Aserl

ASSOCIATION OF SOUTHEASTERN RESEARCH LIBRARIES

Fall 2002 Membership Meeting

Meeting Minutes
November 15, 2002 – Atlanta, Georgia

Attendees

Air University	Shirley Laseter
Auburn University	Harmon Straiton
Clemson University	Joe Boykin
College of William & Mary	Connie McCarthy
East Carolina University	Carroll Varner
Emory University	Joan Gotwals
Florida State University	Althea Jenkins
Georgia State University	Charlene Hurt
Georgia Tech	Rich Meyer
Louisiana State University	Jennifer Cargill
State Library of Florida	Barratt Wilkins
Tulane University	Lance Query
UNC Chapel Hill	Pat Mullin
UNC Charlotte	Amy Dykeman
UNC Greensboro	Doris Hulbert
University of Alabama	Lou Pitschmann
University of Alabama – Birmingham	Steve Laughlin
University of Central Florida	Barry Baker
University of Florida	Dale Canelas
University of Georgia	Tom Cetwinski
University of Kentucky	Mary Molinaro
University of Louisville	Hannelore Rader
University of Memphis	Sylverna Ford
University of Miami	Jeff Barry
University of Mississippi	John Meador
University of South Carolina	Paul Willis
University of South Florida	Derrie Perez
University of Tennessee	Barbara Dewey
Vanderbilt University	Paul Gherman
Virginia Commonwealth University	John Ulmschneider
Virginia Tech	Eileen Hitchingham
Wake Forest University	Rhoda Channing
SOLINET	John Burger
SOLINET	Kate Nevins
SOLINET	Robert Hulshof-Schmidt
Consultant	Sheila Creth

Call to Order
President Connie McCarthy called the meeting to order at 9:05 a.m. EST.

Discussion & Vote – Key ASERL Membership Issues
Barbara Dewey (Chair, ASERL Membership Cmte) reviewed the proposal sent to all ASERL members on November 4th regarding possible changes to ASERL's membership structure.

- **Membership Requirements for State Libraries:** Pat Mullin questioned whether the proposed change would give state libraries additional seats on the SOLINET Board of Directors. Kate Nevins said it would not. Joe Boykin added that if it turned out to be an issue, SOLINET would handle it, not ASERL. This item passed 32-1.
- **Procedures for Membership Review:** Lance Query moved that the last two sentences of the first paragraph and the last sentence under Step #2 be removed. Seconded by Paul Gherman. Rhoda Channing moved that Step #4 be amended to include "Any Board member whose institution is under review shall be excused from the deliberations." The amended item passed 33-0.
- **Expenditure Threshold for Academic Library Members:** There was discussion from several participants about the proposed removal of collections expenditures from the membership requirements. Barbara Dewey responded that in light of the rapid changes in research library operations, collections budgets do not necessarily describe all that is done to provide access to information for users. Therefore it was felt that overall operations would encompass everything a library does to provide services to users. The item passed 32-1.
- **Participation by Research Libraries Outside the Southeast Region**: Paul Gherman asked for clarification that the proposal requires a library that would become an ASERL Program Affiliate would otherwise meet ASERL membership criteria. Connie McCarthy responded that the proposal includes such a requirement. Lance Query remarked that this proposal would be a "win-win" for ASERL as it allows the organization access to other research libraries when desired, allows for additional revenues to offset overhead costs, while still maintaining the overall size of the organization that is widely desired by current members. This item passed 33-0.
- **Other Discussions**: The following items were referred to the Membership Committee for further investigation:
  - Pros/cons of a numerical cap on ASERL membership
  - Pros/cons on requiring at least one member from each state

ASERL Strategic Planning – Updates, Reality Checks, & Goal Setting
Connie McCarthy provided an overview of items that have been accomplished since ASERL's last strategic planning effort in 1999. These include: Kudzu shared catalog, document delivery, ASERL's competencies for research librarians, outreach efforts with LIS school leaders, and linking digital collections (AmericanSouth).

Review of Priorities & Critical Success Factors
Sheila Creth led ASERL members in a strategic planning process beginning with the identification of current activities and success factors gleaned from the survey completed earlier in the fall by ASERL members in two categories.

1. **Operational Activities** – includes Kudzu, document delivery, American South, virtual reference. Critical success factors for these projects are:
   - improved access to collections, unique resources
   - cost effective
   - cost savings
   - problem solving
   - enhancing use of subject specialists

2. **Informational/Planning Activities** – includes director meetings, fundraising discussion, cooperative acquisition of electronic resources, preservation discussions, ASERL competencies. Critical success factors for these activities are:
   - open/frank sharing among ASERL members
   - directors participation
   - learning, staying current
   - common need, interest
   - compare w/other libraries
   - peer support/mentoring

Small Groups: Programmatic Priorities, Support Capacities, Success Factors
Seven groups of 4 – 5 persons were randomly formed to discuss ASERL program planning and set priorities for the next 18-24 months. Specifically, each group was to develop consensus about the following:
- Review current activities and whether to alter, expand, or reduce
- Identify projects in planning & future projects with the goal to determine 2-3 priorities, identify any factors critical to their success, and how to measure them.

Full Group Discussion: Determining Consensus & Priorities
After lunch the membership reconvened and Sheila summarized the priority area as noted by the small groups:
A) CURRENT ACTIVITIES
- Assumption that meeting w/directors will continue
- Sharing fundraising information and expand to include more than private funds
- Electronic resources – monthly updates and informational items
- ASERL act as clearinghouse with regard to digital products and standards rather than actually create the standards
- Competencies – Some say it is done where as others say awareness is still needed
- Buildings – Still need to be kept informed

Areas where ASERL members need to know best practices:
- fund raising
- information literacy
- program assessment
- gather information and disseminate on time wasters.

It was noted that staying current and learning topics still are time consuming. If ASERL members want updates on certain topics (like the above 4), the Board should ask 2-3 libraries work on the topic and update ASERL members via listservs, etc. How will information gathered, collated, kept up to date will vary on a case-by-case basis.

High Priority Projects Among Current Activities
- Document delivery – expand, enhance, enforce
- Kudzu
- CRL consortial pricing exploration

Low Priority Projects Among Current Activities
- Cooperative storage

B) PLANNED & FUTURE ACTIVITIES
   High Priority Projects Among Future Activities
- virtual reference – need more information, white paper, etc.
- America South Project
- digitizing unique collections
- document delivery (expand usage)
- CRL consortial pricing
- cooperative storage
- cooperative acquisition of electronic resources

   Low Priority Projects Among Future Activities
- internships
- electronic repositories
- collaboration with university presses

C) PROJECTS TO DROP OR KEEP AS INFORMATIONAL ITEMS
- library building resource information
- fundraising activities
- ASERL competencies (text is written, other follow-up activities can de done)
- preservation of electronic information (is a national issue)

Activities with Deliverables – What might be done in the next 2-3 years

1) Expand Resource Sharing Activities Among ASERL members
   - Expand Kudzu participation to additional libraries
   - Expand use of courier service (Lanter) to deliver print materials
   - Explore other options for delivery
   - Expand types of materials shared
   - Require new members to participate in reciprocal ILL agreement

2) Explore/Develop options for members to provide Virtual Reference services
   - Examine ways this can be addressed regionally, need more information on how it could be attempted
   - Use draft model from Best Practices Working Group for initial discussions

3) Expand options for accessing digitized collections
   - Use AmericanSouth as a model for other projects (esp. tools and techniques for implementation
   - Inventory special collections and specialized staffing at ASERL libraries to identify those that are a special niche for ASERL (e.g., Southern Writers Project) that maintains ASERL's regional focus (civil rights?)
   - Examine SPARC initiatives on institutional repositories and other commercial projects (e.g., D-Space) to determine what these commercial projects offer
   - Draft white paper with recommendations for future activity

4) Examine options for CRL Consortial Pricing
   - Draft plan that would provide additional revenues to CRL and also reduce per-member costs to ASERL members – perhaps some kind of "associate member" status for the entire association?
   - Use inventory of special collections (see #3, above) to highlight the value of adding new libraries to CRL from ASERL

5) Develop plan for shared cooperative storage
   - Existing committee should more forward, draft a white paper to map-put strategy
   - Initial concept is:
     - ASERL members to designate "holding" libraries to store 2 – 3 runs of JSTOR (and potentially Elsevier) titles by subject area, combine collections as needed to fill any gaps, items kept somewhere in region
     - Use Kudzu to identify where item is held, courier service to delivery paper copies when required
     - ASERL members have option to discard duplicate copies
     - Seek grant funding for implementation
     - Draft resolution to ARL regarding volume counts
   - Encourage virtual storage for monographs on a national level

Activities that are Mostly Informational

1) Fundraising
   - Create listserv for ASERL development people, ask 1-2 to report back with approaches/suggestions/best practices
   - Initiate a broader discussion with public institutions about how we are developing alternative funding streams (overhead funds, tuition increases, library fees, funds from new PhD program)
   - have a break out session at a Spring for those who are interested

2) Competencies
   - Text is finished; what is needed is strategies to move forward to improve quality and numbers of librarians
   - ASERL members can create dialogue with their area LIS school faculty to encourage their use
   - Use them as guidelines for continuing professional education for staff at member libraries and/or criteria for promotions
   - Create boilerplate language for use in job ads
   - Work with search committees to ensure they consider this as well
   - Ensure ASERL Competencies are included in training provided by SOLINET
   - Explore options for internships, but realize significant barriers may exist

Next Steps – Strategic Planning:
   - The ASERL Board will identify priority initiatives an accompanying action plans at their next meeting or conference call.

Updates: Existing ASERL Projects & Activities
   - Kudzu/Document Delivery – John Burger – see handout.
   - Virtual Reference – John Burger – see handout.
   - AmericanSouth – Martin Halbert – see handout.
   - ASERL Statistics – John Burger – It was agreed that ARL members would supply a copy of their ARL survey data to ASERL to help alleviate long lag times in getting data from ARL.
   - Fundraising Workshop at Spring 2003 Meeting – Connie McCarthy – Connie & Eileen Hitchingham are developing agenda now. Will include three panelists. ASERL member are invited to bring their development directors to participate. By a show of hands, approximately 45 – 50 attendees are expected.
   - CIC E-Publishing Venture – John Burger – see handout.
   - SOLINET & E-Resources Update – Tim Cherubini – see handout.

Proposed New Activities
   - LOCKSS Project – Martin Halbert – Martin provided an overview of the LOCKSS project, which provides software to participating libraries that allows them to slowly gather electronic backup copies of the journals to which they subscribe. The local copies would only used in the event the publisher's copy becomes unavailable. Stanford is working with

publishers to develop agreements to permit the copies to be made. Emory is a beta test site. Once testing is complete (sometime in mid 2003), additional participants will be sought.

Adjournment
President McCarthy adjourned the meeting at 12noon.

Respectfully submitted:

_____
Barbara Dewey, Secretary-Treasurer