Attendees:

Slyvia Rael-CMU, Joan Lamborn-UNC, Michael Levine-Clarke-DU, Yem Fong-UC Boulder, Lisa Lister-CC, Rita Hug-UCCS, Heather Whitehead-Mines, Pat Smith-CSU, Allison Level-CSU, Nancy Allen-DU, Terry Leopold, George Machovec, Rose Nelson-CO Alliance

Phone: Cynthia Hashert-Auraria, Wyoming-Sandy Barstow & Julia Proctor

AGENDA

1. University Press e-books. Report from subcommittee and discussion.
        Michael Levine-Clark and the subcommittee
2. Elsevier contract. Update
        George Machovec and Terry Leopold
3. ACS. Update on pricing model. Attachments
        Terry
4. OSO backlist. Discussion on whether and how to proceed.
        Michael
5. e-book pilot. Update.
        Michael, George, Terry
6. Project Muse (if Lyrasis has a new offer)—doesn't have new offer

University Press e-books

Michael handed out two spreadsheets. The first one is from YBP. It provides a list of the top 25 Univ. Presses based on Ebook availability, plus Oxford and Cambridge Press. It shows which of the University Presses are in which aggregators. We wanted more information such as the number of titles from each Press, but this is confidential information according to YBP that they can't easily disclose.

Michael revised the original spreadsheet and created a new one with more information. The updated spreadsheet includes several more publishers. It also includes an additional aggregator, MyiLibrary. YBP is close to signing an agreement with Project Muse, so there will be one more aggregator.

40% of YBP's content is simultaneously published in both print and electronic format.   However, simultaneous publication of ebooks "means" within 8 weeks of print publication--not truly simultaneous.

There are still some unanswered questions regarding what is included in the ebook packages:
 • The number of titles from each Press (Is it all titles, several, a few);
 • Each Press has different terms of agreement.   This affects access;
 • Some offer DDA, while others don't;

YBP also mentioned that publishers get content to aggregators quickly, but aggregators don't always turn things around as quickly.

We are waiting to get more information from YBP. It may be possible to get some information on the number of titles offered through each Press. Michael will send out an updated table when more information is available. We will keep this issue on the agenda for next meeting.

It's important to have good local discovery layers because ebooks will be on a variety of platforms not just one. Multiple platforms are also a challenge because of the variety of devices out there in which users are downloading ebooks. It's difficult to explain to users how to download ebooks from a particular device. So even if users discover the content in one place, they still have the hurdle of successfully downloading the item onto their individual device.

Print On Demand

There was a question about Print on Demand (POD).
Both DU and CSU are providing POD.
DU is having problems providing this through Encore and Summon; it seems to work okay with the Classic WebPac.
Selectors at CSU are using POD to order books. It's easier than filling out a form.
ILL staff also uses POD to order items for patrons.
They are also keeping records of this to track usage by selector or patron.

Although DDA and POD share the same concept of getting the item out immediately, they are deployed in a different manner.
We need to figure out what the best practice is for maintaining a balance between print and online and when is it best to use each format.

Elsevier Contract
The new proposal from Elsevier-Evidenced Based Selection (EBS) is much better than the old one. It is still in negotiation process. To date, there has been no final contract.

Previous proposal
Alliance would pay $250,000 for annual use of ebooks for one year. At the end of the year, libraries could select $250,000 worth of books based on use data or other criteria set by the consortium, but each library would only have access to items based on the amount of money they contributed. So if a library contributed $30,000 to the contract, they would only get $30,000 worth of ebooks.

New Proposal
All libraries in the agreement get full access to the entire platform. At the end of year, the group can select $125,000 worth of titles for permanent access.   . In this model the consortium would pay $250,000 for $125,000 worth of titles which would be permanently owned, a 2 times multiplier.   The ebooks deal could be continued in future years with terms yet to be determined. This would result in DDA over multiple years not just one year.

If someone buys a title that is not in the package, it can be shared by the group. This applies to anything outside of the package that a member buys.

There is a risk that the group wouldn't use all the titles even though they expended the money for them. However, usage statistics for the first year could be examined before deciding to opt into a contract for the second year. Elsevier has verbally stated that they would offer ILL rights to these books. This would likely be similar to our contract with Springer where a patron can request an ebook, but it requires staff mediation to fulfill it.

Questions for Elsevier
- We need to clarify with Elsevier if the agreement covers series.

- The collection includes 2008-2012 imprints. We need to find out if this can also include books from 2013. We want to be sure to get the most recent titles.
- It would be helpful to have the same usage information for Elsevier as we had for Oxford.
- Elsevier has lots of different imprints, which ones are included? We need to be able to block these from the profile.
- Find out if they are offering this deal to any another consortia.

Other Issues with Elsevier
We will want to exclude the veterinary titles because CSU is already purchasing these.
We still need to pay attention to Elsevier coverage in aggregators.
George will send questions to Elsevier and we can discuss this more at the next meeting.
Libraries should hold off on doing further research on their Elsevier titles. We first need to see what is in the package to determine what titles each library already owns.

General Update on Elsevier
Tom Smith sent the updated proposal. There is a slight reduction in the annual rate down to 4.65% but then back up to 4.75%. Overall it's a tiered discount. The discounts equates to $185,000 reduction on the contract over the life of the contract
Elsevier wasn't willing to cut anything off the price for CMU.
CU-Health Sciences would like to pay $125,000 less by subscribing to fewer titles. Elsevier proposed to do this by putting the $125K back into the content fee, which would redistribute the cost to other libraries. Other libraries won't be able to pick up this extra cost as they are also under financial restraints.
The CU Negotiation team, (CLERT) has looked at lowering the number of subscribed to titles. This eliminates archival access to titles, which could be problematic.

There was a question about how the Elsevier invoice was calculated, specifically how much of the bill is subscription versus access fee.
The Elsevier agreement is based on each library's historical expenditure on print.
Big colleges paid more, smaller colleges tended to pay less.
There was also a "fairness fund" in which smaller colleges pitched in a little more because the bigger institutions were paying so much more.   This "fairness fund" was only done one year.
Terry will send out to the group the percentages that each library pays.
Each library pays a percentage of the total cost; it is not broken down by component such as access fee or subscription.

Scopus
Currently only UCCS subscribes to Scopus. Elsevier will offer a 30% discount on this database if at least one more institution agrees to purchase it.

ACS -Update on pricing model
- ACS has revised their pricing model which is based on another set of metrics instead of the historical expenditure on print, which was the old model.
- Terry sent out a revised copy of the ACS pricing model scheme, which evens out the pricing model between now and 2015. ACS is not lowering their price; instead they are suggesting a ramp up so sites don't have such a large increase in price in one year.
- The pricing is based on a 5% increase in inflation. Pricing for 2013 is set in stone. 2014-2015 will depend on inflation.
- ACS is offering a 10% consortia discount plus a 3% discount for single pay. These discounts are already reflected in the pricing model that Terry distributed during the meeting.
- ACS has used a combination of Carnegie class and usage level in creating various tiers of classification.
- ACS won't indicate how they define the different usage bands. (See Terry's handout for explanation)

- They also use peer institutions to classify libraries, but again, they don't explain how they define peer institutions and they only provided peer institutions for 4 libraries.
- The pricing model only covers Web Editions and nothing else from ACS.
- ACS is offering an alternative package, Education Core Plus, for those who can't afford the traditional package. The alternative includes 15 of the most popular titles for 75% of the Web Editions package.
- Member Council did agree in principle on a 3 year transition for pricing so that certain sites don't have a dramatic increase in price in a single year.
- The SCDC agrees with Member Council to adopt some type of a 3 year transition model.
- The Alliance is working on an alternative set of numbers for this 3 year pricing transition model. It is the same in principle as the ACS model.
- If any site drops out of the ACS deal it won't affect the group per se, but we wouldn't have the savings to spread around.

Journal of Chemical Education and Chemical and Engineering News are not included in Web Editions. Ask Terry if you are interested in subscribing to either of these.

Oxford Backlist

We agreed to table discussion about the Oxford backlist until next meeting.
Michael will talk with Yem and Sandy separately and then bring it back to the group for discussion.

Rita pointed out that there are duplicate titles in EBL and Oxford. There shouldn't be any Oxford titles in EBL according to Oxford. If sites find duplicates, they should suppress the title in EBL since we are already paying for it through Oxford.

To Do: Terry will contact Oxford about the duplicates and include some sample records.

E-Book pilot -Update
EBL doesn't seem to have a list of forthcoming titles. This makes ordering items on the spot difficult since we don't know what ebooks we will be receiving from EBL. You can look for the item in Gobi, but it may not be there yet.
There was some concern about receiving notification from EBL about pulled titles. Catalogers get the deleted files. George or Rose will ask Beth Oehlerts, Chair of the Prospector Cat/Ref committee to let us know which titles have been deleted.
Ebrary should be sending the 2012 backfile.
Beth sent out another email of what to do with the records that come in from EBL and Ebrary. George will forward the email from Beth to the SCDC list.

YBP sends out email notifications twice a week—one from EBL the other from Ebrary. These are automatically generated emails, that can't be customized to indicate what records are being sent.
However, each library has a contact list so if they have questions, they should direct it to their in-house cataloger/contact. Terry will redistribute this email.

Pat Smith is retiring at the end of October. The committee thanked her and wished her the best in retirement.
Allison Level will be her replacement on the committee.

Meeting adjourned.

Minutes: Rose Nelson-CO Alliance