Collection Development Committee
Meeting Summary
August 31, 2004


1. **Budget issues**
   a. **Market factor in reallocation process**: This issue was continued from a previous meeting. Esra Coskun (Collections GA) reviewed a Power Point presentation that took the Committee through a couple of ways to consider how to incorporate a market factor in reallocation. Concerns regarding the vendor information from Ebsco and Blackwell were raised, and Lisa and Karen agreed that other data are available and should be used for various funds. The question of whether this information should be in the matrix or not was debated. If it is automatically included in the matrix, will we advantage funds that may not be supporting a growing discipline; that information only comes out in the narrative. The issue of growth of literature was also raised: is there a way to capture the growth in literature as a better predictor of growing areas that might match with growing disciplines? Divisional representatives of CDC were asked to take the issue of putting this factor in the matrix to the respective divisions for discussion and to be prepared to represent division interests at the September meeting.

   b. **Fund structure**: From time to time the Committee has discussed the fund structure and whether it is serving us well. The funds reflect programs in the University, and are valuable for reporting our collecting in these areas. But they make it difficult to manage the electronic and print journal packages that cross many funds. It was suggested that we might be trying to manage too many discrete funds and that we should consider clustering funds, and reviewing funds at a higher levels (such as Math funds instead of Math and Math-Statistics or Western European Languages instead of German, French, Spanish, etc.) This would not do away with funds but allow a broader perspective. Karen suggested a task force to review our fund structure and asked for volunteers from CDC or divisions. Names need to be sent to her and she will form a small group.

   c. **“General Funds” review**: Karen shared a spreadsheet that gave some historic information on the general funds (replacements, serial sets, retrospective materials). After some discussion, the Committee advised Karen to merge the Serial Sets and Retrospective Materials funds, for a total budget of $86,000. This money could go for retrospective material of all kinds, including electronic back files and microfilm sets. We will try out having two opportunities to apply for this funding, once in the fall and once in the spring. Karen will select the items to receive funding and will seek the advice of CDC if needed. The replacement fund will be reviewed at the September meeting.
2. **E-Resource fund review**: Wendy Shelburne reported for the review group comprised of Wendy, Cindy Ingold and JoAnn Jacoby. They developed a detailed spreadsheet of the er14 fund and gave the CDC an overview of their work. The reports can be found at G:/CollectionsInfo/er14fundreport.xls. The review group will provide additional detailed information at the CDC September meeting. Lisa Hinchliffe will shortly be joining Cindy, JoAnn and Wendy to use the ORR overlap information to suggest possible cancellations of e-resources. These recommendations will come to the CDC for review.

3. **Kluwer and Wiley CIC print archive**: Karen reported that she had just learned that the CIC print archiving agreement for Kluwer and Wiley had been approved by the CIC directors. This is a 2 year pilot to model a way to manage the archiving of print during the transition from print to electronic, to assure CIC schools that a print copy will be in a dim archive. Subject librarians are free to cancel print subscriptions, details are continuing to be worked out.