Structure of Session

- Overview of the CCM Pilot Project:
  - Background
  - Aims & Objectives of CCM Phase 1 (Pilot)
  - Results & Outcomes

- CCM Phase 2 Project Proposal
  - Aims
  - Focus on Particular Issues
  - Benefits & Further Information
Background

- White Rose University Consortium (WRC)
  Leeds, Sheffield, York

- WRC Libraries facing increasing pressures on library storage space. Include consideration of disposal of certain sections of very low-use book stock in order to accommodate new materials needed to support current research and teaching and space for new activities.

- Partners rejected a regional Consortium Store.

- Discussions with the British Library (BL) due to proximity of Boston Spa about possible joint solution

- Activity developed into the: Collaborative Collection Management (CCM) Project
The project aimed to test the practicality of withdrawing from WRC libraries and transferring to the British Library, research level materials in two categories:

- Monographs no longer required by the academic institution but requiring preservation within the national collection because they were either not held by the British Library or were not available for loan.
- Additional copies of monographs no longer required by the academic institution but heavily used at the British Library.

- Develop a mechanism enabling WRC libraries to dispose of very low use material to help ease storage pressures

- Ensure locally withdrawn copies would continue to be available to academic researchers in the national collection via the BL

- To consider the issue of perpetual storage at the BL and any requirements for differential access arrangements

- Investigate whether a feasible mechanism could be developed for wider use within the academic community
# Project Timescale

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dec 2004</td>
<td>Start of CCM Project Team planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feb 2005</td>
<td>Initial Draft of <em>Procedural Manual</em> issued, Day Seminar presentation to CCM partners (including local processing staff)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apr 2005</td>
<td>Memorandum of Agreement signed, Start of Practical Operations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aug 2005</td>
<td>End of Practical Operations, Start of Analysis and Write-up</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dec 2005</td>
<td>Publication of <em>Final Report</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Procedure

1. The WR [donor] Libraries identified items for disposal
2. Donor library checked titles against BLIC & Copac to identify duplicated holdings
3. Where not in BLIC titles were offered to the BL (in form of annotated Excel list)
4. BL staff assessed each title against their collections, including manual catalogues
5. BL identified items they required, and returned annotated list to donor library
6. Items (and catalogue records) transferred to the BL, and titles added to stock. BL took full ownership of item.
7. Remaining items were left for local disposal by WR donor Libraries

- Collaboration is donor-to-BL (i.e. not across all donors).
Material Processed: Results

In numeric terms the pilot project processed a modest total of monographs (2,323 titles).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Titles</th>
<th>Total No. of Titles</th>
<th>% of whole</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Titles selected for disposal</td>
<td>2,323</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Titles rejected as already in DSC (Part 1)</td>
<td>1,153</td>
<td>49.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Titles submitted to BL for decision</td>
<td>1,170</td>
<td>50.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Titles rejected by BL (Part 2)</td>
<td>956</td>
<td>41.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Titles judged as acceptable by the BL</td>
<td>214</td>
<td>9.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Outcomes (1)

- All partners agreed methodology was feasible but needed some adaptation
- An analysis of individual “Case Studies” for each CCM partner allowed an investigation of the procedure associated with differing types of stock and processes. Results did differ by donor.
- Some material was transferred to the BL (9%)
- WR Libraries were able to reassure researchers that copies of texts would be available long-term
- Significant quantities of material could be disposed of by the WR Libraries
Outcomes (2)

- Throughput measurements were made for all tasks in the CCM procedure to assist future investigation of staffing and resources.
- Indicative costs were identified.
- Allowed the BL to identify some gaps (and confirmed strengths) in its collections.
- Encouraged the BL to bring forward the retro-conversion of the ‘manual’ NCB into BLIC.
- Indicated that, for the subject areas used in the pilot, the BL would not be required to take in large quantities of material.
Some Key Questions

- Were the results more widely applicable?
- What is the minimum number of duplicated copies needed in the UK? How would this operate?
- How scheme fits in with other CCM initiatives, is it complementary or competitive? e.g. CoFoR Programme, UK Research Reserve?
- How to achieve support, and assistance, of research community?
- What type (and size) of academic library does an individual HEI want?
Phase 2: Project Aims (1)

- The CCM Project Phase 2 will develop a robust and practical methodology to ensure that printed monographs which are withdrawn from individual libraries will continue to be accessible to the UK research community.

- The revised methodology will be tested and refined in anticipation of the launch of a final agreement which can be adopted by the wider UK academic community.

- Will address far wider political and strategic issues than CCM (Pilot) Phase 1.
Phase 2: Project Aims (2)

- Project concentration to be expressly stated as the “difficult” subject areas i.e. arts & humanities monographs.

- Develop a series of models to inform and guide the HEI community in the best local practice to be adopted within a national scheme.

- Will use different subject areas.

- Resource Needs and Costs will be assessed.
Wider Political & Strategic Issues

CCM (Pilot) Part 1 was dominated by procedure, Phase 2 will:

- Address internal “political issues” and national/local strategic concerns, not just the mechanism.
- Be more specific about strategic implications and expand “collection management” issues.
- Make some investigation of the internal assessment of collections for potential discard (prior to processing in the CCM mechanism) may be necessary.
- Explore effects of “collection acquisition policies” on CCM activity (e.g. just-in-time v just-in-case models)
Benefits of Phase 2

- Contribute to the development of a strategic approach to national research support by ensuring UK scholars retained access to any of titles withdrawn from individual libraries.

- Enhance the visibility of materials to the research community

- Launch a national mechanism allowing very low-use monographs to be withdrawn from individual HEI libraries (with assurance they will be available in the BL’s own collections).

- Ease local institutional space and storage issues by releasing substantial numbers of additional monographs for disposal.
Case Study Models in Phase 2

- Develop a series of costed models and different scenarios to assist other HEI Libraries adoption of the CCM process, e.g.
  - Leeds as a major traditional research library.
  - Sheffield with “Zero Net Collection Growth”
  - York as a growing institution
  - Compare different [arts and humanities] subjects

- Outcomes to include “option appraisal” for different scenarios e.g.
  - Do nothing,
  - Store construction,
  - Library extensions,
  - CCM activity,
  - Stock discard to achieve “zero collection growth” etc.

- Investigation of common subject areas for processing to allow comparisons
Further Information

Final Report of Pilot Project at:
http://www.bl.uk/about/cooperation/whiterose.html

Pilot Project & Phase 2:
Chris Senior (CCM Project Officer),
University of Leeds
c.m.senior@leeds.ac.uk

July 2007
Additional Notes

- Other miscellaneous information...
Investigate Views of Research Communities (1)

Requirements of Scholarly Research Community

- Process to reflect requirements of academic and scholarly community which is sensitive to both local and national needs
  - Analysis of existing surveys, and other relevant literature
  - Communication with academics in partner institutions
- Movement from internal (i.e. Library only) operations in Phase 1 to a much wider practice, especially involving academic liaison and consultation
- Improved access and visibility to less heavily used monographs than currently provided via a raised profile within the “national collections”
- Monitoring, analysis, and where relevant, direct discussions with other parallel collaborative collection management projects, services and agreements.
- Contribution to the ongoing debate over the “national collection”.

Investigate Views of Research Communities (2)

Promotion to Academic Community

It is appreciated that there will be unease among the research community by the proposal to dispose of monographs. Many anxieties could be allayed if suitable publicity were presented which emphasised the positive aspects of the project:

- Assurance that any material discarded would still be permanently available through the offices of the BL
- Collaboration in a significant and comprehensive initiative to alleviate storage pressures in the home institutions,
- Permanent preservation of transferred items as part of the national collection,
- Donated titles being made available to researchers nationally
- Donated titles (previously lacking online catalogue records within individual HEIs) would enjoy a raised profile as a result of cataloguing within BLIC.
- The British Library has stated that it would be pleased to assist with this publicity and would support a statement to the effect that unwanted material (matching predefined categories) would be accepted into the British Library’s collections
Discard to Transfer Ratio (10:1)

- A University Library could assume 10% of any texts selected for disposal would be accepted by the BL (Phase 1 process).
- HEI library would need to dispose of remaining 90%.
- Refining the process in CCM Phase 2 would aim to reduce the current ratio of 10:1 (Discard : BL Transfer), also cutting processing costs.
- Aim at more effective and efficient filtering in the early stages of the procedure. Result in less texts offered to the BL but with a greater proportion of these texts being assessed by the BL as acceptable.

- Most desirable pattern displayed by the Leeds case study, where >61% of items in the List were acceptable to the BL.
- Number of monographs of value to the BL is small, but many more titles could be withdrawn by an individual Library thereby easing local space and storage issues.