June 2004

CTW -- Early Explorations and New Directions

Marian Shilstone

Connecticut College, mrshi@conncoll.edu

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

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

Recommended Citation

Shilstone, Marian (2004) "CTW -- Early Explorations and New Directions," *Against the Grain*: Vol. 16: Iss. 3, Article 10.

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.7771/2380-176X.4340>

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.

SWORCS: A Work in Progress
from page 32

Eighteen **OhioLINK** members responded. The results of the survey were as follows:

Religion	Mode	Average Rating
African Religions	2	2.00
Atheism	3	2.60
Bahai	3	2.67
Buddhism	1	1.67
Confucianism	2	1.94
Hinduism	2	1.83
Islam	1	1.44
Jainism	2	2.31
Rastafarianism	3	2.81
Scientology	3	3.00
Shinto	2	2.24
Sikhism	2	2.38
Taoism	2	2.06
Tenrikyo	3	3.00
Unitarianism	3	2.50
Zoroastrianism	3	2.81

Clearly, then, there does seem good reason to purchase books in all of these areas. Thirteen of the sixteen faiths listed above received at least one rating of 1. Respondents also identified a number of other religions and sects covered in their curricula. These included Hare Krishna, New Age, Native American religions, Shamanism, Spiritualism, Sufism, and Vajrayana. There is certainly room for expanded coverage.

As I write, we are about to make our first purchases for **SWORCS**. Fiscal 04-05 should prove a pivotal year in the project. The degree of success we have in establishing good approval plan profiles will prove crucial. Communication between members of the group must continue, and we must advertise our mission throughout the **OhioLINK** community in order to encourage similar ventures. Whether **SWORCS** meets the same fate as the **Farmington Plan** and other attempts at cooperative collection development remains to be seen. What is certain, however, is that the desire to work together exists. Stay tuned.

Endnotes

1. Gaines, Abner J. (1994). *Farmington Plan*. In Wayne A. Wiegand & Donald G. Davis (Eds.), *Encyclopedia of Library History* (p.193). New York and London: Garland Publishing.

CTW — Early Explorations and New Directions

by **Marian Shilstone** (Director, Information Resources, Information Services, Connecticut College) <mrshi@conncoll.edu>

In 1984, under the leadership of **Brian Rogers**, **Ralph Emerick** and **Robert Adams**, **Connecticut College**, **Trinity College** and **Wesleyan University** formed the **CTW Consortium** to purchase a shared integrated library system (**Notis**) and to establish a program for reciprocal borrowing of the collections represented in the consortial catalog. Early cooperative efforts among the three libraries centered on acquisitions procedures and common workflow issues. But after the consortium migrated to the **Sirsi** system in 1995, staff began to consider the potential benefits of cooperating more closely on building shared collections to maximize available resources. In March 1997, the three **CTW** directors established a **CTW Collection Development Committee** and charged the group with examining options for the joint acquisition of resources. The group's efforts very quickly veered off into two distinct directions. The first, the consortial purchase of electronic databases desired by all three libraries, has been quite successful. In all, we have negotiated licenses for 20 electronic databases since the group was formed. For a few of these we have now joined larger groups to enhance the discount — most notably the **Oberlin Group** and **Nelinet**. However, we still maintain consortial subscriptions to 13 databases with considerable savings over individual subscriptions.

The second area of interest to the group grew out of the fact that all three libraries maintained approval plans with a common vendor, **Yankee Book Peddler**. In November 1996, prior to the development of our formal collection development committee, our vendor representative, **Ruth Fischer** (now of **R2 Consulting**), completed an analysis of our three separate approval profiles and our purchase patterns for the months of August through October of 1996. At the time, **Yankee** was beginning to develop an interest in the concept of consortia profiling and was planning a discussion group at **ALA Midwinter** in January. My two **CTW** colleagues in collection development, **Ed Allen** at **Wesleyan** and **Doris Kamradt** at **Trinity**, and I had enjoyed a cordial and cooperative working relationship for a number of years. While we had no "formal" collecting agreements, we had developed some understanding of areas of strength in the three collections. **Wesleyan** had particularly strong collections in medieval studies, classics, gay & lesbian studies, and ethnomusicology, to name a few. **Trinity's**

collections reflected the only engineering program in the consortium along with strong collections in Latin American literature, language & cognition, ethics, and ornithology. **Connecticut College** had well-developed collections in the fine arts, Irish history, ecology and environmental studies, child and family studies and North American archaeology. **Ed, Doris** and I would often confer on major purchases by telephone or, preferably, over lunch at a good restaurant! And so we were eager to work with **Ruth** on a more systematic analysis of our collecting patterns. This initial analysis yielded some surprising results and some expected results. Since all three of our institutions are liberal arts institutions with similar core curricula, the publishers covered in our plans were comparable, although **Wesleyan**, with the largest acquisitions budget, had the largest coverage of publishers. Surprisingly, however, an analysis of the titles supplied during the study revealed the extent to which our collections were, indeed, unique. In all,

of the 894 titles acquired by the three libraries during the three months, 620, or 69%, were unique to one library. Because this was not a catalog overlap study and could simply reflect different buying schedules, we did a subsequent study covering a full year, from July '96 through June '97. The results of this later study showed 56% unique titles purchased within the consortium (51% at **CC**, 47% at **TC** and 65% at **WU**) during that period. So it was clear that to some extent our historic collecting patterns differed enough based on local needs to offer significant resources to our partners within the consortium.

Over the years, **CTW** circulation figures have reinforced the mutual support provided by our consortial collections. Although **Connecticut College** has the smallest collection and acquisitions budget of the three, we have more than held our own in providing resources to our partners. In some years we have actually lent more than we have borrowed within the consortium. Anecdotal evidence suggests that much of our resource sharing involves core titles with multiple copies within **CTW**. This became a central question when we began to consider a more formal collecting agreement in the spring of 1997.

In May of '97, **Ed, Doris** and I met specifically to discuss the possibility of constructing a consortial approval profile and to prepare for a meeting with **Ruth Fischer** in July. We reviewed the data **Ruth** had sup-

continued on page 36

of certain core titles available within CTW was desirable to satisfy the need for books in high demand. We agreed that it would be important for each library to maintain a certain core collection of scholarly materials. How could we define this core and how could we identify areas where each library might take responsibility for collecting in depth? We decided to base our plan on the levels of collecting outlined in **Joanne Anderson's** *Guide for Written Collection Development Policy Statements*, 2d edition, published by the **American Library Association** in 1996. The result of our initial discussion was the following draft document:

CTW CONSORTIUM

Proposed Collecting Levels for consortial cooperation

I. BASIC INFORMATION LEVEL

This level consists of materials appropriate for the support of the needs of general library users through the first two years of college. Normally, 3 copies of these works would be found within the CTW consortium.

Examples:

- Collected works
- General monographs that introduce and define a subject
- Works of scholarship published by major university presses and academic publishers that survey a broad topic
- Introductory works and general treatises in the sciences and social sciences
- Quality non-fiction of broad interest (e.g., memoirs, biographies, essays)
- Works of major writers (literary fiction, poetry, plays)
- Monographs on major artists and artistic movements
- Major exhibition catalogs
- Major reference works
- Selected foreign language materials, including the works of major writers in languages taught at the institution

II. STUDY OR INSTRUCTIONAL SUPPORT LEVEL

This level includes materials designed to support the needs of general library users through college and beginning graduate instruction. Three copies of these works might be found occasionally where the approval profiles of all three institutions reflect a major commitment to collection building. More commonly, 2 copies would be available within the consortium. One copy would be expected in areas unique to one of the institutions, such as engineering at **Trinity**.

Examples:

- Works of scholarship accessible to upperclass undergraduate students but requiring some prior knowledge of the subject
- Literary works by respected but lesser known writers
- Edited collections of scholarly essays
- Foreign language monographs in disciplines other than literature (e.g., history, art)
- Scholarly series such as Sather Classical Lectures, Methods in Enzymology

III. RESEARCH LEVEL

This level includes materials aimed at a narrow academic audience, including faculty, graduate students and undergraduate students working at advanced levels. In general, one copy would be found within the consortium at the institution designated through the common profile as the library traditionally collecting in depth in the area. Two copies would be found when local needs at a second institution require an on-site copy.

Examples:

- Monographs narrow in scope either by geographical or topical area of interest
- Collections of primary source materials in reproduced format

plied us, which included a copy of our three profiles juxtaposed for comparison. We reinforced our agreement that having three or more copies

the three libraries in graphical form **Ruth** was able to illustrate where our collecting patterns were similar and where they differed. The "supraprofile" illustrated our consortial purchasing history by broad LC classes. From the graphs we could easily see that as a consortium we had particularly good coverage in the H and P classifications and that **Trinity** was strongest in the Q's. Graphs of each library's acquisitions showed individual collection strengths contributing to the "supraprofile." **Ruth's** various analyses underscored the advantages of working with a common vendor in designing a formal consortial collecting program. She was able to provide us with significant data to help us understand where we stood based on our individual approaches to collection building. The question that remained for us was whether it would be to our advantage to move ahead with formalizing our program through the development of a consortial profile or would we be as well served by continuing with our more informal approach?

For a number of reasons we elected not to move ahead with the development of a shared profile following our initial discussions. First of all, the uneven nature of our acquisitions budgets made it difficult to identify ways to reallocate resources without compromising local needs. **Connecticut College**, with the smallest budget of the three, would have to set aside some basic or "core" purchases to fulfill its assigned in-depth collection responsibilities. **Wesleyan**, with the largest budget, was able to purchase most of what it needed and was hard-pressed to see areas where it could increase its depth with materials that would be useful to our three somewhat similar institutions. We continued to suspect that duplicate and triplicate copies within the consortium were responsible for a large percentage of circulations, and we asked our CTW systems staff to provide us with a circulation statistics report to show patterns of borrowing and lending. What percentage of circulations was for unique titles and what percentage for duplicate/triplicate copies? Because of the backlog of requests on the table, the CTW staff was unable to provide us with this report at the time.

What did we gain from our initial investigations into developing a consortial approval profile? The data **Ruth** provided us gave us a much clearer understanding of our collecting patterns. We activated a "consortial view" on **Yankee's** Website so that when ordering we know immediately if another library in CTW has ordered the book. Our selectors use this information when making decisions on specialized and costly titles. We were able to negotiate a common vendor discount for CTW with some give and take among the three libraries. We learned that even without a formal collecting agreement our practice was resulting in from 47% to 64% unique titles acquired by individual institutions. We agreed that much of the duplication was desirable because of the need for multiple copies within the consortium. And we decided to shelve our plan to develop a consortial profile for the time being.

Since 1997, we have continued to pursue cooperative efforts of a different sort. We have

continued on page 38

On July 23, 1997, **Ed, Doris** and I met with **Ruth** to discuss consortial cooperation based on the three approval plan profiles. **Ruth** brought with her a set of colorful graphs called *A Three-Library SupraProfile: the road to consortia*.¹ By superimposing the recent collecting histories of

Ohio5 Government Documents

by **Mary Prophet** (Deputy Director, and Head, Government Documents, Denison University Library) <prophet@denison.edu>

and **Megan Fitch** (Director of Information Access and Student Advocate, Kenyon College Library and Information Services) <fitchm@kenyon.edu>

and **Joy He** (Public Services Librarian, Ohio Wesleyan University Libraries) <yyhe@owu.edu>

The **CONSORT Colleges**, (**Denison University**, **Kenyon College**, **Ohio Wesleyan University**, and **The College of Wooster**) are all **Federal Depository** libraries. The documents departments of these institutions have a long history of cooperation. In 1983 the **CONSORT** colleges' documents departments, along with **Otterbein College**, developed a **Union List** of item selections. This union list was updated each year between 1983 and 1991 during the annual depository update cycle. Cooperative collection development began during this period in an informal and uncoordinated manner as documents personnel at each institution adjusted their selections after consideration of the selections at other institutions.

The **Five Colleges of Ohio** (**CONSORT** schools outlined above plus **Oberlin College**) consortium was founded in 1995 with the assistance of the **Mellon Foundation**. The initial goals of the consortium were to "consolidate library activities using electronic and other means to achieve significant savings" and to "develop specific programs and strategies to improve educational effectiveness and gain financial efficiencies by addressing cost-saving opportunities in administrative areas of their budgets." (http://www2.kenyon.edu/Ohio5/press_release.html)

The **Government Documents Subcommittee** of the **Library Committee** developed specific proposals in the area of acquisitions and collection development for federal publications. The group began by updating the existing **Union List** of Item selections and establishing some basic tenets relating to documents acquisition

CTW — Early Explorations... from page 36

analyzed our **JSTOR** holdings with the goal of retaining one archival print copy within the consortium. We have continued to derive benefits from our database subscriptions and our consortial borrowing program flourishes. There is renewed interest in moving towards a more formal cooperative collection development program within **CTW**. **Ed, Doris** and I will meet soon to discuss what direction we might take. We will certainly look at some of the Ohio initiatives funded by the **Mellon** grant and consider whether a program targeting specific types of materials would serve us well. The desire to cooperate has existed within **CTW** since the consortium was established. Our task now is to build on our early efforts and construct a program that will work well for us.

and collection development. The following list quotes and/or synthesizes those basic tenets.

1. All libraries will select titles on the **Basic Collection** list.
2. The **Serial Set**, as the heart of depository collections, will need to be retained by most libraries.
3. All item numbers other than those for the **Serial Set** and the **Basic Collection** will be reviewed for usefulness to the curriculum and the local community.
4. Some item numbers will be of marginal value to all libraries but will be important enough to require selection by one or more institutions. This will require written agreements for selection, retention, and housing between the institutions.
5. Some currently selected item numbers will not be needed by any of the libraries. These should be de-selected.
6. Item numbers not currently selected that would be a valuable addition to the collection of either individual institutions or to the consortium as a whole will be added.

Review of item selections showed approximately two third of all items were selected by multiple libraries. A zero based review of item selections (a review where every item available to be selected is considered, whether it is currently selected or not) began in 1995 with congressional publications. The availability of congressional documents in either paper or microfiche format created an additional decision point. Each item number was evaluated for relevance to the curriculum and/or the local community and ranked accordingly.

The ranking system established for the congressional materials consisted of the following choices:

- 1 = Must have in the current format
- 2 = Not critical to the local collection, would like to keep
- 3 = Marginal value to local collection, will drop or keep as needed by consortium
- 4 = Not needed in local collection, should drop. May be needed in consortium.
- 5 = Not necessary to have within the consortium
- 6 = Volunteers to change current format
- 7 = Volunteers to drop item

At the beginning of the review, **The Five Colleges of Ohio** was a new consortium and the libraries involved were new to **OhioLINK**.

There was little experience with the benefits of direct patron request for materials and the state-wide delivery system for library materials. Given these circumstances members of the group were pleased with the results of the review of Congressional materials. At that time there were 54 active House and Senate committees. Print or microfiche options resulted in a total of 104 different item numbers. After the ranked review, 14 items were dropped and an additional 10 were converted from paper to microfiche format.

As expected from the basic tenets outlined above, very little change was evidenced in the selection of materials that are part of the **Serial Set**. For non-congressional materials only four ranks were used.

- 1 = Must keep — critical to the local collection
- 2 = Would like to keep but not critical to the local collection
- 3 = Willing to drop if available elsewhere in the consortium
- 4 = Not necessary to have within the consortium

As review of the agency selections progressed, the urgency to reduce the cataloging burden across the consortium increased. Some changes in collection development patterns continued to develop but pressure to complete the review and make cataloging assignments gradually moved the focus away from a comprehensive reassessment of item selections.

Cataloging

As previously alluded to, the four **CONSORT** schools also cooperate regarding cataloging of government documents. For those libraries sharing the **CONSORT** catalog, cataloging assignments were made at the same time the collection review was undertaken. Responsibilities for cataloging items received by more than one school are divided by call number range. Items received by only one school are cataloged by that school, regardless of call number. Union lists are maintained and updated regularly, and cataloging is performed using uniform guidelines established and maintained by the schools as a group.

Development and successful implementation of cooperative cataloging procedures has

continued on page 40