

Academic Libraries of Indiana
Board of Directors
Minutes, December 2, 2008
University of Indianapolis Student Union

Present: Bowell, Catt, Clark, Hafner, Lewis, Mullins (presiding), Persyn, Robson (sec'y), Russo, Salyers, Schmidt, Steele, Young, Younger

Absent: Fore and Slayton

Guests: SOLINET – Kate Nevins, Executive Director & Kate Vincent, Senior Library Sales Consultant; INCOLSA – Michael Piper, Executive Director & Beverly Martin, Executive Committee President; and Michigan Library Consortia (MLC)– Randy Dykhuis, Executive Director

- 1. Call to Order.** Mullins convened the meeting of the Board at 10:04 A.M.
- 2. Agenda.** The agenda was approved as posted.
- 3. Minutes of October 7, 2008.** Approved as corrected.
- 4. Treasurer's Report.** Persyn distributed her report as of October 31st. She noted the merger of IUPU-Columbus with Ivy Tech-Columbus libraries, changing the multiplier to 70 from 71. Ivy Tech-Richmond has yet to pay the annual membership. Expenses to date are normal.
- 5. Evergreen.** Lewis distributed notes on the Evergreen meeting of November 18th. The group will conduct a study in the coming year of the merit of a common ILS for Indiana, not necessarily Evergreen. Questions to be considered: What is being spent by each library? What efficiencies might develop? What problems might emerge? What is to be gained by offering the user a common database? Is Evergreen the best or too rigid? What is meant by a common ILS? Is open-source the better choice or is OhioLink?

The Duke study will be important for the academic community and we will not replicate that work. There are a finite number of ILS vendors and it will be relatively simple to gather the data on what is being spent – time, dollars, personnel – in operating our different systems. There are 6-7 multi-institutional systems and 12 independents like Ball State and Evansville.

An internal consultant will be sought – more cost effective. The steering committee will do much of the work, seeking expertise as needed. A grant would be used to off-set the cost of a consultant. An LSTA Innovation of grant of perhaps \$30,000 would cover the travel and personnel. ALI is in the position to contribute several thousand dollars.

The instability in the vendor market makes it critical to conduct a study now. We may have different contract terms and different expirations – all making migration to a new system challenging. In the end, saving money is not likely to be the primary motivator.

**Lewis will explore creating a charge for the taskforce. He will draft an LSTA proposal in the range of \$27-32K.

**Robson to call OhioLink and ask about their experience. How has resource sharing been affected? What might we expect?

6. SOLINET Presentation/Discussion. Nevins and Vincent were welcomed. Bowell provided background on the work with SOLINET over recent years, primarily in regards to database matters. Nevins explained that SOLINET is more than licensing; it is services and programs. Libraries work more effectively when working together and SOLINET's mission is to facilitate library-to-library cooperation. Innovative cooperation and collaboration among knowledgeable parties is critical. SOLINET is committed to helping libraries adopt the technologies that are meaningful and to improve access to products. Education is a core business, too – on-site and Web-based. In Indiana, the State Library subsidizes SOLINET training. SOLINET is very involved with preservation, disaster recovery, binding, etc. Consortial licensing is but one critical component of SOLINET. Some products are open for additional subscribers, others are not. Experts are available for personalized consulting, with priority given – of course – to members. Consulting can include strategic planning, library layout, and better meetings. In the special category of which SOLINET is more proud was the work in the wake of Hurricane Katrina and working with the Gates Foundation in helping the libraries of Mississippi and Louisiana recover.

The changing business plan of OCLC and its relationships with the networks is of great interest. The programs will continue – WorldCat, ILL, etc. It is the business relationships that are changing. The old service models have little merit in 2008. Networks will try to be certified by OCLC in one or more areas: (1) training, (2) administration and management, (3) marketing and communications, and (4) support and consulting. SOLINET will seek certification in all but the last, which OCLC may want to do itself. OCLC's chief concern will be the quality across networks. OCLC will set a national price – not network by network. In the new arrangement, libraries will be free to work with any network – not geographically tied. The network surcharges will cease, so membership dues will be critical to the viability of the networks. While some networks like ILLINET will remain geographically-based, SOLINET wants to be a national entity. The merger with PALINET will help. Only through economy of scale can SOLINET continue to thrive. To thrive, membership will have to be satisfied. In February OCLC will contact libraries directly and negotiating contracts with vendors. SOLINET will try to streamline the process to ensure continuity. Following an OCLC meeting December 12th, Nevins will know more. Members appreciate the bundling of contracts. The importance of sole-source status for a given vendor or a combination of products can be critical for a network's business plan.

The merger with PALINET will be accomplished in 45 days. Branding the new entity will be important as will a new name. Both are 501(c) 3 corporations and are not legislatively governed. SOLINET is working with the State Library to determine if membership has worked well.

How does SOLINET work with consortia? In general, SOLINET wants to work with existing networks. It also works with 'virtual' libraries – GALILEO and ASERL (Association of Southeastern Research Libraries) are examples.

SOLINET works differently with different consortia. Membership or lack of membership does not disenfranchise. There are two types of membership: full (\$1,600) and affiliated as we have through the State Library's membership. Most members are in the mid to large size, with lower pricing a benefit of membership. Members received priority in service. Group membership is customized per agent. The agent takes some responsibilities, per contract.

Managing the inevitable transitions that are ahead will be a key service of SOLINET. The reason that SOLINET came to Indiana through the State Library is that Roberta Brooker was in Georgia and liked what she saw, wanting Hoosier libraries to have access to a broader range of services and products.

National reach, local touch is the key for SOLINET in the past and will be even more critical in the future. There will be a shakeout and there will be fewer networks two-three years from now. Scale matters.

Some libraries may be tempted to buy all services and products a la carte; but only the largest would have the resources to make such a strategy feasible, if then. Only by creating alliances, such ALI and SOLINET, can larger projects be achieved.

7. Resource Sharing. Our most critical resource issue is medical literature. A grant to study how to solve access will have many stakeholders. The Governor has a keen interest in improving rural health care. Purdue and IU have a great interest over and above what IU-Medical Library can deliver. They often have to go out-of-state because the cost from IU- Medical is too high. Costs are difficult to support by each college; but collectively there may be solutions. Elsevier has a great deal of the best content.

**Bowell and Robson should research foundations that would help fund a study of our needs in Indiana to access medical literature. We need to know what will be unique. The State Library and Jim Corydon want to solve this problem. They will meet with Julie McGowan January 16th.

8. Remote Storage. Steele reported that bonding problems have held up the project. The State Legislature may not want to consider any capital projects because of the economy. IU's existing ALF is full.

9. Public Relations. No report.

10. Distance Education. No report.

11. I-Light. Truesdale will be the chair with Steele's participation. The future of the regional depository model is in doubt. Regionals would like to get out of the business and have "Super" depositories. The deaccessioning is a burden for the regionals. Getting the documents catalogued and digitized will solve much of the challenge.

**Mullins, Steele, Truesdale, Younger and Sally Holterhoff of Valparaiso will discuss the matter. For law libraries and legal research it is often essential that a physical copy be archived, digital is not acceptable.

12. INCOLSA/MLC Presentation/Discussion. Piper, Martin, and Dykhuis were welcomed. Martin reviewed the proposed legislation to make INCOLSA independent of state control. Rep. Blanton is the sponsor. From the INCOLSA reserve fund \$900K will be returned to state coffers with the rest retained for INCOLSA operations. ISL supports the legislation and the Governor's office approves. INCOLSA is a 501(c)3 corporation. This gives INCOLSA freedom to seek new members, such as museums, and to enter into contracts more readily. A tiered governance structure will be needed. Large libraries have special interests not shared by Indiana's smallest operations. Members need to be thinking now in advance of the annual spring meeting about changes in governance structure. In the end, INCOLSA will be more flexible and able to meet academic needs. A 60% vote of existing members will be needed.

A joint MLC/INCOLSA executive board meeting was held. Both Piper and Dykhuis met with OCLC. Partnering between the two will be essential, providing a better transition under the new OCLC model. The partnership will help with dealing with vendors. Group purchasing, however, is but one opportunity for the partnership. Education, marketing, and technology consulting are two areas where strengths can be shared.

Dykhuis reviewed the composition of MLC and its 550 members, 20% of which are academic. OCLC services have been the bedrock of MLC, as with INCOLSA. He described the critical relationship with the Library of Michigan, the state library, in planning and extending services state-wide. It is a mutually beneficial relationship. MeLCat, the centralized union catalog, brings together the holdings of 300+ libraries and facilitates resource sharing – 700K+ requests. Another key partner has been the academic libraries. They have the greatest interest in cooperative database acquisition and licensing. There is no ALI-like organization in Michigan. MLC works hard to cultivate a strong relationship with academics.

What prompted the collaboration? Need to reduce duplication like OCLC field reps. There is a need for something like a Midwest Library Federation that would provide scale and financial strength.

What is the nature of the collaboration? There is a MOU and is limited to group licensing. On December 4th there will be a board meeting to see the progress to date.

What is the affect of the new OCLC model? That certainly gave more impetus to the partnership. The future of the networks is unclear but cooperation – perhaps on a regional basis – will be essential. The Midwest has a large number of state-wide networks that will be difficult to support long-term.

Is a formal merger planned? With 12 networks in the Midwest, merger has to always be a topic under consideration. All need to operate more economically. A shared vision is critical. A deepened expertise

would be the benefit of a merger. An expanded MelCat, uniting Indiana and Michigan holdings in one database, should be of great benefit to users coupled with an effective delivery model.

MLC and INCOLSA have applied to be certified for vendor licensing with OCLC. A draft contract will cover both, with MLC the administrator. The contract will cover support, training, billing, and marketing. The goal is to reduce confusion and help libraries move seamlessly. OCLC prefers the networks to handle billing. It does not want to recontract with 1000s of libraries in a 6 month period. There is a bump six months ahead. In February OCLC will publish 2009/10 pricing.

Those wanting to support the legislative efforts of INCOLSA should write letters of support to Martin.

Motion: Lewis moved and Bowell seconded that ALI supports the legislation to make INCOLSA an independent 501(c)3 corporation.

Motion passed. Mullins will write a letter of support.

There may be a challenge to get the INCOLSA membership to adopt the new governance model.

For the February agenda:

- Models of governance for INCOLSA and the merger with MLC
- Moving business to SOLINET – What is our commitment to Indiana and state-wide resource sharing?
- What is ALI's vision for Indiana and how do the State Library and INCOLSA support that vision?
- Update on first diversity admits to SLIS. Dean Cronin to attend.

13. Center for Research Libraries. Robson reported on his conversation with Bernard Reilly, president of CRL. CRL has no active provision for consortial membership. Membership is growing among elite liberal arts colleges. CRL would have a financial concern if an ALI membership meant the loss of the 0.52% membership fee charged to PU, IU, and Valparaiso. No action for now.

The access to rare materials, if seamless, will improve user appreciation of collections. The value will extend beyond scholars if access is improved.

14. Adjournment. Meeting adjourned at 3:03 P.M. Next meeting is February 10th at IUPUI.