Collection Development Committee
April 26th, 2011

I. Agenda (Tom Teper): 5 Minutes

II. Discussion Topic: Special Collections in Units 20 Minutes
A. Scott Schwartz will be joining us.

III. FY12 Budget Update (Tom & Rod) 20 Minutes

IV. Acquisitions Update (Tom, Lynn, and Wendy) 15 Minutes
A. FY11 and FY 12 Acquisitions Calendars
B. The FY12 Year – managing through sabbaticals, etc…

V. Discussion Topic: Game Changing Decisions for Collections (All) 15 Minutes
B. Feedback rec’d indicated that we should take a position on similar issues.
C. So, let’s talk about what we should and should not take a stand on….

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

Scott Schwartz reported on the Administrative Council (AC) discussion regarding implementing a survey of special collections in various University Library divisions. The AC recommended that the CDC consider various approaches to ascertaining the status of special collections across the University Library system, including what collections exist in what divisions and the level of access and preservation that applies to the collections. Many of the library’s special collections are not cataloged, and important information about the collections may be lost, given personnel changes and the security issues surrounding special collections in the stacks. Scott advocated for the addition of questions in the division annual reports to answer questions about what collections exist and the status of their preservation and accessibility. The AC recommended that the CDC address these issues, as the last time special collections have been formally surveyed/addressed in library policy was in 1975. Scott distributed draft criteria for identifying special collections holdings in library divisions and asked for feedback on the criteria and survey questions. The results of the survey would be used to develop a better library-wide approach to special collections and their management, in order to ensure their preservation and accessibility. Better curatorial control of the university’s special collections remains a goal in the new service model, and a systematic approach should be developed to address the issues surrounding special collections, as they will become increasingly important to the University Library’s identity. Currently, no comprehensive information exists regarding how many special collections are in the catalog.

Tom Teper indicated that the first question to answer would be *how* to gather information about the library’s collections. Tina Chrzastowski was against taking a blanket approach, since many libraries do not have special collections, and she also suggested expanded the survey to the larger campus community. Scott Schwartz emphasized that after the initial survey was complete, that decisions regarding the stewardship would follow. Chatham Ewing added that adding some collections to the RBML would be appropriate in some cases, but that other collections, such as the gaming collection, would not be as good of a fit. However, the preservation and access plans for special collections across divisions will have similarities that should be considered in toto. Even just naming the collections would be helpful. Tom Teper suggested starting the survey process with phone calls to division heads rather than including questions on the annual report.
II. Rod Allen summarized the budget report provided at the faculty meeting. He confirmed that one-half of the reserve amount the library put into a special account for last year’s budget cuts would be used to cover cuts in the FY12 budget. However, the university will also require a 1-2% campus assessment, plus there will be a salary program. To cover all of these cuts and expenses, the library will have to draw from its staff/salary pool of money, as the library’s reserves are held in these funds. Rod estimated the cut will end up being around $500,000 and suggested that the question would be how far the library wanted the academic pool to go and how many people would be hired to fill vacancies. Also, whether the library will receive the total request for the IT fee is unclear. This amount would support student worker wages. Rod also indicated that the library would receive a one-time cash amount of around $681,000 that can’t be used to cover the budget cut. Discussion ensued about how this amount might be spent.

III. Acquisitions reported that invoices were being processed as quickly as possible. The calendar for end-of-year purchases would be that April 28th would be the last day for orders and May 20th the last day for invoices (excepting purchase plan acquisitions). The Proquest purchase has to be approved by the Board of Trustees, and because of the changes in purchasing requirements from Senate Bill 51, no additional purchases from Elsevier could be processed for FY11. Lynn pointed out that the accelerated calendar also saved the library money: she estimated that at least $70,000 had been saved so far. In FY12 when Lynn goes on sabbatical, Wendy would oversee fund management, e-resources, and the overall direction of acquisitions, while Beth Trotter would handle orders. Wendy would also have a half-time academic hourly position to help, and April had returned from maternity leave. Tom pointed out that support for e-resources would also be needed because Sharif would be leaving in May.

IV. Tom Teper asked CDC members whether the University Library should take a stand on issues in a way similar to Cornell’s recent declaration that it would not sign non-disclosure clauses with vendors. The University Library has only had one non-disclosure clause in the past, which it declined. All contracts with the University are publicly available by law, so in many ways, the issues faced by Cornell do not apply to the University Library. In the ensuing discussion, Chatham Ewing voiced support for taking an ethical approach to making decisions about similar issues and asked whether making statements such as the one made by Cornell will help the University shape the information and library landscape. Lynn offered a more practical perspective and pointed out that in terms of Cornell’s situation, the University was constrained by the fact that Senate Bill 51 had complicated the library’s relationship with vendors, who were required to complete a significant amount of new paperwork this year. Lynn advocated that the
library be as strategic as possible and consider all the layers of significance when approaching similar issues. Another person put forward the perspective that the library would be unable to “walk away” from the vendors, but that they could walk away from the library. As a result, remaining in consortial relationships on issues related to vendor relations and ethical access to information could prove to be important, given the power vendors have. Kathleen Kern agreed with Lynn that the relationship with vendors should be balanced with the library’s needs.