

**Statewide Database Licensing Advisory Committee  
Sept. 3, 2008 10:00 AM – 3:00 PM**

**Members Present:** Wylie Ackerman, Victoria Ertfelt, Tony Greiner, Greg Doyle, Mary Finnegan, Dolores Judkins, Linda Weight,

**OSL Staff:** MaryKay Dahlgreen, Darci Hanning, Jim Scheppke, Mary Mayberry

**Guests:** Deena Coleman, Caleb Tucker-Raymond, Cindy Gibbon

**Introductions and Agenda Review-**

Denna Coleman, from the DAS State Procurement Office (SPO) was introduced to the group.

**Review Minutes of 8/11/08 Meeting and Approve-**

Linda Weight moved that the minutes be approved, Dolores Judkins seconded; the minutes of the Aug. 11, 2008 meeting were approved.

**CONTINUING BUSINESS**

**Clarify role of SDLAC members and evaluators in proposal evaluation process-**

We need to send our draft of the RFP to Deena at SPO so she can develop a draft statement of work that can then be send to DOJ for their approval. The RFP can then be finalized and a schedule created. The RFP needs to be out for a minimum of 14 days. It may be possible to have the RFP out by Dec. 1. The evaluation period will be 30 days. SPO staff, Denna, represent the State Library as we move through the RFP process. Based on criteria outlined in RFP, SDLAC makes the decision about which vendor to contract with; Denna may facilitate/negotiate dealings with vendors. Negotiations must be with the highest scorer, not necessarily the lowest bidder. All criteria must be documented, especially for the first round of competition. Optional choices (interviews or presentations) have to be documented as wanted in the RFP, even if not ultimately used. What Denna needs for her part in this process: statement of work, list of mandatory requirements and options and how we will decide which vendor to pick, including things that *may* be used for evaluation. DAS then creates the RFP.

### **Finalize General Periodicals Database RFP-**

The group reviewed the draft RFP one last time, Darci will make changes, we will send to Deena who will begin the process of crafting the RFP.

### **Activities and timeline review-**

Denna suggests a pre-proposal conference after RFP. Once the RFP is created we can finalize the timeline.

### **Proposal evaluation criteria-**

To facilitate the creation of evaluation criteria, each committee member was asked to take part of the current document and suggest evaluation criteria for that part. Assignments are:

Victoria – 1<sup>st</sup> 2  
Dolores – 3.3  
Mary F. - 3.4  
Darci - 3.5  
Greg - 3.6  
Wylie - .6x  
Transition - Tony  
Tony - 3.7  
Dolores - 3.8 3.9  
Darci – 3.9  
Linda – 3.10, 3.11, 3.12  
Tony - 3.13.  
Victoria - 3.14, 3.15  
Darci/Wylie - 3.16

Comments to be emailed to Darci.

### **Agenda for next meeting:**

RFP draft (if Deena is able to get to it before the meeting)  
Discuss scoring criteria and method  
Changes to make to external reviewers questions  
L-net presentation to LSTA Council-Report

### **NEW BUSINESS**

#### **L-Net cost share proposal presentation-**

Caleb Tucker-Raymond came to talk about L-net, which is currently funded with LSTA money. The State Library Board has requested cost

sharing for L-net by Oregon libraries and he's getting feedback on the proposal to take back to the Board. L-net administrators (MCL) and the L-net Advisory Committee created a proposal that Oregon libraries each pay a portion of the L-net costs up to 50% over a number of years. Library payment for L-net would be calculated and collected on the same timeframe and structure as the databases. Payment for L-Net would ensure access to SDLP databases. Caleb asked for feedback from the SDLAC about the libraries willingness to pay for L-net service. Would the library community support it? Caleb also introduced concepts that would make L-net more attractive to libraries. Those concepts included a portal for database access, the ability for individual libraries to use the new L-net software for their individual library e-reference, and joint marketing. Caleb has not spoken with school libraries, but has talked with public library directors, who are hesitant to pay more for services. One SDLAC member said that their library contributes librarian hours for L-net and would be unwilling to pay cash also. Caleb pointed out that the highest use is in areas where it has been promoted by L-net staff. There was discussion about other sources of funding. Caleb asked Committee members *"What does the library community think about this suggestion to cost share and tie into the Statewide Database Licensing Program?"* The responses included that L-net must be shown to be valuable to libraries, many libraries don't use it, they'd rather not have it tied in with SDLP.

## **Adjournment**