



**SCRLC Advisory Committee on Information Technologies and Services**  
**Thursday, July 27, 2017 10:00 AM**  
**GoToMeeting**  
**Notes**

**Present:** Adam Chandler (Cornell U)--Chair, Doyin Adenuga (Houghton College—new member), Matthew Kopel (National Digital Inclusion Alliance--new member); Susanna Van Sant (TC3), Julia Corrice, Mary-Carol Lindbloom. **Excused:** Suellen Christopoulos-Nutting (NYCC), Mary Kay Welgoss (TST BOCES School Library System).

**Action items:**

- **Survey:** Julia will create a SurveyMonkey draft based on feedback and share out.
- **Contract:** Mary-Carol will review question 2; Julia will look for state language; this will be sent out in advance of or with the RBDB grant funding.
- **Program Plan/Outline:** This will be provided as a resource for the 2018 application packet (which will need to be created and sent out in September—due back in Nov.
- **Public library systems:** Mary-Carol will get in touch with the public library systems.
- **Grant Application:** Mary-Carol and Julia will work on the 2018 member application for review by ACITS ahead of the September Board meeting and will ensure the application contains a marketing/PR component).
- **SCRLC's website** [www.scrhc.org](http://www.scrhc.org): Review and provide feedback at next ACITS meeting (Oct.)
- **Focus Group:** Mary-Carol will start putting together questions, though some will need to wait until the survey results are in.

**Review of Minutes from the Last Meeting.** No changes.

**2017 Electronic Resources Survey.**

The 2015 survey gave us some useful information for the time; there was not 100% participation. Needs have changed even within the last 2 years, so we need to reevaluate. SCRLC spends \$130K+ on electronic resources—it is a big chunk of SCRLC's program budgets (RBDB=Art Museum Image Gallery, OmniFile, Literary Reference Center; Consumer Health Complete is funded out of MISP). Julia asked for ideas for different questions.

- Adam: What decisions were made as a result of the 2015 survey? Nothing immediate.  
Julia: Possibly dropping the Art Museum Image Gallery, which was packaged in with OmniFile for free but now incurs a fee (\$2,652). We were looking for what was most valuable. We continued AMIG due to special libraries' and schools' use.

**FirstSearch**

- FS use is declining; OCLC cannot provide us consortial statistics on World Cat Discovery use. We can only get (with much effort) figures for those that haven't switched from FS. Is FS falling or is it getting eaten up by WCD? Adam: Can we make it a requirement of renewal that WCD libraries purchasing through us must provide statistics? Julia/Mary-Carol: Yes. Mary-Carol: Another issue: Our large libraries cannot use our subscription, which is outside the RBDB guidelines, i.e., that all databases

funded via RBDB should be accessible to all libraries/systems regardless of degree of use. We ask during our field visits what would happen if we dropped the FS subscription—so far it doesn't seem to be a very valuable subscription. The concern is that they may be using our FS subscription as the base/backbone for modules, e.g. cataloging, ILL. Schools generate some use stats, so their use needs to be explored, as well.

- Other questions to ask about FS? Julia: Do we want to ask if FS is not used, why? Mary-Carol: And how it is used—World Cat? Cataloging? ILL?
- Definitions: Susanna--We also need to define what we mean by FirstSearch, which is a platform not a database. What is WDC—there are paid levels and it could also be a discovery layer.
- One PLS accounts for most of the FS use (22K compared to 33K)—and not the one having its own ILL operation. How valuable is FS to the publics? Note: The PL systems do not mention cite SCRLC as the source of the RBDB databases (technically it is a cost share with them).
- Susanna: Can you go to the public library systems as well as the school meetings?

#### Structure of survey

- We want close to 100% participation this time, so we plan to do two rounds and offer incentives. 1<sup>st</sup> round: people participate themselves; 2<sup>nd</sup> round: For those who didn't respond, we'll call or go over questions in person. Incentives: flash drives? Branded power bricks?
- How do we phrase the questions? Susanna: Have questions about the individual databases, e.g. FS and AMIG. Let people know the pricing has changed, i.e., it is no longer free and SCRLC/ACITS has proposed cancelling it. Ask if there are any objections. Adam: Suggestion for the FS question: phrase it in the form of a proposal, e.g., that SCRLC is considering canceling the FS subscription. If this occurs, will this have a negative effect on your service? YES/NO. If yes, how? Matthew: Seems like a direct way to go--and we need to ask direct questions: We are considering canceling x, if we do, would it affect your library? What impact would it have on your library? Adam: people don't want to give things up, so phrase extreme. Matthew: Leave statistics out of it (i.e., don't say, "Statistics suggest..."). "This is the consideration on the table."
- Susanna: What are your goals? Trying to expand? Or trying to evaluate? Or scale back? If the questions are going to be phrased "SCRLC is considering scaling back..." include when access would end. Anticipate questions about - if the resources are scaled back, will membership fees be reduced? Mary-Carol, not membership fees, but cost-share, which is a good idea to include.
- Along with the survey, we'd be availing an updated e-resources list. Adam: putting this in a page on the site and link directly within the survey and navigate to it as a choice rather than as an attachment. Just add some anchors.
- We do not know what OCLC would do in place due to being grandfathered in. Would we be able to use the subscription as something that is less expensive? We can try.
- Recommendation was made to just include e-resources on this survey. BARC, grants, and AskUs could be separate surveys down the line to understand the efficacy of the projects, Educational programming will be asked in the Education Services needs assessment. Matthew: Can we suss out if anything is missing from this spectrum, i.e., if we can cut it down to 5, what should we be considering as far as possible services, e.g. a subscription to Edge, etc.? Lead the question and find perhaps 3-4 buckets of types of services..., what are areas in which you need ...if you have specific example, please list.
- Julia: Do any of the potential technology services belong in the survey? Matthew: That whole section is a separate conversation. Where else do you want us to spend money is one thing; looking at where do you see this program shaping up with some good

representation to come up with some good plans. Seems too 4 dimensional for the end of the survey.

- Language: Matthew: We don't know who will be answering, so using the term e-resources not RBDB (even if it is spelled out). Any that we want modified?
- Incubator projects (as per Plan of Service, page 7): What resource support is needed and what's missing? Recommendation: Find examples where we don't offer support, to provide examples. There are two different questions, here. Within the context, if we had the budget for, maybe we'd get x. How is this contextualized in the PoS? What do we see as that kind of project? What are examples of places who have done this and we're looking at it as an aspirational direction? That sort of information. This is better to do as a focus group.
- Through what other consortia do they receive e-resources (NOVELny, SUNYConnect, ConnectNY etc.)
- Rather than having a task force, Julia will put the survey in SurveyMonkey and share it back out with the entire group for feedback (there are only 6 members at the moment).
- Timeline: Mary-Carol: We have a lot to do this fall—we will need to know changes for 2018 by December for Board approval. Survey; focus groups. September: survey; October: focus groups. November: determine what 2018 RBDB program is going to look like. And communications out to the membership.

## **RBDB Program**

- **RBDB Contract Review.** Julia: A short, signed contract is needed to help recipients understand precisely the expectations. This should help them complete their projects on time). Matthew: Is there any legal requirement to refer to the source of the funding? Mary-Carol/Julia. Good idea. We can link to the guidelines—the application may contain useable language. Mary-Carol is wanting to work with Question 2 wording a bit more, so she will do a final pass. Julia will add the logo, title, and link.

- **Program Plan/Project Outline.** Julia discussed the project plan that she would like to introduce to help some of the participants work through the grant execution process. If we can provide this ahead of time and get them thinking about the steps contained therein, we expect better outcomes in terms of getting the projects completed on time. If they have to fill out this form, Julia will work with them to complete. We can make it available alongside the application as a resource for those needing help with project planning. Note: We need to ensure that a Marketing/PR component is in the application. Linking back is an example as one thing to do as well as bookmarks, flyers, etc.

- **2016 RBDB Grant Updates.** Julia provided an update on the 2016 RBDB grant projects. Nearly all have been completed. Fenimore Art Museum Research Library (NYSHA) needs more detailed work on Belva Lockwood, CMOG owes us forms. Seneca Falls HS lost their staff— they're getting materials up; it is just taking longer. WS grants have been completed. BU's is up; Cornell completed the History Center's processing just this week. SF Public Library's project is in question. The National Women's Right Historic Park archives moved to Utica; the SCRLC Board asked Mary-Carol to follow up with Fort Stanwick. Are they are withholding material that should be available to the public? Julia will be able to send out announcements about the collections soon.

- **RBDB Budget and Funding Update** (Mary-Carol). 2017 RBDB funding should soon be released. Three program budgets and operating we're to the good \$1,057 (\$111 more for RBDB). This is an austere year without raises, so as we look to 2018, it is too early to know \$\$\$. RBDB is a calendar year program but a ballpark figure is not known

until after the State budget is passed. Precise details are not known until June-July. For programs beginning in January, it means we have to start expending the budget without any money. Julia and I have discussed changing the timeline for the grants, i.e., have the applications due in the fall, approve them with the RBDB budget at the December Board meeting, notify the recipients, and release at least half the funding in January. Provide the remaining monies when our RBDB funding is received. This might avoid having projects spill over into the next funding cycle.

**New Website Review** (<http://scrlc.org/>). Tabled until next meeting. **Action:** In the meantime, spend some time reviewing.

#### **AskUs 24/7 Virtual Reference.**

- SCRLC has a consortial membership in AskUs 24/7. SCRLC participants pay one fee based on their materials budget. SCRLC does not charge them the FTE/per capita fee like some of the other Councils. There are 7-8 SCRLC member libraries/systems per year that participate.
- 2016 statistics are similar to 2015, as are 2017 figures to date. The 2015 and 2016 annual SCRLC regional volume is about half of what it was in 2011—both for questions asked and for those answered by participating SCRLC libraries/librarians. Students/patrons/users asked 3,350 questions via one of the SCRLC queues; SCRLC librarians answered 2,838. The volume in 2011 was 6,026 and 5,631 respectively. Several libraries have switched to LibAnswers and no longer available 24/7 virtual reference to their users.

#### **Around the Table**

- TC3: From Susanna—“1. Our new college president, Orinthia Montague, is here. 2. SUNY Libraries will be shifting, to launch in 18-24 months, its ILS to Alma and its discovery service to Primo. 3. We have lost funding for our 27-hour/week adjunct librarian and so are figuring out how to cover reference duties, in particular. 4. We are preparing a Fake News workshop for area high school teachers as well as our campus faculty and staff and that's been interesting. 5. We have asked NYLA Director Jeremy Johannesen to stop by on his summer tour. 6. I will be volunteering at the New York Libraries booth at the State Fair again this year and encourage others to do the same. I find it to be so much fun!”

**Other.** Note that there were technical issues today with GoToMeeting. Julia and Mary-Carol had to call in via the phone. Not having other items to discuss, the meeting adjourned at 11:55 a.m.

Notes taken by Mary-Carol