**EAR Meeting Minutes**

**Date/Time:** November 28, 2018, 2:00- 3:30 p.m. PDT

**Location:** Virtual through Zoom

EAR Members Present: Michele Van Hoeck (Chair), Brinna Pam Anan, Aslihan Bulut, Cesar Caballero (Vice Chair), Tracy Gilmore, Kathlene Hanson, David Hellman, Teri Joiner, Jill Vassilakos-Long, Mary Wegmann, George Wrenn, Hua Yi

Others present: Lee Adams, Emily Chan (SJSU), Eddie Choy (CO), Heather Cribbs, Jessica Hartwigsen (CO), Jodi Shepherd, Ying Liu (CO)

Minute Taker: Aslihan Bulut

Call to Order: The meeting was called to order by Michele Van Hoeck at 2:01 p.m. PDT.

**1. E-book Pilot Project update – David Hellman (chair), Aslihan Bulut, Kathlene Hanson**

David update: JSTOR DDA has been working out well. We have over $71K in it. Twenty-six books purchased as of 11/26/18 and the list sent to EAR. We have had 43,565 chapter downloads so far and it is an indication of success. Another 4000+ titles added to the corpus. There is a lot of potential for this and the key is to find centralized funding, it is helpful to find this money for the pilot. I have been discussing with Springer a similar pilot and the possibility of exploring this further.

Michele inquired about the remaining budget and David reported that the current budget is fine right now and he will keep us posted if we run out of funds. We may revisit this in late spring.

**2. Streaming Media Project update – Jill Vassilakos-Long (chair), Hua Li, Cesar Caballero**

Jill update: An update to the committee can be emailed if people are interested. Committee looked at EBA projects and looked at Kanopy. A number of campuses are concerned about the costs of Kanopy and they are not interested in EBA. Surveyed campuses to find out a little more and was able to speak to sixteen of twenty-three campuses. There are several models:

1) create access copies from institutional DVD purchases to be used for a single class for a single semester, which they feel is within fair use;

2) purchase access to single titles to stream for a specific period of time;

3) PDA/DDA (open) where content is available and certain number of uses automatically triggers purchase of a license for the year or longer;

4) PDA/DDA (limited) where select content is visible to patrons and librarian selects material at the time of contract negotiation;

5) EBA (open or limited) where libraries commit to a set budget with access to negotiated content. At end of contract, usage statistics provided and used as a factor in purchase decisions. EAR pursued this last year, Kanopy was not interested at that time. See last year’s Streaming Media Committee report for other vendors willing to work with us;

6) Kanopy Public Library model is not available to academic libraries; this is rationed access, where each cardholder can use a negotiated number of movies per month.

Currently, what librarians are doing is an overlap within these categories. Four libraries are doing open Kanopy PDA, one is doing Kanopy, four Kanopy PDA, two used to do PDA Kanopy but moved to streaming, two interested in Kanopy streaming, but cannot at this time.

Committee is suggesting that CO negotiate the public library model (rationed use) approach.

Eddie has seen this model with LA public library and can raise it with Kanopy. We have to determine size of the deal (number of campuses, how much each campus is willing to spend) prior to speaking with Kanopy.

David suggested as a role model could we look at how much we are spending with other streaming platforms? Look at Alexander Street Press as an example.

Cesar increased cost per year is unsustainable and limits to per use is not an option. We should talk to Kanopy about the potential of losing our business if they are not flexible.

Four campuses have PDA Kanopy, but cannot sustain the cost and will have to switch.

Kathlene from Jill’s report it is clear that there are several campuses exploring the different models. Expenses will only increase and will not stay flat.

Michele question what about the campuses purchasing physical DVDs, is it possible that is a better way? Is streaming media where we want to go?

David DVD format is dead and streaming is where we are headed. My academic technology department can only reproduce a certain percentage of the film and not the full film.

Eddie will look at Jill’s report and Jill will forward the report to EAR members.

**3. Textbook Acquisition Project update - Mary Wegmann (chair), David Hellman, George Wrenn**

Mary update: Last year group focused on collecting textbooks from eighteen campuses and identified commonly used texts from the campuses. We forwarded the list to Proquest to determine if they can put together a package that fits our profile. We would need to commit to spending 2-300,000 dollars and up to 500K. Two options:

1. Work with publishers to explore textbook packages
2. Identify core texts – e-reference collection

Pros/Cons: Working with publishers, similar model to implement, do not have to collect lists. Con: package would not include everyone’s requested textbook

Springer has this collection. Wiley may be open to it as well. Will explore other publishers. Also looking at other types of materials like manuals. Are these reasonable paths to pursue?

George Proquest wanted to know enrollment data, courses, campuses and more detailed report from us.

David dovetails from my report on ebooks and had conversations with Springer about the idea of doing an EBA model with their textbook collection. They are not willing to do that, but EBA model to do in tandem with JSTOR going forward. There does seem to be a lot of interest in our collection and there are libraries doing this with some success. We need to do more shared collection development and work with vendors to provide access to everyone and money needs to come from CO. It will benefit all of CSU.

Eddie we need to look at the overall picture of what is being requested.

Michele there may be opportunities to brand this under AL$ and there may be money under AL$, will bring up with Gerry at next COLD meeting. David will share the report.

Jill likes the idea of central funding over campus funding. We have to encourage faculty, but we do not want to appear as if we are intruding in faculty pedagogy or push certain textbooks for their classes.

Michele there are ways to share this information with faculty so that it is not seen that way.

**4. ECC Usage Stats Project update - Michele Van Hoeck, Tracy Gilmore, Pam Anan, Carol Perruso**

Tracy and Michele will report on the ECC stats and they have been shared by email. Last year CO contracted with Tracy Gilmore to do some analysis of ECC usage and CPU across the whole system. Preliminary reports were shared with members of EAR. There were seven ECC reports completed in May and seven more this fall. Tracy will spend the rest of her time taking the subset of ECC and identify what those databases were: JSTOR, Project Muse, Mergent, MathSciNet and others are variations of other DB subscriptions. We have a package of reports with CPU, value, and usage of the resources; and we have compelling information to advocate for funding of ECC to bring to COLD including funding Tracy’s time to complete all of the reports on ECC and someone in CO or EAR to have this data available every year. Have a template setup to run these reports going forward.

Kathlene question to Tracy address CPU and pitfalls of CPU.

Tracy looked at utilization of the resources not just CPU across all 23 campuses. Looking at our ROI on these resources. The template would only require adding current year usage data and cost and can be updated going forward.

Kathlene that is a great idea and we will utilize this going forward.

Tracy there are other tools, but I am using Excel to produce the reports.

Michele has anyone looked at the reports from this morning and have any questions?

Kathlene different products are used differently and CPU can be used differently. I do not want to get into the nitty gritty of this, but the information we have is very useful. Promoting a product that is underutilized and the longitudinal data is useful.

Tracy we can look at substitutes or better promotion of the products.

Michele subcommittee will share reports for 15 ECC resources in January. Then we will ask COLD for more money to finish the collection (16 additional resources. We will ask for input via email sometime in the next few weeks.

Tracy will include Biosys and Biological Abstracts, and a title comparison with CPU of Academic Search Complete and Premier.

**5. ECC budget update –Michele Van Hoeck**

Michele COLD Chair has worked with CSU faculty senate to put together a resolution to advocate and support the increase of the ECC budget. A representative on the Senate is a librarian from Long Beach, and suggested creating this resolution. Every year there is a shortfall in funding the ECC. There was a budget request to increase ECC this year, but it was turned down. CO is not allowing cost recovery funds to roll over. AY2018-19 will be covered, but next year is up in the air.

David we need to start looking at better stewardship of ECC. There is a point in which we have to look at what is essential and not essential. Long-term stewardship is another component.

Kathlene one of the things that came up in the textbook subgroup is that a strategy about emphasizing the resources are part of bigger projects and beyond the library like AL$. When we do this on our own campuses and it tends to get more attention.

Jodi Is there any documentation on the overview of the ECC? I am on the senate right now and would like to share with them what we are doing.

Michele Jen gathered a lot of information on this, I will find the final compilation and send it to EAR for your own individual campus advocacy.

Eddie this year many of the vendors are adamant about proposing higher than normal increases. I met Springer and they are increasing to five or six percent this year. How do we want to handle multi-year agreements? Should we look at single-year options? Now multi-year increases are 5% and it used to be 3% in the past. How do we strategically pressure the vendors in not giving us such increases?

**6. FY 19/20 renewal of Web of Science – David Hellman**

David we are no longer locked into the 3-yr deal that has just ended. I had a meeting with their developers at Charleston; we need better pricing, access to other analytical tools, and side-by-side comparison with Scopus. The prospect of having dual vendor presentations half hour to Clarivate and half hour to Elsevier. Clarivate’s analytics have improved and I would like to see us have a comparison between Web of Science and Scopus.

Michele roughly what proportion of campuses subscribes to one or the other?

David most are still tied to Web of Science. Scopus has included a lot of bells and whistles to campuses. Scopus is actually better for my primary users.

Eddie 17 campuses on Web of Science.

Michele this may be worth exploring more for our in person meeting.

Kathlene a lot of our faculty are using Google Scholar, because we do not have Web of Science or Scopus. Analytics are not necessarily comparable.

David there was a lot of talk about analytics at Charleston.

Emily at SJSU we have both Scopus and Web of Science. Scopus is cheaper and they have components that are part of the base product and not additional modules like Web of Science. Scopus has author IDs that helps disambiguate authors. Faculty members may use the citation indexes for their dossiers. We are doing a comparison this year. We may see some potential action from Elsevier to couple our Scopus subscription.

**7. EAR in-person meeting at SCELCapalooza at Loyola Marymount**

Michele This will be next March and organizer Rick is happy to have an in-person meeting on Wednesday, March 13th before the meeting. Does anyone have any opposition to have our EAR meeting on March 13th at SCELC? Unless I hear otherwise, let us plan to have the March meeting at SCELC.

David stick around SCELC on Thursday, because a lot of the vendors are present there to have conversations.

Next week is COLD meeting send any items to Michele. We have to schedule our spring meetings.

Adjournment: The meeting was adjourned by Michele Van Hoeck at 3:31 p.m. PDT.

Respectfully submitted,

Aslihan Bulut

Director of Academic Services

Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. Library

San Jose State University

EAR Committee 2018-2020