

plan to develop the “world’s largest serials database” including their use data, pricing information, and the survey results.

**PII S0364-6408(97)00053-7**

*Carol Pitts Diedrichs  
Head, Acquisition Department  
The Ohio State University Libraries  
1858 Neil Avenue Mall  
Columbus, OH 43210-1286  
Internet: diedrichs.1@osu.edu*

### ***Hyde Park Corner Breakfast***

The Hyde Park Corner Breakfast Discussion was coordinated by Katina Strauch (College of Charleston), Chuck Hamaker (LSU), and Jane Tuten (University of South Carolina–Aiken). The advertised discussion topic was the allocation of library resources. Traditionally, the format for the breakfast discussion has been very informal, with members of the audience setting the tone and direction. This year, the discussion centered on the impact of electronic resources on acquisitions and collection development. Assessment was mentioned briefly. The discussion ended with the topic of invoice line charges for serial titles with zero discount.

From the discussion, it was evident that ordering electronic resources is a very time-consuming process. Who is involved in the selection? Some libraries have an electronic resources committee. Others consider it the responsibility of the subject bibliographers. Systems personnel must be consulted to determine whether or not the electronic resource will work on the hardware available. The publisher’s terms of sale or license must be studied and the number of simultaneous users determined. Negotiation skills are more important than ever because providers are still determining how to price and market electronic formats. It is imperative that librarians work with the providers to define factors to consider in pricing and marketing to libraries. There is an additional layer of complexity if the resource is being purchased by a consortia.

As electronic resources become more prevalent and increase in price, they are important considerations in the overall materials budget. The percentage of the total expenditure devoted to electronic resources was discussed. One librarian reported that 5% of the materials budget in his library is expended on electronic resources. Within 5 years, he estimates that this percentage will increase to 15%. One librarian, having a small materials budget, reported that users want the electronic resources. Consequently, serials are being canceled to subscribe to the electronic resources. A university librarian reported that librarians are closely examining reference titles that are on standing order and canceling those titles to obtain electronic resources. Materials budgets are being redefined in some libraries. Instead of dividing the budget into books and serials, some libraries have divided the budget into recurring and nonrecurring expenditures or firm and continuing orders. This definition helps in the ordering decisions, but does not define material type. Other libraries break the budget down further into a digital recurring budget. It was pointed out that electronic monographs on CD are beginning to flood the market. Where will they fit into the materials budget? Then there was the question of what budget line is paying the electronic license fees, document delivery, and open-ended electronic resources such as First Search. These are funded in many different ways on campuses. Some institutions have a technology budget or a student technology fee budget. Others use their library materials budget. A few librarians reported

that the open-ended electronic resources are paid for from the library materials processing costs budget.

Briefly, quality assessment of acquisitions processes in relation to teaching, learning, and benchmarks was described. New Zealand, University of Nebraska, and University of New Mexico were mentioned as libraries working on benchmarking acquisitions.

The discussion ended with one serial vendor responding to the recent announcement of line charges on serials invoices for zero discount titles. It was pointed out that there has been an overall decrease in publisher discounts to vendors. Vendors can no longer service subscribers for what they make on discounts. Fourteen percent to 19% of the academic library serial collection could be zero discount titles. The audience was reminded that serial vendors were an early example of successful library outsourcing. When examining line charges, one must consider how much it would cost the library to pay a single invoice for each title from the publisher.

**PII S0364-6408(97)00042-2**

*Betty D. Paulk  
Associate University Librarian  
Odum Library  
Valdosta State University  
Valdosta, GA 31698  
Internet: [bpaulk@grits.valdosta.peachnet.edu](mailto:bpaulk@grits.valdosta.peachnet.edu)*

### ***Who's Buying What and Why: A Report***

Chuck Hamaker's presentation at the 1996 Charleston Conference centered around an ongoing project at Louisiana State University (LSU) to redesign access to research material. The driving force behind this project was the increase in the cost of subscriptions and the shrinking serial budgets. The faculty at LSU were asked to list the journals they needed rather than working from a list of all the journals to which the library subscribed. They were told to list their top 45 titles in rank order. Some faculty turned in more than 45 titles and others fewer. The answers received were not what was expected. Titles considered for cancellation in previous years that had been vigorously defended by faculty did not appear on this list. Hamaker reviewed the returned lists and sent out another list to the faculty listing all titles that the library owned that were not on their lists with a warning that these would be canceled. Based on this survey, \$120,000 worth of subscriptions were canceled. This was following a 1992 cancellation project totaling \$350,000. From 1987–1996, the number of subscriptions went from 13,000 to 9,000. The library was able to order 260 new subscriptions with some of the money freed by the cancellations.

Hamaker also looked at the CARL UnCover system to see if the titles the faculty needed were included in the database. Based on a 50% return on the original survey, 80% of the titles needed were in UnCover. Faculty members were given access to UnCover with the ability to order any articles they needed with a per article cap of \$26.50. Articles were funded by the library using money recovered from cancellations. A customized gateway was created for LSU so that faculty could not order any articles from titles that the library already owned. Six thousand faculty and graduate students set up ordering profiles on UnCover. From October 1995 to June 1996, \$40,000 worth of articles was ordered.

Hamaker also discovered something interesting using statistics available from UnCover to compare the journals for which titles were ordered to the journals that the faculty indicated were