

# Collection Development and Management Committee

## Annual Report 2011

### February 2012

The Collection Development and Management Committee (CDMC) held its annual member meeting at the Summit Day conference in July 2011. The steering team (CDMC-ST) met in person at that time to discuss projects for the coming year. Two phone meetings were held by the CDMC-ST in the fall, in addition to a multitude of meetings dedicated to the CDMC's DDAPIT working group. Progress and outcomes of projects are listed below:

#### **Demand Driven Acquisitions Ebook Pilot**

Due to the scope of this pilot project, please see the Demand Driven Acquisitions Pilot Implementation Team's (DDAPIT) separate report, submitted by group chair Emily McElroy, for a thorough overview of its current status, including evaluation and recommendation.

This final report and all of the accompanying appendices are available on Orbis-Cascade's DDA website under the "Reports" section:

<http://www.orbiscascade.org/index/demand-driven-acquisitions-pilot#stats>

#### **"Three Copy" Threshold Pilot**

##### **I. Evaluation**

The pilot project intended to limit Orbis-Cascade Alliance duplication to three purchased copies of a given monograph was implemented in late 2010. The plan was to run the pilot through the entirety of 2011 and, in early 2012, assess the duplication rate against the benchmark data gathered in 2010. In late 2010, the CDMC liaisons were issued training materials and asked to instruct their selectors to assess the consortia's holdings in YBP's GOBItween. If three copies were listed as being already owned by Orbis-Cascade, they were asked to not purchase that item, unless it fit some exceptional criteria as defined by that institution. It was hoped that this would facilitate more efficient usage of previously-purchased materials throughout the Alliance, thereby allowing each institution's collection managers to shift scarce resources to other areas, including more specialized monographs currently unavailable within Summit.

##### **a. Quantitative Results** (full duplication data found in accompanying appendices, A and B):

<p>2010: Approximately 87% of titles purchased from YBP in 2010 were four or fewer copies. Only 13% of the books purchased had five or more copies. 2011: Approximately 85% of titles purchased from YBP in 2011 were four or fewer copies. Only 15% of the books purchased had five or more copies.</p>
--

Average duplication rate from 2010 was 2.4 for all subjects. Average duplication rate from 2011 was 2.5 for all subjects.
Number of titles purchased in 2010 was 50,025. Number of titles purchased in 2011 was 35,836.
This is a 25% decrease in print books purchased via YBP.

***There was no decrease in the level of Orbis-Cascade Alliance duplication for YBP book purchases in 2011. Duplication levels increased slightly, and fewer books overall were purchased from YBP.***

Although some information was gathered from CDMC members in advance of the midpoint summer meeting at Summit Day, a second request was issued in mid-January to solicit final input on the pilot project from both collection managers and their selectors. The CDMC-ST hoped that this would provide us with more detailed information with regard to local practices, and particularly the implementation of any exceptional criteria that were used to override the three-copy rule. Of the 36 members, 22 responded with detailed information on local practices. The following list highlights some of the most pervasive justifications for obtaining a local copy beyond the suggested third-copy limit.

**b. Qualitative Results** (hierarchical by frequency, all below receiving two or more mentions):

<p><b>Faculty Overrides.</b> Virtually all respondents gave faculty the final word on whether or not they wanted an additional copy purchased for local use. A smaller subset experienced faculty from entire departments requesting a default “always override” rule. Almost all had some level of active communication with their faculty about the Threshold Pilot and its intended goals for cooperative collection building.</p>
<p><b>Selector Overrides.</b> Selectors often requested that local copies be purchased for areas in which they felt the library should collect heavily, or for any title matching a certain level of importance; CHOICE titles and YBP titles identified as “Basic-Essential” or “Research-Essential” were the most common non-faculty-requested overrides.</p>
<p><b>Distribution of Copies.</b> Multiple responders mentioned the distribution of copies to be a factor. For example, if all three copies were held in OR, then a WA member might buy a fourth. Less common was proximity of I-5 corridor, where more remote institutions might obtain an extra copy if the three were held at PSU, UW, and UO. There were also more complaints about courier delivery speed being an issue in that decision.</p>
<p><b>Inability to Identify Ebooks from Print in GOBI.</b> Frustration with not being able to identify, at a glance, the print Alliance holdings from the ebook Alliance holdings for a given title in GOBIbetween, which posed problematic for purposes of Summit borrowing.</p>
<p><b>Insufficient Summit Loan Periods for Faculty.</b> Faculty complained about the lack of Summit renewals when compared to local circulation check-out lengths.</p>
<p><b>Reserves.</b> Or other high use materials due to concentrated class usage.</p>

**Differences in Ordering Patterns.**

Smaller institutions were frustrated with larger ones, who typically got the jump on the initial three copies due to (in their eyes) “larger staffing” or dedicated bibliographers and “auto-ship approval plans.” When busier selectors squeezed in time for their ordering, they often had very little to buy that fit their curriculum that had not been purchased by at least three libraries.

**II. Recommendation:**

Due to the lack of quantitative changes in duplication rates and the spectrum of local practices, the CDMC-ST recommends discontinuing the pilot in its current state. We recommend reassessing the current criteria, closely analyzing the primary reasons why Alliance members are exceeding the proposed threshold, and establishing a new set of standards and guidelines to be issued to the CDMC representatives. These could be planned in the spring and possibly introduced at the summer meeting.

On a positive note, it is clear that many Orbis-Cascade libraries are actively trying to comply with the guidelines, and there has been an impressive degree of effort by each institution to educate their faculty on the necessity of cooperative collection development and the pooling of resources. We feel that this is definitely a step in the right direction. That being said, a major reworking of the project is clearly in order, possibly in coordination with more aggressive shared approval plans. The CDMC-ST will be discussing all of these possibilities in the coming months.

**WEST Participation**

It was decided last year that the Distributed Print Repository project (DPR) would become part of the greater CDL initiative known as the Western Regional Storage Trust (WEST). The Orbis-Cascade Alliance joined on as a consortia member, with several on the CDMC—Jim Bunnelle, Mark Watson, Linda Di Biase—serving as members of WEST’s Operations and Collections Council. It was decided that the chair of the CDMC would serve as the conduit for information to the broader body of CDMC liaisons, all of which received instructions on how to collect the local-level data needed to help the project move forward. All CDMC members provided extensive serials holding information to the OCC, who then used this to assist the process of “archive building,” wherein WEST works with “archive holders” to form complete runs. Several subgroups of the main OCC also worked on various tasks, such as the drafting of policies for disclosure and access for the three levels of materials designation (Bronze, Silver, Gold). Recently, discovery and display guidelines have been at the forefront of the discussions, along with WEST’s partnership with CRL in the ongoing development of the latter’s automated collection analysis system, known as PAPR: (<http://www.crl.edu/archiving-preservation/print-archives/papr> )

WEST is broken down into archival cycles. Below is a brief outline of the past year’s activities and pending projects.

***Archive Cycle 1: April 2011-March 2012***

- Archiving commitments made for 4,362 journal families. Validation and disclosure work to be completed by end of March 2012.

- 3,489 Portico/Clockss print journal backfiles. Includes many major publishers (Bronze)
- 369 JSTOR print journal backfiles. (Silver)
- 342 print journal backfiles with some electronic access (abstracting/indexing) (Gold)
- 162 print only journal backfiles (Gold)

For additional information on WEST, please consult the following FAQ:

<http://www.cdlib.org/services/west/about/faq.html>

The Collection Development and Management Committee would gratefully like to acknowledge the invaluable assistance given by all Orbis-Cascade Alliance staff members, especially Greg Doyle, Elizabeth Duell, Anya Arnold, and John Helmer. Finally, we would also like to thank former chair Diane Carroll who has so often made herself available for any questions that we might have on projects that began under her leadership.

Submitted February 10, 2011

Collection Development and Management Committee Steering Team

## Appendix A: Threshold Data Report 2011

	35836			90,398	2.52
Number of Libraries	Number of Titles Acquired	Cumulative	Percentage	Number of books purchased	Average number of copies
1	15754	15,754	44%	15,754	
2	7364	23,118	65%	14,728	
3	4478	27,596	77%	13,434	
4	2914	30,510	85%	11,656	
5	2024	32,534	91%	10,120	
6	1301	33,835	94%	7,806	
7	804	34,639	97%	5,628	
8	490	35,129	98%	3,920	
9	296	35,425	99%	2,664	
10	146	35,571	99%	1,460	
11	127	35,698	100%	1,397	
12	53	35,751	100%	636	
13	36	35,787	100%	468	
14	31	35,818	100%	434	
15	10	35,828	100%	150	
16	3	35,831	100%	48	
17	1	35,832	100%	17	
18	1	35,833	100%	18	
19	1	35,834	100%	19	
20	1	35,835	100%	20	
21	1	35,836	100%	21	

### Two assessment points

2010: Approximately 87% of titles purchased from YBP in 2010 were four or fewer copies; Only 13% of the books purchased had five or more copies.

2011: Approximately 85% of titles purchased from YBP in 2011 were four or fewer copies; Only 15% of the books purchased had five or more copies.

## Appendix B: Threshold Duplication Levels by Publisher for 2011

Publisher	Number of titles with 5 or more copies
OXFORD UNIVERSITY PRESS	342
CAMBRIDGE UNIV PRESS	250
PRINCETON UNIV PRESS	122
YALE UNIVERSITY PRESS	116
UNIV OF CHICAGO PRESS	114
UNIV OF CALIFORNIA PRESS	98
HARVARD UNIV PRESS	91
ROUTLEDGE	67
MIT PRESS	64
COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY PRESS	58
ALFRED A. KNOPF	56
W.W. NORTON	55
NEW YORK UNIVERSITY PRESS	48
STANFORD UNIVERSITY PRESS	47
DUKE UNIVERSITY PRESS	43
UNIV OF MINNESOTA PRESS	41
UNIV OF PENNSYLVANIA PR	41
ELSEVIER ACADEMIC PRESS	38
INDIANA UNIV PRESS	37
JOHNS HOPKINS UNIV PRESS	37
CORNELL UNIVERSITY PRESS	36
PALGRAVE MACMILLAN	36
BELKNAP/HARVARD	35
WILEY-BLACKWELL	35
UNIV OF ILLINOIS PRESS	33