Consortia, Coordination, Collaboration

What degree of coordination and strategic planning do we anticipate will happen among institutions?

- Yale: Strategic planning in collection development will change ILL/Doc Del to accommodate strat plan. How should we all collaborate?
- Penn: Ebooks, is this an area we can coordinate collections? Do we need a copy of record? Leave it up to the aggregators.
- Emory: Does have Galileo (Georgia) consortia collections of ebooks.
- Yale: What can or can't we do with ebooks? --> questions for copyright, we don't know the answers yet.
- UChicago: What does fair use mean for loaning eBooks? While we have rights for ILL, what does this mean for eBooks?

ebrary - any problems? UChicago has had push back from faculty about quality. Shouldn't good quality be essential to their business model?
Columbia - reading from the computer the quality is better then when the item is printed. Perhaps this is intentional? eBook issues change day by day. Nationwide this may be an area we can organize and work together. Example of how this was done in Korea. Perhaps there is a role for the federal government. Gov't could buy such collections as the Ebsco primary source material for a couple hundred thousand dollars and provide to everyone.

UChicago: Are there opportunities for collaboration with Ivies+ group and our yearly symposium?
- Penn: why don't we allow our users reciprocal onsite access when we're willing to share with one another by mailing it to their own institution?
- UChicago: This would be very positive.
- Penn: How do we do this in a seamless manner not requiring letters and accounts being created manually> We want system to system interoperability. Penn student checks a book out at UChicago and that checkout gets sent to Penn's home system.
- UChicago: If we can get the policy in place we can then refine and make it better.
- Could be similar to incommon wireless use at other institutions.
- Haiti: Shibboleth could handle the authentication.

Penn: floating collections w/in one system - is this something worth thinking about?
- Penn: we've thought about this in our consortia agreements.
- What would this look like? Is there space? Who collects the stats? Would our users like this? Do they trust borrow direct so much? What about browsing?
- Penn: Browsing is discussed in context of offsite, but not with borrow direct.
- Penn: Making collection development decisions as a group so we can have more resources collectively. Penn tries to do this in subjects which would lend themselves to it, i.e., music. The trouble is it is based on the personal relationships between librarians, not policy. We need to move toward that. Engineering/computer science librarians in Ivies are working with publishers to try to purchase a joint

collection of ebooks. Logistics in who pays for what? And how long before we need to buy a second, third, etc. copy? These conversations revolve around licensing, not so much copyright and fair use.

UChicago: How much can access services impact how licenses are negotiated in our organizations?
- Columbia: when licensing, ILL allowed is mandatory. This is now on eresources as well. Including international ILL.
- Emory: Traditionally ILL has been influential in this discussion. Takes a long time, but the landscape for the importance of ill has changed.

Penn: Collaborative shared print repositories - is anyone involved in this?
- Columbia: Recap with Princeton and NYPL. In some cases we send things directly. Within recap there is a working group to look at duplicates and decide what copy should be kept and what can we do with cooperative collection development. Determining if there is a way to make it easier to request via recap items owned by them when requested via ILL.
- Columbia: implementing virtual browsing.
- Princeton: It's one thing to talk about collaborative collections, but it's another to manage. What if both institutions need an item for reserve?
- Columbia: When sending to recap one institution cannot send two of the same item. Now recap is looking at only one copy between all institutions.
- Emory: West (western regional storage trust) initiative (?) Doing research about how many copies is enough, etc. One is likely not enough for the long haul.
- Penn: There are preservation issues and there are access issues.
- Harvard: Original plan: if you have an extra copy go ahead and send it offsite. This model was not set up to weed. Rethinking this.
- Penn storage has extra capacity and would like to explore partnerships, if they have sufficient numbers, to think about cooperative collecting. Being a "regional node" in a national network.

- Anyone doing patron driven acquisitions?

UChicago: Accessible text: How many institutions are working with OCR?

Penn: anyone doing staff sharing like 2CUL?
- Emory: May be going this route with Georgia Tech.
- Yale: Utilizes subject specialists for help with difficult ILL citations. Would like to further formalize that.
- Penn: used to love the Pittsburgh Chinese gateway.
- Emory uses ILLiad custom emails and routing for coordination with subject liaisons. Moving in the direction of service expectations.
- Columbia: how about an ILL nationwide citation expertise network?

Working with subject specialists to determine buy not borrow?
- UChicago will buy and have subject specialists determine whether to add it to the collection after the fact.

- Emory: Study about subsequent use of items that were purchased on demand found that they were within subject scope and had substantially more circs then the general collection.
- Penn: The grief is not on buying the item but bypassing acquisitions.
- Create criteria that collection development was conformable with. Staff would place requests through the collection development system.
- UChicago: Need to determine what the goal is: Are we thinking about collection development or about getting the cheapest item.
- Emory: This can be a particularly good way to feel in gaps in the collection.