Collection Development Committee
Meeting Summary
23 February 2004


Cindy Ingold chaired the meeting – Karen Schmidt is on sabbatical.

1. **Matrix Allocation Procedure**
   
   **A. Matrix Factors:** Continuation of discussion from the last two meeting. Karen would like consensus today if possible on which Matrix factors to include. 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.

   This was to be taken back to division for discussion. LSD thinks matrix is flawed but would prefer to leave as is. PSED agrees. Arts and Humanities feels the same way. SSD would be willing to add Undergraduate majors but would not be upset if left as is. Tech Services Division did not discuss. Area Studies thinks it’s flawed and should be phased out completely at some point; leaving Matrix as is will not affect them. Special Collections is okay with leaving as is. CPS did not vote. The consensus is to leave the four factors in for this year. Early next year, CDC should discuss adding Undergraduate majors as a factor. Jane Block suggested that SSD submit a formal proposal on this with the rationale.

   **B. Matrix Percentage:** At the January meeting, A&HD and SSC both proposed that the percentages be flipped, so that the Matrix is 60% and the Qualitative 40%. Reasons given for this included that A&H did not like budgeting by supplication. Another comment was that narratives could possibly be exaggerated and include hyperbole.

   LSD and PSED want to keep as is, saying they trust colleagues. Tim said the current percentage of 40% Matrix was recommended by the Library Allocation Steering Committee (LASC). Jane Block commented that this decision was made several years ago, and she questioned whether faculty would still feel this way. Tim said LASC got input from around campus, and that it was this process of talking to people which convinced the LASC to recommend the current 40% for the Matrix.

   SSD recommends using 60% Matrix. JoAnn said that in lean budget times, SSD was hesitant to do something that might foster a competition atmosphere, and that the qualitative process creates a mode of competition. Additionally, the qualitative portion of the budget is very time consuming.

   Area Studies feels very strongly that the Matrix remain 40%. They argued that the narratives helped explain their programs, and that they could argue for needed resources in the narrative.

   Katie mentioned that one of the ways the matrix is flawed is that it doesn’t take into consideration the increased cost of materials. JoAnn wondered if the Matrix could be tied in with the EBSCO serials increase. Jane B. said A&H would not recommend this since many of their materials are monographs.
Cindy called for a vote which came out
   40 Matrix/60 Narrative:  4
   60 Matrix/40 Narrative:  2
CPS, Tech Services and Special Collections abstained from voting.

Tim suggested that Karen may want to take this to the Senate Library Committee representatives to discuss. Cindy will let Karen know this, and she can decide if she wants to do this.

2. Decisions scoring Qualitative portion
   Three suggestions were put forward for scoring the narratives that fund administrators will submit.
   1.) Having groups of 3 people thoroughly read certain narratives, and then present them to all of CDC for voting.
   2.) Have only the 9 division representatives read the all the narratives
   3.) Have the Committee as a whole read and score

Someone commented that regardless of whether the whole committee or smaller groups read the narratives, the process will still be a lot of work. If all of CDC is involved, the discussion and voting could be more difficult.

Lisa German said that the Budget Subcommittee which included 5 to 7 people always came to a consensus. Every narrative was discussed and scored, and often after discussions, people changed their votes because compelling arguments were made for certain funds. The BSC used a scoring criteria sheet, which Lisa will bring to the next meeting for review.

Jane Block said that in FRC everyone reads all of the annual reports and then scores them. Discussion of each report helped FRC come to consensus.

There was a lively discussion on who should vote during this budget cycle. Lisa German said it would take about two days to read all of the narratives. She commented that one advantage is that you learn so much about the different funds. The process enriches all of us and might provide a less parochial perspective which is never a bad thing.

Tim argued for the first option above. Katie said she was okay with a having a small group of readers. Cindy said she got little feedback from Area Studies. Arts and Humanities thought fund managers should read and score narratives.

Cindy reminded everyone that there were several people on the Committee who were not fund managers, including the two interns, Wendy, Tom, Lynn, and Rod. Tom reminded the committee that whatever people buy does impact how the Preservation budget. Lynn also commented on how all of this affects ILL. She would welcome the ability to have input into a discussion that would give her a better sense of ILL costs.

Lisa said that at the end of the process, a budget would be assigned to every fund.

Cindy called for a vote. Six people voted for that all of CDC should read and score all of the narratives. One person voted that the 9 division reps read and score.
Katie asked if the past narrative statements could be posted for everyone to look at. Donna offered to put them up on the secured web site, and she will work with Karen on this when Karen returns.

3. Timeline for Collections Budget
Jane Block would like the narratives to be due long after the Peer Review Committee reports are finished. The majority of the Committee voted to have narratives due May 15. We also decided not to do the 2% reallocation before then. At the March meeting, we will go over the form used for the narrative. Donna will put this form up on a secure site and send CDC the URL.

4. Acquisitions Update (Lisa German)
- Acquisitions spent $8 million so far this year
- They are beginning the RFP for French materials
- Elsevier contract should be okayed and not have things cut off at end of February
- Approval shipments have been small but they should be getting back to normal size in the next few weeks.
- Tiffany Tsou’s computer has not been working, so Lisa suggested calling her if you had questions
- Business Office up-to-date on invoice processing
- Naun Chew is taking responsibility for evaluating cataloging records that come with big sets. He will be looking at Alexander Street Press titles first
- In Collection Manager, we can now order British books

5. E-Resources Update (Wendy Shelburne)
Wendy invited John Weible from Systems to give a tour of the new Online Research Resources page at [www.library.uiuc.edu/orr/](http://www.library.uiuc.edu/orr/)

John said that because of the implementation of TDNet, and because eresources change so rapidly, that something had to be done with the current registry. A group has been working on the redesign of the Online Research Resources page.

John went over the features of the site, and discussed why certain decisions were made.

He said that the keyword search only searched the titles and alternate titles of sources, not the descriptions. There was some discussion that perhaps keyword searches should include words from the descriptions of sources. John said this could be done if there was agreement.

He suggested that we all begin looking at this page, and send comments to him.

They hope to roll this out over the summer.

6. Preservation Update (Tom Teper)
**Core Programs**

**Binding**
Despite cuts in serials over the past year and decreasing purchases, the quantity of materials processed through the Bindery Preparations Unit is continuing to grow. As of Jan. 31 last year, we had processed 18,538 items. This year, we have processed 23,078 as of January 31. That represents a nearly 20% increase in the total quantity. Obviously,
expenditures have increased accordingly, so we are finally starting to reach a level where our binding expenditures are reasonable for the size of our collection.

The Bindery is also offering some new services in terms of the types of enclosures that they are providing. These have already started appearing in units.

**Brittle Books and Reformatting**

Brittle books processing continues apace. Connie Jasper-Pearson will be dedicating part of her time to support this program starting next week.

We are currently awaiting word on the outcome of a NEH grant submitted last year through the CIC. If this comes through, we plan on locating the work space in 7A in some of the space vacated by the Oak St. Stabilization program (more below).

**Microfilm Unit**

The first two shipments of negatives have left the building. The final is expected to leave in the next month. As we are winding down this operation, Connie Jasper-Pearson’s time is being split between Oak Street Preparatory work and the Brittle Books and Reformatting Program.

**Repair**

The Repair and Pamphlet Binding Unit’s work continues apace. After almost three years, the backlog that existed before our arrival is almost gone.

Despite cuts in the number of items being pamphlet bound (i.e., new receipts), the total quantity of materials received has increased by about 20%.

**Project-Based Work**

**Assessments**

- Undergrad, Law and the Rare Book Library assessments are progressing.
- Music Assessment and another needs assessment are completed.

**Collections Projects**

- Work to support the Sousa Archives begun in the last several months includes assessing instrument collections and developing proper housing for this collection of unique realia.

**Conservation**

- Several outsourced conservation projects are in process.

**Grants and Other Special Projects**

- Currently beginning discussions to preserve Carl Sandburg Collection. Grant application due date to be announced.

**Mass Deacidification**

- Archives manuscript collection begun and will take another month or so to finish.
- We are shortly to start seeing 583 field notes in items that have been deacidified.

**Reformatting**

- Reformatting the Archives’ Illios continues

**Oak Street**

Work on Oak Street is moving into a new phase. As Hort Field Lab (Faux Oak) is now full, the stabilization crews are moving to at-the-shelf stabilization of materials selected for
transfer. At the same time, the volume of materials to be processed is ramping up to meet the demands of the new preparation program outlined by Stacks. From slightly less than 150 hours per week of student labor, we are increasing number of student hours by an additional 150 hours per week, have added a 40/week evening shift supervisor, and are preparing to accept volunteer labor.

7. Gifts Policy
   We will discuss next meeting

8. Announcements
   Lynn reminded everyone to talk to their divisions about getting the fulltext of ProQuest dissertations from other universities besides those in the CIC.

   Cindy will send other announcements out via email.

Minutes submitted by Donna Hoffman and reviewed by Cindy Ingold