Virginia Tech's Participation in ASERL's Cooperative Print Journal Retention Project

Connie Stovall
Virginia Tech, cjstovall@ua.edu

Leslie O'Brien
Virginia Tech, lobrien@vt.edu

Edward Lener
Virginia Tech, lener@vt.edu

Follow this and additional works at: <https://docs.lib.purdue.edu/charleston>

An indexed, print copy of the Proceedings is also available for purchase at:

<http://www.thepress.purdue.edu/series/charleston>.

You may also be interested in the new series, Charleston Insights in Library, Archival, and Information Sciences. Find out more at: <http://www.thepress.purdue.edu/series/charleston-insights-library-archival-and-information-sciences>.

Connie Stovall, Leslie O'Brien, and Edward Lener, "Virginia Tech's Participation in ASERL's Cooperative Print Journal Retention Project" (2011). *Proceedings of the Charleston Library Conference*.
<http://dx.doi.org/10.5703/1288284314906>

Virginia Tech's Participation in ASERL's Cooperative Print Journal Retention Project

Connie Stovall, Assistant Director for Collection Management, Virginia Tech

Leslie O'Brien, Director of Technical Services and Collection Management, Virginia Tech

Edward Lener, Associate Director for Collection Management, Virginia Tech

Introduction

For decades, academic collection management librarians considered themselves the keepers of the cultural record. With the great Library of Alexandria as an aspirational model, collection builders worked to amass and preserve the worlds' knowledge in one physical space, making it available for its community of learners. Primarily, these library holdings consisted of print resources, and it mattered little that another similar institution, whether it was 50 or 500 miles away, held many of the same materials. In fact, that *hundreds* of academic libraries possessed identical physical print copies of, say, the *Journal of Pragmatics* was viewed as the norm. After more than decade of utilizing the internet to access digital versions of these same resources, and because of increasing and competing demands on funding, 21st century academic librarians find themselves rethinking their philosophy on print holdings, particularly on print journal holdings duplicated in digital archives. Increasingly, academic libraries are participating in the creation of regional, distributed print archives, both for preservation purposes and to increase valuable space for new initiatives. Beginning in 2010, Virginia Tech began to take part in the Association of Southeast Research Libraries' cooperative print journal retention pilot program.

Virginia Tech's University Libraries

Virginia Tech, more formally known as Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University, was established in 1872 with funds resulting from the federal Morrill Land Grant Act. Currently, the total student population stands at 31,006 (VPI & SU 5). Like many land-grant institutions, its academic strengths have historically centered on agriculture and engineering, but in making a commitment to educating the whole student, Virginia Tech has been cultivating strong humanities and social science programs as well. While disciplines in the sciences and technology still provide much of its strength and reputation, Virginia Tech now offers a comprehensive

curriculum through eight colleges and offers more than sixty-five bachelor degree programs in total. One of six Ph.D. level institutions in the state, the university provides masters' and doctoral programs in many areas, with some 17.7% of the on-campus student population of more than enrolled in graduate programs (VPI & SU 5).

The University Libraries support teaching and research at Virginia Tech through their collections and services. The main facility, Newman Library, houses materials covering most disciplines. Specialized on-campus branches exist for both veterinary medicine and art and architecture, along with a small library resource center that serves a satellite campus in Falls Church, Virginia. In total, the University Libraries' collections contain approximately 2.64 million volumes. The library maintains nearly 42,000 current journal subscriptions, over 75% of which are in electronic format.

Like many of our peers, Virginia Tech currently faces a space crisis in its main library. With shelf loads at an average of 80% (some call number areas are over 90% full) and with demands for more public services and student spaces, solutions for managing physical collections have become imperative, especially considering the need of vastly expanding the learning commons area. The opportunity to participate in the ASERL cooperative print archive initiative came along perhaps at the perfect time for University Libraries, given these space issues.

Summary of Conditions

Physical space: Newman Library contains over 125,000 linear feet of shelving space on five floors. Serials constitute no less than 350,000 volumes, accounting for roughly 44,000 linear feet. In order to accommodate new learning commons space, a

minimum of 10,000 linear feet of resources must be relocated. The relocation of these 10,000 feet does not address relieving tight shelf space where many parts of the collection are at 85-90% capacity. (See Figure 1.)

Figure 1: Virginia Tech Shelving Space

Building	Percent Full
Total Building	78.52%
A-Z stacks only	79.66%

About The Association of Southeastern Research Libraries

ASERL, the largest regional academic research consortium in the United States, found its beginnings some fifty years ago. With forty institutions on its roster, ASERL aims to amass and share creative, innovative, and expert resources. Such collaboration ultimately allows all member institutions to better serve their constituents. Currently, ASERL coordinates at least eight projects, with focus on issues like expediting interlibrary loan through its Kudzu Program, and digitizing Civil War resources. ASERL's Collection Development Initiative exists to consolidate efforts in negotiating subscription licenses for its members. More recently, as a high number of institutions face the need to repurpose space for new patron needs while at the same time they are subscribing less to print journals, members

recognized a need for a distributed print archive and have been planning since.

ASERL's Agreement for the Cooperative Journal Retention Program

In January 2010 ASERL deans and directors endorsed the Ithaka S+R report by Schonfeld and Houseright entitled "Print Collections Management in the Wake of Digitization," and within months talk began regarding the creation of a southeastern print journal archive. The overarching objective centered on sharing costs of maintaining a long-term, distributed print journal archive that would allow for both preservation and for institutions to consider withdrawing duplicates, if necessary. Member institutions collaborated to launch a pilot program to determine the archive's feasibility. By April 2011, members had created a proposal outlining objectives of the agreement, procedures, governance, and selection and retention guidelines. Under the cooperative print journal retention agreement, ASERL members can be assured that all agreed upon print journals will be archived in a participating library and that other institutions can then make their own retention decisions for those titles accordingly. To help provide assurance about a title's safety, risk guidelines were set forth wherein a storage facility type and level of risk associated with circulation had to be indicated with each title. (See figures 2 and 3).

Figure 2. Storage Facility Designation

Remote Storage Facility	Locked / Secured Stacks	Open Stacks
An environmentally controlled, secured facility that is not open for public browsing	On-site access that is not open for public browsing	Open for public browsing

Figure 3. Risk Associated with Circulation

	Remote Storage Facility	Locked / Secured Stacks	Open Stacks
Non-Circulating	Lowest Risk	Low Risk	Moderate Risk
Building Use Only	Low Risk	Low - Moderate Risk	Moderate - High Risk
Circulating	Moderate Risk	Moderate - High Risk	Highest Risk

To initiate and participate in the pilot program, participating libraries were asked to bring forward a short list of journal titles they would be willing to store for ASERL initiative. To nominate a title for retention, ASERL's agreement stated that titles should be those that are infrequently used in print form; further, selection of nominated titles should also be based on completeness and quality of physical condition. Beyond these stipulations, the committee devised a 9-point agreement that provided more specificity about governance, the duration of the agreement, retention facilities, ownership of materials, operations costs, lost items, and circulation designation of materials. During the pilot phase twenty-three member institutions nominated well over a thousand titles, with some institutions volunteering hundreds of titles while others nominated just a few. By September 2011, five members had already signed memoranda of understanding, making official their participation in the distributed archive; over twenty-five members had already made verbal commitments. With these commitments and the success of the pilot program, members began to make larger contributions to the archive. As the process moved along, the members continued to meet monthly via conference calls to discuss problems encountered, the approaches taken for title selection, and the solutions devised to combat difficulties.

Various Approaches to Participation and Selection

Several similar distributed print journal archives exist throughout the United States, Canada, and Europe, and most have taken different approaches to title selection. For instance, CIC, or the Committee on Institutional Cooperation, consists of thirteen Big 10 universities and the University of Chicago (CIC n. pag). With the start of their pilot project program in 2005, the institutions agreed to purchase and archive no less than one copy of 1467 Springer and Wiley-Blackwell journal titles beginning with the publication year of 2005. The University of Illinois hoped to house all the Springer journals, while the University of Indiana hoped to house all the Wiley-Blackwell titles. On the other hand, the

thirty-five members of the Orbis Cascade Alliance decided to create an archive consisting of American Chemical Society titles and JSTOR Arts Sciences I and II collections (DiBiase and Watson 23). The individual institution approaches within ASERL vary just as much. Some are looking to JSTOR titles, a few institutions took a disciplinary approach, another institution looked strictly at a group of Wiley-Blackwell titles, and one, with the help of a computer scientist, developed an algorithm to assign a numerical value to a pool of titles populated from several corresponding electronic archives. The latter approach involved less decision making time on the part of the subject specialists, but all institutions appeared to involve subject specialists in the title selection process, to varying degrees.

VT's Approach

Virginia Tech used the subject selector's expertise in the title selection process. But before that began, collection managers made the decision to take a mixed approach in creating a title list for the subject selectors to consider. In other words, Virginia Tech did not look to just one online archive, like JSTOR, or to one specific subject, like engineering, to create a title pool. First, collection management began an investigation of serials duplication with a Serials Solutions overlap report, which included print, microform, and online journal back file holdings for JSTOR, Wiley-Blackwell, Elsevier's Science Direct, and Springer. Months later, titles from the standard Project Muse collection were added to the ever-growing list, a list now standing at about twenty-nine hundred titles long. (It should be mentioned here that alongside making contributions to ASERL's distributed print archive, University Libraries began planning to clear space within the main library to accommodate a much larger Learning Commons area, thus making the choice of discards from the very same list particularly important.) Additionally, one spreadsheet including several years' usage data for those same titles was created to aid in the decision making process. Collection management pro-

vided yet another spreadsheet listing titles already nominated to the archive by other schools.

To aid all subject specialists as they considered titles for nomination, the following handout was created and distributed to all participating in the project. Beyond providing a background about distributed print archives for the subject specialists, six criteria were deemed important in the selection process. (See below in Figure 4 for the Title Selection illustration). To select a title, collection managers emphasized that the following should be considered: 1) low usage statistics for print title; 2) completeness of title run; 3) physical condition of title run; 4) local importance of the title to the university itself; 5) holdings in the

state; and 6) title duplicate exists in online archive. While a selected title certainly did not need to meet all six criteria, it was imperative that a near-complete title run be found and in good physical condition, and, finally, it must be duplicated in a digital archive. Interns and staff determined the physical condition of the volumes, thus reducing the workload assigned to subject selectors. Lastly, collection managers and subject specialists met to address numerous questions, most of which centered around anxiety about the size of the storage facility, (which is nearing its capacity), the viability of the print archive, the legitimacy and legal rights of online archives, and discarding large runs of print journals.

Figure 4: Subject Selector Handout

ASERL COLLABORATIVE RETENTION JOURNAL PROJECT

Draft of the

ment http://www.aserl.org/documents/!ASERL_Journal_Retention_Agreement_DRAFT_Jan_2011.pdf

Criteria to consider for selection

A selected journal must not meet all these, but all should be weighed in your decision making process. The items to be nominated should exist in one of the following: JSTOR, Project Muse, Springer Online Archive, Science Direct Back files, or Wiley-Blackwell back files.

Low use print

Completeness

Physical condition

Local importance

Area holdings

Online Archive

Low use print

Nominate items that we believe we can keep in good condition throughout the years. See agreement for high to low risk use matrix.

Local importance

Nominate items that are important to our research and/or teaching agenda, or are of cultural significance.

Area holdings

Once you have selected an item for potential nomination, search Worldcat to determine Virginia holdings. Perhaps if we own the only copy in the state, a stronger case exists to nominate it. Conversely, if you are on the fence about a title and several other Virginia institutions hold the title, maybe we are not the best library to offer to keep it.

Completeness

After selecting a title for nomination, make sure that all volumes and issues are present; having said that, we are not required to carry a current print subscription. For instance, we cancelled many titles in 2009. If we have a journal from its inception to 2009 (or perhaps even 2005) but do not have the current, it is acceptable to nominate that title.

Physical Condition

Interns are currently going into the stacks to check selected titles and making notes regarding the following:

1. Excessive highlighting
2. Heavy writing or underlining
3. Missing pages
4. Missing issues and/or volumes
5. Portions unavailable to check because they are in storage
6. I will compile a list of those titles and their notes later on.

Other general guidelines

1. Check for title changes.
2. Check with WorldCat to assess state holdings
3. Check Ulrichsweb for more details

Challenges and the Importance of Leadership

The handling of discards and nominations to the ASERL Cooperative Print Journal archive presented

a set of challenges for University Libraries. After subject selectors made recommendations, collection management had to work closely with serials staff members, who were responsible for pulling the materials off the shelves and for inspecting for physical condition of journals. If a title was chosen for the archive, serials staff made a note in the 583 field to indicate that the title constitutes part of the archive. The same staff also changed circulation rules, and then routed the volumes to the person in charge of storage facilities. On the other hand, if a title was chosen as a discard, the same serials staff members pulled the volumes off the shelves, updated the catalog records, boxed up the materials, and then had to wait for university surplus to pick up the items. Often, we found ourselves with no room to temporarily house the volumes—if boxes could be scrounged up to contain the materials. University Surplus guidelines require that all state property (including discarded journals) be collected at Surplus facilities and offered for sale through routine auctions. This meant that University Libraries had to depend on University Surplus' timeframe for pickups, which were too infrequent to meet our goals. Given that many other libraries at state supported academic institutions have already gone through this process, we investigated having recycling pick up in the journal discards instead. This proposal is still in the works, but looks entirely feasible by Spring 2012.

The scale and scope of the project under consideration made it clear that the University Libraries needed to allocate sufficient personnel resources to ensure success. In order to facilitate communication across multiple areas it was important to designate someone in a leadership role who could commit significant time to the project. In July 2011, Assistant Director for Collection Management Connie Stovall assumed responsibility for overseeing Virginia Tech's participation in the ASERL cooperative journal retention program. Establishing criteria for retention became an important consideration early on. Once such criteria were in place, coordinating and communicating with different units and with subject specialists to facilitate workflow and determine appropriate timelines has been an ongoing need.

Bibliography

- Arthur, Michael A. et al. "The Sting of Releasing Print Journals: Surviving the Transition to an Online Environment." *The Serials Librarian* 56 (2009): 260-265. Web. 30 Sept. 2011.
- Di Biase, Linda T., and Mark R. Watson. "Orbis Cascade Alliance Distributed Print Repository: Organizing Collections at the Consortial Level." *Collection Management* 34 (2008): 19-30. Web. 30 Sept. 2011.
- "CIC Libraries Collaborate to Archive Print Journals." n. pag. Web. 30 Sept. 2011.
- Desrosiers, Barbara, Melissa Trevvett, and Michael A. Arthur. "Developing a Distributed Print Depository System." *The Serials Librarian* 48 (2005): 343-348. Web. 30 Sept. 2011.
- Maskell, Cathy, Jennifer Soutter, and Kristina Oldenburg. "Collaborative Print Repositories: A Case Study of Library Directors' Views." *The Journal of Academic Librarianship* 36.3 (2010): 242-249. Web. 30 Sept. 2011.
- University Libraries, Virginia Tech. "University Libraries Annual Report 2009-2010." Web. 30 Sept. 2011.
- University Libraries Virginia Tech. "Facts and numbers | University Libraries | Virginia Tech." Web. 30 Sept. 2011.
- VPI&SU. "University Facts & Figures 2010-11." Web. 30 Sept. 2011.