

Ad-Hoc Overdrive Committee - 11/08/2022 10:06 AM

Meeting was called to order by Chair, Stephanie Harrison

**Columbia County:** Tamara Gaskell, Roeliff Jansen Community Library; Tobi Farley, Philmont Public Library

**Dutchess:** Carol Fortier; Beekman Library; Carol Bancroft, Clinton Community Library; Mary DeBellis, LaGrange Association Library; Courtney Tsahalís, Millbrook Library; Daniela Pulice, Pleasant Valley Library

**Greene:** Catherine Benson, Heermance Memorial Library; Jen Grounds, Heermance Memorial Library

**Putnam:** Stephanie Harrison, Patterson Library (**Chair**)

**Ulster :** Gillian Murphy, Elting Memorial Library; Katie Scott-Childress, Rosendale Library

**MHLS:** Rebekkah Smith Aldrich, Laurie Shedrick, Nina Acosta

The purpose of the meeting to go over feedback from county discussions and make final adjustments to the document that will be presented to the Directors Association in the November packet.

The following feedback was reported for each County:

**Putnam** (Stephanie Harrison): The feedback was minimal, folks found the recommendations to be appropriate and reasonable.

**Columbia** (Tamara Gaskell): County group was appreciative of the work of the committee and agreed with the recommendations. Equitable purchasing is a good goal and appreciated the emphasis on more training.

**Greene** (Jen Grounds) Catherine attended the meeting, and her feedback was that Greene County directors are ultimately on board and interested in more training.

**Dutchess** (Mary DeBellis): Essentially, in agreement with the document. Discussed an issue with the word “should”, preferring it be changed to “are encouraged to”. Recommendations should be “consider best practices”, as purchasing remains a local decision for each library. Large budget libraries were less interested. Small libraries did care and even if struggling to address the financial issue, were willing to act. They found the wording around the use of the violation to be punitive and urged the committee to clarify the intent to allow for change over time, using benchmarks followed, training and follow up. There should not be an immediate move to violation.

Committee discussed the recommendation on “Should” changing it to “are encouraged to” and dismissed the change from “recommendation”. Carol Fortier-Committee agreed on recommendation, where it was used. Best practices already exists in other context. It was acknowledged that the intent was to provide time to improve spending, and the violation would be reserved for no activity or failure over time. Mary DiBellis- “Libraries should be encouraged to work towards the recommendations”

**Ulster (Katie Scott-Childress):** Directors were ok with the document but had larger issues with macro issues related to the monopoly of OverDrive and larger collection development. Large libraries were appreciative of the recommendations. Smaller libraries struggle with the cost, and selection when circ levels don’t trigger purchasing. They would like central purchasing and coordination, to avoid same purchase. Questions raised in the discussion: Could a formula based on % of circ of physical items be

applied? Might be better to recommend a % of their materials budget? How does a super user affect the demand? UCLA is spending, but they were unaware where this was counted. UC libraries struggle with purchasing for low local demand only to fill holds for other library patrons- they circulation goes to patron library. Also how is that figure related to individual demand? Staff education and patron education are needed. Libraries are also spending a portion of their Ebook budget on Hoopla, is there more data on the two interact? Even with training some won't participate. They would like more info on CPC ordering. UC libraries would like to see triggers for high demand hold. Gillian found the information useful in her library to enlighten purchasing staff.

### **Committee Discussion:**

Tamara Gaskell: Asking about use of eBooks by other library users, citing that we do the same with Print books that fill holds elsewhere go out at other libraries.

Stephanie Harrison- Were the concerns small libraries at Ulster mostly from small libraries— Katie confirmed, yes-it hits smaller libraries. Rebekkah Smith Aldrich – Reminded that there is return of investment in shared collection.

Committee discussed the avg. expenditure in OD is \$35, with some titles (ex. Stephen King & Barbara Kingsolver audio titles) reaching \$114 and that the avg of \$35 is not true for the in-demand titles. Laurie Shedrick said MHLS could provide some data.

The cost of doing business with OverDrive, who has a market share of the publishers is overpriced and putting libraries at a disadvantage with digital rights policies

Rebekkah asked if the committee wished to add a recommendation for advocacy on OverDrive / publishing policies, citing the work being done by ALA. Mary DeBellis – add that OverDrive has an unfair advantage with libraries....Push for legislation – acknowledge pain points. Carol agrees –adding, shows directors that there is awareness and commitment to competition or legislation.

Stephanie asked how the document would be received at the DA by Ulster- Is there an edit to answer Ulster concerns – Gillian & Katie said that there would not be discussion to follow about recommendation text. UCLA is not against the document but are opposed to the OverDrive environment. Ulster is mostly agreeable, particularly the larger libraries, who admit that they were under performing and the data was enlightening. Katie added that there should be more competition, adding that title purchase for Hoopla, coming for shared environments. Tammy pointed out that education had been included. A brief discussion about patron education ensued. Nina contributed that she provided the platform resources in training. On the topic of patron education, it was encouraged to use the context of advocacy efforts to hold publishers accountable rather than intimidating patrons from using the product due to the cost to the library.

The committee discussed reducing the number of holds a patron may have by 5. This would lower demand and push patrons to manage their requests closer to their needs. Nina provided that of the patrons with holds (8866) – the top 400 have more than 10 holds.

The meeting was adjourned at 11:18 AM

## **Actions**

Tammy Gaskell made a motion to recommend that the OverDrive limit on the number of holds that may be placed by the patron be reduced from 15 to 10, on our shared platform. Carol Fortier seconded the motion. The vote passed with no abstention or no votes.

Tammy Gaskell made a motion to recommend that the Resource Sharing Committee be charged with the recommendations for purchase levels of eBooks and audiobooks in advantage accounts, and that their recommendations become part of the Resource Sharing Standards. Mary DeBellis seconded the motion. The vote passed with no abstention or no votes.