

MI-SPI 2.0 Steering Committee Meeting Agenda: August 26, 2:30-3:30pm

Meeting Notes (in italics)-Stephanie Davis, September 16, 2019

I. **Welcome & Introductions-**

Members Present-

- a. *Stephanie Davis, MCLS*
- b. *Cara Cadena, GVSU*
- c. *Barbara Cockrell, WMU*
- d. *Amie Pifer, CMU*
- e. *Helen Levenson, OU*

II. **Steering Committee**

a. **Background & History-Helen Levenson, OU**

Helen, past Chair, provided a brief history of the Steering Committee. There was no Steering Committee when MI-SPI started in 2011. Most meetings included 2 representatives from all 7 participating institutions A small task force (Barbara Cockrell (WMU), Bob Kelly (EMU), Ellen Seidel (MTU) with input from Cheryl Burley (MCLS)) developed the original MOU, dated 2012, which is posted on the MCLS site. In 2015, a MOU Task Force was formed which became the Steering Committee. The Steering Committee dealt with issues such as the partnership with SCS and recruitment of new members. Helen also shared the overarching goal of MI-SPI has been to allow libraries to reduce print holding through retention commitments.

b. **Steering Committee—From the MOU--**

“The MI-SPI Steering Committee shall consist of four (4) members drawn from the Governing Board (or their designees) with staggered three year terms; representation is in proportions of public and private institutions in the whole membership. MCLS Executive Director and MCLS Staff Liaison serve ex officio. The Steering Committee Chair, elected annually, is responsible for presenting the Steering Committee’s recommendations to the Governing Board. The Chair is exempt from assignment to the two Standing Task Forces. The other members are participants on either the Collection Data and Analysis or the Resource Sharing and Metadata Standing Task Forces and are responsible for bringing recommendations to the Steering Committee for discussion and approval to forward to the Governing Board. The Steering Committee meets quarterly.”

The group discussed the above description and was comfortable with the key points. The group talked about the focus of MI-SPI 2.0 and expressed a need to receive feedback from Governing Board about access vs. preservation.

- i. No rep to the Resource Sharing Task Force-
Amie Pifer of CMU agreed to serve as Steering Committee Rep to the Resource Sharing Task Force.
- ii. Recruit more members?-
Committee agreed to stay with current configuration.
- iii. Elect Chair-
Barbara Cockrell expressed an interest in serving as the committee chair. She agreed to think about it in mid-September confirmed she could. Cara Cadena is back-up.

III. Decisions for Committee

- a. Review Comparator Groups-(p.16-21 of KickOffPPT)
 - i. ALI (Academic Libraries of Indiana)-KEEP
 - ii. University of Michigan-KEEP
 - iii. Replace Michigan State University?
 - iv. All SCS Retentions?-

This was discussed and the committee would like more information from OCLC/GreenGlass about this option and its potential value. Would the comparison be for all groups? Would it include US and International? Stephanie will reach out to OCLC/GreenGlass and invite MI-SPI 2.0 OCLC reps to next meeting. There was also discussion about the availability of retention data and how long institutions are able to access and use the data. Helen shared that previous retention commitments are available to those involved. (All those that have access to GreenGlass for Groups (G3) from the 2015 data extract can see who has been assigned the retention commitment for an item. Although no retention commitments were assigned to either EMU or WMU as part of the 2015 data extract, G3 includes the information if EMU & WMU had retained the item from the previous round.)

- b. Identify Special Categories for MI-SPI 2.0 (22-23 of KickOffPPT)

The committee liked the idea of including a special category for regional and/or local holding. Would like more input from GreenGlass about this option.

- c. Past MI-SPI Commitments-Retain in MI-SPI 2.0/Start fresh?

There was a fair amount of discussion on this topic. Many libraries have made deselection decisions based on the previous retention commitments. Amie shared CMU has pulled 10% of their holdings, 60,000 titles. Libraries have also put in a

lot of work to maintain their retention commitments. There is a desire to not have to repeat efforts. The issue of missing/lost volumes also arose and there needs to be decisions on how these will be handled.

Though not specifically related, there was discussion about retention needs for specific disciplines, such as Engineering and Computer Science. The group also talked about how at many institutions the desire of administrations to move away from working with the print collections.

IV. Goals & Visions Discussion

a. Indiana Connection-level of interest?

Stephanie will be attending the Academic Libraries of Indiana (ALI) Collection Committee Meeting in October and will report back with details from meeting.

b. Small Libraries?

Discussion about the original hope that many smaller, private would join MI-SPI 2.0. Cost proved to be prohibitive.

c. Partnership for Shared Book Collections

i. Formally launch in 2020

- ii. Six working groups in place to address key concerns & provide recommendations (Business Model, Membership & Governance, Risk, Open Data, Best Practices, Outreach and Engagement)

Stephanie shared briefly about this group and plans for its future, shared at ALA. Helen is on one of the working groups and shared information.

d. Cooperative Acquisitions? -Not discussed

V. Other items?

a. Governance Group meets in late September -

Steering Committee will meet after Governance Meeting.

Meeting name: MI-SPI 2.0 Steering Committee Meeting

Date/Time: Aug. 26, 2019/2:30pm – 3:30pm Eastern

MCLS staff person: Stephanie Davis

Join URL: <https://zoom.us/j/573199214>

Phone number (for those calling in only): 408-638-0968

Meeting ID (for those calling in only): 573-199-214