

Administrative Program Integration Team for Library Resources

REPORT

December 22, 2017

Committee Members:

- **Carol Kim, Chair**, Associate Vice Chancellor for Academic Innovation and Partnerships, University of Maine System
- **Frederick Brittain**, Associate Chief Information Officer, University of Maine System
- **Stacey Brownlie**, Director, Off-Campus Library Services, University College
- **Rudy Gabrielson**, Chief Procurement Officer, University of Maine System
- **Leslie Kelly**, Associate Dean of Information Services and Distance Education, University of Maine at Fort Kent
- **David Nutty**, Director of Libraries and University Librarian, University of Southern Maine
- **Jamie Ritter**, State Librarian, Maine State Library
- **Deborah Rollins**, Head, Collection Services Department, Raymond H. Fogler Library, University of Maine
- **Joyce Rumery**, Dean of University Libraries, University of Maine
- **Marianne Thibodeau**, Director Merrill Library, University of Maine at Machias

I. INTRODUCTION

The Administrative Program Integration Team for Library Resources (LR Committee) was tasked with providing recommendations to “maximize ready access to library resources, particularly digital materials, across the seven campuses within the University of Maine System (UMS).” The UMS is developing multi-campus programs at the undergraduate and graduate level, and so it will be all the more important to provide access to library collections across all campuses.

Vice Chancellor Neely specifically charged the Committee:

- a. to explore and make recommendations for a common catalog of library materials and resources across the UMS, perhaps including the state library system.
- b. to analyze and make recommendations regarding the infrastructure and costs associated with steps to ensure equitable access to all UMS library resources from each of the UMS campuses and centers.
- c. in addition to cost, to identify any other barriers to access to a common catalog of digital materials.

II. OUTCOMES

A. Charge a. To explore and make recommendations for a common catalog of library materials and resources across the UMS, perhaps including the state library system.

As a first step to sharing digital resources, such as online databases, electronic journals, e-books, and streaming media across the UMS, the LR Committee contacted all UMS library Deans and Directors to assemble a comprehensive inventory of subscription digital resources currently available at each of the campuses. The inventory is found in Appendix A. This inventory serves as a means of identifying those resources that are subscribed and/or accessible collectively, or individually by one or more campuses.

B. Charge b. To analyze and make recommendations regarding the infrastructure and costs associated with steps to ensure equitable access to all UMS library resources from each of the UMS campuses and centers

There were many factors to consider when analyzing the structure and cost basis of the library resources for the libraries of the UMS. Because the multi-campus programs will be developed over time and it cannot be anticipated which campuses or which programs will be involved, it is difficult to anticipate which databases and collections should be shared. By providing all UMS campuses with access to all library resources, students at all campuses would have access, irrespective of the multi-campus program in which they are enrolled or on which campus they reside. The LR committee proposes two options that will provide varying levels of equitable access to digital library resources across the UMS, as well as a collaborative strategy that may help make more efficient use of available funding.

Opportunities For Equitable Access

The committee developed two options for Vice Chancellor Neely to consider with the cognate budgetary consideration for each:

1. **Option 1:** The first option would be to provide all of the UMS libraries' digital resources (Appendix A) to all seven campuses. The 2017 cost for the resources was \$7,335,064. The first year cost for this option would be an estimated additional \$8.7 million, including archive purchases, with an ongoing additional annual base budget expense estimated at \$5.4 million with a minimum of 3% inflation annually.
2. **Option 2:** The second option would be to provide several of the UMS libraries' most commonly needed and subscribed digital resources to all seven campuses. The resources in Appendix B have been assessed as essential priorities for all campuses by the library Deans or Directors. Based on actual quotes provided by vendors, the first year cost for this option would be an estimated additional \$1,154,577, including archive purchases, with an ongoing additional annual base budget expense estimated at \$251,923, with a minimum of 3% inflation annually. Although this option is not as comprehensive as Option 1, it would provide the most frequently used digital resources to students and faculty across the UMS.

An advantage of Option 2 is a lower initial cost. A disadvantage of Option 2 is that there would still be more than one thousand currently subscribed digital resources unavailable to all campuses, which will hinder research and scholarship for some faculty and students.

Another disadvantage of Option 2 is that the UMS libraries lose the bargaining power that comes with negotiating pricing and access to all resources at once from each publisher or vendor. Adding System-wide access to additional digital resources piecemeal over the years will cost more in the end than Option 1.

Continued discussions with faculty and students are necessary to ensure that needs are met at all campuses.

Within the LR Committee, a discussion about procurement practices for library resources was initiated, with the prospect of realizing savings by negotiating with publishers on the current pricing for databases and expanded access across the System. Serendipitously, since January 2017, the Maine State Library launched an initiative team to look strategically at all aspects of MARVEL, including but not limited to, how content would be chosen and purchased. MARVEL is Maine's virtual library <http://libraries.maine.edu/mainedatabases/> and enables the UMS libraries to further augment their own online database collections by purchasing additional needed content not represented in MARVEL.

The Maine State Library's state initiative procurement process offers the UMS the opportunity to observe and pilot procurement approaches that, if successful, could eventually lower expenditures for digital resources for all libraries in Maine, including the libraries of the

University of Maine System. As such, the Maine State Library's procurement process will help to further inform some of the options and recommendations presented in this report. A detailed description of this process can be found in Appendix C.

Revenue Strategies

The subcommittee on revenue generation investigated funding models and sought to find any innovative sources of revenue in order to address costs of increasing access to library resources across the UMS. We spoke to New England Land Grant institutions, an Associate Dean at the University of South Carolina libraries, a University of Alaska librarian, and examined some Hanover peer schools' funding models. We also submitted an inquiry to a large American Library Association listserv. Most of the New England Land Grant libraries' budgets come from their Provosts' (or equivalent) office and they are a line item in the academic affairs budget. The University of Alaska academic libraries are behind us with regard to a combined catalog, but they have proceeded with unified ebook packages. They have not renegotiated the rest of their electronic resources yet for System-wide access. There were no substantial responses from the listserv request and there were a few responses about general funding models.

Possible revenue enhancement options for UMS include: student library fees (per credit hour or per course), a portion of indirect costs from grants, regular % of tuition dollars, regular % of institutional total (tuition, state, indirects, etc.) or by FTE weighted by category (undergrad, grad, faculty).

The full committee discussed the possibility of working with the Maine Department of Economic and Community Development regarding the access to resources that would help businesses in the State of Maine. This may lead to support for the acquisition of those resources that would further the economic development in Maine.

C. Charge c. In addition to cost, to identify any other barriers to access to a common catalog of digital materials.

No barriers are noted that prevent users on-campus and off-campus from using the electronic resources.

It is anticipated that if Option 1 above were to be implemented, existing staff FTE from the UMS libraries might need to be re-configured at Maine InfoNet and the University of Maine's Raymond H. Fogler Library, since these units manage UMS shared resources.

III. RECOMMENDATIONS

- A. Select from two options to expand UMS library resources to all campuses. The LR Committee developed two options for ensuring equitable access to UMS library resources from each of the UMS campuses and centers.
1. Option 1: Provide the UMS collection to all seven campuses of the UMS. The first year cost for this option would be an estimated additional \$8.7 million, including archive purchases, with an ongoing additional annual base budget expense estimated at \$5.4 million in Year 2 and beyond, with a minimum of 3% inflation annually.
 2. Option 2: Provide several of the UMS libraries' most commonly needed and subscribed digital resources to all seven campuses. The resources in Appendix B have been assessed as essential priorities for all campuses by the library Deans or Directors. Based on actual quotes provided by vendors, the first year cost for this option would be an estimated additional \$1,154,577, including archive purchases, with an ongoing additional annual base budget expense estimated at \$251,923 with a minimum of 3% inflation annually.
- B. Formally acknowledge and support the University of Maine System's participation on the Maine State Library's MARVEL Sourcing Team and new state procurement process relating to content resources. The Dean of University Libraries for the University of Maine (or designee) and the Chief Procurement Officer for the University of Maine System (or designee) shall formally participate in the State of Maine's MARVEL procurement process as outlined in Appendix C - Component 1. Currently Deborah Rollins and Rudy Gabrielson are actively participating and representing the University Libraries and Procurement, respectively. This recommendation builds upon and furthers a long-standing partnership (over 15 years) between the Fogler Library and the Maine State Library.
- Provides ability to assess the future MARVEL "statewide" database package and to determine the impact on University of Maine System Libraries
- C. Select a minimum of 25 databases currently purchased by the University of Maine System Libraries to be included in the Component 2 portion of the Maine State Library's RFP (Appendix C - Component 2).
- This does not require the University System to purchase any quoted databases, but the process will enable the ability to assess if similar databases can be purchased at a reduced rate.

APPENDIX A

A comprehensive inventory of subscription digital resources currently available at each of the campuses was assembled. This inventory serves as a means for identifying those resources that are subscribed and/or accessible collectively, or individually by one or more campuses.

Because of the size of the printed inventory, the document can be found at this link:

<https://drive.google.com/a/maine.edu/file/d/1bfoiDPrkII7Uwm3bf0IRHSEEdnLIVpSa/view?usp=sharing>

APPENDIX B

Resource title	previously subscribed by System or state budget	Number of campuses currently subscribed								2017 expense for subscribing campuses	2017 quote/annual cost for all UMS	2017 quote for purchase of full archives for remaining campuses	Contact	
			Augusta	Farmington	Fort Kent	Machias	Orono	Presque Isle	Southern Maine					
BioOne journal collection	no	3			\$1,015			\$15,015	\$1,913		\$17,943	\$38,540	n/a	NERL
Choice Reviews Online	no	3	\$651		\$590			\$616			\$1,857	\$3,737	n/a	ALA
Chronicle of Higher Education Online	no	4		\$1,800	\$1,950	\$1,245		\$4,720			\$9,715	\$10,250	n/a	Elizabeth Kennedy CHE
Criminal Justice Abstracts	no	3						\$4,046	\$2,925	\$4,046	\$11,017	\$5,886	n/a	WALDO
JSTOR - all journal archive collections	no	6	\$3,084	\$7,833		\$5,000		\$35,225	\$1,000	\$31,272	\$83,414	\$152,225	\$106,325	JSTOR
JSTOR - Evidence Based Ebooks collection	no	1	\$2,500								\$2,500	\$15,000	n/a	JSTOR
Nexis Uni (formerly LexisNexis Academic)	no	3	\$5,600	\$3,697				\$21,245	\$1,771		\$32,313	\$44,827	n/a	LYRASIS Celeste Feather
Mental Measurements Yearbook w/ TIP	yes	2						\$2,424		\$2,923	\$5,347	\$6,571	n/a	WALDO; no resp fr EBSCO
New York Times Historical	no	2						\$5,800			\$5,800	\$5,800	\$26,787	WALDO
Oxford English Dictionary	yes	4	\$759	\$549				\$3,008	\$1,791		\$6,107	\$6,298	n/a	WALDO
Oxford Music Online (Grove's)	no	4	\$2,930	\$2,225				\$2,449	\$2,859		\$10,463	\$10,128	n/a	WALDO
PAIS	yes	2						\$5,928		\$8,310	\$14,238	\$8,159	n/a	WALDO
Philosopher's Index	yes	3		\$2,791				\$2,816	\$2,011		\$7,618	\$8,178	n/a	WALDO
Project MUSE - Premium Collection journals	no	4	\$3,421	\$4,498				\$33,839	\$6,894		\$48,652	\$122,891	n/a	WALDO
Psychiatry Online with DSM-5	no	2	\$5,035					\$6,476			\$11,511	\$12,432	n/a	WALDO
SAGE Premier journal collection	no	2	\$5,913		\$3,970	\$1,779	\$136,767		\$79,355		\$227,784	\$289,280	\$509,542	SAGE
Web of Science (including BIOSIS, ZooRec, JHG)	some	4		maintain		maintain	maintain		maintain		\$232,037	\$240,037	\$260,000	Chris Ataide
TOTAL											\$728,316	\$980,239	\$902,654	

Total additional funds needed, subscription and one time

ongoing add'l \$251,923 \$902,654 \$1,154,577
one time add'l TOTAL STARTUP YEAR 1

APPENDIX C

State of Maine Procurement Process

The Maine State Library and the University of Maine (Fogler Library) have collaborated for many years related to choosing licensed online database content that is available statewide through Maine’s virtual library known as MARVEL <http://libraries.maine.edu/mainedatabases/>. The core MARVEL content enables the University of Maine system libraries — and in fact all citizens in Maine — to further augment their own online database collections by purchasing additional needed content not represented in MARVEL. The primary state funding sources for MARVEL content come from the Maine State Library and funds drawn from the Maine Education and Technology Access Fund (MTEAF), which is administered by the Maine Public Utilities Commission <http://legislature.maine.gov/legis/statutes/35-A/title35-Asec7104-B.html>.

The Department of Procurement Services believes that there is an opportunity to realize more competitive database content pricing through one RFP process with two distinct components. The process outlined below will commence in January 2018, be completed by April 1, 2018 and all content subscriptions will begin July 1, 2018.

Component 1: Request bids for database content (including a robust user services agreement to include federated searching, proxy access, and reporting, etc.) that is bundled as one single “Statewide Package.” The term “statewide package” is a term used ubiquitously by vendors to describe a single package with bundled database content. Current MARVEL content includes a statewide database package.

Component 2: Request quotes for specific individual database/online content that may not be represented in the statewide package (Component 1). In this component, the Maine State Library will ask vendors to provide a quote for a statewide license, as well as quotes for specific segments of potential access (i.e. Access for only academic libraries, or only K-12 schools, public libraries, etc.). The intention of this particular component of the RFP is to enable the broadest range of pricing and access options for various database or online content subscriptions.

The MARVEL procurement process provides *three* opportunities to the UMS libraries in its effort to provide access to database content resources more equitably.

1. The process undertaken by the Maine State Library is the first time an RFP will be conducted to procure such content, therefore the ability to analyze whether pricing is more/less competitive through such a process can objectively take place. Such analysis may inform future content procurement processes for the UMS.
2. The potential for producing a more robust “statewide database package” exists through this competitive process. Should a more robust statewide package be produced, it may alleviate the need for UMS Libraries to purchase certain databases separately, and therefore, the traditional spending on such databases could be reinvested into expanding content resources across more campuses. While difficult to predict, the amount of funding that could potentially be reinvested may range from \$50,000 to \$200,000.

3. The greatest opportunity for positive impact to expanding UMS content resources to more campuses exists in Component 2 of the RFP process outlined above. Limited benchmarking done by the Maine State Library of other state's database offerings suggests that there is significant pricing variation and competition for similar database products. For example, one particular database *PsychINFO* has been procured by the state of Connecticut for all of Connecticut's Academic Libraries (171,208 FTE) at a rate of \$1.37/FTE. By contrast a limited survey of five Maine academic institutions (38,840 combined FTE) separately buying the same *PsychINFO* database shows that they are collectively paying \$2.83/FTE. The UMS libraries provide this database to all campuses at a rate of \$2.67/FTE, while one of Maine's smaller colleges provides the same database at a rate of \$4.32/FTE to its 1,500 students.

This information suggests that pricing may be more competitive if procured through a statewide process and Component 2 of the Maine State Library's procurement process offers an opportunity to test this. Because Component 2 will require vendors to provide quotes for specific databases at a statewide level, K-12 only, Academic/College Only, and Public Library Only, the potential exists to secure reduced pricing, and potentially enable all of Maine's academic libraries to help purchase – at a reduced and pro-rated share – databases they are currently purchasing separately. For example, if the Maine State Library were to receive Connecticut's \$1.37/FTE pricing (*PsychINFO*) for all of Maine's academic libraries, the cost to the University of Maine's system libraries would drop from \$58,795 (22,000 FTE all campuses) to \$30,140, thus allowing \$28,795 to be reinvested into additional content resources.