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of the programs, generating political will to support the program, increasing local content, and understanding the long-term impact of the programs.

**Session** — Thursday, November 9, 2006
— *Canceling Print Journals for Electronic Only: Developing Guidelines for Decision Making* — Presented by Kristen DeVoe (Electronic Resources Librarian, College of Charleston)

Report by Hillary Corbett (Assistant Head, Print Management, Northeastern University Libraries; Phone: 617-373-2352) <h.corbett@neu.edu>

Advances in the technology and delivery of electronic journals, as well as ever-rising costs, have made it very attractive and viable to cancel print journals in favor of electronic versions. DeVoe surveyed about 200 medium-sized libraries in Fall 2005 and again in Fall 2006 to ask about cancelling print journals for electronic-only, and how that decision process is managed. She found that, overwhelmingly, libraries are cancelling print for e-only — 87.6% in 2005 and 84.3% in 2006 replied that they have cancelled print titles when e-only versions were available. However, many libraries responded that their guidelines for making cancellation decisions are informal or under development, and that there is little time to work on further formalization of guidelines. Only 21% of respondents in 2005 and 18.5% in 2006 said they had guidelines in place. DeVoe argued that guidelines provide consistency in decision-making and allow libraries to defend their decisions to patrons, so libraries should make time to formalize their decision-making process. She listed some important points to cover in a set of cancellation guidelines: a statement of intent, archival concerns, content, accessibility issues, licensing restrictions, stability of provider, accreditation, user preference, cost, space consideration, and associated staffing concerns. These guidelines can be included in a library’s collection development policy, or exist as a separate document.

**Session** — Thursday, November 9, 2006
— *Can Cooperative Collection Development Work for Monographs? The Colorado Alliance of Research Libraries Shared Purchase Plan* — Presented by Michael Levine-Clark (Collections Librarian, University of Denver), Paul Moeller (Original Serials Cataloger, University of Colorado), Yem Fong (Faculty Director, Collection Development, University of Colorado-Boulder)

Report by Leslie Button (Associate Director for Collection Services, University of Massachusetts/Amherst) <leslie.button@gmail.com>

Last year this group did a presentation on their “not bought” purchase plan. In this session, they reported on an approval plan that is shared by 11 of the 25 Colorado Alliance members. They implemented a shared approval plan to reduce duplication in a way that is logical, respects the integrity of institutional collections, and does not force libraries to purchase materials they would not ordinarily buy. As a preliminary step, they examined overlap in LC classification ranges. They decided to work with two vendors (Blackwell Books and Yankee Book Peddler) to compare service and coverage, focusing on four subject areas: economics, mathematics, political science, and religion. They are putting in $200,000 to support this project. Early in the process they discovered they needed to move all books (undergraduate and graduate) with one vendor. Lessons learned from the plan set-up: it takes more than three months to set up local procedures and staff needs to understand the value of the pilot. If the pilot is successful, they need to find ways to continue shared purchasing by staying with a single vendor for greater economies of scale. The pilot has only been active for a couple of weeks.

The session raised many questions. How do you measure use of collection? It is just circulation data? Doesn’t that inherently under measure usage? Yes, but it is underestimated across the board so it’s probably ok. It’s possible there are some call number ranges that have more browsing. It was a decision of the group to achieve consistency across the group. When students request books directly is that considered ILL? No, they count Prospector requests as a separate category but not as a measurable way except through checkouts. It would help measure whether undergraduates want specific books or not. Why aren’t more Alliance institutions involved in this project? University of Colorado Springs just joined, but initially they did not think the areas were relevant to them. In other cases it is because the bibliographers are not comfortable with the idea.

**Session** — Thursday, November 9, 2006
— *LibQUAL+ in South Africa: A View from the South* — Presented by Digby Sales (Manager of Collection Development & Acquisitions, University of Cape Town Libraries)

Report by Ramune Kubilius (Northwestern University, Galter Health Sciences Library) <r.kubilius@northwestern.edu>

This sparsely attended but interesting session drew those interested continued on page 64