Shared Print Monograph Summit 2
Metro Meeting Center, Boston, MA

Wednesday, December 5th and Thursday, December 6th, 2018

Note: these notes are arranged topically and thus do not strictly follow the chronology of the Summit. See the agenda for the actual order of the proceedings. Other documents/links of note:

- List of attendees
- Working Group Reports
- Day 1 Slide Deck
- Day 2 Slide Deck
- April Summit Documents

As the full set of notes is lengthy, we have included a Summary below. It is followed by further details on the major topics discussed over the course of the meeting:

Shared Print Monograph Summit Summary

The primary focus of the Summit was to consider and discuss the work that had been done by the Working Groups formed as an outcome of the April 2018 EAST Shared Print Monograph Summit. That is, this Summit focused on affirming, agreeing, endorsing, and reaching consensus on the recommendations of the Working Groups. By the end of the Summit, we hoped to identify next steps to enable us to continue collaborating.

As outlined below, we substantially achieved our goals. There are remaining questions about funding, and perhaps some additional grant support for the work, and the Steering Committee would appreciate feedback on whether any of the ideas discussed could be supported by grant funding, especially funds that could be made available quickly. Details of the discussions follow this summary.

Through our discussion, we reached agreement on the following:
- Preliminary statements of mission, vision and principles, and taking a federated approach to the coming organizational formation as outlined in the Organizational Structure Working Group report.

- ○ We will continue engagement with providers on a possible bridge solution for Open Retention Data project/tool, and we should be open to quickly seeking other interested providers.
- ○ We should probably soften "standards" as the umbrella for our work, and move more in the direction of guidelines and best practices, particularly as we help to expand existing programs or help new ones form.
- ○ We need more data in support of our work on risk, scope of collection, and assessment.
- ○ Let's not reinvent the wheel (*e.g.*, resource sharing). Things that others are doing might represent places for us to engage, but we may not need to provide leadership through our federation.
- ○ The relationship between this group and the Rosemont Shared Print Alliance, focused on serials and journals retention and archiving, deserves more study. What impact might this have on the organizational structure we'll put in place? Should the two organizations be one? Should they function under a single umbrella?
- ○ Now is the time to (re)organize the original 14 priorities developed in April. This should be a key component of the organizational development work we will undertake in 2019.
- ○ Following a vote by participants, the name "Partnership for Shared Book Collections" was accepted and will be used for this enterprise, at least during the calendar 2019 transition period as outlined in the Organizational Structure Working Group report. Susan Stearns will follow up with the Outreach and Engagement Working Group on a press release about the name. Will also follow up with the journalist Jennifer Howard who was unable to attend.
- ○ Great progress was made on talking through and brainstorming things to be handled during the transition planning and work over the coming year. The following working groups will work during the transition year (tentative conveners in parentheses), volunteers have been identified for all groups, and more will be appointed as needed:
  - ■ NEW: Steering Committee (TBD) will provide oversight for the Partnership and its Working Groups
  - ■ NEW: Governance and Membership (Matthew Revitt)
  - ■ NEW: Services and Business Model (Kirsten Leonard)
  - ■ Sunsetting: Summit Planning Group (Susan Stearns), will work over the next few months to finalize things, push to fill out the committee appointments, and then hand off oversight to the Steering Committee
  - ■ Outreach and Engagement (Galadriel Chilton)
  - ■ Risk Analysis (Ian Bogus)
  - ■ Best Practices (TBD)
  - ■ Open Retention Data (Lizanne Payne)

Upcoming Dates
- ● Update on EAST Summit 2 @ Midwinter 2019 (@ PAN)

- ALA Annual 2019 - Work with CRL to include time after PAN? Matthew will follow up with Marie @ CRL about rooms and coordination.
- Others?
    - We might look for grant deadlines we want to be aware of. We should mine the WG reports for timelines/deadlines.
    - Steering probably needs intermediate deadlines which will drive the Working Groups over the course of 2019.

Organizational Structure [LINK TO REPORT]

Early on the first day of the Summit, Kirsten Leonard led a discussion of the mission, vision and guiding principles for this initiative as recommended by the Organizational Structure Working Group. The expected outcome of the discussion was to reach a consensus on the preliminary statement of mission, vision and guiding principles, and the federated governance structure being recommended.

Kirsten's presentation was intended to frame a discussion/affirmation of the proposed mission and vision, as well as guiding principles that will help us know what success look like. She also led a discussion of the proposal to move forward on a "federated" model where members participate in governance and operations, with no single institution predominating. There was a high level of consensus in the pre-Summit survey responses, with generally strong endorsement of the proposed mission, vision and guiding principles. While most respondents also agreed with the recommendation to form a federated structure, there were some reservations about the loss of momentum, as well as some interest in staying with EAST for one more year. In a discussion of the staffing issue, participants mentioned that the staffing could come from an in-kind dedication of existing staff, and there was a strong feeling that in any event there should be dedicated staff to support this initiative and that the business model and services needed to be more clearly defined in order to determine appropriate staffing needs.

Group discussion focused on the question of accountability and momentum without a single organization taking all of that responsibility. There might initially be no dedicated program staff in the federated model, so there were some concerns about how we will keep ourselves moving forward and ensure accountability.

Discussion Q&A
Q: Did the Organizational Structure Working Group look at any failed models? What land mines are out there?
A: Yes, the group looked at other organizations, and considered how complex a model we need as we begin. Lesson learned is to develop our business models quickly, since without that sustainability is hard to achieve. Also, getting staff is key.

Q: Should we be considering a merger with Rosemont? Do we really need two organizations? Or can we cooperate? Are the mission, vision and goals (and interested parties) really so closely aligned that it makes sense to work together more explicitly, or are the differences big enough to continue separately for now? Can these both live under one umbrella now? Does that make sense? What are the members and constituencies that the two initiatives serve, are they different enough? In any event, we need to consciously consider the relationship to Rosemont? BTW, many present are active members of Rosemont.

A: All good questions, to be discussed during the Summit and beyond.

Agreement: The survey consensus on the recommended mission, vision, guiding principles and federated model for the organization to manage our continued work was affirmed and and endorsed without any dissenting votes by those present through a show of hands. Due to federal regulations, LC abstained.

Day 2

On the second day of the Summit, participants discussed what the next actions should be as we move forward to build out the federation and take action on the recommendations of the Working Groups. Small group discussions based on the report of the Organizational Structure Working Group report were prompted with the following questions:

- As we look at this transitional year to come (2019), what changes do you suggest need to be made to the transition plan based on outcomes of the previous sessions?
- Do we have the right groups? Did we cover the priorities discussed yesterday?
- Is the timing workable?
- Do we have enough non-US representation?
- Is program staff necessary or too problematic from a business model perspective?
- The Rosemont question – how does this group interact and intersect with Rosemont during the transition year?

Reports out from the small groups raised the following issues and questions:

Do we have the right groups?
- Rename "Communications" to "Outreach and Engagement"?
- Resource Sharing? Disband as such, but make sure we engage and have resource sharing folks on our committees. AND make sure we liaise with folks in CARS, etc. We could always reactivate it later if needed.
- Rename "Standards" to something more like "Best Practices" or "Guidelines"
- Does Risk Analysis group need to be recast? Are they primarily a research group? There are bandwidth issues, and we need to get folks to do research, perhaps the group needs to focus on framing research questions and encouraging research to address their questions. Should we rename to include the word "Research". This group might be seen as a resource to identify known/unknown risk levels. Risk group probably needs some guidance on which problems to focus upon. However, this may not be a priority or high-activity area during the transition year?

- Do we have the right expertise represented on the groups? Need to be cognizant of skill sets of the membership of each group. Steering Committee and Conveners should be deliberate in their appointments.
- How to connect groups to Steering? Probably by appointing liaisons from Steering Committee to each group. Need to be aware of bandwidth considerations for folks on the Steering Committee and the Working Group conveners.
- Need to be aware of engaging folks for working groups who may have never attending a summit. We'll want to allow groups to nominate folks if they know of someone great to add as needed. We can be responsive to expressions of interest as well.

Timeline:
> A year seems reasonable to do what the Organizational Structure report calls for. Probably need to set intermediary deadlines, perhaps have a meeting with report deadlines around PAN @ ALA Annual. Certainly the new Steering Committee should set the deadlines. Being aggressive keep the momentum going.

Non-US representatives?
> Would be good to include more representatives from the programs in Canada. Caitlin and Doug will work to find a few more folks to engage.

Staffing:
> Perhaps too complex to do in this transitional year? Seems like a key point for the Steering Committee to consider. The expense is significant, etc. And it could require a premature ask for money from the partnership members. This question should be a focus for the Business Models Working Group.

Rosemont?
- Questions are unanswered, and the Steering and other groups should maintain a focus on it, and there should be some explicit reporting on this at the end of the transition year.
- Maybe we should get the two steering committees together to discuss? Perhaps we should ensure we have a person who is on both groups to liaise?
- Maybe this should be an early action item for Steering Group?
- Rosemont is continuing to work on access principles, and also facing some of the same organizational/governance issues that this summit is facing. Membership criteria, etc.

With the groups now defined, the following conveners and members were identified (with the idea that further members would be sought as the Partnership forms) for the groups over the coming year of formalization and federated organizational development:

- Outreach and Engagement
  - Convener: Galadriel Chilton
  - Members: Mike Garabedian (SCELC, per Linda)
- Risk Analysis
  - Convener: Ian Bogus
  - Members: All current members are tentatively willing to continue, Jennifer Martin (USMAI), Mary Miller (University of Minnesota)
- Best Practices
  - Convener: Mei Mendez has someone she has been talking to, and Tina Baich is willing if that does not work out (Note: following the meeting, Tina and Heather Weltin volunteered to be co-conveners)
  - Members: No discussion
- Open Retention Data
  - Convener: Lizanne Payne is tentatively interested
  - Members: Current members (George Machovec, Andy Breeding, Linda Wobbe and Amy Wood) plus Jeff Kosokoff (offered to co-convene with Lizanne if needed)
- Governance and Membership
  - Convener: Matthew Revitt
  - Members: Pam Jones, Mark Jacobs, Matthew Revitt, Canadian representative TBD per Caitlin Tillman
- Services and Business Model
  - Convener: Kirsten Leonard
  - Members: Cathy Martyniak (but willing to be on Governance and Membership instead, as needed), Rick Burke (needs to be confirmed), Canadian rep TBD per Caitlin Tillman
- Steering Committee
  - Members: Ian Bogus, Susan Stearns, Tina Baich, Kirsten Leonard, and Lizanne Payne (if not convening Retention Data alone)

Naming The Enterprise

As part of the broader discussion of the structure and mission of the organization above, and on behalf of the Organizational Structure Working Group (see report), Kirsten presented some potential names for this new organization, including a solicitation for more options. Participants discussed some of the tensions around a name, these centered on considerations of who the name is meant to resonate with, and what relationship we are setting up with our colleagues working on serials retention through Rosemont. Participants were of various opinions about the utility/necessity of including a format-specific term such as "books" or "monographs". Participants also looked to the "stop words" (and words to include) that are included in the Communications Working Group report. There seemed to be a general sense that we should maintain a focus on

access (thus words like "shared") particularly since the phrase "shared print" has developed name recognition within the academic library world.

An initial list of potential names was offered on the first day of the Summit, additional suggestions were offered by participants. On the second day, participants were allocated three votes to distribute as they saw fit in support of the following name options. Due to federal regulations, LC abstained. The number of dots each option received in parentheses:

- Partnership for Shared Book Collections (22)
- Shared Print Partnership (19)
- North American Shared Print Alliance (10)
- Shared Print Collections Coalition (9)
- Federated Shared Print Collections (7)
- Stewards of Print (2)
- Alliance for Library Book Access (2)
- Partnership for Expanded Shared Print Access (2)
- Print Book Federation (1)
- Book Protection League (1)
- Shared Print Alliance for Monographs (1)
- Partnership for Ongoing Access to Library Books (0)
- Library Book Partnership (0)
- Partnership for Stewarding Print Books (0)
- United Trust for Shared Collections (0)

Voted and Agreed: Given that two options received many more votes than the others, participants discussed those options, and voted in favor of Partnership for Shared Book Collections (19-7). Henceforth this enterprise shall be known as the Partnership for Shared Book Collections (and we may choose to use the acronym, PaSBooC - pronounced "passbook").

Open Data for Shared Print [LINK TO REPORT]

Lizanne presented the recommendations from the Shared Open Retention Data Working Group. The desired outcome was to reach some agreement on the recommended plan to engage with providers interested in offering a bridge solution.

The Working Group developed an inventory of where shared print data is now, use cases for the open data, and sought statements of interest from organizations that might want to develop an interim solution. The Center for Research Libraries (CRL) is not interested at this time, but the Colorado Alliance of Research Libraries' (GoldRush tool), OCLC, and the HathiTrust (maybe) are willing to continue the conversation. The Working Group plans to continue discussions with the interested organizations with an eye towards developing requirements, identifying gaps in current functionality, and look towards the requirements for a Minimum Viable Product. This would lead to an RFP process.

Members present from the HathiTrust (HT), Colorado Alliance of Research Libraries (CARL), and OCLC all confirmed their level of interest:
- CARL is still interested in partnering on this.
- HT is definitely interested in being involved, but remains unsure if they are the right development partner. The timing is working out, since part of the question relates to the Heather Weltin's work as the new Shared Print Program Officer.
- OCLC is still committed and interested in supporting shared print. SCS has been merged with the Shared Print Registry division of OCLC (all under the SCS team). They are continuing their work in shared print and look forward to further engagement. The current CRL/Mellon grant is meant to look at serials and multipart monographs, but should have pieces that could be helpful for work with single-part monographs.

Q: OCLC, how open can the data be with the APIs OCLC might develop?
A: Right now, everything requires the user to have a cataloging subscription.

Q: Ivy Plus has been exploring the development of a tool to do collection development decision support, anything to leverage here?
A: Yes, but nothing is happening quickly in that space. However, there has been some interest and conversation in this area among the ReCAP partners.

Q: Any models in Europe we could borrow?
A: Not really. We're trying to solve the problem of having a single registry that rolls up all the disparate program commitments. Important to keep in mind that the functional requirements we have are now are much bigger than any extant registry.

Q: Did we talk with FOLIO/IndexData? Could we approach them?
A: We could explore that during the next 6 months of planning.

Q: Why are we just building an "interim" solution?

A: Good question, we need to keep that in mind. Minimum viable product might be a bridge to a future version of itself.

Agreement: Group agreed to the action of working with the 3 organizations, with the friendly amendment that other organizations could be approached in the RFP process. There were no dissenting votes. Due to federal regulations, LC abstained.

Standards [LINK TO REPORT]

Mei presented a quick overview of the Standard Working Group report and the relevant pre-Summit survey responses. Consensus in the survey was that we should try and align shared monograph programs with some common set of policies and practices. However, this was not unanimous, and it seems there may be some areas where not all programs would be able to align. The Standards Group also proposed a kit to help decrease variety and increase conformity. Perhaps with some grading (Gold, Silver, Bronze?) of compliance.

The Standards Working Group plans to engage with Risk and Resource Sharing groups to consider where rigorous adherence is more important, *i.e.*, to prioritize which ideas might be more key to include in a set of standards.

Remaining open questions
- Are the next steps we have identified post-survey the appropriate ones?
- Is a standard for collection scope so broad that it needs its own sub-group?
- How much work on making standards should be deferred until the new federated organization is up and running and what can be done between now and then?
- Might there eventually be a round of recommitments if we create/promulgate new standards for any of these topics?
- Do we envision a point in time where we ask shared print programs to revisit their current agreements, that is, reconsider agreement in light of the new standards?

Q: Did the group already come up with things that might be prioritized?
A: Working from the 14 key priorities agreed in the April Summit, the group recast as follows, but has not prioritized :
- Retention Period & Survivability
- Resource Sharing Expectations
- Metadata
- Collection Scope/Curatorial Dimensions of the Shared Collection
- Storage Environment
- Validation
- Condition
- Optimal Number of Copies
- Last Copy
- Replacement Actions
- 'Model MOU'

Q: The level of agreement in survey responses was not super strong here (*i.e.*, lots of "somewhat agree" that it might not be fair to include with the "agree" and "strongly agree").
A: There were lots of reasons respondents gave for this.

Subsequent discussion focused on the path of using the language of "best practices" or "guidelines", and not convey this as "standards". That is, at this point we may want to stay away from a narrative of compliance.

RISK [LINK TO REPORT]

Ian presented the outcomes and questions from the Risk Research Working Group. While the Group focused on risks to materials, they also talked about adherence/deviation to/from standards, and risks that can result related to the stability of infrastructure (*e.g.*, WorldCat and the present Partnership).

The Risk Research Working Group mostly focused on the need for some research to be done in support of our work. We need to find/sponsor/do research to inform our decision making. Also, important to think hard about how we will engage with libraries that are not participating (publics, those not in WorldCat, etc.).

The Working Group also had raised the question of whether or not we should be focused on "all the copies" we have, or on the content in copies (i.e., redundant holdings vs. uniqueness of copies).

Public libraries are involved in shared print in some programs (Maine and Colorado), but there are some issues since they are small, do a lot of things differently (particularly factoring in usage stats) : smaller ones often do not use WorldCat, and public libraries generally weed much more aggressively than academic and research libraries.

Q: What should the role of shared print libraries and shared print programs be in helping save the kinds of materials (e.g., popular fiction) that only public libraries collect en masse?
A: Since the general pattern for public libraries is to weed these in the fullness of time, perhaps we should be looking at how we might facilitate the relocation of these to shared print libraries. Denver Public is using analytics to identify materials that should be relocated to a retention library (maybe 6K volumes thus far) by making an open offer to the CARL retention partners.

Q: What is the risk created by scale?
A: We need research on what the boundaries of the risks are at scale, then we can calculate the risk, and discuss what we need to set up to mitigate the risk. Things like number of copies, and how scale mitigates risk.

Resource Sharing [LINK TO REPORT]

Doug presented on the outcomes of the Resource Sharing Working Group and the pre-Summit survey responses. Substantially, we need to think about whether this enterprise needs to have its own resource sharing group, or focus on engagement and involvement with that community to inform all of our work across the enterprise. That is, we need to partner with our resource sharing experts (not many of those folks in the room right now). The ecosystem for resource sharing is pretty well-evolved, and it is key to really understand what they need at a pretty deep level. With the emergence of CARS (Consortial Approaches to Resource Sharing), we have a great opportunity to engage with a group of like-minded folks.

The general recommendations of the group:
1. Standardize to Simplify
2. Be generous
3. Stop Charging Each Other
4. Open Everything

Revisiting the Priorities from the April Summit [[LIST](#)]
Maureen and Lizanne framed a conversation for small group discussions. At each table, participants discussed and reviewed the 14 priorities that emerged from the April Summit. Are these still the right ones?

General Points of Discussion and Agreement:
- These still should be the priorities
- It is now time to make these more formal, organized, to be discussed in the Steering Committee, new executive group, etc.
- Do we need to call out a new priority making explicit the question of our relationship to Rosemont?
- Need to check in on whether all of these are (or should be) covered by our working groups. Need to map our priorities to who is, or should be working on them. That is, we need to map these to the goals we are trying to accomplish and how we plan to accomplish them. Perhaps transform the 14 priorities document into a matrix that specifies priority level, work underway, responsibility (within the new groups established by the governance group), what is each priority trying to answer?
- Do we need a priority that explicitly calls out the need to develop business models and funding to support our work?
- 14 seems like too many? Perhaps there is some grouping to do? Perhaps rather than adding to the list, we might drop some, prioritize others. Prioritize 1,8 10, 12, 13, 14 as the top ones (Lizanne), maybe 6, as well.
- Where is Assessment? How will we know when we succeed? Perhaps this is covered in some of the groups we have (or are to form under the new organizational work)?
- Perhaps these represent first stabs at what success would look like? These are the conditions of achieving our shared goals? Maybe we are looking to define the minimal conditions for what it means to be a shared print program? This relates to the levels discussed in the Standards Working Group (Bronze, Silver, Gold).

Discussion points about particular items:
- "Develop participation models to support establishment of new SP programs"
  - "business models and who's is going to pay for this" could be included here?
  - Could we kick this down the road for now? I.e., we aren't ready to take this on yet?
  - Could be scoped to explicitly include mentoring/extending existing programs to encourage engagement with SP. Could also include not just establishing new, but also expanding existing programs?
- "Connection online availability to retention…"
  - Could consider deferring for now? Or should be connected to resource sharing?
- "Establish standards (and do research around the optimal number of copies" and "Establish community standards…"
  - Following on a theme throughout the Summit, and as discussed during the Standards Working Group presentation, we might be better off staying with the language of "best practices" or "guidelines",

- "Establish a formal enterprise…." and "Develop some kind of federated organization…."
  - Given how things have evolved since, perhaps these are the same thing. Combine or drop as redundant given that we now doing this.
- "Scope the collection that we are targeting"
  - Some discussion of the ambiguity of the word "scope". Resonates with folks, but seems pretty ambiguous. We don't even know what the scope of existing programs in a way. Is this about diversity of the collection? Diversity of participants? Limiting in some way the kinds of books we are interested in?
  - This was probably mostly about "Just Books" or not. And perhaps the question was really more like "should we establish" a scope at all?

Action: Groups that are forming or reconstituting as we move to the new federated organization should make the priorities into something more structured. It will be important to map these to which group will be working on them, what connections are needed to other organizations, etc. In any event, the 14 priorities should be an input to the more formal documentation to come.

Communications [LINK TO REPORT]

Galadriel and Patrick presented the work done by the Communications Working Group. Key points:

- Core audiences for communications identified, as well as some information about what kinds of messages those audiences might be responsive to (see Communications Matrix).

  > Q: Are there some audiences that we might prioritize/focus? Does communicating to one get us flow of information to others?
  > A: No, but we could. There is a compelling case for starting with faculty, university administration.

- Assumptions about how to communicate with each group were tested through engagement with members of the audiences, communications folks, etc.
- Some work done on what kinds of stories might work best, what medium might reach them best, who should be telling the stories, etc.
- Overall, key to ask: How do we tell compelling stories that resonate with those outside the libraries?
- Outcomes and key points from the Working Group:
  a. Academic communities care deeply about books. So, focus on expanding and guaranteeing and expanding access. Shared print is only part of that story.
  b. Wikipedia article drafted to cover the ground at a very fundamental level. The initial article was rejected by Wikipedia, but will be re-submitted with revisions.

     > Comment: Let's not forget there are other entries in Wikipedia (preservation, etc.) that we should also be looking to edit.

  c. Proposed Strategies:
     i. Compelling narratives that emphasize the "white space". Consider what happens if we don't do this, and new things we can do if we do it.
     ii. Tell stories with images and video, not just prose. A video from Keep@Downsview was shown as an example: https://youtu.be/BXTmYEW5RFs

        > Comment: Video was nice, but didn't show the work of the system (i.e., it was just narrated video of the facility), might be great to emphasize the work we are doing to deliver the materials (show the action). A good example of which audience we are aiming at. Harvard has another good one, discussed in this article.

     iii. Identify what data supports a compelling story, and make sure we have that data.
     iv. Generate attention. Non-librarians play key roles, avoiding jargon
     v. Focus on expanding and guaranteeing long term/perpetual access. Distinguish between resource sharing and shared print.

> Establish realistic expectations and then meet or exceed so as to build constituents trust.

Participants worked in small groups to brainstorm actions we can take in support of the 5 strategies. The tables generated ideas for further consideration/development by the Communication Working Group after the summit. Tables reported back their ideas for full group consideration and discussion. Highlights from the tables:

1. Compelling Narratives: Emphasize the "white space"
   a. Shared print as a way to maintain gaps in digitized collections
   b. Shared print protects unique holdings in case of institutional closure.
   c. Enabler of deliberate collection strategies
   d. Shared print allows us to repurpose space for connecting the community
2. Tell stories with images and video, not just words
   a. Hire a video company
   b. Determine and identify video placement (i.e., where to place the videos on the web) mapped to audiences
   c. Beyond storage spaces, show space reallocation, and how collections are being used, the activity supporting the collections (e.g., folks running around a high-density facility pulling volumes)
   d. Include interviews with researchers benefitting from shared print
   e. What is the "logo" for shared print. Do we (could we) have a single image that would resonate as Shared Print?
3. Identify data needed to support compelling stories, and gather this data
   a. Looking at collecting data around space savings, reallocation of space through shared print (linear feet? square footage?)
   b. Resource sharing data
   c. Collect data from existing shared print programs
   d. Get a consultant to survey selected shard print programs, collect/aggregate much of the data that is at the individual member libraries
   e. Need more high-level data on what is getting saved
   f. Data on increased/enhanced discovery
4. Generate attention (repeatedly)
   a. Challenge: Putting a positive spin on weeding, and on sharing.
   b. Challenge: Staff lack of familiarity with shared print
   c. Challenge: How (or should) we distinguish shared print from collective collections and resource sharing generally?
   d. A "day without" day. Turn stuff off for a day and show how life would be.
   e. Hold open houses at our offsite facilities
   f. "Day in the life of shared print" or "Shared Print Week"
   g. How could we (or should we?) highlight the "shared print" component of "resource sharing"?
   h. Stories in the media are often negative ones about our actions and faculty and others complaining.

<ol type="i" start="9">
Do we have "celebrity" academics who could be poster-worthy in support of Shared Print?

<ol start="5">
Focus on expanding and guaranteeing access
<ol type="a">
Resource sharing: access IS resource sharing. Talk about resource sharing when we talk about shared print.
Use ILL data. Where are the books going, especially to places that would otherwise not have access. Or where are things underserved and shared print can help
Raising awareness through sharing retention commitments in discovery systems
Publicize trust libraries have in each other
Should our goal be to get things to people quickly (like Amazon?).
Can we learn to trust common carrier and our patrons (and other folks' patrons) more?
Need to be sure we are careful about not conflating "expanding" with "guaranteeing" access.

Further discussion led by Galadriel. Question: What is the message, brief statement we'd like to see in the media? What is the hook?

- Declines in enrollment (midwest/NE?) are putting collections at risk. Shared print as a mitigation strategy.
- Perhaps we should be more concerned about our faculty and their worries about local weeding as an issue. How to counteract that?
  - How much does this happen because we don't engage with faculty BEFORE we do stuff like weed?
  - If we involve them in the process, folks will understand, involve them (as a communication strategy)
- Stress how planful we are. We are methodical and thoughtful and supporting our actions with data and analysis. We are "Libraries using Big Data to make responsible decisions to preserve the scholarly record".
- Need to see this movement as a stage in the evolution of libraries in support of scholarship now and in the future.
- Can we leverage the success of resource sharing at places like Harvard and Yale? Even the biggest libraries leverage this.
- Stress that ALL research leans on the collective collection. The library story is functionally ALWAYS a collective story. Good scholarship uses the collective collection.
- Shared print as better risk management strategy. Working together to manage down the risk. Share collections distribute and protect.
- Shared print as mitigation of risk from climate change?

Action: Communication Working Group will organize and evaluate these ideas with the communication matrix in mind. Consider who could/should do what.