COLLECTION DEVELOPMENT NEEDS – GROUP 1 – individual comments

Pre 1   Landscape statement
1.1.0   Identification, package info
        Record things re: why things become a priority (which group recommended, etc.)
        Who's doing what, what stage are evaluation and negotiation in?
        What is the status of each product?
        Need business terms, price caps,
        How many copies in each campus?
        Need to identify "pipleline" information not captured by 1.1.8
        Impact factors
        Usage data
        Coinvestment terms – shares for campus/CDL, proportions by year
        Be clear re: single titles vs. package, simultaneous users, ports, etc.
        Need a URL to link out to Documentation
        Contact information needed for Resource Liaison, Bibliographer Groups,
        Copyright clearance costs
        When necessary, specify serials/monos.
        Need separate fields – vendor vs. publisher, vs. platorm
        Clarify who provides access vs. what we have

1.1.2   Holdings vs active subscriptions (print/online), up to date information on "active" subs
1.1.3   Resource is a duplicate of what print equivalent
        Need to know overlap and gaps.
1.1.4   Campuses with access (Tier 2) 1.1.4 Designate "last copy"
        Include list price , use (see 2.6), data matched in titles, ISI impacts
1.1.5   Emphasis on ERMS should be on info/facts
        Complete report functionality
        Project costs/campuses over life of contract
1.1.6   Package not just title
1.1.7   Include pending titles
1.1.8   Need to track a title which changes pubs for different dates (track package changes)
        Need repeatable fields
        Link packages to titles
        Shared print that relates to digital contract, capture relationships between print and digital
        Have fields for campuses to record decisions for "core" "not core" in the decision-
        making as well as later capturing the final decision
        Ability to export information for local planning reports, generate by campus
1.1.9-10 Full life cycle including negotiation, licensing and renewal negotiations
1.1.11   Platform features for evaluation of similar products
1.2   Limit to serials unless otherwise noted
1.2.3   What does it mean?
1.3   Add everything in 1.1 plus a tickler
1.4   Add everything in 1.1, 1.1.2, 1.2, 1.1.6 plus tickler
2.2.4   Caculate DDP

2.6   ability to show reports, sort by use, impact factor

COLLDEV GROUP 3 – Individual comments

Ability to export information, not just import

Evaluation of platform features

1.1 Tier 1 and Tier 2 Which provide access vs. which do we have/use?
1.1.4   Not sure what this means
1.1.5   Different scenarios for each resource? How would this work?
          Comparing similar products as a vendor license options. With less of historic print other
          cost tracking is needed
1.1.6   Campus department holdings?
1.1.9   Evaluation for retention as well as for purchase

1.2 Shared print = shared print collection
1.2.1   Last copy designated
      Terms of behavior/circ/preservation

      Don't call ERM (include print)

1.2.2   Voting? Migrating? – presumptuous, contradicts voluntary "voting via system", voting
          without collaboration in selector groups
1.2.5   Too general, what does this mean in the real world?
1.2.6   Delete "moving" replace with processing resources to shared print, etc.
          Identify, manage, track, workflow in the shared print collection
          Workflow for processing resources for the Shared Print Collection ('moving" assumes
          RLF as location)
1.3   Titles, price, tier, partner libraries, lead campus for licensing, fund codes or "subject"
1.3   Tier 3 add everything in 1.1 plus tickler, subjects
1.4   Last copy designation important

2.2.3   Advance notice for drop-out options, Time sensitive notices and automated actions
2.2.4   important for collections
2.2.4.1 add cost/share models
2.3   add archival/perpetual rights, license information
2.3.2   Price projections
2.6   Input cost projection
2.7   Alternative access options
          Government documents

(No sections indicated)
COLLECTION DEVELOPMENT (group)
Selection/decision making

Who has what? How many copies, price, impact factor, list price, status of print sub.)
Where is it indexed?
Web-based for ease of use, no password /authorization
Linked to WebOpac and other web pages
Record of who selected/ ownership
Collaborative selection missing, able to see what other people have with status/ decision notes
Re-evaluation process – competitors, other vendors
       Duplication across databases (SFX, Gold Rush)
       Tickler feature
Usage statistics, COUNTER compliant, track over time
Impact factor, list price, discipline (Ulrich's), last copy
Info from existing aggregators – pull into a system
In process decision-making, look at what other campuses think, if not in the bibliographer group
Trace payment history
Background information on each product on decision-making, need to be able to track backward
       Through decisionmaking/mounting
Concurrent steps triggered by CD decisions – trials, comparisons, holdings, other logistics

Outreach and development (regarding Collection Development)
-need to add some activities on front end of decision making and incorporate some activities here
that facilitiate our UC push toward new scholarly information environment
➢ allow faculty and others to suggest titles and/or products
➢ To generate knowledge of trials, evaluations, process-of decisionmaking
➢ Education about what we're doing and why (i.e. how we perceive our activities/ideas to be
   improving comm. Environment – build alliances, inclusive, information open
Initial emphasis for ERMS should be on information/facts like holdings, price, titles, not larger
methods of communications or options.
Ability to show decisions by campus.
Ownership needs to be indicated in a shared collection scenario.
Sections 1.1, 1.1.2, 1.1.3 need to be expanded per Patty's remarks
Would like one tracking mechanism to see campus and system.
Do a better job of keeping each other aware of local negotiation and licensing , local might lead to
systems , local to local might help each other. Minimize duplicate efforts for some of this process

The ability to record different types and level of information for different resource typtes: info at
the title level for publisher packages should include list price, indexed by, access points, LDC
subject, local subject etc. very different info would be needed for an A&I database (titles covered,
electronic or print access at campus level, coverage dates for titles, or a text resource (exporting
capabilities, search options)
Universal update function.