

Cooperative Collection Development: Sharing Funds, Resources, and Responsibilities Across Libraries: A Pilot Program in Nursing

Kay Downey
Kent State University, mdowney1@kent.edu

Follow this and additional works at: <https://docs.lib.purdue.edu/charleston>

An indexed, print copy of the Proceedings is also available for purchase at:

<http://www.thepress.purdue.edu/series/charleston>.

You may also be interested in the new series, Charleston Insights in Library, Archival, and Information Sciences. Find out more at: <http://www.thepress.purdue.edu/series/charleston-insights-library-archival-and-information-sciences>.

Kay Downey, "Cooperative Collection Development: Sharing Funds, Resources, and Responsibilities Across Libraries: A Pilot Program in Nursing" (2009). *Proceedings of the Charleston Library Conference*. <http://dx.doi.org/10.5703/1288284314737>

This document has been made available through Purdue e-Pubs, a service of the Purdue University Libraries. Please contact epubs@purdue.edu for additional information.

COOPERATIVE COLLECTION DEVELOPMENT: SHARING FUNDS, RESOURCES AND RESPONSIBILITIES ACROSS LIBRARIES: A PILOT PROGRAM IN NURSING

AUTHOR:

Kay Downey (*mdowney1@kent.edu*) - Assistant Professor, Collection Management Librarian, University Libraries, Kent State University

PRESENTERS:

Kay Downey, Collection Management Librarian, University Libraries, Kent State University

Rob Kairis, Library Director, Kent State University, Stark Campus

Melissa Spohn, Head of Acquisitions, University Libraries, Kent State University

Michael Walmsley, Director, U.S. Sales, Baker & Taylor, YBP Library Services

ABSTRACT:

Librarians from the 8 campus system of Kent State University came together in the early fall of 2007 to discuss ways to enhance the institution's collection development efforts. It was agreed to begin with a subject area common to all campuses, nursing. If successful, this pilot project could be applied as a model for adding more disciplines and inspire other institutions to consider employing similar cooperative collection development methodology. To date, the 8 campus libraries have worked together to evaluate and select an ebook vendor that provides access to a collection of over 1,700 titles in nursing and allied health and have increased access to content for online nursing journals. Perhaps the most significant achievement was the creation of an approval plan profile for selecting nursing books. The libraries parceled out sections of the LC classification system for selecting book titles. In some cases, selecting responsibilities were assigned for campuses with a particular program within nursing or allied health. In other cases the selection assignments were randomly assigned. For the random assignments, books selected through this method were also randomly assigned to an "owning" campus housing the book, based on an algorithm that weighted the randomization by each campus' financial commitment to the project—the more a campus contributed financially the more books would be housed at that campus. Throughout the 2-year process, thought was given to how this project would be employed within other similar institutions.

PRESENTATION SUMMARY:

1. Kent State University and Project Background
2. Project Process and Development
3. Cooperation
4. YBP - A Partner's Role
5. Looking Ahead
6. Project Development Team

1. Kent State University and Project Background

Librarians from 8 different KSU campuses developed and implemented a plan to enhance the institutions collection development effort by sharing in the purchasing of nursing resources. Over the course of 2 years the project has resulted in a shared ebook collection, enhanced access to electronic journals, streaming video and a combined approval plan where librarians on all campuses select book titles in assigned LC classes. It is hoped that this project will create a model for other disciplines as well as other institutions.

KSU is an 8 campus system, one of the largest regional systems in the country. It covers a geographic area across 7 counties in Northeast Ohio. The campuses offer degrees in a wide array of programs in science, technology and humanities. Kent State's total enrollment has recently increased to more than 38,000 making it the 2nd largest university in the state. Of the eight campuses the Kent Campus has the largest full time enrollment of about 24,000. Among the regional campuses the Stark campus, located to the south of Kent is the largest with a fulltime enrollment of about 3500. The Trumbull and Tuscarawas campuses have an FTE of around 1400 and Ashtabula, East Liverpool, Geauga and Salem are all somewhat smaller with student enrollment of somewhere between 500 and 100 per campus. Each campus manages its own library independent of one another but all libraries share a central catalog and all benefit from OhioLINK (OL) membership which is Ohio's cooperative collection consortium.

In the early fall of 2007 Kent States' regional library directors and technical services librarians at the Kent campus began working together to develop a cooperative project for sharing resources in order to realize economic savings and reduce duplication. The project incorporated cooperation in the shared acquisition of an ebook collection, enhanced access to electronic journals and a combined approval plan where librarians on all campuses select book titles in assigned LC classes. The approval plan was implemented in the fall of 2009. It is hoped that as time goes on group can build upon their experience and expand this model to other disciplines.

Nursing was chosen as the launching point because it was a subject common to all areas. Each campus offers a nursing program at different levels and senior level nursing courses are available at all campuses via distance learning.

One of the first steps in the project was the selection of an ebook vendor. Ebooks have obvious advantages as a shared resource in that they could result in saving shelf space, time in physical processing, etc. The group evaluated several ebook vendors such as Gale's NRC, Rittenhouse Proquest, ebrary OCLC's NetLibrary and MyLibrary but ultimately decided to go with Ebrary for several reasons. Ebrary was selected because is was one of the few vendors that at the time provided a leasing option and could also support an expanded platform to include other disciplines if it was decided to expand the e-collection at a later time. Ebrary provided a collection of over 1700 titles in nursing and allied health. Leasing is substantially less expensive than purchasing and as current content is essential for nursing resources it is not to our

advantage to sustain an ongoing collection of older publications in this area. The subscription costs were shared equally among the regional campus libraries with the larger Kent campus paying twice the amount. TABLE 1 shows that Ebrary usage is fairly proportional to the size of the campus

**TABLE 1
E-BRARY USE STATISTICS July 2008 – June 2009**

| | Ashtabula | East Liverpool | Geauga | Kent | Salem | Stark | Trumbull | Tuscarawas | Totals |
|-------------------------|-----------|----------------|--------|------|-------|-------|----------|------------|--------|
| Documents Viewed | 2 | 9 | 17 | 230 | 7 | 41 | 4 | 7 | 317 |
| Pages Viewed | 8 | 43 | 146 | 3673 | 81 | 846 | 81 | 88 | 4966 |
| Pages Copied | 0 | 0 | 0 | 73 | 0 | 62 | 0 | 6 | 141 |
| Pages Printed | 0 | 1 | 11 | 83 | 0 | 10 | 0 | 0 | 105 |
| User Sessions | 2 | 9 | 19 | 255 | 10 | 64 | 4 | 7 | 370 |

In addition to local collections KSU's membership in the OhioLINK (OL) also provides significant content for nursing. OL is equivalent to the consortia mother ship for more than 80 institutions of higher education in Ohio. Together OhioLink and its member libraries spend about 31.3 million annually on group purchased collections. It began offering collective purchasing of research material in 1992. OL's collective purchasing includes over 140 research databases nearly 8000 electronic journals and 50,000 ebooks. The total collections budget for the Kent campus is about \$4.2 million and of that \$1.5, or one third, goes to pay for OhioLINK resources. Two million is spent on local journal and database subscriptions and less than one million on books and media. The recent economic crisis has resulted in the reduction of state support for the OL consortium and libraries are starting to pay more to the consortium in order to keep the same content. Even so, cooperative purchasing at the state level remains economical, since every collection dollar spent with OhioLINK nets on average three or more times the content than could be purchased locally. Listed here are some of the nursing and health science related resources available via the consortium

- Specialized Health Services Databases
- Ageline (1978 - Current)
- Alt-HealthWatch (OhioLINK)
- Cochrane Central Register of Controlled Trials
- Cochrane Database of Systematic Reviews
- Cochrane Library
- Consumer Health Complete (OhioLINK)
- Database of Abstracts of Reviews of Effects (DARE)
- Doody's Core Titles
- ETOH Database
- Health and Psychosocial Instruments (HAPI) (1985 - Current)
- Health Services and Sciences Research Resources (HSSR)
- Health Source (consumer edition) (OhioLINK)
- Health Source (nursing/academic edition) (OhioLINK)

Human Nutrition Online (1990 - Current)
 Images.MD (OhioLINK)
 Lexi-PALS Drug Guide (OhioLINK)
 MedicLatina (1950 - Current) (OhioLINK)
 Natural & Alternative Treatments (OhioLINK)
 PsycINFO - Current File (1967 - Current) (OhioLINK)
 PsycINFO - Historical File (1887 - 1966) (OhioLINK)
 PubMed Central
 REHABDATA

2. Project Process and Development

One of the objectives of cooperative collection development is potential cost savings in minimizing duplication and processing time. In order to predict future spending we analyzed campus purchasing in nursing over a 3 year period and took averages to determine individual campus commitments. (see TABLE 2) Once analysis was completed each campus committed an amount they determined equitable and the Kent Campus contributed \$10,000.

TABLE 2
KSU LIBRARY EXPENDITURES FOR NURSING (2004-2007)

| KSU Library Expenditures for Nursing (2004-2007) Number of Pooled Purchases = 1138 | | | | | |
|--|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|---------------------------|-----------------------|
| Campus | Money Spent | Ave/Year | Money Committed | Number of Purchases (3yr) | % of Pooled Purchases |
| Ashtabula | | | \$ 2,000.00 | 97 | 18% |
| East Liverpool | | \$ 1,618.00 | \$ 1,500.00 | 74 | 13% |
| Geauga | | | \$ 1,500.00 | 25 | 13% |
| Kent | \$ 30,236.00 | \$ 10,078.67 | \$ 10,000.00 | 417 | |
| Salem | \$ 1,497.00 | \$ 499.00 | \$ 1,000.00 | 158 | 9% |
| Stark | \$ 5,369.00 | \$ 1,789.67 | \$ 2,000.00 | 160 | 18% |
| Trumbull | \$ 5,176.45 | \$ 1,725.48 | \$ 1,300.00 | 86 | 12% |
| Tuscarawas | \$ 3,600.00 | \$ 1,200.00 | \$ 2,000.00 | 121 | 18% |
| Totals | \$ 51,247.45 | \$ 18,700.48 | \$ 21,300.00 | 1138 | 100% |

Once financial commitments had been made the group worked to divide selection responsibilities. It was decided that campuses with unique Nursing/Allied Health related programs (Physical Therapy, Radiology, Vet Tech, etc.) would be responsible for selecting and housing titles in those specific subjects. For the remainder of the areas selection responsibilities were based upon past purchasing habits, expertise and anticipated local needs. (see *TABLE 3*). It was agreed that no course reserve materials or duplicate copies should be purchased with cooperative funds.

The housing of those titles would be handled by a [randomization](#) process based upon the percentage of financial commitment. In other words, the more a campus contributed financially the more books would be housed at that campus. A short randomization program was written to automate this process.

Once financial and selection responsibilities had been determined the group worked with YBP Library Services to create a common ordering account for nursing. The Kent Campus profile for nursing was used as the basis for the new account. The plan was structured by creating a common ordering account for orders from slips. Kent Campus selected and housed titles profiled as Advanced Academic while Regional Campus selections were defined as Basic Academic or Professional. Nursing titles were then removed from each campus' existing YBP profiles and as the cooperative profile develops, individual profiles would continue to be incorporated into the new cooperative plan.

**TABLE 3
EXAMPLE SELECTION ASSIGNMENTS**

| SELECT OR | LC CLASS | SUBJECT | PURCHASES | | | | | | | |
|--------------------------------|---------------------|--|-----------|-----------|-------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-------|-----------|
| | | | Asht | Eastl | Geaug | Kent | Salem | Stark | Trumb | Tusca |
| Campus | R | Medicine (General) | | | | | | | | |
| Tuscarawas | 1-722 | General History | 3 | | | | 4 | 8 | | 10 |
| Tuscarawas | 723726 | Philosophy. Ethics. Psychology. Terminal Care | 3 | 5 | | | | 9 | | 9 |
| Tuscarawas | 727-849 | Practice of Medicine. Medical Education | 1 | 1 | | | | 7 | | 8 |
| Tuscarawas | 850-855 | Research Experimentation | | | | | 1 | | | 1 |
| Tuscarawas | 856-857 | Biomedical Engineering. | | | | | | | | |
| Tuscarawas | 858-894 | Computer Applications. Medical Records | 1 | | | | | | | |
| Salem | 895-920 | Medical physics. Radiology. Nuclear Medicine. | | | | | 4 | | | 1 |
| | RT | Nursing | | | | | | | | |
| | LC Range | Description | | | | | | | | |
| | 1-120 | Nursing | | | | | | | | |
| Salem | 1-81 | General. History | 32 | 16 | | 97 | 34 | 21 | | 27 |
| East Liverpo ol | 82-86 | Nursing profession | | | | 44 | 8 | | | 11 |
| Tuscarawas | 87-88 | Basic nursing care | 2 | | | 4 | | | | 1 |
| Ashtabu la | 89-119 | Specialties in nursing | 2 | 1 | | 47 | 4 | 1 | | 6 |

A fund code structure was then established with YBP. (see TABLE 4) This structure was created to make assigning selection responsibilities easier in [GOBI](#) (Global Online Bibliographic Information), the YBP book ordering system. However, this structure is not practical to replicate in the Kent's ILS, Innovative therefore all nursing fund codes translate into one, single fund code, NURSM, to align with local system protocols.

**TABLE 4
FUND CODE STRUCTURE**

| <i>The funds with a number attached (NURS-1 through NURS-7) are associated with the part of the shared collection that does not assign a specific location (the books that receive a randomized location)</i> | | |
|---|-------------|----------------|
| <i>The funds with a 3 letter location designation attached (i.e. NURS-ASH) are associated with the part of the shared collection but housed at the selectors' location</i> | | |
| Fund | Fund | Campus |
| NURS-ASH | NURS-1 | Ashtabula |
| NURS-LIV | NURS-2 | East Liverpool |
| NURS-SAL | NURS-3 | Geauga |
| NURS-TUS | NURS-4 | Salem |
| NUR-GEA | NURS-5 | Stark |
| NURS-STA | NURS-6 | Trumbull |
| NURS-TRU | NURS-7 | Tuscarawas |
| NURS-KMAIN | | |

Once the profile was in place a historical review was conducted for the slips that would have been received in FY 2008 had the plan been in effect. (see TABLE 5). Each campus director reviewed the areas where their assigned funds were listed to make sure the profile was providing the types of books expected. This helped to predict the cost and number of books each should expect once the plan was in operation.

**TABLE 5
TEST PROFILE AND REVISED COMMITMENTS**

| TEST PROFILE AND REVISED COMMITMENTS | | | | | | |
|--|------------------|-------------------|-------------|--------------------------------|----------------------------|-------------------------|
| Titles included in our profile if the profile was active during first 9 months last year | | | | | | |
| <i>Campus</i> | <i>Fund code</i> | <i># of Slips</i> | <i>Cost</i> | <i>Prorated Estimated Cost</i> | <i>Revised Commitments</i> | <i>Final Commitment</i> |
| Ashtabula | NURS-1 | 3 | \$ 178 | \$ 269 | \$ 453.42 | \$ 400.00 |
| | NURS-ASH | 0 | | | | |
| East Liverpool | NURS-2 | 14 | \$ 431 | \$ 654 | \$ 327.47 | \$ 400.00 |
| | NURS-LIV | 0 | | | | |
| Geauga | NURS-3 | 1 | \$ 122 | \$ 185 | \$ 327.47 | \$ 400.00 |
| | NURS-GEA | 0 | | | | |
| Salem | NURS-4 | 6 | \$ 319 | \$ 484 | \$ 226.71 | \$ 400.00 |
| | NURS-SAL | 0 | | | | |
| Stark | NURS-5 | 2 | \$ 73 | \$ 111 | \$ 453.42 | \$ 400.00 |
| | NURS-STA | 0 | | | | |
| Trumbull | NURS-6 | 14 | \$ 526 | \$ 798 | \$ 302.28 | \$ 400.00 |
| | NURS-TRU | 0 | | | | |
| Tuscarawas | NURS-7 | 1 | \$ 12 | \$ 18 | \$453.42 | \$ 400.00 |
| | NURS-TUS | 0 | | | | |
| Total | | 41 | \$ 1663 | \$ 2519 | \$ 2,519.23 | \$2,800.00 |

3. Cooperation

We recognize that certain conditions needed to be present in order for a shared purchasing program to work. The Kent campus had to be 100% behind the effort (and it was) and ongoing conversation was essential to build relationships and trust. The Kent campus management and administration regularly attended the monthly regional campus directors meetings and engaged in conversation about ways to be efficient, share resources and stretch dollars. The Kent campus Head of Acquisitions was dedicated to helping the group set priorities, review products, communicate with vendors, and coordinate the project. Increasing evidence of duplication in the

shared catalog and shrinking budgets also provided incentive for cooperation. Another factor that made the process more attractive was the fact that all campuses were YBP customers and YBP was willing to help in the project development. Success of the project can be attributed to good communication, good timing and dedicated individuals.

Analysis of nursing purchases from all campuses made it clear that the Kent campus approval plan could serve as the base for purchasing. Since the Kent campus most often selected at the Advanced-Academic content level and the regional campuses generally select materials at the General-Academic level, the shared plan was divided appropriately. With a more concise plan in place the Kent campus could purchase fewer general academic level materials, realize cost savings and use those collection dollars to purchase more Advance-Academic books or other online resources.

Once the approval plan went under review Kent's plan remained the same except that General-Academic slips were now divided among the seven regional libraries. All materials would be received, cataloged, and processed at the Kent campus.-The existing Kent campus approval plan become the core and the parts of the plan concerning regional campuses were built around that core. In order to minimize processing time at the Kent campus the regional library directors agreed to decide the location of the "housing-library" at the point of selection so that when nursing items were received at the Kent campus acquisitions department it would be clear where the item should be sent. Kent campus orders are always added to Kent campus

In retrospect the project was somewhat difficult to coordinate, took longer than anticipated to get off the ground, and effected momentum during different parts of the project. But the difficulties paid off in dividends as relationships were built, understanding and communication increased, and a model was created that may be used in future cooperative enterprises.

4. YBP - A Partner's Role

Another factor that helped facilitate the project was the willingness of YBP to work with KSU to support the project. The group was able to use reports from GOBI3, the YBP online acquisitions and collection management support system, to predict outcomes of the shared plan. YBP and Kent State worked to update the approval profile as the shared plan replaced nursing titles previously available as part approval book or slip plans at the KSU Campuses. The new profile split the plan according to the agreed content definition and adjusted for the treatment of non-subject parameters. One plan on one base account allowed all KSU librarians to see the status of a title at any or all of the KSU campuses

So that the shared plan did not compete with existing plans YBP modified all existing approval plans to exclude the nursing aspects. All existing plans were checked by YBP for „send-all presses' to prevent possible duplication with shared plan.

Four ordering subaccounts for slips were opened to accommodate the different requirements of the orders, allow automatic shipments of books to the Kent Campus only and enable tracking of expenditures by location. The fund codes were also added to aid in identification of titles of special interest to a particular library and to streamline the ordering process. Notifications were set up by fund in GOBI and the selection set can be viewed by all selectors and the status of the titles update in real time.

5. Looking Ahead

Although the Shared plan is now concerned with nursing titles only once in operation for some time perhaps it can be expanded to include other disciplines or aspects. It is also possible that the randomization of material location will set a new precedent for joint “ownership” and further centralize processing. A final goal is a single plan for all the KSU Campuses.

The Power Point presentation slides are available at the following URL

<http://local.stark.kent.edu/library/charleston2009.ppt>

6. Project Development Team

*Kathleen Clatanoff, Regional Manager
Collection Management & Development Group
YBP Library Services
kclatanoff@ybp.com*

*Kevin Deemer, Library Director
Kent State University, Ashtabula Campus
kdeemer@kent.edu*

*Mary Hricko, Library Director
Kent State University, Geauga Campus
mhricko@kent.edu*

*Rose Guerrieri, Library Director
Kent State University, Trumbull Campus
rguerrieri@kent.edu*

*Rob Kairis, Library Director
Kent State University, Stark Campus
rkairis@kent.edu*

*Tom Klingler, Assistant Dean for Systems and Technical Services
Kent State University, Kent Campus
tk@kent.edu*

*George Kobulnicky, Library Director
Kent State University, Tuscarawas Campus
gekobulnicky@kent.edu*

*Lilith Kunkel, Library Director
Kent State University, Salem Campus
lkunkel@kent.edu*

*Melissa Spohn, Head of Acquisitions
Kent State University, Kent Campus
mspohn@kent.edu*

*Susan Weaver, Library Director
Kent State University, East Liverpool Campus
sweaver@kent.edu*