Welcome
Judith Violette (IUPFW), President, convened the meeting at 9:30am with welcoming comments and an overview of the day’s events.

Concurrent breakout sessions
Members attended the breakout session of their choice:

1) Information for directors about Illiad, Odyssey, Direct Request, and other resource-sharing programs - sign staff up for *free* June conference - Robert Roethemeyer (Concordia Theological Seminary) and Suzanne Rice, Lisa Chambers, Christy Groves, Elaine Nelson (all from Ball State University)
2) Digitization projects - Arthur W. Hafner and John Straw (both from Ball State University)
3) Top Ten Assumptions for the Future of Academic Libraries and Librarians: A Report from the ACRL Research Committee - Jim Mullins (Purdue University)
4) A Model for Academic Libraries 2005 to 2025 – David Lewis (IUPUI)

See: http://idea.iupui.edu/dspace/handle/1805/665

Program
Rick Johnson, a senior advisor for the Association of Research Libraries, presented (via audio) a program and discussion on Shaping the Global Digital Library.

Jennifer Younger (Notre Dame University) served as moderator.

Jennifer introduced Mr. Johnson noting that among the things he is known for are his role in founding SPARC (Scholarly Publishing and Academic Resources Coalition) and as a co-founder of BioOne. His presentation was based largely on his February 2007 article in ARL: A Bimonthly Report on Research Library Issues and Actions from ARL, CNI, and SPARC titled In Google’s Broad Wake: Taking Responsibility for Shaping the Global Digital Library. See http://www.arl.org/bm~doc/arlb250digprinciples.pdf

Presentation:

This project started last year which was about two years after Google started its book scanning projects with research libraries. ARL was motivated by a desire to take stock of the experience to date - what the core interests are for libraries: what they have at stake. We actually all have interests at stake here. Intellectual capital is created by every academic institution. These agreements depend on the consent of the institutions with which libraries are associated. Without access to the collections libraries have assembled and cared for at great expense there would be no Google Book Search, Microsoft Live Book Search, etc.

The public perception of these scanning projects (everything will be available free to all) and the reality “…to create a comprehensive card catalog” (as Google says) are not the same. It is
important to understand how their (Google, etc.) motivations match public, scholarly, and institutional goals.

Factors that shape the outcomes are copyright and legal issues, business issues (investments must pay off), and contract terms (libraries must know what they want, identify shared goals, and get them in the contract.

Libraries have an obligation to use their negotiating leverage aggressively for the public interest and for their own interest. Mass digitization projects will advance information, which is their appeal. But we must guard against erosion of the public domain and fair use. Those institutions that make their collections available have the power to shape the global digital library - to preserve the public domain. As public and tax advantaged institutions they have an obligation to do so. Libraries also should expect ambitious outcomes that serve institutional, educational and research goals – a return on the considerable investments they have made in their collections.

Institutions should (by way of agreement) obtain a copy of their scanned works and the right to use them. There is danger that public domain will be degraded as a result of usage restrictions by partners. In the digital environment restrictions have a way of creeping up with technical protections, usage guidelines, and licenses serving as limiters.

The two key goals are to preserve the public domain and to expand the opportunities for new forms of digital scholarship allowing service overlays (at least in the public domain subset). The Google files are simple PDF format which doesn’t allow much to be done with them. This is why specifying technical standards in agreements we sign is so important.

The way to build the perfect digital library is for libraries to do it themselves. The Open Content Alliance (OCA) is one such effort. It takes into account many of the concerns raised, but the biggest challenge it faces is the scope and velocity of Google’s project.

We need to remind ourselves that book scanning is not the end of the road. There is lots of other material that will need to be digitized, much of it in institutions other than research libraries. The fundamental issues that apply to books in research libraries apply to all these other materials and sources.

Libraries need to ask many questions relating to this issue. One question is how libraries add value in this emerging environment. Another question is how far libraries and their institutions want this sharing to go. Libraries may be afraid that if they open their collections to the world they will lose their competitive differentiation. Ross Atkinson felt that there is much else that distinguishes libraries beyond their collections and that differentiation will shift from the scope of libraries’ collections to the extent of the value that the libraries add to them. That is the new competitive arena.

The bottom line is that libraries and their institutions benefit most when the digital library is shared and ubiquitous. Libraries must use their power as collection stewards to negotiate farsighted, principled agreements with those who wish to exploit library collections.

Questions and Answers:

Q. Is there a possibility of censorship of digital collections and caving in much like Yahoo did for the Chinese government?
A. Anytime you have commercial interests at stake there is that danger. Contracts with libraries could prevent it from happening by building in protections and by libraries getting copies of items digitized from their collections.

Q. How can we communicate to people that their perception of what Google will offer and what it will really offer are not the same?

A. This is part of the library value added piece – getting out there and letting your constituencies know what they are and are not getting with Google Book. That Google Book is less than meets the eye.

Q. If there anything we can do to ensure that we will always have access to those things being digitized that are in the public domain?

A. Someone needs to keep at least one print copy. Also libraries that have digitization agreements with Google can make sure they receive digital copies and that they are allowed (by Google) to provide public access.

Q. Why are publishers still publishing printed books? What is your prediction on the publishing industry in its current form?

A. The printed book will not be going away any time soon. Books are used in different ways, for different purposes, by different kinds of users. Printed journals may go away before printed books.

Q. What rights is Google reserving for itself in the contracts it signs for copyrighted material?

A. Google is keeping pretty tight control because they are worried about copyright infringement lawsuits if a work they have digitized is used illicitly.

Q. Why has neither Google nor the government made more government information available since it is not copyrighted?

A. That will come in time. It is an obvious place for Google to be going. We will see more partnerships like Google and NASA, who is making a lot of their records available to Google. Other agencies will follow suit. Google and state governments will partner to make computerized records available. This is why it is important to have some kind of principles to guide these endeavors. Must be sure they don’t abandon the public interest in their haste to get materials digitized.

Q. Do you feel confident that such principles (to protect public domain and public access) are being developed (especially by government agencies)?

A. NARA (National Archives and Records Administration) got some bad feedback when they rushed into some of these agreements. The Smithsonian/Showtime deal illustrated some of the pressures on the agencies. Their funding situations may cause them to do things that may not necessarily be in the public interest.

It is good that these discussions are going on and that libraries and their institutions are concerned.
**Introductions**
Members introduced themselves and noted which institutions they represent.

**Election of at-large Board of Directors’ member**
Janet Brewer (Anderson University), chair of the nominating committee, put forth a slate of two names for the at-large position on the ALI Board of Directors - Myrna McCallister (Indiana State University) and Janet Fore (St. Mary’s College). There were no nominations from the floor. It was moved and seconded that the nominations be closed. The motion passed unanimously. Ballots were marked by members and collected by the nominating committee.

**Break for Lunch**

**Results of at-large Board of Directors vote**
Janet Fore will be the at-large member for 2007-2008.

**Election of officers**
Janet Brewer, chair of the nominating committee, put forth the following slate of officers for 2007-2008:
- Jim Mullins (Purdue) - President
- Susan Mannan (Ivy Tech Indianapolis) - Vice President
- Bill Darr (Grace) – Secretary
- Mary Persyn (Valparaiso Law) – Treasurer

Janet Brewer moved that the slate of officers be accepted, Michele Russo (Indiana University South Bend) seconded, and the slate was accepted. There was a call for nominations from the floor. There were no nominations from the floor. Pat Steele (Indiana University Libraries) moved to close the nominations, Eileen Saner (Associated Mennonite Biblical Seminary) seconded, and the nominations were closed by unanimous vote. Arthur Hafner (Ball State University) moved that the slate be approved by acclamation; the motion was seconded and approved.

**Business meeting**
The Business meeting was called to order by Judy Violette

- **President’s report for 2006-2007**
  Judith Violette, ALI President for 2005-2006 and 2006-2007 took the opportunity to thank the Board members, officers, and taskforce chairs for their hard work and help during her tenure. Taskforce chairs were:
  - Dan Bowell - Database Licensing
  - Susan Mannan - Distance Education/Off-Campus Library Services
  - Patricia A. Steele - Government Documents Light Archives Planning Group and Shared Storage
  - Robert Roethemeyer - Resource Sharing
  - Arthur W. Hafner - Web Site Development and Public Relations
  - Jim Mullins - Strategic Planning
  - Janet Brewer - Nominations

Accomplishments of the taskforces this year included: new strategic plan, Indiana light archives for government documents project, plan for shared services and storage module at
Indiana University Bloomington, continuation of database licensing agreements, RFI for an individual or group to negotiate licensing and content management of databases for ALI, Academic Search Premier project with the Indiana State Library, template for all libraries to use to detail their services for distance education and off-campus students, Direct Request/Resource Sharing Pilot, improved and expanded website, co-sponsored Library as Place with IALA, provided support to send Lewis Miller (Butler University) and the RFI to ICOLC, participated in the Indiana Library Leaders’ Council and Indiana State Library Advisory Council.

- **Recognition of departing Board of Directors members**
  Susan Catt, Janet Brewer, Judy Tribble (in absentia), and Pat Steele were presented with certificates of appreciation. Pat will remain on the Board until the new Dean of Indiana University Libraries is named, which will happen prior to the next Members’ Meeting.

- **Minutes from 2006 Members Meeting**
  Susan Mannan moved and Jim Mullins seconded that the minutes of the 2006 Members’ meeting be approved. The minutes were approved unanimously.

- **Proposed change in by-laws**
  Proposed bylaws change: Article II, Section 2.2. Regular Meetings … [last sentence]: The members shall meet at least two (2) times each fiscal year, which shall include the annual meeting, shall be changed to: The members shall meet at least once each fiscal year.

Margaret Seifert (Ivy Tech Madison) moved and it was seconded that the change in the by-laws be approved. The change was approved unanimously.

- **Treasurer’s report**
  Mary Persyn presented the report from this year and the proposed budget for 2007-08. Mary moved and Pat Steele seconded that the proposed budget be approved. The proposed budget was unanimously approved.

- **Academic Search Premier (ASP) project**
  Dan Bowell noted that ALI members paid $320,000 for ASP this year. EBSCO has quoted $340,000 for next year. The Indiana State Library (ISL) has proposed that we subscribe again this year with the ISL contributing $100,000 to the cost with the proviso that ASP become part of INSPIRE and be available to the entire State of Indiana. EBSCO is agreeable with this.

  It was stressed that the ISL needs to know quickly if we accept their proposal. The details of how we divide the costs can be worked out over the summer. It was mentioned that those ALI members who do not currently subscribe to ASP may be asked to pay some minimal cost. It was also noted that INSPIRE contracts are for three years so there should not be a price increase unless the ISL does not contribute the $100,000 in subsequent years.

Ken Gibson (Hanover College) made a motion that the ALI Licensing Taskforce partner with the ISL to license ASP. Bob Slayton seconded the motion. The motion was approved unanimously.
- **Strategic plan**
  - Kristina Brewer, Tri-State University
  - Ed Edmonds, University of Notre Dame School of Law
  - Janet Fore, Saint Mary’s College
  - John Fribley, Ivy Tech North Central - South Bend, Elkhart, Warsaw
  - James L. Mullins, chairperson, Purdue University
  - Timothy Sutherland, Indiana University Northwest

ALI members joined one of five discussion groups to discuss ALI’s goals and determine what actions we can take to accomplish the objectives listed under the goals:
  - Increase access to electronic databases and content through collaboration by ALI Libraries
  - Enhance quality of, access to, and curation of tangible collections within ALI libraries
  - Provide effective instructional support for students in partnership with faculty via ALI libraries
  - Support professional development and educational opportunities for librarians in ALI’s libraries
  - Proactively engage within our institutions, with government organizations, with statewide library agencies, and with schools of library and information science.

The list of actions generated by each group will be given to the Board to be considered at a future meeting. The Board will generate an action item plan.

**Adjournment**
Members were free to leave as soon as their strategic plan group finished their discussions.