Collection Development Committee
Meeting Summary
December 10, 2003


Tim Cole chaired the meeting – Karen Schimdt is on sabbatical.

1. The Collection Management Calendar has been set. It is located at: "http://door.library.uiuc.edu/collections/files/tf_collections_calendar.htm"

2. Bill Mischo and Tim Cole led an explanation of the Matrix Calculation that was used for FY03, which is located at: "http://shiva.grainger.uiuc.edu/cdc/fy031n1.asp"

It was stressed that the unit factors, such as University Academic Unit Factors and Usage & Publication Factors, are “normalized”, meaning they all have the same weight of one. Discussions ensued about how only 44 of the 90 funds actually use the matrix formula (which was used in FY03 to distribute 40% of the 2% reallocation funds). Area Studies and General Funds are excluded from the formula, since the factors cannot be applied to them in a fair way.

Cindy Ingold asked about the history of the Matrix Calculation, and Bill Mischo noted that we began applying some sort of formula in the mid-1990s, and in 1997 it was officially mandated by the campus.

3. 2% Reallocation Discussion – three main issues.

Budget spreadsheets showing the allocation of funds in FY98, 00, 02 and 04 were distributed. Mary Mallory pointed out that Central Public Services funds and General Funds were excluded from these. Karen Fischer noted that the documents were just supposed to support the 2% reallocation discussion and that she was not certain why these funds were not included.

Discussion and recommendations regarding whether to handle the 2% reallocation and FY05 budget changes at the same time, or to separate them into two different processes, with the 2% reallocation coming earlier in the budget year. It was pointed out by Lisa German that the advantage of doing the 2% reallocation earlier in the year is that it gives fund managers time to see the effects of the 2% reallocation and to prepare and plan for possible cancellations if needed. Furthermore, the state budget is released in April-May (and sometimes as late as July), so the more time librarians have to plan ahead the better. Many people agreed with Lisa. Bill Mischo pointed out that there probably will not be any new money for FY05. Jane Block noted that she thinks the 2% reallocation should be allocated in the same fashion as any new money (40% according to the matrix, and 60% according to narratives). No one disagreed. It was decided that the 2% reallocation
would be done earlier in the year, and Tim Cole said that he would contact Karen Schmidt about the details for moving forward with this course of action.

Discussion and recommendations regarding whether to require narratives every year, or only in the years when subject librarians have something new to tell CDC. Consensus was that narratives should be done every two years at most, and that subject librarians could turn one in for any year in which something important has happened that they wish to report on to CDC. Cindy Ingold requested that some examples of narratives be made available to look at for those subject librarians that have not written them before, and Karen Fischer said she will take care of getting some examples together. Katie Newman asked for an explanation of the 60% allocation process, and Lisa German gave her an overview of how this works.

Discussion and recommendations regarding whether we want to protect certain funds (such as Approval, ER14, Binding, ILL, Serial backfiles, etc....) from the 2% reallocation. It was agreed that any funds that serve the whole population of funds should be exempt from contributing to the 2% pool. A discussion ensued about EBO (which as not been exempt in the past), and Lisa German stated that they plan to take a look at EBO when time permits, but that Acquisitions has several large high-priority projects going on right now, so it will have to be done later.

4. Ebsco Invoices Update (Lisa German)

Ebsco invoices for many of the largest funds have been paid. There is a big push to get all the Ebsco invoices paid before the holidays in order to avoid paying late fees. The process is extremely time consuming because it may involve creating orders, importing bib records, updating holdings, title changes, etc.... and that Lisa, Maria Porta, Stephanie Baker and Mike Soule are working to get all this done.

Also, since Voyager does not allow a fund to be overspent, Acquisitions will be contacting fund managers by email who have insufficient money in their periodical funds. Fund managers should specify how they would like to redistribute their money. Lisa mentioned that there is a reserve fund of about 100K to cover funds that have no money to move into their periodical fund.

5. Division Feedback on the Reference Collection Development Offer (Jo Kibbee’s Proposal)

Arts & Humanities (Jane Block): Overall the division thinks the proposal is a good idea but they have a few concerns. 1 – they want a guarantee of post-reference room stewardship (for example, once the item is sent to Stacks it would not be withdrawn from Stacks at any time). 2 – overall they think the reducing the number of duplicates is a good idea, but to “eliminate” all duplicates in unfeasible since departmental libraries need certain reference books on hand in order to provide good service.

PSED (Tim Cole): Noted that this division wants to make it clear that perhaps the best place for the only print copy might be in a departmental library, and not in the Reference Room.
Social Sciences (Kerry Wu): Overall the division thinks the idea is good, but they have many concerns.
1. The reason for keeping certain duplicate reference materials in the departmental libraries is that sometimes the online version is not current (e.g., Stat Abstract online is one year behind).
2. Related concern: is the e-version exactly the same as, or better than, the print version.
3. One doubt for this move is the possible change in the role REX will play in the future. Will it change into a humanities library in 5 or 10 years, and what will be the implications?
4. Undergrad's role in this move, since UGL has the most copies of duplicates.
5. Don't feel comfortable about yielding purchasing rights to REX.
6. Apart from "real" duplicates, there are other types, such as things similar in content. For example, we can get more from Career Search in terms of company directory than Reference USA, but we have access to both.
7. Request Jo to produce a list of titles possible to be examined. It's hard to talk about this issue in the abstract, so a list of specific titles may help us get the perspective.
8. If departmental libraries cancel their duplicate print copies, can they keep the money in their budget? Or do they need to share with REX the price of the one print copy and one e-version?

Area Studies (Cindy Ingold): Area Studies wanted to make the point that the Proposal, even if adopted, is only advisory and not mandatory.

Special Collections (Alvan Bregman): Alvan asked whether a hand-me-down list existed for reference titles, and said that if not, perhaps one should be created. Spec. Collections also pointed out the retaining different editions for posterity is important.

Tech Services (Tom Teper): Expressed concern over stewardship issues, and how titles that were moved to Stacks would be maintained and never withdrawn.

Life Sciences (Katie Newman): Life Sciences agreed with much of what other Divisions said, and reaffirmed that many science reference titles are best placed in departmental libraries and not in the Main Reference Room.

Overall, the feedback indicated that Divisions are open to the Proposal, but think there are details to be worked out and revisions in the language that must be made.

6. Preservation Update (Tom Teper)

The Disaster Plan is in the process of getting finalized. Tom is still waiting for Salvage Priorities to be submitted from several units.

An assessment of the condition and use of the Undergraduate Collection is beginning.
The deacidification project in the Rare Book Room has been completed. One is currently underway in the Music Library.

ARL stats for this past year have been gathered – they are the first full year of accurate preservation statistics generated by the library. They will be used to devise a 5-year plan.

The Cultural Engagement Council on campus is beginning to cooperate on preserving collections campus-wide.

7. E-Resources Update (handout prepared by Wendy Shelburne)

Wiley negotiations with CIC are essentially done. UIUC will renew for 3 years. Most of the participants renewed for 5. However, we can renew at for 3 and decide to continue on the 5 year agreement without penalty. NOTE: Access should not be discontinued during negotiations. CIC will work to make sure this doesn’t happen.

Kluwer—All CIC participants with the exception of UIUC have agreed to the terms for the renewal. Likely that UIUC will too. The 6% access fee was not negotiable – this was the dual access fee from print and online. NOTE: Access should not be discontinued during negotiations. CIC will work to make sure this doesn’t happen.

Blackwell Synergy – UIUC considered moving from the ICCMP consortial deal to the CIC one. However, the CIC deal has administrative costs that the ICCMP deal does not. This is a one year agreement. CIC was offered the same deal that ICCMP was (the admin cost, which is divided among the participants.). This package increased approximately 20% ($2,000) this year. They are holding on to a no cancellation policy as much as they can, but for an extra cost on the package a conversion can be made to e-only. However, this requires purchase of the package and payment of 95% of the print cost, so not necessarily a deal.

Nature Journals – This is currently under negotiation with CIC. There was a significant increase in the package this year (around 20%). The CIC library directors met recently and rejected the offer and presented to those of us who discuss licensing etc, with CIC to come up with a counter offer to Nature. This was a topic of discussion on the CIC conference call today and a final counter proposal has not yet been decided upon. Nature will be asked to justify their price increase. CIC hopes to offer them last year’s price plus 5%. (This has a renewal date of January 7). If this goes over without being sorted out, CIC will negotiate for trial access until details are done.

U.S. Congressional Serial Set Digital Edition from Readex – and a similar offer from Lexis-Nexis. – this offer is still sitting on the table without much action. Some participants have already said no way to both offers. Most participants are saying that their librarians are not requesting it. Indiana and Purdue may go ahead with Lexis Nexis, but everyone else is sitting at the moment. All has been placed on hold until February.

Proquest Digital Dissertations: This is currently tied up between issues of owning the AandI data and access to full text dissertations. Currently we have only the AandI version, full text is only available through Proquest. There is an offer to CIC that would include the AandI service and all fulltext from 1997 from participating CIC institutions. We have also been offered access to the full database directly from Proquest. This is still
being discussed here and Lynn Wiley and Wendy will be having a conference call with Proquest Thursday afternoon to sort out some of these issues.

New process for renewing and licensing CIC agreements. There have been some documents produced by the CIC and reviewed by CIC Library directors that will hopefully allow individual institutions (such as UIUC) to sign a “letter of intent” to participate in an agreement that would allow access to move forward while licensing details are sorted out.

Locally: Our new Elsevier rep will be here tomorrow in room 428 from 11:00 until approximately 12:30 to meet with a few folks. This has not been widely distributed as the meeting came on short notice. He will also be in Grainger at 1:00 the same day.

Friends and NEH awards have been announced and orders are being placed for several databases. More details to come on this. Silverplatter databases are now being served by Ovid directly rather than locally loaded as has been past practice. Some minor bugs are still being worked out. Invoices are still coming and being paid. E-resources orders did not convert to Voyager so they are being loaded by hand.

8. Wrap-Up

JoAnn Jacoby introduced herself as the new Social Sciences Division Representative to CDC.

Next meeting: Jan. 27th, 2-3:30 in 428 Library.

~Minutes summary by K. Fischer