June 2004

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

Gregory Walker

CURL-CoFoR Project Manager, gpmw@bodley.ox.ac.uk

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

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

Recommended Citation

Walker, Gregory (2004) "Give us the Tools: The CURL-CoFoR Project in Britain," *Against the Grain*: Vol. 16: Iss. 3, Article 6.
DOI: <https://doi.org/10.7771/2380-176X.4336>

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.

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.

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

Give us the Tools:
from page 18

to be in concert with the **Research Libraries Network (RLN)** now being set up to lead a UK-wide strategy for research information provision. With this perspective in view, the project deliverables have been centred around the evolution of a long-term **Partnership Agreement** on the retention, transfer and acquisition of **REES** research materials. In February 2004, after a complex consultation process, **CURL** invited all the partner libraries to join a ten-year **Agreement**⁶ covering:

Retention. Most partner libraries which do not already have a policy of near-total retention are asked to commit themselves to retaining **REES** material in designated fields for the ten-year period of the **Agreement**. In most cases they are also asked to agree to:

Acceptance of Transfer. This allows for the transfer of material in circumstances where a partner may have legitimate reasons to dispose of it, but where it is important to retain the material in support of **REES** research. Transfer will be by agreed procedures to a library accepting a retention commitment for the area concerned, with safeguards against the accumulation of multiple or inferior copies.

Acquisition. The commitment here will be principally to the maintenance of specific serial titles identified through the project's serials deduplication exercise (see below), with special attention to the protection of holdings unique in the UK. A select number of partners are also asked to maintain collecting levels of a wider range of material in

specified subject/country combinations, for periods to be individually negotiated.

The **Agreement** is accompanied by a detailed scheme of proposed commitments for each partner, worked out from a wide range of inputs (See Table 1 and 'The Need for Hard Data' below). In line with the priority given to the direct support of collections catering for newly-emerging research (see 'Research Mapping' below), a number of subject/country combinations have been identified in partner libraries as 'buildup points' to be targeted for further development. At the same time the 'national' status of particularly strong holdings at the **British Library** and a small number of other collections, and the need for their reinforcement, is recognised. For some subject/ language combinations — generally those attracting the most widespread research interest — two or occasionally more libraries have been designated as recipients of transferred material to allow holdings in more than one location in the UK to be strengthened. The scheme also tries to ensure that holdings of scarce foreign-language resources are protected. Of seventeen Slavonic and East European national languages, only Russian, Polish and Czech are now collected by more than four partner libraries, and most by fewer.

CoFoR has been pragmatic in its approach to the concept of resource sharing, aiming to obtain the maximum possible savings and other benefits from **CCM** consistent with partner libraries' willingness to collaborate. In pursuing this the Management Team has had to:

- explore in detail with each partner library what their funding, staff, space and internal priorities will allow them to commit to;

- make clear that the **Agreement** will play to libraries' strengths and will actively foster the strengthening of resources in newly developing areas of **REES** research;
- show partners that we know a lot about their **REES** holdings and collecting, and about their own institutions' **REES** research, and that we're in sympathy with their efforts to support their local academics;
- emphasise the partnership's role as an advocate in putting cases for special funding, and as a negotiator for consortial purchasing;
- demonstrate that this is being done within a national **CCM** scheme.

The Need for Hard Data

We have been convinced from the outset that properly-targeted collaborative collection management is impossible without a large corpus of reliable and up-to-date information about libraries' holdings and collecting, and — at least as importantly — about the research activities that they are supporting. In designing the scheme of **CCM** responsibilities allocated to each partner, we have followed the principle of working with the grain of libraries' existing policies and commitments, taking full account of the strong points in existing holdings, current policies on acquisition and retention, present levels of expenditure, and the character of the research being supported. Partners are not asked to increase the existing scale of their acquisitions, nor to extend their acquisition into subjects or areas not at present covered by their

continued on page 22

Table 1. Excerpt from provisional scheme of assigned commitments (subject to agreement)

1. Library	2. Retention	3. Accept Transfer	4. Acquisition	5. Notes
Birmingham UL (Bham)	Defence (arms control & regional security in R/CEE, defence industry & its conversion); Economics (R/Sov economies & industry); History (econ hist of R/SU); Pol/Govt (SU to 1945); Sci/Tech (sci & tech policy in R); Society (migration, housing in R/FSU)	As Retention, except Sci/Tech	R/Sov econ & industrial hist. Serials identified by DDE	Database of over 34,000 Soviet govt decrees 1930-45 is under compilation at Centre for REES
Bodleian Library (Bod)	Near-total. Legal deposit library.	History (R/FSU/CEE, ex as noted); Media (R/Sov publishing); Music (R/CEE)	History (Russian, Cz, Slk). Serials identified by DDE.	R/Sov econ hist at B'ham; Anglo-R relns at CUL and Leeds. Pol hist at SSEES
Bradford UL (Brad)	Yugoslavia & successor states (econ, pol/govt, society)	As Retention (<i>buildup</i>)	Serials identified by DDE	SEEurope Res Unit collects outside UL. Yugo lit/lang/hist at Nottingham. Baltic studies transferred to Glasgow.

collecting policies. The scheme makes use of the following factual and quantitative data:

- The subject/country coverage of partner libraries' existing REES stock, including special strengths, updated from the COCOREES collection descriptions.
- The subject/country coverage of partners' current collecting policies for REES, updated from the COCOREES statements, including specialisations and academic levels catered for.
- The volume of current and recent REES acquisitions, including the number of current REES serial titles.
- Duplication of REES serial titles and location of holdings unique in the UK, as established by CoFoR's serials deduplication exercise (*see below*)
- Libraries' expenditure on current and recent REES acquisitions.
- Libraries' policy on retention of stock.
- The profiles of academic research in REES at each partner library's home institution, derived from CoFoR's research mapping exercise (*see below*).

Research Mapping

The scheme has unequivocally given first priority to the strengthening of REES collections directly supporting research in partner libraries' home institutions, especially where special strengths of potential national significance are being developed to underpin local academic initiatives. This approach is intended to gain maximum credibility with researchers as well as approval, support and input from our academic advisors in BASEES. It requires a detailed awareness of universities' current research activity as well as of libraries' holdings and collecting policies. The project has therefore included a research mapping exercise to gather information on REES research throughout the UK, and to report on the value of the findings and the effectiveness of the techniques used.

The exercise has had the enthusiastic support of BASEES, which arranged an emailed questionnaire to their members (who include most academic REES researchers in the UK). This was supplemented by a thorough trawl of university and department Websites as well as of published reference works. The result is thought to be the most comprehensive survey of British research in REES ever produced, with information from nearly 100 institutions on research projects, departmental structures, staffing and postgraduate programmes. Besides proving to be a vital input to CoFoR's CCM scheme, the survey's findings have already helped BASEES itself in applications for research funding.

The project is still grappling with the methodological problem of how the significance of current research can be evaluated and expressed in ways that will give it a suitable 'weighting' in decisions on collaborative library support. The point here is that support should be channelled to larger-scale, longer-term REES research

Table 2. Excerpt from National Desiderata List

7. Central Russian newspapers [and] CIS and Baltic newspapers [and] Regional Russian newspapers. Online. East View. £3297, £687, £2129 pa.

Recommended LSE, NLS, SSEES.

BL subscribes, Oxford subscribes to Central RN and Duma pubns only, Birmingham subscribes to Central RN only.

Strong support from BASEES survey

8. The Cold War and the Central Committee. [from RGANI]. Series 1 The International Department 1953-1957, 126 reels (£13,325); Series 2 The General Department, 118 reels (£12,478); Series 3 Congresses of the CPSU 1955-1986, 196 reels / 701 fiches (£23,609); Series 4 Plenums of the CC CPSU, 181 reels / 659 fiches (£21,839). Thomson Gale.

Recommended Birmingham, Glasgow, LSE, SSEES.

BL holds Series 1 and 2

commitments rather than to, say, an isolated doctoral thesis topic.

Serials Deduplication

This exercise is running as a distinct sub-project, supported by the **British Library** and managed by **Ron Hogg at BL Boston Spa**. Its initial assignment was to examine mechanisms for identifying duplicates from the REES serials location listing compiled by the earlier RSLP COCOREES project. The master file at present (March 2004) holds 53,349 records (61% of them for BL holdings), representing c. 35,000 titles in 52 libraries. About 12,500 records (c. 24%) were found to duplicate other records, and work is now concentrating on the library-by-library listing of duplicated titles as the basis for detailed deduplication proposals. The first stage in this, just completed, has been to identify holdings of REES serial titles unique in the UK so that the **Partnership Agreement** can ensure their protection.

Consortial Acquisition

The partnership of twenty leading REES collections constitutes something close to the entire UK market for important research resources in the field, such as major document series in microform and specialised online services. The project is serving as a platform for approaches to publishers over possible consortial acquisitions. The National Desiderata List compiled by the COCOREES project (*see excerpt in Table 2 above*) has been updated and used as the basis for a shortlist of high-priority products for exploratory negotiation.

Costs and Benefits

The costs of the central management of the **Partnership Agreement** will be borne by **CURL** until the end of the **CoFoR** project, and it will be part of the exit strategy, supported by **CURL**, to seek funding for these purposes after that date. The project provides no additional funding for partner libraries' acquisitions. Each partner library is expected to meet the costs arising from its own commitments to the scheme as an integral part of responsible collection management, and will retain in its own budget any savings made by the operation of the scheme. However, the partnership offers the opportunity, and a large body of data, to identify libraries' needs for special funding in REES, and a plat-

form from which to present cases and support applications to fundholders.

An essential component of **CURL-CoFoR** is the development of procedures to monitor the effects of the **Partnership Agreement** after its implementation in terms of costs, savings and other benefits, deliverable in a form applicable to other CCM schemes. The **Agreement** commits partner libraries and the scheme management to providing the necessary data in a standard format, covering:

- **Costs:** startup planning and implementation; administration, monitoring and review over life of scheme; planning, creation and maintenance of supporting databases; costs of transferring material under the scheme.
- **Benefits:** savings from purchases no longer made; reduction in cost of purchases achieved by consortial negotiation; reduction in overheads due to giving up collection and/or retention responsibilities; protection against loss of unique research material from the UK; new purchases made possible by savings achieved; access to new resources gained through consortial negotiation; improved awareness of location and nature of research resources.

Life Beyond CoFoR

In planning **CoFoR's** transition from a 21-month project to a ten-year partnership from September 2004, the maintenance of the project's databases after **CoFoR** itself comes to an end will be the vital factor in securing a robust foundation for the partnership, and will rely crucially on establishing and exploiting reliable data flows from partner libraries and academic sources. For the **Partnership Agreement** to remain viable, partners' commitments will have to be adapted to new directions of research and the appearance of new resources by a process of regular review founded on updated information on holdings, collecting and REES research.

As I noted above, **CURL** is proposing to lead from the front in supporting and regulating longer-term collaborative collection initiatives for the UK's research resources in a wide range of subjects. It is currently (March 2004)

continued on page 24

Give us the Tools:
from page 22

discussing exit strategies with the **CoFoR Management Team** which will aim to continue its work for **REES** while demonstrating the relevance of **CCM** to a broadening constituency of professional and academic interests.

References

Accessible on the project website at <http://www.cocorees.ac.uk>

1. Gregory Walker, *Collection-Level Resource Guidance for Research in Russian and East European Studies*. February 2000.
2. Ron Hogg, *Specialised Listings of Research Material in Russian and East European Studies*. March 2000.
3. Lesley Pitman, Tania Konn, Roman Hobler, Katia Rogatchevskaia, *A Unified Search Interface for Research Resources in Russian and East European Studies*. September 2000.
4. Gregory Walker, *Collaborative Collection Management Initiatives for Russian and East European Studies*. July 2001.
5. *Collaborative Collection Management Project for Russian and East European Studies (COCOREES). Final Report*. December 2002.
6. The texts of the Agreement and the accompanying scheme of commitments will be placed on the project Website as soon as finalised.

Appendix: CURL-CoFoR Partner Libraries

Partners in the earlier RSLP COCOREES project are marked with an asterisk.

Birmingham University Library*
 Bodleian Library, University of Oxford*
 Bradford University Library
 Bristol University Library
 British Library*
 Brotherton Library, University of Leeds*
 Cambridge University Library*
 Durham University Library
 Edinburgh University Library
 Essex University Library*
 Glasgow University Library*
 Library of the London School of Economics and Political Science (LSE)*
 John Rylands University Library of Manchester
 National Library of Scotland*
 Nottingham University Library*
 The Polish Library, London*
 Royal Institute of International Affairs
 School of Slavonic & East European Studies Library (University College London)*
 Scott Polar Research Institute Library, University of Cambridge
 Taylor Institution Library, University of Oxford

Associated Institutions

Russian and Eurasian Studies Centre, St Antony's College, Oxford
 Society for Cooperation in Russian and Soviet Studies, London

The Shared Bibliographer: TRLN Builds Cooperative South Asia Collection

by **Kim Armstrong** (Program Officer, Triangle Research Libraries Network, Chapel Hill, NC 27514-8890) <kim_armstrong@unc.edu>

Summary

The **Triangle Research Libraries Network (TRLN)** consortium appointed a shared bibliographer for South Asia collections in Fall 2001. The appointment was the result of a faculty/library partnership in which the libraries received a portion of a **U. S. Department of Education Title VI** grant to the **Triangle South Asia Consortium**. Monies from the grant provide partial support for the shared bibliographer and for collection purchases and processing. The libraries in the consortium lie within a 35-mile radius of each other in central North Carolina, so the bibliographer has a real presence and impact on the campuses served as well as the opportunity to build a single, shared collection for faculty teaching and research across the four campuses.

The Participants

TRLN is a collaborative organization of the libraries of **Duke University**, **North Carolina Central University (NCCU)**, **North Carolina State University (NCSSU)**, and the **University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill (UNC)**. The consortium offices are based on the UNC cam-

pus. For most of the consortium's history, the cooperative programs have consisted of coordinated collection development and resource sharing. (www.trln.org). Cooperation dates back to the 1930s and current selected areas of cooperative print collections include agreements for Africa, East Asia, Russia & Eastern Europe, and Latin America.

The **North Carolina Center for South Asian Studies** is an arm of the **Triangle South Asia Consortium (TSAC)**. The consortium is an educational cooperative of the same four universities that TRLN serves. Dues for the operation of the Center are paid by the member universities. TSAC's history dates to 1987 and its primary participants are the 32 core and 21 allied faculty whose research and teaching areas are related to South Asia. (<http://www.ncsu.edu/tsac/index.html>)

Getting the Ball Rolling

Faculty from the **NC Center for South Asian Studies** met with the University Librarians in 1998 to discuss their grant application for a **Title VI Undergraduate National Resource Center** and also an accompanying

FLAS (Foreign Language and Area Studies) request. The faculty wanted to propose a new model for building South Asian collections in the **Triangle** and to build support for the new model into their grant. The grant, if awarded, would provide monies over three years directly to the libraries. The faculty envisioned a unified, consortial collection development policy for South Asia and a shared South Asia bibliographer.

The proposal to the University Librarians also delineated how collections might be built to maximize the complementarity of collections in vernacular materials that support teaching and research at the four universities. Each university would build a basic collection for beginning and intermediate language instruction and the more specialized vernacular collecting would be distributed to each university in a division by language. **Duke** would collect Bengali

continued on page 26