**SHARED COLLECTION DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE**

**12 December 2016**

**10 A.M. – 11:45 A.M.**

Sandy Barstow (UW); Barbara Borst (CMU); Beth Denker (Alliance); Katy DiVittorio (Aur); Yem Fong (CUB); Rhonda Glazier (UCCS); Rhonda Gonzales (CSU-Pueblo); Jeff Grossman (CMU); Gregory Heald (UNC); Yumin Jiang (HSC); Peggy Keeran (DU); Terry Leopold (Alliance); Allison Level (CSU); Lisa Lister (CC); George Machovec (Alliance); Kim Medema (Regis); Ellen Metter (Aur); Gabby Wiersma (CUB)

1. **Update and discussion about the ProQuest Access to Own (ATO) proposal**

The Alliance talked to Ed Loera, our ProQuest contact, regarding the missing transition plan and options on how they will reflect current STLs for which we have paid. ProQuest was going to try to get us more details before this meeting, but we have not received those yet. George gave a summary of what we have been given for the ATO proposal. Once we have further details, the libraries can decide if they still want to participate, and also libraries that are not currently participating can decide if they want to join the deal. Additionally, not all publishers participating through ProQuest have agreed to the ATO model, although some big ones like Wiley have. We will then continue on a dual model of ATO and DDA to cover the current selection of publishers. There should be no publishers that are mediated after this, but it will be a mixed plan where those that required mediation would be ATO and those that did not would stay DDA. New publishers have agreed to ATO, but the Alliance told ProQuest that the group needs to see the plan, do the cutover and see what spend is on the new model before adding publishers. The multiplier has not changed, but could change depending on which institutions join or drop on the plan. It is possible to look at cutting YBP out of this workflow and that might be something to look at down the road due to other local implications.

ACTION: The Alliance will send out the transition plan details when we get them from ProQuest. The Alliance will also work on writing up a new description of the program that describes the details of both models.

1. **Draft Conflict of Interest Policy discussion**

Having a Conflict of Interest policy was brought up from CLERT and was suggested to Member Council. Member Council agreed that the Alliance should be proactive in developing a Conflict of Interest policy. This would show that the Alliance has thought about this issue and would help if anything comes into question regarding the high cost of the products that we negotiate. George drafted a Conflict of Interest policy that would cover many different groups (Board, Member Council, committees, Alliance staff) so it is a very broad document. The Alliance is asking for feedback from this committee before presenting it to the Board. George pointed out that we did not want to be in conflict with institutional rules so that part was very general.

Suggestions for improving the policy included:

* Detailing where it would be documented that a conflict was reported and a decision made (either way). The intent would be to reflect this in meeting minutes, but George will clarify that in the policy.
* In the document, #4D seemed unclear. This may be due to the order of the bullet points and George will re-work that to make it clearer.
* It was asked if this needs Legal review and George said the Board would decide that.
* It was asked if consultants need to be included and George said that might be something that we ask them to disclose, but only if it is something that involves their work with the Alliance.
* It was suggested that there may be some conflict between the procedures and the confidentiality listed in the document. Recommendation was made to clarify the line between the two to address questions such as “Confidential except for when…?” and “Where to document if the group is without minutes?”

George asked that if anyone had further suggestions after this meeting that they send him an email with those recommendations.

ACTION: The Alliance will revise the policy with the various suggestions made. This document will be presented to the Alliance Board at the joint meeting in January for approval.

1. **University Press Platform discussion**

Alliance had a working group get together to look at possible group strategies on purchasing. The group decided to start with University Press eBooks and saw presentations from three groups: UPSO, JSTOR, and Project Muse. Group feedback ruled out using Project Muse due to the way they structured what we could purchase (title by title for publisher based purchasing and then around 40% of content was not available through that method).

* 1. **Review UPSO and JSTOR publisher lists**

The list comparing publishers available through UPSO and JSTOR was sent out via the listserv on 12/7/16. There is some overlap and JSTOR has many more publishers, but UPSO has some unique ones that the libraries may want. In general, JSTOR has more titles for the publishers that overlap, with the exception of some foreign press titles. A question was asked about Oxford – the Alliance has Oxford in the DDA plan and also receives some through OSO, so there may be additional work on what the group wants to purchase to eliminate overlap with those other programs. It was also suggested that we see if JSTOR would offer a DDA option.

ACTION: The Prospective Monograph Purchasing working group will look at the details and decide how to proceed and eliminate duplication. George will send out a scheduling doodle for this group to meet in January. The working group will look at options for purchase vs. DDA if the vendors will offer that.

1. **Elsevier and invoice update**

The Alliance sent out invoices in November; however, we discovered that we slightly under billed due to the below issue.

* 1. **SCOAP3 adjustment**

George gave some background on the SCOAP3 project. The project had libraries redirect the money they were paying for these journals to the SCOAP3 project for open access. Elsevier then gives credit for what the libraries have paid. CUB has been redirecting the money for those two physics journals. The credit is not clearly indicated on the Elsevier billing, and the Alliance forgot that had happened. CUB let us know this year that they did not get the credit for that. Because the credit from Elsevier is included in the main billing but not listed out specifically, the rate of rise for the last two years appeared to be less than the 4% negotiated. So last year and this year, the Alliance passed through a credit to all participating libraries that was intended only for the libraries that pay separately for SCOAP3 as this credit was essentially hidden in the total from Elsevier. The Alliance cannot go back and rebill our members for last year’s error, but we will need to send an additional invoice to each library and a credit to CUB for this year. We applied the formula with the weighted distribution to this additional amount.

CSU also stated that they have been paying for SCOAP3. They will need to send the amount paid to Terry and we can confirm that a credit amount was also included for CSU from Elsevier.

ACTION: Once the Alliance receives confirmation for what CSU paid and that it is one of the Elsevier SCOAP3 journals (there are only 2 titles), we will check with Elsevier that they credited for that. The Alliance will recalculate if necessary and will send the spreadsheet to all of the libraries so they can see what their additional billing will be. Beth will then invoice all of the libraries for this additional amount and credit those that paid for SCOAP3 Elsevier journals.

* 1. **Other updates**

After saying earlier that they would not offer an early pay discount, Elsevier just let the Alliance know this morning (12/12) that they will give 0.01% discount for what we pay if we pay 50% or more of the invoice before the end of 2016. We are still $1 Million short of getting to the 50% level. If by chance the Alliance reaches the 50% level, we will pay what we have been paid to Elsevier and we will ask for a credit. We will then pass that credit on to the libraries that have paid, if there is anything to pass on.

George brought up the Elsevier eBook series proposal that we just got from Elsevier and will be sharing with the group. They proposed an all-in model with a 4.5x multiplier, but also modeled if only a certain number of libraries join the deal.

1. **Faculty profiling update**

There was a conference call on Faculty Profiling held 9/29. Beth sent out the notes from that meeting on 10/11 in the form of a template with details for each site that participated. After implementing the feedback from those libraries, The Alliance has posted the information for sharing purposes here: <https://www.coalliance.org/faculty-profile-systems>

The Alliance also sent out this information along with a blank template via the SCDC listserv on 12/9 with the hope of getting additional institutions to contribute information. All of the details gathered will then be shared as a directory on the Alliance website so others in the group may access the information as needed.

1. **Terry & Beth’s e-resource update**

Terry sent out a list of products under consideration via email with the agenda for this meeting. There was a question from the rep on the Taylor & Francis/Routledge offer. If you have not, please take a look and see if you are interested (eBooks and handbooks).

A question was brought up about T&F’s rolling 20 years on journals. We have not seen it in a contract yet, but it may be in the next contract. Terry clarified details on this issue. Essentially, T&F will be dropping the oldest year for which libraries previously had access through the package each year. They will then probably try to sell that dropped content as part of an archive. This has caused push back on the ICOLC listserv and the Alliance also plans on pushing back as this is a contract term to which we would not normally agree. If T&F is successful with this, other publishers may also try to do something similar. This move by T&F may give libraries more of a reason to want to buy the archive.

* 1. **Denver Post archive**

Auraria expressed that they were interested in the archive but wanted feedback from other libraries on this offer. They have access to current years through America’s News and some through Lexis Nexis, but access through Lexis Nexis is going away at the end of 2016. Discussion ensued. 10% fees if a library wants to continue access to the archive and drop the current subscription does not seem reasonable. Consensus among the group was that the archives are also just too expensive right now. A couple of member libraries had offers through a different rep. UW has the Denver Post on microfilm, but were told no regarding a license agreement for that. Terry did ask Lexis Nexis if there would be a credit/refund for those that subscribed through the Alliance via Lyrasis since the Denver Post access will be going away. The answer was no because it is just a small part of that package, but it might change next year’s renewal price.

ACTION: The Alliance will check with the State Library to see why the Historical Newspaper Project included Rocky Mountain News and not the Denver Post. The Alliance will also touch base with DPL on this as they were not included in the offer from the rep through the Alliance.

* 1. **Others**

UW said, related to the AVON offer, that they got Alexander Street to move this into their ProQuest comprehensive package, so they will have access via that over the next four years.

CSU brought up BioMed Central. They are a member and there may be a couple of other Alliance libraries that are members. If there is interest in this at an Alliance level, let Allison know. CC is also a member.

George brought up Knowledge Unlatched again to the group, a project for community funding for open access monographs and textbooks. He asked for feedback and if anyone was interested. CUB has done it before and is planning on doing it again through Lyrasis. CSU also provided money in the first two rounds. UW has not participated before, but is looking into it. Auraria has participated in the past, but has not yet for this round. Mid or end of January is the deadline for this third round.

ACTION: The Alliance will ask Lyrasis if there is a way to get a discount for group participation.

Please look through your email for renewal notifications from Terry as there are many for which we need confirmation. Terry has sent out reminders as there are some expiring and the reps want to hear back for year end.

Happy Holidays to all.

**Next meeting:** Scheduled for 9 January 2017.

Meeting adjourned at 11:40.

Minutes by Beth Denker