

MERLIN Collection Development & Reference Services Committee
Videoconference
October 25, 2007
Minutes

Attendees: Kathy Hall (UMKC), Brenda Dingley (UMKC), Nancy Stancel (UMKC), Christine Angolia (UMKC), Chris Dames (UMSL), Jan Peach (UMSL), Marilyn Rodgers (UMSL), Frances Piesbergen (UMSL), Mary Krieger (SLU), Barbara Rehkop (WU), Sherry Mahnken (UMR), Maggie Trish (UMR), David Hubbard (UMR), Cindy Bassett (MU-Law), Geoff Swindells (MU), Rebecca Graves (MU), Judy Maseles (MU), Goodie Bhullar (MU), Hunter Kevil (MU), Mary Ryan (MU), Rhonda Whithaus (MU – recorder), Susan McCormack (LSO), Abbie Brown (LSO), Terry Austin (LSO)

**I. Cooperative management of government publications in MOBIUS Libraries
- Geoff Swindells**

Geoff conducted a collection analysis of government documents and found that 64% of the collections were shared by 3 or more libraries. 17% were shared by 2 or more libraries.

With the successful MOBIUS delivery system, we can review collection overlap as this makes it easy to move materials between libraries.

MU is creating requestable item types for all formats (e.g., microforms, DVDs, etc.) and all levels (federal, state) of government documents in order to make the materials more easily available to the citizens of the state via patron-initiated loan. Reference materials and those items in poor condition will not be requestable. FDLP does provide for the opportunity to create a shared regional collection via selective housing agreements. A particular FDLP library would agree to designate at least a portion of its collection as the shared regional collection. This is a voluntary and severable agreement.

Institutions would be designating portions of their current collections and not necessarily creating new collections. Once an institution has agreed to designate a shared collection, other libraries in the state could discard their copies of those documents.

Benefits: clearing shelf space; increasing number of cataloged records (many government documents not cataloged).

Requirements: would have to have some designation in the record that the item is part of the shared collection (perhaps in a Note field); would have to allow for patron-initiated loan; would have to ensure each participating institution has procedures to allow non-affiliates to request and view materials (although not required to allow non-affiliates to check the items out); creation of a Memorandum of Understanding.

University of Central Missouri is interested in this idea – would like to designate an aerospace collection.

This program is easily doable among MERLIN libraries and more difficult at the MOBIUS level because of some institutions' concerns about lending other

formats. MERLIN could take the lead to show this will work as well as serve as a project on cooperative collection development.

This is a completely voluntary program. No institution would be required to participate. If an institution designates a collection as part of the shared collection, that institution would be responsible for full cataloging and maintaining the document. If the institution changed its mind, MU is statutorily obligated to take the documents back.

Given their current workload, UMSL is unable to commit to more extensive cataloging of government documents.

Although a recent survey suggests placing PDFs online (using local server space), there is no mandate from GPO to store digital files locally. An institution could elect to participate in the shared collection for only paper copies. If GPO gives the option to select the digital file instead of the paper copy, an institution that selects the digital would then fall under the FDLP rules.

There is no requirement that the documents be stored on-site.

Step 1: MU is going to convert all government document item types to requestable.

Step 2: If any of the 6 MERLIN depository libraries want to designate a portion of their collection as part of the shared collection, then discussions need to begin. Geoff is also speaking to MOBIUS committees and hearing interest from small libraries. He will continue to pursue options at the MOBIUS level.

If you are interested or have questions, contact Geoff

(SwindellsG@missouri.edu).

II. LSO Report

- A. **Saved money with 2 renewals:** Avery renewed for \$1200 less than last year; Dissertation Abstracts renewed for \$9000 less than last year because of the forced move from OVID to ProQuest. These savings went to cover inflation costs of our other subscriptions.
- B. **Cell Press:** At the last meeting, it was agreed that LSO would add 2 new Cell Press titles (Stem Cell and Cell Host & Microbe) to our subscription. A third title has just become available (American Journal of Human Genetics). There is no additional money to add this title, but LSO could bill back to the institutions if there is interest. After some discussion, it was discovered that only 2 campuses are interested in the new title (UMKC and MU) and only one campus is actually interested in all 3 titles (MU). It was agreed that LSO would not order any new Cell Press titles. Terry will ask for re-pricing for the American Journal of Human Genetics for UMKC and MU only.
- C. **OVID User Licenses:** there is no new information. At the last meeting, it was agreed to cut 18 licenses.
- D. **IE Compendex/Inspec:** The bid will go out in late spring/early summer. For the last bid, we requested that both databases have the same search engine. This limits the number of respondents to Elsevier and OVID. It was agreed that Terry will bid for both a shared search engine and then separately so that we can compare costs. Another bid issue was about the dates available. Elsevier is the

- only one that offers a backfile. If this is a requirement of the bid, they can write their own ticket. It was agreed that we would not require the backfile in the bid, but ask for the add-on cost for the backfile.
- E. Nature Clinical Practice journals:** Will need to be bid in December because OVID will offer access also. OVID will offer unlimited access or 2 simultaneous users. Bid will request pricing for both options. Informal price quotes indicate OVID will charge \$11,000 less than NPG. It is highly likely that the in-press articles will not be available in OVID. Although in-press articles are very important, the cost difference is significant. It was decided the bid would not include a requirement for the in-press articles. SLU does want to be included in the bid.
 - F. Catalog Overlay Demos :** As selected at the last meeting, 4 products (Encore, WorldCat Local, Aquabrowser and Endeca) have been demonstrated. Two more demos (Nov. 14 for Endeca and Nov. 15 for Aquabrowser) are left. Contact Susan if you want to register for either of these sessions.
 - G. MOBIUS Funding Report:** MOBIUS submitted a request for \$2 million in one-time funds to equalize clusters. This could include catalog overlay. MOBIUS also requested \$500,000 in recurring funds to restore past level of state support. The request has been submitted, but there is no information on whether the request will stay in the CBHE budget request. MCDAC (MOBIUS Catalog Design Advisory Committee) is currently preparing an RFI for catalog overlays.
 - H. One-Time Purchases:** Since the Committee placed a moratorium on TOC for one year, we have approximately \$32,000 available for a possible one-time purchase. This is not recurring money, so there would have to be a small annual access fee or no annual access fee. All campuses agreed that we would like to pursue a one-time purchase. We will need to spend the money by April. At the last meeting, some suggestions were made for possible purchases. In addition, UMKC and MU sent some ideas to Terry. A final list of suggestions is due to Terry by January. Hunter and Judy will compile a list of e-book titles for the committee to review, also.
 - I. Overlap Analysis:** Abbie has been compiling a list of campuses' subscriptions so that we can see where we overlap and identify resources to pursue for additional campus savings.
 - J. Web of Science and Scopus:** If all was equal (including cost), which would each campus prefer? UMKC likes the Scopus interface but would miss the Web of Science Humanities coverage. Chris from UMSL stated that Scopus had better coverage for Science areas. UMR would like to have both, but faculty want Web of Science and would prefer to stick with it. MU agreed with UMR. The list price for Scopus is the same as what we pay for Web of Science. Elsevier does not want to negotiate if we are not serious, but the final price would be less than the list price. We can't get a price cut on Web of Science, but Terry has asked about them providing additional backfiles and JCR. For negotiation purposes, she'll drop the backfiles request and see if they will agree to add JCR to our subscription without a cost increase. Abbie will run a comparison of Scopus and Inspec. Perhaps down the road we could drop Inspec and apply that money

towards Scopus. Need decision before Christmas on the Web of Science/Scopus issue. We will pursue the Inspec/Scopus information for a future discussion.

K. ScienceDirect Freedom Trial: Overlap in discussion of Scopus and ScienceDirect. Could the savings we will see in FY09 for the cancellation of Current Contents and the end of JSTOR Archive Fee payments (approximately \$113,000) be applied towards either Scopus or ScienceDirect? The preference was to apply money toward content instead of additional indexing source. Since there would not be enough money to cover the entire cost of the ScienceDirect Freedom Collection, there was much discussion about possible formulas for dealing with what each campus would be billed. Terry will run some numbers based on the common campus formula and share with the group for continued discussion.

Meeting adjourned at noon as scheduled. Since there are still agenda items left to discuss, there will be emails or possibly another meeting scheduled for next month.