

**Statewide Database Licensing Advisory Committee Meeting**  
**Oregon State Library - Room B9 (or by phone)**  
**January 10, 2013**  
**1:00 pm to 4:00 pm**

**The meeting was called to order at 1:05**

**Welcome:**

Introductions and members on the phone identified themselves.

**Members present:** Chair, Jane Nichols, Garnetta Wilker, Jennifer Parkhurst, Marika Pineda, and Carol Dinges.

**Members present via phone:** Canon Crawford, Glenna Rhodes, Sheryl Eldridge and Marion Mercier.

**Members not present:** Sean Park, Liz Paulus, Greg Doyle, Thomas Richards.

**Guest present:** Toby Giddings and Josh Hardage, DAS Procurement Office.

**Staff present:** Arlene Weible, Susan Westin, MaryKay Dahlgreen and Ferol Weyand

**Review agenda and minutes from November 15, 2012 meeting:**

The committee reviewed the minutes from the previous meeting. Crawford moved to approve minutes. Eldridge seconded. Motion passed unanimously.

**New agenda item: Gale Database sub-collections:**

Weible reported that there are about 10 sub-collections that are not on the State Library list of databases. The databases listed currently are what were called out in the contract. These sub-collections are available for use, but not listed currently. The committee discussed the need to communicate with the library community about how to promote these resources. These are not new databases, but may be of interest to the community. They are sub-sets of General OneFile and Academic OneFile. These sub-sets can also be obtained using Power Search. Weible will follow up with Gale and have these sub-collections listed on the common menu, noting that there is no unique content in these topics, but that they are available to use. Arlene will work on promoting these resources with those that do course instruction, which is another way to encourage use of Gale by academic libraries.

**Resource Categories Document:**

The Committee asked for clarification on the task. The intention of this document was to be a mechanism to put ideas into a common document for collaboration. This would also be the information that the committee will take to their constituents to find out what they want. The question was raised as to how detailed or specific these descriptions should be in the RFP? They should be as specific as possible and useful for us and the community. The language in this document will go to the state procurement office for them to create the RFP. Categories should be very specific. Nichols will work on developing a section that describes the technical needs of

how a database functions that can apply to all categories. Pineda agreed to help Nichols with final editing of the document.

### **Process and strategies for securing input from constituencies**

#### **Getting feedback about the RFP Criteria:**

The Committee discussed the process. It was agreed that a single survey, with the survey respondents identifying what area they represent (academic, public, school, etc.) would be helpful. Weible would manage the survey administration, and the committee would send it out to their constituents. The survey would help to assure that the resource category descriptions meet the needs of the constituents. Results should be reported before the next meeting.

#### **Guests from DAS joined the meeting.**

#### **Procurement process overview:**

Hardage will be main point of contact for this procurement. Giddings will provide support when needed. Hardage suggested focusing on the current contract and noting what is and isn't working.

There are three groups involved of the procurement process. Department of Justice (DOJ) will focus on legal issues. Department of Administrative Services (DAS) Office of Procurement will be responsible for the solicitation and assist with finalizing the contract. Oregon State Library (OSL) will represent the business interests of the process, since they are the contracting agency. Dahlgreen explained the SDLAC /LSTA grant and money. Weible explained some of the unhappiness with the current contract with Gale. Dahlgreen explained the concerns with the last RFP process regarding scoring and the application of the criteria.

Giddings explained the difference between two concepts, the statement of scope and statement of work. The scope should be inclusive and contain the universe of what you want. He recommended the scope should be broad in order to be flexible. What does it need to be able to do, both now and in the future? All things being within the parameters of what the state allows. The scope statement language is incorporated into the RFP.

The statement of work describes the specific expectation of what the vendor will provide, and is included in the contract. The statement must follow the scope. The vendor is required to "Tell us how your system or product gives us what we want". Giddings suggested multiple levels of evaluation are most likely the best model for the committee and staff to follow. Up to four levels of scoring may be a good idea. Other points may include:

- Consider an open ended instead of a 5 year contract. This would eliminate the need for a more frequent large procurement process. A briefier, annual review may be adequate.
- There can be multiple awards in one RFP. There can also be multiple RFP's, but that would be more to manage.
- Involve DOJ very early in the process.

The Committee agreed that their focus needs to be on developing the scope statement, and a smaller subgroup can work with DAS staff to refine the final RFP language.

**Review Action Items:**

Weible will follow up with Gale to have these sub-collections listed on the common menu and the SDLP web site.

Nichols will draft language for the technical requirements of databases for the committee to review such as works with URL resolvers, ADA compliance, etc. in a separate section of the document.

The Committee will review their sections of the resource categories document and edit the language to reflect the following:

- A description of the resource in each category that we want – be inclusive and broad at this stage
- Characteristics that are absolutely required, and those that are less important, but desired (a ranked list is probably the best method)
- How does our current contract meet these requirements well, as well as how the current contract does NOT meet them
- The Current Events section's list of characteristics is a good model that may be helpful to follow, although don't worry too much about format at this stage.

Edits should be completed by February 19<sup>th</sup> (subsequently amended to **Feb. 12<sup>th</sup>**, so Nichols and Pineda can do a final edit by Feb. 19). Committee members should feel free to comment on others section if they have strong feelings. If further assistance with using the Google Doc is needed, contact Weible or Nichols.

Nichols will send Dinges the results of the survey from last year.

Weible and Nichols will work on a draft survey for the library community and report at the next meeting on March 21<sup>st</sup>.

Weible will work on the RFP timeline with Nichols and DAS, looking at building in more time for the evaluation of RFP responses.

Weible and Nichols will develop a small group that will work with DAS on the detailed aspects of the procurement. Committee members will notify Weible if they want to be part of the small group.

**Adjourn:**

Meeting adjourned at 4:10.