E-Content Committee Special Meeting
11/12/2019

Attendees

Elizabeth vonTauffkirchen, Pine River Library, Chair

Haley Baker & Nancy Trimm, Bemis Public Library

John Major & Alysa Selby, Bud Werner/Steamboat Springs

Darla Baumli, Garfield County

Heidi McNinch, Grand County

Betsey Dick & Jennifer Murrell, Mesa County

Shelly Fratzke, Mesa County Valley School District 51

Genevieve Smith, Pitkin County

Tiffanie Wick, Western State Colorado University

Alison Farnham, Wilkinson/Telluride

Tammy Poquette, Marmot

Flipster vs RBdigital Discussion
- We have heard from both reps and we have seen the price list for both.
- Flipster does not have to be purchased as a group to get the 50% off pricing.
- RBdigital pricing includes the $11,000 platform fee.
    - Public library's pricing is by total checkouts using a tiered system.
    - Academics and School pricing is based on FTE and a tiered system.
    - In the past, we had to pay the platform fee first, and whatever money was leftover was used to purchase content. Now, all the money that is paid goes towards the platform fee first, but we would be getting the entire list of titles, so we would no longer have to choose titles.
    - The pricing for the RBdigital magazines listed on the "Flipster and RBdigital Titles Comparison 10.08.2019" spreadsheet was based on the pricing from last year (assuming at the time that no library was planning on leaving the group).
        - **The original pricing for the RBdigital magazines would need to be renegotiated if any of the current libraries leave the group.**
- Nancy asked why at the MUG conference during the Pika Roadmap Prioritization session the group was prioritizing the RBdigital API as a top priority? It is planned that the Pika team will start working on this API in 2020. Nancy thinks there might be a disconnect between E-Content and the Discovery committees if the E-Content group is considering moving to Flipster?
    - Jo mentioned that a lot of the Discovery Partners using Pika also use RBdigital content
    - Tammy mentioned that the Pika team surveyed the Discovery Committee asking them to vote on the development that would like to see for the APIs. The group voted to have Hoopla API first, and RBdigital API to be worked on second. The Pika team finished the Hoopla development, so now they are working on the RBdigital API development.
    - Liz mentioned the RBdigital has a lot of products other than magazines.
    - Alysa mentioned that every year the group looks at Flipster to discuss whether to move from RBdigital to Flipster, before renewing the RBdigital contact. This seems like a logical conversation, especially since Flipster has much better integration. The frustrating part about RBdigital is that every year they drop a title that is important to Bud Werner, and the group has to subscribe to some magazine that is similar to the one the group lost. Flipster has so many titles that we are assured to get that will not get dropped every year. We do not have to buy the magazines we currently own, so we can get even better ones. Alysa is always the slowest person to switch to a new ePlatform, because of all the training and updating their website, but looking at the title list and price, and if we all end up splitting the cost, we could have a really good magazine collection. Flipster magazines are also tied to their EBSCO databases.
    - It was also pointed out that "The Economist" is not included in the full title list for RBdigital for the current pricing, and the group would have to pay an extra amount to get that title.

- o Liz pointed out that one of the biggest benefits for Flipster vs RBdigital is the ability to login using your library card number. RBdigital makes users create an account with a username and password.
- Heidi mentioned that they are seeing a big disappointment in how many titles are no longer in RBdigital.
- Liz mentioned that it came down to a vote right now, Pine River would vote for Flipster. She likes knowing people could go with different platforms, and that would be okay. She knows that some libraries are really happy with RBdigital, and she would hate to have someone being forced to go with a platform they do not want.
- Jo mentioned that for her it comes down to money. If it is going to cost her more to go with Flipster or to stay with RBdigital (because the group is going in two different directions), she has a problem because she has not put more money into the budget for this kind of expense.
- Alysa wondered if a certain number of libraries went with Flipster, and others went with RBdigital would they both still be consortium level buying?
- Jo mentioned that with the title list if the price is going to be close to the same, she votes to go with Flipster, and she is not big on changing things either as Alysa mentioned earlier. It gets us to titles that the group really wants.
- Tammy pointed out that Flipster has not given her a breakdown of how much each library would be paying to share the cost. She was not sure if the group would stick with the same pricing structure that RBdigital uses, so you pay the same price?
- Alison typed "I would like an exact price for Flipster and for RBdigital based on our current subscription."
- Liz responded that she and Tammy do not have enough information to give exact prices. Liz knows that Flipster charges per magazine, so it depends on which magazine you choose. She assumes that each library can ala carte what they want for their library. Liz asked if there is a platform fee with Flipster.
- Tammy responded that there is a subscription service fee associated with each title.
- Jo mentioned that if the group can get all the titles they want for less than they paid last year for RBdigital, there is nothing that says the group has to spend the same amount for Flipster as they did for RBdigital.
- Tiffany has Flipster and explained that the subscription service fee is 5% for each magazine title.
- Nancy mentioned that the group would need to come up with an ideal list for Flipster for the consortium to get the price.
- Liz mentioned that the list of comparison titles that was created for the current RBdigital to the Flipster titles is great, but it sounds like the group would be interested in different magazines that are not currently available through RBdigital.
- Tammy asked if the group would like to keep the titles they currently have and remove the titles with the smaller number of checkouts, and look at the Flipster titles list to look at getting back titles formerly lost to RBdigital?
- Jo remembers when the group first started with the money they had to purchase RBdigital titles that there were spreadsheets and voting. Purchasing happened first with the titles that everyone wanted and working down the list as we had more funds to spend.
- Alysa mentioned that the list selection process is very labor-intensive. She would support that if the group decides to go with Flipster that they need to get their ideal list and get the consortium cost based off that list.
- The group discussed whether to do this as a subcommittee or the entire group. Tammy offered to create a spreadsheet with a column for the libraries to vote on the titles.
- Liz summarized that the group will go with the spreadsheet, and only create a subcommittee if we do not get enough information from the spreadsheet.
- **Action Item**: Tammy will create a master spreadsheet of Flipster titles with the current RBdigital titles highlighted with information about whether a title is owned, was canceled or not renewed with checkouts.

Reminder for Director sign-off on Macmillan plan
- Currently, there are four libraries who have not voted and six who do not have director approval for the Macmillan plan to charge each library $250 to purchase consortium titles that are not Advantage titles.
  - Edited on 11/19 by EVT: we have two libraries who haven't voted and three libraries with no director approval: http://bit.ly/32q4pkc
- Liz mentioned that there was a note on the survey from Western that this issue should go to the Marmot Board. Liz will leave it up to Adam to decide if this issue needs to go to the Marmot Board.
- Liz mentioned that we cannot go forward until we get the rest of the libraries to sign off. We already have patrons requesting titles, and Alysa cannot purchase any titles until everyone agrees.
- Alysa wanted to get some clarification on the collection development for this collection. What Alysa sees in the comment section of the "Macmillan Consortium Vote" survey is that no one wants her to purchase the entire Macmillan list. Alysa understands their concerns, because some of those titles may not be important to their library. She wanted to know if the purchasing should be put at a request level? If your library gets a request for a title, or your library thinks the title should be purchased, you would reach out to Alysa, and she will purchase the title at the consortium level. If your library gets holds on that title, you can purchase more copies using your Advantage account. Does this seem better than using the "Macmillan 2019-20 preorders" spreadsheet?
- Most people in attendance agreed to Alysa's revised Macmillan purchase plan.
- Liz added that she had comments sent to her directly stating that most people were more comfortable purchasing Macmillan titles only if they get requests for them.
- Liz commented that she thinks to have different libraries own things in the collection that everyone cannot see to be really messy and awkward, so that is why she likes the idea of this option to have a shared copy at half price in perpetual one copy/one user access.
- Liz liked Alysa's comment on one of the email threads that if we have money left over for the Macmillan purchases, we can let that money rollover. We are not obligated to spend the money within 12 months.
- Liz mentioned there was a comment on the spreadsheet that the group collecting money for Macmillan shared titles should be reviewed at the end of one year. Liz agreed with this comment.
- Alysa planned to have a spreadsheet of what she had purchased for the consortium to show at the meetings.
- Haley wondered if OverDrive is putting up notices about hold wait lengths?
- Liz commented that it was her understanding from Abbey that this information was going to be displayed on the OverDrive site to let people know about the hold waitlist.
- OverDrive can put up a banner for use on the Marmot OverDrive site for the Macmillan issue if we want it. We can revisit this issue if there is a lot of feedback and confusion from patrons.
- There was a question asking if libraries putting a banner or blurb on their websites too? Here is an example of one of the Marmot Discovery Partners who created their own information page for their patrons. Here is an example of a library who is using their OverDrive banner to explain the Macmillan issue.
- Tallie commented that it makes good business sense to buy cheap and have unlimited access.
- Alysa pointed out that some libraries like Sacramento are probably boycotting because they can only purchase one title for a larger population base far vaster than any of our libraries serve.
- Tammy asked Liz if she is waiting for every director to agree before the amount goes to OverDrive to have them send out invoices to each member?
- Liz suggested that Adam should make the decision about whether we have enough people to go forward with this process.
- Haley suggested giving everyone a week to respond. Alysa reminded the group that in the past with collective buying, the information went to the directors and would get back to Marmot with a response.
- Alysa mentioned that if we do not have consensus on group purchasing than people will have to purchase copies on their Advantage accounts.
- **Action Item:** Liz will wait another week, and ask Adam to make the decision.

Next meeting is on December 9th at 1 p.m.