Collection Development Committee  
September 28th 2010

I. Agenda (Tom Teper): 5 Minutes

II. Stacks Materials (Tom Teper & Susan Hill): 20 Minutes
   A. Please see attached document

III. Senate Bill 51 and Purchasing (Lynn Wiley) 20 Minutes

IV. Assessing and Demonstrating Value of Collections (All): 20 Minutes
    A. Rundown of FY10 Close

V. FY11 Budget (Tom Teper): 10 Minutes
    A. Questions???

VI. Updates (Lynn, Wendy, Tom & Sarah): 15 Minutes
    A. Acquisitions
    B. eResources

VII. Next Meeting: Tuesday, October 26th from 3:00 – 4:30
II. Susan Hill asked the CDC for guidance regarding the withdrawal of orphan serials, many of which are extremely brittle, uncataloged, and taking up much needed space. She proposed that she, Stuart Albert, or Ida Vineyard could appraise each orphan serial upon its discovery in the stacks and decide whether or not to withdraw it. No publication of any Illinois governmental office (state or local) would be withdrawn, nor would publications represented by a significant run of issues. Hill estimated that 85% of the orphan serials were in Voyager and that they numbered in the thousands. To process and house the materials would engender considerable expense, take up valuable time, and require additional preservation measures and/or conservation treatment. The number of accumulating orphan serials continues to grow as the stacks are shifted and materials are transferred to Oak Street.

Several questions about the proposal were raised as well as suggestions for alternative approaches. One question was whether categories of materials existed about which reasonable assumptions could be made in the appraisal process. Another question was about the cost of processing loose issues when they are transferred to Oak Street. One suggestion included sending a list bi-annually to libnews containing the general call number range with title counts of the orphan serials in question. These would be held for two weeks for examination by subject specialists, who could make recommendations regarding the disposition of the serials being held. If no recommendation is made to keep the serials, then they would be deaccessioned. However, it was pointed out that in the past, this approach has not been successful.

Another suggestion included offering the serials to other institutions (e.g. state libraries), but the logistics of setting up a transfer mechanism could create problems. The issue of orphan serials would be revisited in October after CDC committee members had talked with their divisions for additional recommendations.

III. Lynn Wiley explained changes in purchasing procedures generated by Senate Bill 51. Any purchase over $50,000 must go out for bidding, unless the purchase is from a sole source provider. The Board of Trustees must approve expensive purchases over $200,000, even if the purchase is from a sole source provider. Getting authorization to make purchases is the most problematic of the changes, as signatures must be obtained after purchase orders for many different kinds of items are examined by an ethics commission, appointed by the Chief Procurement officer. In addition, public hearings must be held for certain kinds of purchases. As a result, in order to accommodate the new purchasing plans, requests for purchases must be made far in advance to allow for processing time.

Senate Bill 51 also stipulates that vendors must be certified through the state before any state employee may enter into discussion regarding purchases. This change will take effect in January 2011.
Impacts of the changes:

a. Make purchase requests early.

b. Talk to people about purchases ahead of time.

c. Spend down funds well in advance of the closing date.

d. Don’t wait until April to submit book orders.

IV. Tom Teper asked the CDC to consider how best to assess and demonstrate the value of the University Library’s collections. He asked:

a. How do you tell the University Library’s story?
   i. Inputs: 12 million volumes, number of gate counts, etc.
   ii. Outputs: Circulation statistics, searches, uses

b. What are the outcomes of the above? What can be done to define the outcomes?

c. How does the University Library tell a story that demonstrates a positive impact of the considerable collections expenditures? (e.g. over fourteen million dollars in materials purchasing budget)

d. Do all of the University Library’s services have an impact that levels out in terms of the budget?

e. What makes the University Library special?

f. How does the University Library impact research, instruction, and learning?

g. Who helps the University Library tell its story? What partners can be enlisted?

h. Could a visualization be used to tell the story?

i. Should the CDC partner with the Communications and Marketing Committee to develop a campaign?

j. How can the University Library become more opaque in user initiated, non-librarian mediate searches?