

## Question 1 Public Schools - 15 responses

### Question 2

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

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Yes	14.3%	2
No	85.7%	12
<b><i>answered question</i></b>		<b>14</b>
<b><i>skipped question</i></b>		<b>1</b>

### Question 3

**If yes, specify the page number where the inaccuracy is found, the inaccuracy, a suggested correction, and a source where the correction can be verified.**

Answer Options	Response Count
	3
<b><i>answered</i></b>	<b>3</b>
<b><i>skipped</i></b>	<b>12</b>

Number	Response Text
<b>1</b>	<p>Page 11: The Sunlink address given does not attach to Sunlink. Use <a href="http://www.sunlink.ucf.edu">www.sunlink.ucf.edu</a> instead.</p> <p>Page 26: "A review of existing eResource collections has demonstrated little common eResource need among SUNLINK, FCLA, CCLA and FEL constituents, suggesting a low cost benefit would be achieved by implementing this option. (This is particularly true if ICUF institutions are not factored into statewide licensing.)" - and similar comments are noted --The Children &amp; Youth Services e-resources needs within the public library should closely resemble the K-12 needs of Publis Schools (e.g. The current Gale/Cengage resources provides for K-12 as well as general reference needs) Granted there would be other areas of more K-12 academic needs that would have less on teh public library but of the resources our students and teachers use, I can see a strong correlation.</p>
<b>2</b>	<p>This was a long and in-depth report. I did not find any area that I thought were grossly inaccurate for the majority of public libraries. <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p><input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>Page 19 stated that there was a loss of support from public libraries for DLLI. Speaking only for Calhoun County the degree of participation is driven by funding and need.</p> <p>Page 36 stated that Florida public libraries use local (county and city) funds to purchase and maintain their own library management system. PPLCS (Calhoun, Jackson, Washington, Holmes) uses SIRSI and the entire cost for PPLCS and 4 counties is funded by State Aid. It is true that there is no specific funding or coordinaton to public libraries for library automation which accounts for the disparity. This disparity may be a major problem in implementing this project.</p>
<b>3</b>	<p>pg 11 - Union Catalogs <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>3rd paragraph - SUNLINK union catalog - URL is incorrect - correct web address is <a href="http://www.sunlink.ucf.edu">http://www.sunlink.ucf.edu</a></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	4	2	6	2.17	12
Option 2	1	2	8	2.64	11
Option 3	0	3	8	2.73	11
Option 4	4	4	3	1.91	11
Option 5	1	3	8	2.58	12
Option 6	4	1	6	2.18	11
Comments on Current Options (You may suggest alternative options in					4
<i>answered question</i>					<b>13</b>
<i>skipped question</i>					<b>2</b>

### Number Comments on Current Options (You may suggest alternative options in Question

	<p>Input from K-12 needs to be part of the process when selecting the databases. The current FEL databases provide a lot of periodicals for high school students but little reference. There is so many periodicals that it can be too much for high school students to search. A comprehensive database, like the Gale Student Resource Center, which is designed for high school students, would serve this population much better. □</p> <p>The Junior collection for middle school is a good collection but could be improved by being replaced by the Gale Student Resource Center Junior.</p>
	<p>There is no way that a state agency can select what e-resources each unique district would want to support their curriculum, diverse population, or technology readiness profile. □</p> <p>It took our district 3 years, and tracking of the usage data to hit on that formula so we could justify the return on our investment. □</p> <p>E-Resources is not a one size fits all product, and to approach it that way is a gross abuse of tax-payer dollars, again.</p>
	<p>My assumption is that the initial phase would be funded by LSTA; ongoing by a combination of LSTA, State Aid and Department/User Funding. State Aid funding for public libraries is non-recurring. Each year there is less LSTA available outside the State Library or Florida Electronic Resources for library services. It would be very difficult to justify passing increased charges to the public or multi-type consortiums in light of across the board decreased budgets for every one including rural schools and rural libraries. □</p> <p>Option 1: This seems too costly; coordinating communication between disparate systems would be almost impossible. □</p> <p>Option 2: Too costly. There are no local funds to reassign. A user fee would result in some rural counties not using system; defeating its purpose. □</p> <p>Option 3: Cumbersome. To many institutions with different accreditation requirements; different needs. □</p> <p>Option 4. Appears this would build on existing infrastructure. Authority control agreement from diverse libraries could be hard to reach. How would centralized funding be achieved? □</p> <p>Option 5. Is there a consensus that creating a new body would be cost effective in terms of m</p> <p>Option 6: Least disruptive; uses existing expertise in each system; however, the question of initial and continued funding would have to be addressed; coordination between disparate systems would be a challenge unless the contracts were handled through an entity such as OCLC, that had already addressed this problem.</p>

<b>4</b>	Would like to have a choice of which resources will be available for statewide licensing (ProQuest, Gale, EBSCO), rather than one state entity selecting e-resources for ALL K-12 schools
----------	---

### 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
	2
<i>answered question</i>	<b>2</b>
<i>skipped question</i>	<b>13</b>

Number	Response Text
<b>1</b>	Continue to work with your public libraries, and allow districts based on the above profile attributes to buy into those resources that are a fit. Other widely used databases can be put into a state bid process so that all districts are given the same pricing, small and large.
<b>2</b>	I don't know enough about the intricacies of communication between disparate technical systems; needs and authority control of disparate libraries and their users; the "tug" over who would be final say - the different thinking on sharing materials. The ongoing struggle for adequate funding in the face of disappearing funds. If the trade-off is less services or open hours for patrons of rural public libraries, rural counties would be challenged to support it. I do not believe that there has been adequate use of the Florida Electronic Library by rural counties.

## 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	2	6	3	2.09	11
Option 3	6	5	1	1.58	12
Comments on Current Options (You may suggest alternative options in					1
<b><i>answered question</i></b>					<b>12</b>
<b><i>skipped question</i></b>					<b>3</b>

### Number      Comments on Current Options (You may suggest alternative options in Question 7)

Page 50: I believe the best approach is Option 2 if that contract means no new membership  
**1** charges for rural libraries.

## 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>14</b>

### Number      Response Text

I don't know enough to make a suggestion. It seems that this may be a time to address universal library cards.

## 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	2	5	3	2.10	10
Option 3	4	6	2	1.83	12
Comments on Current Options (You may suggest alternative options in Question 9).					1
<i>answered question</i>					<b>12</b>
<i>skipped question</i>					<b>3</b>

**Number**      **Comments on Current Options (You may suggest alternative options in Question 9).**

- 1** If the idea is to coordinate through multi-type library consortiums, such as PLAN, significant funding has to be made available to help them do it. This cannot become another unfunded mandate and have success.

## 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>15</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>12</b>

Number	Response Text
1	As to the attached proviso language concerning a statewide union database; again this has outlived its usefulness. Many districts already have their collections online and lend across their districts, and never will have the need to lend across county lines. In the 10 years I have worked in media, I have used the ILL component only a few times. Also, I have found the data in Sunlink to be extremely inaccurate. The data is only as good as the process for submitting that data. There are too many ways that data can be left out in the process that has existed and continues to exist.
2	I appreciate the amount of research and effort that went into creating this document. It is very well done.
3	I understand the importance of achieving/establishing an on-line union catalog that is capable of searching the combined library holding of multi-type libraries and what this could mean for the end user - the patron or institution. I also understand the implications of new fees, costs, and/or charges to rural public libraries whether they come in the form of increased annual dues to PLAN or OCLC or DLLI. There are no free monies at PPLCS to support increased charges. There are no new revenue sources for us that support our infrastructure; we are in shrinking economies with out-migration of population. We are not permitted to charge patrons. Our rural public schools are in the same boat.