

UNIVERSITY OF TENNESSEE LIBRARIES
COLLECTION DEVELOPMENT & MANAGEMENT ANNUAL REPORT
JULY 2003 – JUNE 2004

The CDM Team

Gayle Baker, *Electronic Services Coordinator*
Jami Baker, *Administrative Support Asst. II*
Renee Berube, *Library Associate III*
Sara Foster, *Library Specialist*
Teresa Gillispie, *Library Specialist*
Ron Gilmour, *Science & Technology Coordinator*
Dale Gray, *Senior Library Associate II*
Delight Jobe, *Senior Library Associate I*
Linda Phillips, *Team Leader*
Jayne Rogers, *Senior Library Associate III*
Jane Row, *Social Sciences Coordinator*
Molly Royse, *Humanities Coordinator*
Mary Ellen Starmer, *Preservation Coordinator*
Sara Williams, *Collection Management Coordinator*
Elizabeth Young, *Senior Library Associate I*

CDM team members demonstrated leadership and productivity in many ways during 2003-2004. Mary Ellen Starmer's title was changed to Preservation Coordinator. Molly Royse served as President of the Library Staff Association and Gayle Baker was co-chair of the Library Faculty. Jane Row chaired the campus Pay-for-Print Task Force public relations subgroup. Sara Williams was tenured. Linda Phillips co-published a book with her Information Alliance counterparts. Jami Baker won the Library Spirit Award for Customer Service, and Ron Gilmour was recognized by LITA for his national workshops on XML basics. Jayne Rogers was admitted to the CEP program. Maud Mundava spent her third Minority Residency rotation with CDM. Elizabeth Young updated the library's *Disaster Response Manual*, and Renee Berube revamped and added considerable information to the Preservation web pages. Renee, Resa Gillispie and Sara Foster completed the transition from the manual Rolodex tracking system for serials to binding software. Dale Gray and Delight Jobe added Aleph purchase order numbers to the Journals Database, providing essential links between the two systems.

The CDM team focused on creating maximum access to information materials for the UT community through acquisition of content and linking resources. We purchased 14 new databases and added to the databases menu many freely accessible web resources with valuable content or harvesting capabilities. Subject coordinators and the CDM Team Leader created two brochures for the UT community about scholarly communications and distributed them to faculty and

graduate students throughout the year. The Libraries' institutional repository, The UT Scholars Archive, made its debut.

CDM and subject librarians made significant progress in collection maintenance. Retention review of Storage materials resulted in the identification of volumes to be withdrawn, and volumes to be transferred from Hodges and Music to Storage. Installation of compact shelving in Hoskins will accommodate over 100,000 volumes. Thanks to the superb leadership of Abbas Arab, Access & Delivery student workers completed vacuuming of the Hodges stacks during Summer 2004. Preservation engaged subject librarians in reviewing the remainder of the brittle books backlog. The Preservation Advisory Group completed a preservation plan, based on findings in the collection condition survey, and Mary Ellen Starmer presented the plan and action priorities to LMG in September 2003.

The adoption of the Aleph system dominated many collection development and management activities during the year. CDM team members learned to use the new system components and described needs for additional programming to extract basic reports. Subject librarians ordered materials and access totaling \$7,374,825. State resource expenditures accounted for \$6,621,856, with \$752,969 used from restricted funds. Fortunately, an FY 04 increase in state funding of \$500,000 to the base budget covered journals inflation costs. Given the slow start to the fiscal year because of system implementation, endowed expenditures were less than in FY 03.

The following tables show expenditures by subject group for state and endowed funds.

**FY 2003-2004 Expenditures for Information Resources:
State Funds**

Subject Group	Approvals	Firm Orders	Periodicals	Serials	Total
Humanities		\$156,807	\$ 152,665	\$ 53,814	\$ 363,286
Social Sciences		\$ 99,933	\$ 485,721	\$ 23,779	\$ 606,353
Science/Technology		\$170,838	\$2,238,294	\$ 125,671	\$2,534,803
General		\$164,860	\$1,907,115	\$423,030	\$2,230,780
Total Expenditures	\$622,410	\$592,437	\$6,163,795	\$626,294	\$6,621,856

**FY 2003-2004 Expenditures for Information Resources:
Endowed Funds**

Subject	Expenditure
Humanities	\$ 319,942
Social Sciences	\$ 35,782
Science/Technology	\$ 54,087
Special Collections	\$ 89,888
General	\$ 253,270
Total Expenditures	\$ 752,969

CDM team members, in collaboration with colleagues across the University Libraries, made progress towards the following goals.

Expand digital and print collections available to UT clientele through purchases, subscriptions, intellectual access, and digitization projects.

CDM offered trial access to more than 30 database and added subscriptions to 14. Among the new database subscriptions were the *ASTM Standards*, full text of 11,000 standards from American Society for Testing and Materials; *CQ Voting & Elections*, data, authoritative analyses, and historical material on the American voter, political parties, campaigns and elections, the presidency, Congress, governorships, etc.; the *Nation Digital Archives*, full text of the oldest weekly magazine in the U.S.; and the Tennessee subset of *America's Newspapers*. More specialized full text collections included the *Eighteenth Century Collections Online [ECCO]*, digital images of all pages from 150,000 books published 1700-1800); *Project Euclid*, journals in mathematics and statistics); *Siku Quanshu [Wenyuange Edition]*, 3,460 Chinese works, including history, astronomy, geography, politics, economics; and the *U.S. Serial Set, 1789-1969*, containing legislative documents and 50,000 historical maps.

Through vendor changes and consortial deals we saved more than \$3,000 while increasing the number of simultaneous users for some titles. Librarians added entries to the library's databases menu for relevant databases freely available on the Web, such as the *International Critical Tables of Numerical Data, Physics, Chemistry and Technology* and *PrimateLit*, a bibliographic database for primatology. We also included content harvesting resources and locally digitized content. Some examples are *OAIster* that searches over 3 million records from digital collections of nearly 300 institutions and accesses text, images, and multi-media in all disciplines; the *OpenURL Generator*, a tool that accesses full text articles or e-journals to which UT provides access; the *University of Tennessee Herbarium* collection (images of vascular plants, bryophytes, fungi); *Tennessee Documentary History, 1796-1850* (documents and images); the *Albert "Dutch"*

Roth Digital Photograph Collection; and the *Index to University of Tennessee Electronic Theses and Dissertations* (in pdf).

Other noteworthy purchases were the *netLibrary III* shared electronic book collection, for which we added records to the online catalog; and subscriptions to electronic versions of journals from large, reasonably-priced publishers such as Cambridge and Oxford university presses.

Special Collections, funded primarily through endowed funds, increased expenditures 60% over FY 03 with purchases totaling \$89,888. Some of the titles purchased were *John Durham's day book: a manuscript memorandum and diary of experiences during the Civil War*; two manuscripts, *Tennessee in the Civil War* and *Tennessee in the Confederate Army*; and *Corporal Milton Weaver* (Color Guard, Company F, 74th Ohio Regiment who died in battle September 1, 1864) , an archive of 66 letters, 206 total pages, dated 1862-1864 .

The library accepted 2,305 gift items, of which 980 were added to the collection. The following table shows material types included.

Table 1: Gifts in Kind Accepted for FY 2003-2004

Item	Number Received FY 2003/04
Books	1,579
Serials	666
CDs	11
Scores	29
Video/DVD	8
Total	2,305
Gifts Added (All Locations)	980
Acceptance Rate	43%

(Note: The totals do not reflect all anonymous gifts received.)

Preservation contributed to the expansion of digital access through treatment and rehousing of Cochrane photographs and Wiley drawings. Digitization standards and procedures created by members of the Digital Library Center Steering Committee will ensure UT's collaboration with the international digital community to preserve access.

Preserve information resources acquired and/or accessed by the library

Mary Ellen Starmer, in consultation with the Preservation Advisory Group, completed a preservation plan for the Libraries, incorporating data from recent collection condition surveys. The Library Management Group and the CDM

Advisory Group discussed proposed priorities for Preservation attention. The highest priorities include measuring ultraviolet levels from windows in Hodges, vacuuming the stacks, acquiring filters or shades for windows, applying for an NEH preservation grant, and selecting brittle or acidic materials for reformatting or deacidification treatments. Other top priorities are identifying digital preservation projects, documenting library-building areas with leaks, and collaborating with Library Facilities to ensure quick response to leaks. A collection condition survey of Special Collections is now in progress, following a successful pilot survey adapted from those conducted in Hodges, Music and Agriculture-Veterinary Medicine Libraries.

Preservation and conservation statistics for the year reflect the time devoted to learning the Aleph system and implementing changes in procedures. Much preservation activity depends on the referral of materials from other units, and the overall library preoccupation with system implementation was apparent. The unit processed 26% fewer items this fiscal year than in the previous year, notably in transfers of older materials that received lower priority during system downtime. (See Appendix I.) Conservation treatments (Appendix II) declined 43%, presumably because fewer titles were sent to Preservation from circulation, and because conservation activity focused on surveying collection condition. Also, concentration on treating the brittle books backlog in FY 03 may have caused numbers for the previous year to spike. With regard to reformatting (see Appendix III), neither the 11 volumes photocopied in FY 04, nor the 32 volumes photocopied in FY 03 represent significant staff time or budget expenditure. However, reformatting will take a higher priority now that the collection condition surveys are nearly completed, and will be an opportunity for Preservation to identify and treat materials in greatest need of attention.

Commercial binding, led by Teresa Gillispie and Sara Foster, received priority attention from the unit this year. Binding statistics in Appendix IV show a slight reduction in items bound (11%) this year, with an 8% reduction in expenditures. Most binding is for periodical volumes, which actually increased from last year, and is dependent upon receipt of unbound issues from Current Periodicals. The number of recases and rebinds was lower, however, because fewer items were identified through circulation and reshelving processes. Whether this year is indicative of a trend or just an aberration related to system implementation remains to be seen. In the meanwhile, Preservation will give scrupulous attention to record keeping and we will continue monitoring materials flow. Use of electronic resources will inevitably have an impact on preservation and conservation workload and priorities.

Elizabeth Young updated the *Disaster Response Manual* and refreshed the Libraries collective memory about location and availability of disaster supplies. Preservation Environmental Monitors were located in Documents/Microforms, the Music Library, and most recently in the rare books and Archives sections of Special Collections. All PEM data document undesirable fluctuations in temperature and humidity that library staff have observed for years. Renee

Berube managed the Preservation web site, incorporating her work on procedure manuals for processing, binding, and conservation.

Incorporate Aleph protocols into CDM procedures, including financial transactions, data reports, and bibliographic search strategies.

CDM invested much time in learning to use the Aleph system and in helping subject librarians to incorporate Aleph into collection development and management routines. Once we determined an appropriate fund structure, Jayne Rogers entered financial data into the new system. Sara Williams held Aleph orientation sessions for subject librarians and subject groups. Dale Gray and Delight Jobe designed a process for loading Aleph purchase order numbers into the Journals Database. Staff helped subject coordinators translate lists of transaction numbers into specific titles. Creation and dissemination of reports is essential for collection management. Many hours of CDM, Systems, and Technical Services staff time were devoted to the design, creation, and evaluation of system reports. We reviewed the fund structure at year's end and made a few changes that will expedite searching and eliminate redundancy.

Preservation now produces book spine labels in Aleph, and continues to work with Systems to develop solutions for binding challenges.

Gayle Baker and Sara Williams held regular meetings with Kay Johnson and Maribeth Manoff to increase access to titles in electronic collections and to update the complex ordering process that spans evaluation, allocation, tracking and receiving orders, establishing Internet access, and license review. The group completed a first draft of a revised Serial and/or Electronic Media Request Form.

Provide data and analysis to support Subject Librarians' knowledge of the collection and decision-making.

Jami Baker updated the collection growth study, mining the most current Horizon data before it was removed from service. The study provides information about item counts and item circulation, and is posted on Nas3 for shared access. Sara Williams collected information from YBP about monograph publication trends and distributed it to subject coordinators for use in the FY 05 allocations process. Jayne Rogers collected and posted use data for 22 major full text journal aggregators and other electronic resources to a Use Data folder in Nas3.

Delight Jobe and subject librarians produced a dozen program and accreditation reviews for Social Work, Biosystems Engineering, Journalism & Electronic Media, Advertising & Public Relations, Recreation & Leisure Studies, School of Information Sciences, College of Nursing, Deaf Education, English, Geography, Interior Design, and the National Architecture Accrediting Board.

A report of database sessions by frequency for FY 04 revealed the following top ten: *Academic Search Premier*, *Web of Science*, *PsycINFO*, *Medline/PubMed*, *Tennessee Electronic Library*, *LexisNexis Academic*, *ERIC*, *MLA (literature)*, *FirstSearch* databases, and *Business Source Premier*. A complete report of use data can be found in the internal Nas3 CDM folder. Use counts of access to the Libraries' databases tracked trends in access location. Gayle Baker, Ellie Read, and Maribeth Manoff compiled data on user access through the Libraries' Databases page. From August 2003 through June 2004 nearly 32% of 536,618 total sessions were launched from within the Libraries. Off-campus sessions accounted for 33% and various UT campus locations other than residence halls generated 26%. Off-campus use increased 8% from the previous five-year period. A table with more data follows.

**Table 2: UT Libraries' Database Sessions Via Databases Page
August 1999 – June 2004**

	8/99-6/04	8/99-6/04	8/99-6/00	8/99-6/00	8/00-6/01	8/00-6/01	8/01-6/02	8/01-6/02	8/02-6/03	8/02-6/03	8/03-6/04	8/03-6/04
	sessions	percent	sessions	percent	sessions	percent	sessions	percent	sessions	percent	sessions	percent
UTK Libraries	881866	41.53%	170377	57.28%	172226	49.81%	179926	41.55%	189949	37.20%	169388	31.57%
UTK Wireless	75741	3.57%	0	0.00%	79	0.02%	8647	2.00%	27777	5.44%	39238	7.31%
UTK Residence Halls	56636	2.67%	12318	4.14%	5240	1.52%	12806	2.96%	14279	2.80%	11993	2.23%
UTK Other	571471	26.91%	70706	23.77%	106097	30.68%	122284	28.24%	133593	26.16%	138791	25.86%
Off-campus	537831	25.33%	44058	14.81%	62127	17.97%	109395	25.26%	145043	28.40%	177208	33.02%
	2123545	100.00%	297459	100.00%	345769	100.00%	433058	100.00%	510641	100.00%	536618	100.00%

Data compiled by Ellie Read from database use log data, supplied by Maribeth Manoff

Maud Mundava compiled a statistical summary of ARL data comparing several collection-related factors among UT Library peers. The summary is posted on Nas 3, and the following table shows the kind of comparisons that could be extracted to demonstrate UT's need for additional collection resources. For example, Tennessee ranks near the bottom of the group in terms of volumes held, but higher for materials expenditures, suggesting that there has been more attention to improving the collection this year. Total circulations are lower, but ILL borrowing is near the top. Tennessee is also near the top of the group in numbers of graduate students, but near the middle in number of faculty. PhD fields and awards are comparable, and below the median. From this data we can compare the amount of the materials budget spent per faculty/graduate students among universities: UT spent \$1,281; University of Kentucky spent \$1,572; and Vanderbilt spent \$1,357.

Table 3: ARL Collection-Related Peer Data

Institution	Rank	Institution	Vols Held	Institution	Total Materials Expenditure	Institution	Total Library Expenditure
TEXAS	10	TEXAS	8,322,944	TEXAS	\$ 12,688,944	TEXAS	\$36,671,492
N CAROLINA	15	N CAROLINA	5,492,451	N CAROLINA	\$ 10,929,047	N CAROLINA	\$28,662,816
VIRGINIA	25	VIRGINIA	4,921,442	FLORIDA	\$ 10,213,822	VIRGINIA	\$26,867,504
GEORGIA	31	OKLAHOMA	4,427,670	GEORGIA	\$ 9,868,423	NC State	\$26,790,033
NC State	32	FLORIDA	4,021,629	TENNESSEE	\$ 9,764,650	FLORIDA	\$26,119,518
FLORIDA	36	GEORGIA	3,955,004	KENTUCKY	\$ 9,444,910	MARYLAND	\$21,071,290
VANDERBILT	42	S CAROLINA	3,374,496	NC State	\$ 9,211,644	GEORGIA	\$21,010,793
MARYLAND	48	NC State	3,236,096	OKLAHOMA	\$ 8,650,451	TENNESSEE	\$20,907,531
KENTUCKY	51	<i>Median</i>	3,054,075	VANDERBILT	\$ 8,417,130	KENTUCKY	\$20,261,308
TENNESSEE	53	KENTUCKY	3,053,726	<i>Median</i>	\$ 7,707,396	VANDERBILT	\$19,030,188
OKLAHOMA	57	MARYLAND	3,016,940	MARYLAND	\$ 6,475,014	<i>Median</i>	\$18,779,139
S CAROLINA	69	VANDERBILT	2,882,057	S CAROLINA	\$ 5,918,877	S CAROLINA	\$16,122,269
VIRGINIA TECH	96	TENNESSEE	2,880,949	VIRGINIA TECH	\$ 5,749,272	OKLAHOMA	\$15,260,864
<i>Median</i>		VIRGINIA TECH	2,176,916	VIRGINIA	\$ 885,372	VIRGINIA TECH	\$11,784,611

Institution	Grad Stud	Institution	FAC	Institution	PhD Awd	Institution	PhDfields
TEXAS	11,425	FLORIDA	2,955	TEXAS	614	FLORIDA	92
FLORIDA	10,358	N CAROLINA	2,701	FLORIDA	607	TEXAS	91
N CAROLINA	6,563	TEXAS	2,476	MARYLAND	501	GEORGIA	87
MARYLAND	6,503	GEORGIA	1,902	N CAROLINA	412	N CAROLINA	75
TENNESSEE	6,003	VANDERBILT	1,776	GEORGIA	345	MARYLAND	70
VIRGINIA	5,624	TENNESSEE	1,622	NC State	322	KENTUCKY	60
GEORGIA	4,475	NC State	1,607	VIRGINIA	298	S CAROLINA	56
VANDERBILT	4,429	MARYLAND	1,591	VIRGINIA TECH	272	NC State	54
KENTUCKY	4,385	KENTUCKY	1,366	S CAROLINA	234	<i>Median</i>	51
<i>Median</i>	4,179	VIRGINIA TECH	1,301	<i>Median</i>	229	VIRGINIA TECH	48
VIRGINIA TECH	3,958	<i>Median</i>	1,268	TENNESSEE	221	TENNESSEE	48
NC State	3,548	VIRGINIA	1,063	KENTUCKY	219	VIRGINIA	47
S CAROLINA	3,515	S CAROLINA	1,015	VANDERBILT	176	OKLAHOMA	45
OKLAHOMA	2,798	OKLAHOMA	988	OKLAHOMA	131	VANDERBILT	44

Institution	Total Circ	Institution	Total ILL Borr
TEXAS	2,357,656	OKLAHOMA	37,981
VIRGINIA	1,175,386	TENNESSEE	34,981
S CAROLINA	1,076,501	VIRGINIA	30,811
N CAROLINA	1,042,284	KENTUCKY	28,984
FLORIDA	999,650	TEXAS	26,874
GEORGIA	508,986	VIRGINIA TECH	25,720
<i>Median</i>	477,317	FLORIDA	23,886
MARYLAND	393,323	MARYLAND	22,416
KENTUCKY	393,146	<i>Median</i>	22,146
NC State	374,027	NC State	21,585
VANDERBILT	364,903	S CAROLINA	19,117
TENNESSEE	343,507	VANDERBILT	16,660
VIRGINIA TECH	321,271	N CAROLINA	15,698
OKLAHOMA	256,511	GEORGIA	8,328

Conduct collection management activities to assure that the collection keeps pace with the changing, growing needs of the University community, to promote the most convenient access to materials, and to make the best use of available shelving space.

Subject librarians completed retention review of many LC areas in Storage and Dale Gray annotated the Storage list on Nas3 with librarian retention decisions. More than 25,000 volumes are slated for transfer from Hodges and Music Libraries to Storage where new compact shelving has been installed. The shelving will accommodate over 107,000 volumes.

Subject librarians reviewed and updated lower priority journals lists.

Maud Mundava completed a title-by-title search of materials located in the Preservation Collection to determine Information Alliance library holdings and reformatted copies available for purchase.

Engage in collaborative projects that increase the availability of information resources.

Numerous collaborative initiatives directly or indirectly supported access to information for UT clientele, while strengthening statewide resources. UT subscribed to the *Journal of the American Medical Association* and the *New England Journal of Medicine* online editions with UT Preston Medical Center and the UT Memphis Health Sciences Library to take advantage of consortial rates. We joined the New England Research Libraries (NERL) consortium to receive reduced rates for e-resources subscriptions, including *Siku Quanshu* and membership in the Public Library of Science. We received a discount on the *U.S. Serial Set* by purchasing it through the Law Library's COSELL membership.

An Information Alliance program at Vanderbilt explored the potential benefit of repositories. The CDM Advisory Group is envisioning a future UT library collection that merges materials purchased, subscriptions for content accessed, freely accessible resources on the Web, and collections digitized at UT. Providing links among disparate content is a high priority. The Digital Library Center launched the UT Scholars Archive, a prototype institutional repository containing UT scholarly and archival content. Local collections included in the Scholars Archive are a 3-year backfile of the *Journal of Economic Issues* digitized at UT, UT college catalogs, and UT electronic theses and dissertations. Developing procedures for adding content to the library's digital collection will be a high priority for the coming year.

Art and Sociology counterparts from the Information Alliance met in Rugby in September 2003 to plan collaborative collection development projects. Art librarians are using the nationally recognized brief tests of collection strength to identify areas to strengthen. Applying the brief tests methodology to German

literature collections in the Information Alliance, Sara Williams discovered that UT and Vanderbilt have research (level 4) collections of German language and literature, while Kentucky has an instructional (level 3) collection. Further, there is a high degree of overlap among the three collections through level 3, but much greater diversity at level 4. Sociology librarians are reviewing titles that could be located in Storage collections at a single Information Alliance library. Heads of collection development planned a Collection Management Seminar for September 2004 to develop a common vision among subject librarians and to prepare for more extensive collaborative collection development.

Seek and take advantage of opportunities for training and professional development.

The CDM team held an introduction to collection development for Minority Residents and a new subject librarian in Fall 2003. We discussed a list of several collection projects of value to the Libraries.

Members of the team participated in Aleph orientation and training sessions, and offered training to other colleagues.

Publicize the library's collection services.

Collection services and scholarly communications are closely linked, and CDM team members helped to publicize both through numerous venues. Subject coordinators Ron Gilmour, Jane Row, and Molly created and disseminated two brochures for the campus, *Scholars Under Siege: Changing Our Scholarly Publishing Culture* (for faculty) and *Changing Scholarly Publishing: A Guide for Graduate Students*. The brochures were discussed with Library Representatives during the Fall, and they agreed to distribute copies to their colleagues. We also met with student groups and participated in faculty departmental discussions about actions that the academic community can take to ensure maximum access to their scholarly work. At the invitation of the Chancellor, Linda Phillips and Assistant Vice-Chancellor Susan Martin co-chaired a UT Scholarly Communications Committee formed in Spring term.

The Libraries sponsored three E-Forums with presentations discussion about scholarly issues. David Hamrin from Oak Ridge National Laboratory described the life cycle of the technical report. Law professor Glen Reynolds demonstrated and shared anecdotes about his popular blog, *Instapundit*, and Ohio State University Library Director Joe Branin talked about the development of OSU's institutional repository called *The Knowledge Bank*. Librarians created blogs, *Electronic Resources News* (<http://www.lib.utk.edu/mt/weblogs/eres/>) *Scholarly Communication Issues @ the UT Libraries* (<http://www.lib.utk.edu/mt/weblogs/scholcomm/>). Collaborating with UT Press

we began planning for a symposium to be held in September 2004 called *The Book & The Scholar: Celebrating the Year of the University Press*.

Preservation once again sponsored the popular *Book Doctor* clinic for the UT community to bring damaged books for examination and repair. Prominently located outside Current Periodicals on November 12 and 13, 2003, the *Book Doctor* attracted lots of attention. Preservation staff reviewed materials, made minor repairs to 25 items, provided advice on conservation treatments, and answered general questions about UT's preservation program.

Appendix I: Processing Statistics, 2003-2004**New Materials**

Books.....	16,990
Microfilm	1,466
VHS Tape	444
DVD.....	329
CD.....	609
CD-ROM	112
Audio Cassette	21
Carousel	0
Binding.....	12,797
Other	54
Total	32,822

Old Materials

Transfer.....	228
Call # Change	82
Call # Correction.....	362
Lost Call #	72
Binding Correction	0
Replacement Barcode	533
Replacement Microfilm Box.....	21
Replacement VHS Box.....	2
Conservation	163
Other	1
Total	1,464

Appendix II: Conservation Statistics, 2003-2004

Number of volumes given Level 1 conservation treatment	3,276
Number of volumes given Level 2 conservation treatment	982
Number of volumes given Level 3 conservation treatment	0
Total	4,258

Level 1 treatment = less than 15 minutes to complete

Level 2 treatment = 15 minutes to 2 hours to complete

Level 3 treatment = more than 2 hours to complete

Appendix III: Reformatting Statistics, 2003-2004

Volumes photocopied	11
Volumes microfilmed	0
Total	11

Appendix IV: Commercial Binding Statistics 2003-04**Commercial Binding**

	Cost	Number	Total
Corrections	\$ 3.50	40	\$ 140.00
Custom Magazines	\$ 9.60	26	\$ 249.60
Standard Magazines	\$ 6.95	8,516	\$ 59,186.20
Newspapers	\$ 30.50	9	\$ 274.50
Recases	\$ 6.20	1,273	\$ 7,892.60
Rebinds	\$ 5.20	4,340	\$ 22,568.00
Rebinds - Pocket book	\$ 27.50	2	\$ 55.00
Theses/Dissertations	\$ 7.00	793	\$ 5,551.00
Time Charge Per Hour	\$ 27.00		
Phase box/archival pak	\$ 12.95		
Phase box/archival pak	\$ 18.00		
Double-tray boxes	\$ 15.00	1	
	\$ 20.40	2	\$ 40.80
Special Bindings	\$ 105.00	1	\$ 105.00
Special Bindings	\$ 75.00	5	\$ 375.00
Special Bindings	\$ 85.00	1	\$ 85.00
Special Bindings	\$ 80.00	1	\$ 80.00
Subtotal		15,009	\$ 96,602.70
EXTRA CHARGES			
Hand Sewing	\$ 4.25	8	\$ 34.00
Cloth Pockets	\$ 5.00	194	\$ 970.00
Paper Pockets	\$ 3.00	48	\$ 144.00
Tattletape	\$ 0.25	14,890	\$ 3,722.50
Tattletape*	\$ 0.40	0	
Delivery Charge	\$ 10.00	25	\$ 250.00
Subtotal			\$ 5,120.50
TOTAL			\$101,723.20

*Extra Charge for double tray boxes.