EAR Minutes 11/19/13

Present: Gale Etschmaier, Annie Hor, David Hellman, Ken Ryan, Mark Stackpole, Hua Yi, Eddie Choy, Terry Joiner, Wendy Vermeer, Susan Jackson, Jody Shepard, Will Weston, Norm Hutchinson, Carol Perruso, Paula Hammett, Naomi Moy, Jeffra Bussmann, Ann Roll, Grace Torres, Kimberly Smith, Tim Strawn

1. **Welcome and review of in-person meeting dates, questions, etc.**

Susan Jackson volunteered to take minutes.

The in -person EAR meeting will be held on January 30-31, 2014 in San Diego; EAR members agreed to use the schedule model of COLD meetings: the first meeting will start at 1:00 or 1:30 on Thursday January 30th. The second half will begin the next morning at 8:00 or 9:00 and adjourn after lunch. San Diego State University will arrange a block of hotel rooms for the group and provide refreshments for breaks, a continental breakfast and lunch on that Friday. SDSU is finalizing hotel information; the hotel is on public transportation lines. SDSU will also make dinner reservations for everyone who wants to eat together.

Please note that San Diego State does not honor other CSU parking passes, so please let Gale know if you need a parking pass and it will be mailed to you ahead of time. When arrangements are finalized, please let Gale know about dietary restrictions.

**Ebook Working Group report (member of working group)**

Jody Shepherd reported that they are wrapping up 3rd pilot DDA project with ebrary; they have some conflicting financial numbers from ebrary–-but are pretty sure all the money allocated has been spent. Jodi has received some requests from CSUs for records that need to be removed. For the pilot, there were 244 books purchased as permanent additions to the collection and that will be available to CSUs. Jody recommends looking at DDA and Academic Complete to see which is better. The Ebook Working Group should make a decision at to whetherDDA is the best platform for ebooks

David Hellman commended Jody for handling this project and raised the question of whether there is continued interest in this type of project. He noted that he had heard from EBSCO and they have asked why they weren’t invited to the table for an ebook pilot.

Tim Strawn noted that DDA is very different from a large subscription to ebooks and it is hard to compare. It might be interesting to gather analytics relating to which campus bought which material and suggested that PDA-DDA may be better handled at the local level. He would not support another consortial pilot.

Jody is looking into which campus bought which book and will share this with everyone. She indicated that more time is needed to analyze the pilot and the benefits on a system level.

Gale asked the group whether the necessary information can be gathered so that at the in-person meeting we can discuss this situation. This will be important in framing our request for additional money for the ECC. She asked the group to think about how to gather input from all the campuses.

Carol asked for confirmation that we own the entire list of the 1392 DDA titles as a consortia and Jody confirmed that we do.

David noted that the data is interesting but asked if this will be part of the ECC? The ebook collection is a good collection-robust- but we need more time to determine whether this is sustainable. If individual campuses have to pick up the cost, they might lose interest. This pilot provided a big boost to our ebook holding and was a good deal. There was agreement that users are using ebooks more. David asked if central funding will continue. Eddie replied that there are no plans for this at the moment.

Gale suggested that EAR could make a request to support this plan to COLD and that EAR should drive the strategic direction and request funds.

Eddie informed the group that the initial quote of $250,000 was reduced to $175,000, but the price may increase in a renewal.

Gale commented that this was a good discussion and when we request additional funding for the ECC it should be for material we do not currently have. We should not request specific resources but categories of assets—for example, do we want funds for ebooks or streaming media, or electronic content to replace rather than lease.

David had a discussion with EBSCO and they want to present their package to us-it might be worth our time to consider a comparison trial. There was discussion about other options i.e. Springer, and a question of how much can we commit locally or systemwide.

Eddie noted that EBSCO has approached him and it may be a benefit to look at them, if only to encourage Proquest to offer good competitive prices.

The group discussed the ebook platforms and David will take a poll of interest in a trial of EBSCO.

1. **Usage Statistics Working Group report (any updates)**

Carol Perruso indicated there is nothing new to report since the group submitted recommendations in early fall. The common ILS system should be considered when a statistics system is chosen and a determination made about what can be done centrally and what can be farmed out. Carol will work with Ying--might have more information by end of January.

Carol suggested a workshop for the January meeting so that everyone can be walked through the Value Analysis model from David Beales and Nikki DeMoville.

1. **Journals Working Group report**

Paula reported that they are trying to regroup and figure out the status of the work they are doing with the loss of Mary Woodley on the group. They are currently working on analyzing the Elsevier package. She talked to David (Cal Poly San Luis) about his presentation at Charleston and he said they got good feedback on it. The Journals Working Group supports the Value Analysis model that David and Nikki are using. She will try to contact the people on the working group and get back on track. Gale can send the names of the working group members to Paula.

Tim agreed to discuss some ideas with Nikki and David about sharing the Value Analysis tool with other campuses.

Gale reported that COLD members had raised questions about how pricing was determined. Is the Journals Working Group looking at pricing model?  Tim noted that some publishers have their own models for pricing such as FTEs, usage, or what the base price of your print subscription was when you changed to electronic. Carol mentioned that the Working Group may wish to look at the pricing models for Wiley. Paula said they will include that discussion for the working group. Eddie noted he will need the information for the January renewal. Science Direct is pushing us to go onto their new pricing model. Carol seconds the urgency of this and noted that if a campus drops out then it throws a wrench into the pricing issue.

**Media Working Group report**

Susan Jackson and Mark Stackpole presented the draft charge for the Media Group and agreed to add Streaming” to the title of the group. Streamed media content can be tied into the LOFT goals which focus on de-selection of physical assets to open other spaces. This may increase our chances for additional funding. Susan and Mark noted they are still working on the procedure for CSU Trials.

1. **ECC Working Group report and Web of Science as part of core?**

**Request for additional funding for ECC**

Norm reported that the three major additions added to the ECC after last year’s survey (Academic Search Premier / Business Source Premier / JSTOR Arts and Sciences VIII-XII) have been well received by local users.   Other high priority resources not included in the revamped ECC include the former 10/90 journal packages from Springer (62/63), Elsevier (61/63), Wiley (61/63), and Sage (60/63) and more subject specific specialized resources such as  Mental Measurements Yearbook with Tests in Print (57/63) (Psychology), GeoRef (56/63) (Geology), ARTstor (51.5/63) (Art images), SPORTDiscus (51/63) (Physical Education / Kinesiology); Econlit with Full Text (50.5/63) (Economics), Anthrosource (50/63) (Anthropology), and SciFinder (48/63) (Chemistry).  This growing list of unfunded white elephants (~$12 million per year) will continue to put pressure on what is funded and included in the ECC each year.  Also discussed was a recent proposal to add Web of Science (48/63), which is currently subscribed to by 13 campuses, to the ECC.  The consensus of the group was that although Web of Science could be a useful addition to the ECC, that there already was a large funding shortfall between what is already included in the ECC and the many higher priority packages and specialized resources listed above.

Gale suggested that EAR should be realistic in requesting additional funds (discussed at COLD meeting), and an additional $1 million may be realistic. Eddie spoke to Gerry about a much larger amount to ensure equity across the CSU—approximately $12-$15 million, but he has not yet received a response. There was agreement that the ECC needs sustainable funding or material will have to regularly be cut. This will be a discussion topic at the January in-person meeting, with a goal to create a written recommendation.

1. **Chancellor’s Office Update (Eddie)**

The ECC is a bit over budget. Academic Complete (ebooks) contributes to this overage. Eddie sent fiscal year budget to all.

A decision on a CSU-wide Wiley package has to be made quickly because the deadline approaching. The Core titles list has been around for a long time. We can renegotiate these titles but if one campus drops a title everyone loses that title.

Tim noted that for Cal Poly SLO, the campus core subscription list was incorrect and the process to trade in titles needs to be simplified. He recommended that Eddie extend the deadline. There was discussion about applying the Value Analysis tool for all campuses to analyze use of the Wiley package, and there was much discussion about the unfair business practices and difficulties of working with Wiley. Because of this, the  University of Toronto dropped the Wiley package.

There was strong agreement and last year Carol forced the all-in price as a way to reduce the cost by $300,000. The language in the Wiley package requires 14 month advance notice for cancelation and their service has been terrible. Eddie has asked them to throw out present license and start again but Wiley says they are looking at doing this for next year. He noted the price isn’t bad. There was a suggestion of agreeing to all up or all down and then see what happens next year.

Tim noted that Wiley provides an important value for some campuses and asked if we can we renew for just a year? It was later noted that the renewal is for one year. We would need to gather data and analyze usage quickly. Gale will send out a note to COLD for their reactions about dropping Wiley.

Eddie stated that he had copied EAR on his response and the January 1 renewal date. He asked what concessions members would like to ask for from Wiley. Carol suggested that they throw out the current contract and start over-price is not issue-it is their business practices- and get a list of core titles campuses want to preserve. He asked if we would like to contract with them for one year and members agreed that we should move forward but examine the data and analyze for the future. Carol and Paula agreed to work with Eddie on the redistribution of pricing. Members agreed that analysis of the Wiley package could be done at the Value Analysis workshop in January.

1. **Setting our agenda for the in-person meeting**

Ebook anaylsis

Wiley redistribution of prices

Discussion about streaming media

Proposal for additional funds

Half hour demonstration of Value Analysis

Statistics working group presentation

Gale will draft an agenda

**Important note:** Mary Woodley has been a long-time valued member and contributor to EAR and the CSU. At the COLD meeting Gale heard that she was very ill. Gale will send on any updates and information.