

December 2012

Curating Collective Collections-Shared Print Collections Reaching Maturity

Sam Demas

Carleton College & Principal, Sam Demas Collaborative Consulting, sdemas03@gmail.com

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



Part of the [Library and Information Science Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Demas, Sam (2012) "Curating Collective Collections-Shared Print Collections Reaching Maturity," *Against the Grain*: Vol. 24: Iss. 6, Article 43.

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.7771/2380-176X.6257>

This document has been made available through Purdue e-Pubs, a service of the Purdue University Libraries. Please contact epubs@purdue.edu for additional information.

be read as they were being re-shelved, and each reading would be counted as an in-house circulation. We don't barcode our current periodicals, so to record use we used duplicate barcodes. A bar-coded item was added to each bibliographic record for each print title. The item was shadowed so that it was not visible to the public. For the same title, a duplicate barcode was added to the report. Signs were placed throughout the Reading Room asking users not to re-shelve journals. Before re-shelving journals, the staff matched the title of the issue with the entry in the report and recorded the barcode to mark it as a use. This process prompted the "Mark as Used" function and recorded an in-house circulation for that item. A report ran monthly to capture the collective in-house use for each title. The original report contained the URLs of the periodical titles that also had electronic access. The data was filtered by the providers so that usage statistics could be added.

The comparison supported the cancellation of print where electronic use was overwhelmingly greater, and the source for access was stable. We also changed formats. We moved to online if it was economical and the source for access was stable. In one particular collection, the print usage was zero. The comparison between print and electronic was shocking — we understood print usage was low, but seeing the numbers made the contrast more striking.

Based on the data from our project, 864 print titles were cancelled where electronic was acceptable, and 472 titles were changed to online-only. The remaining periodicals after this cancellation were 5,000 subscribed titles.

Currently, we are participating in a beta project for EBSCO's usage tool, **EBSCONET Usage Consolidation**. We are pleased that the SUSHI protocol is part of the process and is easy to configure. The protocol is incredibly helpful. The information is automatically downloaded, and usage can be tied to titles that are serviced by EBSCO. This offers an easy cost-per-use calculation. Having acquisition and usage information available seamlessly is ideal. We're happy to be participating in this project.

Our future plans include comparing unfilled ILL requests to subscribed electronic and print holdings to determine why the request was not filled. We are also considering gathering usage data at the volume level and even the article level. Also, we are working on adding Impact Factor and Eigenfactor to our current reports. It is complicated work but very worthwhile for collection development. 🌱

Interested in sharing your experience with usage statistics? Contact Rossi Morris <rmorris@ebSCO.com>.

Curating Collective Collections — Shared Print Collections Reaching Maturity



Column Editor: **Sam Demas** (College Librarian Emeritus, Carleton College & Principal, Sam Demas Collaborative Consulting) <sdemas03@gmail.com>

This month we'll take a look at the evolving "big picture" of shared print collections for journals and for books.

Lizanne Payne provides an update on two mature journal archiving programs: WEST and the United Kingdom Research Reserve. And I commend to your attention a must-read report for librarians working to develop coherent models for shaping and sharing supra-institutional collections of printed books: *Print Management at "Mega-scale": A Regional Perspective on Print Book Collections in North America* by **Brian Lavoie, Constance Malpas, and J. D. Shipengrover** (OCLC Research, 2012).

The following is just a teaser to prompt the reader to Google the report and enjoy a glimpse into a possible future, and to speculate on how your library will participate in the emerging collective collections.

Following on the brilliant *Cloud-sourcing Research Collections: Managing Print in the Mass-digitized Library Environment* (OCLC Research, 2011), in the "Mega-scale" report **Constance Malpas** and colleagues at **OCLC Research's** paint a picture of a possible "mega-regional" framework for regional shared print collections. While the "Cloud-sourcing" report focused on the implications of mass-digitization for preservation of a national shared print collection and on models like **JSTOR** (the Stock model), **WEST** (a Distributed model), and **CIC** (a Hub model), the "Mega-scale" report begins to describe the characteristics of a Flow model, as exemplified by **BorrowDirect**. The Flow model addresses the reality (amply demonstrated in the fascinating analysis of WorldCat data included in the report) that the North American Book collection is highly diffused by positing the formation of a virtual collection that integrates discovery and delivery across thousands of local collections.

The concept of "mega-regions" is derived from satellite imagery capturing night-time clusters of light around the globe that transcend political boundaries and map concentrations of population and economic activity. This results in 12 mega-regions in U.S. and Canada, such as **BOS-WASH, CHI-PITTS, TOR-BUFF-CHESTER, CHAR-LANTA, and SO-CAL**. Borrowed from a paper by **Richard Florida** (etc.), **OCLC Research** used this geographical framework to analyze WorldCat data for U.S. and Canada using zip and postal codes to develop fascinating data on the North American book collection (comprised of "distinct imprints or editions of books in printed form"). National and regional collection metrics on the 45.7 million print books (889.5 M holdings) in N. America include: degree of uniqueness and overlap within and across regions, extent of holdings in academic libraries and in public libraries, measures of rareness and scarcity, global diversity of holdings, extent of "regional flavor"/uniqueness, analysis of pairings of large regions, and examination of the aggregate holdings of "extra-regional" libraries that fall outside the 12 mega-regions.

Based on these data, the authors examine implications for shared print models including: the need for supra-institutional coordination; why and how scale and models of cooperative collection management will likely vary among regions; possible pairing of regions and thoughts about the challenges of address-

ing preservation of extra-regional collections; the key role of the **HathiTrust** digital collection in shaping large, multi-regional collection management; and the financial implications of a tendency of smaller institutions to view stewardship of print legacy collections as the responsibility of a small number of research-intensive institutions.

The picture painted in this report is of a rich, highly diffused, and asymmetrically-distributed national collection that will be challenging, but not impossible, to shape at mega-regional scale. While existing models such as **CIC, ASERL, Orbis-Cascade, MINITEX, NLM, COPPUL, and WEST** have much to commend them, this report suggests that existing cooperative infrastructure may not be equal to the task of shared print management at mega-regional scale. In addition, the authors point out that to round out the "supply-side" picture presented in the "Mega-regional" report, there is a need for a more complete characterization of the "demand side" through large-scale analysis and projection of inter-library lending data. Altogether, this is a mind-expanding view of potential paths forward in evolving shared collection management for print books. Check it out!

Shared Print Collections Reaching Maturity

Libraries around the world are grappling with the transition from print to digital collections and limitations on space for print volumes. Dozens of initiatives to share print collections have been established in the United States and abroad, usually within existing library consortia, as a mechanism to free space in participating libraries while insuring long-term preservation of research materials.

For decades, libraries have extended their collections by relying on national libraries and repositories in a nonspecific relationship: the **Library of Congress**, the **British Library**, the **Bibliothèque Nationale de France**, the **National Diet Library of Japan**, the **National Repository Library in Finland**, and many others. In North America, libraries can join the **Center for Research Libraries (CRL)** in an explicit membership to gain access to its collections (among other benefits). A number of library consortia have developed shared storage facilities to house and share library collections for multiple libraries (e.g., **Five Colleges, Inc; Research Collections and Preservation Consortium (ReCAP); Washington (DC) Research Library Consortium; Preservation and Access Service Center for Colorado Academic Libraries**).

For purposes of this report, however, the term "shared print program" means something different. It means a formal agreement among multiple libraries that establishes retention commitments and access provisions for specified sets of library materials. Many of the shared storage facilities have retroactively defined such agreements even though they may have originally accepted ad hoc deposits of materials from member libraries with no explicit retention agreement. In a growing number of cases, library consortia or other groups have defined a new program specifically to establish shared responsibility for long-term preservation of collections.

continued on page 82

Curating Collective Collections from page 81

Some of these programs are beginning to reach operational maturity and can demonstrate completion of specific milestones. At the same time, some necessary infrastructure has been developed that will facilitate disclosing these shared collection commitments around the world. This report will describe recent accomplishments and plans in two large-scale shared print initiatives worldwide and will outline these advances in infrastructure.

Western Regional Storage Trust (WEST)

WEST is a distributed retrospective print journal repository program serving more than 100 research libraries, college and university libraries, and two library consortia in the western part of the United States. WEST is the largest shared print program in the world so far, measured by the number of participating libraries.

Key features of WEST include:

- Journal titles are selected for retention based on a customized analysis of member holdings, grouping titles in title risk categories (e.g., availability of digital versions, print-only).
- Funding primarily supports the work of Archive Builders to review journal runs for completeness, call for holdings to fill gaps, review volumes for condition, and update metadata.

WEST recently announced completion of its first round of print journal archiving under a three-year program jointly funded by WEST members and the **Andrew W. Mellon Foundation**. In 2011-12, twelve WEST libraries contributed to the shared collection more than 6,100 journal titles in 4,300 journal families, comprising more than 160,000 volumes. These totals include almost 5,100 titles archived at the Bronze level (no validation, also have digital preservation), more than 500 titles archived at the Silver level (validated for completeness at the volume level), and more than 500 titles archived at the Gold level (validated for both completeness and condition at the issue level).

Archive creation for WEST Cycle 2 is under way, and collection analysis for WEST Cycle 3 will begin in fall 2012. More information about WEST is available at <http://www.cdlib.org/west>.

U.K. Research Reserve (UKRR)

The UK Research Reserve (UKRR) is a partnership between the **British Library** and 29 higher education institutions in the U.K., designed

to preserve and provide access to low use print journals. Under the UKRR program, the **British Library** retains and provides access to UKRR titles, with additional copies held at two other UKRR institutions to insure sufficient copies for the higher education community. After an initial pilot phase in 2007-2008, UKRR received funding from the Higher Education Funding Council for England (HEFCE) to support a five-year Phase 2 (2009-2014).

Key features of UKRR include:

- Member libraries propose journal titles they wish to withdraw, that are then compared to titles already held in the program or represented in other member library collections.
- Funding primarily supports ingest efforts at the **British Library** and the work at participating libraries to donate volumes and to deselect local holdings based on UKRR titles.

As of mid-2012, UKRR has processed 50,000 titles into the program, equivalent to 68,000 linear meters of shelving space. UKRR is the largest shared print program in the world so far, measured by the number of titles designated. UKRR is undertaking a strategic review to inform planning for ongoing sustainability after the current program reaches its conclusion in 2014. More information about UKRR is available at <http://www.ukrr.ac.uk/>.

Others in planning

Some other programs being planned are worth following as they move from planning discussions into implementation:

- Canada: Council of Prairie and Pacific University Libraries (COPPUL) Shared Print Archive Network (SPAN) is a distributed print journal collection using an approach similar to WEST (titles categorized by risk). In Phase 1 beginning in 2012, archive holders will commit to retain low-risk titles for a 10-year period. See <http://www.coppul.ca/projects/SPAN.html>.
- Hong Kong: Joint Universities Research Archive (JURA) will be a shared facility and collection for the eight tertiary education institutions of Hong Kong. Construction of JURA, an automated storage and retrieval system (ASRS) housing up to 7.4 million volumes, is expected to be completed in 2013. See <http://www.julac.org/project/index.html#JURA>.
- United States: Center for Institutional Cooperation (CIC) Shared Print Reposi-

tory is a program of ten CIC members to share **Elsevier** and **Wiley** journals housed at **Indiana University's** Auxiliary Library Facility (ALF). See <http://www.cic.net/Home/Projects/Library/>.

- United States: **HathiTrust** members approved a recommendation in October 2011 to establish a distributed archive of print monographs corresponding to the digital copies held in **HathiTrust**. Detailed planning is expected to begin in 2012-2013. See http://www.hathitrust.org/constitutional_convention2011_ballot_proposals#proposall.

Infrastructure for Sharing Collection Commitments

Most shared print programs use a local database or catalog to analyze and share information about materials that are to be retained. To disseminate such information widely outside the regional group, a more global approach is needed.

In 2011-2012, a working group from the shared print community, including **OCLC** staff, developed and tested a recommended data structure designed to make collection commitment information available in a standardized form to libraries worldwide through the WorldCat database. A description of the pilot project and its final report with detailed metadata guidelines is available at: <http://www.oclc.org/productworks/shared-print-management.htm>.

During a similar time period, the **Center for Research Libraries (CRL)** developed the Print Archives Preservation Registry (PAPR) knowledgebase, with the **California Digital Library (CDL)** as development partner. PAPR includes a Directory providing information about shared print programs and their participating libraries, and a database of Archived Titles contributed by shared print programs. PAPR currently includes Archived Titles from WEST, **CRL's JSTOR Collection**, **ASERL**, and others. The PAPR knowledgebase is freely searchable at <http://www.papr.crl.edu>.

Groups and libraries that are embarked on shared print agreements are urged to share information about affected titles through these WorldCat and PAPR knowledgebases. Amassing consistent data about worldwide shared print retention commitments will enable all libraries to make informed decisions about managing their local collections and will promote comprehensive preservation of research collections. 

Random Ramblings — Does the Focus on Banned Books Subtly Undermine Intellectual Freedom?

Column Editor: **Bob Holley** (Professor, Library & Information Science Program, Wayne State University, Detroit, MI 48202; Phone: 248-547-0306; Fax: 313-577-7563) <aa3805@wayne.edu>



I write this column with trepidation because I am a hardcore advocate for intellectual freedom. Ever since I was appointed Chair of the **ACRL** Intellectual Freedom Committee in 2002, intellectual freedom has been my focus within **ALA**. I've served on the Intellectual Freedom Roundtable (IFRT) Executive Committee, chaired the group, and will now represent IFRT for the

next three years on **ALA** Council. I attend as many meetings as possible of the Freedom to Read Foundation (I also regularly send a check) and the **ALA** Intellectual Freedom Committee. I write on intellectual freedom. The hundreds of students who have taken my collection development course get a rousing unit on intellectual freedom.

I am not questioning the exceptional success

of the efforts to publicize Banned Books Week. **ALA** and all its units involved with intellectual freedom garner attention and much public support with this event. During Banned Books Week, libraries have exhibits of banned books, sponsor readings from them, and generally increase awareness of intellectual freedom. Intellectual freedom

continued on page 83