

Common Suite Support Survey – Results Results and Analysis

Participation:

- 100% (33 partner Libraries)
 - 2-Year – 17
 - 4-Year + Institutes – 16

The information below is a brief distillation of partner libraries' response to the Common Suite Support Survey. It is not intended to be exhaustive. It provides a high level summary of responses and common themes that arose in the comments sections of the Survey.

Summary:

I fully support the recommendation

- 5 institutions: *Alexander, Camosun, Okanagan, TRU, Yukon*

I support the recommendations with some reservations

- 11 institutions: *Columbia, Douglas, ECUAD, JIBC, KPU, Langara, NWCC, NVIT, TWU, UFV, UNBC*

I support the recommendation with strong concerns

- 5 institutions: *BCIT, CapU, CBC, UCW, VCC*

I do not support the recommendation

- 12 institutions: *Ascenda, CNC, COTR, NIC, NLC, RRU, Selkirk, SFU, QUC, UBC, UVic, VIU*
 - Most institutions (10 of 12) support a common suite approach but feel
 - Downgrading from the Completes to the Premiers will create hardship (8)
 - Harmonized spend does not fully address inequities in spend within tiers (2)
 - 2 (of 12) institutions have a philosophical concern with a common suite approach

Themes:

- Common suite approach
 - A common suite approach benefits post-secondary institutions and learners
 - It is challenging to meet everyone's needs
 - There is an acknowledged need for compromise
- Downgrade from Complete to Premiers
 - There is a desire to keep one if not both Completes at most institutions; "getting less for the same amount of money"
 - Loss of content will create hardship
 - The need to add costs to maintain existing levels of access is challenging
 - The current UFC meets many institutions' needs

- Canadian Newsstream Complete
 - Many question the value of Canadian Newsstream
 - Discovery of ProQuest content via EDS is a concern

- Tier Inequities
 - Harmonized spend does not address inequities fully
 - Need for further transparency

- Flexibility
 - There is a desire for control over budget and ability to cancel resources
 - Subsuming new products into the bundle commits more spend and reduces flexibility

Appendix A.

I fully support the recommendation. Please share why your institution fully supports the recommendation.

Alexander College (S. Marsden)	Best of the options made available - good discounts on Proquest products
Camosun College (S. Harrison)	The end result has little impact on us, so in the end we are supportive
Okanagan College (E. Engman)	We believe the common suite approach is critical for optimal cost-effective licensing of core resources
Thompson Rivers University (P. Haggarty)	<i>[No Comments Provided]</i>
Yukon College (A. Goncalves)	We fully agree with the concept of harmonizing spending, as it levels the plane fields across institutions.

I support the recommendations with some reservations. Please share why your institution supports the recommendations with some reservations.

Columbia College (F. Jones)	The way our future contribution is tied to our past purchase of individual titles is weird. Some colleges will be getting more new material in return for the losses in ASC and BSC, while others will not be getting any new content but just losing. We're sort of in the middle, in that we already had CMD but were thinking of stopping it because it is so difficult to search. Now the price of that database that we were unhappy with is tied into our pricing structure forever going forward. However we will be getting CBCA, which is good. Nonetheless, the downgrades in ASC and BSC are really significant for us.
Douglas College (C. Guillou)	I support the recommendations knowing that it won't have a financial impact regarding the cost of subscribing to the common suite. We would want to upgrade to Academic Search Complete and Business Source Complete and the cost of upgrading shouldn't be too expensive.
Emily Carr University of Art + Design (D. Zwierciadlowski)	The reduction to ASP does not result in any savings and we end up with a resource (Canadian Newsstream) that is not that useful for our curriculum. Looking at our current spend and our projected spend we seem to be getting less for the same amount of money.
Justice Institute BC (A.Haddad)	We feel that we are still paying more as we pay full price for ProQuest now.
KPU (A.Richardson)	It seems like a pragmatic compromise that does not fully address the original reasons for the review. I wonder whether it will satisfy all the institutions involved.
Langara College (E. Lawson)	Our main concern is the loss of the Complete levels for Academic Search and Business Source. We will have to source additional funding in order to get back up to the Complete level. While we do get an upgrade to Canadian Newsstream, that was never a priority for us.
Nicola Valley Institute of Technology (L. Epps)	We cancelled Business a few years ago in our cutback - now its back.

Northwest Community College (M. Wilke)	Although I like the idea of the common suite not being completely EBSCO, I do question the value of Proquest's Newstand for our institution. I would prefer Academic Complete - or the option of purchasing the upgrade for a lower price. Would we be able to sub in another EBSCO product in replacement of Newstand, thereby enticing EBSCO to offer a lower price for the upgrade. but still allowing for a common suite that is not completely EBSCO?
Trinity Western University (T. Goshulak)	Philosophically I think that it is a good thing for post-secondary institutions in BC to have a common suite of online resources. Students across the province are taking courses at a variety of institutions and this continues to assist them in their research efforts. It is also beneficially for library support, both in person and via AskAway, to have common products across the sector.
University of Northern British Columbia (H. Empey)	I am concerned with the idea of locking in to this common suite without the option to opt out. I understand that would defeat the purpose of a "common suite" but large packages can be difficult for smaller institutions who may need more flexibility. I am also concerned with the idea that released funds due to previously higher spend can only be directed towards a limited number of options. Again, it speaks to a lack of flexibility that may affect smaller institutions.
University of the Fraser Valley (K. Isaac)	<p>From UFV's Collections Librarian:</p> <p>"I do support the principles of having a common suite that is shared amongst the ELN members and recognize the negotiating power of having this level of participation in a license. That said, the new Common suite does not offer anything to the UFV Library that is an improvement over last year's arrangement.</p> <p>From our point of view, we are going to be paying the same amount of fees and in return will be getting 4173 fewer journals and magazines in ASP compared to ASC, and 1578 fewer journals and magazines in BSP compared to BSC. The gain offered is to upgrade our Canadian Newsstream Major Dailies from 24 newspapers to approximately 396 newspapers. However, gaining access to newspapers such as Airdrie City View, Alaska Highway News, Alberni Valley Times, Almaguin News, Ancaster News, Arrow Lakes News etc is not of interest to us or of the same value as the 4,435 fewer scholarly journals we will potentially lose.</p> <p>It is very time consuming and probably impossible to do a full analysis of which journals are only in ASC and BSC and not in any of our other sources, which of those titles have significant use, which of those titles may be included in course reading lists, e-reserves, LibGuide bibliographies or program accreditation reviews, and what the replacement cost of those journals would be. For this reason, we will likely have to find the additional \$10,000 US to return to our Complete levels."</p>

I support the recommendation with strong concerns. Please share why your institution supports the recommendations with strong concerns.

BCIT (A. Griffin)	<p>BCIT recognizes that we are a part of a provincial consortium, and therefore we will honor our commitment to our fellow libraries by supporting this recommendation if the overwhelming majority of other BC libraries do, but for own library, we do not see this new proposal as adding value to our collection. We already subscribe to CBCA Complete and Canadian Newsstand Major Dailies (so the Canadian Newsstream Complete is a small upgrade, but not one we particularly wanted), and after analyzing our usage statistics for Academic Search Complete and Business Source Complete, we do not feel that we can downgrade them to the Premier versions. The number of searches for ASC was over 90 000 in 2016, and 65 000 for BSC.</p> <p>At the end of the day, even with the harmonized credit, we will essentially be paying \$7000-\$10 000 more for the same content as we have now. (This is assuming we opt to stay with the EBSCO Complete versions, and acknowledge a small upgrade to the Major Dailies database).</p> <p>If it were up to us, we would prefer to stay with the current UFC package.</p>
----------------------	---

Capilano University (K. Hall)	Price.
Columbia Bible College (A. Andres)	For our institution and the programs we offer, ASC and BSC are of more value than ASP and BSP combined with CBCA and Canadian Newstream. CBCA is of some value but Cdn Newstream has no value to us. ASC is of most value, then BSC but if I could get ASC and BSP with CBCA and no Cdn Newstream that would be ok.
University Canada West (A. Mitescu)	<p>1. At UCW, we were quite happy with the previous iteration of the UFC: ASC constituted the backbone of our interdisciplinary academic collection and, as a business school, we were quite happy with BSC. The integration with the EDS was a huge advantage (the students have been trained well – they are looking for a search box, so we gave them one; the problem is that now they see nothing else). We are now in a multi-year commitment to EDS – but the amount of resources that can be discovered have been significantly decreased (>40%).</p> <p>2. In essence, the deal for us boils down to: $(ASC+BSC)-(ASP+BSP)=CBCA\text{Complete} + (\text{Canadian Newsstream Complete} - \text{Canadian Major Dailies})$. For the reasons outlined above (coverage, EDS integration) these two sides of the equation are not equivalent for us (even though we quite like the CBCA Complete – or at least the Business module). We will now have to find the funds somewhere to go back to ASC/BSC.</p> <p>3. As this will be part of a common suite, we think the decision to subscribe to CBCA Complete is forced on us (coupled with the need to find funds to go back to ASC/BSC). If we had found \$5,448 somewhere, we would have liked to have the decision on where to spend it, as opposed to having to spend it on CBCA Complete.</p> <p>4. Which brings me to the proposed prices for the ASC/BSC upgrade: what are the assumptions behind the proposed fee structure? There was a mention that UBC/SFU/UVic have no interest in upgrading – so the cost has to be borne by the remaining institutions. Wouldn't it be better to gauge the level of interest to upgrading first from the members, and then working out a fee structure?</p> <p>5. I will mention again that the tier structure used to calculate these fees is placing UCW at a significant disadvantage when compared to our peers: we only have our students' fees for funding. We have been asked (and continue to be asked) to provide a disproportionately larger level of support for the size of our institution.</p> <p>6. The "Harmonized spend" calculations and justification still hasn't been made public; we were led to believe that it is not likely that UCW will see any of these funds, despite the historical disparities in the level of support that we have been asked to provide.</p> <p>7. I am concerned with the mandatory inclusion of Canadian Newsstream. We will continue to subscribe to Major Dailies for the foreseeable future, but this is a diminishing product. By bundling it with other products, we remove the option of negotiating with ProQuest in the future and possibly securing more favourable terms.</p> <p>8. Referring back to the mandate survey: three of the summary points were "Offering discounts / Maintaining existing spend /Providing flexibility". We were interested to see what discounts PQ would offer and disappointed to see the 2% reduction for ABI/Inform. As we have shown, this deal would force us to spend more money, and provides for less flexibility. We would argue that \$5,448 for CBCA Complete is unsatisfactory value for money (to address the "Offering value to individual institutions and the post-secondary system" point from the survey).</p> <p>9. What is the best alternative to this negotiated agreement? "There is no alternative" is usually a rhetorical device; what are the practical implications for failing to come to an agreement?</p>

	We appreciate that other (larger) institutions had concerns about the structure of UFC and this deal goes some ways towards addressing those concerns. We feel that we could support this agreement, if changes can be made to accommodate our concerns (especially in points 3, 4,5 and 6).
VCC (S. Lew)	After review by our Information Services team, the consensus is that there is a strong preference to retain Academic Search Complete and Business Source Complete; that the loss of content from Complete to Premier is not worth the addition of ProQuest databases. However if this change does meet the criteria of greater equity and access to content across all institutions in BC, we could manage the cost of the upgrade from Premier to Complete and would support the recommendation.

I do not support the recommendation. Please share why your institution does not support the recommendation.

Acsenda School of Management (A. de Haan)	<p>For the most part the UFC fit Acsenda's needs very well. As a management focused institution BSC is indispensable and ASC helped cover our English and elective courses quite well. The old UFC formed the backbone of the library collection. Having these being downgraded to the Premier level will be a hardship for us. We do not have a print collection or other resources to fall back on.</p> <p>Their compatibility with EDS was key in choosing EDS as our discovery layer. As PQ products are becoming harder to discover through EDS, they aren't showing the same usage as EBSCO products which in turn raises concerns come budget time.</p> <p>The new deal of ASP and BSP + CBCA and Canadian Newsstream resource-wise is not the best for ASM. My issue is not with CBCA but with Newsstream. ASM has had the Major Dailies for a while now and it is our most underperforming resource. It has proven the least searchable through EDS of all our PQ products and while there is Canadian content there isn't much focused on management. Not to mention all the issues currently facing newspapers as an industry. It is a troubled product and I don't see much value in upgrading to the full version for ASM.</p> <p>In fact, it very much feels like PQ is pulling a fast one by including Newsstream, like they just threw it in to get more buy in on a low performing product.</p> <p>I have strong issues with the downgrading ASC and BSC to the Premiers.</p> <p>Any money ASM saved from this will not be enough to get us back up to the Complete level. On paper it looks like most members are paying the same amount as last year for ASC and BSC for significantly downgraded databases. Yes our current spend did not increase but I don't think we're getting something of equal value.</p> <p>I'm also concerned the "Harmonized Spend" calculations and justifications haven't been made public. As the newest school to join BCELN, we obviously haven't been around long enough to have much in the way of expectations here despite the level of support we provide but why all the secrecy? ASM hasn't even received a concrete number yet.</p> <p>As this deal currently stands it now will make up over half of my budget. The old UCF was a third by comparison. To get the money to upgrade back to Complete I will have to cut another database. As things stand right now Major Dailies is the one I would have chosen but now I don't get to make this choice.</p> <p>Instead I'm being locked into (and upgrading) underperforming resources just to get the ones we need plus having to pay more to keep them at the same level. I'm not seeing any of the flexibility as outlined in the mandate survey nor any significant savings.</p> <p>I appreciate other institutions, larger institutions, had concerns about the way UFC was structured and I hope for them this proposal goes a long way to addressing them. However I can't help but feel that the concerns of smaller institutions got lost along the way. As the smallest institution this proposal would consume over half my budget, lock</p>
--	--

	me into resources my students don't need while significantly cutting those collections with the highest usage. I can not in good faith support this proposal.
College of New Caledonia (K. Plett)	Concerns about Premier vs Complete; Newsstand (we had plans to curtail); increased use of Ebsco databases now that we are on Discovery; rising costs, etc. I understand the rationale behind the choices but they will not serve smaller institutions very well. We have such limited \$
College of the Rockies (S. Rashid)	We already subscribe to ASC, BSC and CBCA. Downgrading to ASP & BSP will be huge loss to our institution There is no need for Newstream and CBCA at our institution. A Common Suite without CBCA and Newstream but comprising of AS & BS negotiated at complete level would better serve our programs/students and will be financially feasible for our size of institution.
North Island College (M. A. Guenther)	The downgrade to Premier versions of AS and BS represents a critical loss of content for NIC and adding CBCA and Newsstream to the common suite offers no significant gain, as we already subscribe to CBCA Complete and Major Dailies, which is adequate newspaper coverage for us.
Northern Lights College (D. Turcotte)	<p>1) We have absolutely no need for Canadian Newstream. We had it quite a few years ago and cancelled it due to low usage.</p> <p>2) We don't get enough use out of CBCA to make it part of a common suite. I also think that the recent introduction of EDS to our Library, that even fewer students will be using CBCA over time, since Proquest doesn't have a relationship with EBSCO. If the numbers continue decline for CBCA usage, then I would want to cancel this database down the road.</p> <p>3) As a small College, we can only subscribe to a limited number of databases, due to a limited budget. As a result, the switch to ASP & BSP Premier from Complete will be a serious loss of approximately 50% of the content. There is no way I can pay to upgrade to the Ultimate without sacrificing other databases to pay for it.</p> <p>4) What happened to Academic Search Premier and Business Source Premier? Why aren't they included in the Pricing Information?</p> <p>5) I understand that there would be no additional funding for this year; what will happen next year?</p> <p>6) What are the repercussions (costs) of not subscribing to the Common Suite?</p>
Quest University Canada (V. Wallsten)	This proposal penalises many of the smaller universities and colleges, especially in the long run. To increase FT content, then take it away after a few years, seems antithetical to the aims of consortial negotiations, and how our libraries are supposed to be serving our students. This situation is especially true for a core resource like ASC, which is used heavily for all of our courses.
RRU (R. Croft)	I appreciate that there was likely a great deal of thought and effort put into trying to rejuvenate some shared licensing around this and I recognize the complexity; I do wish that meeting these considerations and challenges had been undertaken 3 or 4 years ago. This reconfigured deal would have our institution resubscribe to a product that we have already cancelled and overall continues to leave ebsco relatively unchallenged in a pricing schema, content array, and educational use provisions that are not transparent. I think ebsco's long time primacy has diminished our collective and individual negotiation powers with that vendor, a vendor that rents us an unstable amount of content (that in our case overlaps in large part with content we already have direct from publishers and includes a not insignificant amount of OA material) to us at ever higher prices with copyright/use prohibitions and DRM locks. The last refiguring of this deal was very costly for us with little value, and this is would be true again this time in terms of overall value. I think more value parity is needed in a common suite, particularly in a licensing group that includes for profit institutions.

<p>Selkirk College (G. Currie)</p>	<p>Well I realize this is one long trip across rocks and hard places, and Selkirk always appreciates the hard work you do at ELN, but the current proposal means it will cost me at least \$5K more a year to keep Academic Search at the Complete level, and \$7K to keep Business there as well. Which means I have to cut \$5-7K of something else. And Selkirk College just does not need a newspaper database It does need the Complete level for Academic Search. ASC/BSC provides 20 times as much content to Selkirk students as CBCA, and I dropped Newsstand a few years ago as by any sort of cost/use metric it was not worth keeping. So I can't see any real benefit in the current proposal, other than the fact of no Common Suite would mean ASC/BSC would be completely unaffordable, making this a 'less bad' sort of option.</p>
<p>Simon Fraser University (P. Gallilee)</p>	<p>Main reason for not being able to support: Transparency and equity of cost to each institution. I understand that the harmonized spend, intended to address historical imbalances in spend for ASP does not accomplish this. Costs which are out of sync with like institutions should be addressed. Rather than move historical spends into a new common suite, we should look at apportioning the total cost according to institution type/size. If not now, when? The move to the new pricing model could take place over a few years so that if there are institutions who owe more, they have time to find the funding. Although this seems to contradict the criteria of "maintain existing spend" set by the all partner meeting/report, I feel it is at the core of what a consortium is.</p>
<p>University of British Columbia (S. Armstrong)</p>	<p>Paying more for less content is the primary reason. While we would not need to upgrade ASP we would need to retain BSC and the cost for that upgrade would not be covered by our harmonized spend, creating an additional spend to an already tight collections budget.</p>
<p>University of Victoria (L. Petrachenko)</p>	<p>Not discounting the efforts that have gone into the recommendation UVic does not feel it addresses historical pricing inequities. We cannot therefore support the recommendation as it currently stands. We believe it important to take efforts to address and reset historical pricing inequities, providing transparency to all members.</p>
<p>Vancouver Island University (J. Blackburn)</p>	<p>We have consulted with our librarians' team here at VIU Library and have made a collective (unanimous) decision to select the "do not support" option at this time. We greatly appreciate all the work of the Steering Committee and ELN Office on constructing the proposal. However, we have several concerns that have come out of our conversations:</p> <p>Content Concerns</p> <p>VIU will be getting less content for the same spend (ASP and BSP instead of ASC and BSC). Our understanding is that a principle coming out of the All Partners' meeting was that all member institutions should see value in an all-in deal, but we do not see good value for our member institution in this proposal.</p> <p>We entered the UFC as a BSC subscriber and have paid for it throughout the UFC. In this proposal we will be downgraded and required to spend more money to get back to the BSC level – this is not acceptable to us.</p> <p>We met with EBSCO reps and communicated to them our context at VIU, and they are looking for ways to make the deal more acceptable to us. The spirit of this is appreciated, but seems awkward. We would normally expect our library consortium to be advocating for our interests, rather than the vendor. Also, we are also interested in achieving equitable and sustainable system solutions, not solely in negotiating a better short term deal for ourselves, possibly at the expense of other partners.</p>

We are not interested in any of the flexible upgrades or opt-in licenses offered as part of the bifocal approach, nor do we have money to spend on these or other upgrades that might be identified, even if we were interested.

Model Concerns

As a UFC participant, VIU Library has seen price increases of more than 100% for the UFC since 2010 – an unsustainable trajectory for us. Hence, committing to an even larger suite of e-resources in a common suite model is not attractive.

On several occasions we have expressed concerns about the viability of an all-in license for ELN members going forward, along with several other BC institutions as evidenced in the mandate survey. In 2015, we were not totally comfortable with extending the existing UFC into the future, let alone considering a much expanded suite now. We have not seen this perspective reflected in this proposal or in Steering Committee communications since the December all partners meeting, and that is a concern for us.

We cancel about \$20,000 worth of subscriptions each year, just to keep up with inflation and within our current budget. It is increasingly important that we are able to consider all products when we need to make tough cancellation decisions based on local priorities. The common suite model unduly constrains our ability to do this.

It is our opinion that the common suite rationale, re: equity in the system, supporting AskAway services and transfer students, is no longer as compelling as it once was, with widespread availability of diverse e-resources and discovery layers / web search tools to access them. In fact, attempting to present a common suite may not serve us well in terms of promoting information literacy and resilience in information seeking.

All VIU instructional and service departments are currently asked to find permanent budget cuts of 2-5%, excluding salaries; for the Library, this means the cuts must come from the collections budget. Acknowledging that other ELN members may have been at a disadvantage in cost sharing in the past, this is an extraordinarily difficult time for us to make a case in favour of the harmonization element of this proposal.

Even if we were in such a position, we do not feel that subsidizing resource upgrades for private institutions is a defensible use of our institutional collections funds, 50% of which come directly from VIU student tuition.

Although the tight integration between the ELN UFC / Common Suite and the e-HLbc Core Suite doubtless delivers advantages in negotiations, it also comes with significant risk to both organizations. The current level of integration is problematic in light of the fact that ELN and e-HLbc have separate memberships and governance structures, and hence cannot work together to adequately understand or address the implications, risks and benefits of the integration. The current process, in which we are compelled to consider implications, which we don't understand in detail, for the e-HLbc core suite when reviewing the ELN Common Suite proposal, is a good illustration of this.

We would like ELN to provide regular opt-in consortium licenses for Academic Search, Business Source, CBCA and Canadian Newsstream rather than offering them only via a common suite model. We began licensing Academic Search and Business Source that way before the UFC, and would like to go back to that model which will give us the flexibility and control to ensure sustainability. CRKN has successfully transitioned from all-in deals to "unbundled" opt-in licenses, and in doing more institutions participate in licenses that make sense for their libraries).

Process Concerns

In Spring 2015, when we agreed to sign on for another 2-year UFC term, we understood that a detailed analysis would begin immediately to explore both alternate content options, as well as the implications of dismantling or changing the UFC for the costs of

	<p>other EBSCO products and the e-HLbc Core Suite. Even with the “optional third year” of the license that ELN negotiated with EBSCO), the detailed analysis of alternate content options and costs, and implications for other EBSCO pricing including within the e-HLbc core suite, has not been done to our knowledge.</p> <p>We have asked EBSCO and Proquest for this pricing on our own, but it is proving challenging to obtain.</p> <p>The UFC Review Task Force), comprising a wide representation of ELN member institutions, worked on the mandate survey, but beyond that was never convened again. We are disappointed that the ELN Steering Committee chose not to engage with the UFC Review Task Force during the last year. The task force was never formally consulted, communicated with or dissolved by the Steering Committee after the mandate survey was distributed, and is not acknowledged in the Common Suite background and process documentation. We do not feel that this was a respectful way to treat this committed group of librarians who were prepared to undertake a great deal of work on behalf of the network.</p> <p>We are also troubled that the Steering Committee chose not to be representative during the exploration and negotiation work done since the December 2016 All Partners’ Meeting. We understand from Anita that Steering Committee members opted not to consult with their constituent institutions in favour of ELN staff scheduling calls with member institutions after a deal had been proposed. We would have expected and appreciated consultation and input in the formulation of a proposal, per the Steering Committee’s Terms of Reference. We would like to see a review of the Steering Committee’s representative functioning and perhaps of the structure itself (e.g. it might be better to structure it like e-HLbc’s steering committee, which is composed of a representative from each member institution.)</p>
--	--

Other Comments

<p>North Island College (M. A. Guenther)</p>	<p>NIC would be compelled to upgrade to ASC and BSC, which would be a financial hardship, possibly requiring us to drop one of more databases to cover the upgrade cost.</p>
<p>Quest University Canada (V. Wallsten)</p>	<p>I'd like to see the numbers if Complete was the base level for Ebsco products.</p>
<p>RRU (R. Croft)</p>	<p>As per previous question, repeated if this is the only part to be shared with steering cmmte.</p> <p>I appreciate that there was likely a great deal of thought and effort put into trying to rejuvenate some shared licensing around this and I recognize the complexity; I do wish that meeting these considerations and challenges had been undertaken 3 or 4 years ago. This reconfigured deal would have our institution resubscribe to a product that we have already cancelled and overall continues to leave ebsco relatively unchallenged in a pricing schema, content array, and educational use provisions that are not transparent. I think ebsco's long time primacy has diminished our collective and individual negotiation powers with that vendor, a vendor that rents us an unstable amount of content (that in our case overlaps in large part with content we already have direct from publishers and includes a not insignificant amount of OA material) to us at ever higher prices with copyright/use prohibitions and DRM locks. The last refiguring of this deal was very costly for us with little value, and this is would be true again this time in terms of overall value. I think more value parity is needed in a common suite, particularly in a licensing group that includes for profit institutions.</p>

<p>Selkirk College (G. Currie)</p>	<p>While a multiple vendor core suite is a worthy ideal, I don't know if the cost of saddling smaller institutions with a product of little value (Newstream) is worth it. I would say just take the core suit down to ASP/BSP with the option to upgrade to Complete, and drop the Proquest products. If we have fly the flag of Canadian content, could we see if Gale will give us a deal on CPI-Q, and make that the other vendor in the relationship?</p> <p>I will by necessity go with the Common Suite in whatever final form it takes, but the current proposal seems too costly for my institution.</p>
<p>Simon Fraser University (P. Gallilee)</p>	<p>Not show stoppers, but concerns I have:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - more of my collections budget is in the common suite (cancel decision out of my hands) - although the criteria has been followed - how many members are 'improving their lot' with this recommendation? My library is paying the same for less. Some are paying the same for more (but is the extra what they desire?) A consortium is about the whole being better off, just wondering if this recommendation is accomplishing that.
<p>University of British Columbia (S. Armstrong)</p>	<p>I believe I have expressed most of my concerns in our phone conversations, but will attempt to list here:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Concerned about bundled pricing and losing individual product costs. - Bundled databases (LGBTQ) when only interested in one. - There doesn't seem to be any libraries that will "win" from this point? It would be good to list what or where the vendors have made concessions. - While at this point we are not ready to get rid of Academic, at some point declining usage will force UBC into that decision.
<p>Yukon College (A. Goncalves)</p>	<p>We want to be assured that spending increases will be sustainable over the next few years. Keeping the harmonizing model will probably maintain this level of sustainability.</p>
<p>Columbia College (F. Jones)</p>	<p>I have no idea how the proposed price via the consortium compares to the price we would get straight from EBSCO if we weren't in the consortium. And there's no way to get that as EBSCO is not going to tell us anything that will undermine their ELN relationship. But that is actually the piece of information that would be the most convincing one way or the other.</p>
<p>Nicola Valley Institute of Technology (L. Epps)</p>	<p>As a small institution, I am trying to get the max and what would benefit our students. It would be great to be able to select what we wanted (of course making it fair to all other institutions) but, I understand that this probably is not feasible.</p>
<p>Trinity Western University (T. Goshulak)</p>	<p>Our concern is with the perceived need to have online products from two vendors as part of the common suite. In our case one of the products we do not currently to subscribe to. And, by creating this four product suite it will require us to add cost to keep two of the products at their current level.</p> <p>Thanks.</p>
<p>University of Northern British Columbia (H. Empey)</p>	<p>As we don't have any final details, my concerns may be moot. However, the concept of opting out (or opting in) is a philosophical issue.</p>

<p>University of the Fraser Valley (K. Isaac)</p>	<p>As a member of the Steering Committee, I've wondered in hindsight if we should/could have made it clearer that the choice isn't between the old UFC and the proposed Common Suite. The choice is between having no common suite or having this proposed Common Suite, perhaps modified somewhat. The UFC worked well for many institutions, including ours, but I understand it did not work for all.</p>
<p>Capilano University (K. Hall)</p>	<p>For us the price will increase by at least \$10,000 which is too much. The offer does not allow us the flexibility of excluding a resource that is a low priority for us, namely Canadian Newstream Complete.</p>
<p>Columbia Bible College (A. Andres)</p>	<p>It's unfortunate that we are so dependent on the big players (big universities) for ELN to meet everyone's needs. Is there any way EBSCO would be open to serving the big players one way and the smaller privates and 2 year colleges another way? I appreciate all the work ELN does for us and I would rather be part of ELN than on my own. Thanks</p>
<p>University Canada West (A. Mitescu)</p>	<p>I wanted to thank the Office and the Steering Committee for all the work done so far.</p> <p>I have no doubt that this has been a complex negotiation, with multiple partners and vendors, all with competing and (sometimes) conflicting interests.</p> <p>I look forward to the next steps on this conversation.</p> <p>Good luck!</p>
<p>VCC (S. Lew)</p>	<p>It would be helpful to see more comparative pricing information. For example, what would the cost for each database be as stand alone licenses within the consortium?</p> <p>Thank you for all the work that went into presenting this recommendation.</p>