

## **Shared Print Journal Collection: Issues**

In my role as staff to the Standing Committee on Universitywide Collection Management Planning, I was asked to draft a number of scenarios related to collection management. The one that is pertinent to this discussion is the “Shared Print Journal Collection,” which is available at <http://www.slp.ucop.edu/consultation/cmpg/>

As a result of conversations with Scott Miller, NRLF, and Colleen Carlton and Claire Bellanti, SRLF, I developed the following outline of issues as background to a discussion about establishing a shared print journal collection.

Two clear themes emerged from my conversations with the RLF staff. First, there must be a clear statement of intent for the Shared Print Collection. As one individual stated, “the statement of intent will make or break the acceptance of this program.” It is critical from the outset that the UC community have a common understanding of whether this collection is meant to be a collection of record, an archive (dim or dark), or simply a backup collection to digital content. A statement of intent would include guidance for determining the number of copies of a journal that should be retained in the collection. It is also essential that a “last copy” in the system policy be developed and put in place as part of this process.

### **Potential sources of print journals**

- Publishers/providers of ejournals that provide UC with a print copy as part of their license agreement, e.g., ACM, Elsevier (ACM has already accumulated; EEBO microfilm is expected; Elsevier journals could be shipped in 2003 at no additional cost).
- Initiation of print subscriptions to currently received journals for which digital content is available
- Donations from campus libraries and campus storage facilities
- Journal volumes that already reside in an RLF: Very few print volumes/issues with corresponding electronic content as currently received journals are housed in an RLF, with the exception of the CMI project titles. An

inventory of the JSTOR volumes housed in the RLF's has been created (Scott Miller)

### **Physical location of the collection**

- We assume that the shared print journal collection will reside in one or both of the RLF's
- Space for housing as well as space for staging may be considerable

### **Processing, bibliographic control and conservation**

- How do we handle the check-in, claiming and processing of current issues? Options include:
  - Outsource to a serials agent
  - Outsource to a campus
  - Owning/originating campus receives, claims and processes
  - RLF staff perform the receipt, check-in and claiming functions (SRLF staff feel that they could do some of the acquisitions tasks once they have a new online system)
- How do we add JSTOR moving wall volumes to the collection as a new volume becomes available online?
- Processing impact on the RLF: Even though the campuses receive and claim current issues until an entire volume is cumulated, we learned from the CMI project that there are still processing activities that RLF staff must perform.
- Should we bind currently received issues stored in an RLF? NRLF and SRLF staff both noted that if current unbound issues were not bound into volumes, only standard RLF processing would be necessary. In other words, their processing tasks would be simpler if volumes were not bound.

- Regardless of where the print journals are housed, should they have a common indicator (e.g., University of California Libraries) in the bibliographic record to indicate they are part of the shared print journal collection

## Access

- What will be the preferred method of delivery to UC users given that the digital version of the journal is available? Presumably this will depend upon the mission of the archive. Users may prefer to borrow the print volume (rather than receive a photocopy/Fax) if content is missing from the digital version. The CMI study has shown very few requests for the print versions of journals in storage. CMI use data for print journals, including requests for journals in storage, are now available for the first three quarters of the study. See <http://www.ucop.edu/cmi/data.html>
- Would this collection be used to fill ILL requests to institutions outside of UC or will printing from electronic versions be preferred? Would we loan print volumes or issues outside of UC from this collection or supply photocopies?
  - An open access collection could be used to fill all types of requests from users (photocopy, fax, desk top delivery, loan of print, on site visits).
  - A dim archive would be available only if the user needs to consult the artifact (circumstances could vary from on site to in library examination, to loans (take home).
  - A dark archive would be available only to regenerate the digital content.<sup>1</sup>
- Issue of document delivery charges: Some campuses charge for document delivery, some do not. This could be a barrier to equal access.

---

<sup>1</sup> This is what JSTOR will probably determine to be the purpose of its dark archive.

## Ownership

- Do the campuses retain ownership of donated volumes/issues?
- If current issues are received as part of a license agreement with CDL for the electronic versions, does CDL or UC become the owner? This raises questions, such as:
  - If CDL or UC were the owner, who would monitor the physical items? How would maintenance and repair be handled – Berkeley for NRLF and UCLA for SRLF?
  - Who is responsible for bibliographic holdings records in Melvyl?

The following set of recommendations came from an RLF staff member after our conference call:

- There should be one or two physical copies of the journals
- They will consist of the best physical specimens available for each volume, previous owner notwithstanding, that is, all extra copies will go out the door
- Ownership will no longer matter
- Use statistics when needed would be a part of the RLF's regular statistics

## Funding

- Will the costs for processing receipts (assuming these activities are outsourced) be funded centrally? (CDL Acquisitions staff have already estimated costs associated with processing print journals/issues)
- Will the RLFs receive additional staff to process receipts and maintain the collection?

- There may also be print subscription costs: would these be funded centrally?

## Redundancy

- Number of print copies of a journal that would be suitable: This number may range from 0 to 2 copies depending on the significance and anticipated use of each journal run
- Factoring in the existence of other print repositories, such as the one that CRL is creating of JSTOR journals
- Factoring in the number of copies held by the campuses (the problem with this is that the existence of this collection should make it possible for campuses to begin to cancel subscriptions and discard bound volumes)
- Last copy in UC policy should be developed in concert with the development of the parameters for this collection
- Which journals reside in an RLF currently that might be included as part of this collection?
- Will the best copy of each volume be selected (this question assumes we will have more than one copy to choose from)?  
Some of the issues related to this question are:
  - It is labor intensive to select the best copy.
  - This is a critical step if this is indeed the last copy.
  - Should campus staff or RLF staff select the best copy?

A valuable reference on the question of retention, last copy and copy of record is Abby Smith's The Evidence in Hand: Report of the Task Force on the Artifact in Library Collections, CLIR, 200. Her definitions of digital surrogates may also apply to the issues of retention of print copies (see pgs. 43 – 46).

Cecily Johns  
6 September 2002