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Major milestones 2015 - 2016

- Collection Analysis: over 16 million collective collection
- Retention Commitments: more than 6 million holdings
- Validation Sampling: 97% availability
- Policy Development: MOU and major policies
- Disclosure of retention commitments
- Collaborative work with others engaged in shared print
EAST business model

- **Members contribute @ 30%**
- **One time collection analysis**
- **Annual member fees**
- **Grant funding**

- **Implementation**
- **Collection analysis – 70% grant funded**
- **Validation sampling – 100% grant funded**
- **Set-aside for future collection analyses**

- **Staffing**
- **Administration**
- **Future grant funding requests**
- **Set aside for future collection analyses**
Work still to be done in 2016

- Complete disclosure
- EAST lending network
- Serials/journals planning
- Further cohort 2 outreach
- Collaborate, converse, convene
We aim to preserve access to printed scholarly texts, while freeing library space for new uses.
Helping Libraries Manage and Share Print Monographs
Introducing GreenGlass

GreenGlass is a web-based application built by OCLC Sustainable Collection Services (SCS)

Key Metrics

SCS has been delivering a set of Key Metrics to every client library since the launch of GreenGlass in 2012. For each measure, we offer a green hyperlink to the corresponding list of items, and a calculated percentage of your overall collection. The accumulation of these measures provides an interesting opportunity for you to compare your own key measures with most of the other libraries with which we have worked. These numbers are based on nearly 200 US academic libraries, and 70 million holdings. They include research libraries, state universities, 4-year colleges, and a handful of community colleges.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>METRIC</th>
<th>FILTERED ITEMS</th>
<th>% OF YOUR FILTERED ITEMS</th>
<th>COMPARED TO THE RANGES AND AVERAGE FOR ALL SCS CLIENTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Zero recorded uses</td>
<td>571,363</td>
<td>68%*</td>
<td>42%*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greater than 3 recorded uses</td>
<td>243,328</td>
<td>21%*</td>
<td>25%*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Publications more than 10 years old</td>
<td>984,556</td>
<td>84%*</td>
<td>88%*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
GreenGlass gathers **metadata** and enables librarians to model scenarios and create lists using a wide variety of criteria.
Coordinated Decision Support

GreenGlass provides intelligent decision support for coordinated retention and/or informed deselection.
Meticulous Data Management

Library’s bib, item and transaction data for PRINT MONOGRAPHS
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Adding Context: EAST Comparator Groups

- Regional Large Academic Libraries – 94 OCLC symbols
- Regional College Libraries – 15 OCLC symbols
- Maine Shared Collections – 8 Shared Print symbols
- Connect New York – 5 libraries’ retained holdings from previous project
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
All Included Libraries
Retained Percentage: 20%
Retained Holdings: 3,251,922

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

Average: 19%
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.

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.
Final 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
4/11 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)

**Publication year**
- BEFORE 2011

**Estimated Retention Results**

![Retention Graph]

- Percent of Collection Retained
- Collection Size (Titles)
Actual Retention Allocations:

• 5 Colleges Depository: 92%
• UMass - Amherst: 90%
• Yeshiva University: 59%

• Other Retention Partners: 28-30%
# GreenGlass: 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>20,433</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 (?)</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
language code(s)
example: "eng, spa, fre" (?)

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

Allocated for Retention

- UNMATCHED 71.24% | 299,072
- MATCHED 28.75% | 119,721

Subject

<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 General Works</td>
<td>37.03%</td>
<td>528</td>
<td>1,426</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B Philosophy, Psychology, Religion</td>
<td>29.45%</td>
<td>12,294</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
The EAST Validation Sample Study

Susan Stearns
EAST Project Director
sstearns@blc.org
Validation Sample Study #1

• **Goal**: Sample a statistically significant number of items across the 40 EAST Retention partners to validate presence of items and, hence, provide assurance to EAST stakeholders that the shared print materials will be available for sharing.

• **Validation Working Group**

• **Sample size**
  • 1% accuracy rate with assumption that missing rate would be 10% or less = 6,000 titles per library – 240,000 total
  • Random sample drawn from extracts provided to SCS
The Data Collection Tool

https://github.com/samato88/EastValidationTool
Checking the Shelves

97% availability  
90% average or better condition
Next Steps

- Further data analysis:
  Items publisher pre-1900 are in poorer condition:

  ![Chart showing percentage distribution of condition]

  Widely circulated items are slightly more likely to be unaccounted for:

  ![Chart showing account status distribution]
Some final thoughts

Matthew Sheehy
Interim University Librarian
Brandeis University
Data

• Will this support collective collecting?
  • Necessity
  • Obstacles

• An opportunity. What relationships already exist we do not know about.
  • Is there already something we don’t know about?
Changes in resources

• Changes to collection development and resources
  • New skills in our resource management groups

• Focus on unique and special collections
  • Who buys the content that will enter the cannon in the future?
  • Is there such a thing as altruism?
  • Business opportunity?

• Will we be able to count on our vendors as partners?
  • Libraries want partners
  • Vendors need to see margins
Effects on scholarship

- Access over ownership
  - Rankings
- How this effects various disciplines
  - Liberal Arts
  - STEM
- Who this effects
  - Current faculty
  - Current students
  - Those not even in college yet
Is this just a preservation effort?

Thank You
Matthew Sheehy
sheehy@brandeis.edu
Thank you.
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