Topics addressed at this round table discussion on resource sharing and cooperative acquisitions and collection development include the budget crisis, librarian-faculty collection development cooperation, weeding as a collection development function, and preservation through binding. This volume is composed of abstracts of each round table topic discussion. The budget discussion addressed the kinds of budget shortfalls, statistics for use in requesting funds, CD-ROM budgeting, and a useful procedure for preparing budget allocations (Wanda Dole). The presentation on librarian liaisons with teaching faculty lists useful strategies in encouraging faculty collaboration, and gives recommendations on maintaining positive public relations with faculty (Christine Wondolowski Gerstein). A case study involving librarian and nursing program faculty collaboration at Suffolk Community College (New York) is described (Frances M. Kelly). The discussion on binding included remarks from both university and public librarians on the binding of paperback and old books for preservation (Mary Osborne). The weeding section of the program addressed the following questions: What should be the goals of weeding?; Who should participate in weeding projects?; Why do librarians not weed?; Do you weed the entire library or just selected subject areas?; What criteria are used in making weeding decisions?; and What is the disposition of the weeded books? (Marjorie Shapiro and Florence Scarinci) Each discussion segment is followed by a bibliography. A copy of the registration form and a list of committee members is provided. (MAS)
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COMMITTEE ON RESOURCE SHARING AND COOPERATIVE ACQUISITIONS
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Making the most of what you've got:
Acquisitions and Collection Development Round Table

Wednesday, June 1, 1994
9:00 am - 1:00 pm
SUNY Farmingdale

Moderator: Florence Scarinci (Committee Chair) Nassau Community College

Budget crunch - Wanda Dole, SUNY Stony Brook

Librarian-Faculty collection development: Les liaisons dangereuses -
Christine Gerstein, Hofstra University; Fran Kelly, Suffolk Community College

Weeding as a means of collection development: Predicament or opportunity? - Florence
Scarinci, NCC; Marjorie Shapiro, NY Institute of Technology

Binding/conservation: To bind or not to bind - Mary Osborne, LIU/CW Post

Bibliographic handouts prepared by Valerie Feinman, Adelphi University

Audience participation is encouraged and welcomed. Please bring your questions and your
success (or horror) stories to share.

Registration fee: $10 for staff of member libraries; $15 for nonmembers.
Registration deadline: May 24th.

REGISTRATION FORM

Please register the following for the workshop:

Library: ___________________________ Phone ___________________________

1. ___________________________ Phone ___________________________
2. ___________________________ Phone ___________________________
3. ___________________________ Phone ___________________________

Is your library a member of LILRC? YES ___ NO ___

Registration $10 per person ___________________________

Enclosed is a check for $__________.

Registration $15 per person ___________________________

Return this form with your payment to LILRC/Acquisitions Round Table, Melville Library
Building / Suite E5310, Stony Brook, NY 11794-3399. You may fax the form to 632-6662;
indicate that check is being sent by mail. Directions will be sent with confirmation.
Crisis management in budgeting has become the standard operating procedure in conducting library budget planning.

There are two kinds of budget crunches: dealing with increased costs and defending the allocation of scarce resources.

Sources of statistics to be used in justifying requests for funds include the following:

- Vendor supplied statistics such as reports generated by EBSCO
- Statistical reports printed in professional literature such as those found in *Library Acquisition Practice and Theory* by Alexander or the *Bowker Annual* (useful for monograph prices) or the annual summary printed in *Publishers Weekly* (also useful for monographs)

Budgeting for CD-ROMs was discussed and the difficulty in planning for such expenditures was explained. Pricing of these products is not predictable since so many factors enter into the price such as number of sites, availability on a LAN. There continues to be a
proliferation of these products and librarians must make hard decisions. If an index is available in CD-ROM and book format, does the library need to purchase both formats, different titles in different formats, or one format only? Who negotiates the prices with the vendor?

Budget Preparation

The following procedure has been useful in preparing for budget allocations. Gather statistics on use, price, etc. Deal with what has been given based upon the institution's priorities.
THE BUDGET CRISIS:
A SELECTIVE BIBLIOGRAPHY
compiled by Wanda Dole
LILRC Acquisitions and Collection Development Roundtable
June 1, 1994. SUNY Farmingdale

PERIODICAL PRICES


BOOK PRICES


ELECTRONIC RESOURCES, CD-ROMS


BUDGET PREPARATION AND PRESENTATION


Liaison with teaching faculty is a necessary component in academic library collection development. Subject bibliographers from the library function to build the collection in a logical manner with the cooperation of teaching faculty from appropriate academic departments. As one might expect, participation and involvement from teaching faculty is uneven.

The following strategies have been useful in encouraging faculty collaboration in collection development:

- At the beginning of the academic year, contact faculty by letter to invite participation in the collection development process.
- Ask to attend departmental meetings. Take the opportunity to discuss library support for new academic programs, and to learn of library requirements for departmental accreditation.
- Familiarize the faculty with procedures for requesting new titles for the library collection.
Inform the faculty of the library's budget and the allocation available for their subject area. Explain possible allocation factors such as the number of majors and student enrollment hours, the number of titles published and the average cost of a title in a given subject area, and the circulation level of books in a given subject area. Maintain a positive public relations profile with teaching faculty through the following strategies:

- Notify faculty when a title which they have requested for purchase has been received.
- Express appreciation for faculty donations of library materials with a formal letter of acknowledgment.
- Survey teaching faculty concerning their research interests, and inform them when new titles relevant to their needs have been acquired by the library.
- Provide workshops for faculty discussion of library issues.
- Become involved in campus-wide activities as a vocal advocate for the library.

Commitment to proactive liaison with teaching faculty will result in an enhanced level of faculty participation in the collection development process. Although labor-intensive, investment in a strong liaison relationship with teaching faculty will result in a more balanced and thorough library collection.
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FACULTY/LIBRARIAN LIAISON: A CASE STUDY

presented by

FRANCES M. KELLY
Professor of Library Services
Suffolk Community College

INTRODUCTION

Suffolk Community College (SCC) librarians have liaison responsibilities tied to collection development assignments in specific subject areas. Reader Services Librarians, not the Acquisition Librarian, are responsible for collection development. In practice, liaison means different things. Some librarians are pro-active in initiating and maintaining liaison relationships. They have made presentations at Departmental meetings, visited offices, sent memoranda and assertively attempted to ascertain needs as well as inform "their" faculty of library resources and services. Other librarians are responsive, but do not initiate contacts.

Classroom faculty are, with a few exceptions, not active in the collection development process. Only a few initiate contacts or respond to liaison overtures; most are unaware of the liaison program and, even unaware that preparation of reading lists should involve verifying that the library has the resources cited, or that librarians would assist them in updating their lists to include the
latest research in their field. The most informed faculty request specific materials for specific classes. In the community college environment, this is an appropriate response to liaison overtures.

CASE STUDY:

Part of the evaluation process for the Nursing program involves review of the library's collection. The program is evaluated by the National League For Nursing every five years with a mid-way look at how issues addressed have been corrected. In 1991, in anticipation of an up-coming evaluation, the Director of the Nursing program consulted with the librarian responsible for collection development and liaison in the Health Sciences. At her suggestion, four members of the department spent an afternoon weeding materials from the circulating book collection in the appropriate Library of Congress Call Number areas. The NLN evaluation team member reviewing the collection said there were too many books still on the shelves more than five years old. The Nursing Department was instructed to weed and add new titles, presenting documentation to the evaluation team by May, 1994. During the two years since that directive, the librarian, using Core Collection in Nursing and Allied Health Sciences (Phoenix, AZ: Oryx Press, 1990) and the Brandon and Hill "Selected List of Nursing Books and Journals" (Nursing & Health Care, [annual Spring issue]) and other bibliographies, made a special effort to purchase
as many new books in nursing as were available and relevant to our collection needs. Money was not a problem as Suffolk receives New York State collection development grant funds for health related materials. Each year the librarian brought copies of these core collection bibliographies to the Nursing Department Head and requested the Nursing faculty review the titles and make recommendations. There were no responses to her initiatives.

In April 1994, in anticipation of the NLN interim review scheduled for May, the liaison librarian was contacted by the new Department Head regarding the "imminent need" for a list of all new books purchased in the last three years as well as a list of all withdrawn titles. The library was able to accommodate her request for a list of new titles, but could not give her a list of withdrawn titles. The Campus Head Librarian invited her to review the collection. She did so, but indicated she did not feel competent to weed from areas not in her specialty (maternal and pediatric nursing). A schedule was arranged for nursing faculty to review and weed in their specialties. Nursing faculty did not appear to weed as arranged until after several reminders to the Department Head. The weed was completed in early May with a great deal of input from the Campus Head librarian and the liaison librarian. Nursing faculty were found to be weeding books needed by students in other curriculum--titles not primarily and specifically about nursing, but about related fields like mental retardation, psychotherapy, etc and for which age was not so
relevant. Dialogue ensued regarding exactly what constituted a nursing book, what "old" meant (and here a 10 year rule was agreed upon instead of the NLN 5 year rule). A process for review of deselected items was established, and Technical Services agreed to provide the Nursing Department with a copy of the shelf list card for items withdrawn. The Nursing Department, in some distress that we could not produce the documentation for them, finally accepted the fact that they could use these shelf-list cards to produce their own list of withdrawn items. The Department Head requested that the library set aside a separate "special area" to keep books no longer relevant to the curriculum, but valuable from a historical perspective. The Campus Head Librarian explained that we would be happy to retain any materials in the collection, but we could not have a separate library of weeded materials. An offer to donate the weeded books to the Nursing Department was declined for lack of space.

Other misunderstandings regarding collection development and liaison came out during the course of this interaction. Nursing faculty complained that they are notified every Spring about the grant funds, but that they are too busy then to make recommendations. We have attempted, and, indeed took it for granted that faculty understood, that they can make materials recommendations at any time of the year. The Campus Head Librarian will now send a memorandum to this effect in the Fall and again in the Spring to all faculty. Also, some Nursing faculty complained,
accusing us of refusing to accept their gifts because we would not guarantee they would be added to the library's collection.

Many issues regarding classroom faculty assumptions about the library and its collections surfaced during this experience. Generally, the classroom faculty have no comprehension of what is involved in collection development and collection maintenance. There is some question regarding the NLN evaluating team member's statement regarding age of a nursing collection. Did anyone from either the library or the Nursing Department ask to see the NLN guidelines for library collections? Is this a case of the liaison librarian being passively accommodating to Nursing faculty so that no effective liaison took place, or of Nursing faculty not responding to liaison overtures? The librarian responsible for Health Sciences resources maintains she has very active liaison relationships with faculty in other allied health areas. They keep in close touch with her, they know their collections and their students' requirements and they regularly submit recommendations for purchase. She says only the Nursing Department has not responded to her initiatives. Hopefully, from this experience, and with a new department head, the Nursing faculty will be more involved.

This case study has become the impetus for the Campus Head Librarian to initiate examination of our librarian/faculty liaison program. We can try to involve the faculty more by showing them how their input will provide their students with more resources.
No matter how thorough our subject selection activities, we cannot know what an individual classroom instructor needs or expects unless they communicate with us. Liaison is a two-way street. We can only liaise effectively if we have some interested response to our initiatives.
Mary Osborne spoke about the procedures followed at the C.W. Post Campus of Long Island University. New paperbacks are bound. Acquisitions decides whether or not to rebind old books that are deteriorating. Audience participation was encouraged with the result of a lively exchange of ideas. Some universities will bind an old damaged book if it has artifactual value. Certain public libraries will not bind non-fiction. Other public libraries will bind only those worn titles which are deemed necessary to the collection and are out of print. An article by Mandell and Harris in College & Research Libraries dealing with developing a cost model for rebinding was cited. It was suggested that the paper dust jackets be saved and that they be put on after rebinding.
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Binding/Conservation: To bind or not to bind

Mary Osborne, LIU/CW Post Campus Library

Bibliography:


Are library binders cutting corners?

Edwards, Frank. "It's a bind--but essential to good stock management." Library Association Record Trade Supplement vol.95, no.7 (July 1993), p.4-5.

Written from a British librarian's point of view, this article discusses the merits of rebinding.


Excellent article.


Discusses automated binding preparation software offered by many library binders.


Discusses automated binding preparation software offered by many library binders.


The first part of this overview contains concise information about the library binding industry and its history. The second part is a detailed article on the library binding process.


In-depth article with a mathematical premise for buying paperbacks versus hardbacks.
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WEEDING AS AN ASPECT OF COLLECTION DEVELOPMENT
presented by

MARJORIE SHAPIRO
Head of Technical Services
New York Institute of Technology

and

FLORENCE SCARINCI
Head of Acquisitions
Nassau Community College

This section of the program was conducted as a roundtable discussion with the panelists asking questions and encouraging audience participation.
The following questions were addressed. Audience responses are included.

What should be the goals of weeding?
- Freeing up space
- Updating
- Noting gaps
- Removing shabby copies
- Preparing for accreditation

Who should participate in weeding projects?
- Librarians (there should be a weeding manager)
- Non-librarians and faculty may participate but the librarian should have the final decision
Why do libraries not weed?

Keep the collection size up

Keep the circulation figures high (the literature does not bear this reason out)

Do you weed the entire library or only selected subject areas?

Most academic libraries did selective weeding such as removing books that supported deactivated curricula. Reference departments weed on an ongoing basis, for instance, replacing old editions with new ones.

What criteria are used in making weeding decisions?

Date

Use (academic libraries have to measure inhouse use)

Indexing

Results of conspectus project

Collection management policy

What is the disposition of the weeded books?

Sell or send to a central location or to another institution

Discard to patrons on a list

Store
WEEDING
A SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY
Prepared by
Marjorie Shapiro, Wisser Memorial Library,
New York Institute of Technology
and Florence Scarinci, Nassau Community College Library
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