

MINUTES  
JOINT LIBRARY PLANNING COMMITTEE  
COMMUNITY COLLEGE LIBRARY AUTOMATION AUDITORIUM  
1753 W. PAUL DIRAC DRIVE  
AUGUST 27, 2009  
10 am – 4 pm

**Appointed Members**

Dr. John Holdnak, Division of Florida Colleges, DOE

Dr. Nancy McKee (Chair), Board of Governors, State University System of Florida

Ms. Mary Jane Tappen, Division of Public Schools, DOE

Ms. JuDee Pettijohn, Department of State

Technical Workgroup:

Mr. Jim Corey, FCLA

Dr. Richard Madaus, CCLA

Dr. Tom Owens, SUNLINK

Mr. Mark Flynn, FEL

Others Present:

Diana Vaccari, DOE

Mark Stoffan, FSU Libraries

Barbara Shearer, FSU Medical Library

Janice Henderson, NWFS College

Judi Ring, DOS State Library of Florida

Mike Peltier, CCLA

Paul Parker

Rivers Buford, DOS

Roy Ziegler, FSU Libraries

Judy Bentley, CCLA

Carole Hayes, recorder

1. Call to Order and Approval of Minutes

The chair, Dr. Nancy McKee, called the meeting to order and welcomed committee members, technical experts, and the audience. The minutes were approved without revision. Approval was moved by JuDee Pettijohn, seconded by Mary Jane Tappen and none were opposed.

## 2. Next Steps

Dr. McKee then asked approval to reverse the order of the agenda to allow a work plan and timeline to be refined. The focus of the first meeting will be on technical similarities and differences among the systems, as well as a discussion of the Background document prepared by the Technical Workgroup. The format of the report was agreed upon. For each itemized concept in proviso, there will be: Background, Options with pros and cons, and Recommendations. Future meeting dates were determined as follows:

- A. **September 16** - The Committee will meet at the R.A. Gray building, 10 am-4pm.
  - Public testimony from users representing each resource collection or system will be invited for presentation at the September 16 meeting. Names of invitees will be provided to Carole for formal invitation. The same three questions will be posed for response to each presenter in advance in the letter of invitation; time permitting, there will be dialogue between the presenters and the committee members. Each speaker will have 10-12 minutes total. Speakers will be free to remain for lunch and for afternoon demonstrations.
  - Demonstrations of each resource collection or system will follow the user presentations at the September 16 meeting.
  - Further assignments will be made during this meeting for the October and November meetings.
- B. **October 23** - The committee will meet in the auditorium in the CCLA building in Innovation Park from 10 am - 4 pm or until the agenda is completed.
- C. **November 12** - The committee will meet in the auditorium of the CCLA building in Innovation park from 9:30 am - 5 pm or until the agenda is completed.
- D. **November 23** - The committee will meet by conference call from 9 am - 11 am.

## 3. Overview of Same Parameters across Each Entity

The Technical Experts completed a comparison document wherein information about each resource collection or system was compared across eighteen parameters.

**Legal** - Each entity cited statutory and/or constitutional references. Committee members requested that (1) additional information be included regarding the legal creation of the programs/systems, rather than the creation of the organization and (2) that additional information on SUNLINK and its relationship to district responsibility for library media be included.

**Action required.**

- A. **Mission** – No additional action required.
- B. **Governance** - Chair McKee asked for information about signature authority for contracts for each organization.
- FEL – Mark Flynn reported that signature authority is by the Secretary through the State Librarian. Mr. Flynn also said he would provide more detailed information than is currently in the comparison document. **Action required.**
  - FCLA – Jim Corey reported that UF is the authorized signatory.
  - CCLA – Richard Madaus reported that the Tallahassee Community College Board of Trustees has such authority since TCC is their fiscal agent.
  - SUNLINK – Signature authority is with the University of Central Florida as funds from DOE are managed there.
- D. **Advisory** - Chair McKee asked for more detail on relationship of DOE to SUNLINK advisory process. Richard Madaus, Tom Owens, and Mark Flynn each will clarify the advisory process for each of their organizations. **Action required.**
- E. **User Access Services** -
- FCLA – Jim Corey gave background on development of FCLA as a user driven resource. Library automation infrastructure was developed separately by each library before large scale purchasable systems became available. However, as university librarians indicate needs, the purchased systems, over the years from NOTIS to Aleph to SFX and Metalib to Endeca with its Mango user interface to Digitool have evolved in response to those SUS libraries needs Systems evolve based on user needs, and in FCLA’s case this means SUS libraries needs.
  - CCLA – Richard Madaus explained that the CCLA is also heavily influenced by the needs of the college libraries as expressed in the CCLA Advisory Process. Colleges were comfortable using the Ex Libris “Aleph” online catalog product; however, CCLA also purchased Endeca shortly after it was acquired by FCLA. Simultaneously, CCLA accepted an invitation from Ex Libris to become one of five “Charter Customers” of the PRIMO product to assist in its development over the following two years. After bringing both products to “proof of concept” levels, the decision was made to only move forward with the Primo product due to the level of interoperability with existing Ex Libris products and amount of human intervention required in its support. LINCCWeb 2.0, based on the PRIMO platform is currently being made available as a user access option to the colleges. A by-product of the PRIMO architecture is that it provides the next generation XML based data repository infrastructure for the Unified Resource Manager (URM)

product that will replace the Ex Libris “Aleph” software over the next 5-8 years. Both CCLA and FCLA staff are involved in the advisory process leading to the future development of the URM.

- SUNLINK – Tom Owens explained that the SUNLINK resources have essentially been a flat file database populated with resources based on the expressed needs of schools. The database is being upgraded from Filemaker 6 to Filemaker 9. The Web site is independent of the database. That is, it is not a library system, but a collection of resources that teachers may access through a Web site (home page or portal).
- FEL – Mark Flynn explained that the DOS also does not have a library system as such for FEL. It is a server the size of a “pizza box” that provides links to resources that can be accessed ubiquitously. There are 59 licensed data bases any of which can be accessed as subsets of FEL. Schools can choose what resources their students may access through their own home page or portal. Due to lack of adequate funds, the same portfolio of licensed online resources has been in place since 2002. Currently, there is no funding available for expansion.

**F. eResources and Services** - Chair McKee questioned the 15% overlap in eResources utilized by FCLA and CCLA, i.e. is it necessary. Melvin Davis of CCLA explained that the overlap is mostly within the Wilson suite of resources.

- There are various pricing and licensing options within the Wilson suite and the FCS and SUS do not use all of the same options
- Jim Corey further explained that licensing is by FTE, so it is irrelevant in terms of reducing cost because the FTE would then be cumulative resulting in no difference in cost. In other words, FCLA pays for SUS students while CCLA pays for college students.

**Richard Madaus** explained that in the late 1990’s the Distance Learning Library Initiative (DLLI) brought the two public postsecondary sectors together to determine needs for eResources and to purchase collaboratively from funds provided for this resource. DLLI funding no longer exists, but the collaborative buying practices have continued.

**John Holdnak** noted that the CCLA is treated in the DFC as the 29<sup>th</sup> funding entity along with the 28 colleges. It is appropriated a fixed percentage of the entire college operating budget. He further said that the public has very broad access to FSC colleges because of their locations everywhere in the state.

**Mark Flynn** emphasized that funding and pricing are very different for FEL because it is federally funded at the rate of about \$.15/Florida resident. No state money funds the operation. Because of their contract

with OCLC Worldcat, public K-12 schools have access to their licensed materials. ICUF students only have access via public libraries.

**Mary Jane Tappen** requested a spreadsheet that would clearly indicate sources of funding, collaborative purchases, and authorized users. **Action required.**

**Authentication:** CCLA does user authentication for entire system because most students access library resources from off campus due to higher average age of students. Each university manages authentication to many services on campus and off campus. For most e-resources, vendors accept IP addresses. FCLA provides vendors with lists of valid campus IPs, and off campus users connect through campus proxy servers which convert off campus IPs to a campus IP address. Anyone who is interested in accessing FEL resources from a remote location can authenticate with any Florida public library card. Resources can be linked to from any home page or portal.

#### **G. Library Management Systems and Services -**

**Jim Corey** reiterated the inception of FCLA and the fact that 9 legacy systems had to be able to communicate and that each university has differing needs due to history and mission.

**Union Catalog -** A discussion ensued about the possibility of all resources being cataloged in and retrievable from one Union catalog. The role of catalogers was explained and the fact that part of cataloging is individual decision making based on the purpose of the collection. Materials cataloged by a special collections cataloguer would be tagged in such ways as to make them easily retrievable in the framework of that collection. The same material might be cataloged for various purposes, including general usage, but the tagging would vary thus resulting in multiple records for the same resource. Furthermore, there is more variation among library collections than commonalities due to varying needs of teaching and research faculty. JuDee Pettijohn asked why we would consider a Union catalog given the difficulties. Jim Corey said that it is still an excellent approximation of library holdings even though some duplication is inevitable.

#### **H. Digital Content and Services -**

Chair McKee asked about interoperability of library systems. Dr. Madaus responded that there is considerable interoperability and that ongoing efforts between the FCLA and CCLA advisory boards continue to be explored. The Collaborative Ventures Steering Committee (CVSC) was developed to study collaborative opportunities among FCLA and CCLA. Next year a research project will explore the practicality of cross loading records (along with a virtual search solution) between FCLA and CCLA to

better address student access in the joint use library between Broward College and Florida Atlantic University. This project will assess the complexity and actual costs of this activity. Further information is in the project plan in the Appendices of the Status Review.

Training services were discussed and the differences in audiences, trainers, and systems were identified. Technical experts will elaborate on training in the matrix, page 9, to clarify types of training and nature of different training needs.

*Lunch break, 12-12:30 pm*

### **Background and Current status of the FCLA, CCLA, FEL and SUNLINK in response to Section 81 of the 2009 GAA**

1. JuDee Pettijohn asked how data center consolidation would impact FEL. This led to discussion of the nature of co-location as opposed to consolidation. Mr. Flynn answered that FEL's hardware is already co-located with the Department of Children and Families'. However, it is not yet consolidated into one "box" meaning that FEL has its own server. Consolidation will mean lining up in a queue if there is a functionality issue. FEL will have lost staff and then be charged for services that staff provided, and stand in line for this service. Dr. Madaus explained that FEL and SUNLINK do not operate library management systems. CCLA is a distributed resource to all 28 colleges. Dr. Holdnak emphasized the interwoven nature of hardware/software/user services provided by CCLA. Also CCLA exists to run one application, not many as a data center does. Mr. Corey explained that FCLA provides primarily an academic support mission and that hardware is a small part of the operation. FCLA hardware is co-located at the UF data center but has downsized to Intel server (PC) architecture. Open source developments can impact support FCLA offers. Mr. Flynn added that the Agency for Enterprise Information Technology (AEIT) expects users to anticipate their needs on an annual basis adding further complexity to co-location and consolidation of library resources. The point was made that in the discussion of consolidating library resources, there are governance issues to consider. Governance ranges from constitutional authority to statutory authority to local authority and the details must be examined and addressed.

Chair McKee asked Tom Owens if the K-12 library holdings are in Worldcat. Dr. Owens answered "no." This is an individual school choice and only 10% of the schools are included in Worldcat. Mr. Flynn

explained that FEL purchases the OCLC license which allows all Florida residents access to Worldcat.org which shows the library holding for all Florida libraries as currently represented in the Worldcat database. In general, the Worldcat database does not include Florida K-12 holdings. Florida participated early in the inception of OCLC which meant contributing cataloged records for online uploading MARC records into the OCLC database. Chair McKee asked why K-12 was not included. Mr. Flynn explained with assistance from Drs. Owen and Madaus that public school libraries are not “public” in the same sense that local public, college, and university libraries are. There are issues of resources available and unauthorized adults entering the school property to access library resources. Access to Worldcat is open and public schools filter access to their students. Membership would allow others to view K-12 holdings but not to be able to borrow them. This ability, Interlibrary Loan, is a huge benefit of the OCLC Union catalogue that does not serve K-12. A few large school districts are members of OCLC primarily to serve teacher professional development. Additionally, there is a cost for member services. These costs are tiered; more functionality = higher fees.

Primary reason for Union catalog is to support greater efficiency for cataloging library materials. Cataloger can share bibliographic records in the Union catalog thus avoiding reentry of data if a cataloging record already exists. This speeds up the process of cataloging while reducing the cost to catalog an item as well.

Chair McKee stated that, per the proviso, the committee must seek equal benefits for all systems beyond the Union catalog. Dr. Owens explained that SUNLINK’s Union catalog provides services that OCLC does not. It enables non-Union catalog districts to see the holdings of other schools in the district and for anyone to see the holdings of all schools in the state while providing for means for public K-12 schools requesting loan of materials. Mr. Flynn emphasized that OCLC participation has costs. On yearly basis, a master tape of unduplicated records must be provided to OCLC for uploading at a cost of \$750,000 to \$1.2 millions. He will provide cost data in the technical report. Ms. Tappen asked if Lexile could be included in a Union catalog for K-12 usage. A Lexile level is a measure of text difficulty which, when matched with the Lexile level of the reader, provides a means for identifying a text that is appropriately challenging to that reader. SUNLINK provides searching by Lexile, OCLC does not. OCLC shows holdings by geographic proximity to the querying IP. There is no Web based analytic tool in OCLC. ILL reports can be generated but this is a report, not the output of an analytic tool.

2. Chair McKee asked about language on page 6 involving negotiation of eLicenses by, how, and on whose behalf. The difference is in the ability to negotiate as a proxy on behalf of others and the intricacies of establishing a contract with multiple variables. For example, vendors often have pricing structures that are tiered by institutional types. Information relevant to negotiating and licensing is contained in the Collaborative Ventures Steering Committee report by Dygert and Davis.

Ms. Pettijohn asked for clarification of access provided to all Floridians by FEL. Mr. Flynn clarified by explaining that, at this time, a library card from any Florida public library is adequate. He also stated that soon it will be possible to authenticate to access resources from any Florida IP.

3. Chair McKee moved the agenda on to item 3 on page 6. Dr. Madaus pointed out that FEL and SUNLINK are not library management systems and that the distinction is nontrivial. Chair McKee asked about the efficiencies to be gained by co-location. Dr. Madaus said that co-location of equipment is not problematic; however, the services attached become very complex as they cannot be consolidated, needs are too varied. Dr. Holdnak expressed fear that consolidation will curtail the ability of entities to meet their end users' needs. Chair McKee stated that it is extremely important for this group to recognize needs and underscore efficiencies. Otherwise, the report appears to be no more than a turf protecting exercise. Dr. Owens said that the district media supervisors from whom he has received input see the benefit of system and service consolidation for K-12 providing they are appropriately involved. Ms. Tappen stated that it is necessary to clearly demonstrate how the current situation arose, the realities as they are, what can be done, and at what expense. K-12 library and media services are clearly not as streamlined as the other sectors, but what is the step forward at this point? It is critical to define strengths, weaknesses, options and to move ahead. Two audience members spoke on the necessity of clearly explaining resources, needs, efficiencies, costs, and options. The legislature wants no duplication; this report must clearly indicate which resources are duplicated and why as well as which resources appear to be duplicative and why they are not.

Chair McKee reiterated that information must be well researched, clearly stated, and based in reality. What are the different ways to accomplish what we think is intended by proviso and what are the costs and consequences of each.

4. Mr. Flynn stated that item number 4 is much like item number 2 in the

Background document. Dr. Madaus cited the Illinois model whereby a single source of funding provides individual memberships for all public libraries. A statewide license would offer no cost savings because charges are based on FTE. Dr. Madaus suggested that value added instead of actual dollar savings, i.e., renewal at same rate with expanded services or clients, should be considered an efficiency.

Chair McKee noted that with the remaining time, attention should be focused on reviewing Bookmarks as a review and planning for future meetings. Revised Bookmarks are in a separate document. Meeting dates, times, and location are on the second page of these minutes.

Respectfully submitted,

Carole Hayes  
Educational Policy Analyst  
Board of Governors