Council of UofA Research Libraries
Meeting Summary
April 30, 2007, 9:00-2:30
Conference Room
UofA System Admin. Building
Little Rock

Members Present: Carolyn Allen (Chair, UAF), Sandra Campbell (UAM), Wilma Cunningham (UAFS), Wanda Dole (UALR), Mary Ryan (UAMS)
Recorder: Anne Marie Candido (UAF)

Morning Session (9:00-11:15):

General Discussion of Common Issues and Concerns

Carolyn Allen opened the meeting by inviting Wilma Cunningham to report on the information she found about federated searching. Wilma passed around a handout explaining federated searching, listing its advantages and disadvantages, and providing descriptions of the experiences of various libraries in the state with federated searching software products. She pointed out that Arkansas Tech is pleased with MultiSearch software and Southern Arkansas University is pleased with initial testing of WebFeat. Arkansas State University, however, never had success with Encompass software. Council members generally agreed that software for federate searching is still very expensive, has not yet been perfected, and that it would be best for the group to wait for the technology to improve. At some point in the future, Innovative Interfaces’ federated searching software may be considered.

Carolyn thanked Wilma for her report, and a general discussion ensued about INN-Reach, a major resource-sharing software produced by Innovative Interfaces. This product is currently very expensive—too expensive for the group to consider at this time. This product seamlessly connects multiple library automation systems and allows patrons from one library to request and borrow materials belonging to another library, thus expanding the library's catalog without having to spend resources on new acquisitions. Similar products will also be investigated.

Members also discussed the importance of adopting a shared delivery system as well as a shared resources system. Currently, several member libraries have been using USPS for ILL delivery. Carolyn mentioned that UAF uses the AMIGOS delivery system and that it has improved substantially since a couple of years ago and that the group should look into the member libraries using their service. Mary reminded the group that AMIGOS service will deliver anything—not just interlibrary loan items. Carolyn mentioned that she will be at the AMIGOS board meeting tomorrow, and if time permits she will investigate the prospect of the group adopting the AMIGOS delivery system and inquire about pricing.
A general discussion then occurred on the topic of the UofA System budgets. All Council members agreed that the research libraries in the System campuses are in sore need of larger budgets if they are to purchase books and cover the ever-rising costs of serials. All the System libraries are hurting, and the cost of serials and interlibrary loan service increases significantly with every year. Carolyn proposed that she develop a template for each CUARL member to answer questions about library budgets so that all members can then have the budget profile for each library, and each dean/director can then present these budgeting profiles to their provost or chancellor.

**Resource Sharing Report**

It was determined that it would be best if all member libraries had the same interlibrary loan system. Three of the libraries represented by the group do NOT have the ILLiad interlibrary loan system (UAM, UAFS, and UAPB). Those that do have it strongly recommended this system, saying that it provides excellent statistics. Those who do not have it intend probably to switch over in the near future. If the group (even without UAPB) used ILLiad, it should get a 7 percent discount.

Wanda Dole reported that her group investigated two products to identify book collection strengths and weaknesses and recommended WorldCat Collection Analysis. Carolyn emphasized that it was mainly the strengths that the group would be most interested in. Wilma Cunningham mentioned that UAFS has been using another OCLC product that is less expensive (in the neighborhood of $1,000) than WorldCat Collection Analysis yet quite useful and could be subscribed to on an as needed basis. She will get more information about the product and send it to the group members. The WorldCat Collection Analysis software analyzes primarily, if not exclusively, monographic holdings.

Wanda will return to her group and inform them and the Council what the next steps will be. The working committee will create an ILL group to pursue plans for a shared interlibrary loan system.

**Digital Initiatives Report**

Wilma presented her group’s report and highlighted some of the important issues that need to be addressed before a shared digital project can be implemented. Members present brought up the privacy issue and discussed the need to look into copyright regulations, title stipulations for gift manuscript collections, privacy vis-à-vis IP addresses, etc. The Committee recommended that each library obtain a copy of the ALA Spec-kit on the topic of digitizing collections. UAFS has ordered this kit. There was some discussion about ContentDM and its effectiveness. Most agreed that it was a very useful tool, and most of the members now use it. Two metadata systems were considered (EAD and Dublin Core). Encoded Archival Description, however, requires
large amounts of staff time to manage. Dublin Core metadata (as used by ContentDM), on the other hand, operates on a turn-key system that requires little management.

The issue of a suitable server for a collaborative digital project was a concern. The best scenario would be NOT to have a whole new dedicated server for it. A dedicated server would be too expensive, and the issues of managing it would be too burdensome. Carolyn said it would probably be possible for the group to use the UAF server, which currently has quite a bit of room on it. Cheryl Conway could investigate the server issue and find out if there would be a cost to the group.

The Council members agreed that the issues outlined in the bulleted items were good and that the committee should continue its work. Work on pursuing grant funds, however, should be held off for now.

**Disaster Recovery Report**

Mary Ryan reported that members of the Disaster Recovery Committee have finished their first bulleted item as laid out in their original charge: “To assist member libraries in developing and implementing individual library emergency plans.” They should continue their work to complete the two remaining charges, involving identifying and preserving unique collections and providing information services to local, regional, and federal emergency management entities. The Committee should also address the issue of cyber backup as well. Mary realized that a first, basic step for individual plans is to gather the cell phone numbers of staff members so they can be contacted in the case of an emergency.

Mary said she would get back to her group and provide them with guidance about fulfilling the rest of their charge. Wanda suggested that the disaster recovery committee develop a template to gather information on each campus. Carolyn requested that Mary remind her committee that the emphasis in its work should be on a group backup plan for the campus libraries so that an individual library can be assured of needed assistance and backup from the other sister libraries during a disaster.

**Lunch (11:15)**

**Afternoon Session (1:00-2:30):**

**Education Portal Report**

Carolyn summarized the work of this group, indicating that the committee members found that none of the Arkansas universities had anything similar to the kind of portal
that the Council is considering. Thus, not many initiatives have been made to gather educational materials into a single gateway. The Committee therefore decided to go to outside resources to find content, but with Arkansas needs as the focus.

Members of the Committee expressed a feeling of being overwhelmed with such a formidable project, especially when so little work has been done similar to their charge. Carolyn said she would reassure the group that they do not have to concern themselves with the technical aspects of their project, but rather only with design and identification of content. She would be open to assigning other people to the Committee, as well, so that the burden on a few would be lessened.

The next step will be to build a framework. The framework should first be described, and the areas of elementary, middle school, and secondary education in Arkansas should be the focus. Carolyn indicated that perhaps all that was needed is links to information and educational support materials that already exist on the Web. The UAF web site, then, could serve as a portal for these links.

Wilma asked the group if they had heard of the Ceb resource called “Curriki” (http://www.curriki.org/xwiki/bin/view/Main/WebHome). No one had heard of it before, so she said she would e-mail information on it to the members. It is an informational and interactive Web site providing educational information resources and tools, discussion venues, and posting capabilities—all in the interest of supporting students, teachers, and school administrators around the world. This site might be a good candidate for inclusion in on the gateway.

**Staff Development Report**

Sandra Campbell did not yet have a report as such from this Committee but did have results from a survey conducted by the Committee that was distributed to all personnel in the member libraries. The number of people responding was not particularly large but was sufficient enough, she thought, to develop some valid conclusions.

Sandra indicated that she would get back with the Committee to discuss what has been discovered as a result of the survey and perhaps develop more topical issues to be addressed. She will work with them to bring out a final report in August. Since Janet Parsch has resigned from her position as director of personnel at UAF, and others on the Committee will no longer be available, others should be assigned to take their place. In the meantime, however, Janet has indicated her willingness to continue to serve temporarily and follow through with analysis of the survey results.

Carolyn suggested that the Committee could identify topics that staff might like to see in a shared staff development program and then offer informational sessions in response to their suggestions. Most of the member campuses have an access grid except for UAFS, and these sessions could be offered via those grids.
Other Issues

Carolyn remarked that she would be willing to sponsor a meeting devoted to the topic of fundraising for staff in the member libraries who are active in fundraising and grant-writing. Ben Carter, UAF Libraries’ development officer can present tips and suggestions for fundraising.

Carolyn brought up the issue of who would be the next Council chair. The group suggested that she continue to be chair for the next meeting for the discussion of the final reports. They could then elect a new chair at that meeting. Carolyn agreed to the suggestion.

Future Deadlines and Schedule

Carolyn asked that the Council members get back with their groups and discuss with them the minutes of this meeting and their final reports, which are due on August 1st. She indicated that she would try to have the minutes posted as soon as possible on the CUARL page of UAF’s library StaffWeb (http://libinfo.uark.edu/committees/CUALsystem.asp).

The Council scheduled the next meeting for Friday, August 10 from 10:00 a.m. until 4:00 p.m. at the same location in Little Rock: the Conference Room in the UofA System administration building.

Carolyn thanked all members of the Council for the productive discussions and adjourned the meeting at 2:30.
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