Members Present: Rich Bennett, Suzy Covey, Jason Fleming, Winston Harris, Martha Hruska, Erich Kesse, Cathy Mook-Martyniak, Tom Minton, Lawan Orser, Betsy Simpson and Naomi Young.

Members Absent: Michele Crump

1. Announcements
   • There was a library-wide announcement sent out regarding Martha’s departure from the library in August.
     o There will someone appointed as acting director until a hire is made.
   • Thank you to DLC for the tour last meeting.
   • Martha got approval to order a projector to be installed for the conference room. A cabinet of sorts will need to be chosen to secure the laptop. The order hasn’t gone out just yet, but will be done soon. The following questions/considerations were raised:
     o Would it be wireless/blue-tooth enabled?
     o Would there be one laptop that stayed there or would it be the responsibility of the user to check out a laptop/etc.?
     o Who would maintain the laptop?

2. Updates
   • Metalib
     o Focus groups are still ongoing. A report should be together within a week or so.
     o SUL Summit on Metalib implementation: Email questionnaire went out from ERS to the TSPC and Digital Groups followed by the results. Message was then sent to Directors for March meeting. ERS is going to analyze results and then come up with a proposal for what will need to be included in the meeting in either April or May.
     o Google Scholar: In the near future, the ability to add/include UF will be available in preferences. This will offer results from the SFX server, perhaps even full text. There is one inconsistency in current information is that once the file is put out, the SFX data changes. FCLA generates the file once a week, but it is not certain as to how often Google Scholar comes in to mime data. A message will be sent out to Library Staff to announce when this is available.

   • Resource Navigation Group
     o Tom and LeiLani attended a conference (Computers and Libraries in Washington D.C.) and saw a presentation on Web 2.0 and an extension of that, Library 2.0 and gathered information about components of websites available for browser additions vs. static pages.
       ▪ Web 2.0 is a program that allows for components of websites to be available to other websites rather than having a static website. This is able
to be searched a multitude of ways (such as Google Scholar) rather than patrons needing to come to our website directly.

- Library 2.0 is a program that makes information available whenever and wherever the user requires it as well as multiple use applications. Examples of this are Firefox for Aleph, Google Search for Aleph.
  - There is some controversy about this service as people wouldn’t have to go directly to a Library website.
- There were several other programs/topics of interest such as Wicke Blogs, AJAX, gadgets, etc.

- Cataloging
  - Betsy and Jason have been posting on FCLA’s Swicke where there is now a category for WorldCat. One of the projects that is underway is checking records that are suppressed in the catalog against OCLC to see if holdings are still attached and then deleting those holdings.

- Institutional Repository
  - Was on the Library Council Agenda, see attachment for statement
  - There are subgroups getting together to take care of smaller pieces of the project and coming up with ideas for interaction between the different components.

- UFDC
  - Today (3/28) should be the last day of moving items over and then it will be up and running. The bulk of the IR content going in now is primarily IFAS materials, impact, as well as financial reports.
  - FCLA has switched from PALMM to Mods Metadata. This may have impact on how things are described. The changes should happen after this month.

- TS Workspace Assessment
  - New template is now in Public Folder. Adjacency template has been added as well. This information needs to be filled in by the departments.

- Cager
  - In progress. FIU and UCF are coming up.

- Reclass
  - 38,157 items processed so far. Moving forward, but also looking for missing items. About 400 missing items found, which is still a small percentage. Proposal will be made by Robena that holdings be suppressed for items that have shown no activity since 1986. Large percentage of these items are multiple/extra copies. There is a second pass to check for these extra copies.
  - RFID tags and their possibility in the future were raised. This is still something that is definitely being thought about for future changes, but at this point in time are still not feasible cost-wise (They’re currently @ $0.78/each tag). There were also issues with the gates being able to accommodate the tags and the current system. Having two kinds of gates
would be problematic and cost money not available. FSU may look to use these for a branch library (Music).

- West Update: June is the current speculation.
  - FCLA is on the list of who will be let know when they can flip call numbers and locations.

3. Discussion/Other
- Planning Calendar: Library Faculty Annual Activity reports will be called for in April. This will be revised and posted to the web in the near future.
- Development Officer Position status was asked about. This is still posted and in the works.
- ERM: Per Michelle Newberry, there is a Purchase Order getting ready to be cut.
- There was question raised if there would be an access period for journal subscriptions that will be cut due to budget cut.
  - This will largely depend on the agreement with the company. Often times the dates are a bit sketchy.
- Recommended Reading: Rethinking How We Provide Bibliographic Services for the University of California. A 5 page executive summary is available at [http://libraries.universityofcalifornia.edu/sopag/BSTF/ExecSum.pdf](http://libraries.universityofcalifornia.edu/sopag/BSTF/ExecSum.pdf). The issues and questions raised in the charge mirror concerns raised at UF and within the SUL.
  - The issue of consolidating the library catalogs databases in the state of Florida and having one database that is reported to, has been raised to the University, SUL directors, and Jim Corry
    - There was question if this kind of thing would give UF more control. The response was that it was generally felt that there was a lot of redundant work and this would combine efforts and resources. There could still be institutional views.
    - This would be a long-term process (at least a couple of years…) and not something to do in any kind of fast timeframe.
  - There is also the issue of security.
  - It was expressed that it would be nice if a task force could be implemented at end of June as this would need significant UF involvement.
  - It was the consensus that it would be good if this could be a topic of discussion for the Annual Joint Meeting for CSUL.