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On March 13, the EAR committee met on the Loyola Marymount campus, in conjunction with the annual SCELC meeting. Seven of ten EAR members were present. EAR was joined by several other CSU librarians, most members of the collection development listserv, CSUCD.

After attending to other business, EAR reviewed ECC data presented by EAR sub-committee members Carol Perusso, Tracy Gilmore, and Michele Van Hoeck. This data reflected a cost-per-use analysis of a portion of the ECC (2017-18), as well as results of two librarian surveys from 2018, and is reproduced in the attached “Usage and Perceived Importance of ECC Resources” document.

Based on this data, EAR and CSUCD engaged in discussion, debate, and several straw votes of the full group to identify which ECC resources should be recommended for cutting if the ECC budget shortfall persists in 2019-20. Eddie Choy advised EAR that the shortfall was approximately $600,000, and so EAR used that amount as a goal for “de-prioritizing” an ECC resource.

Ultimately EAR conducted formal votes on five resources, noted in the attached document via color coding and summarized here:

Cut

*Oxford English Dictionary*: Do not renew, unanimous

*Biological Abstracts*: Do not renew, unanimous

*MathSciNet*: Do not renew, unanimous

*EBSCO Business Source Premiere*: Downgrade to *Business Source Elite*, unanimous

Keep

*Westlaw*: Renew, 6 in favor, 1 opposed

These votes would result in approximately $500,000 reduction of costs of the ECC.

Additional resources were considered for cutting at the March meeting, but no consensus was reached. See attached document noting resources considered.

On April 22, EAR met via Zoom, with several members of CSUCD in attendance. The Chair asked each EAR member present (eight of ten) if they would like to revisit any aspect of the March vote or affirm it: all stated they were in favor of affirming the March vote. Discussion proceeded on a number of other potential ECC resources to consider cutting. Despite productive discussion, no consensus was reached on cutting additional databases.

One other cost saving idea was proposed: consolidating the PsychInfo/PsychArticle offering onto a single platform. There was a strong preference in the group for the EBSCO platform, so CO staff was charged with identifying cost savings associated with that choice.

Shortly after this meeting concluded, EAR Chair received a letter from a newly formed CSU business librarians’ group, opposed to the downgrading of Business Source premiere, see attached.