



ASSOCIATION OF SOUTHEASTERN RESEARCH LIBRARIES

ASERL Fall 2009 Membership Meeting
Meeting Minutes
November 17 – 18, 2009
Charleston, SC

Participant List – see attachment.

Tuesday, November 18, 2009

Call to Order

ASERL President Deborah Jakubs called the meeting to order at 12:30p.m. ET with welcome and self-introductions by participants.

Panel Presentation/Discussion: “Cloud” Discovery Systems for Libraries

Marshall Breeding, Vanderbilt University
John Law, Serials Solutions/ProQuest
Anne Prestamo, Oklahoma State University (via webcast)
Bill Garrison, University of South Florida

Marshall Breeding offered opening comments and served as moderator. “Web-scale” is another term for “cloud” discovery systems. There is a crowded landscape of information providers on the web, and meanwhile, libraries are in transition from print to hybrid/oriented to digital resources. At the same time, users are immersed in web 2.0 systems. Library users want and need rich, self-explanatory interfaces that access information from as many different resources as possible. Currently, libraries have a disjointed approach to information and service delivery. Most of our resources have different search interfaces and can only be searched separately; they are silos, understood only to librarians. Marshall made a distinction between the online catalog and the discovery layer, which is a broader approach to discovery. A number of products are emerging to address these needs. Social discovery includes user supplied ratings and reviews, and leverages social networking tools.

Marshall highlighted the need for systems that are designed from ground-up to provide a single point of entry to all content and services offered by the library. Web-scale interfaces might include:

- Single search box
- Query tools
- Relevance ranked results
- Faceted navigation
- Enhanced visual display – cover art, summaries, reviews
- Recommendation services

Marshall noted that web-scale discovery is not the same as federated search, used by many ASERL libraries. Federated search has not proven to be the answer: Among other drawbacks it only returns limited hits from various resources. In contrast, web-scale search takes all content and puts it in a single index – specifically pre-populated indexes to ensure speedy searching. Domain of content then

constitutes library collections. Most publishers (including large publishers) are willing to expose their content in such a way.

Another feature of these tools is “deep indexing” – searching the full text of each item, not just metadata describing each item. Increasingly there is a divergence between discovery tools and library business automation (ILS). The OPAC as a discovery tool is becoming obsolete. This new phase of library automation is ushering in several conceptually diverse options; companies and projects now are competing on innovation.

John Law addressed the importance of libraries being able to attract & retain Net-Gen student researchers as library users. Much information was obtained from observational research of student researchers – 70 plus sessions – conducted by ProQuest/Serials Solutions. Techniques included focus groups and end user surveys. What they learned: users trust library content for quality, credible information, but Google is easiest place to start the research process, hence its popularity. John showed examples of users trying valiantly to gain access to library content, only to encounter numerous obstacles.

An Ithaka survey underscored that the importance of the library as a gateway for locating information has fallen over time. The library is increasingly disintermediated from the actual research process. Libraries are at risk as users get into the habit of using other sources, like Google, etc. John Law then gave a description of Summon, their product that incorporates many features desired by users. (see <http://Gvsu.edu/library>)

Anne Prestamo described Oklahoma State’s participation as a development partner with Summon. She noted that ARL libraries invest hugely in e-content, yet within our OPACs about 30% of searches are failed searches due to poor discovery systems. What we want in our discovery tool is a simple powerful interface; faster query time; consistent results; relevancy ranking & other refinement tools; improved linking; format-agnostic services. That is, all the available data all in one place.

Bill Garrison talked about USF’s implementation of OCLC’s WorldCat Local as a discovery tool, which incorporates many web-scale discovery features. Reasons for selecting WorldCat Local include: User dissatisfaction with the existing interface; no IT staff within the library to devote to maintenance and development. The benefits include a single interface that is seamless and fast; it doesn’t require local IT staff; integrates well with your local ILS. It also includes social networking features like reviews, ratings, and lists, and encompasses all the licensed content offered via OCLC. Bill did note that USF still offers both interfaces (for now). They have encountered some problems with librarians sending users to the “old” discovery system because the librarians feel more comfortable using it.

ASERL Strategic Planning for 2010-2012

Deborah Jakubs opened the discussion of ASERL’s strategic plan, specifically our need to revisit/revise it in light of the current environment and future directions. ASERL leadership is concerned that only about half of the members responded to a recent survey about ASERL’s strategic directions. The Board seeks direction from the larger group. (Also see PPT for overview.)

The membership divided into three break-out groups, focused on (1) Opportunities for deep collaboration; (2) Looking at other similar organizations and what we might learn from them; and (3) What other new activities would be most valuable? (*e.g., assessment, diversity, others?*)

- Lance Query, reporting for group 1 (Opportunities for deep collaboration): There are several possible arenas for deep collaboration – some of which are underway within ASERL -- including government documents; shared storage; Kudzu; consortial activities such as “purchasing clubs”, training, etc. New opportunities for collaborations include support of digital collections, development of digital tools, and foreign language cataloging. He mentioned that Tulane has outsourced music cataloging.
- Tom McNally reported for group 2 (Benefits of inventorying other consortial programs, and consideration of more engagement with provosts, accreditation agencies, etc.): Regarding the strategic planning survey, some may have unintentionally forgotten to complete it. A better indicator of the value of ASERL is the level of participation in the directors’ meetings, which is typically quite strong.

In terms of activities that increase relevancy of ASERL, the group discussed accreditation and SACS as a serious concern and a “moving target.” Perhaps ASERL can invite a SACS rep to present at a future meeting, as well as ASERL members who going through the SACS process to share info. Also suggested was programming on grant funding, such as having agencies come here or members discuss their experiences. There was discussion of having a meeting to which provosts would be invited, and how to draw provosts to such a meeting.

- Kay Wall reported for group 3 (What other new activities would be most valuable? e.g., assessment, diversity, others?): The group suggested the Board reach out to non-attenders to query their wants and needs from ASERL. Also suggested, as good opportunities for ASERL, collaboration with library schools and open source projects.

Discussion with ASERL’s Finance Committee: Options for ASERL’s Financial Future

John Ulmschneider, President-Elect, led a discussion of the Finance Committee’s recommendation for a dues increase. At the Committee’s recommendation, the Board set aside \$40,000 from ASERL’s Net Assets into a separate Reserve Fund, to be used should ASERL ever decide to cease operating. The proposed dues increase would partially replenish the Net Assets (over two years) and provide the income needed to sustain ASERL’s regular operations. Net Assets are used by the Board as an “agility fund” when needed.

For 2010-2011, the recommended increase in dues is from \$4,000 per library to \$4,100 per library. For 2011-2012, the recommended increase in dues is from \$4,100 per library to \$4,300 per library.

ASERL may need further dues increases beyond the 2011-2012 program year. The Committee felt a two-year window for planning was appropriate, so the Finance Committee focused only on 2011-2012.

Discussion: Are there likely to be new members, which could change the finance situation? The current budget assumes status quo in membership. ASERL has received feelers from several institutions from outside the region. These libraries are not currently permitted to be members, although there is an affiliate category that has not proven to be attractive to libraries who’ve asked about membership. The Board has reinstated the Membership Committee to look at the current definition of “affiliate” and whether it can that be changed to make affiliate status more equal to full membership.

Vote: Bill Walker moved to accept the recommendations for dues increases through 2011-2012, 2nd by Judy Russell. Motion was passed unanimously by a show of hands.

Shared Storage Study Group

(NOTE: This item was moved forward on the agenda to allow SSSG member Lynn Sutton to participate in the discussion, who is unable to be present on November 18th.)

The SSSG report was included in the packet. In surveying ASERL libraries, somewhere between 10 & 18 libraries expressed interest in participating in a shared “virtual” storage system as previously discussed by ASERL. The Study Group feels this is sufficient mass to make some kind of system viable. The Study Group is still in data gathering stage and plans to have a full proposal ready for the Spring 2010 meeting.

To pave the way for future cooperative storage solutions, John Ulmschneider moved that ASERL endorse Ithaka’s “What to Withdraw” report, notably the recommendation that libraries can safely withdraw text-based JSTOR journals. Lynn Sutton seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously. John Burger will work with Ithaka to provide web sessions for ASERL members on how this recommendation can be implemented within ASERL campuses.

Civil War Digitization Project

John Burger and Bonnie MacEwan presented an update of the collaborative digitization project that is underway. It is hoped that all ASERL libraries will contribute content to this project. Some libraries have expressed willingness to scan for others, to make contribution as easy as possible. Scanning and metadata specifications are complete and posted on the ASERL website. A centralized metadata index is planned in order to make searching faster and easier for users. We are still seeking a home for the project portal – an RFP has been posted to the ASERL website to identify bidders; ASERL libraries are encouraged to consider submitting a proposal to develop/host the portal.

End of Day 1

The meeting was recessed at 4:42pm until the following morning. ASERL members enjoyed a reception in the evening.

Wednesday, November 18, 2009

Presentation/Discussion: mLibraries – Delivering Library Services to Mobile Users

Joan Lippincott, Coalition for Networked Information

John Ulmschneider, Virginia Commonwealth University, moderator

John Ulmschneider introduced the session, noting the huge increase in use of mobile devices for texting & Web browsing over the past 12 – 18 months. This is an important trend for libraries to attract and retain users.

Joan Lippincott is the current Associate Executive Director of the Coalition for Networked Information (CNI). Founded in 1990 to accelerate progress in digital information related to research and education; she invited participants to come to their web site for updates on issues facing libraries, like learning commons and scholarly communications; she also recommended subscribing to CNI-announce.

It's a Mobile World: 93.6% freshmen own a laptop; 66% use internet capable cell phones; the age of their mobile devices is remarkably new; they often own both a desktop and a laptop. Many users currently do not use internet capabilities on their phone, due to pricing structures; but this could change quickly. Will libraries be ready to take advantage of this change?

Mainstream press is producing mobile compatible versions of new publications. Kindle sales of Dan Brown's new bestseller sold more copies than in print. People of all ages are tweeting.

Much like the data found by ProQuest (see above), it is critical that libraries understand their users and how they are coming to rely on their mobile device. See "[Just a typical college campus](#)" and "What's in my bag?" Users now we have to carry a lot of things; what can be combined? Users want something that will streamline what they carry around, the single device that accomplishes many things.

As a result, the environment is changing. Typical cell phones are moving from communication to information devices. Major universities have a presence in iTunes U. Nielsen reports a 52% increase in viewing videos on cell phones. Kids consider their mobile phone to be their best friend and it would be the one device that they would keep above all others. 67% of students in grades 9-12 maintain a personal website. When asked what they do regularly with technology, 27% of K-12 students said that they create slideshows, videos, and or web pages. K-12 students want to use their own devices in learning. Students in professional programs are key target populations; most are early adopters; heaviest use was to get reference info with 26%; few subscribe to podcasts. All of today's students are going into careers where they will use tech & produce digital content every day.

Characteristics of desired services available via mobile devices:

- Personal
- Social
- Simple
- Practical
- Fun

Can libraries deliver this?

Typical mobile services from libraries include access to basic information (e.g., library hours, catalog; SMS texting, etc.) Joan urges librarians to think more broadly about data used by libraries and how we bring them together, including general info but also patron records, reference transactions, info literacy podcasts and videos, and access to services—booking group rooms, etc.

Libraries should develop a cohesive strategy for delivering services to their mobile users, including access to digital content configured for mobile devices, geo-spatially linked information, and loans of devices (e.g., iPod Touches, Kindles, etc.). She also urged librarians to participate in social networking as a means of building relationships with users.

Much of what libraries already do involves technologies that can be adapted for mobile users, including reference via chat/SMS, info literacy podcasts tutorials, use of clickers in BI, data available from the OPAC and patron records. It appears that licensing issues for loaning content on Kindles has been resolved, too – another opportunity for providing content to mobile users. She suggested librarians could use Twitter to push info/web links following a BI class.

Joan highlighted examples of libraries leading in development of mobile services, including UVA and NCSU.

- NCSU offers “Wolf Walk”, a location-aware campus tour for new students, linked to maps with geo-tagged locations, including stops in the library.
- Duke has optimized digital images from Special Collections for iPhones.

Other mobile-friendly services include:

- arXiv is now accessible via iPhone
- WorldCat Mobile
- Google Book Search
- Refworks Mobile
- Blackboard
- Audiobooks

Where do these mobile-accessible resources fit in your library’s plan?

New technologies on the horizon offer more opportunities, including QR codes that can be scanned by mobile devices to link users with locations, e-books, web pages with additional information, links to social networking sites, phone numbers, etc.

Complementary services: A few libraries are also providing comparison of mobile devices; workshops, help desk support, and other ways to support mobile users. For example:

- U-Colorado’s graduate area provides recharging services – cabinets with plugs
- Arizona State promotes their services via Library Channel, accessible via mobile devices
- Western Ill U Libraries offers a “Text me” service
- Cornell Mann Library provides a graphic sign of all of the mobile equipment that they loan

Many library departments/functions can collaborate to support mobile users, including IT/Systems (for tech support), Reference (fielding questions from mobile users), departmental liaisons (keeping abreast of what faculty are using mobile technology), Special Collections (making content available digitally), and Access Services (loaning equipment).

Lippincott urged library administrators to begin planning for these new services, get resources to support the services and devices, and get a seat at the table to ensure library is a full participant in the university’s campus-wide strategy for supporting mobile-users.

Lippincott sees fewer than 50% of campus IT offices looking to this, although she believes this can give an institution a competitive advantage in attracting students and faculty. This could be an opportunity for libraries to provide leadership for the campus. Some institutional policy and infrastructure issues include:

- What platforms/devices will you support (and which will you not support)?
- Who will make these decisions for the institution?
- Who will provide tech support?
- Who will select, license, fund content for mobile devices?

Now is the Time – Suggested next steps:

- Study your local environment and users
- Experiment – Conduct pilot projects now, when technology is still in infancy
- Encourage students to produce library apps
- Participate in institutional planning
- Promote awareness of your efforts to your community
- Disseminate information on your successes and problems

Questions/Remarks:

- Is there a central repository for library apps? Not that anyone knows. ASERL will offer show-and-tell webinars in 2010 to exchange information.
- Apple is the US market leader, at least right now.
- e-textbooks: Lippincott is unsure current forms of e-textbooks will be a lasting trend, although the need exists
- If your institution is developing a mobile portal, it is essential that libraries be part of the development

ASERL Program Updates:

1. ASERL Collaborative Federal Depositories Program – John Burger
Successful in the IMLS grant; ASERL has hired a coordinator who has 25 years experience working in libraries. At the optional session on November 17th, ASERL formed a Task Force to examine shared goals for handling federal documents housed in ASERL libraries as a shared regional resource, rather than as local or state-based resources. Likely outcomes are simplified, unified processes for handling disposals across ASERL. Members of Task Force: Judy Russell (U-Florida), Bill Potter (U-Georgia), Julia Rholes (U-Mississippi), Bonnie MacEwan (Auburn), Larry Boyer (East Carolina), and Lance Query (Tulane).
2. ASERL IT/Digital Initiatives Interest Group – John Burger
Emily Gore (Clemson) & Tyler Walters (Georgia Tech) are co-chairing this group; starting with simple lunch-and-learn webinars. Response has been strong to date. Current focus is on what is going on at other libraries; likely to expand to subject-specific topics in future (e.g., sharing information about mobile applications.)
3. ASERL Resource Sharing/Best Practices Group – John Burger
 - Work to document best practices within ASERL is ongoing. Survey of current practices to be posted in early 2010.
 - Over the past 6 months there has been strong uptake in use of RAPID ILL within ASERL – now used by 16 ASERL libraries for fast turnaround of article loans.
 - Lou Pitschmann (Alabama) encouraged ASERL deans to consider use of ASERL's contract with Lanter Delivery for physical loans. Alabama will save so much on ILL delivery fees using Lanter that it will cover the cost of the RAPID program fees.
4. Liaison Librarian Training Concept – John Burger
Survey to assess needs in this area will be distributed early next week via email to aserl-admin and aserlcolldev (collection managers) lists. Please circulate to anyone with an interest in this topic.
5. ASERL-HBCU Joint Recruiting Teams – Bonnie MacEwan
No update to report at this time; meeting set up at Pitt did not happen due to scheduling issues. Hope to re-schedule for Spring 2010.
6. OLE Project Status Report – Deborah Jakubs:
In 2008 Duke received grant from Mellon Foundation to spearhead a design effort to identify the important aspects of an open-source expanded ILS system, one that would interface better with other campus automation systems. Design specifications are now complete. Deborah offered thanks to everyone from ASERL who contributed to the specs. The build process is now being led by the Koali Foundation. Libraries that have committed to serve as build partners include Triangle Research Library Network, Florida state-funded universities consortium; Indiana; Lehigh; Chicago,

U of Mich & U of Penn. More information can be found at www.oleproject.org.

Discussion of Late-Breaking Issues:

a. Future of ASERL membership meetings in light of travel budgets?

John Burger queried whether tight travel budgets might force ASERL to meet in person only once per year? Consensus of the group: If future ASERL meetings remain as relevant and useful as this meeting, directors will find the means to attend two meetings per year. There were suggestions that we meet once per year on an ASERL campus and once per year in a central location such as Atlanta to reduce costs. There was some discussion as to days of the week for the meeting to reduce the time away from library, no consensus on this.

b. Kirtas Digitization on Demand concept

Libraries provide bibliographic data for out-of-copyright items in their collection to Kirtas. Kirtas makes it discoverable for users via Google or the KirtasBooks website. If and when a user requests an item, Kirtas requests it from the library and performs a non-destructive scan and then returns the book to the library. The e-copy or a print-on-demand copy is sold to the user. Kirtas recoups production expenses after 4 sales, after that there will be a revenue sharing agreement with the library. Some skepticism was expressed—Is this a priority? Is the provision of the bibliographic data permissible under OCLC policy? John will investigate the latter issue. Libraries are asked to consider whether this would be of interest.

c. SkyRiver

A new competitor for OCLC cataloging services, claims savings of 50%. Collection managers were skeptical of this project. ASERL will offer a webinar to learn more.

d. Sharing Org Charts

Some ASERL deans very interested to learn about other organizational structures; others not interested. John offer a webinar for those who are interested.

e. Resources for non-English cataloging

ASERL will create a spot on its website for members to share information about recommended sources for cataloging of non-English materials (either in-house or reliable vendors). Examples: Tulane will share their source for music cataloging; Duke knows a good vendor in Egypt for Arabic materials.

f. “Targeted” Strategic Planning

Deborah Jakubs talked about the process used at Duke to “target” their strategic plan in light of budget concerns. Several other ASERL libraries have gone through similar revisions.

LYRASIS Update – Kate Nevins, LYRASIS

The merger of SOLINET with PALINET was completed April 1; the merger with NELINET was completed October 1. LYRASIS now serves libraries across 22 states, with headquarters in Atlanta. Full integration of services and systems will take several more months to complete. Cost control is a top priority, as the company has seen a 40% decrease in revenue this year due to changes in compensation from OCLC. There have been staff reductions, but also some new hires in areas of strategic importance.

- Digitization is a big priority for LYRASIS; Robin Dale was recently hired to lead this area. Services now include mass digitization (partnership with Internet Archive & Sloan Foundation), AV digitization and digital preservation. In process of creating regional scan centers at LYRASIS libraries to serve as resources for specialized digitization needs such as maps.

- LYRASIS continues work in cataloging and resource sharing. SOLINET libraries that participated in the long-standing SOLINE group (free reciprocal ILL services across libraries in the Southeast) can also participate in the newly-created LYRA group – reciprocal agreement with libraries across the larger LYRASIS region.
- LYRASIS has received a grant from the Mellon Foundation to develop business plan to serve as an open source clearinghouse for libraries. This may include advisory services for libraries seeking an open source solution, training services for specific open source applications, and/or hosting services for some applications. LYRASIS currently provides some hosting services for dSpace; Drupal and Evergreen for libraries in the former NELINET region.
- LYRASIS will continue to host ‘institutes’ and ‘summits’ around the region and via webinar to share information about hot topics within the profession, such as future of bibliographic services; information about Rochester’s eXtensible catalog; an eBook expo; library renovation showcase; REFolution (changes to reference services). Future topics may include a summit on mobile devices.

ASERL Meeting Wrap-Up/Future Activities:

- Next ASERL Membership Meeting is April 21, 22, 2010. Located TBD (probably Atlanta).
- Deadline for submitting responses to the RFP for the Civil War project portal is January 15th
- Volunteers sought for the 2010-2012 ASERL Board (President-Elect, Secretary-Treasurer, and one at-large position). Contact Deborah Jakubs or John Burger if interested.
- Volunteers sought for the Nominating Committee for the Board slate. Contact Deborah or John if interested.

Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 11:54a.m. ET.

Attachment

Meeting Participant List

1. Auburn University	Bonnie	MacEwan
2. Clemson University	Kay	Wall
3. Coalition for Networked Information	Joan	Lippincott
4. Duke University	Deborah	Jakubs
5. East Carolina University	Larry	Boyer
6. Florida International University	Laura	Probst
7. Florida State University	Julia	Zimmerman
8. George Mason University	John	Zenelis
9. Georgia Institute of Technology	Catherine	Murray-Rust
10. Georgia State University	Nan	Seamans
11. LYRASIS	Kate	Nevins
12. Serials Solutions	John	Law
13. Tulane University	Lance	Query
14. UAB	Jerry	Stephens
15. UNC Chapel Hill	Sarah	Michalak
16. UNC Charlotte	Stanley	Wilder
17. UNC Greensboro	Rosann	Bazirjian
18. University of Alabama	Louis	Pitschmann
19. University of Central Florida	Frank	Allen
20. University of Florida	Judy	Russell
21. University of Georgia	Bill	Potter
22. University of Kentucky	Carol Pitts	Diedrichs
23. University of Memphis	Sylverna	Ford
24. University of Miami	Bill	Walker
25. University of Mississippi	Julia	Rholes
26. University of South Carolina	Tom	McNally
27. University of South Florida	Bill	Garrison
28. University of Tennessee	Jill	Keally
29. Vanderbilt University	Marshall	Breeding
30. Vanderbilt University	Connie Vinita	Dowell
31. Virginia Commonwealth University	John	Ulmschneider
32. Wake Forest University	Lynn	Sutton
33. ASERL	John	Burger