

ALI Board Meeting Minutes
March 27, 2007
IUPUI Library

Present: Dan Bowell, Janet Brewer, Susan Catt, Bill Darr, Arthur Hafner, David Lewis, Susan Mannan, Jim Mullins, Mary Persyn, Robert Roethemeyer, Bob Slayton, John Stachacz, Pat Steele, Judie Violette (chair), and Jennifer Younger (via telephone)

Guests: Michael Piper, INCOLSA Executive Director and Collette Mak, INCOLSA Director of Library Products

Minutes—Susan Catt

Minutes from the December 12, 2006 Board meeting were approved.

Treasurer's Report—Mary Persyn

Mary presented the Treasurer's report as of 02/28/2007. Total expenditures for the year to date are \$3,823.24 leaving a balance of \$18,347.37. The total in reserve is \$34,230.11.

Members' Meeting Program—Jennifer Younger

Arrangements have been made to have Rick K. Johnson, Senior Advisor to ARL and author of "In Google's Broad Wake: Taking Responsibility for Shaping the Global Digital Library" (<http://www.arl.org/resources/pubs/br/br250.shtml>) to engage us in discussion via audio conference and Power Point presentation. This topic aligns with the ALI strategic plan's call for a shared platform for collaboration on digitization. In addition, we would have a panel of four or so library directors speak for four or five minutes on actions their libraries are taking or anticipating taking relating to digitization – how they are helping shape the global digital library. Possible participants are Jim Mullins, David Lewis and Arthur Hafner. Tom Kirk has been contacted about a smaller library to participate. Jennifer will moderate. Suggested format is Rick's comments>panel's comments>discussion and questions, all within an hour and a half timeframe. Suggested honorarium for Rick is \$500.

Conversation with Michael Piper

Michael noted that INCOLSA began in 1974 as the OCLC services network for Indiana. In 1995 INCOLSA merged with the ALSAs (Area Library Services Authorities) and took on their obligations and services which were defined in the Indiana Administrative Code (IAC). This merger also gave INCOLSA a dedicated line item in the state budget. In July, INCOLSA will assume a new business model – a cost recovery model. The 2.2 million dedicated line item in the state budget for INCOLSA (70% of budget) will end. The services outlined in the IAC for INCOLSA (590 IAC 1-2.5-3) will be handled by the Indiana State Library (ISL). These services (from IAC 1-2.5-3) are:

The long range plans of the Indiana cooperative library services authorities shall address the provisions of the following services for members:

- (1) Access to a national bibliographic utility.
- (2) Training and consultation in the area of automation, such as the following:
 - (A) Information retrieval.
 - (B) Retrospective conversion.
 - (C) Equipment and software purchasing.
 - (D) Electronic mail service.
- (3) Reference and referral services to supplement those provided by the local libraries.
- (4) Interlibrary loan of materials, provided in accordance with the most recent edition of the Indiana resource sharing manual.
- (5) Delivery service for the fast, efficient interlibrary loan of materials.
- (6) Consultation, communication, and continuing education for libraries.

The ISL will contract for the services and INCOLSA will presumably be one of the bidders.

INCOLSA will have to find other funding sources for infrastructure (building, staff, etc.). The Build Indiana funds used for INSPIRE will now pass through the ISL. Some LSTA funds will continue to come to INCOLSA (WorldCat will be funded).

The 2008 INCOLSA budget assumes a 32% reduction based on INCOLSA successfully contracting with the ISL to provide services. This will result in a \$1.3 million deficit for 2008. INCOLSA will tap into the operating balance to keep the organization going as it makes the transition to a full cost recovery model. Fees will have to cover costs of services. INCOLSA hopes to use the operating balance as seed capital to develop new services which will become self-sustaining.

INCOLSA's 2007-08 Operating Plan is on its website at <http://www.incolsa.net/inside/INCOLSA30.pdf>

Short term priority is to keep the doors open. Long term goal is to position INCOLSA as a continuing vital partner for Indiana libraries. INCOLSA will become an entrepreneurial start-up. This new INCOLSA will provide fewer services, will seek new opportunities, and will have to increase fees. INCOLSA's role in resource sharing will change but INCOLSA plans to stay vitally engaged.

Bob Slayton asked about the governance model and whether it would change. Michael explained that INCOLSA's governance (a board with 770 members) is outlined in statute (IC 36-12-8-10) so a change in governance will require a change in code. INCOLSA is open to having discussions about a different governance model.

Mary Persyn noted that it sounds like INCOLSA should no longer be in the code at all, that INCOLSA is becoming a not-for-profit (501c3 perhaps) not a municipal corporation. If INCOLSA were to become a not-for-profit then the governance structure could be changed. Michael noted that there is nothing in the code now about how a library services authority can transform itself.

Pat Steele noted that the question of why it was set up the way it was would need to be investigated. The advantages and disadvantages of both (municipal corporation vs. not-for-profit) would need to be weighed.

Jennifer Younger questioned how small public libraries with no real money of their own will be able to pay in a cost recovery model. Some of the 2.2 million INCOLSA received and part of the LSTA money has been used to support services which these small public libraries could not afford on their own. The ISL needs to consider how public libraries are formed and what a public library is. Has INCOLSA looked at the revenue capacity of its 700 plus members and what the potential is for cost recovery?

Michael noted that when you look at regional library consortiums in general there is an inverse relation between the size of the library and extent to which they rely on the consortium. The question of whether small publics will be able to sustain a new cost recovery model remains to be answered. Public libraries are funded in large part with local funds, not state funds. INCOLSA's help was an indirect subsidy from the state. It remains to be seen what the full ramifications of the change to cost recovery will be.

Pat Steele noted that the standards that are in place for Indiana public libraries are not being met by many small publics. Communities love their small libraries but a state either has standards (in which case they should be met) or not. The question is how you can fold those small libraries into a broader context so they have the support they need. It becomes an emotional issue for communities.

Jennifer observed that one upside to this budget crisis is making the un-discussible able to be discussed. A lack of money makes it necessary that issues be addressed. INCOLSA will be the driver for getting these issues discussed because of the new cost recovery model. Jim Mullins noted that this offers an opportunity for us to speak with one voice to the legislature and the governor who are interested. This is a golden opportunity to solve some library issues statewide.

Judie Violette asked Michael about cooperation between consortiums – particularly those in the Midwest. Michael said there is little collaboration. Discussions of collaboration are just now starting to take place. David Lewis stated that consolidation of networks or consortiums and the elimination of inefficiencies may be one answer to higher fees. David noted that fees should be based on the cost of providing the service – one fee should not be kept high to subsidize the fee for another service.

Michael said INCOLSA is uncertain what will happen with the regional service centers. There may be a bid opportunity for providing ILL service. Jim suggested that customer initiated ILL may be an alternate to INCOLSA intermediated ILL. Jennifer said this is a prime area for change. Currently 238 of 770 INCOLSA libraries use OCLC for doing ILL.

Jim observed that the operating balance if used as venture capital would allow INCOLSA to look at what can be done in a very creative way. INCOLSA can completely rethink what the organization is. It was agreed that if the ISL will address the issue of all the small public libraries then perhaps INCOLSA can focus on the libraries that have the wherewithal to make us a fly-to state rather than a fly-over state.

Michael stated that Wheels will continue but there has been no decision on who will run it. As far as the accounting service that INCOLSA has provided ALI (at no charge), Michael stated that we will reach an agreement that meets ALI's needs.

Strategic Planning—Jim Mullins

Jim handed out answers to the survey which show strong support for everything. The ones that came out on top are:

- Shared Licensing
- Access to Collections
- Sponsor Workshops
- Advocate for Librarian Education
- Collections-Related Planning

The subcommittee looked at the results and then decided to reorganize the strategic plan. The new plan will be a lot shorter with just the points we want to cover and the objectives we hope to accomplish in the next five years. The new document will have the vision, the mission and then goals and objectives. It will be the job of the board to determine tactics to accomplish those goals and objectives.

Based on the survey answers the committee produced five categories as project initiatives.

- Digital Resources (acquiring and/or creating)
- Print and Physical Collections (storage, shared repositories, cooperative collection development, last copy initiatives, collections-related planning, document delivery, access, etc.)
- Teaching and Learning Support
- Professional Development and Career Planning (working with library schools to help them educate librarians for the roles we now need in our libraries) (also diversity in librarianship)
- Advocacy

Jim said the committee will continue to work on the plan's wording.

The new plan may still be a draft by the time of the members' meeting but the budget can be drawn up based on the ongoing work of the current taskforces.

It was noted that the by-laws state that there should be two members' meetings per year. Pat Steele moved and Mary Persyn seconded a motion that we take to the members a by-laws change eliminating the second meeting. The motion passed unanimously.

Database Licensing—Dan Bowell

ALI Licensing Survey – sent out February 19, 2007. The results were not overwhelmingly in favor of any one resource. Taskforce is not sure where to go from here. We may have reached the core of resources that the majority of members are interested in. Wonder if there are other sorts of services we should be considering.

Dan Bowell discussed the RFI (request for information) for a service provider to work on behalf of ALI to identify resources, negotiate, and manage licensing. The taskforce is suggesting this position because a volunteer effort is not going to be very fruitful, although Lewis Miller did a lot of work on our behalf in getting the core resources. To go further we need a more systematic approach. The assumption is that we would advertise the RFI and also send it out to agencies that might be interested.

Jennifer asked if we think there are interested parties out there. Dan indicated that in informal conversations there does appear to be interest. Jennifer noted this might serve as a catalyst to single state networks to share and leverage their expertise and resources. Jim suggested that If INCOLSA becomes a not-for-profit instead of a state entity it will have more flexibility about entering into interstate agreements.

David stated that since the next item of business is to send Lewis to Montreal for the International Coalition of Library Consortia (ICOLC) meeting, we should send him to Montreal with the RFI.

Jim and Pat noted that up to this point the work on shared resources has led to a fairly paltry list of results and a fairly paltry list of what people can see doing cooperatively. The question becomes does ALI do an RFI for the few cooperative purchases we are now doing or do we try to join in with a larger entity that already has a significant range of offerings. Jennifer suggested that ALI is too small so we need to look at ALI forming a larger group or offer ALI members the option of joining other larger groups. This might serve as a catalyst for the Midwest networks to think seriously about joining forces.

Jim suggested that the state should help support academic library database purchases. Other states are doing this. The RFI could be a step to show the state there is a need. The Commission for Higher Education (CHE) should be interested in this as a way to bring our resources together and manage them most effectively.

David Lewis moved that we approve the draft of the RFI and that we approve the \$1200 to send Lewis Miller to Montreal to get responses to it. John Stachacz seconded. Motion approved unanimously.

Resource Sharing—Robert Roethemeyer

Robert Roethemeyer presented the plan for Odyssey/Direct Request training to be held on June 5th (for ILLiad libraries) and the 6th (for OCLC Resource Sharing libraries). The cost for Stephanie from Atlas Systems to come do the Odyssey training would be \$1800. The Odyssey part would be the afternoon of the 5th and the morning of the 6th. The INCOLSA Direct Request portion of the training (the morning of the 5th and the afternoon of the 6th) would be \$30 per person (approximately \$1440, assuming 48 participants). Additionally a meal for both days would cost approximately \$300.

The training will focus on preparing people to actually go home and do these things (use Odyssey and implement Direct Request). These are not demonstration sessions. Robert indicated that there are a number of libraries wanting to do both.

Robert noted that we have an opportunity a month before at the members' meeting to make directors aware of this training opportunity that they can then implement over the summer in preparation for fall. We could also use the ALI website for information and links.

Arthur Hafner noted that this is an opportunity for ALI to offer something useful to the members. Interlibrary loan is a core service for academic libraries. David Lewis noted that while this is something we can reasonably fund it would be helpful to test market it on the directors' listserv to gauge interest.

Jennifer suggested that we go ahead and authorize the expenditure as it is directly related to something ALI is trying to support. To move our goals ahead we need more libraries using Direct Request and Odyssey.

David suggested a pre-session to the members' meeting where folks already using Odyssey and/or Direct Request would be available to talk about both with interested directors. Better service to users and efficiency are both selling points. This would help people decide if they want to send staff to the actual training.

David Lewis moved to authorize Robert and his committee to spend up to \$3500 to move this project forward at their discretion as to the particulars. Jennifer Younger seconded. Motion approved unanimously.

Arthur volunteered Kristy to work on posters for the pre-session. Robert will chair that pre-session effort and will promote both the awareness and the training opportunities.

Public Relations/Web—Arthur Hafner

Arthur stated that if people will send him their documents (minutes, treasurer's reports, handouts and reports from meetings, etc.) he will see that they are posted on the website. He does have people ask him where they are – especially reports, which in many cases are nowhere.

Arthur demonstrated changes to the website. The new ALI Calendar has notices of our meetings and links to any information (agenda, directions, etc.) that Arthur receives ahead of time.

Resource Sharing Taskforce—Robert Roethemeyer and Collette Mak

The members of the Resource Sharing Taskforce (convened and led by INCOLSA) are:

Janet Brewer, Anderson University
Jim Corridan, Indiana State Library
Christy Ann Groves, Ball State University
Kathy Halaschak, INCOLSA I*Ask
Collette Mak, INCOLSA
Robert Roethemeyer, Concordia Theological Seminary
Rita Rogers, Indiana University, Bloomington
Ron Sharp, Indiana State Library
Elaine Skopelja, Indiana University School of Medicine
Carolyn Strickland, Lake County Public Library
Suzanne Ward, Purdue University

Many of these same folks served on the ALI Resource Sharing Taskforce.

The big idea – Indiana libraries collectively have the resources to meet user demands within the state. A possible reason why we have not done so is that we have not been able to move the materials effectively between our libraries. We all have some unique material and through resource sharing we can make that unique material available. For fall 2005 and spring 2006, 67% of requests were filled within Indiana and 33% were filled out of state.

We can make incremental gains in resource sharing by working in four different areas:

- Discover
- Locate
- Request
- Deliver

Components of the Direct Request pilot (done in the fall of 2005 and the spring of 2006):

Discover, Locate, Request—this was what the direct request piece was about – having a common catalog (WorldCat/INCat) where users can discover material, locate it in our collections, and request it.

Deliver—this was the five days Wheels service piece - allowed material to be moved more efficiently and quickly.

This pilot showed we could move material in 3-5 days, meeting user expectations based on Netflix, Amazon, etc.

The Taskforce White paper (Waging the Long Tail: Sharing More of Less) available at http://www.incolsa.net/services/uploads/white_paper_final.pdf list some achievable goals:

- Principles
- Recommendations
- Minimum Standards
- Best Practices

Robert noted that best practices should be regularly reviewed and over time would become a minimum as other best practices are identified.

David questioned the statement on page 8 that “...the Indiana library community set the goal of 100% inclusion by 2008” (inclusion in INCat). David questioned whether trying to include all the small libraries with no unique holdings is an appropriate use of resources.

Bob and Mary both questioned whether there was a solution to Indiana libraries having to go out of state for articles from medical journals. Maybe a database or a state funded position that would allow the IU Med Center to meet the need would be a solution. Robert noted that we have at least surfaced the issue (with data) even if we have not resolved it.

The white paper was endorsed by INCOLSA on February 23, 2007. PALNI has reviewed it and will come back to it at their next meeting.

Jennifer stated that we need to get libraries interested in ILLiad and if ALI has to pay to get it going then that is what we should do. David noted that perhaps the money used to support the various INCOLSA regional offices could be better spent. There are more efficient and better ways of doing things for the small publics than the regional offices. We are in an environment where it is much better to look at an electronically delivered system than the INCOLSA regional systems where so much intervention is required. Pat noted that there are other document delivery systems being developed.

David stated that the point is to be able to provide the infrastructure to local libraries so they can take part, but there is a threshold below which you can't fund it. Then whose problem is it? This is a question the state needs to ask.

Jennifer noted that there are other options than trying to equip every library in our state with the ability to do ILL. Collette noted that the white paper is suggesting that if you are going to play you do a good job of it – not that everyone should play.

Jennifer suggested that ALI use some of its dollars to make it possible for more academic libraries to be involved in automated ILL. Bob suggested that the smaller academic libraries should make a commitment to contribute to the bigger whole. Maybe need to look at ILL with a broader perspective – what can the smaller academics contribute to the state?

Twenty-six academics and two publics in Indiana use ILLiad.

David Lewis moved that we endorse the white paper and Dan Bowell seconded. The motion passed unanimously.

Next meeting April 10, 2007

Submitted by
Susan L. Catt
April 5, 2007