Minutes, EAR meeting, May 18, 2018

Topic: Cuts needed in ECC

Chair Mark Stover:

We have difficult decisions to make today. Hoping to conclude business today, but if not, we can meet again Monday.

Process discussion:

One option: cut one expensive database to get close to goal, then finish with a few more smaller cuts

Second option: cut 5-10 smaller databases

Third option: not aim for complete solution today, instead look for 200,000-300,000 in cuts. Then either save remainder of cuts for January renewals, or hope CSU budget improves enough to cover rest, with Jerry’s transfer of funds.

Other categorical options? No responses

Next topic: philosophical underpinnings of ECC. We should make this more explicit in our recommendation to COLD. Two thoughts: 1) Should we explicitly tie the ECC to mission of CSU, i.e. primarily undergraduate education? Or 2) Should we explicitly tie ECC to specific curriculum? Second approach is more difficult. Regardless, this mission element is important component for decision-making.

Comment: disagree with example cited, Digital Dissertations, and undergraduate mission

Comment: my students don’t do recreational research. What they’re actually using is more important than hypothetical use based on mission and curriculum.

Comments in favor of “three-legged stool” approach to evaluating ECC: usage stats, CSU mission, and individual library input all important components.

Discussion of three categorical options:

Comment in favor of third option – aim for large initial cut, get remainder of cuts in January

Two comments in favor of second option

Three comments in favor of option one – cutting Westlaw will disrupt fewer classes; cutting lots of smaller databases will be harder on students

Comment that a more visible, impactful cut, like Westlaw, would highlight need for more budget for library

Comments on Westlaw specifically: we went through a lot of trouble substituting Westlaw for Lexis; social science programs rely on legal material; one campus will go back to print if Westlaw is cut

Eddy: anything cut will be offered as an opt-in

Tracy: way too early to comment on usage stats; will have more meaningful commentary on Monday

Comment: overlap analysis reports were sent. Comment in favor of keeping Academic Search Premier, heavy use by students. We may need to wait for usage data to identify most fundamental databases for ECC

Comment that ABI/Inform usage data suggests it’s not core

Suggestion that we cut Westlaw + 5-7 rated lowest databases in survey

Two comments in favor of this proposal.

Comment that switching to platform consolidation for MLA and Psych databases is no-brainer

Cutting Westlaw would send a signal; cutting OED would send a signal.

Bottom five in survey have had very low interest/usage historically, despite librarian support.

Request for cost savings for cutting OED, Westlaw, and platform change: $400-440,000 est. (Ebsco vs. Proquest)

Discussion about ripple effect on other Ebsco prices with platform shift. Eddie says Ebsco didn’t indicate MLA/Psych platform shift would impact other prices.

Concern expressed that some print resources were cut based on adding Westlaw and Academic Premier in recent years. Acknowledgement that this is our unfortunate reality.

Straw vote:

Cut OED, Westlaw, and make MLA/Psych platform change (Proquest): 6 yes; 3 no

Cut OED, Westlaw, and make MLA/Psych platform change (Ebsco): 8 yes; 1 no

[Stronger vote among non-EAR members for Ebsco platform than Proquest platform]

Cut Westlaw, survey’s bottom 5 databases (Grove, CQ, ACLS ebooks, OED, SCOAP3), and make MLA/Psych platform change to Ebsco: support expressed for this option, which would come close to

Request that Tracy focus on usage data for Westlaw four smaller databases over weekend, if possible, to help inform final vote on Monday.