

**Agenda and Minutes**  
**MCDRSC Videoconference**  
**December 10, 2007**  
**10:00 – 12:00**

**I. Attendance**

Present: UMSL-Chris Dames, Jan Peach; UMKC-Diane Hunter, Kathy Hall, Brenda Dingley; UMR-Sherry Mahnken, Maggie Trish; MU-Hunter Kevil, Rhonda Whithaus, Judy Maseles, Goodie Bhullar; LSO-Terry Austin, Kurt Kopp, Susan McCormack; SLU (minutes)-Georgia Baugh, Mary Krieger

**II. Web of Science – Scopus**

- **MU** prefers Scopus. Their humanities faculty are not concerned about losing WOS. Judy met with engineering faculty and they did not complain about canceling WOS. The difference in cost between the two databases is a big factor in favor of Scopus. The money saved could be used to finance Science Direct.
- **UMKC** prefers WOS because they would lose humanities coverage with Scopus. Diane tested WOS against Google Scholar and found little overlap. Their humanities faculty use WOS for writing grants and for citation searching. If we go with Scopus, UMKC feels strongly that we need to add Arts and Humanities Citation Index to make up for the coverage of humanities citations.
- **UMSL** reference had a split vote but the majority favored WOS. In addition to poor humanities coverage, they felt that Scopus lacked coverage in the social sciences. They mentioned that Art and Humanities Index searches could be purchased from First Search on a “per search” basis. They password this option so students must see a reference librarian to use it; faculty have access on a separate OCLC account number.
- **UMR** favors WOS because it is preferred by faculty and they only had one positive response from the Scopus trial. WOS is better for cross-disciplinary searches. Despite the claims by Elsevier, Scopus is not on par with the coverage of WOS. If we have to buy other databases to make up for loss of coverage with Scopus, then it decreases the savings.
- **Kurt** mentioned that he will have to have a rationale for administration if the committee chooses WOS over Scopus because of the \$200,000 cost difference. Faculty might need to be told that subscription money for other databases may be compromised if WOS is chosen. Long term, other databases may have to be cut to pay for inflation costs.
- **Terry** agreed with Kurt that if WOS is chosen over Scopus, we will need to cut databases to cover inflation. If we go with Scopus, the savings could be used for humanities and social sciences coverage. Deadline for the WOS deal is December 30<sup>th</sup>. This is their fourth and final offer and they will not consider adding backfiles or 0% inflation. We are entitled to a copy of our current WOS backfiles in the format they choose to give us.
- **Decision Deadline:** Terry will set up a trial for Arts and Humanities Index ASAP. There will be discussion per the listserv on Dec. 18-19 to try to reach consensus. If unable to resolve per email, a telephone conference will be held.

### **III. Science Direct Freedom Collection – Financing**

Money needs to be paid by July 1, 2008. The options are: 1) Each campus pays their share by the formula with LSO contributing the money from Current Contents cancellation and from JSTOR archival fee; 2) Consider cutting other databases; 3) Use the savings from subscribing to Scopus over WOS to pay for it. Terry needs a decision soon because of wording on the licensing agreements. The committee agreed that a decision must be made first on WOS/Scopus before pricing structure for Science Direct is finalized.

### **IV. Format Icons**

Felicity Dykas from MU compiled a chart of icons which will be posted by Diane Hunter to the MCDRSC list. Rhonda, Diane Hunter, and Kathy Hall volunteered to be part of a committee that will work with Kathleen Schweitzberger from MQCC to propose better format icons.

### **V. Limit by Format, Specifically A/V Formats and E-Resources**

There was a request from UMKC to expand the list of formats and improve the terminology so that it will be more useful for patrons. The icon working group (see above) has agreed to look into the format terminology also.

### **VI. Move 780 and 785 Fields Higher in Record Display in WebPAC**

UMSL thought that moving the 780 and 785 fields higher in the record appeared cluttered and might be confusing to patrons. Judy Maseles offered to set up a usability study and encouraged MCDRSC to send her any potentially confusing records so that they could be tested in the study.

### **VII. TOC Task Force Report – Chair Needed**

Task force consists of Jan, Maggie, Diane Hunter, and Diane Johnson. They are at an impasse trying to determine item types that could be excluded from the TOC, e.g. test preps. They were also considering using the publication date as a limiter which can be done according to Chris Gould. A previous problem had been found with using the date of cataloging. All of the task force members have been extremely busy and no one could volunteer to chair the committee, but they will try to move the process forward after the break.

### **VIII. Common Purchases of Resources – Compiled List**

- There is \$32,000 available from the TOC moratorium money for a one-time purchase. MU and UMSL both favor purchasing the Nursing Legacy collection. UMKC favors the Readers' Guide Retrospective, but would support getting the Nursing Legacy. UMR would prefer the Reader's Guide Retrospective. Terry proposed taking an amount from the inflation money and purchasing both Nursing Legacy and the Readers' Guide. All campuses agreed to this.
- Any changes to the drop/add list should be sent to Abbie who will keep the list updated.

### **IX. Academic Search Complete, Results of Content Analyses, Trial?**

Georgia sent a content analysis to Hunter several months ago. Since Academic Search Premier has a September renewal, Terry suggested that we hold off on a decision for now and MCDRSC agreed.

### **X. MERAC, MCDAC Reports**

- Rhonda reported that MERAC had been working on a stronger Limited Licenses Resources Policy in order to encourage libraries using a federated search engine and

subscribing to resources with limited simultaneous users (mainly the Wilson databases) through MOBIUS, not to place them in the general or default search category. Doing this causes a vast number of turnaways and also limits access to other institutions that subscribe through MOBIUS to the same limited license database(s). Georgia stated that the policy had been forwarded to the MOBIUS Executive Council for approval, but no formal response had been received. Terry stated that there had been a problem with the art and education databases causing a lot of turnaways. Serials Solutions will allow the administrator to remove databases from the general or default search engine.

- There was no MCDAC report.

**Next Meeting: Videoconference, Thursday February 7, 2008, 10 am – 12 noon**