

L-net Advisory Board Meeting
Friday, October 23, 2009
1:00 p.m.

Present: Lori Moore, Lori Wamsley, Stuart Levy, Dawn Lowe-Wincentsen, JoAnn Klassen, Darci Hanning
By Phone: Buzzy Neilsen, Liisa Sjoblom, Kathleen
L-net Staff: Emily Papagni, Caleb Tucker-Raymond, Brett Lear
Not Present: Erin Sharwell, Dale Vidmar

Welcome and re-introductions

Review Funding

Caleb reported that the state Library Board approved LSTA funds of \$305,000 as requested. The idea of obtaining funding from participating libraries was somewhat waylaid. In February, the Oregon Administrative rules were changed so that libraries fully subsidized by the State Library for statewide databases would not be asked to contribute to L-net. But with the new statewide databases all Oregon libraries are subsidized, therefore no library is be required to pay. The LSTA council recommended that the board drop the issue for now. The board was still interested in seeing libraries contribute to L-net, so The rules may be reconsidered in the future. As of now we are funded until June 30, 2011.

Setting annual goals/poll results

The group discussed the poll results and how to prioritize and implement them:

Marketing and Communication

The following ideas were discussed or brought up:

Does this mean driving more users to site or getting the word out to libraries?

Marketing to libraries we want to join us.

Overcoming misconceptions and fears. Letting libraries know why it is a good service and especially its value to smaller libraries.

Wide range of knowledge it opens up. Better service, more options for patrons. Engaging experts.

Show that patrons are using it.

Need more staff.

L-net as legitimate service. "real reference". Useful service.

Creative ideas for getting the word out.

Caleb reported that there is money to spend for marketing. Possibly \$20-25,000.

Darci talked about the target numbers for the state. The library development team comes up with targets they can measure such as L-net questions asked. We have always exceeded this numbers.

Though we feel we may be at capacity for the numbers of patrons we are serving, it may still be good to keep an eye on this and continue to exceed this goal. With more partners we can become more lofty in our goals to drive in more users.

Caleb will summarize official goals and email them.

It was suggested that marketing to schools and teachers is also important. Working with schools, training and education for school libraries on how to use L-net.

It was agreed that a smaller committee could decide a focus and an action plan. Dawn agreed to head up this committee and Lori M. will help. Stewart and Joann will help with any schools issues.

Funding

We are funded for now. It should be an ongoing idea for us though. Getting partnerships can lead to better future funding. Valued service more likely to lead to buy-in from the state and other libraries. It is not a priority at this time to create a plan.

Partnerships

Mentoring among librarians seems to be a good idea and it goes along with our marketing ideas to garner more partners.

Jim Scheppke suggested “world” partnerships to take 24/7 calls. An English speaking partner on the other side of the globe could take our overnight calls and vice versa. This would potentially save us money because we wouldn’t have to pay After Dark. Caleb will find out more.

We discussed the idea that local collaboration may be more important right now. We are currently waiting to find out if Colorado will join. Few people are actually using the service in the middle of the night but is it still good? Other ways to save money include having more Oregon library partners and volunteers on duty.

(aside: there is the future possibility of video, pictures of L-net staff. We though video would be cool but not widely available to our patrons. Pictures, though would be great)

Text service

This seems to be a service that people are interested in and asking about. There is the potential that by creating a monetary service it increases the perceived value of the service (people pay to send texts so it is not exactly free). Washington County and Eugene are currently using Infotext. Other options are available though. The cost barrier may be an issue for getting libraries on board. How do we do it? How do patrons want to do it? Seamlessness is important. What would the staffing issued be? It was decided to investigate a little more. Caleb will put together a group to examine this.

Evaluating remote services to Spanish

Minimum service might be possible for Spanish, Chinese, and Russian speakers. Caleb reported that the email software has capabilities to choose language. We felt that we need to be able to do it well. MCL would like to apply for LSTA grant to find out how to best serve people who speak those languages with remote service. Caleb would be the point person and the grant would fund a consultant to study this. Caleb will follow up.

Software/Service

There are some small software issues but Caleb and Emily are dealing with them.

Collaboration with Ohio is still in affect but their service standards may not always be equal to our own. We need to think about why and how we are collaborating. Coming up with a common task and standard of service, guidelines, and a base understanding would be good. We do not answer as many questions as Ohio though. Caleb is working on this issue.

Social networking

It was decided that this should be part of Marketing/Communications – Facebook group of librarians? Twitter? Answering questions? Getting fans? Lori and Dawn will follow up.

Rewriting service agreement to include L-net local

Caleb reported that eight libraries are using it and three or four are considering it. Some are not L-net partners. We decided that a formal agreement would be good. This will get us all on the same page for service and privacy. We should request at least minimal level of partnership, asking them to answer questions via email. Emily and Caleb will follow up.

Adjourn 3:45 p.m.