Ten years ago, the collection managers of the Florida State University System libraries decided to pursue what was then—and still is—a radically cooperative approach to collection development and acquisitions, inspired by the Janus Conference on Research Library Collections organized by Ross Atkinson and held at Cornell University in October 2005. The Collection Planning Committee of the Florida State University System libraries embraced the six Janus Challenges, convinced of their utility as a collection management framework, and determined to put them into practice throughout the state university libraries. What made this idea seem practicable was a history of cooperation among the various state university libraries on a number of initiatives, led at the highest level by the Council of State University Library (CSUL) deans and by a number of different committees reporting to them, including technical services, public services, and collection development committees.

In 2006, there were 11 universities in the Florida State System, varying in age, type, and size, from Florida State University, founded in 1851, to Florida Gulf Coast University, which opened a mere 9 years prior, in 1997. Size of student body ranged widely as well, from more than 50,000 at the University of Florida (a research-intensive institution) to 746 at New College of Florida, the state’s honors college. Although the 11 member universities (technically, 10 universities and one college) might have had very different needs and priorities, they did share a single integrated library system (ILS), administered by the...
Florida Center for Library Automation (FCLA), centrally located in Gainesville, home of the University of Florida. In addition to regular committee meetings, annual joint meetings were held in Gainesville to bring together FCLA and library staff who determined ILS enhancements and established standard practices for circulation, interlibrary loan, and cataloging for the entire system.

**EARLY CENTRALIZED COLLECTION DEVELOPMENT EFFORTS**

The advent of funding intended for jointly held library databases from the Florida State Legislature led CSUL (or as it was known at that time, the State University Library Council) to establish its first collection development committee, the Electronic Collections Committee (ECC), in the early 1990s. In 2002, CSUL created the Collection Management Committee (CMC), comprised of the collection development heads of the state university libraries (SUL) and intended to take a higher-level perspective on collection building throughout the SULs, and the ECC became a subcommittee of the CMC. According to the minutes of the December 5, 2002, meeting of the State University Library Council, the deans charged the CMC to “look at the SUL collections as a whole. From the perspective of a ‘single library,’ the CMC will make recommendations for sharing, will identify issues, and will report to the SULC implications of their discussions.”

Among its other responsibilities, the CMC facilitated consortial licensing to Elsevier’s Science Direct based on the pooled title lists of all the member libraries, as well as Cambridge University Press, Oxford University Press, and Wiley. In this manner, the smallest institutions could afford access, if not archival rights, to hundreds of journals to which they could not otherwise subscribe. While all the libraries benefited from this arrangement, the burden of license negotiations fell to one or two of the CMC or ECC members, who found themselves spending much of their workday dealing with title list reconciliations, troubleshooting access problems, and negotiating the next license. In 2007, CSUL and FCLA hired a full-time specialist whose sole responsibility would be to work with the collection committees on e-resource negotiation and management. Having a point person at FCLA was the turning point for the CMC because it allowed
the members to stop working on the minutiae of licensing and title list management and to turn their attention to broader issues of collection development among the consortium.

**JANUS CHALLENGES: A SUMMARY**

In October 2005, the Janus Conference on Research Library Collections convened at Cornell University. Janus, the Roman god of gates and doorways, was chosen for the conference to “symbolize the passage toward a new way of thinking about collaboration and resource sharing for research collections.” Presentations from a number of prominent collection development librarians examined the “shifting ground between writers and readers” from the thematic viewpoints of “legacy, technology, epistemology, and implementation.” Ross Atkinson, associate university librarian for collections at Cornell, set the scene for the afternoon breakout sessions with his presentation “Six Key Challenges for the Future of Collection Development.” These challenges were

1. *recon*—retrospective conversion of full-text sources already existing in print;
2. *procon*—accelerating the shift to digital publishing;
3. *core definition*—collective determination by research libraries as to which titles make up a discipline’s core;
4. *publisher relations*—research libraries working collectively, not separately, in negotiations with publishers;
5. *archiving*—preserving print and digital collections; and
6. *alternative channels for scholarly communication*—creating more effective methods of communication as alternatives or supplements to traditional scholarly publication.

**JANUS CHALLENGES: ESTABLISHING AN INFRASTRUCTURE FOR COLLABORATION**

In February of 2007, a discussion of the Janus Challenges was held at the biannual in-person meeting of the CMC, now called the Collection Planning Committee (CPC). From the report of those who had attended
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the Janus workgroup updates at the recent ALA Midwinter Conference in Seattle, it was clear that little progress had been made on a national level, and these efforts were likely dead. Enthusiasm for the Janus Challenges remained high among members of the CPC, however, and a Janus Challenges Working Group was formed to explore the potential to address these challenges in Florida.

The working group consisted of individuals from 7 of the (then) 11 universities in the State University System (SUS). Led by two co-chairs, the group met in Gainesville in May 2007 to explore the opportunities that the Janus Challenges presented in Florida. The goal was “to use the structure of the Janus Challenges to propose a workable collection development and resources sharing plan for public research institutions in Florida."

Realizing that the Janus Challenges were seen as fairly radical by some, the group’s intent was to “recast the Challenges to what was doable” in order to bring the separate collections and collection development activities around the state together in a unified, strategic approach.

In the fall of 2007, the working group submitted a report, *Six Challenges Facing Collection Development at Public Higher Education Institutions in Florida*, to CSUL, which accepted the group’s recommendation to form six Janus Challenges task forces that would “prepare guidelines and implementation strategies for each targeted area.” For each of the six challenges, the report defined a goal, provided a list of the ways the effort would have a positive impact, made recommendations on how the effort should be carried forward, and provided benchmarks against which progress could be measured.

The next step in setting up the Janus Challenges infrastructure was the establishment and population of each of the six task forces. The individuals who had served as the co-chairs of the Janus Challenges Working Group were designated Janus coordinators, and they led the development of the charges. To emphasize the interrelatedness of all six challenges within an overarching collection development philosophy, each charge began with a section called the “Commons Area.” The Commons Area, which is identical in all six charges, lays out the expectations for each task force, including the requirement that members have a fundamental understanding of the six challenges and are familiar with all documentation produced by the Janus Challenges Working Group regarding the project. It also notes that task force members are
expected to survey the current SUS and national environments in their area. The Commons Area also encourages collaboration and notes that members are free to discuss issues with those outside the task force and to consult with anyone who can contribute.

The charge specific to each task force follows the Commons Areas and includes specific expected outcomes (such as an implementation plan or development of guidelines), followed by a series of deadlines that include a requirement that the task force hold its first meeting within a month and report back to the CPC Janus coordinator, that a status report be submitted prior to an August CPC conference call, and that a final report be submitted prior to the November CPC meeting. The charge concludes with a list of supporting materials with which all task force members are expected to be familiar.

When the CPC Janus coordinators set up the charges with the Common Area, establishing an environment for successful collaboration was very much in their minds. As Tamm and Luyet write in their book *Radical Collaboration*, “successful collaborative relationships require conscious and deliberate action.”

When individuals are operating in this zone, “collaboration is a catalyst for innovations and for higher levels of problem solving.” One of the strategies that Tamm and Luyet recommend is that the intention to collaborate be stated openly and directly. By including the expectation that task force members will look beyond their own boundaries to see what is being done not just at the state but the national level, and stating explicitly that reaching out to non–task force members is encouraged and welcome, a tone of openness and shared contribution was set from the beginning of the task forces’ work.

Another best practice modeled in the format of the charges was the inclusion of reporting deadlines and a mechanism for the task forces to report back. This is another strategy that Tamm and Luyet recommend, that regular reviews be conducted “to insure that the parties are meeting their obligations in the relationship. This keeps little problems from growing into big, relationship-busting problems.”

In addition to the built-in accountability factors that the reporting deadlines provided, the charges to the task forces all began with a clear
statement of purpose. For example, the first bullet point in the charge for Challenge Six: Alternative Channels for Scholarly Communication Task Force states, in part, “The Alternative Channels Task Force advises the Collection Planning Committee on the issues related to the development and sustainability of shared institutional repositories or restricted individual institutional repositories.” Subsequent bullets instruct the task force to review Janus documents related to its charge and to develop an implementation document by the CPC final report deadline.

Taken together, the shared sense of purpose provided by the Commons Area and the graduated reporting deadlines provided much of the infrastructure for successful collaboration. Fisher and Sharp discuss this aspect of collaboration in their book Getting It Done: How to Lead When You Are Not in Charge. Providing people with a clear sense of purpose and a series of goals set over three points—an aspiring distant vision, a mid-distant worthwhile goal, and some immediate objectives to begin working on at once—facilitates the ability to work together to accomplish objectives. An inspiring distant vision (i.e., successfully implementing the integrated Janus Challenges systematically across the SUS) is necessary in creating an emotional commitment from the participants. Fisher and Sharp note, “You will want colleagues not merely to conform to expectations—but to contribute voluntarily to a goal they understand. . . . The effort that any of us will devote to a task will depend on whether that task furthers some higher goal.”

The mid-term goals for the task forces were to have two reports completed for the CPC—a status report prior to the August 2008 CPC meeting and final task force report prior to the November 2008 CPC meeting. These reporting deadlines were essential in keeping the task forces moving forward with a sense of accountability to the larger group and gave the Janus coordinators a chance to provide formal feedback and direction along the way.

The immediate objective before each task force was to have its membership set and have met at least once via conference call within a month after being established. This gave participants immediate engagement in the project, and, as Fisher and Sharp note, once people have started upon an action, they are likely to become increasingly
committed and to consider the project important. “By starting to do something,” they write, “—particularly something meaningful toward a distant and lofty goal—you increase the likelihood that you will shed doubts, put aside ambivalence, and keep working.”

**JANUS CHALLENGES: A COLLABORATIVE EFFORT MATURES**

By the November 2008 meeting of the CPC, all of the task forces had completed and submitted their reports, and their work was considered concluded. The CPC agreed that the next step in moving the Janus initiative forward was to integrate them into the established action plan format for CSUL committees. It was also determined that the ongoing governing of the Janus Challenges efforts would be led by a small Janus Challenges Steering Committee, which was comprised of the past, present, and incoming CPC chairs as well as the FCLA liaison, all individuals who believed deeply in the Janus Challenges concept and were heavily invested in seeing a successful outcome.

Through all phases of the Janus Challenges effort, the question of leadership was thoughtfully addressed, with great consideration given to what governance structure would work best for each phase of the project. Initially the Janus Challenges Working Group was established to evaluate the feasibility of adopting the Janus Challenges across the SUS. This group produced the initial recommendations that led to the formulation of the six Janus task forces and then disbanded so that its members could participate fully in the work of the task forces. Two Janus Challenges co-coordinators were established (the current and past chairs of the CPC) to help monitor and shepherd the work of the task forces. Now it would be the work of the Steering Committee to synthesize the task force reports and formulate their recommendations into a working plan.

The implementation of different governing structures for different phases of the Janus Challenges efforts greatly facilitated momentum and enthusiasm. In their book *Collaborative Leadership*, Archer and Cameron describe successful collaborative ventures as a three-legged stool, with the legs being governance, operations, and behaviors. They see governance as “the skeleton of a collaborative
relationship—the supporting frame that holds everything together.”\(^{14}\) They stress that it is important to get governance right and that as “the relationship progresses and matures, you may need to alter and simplify some of the structures.”\(^{15}\) The Janus Challenges Steering Committee arose from the need to simplify the Janus Challenges governing structure.

The major task of the Steering Committee was to synthesize the actionable items from the task forces into an action plan for the CPC in order to move the work from theory into practice. After reviewing the task force reports, the Steering Committee determined to put all activities into one of two categories: activities related to core collections and activities related to unique collections. Activities in these two categories were then laid out in a two-year plan. For the purposes of this chapter, we will explore whether collaborative efforts were successful in the area of shared core collection development and discuss both the positive and negative environmental factors that contributed to or impeded that success.

**COLLABORATIVE COLLECTION DEVELOPMENT: CHALLENGES AND SUCCESSES**

The action plan produced by the Janus Steering Committee incorporated Janus Challenges outcomes related to more centralized and methodical digitization efforts, development of a statewide scholarly communications portal, and further consolidation of e-journal package management and negotiation. At the heart of the Steering Committee’s plan was a collaborative collection development effort aimed at systematically building a shared statewide collection.

As the February 20, 2009, *Janus Steering Committee Report on Task Force Outcomes and Proposed Activities* states, “within the framework of the Janus initiative we find new opportunities for shared ventures that will provide economies of scale, capitalize on our existing infrastructure, and reduce duplicated effort and expenses. This new strategic direction centralizes core collection activities regardless of format, while programmatically building unique institutional collections that combine to create an extensive and more expansive
statewide collection.” The plan that the Steering Committee developed was to do exactly what Atkinson proposed when he suggested that research libraries “define the core collectively and then devote the precious time of our selectors to selecting (cooperatively) advanced materials.”

The Janus Steering Committee created the graphic shown in figure 22.1 to illustrate this concept of a centrally held core and a cooperatively held set of unique, specialized, and advanced collections. The inner core is comprised of those materials likely to be common to most collections. Their commonalities include that they are typically selected as the result of the parameters of an approval plan, are meant for an undergraduate audience, and are increasingly likely to be in an e-book format. Moving away from the inner core toward the outer core of more advanced specialized materials, those commonalities change. Rather than being selected by an approval plan, a purposeful decision to purchase was made by a knowledgeable subject specialist; the target audience for the material is a researcher or graduate student, the format is more likely to be print, and the work may be held by only one or a few of the institutions in the system rather than by most or all.

Figure 22.1 Building core collections across the Florida SULs.
FOCUSING ON THE INNER CORE

To begin putting collaborative collection development into action in the inner core arena, the CPC decided to develop an RFP (request for proposal) process. The goal was to select e-book vendors who would supply inner core titles on a statewide basis and to create a core shared electronic reference collection, as many reference materials were still being collected in print or in print and electronic combinations.

The process required to develop and acquire a shared e-book reference collection seemed rather straightforward. No new funds would be required as libraries could redirect funds already being spent to acquire these reference materials. FCLA already provided a robust set of reports that should, theoretically, provide the data needed to analyze current collection holdings and format. But it was in the data-gathering process that difficulties arose. The libraries in the system used different object codes in their acquisitions systems for like materials, and even internally, these object codes and other identifying factors were not always used consistently. The resulting data did not provide for the systematic evaluation of holdings across reference collections, and the blurring of definitions of types of content in the electronic environment (e.g., a reference work versus a database) made it even more difficult.

In many environments, and indeed most likely prior to the launch of the Janus efforts in Florida, this difficulty may have been enough to shut this collaborative effort down. However, the environment that had been created through the work of the initial Janus Challenges Working Group, the Janus task force groups with their inclusive levels of participation and the support of the collection development officers across the state through the CPC, proved to be strong enough to weather this setback. The CPC needed a solution and turned to its acquisitions colleagues for help. A joint task force of CPC members, acquisitions librarians, and FCLA staff was formed to normalize object codes and definitions for content in electronic formats so that good data could be gathered for future successful projects in this area.

In this situation, it would have been easy for people to feel defensive, not to want others to be in a position to scrutinize the way they had been doing things at their library. But the end goal—the aspiring distant vision—was strong enough to override these fears.
By this time, the CPC and its colleagues around the state had been actively working in the collaborative environment of the Janus Challenges undertaking for nearly two years, and the behavior was reflective of that experience. Returning to Archer and Cameron’s concept of three legs to the successful collaborative venture’s stool, we see that one of these legs is behavior, particularly important in joint problem-solving. They note that joint problem-solving “takes creativity and courage. It means opening up. It means washing your dirty laundry in public. It means asking for help when you need it, and offering it where you can. For most organizations, this doesn’t come naturally—it’s easier by far to resort to carping and insularity. However, finding a joint solution speeds things up, and usually saves money. What’s more, joint solutions are often more creative, more ambitious and longer-lasting than those made—or ignored—in the context of one’s own boundaries.”

In parallel to the work underway to create a statewide core reference collection, discussions began in earnest about the development of an RFP for vendors to supply inner core titles in the form of e-books on a statewide basis. The original intention had been to establish an approval plan, but a new model of collection development was emerging in the form of demand-driven acquisition (DDA) that seemed like it might provide an alternative with an easier entry point. The creation of a statewide approval plan would require commitment to a long-term plan and repurpose money from existing individual institutional plans, and the CPC perceived that this was an unacceptable risk to some members of library leadership, who were uncomfortable with relinquishing control over aspects of selection and budget. In addition, FCLA, due to a programmatic change in services, had some funding available that could be provided as seed money for the project. The CPC pitched the idea of doing a pilot project for a statewide DDA project to CSUL, supported by FCLA funds and supplemented jointly by funding from all 11 institutions. This approach proved to be a much more palatable one to CSUL, and all but one of the institutions agreed to participate. However, in order to support long-term efforts and in the desire to maintain a high level of collaboration, the 10 institutions committing funding to the pilot agreed to support access to shared DDA records and purchases for all 11 institutions despite 1 institution’s inability to contribute at the outset.
THE CHALLENGE OF THE OUTER CORE

As depicted by figure 22.1, the diagram of the inner and outer collection cores, the concept for collaborative collection development for more specialized materials would have each library focusing on building strong collections in subject areas that aligned with its strongest programs and relying on other universities to do the same. An effort would be made not to duplicate materials across these areas but rather to rely upon the robust SUS reciprocal borrowing infrastructure (UBorrow) and the statewide delivery system to share materials.

The CPC and Janus Steering Committee understood that this was going to be the most difficult of the recommendations to achieve. It would require a close examination of existing collection strengths at the institutional level, and the resulting comparison could be seen as uncovering collection weaknesses. The Janus initiative program also called for an RFP to be drafted for a “single vendor print/electronic approval/firm order plan to support continued development of identified areas of specialization within each library,”19 which, from some perspectives, suggests some loss of autonomy and control over the individual institutional collection—the very thing a library director has been charged to build, protect, and champion. However, this aspect of the Janus Challenges was critically important to the CPC. As stated in the Steering Committee’s report, the “key message that CPC and the Janus Steering Committee has for CSUL from the entire Janus enterprise is this: Our individual collections will only be distinctive and unique in direct proportion to our willingness to work together and to centralize some of the functions that are currently dispersed throughout the system.”20 Achieving both inner and outer core collaborative collection development was the heart of the Florida Janus initiative.

Unfortunately, implementing a programmatic, systemwide collaborative approach to building unique but shared upper level (or outer core) collections proved to be a hard sell to CSUL. According to Atkinson, the depth of the challenge to collaboratively build collections at this level lies in the inherent underlying competition among research libraries. Atkinson points out that “collections attract scholars, graduate students, government support, and donor funding—and add prestige to the institution. This rationale for collection
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building—the collection as institutional capital—is a primary motivation, even though it is seldom specifically discussed. One point we must bear in mind with respect to this rationale, however, is that it entails or implies the existence of a separate collection at each institution that can, in effect, compete with all others.”

In the end, the CPC and Janus Steering Committee were unsuccessful in persuading CSUL to pursue these efforts. Some of the library deans and directors were supportive of the concept, but others were decidedly not, and consensus was unachievable. It is our assessment that the underlying reason was indeed that inherent competitiveness Atkinson describes. As he warns, “cooperation does not, for the most part, put a collection or library on the map. Cooperation is, in fact, viewed by research libraries as a form of following, and following is certainly not something that is rewarded.” (Ironically, Atkinson notes that while a great deal has been written about cooperative collection development, little has been achieved, as “writing and speaking about cooperation are viewed as forms of leadership, while the act of cooperating is not.”)

Most likely, it is the inherent sense of competition that was a major cause of the Janus Challenges failing to be taken up on the national level, and perhaps it should remain an issue for discussion and thought. As Atkinson writes, “competition among research libraries is simply one more condition for libraries to manage. As long as those competitive conditions are ignored, however, they will remain unquestionably one of the main impediments to building effective relationships among research libraries.”

THE LEGACY OF THE JANUS CHALLENGES

While the aspiring distant vision that the CPC had to implement a systematic response to the Janus Challenges across the Florida SUS was never fully realized, the efforts undertaken under that mantle have left a significant legacy. The RFP process for the DDA program pulled together yet another collaborative group, which worked through many problem-solving exercises as it developed parameters for what was then a relatively new model for consortial purchasing. The DDA program with the selected vendor ran for over three years,
with 1,807 titles purchased, of which usage was robust. Between the total expenditure and usage, the cost per page view to the SUS was only $.39, with the cost per page download being $3.78. CSUL agrees with the CPC that this was a very good return on investment and has continued an evidence-based acquisition plan with another vendor upon the cessation of the original deal.

Another legacy of the Janus Challenges lives on in the areas of licensing principles and publisher relations. Under the auspices of this group, shared licensing guidelines were developed to ensure that all licenses for e-resources across the state adhered to best practices. These guidelines were vetted widely across the state and had the benefit of input and review by a lawyer at FCLA’s then home institution, the University of Florida, who specialized in intellectual property law.

In addition to the concrete accomplishments achieved through the Janus initiative, an important legacy remains: an underlying and fundamental desire to collaborate among the librarians in the state university system, particularly in the areas of collection development and resource sharing. Although collaboration across the state is no longer a central theme for CSUL’s effort, it remains one for the CPC and many librarians working in other areas.

**SUSTAINING COLLABORATIVE EFFORTS OVER THE LONG TERM**

Like a good marriage, successful collaborative efforts need to be nurtured over time and to respond to changes in the environment in which they exist. As we have discussed in this chapter, those who lead collaborative efforts must recognize when a governance structure needs to adapt to maturing collaborations and be willing to change that structure in response. Individuals need to be willing to be open and honest and to participate in joint, shared problem-solving. And, as we have also discussed, having a central organization in place that can provide shared leadership and infrastructure can be, as was the case for many years in Florida, very beneficial to sustainability.

Perhaps one of the greatest challenges to collaborative efforts in the SUS libraries was the dismantling of FCLA. In 2012, FCLA, along with its sister organization, the College Center for Library Automation (CCLA), which supported the 28 libraries in Florida’s (Community)
College System, was consolidated with the Florida Center for Advising and Academic Support (FCAAS) and the Florida Distance Learning Consortium (FDLC) through a legislative mandate to form the Florida Virtual Campus (FLVC). New committees that included librarians from FLVC’s 40 constituent institutions were formed and, under the direction of transitional FLVC leadership, FCLA staff were not allowed to attend and provide support for legacy FCLA committees that served only the SUS constituents.

Another factor that can affect the sustainability of collaborative efforts is changes in top leadership. Between the time of the initial creation in 2002 of what came to be the CPC, where CSUL charged the group to “look at the SUL collections as a whole from the perspective of a ‘single library,’” and the uptake of the Janus initiative, a number of the library deans retired, and not all newcomers placed the same value on collaboration. As Archer and Cameron note, “habits that leaders have developed over years of success in situations where they could exercise positional control become major barriers to working effectively in a partnership or strategic alliance.” When added together, issues of control and those of competition, as Atkinson noted, can shut down collaborative efforts pretty quickly.

Despite these impediments, the spirit of collaboration among SUS librarians continues and now, increasingly, includes their colleagues in the Florida College System. The FLVC and its legacy organizations underwent another legislatively mandated transformation in 2014, which created the Florida Academic Library Services Cooperative (FALSC), refocusing part of FLVC directly back on the libraries of public higher education institutions in Florida. As stability returns to this supporting organization and the highly collaborative process of implementing a new ILS across the SUS progresses, the spirit of collaboration will continue to grow.

In the end, however, real transformative changes in libraries such as Atkinson envisioned will only be achieved when leaders at the highest level collectively have the capabilities of collaborative leadership—the ability to build relationships, to handle conflicts, and, as Archer and Cameron note most importantly, the ability to share control with others. They write: “The successful operation of any collaboration is ultimately dependent on productive relationships between the leaders involved. Leaders are role models for the behavior...
of the rest of their organization and the way they act is particularly important at the start of any collaboration—early experience forges the behaviors and habits that others will adopt.”
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