

SPECIAL BC ELN STEERING COMMITTEE TELECONFERENCE

MINUTES

In Attendance:

Jonathan Bengtson, University of Victoria

Gwen Bird, Simon Fraser University

Melody Burton, University of British Columbia

Patricia Cia, Langara College, *Urban Colleges*

Natalie Gick, *Simon Fraser University Officer*

Kim Isaac, University of the Fraser Valley, (Chair)

Scott Marsden, Alexander College, *Associate Members*

Brenda Mathenia, Thompson Rivers University, *Small Universities*

Debbie Schachter, Capilano University, *Regional Universities & Institutes with 4-year programs*

Dawna Turcotte, Northern Lights College, *Rural Colleges*

Ministry of Advanced Education:

Andrei Bondoreff (Alternate)

BC ELN Staff:

Anita Cocchia

Leah Hopton (Recorder)

Leigh Anne Palmer

Regrets:

Kate Cotie, Ministry of Advanced Education

Friday November 3, 2017

2:00 pm – 3:30 pm

1. Adoption of Agenda

The agenda was adopted as distributed.

2. Common Suite Discussion

K. Isaac introduced the discussion with a recap of Common Suite goals:

- To provide equity to the BC post-secondary system and the BC learner
- To offer value to individual institutions and the post-secondary system

K. Isaac summarized progress on the Common Suite to date. Since the July Steering Committee meeting the Office has (a) provided detailed information to partner libraries via the common suite web, (b) held one-on-one consultations with all 33 partner libraries, and (c) issued a Support Survey on the Common Suite recommendation (recommendation is viewable at: <http://bcelnapps.ca/common-suite/recommendation>).

Summary of One-on-One Consultations

A. Cocchia relayed the feedback collected from one-on-one consultations. Common themes that emerged from these conversations:

- Academic Search (AS) and Business Source (BS) were seen as providing value to institutions.
- The downgrade (from Complete to Premier) in the recommendation was seen as a critical loss of content to a significant number of institutions. Institutions would need to look for money to get back to Complete levels, and there was concern about where to find these dollars.
- Generally speaking, 2-year institutions place more value on ASC, whereas 4-year institutions (particularly the larger ones) value BSC more.
- The majority of institutions view CBCA Complete as valuable, if not core. Most of those who weren't already licensing it were pleased with having it added.
- There were widely divergent views on the value of including Canadian Newsstream in the suite.

Common Suite Support Survey Results

L.A. Palmer provided a synopsis of the Support Survey responses:

- 5 institutions fully supported the recommendation
- 11 institutions supported the recommendation with some reservations
- 5 institutions supported the recommendation with strong concerns
- 12 institutions did not support the recommendation

Of the 12 institutions that did not support the recommendation, the majority believes in a common suite approach, but felt the downgrades created significant hardships. Of all 33 respondents, only 2 questioned a common suite approach.

Common themes from the survey included:

- There remains strong support for a common suite – it is seen as valuable, but meeting all institutions' needs will be difficult
- The rollback to the Premier levels from Completes is challenging. The Completes have value (whether only one or both differs by institution) to partner libraries. The need to add costs to maintain existing levels of content creates hardship.
- The perceived value of Canadian Newsstream varies.
- Institutions value trying to address tier inequities in prices for Academic Search. They wanted more details on how this is being addressed in the recommendation through allocations of harmonized spend.
- The continued desire for greater flexibility over budget, and the ability to cancel resources was expressed.

At this point there was a request for clarification regarding harmonized spend. Because negotiations are not complete, specifics were not posted on the Common Suite Web, rather information was provided by way of estimates during one-on-one consultations. When negotiations are finished and numbers are finalized, the Office can share this information with all partner libraries.

Discussion and Next Steps

Based on feedback collected via conversations and the survey, the Office, in consultation with the Executive, reviewed how the recommendation might better meet institutions' needs. A. Cocchia and L.A. Palmer presented the Steering Committee with a modified recommendation that continues to meet criteria identified by partner libraries (criteria viewable at: <http://bcelnapps.ca/common-suite/history-and-review-process>). While dependent on discussions with vendors, the modified recommendation would:

- Retain Academic Search, Business Source, and CBCA Complete
- Allow institutions to upgrade either AS or BS to the Complete level
- Remove Canadian Newsstream from the suite
- Retain harmonized spend to address tier inequities

Several committee members thanked the Office for the work done on the Common Suite to date.

In discussing the modified recommendation, the Committee voiced support for removing Newsstream from the suite. The group also discussed the inclusion of CBCA Complete. Keeping it in the suite means the two-vendor criteria developed at the 2016 All Partner Meeting is met. However, the Steering Committee felt that addressing specific concerns Partner Libraries raised in the Support Survey was more important than adhering to the two-vendor criteria. It was agreed that CBCA's removal was also an option for the Office to investigate.

G. Bird queried if it would be possible to model for members how much it would cost if the sector did not have a common suite. The Office will provide consortial costs for an all-in license versus an opt-in one for AS and BS.

The group discussed the importance of addressing common suite tier inequities stemming from the Academic Search. Different approaches were discussed, including the concept of resetting the entire pricing model across the system. However, survey results showed there is limited or no capacity by a significant portion of Partner Libraries to assume additional costs in order to decrease the costs of others. The Office will continue to refine the plan for addressing tier inequities.

The question of retaining the current UFC (ASC and BSC) was raised. Continuing the UFC is not an option as, during the review process, the largest 4-year institutions indicated that subscribing to any large multi-disciplinary aggregated resources (including ASC) would not meet their institutional needs. Retaining the UFC would also leave no ability to adjust for tier inequities or include a product from another vendor.

Lastly, concerns were raised about timelines and the possible negative impact of the current UFC license expiring before a new Common Suite is established. The Office reassured the Committee that an extension could be negotiated with EBSCO if necessary. Because of the short timeline, it

was recommended that results be brought back to library directors quickly so that institutions could discuss before the All Partner Meeting.

The Steering Committee agreed to the following next steps:

- The Office will continue negotiations with vendors and provide a modified proposal to partner libraries to address common concerns.
- In advance of the All Partner Meeting on December 8th, feedback on the modified proposal will be gathered via survey to seed discussion.

3. New Business

There was no new business.

4. Next Meeting

The next Steering Committee meeting will be held in person after the All Partner Meeting on December 8th.