

Minutes of the Library and Learning Resources Committee (LLRC) Meeting
October 4, 2010 – 1:00-2:25 PM / Room 204, Curtis Laws Wilson Library

- I. Introductions and Welcome
- 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. General Background
 - a. Past Practice: One meeting per semester but subject to committee interests
- IV. Description of “journal pruning” process
- V. Review draft LLRC *Annual Report* for submission to Faculty Senate
- VI. New Business
- VII. Review Action Items
- VIII. Adjourn

1. Introductions and Welcome

The meeting was called to order by Andy Stewart at 1:05 p.m.

Present: Akim Adekpedjou, Michael Bruening, Edward Malone, Alexey Yamilov, Maggie Trish, and Andy Stewart

Student Council: Selin Acar

Council of Graduate Students: Arpana Murthy

Andy welcomed the group and asked each member to introduce themselves and who they represented. Self introductions served as roll call.

2. Elect a Chair

The first item of business was to elect a new chair. Andy gave a brief overview of the Library and Learning Resources Committee and advised the group that this committee reports to the Faculty Senate and is a standing committee of same. This group usually meets once a semester.

After some discussion on eligibility and today’s attendance, the group decided that more faculty members needed to be present to elect a chair. The motion was made and carried that an email ballot be forwarded to the group for election of a chair. Andy will coordinate the email ballot.

Andy served as acting chair for the rest of the meeting.

3. General Background

Andy provided some history on the group and stated he saw this committee as a conduit to send out information to the faculty as well as receive feedback from the faculty to the Library. He clarified for the group that some of the purchases of the Library are a co-operative effort with the four other UM System Libraries. Within that co-operative process, we have 1 vote. That purchasing power has been favorable for the Library in the past but may not continue in the future due to budget constraints. If a major package has to be cut through co-operative purchases, the Library’s acquisition budget could be

affected by trying to continue to carry the package.

4. Description of “journal pruning” process

Maggie advised that the pruning letter was distributed, reviewed, modified, approved and sent out to the departments (Attachment A). The pruning process is based on usage and price paid. The current list was based on low use over the last three years or a cost over \$1,000 per use. Future lists may expand to 5 years and \$550 cost per use. Once the statistics were gathered, a list was generated which was part of the letter distributed. (*Note: The Library does not have any control over the changes that occur within a package*). Not all responses have been received as of today’s meeting but as soon as Maggie has spoken with all departments, a final list will be submitted to the committee. Maggie also mentioned that some statistics are harder to obtain from vendors and if a vendor cannot provide usage data, it is harder to justify keeping those titles.

Edward asked about the cuts from last year and how the money savings was used. Maggie explained that we were able to pick up a couple new journals as well as soak up some of the increase costs in other journals.

Alexey indicated that there was a particular journal his department could cut and replace with something else. Maggie said she would make the pruning letter clearer in the future that additions can be requested at the same time as the pruning process. Michael stated he did not believe the departments know they can request titles. Would it be possible to take requests through the Library website? Maggie will check into developing a process for online requests. Once requests are collected, a process will be put in place to check back with departments on prioritizing the requests based on monetary availability.

Andy asked Maggie to give an overview of Summon. Maggie explained how Summon worked compared to Serial Solutions. Alexey indicated he has had some problems with the “get @MST” button. Maggie asked him to let her know where this is happening so a fix can be made.

5. Review draft Annual Report for submission to Faculty Senate

Andy distributed a draft of Annual Report to Faculty Senate for review. There were no objections on the report. A copy of the draft is attached to the minutes (Attachment B).

6. New Business

Andy presented the architectural renderings recently completed. A program study was completed based on meetings with internal staff and some students as well as one open campus meeting. The new plans make a major change to the first floor in that many staff are moved to the second floor and the

computer learning lab is moved to the first floor for student convenience. The new plans also anticipate a larger coffee shop with possible 24 hour access. To make this possible, compact shelving is being considered for the basement level. Alexey commented that his experience with compact shelving was not good when he was at Northwestern. Students stood in lines waiting to get to the items they wanted. Maggie indicated that the primary titles for the compact shelving would be Gov Docs. Maggie also stated that she had met with the Development Office earlier in the day and they suggested getting out to the current students and find out what they want and need. Statements from our current students would have more of an impact in stimulating our alumni to donate.

Edward asked if this project wasn't hard to sell based on the budget cuts. He suggested that the library might emphasize that the money for this project will come from outside sources -- i.e., benefactors.

Andy also distributed a 2 page, color Profile on the Library prepared by University Advancement. He indicated some of the information needs to be updated but gave the committee an idea of the needs of the Library.

Arpana asked when the Library will get the students involved. Andy explained that the renderings were needed to get the project funded. Before any real steps would be taken to make renovations, the students would be involved in providing feedback on their needs and their vision of the Library. Andy also explained the funding for the architectural plans came through a private donation to the Library.

7. Review Action Items

- 1) Election of a chair – Andy Stewart
- 2) Set Next Meeting Date. The committee decided to meet again in late January or early February.
- 3) Maggie provided a brief update on the status of converting from VHS to DVD. She indicated that Ed Tech no longer supports VHS but the Library will retain old copies for departments if they have a need. The process of selectively replacing VHS titles with DVDs began with feature films this summer and will focus on non-feature films at a later date.

8. Adjourn

Meeting adjourned at 2:25 p.m.

Attachment A - 2010 Journal Pruning Letter and List

Dear S&T Faculty Member,

It is once again time for the Library's annual review of its journal portfolio. Our process in compiling the data was the same this year as the previous year: analyze print and electronic usage over a three year period and base decisions on the total amount of usage as well as cost per use during that period. This year we are making a slight change, which is to evaluate those titles you might wish to add at the same time that we consider eliminating titles. Hopefully that will simplify things because departments will only need to communicate among themselves once to look at both adds and cancels. Using the process described below, departments may appeal proposed cancellations (see Table 1) and/or request new subscriptions.

This year we were pleased to discover that there are only 16 journals that meet the criteria for being cut, which was either zero usage from 2007 to August 2010, or a cost per use of over \$1000 during that same period. Of those 16 journals, 13 were only available in print, which we believe was a large factor in the low usage. For those new to this process, the procedure for compiling usage data is described at the end of this memo (*).

The table below contains those titles that are being considered for elimination. One title that was appealed last year is being given another year's exemption to build a user base. Another title does not provide online usage data from the publisher site, so will not be cancelled at this time, though the title is listed as a point of information.

Title	Electronic Availability from Other Sources	Format	3 Yr Usage	3 Yr Cost Per Use	Notes
Advances in physics.		online	9	\$1425	
ASHRAE transactions.	ASP 2004-	print	0	\$1697	
Journal of educational psychology.	PsycARTICLES 1910-	print	1	\$1352	
Journal of the Ceramic Society of Japan.	JSTAGE free 2007-	print	1	\$1314	
American mathematical monthly	JSTOR 1894-2005	print	1	\$1040	
Choice.		print	0	\$967	
Journal of marketing theory and practice.	Business Source Premier 1992-, ABI 1997-	online	0	\$796	Used in other sources, publisher access unreliable.
Journal / American Water Works Association.	ABI 1996-	print	0	\$611	
CIM magazine.		print	0	\$540	
Advances in dynamical systems and applications		online	0	\$520	No usage data available
Journal of the astronautical sciences.		print	0	\$510	
Cold Spring Harbor Symposia on Quantitative Biology		print	0	\$386	
Journal of general and applied microbiology.		print	0	\$378	
Masonry Society journal.		print	0	\$189	Exempt on Appeal
Auto/biography studies : a/b.		print	0	\$176	
Flannery O'Connor review.		print	0	\$84	

Please note that online usage data was gathered from the publisher site, not from any third party database, such as Academic Search Premier, which might also provide coverage for the title in question. In some cases, the titles above are available from our central database subscriptions, and may be receiving use there as opposed to in the print format that the library owns. If a title has online availability from a source other than the publisher, it is listed in the second column.

If a department wishes either to appeal a cancellation or suggest a title or titles to be added to the journal portfolio, the department library liaison or department chair must communicate on behalf of the entire department to ensure that all of the needs of the department are being considered by those most in tune with the work being done there. Please email Maggie Trish at trishm@mst.edu before **October 8th, 2010**, to ensure that all appeals and suggested journal additions may receive due consideration. It would be very helpful if you could note why interlibrary loan is not sufficient for appealed titles and any information regarding suggested additions -- for instance, the hiring of professors doing research that is unsupported by the existing library journal portfolio.

Please know that the library is trying to retain and add access in the face of dwindling economic resources as prices climb, central resources are cut, and local funding remains constant. We appreciate your understanding as we work together to provide you and your students with the materials you need in the most appropriate way.

Maggie Trish, Assistant Library Director
Andy Stewart, Library Director
Faculty Senate Library Learning & Resources Committee

*For those new to this process, to compile this list of titles we looked at subscriptions that included journals and journal packages not currently in a multi-year license. The complete list included a total of 346 journal titles and approximately 28 small journal packages. To count the use of print resources, we used the MERLIN catalog to count checkouts, as well as a statistic called "in-house use" that counts when a book or journal is used and not re-shelved. The statistics for online use of materials were retrieved from the publisher or vendor; most of those sources use the same format for providing statistics, which ensures they are comparable. The only exceptions to this were the small publishers who have only a journal or two and do not provide usage statistics. Once we had usage data added for 2009, we used the prices for those years to determine the cost per use for each year and a three year average.

Attachment B - Report to the Faculty Senate

The Missouri S&T Library and Learning Resources Committee (LLRC) met twice during the 2009-10 academic year.

Committee Members were:

Daniel Tauritz, Chair

Michael Bruening

Gearoid MacSithigh

Hong Sheng

Krishna Kolan, Council of Graduate Students

Richard Campos, Student Council

Andy Stewart, Library Director, *ex officio* Member

Jacqueline Bichsel

Daniel Forciniti

Edward Malone

Alexey Yamilov

Meeting 1: October 21, 2009

The Committee discussed at some length the “journals pruning” process. The Library can identify high cost-per-use journals and those with no use (over a 3-year period). The list of targeted journals can be circulated to departments, responses can be obtained, and appeals / other comments can be considered. Much more detail can be found in the full meeting minutes.

The Committee also responded to journal appeals from the Fall Semester pruning process. About \$20,000 savings was generated from the journals review/pruning process for 2010.

Wide-ranging discussions and question-and-answer sessions comprised the remainder of the meeting.

Meeting 2: May 13, 2010

LLRC asked the Library to begin switching videos from VHS to DVD, while maintaining heavily-used materials for courses and same functionality.

Using a bequest received in August, Library faculty and staff have begun a “Program Study” with the ultimate goal of renovating the First Floor into a “Learning Commons.” Gearoid represents the LLRC on the planning committee (joined by Physical Facilities, students, and Library representatives).

The Library is pursuing the idea of a student “library fee.” Quite a bit of background work needs to be done, but useful suggestions were received.

Respectfully submitted,

Andy Stewart

Library Director and Acting Recorder

Approved by LLRC, October 4, 2010