Developing a Planning Framework for UC Libraries Shared Print Collections

Version 1.3. October 22, 2004

1. Definition and Aims

In November 2003, University of California University Librarian defined UC Shared Collections as follows:

> The University of California Libraries' **Shared Collection** consists of information resources jointly purchased or electively contributed by the libraries. Such resources are collectively governed and managed by theUniversity Librarians for the purpose of maximizing access to the widest audience of current and future members of the UC community.

The UC Libraries Shared Print Program was developed by University Librarians as a way to advance strategic directions elucidated in the April 2004 report, *Systemwide Strategic Directions for Libraries and Scholarly Information at the University of California*:

> The overall aim of [shared print collections] is to further optimize the management of information resources for students and faculty by reducing unnecessary duplication, leveraging shared assets . . . and expanding the information resources available systemwide, while meeting the information needs of library users at each campus (Section 4.1, p. 12).

Specifically, the UC Libraries Shared Print Program seeks to achieve this aim by creating shared print collections that meet the following objectives:

1. Broaden or deepen UC Library collections in the service of research, teaching, patient care, and public service.
2. Offer economies not available through traditional models of collection development.
3. Enhance access by the research community to important cultural assets by ensuring persistence over time.
4. Enhance access to the collection for researchers on all UC campuses.
5. Enable UC Libraries systematically to develop and manage comprehensive research collections that would otherwise be impossible to build.

This document does two things.

First, it presents the program's progress to date developing and in some cases implementing procedures for sustainably creating and managing selected types of shared print collections. The presentation is largely descriptive but not exclusively so. Throughout, we are careful to summarize what we have learned from our work, notably about the costs and benefits that seem to attach to particular kinds of shared print collections, and about issues that they throw up for our consideration over the longer term.

Second, the document presents in appendices the procedures that have evolved out of our experience with selected types of shared print collections. These, we propose, will guide the program as it develops and include:

- A framework for developing, evaluating, and choosing to implement proposals for candidate shared print collections
- A framework that describes the life cycle of a shared print collection with details about the operational and organizational issues and challenges at every life-cycle stage
- A cost analysis framework (to determine for any candidate shared print collection, its costs and potential cost avoidances for the system)
- Terms agreed by libraries that contribute their own print materials to a shared print collection

Obviously, work remains to be done in key areas not yet represented here or only partially developed. The document does not yet reflect on the business and organizational models required to sustain shared print collections or on the standards and service infrastructure required to support their development and use. It is also silent on issues of long-term care and feeding (preservation, conservation, and access), and on possible collaboration with other research libraries and library systems that take an interest in shared and systematic management of highly redundant print materials.

As work in these and other areas is conducted and comes to fruition, its results will be included here in an evolving document that provides the best and most up-to-date analysis of the shared print program, its progress, principles, and guiding procedures and practices. This document, then, is seen as a planning framework that will, over time, allow us to a) identify the issues, b) set out proposed solutions where we have confidence in their soundness, c) prioritize unresolved issues for further attention, d) formulate and set out the specific objectives for pilot projects designed to gain experience with unresolved issues, and e) codify our cumulative experience and our decisions as the depth and breadth of our experience with shared print collections increases.

2. Progress with types of shared print collections

The program is working actively to define procedures for and in some cases developed four distinctive kinds of shared print collections. Progress of these efforts is set out below along with an assessment of issues raised from them.

2.1. Prospective printed serials which are also available online

***Description*:** These collections realize the priorities and opportunities for cost avoidance that emerge in the development, system-wide, of our shared digital collections. The Elsevier pilot has clearly demonstrated significant cost-savings that can be realized (see Appendix C). Typically, they involve the acquisition for the system of a single set of print journals for all of the titles to which the UC libraries also subscribe electronically. The existence of the so-called "print archive" allows campuses that wish to do so to cancel local print subscriptions in favor of electronic only ones without denying faculty who need it access to the print journals.

***Projects*:** Elsevier (pilot), ACM (pilot) Kluwer/Wiley/Nature/BMJ (in process) Project Muse (proposed), Lippincott Williams and Wilkins (proposed); Core Collection of Annual reports

from California State Agencies (discussed); Physical Science Proceedings collection (discussed).

***Status*:** Work to date has included a pilot project to develop a prospective shared print collection of Elsevier and ACM serial publications that are available online. The Assessment Report for the project, (http://libraries.universityofcalifornia.edu/cdc/elsevier_acm_assessment.doc), concludes, "The procedures and policies set in place for this pilot are scalable for journal collections with electronic equivalents for all content, particularly where low use is expected." The report also confirms the significant cost savings achieved by campus libraries, through cancellations and, in one case, the decision not to bind 2003 Elsevier journals. The assessment report identified significant issues to be resolved for the ACM project, arising from its nature as a mixed monographic/serials project and from the number of non-print supplemental materials received as part of the subscription. The Shared Print Program is currently working with campus staff to resolve these issues.

Based on outcomes of the Elsevier project, CDL is moving ahead to negotiate and acquire free or very low-cost shared print copies of titles from the following publishers of online journals and proceedings:

Publisher	**Titles**
For 2004	
Elsevier	~1,200 titles
ACM	41 (journals plus proceedings)
Wiley	350
Kluwer	560 (may be joined by ~250 Springer titles in 2005)
Nature	28 (may be joined by ~15 titles 2005)
BMJ	25
SPIE	4 titles, proceedings (~50 issues/year), to begin in September
EEBO microforms	
For 2005	
Institute of Particle Physics	32
American Geophysical Union	10
For 2006	
American Psychological Association	65
Some additional possibilities under negotiation for 2005	
American Institute of Physics	50

Health Sciences bibliographers have proposed a shared print subscription to Lippincott Williams and Wilkins titles that would be funded on a campus cost-share model. This proposal is under discussion by CDC.

Benefits: Benefits accrued by UC Libraries from shared print collections based on prospectively acquired online journal subscriptions include impressive cost savings to the campus libraries that cancel local print subscriptions. Cost savings are also available to those libraries that are freed of associated binding, processing and maintenance costs, including shelf space. In addition, campuses have used the Elsevier pilot project to demonstrate to faculty the feasibility of shared print, thus building confidence among the user community.

Challenges and Limitations: As work with the Elsevier and ACM pilots demonstrated, shared print collections of prospective serial publications to which the system is also subscribing in electronic form are relatively straightforward to develop. Some issues, however, remain to be worked through.

- Processing of supplemental materials and monographic continuations (cf. ACM, SPIE) need to be thought through.
- Pilots have focused on science journals. We need to undertake similarly experimental work with humanities and social science journals to see if they raise different sets of issues.
- As with all pilots, it is difficult to assess their scalability. Things should become clearer in the next year as we continue to build the ACM and Elsevier collections and add materials from other publishers

Longer term, other issues will also need to be addressed. While considerable in the short- to medium-term the cost savings that will likely accrue from shared print collections of prospectively acquired online journals are unlikely to last as journal publishers increasingly move to e-only production formats. One needs to question, therefore, the extent to which such collections will be foundational over the longer term to the shared print program. In this regard, the UC Preservation Advisory Group has recommended that preservation funding be channeled to digital preservation rather than print at such a point that the digital version becomes the copy of record. Northern California Science Selectors have discussed the need to focus energies on pressuring online journal publishers to ensure preservation and persistent access. UC CDC has expressed some caution about the possibility of devoting significant resources to pay for shared print subscriptions where they cannot be negotiated as a free copy. In sum, the UC Libraries can expect to achieve substantial economies from prospective shared print collections of journals available in electronic form. However once any savings are absorbed, and campus subscriptions to print titles are cancelled, future savings will not be forthcoming. At such a point that the digital version becomes the "copy of record," we will need to assess whether we should continue to add to the print.

A further challenge is to determine whether, under what circumstances and to what extent it makes sense for a single institution (the University of California) to undertake responsibility for prospective shared print collections of serial publications that are also available in digital format. Clearly other research libraries stand to benefit sufficiently to justify their investment somehow in supporting such initiative. Assessing the prospects for and constraints upon multi-institutional approach will require further investigation. Recently, the shared print program received a proposal from UC History and Women's Studies bibliographers to acquire a prospective print collection for journal titles produced by Project Muse (Johns Hopkins University Press). Discussions with Bernard Reilly at the Center for Research Libraries indicate that there is widespread interest among research libraries nation-wide in

building Project Muse "collections of record." A California Muse shared collection pilot project would serve to help us develop our planning and budget model for a prospective serials project where print content would be purchased from more than one publisher, and where the user community is a humanities community. It could also serve as a pilot for a collaboration that moves beyond UC.

Behaviors
Behaviors were agreed upon by University Librarians for the Elsevier and ACM projects. These behaviors have been expanded to include optimal environmental conditions and conservation treatment and are proposed as a model in Appendix E for all journal shared print projects stored at an RLF where digital exists.

2.2. Retrospective Print Serials Collections (where digital does or does not exist).

***Description*:** Such a collection is created from UC libraries' extant print holdings and is designed to provide a comprehensive print version of a serial publication that is available online (e.g. JSTOR, Elsevier's back file, etc). They have the potential to realize major cost-savings for campuses in shelf space and ongoing preservation and access.

***Projects*:** JSTOR (planning), Physical Science and Engineering Core Journals (proposed)

Status: JSTOR and the UC libraries are working in partnership to plan a shared print collection of 353 JSTOR titles. The collection would be "dim" or "pretty dim" meaning that its contents would be available to JSTOR and to UC faculty under certain restricted conditions. The collection would be built from materials contributed by the UC libraries supplemented where necessary by materials acquired elsewhere. A proposal has also been discussed with physical science and engineering librarians to create a single retrospective archive of core journals, some, but not all, of which are available digitally.

***Benefits*:** Benefits accrued from this type of shared print collection include significant campus cost savings from recovered shelf-space and reductions in ongoing collection management costs. These savings are available for campuses that contribute volumes to such a collection as well as to those that withdraw duplicate volumes from their shelves on the basis of the shared print collection's existence. Other benefits are also likely to accrue to the system. The system will have access to serial sets that are systematically assembled and consequently reliably and verifiably more comprehensive than similar serial sets available at any of the campus libraries. In addition, assembling one complete run of older journal titles will allow the bibliographic and holdings records in Melvyl to be enhanced, and will allow UC Libraries to channel scarce preservation resources to maintain a single copy, rather than multiple copies. In the case of JSTOR, material identified by UC as missing from JSTOR Digital will be referred to JSTOR, which will digitize them, and thus improve the quality and completeness of the online product.

***Challenges and Limitations*:** Uncertainties remain about what level of page by page collation is actually necessary in the assembly of a shared retrospective print collection of serial publications that are also available in digital format. The JSTOR archive is being planned with a very high degree of costly human intervention in the collation process. Evaluation of less labor-intensive (and less costly) approaches should also be conducted.

Should UC undertake the Physical Sciences and Engineering journals project, complete bibliographic and holdings records could be created, for example, without page-by-page collation, making it possible to compare and contrast the integrity and completeness of the archives resulting from these two approaches.

Shared retrospective collections, when stored at a regional library facility, naturally raises questions about what to do with any duplicate copies that reside at that facility and are not contributed to the shared print collection by the campus that owns them.

Behaviors
Behaviors were agreed upon by University Librarians for the Elsevier and ACM projects. These behaviors have been expanded to include optimal environmental conditions and conservation treatment and are proposed as a model in Appendix E for all journal shared print projects stored at an RLF where digital exists.

2.3.**Retrospective serial publications that are not also available in digital format**

Description: Like

Projects: None currently active.

Status: The University Librarians asked SOPAG to charge a task force to investigate opportunities for such a collection comprised of selected government information sourced from campus government information collections. Work of the task force was suspended by the ULs pending further discussion with the California State Library about what if any role it might play in building or maintaining such a collection.

Benefits: Benefits envisaged by the Government Information Task Force included elimination of redundant expenditure on the management and maintenance of highly redundant and relatively low-use print materials, systematic assembly of verifiably comprehensive serial sets, and savings in shelving space for libraries contributing to such collections or withdrawing local holdings based upon their existence.

In addition, through work on the JSTOR archive (see above), it has become clear that assembling and documenting a retrospective print collection of non-digitized journals is a prerequisite and could set the stage for subsequent digitization of those materials.
Behaviors:
Behaviors for retrospective collections where there is no digital counterpart have not yet been developed. Such collections are likely to be used extensively. One model that has been widely discussed by bibliographer and preservation advisory groups is a "second copy"-circulating circulating model, where usage is expected to be significant.

2.4. Prospective specialized monographic collections

***Description*:** Such collections would be built by campuses acting in a coordinated fashion to acquire new print materials in selected areas of common interest.

***Projects*:** Foreign Language and Literatures project (proposed), Area Studies Project in Collaboration with CRL (discussed).

***Status*:** This kind of shared print collection generates great interest and excitement throughout UC libraries. There are clearly a number of different models that can be used to support, build, and manage them. One model that is being contemplated by the CDC is apparent in a proposal submitted by German language and literature bibliographers. In that proposal, it is suggested that

- The collection is planned, funded, and selected on a collaborative basis,
- The collection content is ordered, acquired, and cataloged at a single campus (the "Lead Campus"); and
- Collection storage, distribution, conservation/preservation and maintenance are administered at an RLF.

Another project that has been discussed would focus on a field of area studies (not yet specified) and collaborate with one or more international libraries to acquire collections not available through North American distribution networks.

Although no decisions have been taken yet about whether to move forward with a pilot prospective monograph collection, it is clear that such a pilot would be enormously value to the program. It may in fact emerge as a program priority. Such a pilot would help the program evaluate a particular organization and funding model (and in the course of doing that, think about and develop others). It would also help the program define requirements for the systems and services that may be needed to build shared monograph collections.

Benefits: Shared collections of prospective monographs promise significant benefits to the UC libraries. By reducing unnecessary redundancies from collection development and management processes, and by better leveraging scarce linguistic and other expertise needed to build selected special collections, the UC Libraries would build highly specialized collections with greater depth and scope than could be developed by any one campus acting on its own. Such collections would not, of course, preclude campuses from holding locally "second copies" of items in the shared collection. They would, however, relieve campuses of the responsibility to build comprehensive local collections for each and every research area on the "just in case" model.

Collaborative collection and management of specialized monographic collections will have additional benefits: the ability to identify and manage a specialized distributed monographic collection will provide a consistent shared bibliographic foundation on which to build access services and specialized user interfaces. Such capability has the potential to bring to UC's large, geographically dispersed group of libraries the ability to provide coherent, subject specific front end access for our users, which could include such features as subject enhanced bibliographic access, browsing mechanisms, analytics, digitized tables of contents, and links to supplementary subject materials such as online literary criticism, websites, primary digitized materials, etc. Because UC Libraries have access to technical infrastructure provided by CDL, UC libraries may be uniquely positioned in the research library community to develop a collaborative, subject-specific access services model.

***Limitations and Challenges*:** Success building a shared prospective monograph collection will depend on the ability to delineate clearly and effectively the different roles and responsibilities for campus and systemwide efforts. In addition, it will require our ability to coordinate selection of materials across campuses. A shared acquisitions system would be necessary to track the collection development process and to manage the collection.

Some items in shared prospective monograph collections will be borrowed and heavily used. In selected cases scholars will want extended off-site borrowing privileges. These access requirements, different from those we anticipate for print collections being built for materials that also exist in digital form, challenge the shared print program, for example, to mediate between competing access requests. In some cases, the repeated recall of particular items or collections might trigger the acquisition of additional copies or campus decisions to acquire local copies.

Behaviors
Behaviors for a shared monographic collection have not yet been developed. The "two-copy" model could work well here for collections that are expected to be used heavily. Behaviors for these collections or titles could well vary depending on the rarity of the material.

2.5. Ongoing shared print activities not formally part of the shared print program

Several shared collection development initiatives are underway within bibliographer groups. While these are likely to continue under the auspices of the bibliographer groups that start them, they could conceivably benefit from the shared print program's efforts, for example, in the development of tools and services that support coordinated identification and selection of materials in which there is some common interest, from work on the behaviors of shared print collections, and on mechanisms for assessing their costs and their benefits.

Appendix A: Framework for developing, evaluating, and choosing to implement proposals for candidate shared print collections

09/20/04

1. Introduction

This document recommends a process for surfacing, evaluating, and ultimately recommending (or not) investment in the development of specific shared print collections.

Criteria against which candidate shared print collections should be evaluated are set out in the first section. The second section describes an implementation process.

2. Criteria for evaluating candidate shared print collections

These criteria are intended to guide rather than to prescribe action. Thus, no one shared print collection needs to meet all four criteria of the criteria.

A shared print collection will:

1. Broaden or deepen UC Library collections in the service of research, teaching, patient care, and public service;

2. Expand campus libraries' ability to build comprehensive collections and provide services by offering economies not available through traditional models of print collection development;

3. Enhance access by the research community to important cultural assets by ensuring persistence over time;

4. Enhance access to the collection for library patrons on all UC campuses;

5. Enable UC Libraries to systematically develop a research collection that would otherwise be impossible to build.

Each of these criteria is fleshed out in greater detail below with questions that might be asked of a candidate shared print collection in evaluating its conformance.

1. The shared print collection will broaden or deepen UC Library collections in the service of research and teaching. In assessing whether a candidate collection meets this criterion, the following questions might be asked.

- What UC academic programs and scholarly research areas will the proposed collection support?
- Will the collection provide significant benefits broadly across UC campuses?
- Will the process of building a shared collection rationalize the collection development process over the UC System?

- If the collection has a digital counterpart, does the print version provide material or information for research beyond what is available in the digital version? (Which version is the "copy of record?")?

2. The shared print collection offers economies to UC Libraries that current collection development models do not, thus expanding the ability of campus libraries to build comprehensive collections and provide service. Assessment should be made using the cost /cost-avoidance framework that is set out in Appendix C. .

3. The shared print collection will improve access to important cultural assets by ensuring persistence over time. In assessing whether a candidate collection meets this criterion, the following questions might be asked.

- Does the collection have a digital counterpart? If so, which of the two versions is the fullest and would be considered the "copy of record?"[1]
- Given that UC Libraries will never be able to build shared print archive for the entire printed cultural record, why is THIS collection an "important cultural asset" that should be preserved?
- Are titles in this collection broadly available in other libraries, or is there another archive elsewhere of this material? Why is it important that UC be archiving this collection? Are others libraries or institutions better positioned to do so?
- Is sustained access by researchers "at risk" if a shared collection is NOT put in place?

4. The shared print collection will improve access to the collection for patrons over all UC campuses. In assessing whether a candidate collection meets this criterion, the following questions might be asked.

- What impact on user access across all UC campuses will the creation of this shared print collection have?
- Are there ways in which local access will be hampered? What impact will this have on the research process? What faculty concerns might arise, and how can these be addressed?
- Are there ways in which a shared print collection could improve access mechanisms? (Improved analytics, TOCs online, good digital copies quickly available, better bibliographic access?
- Is a shared print archive really the best way to achieve access goals, or should the collection be digitized?

[1] Which version is the most complete? Which version would the publisher (would you) consider "primary?" Our working assumption is that books or serials which are created primarily as electronic media and that are complete in this digital format should be preserved in their digital formats. On the other hand, books or serials that have been created as print and that have pictures, formatting, color, advertisements, front and back matter, etc. that is not included in the digital version or that is inadequately replicated there would be more important to "archive" in a UC Shared Print repository.

5. The shared print collection will enable UC Libraries to systematically develop a research collection that would otherwise be difficult or impossible to build. In assessing whether a candidate collection meets this criterion, the following questions might be asked.

- Will the creation of a single shared print repository provide a platform for research inter-institutionally?
- Will the aggregation of specialized materials in one place allow for kinds of research that would be impossible if the collection were dispersed?
- Does the building of the collection allow a richer and more extensive research collection than would be possible under older collection development models?

2. Processes for developing, evaluating, and implementing candidate shared print collections.

As the UC Libraries continue to seek service enhancement and cost avoidance through the leverage of systemwide collaboration, it is likely that there will be many "candidate" collections of diverse kinds. Nonetheless, the ability of UC Libraries to build shared collections is limited initially by the organizational and funding challenges implicit in changing from a distributed to a shared print collections framework, and in an ongoing way by the usual collection development funding restraints.

Thus, processes for the selection of shared print collections should involve careful review and selection. This process is best handled by the groups that currently select shared electronic resources. To whatever extent possible, the review and selection process for large shared print projects should reflect that for large electronic purchases. More flexible mechanisms could be put in place for smaller, specialized initiatives originating from bibliographer groups.

Component	Definition	Responsibility
Create a proposal for a shared print collection.	Build a rationale for creating a shared print collection, considering above selection principles.	Bibliographers, CDOs, Shared Print Director
Review and evaluate proposal and forward to CDC with recommendation.	Read, clarify, modify, evaluate, proposal.	Shared Print Director in consultation with CDC.
Recommendation	Recommend to pursue immediately (high priority), keep and consider later (medium priority) or not to pursue in foreseeable future (low priority).[2]	CDC
Decision		University Librarians

[2] This recommendation would be informed both by information in the proposal and by available funding, staffing and organizational constraints.

Appendix B. Life cycle of a shared print collection

Understanding the life-cycle of a shared print collection is critical in order to plan effectively for its development and long-term care. It is also essential in order to estimate the costs and benefits of any shared print collection.

The life-cycle that is presented in this document is intended to provide a common vocabulary about and a shared understanding of shared print collections. Stages of the life-cycle that are presented and defined here map directly to the cost-benefit framework that is presented in Appendix C.

PLANNING A SHARED COLLECTION

Component	**Definition**	**Options for Operational Responsibility**
Define collection	Define the nature, scope, source and other planning parameters for the collection; generate cost-benefit estimates; consult as required	Collaboration: campus libraries/Office of Shared Print (OSP) / CDC
Identify or adopt behaviors	Following established policies and procedures, either determine which established definition of collection behaviors will apply to this shared collections, or pursue the process to develop and adopt a new definition	Shared Print Director in collaboration with campus libraries and CDC.
Review and confirm campus holdings	If the collection requires or optionally allows for contributions of existing campus collections (whether located on campus or at an RLF), determine and verify the extant holdings and locations of the required materials at the campuses. Note that campus contributions may be involved in both wholly retrospective collections and collections that are wholly or partially prospective (e.g., JSTOR material following the "moving wall").	Shared print staff At housing unit And/or campuses
Identify contributors	If the collection requires or optionally allows for contributions of existing campus collections, confirm with campus contributors the specific titles and volumes they will contribute.	Office of Shared Print in Consultation with CDC

PROCESSING A SHARED COLLECTION

Component	Definition	Options for Operational Responsibility
Coordinate order decisions	For collections that envision purchase of material (as opposed to acquisition through the operation of a license agreement that includes archival print in	For specialized monographic collection: Lead campus acquisitions staff.[3]

[3] For highly specialized monographic shared collections, one campus might serve as a lead campus. For example, UCSD might choose to lead in the development of a collaboratively funded prospective collection in the field of fish biology. In this case UCSD bibliographers would coordinate with selectors from other UC campuses to define and choose the collection, and UCSD technical services staff would acquire the collection (using a shared collections tool such as GOBI) and create a catalog record for the collection. The collection could then be shipped to an RLF.

	addition to digital), and particularly for non-serial materials, intercampus coordination on a periodic basis to determine what materials to purchase, and by whom. **Could apply to an ongoing monograph collection or to initial one-time purchase.**	For serials, possibly CDL shared acquisitions unit.
Create acquisitions records	For collections that envision purchase of material, creation of necessary records in the acquisition system of the purchasing library	Lead campus acquisitions unit or shared acquisitions unit.
Update local records	Changes to a local campus' catalog, serials holdings, acquisition system, or other records required to reflect either a contribution of material to the shared collection or to provide access through the local system to the shared collection.	Local campus staff
Create catalog record (for continuations, new serials titles)	Create a shared cataloging program record.	Shared cataloging program.
Create Catalog Record (for monographic collections)	Create a record for local catalog and for MELVYL	Lead campus catalogers.
Content purchase/license	For collections that envision purchase of material, the direct cost of the items, whether by subscription, license, or order, approval plan, or other method. **Depending on the material being acquired, retrospective material may be purchased.**	Shared acquisitions / CDL
Pull and inspect material	For campus contributions of existing material, the cost to page and inspect the material	RLF
Receiving	Opening and sorting mail	RLF or lead campus
Check-in	Check in serial issues and monographs acquired on a standing plan. Identify damaged issues for claiming or conservation treatment.	RLF
Claiming	Ongoing tracking down of lost or missing items (serials).	Lead campus
Conservation	Provide protective covers or do small repairs on incoming items.	Lead campus SRLF conservation facility UCB conservation lab (for UCL collections at NRLF)
Package and Transport to RLF		Receiving campus / RLF
RLF process, mark & shelve		RLF

SERVICING A SHARED COLLECTION

Component	Definition	Options for Operational responsibility

Request handling - originals	Cost incurred by the collection's storage location (usually, an RLF) to satisfy a request for an item in the collection, when the request is satisfied by direct loan to the requesting library. Costs incurred by the requesting library are not considered here, as it is assumed that they would be approximately the same if the requested item were held locally, requested from another campus on intercampus loan, or requested from the shared collection.	RLF
Request handling - photocopies	Cost incurred by the storage location to satisfy a request by photocopy	RLF
Request handling - scan/digitize	Cost incurred by the storage location to satisfy a request by scanning and "desktop delivery"	RLF
Transport – originals (2way)		Tricor or other vendor.
Transport – photocopies (1way)		Vendor

MANAGING A SHARED COLLECTION OVER THE LONGER TERM

Continuing assessment of behaviors, usage, location		Office of Shared Print / CDC / Bibliographer groups
Ongoing preservation and conservation	Possible de-acidification, reformatting, conservation	SRLF conservation facility or UCB conservation facility, depending on location of collection
De-selection	For example, if the print copy of a digital journal is no longer considered by the publisher to be the "copy of record."	CDC
Implement de-selection decisions	Records, orders, etc.	Same units that acquired, etc. suggested above.

Appendix C: Shared Collections Cost Analysis Framework

Purpose

The cost analysis framework for shared collections provides a set of tools and procedures for estimating the most commonly incurred costs and (potential) cost avoidances associated with proposed shared print collections. The framework is considered a "work in progress" that will be improved with experience.

The framework and its associated analysis tools will be used by the Shared Print Program of Systemwide Library Planning, in collaboration with the campus libraries, to generate standardized estimates of the costs and cost-avoidances associated with proposed shared print projects to assist in:

- Informing decisions regarding shared print proposals.
- Identifying where (e.g., at what campuses; in what operational units; at RLFs, Shared Cataloging, etc.) costs are likely to be incurred, as an aid to operational planning and budgeting.
- Assessing aggregate costs and cost avoidance opportunities of the shared print program, as an aid to collective strategic planning and policy development.[4]

The analysis framework is based on a "unit cost" model, where costs are estimated by applying a relevant "unit cost" to the number of units to be processed for each component of the model. The cost components of the model (described further below) are intended to track the life-cycle components of the shared print planning framework (Appendix B), although this alignment has not been fully implemented at this time. At this writing, estimates of unit costs are not readily available for all cost components of the model; developing reliable and relevant unit cost estimates for those components, from campus experience and the literature, will be an ongoing activity. Some components identified in the model do not lend themselves to a "unit cost" approach (e.g., most initial planning activities); these will be assessed on a case-by-case basis. In addition, some costs (and cost avoidances) associated with a particular project will lie outside the existing cost analysis framework; SLP-Shared Print will work with campuses to estimate these costs on a case-by-case basis, and attempt to incorporate them into the framework if appropriate.

Currently, the framework consists of:

- A documentation spreadsheet, listing the cost components and the relevant "unit" for each, along with the available "default" unit costs for monographic and serial collections (Appendix C-1).
- Separate spreadsheets (Appendix C-2) that can be filled in to provide cost (and cost avoidance) estimates for each of the three types of shared print collections currently in place or under active consideration (prospective journals, retrospective journals,

[4] The term "cost avoidance" is used rather than "benefits," which is used more broadly in this document to refer to both cost and other benefits that may accrue from shared collections (cf. increased choices for campus libraries in allocating collections budgets, greater depth and strength of research collections, ability to maintain current collections and services in a stringent budgetary environment, etc.)

monographs). These workforms are based on the general documentation spreadsheet, but exclude the unit costs and cost components that are not relevant to that particular collection type, and add columns and formulas used in estimating the costs and cost avoidances for a particular project.

By way of illustration, sample workforms are provided for two extant projects (Elsevier, and the journal component of ACM) and one current/prospective "project," consisting of the prospective print journal collections from Wiley, Kluwer, Nature, and BMJ (Appendix C-3). These samples are incomplete – e.g., they generally do not include estimates for cost components for which we do not currently have unit costs – but are intended to serve only to show how the cost analysis framework might be employed in evaluating a shared print project and to suggest how a standardized report of estimated costs and cost avoidances might be employed for decision support and for operational planning and budgeting.

It should be noted here that the workforms, in their current state of development, present an incomplete picture of the benefits of space savings made possible by shared print projects. On completion, the forms will show anticipated space needs and potential space savings in terms of asf and (estimated) construction costs avoided, in addition to the (current) estimated annual value of space. Thus, the JSTOR shared print archive is not yet represented with a sample workform, as the major cost avoidance opportunity associated with that project is in the form of potential release of campus shelf space.

To summarize the results of the preliminary *operating* cost and savings analysis for the three projects addressed in Appendix C-3:

Project:	Elsevier		ACM		Wiley, etc.		TOTAL	
	Initial	Annual	Initial	Annual	Initial	Annual	Initial	Annual
Operating Cost	$ 56,491	$ 49,386	$ 2,928	$ 1,313	$ 54,340	$ 50,199	$ 113,759	$ 100,898
Operating Savings	2,422,472	2,428,589	49,050	43,697	630,183	630,183	3,101,705	3,102,469
Net Savings/(Cost)	2,365,981	2,379,203	46,122	42,384	575,843	579,984	2,987,946	3,001,571
Savings/Cost Ratio	42.88	49.18	16.75	33.28	11.60	12.55	27.27	30.75

Following is additional information on the key elements of the cost model.

Cost Components

The cost model identifies several cost components corresponding to components of the shared collection life cycle model -- operational procedures associated with the development and ongoing operation of a shared print collection. A definition of each component is provided. The developers have aimed to create a list of cost components that is both exhaustive (no significant operational steps are excluded) and exclusive (any operational cost incurred in developing and operating a shared collection is accounted for in only one cost component). However, not every cost component will be relevant to a particular shared print project, and as this work is based primarily on the experience of the Elsevier and ACM projects, may not include cost components that would be relevant to a different type of collection. SLP intends to continue to revise and refine the taxonomy of cost components based on the UC Libraries' ongoing experience with shared print collections.

Units
The model indicates what definition of "units" is relevant for each component of the model – generally, titles, volumes, issues, transactions, and space (where applicable). Each unit count, annual and initial, is multiplied by its associated unit cost. Some cost components (e.g., planning) do not lend themselves easily to a "unit cost" approach to planning; in these cases, a unit definition is not provided for that component.

Unit costs
Default unit costs based on pilot projects (such as ACM/Elsevier and CMI, and planning for the JSTOR dim archive) are included in the spreadsheet. Shared collection planners may use these default costs or substitute their own in the unit cost column, along with supporting documentation. Some cost components (e.g., planning) do not lend themselves easily to a "unit cost" approach to planning; in these cases, a default unit cost is not provided for that component. In other cases, no cost data for a particular component are readily available from UC shared print projects or from the literature. In these cases, planners will estimate a total cost for the component (if applicable to the project) and provide supporting documentation for their estimate. It is envisioned that default unit costs will be revised based on experience, including especially the documentation provided by project planners who adopt non-default unit costs, and by data that becomes available in the published literature.

Serial or monographic collections
Shared collections may be either serial or monographic. The spreadsheet provides default unit costs for both monographs and journals.

Prospective or retrospective collections
Application of cost elements and units will vary for retrospective and prospective projects. For example, the "review and confirm campus holdings" component is generally not applicable for prospective collections. The definitions for the cost components identify differences in prospective/retrospective application where relevant.

Initial and ongoing costs
Initial and set-up costs may differ from ongoing or annual costs. The cost model provides room for both initial units and annual units. It also distinguishes planning activities from ongoing processes and services. It is likely that the processes under the "Planning" category will have only initial units (where relevant) and costs. It is important to underscore that the model handles differences between initial and annual costs by varying the number of units to be processed in the initial period (usually, the first year) and the estimated number of units to be processed annually thereafter; the unit costs of these processes are assumed to be the same for both initial and annual operations.

Category	Cost Component	Unit	Default Unit Costs		Cost Notes
			Monographs	Journals	
Planning	Define collection				
	Identify or adopt behaviors				
	Review and confirm campus holdings				Default unit cost of $54 based on JSTOR pilot project.
	Identify contributors				Default unit cost of $25 based on CMI report. Assumes agreement from campuses to contribute titles.
Processing	Coordinate order decisions	Title			
	Create Acquisitions records	Title	$ 4.78	$ 2.70	
	Update local records	Title	$ 1.10	$ 1.10	Default unit cost of $1.10 based on a combination of CMI costs: "Prepare for record updates, print records" ($0.18 per title), "update records" ($0.43 per title) and "staff preparation of titles" ($0.51 per title).
	SCP catalog record	Title	$ 1.60	$ 1.60	Default unit cost of $1.60 per title based on Shared Cataloging program [source: Beverlee French, see 3/22/04 email].
	Content purchase/license	Title			
	Pull and inspect material	Volume			Cost will vary depending on how thorough the inspection.
	Receiving	Issue/Volume	$ 0.08	$ 0.08	
	Checkin	Issue		$ 2.57	In E/ACM study, costs ranged from $2.29 (UCLA) to $2.57 (UCSD)
	Claiming	Issue		$ 0.03	Costs in E/ACM ranged from $0.03 for Elsevier to $0.10 for ACM. Because Elsevier was a larger sample, we are using $0.03 for the default cost.
	Transport to RLF	Volume	$ 0.65	$ 0.65	Based on Tricor contract.
	RLF process, mark & shelve	Issue	$ 3.03	$ 3.03	Default cost of $3.03 based on E/ACM Final Report. Processing new deposits is estimated at $2.90 and receiving and shelving is estimated at $0.13 (see Elsevier/ACM Final Report, Table 8: SRLF Pilot Costs and Projected 2nd Year Budget).
	Preservation	Volume			
Servicing	Request handling - originals	Transaction			
	Request handling - photocopies	Transaction			
	Request handling - scan/digitize	Transaction			
	Transport - originals (2way)	Transaction			Based on Tricor contract
	Transport - photocopies	Transaction			
SUBTOTAL					
Space	RLF space ($)	Volume	$ 0.03	$ 0.03	Default unit cost of $0.03 based on Mike Cooper's estimate for the CMI report.
	RLF space (asf)	Volume	[RLF vols/asf]	[RLF vols/asf]	
TOTAL COST					
Savings	Purchase/license	Title			
	Acquisition and accounting				
	Receiving	Issue/Volume	$ 0.08	$ 0.08	
	Checkin	Issue	$ 2.57	$ 2.57	
	Claiming	Issue		$ 0.03	
	Cataloging				
	Marking/shelving				
	Binding	Volume		$ 12.87	Cost based on UC Bindery.
SUBTOTAL					
	Campus space - initial ($)	Volume	$ 1.43	$ 1.43	12.5 volumes per ASF (library space), based on CMI calculations. $447 building cost per ASF, based on capital costs. Yields $35.76 per volume of space savings. See Mike Cooper's estimate for the CMI report, p. 16.
	Campus space - initial (asf)	Volume	0.08	0.08	
TOTAL SAVINGS					

Shared Collections Cost Analysis Worksheet - Prospective Serial Collections

Category	Cost Component	Unit	Default Unit Costs Journals	# Units Initial	# Units Annual	Unit Cost	Total Costs/Savings Initial	Total Costs/Savings Annual	NOTES
Planning	Define collection								
	Identify or adopt behaviors								
	Review and confirm campus holdings								
	Identify contributors								
Processing	Coordinate order decisions	Title							
	Create Acquisitions records	Title	$ 2.70						
	Update local records	Title	$ 1.10						
	SCP catalog record	Title	$ 1.60						
	Content purchase/license	Title							
	Pull and inspect material	Volume							
	Receiving	Issue	$ 0.08						
	Checkin	Issue	$ 2.57						
	Claiming	Issue	$0.03-$0.10						
	Transport to RLF	Volume	$ 0.65						
	RLF process, mark & shelve	Issue	$ 3.03						
	Preservation	Volume							
Servicing	Request handling - originals								
	Request handling - photocopies								
	Request handling - scan/digitize								
	Transport - originals (2way)								
	Transport - photocopies								
SUBTOTAL							0	0	
Space	RLF space ($)	Volume	$ 0.03						
	RLF space (asf)	Volume	[RLF vols/asf]						
TOTAL COST							0	0	
Savings	Purchase/license								
	Acquisition and accounting								
	Receiving		$ 0.08						
	Checkin	Title	$ 2.57						
	Claiming	Issue	$0.03-$0.10						
	Cataloging								
	Marking/shelving								
	Binding	Volume	$ 12.87						
SUBTOTAL							0	0	
	Campus space - initial ($)	Volume	$ 1.43						
	Campus space - initial (asf)	Volume	0.08						
TOTAL SAVINGS							#REF!	#REF!	

Shared Collections Cost Analysis Worksheet - Retrospective Serial Collections

Category	Cost Component	Unit	Default Unit Costs Journals	# Units Initial	# Units Annual	Unit Cost	Total Costs/Savings Initial	Total Costs/Savings Annual	NOTES
Planning	Define collection								
	Identify or adopt behaviors								
	Review and confirm campus holdings								
	Identify contributors								
Processing	Coordinate order decisions	Title							
	Create Acquisitions records	Title	$ 2.70						
	Update local records	Title	$ 1.10						
	SCP catalog record	Title	$ 1.60						
	Content purchase/license	Title							
	Pull and inspect material	Volume							
	Receiving	Issue	$ 0.08						
	Checkin	Issue	$ 2.57						
	Claiming	Issue	$0.03-$0.10						
	Transport to RLF	Volume	$ 0.65						
	RLF process, mark & shelve	Issue	$ 3.03						
	Preservation	Volume							
Servicing	Request handling - originals								
	Request handling - photocopies								
	Request handling - scan/digitize								
	Transport - originals (2way)								
	Transport - photocopies								
SUBTOTAL							0	0	
Space	RLF space ($)	Volume	$ 0.03						
	RLF space (asf)	Volume	[RLF vols/asf]						
TOTAL COST							0	0	
Savings	Purchase/license								
	Acquisition and accounting								
	Receiving		$ 0.08						
	Checkin	Title	$ 2.57						
	Claiming	Issue	$0.03-$0.10						
	Cataloging								
	Marking/shelving								
	Binding	Volume	$ 12.87						
SUBTOTAL							0	0	
	Campus space - initial ($)	Volume	$ 1.43						
	Campus space - initial (asf)	Volume	0.08						
TOTAL SAVINGS							#REF!	#REF!	

Shared Collections Cost Analysis Worksheet - Monographic Collections

Category	Cost Component	Unit	Default Unit Costs Monographs	Number of Units Initial	Number of Units Annual	Unit Cost	Total Costs/Savings Initial	Total Costs/Savings Annual	NOTES
Planning	Define collection								
	Identify or adopt behaviors								
	Review and confirm campus holdings								
	Identify contributors								
Processing	Coordinate order decisions	Title							
	Create Acquisitions records	Title	$ 4.78						
	Update local records	Title	$ 1.10						
	SCP catalog record	Title	$ 1.60						
	Content purchase/license	Title							
	Pull and inspect material	Volume							
	Receiving	Issue	$ 0.08						
	Checkin	Volume	$ 2.57						Assumes, per ACM experience, that check-in processes are required for monographs acquired on a standing plan
	Transport to RLF	Volume	$ 0.65						
	RLF process, mark & shelve	Issue	$ 3.03						
	Preservation	Volume							
Servicing	Request handling - originals								
	Request handling - photocopies								
	Request handling - scan/digitize								
	Transport - originals (2way)								
	Transport - photocopies								
SUBTOTAL							0	0	
Space	RLF space ($)	Volume	$ 0.03						
	RLF space (asf)	Volume	[RLF vols/asf]						
TOTAL COST							0	0	
Savings	Purchase/license								
	Acquisition and accounting								
	Receiving		$ 0.08						
	Checkin	Title	$ 2.57						
	Cataloging								
	Marking/shelving								
	Binding	Volume							
SUBTOTAL							0	0	
	Campus space - initial ($)	Volume	$ 1.43						
	Campus space - initial (asf)	Volume	0.08						
TOTAL SAVINGS							#REF!	#REF!	

The **ACM cost analysis spreadsheet** is based on the Report of the Elsevier/ACM Pilot Assessment Team (March 5, 2004). It reflects UC San Diego's unit costs for the first six months of the pilot project, and projections of future costs. The number of titles (80) is the number of checkin records that were created in the first phase of the pilot project. The number of titles to be added on an annual basis is not known. San Diego checked in 466 issues during the first phase of the project, and anticipates 220 issues the second year. The savings in the spreadsheet are derived from the eight systemwide subscriptions to ACM titles that would be canceled as a result of the shared print collection.

ACM[1]				# Units			Total Costs/Savings		
Category	Cost Component	Unit	Default Unit Costs	Initial	Annual	Unit Cost	Initial	Annual	NOTES
Planning	Define collection								
	Identify or adopt behaviors	Hours		80		Need to get			Final report estimates 80 hours of dept. head, unit head, cataloger, and acquisitions staff time.
	Review and confirm campus holdings								
	Identify contributors								
Processing	Coordinate order decisions	Title							
	Create Acquisitions records	Title	$ 2.70	80		$0.86	$69		From ACM/Elsevier Final Report, "Create check-in records." There is a lower unit cost ($0.23) for the 2nd year budget.
	Update local records	Title	$ 1.10			n/a			
	SCP catalog record	Title	$ 1.60	80		$1.60	$128		UCL holdings were added to existing SCP records (available in ORION2), simplifying the process.
	Content purchase/license	Title				n/a			
	Pull and inspect material	Volume				n/a			
	Receiving	Issue	$ 0.08	466	220	$0.05	$23	$11	
	Checkin	Issue	$ 2.57	466	220	$2.57	$1,198	$565	Note that UCSD has different unit costs for initial project and 2nd year budget. The evidence for "$2.92 per piece" for processing materials (in the text of the report) is not clear.
	Claiming[2]	Issue	$ 0.03	466	220	$0.10	$47	$18	Per issue costs based on the per claim cost. First year was $0.10, but UCSD projects $0.08 for 2nd year
	Transport to RLF	Volume	$ 0.65	80	80	$0.65	$52	$52	UCSD used Tricor (part of annual contract, no additional cost); assumes one "volume" per title per year
	Preservation	Volume							
	RLF process, mark & shelve	Issue	$ 3.03	466	220	$3.03	$1,412	$667	$3.03 is a combination of $2.90 for creating records and $0.13 for receiving and shelving; assumes one "volume" per title per year.
Servicing	Request handling - originals								
	Request handling - photocopies								
	Request handling - scan/digitize[3]								
	Transport - originals (2way)								
	Transport - photocopies								
SUBTOTAL							$2,928	$1,313	
Space	RLF space ($)	Volume	$ 0.03	80	80	$0.03	$2	$2	
	RLF space (asf)	Volume		80	80		$0	$0	Assumes one "volume" per title per year
TOTAL COST							$2,928	$1,313	

Savings	Purchase/license						$38,910	$38,910	Savings estimate provided by Beverlee French. Annual does not account for inflation.
	Acquisition and accounting								
	Receiving	Issue	$ 0.08	3,728	1760	$0.05	$186	$88	
	Checkin	Issue	$ 2.57	3,728	1760	$2.57	$9,581	$4,523	
	Claiming	Issue	$ 0.03	3,728	1760	$0.10	$373	$176	
	Cataloging								
	Marking/shelving								
	Binding	Volume	$ 12.87	640					
SUBTOTAL							$49,050	$43,697	
	Campus space - initial ($)	Volume	$ 1.43	640					
	Campus space - initial (asf)	Volume	0.08						
TOTAL SAVINGS							$49,050	$43,697	

[1] ACM included 74 monographs and 35 videos and CD-ROMs not included in this cost estimate. Processing costs are reported as $3.92 for monos and $8.57 for non-print titles.

[2] UCSC reported 10 claims out of 466 issues checked in, at a cost of $4.60 per claim.

[3] Document delivery (items pulled from shelves, document scanned) is reported as $3.25. Only one item.

The **Elsevier cost analysis spreadsheet** is based on the Report of the Elsevier/ACM Pilot Assessment Team (March 5, 2004). It reflects UCLA's unit costs for the first six months of the pilot project, and projections of future costs. The number of titles (936) is the number of order records that were created in the first phase of the pilot project. "Annual" titles reflect the anticipated number of titles to be added in the second year of the project. It is not likely that the same amount of titles will be added each year. UCLA received 8,990 issues during the first phase of the project, and anticipates approximately 9,000 issues for successive years. The savings are derived from the 3.9 systemwide subscriptions to Elsevier titles that would be canceled as a result of the shared print collection.

Elsevier				**# Units**			**Total Costs/Savings**		
Category	**Cost Component**	**Unit**	**Default Unit Costs**	**Initial**	**Annual**	**Unit Cost**	**Initial**	**Annual**	**NOTES**
Planning	Define collection								
	Identify or adopt behaviors								
	Review and confirm campus holdings								
	Identify contributors								
	Start-up costs - supplies						$3,650		Identified as date stamps, labels and Princeton files.
Processing	Coordinate order decisions	Title							
	Create Acquisitions records[1]	Title	$ 2.70	936	120	$2.70	$2,527	$324	Combined "Create Holdings Records for check-in" and "Create Order Records"
	Update local records	Title	$ 1.10			n/a			
	SCP catalog record	Title	$ 1.60	936	120	$1.60	$1,498	$192	
	Content purchase/license	Title				n/a			
	Pull and inspect material	Volume				n/a			
	Receiving	Issue	$ 0.08	8,990	9,000	$0.08	$719	$720	
	Checkin[2]	Issue	$ 2.57	8,990	9,000	$2.29	$20,587	$20,610	Unit cost from ACM/Elsevier Final Report
	Claiming[3]	Issue	$ 0.03	8,990	9,000	$0.03	$270	$270	Calculated from per-claim data.
	Transport to RLF	Volume	$ 0.65	936	1,056	?			Assumes one "volume" per title per year
	Preservation	Volume							
	RLF process, mark & shelve	Issue	$ 3.03	8,990	9,000	$3.03	$27,240	$27,270	
Servicing	Request handling - originals								
	Request handling - photocopies								
	Request handling - scan/digitize								
	Transport - originals (2way)								
	Transport - photocopies								
SUBTOTAL							$56,491	$49,386	
Space	RLF space ($)	Volume	$ 0.03	936	936	$0.03	$28	$28	
	RLF space (asf)	Volume	[RLF vols/asf]						
Total Costs							$56,491	$49,386	

Savings	Purchase/license						$2,291,350	$2,291,350	From CDL estimates (Spreadsheet "elsevier print estimates.xls, 9/2/03)
	Acquisition and accounting								
	Receiving	Issue	$ 0.08	35,061	35,100	$0.08	$2,805	$2,808	Units = issues * 3.9 (UC's historic average number of Elsevier subscriptions.)
	Checkin	Issue	$ 2.57	35,061	35,100	$2.29	$80,290	$80,379	Units = issues * 3.9 (UC's historic average number of Elsevier subscriptions.)
	Claiming	Issue	$ 0.03	35,061	35,100	$0.03	$1,052	$1,053	Units = issues * 3.9 (UC's historic average number of Elsevier subscriptions.)
	Cataloging								
	Marking/shelving								
	Binding	Volume	$ 12.87	3,650	4,118	$12.87	$46,976	$52,999	
SUBTOTAL							$2,422,472	$2,428,589	
	Campus space - initial ($)	Volume	$ 1.43	3,650	4,118	$1.43	$5,220		
	Campus space - initial (asf)	Volume	0.08						
Total Savings							$2,422,472	$2,428,589	

Net Savings/Cost							$2,365,981	$2,379,203	

[1] Annual units are just for the second year, not necessarily every year.

[2] For purposes of this model, assumes that all issues received in the initial year were checked in and processed (i.e. attributes costs of 2nd-year processing of backlog to the first year)

[3] UCLA reported 97 claims out of 3,870 issues at a per-claim cost of $1.27.

The **2004 UCLA Shared Print spreadsheet** calculates the costs and savings through the central acquisition of titles from four publishers: Wiley, Kluwer, Nature, and BMJ. In this project, which is an extension of the successful Elsevier/ACM Pilot Project, UCLA receives the hard copies of 963 titles. In addition to these shared print copies, electronic versions of these titles are available systemwide to the entire UC community. The unit costs in the spreadsheet are taken when possible from the Report of the Elsevier/ACM Pilot Assessment Team. Other costs come from work done for the CMI project.

2004 UCLA Shared Print

Commitments:	Titles/ Volumes	Issues (based on 9.6 issues per title)	Subscriptions (used for calculating savings)	Issues (based on 9.6 issues per title)	Expenditures (used for savings)
Wiley	350	3,360	883	8,477	$238,358
Kluwer	560	5,376	1,329	12,758	$132,631
Nature	28	269	94	902	$123,898
BMJ	25	240	63	600	$43,877
Total	**963**	**9,245**	**2,369**	**22,738**	**$538,764**

			Default Unit Costs	# Units			Total Costs/Savings		
Category	**Cost Component**	**Unit**	**Journals**	**Initial**	**Annual**	**Unit Cost**	**Initial**	**Annual**	**NOTES**
Planning	Define collection								
	Identify or adopt behaviors								
	Review and confirm campus holdings								
	Identify contributors								
Processing	Coordinate order decisions	Title		963	0				
	Create Acquisitions records	Title	$ 2.70	963	0	$2.70	$2,600	$0	all unit costs from Elsevier example
	Update local records	Title	$ 1.10	963	0	n/a			
	SCP catalog record	Title	$ 1.60	963	0	$1.60	$1,541	$0	
	Content purchase/license	Title		963	0	n/a			
	Pull and inspect material	Volume		963	0	n/a			
	Receiving	Issue	$ 0.08	9,245	9,245	$0.08	$740	$740	
	Checkin	Issue	$ 2.57	9,245	9,245	$2.29	$21,171	$21,171	
	Claiming	Issue	$ 0.03	9,245	9,245	$0.03	$277	$277	
	Transport to RLF	Volume	$ 0.65	963	963	?			
	RLF process, mark & shelve	Issue	$ 3.03	9,245	9,245	$3.03	$28,012	$28,012	
	Preservation	Volume				$0.00	$0	$0	
Servicing	Request handling - originals					$0.00	$0	$0	
	Request handling - photocopies								
	Request handling - scan/digitize								
	Transport - originals (2way)								
	Transport - photocopies								
SUBTOTAL							$54,340	$50,199	
Space	RLF space ($)	Volume	$ 0.03	963	963	$0.03	$29	$29	
	RLF space (asf)	Volume	[RLF vols/asf]						
TOTAL COST							$54,369	$50,228	

Savings	Purchase/license						$538,764	$538,764	Annual costs have not been adjusted for inflation.
	Acquisition and accounting								
	Receiving	Issue	$ 0.08	22,738	22,738	$0.08	$1,819.01	$1,819.01	Annual costs have not been adjusted for inflation.
	Checkin	Issue	$ 2.57	22,738	22,738	$2.57	$58,435.63	$58,435.63	Annual costs have not been adjusted for inflation.
	Claiming	Issue	$ 0.03	22,738	22,738	$0.03	$682.13	$682.13	Annual costs have not been adjusted for inflation.
	Cataloging								
	Marking/shelving								
	Binding	Volume	$ 12.87	2,369	2,369	$12.87	$30,482.60	$30,482.60	
SUBTOTAL							$630,183	$630,183	
	Campus space ($)	Volume	$ 1.43	2,369	2,369	$1.43	$3,386.96	$3,386.96	
	Campus space (asf)	Volume	0.08						
TOTAL SAVINGS							$633,570	$633,570	

Appendix D: Agreement made by a library that contributes its own materials to a shared print collection
DRAFT – 09-13-04

Shared print collections promise numerous benefits to campus libraries and to the library system as a whole. Yet these can only be fully realized if the collections are fully trusted.

The following agreement seeks to build that trust by explicitly referencing the intentions of any library that contributes its own holdings to a shared collection.

Written initially for the benefit of the JSTOR print archive, the agreement has been generalized since it applies commonly to virtually any shared collection that the UC libraries are likely to develop based on contributions from extant print holdings.

The text of the agreement is as follows:

The UC Library (UCL) Shared Print Collections benefit the UC Libraries by:

- Creating a print collection that can be used to replace materials, print or digital that are damaged or destroyed.
- Extending the breadth, depth, and variety of materials they make accessible to UC faculty, students, and staff in support of their research, teaching, patient care, and public service.
- Easing the transition from a print to electronic usage patterns, realizing savings in acquisitions, processing costs, collection maintenance costs, and shelf space.
- Allowing unique and specialized campus collections to be built by eliminating unnecessary redundancy.
- Allowing new and more efficient resource sharing and bibliographic access mechanisms to be put into place.
- Providing improved bibliographic control for serials and series.
- Providing a secure and environmentally optimal environment for storage of "last copies" of UC print titles.

Governance

Provenance of retrospective UCL shared print collections will remain with the contributing campus library and will be recorded in UC bibliographic systems. Shared print collections will be stored in environmentally optimal conditions. They will be subject to collection behaviors approved by University Librarians. Behaviors cannot be changed without the unanimous agreement of University Librarians, nor can materials be withdrawn.

Appendix E: Behaviors for Shared Print Journal Collections at an RLF where high quality, cover-to-cover digital versions exist.[5]

I. Last Resort. The dim UCL archive will be housed in a closed stack, climate-controlled Regional Library Facility (RLF) and will be accessed physically by scholars only as a last resort at the RLF or in a UC library[6].

1. Library staff on a campus and/or at the RLF will mediate all requests to access archival copies.
2. The following mechanisms to meet the scholar's needs will be pursued by the library staff member mediating the request before making the archival copy available for use by the scholar.
    a. The online digital version.
    b. Scanning/desk-top delivery of content by RLF staff
    c. High quality photo-duplication, including color, performed by RLF staff on site.
    d. Obtaining the hardcopy material from another UC library through interlibrary.

II. Conditions of use. Should none of the above mechanisms satisfy the scholar's need, the following services will be overseen by library staff at the RLF and in UC campus libraries. They reflect existing UC policies and procedures for intercampus resource sharing and for handling of archival-shared copies of material in the UC Libraries Collection; documentation is referenced.

1. A scholar may visit the RLF and examine material in the RLF's reading room.
2. Items may be sent to a UC library for "library use only"[7].
3. Other mechanisms may be put in place for access, as determined by University Librarians, so long as they maintain the security of the collection.

III. Validation and conservation/replacement after use. Upon return of item to the RLF, material will be examined for damage and loss. If there is missing or damaged content, RLF staff will send material for conservation treatment or will reacquire the material.

IV. Monitoring of Environmental Conditions[8]

Material will be kept in a climate-controlled environment at a minimum compatible with standards established by the National Information Standards Organization ("NISO"), as they may be modified from time to time, or with standards established by what University Librarians agree is an equivalent standard-setting organization. At present, the NISO standards are:

A. Temperature and Relative Humidity

(i) The temperature shall not exceed 70º F with maximum fluctuations of (±2ºF) within a 24-hour period and (±3ºF) within any month; and

(ii) The relative humidity shall not exceed 50% within maximum fluctuations of (3%) within any 24-hour period and (3%) within any month.

B. Ultraviolet Light

---

[5] Based on recommendations for JSTOR Behavior prepared by the JSTOR Working Group for University Librarians, and for "Type 2" collections as identified by the UC Libraries Preservation Advisory group. See http://libraries.universityofcalifornia.edu/cdc/pag/summaryofprestypes200403.pdf

[6] Affiliation of the scholar is not specified as long as use is in a UC facility.

[7] See http://libraries.universityofcalifornia.edu/cdc/ucsharedcoll-pilot-rpt.pdf for *Report of the Working Group on the UC Shared Print Collection Pilot*, August 4, 2003.

[8] Adapted from specifications in JSTOR/UC Libraries Agreement, October 2005.

The materials shall be stored in an open area in the Repository where they will not be exposed to harmful ultraviolet light (if at all possible). Sunlight through window glass and unfiltered skylight contain ultraviolet waves and should be avoided. Optimal conditions include filters for these sources of light (including florescent lamps) to eliminate wavelengths below 415 nm.

C. Air Filtration

The portions of the Repository where the Journals are stored shall be clean and well ventilated.

V. Reporting. The RLF will prepare annual reports on the number of uses and physical loans and on their outcomes (returned to collection intact, sent for conservation, reacquisition completed), and on environmental conditions.