Palm Beach and Pasco county school districts had only 92 borrows and 261 lends and then that it was reported that there were over 15,000 ILL transactions in these districts. Needs clarification.</p> <p>Page 47: "Current Status" section: 2d paragraph; last full line. It says "none in CLOCKSS." I thought FSU was participating in LOCKSS or CLOCKSS. Is that no longer true?</p>

## Question 4

Please indicate your preference for each option for "establishing a process for SUNLINK, FCLA, CCLA, and FEL to jointly negotiate the statewide licensing of electronic resources to reduce the overall cost of such resources." (options begin on p. 21 of initial draft report)

Answer Options	Recommend	Neutral	Don't Recommend	Rating Average	Response Count
Option 1	0	0	7	3.00	7
Option 2	0	0	7	3.00	7
Option 3	0	1	6	2.86	7
Option 4	1	4	2	2.14	7
Option 5	0	1	6	2.86	7
Option 6	7	0	0	1.00	7
Comments on Current Options (You may suggest alternative options in					3
<i>answered question</i>					<b>7</b>
<i>skipped question</i>					<b>1</b>

Number	Comments on Current Options (You may suggest alternative options in Question 5):
1	Option 4 and option 6 should have additional funding from State to pay for needed electronic resources.
2	<p>The weight of managing most of these options with an additional layer of centralization/coordination would severely handicap any benefits from closer collaboration in joint licensing. The report indicates the need for increased central staffing, but neglects to mention that there would be an increased need for staffing at the local level to manage the additional access, data analysis, and troubleshooting that would be required. There is also a significant possibility of service disruptions that would have a negative impact on student and faculty access to critical resources. While closer collaboration in licensing is attractive, the complexity of the existing organizations from both a systems/technology and budget perspective must be addressed before any real gains could be realized.</p> <p>This report does not take into account the significant investments in the individual SUS libraries in electronic resources and other technology investments. It is not clear what the impact of these options would be on our local operations.</p> <p>The possibility of mandatory reallocation of funds from the university/library budgets intrudes into the university's ability to manage its resources and strategic priorities.</p>
3	One of the problems that I see with this option is the need for increased funding for resource purchasing.

## Question 5

If you would like to suggest an alternative option for the Committee to consider for establishing a process to jointly	
Answer Options	Response Count
	1
<i>answered question</i>	<b>1</b>
<i>skipped question</i>	<b>7</b>

Number	Response Text
1	<p>There should be a new, centralized funding agency for state-wide subscription to basic databases of broad, state-wide interest (or, the SUS, FCS, or State Library should receive the funding to negotiate and pay for these subscriptions). State-wide access for all residents and types of libraries would be included. This would provide schools and public libraries with good access to these basic databases. The SUS and FCS would continue to manage subscriptions to more specialized materials for their constituents, and would also have access to what the new entity is subscribing to, on behalf of all residents. The costs of the specialized funding agency and its subscriptions could NOT be subtracted from the SUS and FCS. This idea is viable only if new money available for the state-wide licensing and associated staff and space/equipment to do it. The major benefits to the state would be greatly expanded access to information for all residents, and equalization of access for all residents. K-12 schools and the business community, in particular, would benefit. Florida could join Ohio, North Carolina, Georgia, Virginia, and other enlightened states which provide state-wide access to databases for their citizens.</p>

## Question 6

Please indicate your preference for the options for establishing a statewide approach and process for contracting with library cataloging utilities and other providers of library

Answer Options	Recommend	Neutral	Don't Recommend	Rating Average	Response Count	
Option 1	0	4	3	2.43	7	
Option 3	6	1	0	1.14	7	
Comments on Current Options (You may suggest alternative options in Question 7)					3	
					<b>answered question</b>	<b>7</b>
					<b>skipped question</b>	<b>1</b>

Number	Comments on Current Options (You may suggest alternative options in Question 7)			
1	What happened to Option 2?			
2	Statewide contracting with cataloging utilities and other service providers will limit flexibility in managing library functions across our diverse library environments. Further, there is great potential that statewide contracting could hinder innovation in seeking new sources and services in our rapidly changing technology environment.			
3	Since I think that Option 3 is not going to be considered acceptable to the decision-makers, specifically because it doesn't demonstrate a willingness to explore options that might result in cost savings, I have marked both options "neutral."			

## Question 7

If you would like to suggest an alternative option for the Committee to consider for establishing a statewide approach and process for contracting with library cataloging utilities and other providers of library services and products, please provide it now, explaining why it is a viable option.

Answer Options	Response Count
	1
<b>answered question</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>skipped question</b>	<b>7</b>

Number	Response Text
1	Could we recommend that the Division of Management Services, working with representatives of the Work Group, develop a pilot project for negotiation? Should that project be successful (considering all the issues that would need to be resolved), expand to other related initiatives. This process would at least identify the costs involved in developing RFPs, ITNs, etc., negotiating, working out payment options, etc.

## Question 8

Please indicate your preference for the options for establishing a statewide approach and process for securing statewide memberships in library organizations and regional library affiliates (options begin on p. 50 of initial draft report).

Answer Options	Recommend	Neutral	Not Recommend	Rating Average	Response Count
Option 2	0	4	2	2.33	6
Option 3	5	1	0	1.17	6
Comments on Current Options (You may suggest alternative options in					2
<i>answered question</i>					<b>6</b>
<i>skipped question</i>					<b>2</b>

Number	Comments on Current Options (You may suggest alternative options in Question 9).			
1	I don't see any benefits for this activity, and given the many challenges libraries in Florida are facing, I'm not sure this is the best investment of time for the Division of Library and Information Services			
2	I frankly don't see the benefit of this issue at all.			

## Question 9

If you would like to suggest an alternative option for the Committee to consider for establishing a statewide approach and process for securing statewide memberships in library organizations and regional library affiliates, please do so now, including an explanation of why the suggested option is viable.

Answer Options	Response Count
	0
<i>answered question</i>	<b>0</b>
<i>skipped question</i>	<b>8</b>

## Question 10

If you have additional comments, please provide them now.

Answer Options	Response Count
	3
<i>answered question</i>	<b>3</b>
<i>skipped question</i>	<b>5</b>

No.	Response Text
1	For a modest amount of additional money, the State could vastly expand access to information for all its residents.
2	<p>Suggestions:</p> <p>1) There are so many acronyms throughout the document, that I would suggest an attachment with a brief glossary; e.g., CLOCKSS (which I could not see had been defined); TBLC; LINCC; even FCS (which is relatively new to most of us). Those of us in the library world know what these are, but the audience for this paper probably don't.</p> <p>2) I think it would be beneficial to indicate in some way how much it costs to do ILL through OCLC and/or FLIN. These are NOT free services.</p> <p>3) I assume there will be a final proof-reading to catch errors. When I printed this out, it substituted a strike-out of the first letter for every word that should have been in quotes. The last quote mark was there, but not the first.</p> <p>3) on page 11 in the K-12 section, there is a reference to "Multi-Type Library Cooperatives." I don't remember seeing it anywhere else in the document. Does a short statement need to be made about these somewhere in the document? They need funding as well and probably should be a player in this conversation.</p> <p>4) on page 12, first line "FLIN now comprises over 375 libraries. . ." - this makes it sound like loading all</p> <p>Thanks for this opportunity to read and respond!</p>
3	<p>1. The ability to manage almost any of the options presented within our complex systems has a potential negative impact on our ability to manage our local library resources and services. The increased labor record at the local level, in addition to the system level labor, cannot be easily absorbed into our already constrained staffing levels. Troubleshooting with licenses, authentication and service interruption will be extremely difficult when trying to manage these across multiple library systems and types.</p> <p>2. I don't think that the report takes into account the amount of activity and investments in e-resource management and differing systems at the local levels within the SUS.</p> <p>3. Any proposals to centralize funding will at the very least cause interference with internal management of library funding within the SUS.</p> <p>4. I am not convinced that the options outlined will provide the significant cost savings that are trying to be achieved. For example, vendors negotiate different discounts with customers in the same geographic or state area--some institutions receiving better discounts than others. Quantity does not always equal savings.</p>