ALI Board Meeting Minutes 11/11/04

Present: Kathryn Carpenter (by phone), Janet Fore, Art Hafner, Lynn Hufford, Tom Kirk, David Lewis, Lewis Miller, Mary Persyn, Robert Roethemeyer, Michele Russo, Margaret Seifert, Suzanne Thorin, Judie Violette, Jennifer Younger.
Recorder: Janet Fore

Announcements
Board Minutes—corrections were made as sent to Susan. Mary moved to accept, Michele seconded, approved unanimously.

ALI Web site

Art Hafner, Tom Kirk, Robert Roethemeyer discussed. The ASERL site was reviewed for ideas as to design and content. Handouts included copied pages as examples.

Arthur looked at purchasing a domain name from commercial source—about $5/year + $10/month to host. If we really want .edu, one of our institutions will need to host and Earlham and Ball State have volunteered. ASERL appears to be a model for content we might want to offer.

Question: Judie Violette would like for the domain to remain the same because of the difficulty, when moved, for people who link to the site.

Answer: The core that identifies that institution has to remain. You can run a domain inside a domain, but there are significant IT security issues.

Question: IF BSU hosted, could contributors use “Contribute” to edit? (similar to, easier than Dreamweaver).

If Earlham hosts, they don’t want multiple people accessing to edit and there might be difficulty in one person doing all the updating.

What we have is organized from the point of view of the Board and Membership, not from the end user’s perspective.

Jennifer Younger then turned the task back to Art and Tom to address the following questions: What do we need? How much time would it take?

Kate Carpenter suggested the site has a couple of purposes: (1) the organization (membership operations) and (2) users’ purpose (our mission to the outside world)

Art and Tom will work on a few pieces and then give it a look, perhaps starting with a map of the institutions.
Survey of ALI member current technological environments – Robert Roethemeyer

Purpose: Survey of tech environments since much has changed since the original task force explored the issue. We want to see where we have gaps. The task force will work on the survey and test it and present at the January Board meeting.

One piece of this data is the OCLC cataloging and holdings data. Robert will be meeting with Doug Potts in the next two weeks who will bring a report of the OCLC Indiana libraries.

Of interest is a new portal in the Tampa Bay area. OCLC is creating a group catalog.

Jennifer urged Robert and the task force to go ahead and pilot the survey with a couple of libraries, and to include in the cover letter information from the OCLC report.

Direct borrowing—Judie Violette


Brochures are out to member libraries regarding “Reciprocal Borrowing” (in person). Please let Judie know if you have not received the brochures.

What is our goal re resource sharing and direct borrowing?

The statewide resource sharing summit is coming up, possibly as soon as December 2004 or January 2005, and the possibility for a statewide catalog will be brought up. But this is not the same as direct borrowing.

David Lewis stated that if it is just ALI there are different issues than a statewide catalog. The issues related to direct borrowing are load leveling and responsibility of institution of borrower.

Judie noted that another issue is reimbursement for net lenders.

A borrowing module to a state catalog will be expensive, and security issues will probably not be solvable for five years. However, we may not be talking about anything sooner than five years.

David suggested that if we agree philosophically, if there’s an opportunity that allows us, we want to do this.

To Judie and Robert: Do we think academic libraries would support statewide catalog?—Yes.

The question posed was that, if load leveling, net transaction costs, responsibility are solved, would we be in favor of direct borrowing among some set of libraries? We have at least three options: (1) Statewide—with or without some libraries who would choose
to opt out; (2) Academic libraries; or (3) Both, academic libraries and statewide for those who can.

Jennifer asked Robert and Judie to identify the decision points, extent, limits, and discuss on e-mail. We will discuss this at the January and March Board meetings. We can then present a proposal at the membership meeting with a clear direction upon which people agree.

Tom hopes we (ALI) don’t think so far out in the future that we don’t examine all the issues. If this is what we want to do, we should push forward and look at possibilities we can use now.

Robert suggested we put this issue out to our constituencies to reflect on and prepare before the membership meeting.

Jennifer asked that we get out to our constituencies the information Judie and Robert are preparing: a Framework and decision points, which the Board will discuss at the January 26 Board meeting. Then Board members can discuss it with their constituencies and bring back their input to the March Board meeting.

The sense of the group is that ALI thinks a statewide catalog is a good idea.

Judie, Robert and Jennifer will put out an announcement of the upcoming statewide summit.

**INSPIRE – David Lewis**
The meeting of the INSPIRE advisory committee which Lewis Miller is chairing discussed priorities and agreed that it doesn’t make sense to change databases until we know what the legislature will allocate. We have funding through the calendar year of 2005 and, if continuing contracts, through 2006. There will be decision points in 2006. We will hear via the INCOLSA list from the Advisory Committee about priorities and timeline.

It will be useful for ALI to lobby (through individual library efforts) for INSPIRE and useful internally at our institutions to be clear that INSPIRE is important to us. We can get a “value” to our institutions from INCOLSA (cost avoidance, not what it would cost to license individually.)

An ALI resolution (handout) resolution was presented in support of INSPIRE. Tom moved to accept. Margaret seconded. Approved unanimously. Jennifer will convey the resolution to the membership as well as to John Barnett, ILF Advocate; Barbara Maxwell, State Librarian and Michael Piper, Executive Director, INCOLSA.

**Treasurer’s Report—Mary Persyn**
Mary noted the non-profit organization liability insurance policy costs $1500. We have allocated $2000 in the budget to cover and asked the Board to approve expenditure. Suzanne moved to approve. David seconded. Approved unanimously.

Budget report corrections as report after the meeting on e-mail:
ALI’s proposed income for 2004-05 is $25,152 and proposed expenditures are $23,450. The total expenditures so far for this year are correct at $2,741.15.

Discussion on possible proposals for funding
Suzanne reported the Auxiliary Library Facility (ALF) would take $5 million to build another module. IU will need a second module. IU is on the list for a bonding proposal to raise money for building that second module. It could house three million items with ALI using half. IU would cover the structure and upkeep and it would cost ALI less, based on transaction or rental fee. If built by revenue bonds, it would mean that transaction fees would need to cover the cost of bond debt service.

Jim Mullins is looking at need for a module at Purdue. This might result in north and south modules.

Storage is seen as an increasing need for books, journals, government documents.

Judie discussed the ILL task force for government documents, and that GPO is talking about digitizing the legacy collection in five years. This would have significant implications for academic libraries if this were completed.

Tom noted that the facility is an infrastructure issue. It’s a high priority and we should move forward on this as a priority.

We need to be able to make a case for a facility and the program will have to be self sustaining.

We may need to do a survey again about what libraries might consider storing. Libraries would need to think through strategies on what stays on site, what off site, and what gets discarded. There isn’t a state side strategy for what gets saved. We would need strategy discussion to be able to plan the infrastructure. University of California system has a lot of good documents/policies.

We may want to look at programmatic areas and develop a program statement for discussion at the membership meeting which would lay the ground work for a survey.

Jennifer asked the Storage Task Force to convene and develop a program statement and background documents to present at the membership meeting. Preliminary discussion of the program statement at the March 31 Board Meeting.
Enhanced resources sharing and everyday delivery was discussed as the second priority for grant funding. It would be difficult to use grant funding for an ongoing cost. It was agreed that we would put this priority on hold for now.

**Digitization Summit—David Lewis**
This summit will be held December 9. There is LSTA funding available for 6-8, $25-75K projects. He got little response in a call for projects. The deadline for LSTA applications is December 16, 2004. David will get the information out.

**Database Licensing—Lewis Miller**
The task force met October 20, and a week before the meeting had access to the “Database of databases” document compiled for ALI by IU Bloomington library staff. It meets our needs, and will be extremely valuable. The Task Force voted to ask Jennifer to write a thank you letter to IU and the people who did a great deal of work on this.

Dennis Lawson is putting it into Excel and has produced some sample reports. The institutional profile will be included in phase 2. This will be a snapshot with some possible updating. In the next six weeks the task force will see some reports.

The task force will be working on three priorities: (1) the database of databases, (2) new databases available and (3) vendor initiatives.

The task force will bring a proposal to ALI Board in January on the feasibility of an ALI database licensing office. This office would work with the db of db’s, be a license depository, do database negotiating and activities such as accounting.

**Question:** What does it mean once we have capacity to negotiate licenses? What options for models do we want to pursue?

**Membership meeting, May 12, 2005.**
Speaker(s) Suggestions included representative from OhioLink regarding multiple models within a consortium or a PALCI (Pennsylvania Academic Library Consortium) representative regarding how academic libraries of various sizes work together.

The Database Task Force was asked to discuss and then invite Tom Sanville (of OhioLink) to the membership meeting. He could speak on models for database licensing by a library consortium.

Another suggestion for a speaker was someone to talk about government documents digitization.

**Location:** Indiana Wesleyan
Contract is signed. Menu chosen.
Strategic plan and budget will be presented

We’ll need to finalize the budget at the April Board meeting (preliminary in March)
In January, we’ll need to get the Nominating Committee started and we will need to decide what we want on the membership meeting agenda and what to highlight.

**Officers’ Reports**
Jennifer talked to Barbara and Michael in a “cross organizational” meeting and discussed what ALI’s been talking about and what’s on our mind.

No Vice Chair or Secretary report.
Board adjourned at 2:30 p.m