

Notes from the Shared Print Monograph Summit

This document provides a synthesis of notes taken during the Shared Print Monograph Summit held in Boston on April 5-6, 2018.

The Summit was organized by the Eastern Academic Scholars' Trust (EAST) and sponsored by the Andrew W. Mellon Foundation. It was attended by over 30 representatives from the current shared print monograph programs in North America as well as thought leaders in scholarly communications, print preservation and digitization. The full list of participants as well as additional information on the Summit, links to the readings the participants were provided, etc. can be found on the Shared Print Monograph Summit site [here](#).

Summary of Meeting

The meeting kicked off at 1pm on Thursday, April 5th and concluded at 1pm on Friday, April 6th. The following provides an outline of the major agenda items included in each day as well as links to presentation materials and materials developed during the Summit.

1:00, Thursday:

- Welcome, introductions, review of agenda, expected outcomes, pre-event survey results, etc.
- A precis of the welcome by Susan Stearns, a review of the assumptions by Patrick Carr, an introduction to possible outcomes from the pre-Summit survey by Tara Fulton, as well as the list of attendees and slides from the introduction can be found on the [Shared Print Monograph Summit](#) site under Summit Documents

2:15, Thursday, large group discussion:

- “What are we trying to accomplish through collaboration?”
- “What are the challenges in moving forward?”
- “Is there a compelling narrative why? What is the purpose and outcomes of this endeavor and collaborating on it?”

3:25, Thursday, small group discussion with reporting back for large group discussion:

- Assuming some agreement on doing something in this space, what are the key priorities for this initiative?
- 14 key priorities were identified during this session. They can be found on [Shared Print Monograph Summit](#) site under Summit Documents - [Summit Outcome Priorities](#). A few additional items were discussed but determined to be of lower priority at this point in time.

9:00, Friday:

- Discussion of, and voting on priorities from Thursday discussions. The priorities identified in the Thursday afternoon session were made available on flip charts for the participants to vote on. Each participant was asked to vote based on two criteria: BLUE dots indicate a priority that Needs to be done within the next 3 years - the WHAT, and RED dots indicate that some kind of federated Enterprise

is best suited to undertake the work - the HOW/WHO. For details on how the voting turned out, see the [flip chart photos](#) under Summit Documents on the [Summit site](#).

10:15, Friday:

- Next steps for action from prioritization
- The group reviewed the priorities that had the largest number of votes from the participants and agreed to focus on the following:
 - #8 - Shared open data on retention commitments
 - #6 - Research on risk and related issues
 - #3 - Establish community standards and compliance
 - #10 - Connect online availability/access to retention
 - #13 - Federated organizational structure
 - #14 - Develop narratives on the value of shared print for various audiences and stakeholders

10:30, Friday:

- Small group table discussions. What are the desired attributes and next steps for priority #13 - Federated organization structure-- What are the essential components to enable collaboration in our efforts to steward this corpus?

11:30, Friday:

- We ended the Summit by asking for volunteers to form Working Groups to further develop each of the top 6 priorities. See below under Agreement/Actions for details of who is serving on each Working Group.
- The Working Groups met briefly to agree to a convener and discuss next steps.
- As Susan will be providing an update at the ALA Print Archive Network (PAN) Forum on June 22nd, we further agreed that each of the working groups would be ready to provide feedback on their work no later than Friday, June 8th. Susan/Mei will schedule a Go to Meeting session on that date to review progress.
- Susan thanked the participants for their thoughtful engagement over the last two days. The work done by the group and their commitment to continue as part of the Working Groups is a clear indication that collaborative efforts can further the goals of shared print in service to scholarship, from both the research and teaching perspectives.

Themes/Issues Raised/Primary Questions Discussed

The following provides further detail on some of the major themes that were raised and discussed during the Summit.

Open Data

Critical that we keep our data open and broadly accessible at little or no cost.

Without open and standardized metadata about retention commitments, we will be limited in our ability to coordinate across programs, build better resource sharing, and more. From a data science perspective, it is unclear whether this is a set of linked open data services or a centralized data store. In any event, open is key, APIs a must, low/no-cost access important. Open disclosure of holdings with more granularity (and more real-time availability?) key to a future where the collective collection is available everywhere, manageable at scale, etc.

“The Enterprise”

Some questions about how the at-scale entity we were here to discuss should be considered/focused:

- Governance? Is this a formal organization that will need things like a board, employees, budget, working groups, incorporation, mission/vision statements, strategic priorities, etc.?
- Critical to engage the variety of college and university library leaders at a fundamental level as primary stakeholders who can help fund or secure support for the efforts.
- Communication should be a focus. Need a hub for gathering best practices?
- Advocacy. Could the enterprise coordinate advocacy with externals like OCLC?
- Other characteristics of the Enterprise:
 - Self-governing
 - Brings expertise together
 - Needs to be impartial
 - Dedicated staff with funding, someone being responsible as a primary job function (i.e., volunteers not good enough).
 - Represents all kinds of libraries
 - Develops and maintains relationships with ALA, CRL, HT, etc. –
 - Does the group need a more agnostic home such as an ALCTS or ALA Interest Group?
 - Develops standards/guidelines, seeks buy-in and consensus on them - Does NISO have a role in establishing standards?
 - What is the role of PAN? Can PAN become more of an action group? I.e., move beyond an information sharing interest group
 - Engage with OCLC, but kept open
 - Action-oriented, looks to concrete benefits for participants.
 - Are we doing this as a way to hold existing organizations/initiatives accountable, or building a new service organization?
 - Supported by a network of endorsements that will legitimize and promote adoption of standards (look at things like DPLA for how to get these organized?)
 - The enterprise would have a role in advocacy - Help strategize on how to advocate for and/or develop next gen resource sharing in

- print and digital form
- All data open and non-proprietary and compliant with other standards. Support analytics at no/low cost
- Has role in trust-building in support of retention, reciprocity, resource-sharing
- Sustainability. Need to use this enterprise to help guarantee permanence, so design our initiatives as intentionally sustainable when possible.
- Leveraging existing mechanisms and existing systems and workflows. Don't reinvent the wheel
- Do we need to sponsor a think tank?
- Does this group have a role in funding/encouraging our research agenda?
- Shepherd efforts to begin, expand, participate in retention
- Need to acknowledge that we are moving on this locally as parts get built out at network scale. As such, network efforts need to align with local abilities, needs, workflows. Every player in the endeavor gets something they want/need.
- Need a central inventory of the work that is being done. Perhaps the pre-reading document that provides an overview of the current projects enhanced with projects and local developments. That is, let's try and use the Enterprise to surface, promote, and help bring local innovation to all of us. Leverage solutions from one context to avoid reinventing to solve similar problems elsewhere.

Structuring the Narrative

There is a great need for coherent and compelling narratives to help explain and brand shared monograph retention for multiple audiences. Building and sharing these narratives will be key to securing continued access to resources, as well as ensuring that the user communities that need and use print monographs will come to accept the more complete and diverse distributed collection over the perceived need for local collections as primary. We also need to keep in mind that for certain user populations and certain communities of practice, there will be little interest in access to print per se. Narratives, including user stories/personas, should try to address what a given population thinks is important. Any narrative should be crafted in a way that helps stakeholders understand that this set of initiatives is meant to solve that audience's "problems" or improve/maintain what that population values in the print monograph collections of libraries. This could include these kinds of approaches/directions:

- The most complete collection is the shared one. Completeness/diversity (the best collection is the collective one?). We are moving to build one collection to be fairly shared among all.
- "Saving" and "salvage" are not the best narratives and risk misrepresenting the real purpose of shared print initiatives. Need to move past those practicalities to the WHY (i.e., what are the intentions, what are the services (now and in the future) that we are trying to

- enable/create?).
- We are reconfiguring library collections and their reciprocal relationships. Collaborative/collective collections as the next generation, a sensible evolution of collection development/management.
 - Managing down print responsibly requires a coordinated approach to ensure diversity and completeness are not compromised
 - Better resource sharing depends on more reliable holdings assertions, i.e., retention commitments.
 - Print as a reliable backup for digitized collections.
 - Link between collective, shared collections and excellent discovery, e-access, p-access. Best format, quickly available for the need of every kind of user need.
 - Elaborate on the roles each kind of library will have in the future of shared print. Roles for everyone from the smallest college library to the “flagships” and ARLs.
 - The most traction can come from telling a positive story of widest access to the most diverse and complete collection. And that this can only be achieved through collaboration. Comprehensive access to a comprehensive reading public comes only through our cooperative/collaborative effort(s). A story of access and discovery improved through collaboration and redesigned services to support access to this more complete collection. Security, completeness, access, cost-savings and diversity, including shared responsibility and geographic dispersion.
 - We’re balancing efficiency vs. risk vs. effectiveness. This is both operational and user experience driven.
 - How can this be understood in the context of varying disciplinary needs for print?
 - Scholarship support. Can libraries in this context be conceived as a “service industry for scholarship”?
 - We must act in coordinated manner now to give future scholars the same or better level of access to materials (in e and p) that we presently enjoy.
 - No need to make this a narrative of print vs. e. Stress evolution of the new models in the new world. That is, libraries were made for a pre-digital world where information was scarce. But now, things have changed, space is valued differently at our institutions, e-formats dominate for many use cases, resource sharing is transitioning to new models, etc.
 - Collaborative retention initiatives, largely focused thus far on retrospective collection management can enhance/inform prospective collection development

Research Agenda

There are a variety of research questions that need to be addressed in order to extend the shared print collection and help meet its goals. The following came up during Summit discussions:

- What things are currently uncommitted? What things are currently undigitized (e.g., in HathiTrust?)
- How are the shared collections being used?
- How many copies of different kinds (subject, age, language, genre, etc.) of materials are desirable?
- Are there systematic problems with condition and availability? If there are patterns, how can validation and focused digitization help remediate?

Learning from Others

We need to leverage local solutions from one initiative to another. How can we make local success portable to those who would improve or begin a shared print program? In advocating for shared print, can any Enterprise that is developed offer services to support expansion of shared print more widely. What lessons from the early days of the Rosemont Alliance on the serials/journals side would be appropriate?

Group Action AND Local Action

If we continue down the path of forming some kind of federation, we must be sure and focus it on things that cannot be well executed through local action alone. However, local initiatives will continue as the basis for the higher level work. There seemed to be a consensus that this is fundamentally a grassroots program, and The Enterprise is a needed entity that will enhance and fortify, but not supplant, local/regional programs.

Developing a Shared Mission/Vision Statement (for Monograph Retention)

From the table notes on Day 1, various formulations that could be used to help focus The Enterprise:

- Create a comprehensive scholarly collection that is discoverable and accessible and is cost-effective, sustainable, and secure, and includes retrospective and prospective material, in light of funding pressures and risk
- Plan and oversee a rational, efficient, and productive mechanism to enhance access to the scholarly print record.
- Ensure that we ****retain and offer access**** to the greatest possible breadth of print collections to serve the needs of scholarship while optimizing space locally, regionally, and nationally
- In light of the pressures on collection budgets and risks to the scholarly record, create the broadest national research collection that improves cost-effective collection management and security of the collection while improving discovery and access for each member organization both retrospectively and prospectively.

Agreement/Actions

Priority Initiatives and Working Groups

Friday morning, we voted on priorities we might undertake. What emerged from that were some clear favorites in terms of things we should try and work together on. See the [Shared Print Monograph Summit site](#) for the list of priorities and the flip chart voting done by the group to select the most important.

That conversation resulted in the following working groups being created. Each group will work to flesh out a description of the initiative area and propose future actions. That is, something along the lines of writing a charge for a group to move forward on the initiative. Each group identified a convener, and will be working up a brief report that should include some sense of what success looks like, a communication strategy, and also keep an eye out for allied disciplines that can help with the work. Each group will report back to the group about two weeks before ALA Annual in New Orleans. This will allow adequate time to incorporate updates into the EAST presentation at the PAN meeting. EAST will host a conference call for this group on or about June 8th that will include reports back from the working groups and provide input into the PAN presentation at ALA. Groups formed:

- Priority 3: Establish (and share) community standards and perhaps even certify compliance and define levels (cf. LEED). Could include levels of validation, storage conditions, digitization, rareness/scarcity, optimal number of copies for various kinds/types of books, services based on retained print, national print retention rightsizing, data quality (not only for bibs, focus on metadata for holdings, access, and retention commitments?)
 - Members: Sara Amato (EAST), Jeff Kosokoff (TRLN, Ivy Plus Libraries), Marlene van Ballegoie (UToronto, Downsview), Mei Mendez (EAST), Alison Wohlers (WEST, CDL), Dana Bostrom (Orbis Cascade)
- Priority 6: Research on what is at risk and why. This is combined with Priorities 7 - Research on and analysis of how the shared/retained collection is being used and 2 - Establish standards (and do research) around the optimal number of copies.
 - Members: Jake Nadal (LC), Ian Bogus (ReCAP), Kirsten Leonard (ALL-PALNI), Sara Amato (EAST). NOTE: For the past few years, Ian/Jake have been working with a multi-institutional team to study withdrawal/retention practices, risks to the ability for libraries to retain books, and science necessary to support this research. They are hoping that their work will not only help set strategies, but also provide libraries with quick non-invasive condition evaluation methods to assess their own collections.

- Priority 8: Shared open record of retention commitments with cost-effective ways to participate, ability to analyze. Transparency and openness of the collective data. This initiative is seen as a key enabler to success, and voting indicated it is also seen as something best done collectively.
 - Members: Lizanne Payne (HathiTrust), Susan Stearns (EAST), George Machovec (Colorado Alliance), Bernard Reilly (CRL), Andy Breeding and Rick Lugg (SCS), Linda Wobbe (SCELC)
- Priority 10: Connect online availability to retention. Find ways to use the shared commitments work to improve resource sharing. Be more explicit about the connection between retention and improving resource sharing systems/services.
 - Members: Doug Brigham (COPPUL), Anne Osterman (VIVA), Susan Stearns (EAST), Pamela Grudzien (MI-SPI)
- Priority 13: Develop some kind of federated organization structure to develop and communicate best practices, standards, priorities, documentation; federation not a single organization.
 - Members: Matthew Revitt (EAST, MSC), Pam Jones (Connect NY), Ian Bogus (ReCAP), Mark Jacobs (WRLC), Kirsten Leonard (ALI-PALNI), and Ivy Anderson (CDL)
- Priority 14: Develop the compelling narratives for ALL of our audiences.
 - Group: Galadriel Chilton (Ivy Plus Libraries), Patrick Carr (EAST), Caitlin Tillman (Downsview), Teri Koch (CI-CII)

As of late April, 2018, the Working Groups are beginning to meet in anticipation of reporting back initial plans in early June for presentation at the PAN Forum at ALA on June 22, 2018. And, to ensure that the momentum from the Summit continues, EAST expects to host a follow-up meeting in the Fall of 2018.

Appendix to Notes from the Shared Print Monograph Summit

As we undertake responding to the priorities agreed to by the participants in the Shared Print Monograph Summit, a number of key questions arose which may play a role as the Working Groups plan next steps. This Appendix aims to capture some of these questions as well as other thoughts which were raised during Summit discussions.

Key Questions/Other Thoughts

Do we need anything more than what we already have? There was some sentiment that things are fine as they are, local initiatives will continue to inform other initiatives. Is there really a role for some sort of coordinating, centralized, federated or other at-scale enterprise at all? I.e., Is a simple regional division the best solution? Otherwise, will our 15 year commitments just fizzle out without a mechanism for continuing coordination?

Many/most libraries have a complex web of relationships to different groups and consortia. What are the tensions these multiple affinities/loyalties/memberships bring about in the context of shared print and collaborative collections?

What will the role be of some of the big players who aren't partners yet in this? Such players include the national libraries, private research libraries (e.g., Newbery, Linda Hall, Folger).

What is the connection between many libraries' "e-first" collection approaches that are emerging and the need to save print? Resource sharing is often more seamless with print. Many books can't be scanned and shared and/or are better used/shared in print form.

We need to be smart about how we learn from and leverage and are informed by the more mature journal retention space. On the other hand, perhaps we will have things we learn in the monograph space that can be connected to journal retention. Connection between all of this and government documents also warrants some consideration.?

Does THIS group (i.e., the cast who attended the summit) need to convene on a more regular basis? That is, there was some feeling that this event should be built upon and repeated with some regularity.

How can we engage our communities of scholars as partners in operational design? Are there faculty at our institutions who can be SMEs and help as consultants on this like data management, workflow design, logistics, etc.?

Can we/should we be developing a Last Copy strategy and/or mechanism?

We've moved our print collections to the cloud (through these initiatives), how will we keep that sustainable? There are no mechanisms for infrastructure for libraries at scale to manage our cloud collection. Do we want to look at a commercial solution, or does that lead us down the same path as what happened to academic journal publishing? That is, we also need central technology infrastructure at scale. Might corporate interests such as Elsevier, Ex Libris, EBSCO, or ProQuest come in to produce needed products, and will they be at a cost that we can afford?

How formal/enforceable do the agreements underlying Shared Print need to be? Does this vary across the different things we are agreeing to? Metadata standardization is a "won't work if folks aren't compliant" thing, but what of validation, preservation, sharing, succession planning, withdrawal from agreements, etc. standards/guidelines? How can we maximize accountability and compliance without making participation unnecessarily onerous?

How do we measure the success of Shared Print? Need some clarity of the measures of success over various timeframes?

Our conversation moved along two parallel planes: 1) the organizational structure, requirements, and practical considerations to make such an enterprise work, but also 2) the principles, mission, vision, necessary to guide the practicalities. How are these all related? How can we build all of this out, and in what order?

Have we paid enough attention to succession planning? This relates both to programs and changes to institutional priorities.

Lowest level of organization is the working groups we just formed – a necessary start, but not sufficient. They are ad hoc yet purposeful; we need to balance independence with collective commitment. Will we continue to need an umbrella group to bring things together cohesively? To whom do the working groups make recommendations and bring ideas for vetting? Maybe this Summit group will form that next level in some way, perhaps as a form of alliance?

Chicken and egg question: Do we need to have clear purposes in order to form an umbrella body, or do we need such a body to start fostering group work?

This next phase organization will likely be transitional until a more clear and formal need evolves? This relates to the discussion of what the roles will be within the mature ecosystem, and which roles won't be well filled without The Enterprise.

If the alliance is too loose, there won't be enough accountability; also the alliance needs an advocacy voice to speak on behalf of the collective. We need a way to ensure coordinated, quality action.

The current corporate and agency players in this arena (e.g. CRL, CLIR, OCLC, LC,) do not appear to be well-positioned to address the need for a unifying body. Might we nonetheless look to them for certain components of the alliance work?

We might also consider professional bodies like ARL and ACRL in recognition of the fact that our consortia are decentralized groups of independent institutions.

This effort needs to be part of something bigger – is that serials shared print, open access, digitization efforts, etc? Does this initiative have a unique cluster of needs from a leadership organization, or might they be joined with some others? Are we ready yet to form anything formal?

How can we engage with the massive special collections that are generally not part of Monograph Shared Print due to the typical requirement to transport the physical item to another library?

As we consider the problem of measuring usage, what is the role of circulation, ILL and digitized object stats?

How does The Enterprise and its goals relate to or be able to leverage the 2.5% commitment of David Lewis outlined in his [“Funding Community Controlled Open Infrastructure for Scholarly Communications”](#)?

As we evolve the shared, retained collection, should we be looking to establish this area of thinking as a distinct sub-field within library science? Start a journal, etc.?