Collection Development Committee
Meeting Summary
January 27, 2004


Jane Block chaired the meeting – Karen Schmidt is on sabbatical.

1. Matrix Allocation Procedure: Discussion and Recommendations on two main issues to decide for FY05 budget year: Consensus on the Matrix Factors and Consensus on the Matrix Percentage.

   A. Consensus on the Matrix Factors: The four factors which are currently in place are: 1) Academic staffing in departments served (including faculty, post docs and academic professionals), 2) PhD degrees awarded by departments served, 3) Master degrees awarded by departments served, 4) Instructional Units taught by departments served.

   Jane Block fielded feedback from Divisions on these factors.

   Jane Williams noted that Law does not have PhDs or Masters, so that this factor is not important to them.

   Mary Mallory asked why undergraduate majors were not counted as a factor – and pointed out that instructional units and undergraduate majors measure two different things.

   Tim Cole added that some departments, such as Math, have many non-major students taking courses in the Math Dept., so instructional units is an important factor to them.

   JoAnn Jacoby agreed with Mallory and proposed that perhaps the number of undergraduate majors in a department could become a factor in the matrix (and perhaps have it count 50% of one factor and instructional units as 50% of one factor).

   Tim Cole told the committee that people can look at various matrix factors and try them out on the Matrix website. And, it is possible that other factors (such as the undergrad major factor) could be added in, so that people can play with the factors to see their affect on the budget figures. Go to: "http://shiva.grainger.uiuc.edu/cdc/fy031n1.asp"
Jane Block said that the current four factors are the most agreed upon factors, and that proposals for new factors should be considerate as to what may be appropriate for all, and not just for a specific division or fund.

Katie Newman said that that Life Sciences Division would like to see a price increase index as a factor, but since the Matrix only counts for 40% of the budget allocation process, the numbers end up being fairly insignificant. So, LSD isn’t proposing that as a factor as of now.

Tim Cole noted that the current four factors are well understood by the Senate Library Committee.

Jane Block suggested that people take this discussion back to their divisions and bring feedback to the next CDC meeting.

B. Matrix Percentage: The percentage that the Matrix determines is currently 40% of the pool of dollars remaining after the non-matrix allocations have been made. The Qualitative method determines the remaining 60% of the pool of dollars available. Do we wish to alter the percentages that apply to the Matrix and the Qualitative portion of the budgeting?

Social Sciences Division and Humanities Division both proposed that the percentages be flipped, so that the Matrix is 60% and the Qualitative 40%. JoAnn Jacoby said that SSD felt that this would put less pressure on the narratives and that it is a fairer process. Jane Block said that Humanities basically agreed with this. Both Divisions noted that they do “well” on the Matrix portion of the allocation.

Lisa German said that the Senate Library Committee prefers that 60% be Qualitative, since this takes into account professional input from knowledgeable librarians.

Life Sciences Division (Clark) and Area Studies Divisions (Ingold) did not discuss the Matrix Percentage in their last divisional meetings, but they both speculated that their divisions would like to keep the percentages as they are now (40% Matrix, 60% Qualitative).

Jane Block said that Divisions should discuss this further and bring feedback to CDC next time.

2. Logistics in Scoring the Qualitative Portion: Since the budget subcommittee has been dissolved and CDC has taken on the charge of budget allocation, it needs to be decided how the Qualitative Portion will be scored within such a large committee. How will the scoring and negotiating be done? With such a large committee, the process may be too slow and cumbersome. Feedback…. 
Tim Cole suggested that 3 people on the committee could be appointed to divide up the narratives among themselves and read them. This would allow for each narrative to be read carefully by one person, who would then summarize the narrative for the committee during voting. JoAnn Jacoby liked this idea.

Lisa German said that regardless of the committee being larger, if each member of the committee reads every narrative, it is still the same amount of preparatory work and time as it was when the budget subcommittee had the charge. The difference is that with a larger committee the discussion and voting could be more difficult.

Jane Block noted that even if only a few members of the committee were responsible for reporting on specific narratives, the committee of the whole should still be familiar with all the narratives submitted, and should read them all.

Mary Mallory asked whether non-divisional representatives (those who do not write narratives) should have voting rights. If these people where excluded from the voting process, then there would only be 9 people voting, which is a manageable number.

Lisa German said that even though she is not required to submit narratives for the approval plans, she intends to write them. She thinks that they serve as an important reminder of the value of the approval plans.

Jane Block encouraged the various voting possibilities to be discussed in the Divisions.

3. Acquisitions Update (Lisa German)

All the Ebsco invoices have been paid. Stephanie Baker is constructing the price increase reports, which will be available in a couple of weeks. Social sciences and the sciences are seeing high increases this year.

15 funds had to be “bailed out” (they were overspent) while paying the Ebsco invoices, and money from Collections Reserve was used for this. Much of the money will be replaced to Collections Reserve when these funds move money from their monographs fund into their serials fund. Only about 5 funds are in real trouble and don’t have money to move from monographs to serials.

5 RFPs will be written late this spring.

Reminder to all fund managers to look at the Collections Calendar and keep on target. "http://www.library.uiuc.edu/administration/collections/tools/collections_calendar.htm"

Re: Ebsco accounts: The accounts in EbscoNet are all being merged, so that now there will only be 2 accounts (for July and January renewals).

Prompt-Cat implementation is going forward. Thanks to Naun in Cataloging.
Cataloging statistics for the Library are going to be posted to the Tech. Services website soon. Continue to send statistics sheets to Rm. 220 (and don’t forget to put your name, unit and the month on the tally!).

4. Proquest Full-Text Theses (Lynn Wiley)

Lynn’s handout to CDC:

Thanks to the CIC agreement with ProQuest, we now have access to the CIC theses online (available from 1997 -). This deal was based on the Proquest Index and Abstract offer where CIC libraries purchased permanent access to the records through this year, with a fee for new records thereafter (4-5,000?). We did not participate as ProQuest wanted the money upfront.

The Library currently pays $ 9,765 for a subscription to Dissertation Abstracts. To get all the full text available would cost another $15,000 (maybe less if we can negotiate a discount).

The IRRC currently obtains over 600 theses a year that have the potential to be made available online if we subscribed to the full text. Half of these orders have required loan fees totaling over $4,500. Indirect costs in labor and shipping bring the real costs higher. The IRRC also buys between 100 and 200 theses each year from ProQuest Dissertation Express which the user contributes to. Those fees total another $1,100.

How to fund the additional $15,000 required?
The IRRC would propose reallocating $5,000 a year from the fund used to pay ILL fees for the purchase of the Proquest full text access. The IRRC has also accrued the user payments for that service (has gone into a Proquest deposit account in the past) and so has another one time pool of money ($6,000) to pay for the first year pending approval. So for year one, we need perhaps $4,000 but thereafter, $10,000 annually. It is expected that the Dissertation Express service volume would be greatly reduced though pre 1997 theses will still be ordered.

Questions to CDC:
Do we want access to full text theses across the board (remembering that only 1997 on are available) How will the remaining money be found? Should the IRRC take money from the Document Delivery Fund ($30,000, balance goes to pay for copyright fees) and use a portion to help cover the costs?

The access to the CIC titles is a boon to users and will help reduce labor in the IRRC BUT it will be confusing as well as users will be inquiring about the rest; a fact that Proquest is surely banking on.”

CDC Discussion:
Lynn Wiley added that perhaps the difference can be paid by another general fund. Over the long haul, IRRC can reallocate student wages (because of money saved on labor) to this, but that for the short term they need the money to do this.
Lisa German wondered if the “page credits” from UMI could be used for this. Usually there are a couple thousand dollars worth of page credits at the end of the year. Also, the photo duplication fund, which is being dissolved, usually has $4000 in it annually. Maybe a new fund like this could serve the purpose of Lynn’s request.

Several persons questioned how important dissertations are to the library and whether the funds could be better spent elsewhere.

Lynn Wiley and Lisa German said that social sciences and area studies use dissertations a lot. Wiley also said that at least 1200 dissertations were requested last year.

Tim Cole thinks that divisions should discuss this and investigate how important this issue is to their units. Perhaps with another cut in the budget coming, this new service may not be justifiable at this time.

5. Preservation Update (Tom Teper)

The Preservation Committee is putting on a grant forum on February 20th for the NEH Division of Preservation and Access Grants.

The Friends Preservation competition is coming up soon.

Tom is still looking for more feedback on the proposed outline of the Collection Manager Preservation Handbook.

Tom reported that the review process for the Brittle Books program is not going as planned. As it is, Karen Schimdt reviews all the books that have not been reviewed by selectors, and this is amounting to about 200 books/month (about 75% of all the books). Tom asked for feedback about how to get people in to review the books. Sending out notices to individual reviewers would be a serious workflow issue for Preservation (as it is now, a list sorted by call number is posted to LIBFAC once a month). Another option is for the list of reviewers to be narrowed.

Katie Newman suggested putting a prominent reminder at the Approval Plan books.

Others suggested that Preservation personally contact the reviewers who have the most books to review and who are not coming.

Overall, it was decided that Preservation will make the decisions on the brittle books if the selectors do not come. People voiced their trust in Preservation to make good decisions.

Katie Newman said that this concern will be taken back to Divisions and reviewers will be encouraged to work Brittle Books review into their workflow.
6. Electronic Resources Update (Wendy Shelburne)

Wiley--Negotiations with CIC are completed.

Kluwer--Negotiations for CIC are completed.

Blackwell Synergy--UIUC renewed for 1 year with ICCMP. FYI, currently all Synergy titles recognize UIUC IP addresses as UIS. This has been reported.

Nature Journals--This is finalized with CIC. The terms ended at 2003 prices +8%.

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--Lynn Wiley already reported on this.

New process for renewing and licensing CIC agreements--MOA documents were approved for CIC agreements so we no longer have to send those forward to Purchasing.

TDnet/Linkresolver update: John Weible is still working on the data feed. The date to go live is still ASAP.

Ingenta update: Some publishers are dropping out of Ingenta. Also, Michael Norman has an accurate list of what we now receive from Ingenta. The titles will appear when the new registry is in place.

Old e-registry: the URL has moved. If you need access, contact Wendy.

Elsevier will visit soon to demo new product. Wendy will send out a notice.

7. New Business

Karen Fischer was thanked for her excellent efforts on CDC and wished well by all in her new job at the University of Iowa.

Next CDC meeting: Tuesday, February 24th, 2-3:30, 428 Library, to be chaired by Cindy Ingold.

[Summary of the CDC’s minutes written by K. Fischer and reviewed by J. Block]