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Time for a Trip?

"In these difficult economic times leveraging our resources to expand the breadth of our library resources is essential...[Five College Librarians Council] propose centralizing their back office operations of acquisitions, cataloging, and materials processing to the greatest degree possible."

Message from 4 College Presidents, UMass Chancellor to Five College Community, April 9, 2009

"The next area ripe for investigation is electronic resource management..."

Five Colleges Librarians Council, April 30, 2010

"Shared Collections; includes a shared Commons budget, maximizing the size of the Commons, moving toward consortial licensing, continued consolidation of vendors, and a shared vocabulary around e-resources."

By Gerodriguez, Five Colleges - Shared Digital Collections - Shared Digital Technologies
"The next area ripe for investigation is electronic resource management..."

Five Colleges Librarians Council, April 22, 2010
"Shared Collections: includes a shared Commons budget, maximizing the size of the Commons, moving toward consortial licensing, continued consolidation of vendors, and a shared vocabulary around e-resources."

R2 Consulting LLC report: "Five Colleges - Shared Digital Collections - Phase One" Fall 2010
The Destination

“Cooperative arrangements and consortia are further reshaping the institutional environment. Economies of scale, aggregated expertise, new synergies and unexpected opportunities, and strengthened political coalitions and operational capacities are among potential benefits. Local autonomy is less possible or desirable than ever – even as institutional competition remains a hallmark of American higher education.”

Centralized Purchasing Authority Essential in Deriving Savings from Library Consortia

"Most academic libraries are involved in consortial partnerships in which resource, service and infrastructure costs may be shared. Contacts from libraries, publishers, and vendors alike reported that truly substantial savings require a greater degree of both financial and organizational centralization, as well as a larger membership ... than is typical with most consortia. Many contacts are planning to share an increasing number of resources and back-end systems among institutional partners in the near future."

Economy vs. Business Class

Beyond the Buying Club
Centralized Purchasing Authority Essential for Driving Licensing Savings

Shortcomings of Typical Consortia
- Loose affiliation of autonomous institutions
- Costs distributed across members based on size or usage
- Any member can opt out at any time
- Time spent on coordination often exceeds money saved
- Little savings for publisher due to loose coordination, relatively low level of aggregation

Attributes of Ideal Centralized Organization
- Highly centralized organization of institutions in a single state system
- Centralized funding from state
- Central decision-making authority
- Large utilization gives purchaser leverage in negotiations
- Publishers save time and money reducing coordination costs

Source: Education Advisory Board interviews and analysis.

How are You Traveling?

- Solo = Individual library
- Economy = Buying club
- Business = Shared resource, service & infrastructure costs

Image credit: http://thraciangirl.com/?p=178
Flight Plan Research

Library Consortia
- Term "library cooperation" found in literature built on 1875
- Triangle Research Libraries Network one of oldest, formed in 1955 between presidents of UC, and Duke
- Several growth spurts, including in late 1980s and 1990s - new technologies, networking, fiscal pressures
- Formation of ECRLC in 1996 signaled magnitude and influence
- Organizations vary from small to highly centralized
- Role of consortia in geography, type of user, size, funding source, etc.

Cooperative Collection Development
- With space and budget limitations, provide more comprehensive collections together than any one library can offer alone
- Print collections - division between core set of highly used materials owned by each library and unique materials purchased by individual library and shared among partners
- E-resources - focus on acquiring what is in high demand for all member partners
- Access limited by license terms

Acquisitions Process
- Faster
- Observes cost cutting measure, guidelines, aggregated, centralized and local coordination
- Shortening delivery time
- Consistent standardization
- "Buy once, share many" approach
- Large scale volume discount
- No procure separately, shared enterprise
- Broader range based

Advantages of Consortia E-Resource
- Access to more content which was unavailable or too expensive to support individually
- Lower cost/subscription
- Strong position for licensors, consortia, smaller members
- Advocacy and distribution of license

Challenges for Consortia E-Resource Collection Development & Administration
- Complex and time-consuming communication & coordination
- Shared local accounting over budget, priorities
- Less flexibility in acquisition plans
- Risk management of multiple consortia
- Maintaining primary communication channels
Library Consortia

- Term "library cooperation" found in literature back to 1880's
- Triangle Research Libraries Network one of oldest, formed in 1935 between presidents of UNC and Duke
- Several growth spurts, including in late 1980's and 1990's - new technologies, networking, fiscal pressures
- Formation of ICOLC in 1996 signaled maturation and influence
- Organizations vary, from loose affiliations to highly centralized
- Formed on basis of geography, type of user, size, funding source, etc.
Cooperative Collection Development

- With space and budget limitations, provide more comprehensive collections together than any one library could offer alone

- Print collections - division between core set of heavily used materials owned by each library and unique materials purchased by individual library and shared among partners

- E-resources -
  - focus on acquiring what is in high demand for all/many partners
  - access limited by license terms
Acquisitions Processes

- Parties:
  - Library staff, subscription agents, publishers, aggregators, consortial staff and partners
- Negotiating Terms
  - Content included
  - Pricing (& billing)
  - Access ("seats," ILL, authentication, walk-in, etc.)
- Models:
  - "Big Deal" - e-journals and e-books
  - Subscription or purchase by title (w/perpetual access, ?)
  - Pay-per-view (articles), demand driven (books), usage-based
Advantages of Consortial E-Resource Activities

- Access to more content which was unaffordable flying solo, i.e. bulk discount
- Low cost/benefit ratio
- Stronger negotiating position on license terms, discounts, smaller increases
- Advocacy and distribution of labor

Image credit: http://openclipart.org/detail/92868/hands-up-with-arm-by-agore
Challenges for Consortial E-Resource Collection Development & Acquisitions

- Complicated and time-consuming communication & coordination
- Loss of local autonomy over budget, priorities
- Less flexibility w/acquisition funds
- Balancing demands of multiple consortia
- Affects on scholarly communication marketplace
How Do We Get There?
A study of other academic library consortia

Criteria
- Number of members
- Mix of types of academic institutions (liberal arts, research, etc.)
- Mix of size of member institutions
- Geographic proximity of members
- Consortium funded through member fees (not centrally or state funded)
- Types of current consortium activities

Subjects
- Colorado Alliance of Research Libraries
- Five Colleges, Inc.
- Orbis Cascade Alliance
- Triangle Research Libraries Network
- Washington Research Library Consortium
Criteria

- Number of members
- Mix of types of academic institutions (liberal arts, research, etc.)
- Mix of size of member institutions
- Geographic proximity of members
- Consortium funded through member fees (not centrally or state funded)
- Types of current consortium activities
Subjects

- Colorado Alliance of Research Libraries
- Five Colleges, Inc.
- Orbis Cascade Alliance
- Triangle Research Libraries Network
- Washington Research Library Consortium
Table 1. Consortium member composition, geographic areas

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Consortium</th>
<th>Year Founded</th>
<th># of Members</th>
<th>Member Institution Types</th>
<th>Geographic Area</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Colorado Alliance of Research</td>
<td>1974</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>Community college, Large public library, Liberal arts/college, Research university</td>
<td>Northern Colorado, Southern Wyoming</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Libraries</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Five Colleges, Inc./Five College</td>
<td>1965</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Liberal arts college, Research university</td>
<td>Pioneer Valley, Massachusetts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Libraries</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orbis Cascade Alliance</td>
<td>2003</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>Community college, Liberal arts/college, Research/university</td>
<td>Idaho, Oregon, Washington</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Triangle Research Libraries</td>
<td>1984*</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Research/university</td>
<td>Chapel Hill, Durham, Raleigh, North Carolina</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Libraries Network</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington Research Library</td>
<td>1987</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Research/university</td>
<td>District of Columbia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consortium</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* TRLN’s first Memorandum of Understanding was signed in 1984, though participating libraries collaborated back to the 1930’s.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Consortium</th>
<th>Governance</th>
<th>Funding</th>
<th>Current Consortium Activities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Colorado Alliance of Research Libraries</td>
<td>Memoranda of Understanding, Governing Board</td>
<td>Member Dues</td>
<td>Digital Repository, E-Resource Management System, Licensing, Resource Sharing, Union Catalog</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Five Colleges, Inc./Five College Libraries</td>
<td>Incorporated, non-profit 501(c)(3)</td>
<td>Member Dues, Grants</td>
<td>Integrated Library System, Licensing, Print Depository, Reciprocal Borrowing, Resource Sharing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orbis Cascade Alliance</td>
<td>Incorporated, non-profit 501(c)(3)</td>
<td>Member Dues, Service Fees</td>
<td>Cooperative Collection Development, Integrated Library System (in development), Digital Depository, Discovery System, Licensing, Resource Sharing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Triangle Research Libraries Network</td>
<td>Memoranda of Understanding, Board of Directors</td>
<td>Member Dues, Grants</td>
<td>Cooperative Collection Development, Digital Projects, Discovery and Delivery System, Licensing, Reciprocal Borrowing, Resource Sharing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington Research Library Consortium</td>
<td>Incorporated, non-profit 501(c)(3)</td>
<td>Member Dues, Service Fees</td>
<td>Digital Repository, Print Depository, Reciprocal Borrowing, Resource Sharing, Union Catalog</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consortium</td>
<td>E-Resource/Collection Development Coordinating Group</td>
<td>Consortium Staff Dedicated to E-Resources</td>
<td>Licensing Contact/Contract Signatory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colorado Alliance of Research Libraries</td>
<td>Shared</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>Manager of Database Licensing/Executive Director</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Five Colleges, Inc./Five College Libraries</td>
<td>Collection Development Committee</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>Member representative librarian or Executive Director</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orbis Cascade Alliance Libraries</td>
<td>Collection Development and Management Committee</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>Electronic Resources Program Manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Triangle Research Libraries Network</td>
<td>Electronic Resources Committee</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>Electronic Resources Committee/Member Institutions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington Research Library Consortium</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
En Route

Image credit: http://www.loc.gov/pictures/resource/fsac.1a35135/

Collection Development & Acquisitions Processes
- Centralized? Coordinated? Distributed?
  - What resources to collectively acquire
    - from individual librarian, consortial staff, consortial committee
  - Criteria for selection
  - Negotiating pricing & license terms
  - Cost distribution
    - opt-in or commonly held?
  - Payment processing

The View from Above
- Recent changes to e-resource acquisitions
  - Maturation of e-journals & databases
  - More standardized license terms
  - New products
  - Vendors < flexible
- Successes
  - Improved relationships
  - > $ value of products
  - > access
  - better terms
- Lessons
  - Very labor intensive
  - Need better communication w/cataloging from vendor
  - Gap w/user expectations of shared collections
  - Libraries still need reminders to approach consortial partners first
Collection Development & Acquisitions Processes
- Centralized? Coordinated? Distributed?

- What resources to collectively acquire
  - from individual librarian, consortial staff, consortial committee
- Criteria for selection
- Negotiating pricing & license terms
- Cost distribution
  - opt-in or commonly held?
- Payment processing
The View from Above

- Recent changes to e-resource acquisitions
  - Maturation of e-journals & databases
  - More standardized license terms
  - New products
  - Vendors < flexible
- Successes
  - Improved relationships
  - > $ value of products
  - > access
  - better terms
- Lessons
  - Very labor intensive
  - Need better communication w/cataloging from outset
  - Gap w/user expectations of shared collections
  - Libraries still need reminders to approach consortial partners first

Image credit: http://www.flickr.com/photos/hyougushi/224472482/
Where Are We Going, Again?

Breadth of Resources, Increased Access, Substantial Savings or ... Autonomy?

- Autonomy = flexibility & ...
  - ... a benefit
  - ... resource
- Breadth = unique, shared collections
- ... press
  - ... LLI rights for "e"
- Increased access = ... $$$
  - In common or open
  - "Big Deal"
  - DDA
- Substantial savings = ... $$$, investment in shared
  - resources
  - services
  - infrastructure
  - a = $$$, at least initially

Reality & Vision

- How do we provide more access with tighter budgets?
- How do we achieve "economies of scale"?

How do we get there?
Breadth of Resources, Increased Access, Substantial Savings or ... Autonomy?

- Autonomy = flexibility & ...
  - > costs
  - < resources
- Breadth = unique, shared collections
  - print
  - ILL rights for "e"
- Increased access = > $$$
  - In common or opt-in
  - "Big Deal"
  - DDA
- Substantial savings = > size, investment in shared:
  - resources
  - services
  - infrastructure
  - = > $\$, at least initially?
Reality & Vision

• How do we provide more access with tighter budgets?
• How do we achieve "economies of scale"?

How do we get there?