**SHARED COLLECTION DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE**

**9 November 2015**

**10 A.M. – 12:15 p.m.**

Sandy Barstow (UW – by phone); Yem Fong (CUB);Jeff Grossman (CMU); Gregory Heald (UNC); Nancy Hunter (CSU); Yumin Jiang (HSC); Peggy Keeran (DU); Jennifer Leffler (UNC); Terry Leopold (Alliance); Allison Level (CSU); Michael Levine-Clark (DU); Lisa Lister (CC); George Machovec (Alliance); Kim Medema (Regis); Ellen Metter (Aur); Molly Mulligan (UCCS); Heather Whitehead (CSM); Tiffanie Wick (WSCU – by phone)

**Introductions**

Everyone, including those phoning in, introduced themselves.

1. **Elsevier update**

George met with Jeff Voci of Elsevier at the Charleson Conference. Jeff made an informal offer (not yet verified in writing with a formal proposal from Elsevier):

* We could lower our rate of rise over the life of the contract to 4% if we committed to an expenditure of $200,000 a year over five years on e-books.
* We would have access to the entire Elsevier backfile, as well as to the frontfile from a certain to be agreed upon date.
* We would have to purchase as a group $1M of ebooks over the five year contract.
* All participants in the contract would share ownership of all Elsevier e-books at the end of the contract.

NOTE: the group already spends almost that amount on Elsevier ebooks each year.

NOTE: to emphasize – this is NOT a formal proposal yet, merely a verbal discussion between George and Jeff.

George also reminded Jeff of CMU’s and WSCU’s potential interest in joining this contract and requested that pricing for them be included.

1. **Elsevier cost redistribution**

A subgroup of the committee (Denise Pan, Gabby Wiersma, Sandy Barstow, Jen Leffler, George Machovec, Terry Leopold) met on 26 October to review and discuss work done by Gabby and Denise concerning the cost distribution within the Elsevier contract. Historically, cost distribution has been done on the basis of previous print subscriptions. Gabby and Denise worked out several alternate cost distribution models, based on such factors as FTE, acquisitions budget, and usage. Their conclusion was that no one factor was workable as a basis for cost distribution. They instead constructed a formula using multiple factors.

George distributed spreadsheets showing Denise and Gabby’s work to the committee. At the Shared Collection Development committee meeting, their work was presented by Jen Leffler. Final proposal is to use FTE as 10% of the weighting; usage as 40%; and budget as 50%. In addition, libraries are put in tiers rather than applying this formula exactly. Applying it exactly leads to extreme changes in some libraries’ costs. Tiering libraries allows for more gradual change while still adjusting the cost distribution to achieve a more equitable distribution.

One question is whether this formula would be applied only in 2016, or would continue for the life of the contract.

George noted that if either or both CMU and WSCU come into the contract, they would remain outside the formula at least at first, and would instead pay the added cost that Elsevier applies for their inclusion. This is because we have no use statistics for either of those institutions.

NEXT STEPS: This proposal will be presented to Member Council on 13 November. If Member Council approves the proposal, the formula will be applied to the new contract. NOTE that we still don’t have exact costs for 2016 and beyond, as negotiations are ongoing.

1. **DDA Print**

Allison and Nancy gave a presentation on CSU’s print DDA program, which has been in place since 2010. It started with some selected publishers and has expanded. Presently, most profiles have been converted to DDA, with only vet-med and literature remaining as traditional print profiles. A requester can ask to borrow a book through Prospector or have it ordered; availability through Prospector is displayed in real time. The requester can also ask to be notified once the book has been received. Once a request has been made, the order record is displayed. The DDA print program has resulted in a cost savings. CSU is offering to give a workshop on their process for those interested.

ACTION: George will work with CSU personnel to identify suitable dates for the workshop. Early in spring semester is the target. Interested libraries should let Allison or Nancy know who from CSU  
 should be involved, i.e., IT people, Web design people, cataloguers? George will also work with Kim Anderson from YBP to ascertain his availability.

1. **DDA program, in light of shifting models**

Michael reiterated that ProQuest is piloting a rent-to-own model with certain publishers for DDA acquisitions. It is uncertain whether the Alliance DDA program will be affected by this yet.

ACTION: The DDA subgroup will stay informed about developments.

1. **Products under consideration**

Terry discussed the various products under consideration. A spreadsheet with the list went out to the group. Information on these products is available in Gold Rush.

1. **Charleston reports**

Several people attended a presentation on streaming video. This might be a topic for a future Shared CD meeting.

George reported on the ACI Scholarly Blog Index, which is curating scholarly blogs. Some committee members expressed interest. ACTION: George will put Terry in touch with the rep.

Michael reported that after attending Charleston, he feels that publishers and librarians are more willing to work together than before on a model of DDA that works for both. No actual model is in the offing, but the willingness to cooperate is greater.

1. **Possible topics for future meetings**

* Streaming video.
* Examination of the committee’s charge.
* New ILS
* Book scanning robot at UNC – do other libraries have projects which could make use of this?

Meeting adjourned at 12:15 p.m.

Minutes by

Terry Leopold