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Five Colleges Consortium

- Amherst College
- Hampshire College
- Mount Holyoke College
- Smith College
- University of Massachusetts Amherst
About Five Colleges Libraries Consortium

• Long history of cooperation
  – Shared off-site storage facility
  – Two shared staff positions
• Geography helps – all located in 15 mile radius
• Single shared ILS database facilitates sharing
• Daily delivery system gets material to users usually within 24 hours
Impetus

• Five Colleges Presidents and Chancellor sought increased cooperation between institutions
• Five Colleges Library Directors identified cooperative collection development as a strategic priority in 2008.
• Five Colleges Collection Management Committee assigned to implement project
• Money
Implementation

Five College Collection Management charged to:

• Identify 10 subject areas for CCD project
• Expand depth of print books across consortium
• Use YBP as common book supplier
• Implement effective July 1, 2009
Formulating Project

Data gathering

• Initial overlap attempt using OCLC WorldCat Collection Analysis Tool (WCAT)

• Identified architecture, environmental studies, history, law and sociology for CCD project because of above average overlap percentage

• Revised overlap analysis using shared ILS data including;
  – monographic expenditures
  – number of titles purchased
  – circulation data for each institution by fiscal year
Preliminary Data Analysis

ILS data analysis revealed:

- Book duplication ranged from 36% to 79%
- Four Colleges spent $1,139,116 on books purchased by UMass
- UMass spent $636,066 on items purchased by 4C
Weighing Options

• Discussed differences in missions and collection strategies
• Global economic downturn changed picture
• Five College Presidents continued to press for increased cooperation among libraries
• CCD project shifted from focusing on ten then five subject areas to all monographs purchased
The Policy

“In response to requests from the Five College Presidents and the Five College Librarians Council, the Collection Management Committee will facilitate efforts to better coordinate purchases for our book collections, in an effort to reduce unnecessary duplication, so we can increase both the breadth and the strength of our combined collections. We will order additional copies only when they are clearly required to support teaching, learning, and research. This decision will be made at the local library level.”
The Plan

• Philosophical shift
  – View institutional collections as shared collection
  – Eliminate unintentional duplication instead of purchasing “one copy”

• Exceptions:
  – Reserve requests
  – ILL requests (if certain criteria are met)
  – Faculty requests
  – Reference works
  – Core to collection or research need

• Used Single Vendor
  – YBP “Gobitween” feature to inform selection decision
# Monograph Duplication within the Five Colleges Consortium

## Total % Duplication

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Amherst</th>
<th>Hampshire</th>
<th>Mount Holyoke</th>
<th>Smith</th>
<th>UMass</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FY11</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>49%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY10</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>51%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY09</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>84%</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY08</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td>79%</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>61%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Owned by 2 Libraries</td>
<td>Owned by 3-5 Libraries</td>
<td>Total Duplication</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY11</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY10</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY09</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY08</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY10</td>
<td>Amherst</td>
<td>Hamp</td>
<td>MHC</td>
<td>Smith</td>
<td>UMASS</td>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Titles Purchased</td>
<td>14,601</td>
<td>1,850</td>
<td>6,925</td>
<td>11,979</td>
<td>3,384</td>
<td>38,739</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost</td>
<td>$671,857</td>
<td>$69,373</td>
<td>$304,892</td>
<td>$746,400</td>
<td>$165,345</td>
<td>$1,957,867</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Circulation *</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Duplication</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>51%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Circulation of Duplicated Items</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost of Duplicated Items</td>
<td>$351,872</td>
<td>$52,293</td>
<td>$166,040</td>
<td>$238,891</td>
<td>$68,347</td>
<td>$877,443</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Total circulation is from time of purchase through 8/5/2010
What’s next

• Continue to analyze fiscal year print book purchases to measure success of unnecessary duplication project
• Explore cooperative ebook purchases
• Examine current print standing orders for overlap
• More cooperative shared electronic resources
Questions

Leslie Button, Associate Director for Library Services
button@library.umass.edu