



UPPER HUDSON LIBRARY SYSTEM

Together. For Better Libraries.

Directors' Association
February 2, 2016

✓	APLM - Scott Jarzombek
✓	ALTM - Joseph Burke
	BRLN - Sharon Vogel
✓	BERN - Judy Petrosillo
✓	BETH - Geoffrey Kirkpatrick
✓	BRUN - Natalie Schipano
✓	CAST - Melissa Tacke
✓	COHS - Matt Graff
	COLN - Evelyn Neale
✓	EGRN - Jill Dugas Hughes
	GRAF - Veronica Tatro
	GUIL - Tim Wiles
✓	HOOF - Carol Gaillard
✓	MEND - Lenny Zapala
	NASS - Laureenne Teachout
✓	NGRN - Daryl McCarthy

	PTRB - Sharon Hodges
✓	POES - Margie Morris
✓	RCSC - Judith Wines
✓	RENS - Jane Chirgwin
	RVLL - Kim Graff
✓	SNLK - Melinda Fowler
✓	SCHG - Nick Matulis
	STEP - Laureenne Teachout
	TROY - Paul Hicok
	VAFI - Kelly Akin
✓	VOOR - Tracy Pause (guest)
	WTVT - Samantha Fagan
✓	WSTR - Sue Hoadley
✓	UHLS - Tim Burke

9:07 AM - Meeting called to order by S. Hoadley, President. She noted the attendance of Tracy Pause, Assistant Director at VOOR in place of G. Sacco.

I. MINUTES

MOTION: L. Zapala moved to accept the December 4, 2015 Minutes as presented. J. Petrosillo seconded. Unanimous. (There was no January 2016 meeting)

II. REPORTS

Executive Director's Report - T. Burke highlighted features in his report:

- SIERRA: the migration is officially over and UHLS is now on client support services.
- TEXT MESSAGING: System-wide text notifications will soon be available through Sierra. As the time gets closer, J. Thornton will send out complete details. The patron education part of this process will be primarily the responsibility of the libraries.
- III HOSTING: III hosting services for UHLS will be moving to Syracuse in the near future. This should help to alleviate some of the slow response time problems and the slow start up time as well.
- ADVOCACY: The library funding in the Governor's budget is the same as in 2015 - again in line with education funding. NYLA and other library organizations are seeking an increase in the Construction Fund allocation. The Construction Grant guidelines have been modified to allow for the inclusion of projects related to broadband connectivity. Advocacy Day is March 2, 2016.
- NOTICES: G. Kirkpatrick pointed out that there is a serious problem when the notices aren't sent as they should be. He suggested that UHLS should have some means of checking several times a day to make sure that the notices are sent correctly.
- HOLDS: N. Schipano noted that there is still a problem with expired holds. Also, due to Sierra slowness, she has to go into the library ½ an hour before her staff in order to turn on the computers and get them ready to work on.

UHLS Board and Finance Committee - J. Wines

- Rockefeller Institute Board Assessment Project has been approved and will start soon. T. Burke noted that if there are any ideas that come from this that are applicable to Library Boards, UHLS will share them.
- Finance Committee: nothing unusual

UHLS Administration Committee - M. Graff No meeting, no report

UHLS Services Committee - S. Jarzombek No meeting, however he noted that the Annual Awards criteria had been sent to Committee members for their review and he will be encouraging all of the member libraries to submit nominations for the various Annual Awards. There are several valuable outcomes to an Award submission: acknowledgment of the work by the staff and bringing one of the Library's best programs to the attention of the Library Board.

eContent Advisory Committee - J. Wines

- She encouraged the libraries to buy frequently rather than wait until year end to spend their econtent allocation. Frequent purchasing, even small amounts, will help to keep the material current and offer patrons new content during the whole year.
- T. Burke noted the Deanna DiCarlo is always willing to help the libraries make choices and spend their money on econtent. But UHLS really wants libraries to “learn to fish” for themselves, so please contact Deanna to provide the training at your library.
- The Committee is working on updating the selection guidelines.
- G. Kirkpatrick noted a 20% increase in econtent use at BETH.
- Anne Pitlyk (UHLS staff) is developing charts for the individual libraries to show the econtent use statistics for each library.

Ad Hoc Reports and Statistics Committee - S. Jarzombek

- The Committee will be recommending Decision Center as the program to be used in creating statistical reports from Sierra.
- Next meeting: February 22nd at 9:15 AM.

III. OLD BUSINESS

- The CE Program following this meeting will begin at 11:00 AM. “The Politics of Library Advocacy” presented by Jeremy Johannesen and Mike Neppl of NYLA.

IV. NEW BUSINESS

- eContent Advisory Committee: M. Tacke has volunteered to serve as a small library representative on the Committee.

MOTION: L. Zapala moved to appoint M. Tacke to the eContent Advisory Committee. C. Gaillard seconded. Unanimous.

- Resource Sharing and Local Request Restrictions

T. Burke noted that both RCS and APLM have asked UHLS to implement Local Request restrictions for some of their items. He wanted to bring this up as a topic for discussion in order to examine whether this would have any ramifications or impact on resource sharing and customer service at other libraries.

J. Wines noted that RCS took a non-requestable DVD collection and made it Local Request. This has no impact on other patrons’ ability to borrow the item since it was not available for request to patrons outside her library anyway. It has increased circulation WITHIN her library because it is now more accessible to her patrons.

Discussion about the philosophy behind making items Local Request: it helps to ensure that there are new items on a library’s shelves for patrons who browse through the new holdings and helps to enhance a library’s reputation for having the most recent and up-to-date materials.

S. Jarzombek noted that APL is trying this as an experiment to see if they can increase circulation and satisfy user demand. He also noted that although copies of a bestseller will be Local Request within the Albany Public network, there will also be one copy for each APL

location that will be available for request throughout the entire System. APL is trying this in response to a users survey where people noted that the library did not have the newest material available for browsers. Hopefully this experiment will attract new users by making new materials more available and will bring back former users. He felt that it was important to gain new users from browsers. He wanted them to be able to walk into the Library and see that the latest bestsellers, etc. were available.

Further discussion. Local Request is an attempt to keep copies of the newest material available for a library's local patrons. There was no set time limit among the libraries for ending Local Request and making the items available to all UHLAN users. Several people indicated that they stopped Local Request when it appeared that circulation of a specific item had slowed considerably among their patrons and the owning library was now free to make it requestable by all.

J. Dugas Hughes suggested that whatever one library in the System decided to do, it would generally affect all of the libraries and perhaps there should be some agreed-upon guidelines for Local Request time periods. (Smiles all around at the suggestion of "standards." She is new.....)

J. Wines asked if it might be possible for J. Thornton to run a report that would show local request or non-requestable items that haven't circulated within a certain time period - this might help people in determining when to remove the Local Request restrictions.

Discussion. Consensus that the libraries want to share as much as possible. However, there is also the consideration of having materials available for local patrons who are generally the ones paying the taxes, etc. that fund the library.

G. Kirkpatrick noted that at BETH, they want to share as much as they can. However, he would consider restricting requests from patrons in libraries that were not willing to reciprocate and open their collections. He also noted that he realized that the "open and available" philosophy regarding new items was very often affected by the financial reality in the libraries.

L Zapala noted that the smaller libraries did not need agreed-upon guidelines for a Local Request time period. They can usually handle "turning off" the Local Request designation on an item-by-item basis since they were more familiar with their collection use. M. Morris agreed that Local Request was a useful tool for smaller libraries because it allowed them to keep the newest items available to their local patrons.

N. Matulis agreed that hard and fast rules regarding a Local Request time period were not necessary for everyone because use is not the same in all of the libraries. He valued the collective but was also aware of the use and needs of his own users.

M. Fowler asked what type of items were generally non-requestable or Local Request and for how long did they keep that designation: DVDs and new fiction were the items for which libraries typically use Local Request. There did not seem to be a standard time period. Again, it was noted that in the smaller libraries, this time period can change depending on patron use.

J. Wines suggested that it might be useful to compare the circulation patterns of ebooks to that of printed materials since ebooks are freely shared across the entire System.

S. Jarzombek reiterated that he wanted to work with all of the member libraries, but had to respond first to the needs and sentiments of the APL users.

- *eContent Advisory Committee charge*: Currently there are 7 specific members on the Committee with the option of 1-4 at-large-members. G. Sacco was concerned about the Charge to the Committee and sent an email with some suggested changes including : *It (the Committee) works in a collaborative fashion with the Central Library. The Committee develops selection procedures and guidelines and reviews them annually. These guidelines may include purchase models, formats, and best practices for online platforms.* Discussion. Consensus to acknowledge G. Sacco's suggestion but that there was no need to add the (italicized) words since they were implicit in the charge as it now stands.

MOTION:

M. Tacke moved to adjourn the meeting. J. Petrosillo seconded. Unanimous. Meeting adjourned at 10:45 AM.

Next meeting: Friday, March 4, 2016 at 9:00 AM

Heidi A. Fuge
2/8/16