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May 7, 1992

Sue Burch  
Treasurer, SEAALL  
University of Kentucky Law Library  
Law Building  
Lexington, KY 40506-0048

Dear Sue,

Enclosed you will find my itemized expenses for the SEAALL annual conference, along with my check in the amount of $63.41. I apologize for my tardiness in reporting. Callaway Gardens did not send my final bill; I finally called Ebba Jo to get the total, but I was out sick at the time and just got back to work this past Tuesday.

I enjoyed the conference a great deal, learned a lot, and met many, many good people there. I am very grateful to have received a scholarship, because I could not have gone otherwise.

Sincerely,

Barbara Sutherland  
Librarian

cc: Jean Holcomb, Chair  
Scholarship Committee
### SEAALL Annual Conference

**Barbara Sutherland -- Itemized expenses**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Conference registration fee -- SEAALL</td>
<td>$125.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Room -- Callaway Gardens -- 2 nights</td>
<td>$124.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mileage -- 483 miles at $.275 per mile*</td>
<td>$132.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kennel charge (2 dogs for 3 nights</td>
<td>$ 42.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dinner &amp; tip, April 9</td>
<td>$ 12.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$436.59</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scholarship amount advance</td>
<td>$500.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amount due to SEAALL</td>
<td>$ 63.41</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Mileage Midway, Ky. to Callaway Gardens = 483 miles each way. Charged one-way mileage only because shared costs with another person. Charged at federal rate of $0.275 per mile.*
Report from SEAALL Conference
Roundtable presentation: "Coping with Collection Development Decisions in the Face of Budget Reductions"

To routinize acquisitions and check-in activities, many law libraries rely on standing orders and automated check-in. The primary advantage to this approach is enhanced efficiency; the primary disadvantage is that the items tend to come in and be paid for year after year, without being reviewed by anyone with authority to make collection decisions.

The constant stream of standing orders, new editions, and supplements does not create a problem as long as the library has enough money to pay for everything it receives. As budgets get tight, however, most libraries find it necessary to delay supplementation of some items, and to cancel some items altogether. For a very small library, the decision to be made is: "What shall we cancel and what shall we continue to update?" For the larger library, in which many people and processes are involved in the acquisitions process, the decision-making process is more complex. There, the first question to be answered may be: "What do we subscribe to?" and the second may be: "How can we possibly evaluate every title?" In their roundtable presentation, "Coping with Collection Development Decisions in the Face of Budget Reductions," Nancy Strohmeyer and Elizabeth Valadie of Loyola University Law School Library, described the method their library has developed for answering those questions.

In 1986, Loyola began careful review of standing orders and supplementation by a collection development committee made up of the Law Librarian, the head of public services, and the reference librarian.

The review process has been designed to be as efficient as possible. As each item is received, technical services personnel determine whether it is a new edition, an unsolicited supplement, or a standing order which has not recently been reviewed. If it meets any of those criteria, the item is placed on a special shelf for review by the collection development committee. Each committee member visits the shelf and notes his or her comments on a slip inserted in each item. The committee does not have to meet unless members disagree about continuing the standing order.

In 1986/1987, Loyola ceased the practice of entering a standing order for supplementation when ordering a new title. Now, whenever a new title is ordered, the collection development committee decides whether or not to order supplementation as well. The titles which are not to be supplemented are stamped, "Library will not receive later supplements" to alert patrons that the information may not be up to date.

Another cost-cutting measure, implemented in 1988/1989, is the addition of budget fund codes to the library's acquisitions database. This allows staff to track spending on
supplementation, or by publisher, and thus "red flag" titles for which supplementation costs are especially high.

In the last two years, librarians at Loyola have been taking a careful look at Clark Boardman Callaghan and Warren, Gorham & Lamont titles -- especially those that were previously published by Lawyers Coop -- to determine whether the quality of the supplements, and their costs, are in line with former Lawyers Coop quality and costs.

After Nancy and Elizabeth's presentation, roundtable participants asked a number of questions, and discussion was lively. Several participants asked questions about other libraries' experience with canceling Shepard's citations, especially the state citators. Some participants said they had canceled the state citators (except for their own, surrounding, and "important" states), and now ask their patrons to rely on the regional citators or one of the online legal research services; the disadvantage to this is that only the state citators include citations for state statutes.

Other questions concerned updating schedules for looseleaf services. Some participants said that for a number of titles they do not subscribe to updates at all, but simply purchase the title anew every two to three years.
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