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[POLL]

1. Are you familiar with shared print initiatives such as MI-SPI, EAST, or others?
   - Yes
   - No
   - Not sure

2. Does your library participate in a shared retention plan for monographs?
   - Yes
   - No
   - Not sure
OVERVIEW: SHARED PRINT MONOGRAPHS RETENTION
The Facilitated Collection (Lorcan Dempsey)

Increasingly, the library does not assemble collections for local use, but facilitates access to a coordinated mix of local, external and collaborative services assembled around user needs and available on the network.
The ‘external’ collection:
Pointing researchers at Google Scholar;
Including freely available ebooks in the catalog;
Creating resource guides for web resources.

The ‘borrowed’ collection

The ‘shared print’ collection

The ‘shared digital’ collection

The evolving scholarly record

A collections spectrum

The ‘owned’ collection

Purchased and physically stored

The ‘licensed’ collection

The ‘demand-driven’ collection

The ‘facilitated’ collection

Meet research and learning needs in best way
Collection Directions: Some Reflections on the Future of Library Collections and Collecting

Lorcan Dempsey
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Constance Malpas
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“Shared print management schemes represent a cost-effective alternative to institution-scale solutions, redistributing the costs of library stewardship across a broader pool of participants.”
Shared Print: Protecting the Scholarly Record

• Establish a safety net: ensure that all titles are secure
• Group-wide agreement on retention models
• Group-wide commitment to retention rules & duration
• Secure scarcely-held titles within the group
• Secure sufficient holdings of each titles to satisfy likely user demand
• Share responsibility for retention proportionately

• Deselection *only* after retention commitments established
Shared Print Initiatives (Monographs)

- Michigan Shared Print Initiative (MI-SPI)
- Maine Shared Collections Cooperative (MSCC)
- Tri-University Group (TUG)
- Connect New York Shared Print Archiving
- Washington Research Library Consortium (WRLC)
- Virtual Library of Virginia (VIVA)
- Academic Libraries of Indiana (ALI)
- Central Iowa Collaborative Collection Initiative (CI-CCI)
- Eastern Academic Scholars’ Trust (EAST)
- COPPUL Shared Print Archive Network
- SCELC Shared Print
- HathiTrust Print Monographs Archive
Monographs Retention

- Commitment to retain for specified period (usually 10-15 years)
- Responsibility shared across a designated group (state, region)
- Typically a form Memorandum of Understanding in place
  - Ownership
  - Sharing
  - Duration/Review
  - Problems: Lost/Missing, Responsibility to replace, transfer of commitments
- Shared print in place or central collection facility
- Inspired by journal retention programs such as WEST, CRL
- Key Questions: how many copies to retain, and on what basis?
Building Blocks for Retention Models

• Holdings tallies
  o Within the group
  o Within the US
  o Within the various comparator groups

• Year of publication
• Aggregate uses (within the group)
• Last charge year (within the group)
• Last item add year (within the group)
• HathiTrust – In Copyright or Public Domain
Common Patterns in Retention Models

• To retain at least one title-holding of every title currently owned. AND to retain additional title-holdings for specific categories.

• To agree on a definition of scarcely held titles and retain ALL such title-holdings. AND to set specific retention thresholds for other categories of material.

• To identify categories of titles that will NOT be allocated for retention by group members.

• To agree that titles NOT allocated for retention are ‘safe to weed’.
Central Iowa Collaborative Collections Initiative (CI-CCI): 5 libraries

Retain 1 title-holding for all titles currently owned.

Allowed libraries to weed second, third, fourth, and fifth holdings if published before 1991 and had zero recorded uses since 2005.

This decision identified approximately 50% of the shared collection for retention.
Academic Libraries of Indiana (36 libraries)

Retain ALL title-holdings that are:

• held by fewer than 4 libraries within the state of Indiana
  OR
• held by fewer than 20 libraries in the US
  OR
• NOT held by at least one of the three big research libraries in the state (IU Bloomington, Purdue or Notre Dame).

This decision identified 33% of the shared collection for retention.
Virtual Library of Virginia – 1st Pass (8 libraries)

1. Retain all title-holdings that are scarcely held:

   • unique within the state of Virginia
   AND
   • held by fewer than 10 libraries in the US

This decision identified 1% of the shared collection for retention.
Virtual Library of Virginia – 2\textsuperscript{ND} Pass (8 libraries)

2. Retain titles that are widely held

- one title-holding of every title currently owned
  AND
- two-title holdings of every title that had one or more recorded uses within the group

This decision identified 36\% of the shared collection for retention.
SCELC – Trial Model: “Erica’s Adjusted Hybrid”

All Included Libraries
- Retained Percentage: 20%
- Retained Holdings: 979,866

Azusa Pacific
- Retained Percentage: 20%
- Retained Titles: 31,584

Criteria
- Includes 14 of 14 Libraries

- RETAIN 2
  - SCELC holdings: MORE THAN 5
  - Publication year: BEFORE 2006

- RETAIN 1
  - SCELC holdings: FEWER THAN 3
  - Other SCELC holdings
    - FEWER THAN 5
    - (SAME EDITION)
  - Publication year
    - BEFORE 2006

Estimated Retention Results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LIBRARY</th>
<th>TOTAL TITLES</th>
<th>RETAINED TITLES</th>
<th>RETAINED PERCENTAGE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Azusa Pacific</td>
<td>154,269</td>
<td>31,584</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Michigan Shared Print Initiative
MI-SPI
The Michigan Shared Print Initiative

A collaborative project to retain copies of circulating print monographs duplicated among 11 state-supported universities
MI-SPI Partners

• Central Michigan University
• Eastern Michigan University
• Ferris State University
• Grand Valley State University
• Michigan Technological University
• Northern Michigan University

• Oakland University
• Saginaw Valley State University
• University of Michigan--Dearborn
• Wayne State University
• Western Michigan University
MI-SPI Facilitators

• Midwest Collaborative for Library Services (MCLS)
  MCLS is coordinating the MI-SPI project with SCS for all the participating libraries

• Sustainable Collection Services
  SCS has the tools to effectively analyze collective print monograph collections—specifically GreenGlass and GreenGlass for Groups (G3)
MI-SPI    Round One

2011-12

• 7 state-supported university libraries

• Several with urgent need for collection reduction

• A few with newer facilities interested in collection analysis data
MI-SPI Round One

Process:
• Data extracted from each partner’s ILS

• SCS normalized & analyzed for duplication, age, use

• Focused on identifying items for withdrawal

• Retention--a secondary consideration
MI-SPI Round One

- MI-SPI partners & SCS discussed scenarios in early 2012

- Agreed to retain 2 copies for
  - Titles published &/or purchased before 2005 matched at edition level
  - 3 or fewer recorded uses since 1999
  - Titles held by 3 or more libraries

Unique titles—list provided to each partner for evaluation/decision
MI-SPI  Round One

• First set of retention assignments fell short of weeding goals for 2 partners

• 2 other partners had no space concerns & offered to take additional assignments; general agreement that these additions would be addressed in next iteration of the collective collection

• SCS recalculated and reassigned.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Library</th>
<th>Retention Count</th>
<th>Withdrawal Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CMU</td>
<td>204,686</td>
<td>37,438</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EMU</td>
<td>172,423</td>
<td>67,221</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GVSU</td>
<td>45,497</td>
<td>49,654</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MTU</td>
<td>24,899</td>
<td>48,655</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SVSU</td>
<td>30,094</td>
<td>53,724</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WSU</td>
<td>86,633</td>
<td>165,858</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WMU</td>
<td>172,004</td>
<td>111,607</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
MI-SPI Round Two

2015-16

• 9 libraries participated in the refresh
  • 5 original partners

• 4 new partners

• 2 original partners opted out of data refresh; retention assignments maintained
MI-SPI Round Two

- Data extracted from 9 active partners’ ILS

- SCS normalized & analyzed for duplication, age, use
  - Collective collection was created anew
  - More complex situation—retentions of opted-out partners
  - 3 new comparator groups added—ALI (IN), UM, MSU
  - Emphasis shifted to identifying what to keep rather than what to weed
MI-SPI    Round Two

• Maintained the same retention parameters with a twist
• 2 copies retained by the 9 refresh partners
  • Titles published &/or purchased before 2005 matched at edition level
  • 3 or fewer recorded uses since 1999
• Titles held by 3 or more libraries and there are no retention assignments for EMU/WMU
• 1 copy is retained by the 9 partners if the titles is also retained by EMU/WMU
MI-SPI Round Two

- Unique titles: retain all (any edition) within the 9 partners
  - MI-SPI holdings are less than 3
  - US holdings are less than 50 (WorldCat)
  - UM & MSU do not have

MI-SPI is evolving—many aspects to investigate
- Expanding collective collection into more current publications
- Replacing exact editions or opting for the newest edition
- Validating retention holdings
Eastern Academic Scholars’ Trust (EAST)
Eastern Academic Scholars’ Trust - EAST
The EAST Collective Collection

title holdings
16,573,071

title sets
4,749,042

title sets held by one library in the group
50%
2,359,033 title sets

title sets with > 10 aggregate uses
20%
939,819 title sets

title sets represented in HathiTrust
39%
1,865,115 title sets
Collection analysis process

- Working Group formed
- Had early access to GreenGlass to begin modeling
- Each model submitted to the full EAST membership for comment and review via a formal survey
- Results integrated into later model(s)
- 3 rounds and final model agreed and approved
Our retention model – 3 major components

1. Retain all holdings of scarcely held titles
   • Fewer than 5 holdings within EAST
   • Fewer than 40 holdings in WorldCat
   • Fewer than 5 holdings in Large Regional Academic libraries [a comparator group]
   • No copy already held by a ConnectNY partner
Our retention model – 3 major components

1. Retain all holdings of scarcely held titles

2. Retain up to 5 holdings of frequently used titles
   • With aggregates uses of more than 30
Our retention model – 3 major components

1. Retain all holdings of scarcely held titles
2. Retain up to 5 holdings of frequently used titles
3. Retain one holding of every title
   - The “everything else” criteria

• EXCEPT: Titles <2011 and ephemera
The result

• Model showed @36% of EAST libraries’ local collections to be allocated for retention

• Four libraries volunteered to allocate at higher rate

• Final rate was 28-30% for each library
[POLL]

Are you familiar with the concept of “validation” when used in the context of shared print programs?

- Yes
- No
- Not sure
Validation sample study

• Focused on validating “presence” with minimal condition checking

• Sample of 6,000 items/library

• Tool developed by Data Librarian to facilitate data collection
Data collection for validation sampling

[Image of shelves check tool]

**CHECK SHELVES**
Check the shelves to verify the presence of an item.
12 Items In Process (Clear)

[Image of initial entry form]

Enter Your Initials:
- Location:  
- How many?  

[Table]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item Code</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Condition Options</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AC75 .A7 2</td>
<td>[Articles] por German Arciniegas.</td>
<td>Present □ Not On Shelf □</td>
<td>Condition: (?)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

https://github.com/samato88/EastValidationTool
Results

• 97% of the items were accounted for

• 90% in average or excellent condition, 10% poor

• Follow-up analysis of the data from the study resulted in additional retentions being requested of libraries of just under 78,000 items (.01%)
PROGRESS TO DATE
Shared Print Retentions at a Glance

• 9 Group Projects

• 129 institutions with committed print retentions

• 7.4 million distinct editions retained

• 18.5 million title-holdings retained

• In 13 U.S. states and 5 Canadian provinces
Shared Print Retentions Title-Holdings

18.5 Million Title-Holdings Retained
Retentions in Title-Holdings

- 7.4M Unique Titles (first retained holding)
- 11.1M Additional Retained Holdings

Number of Institutions Retaining Title:

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5
- 6
- 7
- 8
- 9
- 10+
Shared Print Retentions by Group

Title-Holdings
U.S. Shared Print Retentions by State
Which States Will be Next?
SHARED PRINT LIFECYCLE

Define the group or entity

Analyze collection data

Decision support

Allocate retention commitments

Review, reconsider, renew

Access

Discovery

Weed? Preserve?

Register retention commitments
Batch Registration of Retention Commitments

• Imminent release at OCLC
  • Software development underway
  • Pilot groups in May/June 2017
  • Fully available Summer/Fall 2017

• Goals:
  • make the committed collective collection visible
  • Improve subsequent rounds of analysis
  • Operationalize the collective collection via discovery & resource sharing
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution ID</th>
<th>Institution Name</th>
<th>In Scope Holdings</th>
<th>Allocated Holdings</th>
<th>% of in-scope title-holdings allocated for retention</th>
<th>In-Scope Items</th>
<th>Allocated Items</th>
<th>% of in-scope items allocated for retention</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4907</td>
<td>Amherst College</td>
<td>505,537</td>
<td>177,820</td>
<td>29.3%</td>
<td>694,324</td>
<td>196,095</td>
<td>28.2%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4908</td>
<td>Boston College</td>
<td>1,045,648</td>
<td>308,552</td>
<td>29.5%</td>
<td>1,178,565</td>
<td>336,676</td>
<td>28.6%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4909</td>
<td>Boston University</td>
<td>632,331</td>
<td>185,245</td>
<td>29.3%</td>
<td>760,726</td>
<td>208,602</td>
<td>27.4%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4910</td>
<td>Brandeis University</td>
<td>789,877</td>
<td>241,060</td>
<td>30.5%</td>
<td>868,762</td>
<td>261,749</td>
<td>30.3%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4911</td>
<td>Bridgewater College</td>
<td>224,720</td>
<td>65,938</td>
<td>29.3%</td>
<td>240,017</td>
<td>68,588</td>
<td>28.6%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4912</td>
<td>Bryn Mawr College</td>
<td>457,798</td>
<td>139,175</td>
<td>30.4%</td>
<td>520,494</td>
<td>153,856</td>
<td>29.6%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4913</td>
<td>Colby</td>
<td>155,361</td>
<td>48,811</td>
<td>29.2%</td>
<td>161,995</td>
<td>46,466</td>
<td>28.7%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4914</td>
<td>Connecticut College</td>
<td>380,220</td>
<td>111,702</td>
<td>29.4%</td>
<td>416,293</td>
<td>119,745</td>
<td>28.8%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4915</td>
<td>Elms College</td>
<td>50,299</td>
<td>15,051</td>
<td>29.9%</td>
<td>54,443</td>
<td>16,291</td>
<td>29.9%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4916</td>
<td>Fairfield University</td>
<td>264,153</td>
<td>78,569</td>
<td>29.7%</td>
<td>282,981</td>
<td>81,905</td>
<td>29.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4917</td>
<td>Hampshire College</td>
<td>112,608</td>
<td>33,625</td>
<td>29.9%</td>
<td>120,824</td>
<td>34,781</td>
<td>28.8%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4920</td>
<td>Lafayette College</td>
<td>342,882</td>
<td>104,076</td>
<td>30.4%</td>
<td>369,269</td>
<td>107,300</td>
<td>29.1%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4921</td>
<td>Middlebury College</td>
<td>477,782</td>
<td>141,171</td>
<td>29.5%</td>
<td>534,145</td>
<td>150,273</td>
<td>28.1%</td>
<td>Locations &quot;mdr&quot; and &quot;mds&quot; omitted.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4922</td>
<td>Mount Holyoke College</td>
<td>518,950</td>
<td>154,906</td>
<td>29.9%</td>
<td>583,599</td>
<td>165,576</td>
<td>28.4%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4923</td>
<td>Phillips Exeter Academy</td>
<td>109,165</td>
<td>32,772</td>
<td>30.0%</td>
<td>117,077</td>
<td>33,776</td>
<td>28.8%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4924</td>
<td>Saint Anselm College</td>
<td>161,598</td>
<td>49,204</td>
<td>30.4%</td>
<td>175,764</td>
<td>52,130</td>
<td>29.5%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4925</td>
<td>Siena College</td>
<td>239,389</td>
<td>72,114</td>
<td>30.1%</td>
<td>259,680</td>
<td>75,809</td>
<td>29.2%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4926</td>
<td>Smith College</td>
<td>771,872</td>
<td>228,416</td>
<td>29.7%</td>
<td>874,547</td>
<td>255,766</td>
<td>29.2%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4927</td>
<td>Swarthmore College</td>
<td>417,332</td>
<td>127,323</td>
<td>30.5%</td>
<td>464,360</td>
<td>136,691</td>
<td>29.4%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4928</td>
<td>Trinity College</td>
<td>400,087</td>
<td>119,370</td>
<td>29.8%</td>
<td>444,193</td>
<td>126,297</td>
<td>28.4%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4929</td>
<td>Tufts University</td>
<td>649,526</td>
<td>195,551</td>
<td>30.1%</td>
<td>735,422</td>
<td>213,269</td>
<td>29.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4930</td>
<td>UConn</td>
<td>912,776</td>
<td>267,620</td>
<td>28.3%</td>
<td>1,080,730</td>
<td>293,713</td>
<td>27.2%</td>
<td>Locations &quot;in std&quot; and &quot;in std&quot; omitted.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4934</td>
<td>UMass Amherst</td>
<td>1,397,202</td>
<td>1,251,698</td>
<td>89.6%</td>
<td>1,549,614</td>
<td>1,329,076</td>
<td>85.8%</td>
<td>Retention target is 90% of in-scope titles.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4935</td>
<td>UMass Boston</td>
<td>350,106</td>
<td>102,242</td>
<td>29.2%</td>
<td>402,952</td>
<td>111,478</td>
<td>27.7%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4936</td>
<td>UMass Dartmouth</td>
<td>159,707</td>
<td>46,675</td>
<td>29.2%</td>
<td>172,809</td>
<td>48,767</td>
<td>28.2%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4937</td>
<td>UMass Lowell</td>
<td>206,865</td>
<td>62,687</td>
<td>30.3%</td>
<td>223,939</td>
<td>66,498</td>
<td>29.7%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4938</td>
<td>UNH</td>
<td>577,303</td>
<td>171,625</td>
<td>29.7%</td>
<td>531,866</td>
<td>182,054</td>
<td>28.8%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4939</td>
<td>Rochester</td>
<td>1,381,051</td>
<td>348,259</td>
<td>29.5%</td>
<td>1,327,829</td>
<td>382,826</td>
<td>28.8%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4940</td>
<td>Wellesley College</td>
<td>513,720</td>
<td>150,611</td>
<td>29.3%</td>
<td>584,977</td>
<td>163,095</td>
<td>27.9%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4941</td>
<td>Wesleyan University</td>
<td>718,335</td>
<td>211,102</td>
<td>29.4%</td>
<td>780,308</td>
<td>221,738</td>
<td>28.4%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4942</td>
<td>Williams College</td>
<td>520,939</td>
<td>154,750</td>
<td>29.7%</td>
<td>570,743</td>
<td>162,528</td>
<td>28.5%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4943</td>
<td>Yeshiva University</td>
<td>281,093</td>
<td>166,331</td>
<td>59.2%</td>
<td>369,215</td>
<td>209,167</td>
<td>55.7%</td>
<td>Retention target is 60% of in-scope titles.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4944</td>
<td>Skidmore</td>
<td>264,186</td>
<td>78,370</td>
<td>29.7%</td>
<td>282,247</td>
<td>81,321</td>
<td>28.8%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5033</td>
<td>Five Colleges, Incorp</td>
<td>47,275</td>
<td>43,386</td>
<td>91.7%</td>
<td>61,620</td>
<td>50,090</td>
<td>81.3%</td>
<td>Retention target is 100% of in-scope titles.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5743</td>
<td>Loyola Notre Dame</td>
<td>320,768</td>
<td>96,046</td>
<td>29.9%</td>
<td>347,492</td>
<td>101,051</td>
<td>29.1%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td><strong>16,257,401</strong></td>
<td><strong>5,778,796</strong></td>
<td><strong>35.5%</strong></td>
<td><strong>18,329,821</strong></td>
<td><strong>6,245,151</strong></td>
<td><strong>34.2%</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>