

COLLECTION ANALYSIS PROJECT

FINAL REPORT

APRIL 2003

CAP Study Team

**David Feinmark, Chair
Gerry Clevenger
Judy Druse
Jan Guise
Cal Melick**

**Mabee Library, Washburn University
Topeka, Kansas**

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Dean's Preface	i
Introduction	1
Overview	4
History of the Collection	4
Environmental Analysis	6
Conclusions	9
Work of the Task Forces	10
Task Force on Collection Management, Organization, and Staffing	10
Task Force on Collection Assessment	11
Task Force on Funding and Materials Budget Allocation	11
Recommendations	12
Common Task Force Recommendations	12
Task Force on Collection Management, Organization, and Staffing	12
Task Force on Collection Assessment	15
Task Force on Funding and Materials Budget Allocation	16
Implementation Strategy	18
Task Force Report on Collection Management, Organization and Staffing	Appendix I
Task Force Report on Collection Assessment	Appendix II
Task Force Report on Funding and Materials Budget Allocation	Appendix III
Collection Analysis Project Interim Report	Appendix IV

DEAN'S PREFACE

The Collection Analysis Project (CAP) was undertaken in response to one of the major recommendations of the Mabee Library Strategic Plan.¹ CAP was seen by the Strategic Planning Steering Committee, and by me, as a crucial first step in promoting the necessary change to bring collection development and management at the Washburn University Libraries in conformity with the accepted best practices and thereby make it more responsive to the University's priorities and needs. The eighteen recommendations coming from the study are, in my opinion, right on target. They address the major needs for change and provide the framework for its implementation. I am impressed by the thoroughness and thoughtfulness of the work and I accept all eighteen recommendations.

To insure that my intentions with regard to the eighteen recommendations are correctly understood, I will briefly comment on each of them:

The following ten recommendations relate to the management of the collection development program and to basic practices and procedures.

The first recommendation is designed to improve the overall effectiveness of the program as a whole.

Recommendation 1. Increase the operational effectiveness of the collection development and management program.

This recommendation identifies the essential first steps for the improvement of the program: investigation and reorganization of the current structure. I recognize the need for an effective organization that can understand and respond to changes in University priorities, technology, student demographics and the economy. I will assign a high priority to providing support for implementation of this recommendation.

The following two recommendations relate to improving selection and acquisitions process and procedures.

Recommendation 2. Streamline the selection process by revising the profile of the announcement slip plan.

Recommendation 3. Streamline the selection and acquisition process by investigating moving from the announcement slip plan to a book approval plan.

Recommendation 4. Identify peripheral costs related to collection development and conduct cost/benefit analysis of interlibrary loan and document delivery.

¹ Washburn University Mabee Library *Strategic Plan 2000-2003*, Recommendation 8.

This is an important recommendation that recognizes that access to information via interlibrary loan and document delivery is an important component of modern collection development and management. It also addresses the important issue of the need for ongoing cost/benefit analysis of library programs.

The following two recommendations relate directly to a need identified by the Libraries' assessment efforts: the desire of both students and faculty for easy-to-use, user friendly, intuitive tools that provide access to the collections, especially materials in electronic format. Both are essential.

Recommendation 5. Examine the Web presentation of electronic resources.

Recommendation 6. Develop a policy for the treatment of third-party Web sites.

The following two recommendations relate to electronic resources. The first recognizes the evaluative, legal, and technological challenges associated with the acquisition of materials in electronic format. It addresses the need to make librarians and faculty aware of these challenges and to provide a standardized method/instrument for selection and acquisition. The second reaffirms a basic tenet of collection development: that the intrinsic value of the material and its relationship to the curriculum are the bases for selection.

Recommendation 7. Develop a form (process) for the selection of electronic resources.

Recommendation 8. Continue to select materials based on the value of the content, not the format.

The following two recommendations relate to common themes in the Mabee Library Strategic Plan: training and staff development and aligning policies and procedures with University priorities.

The following five recommendations relate to assessment and complement the Libraries' on-going assessment program.

Recommendation 9. Compile and analyze the statistical information necessary for effective management of the program.

Recommendation 10. Develop a process for assessment of library support for new programs in the Schools of Business and Nursing.

This recommendation would bring the procedure for new course approval in these schools with that used by the College of Arts and Sciences and with standard practices.

Recommendation 11. Investigate software for collection analysis.

Recommendation 12. Investigate tools to assist with collection assessment.

Recommendation 13. Conduct assessment of all subject collections on a five-year rotating basis.

The following three recommendations relate to the important and challenging task of allocating the Libraries' budget for information resources. They are, perhaps, the study's most difficult recommendations, but also the most important. They recommend the review and adjustment of historical allocations for periodicals and the development of a systematic and equitable method of allocation for all types of materials. This is a sensitive and labor-intensive undertaking that will require the support and understanding of faculty and library staff.

Recommendation 14. Provide training on all aspects of the collection development and management program to librarian selectors.

Recommendation 15. Update the collection development policy to reflect changes in the University's curriculum and priorities.

Recommendation 16. Expand allocation process to include materials in all formats.

This recommendation will permit more reasonable review and effective management of all resources allocated to a given discipline and, ultimately, will provide greater flexibility.

Recommendation 17. Investigate new budgeting techniques

Recommendation 18. Investigate streamlining the current allocation process.

Implementation, review and evaluation of these excellent and extremely important recommendations must be carefully provided for. The Study Team's suggestion that I appoint a CAP Implementation Committee to conduct the initial review in July 2004 is accepted. I will ask the Implementation Committee to remain continuously in session throughout the implementation period. Of course, if needed, I will be available to assist the Committee in its work.

In closing, I wish to thank the members of the Study Team and the Task Forces for their excellent work in producing this important guide for the reorientation and revitalization of the collection development function at Washburn. My special thanks go to David Feinmark for his effective leadership of this absolutely vital effort and to Jan Guise and Judy Druse, who chaired the Task Forces that produced the Final Reports on which this Report is based.

Wanda V. Dole
Dean of University Libraries
April 23, 2003

TASK FORCE MEMBERS

Task Force on Collection Management, Organization, and Staffing

- * Jan Guise, Chair
Martha Imparato
Andrea Leon

Task Force on Collection Assessment

- * Judy Druse, Chair
Dean Corwin
Teresa Nitcher

Task Force on Funding and Materials Budget Allocation

- * Cal Melick, Chair
Janet Homan
Lori Rognlie

INTRODUCTION

This Final Report of the Mabee Library's Collection Analysis Project (CAP) completes the study and planning phase and sets the stage for the implementation phase of the project.

The Mabee Library's 2000-2003 Strategic Planning initiative began in 2000. One major strategy was a comprehensive review of the Library's Collection Development Program. One commonly accepted method of this type of assisted self-study is the Collection Analysis Project (CAP) which was developed by the Association of Research Libraries (ARL) in 1980. Wanda Dole, Dean of University Libraries at Washburn University, contacted ARL, engaged their services, and appointed a five member CAP Study Team. In November 2001, ARL's consultant, Julia Blixrud (Director of Information Services) made an initial site visit to explain the CAP process to the CAP Study Team. The preliminary review was to be undertaken within the context of the history of the Library's collections as well as the influences of a variety of external factors on collection development at Washburn University. During this initial phase of CAP (November 2001-April 2002), the Team reviewed background studies and discussed key collection development issues raised by the Library's Strategic Plan: organization and staffing; collection assessment; and materials budget allocation. The Study Team concluded that a number of actions were required in order to ensure that Mabee Library continue to develop and maintain collections sufficient to support the academic and research needs of Washburn University.

In April 2002 the Study Team prepared an Interim Report that covered (1) historical development of the collections and (2) internal and external factors that have a major impact on the Mabee Library's collections. These external factors included the economy, publishing and pricing trends, technology, access to information, and resource sharing. The Interim Report also identified problems in the collection management and development process and set the direction for further study.

During the second phase of CAP (May-November 2002), Task Forces were established in the following areas: collection management, organization, and staffing; collection assessment; and funding and materials budget allocation. Each Task Force was

responsible for collecting and analyzing data in its area, identifying optional approaches to critical issues facing the Library, and submitting Final Reports to the CAP Study Team.

The overarching goals of the Study Teams' efforts were to:

- clarify collection management and development philosophy and objectives
- determine the most effective use of human and financial resources in meeting these objectives
- improve the effective use of human and financial resources in meeting these objectives

From December 2002 to April 2003 the Study Team (in conjunction with the ARL facilitator and the Dean of University Libraries) reviewed, synthesized, and adapted the Final Reports of the Task Forces to produce this Final Report. The Report is composed of two major sections. The first section is an overview, including a shortened version of the Interim Report and a description of the environment in which the collection development and management program at Mabee Library must function. The second section of the Final Report consists of the Study Team's synthesis of the recommendations of the Task Force Reports and the implementation strategy.

The Study Team has submitted eighteen recommendations, some of which should be accepted for implementation immediately with others implemented over the next two years. The Study Team recognizes the importance of these recommendations in carrying out the shaping of a new paradigm for the organizational structure of collection management in a time of rapid changes in technology, scholarly communication, and higher education at Mabee Library and Washburn University.

The analysis and evaluation of the collection development and management program has demonstrated to the Study Team that some structural changes and new mechanisms must be instituted to meet the increasingly complex information needs of the Washburn University community.

All documents of the Collection Analysis Project, including Task Force Reports as well as the Interim and Final Reports, have been placed in the Washburn University Archives.

The Study Team thanks the many individuals who were helpful in the completion of this report. Wanda Dole, Dean of University Libraries, urged us to undertake the project and consistently provided encouragement, guidance, and valuable advice. The members of the three Task Forces contributed long hours and commitment to the project's goals. Julia Blixrud, the ARL facilitator, gave us the benefit of her expertise and guidance through the long process of this project.

OVERVIEW

HISTORY OF THE COLLECTION

Washburn University was founded in 1865 as a private, Congregational school named Lincoln College. In 1941, Topekans voted to maintain and further develop the school (now named Washburn College). Consequently, the Board of Trustees turned over its physical assets to the newly created metropolitan university, supported in part by the City and governed by a local Board of Regents. Academically, Washburn University has been an undergraduate, liberal arts institution with selected graduate (Master level) programs.

Collection Growth

The University's budget has the greatest impact on the growth of the Library's collection and the trend over the last fifteen years has been toward smaller and smaller budget increases. In fact, since 1998/1999 there has been no increase in the Library's materials budget. This failure of the materials budgets to keep pace with inflation has resulted in a slowing of growth in the number of books added as well as the number of periodical titles available.

There has been a steady growth in recent years in the number of electronic resources purchased by the Library. In FY 1999-00, approximately 25% of the materials budgets is being devoted to information in electronic format.

Collection Emphases

There traditionally has been a great deal of faculty involvement in the building of the Library's collection. However, this involvement has been inconsistent across departments and schools, resulting in the lack of coherent, comprehensive collections in support of the curricula. The University has added several new programs at the undergraduate and graduate levels since 1980, but the evaluation of library resources

to support these new programs has been somewhat erratic. The College of Arts and Sciences has mandated a "New Course Review Form" be completed for each new course and/or program. This form requires a positive library assessment before approval. The Schools of Applied Studies, Business and Nursing do not have such a mechanism in place.

Collection Evaluations

University Program Reviews in 1995 and 2001 and the North Central Association of Schools and Colleges accreditation assessment of 1997 all indicate that additions to the materials budgets have not kept pace with the inflation in the cost of these materials. All three reviews do indicate, however, that Mabee Library has a strong collection for an institution of Washburn's size.

Due to the erosion of the purchasing power of the Periodicals Budget, three major periodical cancellation projects were undertaken (1991-92, 1995-96, and 1999-00). However, there has never been a formal assessment of the Library's periodical collection and its relation to the University curriculum. Additionally, the book and non-print materials collections have not been examined in a comprehensive manner.

Dimensions of the Current Collection

The primary focus of the collection of print and non-print resources is to support instruction at the University. The collection currently contains approximately 386,000 volumes as well as access to over 75 electronic databases. There is an annual growth rate of about 7,000 volumes in the print collections. There are currently eight subject areas which have significant title counts of over 8,000 (Art, Biology, Economics, Education, English, History, Nursing, and Sociology). These may be said to be areas of collection strength for the Library. On the opposite end of the spectrum, four subject areas have title counts less than 1,000 (Astronomy, Communication, Computer Science, and Physical Education).

Impact of Continuation of Current Acquisitions Patterns

In June 1978 Mabee Library implemented a New Title Announcement Slip Plan with a major book vendor. Based on a specific set of subject profiles set by the Library, the vendor sends computer generated forms for new monographs published each week. This plan currently represents approximately 80% of the purchases from the "Books and Research Materials" budget. However, analysis shows that many of the subjects in this profile (hence, many of the books) are selected based on faculty interests rather than curricular needs.

There is a lack of consistency on the part of many faculty liaisons and library selectors in ensuring that the materials acquired reflect institutional rather than personal priorities.

ENVIRONMENTAL ANALYSIS

There are many factors, both internal and external, which affect collection development at any library. Internally, the University determines the Library materials budget as well as the instructional programs offered. Externally, the publishing industry determines the cost and availability of materials. Additionally, federal, state, and local governments determine the availability of funds for higher education as well as policies on copyright issues and Internet access.

Economic Outlook

Washburn University is a municipal university (funded through county-wide sales tax) which began receiving state assistance in 1961 on a per-credit hour basis. Beginning in FY 1992 the method of state funding was changed to a single line item operating grant appropriated each year by the Legislature through the Kansas State Board of Regents. Overall, the University's total "Institutional and General Budget" has doubled between FY 1988 and FY 2001.

Washburn's three major sources of revenue have been the State Operating Grant, student tuition, and local property taxes dedicated for operational support. Combined, these represent approximately 90% of the University's educational and general revenue as of FY 1996-97. Between FY 1982-83 and FY 1996-97 the percentage of the University's educational and general revenue derived from city taxes increased from 21% to 27%, from student tuition from 35% to 42%, while state aid has remained static at 19%. In 1983, for every \$1 in state aid that Washburn University received, it generated \$1.59 in student tuition money. In FY 1997 the ratio was \$1 to \$2.21.

Legislation became effective on July 1, 1999 that shifted the previous Topeka property tax levy for the support of Washburn University to a 65 cent county-wide sales tax. This has resulted in a 4% increase in the percentage of the University budget derived from tax revenues coupled with a 4% decrease in the percentage from student tuition.

Publishing Industry

The unit cost of curricular and research materials for academic libraries has been increasing significantly for the last two decades. The Association of Research Libraries (ARL) reports that between 1986 and 2000 the unit cost of monographs has risen 66% while that of serials has increased 226%. With library materials budgets not keeping pace with this rapid inflation, ARL statistics show that the number of serials titles purchased has dropped by 7% while the number of monograph titles purchased has decreased by 17%.

Mabee Library exhibits similar trends. Since 1989, the costs of the Library's serials has increased approximately 125% while the number of serials acquired has decreased almost 40%. Paralleling this is the 50% increase in monograph costs which has translated into no net increase in the number acquired.

The mix of funds available for serials vs. monographs, mirroring national trends, also has shifted over the last 20 years. In FY 1980-81 the mix was 60% (monographs) vs. 40% (serials) while it is currently 42% (monographs) vs. 58% (serials).

Access to scholarly communication is an area of publishing that has changed dramatically. The Internet and the availability of full-text databases, and electronic journals and books is commonplace in today's university library. The Mabee Library has taken the position of providing access rather than ownership of many materials whenever that situation makes sense from financial and service standpoints.

University Program Needs

There are four main divisions at Washburn University: the College of Arts and Sciences; the School of Applied Studies; the School of Business; and the School of Nursing. Each of these offers some combination of Bachelor and Master degrees as well as Associate and Certificate programs. Consequently, they offer a wide and varied curriculum to Washburn students. It is the basic mission and responsibility of the Library to support this curriculum with its collections and services. This is emphasized in the Library's Collection Development Policy.

The Library is not always aware of new course proposals that are going through the University approval process. Consequently, a collection analysis is not always performed. This may result in a new course being taught without adequate supporting library materials. Only the College of Arts and Sciences has a "New Course Review" form that requires an evaluation of library holdings in support of the course.

Legislative Developments

The Kansas Library Network Board, a division of the Kansas State Library, was established in 1981. One of the Board's initiatives was the Interlibrary Loan Development Program (ILDP) that provides collection development grants to libraries on a competitive basis. These grants allow libraries to enhance areas of strength in their collections. Mabee Library has been the recipient of numerous ILDP Grants over the last 20 years. In addition, the Board has cooperated with academic libraries statewide in the purchase of electronic books as well as other electronic resources.

Cooperative Programs

Mabee Library is involved in consortia at the local, state, and national levels. Locally, there is a common online catalog shared by a consortium of five libraries—Mabee Library, Washburn University Law Library, the Kansas State Library, the Kansas State Supreme Court Library, and the Kansas State Historical Society Library. This consortial catalog provides patron access to over 900,000 book volumes and 20,000 periodical titles.

At the state level, through the Kansas State Library Database Sharing Program administered by the Kansas State Library, Mabee Library has free access to 15 electronic databases. Mabee Library is also a member of the Kansas Regents Libraries Database Consortium (RLDC). Through the RLDC the Library is able to purchase a variety of electronic resources at considerable cost savings.

Membership in consortia at all levels allows Mabee Library to provide patron access to more materials at lower costs.

Impact of Environmental Pressures

Given the rising cost of serials, Mabee Library needs either to increase the portion of its materials budget allocated to serials or to cut the number of titles purchased. The Library should examine best practices of similar-sized institutions regarding print and electronic serials management, as well as materials allocations practices.

Space, or the lack thereof, is another environmental factor affecting libraries. Shelving in Mabee Library and the on-campus remote storage facility are very near capacity. In addition, when new formats are added to the collection, the accompanying new equipment often requires its own unique space or environmental conditions. At the same time, the Library must maintain equipment for the older formats that are retained.

Mabee Library will continue to increase the number of electronic resources available to meet the information needs of our users. Most of these resources are acquired through consortial purchases. Further partnership opportunities may need to be investigated in the future.

CONCLUSIONS

The Collection Development and Management Program at Mabee Library is shaped and influenced by the internal and external factors previously discussed. The CAP Study Team believes that, to be effective, this Program must face:

- rapid technological change
- declining or static information resources budgets
- rising costs of information resources
- increasing demand for information and services

In keeping with the Library's Strategic Plan and after its own deliberations, the Study Team submitted an Interim Report to the Dean of the University Libraries in April 2002. In this Report the Study Team recommended the establishment of three Task Forces to perform further investigation and make recommendations for change in order to increase the effectiveness and rationality of the most important areas identified:

- collection management, organization, and staffing
- collection assessment
- funding and materials budget allocation

WORK OF THE TASK FORCES

In order to further investigate the three main functional areas of the Library's Collection Development and Management Program, Task Forces, each with three members, were formed in May 2002. Each Task Force conducted its own literature review, analyzed current procedures, identified the major areas for its evaluation, and developed a set of recommendations for change. Their written reports were referred to the CAP Study Team for incorporation into this Final Report. Summaries of the findings of the individual Task Forces follow.

TASK FORCE ON COLLECTION MANAGEMENT, ORGANIZATION, AND STAFFING

The Task Force found that Mabee Library's Collection Development and Management Program has a distributed reporting structure with all librarians (except the Dean and the Assistant Director for Technical Services) having some selection responsibilities. Selectors are responsible for materials regardless of format with the distribution of subject areas ranging from one to thirteen per selector. The position of Coordinator of Collection Development and Management was created and filled in September 2000. The Coordinator has no direct supervisory responsibilities but does write collection development policies and procedures, facilitates communication among selectors and Technical Services staff, and has selection duties in many subject areas. Faculty library liaisons are appointed by each teaching department and provide input into the selection process. Sometimes this input may be inconsistent with curricular needs.

Analysis of peer institutions revealed no common pattern for the staffing of collection development and management.

The Library uses a New Title Announcement Slip Plan through a major book vendor, receiving approximately 300 slips per month. In addition, about 500 Choice "Reviews on Cards" are received on a monthly basis. These slips and cards are routed among the library selectors and faculty liaisons and pass through a number of steps and approvals before an item can be purchased.

TASK FORCE ON COLLECTION ASSESSMENT

The Task Force conducted an extensive review of the literature and concluded that there was no standard approach or process for collection assessment in academic libraries. They did, however, find that the literature identified common problems in establishing assessment programs and that these problems were also apparent in Mabee Library.

TASK FORCE ON FUNDING AND MATERIALS BUDGET ALLOCATION

Mabee Library currently uses two methods of allocation for the materials budgets: formulaic and historical. The allocation formula that is currently in use is only applied to the “Books and Research Materials”, budget which is only approximately 28% of the total information resources budget. This formula has not been revised since 1986 but is well-accepted by the stakeholders. The historical method is used for the “Periodicals” budget and has never been reviewed so journal-dependent disciplines are disproportionately affected by the rising cost of periodicals.

The Library uses unrestricted endowed funds to purchase general and interdisciplinary materials. Restricted endowed funds are used to purchase items according to the subject parameters set forth by the donors.

Due to their nature, electronic databases do not easily lend themselves to strict subject areas. Because of this, interdisciplinary fund codes have been established for them. The Library’s ability to purchase electronic databases is leveraged through its membership in the Regents Libraries Database Consortium.

The Task Force compared and contrasted the results of the current allocation formula with that of a Percentage Based Allocation method. They applied both approaches to the Library’s “Books and Research Materials” and “Periodicals” budgets.

RECOMMENDATIONS

COMMON TASK FORCE RECOMMENDATIONS

The following threads became apparent in the Reports and Recommendations of more than one Task Force and are listed below for emphasis. They include the investigation of new processes, the shortening of selection time, and the improving of selector's skills:

- Investigation of new processes should include, but not be limited to, the use of a book approval plan (newly published books arrive automatically from a book vendor based on a list of subjects previously determined by the library) as well as the use of a Percentage Based Allocation model.
- The current length of time between the receipt of a notification slip and the eventual purchasing of the item needs to be shortened. Notification slips are computer-generated forms describing newly published books based on a list of subjects previously determined by the library and supplied by a book distributor.
- Selectors' skills need to be improved through increased training as well as continuously offered refresher sessions on policies and procedures.

TASK FORCE ON COLLECTION MANAGEMENT, ORGANIZATION, AND STAFFING

The Task Force made a number of recommendations are made to enhance operational effectiveness and streamline processes of the collection development and management program and to enhance the Library's capabilities in the area of the selection and presentation of electronic resources.

Task Force Recommendation 1. Enhance Operational Effectiveness: The current organizational structure of collection development and management could be categorized as a distributed reporting structure with librarians performing materials selection as well as liaison work between the Libraries and teaching departments. They do this part-time while having primary duties in other functional positions. The only full-time collection development position is that of the Coordinator. The distribution of responsibility for subject areas follows this part-time/full-time division. Part-time selectors have

responsibility for from 1 to 3 subject areas and the full-time selector currently has 13 subjects. On the face of it there is an apparent unequal distribution of subject areas per selector. Further investigation of the number of areas and selectors and possible re-allocation is warranted.

Who: Coordinator of Collection Development

Timetable: 2003

Cost: Staff time

Task Force Recommendation 2. Streamline Selection Process: To reduce the number of slips that are currently received, the current slip plan should be re-profiled. The number of slips that are handled significantly slows the selection process and involves a large investment of human resources. On an annual basis the Libraries receive approximately 28,500 slips. These forms have a face value of over \$1,500,000, which is more than six times the available \$250,000 for monograph purchases, therefore the scope of the plan should be narrowed.

Who: Coordinator of Collection Development

Timetable: 2003-2004

Cost: Staff time

Task Force Recommendation 3. Streamline The Selection And Acquisition Process By Investigating Changing From A Slip Plan To A Book Approval Plan: The current slip plan process generates slips for newly published titles on a weekly basis in subject areas that the library has requested. These slips are currently handled several times by library selectors and Technical Services staff and at least once by faculty liaisons. The approximate time for this entire process (from the date of original publication to delivery of the material) is from 3 to 9 months. The current process is extremely labor intensive and takes considerable time. Switching from a slip plan to a book plan should be investigated.

Who: Coordinator of Collection Development

Timetable: 2003-2004

Cost: Staff time

Task Force Recommendation 4. Identify Peripheral Costs: Conduct a cost/benefit analysis of interlibrary loan/document delivery (ILL/DD). Knowing firm costs for alternatives would benefit selectors in decision-making.

Who: Coordinator of Collection Development, Interlibrary Loan staff, Assistant Director for Technical Services

Timetable: 2003

Cost: \$2,000 for participation in ARL Assessing ILL/DD Performance Measures Study plus staff time

Task Force Recommendation 5. Examine And Improve The Way The Libraries Provide Access To Electronic Resources: The Libraries should (a) enhance the accessibility of electronic resources in a convenient and easy to use manner, (b) consider presenting e-resources through both the Libraries' Web site and through the online catalog, and (c) acquire and fully utilize vendor-supplied services in this presentation (such as Serials Solutions).

Who: Coordinator of Collection Development, Assistant Director of Technical Services, Coordinator of Reference & Instruction

Timetable: 2004

Cost: \$1,500 for purchase of services from Serials Solutions plus staff time

Task Force Recommendation 6. Develop A Policy For The Treatment Of Third-Party Web Sites: The Task Force identified this as an "inefficient use of human resources" and a written policy should be developed.

Who: Coordinator of Collection Development, Assistant Director of Technical Services, Coordinator of Reference & Instruction

Timetable: 2003

Cost: Staff time

Task Force Recommendation 7. Develop a Form for the Selection of E-Resources: Selection of e-resources is currently handled in the same manner as that of print materials. However, these resources present many unique evaluative, legal, and technological problems. The information needed for the selection, evaluation, acquisition, and presentation of these resources is quite different. This form should include evaluative criteria, cost, and other information needed to address any legal and technological implications.

Who: Coordinator of Collection Development

Timetable: 2003

Cost: Staff time

TASK FORCE ON COLLECTION ASSESSMENT

The Task Force made a number of recommendations designed to assist the ongoing assessment of the Libraries' collections in order to continue to support the curricular and research needs of the University community.

Task Force Recommendation 8. Select Library Materials Based On Their Information Content Rather Than The Information Format. This continues the current practice.

Who: Coordinator of Collection Development
Timetable: Already implemented
Cost: Staff time

Task Force Recommendation 9. Collect, Compile, And Distribute Statistical Data: This data (such as circulation statistics, database usage, materials expenditures, etc.) should be disseminated to selectors as they perform collection assessment.

Who: Coordinator of Collection Development, Public Services staff, Technical Services staff
Timetable: 2003-2004
Cost: Staff time

Task Force Recommendation 10. Develop A Process For Collection Assessment In Support of New Courses In The Schools Of Applied Studies, Business, And Nursing.

Who: Coordinator of Collection Development, chairs of Curriculum Committees in Schools of Business and Nursing
Timetable: 2003-2004
Cost: Staff time

Task Force Recommendation 11. Investigate The Feasibility Of Automated Collection Analysis Software.

Who: Coordinator of Collection Development
Timetable: 2004
Cost: Staff time

Task Force Recommendation 12. Investigate Tools To Assist With Collection Assessment: Examples of such tools are interlibrary loan data, approval plan statistical data, and shelf-list sampling.

Who: Coordinator of Collection Development
Timetable: 2004
Cost: Staff time

Task Force Recommendation 13. Implement A Process To Conduct Assessment Of All Subject Collections On A Five Year Rotating Cycle.

Who: Coordinator of Collection Development, selectors
Timetable: 2004
Cost: Staff time

Task Force Recommendation 14. Provide Systematic, Ongoing Training On Collection Development Policies And Procedures And Assessment Techniques To Selectors.

Who: Coordinator of Collection Development, selectors
Timetable: 2004 and ongoing
Cost: Staff time

Task Force Recommendation 15. Update The Collection Development Policy To Reflect The Higher Level Of Library Support Needed For Graduate Programs In Criminal Justice And Social Work.

Who: Coordinator of Collection Development
Timetable: Completed (November, 2002)
Cost: Staff time

TASK FORCE ON FUNDING AND MATERIALS BUDGET ALLOCATION

This Task Force has recommended changes in the current method of collection development and management funding and materials budget allocation.

Task Force Recommendation 16. Expand The Allocation Process: The process should include materials in all formats. The current allocation formula is only applied to monographs. Investigate including periodicals and electronic resources into the process.

Who: Coordinator of Collection Development
Timetable: 2003-2004
Cost: Staff time

Task Force Recommendation 17. Investigate New Budgeting Techniques: Explore new techniques including, but not limited to, Percentage Based Allocation (PBA).

Who: Coordinator of Collection Development
Timetable: 2004
Cost: Staff time

Task Force Recommendation 18. Investigate Streamlining The Current Budget Allocation Process: Review the process with a view toward ensuring that it is simple and flexible enough to adapt to rapid changes in the accessibility of information (ex. electronic resources).

Who: Coordinator of Collection Development
Timetable: 2003
Cost: Staff time

IMPLEMENTATION STRATEGY

The implementation of these recommendations will result in important and far-reaching changes in the Libraries' Collection Development and Management Program. Therefore, the Study Team feels that the progress as well as the problems of the implementation process should be reviewed annually by a CAP Implementation Committee. This Committee should be appointed by, and report in writing to, the Dean for the duration of the implementation period.

The Study Team has also assigned broad priorities to the Recommendations.

Number

Recommendation

First Priority Recommendations

1. Investigate the number of subject areas and selectors
2. Investigate narrowing the scope of subjects in notification slip plan profile
3. Investigate the possibility of switching from a notification slip plan to book plan
6. Develop a policy for the treatment of third-party Web sites
7. Develop a form for the selection of e-resources
8. Continue current policy of non-format specific selection criteria
14. Develop a system of ongoing training for selectors
15. Ensure that the Collection Development Policy is up to date

18. Investigate streamlining current budget allocation process

Second Priority Recommendations

4. Identify peripheral costs for alternatives to purchase (ex. ILL/DD)
5. Examine Web presentation of electronic resources
9. and 12. Compile and disseminate data to selectors in support of assessment activities
10. Develop and implement a process for collection assessment for new courses in the Schools of Business and Nursing
11. Investigate feasibility of automated collection assessment software
13. Develop five-year rotating cycle for assessment of subject areas
16. and 18. Investigate streamlining current budget allocation process and expanding its application to materials in all formats
17. Investigate new budgeting techniques