

Resource Sharing Committee
11/10/2010

Present: JoAnn Nabe, Nina Pals, Amy Ihnen, Karen Bounds, Ellen Popit
Recorder: Pat Boze
Others present: Michelle Ralston, Jo McLain

Minutes of October 14 meeting were approved by committee. JoAnn volunteered to report out to the Planning Panel's afternoon session.

The committee reviewed the LLSAP capital reserve recommendation passed at the October Planning Panel meeting. Ellen mentioned that, in the future, any resolutions, if time allows, will be given to the Planning Panel and will be adopted at the next meeting. This is how we will do it in the future – and this will let Planning Panel members have a chance to digest the resolution. As a review of the LLSAP Capital Reserve Account resolution – the RS committee's recommendation was to accept, with additional language from motion by Allen Lanham, Diane Steel second, approved when handed out in October. The language included 'Additionally the new system Board will determine the amount of area and per capita funding that will be allocated to support LLSAP services.' The committee had an additional discussion about funding. We need to look at language of how system will fund LLSAP's – separately or at the same level. Nina asked if funding will remain the same for first year? Part of it is to maintain the funding for the first year, then it will have to be looked at – someone will have to make a decision about what percentage will go to support the LLSAP – libraries may have to provide more support. Can the RS committee make those decisions? Or is it the new system board that does this? Ellen said a new Board will do things differently – hopefully will have a greater sense of funding, maybe the best we can do is keep things static for the first year. Ellen said ISL has said they are funding 'automation and delivery,' why not put the money into the LLSAP's. There continues to be uncertainty among the LLSAP managers regarding the phrase 'merged automation system' in the resolution and the first year of funding.

Pat Boze and Jo McLain reviewed the summary document from the first joint meeting of the LLSAP managers/governance group, held Nov. 5. For this group as well, clarification of four catalogs or one catalog is needed as well as definition of 'merged automation system'. The committee asked that the LLSAP managers arrive at a better working definition of the phrase 'merged automation system'. Delivery is what is essential to the LLSAPs, more than help paying for the LLSAP. There was also discussion of a possible two-tier, one for those on a 'lite' version, and another on a more robust product.

The committee reviewed the LLSAP Survey results, including comments, importance of modules, and importance of LLSAP services. Nina said this is a good source of information for what libraries value in an automation system. There is also good data to develop a two-tier approach – by libraries indicating what they need. Nina mentioned also how it proves the importance of resource sharing. Once the world is open up, libraries can't live without it.

The committee then discussed developing resource sharing plans/policies. SHLS does not have written a separate policy, just follow ILLINET – for ILL. The other 3 systems have separate ILL policies and some have reciprocal access policies. Ellen would like to have draft for plan for the December meeting – the committee decided Resource-Sharing should be the policy name. The policy definitely needs definitions (ill, rb, reciprocal access, resource access). The group talked about the components, to include definitions, statement that resource-sharing is an enhancement, not substitution for collection development, responsibilities of member libs – imbalance of rb issue.

Resource Sharing Policy Philosophy will be reflective of the basic philosophy adopted by LLSAP managers, then we will include a plan that will set forth how the philosophy will be adopted. Ellen

indicated it might be best to do a mashup of existing documents, pulling from them what is needed, to create one document – including ILLINET ILL policy adherence.

Intro

Definitions – as inclusive as possible – as many as needed

Responsibilities of member libraries

Suspension of privileges – grievance policy?

Resource sharing is a cornerstone of what we are supposed to be about

The whole issue of being willing to share – OCLC and other ways – is something we need to discuss – how do we arrive at the spot where every library's material is discoverable

RA – in schools – add 'as security permits'

How does the resource-sharing get 'developed' in membership? Is it a requirement?

Distinctions between how systems manage ILL – OCLC membership required

Two systems of requesting – unlimited and limits.

Ellen will look at the policies and get a combined document out to everyone, hope to have a conference call before the next meeting in December.