

Approved Minutes of the Library and Learning Resources Committee (LLRC) Meeting
October 21, 2009 8:10-10:00 AM / Room 204, Curtis Laws Wilson Library

- I. Call to Order and Roll Call, including Self-Introductions
- II. Elect a Chair (note: the Chair must be a tenured faculty member and will also serve the campus as a non-voting member of the Rules, Procedure, and Agenda (RP&A) Committee of the Faculty Senate)
- III. Old Business
- IV. Process appeals for “journal pruning” process
- V. Review draft *Annual Report* for submission to Faculty Senate
- VI. Items from the floor / Questions and answers
- VII. Review Action Items
- VIII. Adjourn

I. Call to order, Roll, and Self-Introductions

The meeting was called to order by Andy Stewart at 8:10 a.m.

Present: Daniel Tauritz (Former LLRC Chair), Michael Bruening, Gearoid MacSithigh, Edward Malone, Hong Sheng, Andy Stewart (Library Director), Maggie Trish, Alexey Yamilov, and Richard Campos (Student Council).

Absent: Jacqueline Bichsel, Daniel Forciniti, and Krishna Kolan (Council of Graduate Students).

Andy welcomed the group and began by stating that the Library’s goal was to afford the utmost service to the campus community within the limited budget the Library is provided. This committee is a standing committee of the Faculty Senate and last year our chair was Daniel Tauritz. After introductions, our first item of business will be to elect a chair for this academic year. Andy asked each member to introduce themselves and who they represented. Self introductions served as roll call.

II. Elect a Chair

The first item of business was to elect a new chair. After limited discussion, Gearoid nominated Daniel Tauritz for chair and the motion was seconded by Ed. There being no other nominations or volunteers, Andy called for a vote. There being no abstaining votes or nays, Daniel Tauritz was elected chair of the LLRC for the 2009-2010 academic year.

III. Old Business

Daniel gave a brief overview of the prior year and his discussions with the past chair of RP&A. They had discussed this committee and Daniel’s charge to lead this committee to become more active.

Daniel started by discussing a Library Strategic Plan last year and from that discussion, it was decided to review the journal subscriptions and the monograph budget to see how best to utilize the limited dollars available. With that as the starting point various steps were taken.

- 1) The Library devised a process based on usage and price paid. This gave a price per usage. Once the statistics were gathered, a list was generated which consisted of ~600 titles and did not include any journals that were part of a package. (Note: *The Library does not have any control over the changes that occur*

within a package). This process was then presented to the LLRC who suggested it become an annual process.

- 2) A letter was drafted to faculty indicating the journals proposed to be pruned from the list of active acquisitions and a process to appeal any title slated for elimination. There were 57 titles identified based on zero usage over a 3 year period or a 3 year cost per use of greater than \$1,000.
- 3) In response to the letter to the faculty, there were 13 appeals. Of those 13, five were resolved after speaking with the department and raising awareness of on-line availability. The remaining 8 appeals will be discussed later in the meeting.

Daniel presented this concept in detail and proposed expanding this into an algorithm that could be used going forward to best utilize the dollars allocated for journals. If the Library could estimate the usage of newer journals and estimated usage of journals to be ordered, then a final list could be generated with lowest cost on top. Using that list, compare it to the current list and see what differences surface. Another area Daniel has asked Maggie to investigate is the number of ILL requests prior to subscribing to a journal. That could also be factored into usage. If possible, Daniel would prefer to stay away from any type of weighting due to its inherent subjective nature.

Questions from the group were raised. Ed asked if it was possible to see usage figures on the web. Michael asked how the usage was obtained. Maggie indicated she could post usage information on the web. She explained that usage was gathered from some of the publishers that provide the data, also through check out, and through use in the Library. The Library has a process whereby unshelved journals are restocked and a count of use is taken.

Andy inserted, at this juncture of the conversation, a copy of the acquisition budget over the past 15 years. The budget has been fairly flat which relates to a 7%-10% annual cut in purchasing power. The pruning the Library is trying to do with the journals will aid in allocating funds to new resources that would meet the needs of the campus community.

Daniel stated there were varying reactions to the letter sent. However, this process did allow for some education to departments that did not know or understand the tools and resources available to the faculty.

Maggie was asked about what happens if electronic goes away. She explained that publishers go out of business and there is an initiative called "CLOCKSS" that has access to the older electronic issues. There is another service called "Portico" that the Library subscribes to that also has post cancellation access.

Other questions arose relating to smaller departments and how those would be factored into any equation. Daniel indicated he would put together a summation of his proposal and list all the variable factors that would influence any algorithm developed.

Daniel indicated there are several of the departments that use journals more than books. The question then arises, how the Library can make the monograph budget more needs based. Is it possible to take a closer look at the monographic needs and move some of those dollars over to journals, or vice versa, based on actual needs identified by the Library?

Questions that arose, what constitutes a monograph purchase? Once the book is purchased, does the Library keep statistics on how often it is used? If someone in a

department requests a book, does it come out of their monographic budget? Monographic purchases are driven by faculty requests but the Library does not automatically purchase textbooks. However, if a textbook is the best book to have, the professor could request the book to be purchased and put on reserve. The reserve process would work for any ancillary books that graduate students would use in addition to the standard textbook or for someone who is planning to major in a field and wants to review some current introductory books. Out of this discussion, the question was raised about liaison in the Library and how that process worked. Each department has a liaison assigned. The liaison librarian works with the department liaison on purchase as well as any instructional needs.

IV. Process appeals for “journal pruning” process

Maggie submitted a list of 8 appeals by title, reason given to keep the title by the department, and the Library recommendation. A copy of same is attached (Attachment A) to the minutes. In all cases, the Library is recommending that the journal be retained. Each appeal was reviewed on a case by case basis and the recommendations made reflect either an attempt by the Library and department to work toward a solution together or recognition of a need not served in another way. The result of the pruning will be approximately \$20K in savings.

Daniel asked for a recommendation from the floor. Ed moved and Alexey seconded the motion to accept the Library recommendation as presented. Motion was carried.

V. Review draft Annual Report for submission to Faculty Senate

Daniel distributed a draft of Annual Report to Faculty Senate for review. In the first section, change the word “raise” to “increase”. In the section on the Mine, insert that the position vacated by Amanda will be filled by mid November 2009. There were no other objections. A copy of the modified draft is attached to the minutes (Attachment B).

VI. Items from the floor / Questions and Answers

Andy asked the committee members to keep the Library informed of any comments they hear. His door is always open and he would welcome any opportunity to address concerns. If there are any questions, something confusing that is brought up in the meetings, acronyms used you don’t understand, please do not hesitate to drop in and see Andy.

Daniel interjected that ILL (Inter-Library Loan) is an amazing resource. He discovered that two of his colleagues were buying separate journal articles when you can get them free through ILL.

Maggie also extended a welcome and stated her door was open if anyone had any questions at any time. She also mentioned that the federated search product would be going away. It was not getting much usage and is not well liked. Our Library will be joining the UM System “Summon” which is much more user friendly and includes UM Digital Library, MOspace, eventually Scholar’s Mine and will search everything simultaneously. Kansas City was able to get their product up and running within 2 months of purchasing. It is Maggie’s hope to have Summon up and running by next semester.

Daniel encouraged the faculty present to promote Matthew Pickens and his availability to teach students how to use the available electronic library tools and advanced searches. They can make an appointment for meetings with Matthew, he can do group trainings and could do something as simple as a 15 minute specialized training segment.

Michael mentioned that he was having problems connecting through VPN from home. Alexey mentioned the same problem but said he was able to access through Scopus

through the Library page. Maggie did not know a lot about the process, but will check into the issue and get back with Michael.

Michael also asked about Google Books and the impact they may have on the Library. Maggie indicated she had recently attended a copyright conference and that the Google Book deal was almost dead at this point but if it revives, the Library will be reviewing our ability to subscribe probably via the UM System.

Daniel addressed Richard and indicated it was important to the committee to know any concerns in the student community relating to the Library. This committee wants the students to feel like a relevant part of this process.

Last year it was mentioned looking at adding scanning to the copier capabilities in the Library for students so they could create PDF to then email. This option is under investigation.

Gearoid asked how often the group met. Usually it was two times in a semester but the committee got a late start this year. Maggie mentioned she would not be able to come up with new usage data until after the end of the calendar year.

Maggie asked the group to review a draft proposal on a list of technology needs in the Library. Currently the other campuses have technology budgets and/or student technology dollars are provided. Our Library does not have any of that funding. Maggie proposed sending out the draft letter for review and then the committee could present the request and possibly invite the chair of ITCC to attend our next meeting.

Daniel offered to sit down with Don Wunsch who is the chair of ITCC prior to our next meeting and test the waters. It is possible Don would be receptive to a joint project with the Library. Gearoid asked where the dollars came from now. Maggie advised that the Multimedia Center revenues pay for hardware but electronic resources are coming out of the materials budget.

VII. Review Action Items

- 1) Daniel will be putting the journal prioritization concept down on paper for the group to review and add any variables that may have been missed in the initial discussion.
- 2) Maggie will apply the application to the current data and compare to the most recent list when usage is available after January 1.
- 3) Maggie will post usage information on the web.
- 4) Andy will send the draft letter for technology needs to the group for review. If the committee can obtain approval via email, Daniel will proceed by holding a meeting with the ITCC chair.
- 5) Maggie will develop 2 examples on the monographic budget

VIII. Adjourn

Meeting adjourned at 10 a.m.

Attachment A

2010 Journal Pruning Appeal Summary 10/20/09

We originally identified a total of 57 titles to prune from our current list of journals. The library is recommending that all journals receiving appeals be retained. Each recommendation was made on a case-by-case basis, and most reflect either an attempt by the Library and department to work toward a solution together, or a recognition of a need not served in another way. The result of the pruning will be approximately \$20k in savings which can be applied to wish lists or to offset possible UM System-level cuts.

Speaking only for myself, this process has been a valuable way of seeing how some of the faculty work with journals, and some of the ways in which I believe the changing usage of the print by students is not being made visible to them. I hope that this process is just the beginning of a more open dialog about the nature of the Library's collections and how research libraries are changing to meet the needs of faculty and students.

Title	Reasons Given to Keep Title by Dept.	Library Recommendation
Journal of Geophysical Research: Solid Earth	Department is using print copies owned by dept., but could lose that subscription in future.	Library switched to online access in 2009, and there is now sufficient usage online to remove from pruning list.
The Masonry Society Journal	Premier resource in this specialized area, important to current and future research.	Keep title. Low cost for now, and library will pursue online access when it is made available.
International Journal of Cast Metals Research	Of significance to department. Has had subscription short time to develop usage.	Library agrees. Previous ILL requests support longer period to build usage as well.
Transactions of the American Mathematical Society	Premier journal. Is used in print but reshelfed by faculty.	Library will switch to online-only access to drop subscription below threshold to get off the list.
Rocky Mountain Journal of Mathematics	Print is being used and reshelfed.	Keep. Move to online if and when possible.
Zeitschrift fur Physicalische Chemie	Is used in print by reshelfed by faculty.	Keep. Not available in online format, but will pursue when available. Faculty now know to not reshelve.
Exemplaria	Only journal in support of our new medievalist.	Keep. We've worked with vendor to add online access. Can re-evaluate in a year or so.
The Shakespeare Bulletin	Important resource in this area, faculty will work to familiarize students with it.	Keep. Low cost, and Gale use too short to show trending. Re-examine in a year or so.

Attachment B

Annual Report to Faculty Senate
Library and Learning Resources Committee
Missouri S&T
October 2009

Meeting 1. The Missouri S&T LLRC met on October 14, 2008.

Andy showed a draft of his presentation for the Chancellor's Council (11/5/08). The content generated several questions and a productive group discussion ensued.

Andy summarized the Library's acquisitions expenditures for FY08. FY09 budget reflects a 4% **raise** over FY08. The total S&T Library budget, expressed as a percentage of the campus operating budget, is 2.7%; the average of the other three UM campuses is 3.5% (FY08 data).

Meeting 2. The Missouri S&T LLRC met on November 7, 2008.

The Committee discussed strategic and tactical planning for the Library. There are both external and internal considerations.

Meeting 3. This Missouri S&T LLRC met on May 13, 2009.

The LLRC reviewed remaining questions from the November meeting.

Maggie Trish (Assistant Director for Technical Services) thoroughly explained and guided a discussion on preparing for 3, 5, and 10 percent budget holdbacks in FY09.

The Library's strategic plan was reviewed; no action was taken.

Scholars' Mine now contains more than 5,500 items (about one year duration). The Scholars' Mine librarian, Amanda Piegza, has taken another position in Indianapolis. **The position vacated by Amanda will be filled by mid November 2009.**

A new journal portfolio management system which involves an annual process for dropping subscriptions of underutilized journals to free up funds to subscribe to journals for which there is more demand was discussed and supported by most LLRC members. The new process has as a side benefit that it naturally adapts to changes in the journal budget: when the budget is cut in tough economic times, not all the funds freed up by dropping subscriptions are used to add subscriptions and, conversely, when the budget is increased in bright economic times, more subscriptions are added than covered by the freed up funds. Over the summer, Maggie and Daniel worked on a letter to all faculty explaining the rationale behind the new journal portfolio management system and submitted it to the LLRC for approval. The approved letter was sent to all the faculty on September 16th 2009.

Much more detail is available in the minutes for each LLRC meeting. Andy continues to express his gratitude to the members of the LLRC for their time and interest.

Respectfully submitted,

Andy Stewart
Library Director and Recorder