**SHARED COLLECTION DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE**

**13 February 2017**

**10 A.M. – 11:30 A.M.**

Sandy Barstow (UW); Barbara Borst (CMU); Beth Denker (Alliance); Katy DiVittorio (Aur); Yem Fong (CUB); Rhonda Glazier (UCCS); Jeff Grossman (CMU); Jessica Hayden (UNC); Gregory Heald (UNC); Stephen Katz (Mines); Peggy Keeran (DU); Jennifer Leffler (UNC); Terry Leopold (Alliance); Allison Level (CSU); Michael Levine-Clark (DU); George Machovec (Alliance); Kim Medema (Regis); Ellen Metter (Aur); Tiffanie Wick (Western); Gabby Wiersma (CUB)

1. **EBSCO AIRs Subsidy from the Alliance**

In the past the Alliance has provided a subsidy for the EBSCO AIRs package. George gave a summary of why this subsidy has been in decline over the last few years. The subsidy has been coming from the Alliance portfolio from the sale of CARL Corp years ago. To stabilize the portfolio, the Alliance Board dictated that these drawdowns should be reduced. Two years ago the Board approved that only 4% should be withdrawn from the portfolio each year instead of the 10% - 15% that was being pulled out previously. The Board did approve modified amounts for FY16 and FY17 of an additional $100k and $50k, respectively, but this coming year the withdrawal will be only 4%. Because of this the subsidy has been getting smaller. The subsidy last year was $50k spread over all member sites and this year it may be nothing. The draft budget for the Alliance is still being worked on in March and will be finalized in April, at which point the Alliance will know for sure if there will be any subsidy given for FY18.

ACTION: The Alliance will let the group know if there will be a subsidy once the budget is finalized.

1. **Denver Post**

Beth gave a short summary of the phone call and email that she received from the NewsBank rep. She also reviewed what the State Library said regarding digitizing the pre-1923 Denver Post for the Colorado Historic Newspaper Project.

* 1. **Latest on the NewsBank deal**

If a library drops the current subscription the rep stated in writing that the hosting fee would be 5% of purchase price per year instead of 10%. The rep also wanted to clarify that this is a group partnership that NewsBank wants to do with the institutions to get this content digitized. Auraria said they had a conversation with the rep and that NewsBank is not making much off of this deal and are open to more breakdowns for payments over multiple fiscal years to accomplish this. Discussion ensued regarding the 5% fee. It is much better and would only be assessed if the library dropped their subscription for current content through NewsBank, but still very expensive. The group also discussed how the fee is being calculated by NewsBank and thought that it might be unfair to some institutions. Concerns were expressed about putting funds into something that NewsBank may put on the back burner if it does not get fully funded. It was suggested that maybe we could include something in the contract saying that: if x% isn’t delivered by a certain date, then NewsBank has to give a discount. The group discussed divvying up the pricing for this among ourselves since NewsBank seems only concerned with getting an overall specific amount to fund the project. One problem with this would be that only some of the institutions have subscriptions to the current content so divvying up the pricing among all institutions would require some to either subscribe to the current content or to pay the hosting fees to ensure access.

ACTION: Beth will send out a range for pricing and will list which institutions have subscriptions to the current content.

* 1. **Information on the Colorado Historical Newspaper project and Denver Post**

The Colorado Historic Newspaper Project (CHNP) would be able to digitize pre-1923 Denver Posts but has run out of grant funding and would need the institutions to fund this. Historically, it has been about $1 per page to digitize for this project. The group discussed that CHNP is really hard to search and the NewsBank platform is much more searchable. There is also the issue that they are only able to digitize the pre-1923 content and that would leave a huge gap in access.

1. **Consortial DDA Program**
   1. **Access-to-Own update**

The Alliance was waiting for additional info from ProQuest, and last night (2/12) George received some pricing for the eBooks on which the Alliance program already had STLs. Currently there are around 60 current imprint titles with 3+ STLs and 1200+ backfile titles with 3+ historical use STLs. The new spreadsheet from ProQuest has the list price of the eBooks, so the Alliance will look at the cost to purchase the frontlist with 3+ uses and negotiate subtracting out the cost of the STLs. The idea would be to then would zero out the counters on the backfile titles and that should be a reasonable and affordable strategy to move from the DDA program to ATO on these publishers to eliminate mediation. The Alliance will share this data with the Task Force. The DDA program would then be a hybrid model with publishers that do ATO (instead of mediated purchases) and the other publishers would be on DDA as before. The goal would be to have a transition that fits within the current budget and does not require any additional funds from participating libraries this year. Once feedback is received, the Alliance can start negotiating with ProQuest on this transition. Discussion ensued regarding various issues to consider and current issues that libraries are having with ProQuest. Beth Oehlerts at CSU has been communicating via the tech services email alias the Alliance set up regarding the cataloging. Cleanup is a responsibility at the local level.

ACTION: The Alliance will do an analysis on what it would cost to purchase the frontlist titles with 3+ STLs at our 2.5x multiplier and will evaluate the cost for the STLs that already took place. We will share that information with the Task Force.

* 1. **Ebook messaging within the new Ebook Central interface**

Some of the changes made in the past to the messaging for EBL did not get carried over on ProQuest eBook Central. The Alliance was not sure if this had been fixed yet.

ACTION: The Alliance will follow up with ProQuest to fix the messaging back to what it previously showed on the EBL platform.

1. **Elsevier credits for sites that paid before the end of 2016**

Beth reviewed the amount that the Alliance received for early pay from Elsevier and how she calculated what each library would get. The calculations are in the spreadsheet that was emailed on 2/9/17. Beth can send a credit memo or put the credit in each institution’s deposit account just depending on what the libraries need for their own accounting purposes. UCCS asked about when the email went out regarding the cutoff date for the payments being received.

ACTION: Beth will send UCCS the details on the email with the cutoff date. Institutions that are receiving a credit back for early pay should let Beth know if they want her to issue a credit memo.

1. **Prospective Monograph Purchasing Task Force**

George gave a quick summary of this project to remind the group of the current work being done.

* 1. **Results of publisher survey for university presses**

The Alliance sent out a survey of University Press publishers on UPSO and JSTOR to see which publishers have the most interest among the Shared Collection Development members. Fifteen publishers received three or more votes, and from those Oxford and University Press of Colorado were taken off the list because of the amount of coverage among the group already. The Alliance then got title lists and looked at those 13 publishers for 2016 to the present and shared that analysis with the Prospective Monograph Purchasing Task Force. Among those 13 publishers, some are only on one platform or the other, but the number of titles that were on those lists fell quite a bit short of the total publishing output (as provided by Gobi).

* 1. **Next steps**

The group decided that it is necessary to roll into this analysis information on publishers included in the DDA program as that might have greater percentages via that program to compare to the other two. The Alliance will bring that data in when we get it, to have a better comparison and then will share with the group. The group discussed that the Alliance has asked JSTOR and UPSO about increasing access, about embargos, and has asked for specific numbers on the ones that they offer for the 13 publishers selected. The Alliance has also asked for details from YBP regarding print vs eBooks to see what had actually been published in eBooks for these publishers. The data received so far has raised more questions.

ACTION: The Alliance will bring in the DDA availability details for these publishers to add a layer to the analysis and will share that with the Task Force. The Alliance will also share the answers that we receive from JSTOR and UPSO regarding the many questions that were brought up at the last Task Force meeting. When YBP shares further information regarding print vs eBook publishing for these publishers that information will also be shared.

1. **Shared Print Working Group**
   1. **Update on their last meeting and the idea of broadly declaring (self-nominating) titles for long term retention**

The Shared Print Working Group met on 1/13/17 to discuss a practical method of moving forward on this project. It was agreed that “self-nomination” is a good method to start. Some have already started and if others could also do likewise it would give data to then react and build on in the future using the Content Comparison tool. Michael shared some examples of “self-nominating” collections to keep: CU said if in PASCAL they will commit to keeping it; DU committed to anything that had been in PASCAL and anything they committed to for WEST; DU committing to circulating cookbook collection as it fits with their special collections and would be something they would keep anyway; DU will commit to anything by DU authors. Then, the Content Comparison tool would tell the group what is left and we could move forward on deciding how to commit to other things. Discussion ensued regarding PASCAL. George emphasized that, as this is being done at the local level, it is important to note the commitments in the 583 field and then resubmit records back to the Content Comparison tool so everyone can see the commitments. The working group would like participating libraries to find something to which to commit by end of August and to also enter a note in the 583 field for that collection to that effect by then. If a library has signed the last copy MOU, this would be something that the Working Group is asking them to do.

* 1. **Keeping the Gold Rush Library Content Comparison System more up-to-date with your content**

As a second portion of this discussion, the Alliance is asking those that signed the Shared Print MOU to update records to the Content Comparison tool as it helps libraries make decisions. By not updating the holdings, it can hurt the ability of other libraries to make decisions regarding the collective collection. It was suggested that libraries should commit to regularly updating records or it might be better to not participate. George said that all libraries that signed the MOU have contributed records, but not all of them have been updating the records. The group agreed that it would be useful to have records updated at least quarterly or when the library has done a big project such as updating 583 field notes or weeding.

ACTION: The Alliance will contact those that have signed the MOU to make a commitment on how often they will upload records. The Alliance will also reach out to get commitments regarding picking a collection to identify to keep.

1. **Altering renewal dates for some contracts (suggested by Auraria)**

Terry gave a short overview of this issue that was discussed in the January SCDC meeting.

* 1. **Do we want to do this or use another approach to balance work load at local sites**

The Alliance will try to move these as requested as much as possible. Most of the libraries involved are willing to adjust the dates so when we have those renewals we will get a quote for 15 months prorated to have the renewals on those happen in October. GeoRef will not be possible as one of the libraries is not willing to move and we would not get the same discount if we broke up the deal. Discussion ensued regarding moving the renewals to August instead of October. Consensus was that October would be fine due to the small number of renewals that it entails, even though it coincides with journal renewals. This Alliance would know about pricing probably mid-May to mid-June for budgeting purposes for FY18. Auraria thanked everyone for helping with this as it will help them and thanked Terry for all of her work on this project.

1. **New offers**

Terry distributed the spreadsheet of databases under consideration via email on 2/9/17. Beth mentioned a few of the many new offers that went out in the last month. For the Gale Digital Collections she mentioned that the bundles they put together were examples of resources that they thought would be timely and needed. Oxford has had several offers come out. University of Wyoming mentioned on Digital Theater Plus that DT+ starting contacting their selector directly and that caused problems.

**Next meeting:** Scheduled for 13 March 2017.

Meeting adjourned at 11:30.

Minutes by Beth Denker