EAR Call-in Meeting Notes

Friday, November 20, 2015

3pm - 4:30pm

1. Roll Call

EAR Members:

Jeffra Bussmann (East Bay)

Eddie Choy (CO)

Kenny Garcia (Monterey Bay)

Sue Kendall (SJSU) – Elena Seto was present as proxy

Ron Rodriguez, Chair (Stanislaus)

Ann Roll (Fullerton)

Jodi Shepherd  (Chico)

Amy Wallace, Vice chair (Channel Islands)

Holly Yu (LA)

Not Present:

Naomi Moy (Dominguez Hills)

Jennifer Ware (Sacramento)

Additional Members:

Paula Hammett (Sonoma)

Amanda Grombly (Bakersfield)

Hua Yi (San Marcos)

Carol Perruso (Long Beach)

Stacy Magdanez (San Bernardino)

Mark Stackpole (Maritime)

1. COLD voted to drop Lexis/Nexis, which will free up $623,288.00  as of July 2016.  COLD would like EAR to compile a list of databases not in ECC butare purchased by a high number of campuses before making a decision on how we might want to reallocate those funds. So I suggested looking at the opt in and surveying campus on databases that they are buying direct or through another consortia like SCELC (the majority use).  I have the opt-in data.  (submitted by Amy Wallace)
2. In July 2016, Lexis-Nexis will be dropped from the ECC. Campuses will have the opportunity to opt into a consortial contract after July 2016. The compilation is being done to assess the products not in the ECC that many campuses are subscribing to. The list should cover as many different subject areas as possible.
3. Discussion:
4. The definition/premise of the ECC is that it should benefit all or most of the campuses.
5. Online and doctorate programs have had an impact on what core resources are needed. The original core list needs to be revisited.
6. Opt-in and consortial purchases can inform the discussion. If 18-20 campuses are purchasing a product, it should be in the core collection.
7. Collection development officers should be surveyed on core products at their campus.
8. Previous EAR surveys are in the EAR repository and will be used in the analysis, as well as the last ECC product study in 2013 or 2014.
9. The ECC may pick up a product that’s not currently in the collection, which may cover the cost of opting into Lexis-Nexis.
10. Action Item:
11. Amy and Stacy will compile recent data to rank products by degree of coreness and estimated costs. The rankings will be ready by the next meeting.
12. Ron will address concerns that were addressed by business librarians regarding the dropping of Lexis-Nexis without picking up Westlaw as a replacement.

1. Pomona has asked that EAR consider moving the Emerald package to the new redistribution formula. If approved, the transition will be implemented in Jan 2017. To give you an idea of the impacts of using the new formula, the attached shows the campuses cost using this year’s (2016) numbers.  (submitted by Eddie Choy)
2. Discussion:
3. Small campuses have been hit hard with the new redistribution formula. These campuses will probably not have the financial resources to opt into this subscription.
4. The legacy-priced packages are using the new formula. Emerald fits the criteria.
5. If there are packages where the redistribution formula is not equitably applied across the system, they should be brought to EAR’s attention.
6. The criteria for usage will be apples to apples.
7. Vote:
8. EAR members voted to recommend that Emerald be moved to the new redistribution formula with a two-year phase-in starting in 2017.

1. Wiley:  where the issue is now.  COLD Exec is likely to have discussed on Thursday 11/18.
2. Discussion:
3. There was mixed feedback across the system on the latest proposal from Wiley.
4. COLD is proposing that Wiley consider a two component proposal. The first component would be a 400 title package subscription and the second component would be a database package. The proposal was sent to Wiley today.
5. Wiley’s offer does not take into consideration the number of campuses that are committing to subscribing to the package. If 9 campuses do not commit, the price will remain the same.
6. Any price changes should be communicated to campuses that are interested in subscribing as soon as possible.
7. COLD asked EAR for feedback on whether or not to commit to one-year or multi-year contracts in the future.
8. Vote:
9. EAR members voted in support of having multi-year contracts.

1. EAR Meeting in Jan or Feb of 2016.  I would like to host this in the beautiful locale of Turlock, CA however I realize that may make things a bit difficult travel-wise so it is up for discussion.
2. Discussion:
3. EAR members were in support of having the in-person meeting in January be held at California State University, Stanislaus.
4. Action Item:
5. Ron will send out a Doodle poll with possible dates for the in-person meeting in January.

1. Future Items that need to be addressed
2. The ECC work group needs a chair.
3. EAR needs an incoming vice-chair for next year.

Notes respectfully submitted by Kenny Garcia, EAR member