



NJVID Sustainability working group

Minutes of conference call held 1/22/10, 10am-11am

Present: David Pinto, Grant Wilinski, Judy Jeng, Sheri Prupis, Sujay Daniel, Brian Gately, Ashish Rajadhyaksha, Tom Nemeth, Sandie Miller, Grace Agnew

Ashish will put assumptions into the pricing model Tom drafted earlier and send around to the group next week. The group discussed what costs will need to be recovered. The group agreed that cataloging costs need to be recovered and therefore included into any NJVID fee. A metadata librarian might need to be hired. Grace said well-qualified candidates are available. There's no need to break down costs according to size of institutions, because size does not necessarily determine how much money an institution is capable of paying. Therefore, the proposed price differentiation between institutional sizes can be eliminated. Grace estimated student labor costs at \$10/hr for video encoding and \$5/hr per video for cataloging.

The group discussed whether to adopt a "fees for service" policy, but Sheri heard at Educause that that's not what works; so she advised against it. How about dues instead? That is, figure out dues by figuring out per-item costs per collection. Grace said why not go with an overall fee plus a fee for service/video. Grace also recommended breaking down costs by collection (Commons, Commercial Videos, Learning on Demand), because all three are different in work involved. For Commons and Commercial Videos, payment can be determined based on number of videos an institution has in the collection. For Learning on Demand, payment can be determined by number of faculty using Learning on Demand's services. Overall, though, the group agreed it's not wise to be too granular in the cost itemization and pricing levels. Sandie will send cost for SCM to Sheri.

Sheri said it's difficult to itemize NJEDge's costs in running NJVID because NJEDge doesn't know realistically how much money to expect to come in to cover the costs of hardware, maintenance, tech support, and staffing. Also, NJEDge is small staffed. NJVID is new for them and does not fall under their traditional, core mission to provide technological infrastructure to NJ institutions. In response, David said VALE's expectation is that NJcore will expand beyond NJVID in scope. For example, it possibly could be expanded to accommodate electronic theses and dissertations (ETD). NJEDge could amortize costs that way. This accommodation would require cooperation between NJEDge and VALE. David said VALE would assess the statewide demand for access to ETDs through NJcore, but he estimated it to be high. Due to economies of scale, adding many dissertations to NJcore would not entail significantly more work than a single dissertation – it's a matter of cataloging. And there is the possibility of offering a deal where if your institution participates in ETDs through NJcore, it gets a discount on NJVID. This is all an effort to raise participation and revenue but contain NJEDge's own expenditures, thus making running NJcore/NJVID more cost efficient.

When expanding NJcore to accommodate ETDs, who could NJEDge and/or VALE consult? Rutgers could help. Grace explained that Rutgers *delivering* ETDs to NJcore through VALE would be at no cost, but

they would charge money to *support* ETD software and provide startup assistance in getting it off the ground. This is because there is a lot of fine-tuning involved in configuring the repository for different organizations. Rhonda Marker is Rutgers's ETD manager. Jeanne Boyle negotiates outside contracts. David can call her to talk about it. Open ETD is scheduled for next year (not before July). David can pose this at VALE Council on 2/5/10.

Next call was set for February 10, 2pm. NJEDge will have a meeting next week to itemize NJEDge's costs in sustaining NJVid. Sheri, Sujay, and Brian will send the resulting data to Ashish to incorporate into his business document(s).