June 2004

Planning a Prospective Shared Print Journal Collection at the University of California

Cynthia Shelton Ph.D.

UCLA Library, cshelton@library.ucla.edu

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

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

Recommended Citation

Shelton, Cynthia Ph.D. (2004) "Planning a Prospective Shared Print Journal Collection at the University of California," *Against the Grain*: Vol. 16: Iss. 3, Article 8.

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.7771/2380-176X.4338>

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.

Planning a Prospective Shared Print Journal Collection at the University of California

by Cynthia Shelton, Ph.D. (Associate University Librarian for Collection Management and Scholarly Communication, UCLA Library)
<cshelton@library.ucla.edu>

The University of California libraries have been building shared digital collections for almost six years. Campuses participate as members of a consortium using the **California Digital Library** as the administrative arm and licensing agency. In the fall of 2002, driven by diminishing funding and space for collections, the University Librarians recommended that the campuses expand the concept of shared collection beyond the digital realm to include print. A robust technological infrastructure for identifying and delivering materials between campuses and shared storage facilities made this decision even more compelling.

Where to begin? No systematic program or infrastructure existed for a shared print collection, much less a "trusted archive." Yet campuses were facing large print cancellation projects to meet constricting budgets. Understandably, they had all targeted the same print journal titles to eliminate: those to which we had electronic cross access through a consortial license. A Mellon funded university-wide study (the **Collection Management Initiative** or **CMI**) had presented convincing evidence that faculty and students overwhelmingly preferred use of electronic versions of journals when both print and electronic were available. The only thing lacking in carrying out large scale cancellations of print versions was a trusted archive. The **Collection Development Council (CDC)**, a standing university committee with campus representation, knew that they needed to give selectors the confidence that at least one print copy of a heretofore widely held journal title would be preserved for the campuses.

In November of 2003, CDC launched a planning effort to conduct a pilot to build a shared collection of prospective print journal titles for which electronic access was available. **Elsevier** and **ACM** journals seemed like an obvious choice to test the ability of a nine campus system to collaborate on a shared collection. A single print copy of each of these two publishers' journals was negotiated as part of the CDL system-wide license for the electronic package. Upon the announcement of the pilot, selectors at all nine campuses made the decision to cancel the majority of print subscriptions to **Elsevier** and **ACM** titles.

In launching the pilot, CDC perceived that the plan would allow the university to confront and test a number of policy and procedural issues for collaboratively building a "trusted archive," including governance, definition of how a hybrid archive should behave, and the implications for borrow, circulation, preservation, and record sharing. The planners also wanted to measure the costs and determine whether such a program was cost-effective and

scalable. The viability of a prospective shared print collection would ride largely on the opportunity costs gained if campuses perceived that they did not have to subscribe to, process, or house materials.

Policy Issues

CDC formed a working group to recommend a plan that could be implemented in early 2003, when the print copies of **Elsevier** and **ACM** would begin to arrive at a UC campus address. Before handing the planning over to the working group, CDC tackled some basic policy questions, some thornier than others, regarding building a prospective shared archive. It was fairly easy to decide that the shared collection should be housed in one of the two regional library storage facilities (**RLF**) for the university. Shelving space in a temperature and humidity controlled environment designed to preserve materials offered a tremendous advantage over any campus library. It was also important that finely honed processing procedures and advanced technology for lending existed at the **RLFs**. Finally, we reached immediate consensus that the print copies should be identified in the system-wide catalog record as belonging to the "University of California Libraries," a first time use of that concept to mean an "owning library."

A more problematic policy decision involved the extent to which the collection would behave as a true archive and, in that context, what would best serve our collective needs. We did not believe that a true archive was necessary or desirable for the campuses. But what kind of controls would we put on the use and access to this single print copy? Campuses had different concerns and we knew by defining any archive as less than "dark," that we were moving into contested territory. Some believed we should create a "dim" archive that could be accessed only on site. Others argued that the collection should be a "light" archive from which items could circulate to campuses and be used there under controlled circumstances. A prevailing concern among the campuses was that we had assured our faculty that in canceling print subscriptions and relying on the electronic version, they could count on access to a "backup" print copy of an issue. This was of particular concern for scholars in the sciences who needed to consult print versions for the superior graphics. We thus decided to circulate the copies for restricted use in campus libraries. We also believed we could be a bit cavalier about our trusted archive since we assumed that print issues of current **Elsevier** and **ACM** journals would be ubiquitous. Finally we assumed that requests to have the print copies in hand would be low. First, every print

copy had an electronic analog that was accessible to every campus user. Secondly, the **RLFs** had the equipment and workflow infrastructure to efficiently do desktop delivery. CDC only briefly debated whether we should retain two copies, one for a dark archive and one for a use copy. We limited use to **University of California** users and limited the borrowing period to one week.

CDL originally recommended that the ownership of the collection should be collective. On the surface this should not have been controversial since we had acquired the journals as part of a consortial license. However, this presented a significant change in philosophy that the campuses were not ready to embrace. It should be noted that heretofore, the **RLFs** housed collections of deposited materials that remained individually owned by the depositing library. In fact, collections that were deposited could be deaccessioned by the owning campus. Even though the statistical rate of "repatriation" of collections was extremely low, the campuses were not willing to extend the definition of their first shared collection to include ownership. The "o" word was dropped from the recommendation and instead the working group noted that the collections would be collectively governed.

Procedures for Implementation

The pilot's working group turned toward the task of defining procedures for implementing the **Elsevier/ACM** shared collection by working with campus-based procedures for technical processing and preservation. Knowledgeable staff with expertise in serial acquisitions, processing for remote storage, cataloging, and preservation were included on the pilot's working group.

Acquisitions. The Working Group anticipated having to make few changes in campus acquisition procedures or **Southern Regional Library Facility (SRLF)** processing procedures to accommodate the shared collection. The **SRLF** is literally on the **UCLA** campus, so the **UCLA** acquisitions department was designated the acquisitions unit for the 928 **Elsevier** titles. **UC San Diego** was already receiving the **ACM** titles and they served as the acquisitions unit for those titles. The routine procedures for check-in, record editing, claiming and physical transfer seemed adaptable for the shared collection. However, we developed a separate workflow stream for the shared print in order to track costs and, in an ideal setup, give priority handling to these materials.

Processing for the regional storage facility. As with acquisitions processing, processing for storage seemed easily adaptable to the shared

continued on page 30

Planning a Prospective Shared... from page 28

collection. **SRLF** staff could follow standard routines to edit records to show location and owning unit. The working group saw no reason to physically house the collection together or to confer upon it the special protections of floor that housed rare materials. One issue that was not anticipated and will need to be addressed is how we alter the campus storage deposit quotas to make room for the steady stream of 10,000 items a year for the **Elsevier/ACM** pilot. Each campus is given a quota for deposits in the **RLFs**.

Cataloging and data elements. UC planners felt it was important to specify in **MELVYL**, the UC union catalog, that the shared copy was a part of the **UC Libraries Collection**. This issue of identifying a title as part of the new shared collection had not arisen with the shared digital acquisitions, because each local catalog had a bibliographic record that linked to the digital content as part of the "local" collection. The holdings record for the print issue, however, had to point to a *physical* location and *owning* unit, being **SRLF** and **UC Libraries** respectively. It was also important to clarify in the public display that the copies had restricted use and loan periods. Once a unique location code was assigned to the shared **Elsevier** copies, all kinds of possibilities for display and limiting were possible: Because the **University of California Libraries (UCL)** copy was restricted use, should it display as the last holding in the **MELVYL** catalog? When a user limits his/her

search to a specific campus can the **UCL** copy display as part of that limited search. In spite of the ability to display collective ownership through a note field in the **MELVYL** record, most campuses still wanted to create a mechanism and work flow to add the holdings *information* on these shared print copies to their individual catalogs. This was driven by a desire to enable users of local campus catalogs to find the print copy when searching locally. We needed to refer to the cataloging experts in charge of developing guidelines for campuses to add holding information to local catalogs.

Preservation. There is no doubt that we made compromises in the level of security and preservation treatment assigned to the shared collection. Why were we willing to make these compromises? We felt that the print copies would be borrowed infrequently because electronic access existed and we could rely on campus redundancy as a source for fill-ins or replacement of damaged or missing issues. We also had faith in our normal claiming procedures to fill in gaps. We had no intention of defining the print collections as the "copy of record" or "last copy" for the UC system, since we were creating a hybrid archive that would allow for "controlled circulation." The decision was made to not bind the issues in the shared print collection in order to facilitate scanning and photocopying. Because we had eliminated the main preservation measure for journals, binding, we built in a new processing step. Upon receipt issues were put into archival envelopes and other types of archival enclosures before transportation to the **SRLF**.

Implementation and Assessment

UCLA began creating check-in records for the **Elsevier** shared print issues in May 2003 and processing issues in July. **CDC** appointed an assessment team to evaluate the effectiveness and outcome of the pilot. University Librarians particularly are concerned whether such a collaborative effort will scale and is cost effective. As the pilot has unfolded some outstanding issues have surfaced. It is clear that we need to develop a set of preservation policies to govern shared print collections that meet the particular type of collection and the behavior we expect out of it. We also realized that we had not written policies for campus staff to follow in mediating the requests for the restricted materials. In retrospect we should have included an ILL expert, who knew the **MELVYL** infrastructure for borrowing, on the working group. **CDC** has already had discussions on how the building and behavior of a shared collection will be specific to the characteristics of the materials. We are eagerly anticipating the report of the **Elsevier/ACM** pilot from the assessment team that has been evaluating the procedures, workflows, and costs. **UC** is signing second and third generation licenses with additional journal publishers that include provision of a single print copy for the system. Concurrently, we are struggling to find time to step back and define the broad goals and vision of a shared collection. We expect the pilot results will both help refine the procedures for UC's first category of shared collections and clarify our broader goals in the uncharted waters of prospective shared print. 🍌

SWORCS: A Work in Progress

by **Paul Jenkins** (Director of Library Services at the College of Mount St. Joseph, Cincinnati, Ohio) <paul_jenkins@mail.msjs.edu>

Since the days of the **Farmington Plan** (established in 1942), librarians have chased the holy grail of cooperative collection development with little success. This ambitious plan fell into disuse in the early 1970s thanks in part to reductions in materials budgets, poor administration, and growing confusion as to its actual mission.¹ In 2002, I proposed a much less ambitious scheme: to see if five **OhioLINK** institutions could effectively work together to purchase books in religions outside the Judeo-Christian tradition in order to reduce unnecessary duplication of titles. While much smaller in scope than the **Farmington Plan**, our project faces many of the same challenges.

Dubbed **SWORCS** (**Southwestern Ohio Religious Cooperative**), our plan has experienced a lengthy gestation period, and we have encountered some of the same difficulties which doomed the national project. The germ of the idea sprang from a comment heard at an **OhioLINK** committee meeting that the consortium's subject groups (Art, Biology, etc.) should be more actively promoting cooperative collection development. Instead of continuing unnecessary duplication of titles in subject ar-

reas, why not purchase titles outside the core held by few or no consortium members? Since my institution, the **College of Mount St. Joseph** (Catholic, enrollment of 2,000), is one of four in the immediate Cincinnati area with a religious affiliation, I sensed an opportunity. Could librarians from a small group of religious institutions attempt a cooperative collection development project in the field of religious studies which might serve as a model for later statewide application?

The first schools I contacted were **Xavier University** (Catholic, enrollment of 4,000), the **University of Dayton** (Catholic, enrollment of 7,000), and **Cincinnati Bible College** (Protestant, enrollment of 600). As I contemplated an agenda for our first meeting in June, 2002 I reflected on the fact that if our schools shared similar heritages, we varied greatly in terms of collection size and annual materials budgets. Dayton's budget in Religious Studies, for example, is roughly ten times greater than my institution can afford. Ensuring that each member would play a viable role in the group would be a challenge. I also wanted to make it clear from the start that though I was the impetus

behind the group I had no clear idea of exactly how we might proceed.

At our first meeting we determined that any cooperative ventures should concentrate on improving holdings in religions outside the Judeo-Christian tradition. Core collections in this area must continue to be developed locally. Indeed, it seems clear to me that cooperative collection development in any discipline will succeed only in areas peripheral to the core. Other topics discussed at the June meeting included creating a union serials list for the group, identifying member institutions' relative collection strengths in the areas of Islam, Buddhism, and Hinduism, identifying titles in these religions not owned by any **OhioLINK** member, finding and addressing gaps in religious monographic series, conducting a conspectus study for the group, investigating whether similar projects were afoot in other state consortia, and finally what sort of usage reports in the area

continued on page 32