

**SDLAC Meeting  
November 15, 2012  
Oregon State Library B9**

**Member present in person:** Chair, Canon Crawford, Sheryl Eldridge, Garnetta Wilker, Jane Nichols, Glenna Rhodes, Thomas Richards, Marion Mercier, Jennifer Parkhurst, Marika Pineda, and Liz Paulus.

**Past Members present:** Tony Greiner, Linda Malone and Steve Cox.

**Members present via phone:** Linda Weight, LSTA Advisory Council representative.

**Staff present:** Susan Westin, MaryKay Dahlgreen, Arlene Weible, Jen Maurer, Ferol Weyand.

**Chair Canon Crawford called the meeting in order at 10:05**

**Welcome and introduce new members and thank outgoing members**  
Crawford welcomed the new members and thanked the outgoing members for their service to the committee over the last three years. Everyone introduced themselves.

**Review agenda and minutes from January 20, 2012 meeting**  
Malone moved to approve the minutes from the previous meeting. Paulus seconded. Motion passed unanimously.

**Review Bylaws**

Weible reviewed the Library Services Technology Act (LSTA) Advisory Council bylaws for the committee. SDLAC is a committee of the LSTA Council and follows their bylaws. Weible informed the members that both the LSTA and SDLAC member information and documents are available on the State Library's website:

<http://www.oregon.gov/osl/LD/Pages/technology/sdlp/index.aspx>

**Choose New Committee Chair**

Crawford invited the committee to consider chair position. Expectations are meeting preparations including agenda, annual report, communications with the library community via libs-or in support of transparency and spear

heading the RFP process. The chair also works with the Library Development staff, primarily Weible. Chair term is July – June. Paulus nominated Nichols for Chair. Crawford seconded. Nichols encouraged members to email her at any time. Motion passed unanimously.

### **Review activities and accomplishments of last year**

Crawford stated that the annual report was completed and accepted by the LSTA Council. Nichols reviewed the survey of the library community for the committee. Survey responses showed a need for niche content and concern about tools and use. Newspapers are a concern. Committee discussed results and usage data. Auto repair is used heavily. Motorcycle repair not always in the auto repair content, but heavily used also. Crawford suggested keeping the survey results handy while considering the RFP.

### **Update on LSTA funding – MaryKay Dahlgreen**

Dahlgreen reported that the OSL Board has reviewed the SDLAC annual report and appreciates the work this committee provides. She also stated that there is a growing need to justify the existence of these programs. LSTA funds are still unknown at this time, as we are possibly facing a federal budget sequestration on January 1, 2013. LSTA is not considered a “held harmless” program, but is considered discretionary and we will not know what kind of funding will be available until the federal government decides. There could be an 8.25% percent reduction in our allotment, which would be approximately \$175,000. The budget is currently approximately \$2.1 million with no wiggle room. The OSL Board has approved the 2013 budget that was supposed to begin in October 2012, but is still on hold until it is passed by Congress. The OSL Board will have to make the cutting decision should that be necessary. Next board meeting will be in December and they will be strategizing for both state and federal budgets. The Governor’s budget is still unknown as well.

Dahlgreen recommends moving forward as if we were going to get the money budgeted, but should consider subsidies for the databases in case a reduction to the proposed budget is made. The Statewide Database Licensing Program is very important and far reaching. In the past, the databases were subsidized at 50%, except for smaller libraries that are less than 1000 population and smaller colleges which were fully subsidized. She suggested that the SDLAC committee should contact the Department of Education to discuss the possibility of subsidizing the databases/OSLIS for the K-12

schools. Common Core requirements have opened the door to a lot more potential usage of the databases. A partnership with the Department of Education would be a great idea. Dahlgreen suggested she and Maurer should put together a presentation for the Department of Education. It was suggested that we consider not using the term database so often but use information resources or other terms that better describes the specific resources being purchased.

### **Review LSTA Five-Year-Plan – Susan Westin**

Crawford commented that the demographic information is very valuable. Background report in this is really good. Westin reviewed the 2013-2017 LSTA Five Year Plan that was adopted by the State Library Board on June 15, 2012 and approved by the IMLS September 24, 2012. She highlighted the senior and Hispanic population, which continues to grow. The table noting the number of licensed school librarians was also discussed. Maurer commented that the data in the survey is 2 years old at this point. Currently she estimates that the number is more like 200 FTE school librarians, rather than the 308 noted in the table. The school libraries are now considered part of the underserved in the state.

### **Review LSTA Five-Year-Plan Goals– Susan Westin**

Dahlgreen briefly explained to the committee some background about the goals in the five year plan. The Oregon State Library uses very broad goals following the IMLS goals. The IMLS is very interested in Outcome Based Evaluations (EBO). Oregon State Library is moving forward with EBO for all LSTA grants starting in 2013.

Westin reported that the Library Development staff is working on several projects, including pamphlets that explain the LSTA five year plan and goals and how the State Library is using the money. These will be used by the staff that goes to ALA Legislative Day to help educate our Members of Congress about how the money is being used. Westin went over each of the goals, which include:

- Provide access to information resources and library services
- Use technology to increase capacity to provide library services and expand access
- Develop a culture in libraries that promotes evaluation and use of evaluation results
- Develop information literacy skills

- Foster the joy of reading

### **Review RFP timeline**

Committee was joined by Linda Weight via phone. Crawford started the discussion about the timeline. Weible has not yet heard from the State Procurement Office, but expects to soon have an analyst assigned to the project that will help with the more technical details of the RFP process. The committee decided to have three meetings (January through May) to work out the specific criteria for the RFP. Dahlgreen stated that these would be working meetings and are not subject to public meeting laws. Google Docs was strongly recommended for any virtual meetings that might take place.

Dahlgreen reminded group that the committee needs to decide what they want for requirements in the RFP, and that they should be in regular contact with constituents to assure their interests are adequately considered. This committee will recommend what they want in the RFP to the LSTA Council and the OSL Board, who may also have feedback on the requirements. The committee decided on the following timeline for the meetings:

- January 2013
- March 2013
- End of April 2013

Recommendations will then go on the LSTA Council meeting on May 9 & 10, 2013. Staff will work on scheduling the above meetings.

### **Discuss RFP drafting process**

Dahlgreen recommended that the committee should do its best to identify what are the primary needs for libraries in the state. Following some discussion, the committee decided to use Survey Monkey to gather feedback on the ideas for the RFP from their constituents.

The committee discussed the content aspect of the RFP. Crawford pointed out the Washington (state) criteria document, mentioning that they have ProQuest as their primary vendor. A variety of issues, including indexing and embargos, full text, the merits of creating multiple RFPs or multiple categories within the single RFP, clear language about what happens when content changes and a clear scoring scale, were discussed. Dahlgreen reminded the group to not focus on what is known that vendors have, but on what content is really needed.

The committee brainstormed a list of categories for content they want represented in the RFP. After developing a lengthy list, committee members were assigned 5 dots to vote for the priority categories that they believe are the most appropriate for LSTA funding. After identifying the top categories, individual committee members were assigned to further develop a description of each category.

<b>Top Categories</b>	<b>Number of Votes</b>	<b>Assignments</b>
General Periodicals	12	Crawford and Rhodes
Research/Reference	11	Paulus and Eldridge
OR/National/Historical Newspapers	7	Nichols
Peer Reviewed Journals	6	Nichols and Pineda
Career and Jobs	5	Rhodes
Current Events	4	Parkhurst and Wilker
Computer Skills	4	Mercier
EBook Collections	added after vote	Paulus and Crawford

**Topics/Content with no votes in the dot exercise**

- Automotive
- Primary Source
- Streaming Media
- Audio Books/Best Sellers
- Consumer Info
- Literary Criticism
- Genealogy
- Language Acquisition
- Biography
- Business
- Investment
- History
- Professional CE
- Social Work
- Legal
- Science
- Arts
- Music

Hobbies  
Poetry  
Non-Profits/Grants  
Technical Education  
Ethnic Newspapers

A Google Document will be created so each member can contribute their thoughts about all categories, but the assigned committee members will edit and refine the descriptions before the next committee meeting in January. Committee members should finish this by mid December before breaks and vacations. As a homework assignment, members should read through the 2009 Oregon RFP criteria and Washington's criteria for a frame of reference.

Paulus notified committee that she will be out of the country January 4 – 20<sup>th</sup>.

Greiner shared some comments regarding the previous RFP process.

- Make sure scoring criteria is very clear, and there is good communication with State Procurement Office staff. A more flexible sliding scale for awarding of points would be helpful. Make sure the point system works well for the criteria being evaluated.
- Build into the review process an opportunity to review outside evaluator comments. Last time the process got too compressed and not enough time was left for evaluation of these comments.
- Allow time for product demonstrations, and try to tie scoring to demonstrations in addition to the vendor's written responses to the RFP.
- Have meetings with vendors after bids come in to provide more concrete information about products. Make sure that the vendor really has the products they are promising, and make sure this is addressed when the contract is negotiated.
- Give more weight to price as a scoring criteria
- Review the Oregon Administrative Rule (OAR) for subsidy formula
- Thanks to this great committee and library staff.

Dahlgreen thanked Greiner for his comments.

### **Open forum on current contract issues.**

Weible suggested the report sent to committee members outlining Gale's effort to add suggested journal titles at the end of October be considered a last report on this issue. There was a brief discussion about Gale's ability to meet the Committee's concerns, and it was noted that students prefer full text above all else.

Dahlgreen told committee that it is okay to tell vendors that they are working on an RFP that will be open in the fall of 2013. At some point later in the process committee members will not be able to talk about the RFP with vendors. It was noted that vendors need to be registered with the Oregon Procurement Information Network (ORPIN) to respond to the RFP, and there is probably a way to check to see if a particular vendor is registered.

### **Action items for staff:**

- Follow up on possibility of Oregon Dept. of Education helping to subsidize databases for K-12 (Maurer and Dahlgreen)
- Schedule 3 meetings between January and May (Weible)
- Create a Google Document to share with the Committee (Weible)
- Send out text from OAR re: subsidies (Weible)
- Send out information about the previous procurement (as available) and instructions for accessing ORPIN information. (Weible)

**Meeting was adjourned at 2:55**