

Shared Print Monograph Projects Overview

COLD SPIRIT (Emily Bonney, Patrick Newell, Karen Schneider, Steven Stratton, John Wenzler)

September 10, 2018

Overview: What is shared print?

Our colleagues in the Statewide California Electronic Library Consortium (SCELC) have a useful FAQ which opens with this definition of shared print:

A shared print program (also called “print archives” or “shared collection management”) is a formal program in which multiple libraries coordinate long-term retention of print materials and provide services for them. The parties in the program share the collection thus retained in the sense that copies are guaranteed available over time to all partners, allowing those not committing to retain a given volume to withdraw their copy in favor of access to the retained copy if they wish. Libraries have made shared print programs for various bodies of printed materials by format, e.g., books, journals, and government documents, or by academic field or subject. The foundation for shared print programs has been laid by decades of increasingly rapid and efficient resource sharing and various schemes for cooperative collection development (SCELC, N.D., retrieved from <https://drive.google.com/file/d/1k93zCBHniv8qIU5hpftecXFAeYd3MRHY/view>).

Most shared print programs include geographic proximity among participating institutions and a commitment to share items identified for retention. Despite the superficial similarity of shared print programs to resource sharing programs, the SCELC FAQ answers another common question, explaining that shared print is distinct from interlibrary loan:

A shared print program’s retention commitments push resource sharing beyond the gentlepersons’ quid pro quo “I’ll lend to you if you’ll lend to me” to the creation of a dependency of libraries on each other for a specified body of material, binding them in a relationship of long-lasting and programmatic significance.

Other shared print FAQs echo SCELC’s descriptions and definitions; see for example this FAQ from the Eastern Academic Scholars’ Trust (EAST): <https://eastlibraries.org/faq> .

High-level decisions common to shared print MOUs and agreements

A review of ten shared print monograph projects among public and public-private universities reveals some common patterns (see Appendix A for brief summaries of these ten programs). These programs were identified through a conversation with Marie Waltz, Special Projects Manager at the Center for Research Libraries, who identified shared print monograph programs for SPIRIT to review, encouraged our group to explore CRL’s Print Archive Registration Registry (PAPR) for additional examples, and provided other helpful information for our summer of discernment.

Shared Print MOUs: Features in Typical Agreements	
Decision	Typical to these programs
1. Opt-in or all-in	Opt-in
2. Governance model	These are unique to each program, ranging from management by fiscal agents to separate NPOs and non-MOU, informal agreements.
3. Startup cost model	Varies
4. Continuing cost model	Varies
5. Data analysis model	GreenGlass
6. Types of monographs included/excluded	Most are usually included (within copy retention model) but there are some exceptions called out
7. Lending policy	Items must circulate to all participating libraries
8. Item storage model	Stored in local libraries
9. Copy retention model	2 or 3 copies of low-use items prior to a fixed publication date; items stored at separate locations
10. Retention period	10 or 15 years
11. Data review cycles	3 years
12. Management of lost/damaged/missing items	Typically requires the Library to 'fess up. Does not appear to be a huge problem.
13. Ownership transfer if library withdraws from program	Back to the owning library

Discussion of Typical, Common, and Unique Features

CRL PAPER lists 45 shared print programs for journals, monographs, or mixed-format networks.

Geographic distribution is skewed toward journals and the East Coast, with WEST (Western Regional Storage Trust) as a significant geographic exception. One program, a project of the large regional network GWLA (Greater Western Library Alliance), is inactive. The explanation provided is that GWLA elected not to pursue a shared print journals project because of the availability of mature journals projects its members could elect to join on an individual basis, including WEST

Most shared print initiatives begin by establishing goals and policies, selecting a consultant, and electing to use Greenglass to analyze collections. Programs typically are opt-in “coalitions of the willing” that start with a pilot of high-interest libraries and expand the project in phases marked by data refreshes from Greenglass that are analyzed to adjust the program. Most of the programs are “buildingless” programs in which materials are held in libraries rather than storage facilities or a flagship library. The number of copies retained ranges from 1 (CARLI) to 4 (VIVA), with a back-of-the-envelope calculation of 2 as the mode. The “science” behind the number of copies retained is not clear from the MOUs, but appears to vary with the size of the program.

The MI-SPI program has a typical model. Libraries identify a need for responsible print management. A pilot project is created where Greenglass is used to identify and determine holdings for low-use titles. A retention threshold, review cycles, and rules for lost items and withdrawal from the network are established. Libraries also agree to share these identified monographs within their shared print network. From the CRL Papr description of MI-SPI:

A pilot program ran from 2011 to April 2012 with seven participating libraries. Libraries assemble a list of titles that were *commonly-held but little-used*. The titles were identified using OCLC's *Sustainable Collection Services (SCS)* services. *Two libraries* commit to retain and share a monograph in their collection so other libraries holding the same title may withdraw it. Access to the two retained copies is *available to all partner libraries*” (MI-SPI, Papr, emphasis added).

GreenGlass

Nearly all shared print programs have licensed GreenGlass for their programs. GreenGlass is a product of Sustainable Collection Services (SCS) and was developed for the specific needs of shared print programs. OCLC acquired SCS in 2016, and has a team of OCLC staff dedicated to sales, support, and development.

For the CSU Libraries, it is natural to ask if Alma Analytics would be able to support our needs for a shared print program. Alma has the ability to produce data such as system-wide “dusty book” reports based on circulation, publication date, and library. But Alma lacks the capacity to identify the more complex data common to shared print retention agreements. This is not intended to dismiss the value of Alma Analytics, but to underscore that it was designed for very different use cases than shared print.

GreenGlass has developed significantly since it was first licensed for the CSU Libraries of the Future project in 2013, and now has a shared ILS product called GreenGlass for Groups. A representative from the COPPUL SPAN project described the services SCS provided their project:

Assembling data from participants and cleaning / normalizing it; developing retention models / rules with the group; analyze circulation data for items from each participant; access to GreenGlass; assemble group-wide database; develop queries; allocation of titles to be retained (developed with the group); ongoing data management; general project support / liaison (SCS, OCLC, COPPUL, participants).

This service description also points up the expertise SCS brings to the table in assisting libraries with their analyses and modeling—expertise not available within the CSU Libraries, the CO, or Ex Libris.

Alma lacks the ability to compare ULMS holdings against WorldCat, HathiTrust, or GreenGlass datasets. The COLD Shared Print survey indicated that most CSU libraries follow the widespread practice of checking WorldCat holdings on an item-by-item basis as part of their current deacquisition workflow, and these comparisons are essential for shared print programs. As an OCLC representative noted:

GreenGlass also looks at title holdings around California and the entire country for analysis on what titles are common or rare, or even unique. Greenglass can look beyond the lens of the CSUs a broader holding set. In addition, GreenGlass mashes this data up with titles from HathiTrust and even *CHOICE*.

Finally, OCLC noted that there are some data GreenGlass produces that could conceivably be kludged out of Alma or other library management systems, but it would be prohibitively laborious.

Cost and Support Models

In many cases libraries pony up startup costs and commit to other ongoing fees, though the cost structures vary widely. Doug Brigham, Shared Print Archive Network Coordinator for COPPUL SPAN (the Council of Prairie and Pacific University Libraries Shared Print Archive Network), and Rick Burke, Executive Director for SCELCLC, provided their current program fee structure, based largely on Greenglass data analysis and support services. Both COPPUL SPAN and the SCELCLC Shared Print Program provided their cost models.

COPPUL SPAN Cost Model

Number of participants: 10

Cost for each institution: a USD \$5,000 set up fee + \$0.03 / record up to 1 million + \$0.015 per record thereafter)

Total cost: approx. USD \$280,000.

SCS's services included: Assembling data from participants and cleaning / normalizing it; developing retention models / rules with the group; analyze circulation data for items from each participant; access to GreenGlass; assemble group-wide database; develop queries; allocation of titles to be retained (developed with the group); ongoing data management; general project support / liaison (SCS, OCLC, COPPUL, participants)

SCELCLC Shared Print Program Cost Model

Number of participants: 26 (12 in Cohort 2, currently onboarding)

Three cost factors:

Set up fee: Standard fee of \$5,000

SCELCLC = \$3750

Per record charge: Standard fee of \$.03/record, no cap

SCELCLC = \$0.02/record capped at 1M records (e.g. USC)

Group project fee: 8%-20%

The Group Project fee was 10% of the sum of the setup fee and per-record charge for each library

Exploring cost models for implementation and continuing costs will be important for a CSU Libraries shared print project.

Support models also vary. Library systems and consortia typically operate on lean in-system funding models. COPPUL SPAN created a dedicated position for shared print, while following the retirement of shared print consultant Robert Kieft, SCELIC supplemented its workforce by hiring an academic director with strong shared print experience.

Conclusion

Shared print programs are in a stage of development reminiscent of the early decades of bibliographic utilities and online catalogs. A few “lead the fleet” libraries led the way toward the first programs, and out of need, a product developed that has evolved in tandem with the growth of these initiatives. With 44 active programs registered in CRL PAPER, consolidation and large-scale partnerships are now the norm. GWLA’s decision to deactivate its shared print journal initiative in favor of joining extant programs such as WEST points to the maturing world of shared print. In the June 2018 survey, the CSU library deans indicated their own awareness of program consolidation and willingness to leverage existing initiatives; the consensus could be summarized as “Use WEST if you want to, and let’s compare going it alone with SCELIC’s shared print program.”

Appendix A: A Sample of Shared Monograph Projects

ALI-PALNET Shared Print Project

Academic Libraries Indiana (ALI) and the Private Academic Library Network of Indiana (PALNI)
<http://papr.crl.edu/program/67/academic-libraries-of-indiana-ali-ali-palni-shared-print-project>
<http://academiclibrariesofindiana.org/home/sharedprintproject>

Established: 2013

MOU: No

Volumes: 126,564 circulating print monographs

From PAPER: “In 2013 thirty-six Indiana academic libraries agreed to participate in the ALI/PALNI Shared Print Project. The libraries engaged Sustainable Collection Services [Greenglass] to analyze the circulating print monographs of each participant. The project has both short-term and long-term goals. In the short-term, libraries make data-driven decisions about weeding their collections and reclaim space for student use. Long term the Project is the foundation for a shared collection and cooperative collection development.”

These systems joined to create an opt-in Shared Print Project. They do not have an MOU but have agreed since the inception of the project not to remove any “scarcely held” titles without conversation among the members. This project includes all of the public and private non-ARL libraries in Indiana. Since the original MOU 4 other academic libraries have joined the project’s original 7. The 2 smallest state funded universities as well as the 2 largest R1 institutions in the state do not participate in this project.

CARLI Last Copy Program

The Consortium of Academic and Research Libraries in Illinois

<http://papr.crl.edu/program/58/consortium-of-academic-and-research-libraries-in-illinois-last-copy-project>

<https://www.carli.illinois.edu/products-services/collections-management/last-copy-project>

MOU: No

Volumes: Unspecified, but has to be immense.

Retention period: not specified.

CARLI has 134 member libraries, representing 94% of all postsecondary libraries in Illinois. From PAPER: [“Informal agreement is that participants will not weed any items classified as scarcely held.](#) ... Preserving 126,564 circulating print monographs held in member library collections. Greenglass used to identify scarcely held monographs.” A request for additional information received no response.

From the CARLI website: “The CARLI Last Copy Program seeks to preserve the last copy of monographs within the Illinois academic and research library community. This project allows any CARLI library that seeks to withdraw a ‘last copy’ monograph to donate it to another CARLI library that will retain the title for resource sharing in Illinois. ...University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign (UIUC) serves as the initial recipient of the monographs submitted to the Last Copy Program. Materials that the UIUC does not

want or cannot house are offered to other interested Illinois research libraries. Items that are not accepted by a library participating in this project remain with the original owning library to keep or discard the items at their discretion.”

Central Iowa

<http://papr.crl.edu/program/53/central-iowa-collaborative-collections-ci-cci>

<http://ci-cci.org/>

MOU: <https://ci-cci.org/files/2013/09/CICCI-MOU-Revision-2015.pdf>

Volumes:

Retention period: 10 years

Started in 2013, added a sixth member in 2016. Institutions are Central College, Drake University, Grand View University, Grinnell College, Simpson College, and North Iowa. CI-CCI was established specifically for shared print. Its goals include collaborative collection development in addition to print reduction. Governance is by a committee of dean/directors and other personnel – one vote per campus. Threshold is retention of two copies, “except in the case of older and low use titles.”

Responding to a query, CI-CCI replied, “Our MOU was aspirational in that we ***intend*** to keep two copies of titles except for older and low use titles. In fact, we’re in the planning phases of doing another data refresh, which we may end up doing exactly that. However, for the first iteration of our collaboration (2013), we did only retain ONE copy of each title because they were all older (pre-1991) and low use (zero circs). ... [If] our retention scenario expands to include newer and more circulated materials, that we will retain two copies.”

ConnectNY

<http://papr.crl.edu/program/63/connectny-shared-print-trust-program>

<http://connectny.org/programs/>

MOU: No.

Retention period: 10 years

12 member libraries. Governance is through the CNY Shared Print Trust Management Committee. From PAPER: “ConnectNY began efforts to create a light archive shared print trust of circulating monographs for the consortium in October 2012. The goal of the CNY Shared Print Trust Program is to preserve legacy print collections across the CNY member libraries and to provide new options for sharing the costs and efforts of long-term collection management. The Shared Print Trust focuses on monographs and uses SCS [Greenglass] to identify two copies of each title [to] be retained for ten years (2014-2024). Five of the libraries are also retention partners with EAST. These five libraries will maintain their commitments to CNY, and EAST for a period of 15 years (through August, 2031). ... There are 852,995 circulating monographs committed to the program. Titles selected are held by 3 or more institutions in the group. The focus is on low use circulating monographs. It was agreed that two copies of each title would be retained for ten years.” Materials are held by the libraries.

EAST – Eastern Academic Scholars’ Trust

<http://papr.crl.edu/program/62/eastern-academic-scholars-trust-east>

<https://eastlibraries.org/>

MOU:

https://eastlibraries.org/sites/default/files/BLC_Uploads/Memorandum%20of%20Understanding%20October_14_2016.pdf

Volumes:

Established: 2015

Retention period: 15 years

EAST is a multistate opt-in shared print initiative of 60 libraries from Maine to Florida (mostly Eastern Seaboard) for monographs and journals. Its startup funding was through foundation funds and a Mellon grant. They used Greenglass for analysis.

Hathi Trust

<http://papr.crl.edu/program/65/hathitrust-print-monographs-archive>

https://www.hathitrust.org/shared_print_program

MOU:

<https://www.hathitrust.org/sites/www.hathitrust.org/files/HathiTrust%20Shared%20Print%20Agreement%202017%2006%20final.pdf>

Volumes: 16 million (Phase 1)

Established: 2013

Retention period: 25 years

Hathi Trust is a print-digital repository composed of members of the Big Ten Alliance and several UC libraries. “In Phase 1, 50 libraries pledged to retain 16 million monographs representing 4.8 million individual book titles.” Phase 2, launching in 2018, projects adding 16 libraries. Hathi Trust libraries “include libraries at universities and colleges from across the United States and from Canada and Australia.”

Michigan Shared Print Initiative

<http://papr.crl.edu/program/66/michigan-shared-print-initiative>

<https://www.mcls.org/engagement/mi-spi/>

MOU: https://www.mcls.org/index.php/download_file/view/199/554/311/

Established: 2011

Volumes: ~ 450k

Retention Period: 15 years

MI-SPI is a project of the Midwest Collaborative for Library Services (MCLS), which has 90 4-year academic library members. MI-SPI started with 7 libraries and now has 9 participants. They used SCS (Greenglass) for data analysis.

SCELC Shared Print Program

<http://papr.crl.edu/program/76/statewide-california-electronic-library-consortium-shared-print-program-scelc>

<http://scelc.org/libraries/shared-print>

MOU: SCELC <https://drive.google.com/file/d/0B0teyr9fJGR5d2JZR0w1Z2xQX0k/view>

Established: 2015

Retention period: 15 years

From PAPER: "Retention criteria includes: all unique holdings, all when there are 2-3 holding libraries, 3 copies, when there are more than 3 holding libraries." Goals include print reduction, retention of special/unique items, and collaborative collection development. They used Greenglass for analysis.

Virtual Library of Virginia (VIVA) Monographic Collection Analysis Pilot

<http://papr.crl.edu/program/61/virtual-library-of-virginia-viva-monographic-collection-analysis-pilot>

<http://www.vivalib.org/committees/collections/monographiccollectionanalysis.html>

MOU http://www.crl.edu/sites/default/files/shared/papr/VIVA_MOU_Rare.pdf

Established: 2015

Retention period: 10 years

VIVA is a consortium that includes 72 four-year postsecondary institutions. Their shared print project started with 12 libraries. Threshold is four copies. Used Greenglass.