ALI Board of Directors Meeting  
IUPUI University Library  
February 14, 2012

Present: Daniel J. Bowell (Presiding), Robert Roethemeyer, Brenda Johnson, Susan Clark, Cheryl Truesdell, David Lewis, Mary Persyn (phone), James Mullins, George Stachokas (Resource Advisory Committee), Matthew Shaw (Resource Sharing Committee), John Fribley, Eileen Saner, John Lamborn, Suzanne Rice (for Arthur Hafner, Ball State), Diane Walker, Janet Fore, David Peter.

Absent: Frank Cervone

Call to Order: Bowell called the meeting to order at 10:07 a.m.

Minutes: The minutes of the November 8, 2011 of the Board of Director’s meeting were reviewed. Lamborn moved and Mullins seconded a motion to approve the minutes. Minutes were passed without corrections.

Treasurer’s Report: The ALI budget through the end of December 2011 was reviewed. Persyn reported that the bank had started to charge ALI $25.00/month because we did not have enough in our savings account. Persyn has moved more money into our savings account to avoid any more of these charges, however this leaves less money gaining some interest in CD investments. She will be looking into changing banks, but suggests we wait to make the change until a new treasurer is elected due to all of the paperwork involved. The deposit account with Lyrasis is considerable at this time because we have not paid our share of Academic Source Premier yet. The treasurer’s report was approved by affirmation.

Committee Report: Information Literacy Committee (Susan Clark, Chair):

The Committee has been meeting monthly. She is pleased with the progress being made and the level of participation. At today’s meeting they will be working on an Information Literacy Week – October 2012 proclamation for the Governor. The Committee would like to add another subgroup to work with dual credit issues. It also wants to do something with ACRL 2013. Call for papers for ACRL 2013 have gone out and they are working on submitting a proposal.

Resource Advisory Committee (George Stachokas, Chair):

The new Lyrasis agreement is in force. The RAC is developing an initiative to provide LIS full-text resources for our profession. RAC is looking into a potential licensing strategy for obtaining group discounts for unique e-journal packages. Customizable deals for e-journal packages will be pursued with Taylor and Francis, Elsevier, and EBSCO. The Board would like customizable deals for e-book packages as well. John Lamborn, would ideally like to have a customizable deal with a vendor that enables us to have a group price even if we all don’t have the same title. George noted that this may be difficult because vendors want a mass commitment to make a deal. Existing models are not cost effective. John suggested that we focus on vendors who are willing to work with us and be flexible, such as Ebrary,
Ebsco, or CHOICE’s e-book collection. David Lewis noted that the ideal way is to select a collection, load it, when a user wants it, we purchase it and everyone has access. The campus that selected it pays for it. He admitted that we would have to commit a chunk of money for this. It was suggested that the RAD “knock on doors and see who will talk.” Need more information from the Board. The Board agreed to ask the committee to investigate and pilot a shared e-book pilot project this semester. Mullins asked the RAC to look at initiatives coming out of university presses. We don’t want vendors to dictate the e-book model. E-books should be available on a “preview to purchase” basis. We would like a model where we could rent the e-book for the first two uses and purchase on the third use. That one purchase would then give ownership to all member libraries. Try to find a vendor that will work closely with us. We would need a maximum purchase /per month and a limited legal obligation so we don’t get over extended. Look at Ebrary, EBSCO, university presses in addition to individual publishers. The Board requested that the RAC bring back a proposal(s) to the Board for its consideration and advice.

George noted that the RAC needs to find out what the membership wants so he can continue to build our portfolio. He hopes that the launch of SharePoint and surveys of interest will gather more suggestions from the membership.

RAC would like to collaborate with ILF to expand vendor showcase at the annual conference. They suggested the possibility of working with Lyrasis or Kentucky/Ohio organizations to have a wider vendor presence.

RAC is continuing to work on model licensing language for e-books. RAC is working on wording that addresses resource and scholarly sharing, perpetual access, resource sharing requirements, and e-books accessible on multiple devices.

Jim Corridan from the Indiana State Library arrived and the agenda moved to updates from the Indiana State Library.

**LSTA:** LSTA funds are the same as last year which is good news. Jim asked if academic libraries took part in advocacy for IMLS funding. ILF does advocacy for libraries.

**INSPIRE:** The state is soliciting vendors for the Inspire contract. Jim asked ALI to let him know if there are databases outside the normal group that we want as part of the bidding process. ALI is represented on the INSPIRE Advisory Committee by Lori Duggan and Rebecca Richardson. Vendors must submit their proposal to the state in another week or so. The Indiana History portal has been added to INSPIRE. The Sabin collection from Gale will be added.

**Leadership Academy Program:** The State Library is developing a new leadership academy program for librarians, modeled after the one offered at Harvard. There is a need to develop innovative leaders at all levels. The first class will be fifty selected librarians who will receive extensive training for five days at a state park and three days in Indianapolis. $100,000 has been set aside for this program. The State Library will subsidize the bulk of the cost to attend the institute and is finalizing the lodging and
application process. Notification will probably go out in April or May with the first class seated in August. Mullins requested places be made available for faculty from the School of Library and Information Science as observers to that they can be thinking about the role of the SLIS education of future librarians. The IUPUI SLIS Associate Dean is on the committee. The Board is very interested in this opportunity and requested that we be sent information about it as soon as it is available. The Board also believes that representatives from all library types can learn from each other and that too often we are isolated in our own silos.

**Discovery to Delivery Conference:** The State Library and ALI are working on the Discovery to Delivery conference in March. Some agenda items include statistics and trends in resource sharing and the Fullfillment program. Fullfillment would provide a statewide portal for discovery of materials in Indiana. Eleven states have expressed interest in developing this open source resource. This would be a huge step forward for Indiana and allow libraries to avoid OCLC charges when they loan to each other. Some of the ALI ILS systems are not currently compatible with the Fullfillment system, but ALI libraries are interested in gathering more information about this project.

**INCAT:** INCAT in OCLC has been eliminated. It was costing $97,000/year to have a segmented view. Now that WorldCat allows segmenting searches, it was not cost effective to continue to pay for a separate INCAT catalog.

**Michigan Regional Federal Depository:** The State Library of Michigan reached out to the Indiana State Library to help with their federal depository. Ultimately, the State Library of Michigan is no longer a regional, but has been taken over by GPO. Indiana is interested in Michigan’s strong training program and offering their strong cataloging program. Federal law requires that all adjacent states have the option to take on a neighboring regional depository. Minnesota is also interested in the Michigan collection, especially for the Google Docs digitizing project. The tension between preserving the legacy collection in print and disbanding (thus destroying) the print in order to digitize it has been raging on the Govdoc-l listserv. CIC libraries, including IU and Purdue are contributing to the digitization of the federal documents legacy collection. Digitizing the documents provides greater access than maintaining duplicative print collections. All academic libraries are going to shared collections, why should documents be different? The mindset that they need to be maintained in a physical format more than anything else is not logical. There are more copies of documents duplicated around the country than journals. A question is why would the Indiana State Library want to take on this depository as an added burden to their already stretched resources? Mullins pointed out that this is not part of Indiana’s core mission and is not a no cost operation, but involves people and space. Corridan pointed out that the state library has the staffing model to support taking on the Michigan collection. The Michigan federal depository issue is in GPOs hands right now and depends upon the actions of the Superintendent of Documents. Truesdell argued that State Library resources would be better used to inventory, catalog and preserve Indiana state documents. Corridan replied that they have an inventory of state documents and that everything they have inventoried has been cataloged and entered into OCLC. Born digital documents need to be captured and archived.
E-books: Publishers don’t want to extend access via a statewide consortium, because they are afraid of losing money. Generally, by summer the State Library has some unspent LSTA funds. One idea would be to negotiate a statewide e-book collection. Stachokas wondered if the vendors would try a pilot consortial deal if we offered them a pool of money.

E-readers: The Indiana State Library has purchased several e-readers and is using them to help the public. The State Library is trying to develop programs for early childhood materials.

HAIL: ISL is open to working with ALI’s HAIL. HAIL members have found that information literacy concerns go across library types. The Indiana State Library’s new leadership academy could address information literacy issues. Also, ISL would like HAIL to include education about INSPIRE in its projects.

Book Repository: Mullins asked if the State Library would be willing to pursue an initiative to develop an off-site repository for books that could help preserve the heritage of the state. Historical societies have awful facilities and need spaces for preservation. Eight years ago, ownership was an issue but collective ownership may be possible to discuss now. Corridan noted that the state library has a foundation now and wondered if ALI would be willing to assist in raising money for the foundation to build a facility. ALI suggested that a joint grant application to Lilly foundation might be successful for such a collaborative and innovative project. Indiana could take the lead and be a model for other states. This is a project that may be considered under the next administration.

Legislation: The State Library has a bill drafted for legislative refinement. The state has a mandate to reduce the number of boards and commissions. ISLAC has been recommended for elimination, but a new committee called SLAC has been recommended. This change is still under discussion.

Borrowing and Lending Trends: State Library research on borrowing and lending trends shows that the amount that is being borrowed is the same, but the type of material is different. Circulation is going down, but ILL is going up. People are finding items more specific to their needs in other libraries. People now have access to materials they really want in other libraries. The challenge is to make the transition from more stuff to the right stuff.

Digital repository: Corridan stated that the state is way behind in electronic records management and that it makes sense for Indiana to start a state electronic records initiative. Corridan believes the correct model is a consortial collaborative model to provide redundancy. The Digital Public Library of America consisting of leaders from all types of libraries, museums and archives is taking the first concrete steps toward the realization of a large-scale digital public library that will make cultural and scientific record available to all. State governments are interested in getting state documents and local history items digitized and available in one place.

Communication: The State Library is interested in improving communication between them and ALI. There is currently no direct communication with academic libraries. ALI suggested that the state library send items to Bowell or Truesdell to send out on the ALI lists for the Executive Board and all ALI library deans/directors. Strong positive relationship is beneficial for both parties. Questions remain on the role...
of ALI vis a vis the State Library. What does the interplay look like? What are the big ideas we are trying to tackle? This meeting has been helpful. We agreed that it will be useful to have the State Library represented at future ALI meetings, possibly twice per year. Susan asked how ALI could communicate with the State Library. We noted that the State Library web site is not user friendly. Corridan noted that we can post on listservs set up for other types of libraries and that the Wednesday Word is sent out every week.

**Resource Sharing Committee report:** Shaw reported on plans for the Discovery to Delivery Conference to be held on March 9 at Ball State University’s Student Service Complex. There will be one session on the Fulfillment project. InfoExpress will also on the agenda with a moderated session. Tony Melvyn is going to give an update from OCLC. There will be three breakout sessions in the afternoon, including sessions on IN-Share and Evergreen. Programs were chosen that would appeal to public libraries as well. The Indiana State Library will be issuing LEU credits. The projected total budget is $5,300, ALI agreed to pay half and the State Library will pay the other half. The budget may have to be adjusted after registration, but attendance has been capped at 200.

RSC is working with RAC on model licensing language for e-book acquisition.

Shaw presented the draft Open Access endorsement and template proposed by the Open Access Subcommittee for individual libraries to use at their institution. Mullins expressed concern about libraries speaking on behalf of the university and the need to have it approved by administration and/or faculty. In addition there was a question about the difference between the endorsing statement and the template. The Board suggested that we remove the template as part of the resolution and make them two separate documents. The Board also suggested that the subcommittee re-craft the motion to support the Berlin Declaration on Open Access.

**Resource Advisory Committee Business:** Stachokas asked if the increase in ALI-Lyrasis fees should be distributed in the same way as they were in previous years. The original calculation was based upon a small base fee + FTE/institution. In this scenario the percentages remain the same. Mullins moved and Lamborn seconded a motion to allocate the ALI-Lyrasis fee on the same model as previous years. The motion passed unanimously.

Stachokas presented a proposal from the RAC to send him to the ICOLC meeting in April. Lamborn moved and Saner seconded a motion to pay for his travel and expenses to attend the ICOLC meeting in Denver. The motion passed unanimously.

**Strategic Plan Update:** A new ALI Strategic Plan Task Force needs to begin working on the next ALI plan. The work would be done over the summer and presented to the Board in the fall. A new plan needs to be approved in 2013. Each constituent needs to be represented as well as the standing committees. Rice (standing in for Arthur Hafner) suggested that the board reflect on the successes of the current plan. It was also suggested that we begin with a relatively small group that can meet face-to-face get the process started, because a large committee slows down the process. It was agreed that the current plan is too precise and operational and that the next plan needs to be more streamlined and focused,
but the plan should also address big issues and ideas. Lamborn commented that the Taskforce will have to wrestle with this, but that we should give them some direction and something to work with. He suggested that we find out what is happening with our partners in terms of strategic planning, e.g. PALNI, ISL, etc. Bowell agreed to flesh out a charge to the Task Force and encouraged Board members to think about who from our constituency needs to be named to this group.

**Nominating Committee:** Susan Clark is chair of the Nominating Committee. The Secretary needs to conduct the election for next year’s membership on the Board. The Nominating Committee will need to solicit volunteers for the various offices. The Committee will have to find a new Treasurer. Persyn suggests that the Treasurer live close to Indianapolis for banking purposes. She noted that the job is not difficult and that the accountant does most of the work. Truesdell will get the ballots out immediately for election to the Board and send results to Clark by the first week in March.

**Draft annual meeting program:** The annual meeting will be held at Indiana Wesleyan in Indianapolis, but it will be in a different location, the second floor. Lunch will be in breakout rooms. Mary will finalize location arrangements. Bowell put out ideas for this year’s program based upon past meeting discussions. The idea for this year’s meeting is to encourage conversation and discussion. The theme will center on the report *Redefining the Academic Library*. Bowell asked Johnson to tell the Board a little bit about this report. The report was compiled by the University Leadership Council of the Education Advisory Board through interviewing librarians and provosts from a wide range of academic institutions and libraries regarding the future of academic libraries. The report is provocative and the themes are universal – e.g., redeploying staff, reallocating space, and scholarly communication. At IU the library sponsored a forum around this report to discuss with faculty. Over 160 faculty came and it was a good discussion. Lewis commented that the report is easy to read, has a nice executive summary and checklist for libraries to see where they stand in terms of the future. The checklist would be a great vehicle for discussion.

The Board wants the format of the meeting to move briskly. Saner thought the report could be the conversation starter and then open up for 15 minute responses from various libraries. This could be followed by breakout sessions by topic or by type of library. It was suggested that the lunch hour could also be by topics, type of libraries or random distribution, so we can get different perspectives. It was also suggested that members of the Board be assigned to each table to take notes and bring back information to the board to help with strategic planning.

A planning group was formed with Arthur Hafner, John Lamborn, David Peter, David Lewis, and Brenda Johnson. John Lamborn agreed to convene the group. Mary will be doing the on-site registrations so requests for meeting layout, etc. should be sent to her.

**ALI Cooperative Periodical Retention Project**

Bowell presented a draft of a proposed shared print periodical repository system based upon a similar proposal to PALNI. Is this a project that could gain momentum in Indiana if it included all ALI libraries and not just PALNI libraries? Could a decentralized approach evolve into a centralized repository?
Mullins posed some questions: would it be limited to journals only available in print or electronic titles that many libraries do not have access to? Would it concentrate on humanities and social science journals? David Lewis commented that this is a problem that doesn’t need to be solved. IU has the ALF and the CIC group will have multiple copies of print legacy collections. Concerns were raised whether the CIC journal repositories will be available for use by other than CIC members. What is the public service access to these items? The expectation is that the journals will not be loaned, but what will the digital access be for non-CIC members? Could PALNI pay a fee to house their legacy collections in the IU ALF? ALI needs to seek clarity from IU regarding the access that will be provided to ALI libraries from the ALF. ALI libraries are concerned about freeing up space for other purposes and need to address the issue of print repositories for journals and books. The Board agreed to wait and see what happens with other academic repository projects, such as the Hathitrust, before embarking on a state-wide project.

ACRL 2013: Jim Mullins is co-chairing the local arrangements committee for the 2013 ACRL conference in Indianapolis. This is an opportunity to promote Indiana in a positive way. Feedback from the Super Bowl emphasized the friendliness of Indianapolis. David Lewis commented that ACRL is struggling to find companies to fund events for ACRL. Jim suggested that ALI contribute funds for a sponsorship of the conference. One strategy in the past has been to start with library support in order to encourage corporate support. It is hoped that if companies see that libraries are willing to support the conference that they will give their support as well. ACRL will not be coming back to Indiana for a long time and ALA midwinter is not scheduled for Indianapolis until 2021, so paying for some level of sponsorship will not be requested again in the near future. Dan asked Jim to bring a proposal to the April board meeting to contribute to ACRL both as a sponsor and provide scholarships for Indiana librarians to attend.

By-laws: Janet Fore presented an update on the bylaws. Persyn found other versions of the bylaws including one from 2007 that includes most of the changes that Board believed needed to be made to the bylaws. We need to verify that this 2007 version of the bylaws was voted on by the membership. The ALI minutes are online so we should be able to determine if this was done. Once we verify the latest version of the bylaws in force we can determine the scope of changes needed. One suggestion is that matters of fact, such as institutional name changes should appear in the appendices and not part of the bylaws so changes don’t have to be made to the By-laws every time a name or other simple factual item is changed. Dan asked the By-laws Group to continue working on the updating of the bylaws.

Digital Preservation Network (DPN, pronounced “Deepen”): Brenda and David attended a meeting of the DPN. The purpose of DPN is to create a digital preservation network that would preserve the nation’s digital information in diverse replicating nodes. This effort is being led by CIOs and librarians with the support of university presidents. Over thirty universities committed to forming a launch team to develop long-term preservation practices. Although the cost will be significant, David is confident that the support and technology is available to develop a system to effectively preserve documents and images, for decades, even centuries.

Other Business:
**OCLC’s Game Changer’s Event**: ALI received an invitation to attend the 2-day OCLC Game Changers event. It is not clear if this is a promotional for OCLC’s “Web-Scale Management” system. No ALI Board members showed interest in attending this two-day open-ended discussion.

**BioLine Request**: ALI received a request from Bioline International to become a consortial member at $5,000/year to support the publication of scholarly journals from developing countries. The Board took no action on this request.

**Ernie Pyle Museum** – ALI received a request from the Ernie Pyle Museum to ask our member libraries to contribute books to replace those missing from the personal library of Ernie Pyle and military history books of all periods. The Board agreed to convey the Museum’s needs to our membership.

The meeting was adjourned at 3:01 p.m.