Shared Collection Development Committee – In person meeting at the Colorado Alliance of Research Libraries. May 17, 2019 10:00 am to 3:00 pm

Attendees: Barbara Borst (CMU-phone), Diana Carney (Alliance), Beth Denker (Alliance), Katy DiVittorio (Aur), Rhonda Glazier (UCCS), Jeff Grossman (CMU), Gregory Heald (UNC), Yumin Jiang (UCHSC), Jennifer Lawson (CSU-Pueblo), Kayla Lenkner (CC), Allison Level (CSU-phone), Michael Levine-Clark (DU), George Machovec (Alliance), Dave Macauley (UW), Danielle Ostendorf (UCHSC), Anna Seiffert (CSM), Shannon Tharpe (DU), Tiffanie Wick (WSCU-phone), Gabby Wiersma (CUB)

1) Attendees introduced themselves.

2) George and Beth provided a history of the Alliance and the Shared Collection Development Committee (SCDC). The Alliance originally formed to buy expensive microform sets and other print items. In 1981 the Alliance developed an integrated library system, CARL, and morphed into two organizations: a for-profit and a non-profit. Membership and staff have grown over time and the Alliance sold off the for-profit business. Currently, the Alliance SCDC is focused on licensing shared electronic resources for its members, looking at shared print collections and working with other consortia such as the ICOLC. The Alliance also develops and oversees Prospector and Gold Rush and develops and administers programming/meetings/conferences of interest to members. The administrative structure of the Alliance is as follows: a Board of Directors consists of five library deans or directors and five university officials. Its primary focus is fiscal matters. Additionally, a Member Council made up of library deans/directors drives projects, products and programs. The staff consists of George Machovec, Executive Director; Rose Nelson, the Assistant Director who manages Gold Rush and Prospector; Beth Denker, E-Resource and Administrative Manager; Chet Rebman, Developer; Steve Walker, Systems Administrator; and Diana Carney, Administrative Assistant.

Beth discussed her workflow process for ERM. She described the Gold Rush ERM and mentioned that members could have read-only access to product records and some general licensing information. The ERM goes back to 2006. All available licenses have been scanned and IT is working on secure space to attach licenses to Gold Rush records.

Beth’s workflow includes receiving ERM notifications from Gold Rush, checking with vendor reps. about renewal pricing and forwarding this information to member institutions. She tries to use the same template for renewal emails and sends renewals by individual products instead of lumping them together in one email. She is open to feedback on this process. Receiving email responses for audit coverage is very important. After renewal approval is given, she waits for the vendor invoice and then bills libraries.

Additionally, Beth negotiates with vendors and checks licenses for anything out of the ordinary. Fully signed licenses are sent out to participating libraries.

Suggestions for good communication included noting rates of rise in renewal emails. Anything over 5% should automatically be challenged and justified by the vendor. Other comments and questions included a concern about members dropping out of a subscription and the effect on other participating members. Beth said she thought there was an effect in about 1/3 of instances. She always checks to see how other members will be affected. Her overall view is that group purchases always work out better cost-wise for everybody; negotiating power is greater and an Alliance signed license is efficient for everybody.

3) George and Michael discussed the Alliance Shared Print Trust. Reasons for developing this program include the fact that legacy print collections are still important but there is a lot of overlap and books take up space and sometimes have low or no usage. Many older titles are not available digitally and probably never will be. Many weeded titles may be out of print and some people still prefer print.

It is important to preserve the intellectual record with local emphasis, control policies and destiny without relying on others.

They briefly described the history and status of the program. The program started in 2011 and Gold Rush development began in 2014 to compare holdings. The program is voluntary, flexible and non-exclusive. The program focuses on monographs at this time.

George provided a demo of the Gold Rush comparison tool. Alliance members have access to this tool at no cost.

Comments and questions included a discussion of controlled digital lending, the Google Books initiative and the current process for weeding and last copy communication. Many participants believe the current process is inadequate. Also discussed were niche subject areas that libraries might be interested in, such as cookbooks at DU. Other libraries may have these niche subject interests, but they might be unknown to the rest of the group. Ebook lending was also discussed. Individual libraries are reaching out to vendors and the group was encouraged to engage vendors in this discussion.

4) Strategic Directions for the Alliance SCDC

George and Michael provided an overview of what is happening with transformative agreements (Elsevier and other publishers). Also discussed was the legacy of “big deal” agreements and how print and purchasing history determine the current spend based on a library’s fiscal health at the advent of E-resources and big deals in the late 1990s. The Alliance needs to keep on top of other library/consortia deals going forward. Also study how and with whom Alliance libraries publish as well as APC spend. Being armed with history and data and current trends will be important for negotiating and gathering this information in advance will be helpful. The July 12 Member Council meeting will discuss these issues in depth. Additionally, having contingencies for deal negotiations is important. Member libraries should know what they own and what other Alliance members own in order to protect themselves if a deal cannot be reached

5) DDA for eBooks

There was a general discussion of what Alliance libraries are doing for DDA/PDA to see if there is anything the Alliance should do to realign and assist libraries. In addition to the ProQuest DDA program through the Alliance, member libraries may have one or more DDA agreements with ProQuest or other publishers/aggregators. A census of Alliance member DDA programs was suggested. Beth had been working on a survey to determine if additional publishers should be added to the ProQuest DDA program and realized that it is not helpful or meaningful to add publishers when the variety of DDA content/agreements is unknown. Additionally, there are a variety of pricing models and potentially duplicate content that complicates this even more. It may be cost effective to bring other non-Alliance subscribed DDA programs into the Alliance. Beth will follow up on a census.

6) Gabby outlined an exercise to gather member opinions on the question: How can we do better shared collection development? The exercise handout provided the following questions for discussion: What opportunities do you see for making progress on building shared collections? What challenges do you see for making progress on building shared collections? What ideas or actions do you recommend? The discussion was for both print and e-resource collections. Ideas and thoughts included collection specialization/focus. For example, the UCHSC library collects health and medical sources, minimizing the need for deep collections at other Alliance institutions. Awareness of collection specialization could help minimize cost across the Alliance. Other thoughts: Libraries need to be able to justify cost, local level retention notices need to be integrated into existing workflow, negotiating lower costs as a group should be emphasized, and fewer copies of more print titles should be purchased across the Alliance. Streaming video content is increasingly in demand and purchasing through the Alliance could help control costs. Concerns included communicating collection development strategies with stakeholders, having an urgent collection need and not having time to work with the Alliance to purchase as a group, and the old chestnuts, budget and staff constraints.

7) Streaming Video ILL pilot (DiVittorio)

Katy presented on SILLVR (Streaming Interlibrary Loan Video Resources), a project started at the Auraria Library. Two years ago they moved ILL to be under Collections Strategies and streaming video has been a huge spend in collections the last few years for them. They sent out a survey nationally and had feedback that indicated that patrons would use it and that there is a need for this if there was a way to make it viable. Reasons for ILL Streaming Video include DVDs/VHS possibly becoming obsolete, using for classes, etc. Statistics from Colorado demonstrate that small rural libraries average $6k annually on e-resources and academic institutions are spending millions on these resources. This is a social justice issue where academic libraries could provide access to this. Katy presented at the Colorado ILL Conference to gain insight on ways to include smaller rural libraries. Katy is presenting this topic at ALA and will notify SCDC when the presentation will take place. Vendors she has approached include Alexander Street, Swank, SAGE, Films on Demand, and Media Education Foundation. She proposed a one year pilot. MARC records would be put into Prospector and then streaming videos could be shared among libraries. Some vendors sound like they will participate. The vendors will need to work on putting technology in place to make it work. Ideally there would be no additional fees for lending. For accessibility, captioning/transcripts is a concern. We need libraries that are willing to lend (and have the content licensed to lend) and then libraries interested in borrowing. The proposed lending period is 21 days (like current DVDs in Prospector) with no renewals allowed. The video could be requested again. Lending libraries should keep access to the content during the lending and statistics will determine usage and interest. The next steps are gathering feedback, working with vendors to get in place (their interest is more about possible further subscriptions/purchasing).

Questions centered on vendor technical capabilities, vendor selection and purchase vs. subscription options. For potential vendors, DU suggested approaching Women Make Movies separately from Kanopy. DU is working with them directly on some custom packages/DVDs with streaming videos with public performance rights and they might be interested in participating in this project. Mines said that Jove is offering a program where an academic institution partners with a high school to offer access so they might be more receptive than they have in years past. DU and UW said that they might be interested in participating as lenders. If libraries had collections that the vendors agreed to loan then the Alliance would work with those institutions to load MARC records and make those discoverable in Prospector. Using Prospector limits the exposure and can provide statistics to see if there is abuse or if the pilot is successful. The vendors also see this as an opportunity to possibly sell additional subscriptions/purchasing. CMU has public/academic partnerships and can see that there could be a good fit for partnering there.