**SHARED COLLECTION DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE**

**10 July 2017**

**10 A.M. – 11:10 A.M.**

Barbara Borst (CMU); Beth Denker (Alliance); Katy DiVittorio (Aur); Rhonda Glazier (UCCS); Rhonda Gonzales (CSU-P); Jeff Grossman (CMU); Gregory Heald (UNC); Yumin Jiang (HSC); Stephen Katz (Mines); Kayla Lenkner (CC); Terry Leopold (Alliance); Allison Level (CSU); Michael Levine-Clark (DU); George Machovec (Alliance); Jack Maness (DU); Kim Medema (Regis); Ellen Metter (Aur); David Schaffter (USAFA); Tiffanie Wick (Western)

1. **Welcome to new member: United States Air Force Academy (USAFA)**

USAFA will be joining the Alliance as a member in fall 2017. David Schaffter will be representing USAFA on the Shared Collection Development Committee and George welcomed him to the group. David introduced himself and gave some background on USAFA joining the Alliance and Prospector.

1. **Elsevier**
	1. **Book Series proposal and update**

Michael gave some backstory to this proposal and how it would cover gaps in what is available to Alliance members. In summary, this would be a subscription starting in 2018 to all of the remaining content in the Book Series and the subscription allows for perpetual access for any years subscribed. Elsevier did submit a new proposal with a better deal, but members were not able to finalize decisions as there were only a few days before their cutoff date of 6/30/17 and it was also year-end for most of the members. For 2017 content, Elsevier had reduced the amount by half as members would be paying for two years at the same time and they also offered access to recent backfile content that is a current gap in our access. There are a significant number of turnaways on this content. Many of the libraries have subscriptions to either electronic or print on some of this and the deal would eliminate those subscriptions. Some libraries have expressed interest and some have said they are not interested, but many did not have time to respond.

ACTION: The Alliance will compile a list of which libraries are interested and which are not and can reach out to the rest of the libraries to figure out their interest when we get an update from Elsevier on the proposal. Libraries should respond via the listserv so everyone is aware of the status.

* 1. **Elsevier ScienceDirect ejournal statistics and cost redistribution update**

George summarized that in anticipation of the Elsevier ScienceDirect invoicing, the Alliance will work to get usage data from Elsevier and will use that data for the formulas and model used previously. Michael gave an overview of how the pricing is based for this Elsevier deal. Historical details from Elsevier have weighted library costs unevenly and a couple of years ago a committee reevaluated the costs based on usage and other factors and came up with a model that would redistribute these costs over time at the Alliance level. Based on that model, some libraries have the straight 4% pass through from the license and some have a greater or lesser rate of rise. It was decided that the Alliance would revisit this cost distribution after a couple of years and share the data. Last time, the libraries shared their JR1 data, but since Elsevier’s numbers matched that data, the Alliance will just get the numbers from Elsevier. Beth will then use the previous model with the new data and the Alliance will share that with SCDC probably at the September meeting. The Alliance will then bring it to Member Council for a decision on whether they want to keep this model moving forward. This does not alter the base price but is a way to mitigate rate of rise for some sites that are disproportionately paying more. Michael emphasized that the Alliance did not have usage data for new members before and that could impact the model going forward. The disparities in price are large; for a small institution a greater rate of rise can have a big impact while proportionately giving not much of a discount to a larger institution. Overall this has helped, but is very challenging.

ACTION: Beth will get the data from Elsevier and work on the modeling based on what was done in the past.

1. **Alliance ProQuest DDA package migration to Access to Own (ATO) model**

ProQuest will be migrating the Alliance DDA program to the new ATO model on July 19th. ProQuest has told the Alliance that there should be no major downtime, but it is possible there will be. Please let the Alliance know if you see any problems. There are two major things happening on this migration: 1) ProQuest will be integrating the Ebrary records into the ProQuest eBook Central platform, and 2) any publishers that are ATO compliant will move to the new ATO model. So there will still be STLs on the ATO model, but fewer and the fees for the STLs will count towards the purchase price. Publishers that have not agreed to the ATO model will still be running under the old model. This transition should be invisible to the end users. Once the Ebrary records are moved to eBook Central, the usage statistics should be much better as there was always trouble getting access to the Ebrary stats.

The MARC record distribution will now be coming through ProQuest and not through GOBI. URLs for Ebrary books will be redirected for five years. The Alliance has asked ProQuest to send a new batch of records so everyone can transition to having records with the new URLs. There have been some issues with Ebrary records over the last few years and a fresh batch of records should help clean up some of this. There will be a couple of changes coming with records pickup due to some other changes that ProQuest is working to implement. Please wait for documentation from the Alliance or CSU on the MARC distribution details. There may be one change for the short term and another later when ProQuest updates their system. At this point, the Alliance needs more details from ProQuest on this.

After this migration, the next step will be to open up this program to any additional member libraries that are interested in joining the program. The Alliance will peg any incoming libraries with a peer library for usage to calculate cost for the first year and after that it would be based on actual use.

ACTION: The Alliance will share ProQuest documents about record pickup and any other details once we receive them.

1. **UPSO University Press proposal discussion**

Michael gave some background on this project. The Prospective Monograph Purchasing Task Force has been working on this for quite some time to come up with a way to get shared access to university press eBooks. Last time the group met, it was decided to make the project a little less complicated by focusing on using UPSO instead of multiple platforms. This project has been more complicated as the coverage is not as good as was hoped due to various factors. George sent out a proposal to the listserv this morning (7/10/17). In summary, participating libraries would turn off purchasing via approval programs and after six months the Alliance would analyze what is missing and the group can either purchase those items on a consortial basis or libraries could also purchase individually. The UPSO platform is DRM-free and good for users. After seeing how the program works, the group could then expand the program to include other platforms or additional publishers. There is some duplication with the Alliance DDA program and the Task Force needs to decide if they want to take those publishers off DDA or off this list. The focus will be on ownership and not just access and the goal is to get eBook coverage that is universally accessible for all the Alliance libraries with maybe later access to print with a discount. Michael asked the libraries to state if they are interested in this program. Auraria expressed general interest, CU Boulder had expressed interest in the past, CSU is interested in the eBooks portion but not the print, and UNC may be interested in this program. The group agreed that cost would be a factor for this program to be sustainable. UNC said that it is important for the list of publishers to be universally desirable and there were some publishers in the Category 2 list from the proposal that were more niche. The Task Force is hoping we might be able to do this with either a 1/1/18 or 7/1/18 start date. George noted that ProQuest is offering a University Press Books subscription package with a possible evidence-based component at the end and that could be something else to keep in mind as we tailor this program.

ACTION: George will schedule another conference call for the PMPTF to look at how to move forward to implement this program. The group can then put out a proposal to get a general idea of interest via the SCDC listserv. At that point, we can ask Oxford to talk to their partners and put together possible costs for this model.

**Alliance Shared Print Trust update**

There have been some updates to records in the Gold Rush Library Content Comparison System.

* 1. **Reminder about declaration commitments**

Michael reminded the group that the Shared Print working group had asked libraries participating the in program to make some commitments for permanent retention in the Content Comparison tool by the end of summer. The goal would be to identify a collection or items in the circulating collection that the library would not be getting rid of. If commitments can be made to those titles, then others can see that and easily weed those titles with the knowledge that someone else will be keeping them so they will retain access. For those that will not be making commitments, it would also be helpful for libraries to know that. George noted that the Disclosure Policy for the Shared Print program is on the Alliance website and it has details on the wording to use for the commitments in the 583 fields. Collectively, DU and CU Boulder have made commitments on over 1 million items.

ACTION: At the next in-person SCDC meeting, the Alliance can do a show and tell on how to compare to those that have made commitments. Member libraries should work to identify collections they will commit to keep.

1. **New and continuing offers**

Beth gave a brief summary of the new offers and highlighted the newest additions to the list. Terry gave details on an offer for perpetual access to eHRAF, which has been subscription only in the past. Please also see the email with details that Terry sent on July 6th. The cost for perpetual access takes the subscription cost and multiplies it by 20, roughly. New content would be included with no yearly fees for updates. HRAF has offered that libraries could pay over more than one year and there might be an additional discount if we bought this as a group, but those details would need to be worked out. HRAF would like to do a webinar if anyone is interested. CU Boulder is also a sponsor member and the Alliance is not sure how that would change their costs if they wanted the perpetual access option. Libraries can continue to subscribe if they do not want the perpetual access option. The group discussed that this could be a good use of year end money. HRAF missed the end of year target for FY17, but libraries could start planning for it for FY18.

ACTION: Terry will ask the HRAF rep about a trial. If libraries are interested, they should let Terry and Beth know. If some libraries want to move forward on this, the Alliance will work with HRAF on a group offer for an additional discount.

**Next meeting:** Scheduled for 14 August 2017.

Meeting adjourned at 11:10.

Minutes by Beth Denker