

## Question 1 - Colleges - 19 Responses

### Question 2

Have you found any statements in the report that are incorrect?

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Yes	11.1%	2
No	88.9%	16
<b><i>answered question</i></b>		<b>18</b>
<b><i>skipped question</i></b>		<b>1</b>

### Question 3

If yes, specify the page number where the inaccuracy is

Answer Options	Response Count
	3
<b><i>answered question</i></b>	<b>3</b>
<b><i>skipped question</i></b>	<b>16</b>

No.	Response Text
1	<p>Page 6 - first paragraph, sixth sentence states, <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p><input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>"In those cases, the library loads the catalog record for each new book into its local computer system and the cataloging is done." <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p><input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>However, in the last sentence of that same paragraph, it states, <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p><input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>"If the record is present, the library simply adds its holding record that says it also owns (or holds) the book. No cataloging is required." <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p><input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>This is somewhat misleading because the cataloging is not really done after the book is loaded into the local computer system - it still has to be added to the union catalog.</p>
2	<p>Page 10: <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>A small point, perhaps, but while TBLC was formerly an example of the "distributed model" of a union catalog, it no longer provides this service because in 2008 majority of its member libraries joined the Pinellas Public Library Cooperative shared system, Pinellas Automated Library System (PALS). Once the Pinellas libraries left, there were only a handful of members who were not already on a shared ILS either with their respective library systems or individually. SUNLINE, the TBLC system, was phased out when those few remaining member libraries were finally able to migrate to their own library systems. Charlie Parker, Executive Director of TBLC, will be able to further elaborate if he has not already done so.</p>
3	<p>There was not enough time to read the document for content, let alone look for inaccuracies.</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

Answer Options	Recommend	Neutral	Don't Recommend	Rating Average	Response Count
Option 1	3	3	11	2.47	17
Option 2	1	4	12	2.65	17
Option 3	4	6	6	2.13	16
Option 4	8	6	3	1.71	17
Option 5	0	3	14	2.82	17
Option 6	12	4	0	1.25	16
Comments on Current Options (You may suggest alternative options in Question					5
<i>answered question</i>					<b>17</b>
<i>skipped question</i>					<b>2</b>

Number	Comments on Current Options (You may suggest alternative options in Question 5):
1	Option 6 would be my first preference, but option 4, I think, could work. Except that it would require additional staff and resources at a time when that is an unrealistic expectation.
2	Joint negotiation with central funding for the licensing of college and university resources is beneficial and provides access to more resources for smaller institutions. There will still be local resource needs due to the differences in programs offered at each institution -- this is true for SUS & FCS as well as within those systems. There will be fewer joint opportunities for K-12 and public resources with the academic licensing.
3	I don't feel that I understood these enough to make a truly informed decision!
4	Any disruption to current services should not be underestimated as to the impact that this would have on our respective library communities which in our case is directly related to student success. Additionally, disruptions in service also mean lost revenue since subscriptions are paid for annually regardless of our systems' ability to support seamless and consistent connectivity.
5	Option 6 would be the least disruptive to FCS constituents and the least restrictive to how the statewide academic consortia function now. This option would allow the academic libraries to continue to collaborate on ways to increase eResources to students while lowering costs. The organizational structure of Option 6 could provide CCLA, FCLA, and ICUF the flexibility to decide on the level of collaboration that would best serve the needs of distinctly different members of their institutions. □

## Question 5

If you would like to suggest an alternative option for the Committee to consider for establishing a process to jointly negotiate statewide licensing of electronic resources, please do so now, including an explanation of why the suggested option is viable.

Answer Options	Response Count
	1
<b><i>answered question</i></b>	<b>1</b>
<b><i>skipped question</i></b>	<b>18</b>

Number	Response Text
1	N/A <input type="checkbox"/> Please go with Option 6...that would be my best recommendation.

## 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 services and products. (options begin on p. 50 of initial draft report)

Answer Options	Recommend	Neutral	Don't Recommend	Rating Average	Response Count
Option 1	4	8	5	2.06	17
Option 3	11	4	0	1.27	15
Comments on Current Options (You may suggest alternative options in Question 7)					1
					<b><i>answered question</i></b>
					<b><i>skipped question</i></b>
					<b>17</b>
					<b>2</b>

Number	Comments on Current Options (You may suggest alternative options in Question 7)
1	Recommend option one only if requisite recurring funds are provided.

## 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><i>answered question</i></b>	<b>1</b>
<b><i>skipped question</i></b>	<b>18</b>

Number	Response Text
1	N/A

## 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	4	9	4	2.00	17	
Option 3	8	6	1	1.53	15	
Comments on Current Options (You may suggest alternative options in Question 9).					1	
					<b>answered question</b>	<b>17</b>
					<b>skipped question</b>	<b>2</b>

Number	Comments on Current Options (You may suggest alternative options in Question 9).
1	If this can be done without losing the benefits of individual membership in organizations like ALA, such as subscriptions to professional journals, or without losing the clout of having 300+ individual member libraries, as opposed to one member voting, I think it might warrant a look. <input type="checkbox"/> However, if we lost benefits that we then had to pay for or if the clout of libraries voting from Florida is diminished I'm against it.

## 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
	1
<b>answered question</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>skipped question</b>	<b>18</b>

Number	Response Text
1	No

## Question 10

If you have additional comments, please provide them now.

Answer Options	Response Count
	2
<i>answered question</i>	<b>2</b>
<i>skipped question</i>	<b>17</b>

Number	Response Text
<b>1</b>	I have worked at both SUS and FCS libraries in positions where I have worked closely with FCLA and CCLA. The CCLA model works very well for smaller institutions like those in the FCS and probably would work for smaller universities. FCLA was a hindrance in many things technical at UF and there were duplicated efforts since UF believed it could (and often could) do it better themselves. I cannot see one system working best for all institutions since the needs and resources vary so greatly. If this is true for institutions that are so similar in mission and patrons, I cannot see how completely consolidating those with public and school library support would save resources. Separate technical staff would still be necessary; separate systems would be necessary to meet the needs of the type of library (public, school, academic); separate databases will still be necessary. This will not reduce hardware needs or most staffing needs (I can see a potential for reducing managerial and administrative costs by centralizing HR, payroll, etc. for CCLA, FCLA, and DoS). Providing joint opportunities for smaller institutions is where a central agency would be most helpful --requiring additional funding, not reduced funding.
<b>2</b>	We were given too little time to review this critical document.