**URSUS Library Directors**
**Friday, April , 2012**
**Meeting Notes**


Present:     Tom Abbott, Chris Hepler, James Jackson Sanborn, Leslie Kelley, Barbara
McDade, David Nutty, Jaime Ritter (for Linda Lord), Frank Roberts, Joyce Rumery,
Ben Treat (for Tom Abbott), JoAnne Wallingford


Guests

Curt Madison
        To discuss the Service Level Agreement with UMA

Jerry Lund
        To discuss the Access Services Best Practices

Deb Rollins
        To discuss the March collections meeting


SLA discussion with Curt and Tom


Curt Madison spoke about the services for students at a distance and the Service Level
Agreement with University College.  This SLA does not take local control from the campuses.
There is an issue with blended courses and with students taking courses at more than one
campus.  It would be good to explore a way to get students the access they need easily, maybe a
new identification card would help.  The multi-use code was mentioned as the way we have used
the patron database to provide access.


Copyright issues

Tom mentioned that one issue is two websites, from two campuses, with opposite views on fair
use and streaming.  We need a consistent policy across the system.  ACRL best practices are a
good way to start on this.  The University of Maine, University of Southern Maine, and
University of Maine at Augusta all have different policies.

A system wide copyright committee was requested. It is recommended that someone from each
library be appointed to the committee.

We need to show the services that are available so that users will access those products or
databases that we have provided, streaming services, etc.  There is a collection development
aspect to this issue.

Access Services Discussion

The group wants to have more involvement in the process for the delivery service and the new ILS.  They want to be consultants for any decision that would affect the staffs.  For next steps they feel that more staffing and funding would help with their responsibilities, particularly funding for technology and software.  In discussions about increasing library hours the issue of security is of concern, maybe access via a swipe card for the late night hours.

There is a feeling of uncertainty about the changing nature of the library.  Regarding loan rule changes, we will not make any changes at this point, it would be a very large task and if we change the library system in the near future it is not worth the trouble.  The group would like to have RFID, but know that it is too expensive for now.

The directors noted that even with changes in the library the circulation staff roles will continue, they are all service providers.  There should be an expectation of changes in duties as technologies and service needs change.

The group has no interest in a retreat.

Jerry was asked to go back to the group and provide statistics to see about the trends, to compare and contrast all circulation including fiction vs nonfiction.


Collections meeting


The Collections Committee met in March and Deb Rollins presented the notes from that meeting as well as the documents that were requested by the directors.  The Committee felt that this was a good exercise.  The documents show the subjects supported, the FY13 budget, and proposed shared resources.

One area we have in common that is not supported is biology.   BIOSIS was on MARVEL, but we lost the contract when they would not support the state wide access.  Also they will not license for UMS access.

The UMS budget has been the same for five years, the committee's recommendation is to renew all current subscriptions.  Some databases were already renewed, because they are on a different cycle.

MARCIVE was taken out of the system budget.  There was a discussion about OED, should it be considered a database for this collection. The OCLS gives $17,000 to support the databases, Orono covers the balance of $5000.

We need to look at priority one first and highlight those items that should be purchased.  For the e-books,we need to investigate more and look at options, not just PDA.  We also need to look at other formats, streaming, like films on demand, and audio.

Also, the committee needs to have representation from BPL and MSL.


Budget pool

The committee will continue the investigation and prioritization.  The Directors want to use the committee as experts to find the products for us.  That way we would have priorities and then create the pool of money.

Libraries will need to have the details on the pool, costs, etc. to be able to show what they are buying to their admins.  Just need to sow the commitment.


ARES

The functionality is much better, there is money from the URSUS budget for some of the cost, but each library will have to put in the remainder yearly.  The URSUS budget is currently underfunded in that line.  University College can put in 500.00 towards the total.  Neither Presque Isle nor Machias want the software.  We do not yet know about Farmington or the Law Library.


 Delivery service RFP

The RFP is basically the same, just added an aspect for future efficiencies, we wanted a discussion of the entire service to make it more efficient.  This is borrowed from the Massachusetts example.  There were some changes, Bowdoin wanted 30 days for a lost book report.  They also added $150 for a lost access key or card.

The security issues, including those as the LLRL were added.


Fund pool for group purchases

A discussion about a fund pool for the group purchases began with the information about Films On Demand from Leslie.  The cost is $42,000 for the UMS.

We need to have the logistics of the pool fund worked out so that all of the libraries have a process that works for their unique situations.  Should it be one invoice a year, itemized with all of the costs.   How do we look at the contribution, by fte or by formula?  We could have an opt-

in consortial arrangement and put a surcharge on the work.  We could also split the workload for billing, but go to the resources with one voice, the collection development would be the same, but different addresses for the resources.

We also need to consider mega purchases like the HathiTrust, also those that we would consider longer term development purchases.


## Best Practices

Reference retreat, need to bill out for the attendees, there are twelve.

Next group to talk to is cataloging, June 15, Lin Wilcox is the chair.


## Maine InfoNet

The opt-in for the readers list was discussed, it would be turned on for the system, but opt-in for the individual.  The School of Law wants to be excluded, but will review the text provided to see if it will work for them.  A question posed was if ptypes could be excluded.


## Future meetings

The group will be polled for the May 18 meeting, we will skip July.

Leslie will be asked about the retreat at FK, then we will set a firm date.