

L-net Advisory Board Meeting

March 4, 2010

Board Members present: Lori Moore, Dawn Lowe-Wincentsen, Erin Sharwell, Dale Vidmar

By Phone: Buzzy Neilsen, Liisa Sjoblom, Kathleen Casey, Darci Hanning

L-net Staff present : Emily Papagni, Caleb Tucker-Raymond, Brett Lear

Not present: Stuart Levy, Lori Wamsley, JoAnne Klassen

L-net Update

Caleb reported that SOU, OIT and eight other academic libraries are now using L-net Local. This is definitely growing L-net. Dale reported that the L-net Local service at SOU has been good. Though there was some trepidation from the staff at first, everyone is now pitching in and it seems very successful. Dawn said that OIT's Klamath Falls campus is also participating and it seems like a great way to get staff on board with L-net overall.

Emily reported that she has done several trainings lately. She has found that she is focusing more on L-net Local.

Buzzy reported an increase in L-net email questions for the South Coast due to a website redesign. He also said that participating in mentor program has been fabulous.

General Statistics

Caleb showed some statistics about who is using the service. Most are public libraries and a growth in academic use is due to L-net local. He pointed out that more users may stress the L-net server and discussed whether to look at getting a bigger server or perhaps contracting out for this service.

Caleb also talked about the service "Library Help". Should Caleb work on our service or think about buying Library Help? He will investigate more and report back. Darci will follow up with information about state and using MCL money for server services.

Marketing

the State stipulates our goal numbers and how much we should be growing. Caleb asked if we need a more ambitious goal as we always exceed our mark. This may depend upon staffing, L-net local and the server issues.

The group looked at Dawn's marketing proposal/ideas:

- Promotion at PLA - it was determined that we can probably use the MCL booth for promotion and have info about L-net.
- Focusing on current libraries – discussed the idea of getting more staff and users by supporting and encouraging current partners with mentorship's, etc.
- Specialists: Emily said law librarians get questions but other specializations are not getting many questions. Getting questions to right people depends on demand, knowledge of staffers, software ability to disperse questions.
- Social networking: Facebook, Twitter, etc. The Summit group is using this mode very well. It seems at this point this mode of marketing is best directed at librarians for info and connecting. What else can we be doing with these accounts? See what others are doing, post patron comments, post interesting questions?

Caleb felt we need a communication plan, how we send info to partners and, in general, what stats to share. Numbers are helpful. For academic libraries follow academic schedule. Fiscal year for public. Caleb would like

to send out a sample, get feedback from us.

Marketing to patrons could be subject specific - tax time, etc

Volunteers add L-net to their Linked-in page. Kathleen will do it!

More and more organized trainings? – Emily will work on this

Partnerships

With the Ohio partnership we share service, software, support contract, backup service. Provided by regional library system: After Dark. Shared hours are cheap. Costs divided by population. There are differences in approach to VR between our services. After dark librarians seem to balk at reference interviews. Caleb has concerns about this. Instead of collaborating with Ohio we could pay After Dark librarians. This could cost \$5,000-10,000 more per year. Currently it's about \$93,000 per year.

Know it Now also has problems. Should we talk with them more, build collaboration? We need good help in the early morning hours and it makes sense to collaborate during low demand times. Currently our costs for staffing \$93000 this year, next year \$71,700 for hours only. \$78,400 for them to do our 7am - 9 am, \$74,500 it it's only during the school year.

Caleb is also talking to N. Carolina. They currently use QuestionPoint but are thinking about dropping it. Colorado has dropped Tutor.com and will hire their own 24/7 staff. Tutor.com providing our staffing? Sharing it out. Dale wondered about utilizing our own people, students, etc. Employing a pool. Brett said that may pose administrative and union issues with MCL. Caleb would like to work with other states with similar interests, come up with service principles. Third option to contract out. Ask After Dark for a bid. Should we be asking others? Ask for 6 mos or a year? Other things we could do to address their quality? Looking a big picture service principles. Brainstorming ideas. Creating our own "after dark" service? Caleb will approach BCR and Colorado and talk to them about multi-state collaboration, put feelers out for tutor.com. Might put bids out for 6 mos. Will report back.

Funding

Caleb reported on the Oregon State trustees meeting. They had decided previously to charge Oregon libraries for L-net based on the subsidy for databases. Then everyone got subsidized so they couldn't charge them. They are discussing rewriting the rule so any library with certain service numbers would have to pay a little. This would start in 2011-2012 but they won't decide until next fall. Made sense when folks were paying for databases but now it doesn't. Caleb would like to find another way for the state to collect money. The rule change will probably happen regardless. Caleb will be meeting with Jim and Mary Kay about direction of L-net.

Texting

It's clear that people use texting and it's growing . What does L-net want to do? What would Oregon patrons do with it? What would Oregon libraries want? L-net as hub? Renewal reminders? Are Oregon libraries interested? Caleb talked about several options:

Join My Info Quest – trial?

Buy Text a Librarian – willing to put up IT infrastructure to create a product that would work with our chat

Contract with Upside wireless or like service

Could text go directly into current spark software?

Reed college uses Library Help and Google voice converts into IMs. Trial with info quest?

Caleb will find out more and report back

Spanish services

MCL would like to study and come up with protocols for service to Spanish speakers using a contracted researcher. Caleb felt Washington county may be better place to study the question. He is following up on this.

Performance targets. Should we set it higher? how much should we challenge ourselves? We agreed that 42,090 patrons for 2011-12 was reasonable.

Dale asked about evaluation and how we are measuring a successful transaction - any written statement of objectives for librarian to make a successful transaction. The Quality team has created a rubric towards this. Focus more on best practices.

Next meeting – Lori Moore suggested meeting in another location in the state for our next meeting. Anyone living in those areas who'd like us to visit should put forth info about local info to entice us :)

4:00 Adjourn