Central New York Library Resources Council

Library Resources and Services

November 15, 2011

2-4 pm. CLRC training room

**Present:** DeAnn Buss (SU.), Valerie Prescott (Herkimer County Community College), Mike Poulin (Colgate), Nancy Virgil-Call (Utica College), Christine Kucharski (Upstate Medical Center), Steve Weiter (SUNY ESF), Debby Emerson (CLRC), Claire Enkosky (CLRC)

*Via teleconference:* Bev Choltco-Devlin (Mid-York), Deb Lewis (OCPL)

**Excused**: Peg Elliott (OCPL), Diana Wendell (OCM BOCES)

Bev Choltco-Devlin called meeting to order at 2:05 p.m.

**Action Items:**

**Meeting minutes of August 16th, 2011:**

Steve moved to approve the minutes from August 16th, 2011. (S/A).

**Agenda Items:**

* RBDB Member Grants
	+ Review process
		- Debby devised a few documents to help the committee review the applications.
			* The first document is a spreadsheet, summarizing the five applications.
			* The second document is a brief sheet that indicates the amount of income we expect in RBDB funding. Our best estimate of what we will receive from the state is approximately $169,000.
				+ Part of our RBDB funding goes towards FirstSearch, which is partially returned by billing members. One of our biggest users is dropping out next year, so we expect that income to drop from $22,000 to $15,000.
				+ We expect a shortfall so we will have to make some cuts.
			* The third document is a rubric so that the committee can assign numerical scores and approach the decision objectively.
				+ The first two categories of the rubric are based on the criteria voted upon during the August meeting. The materials must be of some regional importance and the digitized materials must be accessible and available to students, scholars and citizens (although we didn’t specify how).
				+ The other sections are based on the grant applications.
		- Bev clarified that these reviews will also be sent out to an objective jury. Deb explained that in the past years, the external review felt that the committee had done a very good job at being objective. This, combined with the lack of funds to distribute, persuaded CLRC not to use the external review process in recent years.
	+ Retrospective applications & computations
		- Deb and DeAnn mentioned that in the last few years, those computations have not been considered.
		- Mike Poulin expressed concern that the Syracuse University application is asking for too much for a retrospective grant, based on the NY State guidelines stating a maximum price of $10 per original cataloging record. He and Debby were unable to find clarification on the Division of Library Development website.
		- OCPL is the only one of the three retrospective applications to absolutely fit the computations.
		- Holy Trinity approached it in such a way that we would have to confirm with them that they have to follow the state guidelines. They basically have an unlimited number of records.
	+ Bev suggested that the committee decide whether committee members who have applications under review be allowed to submit clarifying remarks. Several applications are not represented. The committee agreed that, like in years past, committee members could clarify their own project applications, and any unrepresented applications could be followed up with.
	+ Steve Weiter suggested that if there are no significant shortcomings in any of these, we give every project a proportional amount. If we disburse 90% to each project, he approximates that we would break even.
		- None of the committee members noticed any glaring or obvious errors.
		- Steve remarked that all of them have merit and value. All of them reflect resource-sharing values.
		- Bev asked if everyone agrees with Steve’s suggestion that we divvy the funds up across the board.
			* Mike is still concerned about the amount Syracuse asked for, based on NY State guidelines for retrospective conversion projects which allow $1 per ubiquitous record and $10 per unique record. He calculated only $2,200 when they asked for $10,000.
			* Bev suggests a contingent recommendation: “Given clarification from the state on Syracuse’s request as presented, we recommend if their total grant amount is in compliance with the requirements, then each grant will be pro-rated. If not, then all grants will be fully funded, except for Syracuse, which will meet the state requirements.”
			* We will also need clarification from Trinity as to how many records they plan on converting.
			* Mike asks if this sets a precedent. Valerie and DeAnn both conclude that a precedent for these rates has already been set.
	+ Bev would like to look over the previous years’ evaluation plans.
		- All of the applications are weak on the previous years’ evaluation plans. Holy Trinity does not have enough staff and had the weakest evaluation plan. Upstate does not have a previous year evaluation plan.
		- However, it only applies to the immediate previous year.
		- This may also be an issue of clarity on the application.
	+ Bev asks if the digitization funding should be treated differently than the retrospective applications. Steve and Mike agree that the guidelines mandate such an approach.
		- The committee decides to get clarification from Syracuse University and from Holy Trinity about their estimated per record rates, as well as further clarification from the state about guidelines.
		- Steve adds that the state may simply not fund these projects. Deb recalls that in the past few years, the state has not objected to similar projects. Debby is waiting on a response from people in the NYSL DLD about the guidelines.
	+ Motion to approve member grants
		- Mike made a motion that:
		Given clarification from the state on Syracuse University and Holy Trinity’s request as presented, we, the LRS committee, recommend if their total grant amount is in compliance with the requirements, then each grant will be pro-rated. If not, then all grants will be fully funded, except for Syracuse University and Holy Trinity, which will meet the state requirements.
		Steve seconded.
		- DeAnn questioned if CLRC grants were included in this motion.
		- Mike made an amended motion that:
		**Given clarification from the state on Syracuse University and Holy Trinity’s request as presented, we, the LRS committee, recommend if their total grant amount is in compliance with the requirements, then each member grant will be pro-rated. If not, then all member grants will be fully funded, except for Syracuse University and Holy Trinity, which will meet the state requirements.**(S/A)
* Regional grant funding
	+ Wilson databases are no longer part of the FirstSearch package so the cost has been reduced by $35,000. At a previous meeting, this committee discussed that and decided that instead of finding a replacement database, we would make this remaining money available to fund additional member grants.
	+ DeAnn has questions about the regional technology training and regional bibliographic services. On page 2 of the regional bibliographic services application, $500 is requested to fund the Interlibrary Loan Workshop. Another $500 is also requested from the regional technology training application. Debby agrees that this was a mistake. CLRC only needs $500 for the ILL workshop. Another $500 comes from LSTA funds.
		- Bev suggests that the $500 in the regional technology training application remain so that CLRC can hire an outside consultant, like the Access to Justice workshop from last year.
		- Steve makes a motion to move the $500 requested in the regional technology training application from ‘Continuing Education’ to ‘Contractor or vendor services,’ to total $5,500. (S/A).
		- Any mention of the Interlibrary Loan Workshop will be struck from the regional technology training application.
		- DeAnn asks if RBDB funds will cover shipping. On page 4 of the regional bibliographic services, UPS CampusShip is mentioned, although shipping is not paid for through RBDB funding. DeAnn suggests this be struck from the application. Steve, Debby and Bev agree.
	+ CLRC is moving next door to a slightly larger office. The training room will be approximately twice as large and so CLRC will need more furnishings. Furnishings cannot be purchased with LSTA money. RBDB funds can be used for furnishings.
	+ As for the regional database access application, Mike questioned if there will be a planned migration path, in the case of OCLC’s move to WorldCat. He suggests that OCLC may be headed towards abandoning FirstSearch, since they are changing their offering. He is concerned that we are making plans based on OCLC’s potentially changing services.
	+ Mike also wonders if the cost for Newsbank will be covered if one participant drops out. Debby spoke to Rob from Waldo at NYLA and he reported that the price will be lower.
	+ The following amendments to the CLRC applications have been proposed:
		- The header of each grant will be changed so that they do not all read “Digitization Application.”
		- In the Regional Technology Training application, all mentions of the Interlibrary Loan Workshop will be struck. This includes the second half of the paragraph under “Continuing Education” on page 2, beginning with “CLRC hosts an annual…” The Continuing Education section will be reduced to $3,500. The paragraph on page 6 titled “Interlibrary Loan Workshop.”
		- Also in the Regional Technology Training application, the Contractor or vendor services section will be increased by $500 to $5,500. The Contractor or vendor services section will also have a second item to read “Attended expenses for outside contractors.”
		- In the Regional Bibliographic Services, on page 2 under Continuing Education, the description will be expanded to include the sentences struck from the Regional Technology Training application about the Interlibrary Loan Workshop.
		- Also in the Regional Bibliographic Services, the last paragraph on Page 4, referring to UPS CampusShip, will be struck.
	+ DeAnn makes a motion to approve the amendments to the applications made by CRLC. (S/A).
* Lyrasis update
	+ Since Waldo stopped working with the 3Rs, the NY3Rs as a group have sought another way to offer consortial database subscriptions to our member libraries. We’re in the process of forging a relationship with Lyrasis.
	+ So far, any offers that Lyrasis has generated have been too close to renewal dates for anyone to accept them. We are not able to see the quotes so we do not know a comparison of the price offerings. Members can expect to see more from them. Debby just forwards them on.
	+ Valerie asked about eBook offers.
		- Steve and Debby brought up WNYLRC’s pilot project regarding consortial purchasing of eBooks. They have extended this to everyone west of the Hudson. They would love to have more members, but are still establishing the details.
			* SUNY ESF is unable to participate because of the shared proxy server with SU. Also, Springer and Elsevier, two major science publishers, have refused to deal with consortial databases.
			* WNYLRC is not mandating a significant financial contribution. They are using EBL. They also have Wiley and Sage. It’s going to be a four or five publisher deal with a broad spectrum.
		- Mike mentioned that ConnectNY is also working on such a project.
* RBDB Funding
	+ Debby reports that we have not yet received 2011 RBDB funding. According to the state’s website, we should get it around August (two months ago). Our 2010 funding was received in March 2011.
	+ Libraries receiving these grants need to be aware that if this year is like last year, if you’re awarded a grant and start your project, if something goes awry and we don’t receive our funding, the member will have to absorb the cost.
	+ There were no assurances from the state about this.
* Other business
	+ Mike suggested that the RBDB application schedule be shifted to better fit the academic calendar. This will be addressed at the next LRS committee meeting.
	+ Bev asks if Debby knows more about the comments on the Regent’s 2020 Vision for Libraries’ first draft.
		- The 3Rs submitted additional comments as a group. A comment was made a NYLA that library systems don’t communicate enough.
		- Bev reported that the NOVEL group reflected that the first draft seemed hodge podge and badly organized; not like a plan.

Debby will send out a Doodle pool to determine the next meeting date.

Steve made a motion to adjourn the meeting. (S/A).

Bev called the meeting to a close at 3:50 pm.

Respectfully submitted,

Claire Enkosky

CLRC