June 2004

Some Practical Models For Cooperative Collection Development

Margo Warner Curl

The College of Wooster Libraries, mcurl@wooster.edu

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

Part of the [Library and Information Science Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Curl, Margo Warner (2004) "Some Practical Models For Cooperative Collection Development," *Against the Grain*: Vol. 16: Iss. 3, Article 5.

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.7771/2380-176X.4335>

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.

ALA ANNUAL ISSUE

VOLUME 16, NUMBER 3

Against the Grain

c/o Katina Strauch
209 Richardson Avenue
MSC 98, The Citadel
Charleston, SC 29409

TM

JUNE 2004

Against the Grain

"Linking Publishers, Vendors and Librarians"

ISSN: 1043-2094

Some Practical Models For Cooperative Collection Development

by **Margo Warner Curl** (Coordinator of Cooperative Collection Development, CONSORT Colleges (after July 1, Technical Services Librarian, The College of Wooster Libraries) <mcurl@wooster.edu>

There is a lot of interest in **Cooperative Collection Development (CCD)**,

and increasing pressure to participate in cooperative projects as a way to maximize materials budgets. Many library partnerships and consortia have formed in order to collectively purchase electronic resources (electronic journals, databases) or to create efficiencies through a shared integrated library system (ILS). These types of cooperative projects, though time-consuming and difficult, have proved themselves as they continue to thrive. Cooperating in developing print collections is more of a challenge, and there are few successful models out there. This lack of models makes it harder for new projects to start. This has certainly been the case for our cooperative project (**CONSORT Libraries** — see *ATG* volume 14, no. 6. December 02-January 03 issue for some somewhat naïve musings as we started into our project): the only models we could find three years ago were those of compre-

hensive country coverage distribution among Research Libraries, and the college groups of **CTW (Connecticut-Trinity-Wesleyan)** and the **Tri-Colleges (Bryn Mawr-Haverford-Swarthmore)** that were also just in the early stages of exploring cooperative collection development. These latter two groups have been of assistance to us as our project has evolved, just as they have also gleaned from our experience.

Based on the descriptions in the articles that follow, there seem to be a number of common factors that contribute to the (potential) success of projects. All the projects described in these articles come out of formal consortia, though not all involve all consortial members. The projects do not always involve only those libraries of a similar size. A shared ILS is useful, but not necessary if patrons can easily see the holdings of institutions participating in the CCD project. An efficient system to deliver materials among the participating libraries is a strong supporting element. Working with a common vendor is especially useful when the

project involves the acquisition of current print monographs. A financial commitment to the project strengthens it, but in all projects described here, the money for material comes from within current budgets, so extra funding is not a necessary ingredient.

While the articles do not represent the entire universe of CCD projects underway, they all claim some degree of success. They all claim a good working relationship among the member libraries. They all emphasize that member libraries retain their autonomy in collecting decisions — no member is forced to give up acquiring what is needed locally, none is forced to collect in areas of little local interest. The projects all focus on a particular material type or subject area, rather than trying

continued on page 18

If Rumors Were Horses

I want to take a minute to update everyone on the **2004 Charleston Conference**. The conference will be the same as always! This year it is being held (November 3, pre-conferences and Vendor Showcase, and November 4-6, main conference) in the **Francis Marion Hotel** on King Street, right next to the now-closed College of Charleston Conference Center. The Francis Marion has added a new Conference Center which will allow us to hold the Conference in one place. Since the College of Charleston has closed their Conference Center, it became necessary to set up a separate group to manage the Conference independent of the College. This group is **Regina Semko** <rsemko@comcast.net> (once a head honcho at the Conference Center) and **Ilze Visocka**

<ivisocka@hotmail.com> (her able assistant) as well as **John McDonald** <mcdonaldj@cofc.edu> of the College of Charleston, **Edna Laughrey** <elaughrey@aol.com> of *Against the Grain*, **Toni Nix** <justwrite@lowcountry.com> of Just Right Group, LLC, and **Yours Truly** <kstrauch@comcast.net>. This year the theme is "All the World's a Serial" and the Website is <http://www.katina.info/conference/>. There is a registration brochure included with this issue of *ATG* and you can also register on the Website. See you in November!

So exciting! The perfect **Rosann Bazirjian** <rbb9@psulias.psu.edu> is the new **University Librarian** at **Walter Clinton Jackson Library** at **UNC-Greensboro** effective August 15, 2004. Besides be-

continued on page 6

What To Look For In This Issue:

Function and Friction	83
Little Red Herrings — PASCAL	88
A View From Fiesole 2004	90
XML in Action	91
Portals & Politics: Federal Government Gateways	93
RFID	94
Profiles Encouraged	
Steve McKinzie	62
Margo Warner Curl	64
Michael Mabe	65
Dr. Gregory Walker	65
Interviews	
Ron Klausner	63
Christopher Warnock	66
John Riley	70

1043-2094(200406)16:3:1-T

Some Practical Models For... from page 1

to tackle CCD across their whole collections. The most important element for getting projects off the ground seems to be leadership, which may come through temporary grant funds or from the determination of one or more participants.

So — we present these models:

- Cooperative building of a national level collection by research libraries in the U.K. of materials on **Russian and East European Studies** by **Dr. Gregory Walker**. This project is intended as a model for future cooperative projects, including elements of acquisitions (including research mapping and a National Desiderata List), retention (including serials deduplication), and acceptance of transfer.
- A bibliographer for South Asian studies shared among the **TRLN** libraries contributed by **Kim Armstrong**.
- A shared print journal archive for the **University of California** libraries described by **Dr. Cynthia Shelton**.
- A regional group of **OhioLINK** members cooperating in non-core areas of religious studies, their success due much to the personal efforts of the author, **Paul Jenkins**.
- The work of a consortium liberal arts college libraries is discussed by **Marian Shilstone**. This group has put careful thought into the groundwork for **CCD** and has tackled the difficult issue of the notion of the “core” collection.
- And finally, a project focused on collections of U.S. government depository publications that includes many of the same elements of the first model — acquisitions, retention, and acceptance of transfer. **Mary Prophet, Megan Fitch, and Joy He** author this article.

Group Therapy from page 16

covering the journals of many publishers and the publisher gets one order covering journals from many libraries.

However, online subscriptions have brought changes. While a library could consolidate shipment of all their print journals through an agent's warehouse, the activation process for online titles varies from publisher to publisher and we find we need more information about the library customer to effectively maintain their online access.

One area of concern to publishers with the multiple types of subscriptions — print-only, online-only, or print+online bundle — is confusion in the renewal process. This may be the source of Lauren's comment about penalties for late payment. We have noticed that several agents have renewed a number of orders that had been for a print + online bundle one year as a print-only subscription for the next year. Such “renewals” kick out of the automatic processing system at the publisher's end and have to be changed over to the new subscriber type, usually manually. When the online access is terminated, either at the end of the year or the end of the online grace period, the library customer realizes the problem and often wants the order converted back to the print + online combination. This results in another manual intervention and, in some fulfillment systems, loss of subscriber history data. For many journals, particularly in the humanities and social sciences, the overhead cost of these multiple changes exceeds the difference in subscription price. I would ask librarians to review their agent's consolidated renewal orders carefully to make sure that it includes the desired level of online access.

to tackle CCD across their whole collections.

Give us the Tools: The CURL-CoFoR Project in Britain

by **Gregory Walker** (CURL-CoFoR Project Manager)
<gpmw@bodley.ox.ac.uk>

Origins of the Project

CURL-CoFoR has its roots in the earlier **COCOREES** project, which ran from 1999 to 2002 as one of several **Collaborative Collection Management (CCM)** initiatives launched by the **Research Support Libraries Programme (RSLP)** with the support of UK government funding agencies for higher education. For the first time, it provided the resources with which to lay the groundwork for the major British collections in **Russian and East European Studies (REES)** to work together systematically on improving library provision for researchers in the field. Four interim **COCOREES** reports and its *Final Report* are accessible on the project Website.¹⁻⁵

Early in 2002 the project management was approached by the **Consortium of University Research Libraries (CURL)**, representing 25 of the largest academic libraries in the British Isles. **CURL's Task Force on Resource Management** was looking to work up and implement a range of procedures and documentation (“tools”) to support **CCM** for a variety of subjects in research libraries, and saw in **COCOREES** a promising platform for further development, testing and demonstration. In October 2002, shortly before the **COCOREES** project ended, the **CURL** Board accepted the proposal for a successor. While **Russian and East European Studies** remains the subject focus, the new project's remit has been to produce tools for **CCM** which can be widely applied in other fields.

The Project in Brief

The **CURL-CoFoR** project runs from December 2002 to August 2004. It is a partnership of twenty UK libraries, all with important collections in **Russian and East European Studies**, with two further associated institutions (for a full list of partners, see Appendix). **CURL** has provided funding to support a part-time Project Manager and two part-time Project Officers, while certain other partners — notably the **British Library** — have generously contributed additional staff resources and other facilities. The project is committed to delivering tested and agreed procedures and tools (model agreements, protocols, templates, etc.) to serve as a practical basis for the **Collaborative Collection Management (CCM)** of research resources in UK libraries. All deliverables have **REES** materials as their sub-

ject matter, and academic **REES** research as their primary object of support; but it is fundamental to the project that the outcomes should be delivered in forms that allow wider subject applicability. The committees of the **British Association for Slavonic and East European Studies (BASEES)** and of the **Council for Slavonic and East European Library and Information Services (COSEELIS)** are the project's academic and professional advisory bodies respectively.

The COCOREES Inheritance

CURL-CoFoR is much more than a simple extension of the **RSLP COCOREES** project, but **COCOREES** has provided **CoFoR** with an essential set of products, people and relationships:

- A searchable set of descriptions for research collections in **REES** in 80 UK libraries.
- A searchable location list of Russian and East European serials held in 52 UK libraries, currently recording c. 35,000 titles.
- Standard-format collection policy statements for partner libraries.
- A National Desiderata List of major research resources for **REES** to act as a basis for consortial acquisition.
- Development of an IT infrastructure for the above, all of which are accessible on the project Website at <http://www.cocorees.ac.uk>
- Accessions and expenditure data for **REES** from partner libraries.

CURL-CoFoR has benefited immensely from this inheritance of several major bodies of factual information about the library resources with which it is engaged, as well as from the experience of area/subject-specialised IT development work. There has also been the advantage of continuity in personnel. All four members of the **COCOREES** management, including the present Project Manager, joined the new Management Team, and both Project Officers also transferred to **CURL-CoFoR**.

The Partnership Agreement

CURL is committed to playing a leading role in seeking to maintain and develop a governance structure for a UK-wide **CCM** scheme beyond the completion of the **CURL-CoFoR** project in August 2004. This is likely

continued on page 20