DRAFT NOTES

Minnesota Library Access Center Advisory Board
18 Andersen Library Conference Room
Wednesday, Feb. 23, 2010
9 a.m.-2:30 p.m.

(These notes summarize the meeting’s discussion. Additional information is available in the form of a PowerPoint presentation by Constance Malpas from OCLC, http://tinyurl.com/4zrrujn.)

Members Present:
Sam Demas
Kit Hadley
Robbie LaFleur
Kathy Parker
Betsy Williams
Brittney Goodman
J. Michael Homan
Wendy Pradt Lougee, Chair
Joan Roca

Ex Officio Members:
Mary Lou Dresbach, absent
Nancy Walton

University of Minnesota – TC Staff
Peggy Johnson
Charles Spetland, absent

Minitex Staff:
Bill DeJohn
Kathy Drozd
Tim McCluske

Visitor:
Constance Malpas

Observers:
Sarah Anderson
Kate Brownrigg
Cecelia Boone

1) Introductions, Review of Agenda & Outcomes for the Day
Lougee welcomed those attending the session and briefly noted the activity of the Advisory Board’s Task Force since the Board last met in November.


3) Discussion with Constance of her report and presentation
Board members discussed various aspects of Malpas’ presentation. Topics discussed included:

- The need to be able to explain library issues in ways that are understandable and engaging to library board members, officials, and other funding sources. (or non-library groups).

- It is important for librarians to be able to emphasize to the broader community that individual libraries will not be able to retain broad collections of print material regardless of age and limited local usage.

- It is important for libraries to be able to demonstrate that current economic stresses are driving libraries to act to resolve both long-standing and new problems.
• Current proposals for dealing with print materials in remote storage facilities have the goal of providing a bridge from the current mixed print/electronic environment to a future in which electronic access to all kinds of information and knowledge resources is the expected norm.

• Libraries need statistical tools and research methods that can help describe current library content and potential future libraries as well as provide the means to phrase questions and explore issues. Topics to be explored include issues related to item-level information about library content, cost savings provided by various library scenarios, and research into duplication within library collections.

• Libraries need to collaborate and work together to address common problems.

4) Quick Overview of Recommendations of report “Storage Facility or Shared Collections” by Demas and discussion of “MLAC Evaluation and Analysis” section, pages 22-23

Board members discussed topics related to this section of the report:

• 60/40 split (Designation of 60% of MLAC’s space for UMTC Libraries’ material and 40% for material from other Minnesota libraries).
  DeJohn and Lougee discussed current arrangements for funding of MLAC. Infrastructure costs are paid by the University Libraries, and the operating budget is supported through the Minitex budget, which is considered as part of the Libraries’ total budget in University financial reporting. Demas noted that there is no charge to depositing libraries for storage of materials in MLAC, noting that fees are paid by depositors at most other storage facilities around the country.

  Board members agreed later in the meeting that they did not think it was vital for the 60/40 split to continue to be strictly observed once MLAC was considered to be filled to capacity.

• Role of OCLC in considering potential changes for MLAC
  Malpas noted there is national discussion underway of possible changes for library storage facilities around the country. There are many organizations involved in this discussion. OCLC respects the autonomy of these organizations and individual libraries. OCLC feels an absolute responsibility, however, to provide support through data and other resources it can contribute to the discussion.

• National discussion of possible changes for library storage facilities
  Board members discussed national trends that Malpas had described and questioned how MLAC could be involved, noting that there is no defined structure or coordinating body for the discussion.

  DeJohn noted, if it was decided that MLAC’s role should be changed to become part of the national strategy, the rationale and benefits for these decisions would need to be communicated to the Minnesota library community and Minnesotans as a whole. Changes would need to bring benefit for Minnesota.

• Possible name change for MLAC
  Lougee, Demas, and DeJohn talked about the current name’s lack of specificity and questions posed to staff because of the name’s generic nature. The Board indicated interest and approval of the concept of selection of a new name. If the decision is made to change MLAC’s mission, that new mission should be reflected in the name.

• Relationship of MLAC and the University Libraries
Demas noted that working relationships between MLAC and University Libraries staff are positive, but suggested there be exploration of how the relationships can be enhanced as well as ways be found for greater coordination and greater benefit be made from staff expertise. Demas suggested that succession planning be included within MLAC’s strategic plan. Lougee noted the University Libraries’ new Collection, Management, and Preservation Strategist and the Libraries copyright resource staff member are available to provide support for MLAC as appropriate.

Lougee explained that Minitex and MLAC need to continue their current status as units within the University Libraries for purposes of copyright to support Minitex’s role in resource sharing and interlibrary loan. (Better way to say this???)

- Governance related issues
  Board members discussed the roles of the Board, the Office of Higher Education, Minitex, and the University Libraries in determining MLAC’s future direction. DeJohn explained that OHE appoints the Minitex Policy Advisory Council based on recommendations from constituent bodies and that the MLAC Advisory Board is made up of directors of depositing libraries with the University Librarian as the chair. An OHE representative is included in meetings of both the Policy Advisory Council and MLAC Board. He updates OHE on decisions regarding future directions and policy matters for Minitex and MLAC. (This phrasing okay?)

5) Working Lunch – Discussion of Survey Results
Demas reported that 29 academic and 24 public libraries responded to the survey. He will release information about the responses in April. Generally speaking, public libraries indicated that weeding collections was part of their normal operating procedure because of their missions and that there was limited interest in coordination of weeding. 77% of the academic library responders indicated that their organizations were weeding their collections. Publics had less interest than academics in receiving new services from MLAC.

Board members noted the fact that MLAC is nearly full and relatively few more items can be added under current operational plans impacts the view that Minnesota librarians have of the MLAC’s current and future status. Lougee outlined the University Libraries’ current plans for additional collection storage space and questioned whether the interest of Minnesota librarians in MLAC’s future would change if it became possible for MLAC to accept more deposits.

Board members discussed the role the University Libraries would play in relation to Minnesota libraries as a whole. The discussion moved beyond the terms “collection of record” or “collection of last resort,” noting that the Libraries were not funded to have a formal role as collection of record. Lougee spoke of the Libraries have a role in seeking to ensure access for Minnesota libraries for the widest possible range of resources. Demas spoke of all Minnesota libraries seeking to consider the benefits that their collections can provide to Minnesota libraries as a whole.

6) Discussion of “Three Possible Scenarios” (p. 42-44) section of the report and any other scenarios we might wish to consider.
- Three Scenario Proposals
  Demas opened the discussion by briefly describing each scenario. His thought was that Scenario 3, which would have MLAC be actively involved in the national collective collection discussion, is probably beyond what could be accomplished in the next 3-5 years and suggested that Scenario 2 might be more feasible. He asked: Should Scenario 2 be the basis of MLAC strategic plan going forward and Scenario 3 served as a vision statement toward which we would work? Board members discussed the feasibility of breaking the Scenarios into steps for planning purposes. The possibility of seeking grants to help fund activities required by
the Scenarios was discussed. Lougee said the University Libraries is planning to develop a grant application that could provide funds to be used for MLAC work.

Demas asked for a show of support for the three Scenario proposals. The majority of Board members indicated they favored Scenario 2. Others votes were for combinations of Scenarios 1 & 2 or Scenarios 2 & 3. (See my rough notes about this poll at the end of these minutes. Should any of those specifics be included here?) Demas talked about the importance of building allegiance for and knowledge about MLAC throughout Minnesota.

Lougee questioned what type of organizational structure would be needed if the mission, governance, and policies of MLAC were to be changed significantly. DeJohn suggested that joint powers agreements have been used in the past (such as early in the development of MnLINK) to provide structures when multiple independent organizations needed to work in concert on a project. Memoranda of Understanding were also discussed as possible tools.

- Future of MLAC (Developing a Collection Profile or Policy)
  Demas outlined proposed options, which included collection focuses (or foci) on:
  - Journal runs
  - Domain or discipline-based collections
  - Low use, widely held monographs for which digital surrogates are available. Discussion of the third option focused on the rationale and mechanics that would be required for implementation. Malpas noted that libraries could see benefit because many hold these items, would like to withdraw them to gain additional collection space, and would like to be able to depend on another facility to provide the items if needed. Homan and Roca questioned whether the premise is one that would readily win acceptance outside the library community. Lougee questioned whether fees generated for circulation of materials could produce revenue. DeJohn noted that the Legislature approved initial MLAC funding based on the explanation that funding a central storage facility would help reduce the need for multiple libraries to devote parts of their own space to storage.

Demas asked the Board to participate in a straw poll to indicate their support for the following concepts and activities:
  - Concept of implementing a monographic focus for MLAC – Board members indicated that they wanted more time to consider the proposal.
  - Invest in further cost-benefit analysis of collection management – Board members agreed.
  - Pursue grant funding – Board members agreed.
  - Non-duplication policy – Board members agreed with the proviso that the policy would need to be well defined.

Demas asked Board members to indicate whether their response to the following question had changed since the meeting last October. Where do you stand on the continuum of options for collective management of MLAC collection?
  - Board members again indicated that their response was Persistence Requirement on a continuum that ranged from a) Shared Ownership to b) Persistence Requirement, c) Retention Commitment (e.g., 25 years), d) Last copy agreement, to e) Private Ownership with no retention agreement.

Board members discussed the Comparative Costs for Creating More Space included in Demas’ preliminary report. It was decided that the costs of building a new cavern with no changes to the existing cavern should also be estimated to complete comparisons of all possible options.

Lougee suggested the following list of questions and issues to be considered in identifying next steps, with which Board members concurred:

- Need better information on the cost of deduping and on various space options.
- Identifying the possible stakeholders and interested parties for various options. What would be the value derived from various options? Would stakeholders/interested parties include those libraries that have already made deposits – or should interests of a wider group be considered?
- Access dimension. What services should be provided?
- Copyright implications. How would potential scenarios impact MLAC and Minitex’s role as a high-volume resource sharing provider?
- What should the University Libraries’ role in MLAC be and, more widely, for the state of Minnesota as whole? A collection of record – understanding the term collection to mean more than just the physical collection held by Libraries? Steward of national and regional relationships that result in access and service?
- Who is MLAC to serve? Minnesota libraries or residents of Minnesota?
- Policy questions including materials retention, deduplication of materials, service options.
- Collection profile questions? What would be the secondary impacts of selecting a new profile?
- Seeking grants? What role would the University Libraries, Minitex, other groups play in seeking grants for MLAC activities?

Board members discussed the importance of developing thoroughly considered rationale and impact statements before seeking to move any of the options forward. Homan emphasized that a coherent narrative expressed in language that would be meaningful for governing boards and other non-library constituencies is critical.

8) Discussion of our “Next Steps” in engaging the depositing libraries, finalizing a strategic plan, and organizing ourselves to undertake implementation of a strategic plan.

Demas questioned what next steps should be taken. Board members agreed:

- It would be good for MLAC staff (DeJohn, Drozd, and McCluske) to identify needed changes in current policy and operating guidelines.
- Such possible tools of Memoranda of Understanding and Joint Powers Agreements should be explored.
- Proposed statements outlining persistence retention or time-delimited (e.g., 25 years) storage should be drafted.

Homan and Goodman volunteered to work as an Executive Group for the Board to provide advice and review the MLAC staff’s work.

Work products would be routed to the full Advisory Board after review and response from the Executive Group.

Demas urged that the proposals be framed in terms of work to be done over the next 3-5 years. He said that he would produce a framework document to support project planning.

Board members emphasized that plans for MLAC’s future should be discussed and shared widely with the Minnesota library community. Presentation will be made to the Minitex Policy Advisory Council. Presentations to CALD, MLA, and other Minnesota library groups were discussed.
9) Adjourn.
Lougee noted that Malpas will be making a presentation to University Libraries staff on OCLC’s
shared print repositories report tomorrow.

Raw notes re Scenario’s discussion (item 6)

SD Scenario 3 is probably more than we could handle in 3-5 years. He suggests 2. Asks opinions
of others
MH – likes 3 excitement – maybe not doable in 3-5 years, but could be basis for grand requests.
WL – what would be interest of libraries in distributed archiving system.
NW – maybe take steps over time. Scenario 1 maybe all we can hope for this year.
SD – Should Scenario 2 be basis of strategic plan. 3 serve as vision statement toward which we
work?
JR – Is there a possibility of 1.5?

THREE-YEAR STRATEGIC PLAN – SD ASKS FOR VOTES (I’M NOT ABSOLUTELY
SURE OF THESE NUMBERS – but 2 was the GREAT majority)
Scenario 1 – 0
Scenario 1.5 – 1
Scenario 2 – 9 (or so)
Scenario 2.5 or 3 – MH wants to vote twice