

The EAR Streaming Media Working Group sent out a survey to the Collection Development list and COLD to collect information related to the acquisition of video materials within the system and potential aspects of a CSU-wide streaming video pilot. Sixteen respondents completed the survey via Qualtrics ([https://csub.qualtrics.com/jfe/form/SV\\_b7KuOhjCHBTiFk9](https://csub.qualtrics.com/jfe/form/SV_b7KuOhjCHBTiFk9)). The data of most interest to the working group included: hosting, methods of acquisition and selection, and funding.

Based on the data from the survey, most campuses do not host their own streaming media servers from within the library. Alternative hosting options were discussed and dismissed as managing a centralized server is costly and would require devoted staff time. It is worth noting here that a streaming server was managed centrally once before. The EAR Streaming Media Working Group recommends that any streaming video pilot make use of vendor hosting.

Respondents indicated a preference for perpetual access or one-time acquisition of content (11 of 16 “preferred” or “highly preferred”<sup>1</sup>) over annually licensed content (8 of 16). Coupled with the preference for PDA/DDA (10 of 16) or CSU (7 of 16) selected content over a vendor curated collection (3 of 16), vendor options may limit how a potential pilot is carried out. PDA/DDA selection does not generally yield perpetual streaming rights in the current market. Proceeding with a PDA/DDA pilot would yield limited term licensing, so sustainability of access, which has been discussed at length in EAR this year, is an obstacle for this pilot model. In order for the CSU libraries to centrally curate streaming video content for a perpetual access pilot, the working group would need to survey existing holdings of the libraries and vendor offerings of content with perpetual access. With our move to Alma, it may be doable, via analytics, to ascertain current streaming content holdings from all libraries.

Streaming video is still very costly; at least six of the respondents indicated they were not sure or are unable to afford the cost of a streaming video pilot. And while nine of the respondents indicated they use stateside funds to currently fund digital or streaming video, the remaining respondents (11) use a combination of lottery, endowment, and grant funds for these purposes. Given these methods of funding, those 11 campuses would likely not be able to participate in an opt-in with current funding for this format. The working group recommends that any pilot in streaming media be funded through the ECC via one-time funding. Because of the newness of the format and the potential value of this format as a distance learning tool, the working group believes there is sufficient reason to request centralized funding.

In addition to these major issues in defining the structure of the pilot, the working group appreciates the feedback from the survey (and directly) via the selection criteria of materials for the pilot. Because feature films are so much easier and cheaper to acquire than non-features (documentaries and/or instructional videos), and because they can also be commercially streamed by end users on platforms like Netflix, Hulu, or Amazon Prime, the EAR Streaming Media Working Group recommends any streaming video pilot be limited to non-feature films. These are typically costlier and harder to secure streaming rights by

---

<sup>1</sup> When referring to preference, the number presented is the number of respondents who responded “highly preferred” or “preferred” for the option mentioned.

students and faculty, and our end-users would benefit more from access to this type of material at the system level.

By and large, the requests for video materials are reported as coming from schools and departments in the humanities and social sciences. Specific disciplines reported most often by respondents include ethnic studies (9 mentions), psychology (5 mentions), gender studies, education, environmental studies, film and media studies, and performance arts (all with 4 mentions each). Campuses who do not currently have collections in the social sciences and performance arts expressed an interest, but there was also a call to collect more in science. The curation of a CSU-wide package would need to take into account more detailed, collection level information in addition to campus specific selection criteria which may influence when and how materials are purchased. Using analytics in conjunction with collection policies will also assist the group in better differentiating between perceived and actual needs to collect in specific areas.

As for vendor selection, many campuses already purchase streaming video content via Alexander Street Press, Amazon, Ambrose, Docuseek2, Films on Demand (Films Media Group), Filmmakers Library online, Kanopy, NBC Learn, Psychotherapy.net, Swank, Tugg, and Videatives. Some of these vendors already have established relationships with SDLC or SCEL. Others, like Kanopy, negotiate directly with campuses. The acquisition model (PDA/DDA for a year or perpetual, CSU-curated) will determine which vendors would serve as a best fit. Another popular preference that comes to bear with vendor selection is the availability of Public Performance Rights which ten of 16 respondents preferred.

Management of the pilot in Alma is another concern discussed amongst the working group, although it was not included in the survey. More information from SDLC and the ERM Task Force may be necessary for ensuring access and discoverability.

To initiate a pilot, we need to:

- Gather collection data on what is already held and how it was selected
- Build an argument for funding the pilot from the ECC
- Select an acquisition model
- Search for vendors who can provide the content we want in the acquisition model of our choice
- Evaluate access and discoverability options offered by selected vendors

Amanda Grombly, Bakersfield, convener

Fang Gu, Sacramento

Kathlene Hanson, Monterey

Mark Stover, Northridge

Hua Yi, San Marcos