

MCDRSC Meeting 9am November 16, 2010

Attendees:

UMLS – Janis Peach

Tim Nelson

Lindsay Schmidt

Chris Daniel

UMKC Steve Alleman

Christine Angolia

LSO Terry Austin

Abbie Brown

MU Rhonda Whithaus

Judy Maseles

Cindy Bassett

Goodie Bhullar

Mary Ryan

Hunter Kevil

Diane Johnson

Ann Riley

MST Maggie Trish

Sherry Mahnken

Agenda

LSO Report

I. LSO Report

T. Austin....

I.a. ACS Update

American Chemical Society proposed a new pricing proposal for FY11 to “get us on model”. This model would have been an overall 25% increase from FY10. Resource required as several departments need their publications for accreditation. Discussions continued with ACS finally agreeing to honor the existing 5-year agreement which will go through 2012. ACS was priced by subscriptions of campuses in the past. After 2013, the cost will be much more because we will have to be on model. In order to be considered a consortium and receive consortium pricing there must be at least five institutions participating which we now have counting SLU. The largest increase will be for UMKC and it may be a consortia problem if UMKC does not participate.

Alleman UMKC – pricing is base on?

Austin LSO –

1. FTE
2. Carnegie (like) classification
3. Usage

2. Discussion of Usage Statistics LSO does monthly statistics

Concern of this request: do we use calendar year statistics of fiscal year statistics. There was a comment that fiscal year statistics might be useful for calculations regarding the database list assessments in the future.

T. Austin reported that the Directors have advised that do not want LSO to provide services for providing individual statistics for each campus.

There was discussion regarding accuracy of statistics from ProQuest and the impact federated searches have on the database usage statistics. Rolla Representatives indicated the definition of "access" is defined – gateway vs. individual databases; the impact of link resolvers. It was suggested to the committee that they consider further discussion regarding TRD and how access is provided. MST indicated it would be very useful if LSO might create a trending document. Running local statistics also are useful to see how each campus is doing.

UMSL – runs statistics when needed; has no statistics package

MU - so many databases – does their best uses; Scholarly Stats

MST runs statistics every 6 months was monthly; uses 360 COUNTER

UMKC runs every six months but has breakdown by month does; not know if they have a stats package

Statistics Usage Decision needed by Dec. 15, 2010: Should LSO provide statistics based on Calendar Year or Fiscal Year.

II. Discussion of Cancellation List FY 2012

MCDRSC group grateful and appreciative of the email received below:

=====

Edited....

From: Stewart, Andy

Sent: Friday, November 12, 2010 2:03 PM

To: MRSC-L@PO.MISSOURI.EDU

Cc: Allen, Gary K.; Kopp, Kurt; Bostick, Sharon; Cogswell, James A.; Dames, Christopher; Stewart, Andy

Subject: 11/16 MCDRSC Meeting

November 12, 2010

Members of MCDRSC:

I wanted to inform you at the earliest convenience of what I consider to be (at least temporary) good news.

Effective today, the UM Library Deans and Directors, in close consultation with UM System CIO Dr. Gary Allen, can inform you we are able to preserve the current (FY11) level of UM shared database funding into next year (FY12). The effect of this change, of course, is that MCDRSC does not need to plan for imminent database cuts in the range of \$250,000.

You should know this news comes with a huge cautionary note: Our decision is subject to change in the event the UM System is further affected by State of Missouri funding cuts. Because of that possibility, your group should continue to develop and maintain your list of potential databases to be cut.

=====

As requested by the UM Directors, the committee worked on the cancellation list. Some cancellations had little discussion and a consensus was easily achieved. Other database choices resulted in significant discussion and proved challenging when it came to a vote.

Consensus was reached for a total of \$250,000.

The List: Yes-Cancel /// No- Retain

Ovid Nursing Collection 1

- MU, UMKC, MST – yes; UMSL – No: Needed by Nursing School UMSL, UMKC, and UMC would all need to pick up some journals

Gut and Thorax

- UMSL, MU, and MST – Yes; UMKC – No - if cancelled MU could pick up the cost for their campus. Suggestion was made that UMKC & MU might share the cost as both would have to pick it up.

LN Statistical Universe

- UMKC, UMSL, MST, MU – Yes – data increasingly available for free and/or in other databases.

Annual Reviews

- UMKC, UMSL, MST, MU – Yes; many of the titles and resources are in Academic Search Premier Also included discussion about GWLA vs. purchasing some titles directly from Annual Reviews, and how that would mean a lesser discount for the campuses. A bill-back option would be considered, and if necessary to cut it, discussion would continue.

Annual Reviews Economics

- UMKC, UMSL, MST, MU – Yes; mostly new titles available in Ebscohost products, might be picked up in smaller package and grouped by campus-LSO. The deal through GWLA means that to get selected titles instead of whole package, we would need to go direct. LSO could bill back to interested campuses.

Table of Contents

- UMSL, MST, MU – Yes; UMKC – No; LSO – TOC is current. Update: Baker & Taylor will take it over. Yankee Book Peddler contacted and does not yet have the programming done. Yankee is not yet prepared to discuss pricing. Representatives like TOC, however, feel it can be picked up in the future [including a possible candidate for one-time funds] for updates. UMKC indicated that eventually there may be a decrease in buying books and cost might decrease accordingly.

E! Compendex (substantial discussion on this title) – it was tabled

- MST, MU – No; UMSL, UMKC – Yes

MST cannot pick up the cost, MU (it would be approximately half their budget) might be able to pick up the cost. The suggestion by UMKC that Scopus might cover the same resources was questioned by MST. They stated that the indexing in Scopus was less valuable and that Compendex search filters and relevance ranking was very good and very valuable to their students and faculty.

TRD

- UMKC, UMSL, MU, MST – Yes; MST must have Compendex if they give up TRD

Library Literature

- MU, UMSL, MST – Yes; UMKC- No. MU although usage is high due to Library School there **is** not many unique titles. Many may be found in Academic Search Premier and LISTA. UMSL –

usage is extremely low. UMKC has found some opposition to cancellation. Some usage for other campuses is also appearing as UMC usage. UMC does not think that they would pick it up.

ABI/Inform ProQuest Significant discussion; eventually tabled – further assessment required

- MST, MU – Yes; UMKC, UMSL – No;
The debate centered on the Wall Street Journal full text available through this database. MU has access to WSJ via the database Factiva.
LSO – if dropped ProQuest will raise the price for Theses & Dissertations up to \$15,000 so there are ramifications.
UMSL – huge usage and they cannot pick up the WSJ “no hope” of that. The business courses support 25% of credits hours at UMSL
WSJ core of the issue regarding this database.
MST – suggested a title analysis needed of use of WSJ.
LSO – will do an analysis of WSJ; will pull statistics for individual campuses on this title. Each campus should also review their usage. May be way to achieve savings to retain WSJ, not ABI/Inform – not known at this time.
This issue may be revisited after campuses see what their WSJ usage is.

LN Academic

- UMKC, MU, MST – Yes; UMSL – No – UMSL indicates good usage and a significant resource for foreign language newspapers. Other campuses find it useful but usage has dropped over the last several years. Concern expressed for loss of some business resources. Legal portion – many law journals are freely available at a number of websites including FindLaw.
It was agreed to put this resource on the list but leave it last to round out the necessary \$250K for the list, so that it would be less likely to be cut.
- **OVID User Licenses**
When the cut decision was made last year is implemented, we will only have 48 user licenses left. This is pretty low so we won't cut any more until we see how the previous cut affects access.

At this point, the approximate \$250,000 reached, factoring in the potential savings by bidding Biological Abstracts and the discussion ended. And the list was finalized for now. UMKC suggested that we cut stuff that we agree on with the possibility of using savings for a wish list, since there were several resources we agreed should be cut. Terry reminded us of further cuts for FY11 and FY12, but agreed that we could go ahead with a wish list to make better use of funds as our needs change. Discussion on whether we want to move forward with canceling some items even if we are not required to do so. We would need to decide in April for resources that renew in July. If we are not required to cancel for FY12, we could then decide to purchase/subscribe to other resources with the money saved from the cancellations. Also, we should know the results of the MOREnet evaluation process for databases. Agreed to discuss at next meeting which resources to move forward with canceling.

Also briefly mentioned was that MOREnet is preparing to make decisions on their database subscriptions/renewals, and that LSO will not have an MOU with MOBIUS Database Cafeteria for the upcoming year, which will mean paying an administrative fee to whoever handles the orders.

LSO indicated that MOBIUS pricing for some of its resources and services will go up next year – amount unknown.

II a. Biological Abstracts – should we bid it?

LSO - after some research, **decided to propose** a fully fledged bid. (Thomson Reuters and EBSCO would both mean a lower cost, no response from Ovid regarding pricing), All campuses- MU, MST, UMSL, UMKC supported pursuit of bid.

III Discussion of process for creating a collection development statement

UM Directors asked MCDRSC to develop a collection development statement that is more in depth about the principles guiding the expenditure of funds for jointly funded databases. A task force will be created that is comprised of 1 member from each campus. MST suggested a brainstorming session, which will be set up in the near future so that all MCDRSC members can share ideas for the task force to review. Rhonda stated that she wants the process to be transparent and provide ways for all MCDRSC members to provide input – perhaps by using a wiki to collect input as we have done with the MERLIN redesign issues. We will need to take the historical background into consideration. LSO will email the current committee charge and post to the MERLIN website

The report or statement is due by April, 2011. The group will need to discuss various options. Alleman UMKC - volunteered to be on the task force and suggested we look at what other consortia have done.

MU-A. Riley – recommended the statement concentrate on databases that have the most value to the various campuses.

What are the “principles” we should follow or, perhaps, create? Example: How to address ties in votes, or how to handle when three campuses vote to cut something crucial to the fourth.

A brainstorming session will hopefully be scheduled for sometime in December, 2010.

RW would like to know who wishes to be on the campus taskforce in a week – Nov. 23, 2010. Will contact via email.

Not originally on the agenda, there was also a discussion regarding whether we should go ahead with any cuts now. Any cuts would have to wait for the next fiscal year, due to vendors requiring a 60-day cancellation notice. Terry Austin spoke about how LSO deals with inflation. Cindy Bassett questioned replacing cancelled resources with new subscriptions. TA thought that by April, it will be known what will happen with the budget. The campuses also need to continue to consider cuts for 2013, as well as working on a wish list for any potential money.

The next meeting date was discussed – Feb 1st or 2nd 2011. UMSL will take minutes

(Email later in the week) The date is Tuesday Feb. 1, 2011 from 9-Noon. Agenda items will include discussion of the work of the task force on the collection development statement, discussion of whether

to move ahead with some resource cancellations and the MERLIN redesign (it was not included in this meeting due to the higher priority of database list assessment.

The meeting adjourned at 11:35pm. Terry Austin, LSO, thanked all for working well together.

Consolidated Potential Cut List FY12

bid Biological Abstracts	Sub Date	UMC	UMKC	MST	UMSL	Total	Rank
Ovid Nursing Collection 1	10/01-9/30	3	2	3	100	108	1
Gut and Thorax	10/01-9/30	5	100	4	1	110	2
LN Statistical Universe	07/01-06/30	9	3	2	100	114	3
Annual Reviews	01/01-12/31	10	4	6	100	120	4
Annual Reviews Economics	09/01-08/31	11	5	7	100	123	5
Table of Contents		2	100	1	100	203	6
TRD	12/31-12/30	100	6	100	2	208	8
Library Lit	09/01-08/31	7	100	5	100	212	9
LN Academic Universe	07/01-06/30	8	100	8	100	216	11
Not on suggested cut list for FY12							
PAIS	07/01-06/30	4	100	100	100	304	13
GeoRef	07/01-06/30	100	100	100	4	304	14
Avery Index BID	11/01-10/31	100	100	100	5	305	15
Nature Clinical Practice Journals	01/01-12/31	100	100	100	6	306	16
MLA Bibliography	09/01-08/31	100	7	100	100	307	17
Nature and Nature Reviews and Research	01/01-12/31	100	100	100	7	307	18
15 Ovid User Licenses		1	100	100	100	301	12
EI Compendex	09/01-08/31	100	1	100	3	204	7
ABI/Inform	10/01-09/30	6	100	9	100	215	10