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Northeast Regional Library Print Management Project
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November 14, 2013

Attendees
Pat Tully (Wesleyan University) (convener), Ian Graham (Wellesley College), Clem Guthro (Colby College), Susan Raidy-Klein (University of Massachusetts Dartmouth), Terry Snyder (Haverford College), Laura Wood (Tufts University), Kathy Leigh (Project Coordinator), Lizanne Payne (Planning Consultant).

Unable to attend: Matthew Sheehy (Harvard University)

Reports on contacts

Several members reported on information they had gathered from other programs and organizations.

Clem Guthro:

- Orbis-Cascade Alliance—They have not yet nor do they plan to move to monographs. They are working on implementing a shared ILS right now and perhaps will think about dealing with the monographs question after that.
- University of California Libraries -- Emily Stambaugh (UC Shared Print Manager) described how the UC Libraries have a big advantage in that the two storage facilities (the Southern and Regional Library Facilities) have long had a single-copy, shared collections policy for deposits of general circulating collection materials and a practice of using a separate OCLC symbol for stored collections (facilitating group collection analysis). In addition the RLFs are governed by a “Persistence Policy” which governs deposits and ensures they cannot be deselected (materials can be recalled to a campus, but they cannot be withdrawn.) Emily also made a presentation at an OCLC webinar that raises interesting questions: how do we bring this sort of effort up to the network level?
- Sustainable Collection Services – SCS is a company focusing on collection analysis for shared print monograph projects. They are interested in what we are doing and Clem talked to them about the scale of what we are considering. SCS is working on ramping up technology and would need to consider the staffing implications in a project as large as ours might be. Phasing over time, start out working with a pilot group, may be ways to approach this.

Pat Tully : OCLC – She discussed OCLC’s support for shared print collections with Bill Carney. He described OCLC’s collection analysis and services available from SCS (business partner of OCLC).

Susan Raidy-Klein: Massachusetts Library System (statewide public library network) does not have much interest in an inter-state collection or delivery system at this point. Their mission is very
‘state-bound’ and very different from the academics in the state. That said, they should be invited and contacted about any effort we make.

Ian Graham: Five Colleges, Inc. Planning for expansion of Five College Depository is underway and Five Colleges group is very interested in the possibility of expanding the 5C facility to include others, perhaps through some sort of hybrid model or as a node in some sort of NE network.

Lizanne Payne – She developed and sent a spreadsheet to the group with information on various programs, derived from CRL’s PAPR database of shared print programs (papr.crl.edu). Of the 33 programs listed, 6 were monographs, 11 were journals, the others were mixed or gov docs. Only 2 of the monograph projects are operational – Maine and Michigan are the farthest along. For the monographs programs, selection was done through some sort of collection analysis. Ownership stayed with original institution in most cases: ownership transfer is much more rare (in the Florida program where ownership transfers to the University of Florida, the other members are also state universities in Florida and so have a common governance). There is a roughly even split between centralized and distributed models.

Discussion of baseline model for Northeast region

The group discussed some elements of a possible shared print program to serve as a baseline model. The goal is to develop one or more models to recommend in a report due in mid-December. Some factors seemed to have consensus and others will need more discussion.

- Ownership: Recommend original owner retains ownership. There are constraints on public institutions transferring ownership especially across state lines. Lizanne Payne pointed out that most current programs adopt the “original owner” approach (or, in case of transferred volumes for journal runs, the “holding library” gets ownership). Most have found that changing ownership is not simple and choose not to spend too much time on this issue.
- Location: Recommend distributed model. Given the diversity of institutions in our region we need to recommend a distributed model with original ownership (some ‘nodes’ may have a more shared centralized model in place, i.e. possibly a shared storage facility). Moving materials to another location would not be restricted as long as the retention and access agreement remained in place.
- Retention period: Recommend a minimum of 15 years with a commitment to review the overall agreement at future intervals (possibly every 5 years). Individual participants can commit to longer timeframes if they wish. There will be extremes in opinion and in mission of individual participating institutions. An institution like Harvard may want to retain volumes forever, other institutions don’t want to commit their institutions to long terms of retention. Even 25 years can be hard for some to commit to, and larger libraries may be caught being the library to retain more than their share. The agreement will also need a process for an individual library to petition for reconsideration of their commitment due to local factors.
- Access: Recommend non-restricted access. A dark archive or restricted access would be a hard sell. We should allow for restricted access for rarer materials or perhaps construct a scale or tiered system that seeks to protect these materials. Recommend providing digital access also.
- Discovery: Recommend disclosure and discovery through OCLC WorldCat as the minimum, default starting point. Does there need to be a special discovery system (catalog) or are existing systems sufficient? Smaller libraries holdings are often not represented in OCLC. At least OCLC
is most of the way there as a shared catalog and is already considering aspects of the things we want to do (new symbol to represent the shared collection, notes to record retention agreements). Question of discovery may need further consideration in the future.

- Selection: Recommend selection by collection analysis. What gets selected to go into the shared print program is very important. What is an efficient approach? We don't need to provide collection analysis specifications in detail now, will need to discuss more.
- Validation (condition review): Recommend allowing for condition notes but not requiring validation as part of this project. Clem Guthro: it is impossible to do wholesale, it is not scalable for the very large number of monographs. Lizanne Payne described an approach considered in ReCap, to define pass/fail conditions to be examined only after circulation/use, then flag records for replacement of poor copies only if encountered. Do we want to make a statement about preservation? Object preservation or collection preservation? Retention commitments mean that the owning library is committed to replacing if it goes missing or found to be in unusable condition. The agreement would support collection preservation, not object preservation, and we should make a statement about this.

Next meeting: Nov. 25th 10-11:30

For the next meeting the group will begin drafting a report based on the tentative recommendations. At the next meeting we will also discuss collection analysis and delivery in more depth.