**EAR Meeting Conference Call – April 9, 2014, 2pm – 4pm**

In Attendance:  Jeffra Bussmann, Eddie Choy, Gale Etschmaier, Paula Hammett, Kathleen Hanson, David Hellman, Annie Hor, Norm Hutcherson, Susan Jackson, Terri Joiner, Stacy Magedanz, Christina Mayberry, Naomi Moy, Carol Perruso, Janet Pinkley, Ann Roll, Ken Ryan, Kimberly Smith, Mark Stackpole, Tim Strawn, Grace Torres, Wendy Vermeer,  Hua Yi

1. Welcome and Review of Agenda, including volunteer for minutes

No revisions of the agenda requested; Janet Pinckley volunteered to take minutes.

1. Report from Ebook Working Group (David Hellman)

Discussion is based on the Academic Complete usage statistics provided to the EAR working group via an e-mail from David Hellman on April 7th.  These statistics are the most up to date and cover June 2013 through March 2014.

Things that David noticed about the statistics:

* The number of subscribed titles is almost as big as the package itself.
* Almost $9 million dollars’ worth of titles used
* As you look down the list, some of the lower users make sense (smaller campus population) while other campuses may have low usage because they added their MARC records late.
* The anomalies appear at the campus level data; there is possibly duplication in usage so David is encouraging everyone to go to Neil to ask for a custom report for their campus.

The package is getting renewed for the 2014-2015 year.

It should also be noted that there is overlap between Safari and Academic Complete so that might impact some of the usage as well for campuses that have Safari.

Some issues David sees with this package:

* Stability of content
* Issues with Hackett Publishing – David received a note from  that Hackett Publishing was pulling their titles from the package.  By the time he received the notification the titles were already gone.  There was no prior notice given; we absolutely need notice for disappearing titles as they might be being used for a course.
* There are some issues with the interface, particularly with mobile access, mobile sign-ins, etc…
* There are questions and concerns about how they are going to integrate EBL.
* We really have to stay on top of and articulate our needs and what we want from them rather than just accepting what they have to offer.

Eddie is currently working with  on renewal; he is asking that as part of the agreement they can’t pull any titles during the academic year and they have to give us advanced notice of pulled titles.

The ebook working group is working with Eddie for an EBSCO ebook trial.

There will be turnover for the ebooks working group for next year.  Here are some things for the new members to consider as they take over:

* Should we do other ebook subscription trials (Springer?)?
* Should we consider purchasing bundles of books vs. subscriptions?
* Interlibrary Loan/sharing resources – where is this going to go with ebooks?

Gale: Before the end of the year and the transition to new committee members and working group members, maybe this group could make some preliminary recommendation on other products that we could consider for the future.

1. Report from Streaming Media Working Group (Susan Jackson, Ann Roll)

The streaming media working group is still developing their survey but hope to get it out in the next week with a tentative response deadline on May 1st.

Clarification: Once it is ready to send out, who should it be sent to?  EAR members?  CD Officers?  Both?

Gale: Since it’s done through a working group of EAR it should get sent out to EAR but it should go to the CD Officers as well.

Susan Jackson will send a draft of the survey to Gale so that she can see it before the COLD meeting on April 17th and 18th.

There was not enough interest from campuses on the Alexander Street Press trial to justify a system-wide agreement.

Tim S: We have had the Alexander Street Press VAST collection for a year now and the usage stats indicate that people spend about 6.5 minutes per session looking at different pages but don’t download any videos so we are not likely to renew.

Paula: We have had VAST for several years and some components are much more heavily used than others.

Sharing information about what people are using and their experience is very valuable.

1. Report from Journals Working Group and Identification of a new Chair for this group (Carol Perruso)

The following conversation centers around the distribution spreadsheet sent out by Gale Etschmaier to EAR members on April 7.

The analysis that Carol picked up from the work that she and Paula had done came about after feedback from COLD.  Gale asked Carol to also include a new formula that combined FTE, usage, and a factor called base (meaning an even distribution of costs between 22 campuses).

She also did another calculation which was distribution of costs for upper division students and grad students.

She has been asked about breaking it down to degrees offered – she did do this but it is not a distribution that is sustainable.

In any scenario, there will be significant decreases in the cost for the following campuses:

* Fullerton
* Long Beach
* San Diego
* San Jose

In any scenario, there will be significant increases in the cost for the following campuses:

* Channel Islands
* Monterey Bay
* San Bernardino

Carol tried to look at how we could lessen the impact to the 3 campuses with increases but there was not a logical formula that resolved this.

1/3 base (price divided between 22 campuses – Maritime and Moss Landing were not included in this), 1/3 upper division grad FTE, 1/3 on usage.  Using that formula she also added on a 10% surcharge to the 4 campuses that were going to see a large reduction in cost and gave that to the 3 campuses that were going to see a large increase in cost.   These surcharges are included and applied in the spreadsheet.  An important issue noted: any equal distribution of the “base” cost penalizes smaller campuses. As a group, EAR has discussed implementing a new price distribution. The changes would be significant and would need to be phased in to allow planning time. It is also important that the new price distribution not penalize the smaller campuses.

There is no perfect solution.

In all scenarios the impact is as follows:

15 campuses would have a fairly benign change one way or the other.

4 campuses would see significant decreases in their costs.

3 campuses will see significant increases in their costs.

The detail tab is not all the way cleaned up.  The sum tab is what people should be referring to.

For campuses that are facing an increase, if they decided to then drop some of the products, what would that do to the formula and everyone else’s prices?

Comment: As our enrollment potentially changes/ grows, that will have an impact.  It is not a bad idea to continue to look at a more equitable distribution of costs.  To some extent it may undermine potential negotiations with publishers.  It may allow institutions to participate at a better price point but it’s not a message that we want to send to vendors who are obsessed with pricing of their package, pricing of core titles, etc…

Response: If these internal distributions get communicated to the vendors, then yes, we might see negative impact.  However, we usually just talk about pricing overall and how we distribute this amongst us.  However, if a campus opts out and what the vendor is calculating for that campus is different than our number this will not only impact the distribution but the vendor will see that our price doesn’t match.

Kimberly: Fresno has considered pulling out of the opt-in resources because overpaying caused their collection to suffer.

Carol: Everyone needs to do what is right for their campus.  For example, when Carol pulled out of Wiley for her campus it was not an easy decision and it caused problems for the formula, but it was a decision that she had to make for her campus.

Eddie: We don’t have to have one formula for all of our opt-in packages – we can tweak the formula for individual packages.

Gale: In the COLD meeting there was a strong request to examine and adjust the price distribution.

Questions to Gale:

* On the April 18th meeting COLD members are planning to vote on what formula to use?
* Are they also planning to discuss how to mitigate the effects on the smaller campuses and how to implement this over time?

Gale: If we recommend some options, probably.  COLD will really be relying on recommendations from EAR on this.

A concern is that the formulas we have sent over only included 3 packages, and it was the 3 simplest packages.  If we throw some other packages into the formula, we haven’t really looked at the impact of this.

There needs to be more exploration into the application of this formula to other packages.

Carol is going to try to apply the formula to additional packages prior to COLD.

Stacy: A little bit alarmed about the direction that this is moving; this started as the repricing of certain packages not a complete repricing of all things offered through ECC.  One way to phase this in for the campuses that will take a large hit is to select one package at a time to implement the new formula.  Also, we would need advanced notice to ensure that we don’t have to continually drop because of drastic price increases.

Gale: This is the same conversation that is happening in COLD on some level; those overpaying are saying that they can’t continue to pay part of other people’s share and they are going to have to consider dropping and seeking alternative pricing.

1. ECC (Norm Hutcherson)

Discussion based on revised ECC draft proposal documents sent to EAR committee members by Norm Hutcherson on Friday, April 4.

This is a document for us to review for things that we would like to have included at the various pricing options ranging from the current $5M baseline package, to more inclusive packages ranging from $6.5M (30% increase) to the $20M Mega ECC proposal.

Paula: Did you have a chance to look at subject content?

Norm: Yes, to a point, but primarily the resources included especially at the lower levels were based on both the priority established by last year’s ECC survey and the cost of the various resources that could be effectively included.  For example, I would have liked to put Sage higher than Springer at the $6.5M and $10M levels, but instead had to opt for Springer instead (or a variety of other resources) at the $6.5M level simply because of cost.

Question: If we do not get an increase from the Chancellor’s Office, will we need to drop any packages from the ECC?

The current ECC priced out at just over $5M last year.  Assuming a 5% inflation, the working group assumes that there will be a $300K shortfall that will have to be accounted for.  Based on a quick look at priorities, potential drops would include:

[Soft Break]

* Sociological Abstracts (54)
* Oxford Music Online (53)
* Oxford English Dictionary (49)
* MathSciNet (46) access fee
* Mergent Online (57)
* and/or CINAHL (55)

On the $10M package, Sage could be substituted in place of Springer as a key component of the proposed package.

1. NBC Learn update

Eddie: The first he heard of this was at COLD – he started looking into NBC Learn and they informed him that they were now working directly with the Chancellor and procurement.

David H:  Is there any consensus of opinion from COLD about this?

Gale: There has been some discussion about meeting with the Chancellor to impart the importance of libraries in the CSU and the role of EAR and COLD, to the Chancellor.  Discussion of the purchasing decision about NBC Learn may distract from this message.

It is a done deal and it is a 3 year commitment from the Chancellor’s Office.

1. Update on Renewals and Mega ECC (Eddie Choy)

Renewals for July are going on the normal course.

Mega ECC Eddie is working with the business and finance people at the CO and they are very interested in the mega ECC and are being strategic about crafting it so that it is appealing to all involved.

How can EAR and COLD best participate in putting forward this proposal?

Once Eddie knows the approach that the finance people want to move this forward; he will advise.

There is concern that the Mega ECC will appear as if the CO is making budgetary decisions on behalf of the campuses.  SDLC is working on crafting a message to inform campuses that the decisions regarding Mega ECC will be made by collaboration between campuses. Eddie asked that if opportunity arises, for campus library leadership to promote the Mega ECC to campus presidents.

If we don’t go forward with this large mega ECC at this time, maybe we can go forward asking for $1-2 million to account for inflation.

1. UC Potential Collaboration

Eddie informed the group of potential collaboration among the UCs, CSUs, and CCs. This kind of collaboration could enhance the bargaining power of all of our institutions with vendors.

Meeting adjourned: 4:08pm