Minutes
Friday, July 23, 2010
Providence, Rhode Island

Members Attending: Patricia Figueroa (Brown), Cecilia Sercan (Cornell), Daisy Dominguez (CCNY Libraries, CUNY), Pamela Graham (Columbia), Miguel Valladares (Dartmouth University), Sarah Aponte (Dominican Studies Institute), Lynn Shirey (Harvard), Dan Hazen (Harvard), Peter Altekruger (IAI), Ricarda Musser (IAI), Angela Carreno (New York University), Fernando Acosta-Rodriguez (Princeton), Melissa Gasparotto (Rutgers University), Jesus Alonso-Regalado (SUNY, Albany), Marisol Ramos (University of Connecticut), Joseph Holub (Univ. of Pennsylvania), Martha E. Mantilla (University of Pittsburgh), Cesar Rodriguez (Yale University), María Vazquez Estévez (Instituto Cervantes), David C. Murray (Temple University), Peter Stern (University of Massachusetts).

Guests: Ellen Jaramillo (Yale University), Stephanie Miles (Harvard University), Rachel Schneiderman (Pennsylvania State University), Iria Alvarez (Revista de Libros), Manuel Iglesias (Extramuros Edición), Felipe Varela (E-Libros), Dan Hazen (Harvard University), Joanne Edwards (University of Oxford), Barbara Tenenbaum (Library of Congress).

1) Approval of November 2009 minutes

2) Summary of November meeting for those who didn't attend

3) Presentation and proposal from Miguel Valladares

Miguel started his presentation by noting the wide variety of institutional experiences within LANE, including differences in size, geography, public/private status, etc. However there are many similarities, including: similar acquisition models, cooperation/communication, and a sense of transition/crisis/change. In the midst of this, the Harvard Task Force released its report which urged access over acquisition, a major development in how we consider collection development.

Miguel then went on to talk about an expansion of his prior analysis of collections at LANE institutions. His conclusions:

- There are no big institutions (even Harvard can't keep up with acquisitions in an expanding publishing world)
- There are no small institutions (even Dartmouth has a number of titles unique from Borrow Direct, even in a country in which it doesn't specialize)
- There is a substantial contribution of each Borrow Direct library, in terms of unique titles, in an organic manner, w/out direct collaboration
- Nevertheless, there are substantial, alarming, gaps. He bases this observation on an informal survey of books culled from an exhaustive bibliography of books published in Mexico City on a particular topic. He found that approx 20% on that list were not held in any single US library.
Miguel proposed the following: That we begin coordinated collection development pilot project within LANE to address the above conclusions.

4) Open Discussion following Miguel's presentation:

Jesus discussed his ability to acquire unique materials at FIL, approx 20-30% of which titles are not in WorldCat, 60% not even in NY State. If he can do this with such a small budget, we can do even more as a regional group. He also discussed his collaborative collection development project with SUNY Binghamton--between two institutions they have acquired 30% of the entire Barlovento catalog.

Fernando noted that the numbers on holdings and institutional overlaps among collections will only take us so far if we don't know the subjects of the materials. How do we get that information? Can we get it from WorldCat?

Marisol noted that ILL plays a role in any collaborative project, and that we would have to address the fact that some institutions lend more readily than others.

Miguel noted that the hardest part of this proposal is not dividing up the subjects for collection development collaboration, but the work of assessment. He addressed Marisol's concerns by noting that if we as a regional group begin to collaboratively collect DVDs, for example, then our institutions will have to start lending them out.

Lynn noted that there has never been an assessment of LARRP. It is hard because the institutional commitments are sometimes by subject and sometimes by region and there are substantially different resource levels between participating institutions.

Addressing the ILL issues, Peter Altekruger noted that German libraries have a longstanding and well-funded ILL program. However, he noted that it only works when you have a certain budget and division of specialization, because it can't involve the regular daily work. An ILL system has to function *alongside* the needs of the local institution.

Cecilia noted that existing collection strengths may not be appropriate to build on as faculty retire or leave, and no one with that specialization replaces them.

Patricia noted that the core collection continues to be acquired within the collaborative project between Dartmouth and Brown, and also that there is a problem with using WorldCat as the sole source of information.

Dan Hazen noted that a distinction needs to be made between goals of a) developing a comprehensive collection and b) assuring access to those materials. He noted the 4 tiers of collections (which he went on to elaborate further in the SALALM program):
1) The core
2) The record of scholarship in the field. (We would hope that this is already held by US institutions.)
3) Human expression -- music, journals, movies, blogs, etc. -- materials that have been un-sifted
by scholars but will be fodder for future scholarship

4) Raw data

Pamela suggested using serials as a collaborative collection development project regionally. She noted, however, that this would rely on good discovery tools.

Miguel noted that the pilot project he is proposing could also be a project to help expand e-journal access. For example, he has in the past approached Lluis Claret about a particular print journal of interest, and Lluis had it digitized.

It was agreed that LANE will have another meeting about this proposal in a few months to agree on a project, and that the project should include benchmarks.

Minutes taken by Melissa Gasparotto (Rutgers University)