

SDLAC Meeting
JANUARY 20, 2012
9am-12pm
B9 and via iLinc

Members present in B9: Stephen Cox

Members present via iLinc: Sheryl Eldridge, Jane Nichols, Tony Greiner, Glenna Rhodes, Sean Park, Linda Malone, Canon Crawford, Chris Tanner, and Thomas Richards

Staff present: MaryKay Dahlgreen, Jennifer Maurer, Ferol Weyand

Chair Canon Crawford called the meeting to order at 9:03.

Review minutes of November 4, 2011 meeting:

One correction to a date was noted. Tony Greiner moved to approve minutes, as corrected. Stephen Cox seconded. Motion passed unanimously.

Update on annual report for LSTA Advisory Council:

Maurer thanked Crawford, Greiner and Malone for their work on the draft of the annual report. After discussion of section 1B, group decided to add the year that databases were added to the statewide contract and a one-sentence description of each of the databases.

After seeing Maurer's database usage spreadsheet, Dahlgreen suggested that from now on we only review Gale usage and not include EBSCO usage. Maurer will summarize stats by annual totals, will not include EBSCO usage, and will include Gale's definition of a session. Crawford suggested including a statement that the committee is considering further statistical analysis of the EBSCO and Gale annual statistics, but that it may be difficult to truly compare them. One reason for the difficulty is because the way Gale attributes usage when someone uses PowerSearch potentially inflates usage statistics. Crawford will look into this and send out something to the committee next week; statement will mention that Gale adheres to COUNTER. Committee decided to report usage from April through March for the annual report, and this first report will include April 2010-March 2011 and April 2011-March 2012.

Crawford or OSL staff will post note on Libs-Or to remind each library they can contact Gale directly regarding access and title issues.

Crawford stated that OSL staff and SDLAC are sending SDLAC meeting announcements to Libs-Or in an effort to be more transparent.

Crawford will include annual usage totals by library type in the body of the annual report. Maurer will send Crawford an updated statistics spreadsheet through December 2011. Maurer will add the statistics for January – March 2012 after she receives the March stats in early April. Crawford will

update the annual report by mid February.

Crawford will include the updated statistics spreadsheet as an appendix to the report.

Crawford thanked Malone and Greiner for their help on the report and Nichols for all her work on the pie charts and data sheet. Maurer thanked the committee for taking on the task of this annual report. Malone also thanked Crawford for all of his work.

Develop recommendations for LSTA five-year-plan development (includes review of SDLAC survey results and continued discussion about RFP process):

In January, the committee posted a survey to several Oregon library electronic mailing lists to begin gathering feedback from Oregon library staff in anticipation of the next database vendor RFP. Committee reviewed the survey results. Greiner suggested keeping the original unchanged and saving it. The committee agreed. Crawford stated that in the late spring, after the LSTA Advisory Committee meeting, he will share a summary of the survey results with the library community, probably in combination with an email to communicate about the annual report.

Nichols inquired if the committee is able to send out multiple RFP's. Greiner stated that since the revised ORS and OAR's dropped the general database language, they are authorized to make specific RFP's for K-12, academic, and public libraries. It will be more challenging to create different RFP's, but it is an option.

Crawford suggested each committee member might review the specific constituent content from the survey and summarize. The committee member would then give feedback to constituents that they will apply information from the survey to the RFP process. Greiner suggested that the survey be converted to Excel and then sorted for specific content. Nichols completed this task during the meeting and emailed the spreadsheet to the SDLAC list. Greiner will review the comments regarding the process of the survey and write up a few paragraphs describing what we learned and what the committee would like to do about addressing concerns expressed in the survey. For example, the committee decided that future surveys should ask about library size, type of academic library, and grade level of K-12 libraries. Dahlgreen and the committee will review his statement before potentially sharing with library community. Dahlgreen reminded everyone that the RFP development does not start for 2 years and that the committee should not overpromise at this time given the budget and future developments in the technology arena. Dahlgreen stated that we should move forward with the RFP process, using what was learned from the previous RFP process. What is the best possible outcome for the least cost? Inform the library community what the process is and help them understand why the results are what they are. Are they willing to pay more for something in the future? Cox commented that the survey is a snapshot of what we have now, not necessarily what we want in the future. Cox suggested that another survey be done in a year to find out what the needs are and how to make the best use of the money that they will have. Richards suggested that the committee should try to define the problem it is trying to solve with the RFP; that can dictate the best method. For example, is the goal to make as many people happy as possible, even if that cannot be done with the best price possible? Or, is the goal to have the best price? Dahlgreen stated that the RFP can be as specific as we want it to be or as broad as we want it to be; we

have to be very clear regarding what we want, use the same criteria to judge everybody, and make a decision based on criteria that we have established. Dahlgreen stated that the databases are one piece of the LSTA program, and we need to focus on the purposes of the LSTA act. For example, should we be spending money on databases for university libraries when they may have the money to purchase databases? Or should we be spending money on the smaller libraries or community colleges that have been really cut? There may be other ways to help the academics, not just with databases. Cox asked about how much use is being generated from which area. Maybe those figures should be part of the equation? Dahlgreen clarified that the LSTA 5-year-plan reviews purposes and determines needs and goals in Oregon. The amount of money available for databases is determined by the OSL Board, after recommendations from the LSTA Advisory Council. The evaluation of the previous 5-year-plan is being reviewed by the LSTA Advisory Council, and the SDLAC needs to convey to the LSTA 5-year-plan development committee the importance of the databases. Crawford inquired about the process of communication and Dahlgreen recommended a memo to the chair of the development committee, John Russell, to share the results of the survey, the importance of the databases to the library community, and philosophical issues discussed today. Crawford will combine a brief overview of the survey along with the report that he will send to the LSTA. Following the report being reviewed by the LSTA Advisory Council, Crawford will share report with the library community, giving time for the library community to respond with feedback in early spring in time for the May LSTA meeting. Dahlgreen suggested that the SDLAC respond directly to the LSTA Advisory Council regarding the 5-year-plan by the middle of March. Staff will convey SDLAC's desire to have contact with the LSTA Advisory Council. Dahlgreen thanked Nichols for the survey charts she created, and the committee expressed that the information is very beneficial. Nichols will send survey charts to the committee.

Next meeting of the SDLAC:

Crawford suggested talking about the RFP process at a future time.

Maurer suggested communicating via email, then possibly having an hour-long meeting on iLinc, if necessary, to finalize the annual report for the LSTA. Dahlgreen suggested that the goal session should be in person, probably in July.

Review of action items:

Crawford will revise and distribute the annual report by mid February.

Crawford and Maurer will summarize the statistics from April 2010 - March 2012 for inclusion in the annual report.

Each committee member will review their constituents' survey comments and submit results to the SDLAC list by February 20, 2012.

Dahlgreen will convey SDLAC's desire to have contact with the LSTA Advisory Council regarding draft of the new 5-year-plan.

Greiner will produce summary of survey comments on the RFP process.

Crawford will communicate with the library community in late spring regarding the final report and an overview of how the committee is using the survey results.

Meeting was adjourned at 11:45.