Call Meeting to Order
Collette Mak called the meeting to order at 10am.

Roll Call
Tina Baich will take attendance.

Approval of Agenda
The agenda was approved as presented.

Approval of Minutes
Jim Corridan offered a correction. I-Share should be IN-Share throughout the minutes. The minutes were approved as amended.

Reports
A. Officer Reports
   No officer reports.
B. State Library
   1. IN-SHARE
      Mr. Corridan provided a spreadsheet of all the active IN-Share libraries, which includes any library that has used IN-Share to request materials in the past two years. In column 2 (Type), A = Academic, C = Corporate, E = Schools, I = Institutions, and P = Public. In column 3 (Evergreen), V indicates an Evergreen library. There are 295 libraries total.
Ms. Mak asked if Evergreen libraries are so well-served through that program that they might be retired from the IN-Share list. Mr. Corridan indicated that Evergreen libraries saw a 66% decrease in IN-Share activity following implementation with a few exceptions. The hope is that the Evergreen program will eventually reduce the number of IN-Share libraries. Ms. Ehinger commented that the Adams Public Library System still uses IN-Share to obtain articles, which are mostly those not held by public libraries. One of the libraries that saw a spike in IN-Share activity was the West Lafayette Public Library. Mr. Schenkel later addressed this saying it was related to books, but that their IN-Share activity is trending downward now.

There are only 342 libraries eligible to participate in IN-Share per negotiations with OCLC. The IN-Share OCLC symbol is the most heavily lent to in the world. Some libraries in the IN-Share program have a larger volume than is appropriate for the program. A recommendation on how to revise the membership of IN-Share may be a matter for this committee.

2. Evergreen Indiana

Mr. Corridan reported there are about 90 libraries currently active with four more going live this month. Indiana is active in the international Evergreen community. The Indiana State Library continues to suggest that Indiana academic libraries look at Evergreen as an option. There has been some discussion about Ivy Tech joining Evergreen. There is a multi-type consortium in Canada that could serve as a model. Indiana is a big player in the Evergreen community and is looking at working with two other large Evergreen consortiums to provide their own support rather than paying a fee for support.

3. Fulfillment Program

Fulfillment is an open source product under development by Equinox, the same company that developed Evergreen. Mr. Corridan explained that the software would live on an Indiana State Library server and various EDI hooks would go out to ILSs. Fulfillment is intended to integrate with ILSs from a variety of vendors. Patron-initiated requests would be made through the Fulfillment interface. The product is supposed to be up and running at the beginning of 2012.

Ms. Mak said it would be interesting to have one of the Ohio project coordinators come speak to us. Mr. Corridan said the Indiana State Library could share the RFP for the project with the committee. Interest was expressed in seeing it so Mr. Corridan will follow up with that.

Mr. Corridan also provided a handout showing the ILSs used by Indiana public libraries. The Indiana State Library has to vote on its top ILS choices based on usage within the state. The top choices of the various partners will be the first Fulfillment will work on. The Indiana State Library hasn’t voted yet, and it would be nice to have ILS information from the academic libraries prior to doing so. Paul Bracke will see if he still has this information from an ALI task force he worked on a few years ago. It will also be brought up at the ALI board meeting next Tuesday.

The protocol for Fulfillment is LAI, which works with NCIP and Z39.50. Ms. Mak would love to see NCIP take off as a way for all of us to circulate materials to one another.
VI. Old Business
Mr. Corridan answered the remaining questions posed at the previous meeting and gave additional updates. The Indiana State Library has had a brief conversation with Bookware to see what opportunities there are for reducing costs for libraries and expanding resource sharing.

The fulfillment rate in Indiana is 78-80% (based on IN-Share).

There are course reserve options in Evergreen developed by Canadian libraries.

Bandwidth requests from the public library sector to the federal government the Indiana Office of Technology are up 74% over last year.

There was high demand for LSTA funding for e-readers. As a result, the library held an e-reader summit to get input on what the Indiana State Library should be investing in when it comes to e-readers.

Mr. Corridan suggested we look at creating a statewide article sharing system.

VII. New Business
A. Principles—Establish common principles as the basis of our discussion; Share the Rethinking Resource Sharing manifesto.

Mr. Corridan stated that the Indiana State Library wants to make sure resource sharing is a priority for all Indiana libraries and to provide efficient, cost-effective resource sharing mechanisms.

Ms. Mak would like the committee to develop a set of principles to guide our discussions and recommendations.

Matthew Shaw suggested using the term core service rather than priority. The committee agreed that resource sharing is a core service.

Other principles suggested included:

- Free resource sharing within Indiana. Libraries don’t charge other libraries transaction fees. Libraries don’t charge patrons if there is no charge to the library.
- Raise visibility of local history collections; get Indiana Memory collections into catalogs
- Patron-focused

[POSSIBLE ACTION ITEM] With the changes in INSPIRE, where are we in terms of needs that aren’t being met for medical literature?

Ms. Mak shared the Rethinking Resource Sharing Manifesto and asked that we review it. A discussion of whether or not to endorse the Manifesto will occur at the next meeting.

B. NISO draft standard on physical delivery [Information Item]

The NISO draft standard on physical delivery is more of a best practices document than a standard. The draft is currently open for public comment. The University of Notre Dame is a voting member of NISO. If any committee members have comments they want Notre Dame to share, please send them to Ms. Mak.

Mr. Corridan mentioned the statewide delivery contract was renegotiated, and the pricing is only slightly different. They negotiated a four year contract. The price is locked in with an option for a 3% increase if gas is over $4 for 12 months.
C. ICOLC’s statement on STM materials for international interlibrary loan [Information Item]

A group of STM publishers issued a statement on what they think is appropriate in terms of resource sharing of articles. ICOLC issues a statement in reply. Ms. Mak thinks this is something of which the committee should be aware.

D. Training needs — gap analysis, what are the skills someone should have for resource sharing and how do they get them.

Ms. Mak wanted to discuss how we can assess the training needs of Indiana resource sharing staff and how we can try to fill those needs. Mr. Corridan said he has no doubt that there is a need for resource sharing training. Assessing training needs is difficult because people need to understand their own needs and the topics suggested in order to identify those needs. He sees a need for base-level education before we can get to specific topics for training. Mr. Corridan would love to have a statewide resource sharing conference for all types of libraries in conjunction with the Academic Libraries of Indiana (ALI).

Ms. Nahrwold talked about need for patron education as well. Many don’t realize ILL exists.

Ms. Mak summarized the conversation as seeing a need for both marketing of resource sharing services and the creation of minimum competencies. The committee could then develop training around those competencies. Ms. Baich suggested creating an ILL 101 course similar to the workshop offered by ALA RUSA STARS. The Indiana State Library could support a statewide conference. Mr. Corridan recommended it having the lowest possible registration fee.

A discussion about the needs and concerns of academic libraries followed. Mr. Cervone said he would be very concerned about having multiple systems. Implementation of a system that worked in conjunction with the current circulation system would depend on how the added system worked. His library borrows in-state, but also borrows a lot from out of state, and any system needs to take this into account.

Mr. Bracke told the committee that the new CIC direct consortial borrowing program uses Relais for the patron interface, but all requests flow into ILLiad. CIC worked with Atlas to make this possible. It minimizes the need for staff training. He also thought we should discuss how ILL can be more collaborative with collection development staff.

Mr. Corridan stated there has been some discussion of creating a Midwest consortium around the participants in the FulfILLment project.

Mr. Shaw asked if there has been any discussion of an interstate delivery system or connecting to other state delivery systems. Mr. Corridan said the Indiana State Library is waiting for other things to develop before moving in that direction. There needs to be an assessment of demand and whether there is the traffic to support such a service.

E. Planning for digital ILL, e.g. the Kindle/Overdrive making sure that license terms support resource sharing

There are 43 Indiana public libraries participating in an Overdrive consortium. David Lewis approached the Indiana State Library about creating an academic Overdrive consortium. He would like to apply for an Innovative LSTA grant to help support the purchase of academic-
oriented titles for an academic Overdrive consortium. There have been some problems between Overdrive and libraries due to contract issues. There was an Overdrive conference last week where they hinted that Overdrive materials would be available for Kindles. Some libraries have had difficulty implementing Overdrive while others have had no problems.

Ms. Mak stated the need to ensure resource sharing rights are negotiated in contracts for electronic resources. Ms. Knapp said there was a discussion of licensing terms as the e-reader summit. Mr. Schenkel talked about the problem of not being able to lend outside of consortia. We are creating a whole new area of content that isn’t available to everyone in the state. Ms. Mak suggested creating a document on best practices for e-book license agreements.

Mr. Corridan asked about use of actual library facilities as well as print collections. Mr. Schenkel and Mr. Speer both indicated circulation of their print collections is up. Mr. Roethemeyer mentioned the economy and cuts in family spending as a factor in increased public library circulation and use.

VIII. Announcements
Prior to adjourning the meeting, Ms. Mak summarized the topics to be addressed at the next meeting.

- Statewide resource sharing conference jointly presented by the Indiana State Library and ALI
- Statewide article sharing system
- Basic resource sharing competencies

Mr. Shaw, Mr. Roethemeyer, and Mr. Cervone will raise the idea of a joint resource sharing conference and the Indiana State Library’s desire for ILS information from the academic libraries at next Tuesday’s ALI board meeting. The committee would like to hear a report back about these issues.

IX. Adjournment
The meeting was adjourned at 12pm.

Next meeting: Monday, October 3, 2011 at 10am EDT at the Indiana State Library

Respectfully submitted,

Tina Baich
Secretary, Indiana State Library Resource Sharing Committee