Collection Development Committee  
February 22nd, 2011

I. Agenda (Tom Teper): 5 Minutes

II. FY12 Budget Update (Tom & Rod) 15 Minutes

III. SCL OA Resolution (Sarah Shreeves) 20 Minutes

IV. Request from Advancement (Tom & Lynn) 15 Minutes
   A. Library is looking for....

V. CIC Shared Print Archives (Tom Teper) 15 Minutes
   A. Background
   B. Questions and Clarifications…?
   C. CIC-CLI Conference (May 23 – 24, 2011)

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

VII. Next Scheduled Meeting: Tuesday, March 22nd from 3:00 – 4:30
I. Acquisitions

Lynn Wiley reported that purchase orders continue to come in, which is a positive sign. She was working on generating the monthly fund summary reports by book, serial, media, and discretionary funds, minus any existing fund commitments.

Tom Teper suggested that people look at UIC’s recent faculty newspaper for helpful information about the new procurement ethics requirements. The newspaper provides more detail about when reporting vendor contact is required.

II. FY12 Budget

Rod Allen did not have any new updates regarding the FY12 budget. The annual report was currently being written, the first draft of which was slated to be finished by March 3rd. Becky Smith asked if the FY12 budget would be similar to the FY11, and Rod indicated that it would have additional cuts, similar to last year’s. Although the funding set aside in FY11 to accommodate additional cuts would cover some of next year’s budget reductions, it would not likely cover all of them. Rod warned that the outlook for FY13-14 is much worse and that the Library might want to plan ahead for these more significant budget reductions.

Tom Teper indicated that the Senate Committee would be making a student fee increase request and that collections funds benefit from fee increases, especially in accounting for inflation. The likelihood that the requested increase for FY12 would be approved was somewhat more uncertain than in previous years, due in part to an article in The Daily Illini, which erroneously reported that the Library had a four million dollar reserve stemming from a surplus of Library/IT fees. Ultimately, the Library should be prepared for the possibility that these funds will not be available as in the past.

III. Sarah Shreeves presented information about the Senate Committee’s Open Access resolution, which was currently under consideration by Library counsel before it would be forwarded to the University’s Faculty Senate Committee. The resolution, modeled on similar ones at institutions including Stanford University and MIT, would stipulate that faculty journal articles be made available via IDEALS, although an opt out clause would be included in the resolution to accommodate publishers who do not permit the deposit of published articles into institutional repositories. The resolution would have the faculty
grant the Library/IDEALS the non-exclusive rights to publish their research freely. The publications that would be deposited would be the final draft of a research paper, (essentially the same as a published version but with potentially different formatting). Lynn Wiley asked about the time frame for enacting and implementing the resolution and if there would be an embargo period, and Sarah responded that IDEALS offers a delayed release option, making an embargo period unnecessary.

Tom Teper added that legal issues were still being worked out, as the role of co-authors or A.P.’s was unclear. Sarah Shreeves responded that copyright legislation gives each co-author full copyright, so technically, co-authors could deposit research in IDEALS without the permission of other contributors.

MIT has established helpful blanket agreements with publishers so that faculty members do not have to contact individual publishers for permission to participate. MIT publishes online the list of publishers who have granted such permission.

Sarah mentioned that the infrastructure of IDEALS would be impacted if the resolution passes with University Counsel, which is primarily interested in finding out if there would be repercussions for faculty members who choose not to deposit their research.

IV. Roxanne Frey asked the Collections Development Committee to alert library divisions that University Advancement would like requests for the “Library Is Looking For” feature of the Friendscript and Advancement website. Advancement would like for the list to be broadly representative of the library and not just one subject area. Books, e-books, and similar items are the best candidates for the list; supplies are not usually appropriate to request. Items ranging anywhere between $500 to $5,000 would be acceptable.

Lynn Wiley suggested that subject specialists could request titles that were already included in an approval plan, and that way funds for additional acquisitions could be generated via the “Looking For” list. She cautioned not to include titles from a firm order, since these could not be rescinded.

Someone asked how long to leave a book on the “Looking For” list before going ahead and purchasing it, and the suggestion was to use Friends funds to purchase the item and then direct any donations coming from the list back into the Friends fund. Roxanne would be happy to answer questions about appropriate items to list.
V. Tom Teper reported about the potential for a Share Print Archive (SPA) among CIC Libraries. Directors of CIC Libraries have been talking about the possibility for some time, and the potential project has begun to take shape. Given research by Constance Malpas at OCLC (“RLG Partnership Shared Print Collections Working Group, Shared Print Policy Review Report”) and conducted at Ithaca College, CIC Directors are looking into how space, budget, and preservation issues might be addressed via a shared print archive.

The University Library would benefit, as the Oak Street storage module is nearly full, and beyond the financial constraints of a new building campaign, the University has established a moratorium on new building projects for the time being. The shared print archive would help alleviate these issues.

The initial plan would be to look at Elsevier content, with Indiana University in Bloomington serving as the hub for the physical collection. One potential problem with relying on electronic Elsevier content is the lack of images, whereas the print versions feature images that are often critical to the text.

Tom asked the CDC what it would mean for the University to have material stored at a storage site with an approximate 48-hour retrieval turnaround. This prompted a question as to whether the University would be sending print copies of Elsevier journals to IU.

Jennifer Teper responded that preservation issues will need to be addressed before a SPA could be established. First, all materials that would be kept at IU would need to go through a conservation review and possibly receive treatment before being deposited at the hub repository. She added that the Ruth Lilly Auxiliary Library Facility (ALF) provided a good preservation storage environment, but if additional central hub facilities would be needed in the future, how would the CIC be able to guarantee similar environmental conditions? Another question was whether IU would examine their “copies of record” to verify their condition before CIC partners decided to deaccession their copies of the same publications. IU was mentioned as the hub repository because the ALF had a relatively large amount of space. These
issues would need to be addressed before a SPA was put into place. Jennifer also commented that the proposed “archive” did not meet archival criteria and should be named accordingly. The CIC preservation officers generally agreed that the SPA could work but that preservation logistics would need to be worked out.

Tom responded that the SPA discussion and planning existed at an administrative level at this point and had not progressed far in terms of detailed plans. One of the main reasons behind the discussions is that Purdue University needs additional space for collections storage, but all of the project partners came with particular needs and issues that make a SPA an appealing proposition.

Jennifer also asked if the copies that would be stored at IU would be verified for completeness. Tom responded that page verification is expensive and referred to the Ithaca report, which recommends that if six copies of an item exist, its preservation and the availability of a complete copy would be guaranteed at an acceptable level of risk.

Chatham Ewing asked if the discussion had included issues about long-term budget guarantees and whether the CIC was coordinating nationally. Tom responded that the CIC was coordinating nationally, but not in a formalized arrangement.

Returning to the content that was being considered, Tom indicated that journals were given first priority because of the level of duplication across collections, electronic availability, and cost-benefit impact. Government documents were also under consideration for the same reasons. JSTOR presented an ownership model slightly different than that of Elsevier, which is why Elsevier had been given first priority. Starting with Grainger Engineering Library’s journal might be a good place to test the possibilities.

In terms of the economic incentive for the SPA, the cost per volume for storage is about $5.00 per year, whereas electronic access is around $2.00 per year. The savings would most likely come from reductions in staff and space, as the need for a new storage model could be put off indefinitely.
Continued discussion of the SPA would occur at the CIC conference in Lansing from May 23 to 24, where the topic will be collaborative storage. Tom encouraged the CDC to consider who might want to attend.

VI. Becky Smith asked why the collections budget supported the purchase of the Refworks software, as it is a research tool rather than a collection. Tom responded that the collections budget was more broadly conceived to support a range of programs including collections acquisitions, memberships in various consortia, the purchase of catalog records, as well as the purchase of cover art for inclusion in the catalog. Tom agreed that split purchases sometimes could cause problems as the logistics were not always straightforward.

VII. The next CDC meeting would be held March 22nd from 3:00-4:30 p.m.