MINUTES
DALNET STUDY GROUP

January 6, 1986

Present: J. Williams, Chr. (WSUL), F. Buckley (DPL), J. Flaherty (WCCC), B. Johnson (Harp),
E. Hitchingham (OU), N. Skowronski (UD), J. Smith (Beaumont).

1a) J. Williams distributed minutes of 12/16/85 and WSUL Progress Report for Nov. 1985, and
   set agenda for review of Cost Analysis, By-Laws and DALNET Online System Agreement.
b) J. Williams announced NOTIS contract has now been signed by WSUL and NOTIS.
c) J. Williams also said the "Subscriber" category in the System Agreement will not be
   used currently to allow current DALNET Study Group institutions to be voting members.
   Part of any monies paid would be considered a capital investment.
   Also, he said, what must be decided soon is if there is to be an incorporated DALNET
   or, rather, individual contracts with WSUL.
   System operational expenses will be borne separately by WSUL and DALNET.
d) Grants discussion will begin once an agreement to participate in System is signed,
   and an organization established.

2. MINUTES of 12/16/85
   a) F. Buckley questioned the accuracy of #6 d. and e. regarding DALNET paying 100% of an
      upgrade in Year III and DALNET capital contributions reimbursing WSU for the initial
      and not the depreciated cost of the IBM CPU, disk and controller. If DALNET is
      charged the original expense, Buckley continued, there would be no overage remaining
      for a capital investment fund for upgrading.
      J. Williams responded that the minutes are accurate. The WSU finance officers see
      WSUL paying the remaining costs of the CPU, disk and controller and reimbursing
      itself to the extent that DALNET libraries join the Online System. WSU wishes
      to recapture 49% of the original monies. This $755,000 cost is negotiable, but that
      is where WSU will start. The financial officers and representatives of DALNET
      institutions will do the negotiations at the meeting with the WSU finance officers.
      P. Duran and J. Williams have already indicated to the WSU finance officers that
      DALNET members oppose the $755,000 figure. Thus it will definitely be an agenda
      item at the finance meeting.
      Also, WSUL will be showing the amount of the original capital investment monies
      which will be going toward the investment fund.

      Much discussion ensued regarding this matter, with DALNET members reiterating
      opposition to the $755,000 figure.
      B. Johnson indicated that WSU is neglecting what the original DALNET members have
      contributed so far and have reduced the proceedings to a mere financial matter.
      J. Flaherty was unsure he could convince WCCC finance officers to invest in a used
      computer at its original cost.
      F. Buckley restated his concerns about the validity of budgeting the equipment
      at its initial purchase price since WSU has had use of the equipment for other
      programs for more than a year, and about there being any investment to support
      future upgrades if DALNET reimburses WSUL for 49% of the initial cost.
      Also, if DALNET is responsible for 100% of the upgrade and if there are, in fact,
      investment monies, then one can see a proportion of capital investment continuing.
      But if there are no or little investment monies, will there be a shift in the
      capital investment percentage?
      J. Williams said no answer is clear now. It depends on the need for an upgrade,
      whose need, and the investment amount for DALNET.

DALNET minutes 1/6/86, page two.

3. Review of Cost Analysis
    a) J. Smith questioned the benefits of the System for small institution members
       if there is no WSUL maintenance or Help Desk.
       J. Williams explained these two services initially were offered as an extra, and
       elimination (at least in year one) would cut costs. Also, in the first year, WSUL
       would not have repair experience. However, WSUL techicians will attempt to gain
       this repair experience during year one in hopes of avoiding future maintenance
       contracts.
       F. Buckley added that the Help Desk may not be necessary in year one because WSUL
       will be troubleshooting and training, and also there will be a DALNET programmer
       on board.
       J. Williams noted that L. Bugg, Ms. Fox and D. Taylor would answer questions
       in year one.

    b) F. Buckley asked what the Library Salaries represented.
       J. Williams explained that L. Bugg, a secretary and a billing clerk represent
       $113,968 x 21%; and P. Duran and a business officer represent $96,800 x 3%.

    c) F. Buckley questioned the accuracy of the capacity requirements figures.
       J. Williams and N. Skowronsky noted the descrepancy could come from the LOTUS
       program feature of "rounding up."
ACTION... J. Williams will have the figures checked.

    d) E. Hitchingham asked if only Oakland University signs the agreement, would the
       cost be the same, less or more and what assistance and service could be expected.
       J. Williams explained Service would be adequately given with the large amount of
       training time and bringing up the system, both of which WSUL would provide.
       Costs, as noted, would be the same or possibly a bit less, with special costs
       for use of WSUL staff costed at the percentage needed per individual member.

    e) Two Critical Decisions if desire September 1986 OPAC
       I) TAPES: Must send tapes by March 1, 1986. Five months are required for processing.
                 If tapes are to be processed by BNA, a bid is unnecessary. WSUL will
          ship tapes, invoice the member library and store all processed tapes.
       II) TELEX 476SL TERMINALS: these full diacritical terminals are necessary for
           data entry and circulation. WSUL is ordering these now because Telex only
           manufactures these terminals quarterly. March 1986 is the next production date.
           (An IBM PC will be able to be used for Circulation in about one year, once
           the necessary board is developed.)

4. Loading
    a) WSUL has loaded 9,000 titles into its NOTIS database and is testing for OPAC by
       subject searching LC subjects, searching Corporate names, and searching titles.
       The tests are highly successful so far, aprt from some WSUL retrocon errors that
       were detedted and corrected.

    b) For NOTIS to develop a loader, it will need much information regarding a processing
       center's records. Individual processing centers must go through the NOTIS manual,
       then describe to NOTIS how the cataloging has been done, i.e. what's on the tapes.
       Because WSUL has done this, information will be sent to member libraries as a pattern.
       Nonetheless, the process takes several months. A history and manner of cataloging
       should begin to be written now.

4. c) E. Hitchingham suggests a timetable be developed to help in making decisions.
ACTION   This timetable should reflect the typical time spans required as they relate
          to sub-system start-ups, and what must be done in a timely way to prepare for the
          start-ups.

5. By-Laws Review
   The following revisions were recommended:
   a) Article II should be restated to reflect impact of organization. Suggested
      revision: "This organization shall determine policies and operational implementations
      of the DALNET Online System and promote and develop cooperative programs using
      shared library automation applications."
      This impact should also be reflected in Article VII, Section 1, Authority. which
      should be made clearer.

   b) Article VI, Section 4 - Treasurer: It was questioned whether the Treasurer should
      be appointed rather than elected because of the apparent large workload this
      office requires. It was decided that WSU financial officers and their required
      yearly audit would bear the brunt of most of this work.

   c) Article V: It was agreed that rotating the offices of President and VicePresident
      between WSU and DPL would give the necessary continuity to these offices.
      Some uncertainty was expressed regarding limiting the office of Treasurer to the
      two next highest institutional investors.
      Composition of the Board shall be revised as follows:
      "Section 1 - Composition. The Board will consist of one representative from each
      member library. Alternates with a proxy vote shall be appointed by each member
      library as needed.
      Section 2 - Elected Officers. The elected officers...." (as in former Section 1)

   d) Article VII - Board
      Section 1 - Authority. Make clearer to show what Board does, i.e. establish
         policy and operational procedures.
      Section 2 - Voting. Revise to clarify this means two thirds plurality of the
         total proportional votes assigned each member.
      Section 3 - Meetings. Add: "With a minimum of one meeting per year."
      Section 4 - Special Meetings. Revise to: "at the request of four (4) members...."
      Section 5 - Quorum. Revise to: "A quorum shall be a simple majority of the Board."

   e) Article VIII - Membership Committees
      Change title to "Committees."
      Section 1 - Standing and Ad Hoc Committees. Revise to indicate: "The chair of
      any committee must be from member libraries." Eliminate: "with consent of the Board."
      Section 2 - Standards Committee. Eliminate number of meetings required per year.
      A minimum is not needed.

   f) Article IX - Parliamentary Authority
      Correct spelling to "Robert's Rules...."

ACTIONS
     1. Check accuracy of capacity requirements percentages.
     2. Establish timetable as suggested in 4. c.
     3. Revise By-Laws as suggested in #5.

Next Meeting: January 13, 1986

Partial Agenda:
     1. Review DALNET Online System Agreement.
Recorder: J. Flaherty