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Selection for High Density Storage (Tom & All)

Review Revised Document

Several members of the CDC shared their comments on the document, Selecting Materials for Remote Storage. JoAnn Jacoby mentioned that before finalizing, the document needs some minor edits.

Alvan Bregman spoke to the CDC about making more wide-spread use of ‘Rare Book Oak St’ as a possible Oak Street Facility designation. He informed the CDC that they could send older materials to OSF using RBOS. Due to time constraints the CDC had to move on to other agenda items, but Alvan said he would be willing to draw up the appropriate language for what he would like to propose to the CDC for our next meeting.

Lynn Wiley mentioned that the document should contain a section stating how some new materials will start being sent straight to the OSF. She, too, will write this up for the next CDC meeting.

(Diane Schmidt submitted the following comments via email prior to today’s meeting) “I read the Oak Street document and think it looks good--it pretty much follows the criteria we've been using at Biology to choose materials for Oak Street and stacks. However, the wording on p. 2 relating to gifts is problematic. Perhaps the second sentence should read, "It may be appropriate to send some gifts straight to remote storage.” Personally, I generally don't select gifts that are Oak Street candidates but that may be due to the type of gifts we generally receive (30 year old textbooks).”

Process for Identifying and Filling Backfile Holes (Tom & All)

Tina Chrzastowski stated that she will pull together some pertinent data so that the CDC can have a more informed discussion at our next meeting. Today, however, some people did have some ideas/comments about the process for identifying and filling backfile holes. Tina suggested looking at Springer and Elsevier and purchasing everything that we do not already have. JoAnn Jacoby suggests purchasing Sage backfiles. Diane Schmidt could not be at today’s meeting; however, she sent in her comments via email to Tom: I had forgotten to talk to the division about identifying and filling backfile holes, but understandably backfiles are something we've talked about a LOT and purchase as we can afford. This is a hard area to deal with since new packages become available so frequently. We also have discussions about whether it is appropriate to buy, say, medical journal backfiles if we don't have current subscriptions to the titles. Yes, it fills in gaps but not the right ones (the current material being more important).
Wendy Shelburne noted that Elsevier, Springer and Wiley are the three biggest publishers where the most backfile money is going.

**Approval Plan – (Lynn Wiley)**

Lynn reported that the approval plan task force has met and that they are developing a six question survey. The survey will include questions regarding: the bid, money for the approval plan, etc. They may also look at what we are not getting that we should be receiving on the approval plan. The survey should be distributed within the next couple of weeks. Lynn also stated that there is no new money for the approval plan. If any money becomes available, then it is because it has come from people’s personal firm order funds. This transfer of money is a one time occurrence and not done on a permanent basis.

**Setting Collections Priorities Discussion – (Tom & All)**

The question that Tom presented to the CDC is: Why can’t we seem to set collections priorities? What has impeded us, historically, from setting collection priorities?

Tom asked that these questions be taken back to the divisions for further discussion and report back their findings at the next CDC meeting.

**Updates**

*Ind8 & Ind9 review*

The review of the Ind8 and Ind9 funds is wrapping up.

*Serials on the 8s*

All serials on the 8s (those from Ebsco) are moving to the 9s.

**Next Meeting:**

Tuesday, December 18th from 2-3:30pm in Room 428.