SCDC Minutes 2018-10-08

Attendees: Barbara Borst (CMU); Diana Carney (Alliance); Beth Denker (Alliance); Rhonda Glazier (UCCS); Jeff Grossman (CMU); Gregory Heald (UNC); Sandy Hudock (CSU-P); Yumin Jiang (HSC); Michael Levine-Clark (DU); Kayla Lenkner (CC); Allison Level (CSU); Dave Macauley (UW); George Machovec (Alliance); Debbie McCarthy (UW); Ellen Metter (Aur); Rose Nelson (Alliance); Cairie Riney (Regis); Anna Seiffert (Mines); Shannon Tharp (DU); Gabby Wiersma (CUB); Tiffanie Wick (WSCU)

1. Michael opened the meeting with introductions.
2. George provided a distant history of the Shared Collection Development Committee (SCDC), which dates back to the beginning of the Alliance when the focus was making large group purchases for physical items such as microform sets. The advent of the Alliance’s non-profit status coincided with the new world of the Internet and e-resource licensing became the focus of the group. The make-up of the committee usually consists of one representative from each Alliance library, although other library representatives occasionally participate. Michael continued the history by stating that the new leadership configuration of the SCDC consists of two co-chairs: one library dean or director and one collection development professional. Most meetings are virtual. The leadership of the committee has recently discussed having two in-person meetings per year to build community and develop more substantive meeting agendas that might include a workshop format. Beth solicited ideas for developing high value in-person meeting agendas and Gabby mentioned that the listserv could also be a means of building a community and sharing ideas. The goal of leadership is to provide more ambitious programming and make the meetings/workshops valuable to SCDC participants and member libraries.
3. Beth shared the results of the Alliance video streaming survey. Eleven institutions responded. The most frequently used vendors are Kanopy, Swank and Alexander Street and the most common types of purchasing are DDA/PDA and package subscriptions. The most common categories of streaming video are documentaries and feature films and the latter category is the most frequently problematic in terms of content gaps. Most libraries still purchase DVDs and most loan them via Prospector although, in some cases, there are vendor borrowing restrictions on this practice.

Discussion: Budgeting issues were of great concern with several people commenting on large cost increases year over year and also having to scramble to find funds for current year, demand driven cost spikes. Other budgetary concerns include the unpredictability of costs year over year and selection models that do not inherently include cost controls. Other concerns included the political difficulty of communicating cost concerns to faculty and students and potentially requiring users to log in depending on their status. DDA vs. subscription vs. DVD purchase models were also discussed with most institutions using all three situationally. It is unclear if the content is being used for educational purposes. Some institutions are thinking of using a mediated request model in place of the DDA/PDA model for greater cost control.

CU Boulder is currently looking at a service called Action! Library Media Service that would provide an approval plan for award winning films. Other libraries expressed interest in this service. Michael proposed the possibility of collaboratively purchasing a DVD collection to ensure statewide access to selected titles. Ellen mentioned the development of a campus wide survey on video usage at Auraria to help determine the future model for purchasing content, as the current model is financially unsustainable. George concluded the discussion by stating that streaming titles are not a great Alliance purchasing option because of the inability to own most of them in perpetuity and the unreliability of title availability. Prepackaged collections with perpetual access would be possible purchases at the Alliance level.

1. Beth discussed the Academic Libraries Video Trust, a non-profit formed to provide access to video content on VHS that is not available for streaming or purchase anywhere else. Due diligence must be performed in order to determine if a VHS titles meets the criteria for uploading: 1) the original distributor must assure that the title is not available through them via DVD or streaming and that the rights have not been transferred, 2) A search of Worldcat must be performed to assure that there are no alternative formats available, 3) A search of Amazon.com should be performed to make sure the title is not available in physical or streaming formats. Those titles that pass the due diligence fall under fair use and may be uploaded; metadata tracks due diligence. There are four levels of membership: founding benefactors pay a one-time fee of $10,000, have unlimited downloads and no future maintenance fees, founding members pay a one-time fee of $1500, may download 300 files and will have an annual maintenance fee; regular members pay $1000 annually for 200 files per year and an annual maintenance fee; basic members pay $500 annually for 100 downloads with an annual maintenance fee. The top levels of membership allow for uploads with due diligence to receive credit towards the next year maintenance fee. The title list includes many documentary titles.

UNC asked about accessibility for the visually impaired. Beth will check on that with the provider. There is some interest in pursuing a consortial membership for the content and also for the opportunity to upload titles and dispose of the VHS tapes. Beth will get more information about formatting for uploading and the cost for a consortial membership.

1. Beth presented the refreshed Elsevier ebooks offer with All Access at an additional $75,000 per year distributed across participating libraries. This includes access to all MRWs, book series back to v.1, and eTextbooks. The All-Access portion is a subscription model with no ownership. One of the values of subscribing would be having actual usage data to assist in determining future purchases. Beth reviewed the pricing models of splitting costs based on the Alliance assessment model vs. Freedom Collection pricing model. UNC, Mines and CSU expressed very strong interest in pursuing this subscription. Allison mentioned the requirement of very strong contractual language stating that Alliance members must be greatly advantaged in future purchasing deals. Michael said it must also be made clear that this is a separate contract and will not necessarily be rolled into a bigger deal when the next contract negotiation rolls around. George stated that the current contract is expiring and that 2019 ebook titles will be available very soon; therefore, decisions need to be made and feedback received as soon as possible. The offer expires at the end of the year. Beth emphasized that it would be great to make this deal for everybody who currently invests in Elsevier as everyone has benefited from owning these products. She needs feedback via email in the form of what members are willing to do/spend and, if the decision is yes, at which pricing model. What is the upper limit that can be contributed on an annual basis? Members were asked to provide this feedback in the next couple of weeks.
2. Beth updated the group with the status of Oxford UP’s UPSO proposal. Eight libraries have agreed to purchase this for three uploads and three payments annually. The upload and payment model are similar to the OSO product. The first upload will be available soon. She is also waiting for some responses to the OSO renewal proposal. She would like to get this finalized soon as the September upload is available.
3. Beth discussed the status of the Springer ebook deal including the new Robotics and Intelligent Computing module. This full ebook deal that Springer offered required a commitment from all participating libraries and is not going to happen as a few libraries have already said they are not interested. If member libraries are individually interested in filling gaps in their Springer ebook collections, they may contact Beth and she will pursue it. Some libraries are interested in the aforementioned Robotics module and she is getting pricing for this as well as working on pricing splits for the ebooks renewal contract. Gregory requested that the Alliance express the libraries concerns to Springer Nature about their decision to accede to the Chinese government’s censorship demands and the result of Transcultural Research pulling out of publishing their series with Springer Nature. CSU is interested in the Robotics content but needs to know where it is coming from. Are they cannibalizing already published content that may have already been purchased? Beth will follow up on these questions and concerns with the Springer rep and share the information she receives with SCDC.
4. Beth next discussed the DRM-free ebooks rollout through the Proquest DDA program. She is exploring the cost to upgrade items the Alliance group already owns. Unlimited access items are the only things that get upgraded to DRM-free and they must also be DRM-free through the publisher.
5. George provided an update on the Alliance Shared Print Trust. This program has been in existence since 2015. Two thirds of Alliance libraries have signed an MOU; although other libraries informally participate. Other program documents include information about circulating monographs, serials, and disclosure requirements. Libraries are tagging catalog records and the number of tagged records is currently 1.1 million. CU-Boulder, Auraria and Mines are consistently tagging records and other libraries are contributing to a varying degree. The records will be ingested into Gold Rush® and institutions can use the comparison tool for weeding/acquisitions.

George also reminded members that libraries may send a list of last-copy, discarded circulating monographs to the listserv for review and selection by participating libraries. He reported on the national shared-print landscape by stating there are currently 20 other consortia engaged in shared print programs. A sampling includes the National Shared Print Summit organized through the Boston Library Consortium. They have received a grant to coordinate national programs including a registry of who has long term retention commitments. Ideally, OCLC should fill this role, but they are slow to move on most projects. An interim solution is being proposed and the Alliance has responded. Another group, the Rosemont Group, is looking at long-term retention focused on serials.

1. Rose presented a Gold Rush® demonstration that she and Stacy Watson from DPL had recently delivered at the CAL Conference. They used the Gold Rush® Collection Analysis tool to review a large collection of musical scores at DPL and were able to find unique items and offer duplicates to other libraries or put them up for sale at the annual book sale.

Rose also mentioned CLiC spring workshops in Grand Junction. CLiC is looking for speakers for their academic track workshops. Gold Rush comparison use cases have a high value for conference participants. Incentives for speaking include mileage reimbursement and registration fee waivers. The workshops take place from March 21 – 22, 2019.

Gabby suggested using Google Docs vs. Excel to circulate available titles, last copy or otherwise. Google Docs is online, transparent and interactive. A discussion ensued regarding the DPL musical score selection decisions and the inadequacy of spreadsheets and MARC records to make selection decisions. In this particular case, UNC took large number of scores and the UNC Music Librarian hand selected scores they wanted.

1. George offered an update and demo of the SuDocs call number range feature in the Gold Rush® analytics tool. Filtering on this range gives users information on what is owned and what is unique across selected libraries. There are plans to add search functionality for SuDoc call number stems. George also demonstrated the filtering functionality for narrowing by publisher and used, as an example, the Alliance ownership of university press titles for negotiating deals with ebook publishers and aggregators.
2. George reminded members that they have access to CCAdvisor.org, the online version of The Charleston Advisor.
3. George discussed the current status of consortial membership to the Open Textbook Network (OTN). Consortium members sit on the Colorado state OER Council and are exploring the possibility of using some of the existing grant money ($500,000) to pay for a consortial membership. This is complicated by the fact that some Alliance members are private institutions, but the outcome is to be decided.
4. SCDC agreed to discuss Textbook Affordability at a future meeting.