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GreenGlass Group functionality employs data visualizations and modeling tools to enable groups of libraries to:

• understand their shared collection in terms of overlap, subject dispersion, and usage.

• experiment with various retention scenarios, and estimate the impact on each participant library.

• commit to specific retention agreements, with confidence in the outcome.
Shared Print: Retention First!

- Establish a safety net: ensure that content is secure
- Group-wide agreement on retention model
- Group-wide commitment to retention rules & duration
- Secure scarcely-held titles within the group
- Secure sufficient holdings to satisfy likely user demand
- Share responsibility for retention proportionately
- Deselection only after retention commitments established
Retention Models

All Included Libraries
Retained Percentage: 20%
Retained Holdings: 3,251,922

Boston College
Retained Percentage: 20%
Retained Titles: 204,227

Average: 19%
Schedule and Organizational Structure

Matthew Revitt
Maine Shared Collection Librarian and Shared-Print Consultant to EAST
Steps for Analysis in Collection Analysis Subgroup

• First step - Look at example of retention concepts and models from other shared print initiatives.

• Second step - Establish the expectations of which retention rules were feasible and would have the greatest impact.

• Third step – Experiment with GreenGlass Retention Model Builder and agree on a retention model.
Keys to Success in a Short Timeframe

• Two month window to agree the retention model across EAST.

• Seeing immediate results in GreenGlass modelling allowed for quick decision-making.

• Our subgroup was focused and effective.

• Seeking EAST Member opinions about retention rules created buy-in.

• Getting that buy-in led to smoother approval by the Executive Committee.
Personnel

- Collection Analysis subgroup
  - **Helen Anderson**, University of Rochester
  - **Richard Bleiler**, University of Connecticut
  - **Karen Bohrer**, Worcester Polytechnic Institute
  - **Berry Chamness**, Bryn Mawr College
  - **Charles Getchell**, Saint Anselm College
  - **Lorraine Huddy**, CTW Consortium
  - **Susan Raidy-Klein**, UMass Dartmouth
  - **Matthew Revitt**, Maine Shared Collections/UMaine

- **Ray Schmidt**, Wellesley College
- **Debbi Smith**, Adelphi University

- Project Team members
  - **Sara Amato**
  - **Lizanne Payne**
  - **Anna Perricci**
  - **Lizanne Payne**
  - **Susan Stearns**

- **Ruth Fisher** from SCS
Retention Modeling: Parameters and Thresholds

Lorraine Huddy
CTW Librarian for Collaborative Projects and
Member of the EAST Collection Analysis Working Group
The Retention Model’s Primary Components

1. Retention of ALL existing holdings for titles that are scarcely held.

2. Retention of up to FIVE holdings for titles with significant use across EAST.

3. Retention of ONE holding for titles that fall outside the above criteria.

4. EXCLUSIONS: Recently Published and “Ephemera”
Ephemera Rules

Holdings with limited scholarly value; items expected to have limited importance or usefulness over time.

- Examination prep books (GRE, GMAT, etc.)
- Computer & Software manuals
- Travel Guides, Textbooks

A publisher lists was created for the purpose of excluding these titles.

RESULT: Approx. 1% of EAST titles and title-holdings were flagged and excluded from retention allocations.
4/11 Proposed Retention Model

SCARCELY HELD TITLES

Retain ALL if
- EAST holdings fewer than 5
- US holdings fewer than 40 (any edition)
- Regional Large Academic Libraries holdings fewer than 5 (any edition)
- CNY Retention Partners holdings fewer than 1 (any edition)
  - Publication year before 2011
  - Not Ephemera

WIDELY USED TITLES

Retain 5 if
- Aggregate uses more than 30
  - Publication year before 2011
  - Not Ephemera

“Retain All” PARAMETER

Retain 1 if
- Publication year before 2011
  - Not Ephemera
**Proposed Retention Model**

### All Included Libraries
- Retained Percentage: 36%
- Retained Holdings: 6,003,283

### Boston College
- Retained Percentage: 36%
- Retained Titles: 378,669

### Criteria
- **Libraries**
  - Includes 36 of 36 Libraries
- **Retain All**
- **EAST holdings fewer than 5**
- **US holdings fewer than 40 (any edition)**
- **Regional Large Academic Libraries holdings fewer than 5 (any edition)**
- **CNY Retention Partners holdings fewer than 1 (any edition)**

**Estimated Retention Results**
Actual Retention Allocations:

- Five College Library Repository Collection: 92%
- UMass - Amherst: 90%
- Yeshiva University: 59%
- Other Retention Partners: 28-30%
Mid-Stream Communication with Retention Partners

Matthew
Two-way Communications through the Surveys

Subgroup’s plans for retention rules & how retention works

Members’ feedback on retention rules & buy-in
Seeking Feedback on the Retention Model

- Two models developed for EAST members to consider
  - Survey 1 – opinions of all GreenGlass users
  - Revised model created
  - Survey 2 – responses of all GreenGlass users
  - Revised model tested against new ideas in survey 2
  - Survey 3 – buy-in per institution
  - Model finalized and submitted to the full Monographs Working Group
  - Working Group approved and sent on to Executive Committee
  - Executive Committee Approval!
SCS Allocation of Retention Candidates

Ruth
EAST Retention Model

**All Included Libraries**
Retained Percentage: 36%
Retained Holdings: 6,003,283

**Boston College**
Retained Percentage: 36%
Retained Titles: 378,669

---

**Criteria**

**LIBRARIES**
Includes 36 of 36 Libraries

**RETAIN ALL**

**EAST holdings**
FEWER THAN 5

**US holdings**
FEWER THAN 40
(ANY EDITION)

**Regional Large Academic Libraries holdings**
FEWER THAN 5
(ANY EDITION)

**CNY Retention Partners holdings**
FEWER THAN 1
(ANY EDITION)

---

**Estimated Retention Results**
Equitable Allocation or Non?

• Non-equitable in the case of EAST

• Dropped the retention commitment for most libraries from 36% to 30%
Allocation of Retention Candidates
June 2016

• SCS allocated retention ‘candidates’ to participant libraries – meeting % targets

• Retention ‘candidates’ were then flagged in GreenGlass so users could review them
Your List of Retention Candidates

Allocated for Retention

EAST overlap
- no restriction

Aggregate uses
- no restriction

Ephemerata (2):
- No restriction

Allocated for retention
- Allocated for retention in my library
- No restriction
- Allocated for retention in my library
- Not allocated for retention in my library
- Allocated for retention in the group
- Not allocated for retention in the group
- Allocated for retention but NOT in my library

Allocated for Retention
- MATCHED 81,831
- UNMATCHED 71.08% | 201,150

Allocated for Retention
- MATCHED 28.91% |
Review of Retention Candidates

Lorri
# Metrics and Allocations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Metric</th>
<th>Filtered Items</th>
<th>% of Your Filtered Items</th>
<th>SCS Average</th>
<th>Compared to the Ranges and Average for All SCS Clients</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Zero recorded uses</td>
<td>149,527</td>
<td>36% *</td>
<td>42% *</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greater than 3 recorded uses</td>
<td>194,922</td>
<td>47% *</td>
<td>25% *</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Publications more than 10 years old</td>
<td>361,852</td>
<td>87% *</td>
<td>88% *</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than 100 US holdings - same edition</td>
<td>310,895</td>
<td>75% *</td>
<td>75% *</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fewer than five US holdings - any edition</td>
<td>3,477</td>
<td>1% *</td>
<td>1% *</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unique in Connecticut - any edition</td>
<td>28,433</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In HathiTrust - in copyright</td>
<td>175,578</td>
<td>42% *</td>
<td>40% *</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In HathiTrust - public domain</td>
<td>36,648</td>
<td>9% *</td>
<td>5% **</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ephemera <a href="#">?</a></td>
<td>2,518</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allocated for retention</td>
<td>119,721</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Allocated for Retention

Subjects
- All subjects
- Specific LC classes
- Specific Dewey ranges

Locations
- All locations
- Specific locations

Formats
Primary Language

Local Circulation History
Include items with the following threshold:
- Recorded uses: no restriction
- Last change date: no restriction

Allocated for Retention
- UNMATCHED: 71.24% | 290,572
- MATCHED: 28.76% | 119,721

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SUBJECT</th>
<th>PERCENT MATCHED</th>
<th>MATCHED ITEMS</th>
<th>ITEMS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>28.76%</td>
<td>119,721</td>
<td>416,293</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>37.03%</td>
<td>528</td>
<td>1,426</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>29.45%</td>
<td>12,204</td>
<td>41,446</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Pub Date Review for Special Collections

**Copy of Allocated for retention**

- 1.9%
- Matches 7,727 items

**Allocated for retention**

- 0.4%
- Matches 1,546 items

**Subjects**

- **Pub Year**: before 1900
- **Allocated for Retention**: Allocated for retention in my library

- **Pub Year**: before 1851
- **Allocated for Retention**: Allocated for retention in my library
Titles that are inappropriate for retention may include:

• Non-circulating materials that should have been excluded from the original data set

• Materials in a specific location that should have been excluded from the original data set

• Non-scholarly materials that do not merit retention by academic libraries

• Titles that are now damaged or missing since the library's extract was delivered to SCS
Title Review Results

Timeframe: Friday, June 24 – Friday, July 29

Retention Commitments discovered on:
- Lost & Missing titles
- Non-Circulating titles
- “Ephemera”
- Out of Scope materials
- Special Collections materials
Retention Information in GreenGlass

Ruth
Retention Commitments
August 2016

• SCS reloaded GreenGlass – to ‘un-allocate’ rejected retentions --- in total, about 30,000 title-holdings

• Now --- the retained holdings as reflected in GreenGlass are COMMITMENTS rather than CANDIDATES.

• Participant libraries can use GreenGlass to weed surplus copies according to local needs and circumstances
Weeding AROUND your Retention Candidates
### Item-Level Information about Retentions

#### LOCAL TRANSACTION DATA - TITLE LEVEL

| Recorded Uses | 3 |
| Allocated for Retention | No |

#### FORMATS

| Bib Record Type | Book |
| Primary Language | eng |
| Possible Duplicate | Yes |

#### GROUP DATA

| EAST Holdings | 4 |
| Aggregate Uses | 16 |
| Ephemera | No |

#### EAST HOLDINGS

- Connecticut College
- Fairfield University
- Loyola Notre Dame
- Wesleyan University *

* ALLOCATED TO RETAIN
GreenGlass Access to Retention Data for All East Libraries

Ruth
### ALL EAST Retentions - Known-Item Search

Search for:  
- WorldCat OCLC #
- Bib Record #
- Barcode #
- OCLC Work ID #

Search for: 1368591

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CALL #</th>
<th>LOCATION</th>
<th>TITLE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Export Re
## ALL EAST Retentions - Item Details

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CALL #</th>
<th>LOCATION</th>
<th>TITLE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### LOCAL TRANSACTION DATA - TITLE LEVEL
- Recorded Uses: 1

### FORMATS
- Bib Record Type: Book
- Primary Language: fre

### GROUP DATA
- EAST Holdings: 5

### WORLDCAT HOLDINGS
- US Holdings: 54 / 108
- EAST Region Holdings: 6 / 9
- Comparator Libraries: 9 / 22

### OTHER
- HathiTrust IC/PD: No / No

### COMPARATOR LIBRARY HOLDINGS
- Maine Shared Collections: 0 / 1
- Regional Large Academic Libraries: 5 / 11
- Regional College Libraries: 0 / 1
- Boston Library Consortium (BLC): 1 / 3
- CNY Retention Partners: 2 / 2

### EAST HOLDINGS
- Amherst College
- Bryn Mawr College
- Middlebury College
- Swarthmore College *
- Wellesley College

* ALLOCATED TO RETAIN
To request access to GreenGlass

http://goo.gl/forms/fZLSQ2gSqx