CSU **The California State University**
COLD │ **SCOPM**

February 24, 2014

To: COLD

From: Systemwide Committee on Print Management
- Liz Ginno, Co-Chair (East Bay)
- Patrick McCarthy, Co-Chair (San Diego)
- Johanna Alexander, Member (Bakersfield)
- Kimberly Embleton, Member (Northridge)
- Alice Kawakami, COLD, ex officio (Los Angeles)
- Tim Strawn, Member (San Luis Obispo)
- Jan MacMichael, Project Assistant (Los Angeles)

Subject: **Report on Print Management**, a Libraries of the Future Initiative

---

The prospect of collaboratively managing the CSU print collections offers an opportunity to work together to build and improve the depth and breadth of our resources on behalf of our collective constituents. This report will outline the various aspects of print management, discuss the findings about best practices, address concerns and provide recommendations for what could be implemented systemwide. Please note that some of goals overlap and will address the same issues.

PRINT MANAGEMENT GOALS

GOAL 1:   Reducing onsite print storage without loss of access to print collections, and making more effective use of excess storage capacity within the CSU system.

Reducing print collections to repurpose library space for learning commons, academic support services and other uses—while maintaining access to print collections—presents a number of issues and opportunities for libraries to collaborate with mutually beneficial results.

Weeding and Sharing Resources

The idea of collaborating among the CSU Libraries to become "one" and make deselection, acquisition and collection decisions has some merit, but it would be difficult, if not impossible, to implement systemwide for a variety of reasons. Alternatively, examining the intended outcomes of collaboration (unified catalog, collection management, diversity, reducing redundancy and cost, quicker ILL turnaround where needed, etc.) and how they might be achieved will help us understand what is possible, and identify the benefits and potential challenges. For example:

- The ULMS will make it easier to make collective weeding decisions and collaborate on collection management, as well as provide students with a more robust catalog of available materials.

- Collaborating by classification would help each campus support their respective curriculum and shared management could help make informed collection decisions that will increase the breadth and depth of collections overall through intentional selection of more unique titles.

- Sharing resources systemwide may prove challenging in a system with campuses as much as 773 miles apart (distance between San Diego State and Humboldt State). Sharing within regions or more localized areas could be more efficient and thereby more cost effective.

- Technology has made ILL easier, and it has become an accepted substitute for ownership. In the regional LOFT meetings held in May 2014, discussions revealed that most libraries consider ILL a vital service to their users. Because many sources have the materials available for loan, libraries are able to weed little used books to make room for more pertinent or current information. With many libraries adopting similar print management and deselection projects, finding sources for ILL may become more difficult.

- The destinations of weeded materials vary. Books are discarded, sold, offered to faculty or other libraries, or simply given away. When books remain on campus with a faculty or in a department reading room, they would still need to be listed in a catalog to be visible in the discovery process.

Considerations

There remain a multitude of important considerations when making decisions to reduce onsite storage, while maintaining a pertinent collection and providing access to materials. For example:

- *Remaining viable.* It is essential for each library to set its own criteria for what it wants to hold for the future rather than just weeding to reduce duplication.
  - Each campus needs to provide resources in formats that support their curriculum and meet program accreditation standards.
  - Librarians should work closely with faculty in selecting books for acquisition and weeding.
  - When sharing resources, it is important to remember that who owns materials doesn't matter to the user as much as having the right materials available to fulfill user needs. Therefore, determining which materials are relevant is the key.

- *Trends in user preferences and behaviors.* Speed and convenient access to resources is important to library users, and a preference for desktop access to scholarly content is becoming apparent (OCLC Research, 2010). However, students and faculty continue to request print versions even when e-books are available. The lack of standardization may be confusing, as users sometimes have difficulty accessing e-books with all the differing screens, options and log-ins, as well as differing restrictions on the number of pages that can be printed, etc.

- *Training is needed.* Students and faculty need help to become more comfortable with the various types of e-book formats. The goal should include accommodating the wide range of needs and preferences, which would include providing required technology, e.g., e-readers and tablets, as well as providing training on the different modes of e-reading technologies. Using standard proxy authentication and the same access protocol for all e-book vendor products, as is presently used with e-journal articles, would likely enhance and increase the use of e-books within the CSU.

- *Digitizing.* Libraries are now more central in students' mobile lives, and many students now access library resources and services virtually. Not everything can be digitized, though, because of licensing restrictions. Digitizing special collections, which are usually older and not bound by copyright or licensing issues, could improve access to this category of materials systemwide. Digitizing is labor intensive and these projects need to be adequately funded.

- *Access to books.* Buying, renting and borrowing are the only avenues for providing books to users. Because scholarly publishing output has dramatically increased over the years, libraries are able to purchase only a small percentage of what is published and must rely more on ILL to fill in for specialized, expensive or little used materials. In libraries where lengthy turnaround times discourage a large percentage of users from requesting ILL, shortening delivery times would be welcome and provide more comprehensive service.

- *Resource sharing costs.* Providing faster turnaround for physical materials could increase the average cost of ILL, which now ranges from $20 to $50 per transaction. The introduction of a ULMS could likely increase ILL activity and some campuses could be inequitably burdened with ILL fees for technology, labor and shipping.

  If all libraries used the same cost accounting model to determine the cost of lending and borrowing, then the systemwide ILL expenditures could be analyzed using the same criteria and the impact of increased activity could be identified. This activity-based costing data could also help libraries make decisions regarding purchasing over borrowing, as well as format decisions and full journal subscription access versus pay per article. The Chancellor's Office could establish a template for all libraries to use; and OCLC is in the process of rolling out a free ILL Cost Calculator[i] (though they are admittedly behind schedule).

- *Electronic resources model.* Since electronic resources are increasing in popularity, many libraries are now focusing on acquiring or renting e-books instead of print; however, licensing agreements may curtail lending capability. For example:
  - The right to lend or borrow nonsubscribed materials may not be permitted.
  - Lending via ILL may be restricted to only a few book chapters.
  - Copyright fees may apply.
  - Borrowing may be limited to one patron at a time.

Book Storage

The main purpose of book repositories has been archival (research) and preservation (perpetuity), which does not directly align with the teaching mission of the CSU. To date, excess storage for books in the CSU has been established by individual campuses for the growth of their respective collections, not with the thought of storing books from other campuses.

| TABLE 1 | EXCESS STORAGE | | | | WILLING TO SHARE WITH OTHER CSU? |
| | COMPACT LF | | ROBOTIC LF | | |
CSU CAMPUS	Capacity	Utilized	Capacity	Utilized	
Dominguez Hills	Unknown				Unknown
Fullerton	26,586	10,870			No
Los Angeles	4,524	4,449			No
Northridge	2,600	2,600	105,256	84,204	No
Pomona	Unknown				No
San Diego	21,816	21,816			No
Sonoma*			88,235	38,941	Perhaps
• Maritime				1,765	
Stanislaus	Unknown				No

*Sonoma submitted capacity by items, which was converted to linear feet using the standard of 8–9 volumes (or 8.5) per linear feet.

Using information from the Pfeiffer Benchmark Survey, the SCOPM Excess Storage Survey and the available LOFT Vision Strategy Statements, it was determined that seven campuses have compact storage and two have robotic storage. Table 1 above identifies the campuses, type of storage and linear feet of storage. In response to the SCOPM survey, only Sonoma indicated they would be willing to consider storing books from other campuses.

The CSU could build regional library storage facilities for its own use. Would it be beneficial? There is a widely held belief in the profession that if books aren't circulating in the library, they most likely won't circulate from a storage facility. So unless the primary mission of the CSU libraries changes to archival and preservation, then building, staffing and maintaining a repository to hold little used books and then paying to send them out on occasion would not seem to be a good return on investment.

Recommendations

1. Provide funding for digitizing resources, especially special collections, to make access available systemwide.

   Priority: Ongoing

   Dependent on: Budget and funding

   Estimated time to complete: Ongoing

   Estimated cost to implement: Not applicable until requests are made

2. Create or find a cost accounting template to determine the cost of lending and borrowing to standardize criteria for comparison to track impact of potential increased activity.

   Priority: High

   Dependent on: Chancellor's Office/OCLC

   Estimated time to complete: Unknown

   Estimated cost to implement: Each campus would be responsible for collecting, coding and presenting the required data.

GOAL 2:   Resource sharing within the CSU to reduce duplicative print acquisitions. Identify the considerations and the coordination of resource sharing and interlibrary service implications of print management strategies. Consult with I-SPIE when appropriate.

Considerations

ILL continues to fulfill a critical systemwide need. Lending and borrowing within the CSUs is an important part of the system's resource sharing program, and the majority of CSU interlibrary transactions are between other CSUs. However, improvements could be made to enhance ILL services, especially as a part of a shared collection management program.

TABLE 2	BOOKS	
CAMPUS	**LOANED**	**BORROWED**
Bakersfield	722	692
Los Angeles	730	1,677
San Diego	1,658	1,173
San Luis Obispo	650	691

- *CSU ILL.* All CSU libraries rely on the system's collections regardless of the number of volumes in the library, the distance to other library collections, or other lending/borrowing applications that are used. Using sample data from 2013–2014[ii] of several CSU libraries, borrowing and lending books only among CSUs varies, as shown in Table 2. This is not the full picture of lending and borrowing, but rather a sample of different size campuses and their CSU book lending and borrowing, showing the importance of shared CSU collections. Relying on resource sharing for print access continues to be a viable and important option.

- *Operational currency.* The age and quality of equipment and software in the CSU interlibrary Loan departments vary, as does the level of training.

- *Consortium.* There remains an opportunity to develop additional collaborative initiatives among CSU Interlibrary Loan Departments through I-SPIE to make CSU ILL services an integrated consortium.

- *Systemwide collection analysis.* CSU collections have had data extracted at different times, which means many analyses are not current. It would be preferable to analyze all the collections at one time using GreenGlass[1] developed by Sustainable Collection Services (SCS) and/or other service assessment tools so that CSU libraries and collection development personnel could make decisions on discarded titles, titles that should be offered to other CSU collection development coordinators, and/or other titles that should be offered as last copy for state and regional storage options.

- *Resource sharing costs.* ILL activity and costs will likely increase with the implementation of a ULMS. It would be prudent to track lending and borrowing costs to identify campuses that are inequitably burdened with ILL fees for technology, labor and shipping.

- *ILL turnaround.* A long turnaround time discourages some users from utilizing ILL services. There are supplemental resource sharing programs, but not every campus utilizes these outside services. The following services should be considered to improve ILL delivery time where needed:

    a. **RapidILL** is a resource sharing system designed by interlibrary loan staff at Colorado State University offering staff, task and cost savings. It has received excellent reviews as a source for article delivery and book chapters. Fourteen CSU Libraries already use RapidILL, and while most of these are larger campuses, it is a viable option for any size library with varying numbers of staff. It integrates well with Illiad and other interlibrary loan systems and is seamless to the user.

    b. **Get It Now**, currently available to CSUs, provides paid access to articles from scholarly publishers. While it is a more expensive service, Get It Now provides immediate access to articles and would continue to be a supplemental option for CSU libraries.

    c. **LINK+** is a union catalog of contributed holdings from participating libraries in California and Nevada. Users from member libraries electronically request an item not available in their own library and it is delivered to them for check-out. It is available to authorized users of the participating libraries and may be accessed directly at http://csul.iii.com, or while using the local catalogs of participating libraries.

       Books and media may be borrowed if they are listed as available in the union catalog. An item may arrive at the requestor's library in 2 to 4 days. Books and some media will be held for up to 10 days. Selected media will be held for up to 5 days. The loan period for books and some media is 21 days with one 21-day renewal. The loan period for selected media is 7 days with no renewal allowed.

       There is no charge to request or borrow LINK+ materials. Although LINK+ is adaptable to other integrated library systems, only CSUs with Innovative Interface currently use it. As shown in Table 3 on the next page, these campuses have found this service to be very useful. In addition to displaying lending to borrowing ratios, which range from 0.66 to 1.48, the table also indicates how many items each campus loans to the other CSU campuses.

---

[1] OCLC acquired Sustainable Collection Services and their proprietary GreenGlass software in January 2015

Requests Report
July 2013 through June 2014
Created on 10/30/14

CSU LINK+ 2013-2014 Data

Table 3			CSU BORROWING SITE									
			EAST BAY	**FRESNO**	**LONG BEACH**	**MARITIME**	**STANISLAUS**	**POMONA**	**SAN LUIS OBISPO**	**SAN FRANCISCO**	**SAN JOSÉ**	**SONOMA**
CSU OWNING (LENDING) SITE	**RATIO L/B**	**TOTALS**	**1,095**	**1,430**	**3,728**	**191**	**1,016**	**1,869**	**2,151**	**2,141**	**1,696**	**1,208**
EAST BAY	1.48	**1,618**	0	82	268	16	118	91	74	568	218	183
FRESNO	1.38	**1,975**	72	0	905	16	75	225	323	185	124	50
LONG BEACH	0.70	**2,616**	121	545	0	20	51	572	854	217	137	99
MARITIME	1.13	**216**	10	6	79	15[2]	9	19	41	16	15	6
STANISLAUS	0.66	**669**	55	39	99	9	125[3]	34	46	130	57	75
POMONA	1.05	**1,961**	53	171	659	8	41	337[4]	379	122	135	56
SAN LUIS OBISPO	0.72	**1,549**	84	210	660	10	42	267	0	104	103	69
SAN FRANCISCO	1.47	**3,154**	422	189	606	54	376	184	250	0	591	482
SAN JOSÉ	1.13	**1,910**	183	145	319	25	115	97	133	514	191[5]	188
SONOMA	0.71	**857**	95	43	133	18	64	43	51	285	125	0

[2] Sonoma stores items for Maritime, which makes Maritime look like they are borrowing from themselves.
[3] Stanislaus requests are generated by the satellite campus in Stockton.
[4] Pomona allows items that are available at their own library to be requested through the Link+ catalog.
[5] Link+ also has a "pick up anywhere" option where a student might be borrowing something from their own library through Link+, and picking it up somewhere else.

- *Systemwide e-book licensing.* Collective licensing may be an option for the CSU. As CSUs and other lending libraries acquire fewer print books and more e-books, lending these resources has become more complicated. Future systemwide licenses may be useful to alleviate these issues. User preferences for print versions of books will also impact this recommendation, as print versions of books are sometimes preferred and continue to be requested. Ying Zhong and Sandra Bozarth (CSU Bakersfield) have a research study in progress regarding student and faculty usage of e-books. The results may be useful in developing e-book acquisition models.

  As an example, the UC system is seeking the acquisition of systemwide licensing of e-books and e-book packages. It appears that other multicampus systems are investigating this as well. In a 2014 UC report[iii] it was related that:

  > "Shared…purchases provide a high percentage of core materials for all campuses and are greatly beneficial. Systemwide licenses avoid redundant work for campus and…staff and nearly always cost less. In addition, they provide for efficiencies of cataloging and processing invoices and renewals."

- *Floating collection.* While it appears few academic library systems have used the floating collection model, wherein borrowed ILL books from one institution are retained at the borrowing institution until requested from another institution, a successful pilot program has been completed at a consortium comprised of nineteen Pennsylvania state university libraries with a total floating collection of over 950,000 titles. The benefits include a reduction in shipping costs and staff time, and items not being in transit. This study also provided some useful tips in implementing such a program, i.e., focusing only on general circulation monographs, giving autonomy to the owning library, and working with the library system vendor. There is a fair amount of work involved in implementing such a program and for the time being, it would be prudent to wait and watch this project and any others as longitudinal data is gathered.

  The functionality of any future systemwide ULMS could affect the implementation of a floating collection. After the ULMS is implemented, CSU could investigate the floating collection, perhaps among CSU Libraries with the least storage and those with the most open capacity. The purchasing/owning library would continue to handle all collection development decisions regarding titles, including whether a title should be part of the floating collection; and if part of the collection, all repair and replacement decisions.

Recommendations

3. Provide the same level of equipment and training for all CSU Interlibrary Loan Departments.[iv]

   Priority: Begin now

   Dependent on:
   a. COLD requesting I-SPIE leadership to recommend minimum standards for equipment, software and training.
   b. I-SPIE would need to initiate a survey of all CSU interlibrary loan departments to inventory the needs based on the recommended minimum standards and report their findings to COLD.
   c. COLD would then fund needed upgrades and training. COLD members should ensure that funding is provided to meet these minimums and refresh equipment at standard industry rates.

   Estimated time to complete: By end of June 2015

Estimated cost to implement: Unknown until inventory is taken

4. Develop additional collaborative initiatives among CSU Interlibrary Loan Departments through I-SPIE to make CSU ILL services an integrated consortium.[v] Recommendations are currently under review by an I-SPIE member, Gretchen Higgenbottom (CSU Fresno).

Priority: Ongoing

Dependent on: Recommendations of I-SPIE members

Estimated time to complete: Unknown

Estimated cost to implement: Not applicable until requests are made

5. COLD should establish a timeline with the last SCS refresh in mind to utilize a collection analysis system that reviews all CSU collections at one time for accurate comparison.

Priority: Begin before the last contracted OCLC refresh in June 2015

Dependent on: COLD developing a plan for implementing a consolidated and joint analysis for remaining CSUs that have not used the GreenGlass analysis for collection development purposes.

Estimated time to complete: By end of 2015

Estimated cost to implement: This expenditure has already been made through the SCS contract.

6. Improve turnaround time and access for CSU interlibrary loan services by continuing central funding for the *Get It Now* service and add funding to the budget for RapidILL.[vi] Such funding will help increase CSU library participation. Investigate Links+ or a similar service in the future.

SCOPM recommends that all remaining CSU libraries adopt faster means of providing information resources to students and faculty to ensure interlibrary lending and resource sharing remains a viable alternative to keeping and/or purchasing multiple print copies.

   a. **RapidILL** Implementation

   Priority: Begin within the next six months

   Dependent on: Central funding.

   Estimated time to complete: The remaining nine campuses would have RapidILL implemented by January 2016

   Estimated cost to implement: Costs for joining include a one-time set up fee of $4,500 for each library with an annual maintenance fee of $3,895 per library. This is a special negotiated rate for California libraries and is based on the Carnegie classification. There is no transaction cost or FTE charge. Initial one time set-up cost for nine campuses totals $40,500. Continued maintenance for all 23 campuses totals $89,585 per year.

   b. **Get it Now** Continuation

   Priority: Continue

   Dependent on: Continued funding

   Estimated time to complete: Ongoing

   Estimated cost to implement: Already funded

c. **LINK+** Information

Priority: Wait until ULMS is selected and implemented. The selected system may have similar functionality as LINK+ and may be preferable. When the ULMS is running, I-SPIE could research these options.

Dependent on: Functionality of selected ULMS

Estimated time to complete: Not applicable

Estimated cost to implement: Unknown

7. Develop CSU-wide licensing of e-books so that campuses may freely share content.

Priority: Should be investigated by EAR Committee by the end of January 2016

Dependent on: Data on e-book usage within the CSU, systemwide licensing availability and viability, negotiated systemwide pricing, input and reviews from the EAR Committee, and EAR recommendations

Estimated time to complete: Ongoing

Estimated cost to implement: Unknown

8. Continue to monitor the interlibrary loan "floating collection" concept.[vii]

Priority: This should not be a current priority until more information is gathered and a new ULMS is selected and implemented.

Dependent on: ULMS implementation

Estimated time to complete: Unknown

Estimated cost to implement: Unknown

9. Implement ULMS RFP features that promote resource sharing among all CSU campuses and support suggested print management strategies.

Specifically, the ULMS should be compatible with ILLiad, provide for unmediated interlibrary loan requests, floating collections, and other outside resource sharing systems such as RapidILL and others. Provide systems that are seamless, easily understood by users, and integrated in all interlibrary loan systems and processes. Utilize among CSU libraries, statistical and automated features available in ILLiad and ULMS to reduce cost, enhance services, fairly balance use in lending/borrowing, and speed interlibrary lending among CSU Libraries.

Priority: Throughout ULMS search, selection, and implementation stages

Dependent on: ULMS procurement and implementation

Estimated time to complete: Unknown

Estimated cost to implement: Cost already part of ULMS procurement

GOAL 3: Replacing selected print collections and other nonprint materials (microforms, videos, etc.) with electronic access.

Print, digital, data and special archival collections of the California State University are fundamental building blocks for the University's teaching, research and public service programs. Building and

managing collections to provide access to a broad array of scholarly information resources in support of these programs remains one of the highest priorities for the CSU libraries.

Considerations

- *Microforms.* There are several different types of microform collections to take into consideration. General microforms such as monographs, serials and periodicals should be retained by at least one institution. Newspapers are a key example.

  Issues: Cost of the microfilm, equipment, maintenance, manpower and the space required to house it.

- *Government documents.* Many government documents are available electronically, but not all. Libraries designated as government repositories are required to keep copies of government documents. Only 18 CSU libraries are selective repositories for federal documents, and 19 are California State Document Repositories.

  a. **MARCIVE** is a federal program that does not include California government documents.

     The Government Printing Office's MARCIVE Cataloging Record Distribution Program offers free cataloging records from MARCIVE. The CSUN library, which participates in this program, opted for electronic federal documents with accompanying catalog records only since they have been slowly replacing their physical collection with electronic versions. Their government documents cataloger (LSS II) still has to edit the records, but it saves on OCLC cataloging costs. For more details, please refer to the MARCIVE website at http://home.marcive.com/cataloging-record-distribution-project.

     MARCIVE also offers a product called Documents without Shelves that provides MARC records for federal documents in electronic format, and a library does not have to be a designated depository to participate. The cost is nominal, they offer consortial pricing and the content is customizable. For more details, please refer to their website at http://home.marcive.com/wp-content/uploads/2013/09/dwsl.pdf

  b. **California Government Documents** http://www.library.ca.gov/gps/

     The California State Library is the regional library for federal and state documents and is required to archive and provide ILL. It is also a complete repository for all California documents and it is the "official California State Document Depository and houses the largest collection of California State documents in the United States." According to the Library Distribution Act, "A library designated as a 'complete depository' shall be sent one copy of every state publication, while a library designated as a 'selective depository' shall be sent one copy of each publication of the type or issuing agency it selects."

     Nineteen CSU campuses are depositories: Chico, San José and San Diego are complete depositories, while Bakersfield, Dominguez Hills, East Bay, Fresno, Fullerton, Humboldt, Long Beach, Los Angles, Northridge, Pomona, Sacramento, San Bernardino, San Francisco, San Luis Obispo, San Marcos and Stanislaus are selective depositories. For more details, please refer to their website at http://www.library.ca.gov/gps/docs/DepositoryLibrary-Current.pdf

     The website states that "there is no way to be a partial California repository and refuse physical publications, which come with the obligation to keep for five years even though the publications are available electronically." While it is true that selective California depository libraries automatically receive shipments from the State Library and from state agencies, whether by choice or by virtue of being on a mailing list, they are required to keep much less than what is required of complete depositories.

However, if a library receives California documents that do not fit the requirements for selective depositories and/or they would not be of local interest, it has the option to offer the documents to CALDOC-L or withdraw them without keeping for five years. In recent years, the State has produced much less in print due to cost saving measures so that often the shipping lists sent to the library contain lists of titles and URLs to catalog.

For complete Retention and Disposal Policies for California State Document Depository Libraries, refer to their website at http://www.library.ca.gov/gps/cal-policies.html. To review the performance standards for California State Document Depository Libraries, please refer to the website at http://www.library.ca.gov/gps/cal-standards.html

c. **Federal Depository Library Program.** Eighteen CSUs are currently "selective" federal depositories. Their website lists all federal depositories by state, and clicking on "view" will open the record, where it lists the name of the "depository coordinator," who may or may not be a librarian (http://catalog.gpo.gov/fdlpdir/FDLPdir.jsp?st_12=CA&flag=searchp).

Although libraries are no longer required to have a government documents librarian, as part of the government documents repository agreements they are obligated to have a dedicated staff member. This is the only financial obligation the repositories impose. Each campus handles government documents differently, e.g., CSULA has a librarian, while CSUN has a staff member supervised by a librarian.

Issues: Too many variables to sort out for consortium collection. Space required. Working with the agencies. Personnel needed.

- **Archival materials**. These materials will differ at each campus and may or may not be digitized.

    Issues: Personnel and digitization costs.

- **Videos**. The cost of streaming videos is prohibitively expensive. Streaming videos can be purchased or subscribed to from various vendors. However, there are many considerations.

    a. *Lack of rights in perpetuity.* Vendors may charge per class use or for certain time periods. So a campus may retain the use of a video for a predetermined amount of time and then lose access.

    b. *Hosting*. Most vendors do not host the videos on their server. So each campus must factor in the cost, time involved and technology necessary to host on site. The best possible solution would be to have the vendors host the streaming for all campuses, as it would be technologically difficult to have one systemwide host.

    c. *Copyright and public performance rights* must be taken into consideration and can be very costly. These rights are different from other types of media.

    d. *Lack of consistency* among vendors and products as the technology is still quite new. Licensing agreements are inconsistent, and product uniformity, i.e., ADA compliance features and closed captioning, vary widely.

Policy for Ordering Streaming Media

Currently, there is a separate EAR working group charged with investigating the options and issues of streaming video. In May 2014 the Streaming Media Working Group administered a systemwide survey, the results of which are shown in Appendix A.

Issues: Cost of subscriptions or outright purchases. Other costs involve access fees, maintenance fees and licensing, which are not dependable and can vary widely. Unless centrally purchased by the Chancellor's Office, streaming media policy remains a campus-by-campus decision.

Below are links to two examples of nonprint materials collection policies for academic libraries:

1. Mesa Community College—Arizona MCC nonprint materials policy
   http://www.mesacc.edu/library/services/acquisitions-collection-development/policies-ordering-non-print-materials

2. Lake Land College—Mattoon, IL LLC Material Selection Policy
   http://lakeland.libguides.com/content.php?pid=379214&sid=3114054

Recommendations

10. Consortial purchasing of electronic streaming hosted by the individual vendors.

   Priority: Ongoing

   Dependent on: Chancellor's Office funding and EAR Working Group recommendations

   Estimated time to complete: Unknown

   Estimated cost to implement: Unknown

11. Investigate systemwide purchase of MARCIVE so that all campuses participate.

   Priority: Low

   Dependent on: Survey campuses for interest

   Estimated time to complete: Unknown

   Estimated cost to implement: Unknown

GOAL 4:   Recommending CSU-wide participation in regional and national print management, sharing and preservation systems (e.g., WEST).

Long-Term Storage Facility

There is little indication that there is sufficient capacity or strategic imperative for the CSU to create facilities dedicated to the long-term storage and management of print resources, or to commit existing space in system libraries for the purposes of hold-in-place print storage and preservation—especially given the results of the recent survey on print storage in the CSU system, the strategies outlined in the LOFT initiative, and the general tendency for CSU libraries toward repurposing existing print collections space.

Instead of considering its own long-term storage, the CSU could make use of other established and emerging programs and investigate a partnership model that would enhance the capability of CSU system libraries to contribute and maintain access to archived print resources. Entering into these cooperative initiatives to provide a last copy in state or region for journal literature and monographs would be advantageous to both the CSUs and these other entities.

- While access to archival storage collections is needed and useful to the CSUs, use of archival storage collections as a percentage of all CSU resource sharing is very minimal. As one example, CSU borrowing from the UC's Southern (SLRF) and Northern (NRLF) Library Regional Facilities was analyzed.[viii] Most CSU Libraries borrow some items from the SLRF and NLRF; however, the UC system charges fees for ILL, which may account for the low level of activity (less than 1 percent) rather than interest in titles held in their facilities. Appendices B and C show the lending statistics to CSU from both facilities.

Journal Storage Program: WEST (Western Regional Storage Trust) http://www.cdlib.org/west/

WEST is a collaborative, sustainable network-level shared print journal archiving program that has transformed the methods applied to housing and managing legacy print journal collections. Started as initiatives of CDL (California Digital Library) in 2009, research libraries and library consortia in the western region of the United States joined together, with support from the Andrew W. Mellon Foundation, to plan a shared print archiving program.

The goals established for WEST were to:
- Preserve the scholarly print record (for journals in the initial phase)
- Provide access, when needed, to the scholarly print record
- Facilitate space reclamation in WEST libraries and storage facilities

There are three categories of membership as shown in Table 4 below:

TABLE 4

ARCHIVE HOLDER	ARCHIVE BUILDER	NON ARCHIVE HOLDER/ BUILDER MEMBER
An institution (library and/or storage facility) that retains the print back-file for journal family.	Proactively assembles print holdings from various libraries, validates them and discloses them. Once the back-file for a journal family is built, the Archive Builder becomes an Archive Holder for that family. Archive Builders are usually storage facilities. When an institution does not have a storage facility, the Archive Builder can be a library.	Participates in WEST governance, working groups; provides annual report of print holdings; and may contribute withdrawal candidates to Archive Builder/Holders.

In the WEST program, participating libraries consolidate and validate print journal back-files at library storage facilities and at selected campus locations. The resulting shared print archives ensure access to the scholarly print record and allow member institutions to optimize campus library space. As of June 2014, just over 500,000 volumes have been archived during three archiving cycles.

According to WEST documentation: (http://www.cdlib.org/services/west/collections/)

"There is significant overlap among library collections of print serials, and—especially for those that are also available in electronic form—there is significant opportunity for collaborative action and individual space savings. On the other hand, substantial numbers of scholarly journals are available only in print form, and thus may be vulnerable to systemic loss if libraries individually deselect them in response to local space pressures without developing a collaborative plan to preserve these materials for the community at large.

WEST planners defined a set of six title categories, or expressions of risk for each kind of journal. The combination of format availability, digital preservation coverage, print overlap, presence of existing shared print archives and other factors form the risk profile for each title category. Each title category is assigned an archive type that reflects the level of archiving effort considered appropriate for titles in that risk category. The archive types—bronze, silver and gold—define the level of validation for completeness and condition, effort to fill gaps, and required environmental conditions appropriate for that category."

There are currently 109 participating members, including seven CSU libraries. Six CSU libraries are members with no obligations to build or hold print journals, while California State University, Northridge is an archive builder. The CSU members are:

1. San Luis Obispo
2. Channel Islands
3. Fullerton
4. Northridge *(Archive Builder)*
5. San Diego
6. San Francisco
7. San José

Considerations

- WEST participation provides CSU libraries with a sustainable and networked solution to support withdrawing print journals within the WEST preservation scope:

    o Print and Electronic full text with digital preservation, e.g., Portico and CLOCKSS

    o Print and Electronic full text, no digital preservation

    o Print with selected full-text access through aggregator databases

    o Print with electronic abstracting and indexing

    o Print only, no electronic access points

    o JSTOR Access Archive

- WEST provides members with annual overlap analysis for member libraries to evaluate WEST archive holdings against local print journal holdings.

- WEST participation levels are affordable (2014 membership fees were $4,000–$7,000 per year for non-archive holder/builders). Member fees may increase as the original grant funds are depleted.

- In 2014-2015, WEST/CDL is leveraging existing software solutions such as CRL's PAPR tool (http://papr.crl.edu/); The University of Florida JRNL tool (http://guides.uflib.ufl.edu/jrnl) and building new tools such as AGUA (http://www.cdlib.org/cdlinfo/2014/07/09/announcing-agua-wests-decision-support-information-center-2/), a decision support portal to support robust overlap analyses and the ability for member libraries to offer withdrawal candidates to archive holding members in order to add or fill gaps in existing archived journal holdings.

Monograph Storage Programs

There are a number of mature shared print management initiatives underway regionally and nationwide. While the emphasis for many of these programs has been on preservation of print serials, there are initiatives to preserve in place or provide storage for large collections of monographs.

- **CIC** (Committee on Institutional Cooperation) (http://www.cic.net/projects) provides a model for shared print storage.

- **ASERL** (Association of Southeastern Research Libraries) (http://www.aserl.org/programs/) provides a model for shared collection development (Collaborative Federal Depository Program).

- **Texas Joint Library Facility**. The University of Texas system and Texas A&M University have collaborated on print storage facilities with consequent policy development on a shared ownership model known as Resource in Common. There is an existing facility in operation adjacent to the University of Texas, Austin campus and a new facility underway adjacent to the Texas A&M campus—Texas Joint Library Facility—that will eventually hold upwards of three million volumes (http://library.tamu.edu/joint-library-facility/).

Shared Print Management

- **UC Regional Library Facilities (RLF) and the California Digital Library (CDL)**

  The UC RLFs (Southern and Northern Regional Library Facilities) are examples of large off-site storage facilities in California that include both print serials and monographs. They had target dates when they will be filled to capacity, and the UC SRLF was not taking any deposits until space became available after January 2015. However, Emily Stambaugh, Shared Print Manager of the UC's California Digital Library, has suggested a process whereby CSU Libraries could deposit unique titles into the UC's RLFs to insure a "last copy in state" initiative. She also states that she "will discuss with the UC shared print strategy team and explore whether a last copy policy might be developed. This might be an interesting area of policy collaboration amongst UC and CSU storage facilities." The process and details are provided in Appendix D.

  Liz Ginno, librarian from CSU East Bay, ran a sample test using the Sustainable Collection Services GreenGlass analysis for East Bay. It was interesting to note that over 400 titles slated for deselection were not part of the UC's holdings.

  The CDL Shared Print Program (http://www.cdlib.org/services/collections/sharedprint/) is just one part of the UC system's efforts to share services and operations that also support their overall strategy for both print retention and, to a lesser degree, shared collection development. CDL recommended activities to pursue in a print strategy paper, UC Shared Print RoadMap for 2014–2018, in August 2014 outlining their plans for the next five years. The paper can be downloaded from their website: http://www.cdlib.org/services/collections/sharedprint/docs/RoadMAP2014-2018_Final.pdf.

- **SCELC** (Statewide California Electronic Library Consortium) http://scelc.org/

  Much like the CSU system, SCELC has only just recently begun to investigate cross-institution collection analysis and the potential for shared storage and management of print collections. They conducted a membership survey on print management that included CSU libraries, assembled a pilot group, and recently (October 2014) contracted with ProQuest to use Intota to conduct a cross-institution print collections analysis. The SCELC Shared Print Feasibility Study is posted on their website at http://scelc.org/Shared-Print-Feasibility-Study. The SCELC Feasibility Group expects to share a final report with their membership in spring 2015. It is expected that the basis of any further policy development and action will be as a shared preservation of collections in place in either local campus storage facilities or in library stacks. While the SCELC Feasibility Study and CDL Roadmap naturally focus on their member organizations, it is interesting to note that both groups recognize in their planning documents, the need to share information and the potential for partnerships with the CSU.

- **HathiTrust Digital Library** http://www.hathitrust.org/home

  "HathiTrust is a partnership of academic and research institutions, offering a collection of millions of titles digitized from libraries around the world." As of November 2014, they had 12.9 million total volumes, 6.6 million book titles and 4.8 million volumes in the public domain.

  In April 2014, the HathiTrust Print Monographs Archive Planning Task Force (http://www.hathitrust.org/print_monographs_archive_charge) began work to investigate the potential for developing print preservation policies for the digitized collections by the HathiTrust membership as a distributed print archive. The recommendations from this group may have profound implications for its members as well as nonmembers in relation both to print archiving programs and resource sharing agreements.

The current membership model offers certain search, access and digital collection building only to its members. The membership model is not attractive to libraries, like many in the CSU, who have not, and are not planning large digitization programs.

Hathi membership fees are fairly prohibitive and cost is based on a complicated formula involving:
- o number of public domain volumes in HathiTrust
- o number of in-copyright volumes in a partner's print holdings that overlap with HathiTrust digital holdings
- o number of partners that hold a particular in copyright volume
- o other fixed and variable cost factors

The impact of a distributed print archive program has implications for resource sharing. Longstanding resource sharing programs, such as OhioLink, are comprised of both HathiTrust member and nonmember libraries. Any trust-based print management program must account for these pre-existing sharing programs. Hopefully, these longstanding relationships and agreements will not be disrupted by Hathi plans for distributed print archives, but in order to effect that, Hathi will need to address its current membership (including pricing) model in order to sustain regional and national resource sharing agreements as well as to broaden access to digitized content.

Recommendations

12. CSU system libraries interested in space reclamation while maintaining preservation and access to the print journal record should become members of WEST. The option is available for consortial membership (to include all CSU campuses) in WEST (Orbis-Cascade and the UC libraries are examples of consortial members)

Priority: High

Dependent on: Central and campus funding

Estimated time to complete: Second quarter FY2015-16

Estimated cost to implement: Dependent on individual or consortial membership model

13. Discuss the potential for another CSU campus to join Northridge as an archive holder/builder, e.g., this might be Sonoma, or another other campus with existing storage capacity.

Priority: Medium

Dependent on: Campus "Hold in Place" policies; CSU/WEST membership model

Estimated time to complete: FY2015-16

Estimated cost to implement: Membership fees, staff time working with WEST/CDL

14. COLD should formalize a policy statement on shared print preservation and management for the CSU library system and include a governance and policy framework for any strategy or resultant program. It is important to identify responsibilities and expectations of this expanded partnership among the CSU libraries. *(Proposed MOU, Appendix E).*

Priority: High

Dependent on: Decision by COLD and subsequent development of program policies

Estimated time to complete: Unknown

Estimated cost to implement: Unknown

15. CSU should continue to monitor and engage with the development of regional distributed print preservation/management plans and programs underway by CDL, UC Regional Library Facilities and SCELC contingent on the direction outlined in any policy statement.

Priority: High

Dependent on: CSU strategy on collaboration and communication

Estimated time to complete: Ongoing

Estimated cost to implement: Unknown

16. CSU should continue to monitor the results of the HathiTrust Print Monographs Archive Planning Task Force and evaluate any changes in services or membership to enhance access to the digitized print record before considering any CSU membership.

Priority: Medium

Dependent on: Taskforce report

Estimated time to complete: Start in spring 2015 with issuance of task force report

Estimated cost to implement: Unknown

GOAL 5: Developing communications and workflows to support coordination of systemwide print management strategies.

Implementing a successful system for managing print across all CSU campuses will require clearly defined communication and workflows. Fortunately, each campus currently employs these aspects to their existing local collection management practices. The key to success will be extending this as a systemwide collaboration.

In addition, we have many established relationships among the CSU system libraries from which to build. Some collaboration may be based on shared collection development or print management within geographical regions or with campuses supporting similar majors.

Considerations

- Historically library collections have been developed and maintained on a subject or discipline basis. Correspondingly, libraries have hired discipline expertise to facilitate this model. It will be challenging to extend this model CSU-wide, but a discipline-based approach will enable us to make appropriate decisions.

- If our goals are to limit unnecessary duplication while ensuring rapid access to necessary resources, the experts of like disciplines from across the CSU will need to function as collection development committees. They will need to understand the priorities of their own campus as well as the other CSUs because they will ultimately be deciding which titles are added to which campus library. These committees will be essential in making a shared collections effort successful.

- Network infrastructure and delivery services and technologies make it much easier and faster for libraries to share both information about materials and the materials themselves. An effective ULMS, rapid delivery service, and a commitment to acting quickly on requests within the CSU will be critical. Ideally, delivery within 24 hours would help ensure broad buy-in and participation. This may require rethinking how we move items around the CSU.

Recommendations

The features outlined below should be developed to ensure success:

17. A clear mission statement should be crafted in the form of an MOU that describes the purpose and goals of the collaborative. It should include justification and benefits for local involvement. The goals should include measurable objectives in order to evaluate success.

    a. A governance structure must be in place to determine process, taking action and resolving conflict. COLD should continue to function in its existing role of coordination at a strategic level, a directing board or steering committee directly charged with overseeing systemwide print management is recommended.

    b. Each participating library should develop and share a collection conspectus so that a shared understanding of one another's collections is established. The conspectus should not be so complex that it hinders progress, but enables participants to think systematically about what they have and can share.

    c. In addition to a governance structure, a network of key personnel from each participating library should be identified with clearly defined roles. These individuals monitor and disseminate appropriate information regarding collection decisions and daily operational concerns. Given the diversity among 23 campuses, the number of participants and their roles may vary significantly. What is essential is that each campus is able to leverage their existing structure to an extended systemwide collaboration.

    d. Frequent and clear communication will be essential to success and it is at the operational level where this is most critical. Individuals with particular or unique expertise may be assigned, as appropriate, to oversee projects or advise partners, including campus faculty.

    e. In addition to mission and goals, a mutually agreed upon set of basic inter-institution procedures and policies should be established. The collaboration should be guided by principles, not by persons. Participants should understand their obligations, expectations and financial commitments. Orientation sessions and training should be included as appropriate.

    f. Current collection development policies and priorities are diverse as the populations we serve. In order to make the acquisition and de-acquisition of print materials meaningful and effective across the CSU, systemwide collection policies should be developed. A shared print collection means that each CSU will be dependent on its sister campuses at a much higher level. In addition to building in particular areas, specific campus will need to maintain retrospective collections in particular areas on behalf of the CSU.

Priority: High

Dependent on: Decision and commitment to move forward on shared print management

Estimated time to complete: June 2015

Estimated cost to implement: Unknown

CONCLUSION

Collaboration

Historically, each campus has made independent decisions in the area of print management. For this collaboration process to be successful, everyone involved needs to buy in to the benefits of a cohesive collection management practice and be willing to change their practice and begin to think collectively for acquisition and weeding. It will require time and effort, and will require librarians to forge new work relationships with colleagues on multiple campuses. Efforts to get people to willingly agree to cooperate in groupings large or small is paramount to the success of this project and cannot be minimized.

Until the CSU can begin collecting our own statistics, the successes of other resource sharing programs can be used as examples as encouragement relative to what can be accomplished with collaboration. Meanwhile, utilizing an experienced consultant such as SCS, a division of OCLC, can help us look at our own collections the way in the future we would be able to look at utilizing the ULMS.

Implementation

Based upon the experiences of other collaborative networks, a successful implementation of this strategic vision will require planning, oversight and guiding principles. The following steps are necessary for the project to be successful:

1. Commitment to the project from the participating campuses and the Chancellor's Office.

2. Adopt a Memo of Understanding outlining goals and guiding principles, with details of how to handle the day-to-day issues of shared management.

3. Appoint a project or consortium manager to implement and guide the project.

4. Retain SCOPM as an advisory board to the project or consortium manager.

Summary of Recommendations to COLD

The recommendations are consolidated in Table 5, beginning on the next page.

> *Coming together is a beginning.*
> *Keeping together is progress.*
> *Working together is success.*
> *—Henry Ford*

Table 5   **Summary of Recommendations**

Goal		Recommendation	Priority	Dependent Upon	Estimated Time to complete	Estimated Cost to implement
1	1.	Provide funding for digitizing resources, especially special collections, to provide access systemwide.	Ongoing	Funding	Ongoing	Unknown
	2.	Create or find a cost accounting template to determine the cost of lending and borrowing to standardize criteria for comparison to track impact of increased activity and identify libraries burdened by excessive lending.	High	Chancellor's Office or OCLC	Two months/ whenever OCLC supplies their template	Each campus would be responsible for collecting, coding and presenting the required data.
2	3.	Provide the same level of equipment and training for all CSU Interlibrary Loan Departments	Begin now	COLD and I-SPIE recommending standards, administering a library inventory survey, and funding	Five months (by end of June 2015)	Unknown
	4.	Develop additional collaborative initiatives among CSU Interlibrary Loan Departments through I-SPIE to make CSU ILL services an integrated consortium.	Ongoing	Recommendations of I-SPIE members	Unknown	Not applicable until requests are made
	5.	Use a collection analysis system that reviews all CSU collections at one time for accurate comparison.	Begin before the last contracted OCLC refresh in June 2015	COLD developing a plan for implementing a consolidated and joint analysis for remaining CSUs that have not used the GreenGlass analysis for collection development purposes	By end of 2015	This expenditure has already been made through the OCLC contract
	6.	Improve turnaround time and access for CSU interlibrary loan services by continuing central funding for the Get It Now service and add funding to the budget for RapidILL. Such funding will help increase CSU library participation. Also consider expanding Links+ usage in the future.	a. Begin *RapidILL* within the next six months	Central funding	The other nine campuses would have RapidILL implemented by Jan. 2016	Initial one time set-up cost for nine campuses is $40,500 Continued maintenance for all 23 campuses is $89,585 per year.
			b. *Get it Now* Continuation	Continued funding	Ongoing	Already funded
			c. Consider *Link+*	Functionality of selected ULMS; I-SPIE recommendations	Not applicable	Unknown

Table 5

<p align="center">Summary of Recommendations</p>

Goal		Recommendation	Priority	Dependent Upon	Estimated	
					Time to complete	Cost to implement
2	7.	Develop CSU-wide licensing of e-books so that campuses may freely share content.	Finish by the end of January 2016	Should be investigated by EAR Committee	Ongoing	Unknown
	8.	Continue to monitor the interlibrary loan "floating collection concept."	Low	ULMS implementation		
	9.	Implement ULMS RFP features that promote resource sharing among all CSU campuses and support suggested print management strategies.	Throughout ULMS search, selection, and stages of implementation	ULMS procurement and implementation process	Unknown	Cost already part of ULMS procurement
3	10.	Consortial purchasing of electronic streaming hosted by the individual vendors.	Ongoing	Chancellor's Office funding and EAR Working Group recommendation(s)	Unknown	Unknown
	11.	Systemwide purchase of MARCIVE so that all campuses participate.	Low	Survey Campuses for interest	Unknown	Unknown
4	12.	CSU system libraries interested in space reclamation while maintaining preservation and access to the print journal record should become members of WEST. The option is available for consortial membership (to include all CSU campuses) in WEST (Orbis-Cascade and the UC libraries are examples of consortial members)	High	Central and campus funding	Second quarter FY 2015-16	Dependent on individual or consortial membership model
	13.	Discuss the potential for another CSU campus to join Northridge as an archive holder/builder, e.g., this might be Sonoma, or another other campus with existing storage capacity.	Medium	Campus "Hold in Place" policies; CSU/WEST membership model	FY 2015-16	Membership fees, staff time working with WEST/CDL

Table 5   **Summary of Recommendations**

Goal		Recommendation	Priority	Dependent Upon	Estimated	
					Time to complete	Cost to implement
4	14.	COLD should formalize a policy statement on shared print preservation and management for the CSU library system and include a governance and policy framework for any strategy or resultant program. It is important to identify responsibilities and expectations of this expanded partnership among the CSU libraries.	High	Decision by COLD and subsequent development of program policies	Unknown	Unknown
	15.	CSU should continue to monitor and engage with the development of regional distributed print preservation/management plans and programs underway by CDL, UC Regional Library Facilities, and SCELC contingent on the direction outlined in any policy statement.	High	CSU strategy on collaboration and communication	Ongoing	Unknown
	16.	CSU should continue to monitor the results of the HathiTrust Print Monographs Archive Planning Task Force and evaluate any changes in services or membership to enhance access to the digitized print record and before considering any CSU membership.	Medium	Taskforce report	Start in spring 2015 with issuance of taskforce report	Unknown
5	17.	A clear mission statement should be crafted in the form of an MOU that describes the purpose and goals of the collaborative. It should include justification and benefits for local involvement. The goals should include measurable objectives in order to evaluate success.	High	Decision and commitment to move forward on shared print management	June 2015	Unknown

APPENDIX

A. EAR Report on Streaming Video Survey

B. SRLF to CSU | Lending Statistics 2011-2014

C. Loans from UC-NRLF to the CSUs

D. E-mail from Emily Stambaugh to Johanna Alexander

E. Proposed Memo of Understanding (first draft)

EAR Report on Streaming Video Survey
May 2014

Thirteen surveys were completely filled out with contact information. Some were partially filled out but had no contact information.

Three quarters of the campuses surveyed are currently using streaming video content.

Here is a list of some of the streaming video packages campuses' subscribe to:

- Psychotherapy.net

- Alexander Street Press (Dance in Video, Opera in Video, Nursing Education in Video, VAST-Academic Video Online, Education in Video, American History, PBS)

- Ambrose Video: BBC Shakespeare

- Films on Demand (Business and Economic collection, Health collection)

- Ethnographic Video Online

- Kanopy Streaming Service

- Filmakers Library

- Safari

- Docuseek2

Three quarters of the campuses surveyed have had a trial of streaming video content. (3/4 of 13)

Some Comments on Streaming Video Services:
- Budget seems to be a barrier to subscribing to streaming video services. In addition, some campuses rather own video content than lease it.

- Kanopy and Psychotherapy.net got positive comments.

- One campus commented that they were not impressed with the content of Films on Demand and Alexander Press. This campus felt the content wasn't worth the price.

- Another campus commented that Films on Demand was hard to get into the users' hands. Hoping that adding their MARC records will help this situation.

- One campus stated that there was limited interest in the subject matter from Ambrose Video.

- Ethnographic Video was trialed and was subscribed to so I assume this would be a positive comment for that service.

Factors campuses consider important for the evaluation of a product:

Price and ADA Compliance were two important factors then reviews and ownership are next on the list.

A list of subject specific needs:

- Nursing (a number of campuses had this subject on their list)
- Education
- Science
- Current Events
- Business
- History
- Psychological counselling
- Documentaries for Ethnic and Area Studies
- Theater and Dance
- Multidisciplinary service that covers abroad range of topics

Most campuses would be interested in a PDA pilot for streaming video.

Two thirds of the campuses surveyed would be interested in a pay-per-view cost plan for streaming video.

Result of survey:

Our proposal would be to try to get a PDA pilot from Kanopy and/or Alexander Street Press

SRLF to CSU | Lending Statistics 2011-2014

CAMPUS*	Requests Filled														
	CY 2014 to Oct 30			CY 2013			CY 2012			CY 2011			FOUR-YEAR TOTALS		
	ARTICLES	LOANS	TOTAL	ARTICLES	LOANS	TOTAL	ARTICLES	LOANS	TOTAL	ARTICLES	LOANS	TOTAL	ARTICLES	LOANS	TOTALS
Bakersfield	3	2	5	6	2	8	7	5	12	8	7	15	24	16	40
Chico					2	2	2	4	6	1		1	3	6	9
Dominguez Hills	23	3	26	10	3	13	22	4	26	1	9	10	56	19	75
East Bay	1		1	1	3	4	1	2	3	1	1	2	4	6	10
Fresno	4	3	7	8		8	12	2	14	2	2	4	26	7	33
Fullerton	5	5	10	1	9	10	5	17	22	1	19	20	12	50	62
Humboldt	8	5	13	10	6	16	24	11	35	7	8	15	49	30	79
Long Beach		19	19	3	10	13	18	12	30	2	10	12	23	51	74
Los Angeles	50	6	56	48	10	58	24	18	42	23	16	39	145	50	195
Monterey Bay	22	1	23	16		16	7	3	10		2	2	45	6	51
Moss Landing	1		1					1	1				1	1	2
Northridge	1		1		1	1	4	4	8		7	7	5	12	17
Pomona	34	2	36	24	5	29	27	4	31	24	6	30	109	17	126
Sacramento	1	9	10		9	9	1	6	7	4	7	11	6	31	37
San Diego	9	3	12	8	4	12	14	14	28	2	9	11	33	30	63
San Francisco	14	14	28	9	9	18	9	17	26	15	25	40	47	65	112
San José	18	6	24	2	1	3	1	2	3	1	4	5	22	13	35
San Luis Obispo		8	8	6	6	12	11	13	24	5	13	18	22	40	62
San Marcos	2	1	3				3		3	1	4	5	6	5	11
Sonoma	1		1				1		1		1	1	2	1	3
Stanislaus	1	5	6	1	1	2	1	3	4	3	2	5	6	11	17
Annual Total	**198**	**92**	**290**	**153**	**81**	**234**	**194**	**142**	**336**	**101**	**152**	**253**	**646**	**467**	**1,113**

Source: CDL Jreport vdx_lending.rpt

Contact: Jon Edmondson, (310) 206-2011

*Campuses with no activity: Channel Islands, Maritime and San Bernardino

Appendix C

ILL Reciprocity Report

Reporting Period: October 2009–September 2014
Institution: UNIV OF CALIFORNIA, N REG LIBR
Symbol: ZAP

Loans from UC-NRLF to the CSUs

OCLC Symbol	Library Campus*	No. of Loans		
		Total	**Copy**	**Original**
CBA	Bakersfield	7	6	1
U$C	Channel Islands	3	3	-
CCH	Chico	4	4	-
CDH	Dominguez Hills	8	5	3
CSH	East Bay	2	1	1
CFS	Fresno	10	8	2
CFI	Fullerton	5	5	-
CHU	Humboldt	25	15	10
CLO	Long Beach	19	11	8
CLA	Los Angeles	39	27	12
CVM	Maritime	3	2	1
MB@	Monterey Bay	19	17	2
CPO	Pomona	62	59	3
CSA	Sacramento	19	6	13
CSB	San Bernardino	6	5	1
CDS	San Diego	22	20	2
CSF	San Francisco	32	24	8
CSJ	San Jose	7	6	1
CPS	San Luis Obispo	8	8	-
CSO	Sonoma	2	-	2
CTU	Stanislaus	4	4	-
	Totals	**306**	**236**	**70**

*Campuses with no activity: Northridge and San Marcos

E-mail from Emily Stambaugh to Johanna Alexander
Subject: Questions regarding SRLF
Date: 7 NOV 2014

Hi Johanna,

I have information for you. I hope this is helpful. Please let me know if you need more.

UC RLF Lending to CSU

Attached are lending activity reports from both RLFs to CSUs. If you have questions, Jon Edmonson (SRLF) and Charlotte Rubens (NRLF) can help.

RLF Fill Dates

UC Libraries are exploring options to remedy the impending fill dates for the RLFs.

The NRLF is projected to fill for common volume sizes between 2016 and 2017. NRLF is engaging a Library Academic Senate Committee at UC Berkeley as space constraints are further studied.

In 2014/15 SRLF has placed a moratorium on all campus deposits, effective July 7, 2014, through January 2, 2015. Incoming new deposits are limited to the UC Shared Print programs: Shared Print for Licensed Content, the JSTOR Archive, and WEST Cycle 4 Silver and Gold contributions. The moratorium is in force due to delay in the relocation of UCLA Film & Television Archive collection. Once moved, SRLF will reclaim space for 1 million volumes for standard-size circulating materials. At that point, SRLF's projected fill dates for monographs and journals are May 2022 and January 2029 respectively. Space for oversized materials and microfilm will be exhausted in 2016.

CSU Offers of Weeded Books

It would be useful to ensure that we, collectively in California, do not weed last copies. UC Libraries haven't yet developed a last copy policy or process for receiving last copies from libraries in the state. However, occasionally offers of unique materials are accepted as gifts by a campus or an RLF.

The RLFs have a single copy policy. We have a tool that our campuses use to determine if an item already exists in the storage facilities. The tool is openly available and could be used by CSUs. Also, at present, UC copies for deposit are preferred, so it might be a good idea to also check Melvyl for campus holdings. If, after checking these two sources, a title is determined to be not held by UC, please feel free to offer it to the RLFs (keeping in mind the above moratoria and fill dates). It would be good if CSU staff could let RLF Directors know that these checks had been performed at the point of making an offer.

The RLFs can receive last copies as gifts. We need to keep overheads low, so these would need to be received without strings attached, whenever possible.

So, if CSUs have items to offer, and in the spirit of ensuring that last copies in the state are preserved, I'd suggest the following approach:

1. Check the RLF Duplicate Screening Tool:
   http://www.cdlib.org/services/d2d/melvyl/rlf_tool.html

2. Check Melvyl for UC Campus Holdings: http://www.cdlib.org/services/d2d/melvyl/

3. If no copies are held by UC, contact RLF Directors: Colleen Carlton (SRLF), Erik Mitchell (NRLF)

   - http://www.srlf.ucla.edu/

   - http://www.lib.berkeley.edu/NRLF/

I'll mention this to our UC shared print strategy team and explore whether a last copy policy might be developed. This might be an interesting area of policy collaboration amongst UC and CSU storage facilities.

All the best on CSU's endeavors in this area! I'd be interested in hearing about the SCOPM's recommendations.

Let's stay in touch.

Emily

**Proposed Memo of Understanding for
CSU Libraries Systemwide Print Management Participants**

1. **Project Goals**

    The project has two distinct goals:

    1. Responsibly reduce the size of local print collections by reducing duplication of low circulating titles among the participating libraries so that library space may be freed up for other uses.

    2. Create and maintain a distributed, shared collection of identified monograph and periodical titles to ensure that circulating or available copies of them are accessible to other CSU libraries and state and regional collaborative partners.

2. **Guiding Principles**

    Participant libraries are committed to work together collaboratively to meet the project goals above for a minimum of 15 years, with options for review, renewal and dissolution as outlined below in section four. Additionally, the principles of this MOU include autonomy of each CSU library to:

    a. make appropriate deselection and acquisition decisions,

    b. provide deselection lists to all CSUs, allowing a minimum of two weeks for other CSUs to select any titles they would like to add to their collection, and

    c. participate in CSU collaborative agreements including state and regional archival repositories and CSU system and subject collection initiatives.

3. **Role of Project or Consortium Manager**

    The project or consortium manager will act as the agent for this project in ways that facilitate its success such as:

    a. Creating an implementation plan.

    b. Coordinating communication among participant libraries, OCLC (formerly Sustainable Collection Services LLC) on behalf of the project, CSU libraries, CSU Collection Development Coordinators, COLD and state and regional archival repositories.

    c. Keep the project on track and improve the success rate by monitoring the project and helping to solve issues as they surface.

    d. Focus on achieving goals and with experience, be able to streamline the process by sharing "what works" with participants.

    e. Report to COLD on progress as well as stakeholder satisfaction.

    f. Make recommendations for improvement.

    g. Once the ULMS is implemented, it will be important to use the available information to understand how the resources are being used, and if utilization can be more effective.

4. **Role of SCOPM**

   SCOPM members should be representative of the 23 campuses, similar to STEM an EAR composition in order to advise and assist the project or consortium manager.

5. **Duration of agreement**

   Libraries agree to work together collaboratively to meet the two project goals of the CSU Systemwide Print Management Program for a minimum of 15 years from the start of the original agreement, unless this agreement is dissolved or superseded by the mutual agreement of COLD. The length of this agreement may be extended at the end of the original period by mutual agreement of COLD.

   Review of the agreement, its terms and implications will occur at no less than three-year intervals, or when a request is made to SCOPM or COLD.

6. **Participating CSU Campuses**

   1. California Maritime Academy
   2. California Polytechnic State University, San Luis Obispo
   3. California State Polytechnic University, Pomona
   4. California State University, Bakersfield
   5. California State University, Channel Islands
   6. California State University, Chico
   7. California State University, Dominguez Hills
   8. California State University, East Bay
   9. California State University, Fresno
   10. California State University, Fullerton
   11. California State University, Long Beach
   12. California State University, Los Angeles
   13. California State University, Monterey Bay
   14. California State University, Northridge
   15. California State University, Sacramento
   16. California State University, San Bernardino
   17. California State University San Marcos
   18. California State University, Stanislaus
   19. Humboldt State University
   20. San Diego State University
   21. San Francisco State University
   22. San José State University
   23. Sonoma State University

7. **Materials and Collections**

   a. **Exclusions**

   Examples of library materials not covered by the agreement include but are not limited to: uniquely held items, items added to the collection after 2005, items published after 2005, items where circulation exceeds the minimum level of three times at participating libraries. Date limits would likely change after each analysis.

   b. **Ownership and location of resources**

   Items deselected by one CSU and selected by another CSU fully change ownership and the new CSU owner has full rights for future disposition.

   c. **Maintenance of the shared collection**

   Each library will use their best effort to maintain, house, preserve and make available the titles selected from other CSUs, but at any time the receiving library has full rights of disposition.

   d. **Protection of retention list titles**

   Participant libraries will work toward adopting an agreed on standardized bibliographic identification, e.g., to MARC 583 (http://www.loc.gov/marc/bibliographic/bd583.html), for retention items in their collections. The aim is to facilitate data refresh and also to create the potential for all participants to identify retention items in OCLC/CSU ULMS or alternative shared discovery system.

   e. **Circulation**

   All titles will be searchable in the CSU ULMS or the OCLC interlibrary loan module and able to be requested through CSU's interlibrary loan delivery service. The shared titles will circulate locally according to each library policy and will follow the ILL practices of each institution for lending to other libraries.

   f. **Damaged, lost, missing and replacement copies**

   Libraries are expected to follow their usual workflows and procedures for identifying, repairing and replacing selected titles. They will make a good faith effort to respond to badly damaged (unloanable) or lost titles in a way that displays sound judgment in the context of the particular title and its availability to other libraries in the state. For example where titles are available in other libraries in the state (or widely available nationally) it may not be necessary or prudent to replace them given the low circulating history of these titles.

   g. **New editions**

   Libraries may follow their usual workflows and procedures with respect to new editions of selected titles. Where it is general practice for a library to replace a title with the most recent edition, this procedure may be followed even where the older edition has been transferred from another library.

   h. **Data refresh**

   Libraries may choose, if they wish, to take part in a data refresh with updated circulation data and additional libraries' holdings at regular intervals (anticipated every 3-5 years). Data refresh will provide additional withdrawal opportunities and extend the shared collection.

END NOTES

[i] Link to OCLC ILL Cost Calculator: http://www.oclc.org/research/activities/interlibrary-cost-calculator.html

[ii] Goal 2, Sources of interlibrary loan data:

1. Costa, Annie [CSULA Library]. ILLIAD Data Report from CSU Los Angeles. 2013-2014.

2. Gonzalez, Janet and Ariel Lauricio [CSUB Library]. Personal interviews. 2014 – 2015.

3. Lauricio, Ariel [CSUB Library]. ILLIAD Data Report from CSU Bakersfield. 2013-2014.

4. Lee, Christopher [CSUSLO Library]. ILLIAD Data Report from CSU San Luis Obispo, 2013-2014.

5. MacMichael, Jan [LOFT Project Assistant]. "Historical Data for Interlibrary Loans." Includes personal interview with Annie Costa, CSULA Interlibrary Loan Department. Message to SCOPM Members. 13 March 2014. E-mail.

6. Nowak, Darlene [CSUSD Library]. ILLIAD Data Report from CSU San Diego. 2013-2014.

[iii] Goal 2, Recommendation 5, source of quote on the UC systemwide e-book sharing:
1. University of California. CLS Ebook Framework Lightning Team. *Workflows for Evaluating Systemwide Ebook Offers*. Report endorsed by CLS on April 25, 2014 http://libraries.universityofcalifornia.edu/groups/files/cls/docs/ebook_team_public_3_.pdf

[iv] Goal 2, Recommendation 1, sources of information for standardizing level of equipment and training for all CSU Interlibrary Loan Departments:

1. Caron, Stay [CSU I-SPIE and CSU Fullerton Interlibrary Loan Department]. Personal interview. 30 Oct. 2014.

2. Gonzalez, Janet and Ariel Lauricio [CSUB Library]. Personal interviews. 2014 – 2015.

3. Ricciardi, Dawnelle [CSU I-SPIE Chair and CSU Sonoma Interlibrary Loan Department]. Personal interview. 30 Oct. 2014.

[v] Goal 2, Recommendation 2, sources of information about I-SPIE collaboration initiative:

1. Caron, Stay [CSU I-SPIE and CSU Fullerton Interlibrary Loan Department]. Personal interview on 30 OCT 2014.

2. Ricciardi, Dawnelle [CSU I-SPIE Chair and CSU Sonoma Interlibrary Loan Department]. Personal interview on 30 OCT 2014.

[vi] Goal 2, Recommendation 4, sources of information relative to:

1. Rapid Staff [Richins, Micheal]. "[146-1C015488-0806] a few follow-up questions regarding RapidILL." E-mail message to Johanna Alexander on 01 NOV 2014.

2. Richins, Micheal. "RE: RE: [355-1BE2FD7A-080A] cost information." E-mail message to Johanna Alexander on 22 JAN 2015.

3. RapidILL website on 21 JAN 2015. http://www.rapidill.org

[vii] Goal 2, Recommendation 6, source of information on floating collections:

1. Coopey, Barbara and Barb Eshbach. "Floating Collection: How It Can Work in a Large, Multicampus, Academic Library." ALCTS Webinar. 2 Oct. 2013. Accessed 20 Nov. 2014. http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=8KVtKrRgZxQ

2. Coopey, Barbara. "Re: floating collections and a couple of questions." Message to Johanna Alexander. [Includes PowerPoint slides]. 3 Dec. 2014. E-mail.

viii Goal 2, Statistics about

1. Carlton, Colleen (Director SRLF) and Jon Edmonson. CSU SRLF Stats 4 Years. Received 7 Nov. 2014.

2. Mitchell, Erik (Director NRLF) and Charlotte Rubens. Loans to the CSU's2009-2014 NRLF. Received 7 Nov. 2014.

3. California State University. 2012-2013 CSU Library Annual Statistic Report. 2014. Web. 21 Nov. 2014. http://www.calstate.edu/library/content/statistics/documents/LibStatRpt12-13_revised_20140805.pdf