Idaho State Library  
LiLI BOARD MEETING  
April 22, 2004 ~ 9:00 am – 4:00 pm

Board Members Present:  
Marcia Beckwith, Boise School District  Karen Ganske, Nampa Public Library  
Mary Nate, Bear Lake Public Lib District  Ron Force, University of Idaho Library  
Kay Flowers, Idaho State University Library  Cora Caldwell, Gooding High School Library  
Tim Brown, Boise State University Library  Charlie Bolles, Idaho State Library

Liaisons and Guests:  
Dan Lester, Boise State University Library  Edit Szanto, College of Southern Idaho Library

ISL Staff:  
Gina Persichini, Networking Consultant  Ann Joslin, Associate State Librarian  
Stephanie Kukay, Research Librarian (Facilitator)  Sonja Hudson, Grants Officer (Recorder)  
Erin McCusker, Public Library Consultant  Frank Nelson, Public Library Consultant  
Jan Wall, Public Library Consultant  Anne Abrams, Marketing Consultant  
Charlotte Fowles, Electronic Resources Librarian  Michael Samuelson, Web Design Specialist

LiLI Databases - Update on Cost Comparisons (Charlotte Fowles)

Charlotte provided a handout showing a cost comparison for the LiLI Databases with a statewide contract versus individual purchases. The comparison was requested at a previous meeting to show the value of LiLI-D for advocacy efforts.

In regard to a change with the EBSCO databases, it was said that we don't want to see journals that we previously had access to being moved to another database that we don't currently subscribe to. It was recommended that we write a formal letter to EBSCO about the situation. Ron Force will draft the letter and provide it to Charlotte.

LiLI Portal and Branding (Anne Abrams)

A team at the Idaho State Library investigated the possibility of creating a single-portal access point to LiLI-D. In her presentation, Anne Abrams explained the reasons why a portal came up (preparation for budget challenges, simple access to increase usage, lack of branding that ties to funding). The Portal Team gathered data through interviews and surveys to determine how/if libraries use LiLI-D statistics, how they brand, and if/how a single portal would be a benefit. They learned that most libraries do not brand with the LiLI logo or tie to the funding source. Few libraries use the statistics available to them. And, a number of libraries enhance LiLI-D with databases purchased on their own. The Portal Team decided on a tailored approach: Libraries continue to access LiLI-D with their own passwords the way they do now. Meanwhile, ISL staff will enhance the LiLI-D Portal available through the LiLI Website. New users will be encouraged to access LiLI-D through lili.org as promoted in the statewide media campaigns. The lili.org portal will also be the access point used in training.
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Michael Samuelson, ISL’s Web Design Specialist, indicated that he is working to simplify the lili.org access so users can log in with just one password to access all the databases. The updated lili.org portal will be available in Fall 2004.

**OCLC Group Services Proposal**

A handout with highlights from the quote was provided. The proposed services would create a Union Catalog that is accessible through FirstSearch with accompanying unlimited Interlibrary Loan and cataloging services for publicly funded Idaho libraries. The proposal also includes all training by OCLC, unlimited batch-loading of MARC records, and unlimited serials union listing with OCLC. All services are provided at one flat rate; and OCLC is willing to handle billing if we decide to share costs among libraries. The proposal includes 41 current OCLC customers, plus an additional 86 public libraries and 779 schools.

Prices were determined by using the past 12 months of activity from Idaho libraries as a base and considering annual ILL and collection statistics. From that, OCLC projected an increase of 3.1% annual increase for cataloging fees and 3.5% increase for ILL fees.

It was explained that OCLC and ISL staff had to make a number of educated guesses to figure school costs. We are lacking data on school library activities for ILL and cataloging. Gina contacted Val Fenske at the Department of Education to see if we could come up with any additional data, but Val did not have anything to use for this purpose.

**Comments:**

- From school librarian: I do very little ILL, I rely on the public library.
- Traditionally schools have sent students to the public library for ILLs; it seems to be a common practice as though many schools assumed they couldn’t do ILL and still can’t. Is this anything we want to change?
- It seems to me that the schools that had no access to shared catalogs didn’t have a place to begin. This is a paradigm shift.


**Brainstorming for successful project:**

- Growth of the Idaho database
  - All participants catalog
  - Regular batch loads
- Support of LiLI Advisory Board
  - Represented libraries participate
  - Board members advocate for service
- Identify: What makes participation attractive
  - To full cataloging libraries
  - To new participants
- Courier service for Idaho libraries
• Make maximum use of proposed service
• Phased Implementation with
  o Strong training schedule
  o ISL staff support for libraries
  o High percentage of participation

Discussion:

• No incentive for current users if cost is higher
• ISL funds can be made available to support resource sharing portions of project
• Don’t purchase unlimited access to WorldCat unless necessary
• Other FirstSearch options
• OCLC Western group purchase of FirstSearch includes 3 academic libraries in Idaho (BSU & UI). This complicates things for them as WorldCat is already with their current access.
• Could be LSTA project for start-up, first 3-4 years possibly.
• At present time, we have not specifically addressed funding sources, right now we are talking conceptually. What would make this a success? Is this something that we want to pursue?
• Have talked about using LSTA to cover 2/3 the first year, ½ the next. Bring the libraries in on a two/three/four year period.
• Concern for LaserCat users: What would their charges be as opposed to LaserCat.
• Most LaserCat users pay $1,595 per year. If they move to CatExpress for cataloging, they will likely pay less, depending on cataloging activity and whether or not they use LaserCat for ILL.
• Montana’s pricing is based on staff FTE for public library and student FTE for academics; could be used as a guide in setting up our own formula
• Concern about making up difference from actual costs versus projected costs. Think it can be done, but I don’t think it can be done in the first 2 years.
• Implementation needs to be a gradual build-up
• Is there a way to pay after the fact?
• Heavy training component and OCLC has agreed to do training, but will be a heavy load on staff.
• How important is an Idaho WorldCat? How important is it to have a separate list of Idaho holdings?
• The Northwest catalog is more important
• I think it’s a Northwest concept to move forward.
• The cost for the Idaho catalog is not a huge part of the quotation, but it is the base of the quotation. Removing it, could affect the other costs.
• Is a focus on Idaho more attractive to the legislature? It might look attractive to the legislature to not replicate materials purchases if we had an entire listing of materials.
• Suggest we consider a longer phased approach starting with current users, first and adding smaller groups each year.
• Sudden cut-over for smaller libraries -- potential spike in cost.
• I can see that you could do existing users without a potential spike in costs
• Phase-in more slowly; in first year work with just existing members
• LSTA funds as a foundation permanently has not been ruled out
• Ann would like to have state money built into the base for resource sharing and a courier.
• Will the implementation of universal borrowing in WIN libraries create an effect on ILL?
• Is there an effect of electronic databases on cataloging and ILL?
• Affect of cataloging all collections
• Time for ILL affects usage
• Using CatExpress may be a problem for some libraries that don’t have to pay now for Z39.50 access to records
• About 20 libraries in LCEI used CatExpress a few years ago. Cost was an issue. Generally, they aren’t paying anything now for their records

Next Steps:

• Let’s do this project, but we need to be concerned with costs
• Estimate of cost for 05-06, what will it cost to include current OCLC users and LaserCat users?
• Will LSTA pick up resource sharing or another part? Look at helping LCAT users make the transition.
• Get OCLC to redo quote
• Don’t do Idaho WorldCat unless politically necessary
• This might radically alter the price quote because state catalog is integral part
• This would tie us to OCLC
• We do not want to wait until the next meeting to work on process. Volunteers to work on process: Marcia, Sandy Shropshire (ISU).
• Use libraries that are operational first for advertising and training purposes
• Check with neighbor states; compare pricing, group services if they will share
• OCLC forces us all under the same label?
• Montana has been sharing a lot of information so far; there should be 3 or 4 other BCR states that have entertained a similar quote
• Talk up resource sharing to legislature with each phase: resource sharing, courier

State Library Update - Charlie Bolles

Some ISL staff will receive merit salary enhancements due to salary savings and an increase from the legislature. The average raise will be about 4%.

ISL is going to have to redo the legislation related to the State Library. Because of the transition that has occurred here, that legislation is outdated. If we update the legislation, ISL might be able to arrange being a fiscal agent for statewide efforts. It could be beneficial for an Idaho network of libraries. It would also allow ISL to be full members of consortia like the Southwest Library Consortium (SLC). In addition to benefits, there are some risks to opening the Code in that way. This will likely be discussed at a future meeting. Doubtful that this will be ready for the next legislative session.

The state documents depository is in the State Library statute. We are still looking at what that might look like. There seems to be an interest in financial management. There was an interest in discussing the topic after the legislature left, but no date set to do so. If we suggest changes, whether or not we make recommendations, other agencies may choose to.

Regional Network Development

Gina provided a handout that shows a number of activities that are in place, in process, or planned for the future. The activities on the list all support regional network development.
Anne Abrams facilitated an activity to develop talking points in support of networking activities. Information collected during the activity will be used for a brochure, the Website, and a future LiLI Display.

**Courier Update**

The LiLI Advisory Board has said that delivery service throughout Washington, Oregon, and Idaho would be most attractive. In conversations with ORBIS staff, Gina learned that we basically had 2 options: (1) get the courier contractor that service ORBIS to extend their service into southern Idaho, and (2) fill the hole in southern Idaho (where no service exists) and then connect the 2 systems afterward. Since the contractor that service ORBIS is not able to extend their service at this time, we are left with the second option and/or identify other options.

A number of ideas were presented from using bank couriers, developing a series of smaller courier systems, using the commuter ride vans, and even hiring a driver and van.

**Dan Lester volunteered to follow up on ideas for developing courier service.** *Update: LiLI Advisory Board member Julie Woodford, who was not present at the meeting, offered to assist in some of the follow-up on courier ideas after the meeting.*

**Continuing Education Break**

Participants discussed some of the ideas brought up in “Trend #2: Restructuring Work” from the book Library Networks in the New Millennium: Top Ten Trends.

Topic for next meeting: Given all the distance education going on, how can the academic school and public libraries work together to provide library services. The distance learning numbers continue to grow. The seamless, boundary-less library services are very relevant considering the distance learners. This includes the home schools students.

**Update - LSTA Council: Ann Joslin**

The 2004 awards were made in January and there are two dealing with networking issues: (1) Mini-Cassia Consortium project (Rupert, Burley, and their area schools) are doing a network planning grant, and (2) the digitization project with ISU.

Two previously completed projects have been identified for peer evaluations: (1) Lewiston City computer lab used for training of staff and patrons, and (2) the CIN/VALNet project.

2006 Allocation Plan distributed. Ann explained that ISL is trying to build in flexibility for applicant libraries to expand the variety of projects we receive. Also, in 2006, ISL will be doing a comprehensive survey of school districts to see what school libraries they have.

**Update - Gates Connectivity Grant: Gina**

---
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In February and March, ISL contracted with TMC Group to research the current status of Internet Connectivity in public libraries. Of the 143 library buildings that were looked at, 47 buildings have access at less than 200Kbps. Two libraries have no data as their staff were unreachable.

The 2\textsuperscript{nd} part of TMC’s research was to provide potential options to upgrade existing access to dedicated connections of at least 200Kbps. Five libraries had no alternative access providers (aside from satellite, which we were advised was not a good option). ISL staff projects that 30 libraries (buildings) could need $192,350 to upgrade their Internet connectivity. That number includes cost of upgrade and first year of monthly access fees.

One third must be match from Idaho. ISL has decided to split that third with the libraries: ISL is requesting Library Services Improvement Funds to cover 2/3s of the Idaho match, which will leave 1/9\textsuperscript{th} of the total costs to be covered by the local libraries that participate.

\textbf{LiLI Advisory Board Membership}

Karen Ganske is in her second term to expire on June 2004. We thank her for her many years of service and contributions to the LiLI Advisory Board. Karen recommended Mary DeWalt to take her place. ISL staff will follow up on and make a recommendation to Charlie for appointment. Marcia Beckwith's first term has also expires in June 2004. She has agreed to fill another term.

Input was requested on the make-up of the Advisory Board. Are their suggestions for changes to alter representation in any way or changing term criteria? As advisory board members are appointed by Charlie, comments will be considered by him for the future. Comments:

- Are you trying to have 1/3 academic, 1/3 public and 1/3 school? Not necessarily.
- When we started it was recommended that representatives be elected. We didn't feel that there was that much knowledge out there about networking. So we identified our group on their experience. The last time we had this discussion, we still weren't far enough along to go to elections.
- In the past we had representatives from the large consortia. With the recent realignment up north we have no representation from VALNet or CIN.
- I'd be interested in seeing whether or not you think things have progressed enough for the consortium to elect their own members on this board. Is there a reason for ex-officio. We may want to have BSU, ISU, and U of I to have ex-officio positions.
- We're looking ahead at next year at this time, we will have seats turning over for BSU and U of I.
- If you start with the anchor schools, that is half of the group and the other schools never get on. You might want to take a couple of those positions for the smaller schools.
- That’s an idea--that a portion be academic, portion be public and a portion be schools.
- I thought participation with schools could be a problem if you weren't around Boise. This would be one way to be absolutely sure we never had a complete replacement of publics, complete replacement of schools or academics at one time.
- There is also a certain amount of geographic representation as well as representation of various sized libraries.

\textbf{Next Steps}:

- Next Meeting Date: July 21, 2004 - TENTATIVE
- New agenda items - Kay reporting on her adventure in June, courier, CE, OCLC.