Collection Development Committee
Meeting Summary
October 29, 2003


1. **Introductions:** The Committee welcomed Bruce Wicks and Rolando Romero from the Senate Committee on the Library. They join the CDC for FY05 budget discussions. Karen reported that Lisa Romero has resigned from the Committee because of loss of staff in the Communications Library. The Social Sciences Division will be selecting a new representative soon.

2. **Circulation issue:** Betsy Kruger led a discussion on how the Library works with patrons taking our materials out of state when they are moving, have graduated, etc. Present policy keeps patron status at “active” if the patron has current status in in campus payroll database or registration database. If status in these databases is not updated, the patron status changes to “expired.” We can extend borrowing privileges to doctoral students who are not registered for a class, if a letter from the doctoral advisor is provided. After some discussion, we advised that the Library work with the Graduate College to obtain their aid in alerting departing students to the need to return library material. The Committee also endorsed running monthly “expired patron” reports, and sending follow-up letters that advise departing patrons on how to handle material in their possession and repercussions of not doing so. We further suggested that Betsy send this on to Administrative Council for their information.

3. **Collections calendar:** The draft collections calendar was reviewed and amended. Karen will put it up on the Collections web page and send it out to subject librarians.

4. **Budget allocation process:** Karen reviewed our plan for discussing FY05 allocation procedures, and reminded the Committee that we need to include the 2% reallocation in this cycle. We should plan on no new money for collections in FY05, but also have an idea about what we would do if in fact we did receive new dollars. Kathleen Kluegel, reporting for the Arts & Humanities Division, affirmed that the number of funds we have is fine and reflects the many different scholarly and educational interests on our campus. She also noted that the cost of serials and data such as the LIUR reports do not reflect arts and humanities scholarship and publishing well. After some discussion about the difficulty in finding good and broad-based data, Lisa German volunteered to get current serials price information from EBSCO for the CDC to review. We discussed the need to have adequate resources to process and preserve materials that we acquire. We discussed past difficulties in putting Area Studies funds into the regular formula, and whether this
practice can be changed for FY05. The Life Sciences Division is seeking some recognition of pressure on Library resources for grants that are received in their departments, either in the formula or in the narrative. Karen reminded everyone that subject librarians have asked that narratives be required only every 2-3 years, unless the subject librarian feels there are significant changes in their disciplines to report. Bill Mischo will be attending the December 9 meeting and we will continue our discussion of the budget process, focusing on the actual process and timeline.

5. **Reference collection development discussion:** Jo Kibbee discussed a proposal for Reference to cooperate more regularly on the acquisition and retention of reference titles. Reference is suggesting that they take the lead in identifying good reference titles for networking, and help pay for them when appropriate. Reference can purchase the print copy of large and expensive reference works with strong interdisciplinary interest, when the Library also subscribes to the online version. The Library also has multiple copies of reference works, and Reference is offering to be sure to keep their copy for archival purposes, or withdraw their copy when multiple other copies are available. These are beginning ideas for discussion of how Reference and subject collections can collaborate. Committee members agreed to discuss with divisions, with feedback at the December 9 meeting.

6. **E-resource update:** Wendy updated the Committee on a number of electronic resource issues, including ingenta (now separated from the ILCSO gateway, allowing UIUC to be the administrator), the Silver Platter move from CD to web, activation of Project EUCLID and the new JSTOR arts and humanities offering, investigation of Elsevier back files and full text for Proquest dissertations, and the Kluwer and Wiley licensing negotiations.

7. **Preservation update:** Tom reviewed issues related to the east stacks, where shelving is an integral part of the structure and is not weight-bearing for the kinds of uses we are putting it to. He provided an update on the Collections/Preservation handbook and agreed to send it out to CDC for comments. Binding volume is down from the departmental libraries, and he asked that libraries begin to send in items now if possible, to avoid the bulge of material that comes in over the holidays when staff here and at the bindery are out. He asked that we encourage our colleagues to come down to review brittle books on a regular basis.

8. **Next 3 months:** Karen reminded people that the November-December meeting is December 9, with Tim Cole as chair. Jane Block is chair of the January 27 meeting, and Cindy Ingold will take the February 24 meeting.

------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

**QUESTION:**

With some regularity, we have instances of library users moving out of town and taking library materials with them, sometimes in large quantities. Usually these are doctoral
students who have not yet deposited but have taken a job somewhere outside CU, but say they still need the material to check citations; occasionally they are faculty members who move to other institutions. Should Library policy allow or prohibit this? If we allow it, should there be any limitations imposed in terms of geographic distance, number of items, etc? Here are two examples:

1. We have a patron who used to be on our faculty but is now teaching in Florida. She was also teaching at two other institutions between UIUC and her current institution. She has about 14 UIUC Library books checked out to her and with her in Florida. This person visits CU annually and renews her privileges at that time in person. Circulation Office staff has been renewing her privileges because she has materials checked out, and because they have no other policy to follow. Had I known about this, I probably would not have OK’d it, but rather would have encouraged person to acquire books from their own institution or through their ILL department.

2. About 2 months ago we had a graduate student who had not yet deposited, but had taken a first teaching job in Albuquerque. He had about 350 library books out, which he intended to move with him. This came to our attention because he had neglected to renew them and they all had been billed (over $10,000) and his account was blocked. We didn’t allow him to take the materials with him, but if the material had not gone to the billing stage it would not have come to our attention until the first time he attempted to renew the materials on an expired account. By that time the 350 books would probably have been in Albuquerque.

Current related policies:

- Patron statuses are updated to “Active” if they have current status in either the campus payroll database or the current registration database on the date we run the patron load program (each Tuesday). If not updated, the patron status becomes “Expired.” This will happen to doctoral students if they are no longer registered for classes. In these instances, we will issue a courtesy borrowing card to reinstate their borrowing privileges at Grad Student level if we have a letter from their advisor. This is not problematic if the person continues to reside in CU.

Options:

1. Continue our current liberal practice, but codify it a bit more.
2. Run “expired patron report” monthly and send follow-up letters to those who still have books charged to their accounts. Letter would address what to do with library materials in persons possession; outline any other options the person may have; and describe repercussions of not responding (billing, etc.)
3. Other?
Documentation on Reference discussion, item 5

To: Collection Development Committee

From: Jo Kibbee, Head of Reference

Re: Proposals for Reference Collection Development and Maintenance

Date: Oct. 28, 2003

Our departmental library system and previously adequate collections budget traditionally allowed for a significant amount of duplication of reference titles, with multiple copies throughout the system and in the stacks. The situation has changed now, with the (evil!) twin circumstances of a tight budget and tight collection space, and I would like to propose strategies for increasing inter-unit cooperation regarding the acquisition and retention of reference titles.

**Acquisition of Reference Titles**

The Reference Library maintains a strong interdisciplinary collection in bibliography, biography, directories, “ready reference” sources such as quotations and style manuals, and “classic” reference works such as encyclopedias and dictionaries. Since we’re generally staffed and open all the hours that the library is open, and offer services by telephone, e-mail, and chat, we aspire to develop a collection that addresses the questions we receive, and offer researchers a core onsite research-level reference collection. That said, drawing the line between a reference title that fits our profile and one that is more suitable for a departmental library is often difficult to do. I would like to put forward a few proposals, however, to encourage cooperation:

1. Reference will take the lead in identifying reference titles that are appropriate for networking, and negotiate cooperative funding if necessary. In principle, duplicate print copies should then be unnecessary. Except in cases when maintaining a print subscription/copy is prohibitively expensive or illogical (e.g., *Arts and Humanities Citation Index*), Reference will acquire and maintain a print copy.
2. Reference will purchase the print copy of large, expensive reference works that have significant interdisciplinary content (e.g., *Encyclopedia Britannica*, *McGraw Hill Encyclopedia of Science and Technology*) when the library also subscribes to the online version. When an online version is not available, subject selectors and Jo should discuss and negotiate purchase and location of the print title.
3. Subject selectors and Jo should discuss and negotiate the purchase of reference titles that have potential cross- or interdisciplinary content (e.g., *Encyclopedia of...*
Retention of Reference Titles

Retention of multiple copies of reference works is contributing to overcrowding in the stacks and in departmental libraries. In many instances, they are unlikely to circulate or be consulted except for archival research purposes (e.g., previous editions and superceded volumes), and are good candidates for the Oak Street facility. In order to help relieve overcrowding and simplify retention procedures, we would like to propose the following:

1. When multiple copies of older reference titles are held, Reference will agree to keep our copy, which will be sent to the stacks or to Oak St. as appropriate.
2. If multiple copies are already available in the stacks, we will withdraw our copy.
3. We will notify selectors who still retain superceded editions in their reference collection, so that they can decide whether to withdraw them.

These are just a few suggestions and a means of opening a discussion that’s long overdue. Your feedback is appreciated and other ideas are welcome!

Jzk
10/28/03