Kansas Library Association College and University Libraries Section Proceedings

Volume 7
Number 1 *Building the Future on Strong
Foundations*

Article 2

2017

We Did It! A Collaborative Collection Development Project at the KU and KSU Libraries

Lea H. Currie
University of Kansas Main Campus, lcurrie@ku.edu

Mira Greene
Kansas State University Libraries

Follow this and additional works at: <https://newprairiepress.org/culsproceedings>

Part of the [Archival Science Commons](#), [Cataloging and Metadata Commons](#), [Collection Development and Management Commons](#), [Curriculum and Instruction Commons](#), [Educational Assessment, Evaluation, and Research Commons](#), [Educational Leadership Commons](#), [Educational Methods Commons](#), [Higher Education Commons](#), [Information Literacy Commons](#), [Instructional Media Design Commons](#), [Other Education Commons](#), [Scholarly Communication Commons](#), and the [Scholarly Publishing Commons](#)

This work is licensed under a [Creative Commons Attribution-Noncommercial-No Derivative Works 4.0 License](#).

Recommended Citation

Currie, Lea H. and Greene, Mira (2017) "We Did It! A Collaborative Collection Development Project at the KU and KSU Libraries," *Kansas Library Association College and University Libraries Section Proceedings*: Vol. 7: No. 1. <https://doi.org/10.4148/2160-942X.1065>

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by the Conferences at New Prairie Press. It has been accepted for inclusion in Kansas Library Association College and University Libraries Section Proceedings by an authorized administrator of New Prairie Press. For more information, please contact cads@k-state.edu.

We Did It! A Collaborative Collection Development Project at the KU and KSU Libraries

Abstract

For many years, the KU and KSU Libraries have looked for a method of combining their resources to create a collaborative collection development project. When KSU joined YBP as their main book vendor, it became evident that such a project might get off the ground since KU Libraries were longtime customers of YBP. Since Proquest was the main vendor for e-books for both schools and YBP sold e-books from Proquest, KU and KSU decided to approach their e-book specialist with Proquest to find out if a collaborative demand-driven (DDA) e-book project was possible. Proquest negotiated with the publishers the two schools selected and settled on an agreement with Proquest to set up a DDA program with short-term loans. When a purchase was triggered, KU and KSU would together pay 150% of the list price for an e-book and both schools would have access no matter which school triggered the purchase.

There were many other questions to consider, including:

1. How much money would each school contribute to the project up front?
2. How would invoicing through YBP take place and how often would KU and KSU be invoiced?
3. How many short-term loans would trigger a purchase?
4. How would the new account be set up with YBP?
5. How could each school track their short-term loans and purchases?
6. How often would catalog records be received?
7. What were the tech specs for full catalog records?

Keywords

collaboration, consortia, demand-driven acquisition

Introduction and Background

After studying the literature, the University of Kansas (KU) Libraries and Kansas State University (KSU) Libraries met during the summer of 2016 and agreed to develop a collaborative DDA e-book project. In the past, KU and KSU Libraries had looked for opportunities to create a collaborative collection development project. At one point, both schools participated in an overlap analysis of their chemistry collections to see if there were individual strengths on each campus. KU and KSU also had an agreement that KU would collect in certain languages and geographical areas, like Slavic, Spanish, East Asia, etc. and KSU would collect for the Middle East, South Asia, and other areas not collected at KU. Over time, these agreements evaporated as demand for resources changed on both campuses.

Prior to their joint meeting and collaboration, KU had already adopted the DDA model in 2009, both in print and electronic formats, working with YBP to develop a DDA program that generated cost savings, while making more titles available for discovery. The program has been successful in the social sciences and sciences, with approximately 250 MARC records for print books and 50 MARC records for e-books loaded in the library catalog each week. It has been a little slower to get off the ground for the humanities, but each week humanities subject specialists find books they cannot afford to purchase while reviewing slips and they have the option to load the MARC records for these books as DDA. KU also started a new process with YBP last year called Apex that anticipates what e-books KU would normally select and when certain criteria are met, a purchase is automatically triggered. At KSU a DDA program was started in 2013 with Coutts, the approval vendor at the time. Coutts utilized their own e-content platform, MyiLibrary. When KSU subscribed to ebrary's Academic Complete in 2015, the eBook platform proved to be more user friendly and the preferred platform. In July 2015, KSU migrated from Voyager to Alma and was interested in implementing an API for monographs. YBP was offering API capability and had the process working at several Alma institutions. In addition, YBP offered eBook ordering from various publishers already utilized by the KSU Libraries, so KSU moved from Coutts to YBP as their monograph vendor in January 2016. By moving to YBP as a vendor, KSU was also positioned to do a joint DDA program with other institutions.

Literature Review

Libraries have long participated in consortial arrangements to purchase resources at discounted prices, as consortia have more clout than individual libraries when negotiating with vendors and publishers. Evans and Schwing (2016) that as e-books became more and more utilized by academic libraries, many consortia discovered that managing licensing restrictions to be problematic, particularly for interlibrary loan purposes. As the number of e-books increased, library users became increasingly frustrated at their inability to access resources in consortia union catalogs. Some consortia moved to homegrown e-book platforms to solve their ILL sharing problems by expanding e-book access to all of the users at their institutions (Pronevitz, 2015). Members of the Greater Western Library Alliance (GWLA) developed a method of sharing e-books through interlibrary loan called *Occam's Reader*, a system that allows a library to share an e-book temporarily with a user at another library (Litsey and Ketner, 2015).

Library consortia have also combined the efforts of libraries to share in the purchase of e-books. In 1999 *netLibrary* became one of the first companies to pioneer consortial e-book programs, including demand-driven acquisition (DDA) and then other companies started experimenting with new ways to license content (Machovec, 2013). Licensing models now include licensing e-books as packages in aggregator databases. The DDA/Multiplier model, whereby the consortia negotiates a multiplier that is added to the retail cost of an e-book and all member libraries get access to e-books at a lower price, has become popular with

consortia. Another model is the DDA/Limited Access model where the consortia selects a number of short term loans which lead to a triggered purchase. Once the books are purchased, there is a limited number of uses before a second copy purchase is triggered. A third model is the DDA/Act Together, Spend Separately model, which is designed so that short term loans are paid from a joint pool of money, but the individual libraries pay for the triggered purchases they generate locally (p. 395). The last, and most attractive for some libraries, is the Evidence Based Selection Model is attractive to some libraries. With this model, the libraries load MARC records for all of titles offered by the publisher and after a contract year, they purchase based on usage at a pre-negotiated minimum expenditure.

Harloe, Hults, and Traub (2015) discuss the “1% method” as an equitable model of contributing to a consortial DDA program. With this model, 18 New York academic libraries contributed 1% of their overall collections budget to form a pool to purchase e-books and found the return on investment during the first year was well worth the initial cost.

Setting Up a New Kansas Consortia

KU has been a client of YBP for many years, so with the addition of KSU to the company’s client list, it was now conceivable that the two schools could create a consortia through YBP to purchase e-books collaboratively. When YBP was approached with this idea of developing a DDA program, their first inclination was to offer a discounted title list for the purchase of e-books to be shared by the two schools. They were doubtful that publishers would be willing to negotiate a DDA program, since more and more publishers are choosing to move away from DDA in recent years. Two years ago, ProQuest had approached the Greater Western Library Alliance (GWLA) with several models for offering the consortia a DDA program, so KU and KSU contacted their Proquest e-book specialist to see if they could offer a similar program for the Kansas schools. ProQuest was happy to oblige and supplied lists of the top publishers based on usage for both schools to help them decide which publishers to choose for the DDA program. KU and KSU chose eight publishers to begin the program and ProQuest went right to work to negotiate an agreement with them. Of those eight publishers, only four were willing to participate in a DDA program. These publishers include Springer Publishing, Wiley, Taylor and Francis, and Wolters Kluwer.

The agreement that ProQuest, KU, and KSU negotiated is that each school would initially contribute \$10,000 to set up a deposit account. Originally, Proquest wanted twice that much as a deposit, but KU and KSU were successful in negotiating the lesser number and any leftover funds at the end of the year would carry over into the next year. The DDA/Multiplier model seemed to be the least expensive model for the two schools. For each book, there was an allowance of two short-term loans, but no matter which school triggered them, a purchase would be triggered with a third use. KU and KSU would together pay 150% of the list price and both schools would have perpetual access to the purchased books. KU manages the individual invoices triggered by the purchases drawing from the deposit account. KU and KSU split the costs of the short-term loans, which is also drawn from the deposit account. Each school can track its short-term loans and purchases in the administrative module of ProQuest LibCentral. In addition, both schools can view the IP address of each request in the report generated through this module. KU and KSU agreed to review this data annually and adjust their deposits accordingly.

Catalog records were to be loaded into the catalog as they became available and the schools worked together to agree on combined tech specs based on each campus’ cataloging needs. When there are differences, they work to automate the processes for record loading by adding or removing applicable fields. Since ProQuest was planning to migrate (E-Book Library (EBL) and Ebrary into one ProQuest Ebook Central platform, the two schools decided to delay the collaborative e-book project until the migration was complete and any problems with the new platform were worked out.

Conclusion

The first records were compiled on February 20, 2017 and MARC records were loaded into the KU and KSU catalogs and went live on February 27. Since then, KU and KSU have encountered a few small problems. Both schools decided they wanted to continue to receive slips for the e-books that were loaded as consortial DDA, making duplication tracking a problem. To resolve this issue, YBP created a Kansas consortia in GoBetween, the tracking device in Gobi that allows libraries to see what other libraries have purchased when reviewing slips. Now, subject librarians can use GoBetween when reviewing slips to see what records from the Kansas consortia have been loaded before deciding on a purchase. Also, the two libraries encountered problems when specifying their preference of only purchasing non-linear lending editions of e-books. Non-linear lending allows for multiple, simultaneous user, with a limit of 325 uses before a new purchase is triggered. Some imprints from Taylor and Francis, particularly Routledge, did not offer non-linear lending, which knocked many books out of the program. KU and KSU asked ProQuest to allow the purchase of e-books with one simultaneous user, and if use was persistent, to automatically increase the users to the next level, which in most cases is three simultaneous users or unlimited simultaneous usage when the demand is high.

As of April 28, 2017, the consortial DDA program had only triggered two purchases. KU and KSU want to get the program off the ground a little faster, so they have asked ProQuest to negotiate with more publishers, so hopefully, the program will grow. After the initial tech specs and workflow were worked out between the schools, there have only been minor invoicing problems, but little additional staff time has been needed for the collaborative program. The two schools have also considered approaching other Kansas academic libraries to build interest in participating in the consortial DDA program and would be open to entering negotiations with other schools who work with YBP who want to join the program.

References

- Evans, G. & Schwing, T. (2016) OhioLink-recent developments at a United States academic library consortium. *Interlending & Document Supply*, 44, 172-177. <https://doi.org/10.1108/ILDS-06-2016-0021>.
- Harloe, B. Hulst, P., & Traub, A. (2015) What's the use of use?: return on investment strategies for consortial DDA programs. *Journal of Library Administration*, 55, 249-259. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/01930826.2015.1034055>.
- Lightsey, R. & Ketner, K. (2015) Occam's reader: the first library-developed ebook interlibrary loan system. *Collaborative Librarianship*, 7, 13-15. <http://digitalcommons.du.edu/collaborativelibrarianship/vol7/iss1/4>.
- Machovec, G. (2013) Consortial ebook licensing for academic libraries. *Journal of Library Administration*, 53, 390-399. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/01930826.2013.876833>.
- Pronevitz, G. (2015) Consortial ebook platforms: an update and good news. *Collaborative Librarianship*, 7, 38-41. <http://digitalcommons.du.edu/collaborativelibrarianship/vol7/iss1/8>.