EAR Minutes Jan. 15-16, 2014, CSU Channel Islands in-person meeting

Present: Stephen Stratton, CI; Annie Hor and Ron Rodriguez, Stanislaus; Jodi Shepherd, Chico; Hua Yi, San Marcos (phone); Norm Hutcherson, Bakersfield (phone); Sue Kendall, San Jose; Eddie Choy and Terri Joiner, SDLC; Carol Perruso and Susan Jackson, Long Beach; Mark Stackpole, Maritime; Ann Role, Fullerton; Jennifer Ware, Sacramento; Kenny Garcia, Monterey Bay; Wendy Vermeer and Ann Morgan, Pomona; Holly Yu, Los Angeles; Jeffra Bussmann, East Bay; Stacy Magedanz, San Bernardino.

Day 1

ECC Survey Results - Magedanz

Carol asked about interest in Westlaw replacing Lexis; Stacy noted that there was no specific question on the survey about that. Carol and Jodi commented that they prefer the law coverage in Westlaw to that in Lexis, and that the news content in Lexis is duplicated better by ProQuest.

The need for an archive of past surveys was noted. TJ will check back through her old files, SM will try looking also. These, along with other EAR documents really need to be archived on the web where people can get to them. [update: Most EAR documents are stored at the EAR SharePoint site, https://csyou.calstate.edu/groups/cold/ear/SitePages/Home.aspx)

Stacy commented that people do seem to want journals managed centrally, largely because they are expensive and people's budgets are shot. However, we have usually deliberately left them off the survey because they are so astronomically expensive there's no possibility of adding them to the ECC. Stephen and Eddie have heard of no new money coming in, although perhaps the Chancellor has an eye toward this for the future. Eddie and Gerry continue to pursue a "mega ECC" but Eddie is not optimistic, nor did he think we would get an inflationary increase this year.

ECC group should write up a set of recommendations, similar to those from a couple of years ago, although we are not optimistic getting them. Carol noted that no overlap analysis has been done between EBSCOhost Academic Search Complete and local subs; savings from cancellations might help subsidize the difference. Could interest in Complete be used as a bargaining chip with EBSCO to get better pricing? Some campuses are switching already.

Would rather use the survey as a recommendation for additions than for cuts. Might help Eddie and Gerry advocate for more funding. (Eddie deliberately overruns the budget each year, figuring that forgiveness is better than permission.) Deadline by next meeting.

We will need prices for the ECC items not currently available; Terri can get. Stacy noted that there's a need to capture oddball data, like the fact that CollegeSource is paid for centrally but not out of the ECC budget.

Stephen sent around a C.O. RFP for streaming media servers (not a content service, just a way to post your local content). We were unaware that they were doing so; several libraries have expressed need for such resources. Likely would not be paid for, but would have contracts available.

Response to Ebook editorial - Shepherd

Ebook working group is looking for feedback to write a response to an article about the hidden costs of ebooks written by SDSU professor Peter Herman. See: http://timesofsandiego.com/opinion/2014/09/29/hidden-costs-e-books-university-libraries/. The feeling in the group is that faculty may be complaining about things that they don't fully understand (and the writer's opinions may represent a particularly viewpoint). Usage statistics and student comments don't necessarily bear out the writer's dislike. Some disciplines seem particularly resistant to digital books, so we may need to take this into account. Ebooks can be particularly helpful in providing affordable textbook access, but they are not always available. Other points:

- Access across the system
- 24/7 access
- Economies of scale, in both purchasing and cataloging
- Ability to download may be limited, but at least it's there.
- Textbook access
- Searchable text
- Unlimited simultaneous users
- Enhanced reading tools for disabled users
- Save space & paper
- Writer assumes all ebooks are created equal
- Writer seems unaware of difference between purchase and subscribe
- Writer seems unaware of variety of ebooks available (many scholarly titles)
- Does the study literature really bear out his assertion that reading comprehension is poorer for ebooks than for print?
- Ignores needs of students in online degree programs and remote locations
- OK for trashy novels but not for serious learning? Condescending!
- Yes, we agree that libraries are underfunded! But money savings aren't the only reason for buying ebooks.

Working group reports:

Ebooks (Shepherd) – getting survey data. Discussed doing another more in-depth survey of libraries. Need for a mission statement. Investigate previously compiled lists of possible vendors. Getting usage stats from ebrary is a chore; awaiting delivery.

ECC (Magedanz) – Next step is to write recommendations based on survey.

Journals (Perruso) – Carol asks for a new chair for the working group; Nikki DeMoville of SLO was suggested. Price redistribution: There was an email from one campus objecting to a perceived high and solitary increase in their package. Carol is happy to pursue this with that campus rep offline. Questions raised about the "subsidies" – one from "winner" campuses, one from the system. There is a final, Gerry approved spreadsheet, but it's very complex—in addition to the formula and the subsidies, there's also inflation to contend with (and inflation is not factored into the spreadsheet). Yes, Steve and Annie will distribute it, for the sake of transparency.

What about the brutal hit in year 3? The idea with the subsidized phase-in was to give libraries time to talk to their administrators to increase their funding. Carol notes that the formula was adjusted twice to try to spare the smaller campuses. Here's an area where central payment and management of journals would really resolve all these issues of inequity, both in terms of payment and access across the CSU.

Sage also has complexities based on the number of titles; there are three different packages. For price reallocation, we will treat the 2013 package as "standard" and the 2014 as an "upgrade." (Again, central management would eliminate this sort of complexity.)

Statistics (Perruso): No report. Waiting on RFP responses for ULMS.

Streaming Media (Jackson): A streaming media collection should be added to the ECC. If additional funding was available the following vendors should be contacted: Alexander Street Press, Kanopy, and Films on Demand as potential providers. Depending on the amount of funding an existing collection offered by these vendors or discounted single titles could be considered. The content should have broad appeal.

Next step is to survey collection development officers in all CSU campuses in order to gather the knowledge and experience each campus has to offer concerning streaming media. The purpose would be to share this information with all campuses so that each campus could be better informed about streaming media and what is available commercially.

Day 2:

Charge to EAR - Stratton

The charge is old and badly in need of updating. Some points noted:

- ITAC representative—haven't had one for years, probably needed.
- SEIR has changed to SDLC
- Meets quarterly (online, via phone, or at various locations)
- 8 librarians—add instruction? Or just take out the specifications?
  - Move last paragraph, about geographic and size distribution, up.
- Vendor reviews—maybe add "as budget allows." Haven't done any product reviews for years.
- Delete "develop RFP & RFQ"
- Change SEIR to SDLC, UIAS to ULMS

- Two documents referred to—where are they? Also committee minutes of 96-97, long gone.
- Bottom of page 2 to mid-page 3—describes the review process, all of which has fallen by the wayside.
- Working groups--not mentioned (didn't exist prior to 2012)
- Mention outreach to collection development officers--has become much more important recently. Who runs the CD listserv? Also, some people who really should be on that list aren't; SM pleads for COLD to canvass their people to make sure they're on it. Ying in SDLC can add people?
- Survey and analyze hardware—no, we don't do that.

Stephen will make changes and send for comments.

Wiley - all

Need to gather info on what people are doing, collate into a web page or something. Carol agreed to collect campus action reports and then Steve will send to COLD.

Suggested that we gather a list of 200-400most valuable titles to use as a basic for negotiation next year; will need a working group. (Preliminary list was distributed prior to meeting.) Need to do analysis at system level of which titles are most used/cost effective across system, although Wiley has not been helpful at providing 2014 system statistics. Could someone at SLO run their nifty analysis formula? We noted that their formula does not factor in JR5 (e.g. current year) usage, which is a major factor considering that in most cases, at least for this year, and taking into account continued access & embargoes. Would help to have all campuses send their JR5's and 2014 data to Ying to collate, since Wiley is not helping. One lesson is that Wiley's value differs from campus to campus; some are heavy users and others are not.

COLD recommends that campuses do EAL licenses if they get local subscription. What about confidentiality clause? Debate about this, Wiley has said the contract language is non-negotiable, but it does have a confidentiality clause. Eddie felt that the clause does not prohibit sharing info among the CSU's (our interpretation is that the CSU is one entity), question is whether COLD wants to be able to publicly discuss costs, not just among ourselves. Straw poll of those in attendance:

- San Bernardino will subscribe a la carte to less than 20 titles
- Fullerton 65 titles
- Long beach 48 titles
- Sacramento none
- SJ none
- Monterey none
- SM working on selecting titles
- Pomona working on selecting titles
- LA working on selecting titles
- Maritime none

- East Bay none
- Stanislaus less than 20
- CI none
- Chico none

Campuses not renewing any titles from package plan to rely on ILL and Get It Now, particularly since we consider the impasse will last one year. Things will likely change if there is no 2016 contract.

Debate about whether to go direct through EBSCO (and pay service charge) or go direct to Wiley, since you have to sign the license in any case.

Generally regarding coverage: Purchased backfiles (pre-1997) remain permanently. "Core" for your campus will be 1997-2014. "Full" will vary, mostly 2007-8 to 2014. The main point is that the bulk of the material won't be lost; you just won't get 2015 content unless you have a current subscription. We need a generalized statement about coverage to give to our campuses.

The presence of the multiple "cores" for each campus has been another sticking point; it was based upon what each campus had in print way back at the beginning of the contract.

Minutes by SM.