

**LiLI Board Meeting
February 20-21, 2001**

Tuesday, February 20, 2001

Attendance: **Board:** Paul Krause, Joe Reiss, Charlie Bolles, Kay Flowers, Ruth Funabiki, Karen Ganske, Tom Olsen, Dawn Wittman, Paul Holland, Ron Force. **Board Staff:** Rand Simmons, Ann Joslin, Sonja Hudson. **Committee members/liaisons:** Marcia Beckwith, Dan Lester. **ISL Staff:** Jan Wall, Frank Nelson, Marj Hooper, Carol Silvers, Mike Samuelson, Keith Hammer. **Guests:** Dave Brunell.

Meeting was convened at 1:30 p.m.

BCR Presentation: Dave Brunell, Executive Director.

Dave Brunell, Executive Director of BCR discussed the services offered to members including the coordination of purchasing databases and training. The Idaho State Library became a member of BCR on January 1, 2001. They joined with four other western states: Alaska, Washington, Oregon, and Hawaii. Montana is already a member.

Databases:

ISL membership in BCR allows Idaho libraries to purchase databases and services through BCR without paying an individual membership fee.

Discussion focused on purchasing a statewide license to World Cat through BCR, and, more broadly, the issues of a virtual catalog and lack of MARC21 records in small libraries.

There are a number of smaller libraries without machine-readable records. Idaho has approximately 107 public libraries and 113 school districts with numerous libraries in each district. It was estimated that 85-95% of the collections in Idaho libraries are already in the OCLC database but only about 50-60% of the total Idaho libraries are in the system.

The question was raised, whether it is more important to get the final 5-10% of the data from those not in the system, or the 40-50% of the libraries not participating, when, perhaps, their records may not be borrowed heavily anyway, or may not be unique. Additionally, what is the cost to the small library? Will they be able to keep current by adding records for new items and deleting records for discarded material?

The issue of the status of LaserCat and CatExpress was also discussed.

Brunell will look into the cost of a statewide World Cat subscription. ISL staff will provide the necessary data. ISL will also check the cost of purchasing World Cat directly through OCLC. Brunell suggested that looking at licensing by simultaneous users may be a more cost effective means than licensing for unlimited use. BCR would be willing to investigate multi-state licensing of databases.

Training:

BCR has a number of training packages and can provide on-site training for individual libraries or groups of libraries. They will also develop customized training for individual libraries or training on specific topics. Libraries should contact BCR directly.

Custom Cataloging:

BCR currently does custom cataloging for 31 institutions primarily cataloging non-English materials.

Networking News:

Report were given on the following
2001 LSTA grant awards - Ann Joslin
SFY 2002 State Library budget - Charlie Bolles
LiLI-D contracts renewed - Rand Simmons
LiLI-D Satisfaction Survey - Rand Simmons

The Board needs to decide fairly soon about when to go to bid for the LiLI databases. ISL just renewed for 1 more year, the 2001 calendar year. We can renew for one more 1 year period, calendar year 2002, but will have to go out for bids for the 2003 calendar year. The question was raise, is there any compelling reason why we should not wait as long as possible?

Rand Simmons said that he has done some analysis on the LiLI database satisfaction survey and did not see any compelling reason to rebid this year. Delaying rebidding gives the Network staff one more year to continue to bring libraries on board. It also gives us the opportunity to see how our membership in BCR might affect the rebidding process. Simmons will do more analysis on the survey and report the results to the next Board meeting.

The State Library needs at least 6 months lead time to go through the rebidding process particularly if it is done through Purchasing. If we rebid the contracts this year, we will need to start the process right away. Renewing the contract will buy us another year's time.

Information Items

Anne Abrams - LiLI-D train the trainers workshop, March 28-29, 2001. Boise State University.
LiLI-D Statistics Annual Report - Rand Simmons / Michael Samuelson. See handout.
Washington Idaho Network (WIN) - Paul Krause
Eastern Idaho Library Network (EILNet) - Frank Nelson
West End Library Consortium (WELCo'm) - Rand Simmons

WorldCat:

The question of funding WorldCat as a LiLI database was raised. Do we want to include this in the 2003 State Fiscal Year Budget Request? Discontinuing further development of LiLI Z would free up \$16,000 in the SFY2002 budget. There is some amount of LSTA funds currently budgeted for the gateway that could be redirected.

Testing of Assumptions

The Board concurred with the following assumptions agreed upon by the joint committees and task force meeting held Tuesday morning:

- The less technical support provided by the local library the better.
- The less technical support provided at the network level the better. This is not to say that we will not provide necessary support, only that this would be better for ISL and BSU.
- In the absence of adequate network resources (staffing, technical expertise), the best option may be outsourcing.
- With the present staff and funding levels, we can not provide more services than we are at the present time.
- It would be ideal to be able to search all on line accessible catalogs with one search. Some proposals say we can do this, others say we cannot or that it is prohibitively expensive to maintain such a system.

Montana Library Network

The Board asked State Library staff to gather more information on the Montana model, especially with regard to OCLC's CatExpress.

Ron Force suggested that we look toward an Orbis model of building a physical database

Wednesday, February 21, 2001

Review of the Network Plan

The Board reviewed the Network Services as listed in the 200-2001 Plan. They focused on outcomes, understanding that strategies and activities may need to be changed (in light of this meeting). The Board agreed that the Plan was still valid and reflected our present activities.

The following were noted:

1. LiLI web site. LiLI web server was upgraded last spring and the web site was redesigned.
2. Full text electronic resources. Documenting usage and user satisfaction is under way.
3. Virtual catalog. Network staff thought they would do a lot of development on the LiLI-Z gateway but there has not been sufficient time. Because LiLI-Z is being refocused as a cataloging tool, rather than a virtual catalog, activities and strategies will change.
4. Delivery service. An appropriation request was included in the SFY 2002 ISL budget (unlikely to be funded). The Network Board has not addressed electronic document delivery in this plan. **It was agreed that electronic document delivery is important. We need to state that in this document.**
5. Statewide walk-in access. The LiLI-ILL Committee is working on this.
6. Electronic ILL Requests. There is no plan to implement in this current year.
7. Assisting libraries to automate through regional networking. A good part of this objective

does includes RECON to get library records in MARC format. In the table it is implied that when libraries join consortia they need to do RECON. However, this is not always true.

8. Training and education in network services. We have not spent a lot of time on this. The general strategy was promotion and there were no dates assigned to these strategies.
9. Technical Support. We have not identified priorities or developed target dates.

The plan calls for an annual review and revision. If we are to do this in the present fiscal year, we will need to put it on our next agenda.

Continued Development of Z39.50 Gateway

Considerations:

- What is the best use of the resources available and our political capital in terms of a request to the state legislature?
- What produces the best results for the patrons?
- Are we willing to just walk away from the project? If we do, we need to be up front with the library community that we tried this and it did not work.

LiLI-Z Options

Rand outlined several option for the LiLI-Z Gateway.

Continue development

We may be able to do some development work this spring. We have some LSTA funds set aside for this purpose. We have an appropriation request for \$16,000 for development work before the present legislature.

Discontinue development but leave LiLI-Z on web site.

The gateway is not very usable as it is now. We could clean it up and add the Library of Congress for cataloging records. We can add the Eastern Idaho Library System now (Pocatello, Idaho Falls, Rexburg). There might be merit in adding links to major libraries such as Seattle Public, Cleveland Public Library and Spokane Public. Drop targets that never produce results or are erratic, specifically Boise Public and EITC. We should not put a lot of time or money into these revisions.

This could be an economical resource for MARC records for smaller libraries. They need the MARC records for their own system and sharing on the network.

There was consensus that we will not try to display holdings and call numbers. It was suggested that links to web catalogs be provided (for end users to determine which library in a consortium, e.g., owns a book and to get call numbers).

It was agreed that the LiLI-Z gateway would be cleaned up, refocused as a tool to get MARC

LiLI Board Meeting February 20-21, 2001 - 5

records, and left on the LiLI web site.

Next Steps with the Virtual Catalog/ ILL RFI Responses

It was agreed that the Network Board will pursue World Cat as our virtual Catalog. If the Network Board wants to ask the legislature for an appropriation, a decision needs to be made quickly in order to include it in the State Library's SFY2003 request.

It was agreed that we would step back from developing an Idaho Virtual Catalog for the time being.

World Cat becoming one of the State Libraries delivered databases.

If we determined that World Cat would be one of the State Library's delivered databases, an evaluation of the packages provided by OCLC and other databases would take place to get the most for the dollars available. Net First and ERIC were a few of the databases discussed.

We might not have to go through Purchasing to bid this, but if something were to go wrong, this would be preferable.

It was agreed that a price quote should be obtained from OCLC and BCR, looking at either WorldCat by itself or as part of a basic package of databases. It was agreed that we are looking at World Cat as a virtual catalog for the time being.

OCLC/ ILL

It was agreed that we would not pursue ILL at this point.

OCLC/ MARC21

The issue of helping smaller libraries get machine readable records into their local systems and OCLC was discussed. CatExpress is being provided through the Montana Library Network. The Montana model was placed on the agenda for the next meeting.

For the last few years we have not funded RECON with LSTA unless they are joining a network. It was agreed that we should continue to use LSTA funds to add records of small libraries to networks.

SFY2003 Network Appropriation Request -

Rand presented a draft of a proposed networking budget as the basis for an SFY03 appropriation request. Discussion followed. The Network Board agreed on the priority of the LiLI web site, LiLI-D, and WorldCat in the budget.

Walk-in Access, etc.

Ann Joslin presented information on the costs of non-resident card for public libraries. See handout. Ann also reported on a response from the Attorney General's office regarding a "deadbeat database." The Attorney General advised us not to pursue this.

Proposal for Replacing Board Members

Ann presented a proposal. Appointments are for four years. As per discussion at the last LiLI Board meeting, ISL staff had a sense that the Network Board is not ready to develop a formal process as described in the Himmel & Wilson study. The considerations are that LiLI is in its formative stage and there is a limited pool of qualified people in the state. That we would reappoint Network Board members whose terms are expiring if they wish to continue; if they do not, State Library staff would seek suggestions from the Network Board. Charlie would make the appointment. This would be similar to the procedure for appointing Advisory Council members. Further down the line it might be a benefit to go to a process as described by Himmel & Wilson.

The members with expiring terms are Carolyn Mauer, Karen Ganske, and Joe Reiss. They will be contacted by the next meeting regarding reappointment.

Draft of Priorities for Districting and Networking Grants

Ann and Rand presented a handout that attempts to prioritize LSTA grants for networking and creating library districts. See handout. The document does not attempt to prioritize networking grants vs. district grants. The Network Board agreed in concept that developing criteria by which to prioritize these kinds of grants was a good idea but suggested they be used as guidelines only. The LSTA Advisory Council will need to use their judgment.

Miscellaneous

Idaho State Library organizational design study. Keith Hammer, Organizational Development specialist was introduced.

NetLibrary. Information packets were provided.

CIPA. Information provided in packet.

Next Meeting

Rand

- Further analyze LiLI-D survey
- Will contact OCLC and BCR for estimates
- Revise the networking budget
- Follow-up with members whose terms are expiring
- Work with Blue Angel Technologies and ITTF on LiLI-Z development work

Next Meeting

LiLI Board Meeting February 20-21, 2001 - 7

The next meeting is scheduled tentatively for May 22-23, 2001. Information items will go out in advance so members have an opportunity to review and be prepared for discussion.