

Shared Print Collections (Scenario 2)

The shared print collections scenario presumes that there are collections of volumes or documents in the UC libraries that are characterized by high levels of duplication and low-usage. These collections are prime candidates for a systemwide, shared collection and present opportunities to promote a higher level of efficiency and integration among collections. Examples of duplicated collections include federal or state government documents, superseded reference works and the materials already deposited at the RLFs. Like the Shared Print Journal scenario, this scenario also relies on the availability of rapid access and delivery systems between libraries.

Government Documents

All of the UC campuses have developed substantial collections of government publications. Eight of the ten UC campuses are selective depositories for federal government documents. Berkeley, Davis, UCLA, San Diego and Santa Barbara are designated as “completes” under the California Depository system, which signifies that the campus receives everything published by the California Office of State Printing and various State agencies. As a result, substantial duplication exists among campus holdings of federal and state publications. Within the UC system the number of documents held is over 2 million items. Over the last several years, government publications have made a rapid migration to a digital environment but large collections in print, microform and compact disk exist on many of the UC campuses.

This scenario proposes a unified government publications collection assembled from the campus collections. Either a campus or an RLF could be identified as a repository for a comprehensive collection of U.S. government publications. Or, a government documents repository might be located in a variety of locations within the UC system, but have a single "location" in the catalog record to tie the materials together as a collection. Campuses might offer to take responsibility for housing specific government agencies or publication dates, for example. This would have the affect of sharing the responsibility of archiving, preserving, retrieving and providing access. Campuses would be encouraged to offer unique items to the central collection and discard their duplicate paper collections. Because one of the characteristics of this collection is low use material, government documents issued before a specified date or agencies of less relevance to academic programs, might be selected first to go in the repository. (Special Collections titles would be exempted.)

Providing bibliographic control is essential, and one criterion for the selection of a campus may be the availability of full catalog records in Melvyl. Another criteria may be the comprehensiveness of a campus' collections.

Cost savings to the campuses, if they were to discard paper government document collections duplicated in the central repository, would include additional shelf space, physical maintenance (repair and rebinding), cataloging and conversion (not all UC government documents collections are fully cataloged), and shelving and re-shelving. In addition, fewer staff may be required to provide reference and retrieval services for the extensive and complex government collections. Initial costs to create such a repository would include bibliographic checking to determine duplication and to identify unique titles and the cost of relocating unique titles to the central repository. Staff to retrieve and fill requests and to provide knowledgeable reference assistance locating information within the collection would be a substantial ongoing cost to the service needs of such a repository.

Superseded Reference Works

Academic libraries tend to retain superseded reference works because they often contain useful information that would be lost if they were discarded and only the latest version or edition was kept. Print titles superseded by digital versions, such as the *Encyclopedia of Associations*, are also maintained in library stacks or removed to storage locations. Dictionary catalogs, such as the National Union Catalog and its predecessors, use considerable shelf space in campus libraries and have been largely superseded by online resources. There is a high degree of duplication of these materials across the campuses. Maintaining a single copy of these materials in the RLFs as a shared print collection would have significant benefits.

Collections already housed at the Regional Library Facilities

The northern and southern Regional Library Facilities (RLFs) already house copies of low-use books and other volumes. In the context of developing shared print collections, it is possible to think of each RLF as already hosting an existing shared print collection. Extending this concept, campuses would be encouraged to discard low-usage volumes for which copies exist in an RLF.

Anticipated Effects on the Regional Library Facilities

If the University libraries were to implement the creation of a shared print collection, there would be implications for the costs and management of the RLF's, including:

- Initial costs for reviewing campus and RLF holdings in order to assemble a central print collection of government documents and superseded reference works

- Initial costs for selecting University Press titles that have a high rate of duplication among campuses and are predictably low use
- Initial costs for processing existing library materials held on the campuses prior to being transferred to an RLF
- Ongoing costs of operating a receiving, check-in and claiming operation (Note: this could be outsourced to a campus)
- In the case of the government documents central repository, knowledgeable reference service would be necessary to provide adequate access to the collections from a campus