

SUL CMC — Conference Call
October 15, 2004
10:00 AM — 12:00 PM
— revised DRAFT—

Participants:

FAMU: Brenda Wright / FAU: Rita Pellen and Eleanor Lomax /
FIU: Tony Schwartz / FSU: Maryhelen Jones and Carolyn Klatt /
FSU-LAW: Anne Bardolph / NCF: Judy Kelly / UCF: Jeannette Ward
UF: John Ingram / UNF: Vicky Stanton / USF: Monica Metz-Wiseman as Chair of ECC

1. Review and approval of minutes from the September 16th meeting.

Elsevier was not available to join this conference call. Megan Waters was not available to report on the Special Collections Task Force.

2. Draft CMC White Paper On Collections Analysis

Everyone has read it. John saw a presentation at the Electronic Collections Committee of Ulrich's Serials Analysis System <http://www.ulrichsweb.com/ulrichsweb/analysis/>.

For our consortium, it would cost about \$23,000. We would be a beta test site.

(Ulrich's is also developing a collection analysis tool for monographs. OCLC is developing a monographic tool, too—perhaps to be ready by ALA Midwinter, January 2005 <http://www.oclc.org/services/collection/>.)

Ulrich's tool should provide analysis by subject, not just ISSN, and eventually cover publisher cost information (which might be useful in negotiations).

Each university library would provide its serials data to Ulrich's—or possibly a common vendor, such as Ebsco, could do that for us (such data would not come from FCLA).

For now, the tool would not distinguish formats (print, electronic, microform) or a given library's volume/issue holdings.

Factors and issues in deciding whether to go forward with this tool:

- The SUL Technical Services Committee should be brought into discussions.
- The specific uses of the data need articulation.
- The amount of work it would entail for each library, both to prepare records for uploading and for editing the gross data, needs consideration.
- A pilot test may well be a useful step.
- The project's fit with CMC's original charge of statewide coordination of collection development efforts needs articulation.

The immediate next step is for John and Monica to contact other consortia that are using this tool to learn about their experiences with it.

At the next (November 10th) conference call, John and Monica will report on what they learned; CMC will make any needed edits to the draft White Paper, along with a decision on whether to formulate a recommendation to the group of directors.

3. Update on Electronic Collections Committee meeting (earlier this week at UCF)

Day-1 involved vendors: Cambridge University Press (the consortium package looks good); Bowker (Ulrich's serials analysis tool); Gale Group (virtual reference); and SOLINET/OCLC (NetLibrary IV).

Day -2 involved the \$82,000 overage in the ECC budget for which there is unanimous agreement that each institution will cover its share. ECC has a growing wish list of resources (e.g., index to legal periodicals, an INSPEC archive). The ECC will send a recommendation to the library directors that all SULs should capture use statistics of institutionally held electronic resources on an annual basis. For those institutions interested in sharing use statistics, FCLA will host a secure web site. There were reports from institutions on new resources. The Humanities subcommittee will work with Thompson Gale on the MLA bibliography.

ECC has a document on its structure coming to the CMC. As a rule, while there is no definite distinction between the roles of ECC and CMC in assessing electronic-journal packages, the ECC has greater expertise to which CMC usually defers.

John asked for any questions he might submit on behalf of CMC to the Springer Library Advisory Board meeting later this month.

John will develop a list of specific questions for Elsevier and report back by e-mail to CMC on his talk with them.

Next conference call November 10th from 10:00—noon.

Minutes submitted by Tony Schwartz.