CHAPTER 2

Collaborating to Create Space: Tweaking the Resource in Common Model to Share Collections

Wyoma vanDuinkerken
Co-editor of the Journal of Academic Librarianship (Elsevier)
Director of the Joint Library Storage Facility, Texas A&M University
Texas, USA
wvanduin@library.tamu.edu

Abstract. Many libraries in the US turned to developing consortia collection development and print repository agreements.Texas A&M University – College Station (TAMU) and the University of Texas- Austin (UT) built on the relative success of their jointly owned print repository facility introduced the idea of building a second facility to its consortium members. This paper describes the factors considered by two task forces to simplify the workflow, processing needs and workload while utilizing expert knowledge of their individual unit's.

Keywords: Library Space Management, Shared Collections, Prints Repository

1. Introduction

In 2011, Texas A&M University – College Station (TAMU) and the University of Texas- Austin (UT) decided to build on the relative success of their jointly owned print High Density Repository (HDR) facility and introduce the idea of building a second facility to its consortium members. Unlike the first facility, which only held material that was owned by the two flagship institutions, this facility would give all the members of both Texas A&M University System Consortium (TAMUS) and University of Texas System Consortium (UTS) the opportunity to participate in a storage facility endeavor, called the Joint Library Facility (JLF). The TAMUS consortium is made up of 12 institutions and educates more than 120,000 students a year (Texas A&M University, 2013). On the other hand, the UTS consortium is made up of 15 institutions and educates more than 214,000 students a year (Texas A&M University, 2013). The libraries housed within these 27 institutions, have an accumulated collection of well over 12 million volumes which supports the teaching and research mission of these institutions.

Like the previous jointly owned facility HDR, the fundamental idea for building this new facility would be cost savings. Texas, like other States across the United States, was affected by the economic crisis and consequently, it became even more imperative for TAMU Libraries to continue seeking out additional cost saving measures related to space allocation for its collection. One way they could do this was through developing a more efficient Resource In Common (RIC) model than had originally been planned in HDR (vanDuinkerken, 2012). Initially, when planning HDR, UT and TAMU planned to make the most of their cooperative storage space by de-duplicate their print collection and achieve their cost saving goal by housing only one "*low usage*" print copy "*owned*" between the two institutions at HDR which they called a Resource in Common (Heath, F., 2009).

However, the TAMU library processing team, the group responsible for updating the MARC records for the items identified to be shipped to HDR from TAMU, began to identify unexpected challenges that undermined and led to the failure of the original Resource in Common model at HDR. These challenges primarily focused around: the definition of what was a RIC, which let to additional confusion surrounding what defined a "*low usage*" print copy as well as how processing a RIC would affect all the stakeholders workload. In an attempt to avoid these challenges with the new consortia storage facility, TAMUS and UTS began to address these issues early on in the planning stage as a way of ensuring that the RIC model at JLF would be more effective.

2. Literature Review

Most of the academic libraries across the United States today are facing budget cuts due to the economic downturn of the nation's economy. With little hope of a recovery in the economy in the near horizon, libraries need to continue focusing on improving cost effectiveness as a long-term strategy in order to achieve their future library strategic plans. (Hamilton, A., 2004) However, according to Maskell et al, when it comes to planning print repositories "*cost remains an over-riding factor and the uncertainty of future budgets make commitment to long-term planning difficult*". (Maskell, Cathy. Soutter, Jennifer and Oldenburg, Kristina, 2010) Nevertheless, Kohl and Sanville believe that libraries can improve on their cost effectiveness four ways: "*sharing printed books, storing print materials, providing access to the journal literature electronically, and providing access to electronic versions of library special collections, faculty publications, or university projects through a consortia institutional repository*" (Kohl, D. F., Sanville, T., 2006). Although many libraries are shifting away from print toward the electronic format, Heath stated that: "*the flow of printed resources continues unabated with no end in sight*" (Heath, F., 2009). This continual increase in print library collections calls for libraries to continue needed additional stack space for their newly purchased printed materials. As early as 2004, Holton et al, reported that academic libraries in North America hold over a billion print volumes, and continue to add to their library collections by approximately 25 million more each year (Holton, B., Vaden, K., O'Shea, P., Williams, J., 2004). In 2009, Heath supported Holton et al's statement when he reported that large research libraries, such as University of Texas-Austin, where he has been the Dean of the Libraries since 2003, continues to add as many as 200,000 print volumes annually. This accumulation of print materials to these academic collections creates a shelving demand of almost 10,000 square feet of library space a year (Heath, F., 2009). However, despite this increase in need of stack space, print collections are not growing at the same rate it did in the early 2000s. This is due primarily to the necessity to economize and purchase only one format of an item. As a result, libraries are purchasing more and more electronic material over print.

There are a number of reasons why space needs for print collections continue to grow along side the increase in electronic collection development. One reason is quite simple. Not everything is available electronically and since the mission of most academic libraries is to maintain the scholarly record so that researchers can have access to the most up to date material, print only material will need to be purchased even if academic libraries have an electronic preferred collection development policy in place (vanDuinkerken, Wyoma, 2012). Case and Thorp Ingram support this by agreement by stating: "*the much touted adage 'EVERYTHING can be found on the Internet' has proved to be wishful thinking. Books continue to be an important resource for curriculum support. As a result, many libraries are sharing a common situation. There is little or no room to add more books onto the shelves*". (Case, Jackie L., Ingram Thorp, Marion) Another issue, related to this revolves around the libraries' mission. Since most academic libraries, for example, have a mission to maintain the scholarly record, (DeGeorge, D., Seaman, S., 2002) material (print or electronic) needs to be close at hand. As a result, this has led some libraries to turn their backs on developing consortia collection development and print repository agreements. When libraries do develop consortia collection development agreements they tend to purchase multiple copies of the same items so that they can meet the needs of their users. Consequently, this duplication continues to increase the need for stack space despite the common misconception that because there is an increase in collection shift from print to electronic this change would decrease the need for increasing stack space in libraries (vanDuinkerken, Wyoma).

Adding to the space issue is the need for libraries to "*increasingly house technology labs, multimedia rooms, group study rooms, and cafés*" (Maskell, Cathy., Soutter, Jennifer, Oldenburg, Kristina., 2010) to meet the needs of their patrons. Today, this is commonly known as the "*library as place movement*". According to Payne, "*the 'library as a place ' movement has redefined what space within the library should be used for. As a result, libraries are coming to be seen primarily as centers for independent and collaborative study and learning rather than as housing for physical collections*" (Lizanne Payne, 2013). O'Connor and Jilovsky believe that the '*library as place movement*' and not the arrival of the electronic book is the primary driver behind the current directions of library physical space (O'Conner, Steven and Jilovsky, Cathie., 2008). In order to create these needed user spaces, libraries are looking at their current facility to see where they can re-purpose areas. With the increasing belief that users prefer the electronic format over print, particularly print journals, libraries have looked at the print collection footprint within their facilities as an

obvious place to create needed user spaces. However, the question arises, since there is little to no money to build new libraries, library administrators are moving their low used print materials to storage (Maskell, Cathy, Soutter, Jennifer, Oldenburg, Kristina, 2010).

As early as 1942, as a way of creating needed space, some libraries built off-site print storage facilities devoted to storing low-use print materials (Austin, B., 2012). In the 1980s off-site storage facilities were being built at a continual rate, and by 2007 there were 68 library storage facilities built all over the USA and Canada (Payne, L., 2007). However, it was not until 1986 when Harvard University built its storage facility was the standard high-density storage facility, known as the '*Harvard Model*' created (Seaman, S., 2005). "*Not only did Harvard build a high-density storage unit with* 37 *feet high stack ranges, they shelved the material in these stocks by size in an attempt to store the large amount of material*" (VanDuinkerken, Wyoma., 2012). Organizing material by size rather than call number in these high density shelving units increased material storage by seven times and decreased the cost of storing the item. According to Murray-Rust, "*the cost per volume of construction is* $3.75 *for a high-density facility versus* $13.39 *for a standard on campus library construction*" (Murray-Rust, C., 2013).

This cost saving could be also be increased depending on the type of high density storage unit built. For example, approximately 79 percent of the 68 library storage facilities which Payne reported to have been built were institutional storage facilities built to house only one library's individual collection. Rarely do institutional facilities consider what other storage facilities were holding and as a result multiple copies of the same items were being stored in multiple storage units. Despite this duplication, Genoni reported that the increase interest in long-term storage of print collections has led libraries to realize that "*the traditional paradigm based on the widespread duplication of items intended for long-term storage is becoming unsustainable*" (Paul Genoni., 2012). This is one reason why shared storage facilities models are continually being developed. These four models are known as: Cooperative, Collaborative, Regional, and Repository. However, according to Payne, these different types of shared facilities typically do not operate as a jointly owned collection. Instead, these shared facilities, were similar to secondary shelving space for the individual member libraries where they could house items from their individual collections without considering if these items were duplicated in the storage facility (Payne, L., 2013). Despite that fact that the majority of these 68 storage unit's immediate shelving space issues was solved, these libraries could have increased their cost share if they had considered to no longer store multiple copies of the same item within their storage units. Instead they could have combined their print collection with each library sharing ownership of the single item held in the storage unit. This arrangement would move away from the five traditional categories of library storage units and create a new type of storage unit: a resource in common storage unit (vanDuinkerken, Wyoma, 2012).

3. What was a Resource In Common in 2008?

Initially, in 2008 when the RIC definition was agreed upon by UT and TAMU, it was defined as "*an item deposited in the shared storage facility shall be marked as a Resource in Common (RIC) when TAMU Libraries or the UT Libraries discards all duplicates of that item from its local collection and registers the item as a RIC*" (TAMU Libraries and the UT Libraries, 2008). What this meant was that if a volume was deposited into HDR by UTA, and if that volume was also held in TAMU's library collection, then TAMU could ask the manager of HDR that the item be classified as a RIC. HDR would contact UTA to see if they agreed that the volume could be a RIC. Once UTA agreed that the volume could be a RIC, TAMU and UT would withdraw all duplicates of the volume from both their collections. The single volume housed in the storage unit would then be shared by both university libraries and both would continue to count the single volume as part of their available collections for the Association of Research Libraries (ARL) statistical reporting purposes.

What is interesting about ARLs idea of shared counting is according to ARL's Supplement Statistics 2009-2010 Worksheet; the definition of volumes held collectively focus on the volumes withdrawn from individual collections, rather than the numbers shared in the storage unit. According to ARL:

> "*The defining criterion for this number is that the library formerly devoted financial resources for the purchase of these items and is now taking responsibility for their availability through participation in a cooperative that supports shared ownership. The library may demonstrate commitment to shared ownership through a shared storage facility, or similar collaborative arrangements, by supporting a consortium financially through a legally binding arrangement. Report here volumes originally held that were withdrawn from the local collection beginning with fiscal year* 2003-04. *Note that this is not the number of volumes held in a shared storage facility but literally volumes withdrawn from your collection*" (Expenditures- ACRL Academic Library Trends and Statistics, 2013).

This made de-duplication of the exact item (within the same collection) even more appealing because, the multiple copies of the duplicated items would continue to count for ARL statistics as jointly owned. Consequently, this de-duplication added to UTA and TAMU's plan to save space in their collections. In addition, both libraries went a step further and decided not to hold any copy of the same item in the Library Storage Unit and the item chosen for the shared collection needed to be considered "*low usage*". However, what was lacking from the plan was the actual definition of low usage versus high usage of an item, as well as the understanding of the increased workload associated with processing an item for RIC and how it affected all the stakeholders involved. These problems created a need for all stakeholders to reconsider what the RIC model would look like at the new Riverside facility. Working together with several of its participating consortia members, UT and TAMU began reconsidering the RIC model as a way to address some the past issues which plagued their original HDR RIC model.

4. Developing a New Resource In Common model

When the decision was made to build a second shared storage facility on TAMU's Riverside Campus, the first thing TAMU did was to encourage more involvement from the participating system libraries as a way of addressing some of these past struggles before the new storage facility was opened. This was done by creating two task forces, (Policies and Procedures and Technology and Access) which were made up of stakeholders from members of the participating system libraries who had indicated to TAMU that they were, not only going to send materials to JLF but also participate by claiming RIC items. These task force members came from a variety of departments from these participating libraries and had practical day to day workload and process knowledge of their units.

5. Task Force on Policies and Procedures

The first task force called The Taskforce on Policies and Procedures was responsible for establishing the basic policies and procedures for items going into JAL. Two fundamental policies which this task force was assigned to develop revolved around what a RIC was and what items JLF could ingest. It was hoped that this task force would develop additional policies that would address the past issues revolving around what a RIC was and how to claim an item as a RIC. It was agreed upon by the committee that the RIC definition would need to change based on the past challenge of what defined "*low usage*". As stated above if a library wanted an item to be registered as a RIC, than it first needed to own the exact item and then it needed to get the library who placed the item in the storage unit to not only agree to allow the item to be registered as a RIC but also had to agree to discard all its duplicates of that item from its local collection. This is where the problem with how "*low usage*" was defined. Initially, although one departmental library may have placed the item into the storage unit because they considered the item to be of "*low use*" to their library, it may not have been considered '*low use*' to all other departmental libraries. As a result, not all departmental libraries wanted to remove their copy from their collection because they considered the item to be of "*high use*" to their patrons. Consequently, the definition of what a RIC was changed.

Now any item deposited in the shared storage facility would be automatically marked as a Resource in Common (RIC) and there would be no reason to have to request permission from the library that initially place the item into JLF for the item to be considered a RIC. Instead a library only needed to claim the item as a Resource-in-Common. To claim an item the library must have already acquired the title for its library's collection and must withdraw at least one locally

held copy of the item from its collection. What this meant was that each departmental library could define what it thought "*low use*" of an item was and each definition had no bearing on the other departmental library definition.

Along the same venue, the Taskforce on Policies and Procedures also developed a guideline for selecting materials to go to JLF. This guideline was developed in order to avoid misunderstandings and to help libraries identify what items could and could not be ingested into the facility (Guidelines and Criteria for Selection of Materials, 2013). This guideline highlighted specific acceptable/unacceptable formats, while indicating that "*materials with significant chemical deterioration that could lead to high flammability or materials needing special preservation/conservation environment, mold abatement, or pesticide treatments*" (Guidelines and Criteria for Selection of Materials, 2013) would not be accepted into the facility. This guide was also supported by a second guide called Condition Review and Requirements. This supportive guideline considered the physical condition of an item and if its condition was acceptable or unacceptable for ingestion into the facility. The guideline also indicated what would occur if something unacceptable, such as a moldy or bug infested book was received at the storage facility. It was hoped that this guideline would clearly define what each library could and could not send to JLF and thereby help reduce the participating libraries workload by only processing the items that could be ingested into the facility.

6. Task Force on Technology and Access Infrastructure

The second task force called The Taskforce on Technology and Access Infrastructure was primarily responsible to advise TAMU which inventory and interlibrary loan software to purchase for the facility's collection. This software would not only be used to manage the collection at JLF, but also communicate what was in the collection of its members and the larger library community. It was hoped that his communication would help reduce the workload amongst the members of the consortia by having only one OPAC for the member so search instead of a possible 27 when trying to identify items already in the facility. As stated above, the processing of items going to HDR, including a RIC item, created an unexpected increase in the stakeholder's workload and as a result made processing RICs impossible. One unexpected task which increases the workload initially for the processing team was the verification that an item was not already located in HDR since storing a duplicate item was not allowed. HDR did not have its own OPAC and as a result, in order to perform the duplication check, individuals need to search each other's OPAC to see if an item was indicated as being located at the storage facility. For JLF, it was recognized that the workload of checking all possible 27 libraries' OPACs for duplication of items in HDR was too much. Consequently, the task force recommended that JLF has its own basic OPAC with the sole purpose so that the participating libraries could search one location instead of a possible 27 OPACs. The basic OPAC would be developed by Generation Fifth Applications so that it could talk directly to the GFA Library Archival Software which was being used within the facility to track the location of items on the shelf. In order to avoid having two contributors processing the same title simultaneously, a Communication model made up of excel spreadsheets was created so that participants would know what titles they can process (Guidelines and Criteria for Selection of Materials, 2013).

In addition, in order to communicate that there would be an increase in workload for items being processed for JLF, the task force on Technology and Access Infrastructure also created for the participants a Recommendation for Processing Materials for JLF Accessioning (Transfer Processes Recommendations for Materials Going to the Joint Library Facility (JLF), 2013). This recommendation, not only specified what steps the facility needed from each participating library to preform before an item was shipped to the facility but also what the facility would be doing to their items. This guide also spelled out a number of expectations and best practices for sending items to JLF. It began very basic focusing on non-RIC submissions and then progressed into the recommended processing steps to submitting a RIC into the facility. As stated above, one of the biggest changes between HDR and JLF was that unlike HDR, the Director did not have to contact the library who placed the item in the storage unit to see if it was ok to declare the item a RIC. It was agreed upon by all the participating libraries that all items going into JLF were automatically to be RIC and therefore no permission was necessary. Consequently, items placed into JLF could not be permanently relocated out of the JLF without approval of all libraries sharing the RIC item.

The Recommendation for Processing Materials for JLF Accessioning spelt out to the participants how the new facility, like the previous HDR facility, would storage items. It highlighted that items would be arranged according to size and not call the number on a shelf and as a result all items would need to have scan able items barcode which would the only identifier for where the item sat on a shelf. Consequently, every item going into the storage would need to have a scan able item barcode which was why it was recommended that libraries should consider having a qualified staff to test the barcode to make sure it was truly a scan able barcode before sending it to the facility. It was recognized that requiring scan able barcodes on each item would create an immense amount of work for each technical service department that was sending items to JLF, it was hoped that by communicating the need participants would be able to prepare themselves and their technical services units for the increase in workload.

7. Conclusion

The plan for the new joint library storage facility is set, the building is almost erected and although later purchased the software implementation has begun. If all continues to go well, the facility to open in May 2013 and item ingestion will begin soon after in early July 2013. It is clear that there will be a considerable workload increase involved for all who are participating in placing items into the storage unit. The task forces have attempted to simply workflow and processing needs while communicating requirements that will have a direct impact on each participant's workload. In order to accomplish this early communication goal, the members of the task forces were chosen for their expert knowledge of their individual unit's day to day workflow and could communicate to their fellow colleagues how processing items for JLF would increase their workload. It is hoped that by increasing communications and participation during the initial planning stages, the workload problems will have been identified and addressed earlier to meet the needs of the RIC dream.

References

THE TEXAS A&M UNIVERSITY SYSTEM: ABOUT THE A&M SYSTEM, http://www.tamus.edu/about/, Accessed January 29, 2013

THE UNIVERSITY OF TEXAS SYSTEM: Fast Facts, 2012.
http://www.utsystem.edu/sites/utsfiles/assets/FastFacts_2012.pdf Accessed January 29, 2013.

VANDUINKERKEN, WYOMA. Lessons Learned: Can a Resource in Common Work?, New Library World, 113 (1-2) 65-76. 2012.

HEATH, F. The University of Texas: Looking Forward: Research Libraries in the 21st Century. Journal of Library Administration, 49 (3) 311-24. 2009.

HAMILTON, A. Handbook of Project Management Procedures, (Thomas Telford : London). 2004.

MASKELL, CATHY. SOUTTER, JENNIFER AND OLDENBURG, KRISTINA. Collaborative Print Repositories: A Case Study of Library Directors' Views. Journal of Academic Librarianship, 36 (3) 242–249. 2010.

KOHL, D. F., SANVILLE, T. More Bang for the Buck: Increasing the Effectiveness of Library Expenditures Through Cooperation. Library Trends, 54 (3) 394-410. 2006.

HEATH, F. The University of Texas: Looking Forward: Research Libraries in the 21st Century. Journal of Library Administration, 49(3) 311-24. 2009.

HOLTON, B., VADEN, K., O'SHEA, P., WILLIAMS, J. Academic Libraries: 2004, National Center for Education Statistics, US Department of Education, Washington, DC, NCES 2007-301, 2004.

HEATH, F. The University of Texas: Looking Forward: Research Libraries in the 21st Century. Journal of Library Administration, 49 (3) 311-24. 2009.

VANDUINKERKEN, WYOMA. Lessons Learned: Can a Resource in Common Work?" New Library World, 113 (1-2) 65-76. 2012.

CASE, JACKIE L., INGRAM THORP, MARION. Stacks Management: An Organic Approach to Growing Space, Journal of Access Services, 4 (3/4) 137-152.

DEGEORGE, D., SEAMAN, S. High-density remote storage: the Ohio State University Libraries Depository, Public Services Quarterly, 1 (1) 87-90. 2002.

VANDUINKERKEN, WYOMA. Lessons Learned: Can a Resource in Common Work?, New Library World, 113 (1-2) 65-76. 2012.

MASKELL, CATHY., SOUTTER, JENNIFER, OLDENBURG, KRISTINA. Collaborative Print Repositories: A Case Study of Library Directors' Views." Journal of Academic Librarianship, 36 (3) 242–249. 2010.

LIZANNE PAYNE, Library Storage Facilities and the Future of Print Collections in North America (Dublin, Ohio: OCLC Online Computer Library Center, 2007): 16, www .oclc.org/programs/publications/reports/2007-01.pdf, Accessed January 29, 2013.

O'CONNER, STEVEN, JILOVSKY, CATHIE. Approaches to the Storage of Low Use and Last Copy Research Materials, Library Collections, Acquisitions, & Technical Services, 32 (3-4) 121–126. 2008.

MASKELL, CATHY, SOUTTER, JENNIFER, OLDENBURG, KRISTINA. Collaborative Print Repositories: A Case Study of Library Directors' Views. Journal of Academic Librarianship, 36 (3) 242–249. 2010.

AUSTIN, B. Establishing Materials Selection Goals for Remote Storage: A Methodology, Collection Management, 27 3-4) 57-68. 2002.

BAILEY, J., RADNOR, M. C. Cooperative Remote Storage: Challenges for Resource Sharing, *Journal of Interlibrary Loan*, Document Delivery and Electronic Reserve, 19 (3) 227-33. 2009.

HEATH, F. The University of Texas: Looking Forward: Research Libraries in the 21st Century. *Journal of Library Administration*, 49 (3) 311-24. 2009.

VANDUINKERKEN, WYOMA. Lessons Learned: Can a Resource in Common Work?, *New Library World*, 113 (1-2) 65-76. 2012.

PAYNE, L. Library Storage Facilities and the Future of Print Collections in North America, report commissioned by OCLC Programs & Research, available at: www.oclc.org/programs/publications/reports/2007-01.pdf, Accessed January 31, 2013. 2007.

SEAMAN, S. Collaborative collection management in a high-density storage facility, College and Research Libraries, 66 (1) 20-7. 2005.

VANDUINKERKEN, WYOMA. Lessons Learned: Can a Resource in Common Work?, New Library World, 113 (1-2) 65-76. 2012.

MURRAY-RUST, C. High density storage for libraries", available at: http://www.orbiscascade.org/rlsc/Storage.html, Accessed January 31, 2013.

PAUL GENONI. Storage of Legacy Print Collections: The Views of Australasian University Librarians, Collection Management, 37 (1) 23-46. 2012.

PAYNE, L. Library Storage Facilities and the Future of Print Collections in North America, report commissioned by OCLC Programs & Research, available at: www.oclc.org/programs/publications/reports/2007-01.pdf, Accessed January 31, 2013.

VANDUINKERKEN, WYOMA. Lessons Learned: Can a Resource in Common Work?, New Library World, 113 (1-2) 65-76. 2012.

TAMU Libraries and the UT Libraries. Memorandum of Understanding Related to Library RIC, internal publication (August 23, 2006; revised November 12, 2008).

EXPENDITURES- ACRL ACADEMIC LIBRARY TRENDS AND STATISTICS
http://www.google.com/url?sa=t&rct=j&q=%22the%20defining%20criterion%20for%20this%20number%20is%20that%20the%20library%20formerly%20devoted%20financial%20resources%20for%20the%20purchase%20of%20these%20items%22&source=web&cd=2&ved=0CDMQFjAB&url=http%3A%2F%2Facrl.countingopinions.com%2Fdocs%2Facrl%2FACRLFY2011_Worksheet.xls&ei=8IoKUf_nKsWxqQGVgYHwBA&usg=AFQjCNHektgS-_fWuLkMCmVJyEviq8txg&bvm=bv.41642243,d.aWM&cad=rja, Accessed January 31, 2013.

GUIDELINES AND CRITERIA FOR SELECTION OF MATERIALS
http://library.tamu.edu/pdfs/JLF%20Guidelines%20and%20Criteria%20for%20Selection%20of%20Materials.pdf Accessed January 31, 2013.

GUIDELINES AND CRITERIA FOR SELECTION OF MATERIALS
http://library.tamu.edu/pdfs/JLF%20Guidelines%20and%20Criteria%20for%20Selection%20of%20Materials.pdf Accessed January 31, 2013.

GUIDELINES AND CRITERIA FOR SELECTION OF MATERIALS
http://library.tamu.edu/pdfs/JLF%20Guidelines%20and%20Criteria%20for%20Selection%20of%20Materials.pdf Accessed January 31, 2013.

TRANSFER PROCESSES RECOMMENDATIONS FOR MATERIALS GOING TO THE JOINT LIBRARY FACILITY (JLF),
http://library.tamu.edu/pdfs/JLF%20Recommendations%20for%20Processing%20Materials%20for%20JLF%20Accessioning.pdf, Accessed January 31, 2013.