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2000/01 represents the second year of the implementation of *The Bridge to the Future: The Rutgers Digital Initiative, the Libraries Five-Year Plan* (2000-2004). Tremendous strides have already been made in implementing this plan, particularly during 2000/01.

The *Plan* envisions an environment wherein traditional library collections grow and are preserved at the same time as we expand digital resources aggressively and intelligently. Both aspects of the plan for collections were advanced last year.

**I. BUDGET:**

**The Plan and Progress:**
In addition to describing the vision of the digital initiative in *The Bridge to the Future*, a budget plan for state funds was developed to help make that vision a reality. The components of the collections portion of the budget plan are:
- annual increases for inflation on existing subscriptions
- annual increases for the additional costs of converting current print subscriptions to include electronic access
- annual increases for new electronic resources
- annual increases for adding new books
- annual increases specifically to support academic areas targeted by the university strategic plan

The five-year budget plan for collections and the progress that has been made in the first two years of the plan follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fiscal Yr.</th>
<th>Actual</th>
<th>Plan</th>
<th>Difference plan &amp; actual</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Base</td>
<td>On-time</td>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>$6,065,703</td>
<td>$428,057</td>
<td>$6,493,760</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>$6,140,703</td>
<td>$1,106,791</td>
<td>$7,247,494</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>$7,598,979</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$7,598,979</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>$8,469,393</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$8,469,393</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>$9,452,268</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$9,452,268</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In terms of actual dollars available, we were ahead of the scheduled increases in 2000/01. In terms of the base or permanent increases that were recommended, we have fallen behind. The reason for the recommendation for base increases is due to the planned expansion of electronic resources, which in most cases are purchased as annual subscriptions (annual access and content fees), and therefore, become part of the fixed-costs for library materials. Even with that budgetary conundrum, we are making substantial progress in developing collections.

**Analysis of 2000/01 Collections Expenditures:**

In 2000/01, the Libraries spent more on collections than ever before, with total expenditures of
$8,316,900. This represents a 12% increase over the previous year’s expenditures. State fund expenditures amounted to $7,214,526 or 10.2% more than the previous year and non-state funds (gifts and endowments) were $1,103,374 or a 25.1% increase over 2000/01.

Campus and Systemwide expenditures:
In terms of percentages of total expenditures, the following was the case:

- $3,118,909 or 37% was spend on systemwide resources. (This represent a 137% increase over the previous year’s systemwide expenditures. This huge increase is due to the $2,615,181 or 31% of the total budget that was spent on networked electronic resources. The rest supported institutional memberships in library organizations [$120,635], Interlibrary Loan [$101,682], document delivery [$35,256], and other systemwide resources, such as reserve collections, and “big ticket” items.)
- 49% was spent on New Brunswick acquisitions.
- 9% on Newark resources.

The dramatic increase in systemwide expenditures and the diminishing of campus budgets reflect the expansion of electronic resources that are networked to all campuses as well as to the Rutgers community wherever they are located. This expansion of these resources levels the playing field among the three campuses, giving equal access to Rutgers students and researchers regardless of their location.

Fixed, Non-fixed, and Binding Expenditures:
In terms of fixed or ongoing costs, one-time or non-fixed costs, and binding costs for books and serials, the total Libraries expenditures were:

- $5,909,004 or 71.0% for fixed costs
- $2,213,859 or 26.6% for non-fixed costs
- $194,037 or 2.3% for binding

Nearly 80% of Newark and systemwide expenditures were for fixed costs. Expenditures for non-fixed or one-time costs declined by 15% compared to 1999/00. Expenditures for binding of serials will diminish in the future as more serials are available either in electronic format only or as duplicate print subscriptions are reduced to one archival copy. This will free up money for other preservation activities. In terms of the percentage of the total expenditures for binding, expenditures for binding went down from 2.6% 1999/00 to 2.3% in 2000/01. However, actual expenditures went up from $177,896 to $194,037.

Available Funds vs. Spend Funds:
Over $9 million were available for collections purchases. $8,316,900 were spent or 92.3% of total available funds. In non-state funds the discrepancy was greatest: $1,715,172 were available and $1,103,374 were expended or 64.3% of available funds. As for state funds, $ 7,298,115 was available and $7,213,526 was spent or 98.8% of available funds. Unexpended funds for non-state monies, by and large, carry over into the next fiscal year. State funds for collections do not carry-over and the $84,589 unspent funds were spent on other 2000/01 library needs.

The reasons for this situation are many. First, for some time the entire allocation and spending
processes have gotten started and been completed late in the fiscal year. In 2000/01, the university informed the Libraries about the state allocations for collections in late September, which is earlier than in the past. (State university libraries normally get their allocations by August; private university libraries are usually informed before the new fiscal year begins.) The allocation process within the libraries last year was more complex than usual due to the Elsevier ScienceDirect package, which required the transfer of campus funds for Elsevier print subscriptions to the systemwide budget. Following this determination, the allocation process within each campus to the fund code level (there are 770 fund codes reflecting subject, material type, and location) took several months to complete. A new plan for an accelerated allocation process within the Libraries was development by the Associate University Librarian for Collections Development and the Libraries Budget Officer for implementation in 2001/02.

Furthermore, there was an extremely high encumbrance for outstanding orders ($660,959 total, $449,429 in state funds and $325,068 in non-state funds) at the end of the year. Because of the large encumbrance, it was thought that many more orders would come in during the year than actually did. Some of the encumbrance appears to have been based on inaccurate information in the Unicorn financial system, such as subscriptions that had been cancelled with the vendor but not in Unicorn, orders that were miscoded, and old orders that could not be filled but were still in the system.

In early June, it became clear that many of the orders represented by the encumbrance would not be received by the close of the fiscal year or ever. “Big ticket” items that could be supplied quickly were purchased with systemwide funds, including several networked electronic resources that were one-time purchases. As a result, all state funds in the campus budgets were underspent, overall by 7.7%, and the systemwide budget was overspent, by 10.3%.

In 2001/02 as result of beginning the allocation process early in the fiscal year and weeding out incorrect and misleading encumbrances, we hope to see a more regular flow of orders and more diligent monitoring of funds throughout the year.

**New Initiatives:**

There were several new initiatives in the collection development during the year, which the new funding made possible.

**ScienceDirect:**

The biggest e-resource initiative was the acquisition of ScienceDirect, a database with full-text of Elsevier Science journals. Through a consortial purchase with the North East Research Libraries (NERL), Rutgers was able to convert all of its current Elsevier print subscriptions online, and gain access electronically to all titles to which other members of the consortium (including Harvard, Cornell, Yale, and Columbia) subscribed. Elsevier titles available to Rutgers went from just over 413 titles in print to 1,100 titles online. Because of a 10% discount offered by Elsevier to institutions that take the online-only option (i.e., cancel all print subscriptions), we decided to cancel all our current Elsevier print subscriptions for a savings of approximately $90,000 for the total package. The average cost/title went from $2,425 in print to $906 for online. The monies previously in campus budgets for individual subscriptions were transferred
to the systemwide budget to make the purchase possible.

Another major new initiative undertaken was to explore area of electronic books and acquire a collection of e-books from netLibrary. A task force completed the investigation and a recommendation was made to acquire the Computer Science collection. While the purchase was made in 2000/01, because of many complex implementation issues, it will not be available to the public until early in fall 2001.

Networked Electronic Resources:
Overall $2,615,181 were spent on networked electronic resources. $2,398,342 was spent on ongoing costs and $216,339 on one-time costs. One of the main reasons for the huge increase in recurring costs in the systemwide budget was the conversion from print to electronic of journals published by Elsevier Science in the Science Direct package noted above, which cost $996,959. This transfer did not increase the Libraries overall recurring costs for Elsevier journals. In fact, it decreased them because of the 10% discount for the online-only option. Rutgers is one of the few libraries that has switched totally to the online-only option for the Science Direct package. Users of these journals adapted quickly to having online access only. Others libraries maintain the print and pay an additional cost for online access. What is counted for their electronic costs is only an online access fee which is a small percentage of the print costs.

In addition to Science Direct many other new electronic resources were acquired. The following were purchased in 2000/01:

AccuNet/AP Multimedia Archive
ACM (Association for Computing Machinery) Digital Library
African Studies
AMICO Art Library
ATLA Religion Database
Biography and Genealogy Master Index
BioOne
Biosis Previews
Books-in-Print Plus
Columbia Granger's World of Poetry Online
Computer Abstracts
Country Watch
CQ Researcher
Dun & Bradstreet's Million Dollar Database
Ethnic NewsWatch Historical Files
FIS Online
Gay and Lesbian Abstracts
Granger's Poetry Online
Grove Dictionary of Art
International Pharmacy Abstracts
International Women's Periodicals
JSTOR Ecology & Botany Collection
JSTOR General Science Collection
Journal Citation Reports
MultexNET Academic Research-on-Demand
Usage Data for Electronic Resources:
Total number of database searching was rather consistent in 1996/97, 1997/98, and 1998/99, averaging 1,747,124 searches/year. In 1999/2000 and 2000/01, the annual usage jumped to over 2,000,000. Total searches for 2000/01 were 2,438,411 or a 13% increase over the previous year. Cost/use or more accurately cost/search data for databases and indexes have been compiled consistently since 1998/99. They reflect the total number of “searches” divided by the total cost of the database subscriptions. We have reported the cost/search as:

- 1998/99 - $.36
- 1999/00 - $.39
- 2000/01 - $.89

We first reported the total cost for e-resources (including one-time costs) and database usage separately since 1996/97, but did not make the calculation on cost/search (based on subscriptions costs only) until two years later. A retrospective recalculation (with full annual costs including one-time) reveals the following:

- 1996/97 - $.22
- 1997/98 - $.35
- 1998/99 - $.48
- 1999/00 - $.42
- 2000/01 - $1.25

These figures are problematic for several reasons. Vendors do not have a standard for reporting usage. What vendors count varies greatly: “session logons,” “total successful searches,” “number of searches,” “documents reviewed,” “times databases searched,” “number of queries,” and “no user data available.” The unit of measurement is inconsistent and reporting by vendors is sporadic, delayed, and non-existent. The historical trend, however, is clear. Cost per/search is going up. There are several explanations for the especially large cost/search increase in 2000/01.

- The total expenditures for electronic resources included several products that were only available for part of the year or, in some cases, payment was made in 2000/01 and the resource was not available until a few months after the beginning of the new fiscal year.
There were some large one-time payments.

Many new resources were introduced and users were not fully aware of them and did not make use of them.

In addition to not being available until October, Science Direct is a very expensive product ($996,959 last year). Its usage (35,010 searches) was high for a new product introduced in the second quarter of the fiscal year, but the expense of the Science Direct will never make it a cheap cost/use database. It does contain many of the premier science, technology, and economics journals, which were even more expensive in print. The cost/use in electronic format, one assumes, is much less than in the print format and therefore the cost benefit is greater.

Document Delivery Project:
No library can subscribe to all the journals its users may need. In the past, these additional needs were met by getting copies of needed articles via Interlibrary Loan (ILL). This can be a slow process. The Libraries initiated a new document delivery service project to supplement traditional ILL. Though this service, provided by Uncover, articles can be either delivered electronically or by fax directly to the user. The new service for faculty and graduate students was completely subsidized by systemwide collections funds. The first year of the project can not be deemed a tremendous success. Initially a $150,000 was allocated to this project, based on the experiences of other academic libraries providing subsidized document delivery. However, beyond the fee for the gateway into the system ($30,000) only about $5,000 was spend on 259 delivered articles.

There were several problems with the service including: the source libraries’ collections not robust enough to satisfy many users’ needs beyond what the Libraries were subscribing to; managerial and software glitches; and insufficient knowledge by our users of the document delivery project. Furthermore, other libraries have informed us that the first year of such a service usually starts up slowly and builds in the second year. Several vendor issues are being address in 2001/02 and a greater public education effort to make the service better known will be undertaken.

ILL Current Imprint Project:
One of the issues facing Interlibrary Loan Services is the requesting of books that are very recent, i.e., have current imprint dates. These books are usually checked out at the libraries to which our requests are sent. Either the books are unavailable in these libraries or take a long time to be delivered to our users. It was determined that all ILL requests for current imprints that are readily available English language books should be treated as high priority purchase requests from users. A process was established with funding for these requests from collections systemwide funds that enable the requested books to be ordered, received, cataloged, and available to the requester within a week or two. 252 books were acquired through this process at a total cost of $10,560.89. The most high use areas were language and literature (P-PS -35 titles) and Science and Technology (Q-QA, R-RT, and T-TS - 74 titles). 143 books were ordered in other disciplines. All of the books are considered good additions to the collections. The project is considered to be a success.

Overall ILL costs, which are covered in the collections budget, were $101,682. Among ARL
libraries this is very high. A primary reason for this is we borrow more than we lend. It is three times more expensive to borrow a book than to lend a book. In 2000/02, we borrowed 18,407 items and we lent 14,493. This situation reflects an underlining weakness in many of our collection areas. It is impossible to make up for these collection deficits in the near future or ever, in most cases. ILL will remain a significant component of our collection strategies and expenses. We will be looking into forming a regional consortium for ILL in 2000/02 to see if our ILL costs can be reduced.

Big Ticket Purchases:
Because of the large amount of unspent funds near the end of the fiscal year, several one-time purchases for microform collections were acquired. Some of the purchases were to fill in gaps in ongoing sets and some were new titles. Microform sets purchased were:

*Archives of the Settlement Movement (64 reels)*
*CIS Index to U.S. Executive Branch Documents, 1789-1909*
*Eighteenth Century Microfilm (units 232-235, 242-243 & 245-250) (420 reels)*
*Film Daily and Yearbooks and Major Film periodicals (Major Film Series) (125 reels)*
*Landmark Briefs and Arguments of the Supreme Court, 1999 (without Opinions vol.)*
*Latin American Anarchist and Labour Periodicals (180 reels)*
*Lillian Wald Papers (112 reels)*
*New Jersey Law Journal (nos. 1-108)*
*Property & Privilege in Medieval and Early Modern England and Wales (70 reels)*

With the anticipated purchase in 2001/02 of new digital microform reader-printers, all microform sets will be easier to use.

The unexpended funds were also used for one-time purchases of networked electronic resources that were enumerated above.

**Other Areas of Collection Growth:**

Physical volumes (books and bound journals):
Volumes added to the collections amounted to 71,683, below the average over the last 7 years, but almost exactly the same as last year. Books received (12,740) on the approval plan cost $526,533, the most we have ever spent on the plan, for an average cost of $41. This expenditure represents a 25% increase over the previous year.

One facet of the five-year plan envisions a higher level of acquisition of books to lend better support to current programs and to new areas targeted for excellence. During the first two years of the plan, this component has not been sufficiently addressed by current collection development activities. There are many areas of study in which books continue to be the primary form of scholarly communication.
It should be noted that in addition to the traditional counting of physical volumes which in some fields remain the primary means of scholarly communication, there are many monographs available in electronic packages that are not included in this counted, such as 96,000 books published between 1475-1700 in Early English Books Online. (History professor Rudolph taught in the Fall 2000 semester an innovative undergraduate honors seminary in which Early English Books Online were used exclusively for source materials. He also spoke to the Metro Research Libraries [Columbia, New York Public Library, New York University, and Princeton] Selectors Annual Meeting held at Rutgers in May 2001 about how to develop an innovative curriculum using electronic resources through collaboration between teaching and library faculty.)

Current serial subscriptions:
The subscriptions to print serials in 2000/01 amounted to 20,900. 625 print titles were cancelled, the primary reason being that all Elsevier titles covered in Science Direct (507) were cancelled. In addition to the print subscriptions, there were 6,121 catalog records for titles of electronic journals. But these two figures combined, 27,021, do not include many other electronic serials in packages for which there are no specific catalog records. Access to these serials is through searches in the entire database. These packages include Academic Universe (approximately 5,000 publications in full-text); Dow Jones (with texts of many of the world’s leading newspapers and the full text of 6,000 leading business newspapers); ABI/Inform (approximately 600 periodicals in business, economics, and health care); and CIAO: Columbia International Affairs Online (working papers from university research institutes, occasional papers series from NGOs, foundation-funded research projects, and proceedings from conferences).

Our extensive microform collections continued to grow, with 50,361 units added last year.
Our map collections increase by 1,418 items.
Our Audio Visual collections increased 4,241 items.

Preservation:
There was a major development in preservation last year. The Preservation Planning Task Force completed it report, Reinvestment In Knowledge: Preservation of Library Materials in the Rutgers University Libraries (May 2001):
It outlines the general issues in preservation in all formats (electronic is the least stable of them all) in libraries in general as well as those specific to Rutgers. It develops a plan for a systemwide and systematic approach to solving these issues.

Ongoing preservation activities were significant as well:
3,117 books were bound (both new paperbacks and damaged books)
19,778 periodicals were bound
3,322 volumes (books and pamphlets) received conservation treatment, 90% was performed in-house
4,170 photographs received preservation treatment
981 custom-built enclosures were made, again 90% performed in-house
Preservation efforts other than binding were primarily funded by grants and gift money.

**GRAPHS**

2000/01 Expenditures
- 2000/01 Total Collections Expenditures by State And Non-state Funds
- 2000/01 Total Collections Expenditures by Campus, Systemwide, and Electronic Resources
- 2000/01 Total Collections Funds Available and Spent
- 2000/01 State Collections Funds Available and Spent
- 2000/01 Non-state Collections Funds Available and Spent
- 2000/01 Collections Expenditures by Fixed Serials, Non-fixed, and Binding

Historical Trends 1994/95-2000/01
- Total Collections Expenditures 1994/95 - 2000/01
- Percentage of Change in Total Collections Expenditures from Previous Year 1994/95 - 2000/01
- Collections Expenditures by State (Base and Temporary Budgets) and Non-state Funds 1994/95 - 2000/01
- State and Non-state Collections Expenditures 1994/95 - 2000/01
- Collection Expenditures by Systemwide Funds and Total Funds for Campuses 1994/95 - 2000/01
- Collections Expenditures by Systemwide Funds and Campus Funds 1994/95 - 2000/01
- Collections Expenditures by Campus 1994/95 - 2000/01
- Networked Electronic Resources Expenditures and Total Collections Expenditures 1994/95 - 2000/01
- Networked Electronic Resources Expenditures 1994/95 - 2000/01
- Networked Electronic Resources Expenditures as Percentage of Total Collections Expenditures 1994/95 - 2000/01
- Database Usage 1996/97 - 2000/01
- Cost/Use of Databases 1996/97 - 2000/01
- Volumes Added 1994/95 - 2000/01
- Current Print Subscriptions 1994/95 - 2000/01