

Florida Library Network Council
Meeting Minutes
January 29-30, 2008
University of Central Florida Main Library, Orlando, Florida

The following council members were in attendance: Judi Ring, State Librarian, Barry Baker, Mary Brown, John Callahan, James Corey, Danny Hales, Mary Anne Hodel, Betty Johnson, Brian Kelley, Richard Madaus, and Brad Ward. State Library attendance included: Loretta Flowers and Mark Flynn: Guest Speakers: Beth Jefferson, Karen Schneider, Beth Farmer, Priscilla Caplan, Diana Sachs-Silveira, Chuck McClure, and Pat McClintock. Visitors included Charlie Parker.

Day 1: January 29, 2008

Mark Flynn opened the meeting by reviewing the agenda. The purpose of this meeting is to review progress of implementation of the Florida Virtual Library Plan and to develop a strategic plan that will address future development of the Florida Electronic Library through 2012.

The Division has a new long range plan called "Lead...Develop...Innovate." It was designed to provide an ongoing process for thinking and planning strategically and an implementation strategy that could be integrated throughout the agency for LSTA funded services such as the Florida Electronic Library. At this meeting we will be seeking to refine the goals outlined in this Division plan as they relate to technology and library resource sharing and to create new objectives and strategies for enhancing services offered statewide through the Florida Electronic Library.

We will spend the first day reviewing the core programs and services offered by the Florida Electronic Library and have invited special guests to join our discussion and who will also present information about the latest service trends and emerging technology that will impact each of the core service areas over the next five years. On the 30th, we will prioritize each of the core areas in terms of potential new objectives and strategies based upon the discussion held on the 29th.

The FEL core service areas are:

- a Library portal offering access to licensed electronic resources,
- a statewide union catalog representing the holdings of Florida libraries,
- a resource sharing management system (Ill and reciprocal borrowing) that can work with the union catalog and portal,
- Florida related digital content created by Florida libraries involved in digitization programs,
- the Ask a Library virtual reference cooperative,

- time will be made available for discussion of new ideas too.

Pat McClintock of RMG Consulting will facilitate the planning presentations and discussion on both days. Pat will then be tasked with writing up a report based upon the Council's recommendations and stated priorities. Upon approval by the FLNC, this report will be the basis of an addendum to "Lead...Develop...Innovate" and will guide the state's future LSTA expenditures for statewide virtual library services.

First Presentation:

A Library portal offering access to licensed electronic resources and a statewide union catalog representing the holdings of Florida libraries.

The guest speaker for this presentation is Beth Jefferson, founder of [Bibliocommons](#). Her company's new software aims to transform public libraries' online catalogs into environments for social discovery of resources that are cataloged not only by librarians, but also by patrons (among other Web 2.0 concepts). Beth was asked to share information about her research on how patrons want to use library portals and the work that Bibliocommons is doing with public libraries in Canada to implement library portal technology.

BiblioCommons seeks to create a new "social discovery" system for libraries by making connections between a library's collection and library patrons through the public access catalog. Bibliocommons replaces the traditional library OPAC with a different user interface that enables user commenting and tagging on library holdings wherever they are in the system, the ability to create "best of" lists, as well as the ability to interact with other library patrons who share the user's interests.

Enabling users to contribute data doesn't mean they will. Bibliocommons has spent much effort in trying to look at what is known as the "architecture of participation." The key is to design a system that provides incentives for library patrons to participate and to add new data while creating a social network around their interaction with the online library and all of its users. The best searching mechanism that most users rely on is information from peer networks and colleagues. Bibliocommons seeks to make this kind of information readily available within the OPAC.

Beth walked the FLNC members through a BiblioCommons mocked-up Web user interface for public library catalogs. Currently BiblioCommons has agreements with Knowledge Ontario (a network of libraries, cultural heritage organizations, and educational institutions), British Columbia Provincial Public Library Services, and the Alberta Library (a provincial consortium). The total population base of users is over 20 million.

BiblioCommons replaces the library OPAC module. When implemented in a consortia or state wide configuration, it has the ability to pull information from each participating library's ILS in order to build a union catalog of holdings. This catalog is refreshed automatically each day updating the OPAC by representing each library's additions and deletions from the day before.

Second Presentation:

Karen Schneider of College Center for Library Automation gave a presentation on current trends for union catalogs.

Karen's presentation was based on a series of "posts" she did for ALA TechSource entitled "The OPAC Sucks!" These can be found at: <http://www.techsource.ala.org/>

State Union Catalogs are built around the concept of a "Master Record." Early on, librarians have developed a fixation on the "record" or the MARC record. Today, we need to move to a new concept of shared data. It's a different construct that has become more important with the advance of the internet. Our current OPAC software is built around the "master record." Not shared data.

With Google, when a user enters a search term, they get results that are pretty good—even if you spell your search term wrong. Amazon works the same way.

With a Library catalog it is not the case. Enter a search and get 75 results, mostly not relevant.

There is no spell check on library catalogs!! Why not??

What works well.

Recommendations: "Library Thing for Libraries." This is a Web site that allows users to contribute information about the books they have read. As such, it is data from passionate readers. (However, it is also very one directional, not fully 2.0)

Library Thing does any book in your catalog. Danbury Public Library is leveraging the data in Library Thing by creating a mash-up between Library Thing and their local catalog. If a Library's OPAC worked well this is how it would go. Patrons would crowd into the library Web site and add content like recommendations, tagging etc.

This approach works much better than commercial products like "Novelist" or attempts to do the same thing by WorldCat.org. For example, with Novelist, If you like creative nonfiction, you're out of luck. With Library Thing, ANY book you put into your catalog can be leveraged this way.

"Same day availability" is something Web users have come to expect with commercial sites. Why can't we do this with the OPAC? Polaris has really figured out how to do it. You do a search and with the results you also get information about whether or not I can get my hands on the book right now.

Display of faceted search results is another key function that should be incorporated into our OPAC. 2/3 of library patrons browse and do not really search for specific items. Faceted search results allow the user to quickly parse out the results and narrow the search set resulting from browsing activity.

Other key components that should be present:

- Doing editions. Example: LibLine. One consolidated record for all known copies.
- Working List. Users need to have the ability to build working lists as they browse.
- Review and rate. Let the end user contribute.
- Ready access to an expert when you're stuck, e.g. Instant Messaging within the PAC. If you don't like the search, you can immediately get to the librarian and interact with them to find what you want.
- Persistent links are very important. To share a book with someone you need to have a persistent link.
- Best bets. Who looks at search logs to develop this as a resource. Find resources that are most popular by log analytics and then point them out in the PAC.

Bottom line, we need to do more testing and usability studies with our library patrons. Today, what wins over patrons is web design that is based on genuine evidence driven data from users. This is what should drive development

What to avoid:

Tag Clouds. This is a fuzzy bunny. Everyone thinks patrons should like it. But it doesn't work very well for users. Users don't really want to use it or know how to use it.

Unified search pages. Examples: "Primo" Endecca. This is bolting a better search engine on top of the OPAC. That was cool. We realized that it was NOT our metadata causing the user problems, but the underlying vendor software is the problem. This trend however has come and gone. Just putting a better search engine on top did not solve the problem. What users want is more than just federated searching. We don't want to send our users to lots of different places. Advance search seems to be a Dark Art driven by librarian wants and not user needs.

An example of user driven Web design is the Phoenix Public Library Web site. They spent a couple of years doing usability studies, testing what really serves the public and working on

returning results with high relevance. When libraries use usability studies, the results are impressive.

Most commercial sites have a personalization feature. The site remembers you, recognizes you and is better design to serve your interests.

Service oriented architecture. We've lived in silos up until now. That is changing. There is now a lot of conversation making software modular enough so that we can use an architecture that is strategic in its design, that also allows the library to mix and match components.

The Architecture of Participation. People are not consuming the Web but participating in it. Partly it is style, voice and authenticity.

WorldCAT.org has made attempts at implementing architecture of participation but with weak results.

Getting users to engage is key. In Bibliocommons you see the handprint of the user and not the librarian.

Beth: If we develop systems, the librarian can have a voice on the site as a person. To be a passionate leader on that subject and make their voice known.

Schneider: Librarian Expertise should not be the "Sage on the stage" anymore but rather the "guy on the side." They want experts, but they want them friendly, and they want to weigh their opinions against what other users have to say.

Schneider gave examples of Web sites that are effective at engaging participation from users:

If you go to the Da Vinci Code Web site, you will find 3500 different views on the DaVinci Code. This is a bookselling site and people stay all day on this site arguing about the book and the movie. You go to Library Thing you will find 471 reviews. (Smaller but still a good percentage of people putting in reviews). Go to WorldCAT.Org and DaVinci Code has 5 reviews.

A lot more is involved to get participation than putting in a "review" tab. I've put reviews in WorldCat and I don't know where they've gone. I can't go back and look at my reviews or see how others have found them useful or not. I cannot find my handprint in WorldCat.

Open Source. Works like a Bazaar. There are strong arguments for the open source trend that is emerging in libraries. These are different cost and service models than what we are used to. What has happened to library software? We can't afford what we need. The result is bad service and no development. With Open Source you get the code and you get to build what you need. It is a different model. The Library is not locked into a single vendor's service. There

are also companies now, like LibLine that will contract with a library to provide ongoing maintenance and support for your open source ILS.

Karen demonstrated Koha in action in one library. Click on a call number and a map pops up and walks to you the location in the library. Karen also demonstrated “Pines” system being used by Georgia. 270 libraries have saved 10 million dollars and got a better product than any traditional ILS vendor.

“Library Find” built by Oregon State built is another Open Source product. They wanted one click to search and one click to find. No complex menus here. They do not tell you all of the possible sources of information. They just take you to it. Contrast this with MetaLib/SFX.

70% of people who see an SFX menu simply close it.

There are a lot of innovations in the market right now. What is useful to Florida?

A very strong argument can be made for using the OCLC group catalog as a Union catalog. Using almost anything else doesn’t make sense because you’ve already invested the funding to build holdings in this resource.

However, WorldCat Local needs to be closely monitored. OCLC is going through a lot of changes and all of their experience in this new arena has not been successful. Peninsula Library System will be dropping this project. Scoping at the local level didn’t happen. OCLC says this is not important. The library system did not agree. The question “does this library have the book” is very important to a library patron standing at a particular branch outlet. But OCLC has only 3 letter symbols, not 4 letter symbols needed to describe holdings at a specific branch. When you get to a branch there is no way to express ownership at this level.

In theory, they would do NCIP and attach the ILS to worldcat. Even for vendors supporting NCIP, there is difficulty in implementation. When is a standard not standard. By the time NCIP is fully mature, it will be two more years. Development and implementation of standards in libraries does not work. (This is another reason why libraries are looking toward open source.)

Network Cloud. In theory the workflow of the user are in the network cloud and patrons will look for bibliographic resources inside the cloud. Have yet to stumble across a Worldcat record in my workflow on the internet. Amazon? Yes. IMDB? Yes, but WorldCat? No.

This is not boots on the ground standing in the library looking for a book. OCLC was very abstract in their focus on outcome and how Worldcat local might be used.

What WorldCAT local did encourage was a huge increase in ILL and reciprocal borrowing.

If you look at the Group Catalog in FEL, this is a pretty homely interface. There is no static URL. You cannot google it. It is the old FirstSearch interface. There is no relevance ranking. You don't see the results you would expect on the first page.

However, the click through traffic from WorldCat.org to local libraries, even with an ugly interface that no one can find, is impressive. In its own way, it has produced a ripple effect into library usage even without user participation. WorldCat.org is an interesting trend of using a national bibliographic resource to push people to their local library.

Madaus: OCLC's thinking has been the reverse of starting local. With OCLC you can put records in, but you cannot easily take them out. Nobody at OCLC will give you a % error rate for representing local holdings accurately because they do not have a way to do maintenance. Libraries have to delete records one at a time.

Beth pointed out that the effort at maintenance is in the local OPAC. If you want to display accurate results to patrons you have to start with the local OPAC. That is one of the issues with WorldCat Local.

Click through from WorldCAT.org to local libraries really increased in January. That's when OCLC went to IP authentication for Worldcat.org. Now, Worldcat.org can tell where a patron is located in Florida based on the users IP address. Worldcat.org will display holdings based upon libraries that are located closest to the user. A user can see libraries in their neighborhood that own the book and can go and get it. It is a lower barrier of access for the patron. .

OCLC still does not have an OPEN URL Link resolver as they have promised.

McClintock: To a certain extent we have been debating the union catalog vs lots of distributed local catalogs. To leverage what Beth is saying I do believe in a unified presence for libraries. Without it, we do not have a commanding presence on the Web. We'll never have it with a distributed approach. We need a site that says, this is who we are. What OCLC is doing might get us there. Certainly what Bibliocommons is doing has great potential.

Also, the nature of Florida library service is changing owing to higher population density. As Florida grows and is more mobile it will be more common that users may live in one county and work in another. They may pass 3 or 4 libraries on the way to work. They want to stop in and get the book they want on the way home. They don't care about the jurisdictional issues that local governments deal with. They want the book that they found on WorldCat.org and they see it in what they consider to be their neighborhood.

At the end of the day, the message that Karen brings here to us is that library systems as they are today do not respond to the way people today go to the Web to find information. We have big systems that don't do what users need to be done. Google, Amazon, they are all way ahead of libraries on Web 2.0 features that include community building, participatory learning, partnerships, feedback loops, social networking. Libraries do not have the technology or the skills to implement.

Flynn. An important service that Florida residents want is the ability to link the bibliographic database to some sort of delivery mechanism that allow users to use the Web to discover that the book exists, then to request the book online, and have it delivered to them so that they can get their hands on it in a convenient manner.

Callahan: Palm Beach County circulated over 7 million items last year with only 12,000 ILL transactions. We're spending a lot of funding on building this database and services around it such as ILL. It benefits a very small number of people.

Hodel: ILL has a very high unit cost. I want to give value to tax payers. We have 9 million transactions every year. I want our value distributed across a much broader group. Right now we provide a books-by-mail service to our own patrons directly to their door for \$1.65 per item. If you can bring the ILL costs down to something like that I would listen. The Labor costs are the most expensive. We are trying to control the costs to make it work.

Brown: In Pinellas County, we've been on 6 or 7 different servers in the one county, Collections are spread across many databases. We are finally going to be on one database server with all of the collections in one place. They are moving away from this resource sharing model which was using first AlleyCat and then iBorrow. The directors' theory, is that once the entire holdings are seen in one place at one time, once the whole county can be viewed in a single database, 80% will be served from the county; there won't be a need to go out of county to do resource sharing as they have been doing. For the first time they will be able to see everything that everybody else has. Once that becomes a reality it will be interesting to see if that is true. We were heavy users of AlleyCat and iBorrow because it was easier to see what was in Pasco, Hillsborough or other counties than what was down the street. iBorrow allows users to see what was in Pasco and other areas when they could not see all of Pinellas in one place. It also allows for sharing within Pinellas.

Brown. It will be an interesting dynamic. I'm not saying that we should not have a central catalog, but maybe but maybe it needs to be within the WorldCat.org model rather than a separate catalog.

Callahan. The discouraging thing is that OCLC is the big kid on the block, and they are doing the R&D, and it appears that all they are trying to do is tweak the existing catalog with WorldCat local. They are not doing anything radically different. We don't see anything coming out of OCLC that looks at resource sharing in a different way. All of the innovation is coming from somewhere else.

Schneider. Why couldn't we use an Open Source product like Evergreen as Georgia is doing? Wouldn't have to put records in OCLC, we would have a statewide database. People could say what they share or not.

McClintock: ILS Systems are good for database management, but not good for providing innovation for discovery, exposure tools, social networking, patron contributions like tagging, reviews, etc.

Brown. Isn't one of the problems in Florida is that we have so many networks, consortium, etc.? We do not have enough funding to start over with so many disparate systems. Georgia had one system for the whole public library community and was top down.

McClintock: Only libraries outside of the big urban systems, like Atlanta, Fulton county, Cobb county, etc. participate in the state-wide system. They are struggling now to find a way to bring the bigger counties into this new Evergreen system.

McClintock: Is the Florida UNION Catalog something you want to use. Is it a resource sharing tool, or a discovery tool? Do you want to move books around the state, or encourage a highly mobile population to be able to get what they need? Perhaps what is needed is a union catalog and the discovery and social networking tools that BiblioCommons offers. Bibliocommons can build the union catalog in different ways. It collects from ILS databases but can also use other sources of data. It collects the data daily and can generate updates, such as additions and deletions, overnight automatically. Just to think that OCLC can't batch delete from a Union Database in 2008 is just mind boggling. Their business model still relies on single transactions and the fees that they generate.

Madaus: OCLC has stated that it doesn't matter if your library's records are in the database and the holdings are wrong. The wrong record still exposes the existence of that title and the end user can find it somewhere else if you don't have it. The OCLC business model is dependent upon transaction based pricing.

Third Presentation:

Mark Flynn, State Library and Archives of Florida, and **Beth Farmer** of TBLC provided information about resource sharing in Florida.

Beth Farmer provided an overview of Statewide ILL using statistics provided by OCLC and the iBorrow system at TBLC and the courier delivery service administered by TBLC. (See attached statistical report).

Summary

- Over 365,000 lends during 2006-2007.
- 63% percent to other libraries in the state
- 37% went to libraries out of the state.

Beth also provided a status report on the iBorrow program at TBLC.

iBorrow handles more than 40,000 ILL transactions each year in the Tampa Bay area. Iborrow is based on the new release of the SirsiDynix resource sharing system called URSA.

In summarizing iBorrow Mark noted that if you make holdings known to the broad population via the Web, create a system to allow a patron to request materials easily, a system that automates the process while offering patrons the option of going to the library and picking it up and not waiting, you can increase the service dramatically, but also lower the cost to libraries and to the end user in terms of time and convenience.

Flynn shared usage statistics regarding shared licensed electronic resources with the Council. (See attached report).

Flynn stated that the usage stats for MetaLib SFX are not enough to warrant continuing our licensing this search engine. All of the full text is from Gale. If we were offering a more extensive array of full text from multiple vendors, we might see a different picture. The MetaLib/SFX product really works best with a lot of database sources. However, that is not the case. Gale currently has a new search engine that can provide access comparable to what MetaLib/SFX offers but without any additional licensing fees. Recurring cost for MetaLib/SFX and management of the system comes to about \$90,000. These are funds that could be repurposed to other programs or services within the FEL.

Review of Statewide Digital Collection initiatives.

Priscilla Caplan, Florida Center for Library Automation, discussed Florida related digital content created by Florida libraries involved in digitization programs. These programs are regarded as digital library collections rather than just digitization projects. Digital collections will include items that have been digitized but also materials that are born digital.

These are not necessarily what library directors think of as core collections. You may care about your digital collections, but not as much as you care about your OPAC or the electronic resources to which your library subscribes.

There are four main digital collection programs that are being funded by the FEL.

Florida on Florida

Florida On Florida is a catalog of digital materials related to Florida. It includes all sorts of items including maps, photographs, postcards, books, and manuscripts. The materials in Florida On Florida come from digital collections held by libraries, archives, museums and historical societies throughout Florida. Currently there are 19 contributors and 285,000 records included. FCLA sponsors quarterly harvest of participating collections. We have identified a lot of new potential contributors. There will be a new emphasis over the next year in bringing in additional digital collections.

Florida Voices.

This is brand new. It has not been released but will be in the next few months. Florida Voices is an initiative to support all types of libraries and cultural heritage organizations in Florida in initiating and maintaining digital oral history programs. The ultimate goals of the project are:

To develop an online digital archive of oral histories that give voice to Florida's diverse communities

To design and develop infrastructure to collect, store, preserve and provide access to oral histories

To collect and disseminate procedures, policies and best practices pertaining to oral history in Florida

As a first step towards meeting these goals, the Florida Electronic Library sponsored a set of deliverables for 2007/2008 that included:

- This Florida Voices website, which includes a detailed [guide](#) to oral history and a [directory](#) of oral history collections.
- A prototype collection of oral histories.
- Records for Florida oral histories in Florida on Florida.
- The workshop "Telling It Like It Was: Doing Oral History in the Digital Age," held in conjunction with the Florida Library Association 2007 conference.

Archives Florida.

This is a centralized searchable collection and part of the PALMM collaborative digital collections program. This is the result of an LSTA grant received by FCLA under the FEL Goal. The purpose is to provide training on how to create archival finding aids using the EAD standard. These finding aids are collected and housed as part of the Archives Florida database. The material described here are unique, but mostly not digitized. What is offered online is a finding aid to the collection so that at researchers can find out what material is contained in these collections. The workshops offered provided training to teach staff at historical archival repositories in Florida how to create finding aids that conform to the EAD standard. The workshops were very popular.

Florida Digital Newspaper Library

Hosted at the University of Florida it not only has digital newspapers from every county in the State, but it will ultimately accept contributions from any library digitizing Florida newspapers. This is in the process of being built but growing very quickly. There are currently 220 titles and 4,093 issues. We are building a big database of local Florida newspapers.

All told, there are four programs, but Florida on Florida is what ties them together. Metadata is collected from all four collections and contributed to Florida on Florida.

Flynn also noted that the State Library has undertaken an extensive program for capturing for State Documents that are born digital. Eventually, this metadata will be contributed to Florida on Florida as well.

Flynn spoke of the problem of Florida libraries who wish to do digitization projects but lack the technical knowledge or staff that would allow them to follow digitization guidelines and best practices for implementation. The goal of funding digitization at the State level is to get consistent data relating to Florida history that can be shared statewide. One way to do this is to change the model by which we offer grants for digitization. One idea is to set aside an amount of \$30,000 or \$40,000 as part of the FEL LSTA grant, and then solicit libraries that have analog collections that meet predefined criteria for digitization. The State Library would empanel a team of experts to go through a selection process and then provide support to the libraries selected for their digitization effort. Support would include more than funding, but also access to equipment and hands on assistance in implementing the digitization program. This may be an approach that could improve the level of contributions to Florida on Florida and increase the availability of digital resources about Florida.

Caplan then turned to Future Trends for digitization. What will influence digitization in the near future?

- The Googlization of Everything
- Aggregation of content
- Ubiquity of GIS
- Library 2.0
- Information behavior
- Digital curation

Trend No. 1: Googlization of Everything

Google is the elephant in the closet. It is problematic mostly because it's hard to figure out what it mean to "me" the individual, e.g. is this a form of transportation or will it step on me. What does it mean to have a big elephant in the closet?

We know that Google is digitization books from libraries and making them available either in full text or in snippets. That is massive. But it's difficult to see the implications. Does it mean we don't need to digitize books? Or we really do because it's not a good thing to privatize a public good. What about the books that Google does not own but we do?

Type a search term and you get everything there is. It's very complex to organize. The difference between Google books, Google Scholar and Enter a term and what can you expect to get back. Sometimes you get the whole book, sometimes only snippets. Some say, this is the worst thing to ever happen. When Google loses in court, we won't have fair use left.

Also, every time you go into Google Books you see a different set of books. However, take note, at the bottom of the screen you will see a note that says "Search library catalogs for ..." If you put in a search term it will take you to WorldCat.org where you are then presented with Florida holdings.

This is a way of leveraging the power of different systems together to do something really nice for the end user. This is a way to bring digital collections to Florida residents.

One approach that many libraries are seeking to leverage the power of Google is to find ways to get everything in Google. The State Library has insisted on Google site maps being created for everything digitize. This is part of the Google Public Sector program. (For more information go to <http://www.google.com/publicsector/>) A site map is a guide to the Google Web spider providing instructions on how to more effectively crawl sites that are database driven. It provides a guide to Google for better automated harvesting and indexing of content.

Does this always work for all digital content in all cases? Not especially. For example, FCLA has created a sitemap for everything in Florida on Florida, however if you search for photos of Hurricane Rita you get 3.5 million hits. The Florida on Florida Photograph is not in the first 10

pages, not in the last 10 pages. If you limit your search to Google images you get 98,000 pages. Google uses relevance ranking to display search results. Your digital item will be displayed based how many people have linked to this photograph. Metadata records in Florida on Florida are dynamically created. That means no one really links to this photograph. No one is likely to find this through Google. The lesson is, we also need to have our stuff in other places besides Google.

Madaus: Before you leave Google books, one of things that blew me away is the full-view downloadable pdf available from Google is almost up to 2 million volumes. Which means my laptop is number 103 in the ARL holdings list. How do we end up incorporating and using this shared resource in our processes in libraries and reference instruction and in our interaction with our users? This is a 2 million volume free downloadable collection. Special collections materials are there from Stanford, Michigan, NY Public, other major collections. That's a huge resource and how we can capture that in our normal search environment is a key element as we look at making things available. The Google Book one, I don't think we in Libraries comprehend what is in there and how vast it is, and oh by the way, it's not "search and locate," it's "find and deliver" because it's searching full text, it's searching inside the book.

Trend No. 2: Aggregation of Content

Florida on Florida is an aggregation of metadata. It is a union catalog. The trend now is away from aggregation of metadata to aggregation of content. When we were enamored of metasearch, your content could be distributed across a lot of targets sources. Now the thinking is you can build better services by the aggregation of content that you cannot do with just metadata. You cannot do a google like full text search unless you have the full text content.

The same people brought us the Open Archives Initiative (OAI) has come up with a new protocol called Object Exchange and Reuse or OAI-ORE. (For more information go to <http://www.openarchives.org/ore/>) It is a very Web friendly protocol for aggregating content. If ORE takes off, we will see harvested aggregation of content rather than harvested aggregation of metadata.

Trend No. 3: GPS/GIS

One of the things you can do with content is a mash up between GPS and GIS data. A few years ago, you had to use a very expensive unit in your car if you wanted GPS navigation. Now, they are very affordable and included as standard. You can get a good system for a few hundred dollars. So, GPS is now all over. Even dog collars have GPS technology so if your dog is lost you can get the coordinates over the Web and go get your dog.

Combining GPS with GIS or any data you have you get a great ability to map stuff. A good example is the way avian flu is being traced. You can find maps that re updated monthly showing the Density of poultry where you live. You can tell how many chickens are in your neighborhood. Another map shows the spread of avian flu across the world.

Florida digital collections are inherently tied to geography. The ability to go from a digital collection to satellite maps via Google is something that we will see and expect in the near future.

Trend no. 4: Web 2.0 – the interactive Web.

It's shorthand for a lot of technologies. Basic idea of a social Web is to provide an ability to build community around our digital collections. It is the expectation of users. Libraries are trying to implement these technologies and find out what is useful for allowing end users to discover digital objects in new ways.

A good example is the Library of Congress using Flickr to post historic photographs. This has become extremely popular. The photos generate comments and lots of comments. Exposing photos to the public can generate information that can elucidate and enhance our use of the digital images. One good use of Web 2.0 technology is a very simple one. Put content where the users are. If the users are on Flickr or Youtube, put your media in these locations. In any case, making your digital collections known in many venues is definitely a trend that we should follow.

Trend no. 5: Information behavior of the Google Generation.

A very interesting report commissioned by the British Library is called "Information Behavior of the Researcher of the Future."

(<http://www.jisc.ac.uk/media/documents/programmes/reppres/ggworkpackagei.pdf>) It is a study of the information seeking behavior of the Google generation. These are kids born after 1992 who don't remember life before the Web. One finding that jumps out is that the Google generation is as bad at searching for information as all prior generations. Younger children put in a couple of terms for exactly what they want, if they don't find it, that's it, they give up. They do not try other words. Other searchers, tend to click around and explore. They will do a search, click on results, download without reading, then move on and search more. Do they ever go back to look at the results? This we don't know. But they do download and they do not read extensive content online. If you're putting digital materials up online, they better be downloadable. This has implications for the use of eBooks and other large digital objects.

Trend no. 6: the Concept of Digital Curation in Libraries and other Cultural Institutions.

Within a lifecycle framework, digital curation involves a series of technical, intellectual, and managerial activities in support of stewardship for digitized or born digital information assets. Reformatting resources into digital objects is just one part. The concept of digital curation seeks to manage digital assets for long-term persistent access. We have been focusing in Florida on creating and providing access to our digital collections. We need to give greater thought to long term usability of digital collections. Building collections happens now, but curation goes on over time. It includes continued efforts to add value by adding links, adding annotations, allowing users to supply enhanced content, making the collections available across platforms and used in mash-ups. There's a whole literature on digital curation. It's been more dominant in the UK. It's becoming more important in the US.

Fourth Presentation:

Diana Sachs-Silveira, Tampa Bay Library Consortium, provided an update on **the Ask a Library virtual reference cooperative**. Florida's Ask-a-Librarian services bring virtual reference to users via the Internet. The "Ask a Librarian" annual report completed for this grant year was distributed. Below are a breakdown of statistics and other items discussed:

Since the start of the program there has been a 94% increase in Ask-a-Librarian services. The service is currently growing at a rate of 15% per year.

In the next year, the program will be evaluating the software that is currently being used to deliver virtual reference services. There have been a number of software releases since the start of the program that have led to an improvement in the users experience and fewer dropped calls.

The Ask A Librarian program recently completed a Community college campaign which was successful. It led to an 11% increase in community colleges participation.

University of Florida and other larger libraries have recently joined the program. In September the *Ask a Librarian* service introduced an academic desk to better serve large academic libraries and their clients.

The program has also added staffing and increased the hours open for service. With the introduction of *AskALibrarian Mobile*, the service is now optimized for PDAs and other handheld computing devices.

Current marketing efforts are directed at becoming better known in the social networking world including *Myspace* and *Facebook*. To highlight the program to high school students Ask a Librarian is sponsoring a video contest as a method of developing a 30-second video product that can uploaded to *YouTube.com*. (See <http://www.tbcl.org/aal/directorschair/index.shtml>)

Diana mentioned that they present three awards a month to librarians for their effort in *Ask a Librarian*. Diana mentioned that they have questions about the software, but they are continuing the training.

Evaluation and the next FEL Plan.

Chuck McClure, Information Use Management and Policy Institute, Florida State University.

The Institute has been working for the first 5 years to assure that we have gathered data needed to evaluate the FEL program and to show its impact on Florida residents. The Institute used these measures and methods to provide the Five year evaluation study that was provided to IMLS as part of the requirements of LSTA. (See:

With Web 2.0 we are dealing with drastic changes in evaluation that we have not encountered before. If the FEL seeks to implement goals that include Web 2.0 it will necessitate new techniques.

In Web 2.0 environment, there are really not evaluation goals and objectives in a socially dynamic environment where individuals select their own services based on their own needs and data is contributed by users.

Penetration measures. What % of the total population is really using a service like Ask a Librarian. But what constitutes a session with a teenager in a blog, or contributing a review, or tagging data. The activity is dynamic and specific to the individual.

Measures are activated by the user in a dynamic environment individually driven. Outcome measures don't work in this kind of environment. Outcomes measure change in attitude, behavior, knowledge, skills. What change happened for one person specifically on a Web 2.0 site and did that change have a measurable outcome.

Richard raised the issue of comparability issues. How do we make comparative measures across Web 2.0 environment? How do you compare the impact of different Web 2.0 applications? How to separate the technology and the system that is driving the application from how well people learn from their interaction with the system? How do we compare, for example, the North Carolina system to the FEL? It's almost impossible to make any meaningful assessment.

The measures in this new environment are really guestimates. We're entering a brave new world in network evaluation. Can we realistically come up with meaningful measures that will help us improve our Web based services?

As we move the FEL forward into a new range of applications, many of the things Beth talked about, the ways we have to think about evaluation has to change as well. And the practice is way out in front of the theory on how to do it.

We need to consider what kind of measures and statistics will go with the next five year plan. As we move more into the social networking, participatory, dynamic environments, we need different kinds of counts and measures for success.

Six different categories of measures have been used by the FEL. For the most part, they measure system generated outputs. However, in participatory networks, success indicators are no longer just reflected by system generated outputs like the number of searches, page views, etc. What needs to be measured now has shifted to the question of “what can a user do now that they are engaged in using the FEL, a database, a digital collections, Ask a Librarian, etc.” You cannot get at this without interviewing the users and get behind the bar charts and graphs that plot outputs.

McClure asked for input from the FLNC regarding what new measures need to be considered. A good mix of statistics and anecdotal information is useful. The only way to convey user impact is through “stories” collected through talking to users. You’ve got to have the statistics too. But it’s not enough.

Hodel: Being able to shape the user population by using demographic data is important too, e.g. how many home-schoolers do you serve? How many seniors in the home? What are the different ways to view your community that are needed to show the reach and impact of your programs to your funders?

McClure: And better yet if you can tie together the anecdotal data with the demographic data. To find evaluation approaches that move beyond just data is where we need to get in the next plan. There are basic statistical data that are necessary to prove your case, but it’s important to remember that data alone cannot get more funding. It’s not the same as persuasion through promotion and advertising, or political knowledge of how to get support for programs through advocacy. But it can measure how well we are taking care of people who use our services and that is important to know. That is basic. The traditional reasons for doing evaluation are still there. We have to report to IMLS regarding why x amount of money went into this program and what was the impact.

We need feedback regarding how well evaluation has served the program and what new measures and techniques need to be introduced that are appropriate for the next five year plan.

The FLNC adjourned at 5:00 pm.

Day Two: January 30, 2008.

Pat McClintock, RMG consultants, facilitated a discussion and review of main components of the Florida Electronic Library and the trends and conditions discussed on the first day. A summary of this review and discussion is included in the final consulting report "*Strategic Goals for the Florida Electronic Library*" (August 2008).