

# ESIG Meeting Minutes

Montana State University, Bozeman, MT  
June 7, 2002

## **In attendance:**

Elaine Albright, University of Maine  
Joe Boykin, Clemson University  
Terry Burton, Health Sciences Library, West Virginia University  
Karen Cole, Kansas State University  
Frank D'Andraia, University of Montana  
Maggie Farrell, Montana State Univ, Soon to be Univ of Wyoming  
Kay Flowers, Idaho State University  
Ron Force, University of Idaho Library  
Richard Fyffe, University of Kansas Libraries  
Dr. Joan Giesecke, University of Nebraska-Lincoln  
Elizabeth (Betsy) Harper, Montana Tech of the Univ of Montana  
Pat Henderson, University of Alabama  
Ruth M. Jackson, Wichita State University  
Jodee Kawasaki, Montana State University  
Jane Kleiner, Louisiana State University  
Steve Laughlin, University of Alabama at Birmingham  
Ken Marks, University of Nevada Las Vegas  
Paul H. McCarthy, University of Alaska Fairbanks  
Bruce Morton, Montana State University  
Karen Rupp-Serrano, University of Oklahoma  
Wilbur Stolt, University of North Dakota  
Christopher Sugnet, University of Nevada, Las Vegas Libraries  
Elizabeth A. Titus, New Mexico State University  
William Van Arsdale, University of Wyoming Libraries  
Barbara Winters, Marshall University  
Juana R. Young, University of Arkansas

Meeting opened at 8:30 a.m. with greetings, announcements, and introductions.

## **Review of past history:**

Group met one year ago. The idea was born of a presentation that Bruce Morton and Steven Zink made to the meeting of EPSCoR State program & project directors in March 2001 in Washington, DC. EPSCoR was created to provide money to “poor” states but none was designated for the information infrastructure. The group that met last year decided to form, named themselves ESIG, put up a web site, and created a listserv.

To have a fast success, two deals, with Kluwer and Blackwell, were put together quickly. Later, a deal with Wiley was put together. These deals represent the impact of ESIG so far.

The Alliance for Innovation in Scientific and Technical Information (AISTI), based in New Mexico, acted as agent for the Kluwer and Blackwell deals; the Mississippi State University Library acted as agent for the Wiley deal. The issue of “agency” is something that we need to deal with. AISTI does not want to continue

to broker our deals. The Greater Western Library Alliance does not want to act as our agent either. There is a need to look at other models.

It has also been difficult to collect the funds to compensate AISTI. Half of the participating institutions have not yet paid the 2002 agency fee. Bruce gave list of those who have paid. Those who have not are asked to follow up. The money will channel through Montana State so that one check goes to AISTI. Montana State will follow up with another invoice (may be by email).

Goal for this meeting: does the ESIG group/concept have a future? If yes, we need to define what it is.

### **Impacts of ESIG (journal deals) on campuses:**

Those in attendance were polled for the impact of ESIG on the local campuses.

It was noted that the only qualification for ESIG membership is that an institution is in an EPSCoR state and wants to participate. Last year, Bruce relied on the EPSCoR offices to spread the word about the meeting. This year, used listserv and contact lists.

B. Winters (Marshall U): Heavy use for Synergy, but don't have statistics for Kluwer. Most faculty-like, but not getting at what researchers need. Two or three titles in each deal were wanted. But researchers want association publications and broad access to Nature and Science. Also went to EPSCoR meeting.

W. Stolt (U of ND): They are still publicizing. Has put the library in good light. The EPSCoR director gave them a small grant to get started, but in most cases, they want the EPSCoR money to go to the researchers, not in support of infrastructure. They met other EPSCoR library directors.

**note:** NSF may be changing the way it views libraries. ALA is working with the NSF to study relation to libraries.

F. D'Andraia U of Montana): Good for users and the university. They got some direct money from the EPSCoR office on campus. Some faculty have put in grants. Some schools have looked at providing more money. This project resonated with the president. The library is seen as an advocate for teaching faculty and researchers. Wiley package getting heavy usage. Monitoring use, giving feedback to EPSCoR office. Challenge that came up: added pressure for other online resources; it has driven a wedge between humanists and social scientists and the scientists.

P. Henderson (U of Alabama-Tuscaloosa): Head of Science and Engineering Library got the word out, everyone pleased. Opened up dealing with state EPSCoR office. Dean talking to head of EPSCoR office on ways to partner. Good public relations, higher profile among science and engineering faculty. Vendors aware we got a good deal.

J. Kleiner (Louisiana State U): Already had Kluwer & Blackwell, now interested in Wiley.

J. Young (U of Arkansas): Real useful on campus, gained attention for library. The university is trying to grow research programs, not doing serial cuts and have some money to spend.

J. Giesecke (U of Nebraska): Almost no impact. State EPSCoR office has different focus.

K. Cole (Kansas State U): Kluwer and Blackwell deals came at an opportune time since looking at an engineering branch library that is mostly an electronic library. Also picked up Blackwell periodicals for humanists. Haven't looked at usage. EPSCOR office at KU. At KSU president, provost involved with library. Have provided overhead money last four years.

R. Fyffe (U of Kansas): \$1.65/use for Blackwell. No stats from Kluwer. He's met with EPSCOR office and they are pleased about what is happening, but no real change. Some feel library doing too little too late. Running into inability to cancel, so seeing some backlash. Stayed out of Wiley for this reason. Wiley, Elsevier provide opportunity for cost management.

**note:** Kluwer supposed to have stats up this summer.

B. van Arsdale (U of Wyoming): Participation came right after a survey they did. Helped build a critical mass for folks to think of e-journals as regular library activity. Whetted appetite. Grant overhead went to departmental allocations. Discovered a lot of law titles and has led to connections with law school. Not a lot of conversation with EPSCoR office.

T. Burton (West Virginia U): He is from the Health Sciences Library. Additional resources very positive since main library cut journals last year. Health Science cut this year. Flat budget. Response positive, but lost flexibility.

K. Flowers (Idaho State U): In use. Did not do Wiley because of lack of flexibility. Got 2% IDC overhead this year.

B. Morton (Montana State U): Have all three packages, but predated EPSCoR deals. Main ESIG impact has been in leveraging \$16k each from local EPSCoR office and VP Research toward Web of Science, which is getting high use-2000+ downloads/month. Total IDC directed to the library close to \$230k, split evenly from faculty side and office of research sides of equation. State EPSCoR office funding this meeting. Educating folks: e-journal package strategy is high risk, high benefit. Library inflation has been built into the university budgeting process as a fixed cost. The university is taking a 3% cut, but the library is held harmless. They have the Elsevier e-package which will be coming up for renewal for the 2003 subscription year. High satisfaction.

R. Force (U of Idaho): Decided several years ago to go electronic. Increased titles for 40%. Well-received by faculty. Same problem with flexibility. Close to 25% budget reduction. Protecting packages. Grad students say "get off internet" with no understanding. Get \$50K from EPSCoR office but only for printed monographs. E-journals gets 10 times the use of printed.

R. Jackson (Wichita State U): Packages fit in well with developing new info model. Part of strategic planning process. Engineers want all electronic, humanists said do not touch paper. Launched 17 electronic products at the same time. Need to brand so campus recognizes arrangements. Some concerns with inability to cancel. May need to look at lack of ability to cancel in future agreements.

E. Albright (U of Maine): Already had Elsevier, so not as big a splash. Campus gave \$10K to subscribe. Research VP came last time, got more feeling for national problems. Some vendors getting message, encouraging libraries to cancel paper by giving 10% discount. Pricing models going up when just electronic. It is a difficult time to be negotiating.

K. Marks & C. Sugnet (UNLV): Interactions with EPSCoR people miniscule. Most EPSCoR activity in north of state (at UNR). Got cut of indirect costs. Relatively happy with Kluwer. They do cost per use for all products. Just beginning to look at use. Not happy with Blackwell. Had been in negotiations, but contract did not include any of UNLV's stipulations.

B. Harper (Montana Tech): A campus program that gets EPSCoR grants very happy with products.

E. Titus (New Mexico State U): The state is too new in EPSCoR, just getting act together. Library has good links to research community. Will get 5% of research overhead from every college on campus. NMS was a founding AISTI institution, so do all business through ASTI. So she sees the benefit of ESIG not in purchasing but in working in new areas. Still could look at cooperative collection development.

P. McCarthy (U of Alaska): Kluwer & Blackwell's Synergy have made impact on campus. Have been able to serve interests at a distance. Also brought around their most independent research institute. Not as much contact with EPSCoR. Get 4% of administrative overhead share: additional \$125K. Pressure to develop more in earth sciences.

S. Laughlin (U of Alabama-Birmingham): Has blurred distinction between medical library and main library. Don't get overhead. Have been supported by EPSCoR office. Added several packages at same time as Kluwer and Blackwell. Lack of flexibility in cancellation scenarios an issue.

J. Boykin (Clemson): Deals were very timely. New president, former dean of art, architecture, and humanities, has become ardent library supporter. Had library summit. Outcomes included going as electronic as possible and collaboration. These deals did that. Getting \$1 million increase, but have to sequester.

K. Rupp-Serrano (U of Oklahoma): Added several packages. Are looking at local cooperation since benefit from joint deals. Have Tulsa campus that has to go electronic. EPSCoR in Stillwater, need to get communication going.

### **Becoming a Competitive Consortium:**

A proposal from UNLV was put before the group to consider. See handout.

Because of Nevada's isolation it has made arrangements with 18 different consortia or buying groups. EPSCoR seems a logical collaborative body. Collaboration puts them in good light on campus.

ESIG cannot/should not stop with the Wiley, Kluwer, and Blackwell deals.

It appears that unless with Texas, Ohio, or California get in trouble, those will remain closed consortia. Nevada works with whomever it can. This is complicated since content providers are not sure what they are doing.

Open consortium - vendors don't have to negotiate with one person, can cut deals within consortia.

The virtual library is being created around us. Researchers find stuff on their own and/or vendors market to researchers. Then if shut off, folks deluge library.

What about set of databases we could do a contract for and that everyone gets? What do we want to do to move us forward?

GWLA - can expand to every citizen in state just if GWLA member. Could even be K-12. So lots of benefits to expanding beyond buying club of academic libraries only.

Grant money critical!

Very complex environment. See handout of problems encountered by the Utah consortium. Need central office. It does not need to be ESIG only; it could be ESIG partnering with other consortia.

In addition to Chris Sugnet at UNLV, he suspects that the licensing person at the University of Nevada-Reno might be available to help in the effort.

**Open vs. closed consortia:** vendors will want to know how serious ESIG is; what are drop dead negotiation points. Ohio State does not always agree with Ohio link, but vendors do not get to OSU behind Ohio link back. Open consortia are ad hoc. Vendors will even help create one. A closed consortium has a firmer negotiation basis.

At renewals, can be faced with added content, lost content, different pricing, etc.

Vendors want to sell products since once they get us, we're stuck.

Dollar issue, but can't go deep (history).

Getting critical mass that can be sustained is difficult.

Wiley is going with smaller numbers, new model.

== After break ==

==Continuing discussion on Marks (UNLV) proposal about the future of ESIG.

Elaine Albright related an instance of a New England consortium that did negotiation and got less than others since ARLs peeled off.

Karen Cole noted that a single consortium could serve to develop vendor allegiance, thereby creating a stable arena that could be more advantageous. Sometimes a particular institution may need to give more than it will receive, but will have to look at the bigger picture, look for greater good, not the best deal for itself on a product by product. So, if we pull this together, it could be better for all of us. It is important to maintain some continuity, so stability very helpful. May be at crossroads and need to leave egos at the door.

Ruth Jackson: Would like group to move toward a set of principles, which would be useful to have. What are we going to go for when we negotiate for a package? Proposal is framework for what principles could/should be.

Bruce Morton: In one sense, it is problematical to be held hostage by no-cancellation deal. But, on the other hand MSU doubled our subscriptions in last two years. Previously, subscriptions had been reduced by had reduced by 2000 through cancellations over a 15-year period. One cannot be risk averse and step off the slippery slope.

Frank D'Andraia: Packages have given institutions parity with institutions with longer history and/or more money. The perception is that we are moving forward and getting more resources on this basis. He would welcome someone else doing the negotiation. Tired of being a bargain shopper, have to shop around constantly since do not have other consortial affiliations. UM wants a viable option. Not sure how the EPSCoR research community will take the ESIG initiative since many view EPSCoR as entitlement money. So, method is important and it needs to appear that researchers are getting something of value. For some states, researchers now have more resources than they did before ESIG.

Elizabeth Titus: Even when took cut, 40% retained in content. Electronic resources helped and were viewed as being valuable.

Barbara Winters: Yes, we need a negotiator. She does not want vendors calling her. Library deans are out there trying to raise money, work on relationships, so we need negotiator.

Richard Fyffe: Still believes we did right thing even though non-cancellation is a political difficulty; it is the only way we can move forward with the way information is now priced and marketed. ESIG does have the opportunity to carve its own niche out due to a commonality of interests, which gives us more focus. KU is part of GWLA, but is looking at what best consortial options are. Another benefit is tie to the national EPSCoR program. The end game is a shift in scientific information model. NSF is thinking hard about what scientific communication should look like and what the underlying infrastructure should look like. Having a single or focused point of contact for vendors is very important. Could be a different person for every vendor, but still offered at a single place for a vendor to go.

Elaine Albright: We are not all the same size, and some deals are better for smaller libraries than larger (e.g., 10% of what you spend). So it is very important to negotiate deals more like Kluwer (flat plus). Smaller libraries may pay more, but it is fairer.

Terry Burton: WVU has gotten library the ESIG-sponsored resources as part of a grant. Several groups are part of the grant, so are they part of ESIG? How open a consortium will ESIG be?

Chris Sugnet: He is proposing a closed consortium. Then, whenever you can, negotiate things for additional groups.

Bill van Arsdale: Wished to propose that we adopt the UNLV proposal to move on from discussion. Bruce Morton asked that we hold off any decision until after lunch and that we continue to thoroughly discuss issues.

Joan Giesecke: In talking about redoing scholarly communication, it is her sense that the current head of NSF does not want to mess with publishing and wants to wait for the market; she seems is set on this. Also, larger schools do not benefit from many of the deals except for those that are centrally funded out of a state library.

Frank D'Andraia: The federal representatives of the states here are some of the most senior leadership in the U.S. Senate, all of whom are aware of problems of state universities. So we may be able to work with pork on this. ESIG is an unusual collection of states.

Karen Rupp-Serrano: BRIN grant from NIH, EPAInfo. Infra. Network. Build environmental research network. States vary on what they are focusing on.

Maggie Farrell: In Montana, tribal colleges are involved. Librarians are involved in the grant with the focus of building training for tribal colleges. What about BRIN research? Do we have journals? If there is trouble with Elsevier at the University of Montana, then how do they get Elsevier journals at Little Big Horn College? Do we look at something like WAMI (first year med school program in NW state without med schools)? BRIN is relatively new, going through supplemental funding. It may be worth investigating at home; electronic resources could be included.

Joe Boykin: South Carolina has a BRIN grant at the three research institutions. Library portion is being done out of medical libraries. Using BRIN money to bring in second tier of institutions, specifically for Elsevier Science Direct. There is a third tier as well, which we have not talked about.

Bruce Morton (some follow up): larger institutions carrying the smaller. MSU's attitude is that everyone must win, no one must lose, but some may win bigger. "Grant": grants are good for projects, but harder for programs where sustainability is an issue. EPSCoR dollars may be thought of as entitlement (a competitive entitlement), so there may well be wariness if bring up as the need for a funding source in the current EPSCoR program for libraries, since it may be perceived that we will pick the pockets of researchers. We may want to present a new model to NSF. As we think of philosophy and the roles ESIG might adopt, we may want to carry banner for national site licensing, engaging in that discussion again. Need to couch discussion not as being about libraries, but as being about research. It could be about both, but libraries are incidental to the goal of forwarding the research agenda in the EPSCoR states. The EPSCoR community we are talking to is not focused on libraries but on research; we need to convince them that we are essential to their mission and to their success.

Barbara Winters: There are fundamental public policy implication; researchers are given money for research but do not have the infrastructure for it. We need to follow up with this.

Ken Marks: There are two other issues: economic development and economic diversification. If we can tie in these two, we shall make a more persuasive case.

Ruth Jackson: Also technology transfer is part of this. On the topic of grants, she agrees that they should be project oriented. If we pursue grants, could look at backfiles as one possible area.

Ron Force: The latest trend for publishers is to make access to backfiles an ongoing cost (e.g., ACS)

Jane Kleiner: This will require certain people who are totally committed to getting this done. This will be an ongoing thing. Someone has to keep writing all the time to keep money coming in until ESIG gets regular funding. Have to pay salaries, equipment, etc.

Barbara Winters: There is the Mellon grant model: got \$3M, \$2M invested for living off proceeds.

Ruth Jackson: Do not write off the perpetuity issue. If we can move quickly, we may be able to get the backfile perpetuity deal before publishers. Some areas of science need the historical view.

Bruce Morton: We need to think of what we are doing then try to communicate it. If we couch it in terms of competition, which is the core of EPSCoR grant program, we should be saying that the success of ESIG will make institutions more competitive, research dollars resonate in local community, states become more competitive, the national research agenda more competitive against other Western nations where there is national site licensing.

Frank D'Andraia: Need to continue to emphasize what have accomplished so far. Pays dividends for us all. Part of what needs to come out of today is "branding" what we are doing. Need to bang drum or might lose some alliances.

Elizabeth Titus: Have we looked at where we are and where we want to be? We need to demonstrate empirically that we are resource poor. We shall see a mix, discrepancy among the EPSCoR states. Then could cluster groups. We need to identify the baseline, then see what we can do to move us forward. We need to identify where we are so we can have accountability.

Joan Giesecke: Last year got a list of who we are, how many ARL members, etc.

Bruce: It is on website in last year's minutes. Also, an underlying purpose of EPSCoR is to increase competitiveness so institutions/states can compete outside of EPSCoR.

Jane Kleiner: EPSCoR has done a lot of research, profiling of states--looking at research resources.

Barbara Winters: We need dataset for a baseline.

Bruce: We need to establish baseline metrics. He also, is trying to get ESIG some money from the EPSCoR Foundation Board to have study to measure impact of EPSCoR initiative. Libraries do not necessarily want to make the investment if it is not making a difference. Hard metrics (attribution of increased success in grants & contracts, papers coming out of campuses, recruitment of faculty & graduate students, etc.). To be able to correlate with initiatives out of ESIG would be a good thing.

Richard Fyffe: EPSCoR faculty have a rising research profile, but lack a lot of core resources they say they need. Ironically, this could be used as proof they do not need.

Wilbur Stolt: Some things may be more difficult. Electronic information is coming in different packages, so may not be able to differentiate between ESIG packages and others.

Bruce Morton: Bulking up on STM electronic packages helps the university in recruiting research-oriented faculty.

Ruth Jackson: In regard to branding, we may want to look at segmenting faculty, to target PR especially for those supported by databases. We could do a better job of this.

Karen Cole: In regard to assessment, we may want to define what the end result is desired to be so we know what data we want to gather. If want to document increased research, have to be careful in asking questions. Easier to go to EPSCoR if we have data, but we need to be careful in asking questions. So go to faculty with real purpose in mind.

Frank D'Andraia: He wants to keep in simple. He likes JSTOR since it gives all kinds of graphics. Something simple, but clear: what we had before, what have now.

Elizabeth Titus: Granting agencies want to see results for grant money. We have to prove we are doing things.

Frank D'Andraia: He has gotten extremely positive feedback on packages. He will want to work on department chairs, deans, and vice provosts. This is different group, and therefore he needs to package data differently. All like successes they want something they can put in brochures. This helps with redistribution of funds.

Barbara Winters: I think we have a lot of anecdotal data that we are doing OK. Can use anecdotes to help design assessment tool. Have folks with grants writing authors for articles.

Karen Cole: Is the intent to raise the boat for everybody? Or is intention to raise for states. Part of issue of competitiveness. Intent to be able to compete with the big schools in the big states. What is the story we are telling together.

Joan Giesecke: Rise in ILL as a positive (using services) rather than need more collections. So have to be careful, think about how use numbers. [Reduced ILL could also be construed as a positive.]

Joe Boykin: We have a lot of similarities as well as differences. How well does this group help each of us accomplish our goals at our institutions? Instead of we have x amount of titles available at each institution. If could say "as a result of this group and our participation" I was able to accomplish these goals... Part of what we have done is a buyers club. Have we considered doing something similar for document delivery, negotiating deals for the group? Or an agreement for providing ILL to each other quickly.

Jane Kleiner: She is on the board of Ingenta if want to look at it as a possibility

Joan Giesecke: The University of Nebraska is involved in so many ILL consortia, it does not need another. But a joint contract might be nice.

Chris Sugnet: Also, there is a desire to stop ILL, handle cooperatively...

Ruth Jackson: Do not forget graduate students as selling point for services. Assessment from them would be important.

==Break - for lunch.==

The discussion now turned to the future of ESIG. There was a consensus that ESIG should have a future. The UNLV proposal has some direction, philosophy, and agenda. Discussion followed as to where go from here.

By consensus there was a sense that ESIG should have an organization.

How formal do we want to be? Formal or not? Bruce would prefer something on the more formal side of the scale since so far what has been done has been function of his spare time. There is a need to spread the ownership of ESIG. Also, would formal structure help in negotiation?

The discussion then turned back to question of what we want the organization to do.

Back to the question of what the ESIG organization looks like? Should we have a small group look at this issue? The criteria thus far for ESIG membership has been if you are in an EPSCoR state, do you want to be a player.

Last year, we looked for simple successes on which we could build. Are we still looking at furthering collection development activities? Still looking at licensing (is UNLV volunteering to lead negotiations)? Is there still commonality here. Each library looking for an advantage. If we stay loose without recognized structure, the chance of it falling away is greater than if have something in writing that can be built on. Example of the Big 8 to Big 12, to Big 12+, etc. So if we can have UNLV help us continue, should do it.

Much to be said for loosely structured organization moving into more formal later; still need to look at purpose. For instance, the purpose of Big 8 clear before bylaws.

In discussion of purpose, three things seemed to come to the fore: Buying club, EPSCoR relationships, communication network.

It is important that libraries understand understandings of what the implications of being an EPSCoR state are. Are there institutions that would not qualify as ESIG institutions? Informality ok for now, in order to avoid constraints. But eventually, we shall have to renegotiate the current agreements; how do we do it so we do not lose progress. Some joint activities may need more lead time. Can there be sufficient agreement to continue work on these facets in interim. UNLV volunteers Chris to be involved, but cannot turn him over 100 % of time.

We need to address issues such as who is the official representative of organization? Who does the licensing contact? These are different people. So, each institution has to identify at least two people. That way there is a communication channel.

Strength of a certain amount of sameness, common focus. The University Maine is looking to not carry the state with it, looking for something more than the state consortia offer. Some states have multi-type library configurations while others do not. ESIG should not assume all institutions in a state would or should be part of an ESIG model.

Focus was brought back to the need to keep ESIG streamlined.

- End of meeting, have a proposal
- Look at documentation re point person for negotiation
- What is the organization, where is it going, how be organized.

We have an informal organization. We need validation that has a name. Need to validate the group. Then Chris has something with which to work. Validation might mean that each institution agrees to sign on and provide a little money. Money helps validate and legitimizes the group.

Elizabeth volunteers on the assessment portion.

Needs groups to work on negotiation, bylaws, etc.

Should not assume that Chris is only person doing this work. Should look at subcommittees. General notion of signing a memorandum of understanding and contributing to a common pool is how other groups got started. Principles, how decisions made, are more important.

If not interested in licensing, why else would you contribute funding? Commonality that are EPSCoR states and dealing with scientific information.

As EPSCoR libraries, we represent a market where there has not much penetration. May also represent changing communication paradigms. Moving beyond to information delivery in scientific community. Should also talk to researchers. Venues for shared learning. Raise consciousness level of EPSCoR and leverage awareness into dollars.

**Proposal:**

- Every institution sent an invitation to participate in this group.
- Commit in writing to participation
- Set nominal sum for participation as a membership fee.

Get into hassle of receiving money and where the money is going. Wait until identify the need for the money before collect. Then, invoice as needed. Treasury without an organization is problematic. We would need more formal organization to identify fiduciary responsibility.

So institutions need to agree to participate and to pick up costs as they come.

Fee per project easier to work with, easier to get by auditors, easier to justify.

Memo of understanding regarding what will do. We also need a list of something we are interested in pursuing.

A kitty is probably easier than project for things like mailing costs, incidental fees.

Need to get group to draft MOU agreement.

Need someone to do listserv, listserv maintenance (MSU volunteers to continue doing this)

Someone for licensing, way of operating (Chris Sugnet will lead this effort)

Someone for assessment (Elizabeth Titus volunteers to lead this effort)

MOU (Kay Flowers volunteers to take lead on this one)

At this time it was agreed to split the meeting up into three subgroups for 20 minutes in order to have one group each to discuss how to proceed on licensing, assessment, and a memorandum of understanding.

**Caucus Reports:**

*Assessment:*

Committee volunteering to be assessment group: Bruce, Ron, Betsy, Elizabeth, Richard

- Validate success of ESIG

- Establish benchmarks
- Provide peer comparisons of ESIG members
- Focus on electronic based stats

*Tasks to achieve this year are:*

- Establish metrics
- Establish data gathering
- Design survey instrument
- Administer instrument to collect data
- Report data electronically.

Listserv will be asked what measures will be useful to you. This will be basis for future.

*Licensing:*

Have licensing team to review licenses. Chris will be first chair of this group. He will send out message to everyone identified as members to get name/address of person who is licensing representative. List on website. Will have signup on website after initial signup.

Website: would like intranet availability of licenses negotiated thus far. And who has entered into licenses. Also license renewal date. Information about licensing on website: geographical sites, FTE, etc. for each member. Identify key numbers (where costs go up).

The was discussion about new products as well as the need to renegotiate the contracts. Chris will start negotiating with Blackwell Science. He will also talk to them about the humanities and social science part segments and ask for separate bids: science, social sciences, humanities. He will message Blackwell and identify key issues.

When ESIG decides to do its own negotiations, we shall have to notify ASTI that it will no longer need to act as ESIG's agent.

As for Kluwer, Chris will likely talk to someone at University of Nevada-Reno to take the lead on negotiating with Kluwer. Chris will not take the lead on every purchase. However, he will be willing to coordinate, pointing vendors at the appropriate ESIG negotiator.

Wiley will need special attention; the goal is for every ESIG member have access to every Wiley title.

It should be expected that there may be a charge for services provided.

There must also be consideration given to how licenses will be distributed to group. Some have to be reviewed by local university review processes, i.e., university legal counsel. The ESIG licensing group will try to get things out early.

Looking to the long-term we shall be working out some principles for licensing. There are lots of things the vendors give us to do that we can and should can pass back to them; it was not thought that ESIG needs a business office per se.

*Products discussed (& interest poll response):*

- Springer-Verlag (now doing consortia pricing) (18 =2 if better deal)
- CISTI for document delivery. (20)
- Web of Science (15)
- CINAHL (11)
- Ingenta? Maybe as part of conversation with CISTI
- Nature: It was suggested that we if purchased a large block of simultaneous uses, would we get unit cost down. (21)
- Science (22)

These products are not really like what we bought last year (except for Springer).

Counts are not that far apart. CISTI is very different; ESIG might take aggressive lead on it. On others, ESIG may make initial contacts to see which publishers are most amenable. It is likely unrealistic to expect to be able to do all of these at once.

May not want to limit our thinking to just those programs that are funded by EPSCOR since we are supposed to be self-sufficient.

There was consensus that ESIG will need to build its presence in the eyes of the publishers

*Memorandum of understanding:*

A draft MOU was distributed; there followed discussion and editing (see draft MOU attached at end of minutes).

Discussion moved to just what ESIG agenda for the coming year should be.

Limit focus to CISTI and Springer.

Chris probably will not have group together before ALA, but hopes to have enough information to stop by booths. Building on past success.

USE THE LISTSERV!! Information is key.

For those aware of non-participating institutions, get them on listserv. Share the MOU.

Minutes will go out on listserv and will be posted on website for permanence. Can find at <<http://www.lib.montana.edu/~bmorton/esig/>> . Will also send out website URL via the ESIG listserv.

Who becomes host for next meeting? Really two questions:

Bruce Morton would like someone else to take over as convener/facilitator

Meeting question: may be some virtue in trying to persuade EPSCOR to have ESIG meet concurrently with the state directors meeting in March in Washington, DC. This would have to be with their consent, of course. Bruce will explore as a possibility.

Kay Flowers will convene MOU group online this year.

Elizabeth Titus will lead assessment group.

Chris will lead licensing group.

So, need volunteer to lead the whole group. MSU does not mind continuing to host an annual meeting if the meeting does not shift to Washington, DC. Bruce Morton, however, does not want to "own" the group. ESIG needs more people invested in its leadership. UNLV always willing to host (air connections easy). Just have to meet before May 15th of the heat. Meeting earlier than June would be desirable in any case since we need more lead time prior to a budget cycle.

Meet the day before the EPSCOR meeting, but still one meeting a year.

At request of those in attendance, Bruce Morton agreed to serve during the transition (FY03) as we figure out the meeting schedule.

Fee issue:

- Need to decide since affects the MOU.

- Project-based, pay as you go seems most attractive and agreeable.

Agent has been the most onerous of the tasks. Compensation appropriate for the agent? Service fee? From UNLV's perspective, it will want to find exact investment, then if fees involved, they will brought forward.

The meeting was adjourned at 3:45 p.m.

## **Draft Memorandum of Understanding (June 7, 2002)**

The EPSCoR Scientific Information group is a consortium of college and university libraries that will work together to provide the information resources and infrastructure to support EPSCoR researchers. EPSCoR identifies, develops, and uses a state's academic science and technology (S&T) resources to support its economic growth and a more productive and fulfilling way of life for its citizens. EPSCoR acts on the premise that universities, their science and engineering faculty, and their students are valuable resources that can influence a state's development in the 21st century. To achieve this goal, NSF collaborates with state leaders in government, higher education, and business to create partnerships that can bring lasting improvements to the state's academic research infrastructure and increase its national research and development (R&D) competitiveness. EPSCoR increases the R&D competitiveness of an eligible state by developing and using the S&T resources in its major research universities (institutions that grant significant numbers of the state's Ph.D. degrees in science and engineering disciplines). EPSCoR achieves this by:

- Stimulating sustainable S&T infrastructure improvements at the state and institutional levels to increase the ability of EPSCoR researchers to compete for federal and private sector R&D funding
- Accelerating the movement of EPSCoR researchers and institutions into the mainstream of Federal and private sector R&D support

Membership in the consortium is open to college and university libraries in EPSCoR states that focus on research-oriented scientific, technical, and medical fields. This consortium seeks to use the strength of its membership to explore common needs, provide resources to support EPSCoR scientific, technical, and medical programs, and to seek out reasonable and competitive alternatives to enhance information delivery to the scientific community

### **Immediate Goals:**

- To continue the cooperative purchasing of STM materials and to maximize electronic delivery
- To assess the status of the current information infrastructure in EPSCoR states
- To establish working partnerships with EPSCoR, both nationally and in each state
- To investigate various information delivery options
- To seek funding opportunities with other agencies and organizations

### **Expectations of Members:**

Members of this group are expected to

- To sign this memorandum of understanding
- To designate one or more representatives to ESIG
- To designate a licensing representative
- To attend one ESIG meeting per year