**EAR Meeting Minutes**

**The meeting was held on January 26, 2016, 9:00-11:00am**

Members and guests convened via Zoom and/or phone at 9:00 a.m.

Members: Amy Wallace (Chair)(CSUCI), Laurel Bliss (SDSU) Naomi Moy (CSUDH), Amanda Grombly (CSUB), Kimberley Smith (CSUFr), Tim Strawn (SLO), George Wrenn (CSUH)

CO: Terri Joiner, Jessica Hartwigsen, Ying Liu, Grace Torres

Guests: Baron Becker (SDSU), Wendy Vermeer (CSUDH), Hua Yi (CSUSM), Stacy Magedanz (CSUSB), Ann Roll (CSUF), Michele Van Hoeck (Maritime), David Hellman Steele (SFSU)

**Updates**

1. **Upcoming Meetings**

The upcoming meeting schedule was presented.

Amy discussed the EAR meeting at Loyola Marymount in March to coincide with SCELC Vendor Day. SCELC is renting a room for CSU. Amy asked for names of those coming from campuses to SCELC for the EAR in-person and SCELC Product Review Committee. Committee members should notify Amy if they can attend the SCELC Product Review Committee meeting on the 10th. Those wishing to attend SECLC Vendor Day and other SCELC events need to register with SCELC.

Register here (research day, bowling, vendor day): [https://scelcapalooza2017.eventbrite.com](%20https%3A//scelcapalooza2017.eventbrite.com)

You can view the full Vendor Day schedule on [sched.com](http://sched.com/) here: [https://scelcapalooza2017.sched.com/overview/type/Vendor+Day](https://scelcapalooza2017.sched.com/overview/type/Vendor%2BDay)

**EAR In-Person Meeting on March 8, 1-5pm at Loyola Marymount University**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| WednesdayMarch 8 1-5pm | EAR Meeting(Limited to 1 rep plus EAR member per campus) | Laurel Bliss - SDSUJohn Brandt - StanChris Bulock – CSUNAmanda Grombly - FresnoAnn Roll – CSUFKathlene Hanson - MBDavid Steele Hellman – SFSUTerri Joiner - CONaomi Moy - CSUDHCarol Perruso – Long BeachGrace Torres – COKimberley Robles Smith - FresnoMark Stover – CSUNTime Strawn - SLOAmy Wallace – CIGeorge Wrenn – HumHolly Yu - LA |

**B. April 7, 1-2:30 pm (via Zoom)**

1. **Check-In on Campus/CO Logistics**
2. **Subscription Memos & Payment**

Has the additional information placed into the memos expedited the payment process for campuses?

Amy asked if the new subscription memos and payment processes is working. Amanda noted that it has been helpful. Tim noted a concern that was resolved via email. Amy took others silence as it is working.

1. **Subscription Memo Timeline**

Terri sent out an email on 9/26 on subscription memo timeline changes as a result of the ULMS implementation. Are there any questions?

Amy asked if there were questions about the timeline for ULMS implementation and delivery of EAR memos in the spring. The email regarding timeline changes will be resent.

1. **Other Campus/CO Logistic Concerns**

Amy and Mark Stover have discussed crossover representation on EAR/ULMS committees to ensure that committees are not doing duplicative work. Amy asked for feedback if there are still any concerns with overlapping responsibilities.

1. **Budget Discussion (See Attached Budget Research Document)**
2. **Potential Efficiencies**
3. ~~ECC MLA: Why are we paying the same cost for MLA for 5 Proquest (Channel Islands, Chico, MB/ML, San Diego, Sonoma) = $ 86,316 as 18 Ebsco = $ 85,506?~~

Updated Agenda Item:

1. ECC MLA via Proquest supports 13 campuses.  (Channel Islands, Chico, Dominguez Hills, East Bay, Humboldt, Monterey Bay, Northridge, Pomona, San Bernardino, San Francisco, SLO, San Marcos, Sonoma).

ECC MLA via EBSCO supports 10 campuses. (Bakersfield, Fresno, Fullerton, Long Beach, Los Angeles, Maritime, Sacramento, San Diego, San Jose and Stanislaus)

Amanda noted via chat: I have a feeling we may see more people leave EBSCO as we get further into ULMS because of the way it works in Primo.I think the issue was that we only had 2-3 weeks with Biological Abstracts. We need to be able to trial the other interface, at least 30 days.

1. ECC PSYCInfo/Art: Why are we negotiating with a different vendor just for Humboldt?
2. Overall ECC: Do we have too much in one area or has a resource outlived its usefulness for our students and faculty?

In discussing potential efficiencies, Amy noted that 13 campuses are now on ProQuest platform for MLA. Many switched last year. Discussion addressed reasons for switching, including cost savings, and whether switching platforms should be voluntary (Amy noted that CO continues to negotiate when only a few campuses continue to subscribe to a resource). Ann noted that appropriate lead time is needed for these negotiated vendor changes. Terri asked how much time is needed. Stacy responded that it’s important to know “as soon as possible” and that it is especially difficult to let faculty know of a change in the summer. It would be helpful to have information in March for a July renewal. It was noted that this is not always possible.

Amy noted that the rationale for platform changes were very much about vendor interfaces five years but that it’s much more cost-related now. George asked about the larger strategy for platform adoption and what drives those choices. Kimberley noted that Fresno chose EBSCO based on platform. The important of not “putting all one’s eggs in one basket” was noted. Amy suggested that a larger strategy discussion is needed to address how we are buying, and planning for, resources. This will be taken up at the March meeting when we address MLA pricing.

Amy asked if we have resources in ECC that have outlived their usefulness. George asked if CQ Researcher continues to be useful (there was an enthusiastic “yes” in response). **Via chat Wendy** said Keep CQ!, Laurel said SDSU is about to feature CQ on our home page, and Amanda said Bakersfield uses CQ and Opposing Viewpoints, but Opposing Viewpoints is easier for students to use.

Amy noted that it’s important to look closely at how what makes a resource core and to consider which resources would be maintained by campuses if they fall out of the ECC. Stacy noted that it would be wise to wait for dust to settle from the Alma migration and then evaluate data to help us make those decisions. Elements of this discussion will help with the timeline for EAR recommendations currently being developed by the committee.

1. **Permanent Budget Options:**
2. **Ethnic Studies Additions 2016/2017**

Ethnic NewsWatch $26,652 and GenderWatch $28,821. Backfiles? Other Databases. Justification the Ethnic Studies Task Force Report. <http://www.calstate.edu/AcadAff/ethnicstudiesreport.pdf>.

Amy noted that it will be important provide justifications for any requests for additional funding. The inclusion of GenderWatch and Ethnic NewsWatch in the ECC is supported by the increased attention being given to ethnic studies within the CSU (see Ethnic Studies Task Force report).

1. **Actual Cost**

Actual ECC Deficit as a result of incremental cost increases over the years $135,000 plus 5% for items on annual renewal. CO been paying on one time for years.

Amy noted that we are over budget in ECC spending and asked the group to consider ways to address the $135K deficit which exists in the ECC budget after the switch to WestLaw (before factoring in the additions of GenderWatch and Ethnic NewsWatch).

1. **Other Budget Additions (See Appendix A)**
	* No Education Resource currently in ECC despite EDD and credentials at every CSU. Proquest Education Full-text? EBSCO Educational Complete? Justification memos, online?
	* Update to academic & Business search complete
	* Mental Measurements?
	* Dissertations Part B – STEM
	* Others? Before we discuss should we add something to the Resources to be considered list and why. Open Access Investments (LOCKSS, Knowledge Unlatched, West, etc.)
	* Strategy for joint meeting and vendor day?

**4. Other Budget One-time Asks (See Appendix A)**

* Backfiles? Perpetual eBook? Perpetual Media?
* Strategy for joint meeting and vendor day?

Amy asked if there are ideas for purchases or other items that we should pursue if money becomes available. Discussion included: resources for EDD Credential programs, which seven campuses have. The importance of access to dissertations was noted (CSUSB). There was support for updating to Academic Complete and Business Complete. Amy noted that the greater universality of coverage provided by these products is important. Amy also noted that interest in additional STEM content should be addressed.

Amy noted that it will be essential to provide justifications for any budget augmentation request. She wants EAR to make the case for the resources and why they are considered essential, not just address the need for covering costs. Suggestions for resources mentioned in chat included: Royal Society of Chemistry, BioOne, RefUSA, IBISWorld, opt-ins like Elsevier, nursing resources.

Tim noted that smaller campuses suffer from smaller budgets and that we need to provide a broad-based undergraduate experience for the whole system. Resources that support 1st and 2nd year students are essential and 6-8 resources of that nature should be identified. The importance of considering one-time purchases, rather than subscriptions, was also noted. Amy noted that NBC Learn will not be renewed (this resource was not funded by the ECC).

Amy asked the group to think about resources for a one-time list that we should have ready to go if the budget improves, along with reasons for those resources in relation to programs or areas in need of support.

Via Chat: Wendy noted DH tries to balance expensive nursing subscriptions that aren't available elsewhere. Laurel said thumbs up to upgrading to academic/business complete. Ann agreed. Amanda would want to see an overlap analysis. Wendy wants to see Royal Society of Chemistry, BioOne, IBIS World would be high priorities for usRef USA -- the angle to spin that one is that helps students with job search! Amanda said IBISWorld, and some of the opt-ins like Elsevier. Wendy added OVID Nursing collection I & II. Amanda noted CSUB had to cancel OVID. George said Streaming media products: Kanopy, Theatre in Video Series (ASP); Counseling and Therapy in Video (ASP). George added Web of Science. Some wanted to dump but faculty use.

Funding Ethnic Newswatch and Gender Watch, funding erosion, and upgrading all will be the foundation for EAR’s 2017/2018 budget recommendation. The in-person meeting will be used to craft this recommendation as well as augment with future subscription proposals and one-time purchases.

1. **Workgroup Finalization & Chairs**

Amy noted that volunteers have been identified. Reports will be due on April 7th. Amy asked for a volunteer to convene each group. The group will then choose a chair and provide Amy with a brief report on their work plan.

Conveners are:

Analytics: George Wrenn

Ebooks: Naomi Moy

Media Group: Amanda Grombly

**#1 Electronic Resources – Analytics**

**Volunteers:** Perruso (Long Beach)Smith (Fresno), Strawn (SLO), Ware (Sacramento), and Wrenn (Humboldt)

Charge: Provide COLD with and executive summary of on the state of out analytics for collective and individual decision making on electronic resources.  Plus any recommendations for change.

Premise: The CSU Libraries will implement a ULMS in summer 2017, which will provide a suite of central capabilities that could create collective opportunities and efficiencies. Available funding in the CSU continues to move from central to local allocation, and the allocation of local funding will most likely be driven by the Graduation Initiative. The funding allocated via COLD is not expected to increase in the near future.

Proposal: EAR charges 3-5 subgroups led by EAR members and populated with knowledgeable non-members to consider a way(s) forward on issues raised by past and present EAR committees. Provide ways forward at the **April 7 meeting**.

* Where does data come from (IPEDS, ULMS, CDers, Vendors) centrally and individually.
* What is the quality of that data
* When is it available
* What does it tell us
* What decisions could it help us make in terms of acquisition, negotiation, renegotiation, renewal, or elimination
* What needs changing to make better decisions in terms of acquisition, negotiation, renegotiation, renewal, or elimination
* What might be missing to make better decisions in terms of acquisition, negotiation, renegotiation, renewal, or elimination

**#2 Electronic Resource – Electronic Books**

**Volunteers:** Bliss (San Diego), Moy (Dominguez Hills), Hagan (Humboldt)

**Charge:** Provide COLD with a proposal for moving electronic book acquisition from local to central post ULMS Implementation.

Premise: The CSU Libraries will implement a ULMS in summer 2017, which will provide a suite of central capabilities that could create collective opportunities and efficiencies. Available funding in the CSU continues to move from central to local allocation, and the allocation of local funding will most likely be driven by the Graduation Initiative. The funding allocated via COLD is not expected to increase in the near future.

Proposal: EAR charges 3-5 subgroups led by EAR members and populated with knowledgeable non-members to consider a way(s) forward on issues raised by past and present EAR committees. Provide ways forward at the **April 7 meeting**.

* How could this be handled centrally?
* Vendors
* PDA or Non-PDA
* Perpetuity only/Blend/Licensed Only
* How might we fund with no new monies (request annual $ from CO, everyone kicks in X amount like journals or ULMS).
* Conversion of high use electronic book to 23
* Phase out local acquisition?

**#3 Electronic Resource – Media**

**Volunteers:** Stover (Northridge) and Grombly (Bakersfield), Gu (Scramento, Hanson (MB), Yi (SM)

**Charge:** Provide COLD with a proposal for a media pilot for post ULMS Implementation.

Premise: The CSU Libraries will implement a ULMS in summer 2017, which will provide a suite of central capabilities that could create collective opportunities and efficiencies. Available funding in the CSU continues to move from central to local allocation, and the allocation of local funding will most likely be driven by the Graduation Initiative. The funding allocated via COLD is not expected to increase in the near future.

Proposal: EAR charges 3-5 subgroups led by EAR members and populated with knowledgeable non-members to consider a way(s) forward on issues raised by past and present EAR committees. Provide ways forward at the **April 7 meeting**.

* Acquire or license?
* System to stream (hosted by CSU or individual vendors)
* Could this be handled centrally?
* Vendors
* PDA or Non-PDA
* How might we fund with no new monies (request annual $ from CO, everyone kicks in X amount like journals or ULMS).
* Potential book chapter

**IV. Other Concerns**

Amy asked if there are other concerns and none were raised.

**The Meeting adjourned at 10:20.**