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Major Accomplishments

• Aggressive moves into e-preferred models for many general collections areas
  – Relatively few print periodicals left
  – Ahead of peer curve on ebooks acquisitions (although still working on access)
  – Significant subj. fund and central allocation to acquire backfiles
• Experiments with streaming media, the acquisitions of datasets and other media, patron initiated acquisitions, targeted acquisitions, etc....
  – Exploring and meeting changing user needs
• Significant improvements in care and access of collections
  – Preservation and conservation (Spec. Coll. Conservation endowments, media preservation developing, several grants received)
  – Cataloging of many backlogs; resources allocated or grants received to process and/or enhance access to special collections
  – Environmental improvements for RBML (disaster recovery, resources secured for new HVAC, construction almost done)
  – Added appropriate storage facilities (Oak St Phases II and III)
  – Eliminated/minimized some marginal storage (Wohlers Attic, Press Basement, CDL, etc...)
• Significant contributions to local and national digitization efforts
  – Google Digitization (general and gov. docs.), Internet Archive, and digitization for IDEALS
• Significant growth of materials allocation over last five years; at of FY11 close, 21% of total allocation added in last five years
  – None of our annual spending dependent upon deficit spending
• Feasibility Study completed
Impact

• **Aggressive move to e-preferred acquisitions**
  – Pro: Declining use of print journals, print reference, etc... – supports rethinking service profiles, collection development models, acquisitions processes, etc....
  – Pro: Opportunities to deduplicate holdings and enter into cooperative storage schemes
  – Con: Significantly different access needs have impacted Technical Services personnel, operations

• **Experiments with streaming media, datasets, patron initiated acquisitions, gaming collections, etc...**
  – Pro: Reach broader user communities, serve growing distance ed populations, etc...
  – Pro: Fill gaps in collecting
  – Pro: Explore different scholarly needs
  – Pro: Explore opportunities not otherwise available, and in some cases, support research & publication activities
  – Pro/Con: Different models of collection development

• **Improvements in care and access**
  – Pro: Improved environment for the preservation of collections
  – Pro: Poised to eliminate major area studies backlogs
  – Pro: Significantly broader access/discoverability for special collections through grants and internal funding

• **Digitization**
  – Pro: Broader access to resources, service for off-campus users, greater access to general and special collections
  – Pro: Opens doors to rethink collection management

• **Materials Allocation**
  – Pro/Con: Ceased deficit funding Approval Plan
  – Pro: No cuts in content acquired in five years
  – Pro: Significant growth in some areas - Health Sciences, base-level allocations for approval sub-allocations
  – Pro: Opportunity funds that did not previously exist
  – Pro: Resources earmarked to support NSM activities

• **Feasibility Study**
  – Pro: Spurred rethinking management of collections
  – Pro: Campus allocations to begin addressing physical needs of Main Library (building envelope, gutters, etc...)
  – Con: Little visible impact on NSM process or locations of units
Opportunities

- **Relative Health of Materials Budget**
  - During a period of cuts, we are adding funds, making strategic allocations, off-setting personnel cuts by supporting tech services operations, and looking to cover expected losses from Federal grant funding

- **Financial Crisis**
  - Some vendors are hungry and open to discussing more creative pricing and opportunities for building new revenue streams, especially with one-time acquisitions...
  - Time is ripe for targeted acquisitions programs
  - Opportunities to enhance collecting of rarely held materials – “the long-tail”

- **Senate Bill 51**
  - Increased scrutiny of acquisitions process has already compelled us to internally coordinate acquisitions – saving UIUC money.

- **Feasibility Study**
  - We have a vision for the University Library that we could be using as a model for concrete changes

- **“Ubiquitous Access”**
  - Digital Access creates misconceptions and unrealistic expectations, but it also supports rationalization of print holdings, rethinking collection development for resources that serve general needs

- **Collaborative Programs**
  - Coop. Coll. Dev. – institutions are hurting, resource sharing, and data sharing capabilities are more advanced than 20 years ago
  - CIC - Digitization, Cooperative Purchasing Program, Shared Print Repository, rethinking area studies support (personnel, etc…)
  - HathiTrust
Initiatives

• Embrace local and collaborative initiatives that position us to move ahead on the Feasibility Study
  – Deduplication (Metric: Fewer duplicate holdings)
  – CIC Shared Print Repository (Metric: Linear feet recovered locally through participation)
  – Rationalized Collection Management (Metric: Clearly documented and actionable coll. mgmt. plans)

• Rationalize acquisitions process with large vendors
  – Cont. aggregating acquisitions of e-content (Metric: Aggregation of licensing)
  – Cont. process of targeted acquisitions (Metric: Cont. funding for targeted acq.; success in at least two)

• Build financial support to acquire and process unique materials
  – Special Collections (Metric: Growth in endowment funds to support special collections operations)
  – Specialized Collections: “The Long Tail”
    • Metric: Permanent allocations that support acquisitions of rarely held gen. coll. materials
    • Metric: “Temp.” allocations to support “catching up” for campus priority areas - Health Sciences, Lemann Institute, etc...

• Invest resources to enhance access and preserve resources
  – Continue investing resources necessary to re-tool technical services operations to meet emerging needs
    • Metric: Fill three approved positions; restructure vacancies as needed to meet new needs
  – Continue annual investment from NEH Endowment in enhancing access to special collections
    • Metric: Maintain last three year’s allocation of ca. $60,000 annually
  – Continue regular investment from NEH Endowment to support preservation, rehousing, and improved handling of resources
    • Metric: Maintain flexibility with funding to allocate in support of projects as tendered
Resources Needed

• Embrace local and collaborative initiatives that position us to move ahead on the Feasibility Study
  – Deduplication (Resources: resources to analyze holdings; continued support of IPM personnel)
  – CIC Shared Print Repository (Resources: collection analysis; commitment to withdraw duplicate journal content; continued support of IPM personnel)
  – Rationalized Coll. Mgmt. (Resources: resources to analyze collections; trust; faith in common goals)

• Rationalize acquisitions process with large vendors
  – Cont. aggregating acquisitions of e-content (Resources: acquisitions personnel; co-op. of subj. spec.)
  – Cont. process of targeted acquisitions (Resources: cont. campus support; acquisitions personnel; co-op. of subj. spec.)

• Build financial support to acquire and process unique materials
  – Special Collections (Resources: Continued support of Advancement Office activities)
  – Specialized Collections: “The Long Tail” (Resources: cont. campus support for materials allocations; subj. expertise; Tech Services expertise; Spec. Coll. collaboration for non-book collections)

• Invest resources to enhance access and preserve resources
  – Continue investing resources necessary to re-tool technical services operations to meet emerging needs (Resources: HR support to fill current vacancies; cont. support of BG/EC as new vacancies created; continued availability of coll/other funds to support outsourcing)
  – Continue annual investment from NEH Endowment in enhancing access to special collections (Resources: existing endowment funds; cont. unit oversight for projects)
  – Continue regular investment from NEH Endowment to support preservation, rehousing, and improved handling of resources (Resources: existing Endowment Funds; cont. unit oversight for projects)
Impact

• **Embrace local and collaborative initiatives that position us to move ahead on the Feasibility Study**
  - Deduplication & Coop Storage (Better use of space allocated to library; space savings to further benefit pres. of unique or scarcely held resources; increased justification to ask for more space down the road)
  - Rationalized Coll. Mgmt. (Clarity for our users as opposed to a patchwork model; increased space for highly used resources; embracing fairly common practices elsewhere)

• **Rationalize acquisitions process with large vendors**
  - Aggregated/Targeted Acq. (More content/less $$; save personnel time; easier compliance with campus/state regs; potentially “transformative” acquisitions)

• **Build financial support to acquire and process unique materials**
  - Special Collections (More resources to support acquisition and processing of unique resources; more notoriety)
  - Specialized Collections: “The Long Tail” (More coverage of scarcely held gen. coll., in particular in the area studies; more notoriety for our holdings)

• **Invest resources to enhance access and preserve resources**
  - Continue investing resources necessary to re-tool technical services operations to meet emerging needs (Better access/bibliographic control for e-resources; ability to re-tool staffing as personnel retire to ensure that new backlogs are minimized; more flexibility in adopting new activities)
  - Cont. NEH Endowment investments in enhancing access and supporting special collections (Better user access, discoverability, and service for special collections; better intellectual control; better management of special collections; improved preservation and access to special collections)
Task Force Questions and Discussion