**EAR Meeting Minutes**

**Date/Time: March 7, 2018, 1:00-5:00pm**

**Place: SCELC conference, Loyola Marymount University**

Present: Mark Stover (Chair), Michele Van Hoeck (Vice Chair), Laurel Bliss, Amanda Grombly, David Hellman, Tim Strawn, Jill Vassilakos-Long, George Wrenn, Mary Wegmann

Chancellor’s Office: Terri Joiner

SCELC: Donna LaFollette

Visitors included: John Brandt, Carol Perruso, Sandra Bozarth, Chris Bulock, Moon Kim, Ann Roll, Lauren Magnuson, Heather Cribbs

I. Minute Taker – Mary Wegmann

II. Introduction of Committee Members and Visitors

III. SCELC Welcome

Rick Burke welcomed the group and discussed the value of the partnership between SCELC and the CSU. He also mentioned a potential discussion about Shared Print with COLD. Burke is working with Dean Schneider (SSU) to coordinate.

IV. Last meeting of the year

April 18, 2018 2-3:30pm Zoom meeting

V. Streaming Media Subcommittee Report (Jill Vassilakos-Long)

The subcommittee began their work under the assumption that they were looking for a platform to host local streaming media holdings. After reviewing the 2017 Survey results they determined that they should focus on looking for streaming media packages. The subcommittee identified the five most popular platforms from the survey. The Chancellor’s Office has opt-in offers for 2 of the platforms, so the subcommittee went to the remaining three to see if they wanted to develop offers. The subcommittee has received responses from 2 or the 3 vendors and is looking at DDA offers based on the feedback from the survey. They are still reviewing the offers.

Discussion:

* Kanopy has been very successful and very expensive across several campuses
* Alexander Street Press might change their DDA model for the CSUs. Kanopy has already made changes to its model for us.
* Docuseek provides perpetual access for a certain number of titles
* The subcommittee is planning on putting together a proposal for a one year pilot project. They have not determined whether or not they will propose an opt-in pilot. They have also not determined the multiplier for purchases.
* The subcommittee will consider payment options that make the offer equal for all campuses.
* Kanopy
  + Kanopy claims that the Criterion Collection will be available through their platform for the next year.
  + Some campuses have found their back office to be ineffective and that their dashboard is not compliant with standards.
  + Kanopy will try and add requested titles to their platform, but the fee may be different than their other holdings.
  + Kanopy will dedup with other streaming platforms; Films on Demand has the biggest overlap.

The subcommittee is telling vendors that offers will be opt-in and that we need information about multipliers. Vendors have confirmed that public performance rights are not an issue as long as there is no admission charge.

The subcommittee will provide a final report next month.

VI. Ebook subcommittee pre-discussion

David Hellman provided an overview of the Ebook subcommittee’s process which included reviewing a poll taken last year and identifying an interest in PDA and DDA models. They contacted the top 6 vendors identified in the poll (ProQuest, Springer, JSTOR, EBSCO, Oxford, and Gale) and asked for proposals from each of the vendors. Oxford declined to participate. Of the proposals, the subcommittee recommended ProQuest and JSTOR as the top two candidates.

Discussion:

* We could consider basing the opt-in cost on the campus budget instead of FTE
* The overlap analysis from Alma Analytics is questionable; Analytics needs additional configuration before it will provide adequate data.
* Much of the overlap is with Academic Complete. Do we want to dedup these titles? Some of the titles in Academic Complete might not have perpetual access. Is our goal to replace Academic Complete?
* The purpose of this proposal is to engage in a one-year pilot that will allow us to “dip our toes” in collective DDA or EBA.
* Platforms with content from one publisher are not desirable – Wiley, Springer, Elsevier
* What will be the management of the selection process for EBA titles across campuses? We will have to decide how to decide and then make the selections.
* We should reach out to Jodi who ran the last pilot project.

VII. ProQuest presentation: Neil Sorensen

See attached slides.

VIII. JSTOR presentation: Greg Bodkin

See attached slides.

IX. Discussion on Ebook Presentations

* JSTOR did provide an EBA proposal but did not present it. $321,000 with $80,000 towards an access fee.
* JSTOR has a generous trigger point
* JSTOR provided lots of data that correlates with JSTOR journal usage
* JSTOR does not have a profit motive. There is something to be said for supporting this model. ProQuest always has a profit margin.
* We have a lot of eggs in the ProQuest basket.
* JSTOR might help with AL$
* JSTOR user experience is better and can do lots of customization.
* ProQuest offer requires purchase decisions by 1/1/19. We might not get the title list until shortly before that date.
* Do we want to keep Academic Complete overlap titles in as an alternate access point or dedup them? Academic Complete usually retains about 95% of their titles
* SLO will pay for Maritime. We may not have time for an opt-in option.
* With JSTOR trigger points so high it is almost like an EBA model
* Many users use JSTOR for discovery. JSTOR has MARC records in the CZ

The Ebook subcommittee will have a proposal for EAR by 3/16/18.

X. Campus and C.O. Updates and Offers

* Leganto: This is a reserve system software that relies on the ProQuest knowledge base. They will provide demos for “serious” inquiries.
* The July renewals are coming next week.
* All campuses will get the current Marcive access. The COLD executive committee deferred the backfile offer until next year
* David Hellman suggests that EAR compare Web of Science to Scopus when Web of Science is up for renewal.
  + Some schools may be using the Endnote access that comes with Web of Science

XI. Textbook Working Group (George Wrenn, Chair)

This is a new EAR working group that will try and improve access to required texts by providing system-wide access. The group is collecting textbook lists for spring 2018 from all campuses as a first step. This information will be shared with ProQuest to see what they are able to provide. Funding for this project is uncertain.

Discussion:

* This initiative falls under AL$ or open education
* Even if we simply collect textbook lists from all 23 campuses we have made traction and could do something creative or fill in some gaps.
* Working with ProQuest is not affordable learning.
* Faculty have responsibility in affordable textbook initiatives. Some campuses have made progress on working with faculty on using library materials.
* The transition from quarters to semesters is a good time to switch to AL$

XII. Alma Analytics (Amanda Grombly)

Amanda is the liaison between the Analytics group and EAR. Analytics has just finished with the ACRL reporting project. They would like to know what type of analytics are needed for collections. Amanda will send examples of the type of reports available. The working group could also create a dashboard for collection development.

There will be Alma training in the summer, but a dashboard might be more helpful for EAR/Collection Development than a training since Analytics is not intuitive.

The level of work around Alma has not diminished from implementation. Joining the network zone has changed workflows for campuses that were already on Alma as well. The CSU should think about reclassing people or providing stipends to support this work. The data visualization task force is writing a grant to try and get funding for a position at the CO.

We can only pull out of Analytics what we put in to Analytics, so it may be a few years before the data is useful.

**Action item: EAR could schedule a special meeting to talk about Analytics and send questions to Amanda who will work with the Analytics committee.**

XIII. New Business

Shared Print (Amanda Grombly)

Amanda requested that we discuss the status of shared print initiatives in the CSU. There is a COLD working group chaired by Dean Schneider, however the work of this group will be impacted by the departure of the Dean at Fullerton. Several Deans are interested in this initiative and Dean Schneider has met with Rick Burke to discuss the SCELC program. Several CSU campuses are already part of WEST. The COLD working group is likely focusing on both preservation and development. WEST is focused on preservation and has not come up with a clear workflow for borrowing materials from the WEST archive holders.

What is EAR’s role in collection development? Collection Development is just a listserv, not a group that meets. Where do questions related to collection development get answered?

**Action Item: Mark will investigate these questions and explore whether EAR should be repurposed to focus on collection development**