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Welcome & Introductions – ASERL President Connie McCarthy welcomed the ASERL membership and introduced Natalie Chase, as CFO of ASERL.

Rich Meyer (Georgia Tech) discussed his library’s effort in building a digital infrastructure as a means of advancing scholarly communication process, adding value to the publication of intellectual property, and as an emerging new role for the library. This is a result of a changing paradigm for how faculty perform their research -- communicating through alternative mechanisms. Scholars will soon seek a network of digital repositories. GT has started by inventorying what scholarly digital objects are located on campus.

National Trends (collection of repositories):
- Networked Digital Library of Theses and Dissertations
- Open Archives Initiative
- Metadata standards and harvesting portal implementations
- ARL collective of digital repositories
- MERLOT, SMETE, other initiatives

Georgia Tech’s model:
- Start with overall vision
- Staff at the top to build entrepreneur ally
- Partner with other campus components
- Proceed incrementally
- Offer flexible support for intellectual property submissions
- Provide means for indefinite archiving and database migration

The library has a learning objects partnership with Engineering and GT’s Information Commons which provides a 24 hour venue; they also have a webpage where faculty can submit learning objects. Submissions go to the library’s technical service department where metadata is applied and added to repository. GT uses BRS search software, users need to select databases but can search across them.

Library’s Role:
- Metadata expertise
- Database maintenance and migration expertise
- Online multimedia demonstration projects
- Variety of repository and licensed digital collections
- Growing production capacity

OIT’s Role:
• Info Tech architecture maintenance
• Systems, hardware and network support
• Network security and disaster recovery
• Software development support

Repository content will include:
• Learning objects
• Center reports
• Working papers
• Theses and dissertations

The electronic theses and dissertations effort is a joint project between the graduate office and OIT; will increase access and preserve ETDs in digital form via internet and will also improve processing and provide non-print augmentation.

Other Relevant Issues:
• Intellectual property rules need to be revised to include repository environment.
  o Repositories require staffing for the new service, and require excellent facilitation to foster partnerships with other departments on campus.
  o Staffing in technical services is also needed to work on digital initiatives. Need teams -- including bibliographers and partners from the university -- to select content for inclusion in the repository.
• Repositories create service components that support every undergraduate need – in labs, library, tutoring, advising, cooperative areas + online interfaces – to provide information service points right at patrons’ “front door.” This requires IT and support staff to maintain the services.
• GT seeks to re-do their library portal to connect better with learning courseware.
• Incentives for faculty to participate will help foster development of repositories.
• Cross institutional participation and standards are needed as well to foster interoperability with discipline-based repositories.
• Institution-based experiments underway include Dspace, Berkeley Electronic Press.
• Discipline-based experiments also underway (e.g., Los Alamos e-print).

Discussion: “Scholars’ Contributions to the Development of AmericanSouth.org” – Martin Halbert (Emory)
• AmericanSouth will allow a regional focus on topics, providing a new way for faculty to frame their research. It includes annotated comments by users on archival sources and summary articles written by scholars on larger topical areas. Scholars and the public benefit from this interpretive framework.
• Additional ASERL may contribute content to the AmericanSouth database.
  Requirements for participation include: 1) collections that are germane to the study of American South culture and history, 2) technical staff to bring up a local OAI provider, and 3) some local metadata – not unprocessed.
• David Ferriero suggested AmericanSouth also consider adding state-wide projects with appropriate content such as North Carolina ECHO.
• OAI provider development services might be provided in the future, possibly by SOLINET.
• ALSO: Emory will host a symposium on Online Scholarship and Open Archives in June 2004 and hopes for ASERL to co-sponsor the effort. The goal is to share perspectives and gain expertise from AmericanSouth and other online portal efforts, and get the word out on this new model for collaboration between scholars and information providers.

Discussion: “RAPID – A Model for Improved Article Delivery?” – Barbara Dewey (U-Tenn.)
• RAPID is an automated system developed by Colorado State University that processes ILL requests very efficiently, resulting in very quick delivery time. U-Tennessee has been using RAPID for several months and found it to be very satisfactory. RAPID might prove to be an interesting model for Kudzu to improve sharing of journal literature and possibly books. ASERL staff will monitor the use/availability of the system as it develops in the future.

Discussion: “Budget Reductions: Different Paths to the Same Result” – Connie McCarthy (William & Mary), John Ulmschneider (VCU)

Connie:
• William & Mary’s overall budget was reduced by 5% as of July 1, 2002.
• Cuts were managed by a campus budget policy advisory committee chaired by the Provost and Vice President of Finance, with faculty and dean representation. The Advisory Committee looked at programs and percentages and voted on how to make cuts in consideration of campus priorities. The Committee also held hearings on campus about possible cuts.
• Consensus was that the college would continue to upgrade campus IT infrastructure; the library ranked second in importance. This still resulted in a $426,000 cut from the library in August.
• Additional cuts may still occur; each department prepared confidential scenarios for the Governor’s office to consider.
• Connie’s cuts affected all areas: collections, positions (retirements), part-time positions, and one layoff. Cuts also caused a reduction in service hours. Staff/faculty have not had raises in three years (although they were given an option of taking additional leave time or receive a one-time bonus of 2.5%).

John:
• VIVA played a key role in advocating for higher education during budget negotiating process. VIVA also gets $5.5million from the General Assembly annually for statewide resources; this is critical to libraries.
• Universities with medical centers face a special challenge in funding indigent care. (Example: VCU’s hospital cares for 35% of state’s population. A decision was made not to take the shortfall from other University operations.)
• VCU maintains open and full disclosure of all budget information which is posted on University’s website.

Discussion:
• ASERL members from other states shared their experiences: cuts in state funding for higher education range from 0% to 24%.

Adjourn Sunday Session
Connie McCarthy adjourned the Sunday session at 12:15 p.m.

Monday, March 3, 2003

Review of Strategic Programming & Priorities – Connie McCarthy reviewed the priorities that were established by the ASERL Board for 2003-04, based on the interests and needs of ASERL members. The priorities include:
• Expand resource sharing (including ILL Reciprocal Agreement)
• Launch virtual reference
• Provide options for increasing digital collections (survey is being conducted by Eileen Hitchingham)
• Continue work started with Competencies
• Investigate options for cooperative storage (white paper is being written by Paul Gherman)

The Board reaffirmed the Program Manager position with SOLINET and signed a revised memorandum of agreement. For 2003-4, dues will remain at $2500/member.

Discussion: “A Model for ASERL’s Cooperative Virtual Reference Program”
Sarah Watstein (VCU) presented a proposal for a cooperatively-staffed virtual reference service:
• The service will provide participants with 84 hours of service staffed by experienced ASERL librarians.
• The service will focus on the instructional component of the question and answer via application sharing, voice, live video supports this instructional component.
• ASERL’s Technology Working Group reviewed all of the chat software on the market and selected QuestionPoint. Participants are asked to subscribe to QP’s “enhanced” service, and agree to contribute information to the knowledge base.
• The project includes a part-time project coordinator to lead, develop, and manage schedules/staffing. Policy and planning decisions will be made by a Steering Committee; members drawn from participating libraries.
• The launch of the pilot set for September 1, 2003.
• ASERL members discussed the timetable; some expressed concerns that it was too aggressive.
• Questions came up about the requirement to use librarians to answer questions. The members suggested that the requirement be changed to be qualified reference personnel. Quality control is based on mutual confidence with ASERL members.
• Local institutions requested the option of keeping their own program name for the service or use the name selected by ASERL.
• Sarah agreed to revise the proposal based on these requests and re-circulate it to the ASERL membership.
ASERL Administrative Updates – Barbara Dewey reviewed the summary of programs implemented since the dues increased in 1999. Barbara brought special attention to ASERL staff who have done an excellent job in moving ASERL forward. Major programs noted:

- Kudzu
- Document Delivery
- Virtual Reference
- AmericaSouth.org
- Digital Collections
- Cooperative Storage
- ASERL Competencies

- Board Elections – Candidates for the open positions were reviewed. Elections will be held on May 1st in Atlanta. Members may vote via proxy if desired – see Program Manager for more information if needed.

ASERL Program Updates

- **ASERL Membership Statistics Update** – John Burger – see handout.
- **Renewal of ASERL Reciprocal ILL Agreement** – Connie McCarthy asked members to review the reaffirmation of the 1993 ILL Agreement (see handout), with a note that section G was changed to “failure to provide timely returns may result in loss of borrowing privileges.” It was suggested that an additional statement about paying replacement/processing costs for materials not returned. All ASERL members present pledged to abide by this agreement. Staff will determine participation by absent members.
- **Kudzu** – John Burger presented improved Kudzu statistics; this data will be collected quarterly. John also presented minor changes to the ILL Kudzu Guidelines, mainly to include services provided by Lanter Systems for delivery. A promotional piece for Kudzu was developed to encourage other ASERL libraries to join; this will also be mailed to potential ASERL Program Affiliate sites. The costs are $3500 per library for the first year and $260 for subsequent years.
- **ASERL Competencies** – Derrie Perez reported that a short survey will be sent out to find out how members are using the competencies (i.e. wording on descriptions, interview questions, etc.). The results will be put on the website for members to use. The text needs to be reviewed and updated. For example, the text may need to include other professionals working in libraries. ASERL staff will ask for input from members via email.
  - **ALSO**: Members interested in library school collaboration got together and decided to send out a short survey to those ASERL sites who have a library school or work with library schools to see what kind of relationship members have and what we do with library school students. The goal is to see what kind of partnerships are going on.
  - Further, Lou Pitschmann and Charlene Hurt are going to work on a one-page concept paper on how libraries can work with the library schools and a one-page concept paper on how we can further education about research librarianship for functional professionals (i.e. human resources, information technology, development, accounting). (Note this may fit well with the certification program being developed by SOLINET for library support staff.) Paper will be discussed at Fall Meeting.
• **Survey of ASERL Digital Programs** – John Burger reported that Eileen Hitchingham will send out a survey on ASERL digitization programs. Results will be discussed at ASERL’s Fall 2003 meeting.

• **Survey of Cooperative Virtual Storage Options** – John Burger reported that Paul Gherman is working on a paper looking at options, costs, etc. Results will be discussed at ASERL’s Fall 2003 meeting.

**SOLINET Update** – Kate Nevins

- Kate was enthusiastic about ASERL members’ decision to renew agreement for staffing, and thanked staff for their efforts.
- SOLINET is developing a proposal to NEH for continued funding of the microfilming effort. NEH will now allow digitization along with microfilming.
- Library Products and Services – Kate introduced Tim Cherubini who replaced Amy Dykeman and is from Emory by way of Duke.
- In October 2002, SOLINET facilitated a national meeting of all Historically Black College and University libraries – a first-ever event. Meeting was supported by a grant from CLIR. Based on ASERL’s experience, the group has formed the “HBCU Library Alliance” to address common issues. Priorities include recruitment and access/preservation/digitization of special collections. SOLINET is helping to draft a Mellon grant to support costs for the first year of operation.
- SOLINET’s annual membership meeting is May 1 and May 2 in Atlanta.

**E-Resources Update** – Tim Cherubini reviewed the current listing of products available at a discount via SOLINET. Of note:

- Lexis-Nexis will not increase prices through June 2004 on products through SOLINET. He discussed World Data Analyst Online which is geared more to the undergraduate population.
- SOLINET’s third shared collection with netLibrary is underway. First part of the collection will be available in mid-March. Tim discussed the need to increase the loan time for e-books, from 2 to 24 hours. ALSO: SOLINET Members can get a 4% discount on other titles they would like to purchase separately.
- SOLINET is speaking with Berkeley Electronic Press. A future offer is possible.
- SOLINET is talking with vendors for cross searching portal-type products. These are difficult to evaluate right now as they are very new, and maintenance and setup issues are not completely known.
- Readex is producing “Evans Digital Edition” (items published up to 1800). Interested ASERL libraries can receive discounts directly from vendor.

**Other Updates/Announcements**

- Dates for next meeting: Thursday, May 1 at 5pm, Sheraton Buckhead, Atlanta.
- Fall meeting: Monday, November 3, 2003 in Atlanta.
- Spring 2004 meeting: Group discussed possibility of St. Augustine, Florida (looking at Casa Monica Hotel). Another possibility is Point Clear or New Orleans. Board will decide and announce decision soon.
Meeting Wrap-up/Adjourn
Connie McCarthy adjourned the meeting at 11:40 a.m.

Respectfully submitted:

_____________________________
Barbara Dewey, Secretary-Treasurer