Northeast Regional
Shared Print Planning Meeting

Tuesday July 9, 2013
## Agenda

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Activity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9:30 am</td>
<td>Welcome and overview of the project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:45</td>
<td>Context: Overview of shared print programs and report on survey responses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:15</td>
<td>Break</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:30</td>
<td>Table Discussion: Operating principles (content, location, availability, others)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12:00</td>
<td>Lunch (provided)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:00 pm</td>
<td>Table Discussion: Organization structure and business models</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2:30</td>
<td>Break</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2:45</td>
<td>Discussion: Other questions, issues, identify models for further study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3:15</td>
<td>Breakout Discussions: Models and working group tasks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4:15</td>
<td>Next steps (Neal Abraham and Chris Loring)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4:30</td>
<td>Adjourn</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Overview of the Project

An 18-month planning activity to identify detailed strategies and business models for developing and managing regional print collections of monographs (and, along the way, other library print materials) and to document willingness of libraries to participate in one or more of the models, funded by an Officer’s Grant from The Andrew W. Mellon Foundation with matching contributions (for travel and staffing).

Website:
https://www.fivecolleges.edu/libraries/regionalproject
# Project Team

## Project Directors

<table>
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<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Email</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Neal Abraham</td>
<td><a href="mailto:nabraham@fivecolleges.edu">nabraham@fivecolleges.edu</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Executive Director</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Five Colleges, Inc</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chris Loring</td>
<td><a href="mailto:cloring@smith.edu">cloring@smith.edu</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Director of Libraries</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smith College</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Project Coordinator

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Email</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kathryn Leigh</td>
<td><a href="mailto:kathrynr@library.umass.edu">kathrynr@library.umass.edu</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning Consultant</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
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<td><a href="mailto:lizannepayne03@gmail.com">lizannepayne03@gmail.com</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Steering Committee

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Email</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bryn Geffert, Amherst College</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clement Guthro, Colby College</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W. Lee Hisle, Connecticut College</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bart Harloe, ConnectNY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
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</tr>
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</tr>
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## Project Timeline

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time Period</th>
<th>Activities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Spring 2013</td>
<td>Invite participation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring/summer 2013</td>
<td>Survey of needs and interests</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kick-off planning meeting July 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall/winter 2013</td>
<td>Complete inventory of campus interests (followup to survey)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Convene working groups to generate recommendations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring 2014</td>
<td>Convene Summarizing Panel to develop specific proposal(s)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summer 2014</td>
<td>Final group meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2014</td>
<td>Final report and plan</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Shared Print Programs in North America:

Going Main Stream

and

Picking Up Steam

Lizanne Payne
Shared Print Consultant

lizannepayne03@gmail.com
What is a Shared Print Program?

• Not just resource-sharing

• Not just a shared library storage facility

• Key factor is retention agreement

• Commitment to partners to retain certain holdings for a specified time period
Selected Major Programs

Western Regional Storage Trust (WEST)
- 109 libraries

Michigan SPI
- 7 libraries

CIC
- 10 libraries

ReCAP
- 3 libraries

ASERL/WRLC
- 49 libraries

Maine SCC
- 9 libraries
Moving from Journals to Monographs (2013)

**Discussion/Planning**
- ReCAP
- GWLA
- California State University system
- Hathi Trust

**Implementation**
- Maine Shared Colls
- Florida Flare
- CIC Shared Print Repository
- COPPUL
- OhioLINK
- WRLC

**Operational**
- Michigan Shared Print Initiative
- ASERL Coop Journals
- CRL JSTOR
- LLMC Law
- Orbis Cascade DPR
- UC Shared Print
- WEST

*partial list*
Monographs are the New Frontier

- Different selection issues:
  - Consolidate the common or preserve the rare?
  - Collection analysis rather than a priori selection

- Different delivery issues:
  - Searchers more likely to want full print version

- Different space recovery issues:
  - How to make monograph deselection cost-effective
# Shared Monograph Projects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Maine Shared Collections Cooperative (SCC)</td>
<td>• Held in 1 or 2 MSCC libraries, pub prior to 2003, other considerations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Collection analysis by SCS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Over 1 million titles in 9 libraries identified for retention</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michigan Shared Print Initiative (SPI)</td>
<td>• Unique titles and held by more than 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Collection analysis by SCS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• About 750,000 titles in 7 libraries identified for retention</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Some deselection under way</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ReCAP Shared Collection</td>
<td>• Monographs already held at ReCAP storage facility, some exclusions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Overlap analysis by OCLC Research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• As many as 5 million titles could be included</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
We Are at the Beginning of the Wave

What’s next?

• Large-scale shared monograph collections take off

• Libraries add critical mass of shared print records to WorldCat

• Libraries gain experience with access and delivery

• Libraries reclaim collection space AND preserve print
Northeast Regional Shared Print Program

Survey Results

A web survey of library interest in shared print collection management solutions, particularly for print monographs

138 institutions invited to participate

85 institutions responded to survey (87 responses)
Responses by Type of Institution

n=85

- College Libs: 36 libs (43.4%)
- University Libs: 28 libs (34%)
- ARL: 8 libs (10.6%)
- Consortia/Other: 2 responses (2.4%)
- Community Coll Libs: 7 libs (8.4%)
**Responses by Collection Size**

- > 5 million vols: 3
- 3 million to 5 million vols: 3
- 1 million to 3 million vols: 14
- 500,000 to 1 million vols: 18
- 100,000 to 500,000 vols: 27
- < 100,000 vols: 20

n=85
Shared Print Participation & Interest

About 34% of respondents said they are participating in (or at least discussing) a shared print program in the list below:

- Five Colleges Library Depository
- Maine Shared Collections Strategy
- Boston Library Consortium (BLC) Science Indexes
- ConnectNY Shared Print Trust
- Dartmouth-Brown legacy journal project
- CTW consortium last copy policy
- PALCI journal retention project
Plans to Reduce Print Monograph Holdings?

Selected survey comments:

- Reduce by 20% over the next 5 to 7 years
- Reduce by 25% by July 2014
- Reduce 25% by 2017
- Reduce by 1/3 in 2-5 years
- Reduce 10% in next 3 years
- 32% reduction in stacks footprint this year
- 60,000 volumes this year
Interest in a Northeast Regional Shared Print Program

n=87

- Very interested: 60%
- Somewhat interested: 39%
- Not interested: 1%

Very interested  Somewhat interested  Not interested
Primary Goals for Northeast Regional Shared Print Program

- Reduce duplication of widely-held monographs
- Preserve rarely-held monographs
- Provide storage space for privately-held library collections
Biggest Factors in Participation

Per cent

Contents of shared collection
- Ranked first: 44.4
- Ranked second: 38.9

Types and speed of access/delivery
- Ranked first: 33.3
- Ranked second: 38.9

Participation by certain libraries or by consortium
- Ranked first: 18.1
- Ranked second: 16.7

Geographic proximity to my library
- Ranked first: 4.2
- Ranked second: 5.6
Questions, Comments?

Break

Upcoming Discussions

- Operating principles: Content, selection, location, others
- Administration: Organization structure and business model
## Decisions: Operating Principles

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Questions/Options</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Content & Selection**         | - What kinds of materials are retained?  
- How are items chosen?           |
| **Collection Locations**        | - Centralized or Distributed?  
- Storage facilities, libraries, or both? |
| **Availability**                | - Dark archive or accessible collection?  
- Access/Delivery methods        |
| **Ownership & Retention**       | - Original owner, new holder, consortium?  
- Perpetual, 25 years, 10 years, unspecified? |
| **Validation**                  | - Review for completeness, condition  
- Volume, issue, page, none       |
Survey responses: Preferred Content

Percent Interested

- Monographs: 37 (Rarely held)
- Journals: 94
- Govt docs: 32
- Private Storage: 29

These results indicate the percentage of respondents interested in different types of content, with journals being the most popular choice.
Monographs: Consolidate the common vs preserve the rare?

“Approach Most Likely to Attract Financial Support”

Central vs Distributed

- Distributed rarely-held
- Distributed widely-held
- Centralized rarely-held
- Centralized widely-held

Widely-held vs Rarely-held

- Rarely-held, distributed
- Widely-held, distributed
- Rarely-held, centralized
- Widely-held, centralized
Selection: Which Specific Holdings to Retain?

- Shared journal programs usually identify titles a priori by publisher (e.g. JSTOR)

- For monographs, identifying “widely-held” or “rarely-held” requires comparing library collections
  - How important is edition?
  - How important is digital version (e.g. Hathi Trust)?
  - How many copies are enough?

- De facto options:
  - Last copy
  - Holdings already in storage facilities
Straw Vote

- Widely-held monographs?
- Rarely-held monographs?
- Last copy monographs?
- Monographs already in storage facilities?
- Journals or serials?
Availability: Who has access?

Dark or light archives?
- Almost all current programs are “light”
- Dark archive journal programs: PALCI, Minnesota (JSTOR), UC and Harvard (JSTOR)

Do members have special access privileges, or not?
- Almost all provide access within and outside the membership via ILL, with no special privileges
Ownership and Retention Period

• Original owner, new holder, consortium?
  ▫ In most programs, ownership stays with original owner (simpler)

• Perpetual, 25 years, 10 years, other?
  ▫ Borrowers often want longer, Holders often want shorter
  ▫ Most commit to a specified time period
Validation (Condition Review)

- Critical for preservation and libraries’ dependence on these volumes? Or, too difficult and expensive?
- Choose the best copy? Or, record problems for possible replacement?
- If reviewed, at what level? Volume, issue (for journals), page?
**Table Discussions: Operating Principles**

Each table try to identify recommendations. We are trying to eliminate ideas with little/no support. There will be future study and consideration of all these details.

- **Content:** Widely-held monographs, rarely-held monographs, journals, last copy monographs, existing stored volumes, other

- **Location:** Centralized or decentralized

- **Availability:** Dark archive or available

- **Ownership:** Original owner or transfer ownership

- **Retention:** Indefinite or stated time period (how long?)

- **Validation:** What level or none

*This is a planning exercise, not a commitment*

*Alternative reports allowed*
LUNCH
Decisions: Administration

Organization Structure
• Existing or new consortium?
• Federation?
• Informal agreement, formal MOU?

Business Model
• What costs are involved?
• Who supports costs?
• Sustainability?
Organization Structure

How to organize and manage:

• Membership
• MOU and service standards
• Project management
• Interinstitutional communication
• Participation fees if any
Existing Northeast Regional Programs

- Connect NY
- Shared Print Trust
- Five Colls NERD
- CTW Last Copy
- PALCI journals
- Brown-Dartmouth journals
- BLC Science Indexes
- Monographs
- Journals
Options for Organization Structure

Federation of existing programs?

Consortium manages all?*

* Or, possibly, all those not already affiliated
A Word to the Wise

“Data scales more easily than communications and decision-making.”

Rick Lugg
Sustainable Collections Services, Inc.
Shared Print Monographs Preconference
June 27, 2013
Straw Vote

- Federation?
- Existing consortium?
- New organization?
- Cover only unaffiliated libraries?
**Business Model: What are the costs and who supports them?**

| Overhead               | • Project Mgt  
|                       | • Administration |
| Fixed Costs           | • Space  
|                       | • Collection Analysis |
| Activity Costs (Holders) | • Accessions  
|                       | • Validation  
|                       | • Lending  |
| Activity Costs (Borrowers) | • Transport  
|                       | • Deaccessioning  |

**Member fees?**

**Transaction fees?**

**Absorbed?**

* Grant funding may cover some costs, for a specified period
How to Promote Sustainability?

- Encourage Holders to participate long-term
- Encourage members to support Holders
- Fund the activities deemed critical (Collection analysis? Validation?)
- Discourage free riders – or find ways to accept them
Common Business Models

Potluck
Members cover own costs (self-funded)

Rent
Party
Members contribute to Holders’ costs

No money changes hands
**Approach Most Likely to Attract Financial Support**

Central vs Distributed
- Distributed rarely-held
- Distributed widely-held
- Centralized rarely-held
- Centralized widely-held

Widely-held vs Rarely-held
- Rarely-held, distributed
- Widely-held, distributed
- Rarely-held, centralized
- Widely-held, centralized
Table Discussions: Administration

Each table try to identify recommendations.

Organization structure:
• Federation of existing programs?
• Existing consortium take lead?
• New organization?
• Do we need a new name for this effort? Distinguish from New England Regional Depository (NERD)

Business model
• Self-funded or member fees?
• Activities worth paying for?

This is a planning exercise, not a commitment
Alternative reports allowed
Other Planning Considerations

Are there other issues not yet raised?

Concerns to be explored further?

Points to remember for later stages of planning?


**Breakout Discussions: Models and Working Groups**

Models for discussion

1. Widely-held monographs
2. Rarely-held or last-copy monographs
3. Journals or serials
4. De facto storage facility collections
5. Private storage space for individual library collections
Thank you

and
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