

>> Hello, everyone, and welcome to our session on models for shared print monograph retention. We have a lot to do today. We plan to deliver many nuggets of information this afternoon, so use the twitter hashtag that you see on the screen here and pass along these observations.

My name is Rick Lugg. I am the consecutive director of sustainable collection services. I'm lucky to be joined today by two pioneers in the shared print monograph space, Pamela Grudzien, who is part of the Michigan shared print initiative, fondly known as MI\_SPI. She's on the chair committee and works at central Michigan University. It was one of the first projects that took place in the U.S., and also with Susan Stearns who is the project director for EAST, the Eastern Academic Scholars' Trust, which just recently completed its retention modeling and allocations and is the largest such project to have occurred here since we began work in this area.

What we're going to do here is have a quick overview of the shared print space by me, and then we're going to dive a little more deeply into both the Michigan and the EAST projects and then wrap up with progress to date nationally.

So before we get started, we're curious about the relative level of experience of people with and familiarity with shared print so if you wouldn't mind taking a minute to answer these two very simple questions here, it will give us a sense of sort of how to pitch our remarks and to see how familiar folks are with this space. And we're seeing lots of voting happening right out of the gate here.

So it looks like familiarity is higher than planned participation, at least so far. Kind of mixed on both of these. So we'll definitely explain what we're talking about when we mean shared print monographs initiatives, and we'll be interested to hear perhaps in some of the Q & A whether people have plans for specific projects. So thank you very much for that. Much appreciated.

So I'm going to start with just a really straightforward observation that libraries are thinking very differently about the way that they manage their print monograph collections and print collections in general, and in part that I think is well summarized by my colleague Lorcam Dempsey who talks about the facilitated collection where increasingly users are not relying on what we have on the shelves in our particular location but a much broader array of resources that are accessible to them, and his idea of the collection spectrum, when we're looking at one end between the owned collections, the physical collection based on print logic to the other end of the spectrum, the fully facilitated collection where we're seeing an array of resources that we put \_\_ disposable by users. The shared print collection has a prominent role in that. It kind of extends the range of resources that are available in print, but don't necessarily have to be on the shelves of the institution.

Shared print also has another very interesting dimension. It helps to share costs of managing and maintaining these collections over time, and I think a lot of the libraries that have worked in this way have found that sharing responsibility for print collections over a state or region is a very effective way to do this. One of the core principles of the monographs projects we've seen to date is a very

important principle. The first thing is that nothing should disappear from the scholarly and cultural record. We need to create a safety net, and in working together, collaborating on this is the best way to do that. So in establishing that safety net, we're working with group-wide agreements on what to retain, how long to retain it, and just generally securing that collection \_\_ collective collection for a particular region.

And we only really begin to think about withdrawal or drawing down of surplus copies after that has been established. And this seems like a very, very important principle for these projects, and that's what we'll mainly be talk about today. We've worked intimately with about nine shared print projects to date. There are a couple of others that are still in progress, and a couple of new ones that are emerging even as we speak today, but a cool bit of collective experience in this regard, most of these are state level or regional level kinds of projects. Sometimes consortia that crosses many states like the EAST Project or the COPL shared print archive that operates in western Canada. We'll look more at a couple of those in a minute.

What we're talking about here is libraries coming together to think about conscious and deliberate retention of certain \_\_ of monographs across a particular area or region. Typically that involves a specified time period, usually 10 to 15 years, with review at that point. There are all kinds of issues that are specified in the formal memorandum of understanding that underpins these libraries agree and pledge to one another to work with that.

We've seen it work in both ways where it's shared print in place, where the actual retained items are kept on the library shelves around campus, or sometimes a group like WRLC shares a central collection facility and the shared collection is housed there. Obviously we're building work done by the journal projects, such as west and research libraries and, you know, we have some of those same characteristics but they do obviously different \_\_ they're monographs focused. And the key questions always are how many copies to retain and on what basis and where. So that's what we'll be digging in to today.

Sometimes it's important when we're talking about this to think differently about our language when we're talking about the same title that's held in a group. How do we distinguish between the title level and the individual holding level. I think for today what we'll do is simplify this to the title slot means the title and the title holding means copies. Definitely a little more to it than that, but I think that will keep us clear for today.

The common data points that are useful in building retention models are some of these, holdings overlap, both of them in group and externally. Age of titles, usage, both in the aggregate and in specific periods of time, how long the item's been in the collection, and also whether it's been securely digitized by HathiTrust and whether that is in copyright or public domain so all of these can be useful in understanding what to focus on retaining.

We do see some common patterns here that there's a real strong urge to make sure that we protect at least one copy of every title that is currently owned. That's a characteristic of these retention models. There is typically an agreement within the group about definition of what constitutes a scarcely held title, and a responding urge to protect those to make sure that those are formally retained. And then to identify outliers, things that may not be under formal retention agreements and things that once the safety net has been established to agree that there are surplus copies over and above those designated retention can be designated as safe.

So of quick examples here. The central Iowa \_\_\_ they allowed libraries to weed surplus copies over and above that if they met certain conditions, published before 1991 and no usage since 2005 so at least 12 years without usage.

And then that constituted about 50% of their collection.

Another example, a much larger group, academic libraries of Indiana were basically focused on what constitutes scarcely held and making sure that they kept copies of those and all copies of those that were in place, so they defined that as you see here, fewer than four libraries within Indiana or fewer than 20 within the U.S., or not held by one of the three big research libraries in Indiana. And that amounted to about a third of their shared collection that they formally retained.

The virtually library of Virginia took a slightly different approach. They, too, in their first pass identified scarcely held items. They defined that a little more tightly, unique within the state of Virginia and held by fewer than ten libraries in the U.S. That came to just one percent of their shared collection across the eight libraries. And then we also had a dimension to the model that had them retaining titles that were widely held, as defined as you can see here. So they kept one of everything that was currently owned within the eight libraries, but more than one if they had recorded uses within the group. So that identified about 36% of their shared collection.

And those of you who looked at the pre\_readings that we set out, there was a video showing the interaction of this model builder that's part of the GreenGlass software, and I'm just showing this as here's a model that's still in evolution for SCELCL, a consortium in California. This is the third or fourth iteration of their model, and they're continuing to work on that at this point. Anyone who's interested, June 5th, they'll be doing a webinar on that themselves, so we can get you more details about that.

So what I'm going to do at this point is I'm going to turn it over to Pamela who is going to speak more specifically and a little more depth about the Michigan Project. Then Susan will talk about the EAST Project, and I'll come back and sum up. Pamela? Are you unmuted, Pamela?

>> Pamela encountered a brief technical issue and so she had to come back into the room. So Pamela, you can go ahead now. Pamela, you'll need to turn your microphone back on.

>> Pamela Grudzien: I think I'm here. Can you hear me? Hello.

>> Rick Lugg: Yes. You're good, Pamela.

>> Pamela Grudzien: Oh, thank you. Of course that would happen, wouldn't it?

Okay. Good. Rick.

>> Rick Lugg: All yours.

>> Pamela Grudzien: Okay. Thank you. Thanks, everybody. And sorry about the little glitch. Good afternoon. As Rick introduced me earlier, I'm Pamela Grudzien. I'm director of acquisitions, metadata and resource hearing service as central Michigan University and I'm the chair of the MI\_SPI sharing committee. I'm going to be talking to you this afternoon about MI\_SPI and the retention model used by our group.

Next slide, please. This is a roster of the 11 institutions whose libraries are involved in MI\_SPI. There are 15 state\_supported schools in Michigan and 11 of them are MI\_SPI partners. I've color\_coded these names to illustrate three versions of MI\_SPI membership. Blue and red show the original seven partners, and they were involved in our first round of retention assignments in 2011/12. Green shows the four partners that joined MI\_SPI for our second round in 2015/16. The two names that you see in red are institutions that opted out of the collection refresh in 2015/16, but whose retention assignments are maintained. Next slide, please.

This is simply paying tribute to two organizations that helped facilitate the MI\_SPI project. Without the assistance and the expertise of these two services, MI\_SPI wouldn't have happened. Next slide.

MI\_SPI has been through two rounds of collective collection analysis and retention assignments. The first shared print group to do so. The first round took place in 2011/12 with seven partner libraries involved. Some of these had renovation or remodeling projects that required downsizing their book collections to make space. A couple of these were very urgent. A few didn't have space concerns, which turned out to be very helpful later on. Next slide, please.

When the collective collection was being created, the partners discussed several combinations of criteria, looking for an option that would maximize withdrawal numbers. The first round of MI\_SPI was focused on what could be withdrawn from the large numbers of duplicated little\_used holdings. Next slide, please.

These were the criteria that the partners agreed to, and I'm recalling that there were several conversations and discussions about these criteria. We would retain two copies of titles published before or purchased before 2005, with three uses or less since 1999 that were held by three or more libraries in the group. We also agreed that our retention assignments would remain for 15 years, that is 2027. In other words, we looked at items added to our libraries ten or more years before, that had been sitting on the shelves for at least 20 years, with minimal use. They were widely held among the

seven, and with the two copies held among the group, we felt very comfortable with this set of criteria. Decisions about unique titles were left to the individual library. Next slide.

We hit a snag with the first set of retention assignments. When those numbers didn't meet the withdrawal goals for the two libraries with the urgent projects. So two other partners within the seven agreed to take on more retention assignments with the caveat that rebalancing would happen during the second round. Almost from the start, the group was talking and planning for a second round. Next slide.

This chart shows the final retention and withdrawal counts for that first round in 2012. After the rebalancing and the reassignment, Wayne State University, you'll see second to the bottom there, had the largest withdrawal amount, and they were one of the urgent projects that needed to meet a certain goal. And Central Michigan University had the largest retention amounts. Okay. Next.

We initiated the MI\_SPI round two, or the refresh, as it was called, about four years later. This time, the mix of partners was different, as you can see. We had five of the original seven. We added in four new partners, and two of the original partners opted out, which was, by the way, part of our MOU. We had written in this kind of a clause into the memorandum of agreement. Next slide.

In the intervening years since the first round, several of the original partners had done weeding projects. All of the four new partners had had SCS analyze their individual collections using the MI\_SPI collective collection as a comparator, and they had done weeding projects. And two of the original partners, as I mentioned, Eastern Michigan and Western Michigan, elected to maintain their current retention assignments without adding their bibliographic data to the mix. For the second round, we were much more concerned with retaining titles rather than identifying things that were going to be weeded. Next slide.

To maintain continuity in the collective collection between round one's analysis and the analysis of round two, and the retention assignments, and to incorporate eastern and Western Michigan into our new mix, we used the same criteria as the first round, but with a little twist. You'll see here on the slide that two copies were retained among the nine partners. If there were no retention assignments at Eastern Or Western. Only one copy was assigned among the nine if Eastern or Western had a retention copy. In this way, their shared print commitments were maintained as part of the rebalanced assignments. Next slide, please. Unique titles were defined more clearly in the second round. We acknowledged the research collections at the University of Michigan and Michigan State University, two of our comparator libraries. If a MI\_SPI title is not held by the U of M or MSU, the MI\_SPI title is marked for retention. That way, we are sort of enhancing the statewide collection by acknowledging what is available at the two largest research institutions in the state.

MI\_SPI partners is looking to the future. We met two weeks ago and we discussed our next step, and we have several. We know that we these to add in newer publications next time around. That 2005

cut\_off date is looking pretty historic by this time. We hope to collaborate with another shared monograph project in Indiana. We have set up a task force to investigate the retention disclosure statements in \_\_ using the 583 in our statewide catalog, which is called Mal cat and in WorldCat and another task force is investigating validation of retention holdings using the east process as our model. Susan will be telling you more about that next. And last slide, please.

Thanks, everybody, for listening, and now over to you, Susan.

>> Susan Stearns: Thank you. Can you hear me okay, Rick?

>> Rick Lugg: Yes, I can. Go right ahead.

>> Susan Stearns: Okay. Thanks. First slide, please. Good day, everyone. Thanks for joining us. As Rick indicated, I'm Susan Stearns, project director of Eastern Academic Scholars' Trust, or EAST Project. We are a shared print collaboration currently including 59 academic and research libraries. The slide that you're seeing here is actually an old one that shows the original 47 EAST members. We recently added 12 new what we're calling cohort 2 libraries, which actually extends our geography from Maine to Florida.

We begin work in July of 2015, completed our initial retention of just over six million holdings in mid 2016 for the original retention partners. The map that you're seeing here. And I'll be talking today about the retention modeling we did with this group. I won't focus on it here, but with the addition of the new cohort 2 libraries, we will be undertaking a new collection analysis beginning this summer. Next slide, please.

Here you see some statistics on the EAST collective collection as it was loaded into the SCS GreenGlass database. We began with just over 16.5 million holdings, representing almost 5 million title sets. We had, as you see here, quite a bit of uniqueness within the group, and as is typical, minimal usage. While there was reasonable overlap with trust because the majority of these members are, in fact, not full trust members, we did not include this as part of our retention model. Next slide, please.

Just a quick note on the process that we followed to develop our retention model. Early on, we established a working group to represent the member libraries and to meet regularly with the EAST project team and with our SCS project manager. Each of these libraries had early access to the GreenGlass application from SCS so that we could begin to understand the SCS collection. Shortly after, all of the eastern libraries were given access so they could see both the collections in the Green Bay GreenGlass database. We worked with groups over a three\_month period to develop candidate models for retention. Once the model was agreed to by the working group it would be loaded into GreenGlass so that all of the EAST members could review it and determine the impact on their local collection. For each of the sample retention models, we then did a formal survey of the membership, asking for comments and feedback on that candidate model. And then incorporated that feed into

subsequent models. We did three rounds of that and when a final model was agreed to by the members, it was then approved by the EAST executive committee, our governing body. Next slide, please.

Let me briefly describe the three major components of the EAST retention model. First, we agree to retain all holdings of models that were defined as scarcely held. That included those with fewer than five holdings within EAST. Fewer than 40 holdings, as reflected nationally in WorldCat. Fewer than five holdings in a comparator group we called the Large Regional Academic Libraries. This was primarily but not exclusively the ivy plus group, and then finally no copy already committed to retention by a ConnectNY partner. This consortium, a number of those libraries had already undertaken a shared print initiative and had titles committed to retention since they were also EAST members, we felt confident we could rely on their retention commitments. Next slide.

The second component of the model was to retain up to five copies of titles that had been frequently used, which we defined as aggregate uses of more than 30 across the east membership. Next slide, please.

And our third and final rule would ensure that we would retain one copy of every other title not already committed to retention by the first two criteria. However, we made two exceptions to each of these retention rules. First, publication year prior to 2011, the working group and the other EAST members were confident that newly published materials were not going to be weeded by the libraries, so 2011 was our cut\_off for retention. And then finally, we had criteria titles that we included in a group that we called ephemera. We eliminated them from our retention modeling. It was only about 1% of the holdings in the total EAST collective collection that fell in to that category. Next slide.

The result of this was that each library would allocate approximately 36% of its local collection to retention. An important operating policy for EAST, and one that has actually been integrated into our formal memorandum of understanding is that all EAST retention partners should participate equitably in the allocation of the retention commitments. Once the model that I just described to you had been approved, there were a few EAST libraries that were concerned that this 36% might be too high for their local needs. After discussions with them individually, all but one agreed to the equitable allocation process. However, we ended up with four libraries who volunteered to allocate at a higher rate. So the actual final rate of retention across the remaining EAST libraries was between 20 and 30%.

Next slide. Before I move on and finish up with a quick discussion of our validation sample study, as mentioned by Pamela, I just wanted to get a sense of the familiarity that each of you have with this concept of validation. I wasn't sure if the formal poll was going to be presented here as well. Great. Thank you. As you complete this, validation in the context of shared print, typically has kind of three definitions. The first is simply to determine the presence of an item in a physical collection, and confirming presence was, in fact, a primary focus of the EAST sample validation study. Our goal was to

ensure that the stakeholders at EAST institutions would have confidence in their ability to access the holdings of their partner EAST member libraries.

The second kind of validation actually compares the physical item with the catalog record describing it. We did not undertake this level of validation.

And finally, the third is determining the condition of the physical item. And we were able to do a cursory condition review as part of our validation sample study. There's certainly been other validation studies that have been significantly more in depth.

Because the east collective collection was so large, over 16 million holdings, and the libraries were so geographically disbursed, it was clear that we couldn't do full validation so we worked with a statistical consultant to develop a sampling methodology. This resulted in our sampling 6,000 items at each of the retention \_\_ 40 retention partner libraries, a total of 240,000 items sampled. The actual work was done in the stack using a tool that was developed by the EAST data librarian and each library was reimbursed for their work from funding that we had from the Andrew W. Millen foundation. Next slide, please.

Here you see some screen shots from the collection tool that was designed by Sarah Amato, our data librarian, in conjunction with an EAST working group. If you have further interest, all of the code and documentation for this is available on github, as shown here. This software tool was actually loaded on to either a laptop or a tablet, typically with an attached bar code reader, and workers, usually students, did the validation sampling in the stacks, and then uploaded the results. In this way, the project team was able to track the progress of the study and ensure that although the libraries were able to complete it on time.

And our final slide, please. The results of the validation sample study were that 97% of the items were accounted for. This number we felt really reinforced the confidence that scholars and faculty at EAST libraries could have in borrowing from their EAST lending partners. Of these, 90% were in average or excellent condition. And while 90% is not bad, we did have concerns over the remaining 10% and worked with our statistical consultant to review the full set of EAST retention commitments and statistically identify those titles at highest risk of being either missing in poor condition. The result of that was just under 78,000 titles. About .01% of the collective collection that we felt were at higher risk. These are titles with only one copy currently being retained within EAST, but other, unallocated surplus copies exist at other EAST libraries, so as a risk mitigation strategy we are recommending to the owning libraries that an additional copy of these titles be retained in order to help protect their availability.

With that I want to turn it back to Rick for our last few minutes. Here you go, Rick.

>> Rick Lugg: Thank you, Susan. Thank you, Pamela. So you've heard a bit about an overview of what's happening with shared print and in more depth about these two specific projects and what I want to do now is just kind of pull all of those strands together at a national level and see what the picture looks like. So what's been completed in terms of monograph projects that we're aware of are nine group projects representing 129 institutions that have made specific long\_term commitments to monograph titles. If we add all of that up, we have about 7.4 million titles, which we're defining as distinct editions here. 7.4 million titles that are under long\_term retention agreements and those are represented by 18.5 million titles, title holdings so that means there are multiple copies of some of these. And the bulk of that activity has taken place across 13 U.S. states and five Canadian provinces.

So if we look just quickly here, we can see this is a graph that represents the number of institutions retaining the title. So over on the left, you can see that we have just over four million that are retained formally by one institution, whereas on the other side of the graph, we have almost an equal number that are retained by ten or more institutions. So we're starting to see some depth as well as some breadth to this collective collection. Here's another way of looking at that that's maybe a little bit clearer. The orange part of this grab represents the unique titles that are being retained out there. The gray part represents the additional copies of those titles. And so over time, as we think about trying to stitch this all together in to some kind of national archive or print archive or shared collection, it will be important to have this kind of view to see both the breadth and the depth of the holdings that are committed out there.

This is by the specific groups that have actually made these retentions, starting from the smallest at the top to the largest at the bottom. And you can see, not surprisingly, again, in the orange that these smaller groups are retaining titles that are mostly also retained by the larger groups. Of real interest, I think, is the kind of gray color here which represents the titles that are just \_\_\_ where there is just one institution as part of the group that's actually committing to retaining it. So that's a place where we might want to see more depth, but I think we can be pretty pleased with the progress that's occurred to date.

So if we skip that on a map, it's a bit east coast centric at this point. We can see how those formal retentions kind of distribute by state. The main shared collections project was again one of the earliest ones. They have 1.4 million monographs under long\_term commitment there. You can see 774,000 in Michigan and so forth. If we look up toward Canada, we can see that there's pretty good distribution across the western provinces as a result of the Copral work and in Ontario because of the triUniversity group. There's another initiative going on right now in Nova Scotia that will add something to this map in the very near future. And I think the question we have looking forward is how do we fill in the rest of this map? How do we think about consciously and carefully creating this collective collection and this kind of retention safety net for print monographs out there. We have activity going on in California now and in Maryland, and lots of discussion about potentially some of the other states that \_\_\_ to be filled in here, and they may be things that we're not aware of. These are the

ones that we kind of surveyed. What we know about is out there. This is what we know about. So we'd be happy to have more information on this if possible. And I think one of the things, when we're thinking about managing shared print, we're talking about the kind of constantly changing groups and getting the data underpinning that, making decisions about what should be retained, allocating those retention commitments within the groups that we're working with, and then somehow disclosing or making those visible to everyone else so that, you know, we're not continuing to do more and more copies of the same titles, but we're gradually broadening the number of titles that we have under long\_term management. And one of the ways we hope to do that over time is through WorldCat and there will be some additional tools available in the near future to be able to help registration of those potential commitments in WorldCat so that we can get a kind of national North American and eventually a more globalized view of the shared print monograph collection. How deep, how broad it is, and how can we be smart about filling in the gaps and making sure that we have the scholarly record fully secured. So you can see in certain ways we're building it like a mosaic at this point, some of the pieces are large, some of the pieces are small, but good progress being made and I think we want to stop there and potentially have a few minutes for questions.

>> Santi Thompson: All right. Well, thank you so much. This is Santi Thompson, one working group members. We're now going to move into a question and answer session. And we have about five minutes left in the session to ask any questions you have. And so I'm just going to start from the \_\_\_ one of the questions we have posed while the presentation was occurring. So Harriet from UNL would like to know how do you register the retention commitments? Are your catalogers or bibliographic databases updated to reflect retention status or do you have to look it up in GreenGlass or any kind of other separate list?

>> Susan Stearns: I'm more than glad to answer that from the east perspective. We actually established what we called the 583 committee, and worked to develop to ensure that all of the retention commitments that can be pulled directly out of the GreenGlass database were uploaded, downloaded, whatever the appropriate word is, to the library's local catalog. So all of the EAST libraries have already disclosed and recorded those retention commitments in their local catalogs and in some cases in \_\_\_ such as New York and Maine, in more union catalogs as well. Once the OCLC registration tool is available, we expect to do the same for WorldCat. Since that tool is still under development, our data librarian actually developed a database of EAST retention commitments separate from GreenGlass in order to allow us to ensure that as changes were made to those retention commitments, we could record them in the EAST database.

>> Pamela Grudzien: Hi, everybody. Pamela here. From MI\_SPI, we have identified our retention commitments in our individual catalogs. We have been working with Triple I and their inreach software, which is the underpinning of our Michigan electronic library catalog to recognize the 583 in MelCat. It looks like that is now possible and that is one of the task forces that we set up a couple

weeks ago to investigate the most efficient way of disclosing that information in MelCat. We also are looking forward to that OCLC tool so that we can very efficiently disclose in WorldCat as well.

>> Santi Thompson: Wonderful. Harriet followed up with fabulous and thank you. So another question from Stacy Marion. She asks, have you found you're spending more on replacing damaged or lost books that are marked for retention?

>> Pamela Grudzien: This came up very early on in MI\_SPI, and I have to disclose that it was CMU that brought up the issue right away. We had put in our retention assignments in to our local catalog, and we were going through our lost and missing replacement annual process and very quickly discovered that there were retention items that were lost and missing. So brought it back to the group, and we established a sort of shoe string procedure in that the individual library would be responsible for replacing, and unless that cost was prohibitive for their particular acquisition's budget, that would remain the responsibility of the retaining library. If things are very expensive, we go to the group and see if there is another title out there that can be designated as the retention replacement.

>> Susan Stearns: We have a similar process in EAST of either attempting to replace the material or reallocating it to another library in EAST.

>> Santi Thompson: Okay. Great. We have one more question, but we're just about out of time so what I will say is if folks continue to have questions, they should remember to place those in to the discussion forum for this particular presentation. And any remaining questions we currently have that haven't been answered, we will be sure they are transferred over to the discussion forum and you can go there and see responses from the presenters. But for now, I would like to thank Rick, Pamela and Susan for presenting here today. So thank you all.