Shared Resources & Digital Content

Committee of the Whole

Agenda minutes – Meeting 1

Wednesday, October 5, 2022, 3-4 PM

Zoom: <https://csueb.zoom.us/j/81417495904>

1. Note Taker – Wil Weston
2. Attendance: Lee Adams, Wil Weston, Ann Roll, Emily Chan, Katie Lage, Laura Krier, Marianna Foley, David Gibbs, Nerissa Lindsey, Jennifer Fabbi, Stacy Magedanz, Mantra Roy, Carole Correa- Morris, David Hellman, Kristen Gallant, Chris Bulock, Ann Agee, Ashley Wilson, Jodi Shepherd, George Wrenn, Tim Strawn, Linda Salem, Holly Yu, Kathlene Hanson, David Gibbs, Monica Kirsch, Tracy Gilmore.
3. SRDC Steering – Updates from Lee Adams & Tracy Gilmore, Steering Committee Co-chairs
	1. Introduce the 22-23 SRDC Steering Committee
	2. Goals
		1. Improve Communication: Lee discussed that we are developing better ways to share information between committees and outside. Confluence site is being used to share information (Note: not up to date yet).
		2. Feedback from COLD

Jen Fabbi updates from COLD: COLD, as well, discussed how do we make communication more seamless. COLD will be updating the strategic plan and that this group and other groups will be asked to provide feedback. Wiley eBooks discussed were also discussed; although, no action formally taken. Noting that Unlimited license books were not able to be purchased (although recent temporary corrective measure taken). COLD discussed. International Coalition of library consortia, Metadata rights. COLD has decided to sign on to their statement listed here (not on site yet):

<https://icolc.net/statements/icolc-statement-metadata-rights-libraries#:~:text=Metadata%20describing%20library%20collections%20is,contractual%20terms%20and%20market%20influence>

* + 1. Overview & Future Directions from SDLC Director

Ann Roll: Discussed future directions of SDLC. How can we work better together collaboratively. SDRC and SDLC. 1) Want to focus more on being proactive than reactive (opt in not just core). How do we develop a method to be proactive? 2) There are resources that many campuses have that are not coming through SDLC –a number of campuses are often going direct. Suggested path forward is to first do an analysis of what overlap already exists. Examine what do we collectively need as well as part of this analysis. Work with this group (Steering) on these priorities – overall goal is to flip the narrative – where we are going to vendors to express our needs – rather than the vender coming to us with offers.

Nuts and Bolts issues – current plan is on getting the consortial manager up and running by the end of the year.

1. ECC Criteria Document: when recently discussed were not sure that it had been shared widely. So, communicated out to the SRDC membership and COLD.

Feedback on ECC Document:

* 1. Stacy Magedanz: Secondary criteria and contractual text may have migrated in from draft to draft. Might want to look at data privacy. The criteria are clear, but process is not clear.
	2. Tim Strawn: a few years ago, a process was started to update licenses with vendors before we just accepted or add a rider (specifically in regard to text and data mining). It is happening – however, it is happening outside of general acceptance. Not that we don’t just cover students, but also so we are actively pushing the venders into a more open direction. Also, the Rapido insanity – e.g. Rapido brought in all the overdrive records – so folks are requesting overdrive eBooks. We need greater clarity around interlibrary loan terms of subscribed resources. I think that we now have the clout to make those changes/push backs with vendors.
	3. Holly Yu: Maybe at this meeting we can come up with a mechanism to provide feedback? (Google doc suggested or Jam board)
	4. Linda Salem: Comments on the document would be really helpful.
	5. Chris Bulock: Concern that there must be 15 subscribers. One part that says we can replace, but unclear about when we cannot add, because we don’t have enough subscribers. (Ann Roll: There was a process for making the decision and how those decisions are made does need to be examined. This may need to be 2 different documents)
	6. Kathlene Hanson: The criteria (instigator) of the Westlaw consideration was centered around money. It would, now, need to meet the criteria outlined. The Criteria and the Process might be represented in two different documents.
	7. David Hellman: We never thought of it the process document. We simply thought of it as the criteria document.
	8. Stacy Magedanz: The reason for the 2/3 criteria was once you hit a certain threshold then everyone was obliged to subscribe. For instance, adding JSTOR collection to the ECC – smaller campuses were holding off – in the hopes that they would come through the ECC. So, this might need some rethinking – there may be certain resources that wouldn’t hit this threshold, but are desired.
	9. David Hellman: Who ultimately made these decisions? Part of the spirit of revising this document was to provide some clarity on who made these decisions.
	10. Stacy Magedanz: I was involved in two big additions and removals – it was EAR that made those changes. We did survey the campuses and asked for rankings. It got to be really cumbersome. Revisions came typically when the budget was falling short. Also, at times pleading with the system to increase funding and ability to add/expand the ECC. EAR would vote on the items, then the recommendation got sent to COLD for their final approval.
	11. Jen Fabbi: We posted a FAQ that reflects some of the history here: <https://libraries.calstate.edu/ecc-faq/>
	12. Ann Roll: Those surveys were very useful at the time. There is a lot of data that we can get now get (data-wise) that we couldn’t then.
	13. Lee Adams: Is this something that we should take on, creating a process document as a partner to the ECC Criteria document – is there a committee already that could take this on, or should we create a new task force?
	14. Ann Roll: We did handle much of this work through working groups – but there may be folks in our committee that could tackle it. Perhaps, EVL?
	15. Lee Adams: We can put this on the agenda for the next steering committee.
	16. Lee Adams: I will send the document as a google doc for feedback. If you aren’t a google campus can send comments directly to me.
1. ECC/Opt-In Vendor Liaisons (EVL) - Updates from Pam Anan (not present, Lee gave the update Pam had emailed her)

EVL –  EVL has met and we've talked about how to redefine the roles of the vendor liaisons in addition to taking a more proactive and/or research approach to vendor deals, packages, and products that may be of interest to multiple CSUs.

1. Collections, Licensing, & Negotiation (CoLiN) - Updates from Stacy Magedanz

Met this week. Discussed direction of the group.

Transparency and communication were the main topics. Also, data mining and privacy came up as issues for the group to tackle.

1. Collection Analytics - Updates from Tracy Gilmore

Have not met yet.

1. SDLC - Announcements & Updates: Ann Roll wanted to remind people that she is here – if there are questions.

Tim Strawn: If there is a chunk of money at the end of the year (April) we need to have discussions on how this could be spent. Try to think about expenditures – potential expenditures earlier – to we can have more informed choices/discussion.

Stacy Magedanz: Concern about the most recent model of meetings where it is just updates and less of a discussion (especially where we need more input). Updates could be sent in email… and we can then spend more time talking. Meetings were also much longer (might expand time?).

Jen Fabbi: Question about the ECC Document. If this is placed into a google format, is it appropriate for deans to make comment. (General consensus seems to be --No) Regarding the added money, we never really added to the ECC – just kept up with maintaining.

Lee Adams: SDRC Steering Committee did discuss having the committee more frequently – however, the concern that we might create unintended scheduling burdens for folks. But I will extend the current meeting times to 1.5 hours (3-4:30pm)

David Hellman: 1) hoping the JSTOR EBA would get some consideration 2) I really want more transparency with COLD – frankly, COLD would benefit from some feedback on those that work closely with collections in the decision-making process (e.g. some resources create additional burdens for librarians/CDs/electronic resource managers).

Wil Weston: Would like to see portion of ECC funding set aside for one-time system wide purchases. Supportive of JSTOR EBA, view a very successful from my campus perspective.

1. COLD - Announcements & Updates – (None – see above).
2. Meeting Adjournment