Minutes of the MARINet Board of Directors' Retreat Meeting
February 3, 2005   9:30 a.m. – 4:30 p.m.
China Cabin, 52 Beach Road, Belvedere, CA 94920

Board Members Present: Sara Loyster, San Anselmo
Cathy Blumberg, Mill Valley
Mary Richardson, Sausalito
Frances Gordon, Larkspur
David Dodd, San Rafael
Carol Starr, Marin County Free Library
Deborah Mazzolini, Belvedere-Tiburon

Also Present: Deb Moehrke, MARINet System Administrator

I. **Public Comment Period:** No public present

II. **An opportunity for any citizen to address the MARINet Board on any MARINet matter. Please limit statements to 3 minutes**. No citizens present

III. **Introduction of any guests:** No guests present

IV. Additions to the agenda (This agenda is not final. Board members may add to the agenda up to the date of the meeting.)

V. **Retreat Business**
   A. Review of Board Goals for 2004-2005:
   The Board discussed the status of MARINet Goals (FY 04/05)
   Goal #1: Deb reported that improvements to the web page is moving along toward a consistent design.
   Goals#2: Deb reported that some work has been done on standardizing MARINet's policy and procedure manual. Improvement has been slow due to time constraints and trying to simultaneously work on several projects at once. Deb stated that she has had to pull Phil away from this goal to help with other tasks, and that it's very difficult to get the committee to agree on standard procedures.
   Goal#3: The Board agreed that they had accomplished the goal of developing/implementing the Ecommerce module.
   Goal#4: Deb reported that the PSC is just getting started on exploring meta-search engines (Metafind & WebFeat Knowledge Prism). She reported on the difficulties in setting up a trial and felt there was a serious need for appropriate customization of the product to ensure that MARINet can efficiently maintain it.
   Goal#5: Deb reported that work will begin on this goal after the new Web Opac interface goes live. There will be an ongoing challenge to keep the Spanish version in sync with the English language version as changes to the web pages are frequent. Deb stated that perhaps MARINet will be in beta-testing for this interface by the end of 2005. Carol expressed her concern over the progress on the Spanish interface, and didn't want it to get lost behind the work on other goals.
   Goal#6: Deb reported that MARINet has been successful in providing appropriate training as needed. Phil has made good use of Raindance to do web training for small groups. Deb stated that Phil would like the version that allows group training, but it is very expensive.
   The Board agreed that work on some of the goals will be ongoing.

   B. Consultants' Report, July 30, 2001: MARINet Network Assessment: Review and Discussion:
      The Board discussed various aspects of the consultants' report and addressed certain questions:
      Personnel:
      - #2– is this still true and do we need this (Carol);
      - standardized procedures need to be created for weekend trouble-shooting (Debbie);
      - update the calling tree (Deb volunteered Phil to update the);

- #3 should remain the same – The Board agreed to establish some form of protocol for library staff to contact MARINet staff (the who, what, when and why) to ensure that questions are routed through the MARINet office most efficiently.
- There is a need to develop in-house procedures for having staff questions answered by MARINet (Debbie);
- Deb and Phil's responsibility is for documentation for the staff and the libraries are responsible for producing training and documentation for the public (Debbie);
- Why not contract a web page consultant as needed to take the workload off Deb (Cathy);
- Beth is being trained to help maintain the web OPAC (Deb)
- The Board recommended that Deb should communicate any time management problems to either the Board or the Executive Committee and to ask for clarification on priority assignments and additional requests.
- #5 – Carol reported that the County is studying the System Support Analyst positions this year. It was recommended that a market survey on Bay Area salaries be conducted for the position of System Administrator (Carol); David Dodd agreed to do this survey including both a look at salary and benefits to be completed by Feb. 28th .
- #6 has been accomplished through I.U.G. meetings;

Committees:
- #1 – the Board agreed that they have done a great job in "cultivating communications with committees";
- it was recommended that the Board discuss these goals at the September meeting with the committee chairs (Carol);
- the Board agreed that the committees should be reminded to provide multiple options and their pros and cons when they make recommendations to the Board;
- it was recommended that the Board rewrite the charge for the PSC Committee to ensure clarification (Carol);

Innovative Interfaces System Issues:
The Board discussed a variety of issues facing MARINet in the future:
- they must be proactive in evaluating other library systems;
- keep abreast of the changes with Innovative and investigate formal ways to stay current with technology innovation;
- Define a common set of core services for MARINet and develop a way to move beyond core services, including assessing financial implications;
- Remove goal #7 (Debbie)
- The Board should keep #8 in mind when developing new goals (Deb)
- Develop policies for expenditures from the Sinking Fund (Carol);

Conclusions:
- The Board should embrace a variety of opinions and members shouldn't be worried to speak their mind – disagreement works to support improvement (Sara & Mary);
- The Board should evaluate old policy on how the current JPA (now 7 members) makes decisions and possibly add some amendments.

C. **Setting Priorities for MARINet staff:**
   Highlights from previous discussion:
   - Encourage Deb to communicate any time management problems and to ask for clarification on priority assignments;
   - Major assignments are a top priority;
   - There was a discussion of the committee structure and possibly creating ad hoc committees or working groups around areas of interest such as marketing. The Board will discuss this idea further at a future Board meeting.

D. **Decision making and communications, including**
   a. **Waldo:**

The Board discussed several options of how to restructure the committees and their decision making process because the current use of Waldo to conduct Board and Committee business violates the Brown Act.

b. MARINet Committee structure
The Board made the following recommendations:
- Waldo communication is cancelled;
- Committees will be advised to form subcommittees consisting of fewer members than a quorum (less than half the committee members);
- Subcommittees may work together via email to accomplish their tasks and draft documents (documents may be distributed along with the agenda but should only be discussed at the regular meetings with all the members);
- For next Fiscal Year the committee meeting schedule will return to six meetings a year.
- Deb will notify all committees via M.U.D. regarding canceling Waldo and new committee meeting schedule and structure.

Break for Lunch 12:30 – 1:30
Morning Session – Minutes by Frances Gordon

MARINet Board Retreat Feb. 3, 2005
Afternoon Session – Minutes by Carol Starr

E. Budget Review for 2005/2006

a. OCLC World Cat: Deb handed out email from Paul Cappuzzello/OCLC and figures that explained the costs for either Open World Cat Option or Group Services Option. Paul explained that while normally they would charge for each jurisdiction symbol, he would make a special deal for MARINet to use all 7 jurisdictional symbols and only charge us for one (and this on-going, not just the initial input).

Open World Cat option would give us access to First Search Account for Open World. We would wipe out all our current (old) holdings in OCLC and input all current data as new. Then on a regular basis, we would batch load new records and delete records that we had discarded. This would require us to figure out a way to track our discards, so we could discard one jurisdiction's title without others.

Group Service option would provide First Search (same as above) and also provide us with unlimited cataloging and ILL OCLC services. This would allow each jurisdiction to delete titles, daily, from OCLC, as they made delete decisions.   The annual cost increases would be a flat 4% (hence not based on usage). We would have a 3-year contract, but need only to commit to one year. Although it is about twice as expensive, it would offset all other OCLC charges that some library jurisdictions currently make.

Open World Cat is no longer a pilot project, and is available on Yahoo and Google now. Since this would be an on-going expense, it is not a cost that we should take from our Sinking Fund.

The Board will ask the Bib Standards Committee to take a look at both OCLC options and how our current cataloging practices would have to change and make a recommendation in 05/06 for a possible purchase for 06/07. The Board discussed that taking the Group Services option might be a good idea, but those smaller libraries (not currently using OCLC for any cataloging services) would have to make changes in how they catalog. It is possible that the costs of how they are cataloging could be eliminated, but the cost comparisons need to be further studied, along with the concept of all jurisdictions moving to OCLC for cataloging. Or alternatively, perhaps it is time to study the idea of doing some kind of centralized cataloging for special items, and have local libraries only do copying cataloging.

b. New Server: we do not need a new server in 2005/2006, since Innovative repartitioned our existing server and it will work for at least another release. We may need a new server in 06/07. Deb told us that III charges in the neighborhood of $30-40,000 for a new server, installation and maintenance. While this is a very high figure for a server, we need to purchase it through III, so we can be assured that they will take responsibility for making it work.

c. Web Bridge: cost about $17,500 and is a context sensitive help tool. A customer in the catalog doing a search would get context sensitive "see also" type of prompts depending on what we would put into background prompts to make this happen. The Board decided that we were not interested in this product at this time.

d. Meta Search products: MetaFind is the III single search tool. Deb did not have a price quote (III has not gotten back to her yet on her request for a price quote) but thought it would be in the $17,500 range, similar to Web Bridge. The Board is interested in providing a single search tool, either III's MetaFind or perhaps WebFeat, a competing product used by SFPL. The Board will ask our Public Services Committee to look at these products and make a recommendation for purchase in 2005/2006. The cost will come from our sinking fund.

e. Mobile Collections: only the Marin County Free Library is interested in this tool. It was agreed by the Board that the County could purchase this module, and that MARINet would install it; the consortium would pick up the maintenance costs after the first year. It was clarified that if any other library jurisdiction wanted to use this module, after it is installed, they will negotiate with MCFL and pay them a fair share of the purchase price.

F. Web Page Discussion: Deb will check on Cathy's concern about how the wording is made on copies available, so that it would say something like "12 copies available" rather than 1 copy available in Sausalito (for example) and user has to scroll down to find out, on subsequent pages, that there are really 11 other copies available in other libraries, including Mill Valley.

Carol asked about ADA issues with the new web design and Deb said that the new design passed without any Bobbie Hats (hats are the serious problems), but there were other things Bobbie suggested needing changes. Deb said the alternative text tag problem had been resolved.

Deb will get the buttons to match for consistency before the new web page is put out on Feb. 14. The new functionality is

1. Ecommerce
2. Expanded use of the Partners module
3. My Reading History
4. limits to Available

The Board had a lengthy discussion about the partners button locations again. Cathy agreed to email the Board with the Ten Good Things About the New Catalog Coming that Allen Testa had created for their library. The Board discussed that we should just put the new design out and hire a web designer, perhaps using the one used part time by Mill Valley, to work part time on improving specific things we could contract out for. The Board was concerned that by having Deb do all the design work, she is unable to focus on other important tasks.

In the end, it was decided to go with what we have now, putting Supersearch and Partner buttons at the top (and bottom), to ask for an enhancement request that would allow us to only have this at the bottom of the screen, to use a consultant next year to make web design changes, and to proactively gather customer input on our new web design.

G. Shared Services and Interests:
a. Electronic access to existing magazine subscriptions through WAM: after an explanation about how dicey this really is, it was decided to abandon all thoughts of adding this to our catalog.
b. Entrepreneurial use of MARInet page: we are interested in exploring this issue. Carol moved, and David seconded, that we direct Deb to move forward with contacting both Amazon.com and Barnes and Noble.com to put links to them on our webpage and reap whatever income would derive from that for the MARINet coffers. The Board passed this motion.
c. Shared Databases: we need to figure out a way to support our customers using Overdrive. Sarah H from MCFL offered to be the contact person, and Carol (reluctantly) agreed to let her do this for right now. Carol is concerned about the time and costs for doing this for the system and reminded the Board that while our cataloger does the Library Authority work for MARINet, MCFL is compensated for his time. Depending on how much effort this might be for Sarah, Carol would like similar compensation. Even so, if this develops into a significant workload for Sarah (doing this task takes her away from her

assigned duties), Carol was reluctant to say that Sarah would take this task on as a regular assignment. It was agreed that each library jurisdiction would identify a person in their library to whom their customers would be referred. There was a concern about Overdrive training. This issue will be discussed at the February Board meeting. The test site is out and available for staff right now and that, so far, is the training available. The Quick Start Help Guide tells you how to use it. Deb will send out this link to each staff and we will decide when to put out Overdrive at our February Board meeting.

Meeting adjourned at 4:30 pm.