

## E-Content Committee Meeting

2/09/2016

### Attendees

Shelley Walchak, Pine River, Chair  
Chris Cook, Basalt  
John Major, Alysa Selby & Emily Veenstra-Ott, Bud Werner/Steamboat Springs  
Diane Levin, Eagle Valley  
Karin Martin, Englewood Public  
Amy Shipley, Garfield County  
Sharlene Harvey & Jennifer Murrell, Mesa County  
Elizabeth Von Tauffkirchen, Pine River  
Nathalie Crick & Genevieve Smith, Pitkin County  
Joyce Dierauer, Summit County  
Jo Norris, Vail Public Library  
Tiffanie Wick, Western State Colorado University  
Brandon Cole, Marmot  
Pascal Brammeier, Marmot  
Tammy Poquette, Marmot  
Jimmy Thomas, Marmot

### BiblioBoard - Discussion re Marmot involvement - Jimmy

Jimmy talked about the materials we have seen presented by Biblioboard, and asked for comments. He asked if this looked like something we should be pursuing as a consortium, or are there a few libraries who are interested in perusing this on your own? No libraries were interested at this time. Jimmy mentioned that Biblioboards repository functions, we similar to our own Islandora, and Pika based digital archives program. The only thing to pursue with Biblioboard at this point would be Self-Publishing. The reason to watch another product for its digital archive functions would be to if there are any features that we admire so much that we want to copy them.

**Action Item:** Shelley will call to find out the prices for the Self-E and Self-Publishing.

### Zinio - Renewal information – Jimmy

We now have a different price sharing model than what we had used in the past. In the past, we were using platform fees that were based on library size. Going into this year, we are doing a simpler price model that is still based on member library size. The difference is that it is in broad tiers that include platform and content. If all the Marmot publics are involved, it looks like a great deal compared to what we have been paying in the past. Questions about the price model can be directed to Jimmy. Jimmy has sorted out with Mark Haley, our rep, away for the last few libraries (who are not involved) to come in at their leisure. We have 10 libraries using Zinio. We are in the process of adding Mesa & Summit County. They will be working with Tammy on the title list.

**Action Item:** Tammy will also setup both Mesa and Summit County in the admin system to allow their patrons to have access to Zinio.

We have 126 titles available right now, and with the infusion of content money from Mesa and Summit, we will be building that title list. New libraries coming in are also getting all the back issues, since we started with Zinio. Salida and Rampart are interested in joining soon, but may be waiting for their new directors. Buena Vista and Pine River are the furthest from making a decision. For every library that was already in Zinio platform your shared cost is going down. This is good news across the board. Summit was sent a list of titles to add to the collection. Jimmy suggested that if Joyce needed help that the other members could help her make the selections. Joyce agreed and would appreciate the help.

**Action Item:** Tammy will get a Google spreadsheet with the list of titles for members to pick. It will be sent out to the E-content Committee.

In addition, when we grew by adding Mesa County, that put the whole collective in to a new price tier to help compensate publishers. We as a consortium are obliged to buy two copies of every title. That might sound like a problem, but it's not. With the money we have allocated from Mesa & Summit, we are in a position to still increase the number of titles even though we are buying two copies of every title. Partly what they did to make this easier on us, was to cut the platform fee in half. The platform fee was \$22,000 dollars a year, and is now down to \$11,000. This leaves us more room to buy content. Some of the members requested to have a list of current titles.

**Action Item:** Tammy will send the list of titles out to the members who requested a copy.

### **OverDrive - Suggest a title function – Alysa**

The situation is there is a Suggest a Title link on the Overdrive website for patrons. If a patron clicks on that link, that email goes to Tammy. She distributes that email to the appreciate person. The suggestion on the table was to open this up, so patrons can see all of the titles available in Overdrive. The patron can click on a title to buy the item. If we do open this up, those titles will go into a single cart in Overdrive. This means that someone in the consortium is going to have to take care of that cart. Currently, it is up to the individual libraries to buy a patron requested title from their own budget. When all the items go into a single bucket, one thing that Alysa does not know is who would be paying for them. Would we be able to tell whose library patron requested the item? The next question is does this money come out of the Marmot collective budget to fill these requests? We have just increase the Marmot collective budget, and Alysa and Joyce have been able to shop in the last few months with enough money. The issues on the table are who manages that cart, and who pays for that cart? Can we even decide if it belongs to a specific library?

Alysa suggested that what Marmot can do instead is to use a simple Drupal webform, since Marmot already has a Drupal website. This form would be similar to the one used at Bud Werner. The webform link will continue to go to a specific spot where patrons would fill out the form. Based on the library that patron selects, the email would automatically go to appropriate selector at that library. This would replace the email going to Tammy, and having her forward it to the appropriate person. Member libraries would still have to go into Overdrive to see if that title is available. If the title is not available, they would need to respond to the patron accordingly. Another question is how the Overdrive API will look in Pika? Do we want the entire Overdrive collection showing up in Pika? Jimmy thinks we might have to develop some new code in Pika to even deal this eventuality. The bigger question is how much of the Overdrive collection do we tease patrons with, unless we are confident about the budget? We would also have to give some thought to the policy about how many patron recommendations we actually want to buy. Do we set a budget limit for it? We might need to contact Overdrive to find a library that is using Patron Driven Acquisition (PDA), and who likes the results. The questions on the table are can we improve the process with patrons, who find the form for suggesting a title? What do we do with these requests, do we keep redistributing them, or find a better way to fine tune it? Do we open this up to patrons to see all the available Overdrive titles? Some members are not open to PDA, while others would like to consider allowing patrons to have a say about their own collection.

**Action Item:** Tammy will contact Meghan at Overdrive to attend our next meeting to show us the Recommend to Libraries ([RTL](#)). She will ask Meghan for a list of libraries we can talk with to hear about their experience using it.

### **SimplyE - a mapping product - Jimmy**

Jimmy thought this was Library Simplified, which is the app that is supposed to be the one app for all libraries eBook sources. This was actual a survey about the eBook platform marketplace. Since it is not about Library Simplified, he withdrew the agenda item.

**Other Items:** Pine River joined Boopsie, which is a mobile app for libraries. Here is the [link](#) on the Marmot.org site to view all the members using Boopsie.

**Next meeting is on March 8<sup>th</sup> at 1 p.m.**