**EAR Meeting Minutes**

**Date:** March 8, 2017

**Time:** 1-5 p.m.

**Location:** Loyola Marymount, Room 1775, University Hall

**EAR Attendees:**

Laurel Bliss (SDSU), Amanda Grombly (CSUB), Kimberley Smith (Fresno), Mark Stover (Northridge), Tim Strawn (SLO , Amy Wallace (CSUCI, chair), Jennifer Ware (Sacramento), George Wrenn (Humboldt)

**Guests:** John Brandt (Stanislaus), Chris Bulock (CSUN), Kathleen Hansen (CSUMB), David Hellman (SFSU), Terri Joiner (SDLC), Donna LaFollette (SCELC) and Jason Price (SCELC), Ann Roll (CSUF), Michelle Swadish (CSUF), Wendy Vermeer (CSUDH), Holly Yu (CSULA)

Rick Burke welcomed the attendees to SCELC.

1. **Updates**
2. **COLD moved its April meeting so EAR April needed to be moved. Doodle poll taken, and the meeting has been rescheduled for April 25 1:00-2:30.**

Next meeting will be call-in. Subgroups are requested to meet the April 7 deadline set for reports.

1. **COLD has called for a proposal to spend $35,000. EAR will draft a proposal at this meeting as part of its One-Time expenditure discussion.**

One time expenditure recommendation will be addressed in the proposal.

1. **Member Tim Strawn on behalf of EAR asked the CO has open opt-in negotiations for YBP’s GOBI. Eddie indicated that he was already in talks and will add in requirements suggested in the EAR request. EAR will explore other potential opt-ins at this meeting.**

Opt-in for YBP GOBI: Talks are underway to license the api for electronic ordering.

1. **Check-In on Campus/CO Logistics**
2. **Other Campus/CO Logistic Concerns**

Wendy Vermeer asked for advice on setting up effective lines of communication with her campus, given changes to library staff responsible for budget, and recordkeeping that is poor or absent. It was noted that CPOs and chartfields are important to preserve. It was also noted that the campus officer should sit in on library acquisitions meetings to understand how they work. Licenses, contracts, and spreadsheet of expenditure are important to maintain. PeopleSoft will not reflect all library transactions and it’s important to keep parallel records in the Library. It was noted that reconciliation between the library system and CMS should be done. Rollovers in fiscal years can be inconsistent; find out what the campus requires; know what’s coming down the road.

Terri noted that new memos will be coming in the next couple of weeks. EBSCO is still being worked on.

1. **Acquisitions Discussion**
2. **Discussion: Opportunities to Save on ECC**

**From Eddie: Our main concern has always been to rein in the costs for the ECC.**

**We have slowly reduced the number of multiple sources for ECC packages over the years, so there are now only a few products left that fall under multiple vendors. We have done this in a number of ways, all of which allowed for campuses specific needs.**

* **SDLC continues to monitor Psych Info and Psych Art pricing…In 2017/18, SDLC will work on systemwide pricing for both APA products.  Like MLA, the goal will be to allow campuses to choose the preferred platform and hopefully save the ECC money.**

Amy noted that campus can continue work with the vendor of their choice.

* **BioAbs – SDLC was able to negotiate an extremely good systemwide offer so we announced that all campuses would be moved to Thomson/Web of Science.  The move reduced the ECC spend by approx. $47k.  The feedback from campuses was very positive and supportive.**

Amy noted that BioAbs is moving forward without choice of platform.

* **For MLA, we provided campuses with pricing from both EBSCO and ProQuest.  Because campuses had strong opinions on which platform they prefer, they were given the option to choose, regardless of the cost.  The result saved the ECC over $10k.   If the remaining campuses would agree to switch platforms, the ECC would save an additional $12k.**
* **Competitive opt-in pricing for GeoRef and Philosophers Index is currently available through EBSCO and ProQuest.**

To date, 50% have switched platforms to Proquest.

Amy noted that choice of platform will continue. There will be an overall savings to the ECC. Platform switches may allow ECC to save money. It was noted that EBSCO representation overall is high. Alma indexing of EBSCO products continues to be an issue. EBSCO rep Janet Lerch has indicated that they are talking with ProQuest but nothing has been resolved.

CSULA noted that their analysis indicates that Primo retrieves 1/3 of the results of Summon. It was also noted that work is being done to close the gaps and that the Alma Discovery Subgroup is looking at indexing issues. Amy suggested asking for updates from the Discovery Subgroup if there are concerns. Indexing problems are unlikely to be solved before the go live date. Amanda noted that there are way to boost results but that the underlying problem remains.

Amy will send a note to the Discovery Subgroup about the concerns expressed.

1. **Discussion: ECC Drops or Additions**

Notes: Amy asked for thoughts on drops or additions in the context of establishing universality of access across the system. She noted that a budget augment for Ethnic Newswatch and GenderWatch is desirable.

Adds discussed:

Data, GIS and industry products: Policy Map; Dun and Bradstreet; Social Explorer; Simply Map; Policy Map; Data Planet; Statista; IBISWorld.

Reasons provided for Policy Map included: interdisciplinarity and the fact that it touches all areas of curriculum.

Tim asked if all campuses have ESRI. Tim noted that the audience for these data/GIS products should be considered (upper vs. lower division students), as well as the availability of free resources. It was noted that lots of calls come for this kind of material. Statista was noted to be most useful for its plug and play features. It was requested that SDLC look into options and consider existing campus usage stats.

Other additions mentioned for consideration:

Reference collections (e.g., Oxford), multimedia and ebooks.

The concept of pooling money for ebboks, so that multiple campuses are not buying the same book over and over again, should be considered as a way to realize cost savings and provide better overall access. Alternative ebook models should be considered. Perpetual access and purchase of the highly-used titles that drop from packages should be considered.

Drops discussed:

It was suggested that the most logical place to look for drops is the abstracting and indexing products. It was also noted that indexing products fit into the spirit of the ECC.

Amy stressed the importance of making ECC decisions that reflect campus and CSU priorities, as well as the long-range goals of the CSU and CSU libraries. An effective message about the value of the ECC and what it accomplishes in terms of stability is also needed. It will also be important to develop a map of the landscape we want to move into. What should the ECC look like 5 to 10 years from now? If we continue to make incremental decisions, we don’t assess the big picture. Modes of access such as licensing vs. perpetual access should also be considered. It was noted that making the most of dollars should be a priority.

ECC support for the CSU Graduation Initiative, and the need to provide more universality of access (e.g., mega-ECC), were also discussed. Mark noted that data about resources and how they support student success should be developed. He noted that we should be more strategic and less tactical. CSU-LA has been looking at ways to include library resource use in student success initiatives at the campus level. Their study is expected to take 3 years. Amy noted that it’s important to have library representation on campus GI committees. The people-to-people relationships and connections will be key. Emma Gibson at Pomona is engaged in data collection related to student success: they have four years of data and they will be publishing on it soon.

1. **Discussion: All-Ins**

Discussion of all-ins included:

GOBI api (YBP); Up-to-Date Nursing (Walters-Kluwer);Kanopy Streaming (how to centralize would need to be determined); Audiobooks (under an academic model); Films on Deman); ArtStor

Questions were raised about the mechanics of doing all-in for streaming media.

Ebook discussion considered: finding ways of licensing popular titles (so that they don’t get pulled); the need to be selective about titles to be kept in perpetuity; losing ebook titles and finding ways to retain the most popular titles; the need to be selective about titles kept in perpetuity; packages that are used highly for textbooks and tying purchases to textbook use; one-time purchase of high-use reference works; and the need to be selective about titles to be kept in perpetuity.

It was mentioned that Springer’s ebook packages permit purchase of print books (“my copy” service). SLO does overlap analysis to match textbook lists to ebook packages.

Amy noted that affordability and stability should continue to be a priority. Amy will consult with Eddie Choi about want can be done to address ebook stability issues. She indicated that Subgroups will continue to explore solutions for moving forward with ebook disruptions. Jason Price mentioned that a SCELC all-in for ebooks is under consideration. It may be appropriate to ask vendors to address the issue of drops and provide CSU with analysis of what is being bought across the system. Jason also mentioned that pressure from multiple consortia can be brought to bear on ebook vendors. He also indicated that EBL data is available and can help with analysis. Amy noted that data from three previous pilots should also be considered.

1. **Opt-Ins**

Suggestions included:

Naxos Music

Music Online

SciFinder

Choice Reviews

Foundation directory

HAPI

1. **One-Times**

None were mentioned.

1. **EAR Budget Proposal & 5 YR Plan**

Amy mentioned the importance of providing justifications for ECC budget increases. Going forward, the intention is to work on incremental yearly increases and put a renewed focus on stability and universal, equitable access. Analysis of individual campuses spending on ebooks and other packages will be essential to the goal of achieving more equitable access. It was noted that it’s worth looking at turnaways at the system level. Mark noted that the preservation aspects of resource acquisition should be considered and he will be asking for LOCKSS pricing through STIM. Mark mentioned that open access initiatives and projects will be a focus for EAR in the next year.

Amy asked that further suggestions for about budget be emailed to EAR list. A long-term plan for budgeting will be essential for the success of future EAR committees.

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Budget Proposal | Amount | Type | Notes |
| **2017/2018** | **$135,000** | **Increase** | **Maintain CSU Electronic Core Collection (Subscription): Actual ECC Deficit as a result of incremental cost increases over the years $135,000 plus 5% for items on annual renewal. Rationale: CO been paying on one time for years and allows for stable access to core databases for all CSU students at significantly reduced consortia prices.** |
|  | **Increase** | **Maintain CSU Electronic Core Collection (Subscription): Implement LOCKSS for the system and Subscribe to West. This will insure access to subscription content if licenses are not renewed.** |
| **$60,000** | **Increase** | **Content to ECC: Ethnic NewsWatch $26,652 and GenderWatch $28,821. Rationale: These two databases were added to the core collection after the CO circulated the** [**http://www.calstate.edu/AcadAff/ethnicstudiesreport.pdf**](http://www.calstate.edu/AcadAff/ethnicstudiesreport.pdf)**. CSU paid on time for consortia prices which allowed the system to pay a bit less overall for the databases and at the same time opening access to the six campuses that did not already subscribe.** |
| **$200,000.** | **One-Time** | **Content to CSU Electronic Core Collection (Permanent): Explore Central Electronic Book and Media Acquisition Efficiencies Post-ULMS. EAR subgroups will identify high use ebook and media titles that have been purchased individually by 10 or more CSU libraries and work with vendors to upgrade access to all 23 campuses.** |
|  | **0** | **Potential Savings Centrally & Locally** | **Efficiencies, All-Ins, Opt-Ins** |
| **2018/2019** | **$250,000** |  | **Maintain CSU Electronic Core Collection (Subscription): Incremental cost for items on annual renewal. Rationale: CO been paying on one time for years and allows for stable access to core databases for all CSU students at significantly reduced consortia prices. Items have been dropped in the core to absorb cost increases over the last 10 years. Costs have shifted to campuses which does not allow the system to leverage consortia pricing and campuses absorb the costs of these core databases resulting in inequities in access across the system to core electronic resources.** |
|  |  | **Increase** | **Content to CSU Electronic Core Collection (Subscription):** |
|  |  | **One-Time** | **Content to CSU Electronic Core Collection (Permanent):** |
|  | **0** | **Potential Savings Centrally & Locally** | **Efficiencies, All-Ins, Opt-Ins** |
| **2019/2020** | **$250,000** |  | **Maintain CSU Electronic Core Collection (Subscription): Incremental cost for items on annual renewal. Rationale: CO been paying on one time for years and allows for stable access to core databases for all CSU students at significantly reduced consortia prices. Items have been dropped in the core to absorb cost increases over the last 10 years. Costs have shifted to campuses which does not allow the system to leverage consortia pricing and campuses absorb the costs of these core databases resulting in inequities in access across the system to core electronic resources.** |
|  |  | **Increase** | **Content to CSU Electronic Core Collection (Subscription):** |
|  |  | **One-Time** | **Content to CSU Electronic Core Collection (Permanent):** |
|  | **0** | **Potential Savings Centrally & Locally** | **Efficiencies, All-Ins, Opt-Ins** |
| **2020/2021** | **$250,000** |  | **Maintain CSU Electronic Core Collection: Incremental cost for items on annual renewal. Rationale: CO been paying on one time for years and allows for stable access to core databases for all CSU students at significantly reduced consortia prices. Items have been dropped in the core to absorb cost increases over the last 10 years. Costs have shifted to campuses which does not allow the system to leverage consortia pricing and campuses absorb the costs of these core databases resulting in inequities in access across the system to core electronic resources.** |
|  |  | **Increase** | **Content to CSU Electronic Core Collection (Subscription):** |
|  |  | **One-Time** | **Content to CSU Electronic Core Collection (Permanent):** |
|  | **0** | **Potential Savings Centrally & Locally** | **Efficiencies, All-Ins, Opt-Ins** |
| **2021/2022** | **$250,000** |  | **Maintain CSU Electronic Core Collection: Incremental cost for items on annual renewal. Rationale: CO been paying on one time for years and allows for stable access to core databases for all CSU students at significantly reduced consortia prices. Items have been dropped in the core to absorb cost increases over the last 10 years. Costs have shifted to campuses which does not allow the system to leverage consortia pricing and campuses absorb the costs of these core databases resulting in inequities in access across the system to core electronic resources.** |
|  |  | **Increase** | **Content to CSU Electronic Core Collection (Subscription):** |
|  |  | **One-Time** | **Content to CSU Electronic Core Collection (Permanent):** |
|  | **0** | **Potential Savings Centrally & Locally** | **Efficiencies, All-Ins, Opt-Ins** |

1. **Workgroup Updates**

**Workgroup will still provide ways forward on April 7. We will discuss at April 25 meeting to prepare for COLD June meeting.**

1. **Electronic Resources – Analytics**

Survey has gone out. Amy noted that she is willing to contact campuses to ensure a high response rate.

1. **Electronic Resource – Electronic Books**

Survey has gone out.

1. **Electronic Resource – Media**

Data from the survey of two years ago is being analyzed. Another survey may be done. Vendor logs are being analyzed.

Wendy mentioned that consortial media acquisitions in the Alma environment are being looked at with Terri Joiner and Edie Choi.

1. **Other Concerns**

Ann Roll asked if group acquisition of non-electronic (print) resources has been discussed. Amy noted that discussions have happened amongst deans about resource sharing and shared print acquisitions. Alma will provide opportunities for new governance models. She encouraged the group to keep thinking about, and sharing, possibilities for Alma and what it will allow us to do.

Other items discussed: popular reading collections and sharing of these collections; approval plans (and mechanisms governing approval); print book spending.