UNIVERSITY SENATE 02-03-16

VAN PELT AND OPIE LIBRARY

TOPICS

- **Journal Collections Update**
  - Current Status
  - Request to revisit Proposal 32-15 (03-18-15) or preferred means of Senate awareness and involvement
- Digital Commons and Federal Mandates for Deposit

BUDGET FOR COLLECTIONS

- From 2008 – 2016

- **All materials: $2, 700, 000**
- **Serials only (2015): 2, 620, 000**

- Inflation: 2008 – 2012 nearly 30% (see charts)

- Anticipated increase 2017 (before currency impact) = 7%

HISTORICAL COST FACTORS

- Majority of journal expenditures for STEM journals:
  - Average cost per (print) journal (2015)
    - Chemistry: $4,871
    - Physics: 4,341
    - Engineering: 3,039
    - Geology 2,195
    - Math/computer 1,866
    - Social sciences 869
    - Philosophy 410
- By 2000, packaged multi-year "deals" emerged as means to stem inflation. Michigan Tech joined for Elsevier, Wiley, Springer, Sage (not all journals)

HISTORICAL FACTORS

- By 2011 the library supplemented the cost of multi-year "deals" through its only non-discretionary fund.

- By 2014, the cost of the 1800 journal Science Direct package was $896,000 plus $45,000. For 2016, the cost would have been $935,000. Base spend level would not be negotiated.
  - 1100 journals were used less than 5 times/year
  - Cost per article purchase: $32.00 or "free"
  - 311 titles warrant subscription (evidenced by use)
  - Individual purchase would be $1.2M
  - We now have 85 titles, nearly $600,000 (price +15%)

FACTORS UNIQUE TO MICHIGAN TECH

- Michigan among few large states without a state-wide system for university libraries
  - Michigan and MSU in the CIC network (Big Ten)
  - We have a voluntary consortium that marginally helps (CAS, Proquest, Sage, Wiley, Springer e-books)
- Fewer publishers are using FTE for pricing
- 50% + of our journals are non-U.S. publishers
- No history of IRAD to library collections

RECENT STEPS

- 12/2014: Concluded big deals with Elsevier and Springer.
  - Never included all titles
- Senate established the Ad-hoc committee (1/15)
- Ad-hoc committee drafted policy for Senate (3/15)
- Faculty were asked to identify their most essential journals by mid-April – most departments complied
- Chairs identified departmental liaisons
- Senate proposal approved with revisions needed 4/22/15

THE LIBRARY'S STEPS

- Journal renewals, cancelations and additions – normally by July 1, this year October 1

- **Analyzed each 'essential' journal:**

  - Use over 3+ years and cost per use (when available)
  - Identified very high use titles that were not "essential"
  - Interlibrary loan borrowing and rush order requests
  - Identified journals in which Tech authors published, 05 years

THE LIBRARY'S STEPS

- **Goal:** to add as many 'essential' titles as possible
  - Added titles requested by more than one department
  - Canceled very low use titles "lightly"
  - Eliminated duplicate access titles when possible

- The cost to acquire all "essential journals" leaves an *approximate* gap of $1.2 million
  - Health sciences/biomedicine approximately $421,000 (some were newly acquired)
  - Generally, Taylor and Francis and Springer titles and the Elsevier $350,000 gap plus Business

THE LIBRARY'S STEPS

- Decreased borrowing turn-around to 10.4 hours, 7 days/week
- Added faculty rush service (4 hour TAT, 7 days)

WHAT THE LIBRARY DID NOT DO

- The library did no do:
  - Attempt draconian cancelation decisions
  - Attempt to ask departments, institutes to develop consensus – although most departments were thoughtful and reasonable

FACULTY AND GRADUATE STUDENT ENGAGEMENT NEEDED

- **Recommendations of the Ad-hoc Committee provides**:
  - Assurance for annual report to the Senate
  - A structure for identifying a smaller, working group of liaisons and students to understand the options and limitations
  - Potential to develop fair guidelines for decision-making and unanticipated challenges
- **Issues**
  - When is a subscription warranted v. borrowing or rush?
  - Weighing whether formulae should be introduced; formula variables
  - Different model for doctoral students?
  - Importance of educating graduate students
  - How should extremely low use be managed?
  - Representation by broad NSF research area rather than department?
  - Best ways to reduce by 7% for 2017

CONCLUSION

- Organizing the liaisons can be done outside of the Senate with an annual report to the Senate, is this what the Senate would like?
- How best to keep the Senate informed?
  - Newsletter for faculty In/Focus
  - Encourage colleagues to use Interlibrary Loan and to use the library's HuskyFetch for access
  - Other?

DIGITAL COMMONS

- The campus repository is Digital Commons@Michigan Tech: http://digitalcommons.mtu.edu/
- Increases awareness of your publications (open and those permitted by an author's agreement, metadata only with links)
- Can include any output including data, videos, instructional materials, projects
- Search engine optimized, can increase citations and alternative metrics
- The library does the work

MANDATES

- Federal agencies require deposit of publications and data after x months in a recognized, open repository. Combined investigator and institutional responsibility.
- Increasingly, foundations and journals have similar requirements.
- Your role is to help describe your work effectively but the library will review the rights and create the metadata.
- Consider being an early adopter. A non-exclusive copyright and posting on Digital Commons benefits everyone.