**EAR Meeting Minutes**

**Date/Time: September 8, 9:30-11am**

**Place: Virtual through Zoom**

Present: Mark Stover (Chair), Michele Van Hoeck (Vice Chair), Laurel Bliss, Amanda Grombly, David Hellman, Kimberley Smith (was there by 10:15, when I cheked, not sure when she arrived), Tim Strawn, Jill Vassilakos-Long, George Wrenn. (Also Bing Zhang who may be a representative for STEM)

Chancellor’s Office: Eddie Choy, Terri Joiner, Jessica Hartwigsen.

Visitors included: Lisa Bartle, Stacy Magedanz, John Brandt, Carol Perruso, Sandra Bozarth, Chris Bulock, Holly Yu, [Iwing John] (sp?), Carol Correa-Morris, Nikki DeMoville.

1. Minute Taker – Jill Vassilakos-Long volunteered.
2. Introduction of Committee Member and Visitors
3. General Updates
4. Meetings

* September 8, 2017    9:30-11am
* November 2, 2017      1:30-3pm
* 2018 meetings TBA
* It was agreed that we will have an in-person meeting at the March SCELC conference.

1. Use of Confluence for Reports and Minutes: Please work with your campus to access Confluence: <https://calstate.atlassian.net/wiki/spaces/COLD/pages/11632815/Electronic+Access+to+Resources+EAR>

It is the archive for the committee and sub-committee reports and minutes. It is not complete, Michele Van Hoeck, with the help of Stacy Magedanz and [Ing Lu](sp?) will work on moving everything over from SharePoint in the next six months. It already contains the most current reports and should be useful to your work on the committee.

Tim Strawn requested that the full text of current contracts be made available. Jessica Hartwigsen has been inputing contract terms into Alma since July 2017 and is uploading the full contracts as attachments. You must activate something in Alma to view these. Nikki DeMoville will explore this.

Tim Strawn proposed that the Chancellor’s Office negotiate for text and data mining to be included in future licenses. He would like EAR to:

1. Identify publishers and vendors who will allow a text and data mining codicil to agreements
2. Make the full text of licenses available to EAR (this may already be done, see above)
3. Add provisions for text and data mining to our standard license agreements.

Tim Strawn will lead a discussion on this at our next EAR meeting.

1. EAR Report to COLD
   * Recommendations to COLD
     + Long-term budget plan: asked for two separate budget lines. The first was for one-time funds totaling $1.3 million over five years. The second was for a $1 million baseline fund increase to the (currently $5 million) line for EAR. If approved, this would begin in the 2018/19 budget year. The baseline has been at $5 million for more than 7 years. One-time money has staved off disaster, but we are at the point where cancellations are required to stay within budget. (Lexis-Nexis was canceled last year and we subscribed to the less expensive WestLaw.) $5 million has been approved for 2017/2018. There is no decision yet on a requested 2017/18 augmentation. July subscriptions have been paid. If we need to cut it would be easiest to do so from the January renewals, but there is language in the contracts that will allow us to cancel items already renewed in July if there are budget difficulties.
     + Analytics: the recommendation from last year’s subcommittee has been sent to COLD. The subcommittee will review the recommendation and send selected elements to the ULMS Assessment and Analytics group.
     + Ebooks: the recommendation from last year’s subcommittee has been sent to COLD. Volunteers to work on implementation and developing further recommendations are: David Hellman, Carol Correa-Morris, Holly Yu, and George Wrenn. Mark Stover will send them an updated charge for the committee.
     + Media: The focus of this is on streaming media. The recommendation from last year’s subcommittee has been sent to COLD. Volunteers to work on implementation and developing further recommendations are: Amanda Grombly, Laurel Bliss, and Jill Vassilakos-Long. Mark Stover will send them an updated charge for the committee. Specifically, there is a recommendation to develop a pilot project. Funding challenges were discussed: asking some of the larger campuses to contribute to a pilot or asking COLD for funds for a pilot.
   * 2017-2018 Budget Request (already discussed, see above.)
2. Campus and C.O. Updates and Offers
3. C.O. update: ECC status, Big Deal renewals, etc. (Eddie or Terri): If there is no augmentation this year we may need to cancel some subscriptions. (Negotiations are ongoing for some packages, so the extent of the shortfall is not yet known.) There was a question about how EAR feels about multi-year packages. Pros: lock in prices, there is a clause in the agreements that allows us an out if there are budget problems. Cons: can’t lock in budgets, so may not be able to meet obligations and the clause may not be sufficient. There are special problems if only a couple campuses need to cancel, because then the rest of the campuses must cover the cost. Suggestions included developing a list of databases that we would all hold on to if we possibly could, and if a multi-year contract gave us a real advantage with those, then agree to that. Currently, it was left that Eddie Choy would bring multi-year proposals to EAR. Currently there are fewer than 10 multi-year contracts.
4. Web of Science questions (David): Currently we are in a multi-year contract with Web of Science and a much less expensive competing product (Scopus) cannot be substituted because of our contractual obligations. Other issues involving Web of Science include that some campuses have purchased backfiles which would not be usable if Web of Science were discontinued. (No mention of LOCKSS.) Also, that some tenure committee are using Web of Science analytics to determine publication impact. (Note: there are institutional repository applications that measure publication impact, if we are of a mind to take our intellectual property back. Unfortunately, BePress has just been sold to Elsevier…)
5. Possible Proquest ebook textbook initiative (David): An academic library system in Australia worked with Proquest to get library selected textbooks electronically. (The Library system surveyed textbooks being used, gave the list to Proquest, and Proquest negotiated licensing where the publishers were amenable.) This seems like a project that could get a boost through the Affordable Learning Solutions initiative. If we pursue it, we need to be careful that the budget augmentations needed for the ECC Core Collection don’t end up given to us but earmarked for Affordable Learning Solutions.

11 am – meeting adjourned. These Agenda items will be held over for our next EAR Meeting:

1. Elsevier ebooks (Mark)
2. Open Access Crowdfunding Models (Mark)
3. New Business