Shared Print Motion: Language and Fact Sheet

September 10, 2018
COLD SPIRIT: Emily Bonney, Patrick Newell, Karen G. Schneider, Stephen Stratton, John Wenzler

Motion for the September 13, 2018 COLD Meeting

SPIRIT asks COLD to vote on this motion:

Resolved, that the CSU Libraries commit to investigating the feasibility of joining the SCELC Shared Print Program or establishing a standalone CSU Libraries shared print program, with a recommendation to COLD by November 9, 2018.

Summary Discussion

"A shared print program … is a formal program in which multiple libraries coordinate long-term retention of print materials and provide services for them" (SCELC, N.D.)[1] In November 2017, COLD adopted a strategic plan for which shared collections was one of four strategic priorities. The shared collections strategic priority included an objective to "Collaboratively develop a model for a CSU-wide, long-term, shared print collection." In spring 2018, the COLD voted to form the **S**hared **P**rint Investigative Reconnaissance & Implementation Team (SPIRIT), with direction to provide a recommendation for the September, 2018 COLD meeting. 22 out of 23 CSU libraries participated in a shared print survey distributed by SPIRIT in June designed to measure interest, need, and focus areas for shared print in the CSU Libraries.

The survey data indicated a strong interest in taking action on shared print and articulated the motivations that led COLD to prioritize shared collections and specifically, shared print. As demonstrated in Figure 1 on the following page, the CSU Libraries identified the need for space reclamation for student learning, improving access to library materials, collaborative collection development, and preservation. Shared print programs enable all of this through data analysis and retention agreements that allow libraries to strategically, selectively, and responsibly reduce print collections while maintaining thresholds of scarce items in fulfillment of our professional stewardship of the long half-life of traditional print.

---

[1] Note: additional background on shared print monograph initiatives can be found in *Shared Print: An Overview*, on the Confluence page for SPIRIT (we should include the link for this page)

Figure 1. Q1.19 - The following objectives are commonly cited as motivation for participating in shared print programs. How important is each of the following objectives for you?

#	Question	Extremely important		Very important		Moderately important		Slightly important		Not at all important		Total
1	Reclaiming library space for student learning	50%	11	23%	5	14%	3	5%	1	9%	2	22
2	Reclaiming library space for newer books and materials	14%	3	9%	2	41%	9	23%	5	14%	3	22
4	Reclaiming library space for services such as tutoring, writing centers, and makerspaces	18%	4	18%	4	27%	6	9%	2	27%	6	22
3	Reclaiming library space for other purposes	5%	1	18%	4	27%	6	27%	6	23%	5	22
5	Saving money through collaborative acquisitions	36%	8	36%	8	27%	6	0%	0	0%	0	22
6	Improving access to materials for students and faculty	45%	10	45%	10	5%	1	0%	0	5%	1	22
7	Preserving the scholarly record	23%	5	45%	10	14%	3	18%	4	0%	0	22

For journals, WEST is best

Responses to the CSU Libraries shared print survey demonstrated a strong interest in shared print journal programs but also a general concurrence that the Western Regional Storage Trust (WEST), a program of the California Digital Library of the University of California but open to participation from academic libraries, fulfilled the CSU Libraries' need for shared print journals, a decision echoed in the decision of the Great Western Library Alliance (GWLA), a large consortium, to deactivate its shared journal project because of the availability of WEST (http://papr.crl.edu/program/40/gwla-shared-print-program-inactive).

Q1.24 - With respect to shared print programs for print journals, if cost and other factors were roughly equal, what would be your preference for organizational models?

#	Question	Prefer a great deal		Prefer a lot		Prefer a moderate amount		Prefer slightly		Do not prefer		Total
1	Prefer to participate in WEST	38%	8	24%	5	19%	4	5%	1	14%	3	21
2	Prefer to participate in existing shared journals programs other than WEST:	0%	0	5%	1	15%	3	10%	2	70%	14	20
3	Prefer to create a CSU-only shared journal program	11%	2	5%	1	5%	1	26%	5	53%	10	19
4	Undecided	8%	1	0%	0	15%	2	0%	0	77%	10	13
5	Not interested in shared print journal programs	7%	1	7%	1	0%	0	0%	0	87%	13	15

For shared print monograph programs, two choices

Survey responses also indicated a strong interest in taking action (85% "do not prefer" taking no action), and a slight preference to partnering with the Shared Print [monograph] Program of SCELC, the Statewide California Electronic Library Consortium. The choices were provided without additional context, such as cost, time to implement, or governance models.

Figure 1. Q1.26 - With respect to shared print programs for print monographs, if cost and other factors were roughly equal, what would be your preference for organizational models?

#	Question	Prefer a great deal		Prefer a lot		Prefer a moderate amount		Prefer slightly		Do not prefer		Total
1	Create a CSU-only shared print monograph program	20%	4	15%	3	20%	4	25%	5	20%	4	20
2	Join SCELC print monograph program	23%	5	23%	5	14%	3	27%	6	14%	3	22
4	Take no action on shared print monographs	5%	1	5%	1	0%	0	5%	1	85%	17	20

With respect to mandatory or opt-in participation in a shared print monograph program, only 27% of the respondents agreed that participation should be mandatory (as stated in the survey, "all in or nothing").

The path ahead

Following the survey, SPIRIT conducted an environmental scan of active shared print programs in the United States using the Print Archives and Preservation Registry (PAPR). PAPR maintains a searchable database of "print archiving programs" (http://papr.crl.edu/), which confirms that the SCELC Shared Print Program is the only shared print monograph program west of Iowa. Since the CSU Libraries committed to shared print action in the strategic plan and reaffirmed this commitment in the June shared print survey, this means that the decision for the CSU Libraries is to build its own shared print program from the ground up, or join the SCELC Shared Print Program.

What would the SPIRIT investigation entail?

Some of the open questions for identifying a path forward with shared print monographs are:

- Governance: Adapting the SCELC governance model to give the CSU Libraries representation in the program
- Contracts: Contractual review of a proposed SCELC-CSU MOU
- Cost: Determining cost models for startup and ongoing or periodic costs, and comparing both models
- Support: analyzing support models to ensure adequate support not only through startup but through the life of the shared print program
- Agreement on types of materials held by the shared trust
- Identifying copy sharing mechanisms for either approach
- Identifying "pre-nup" and similar details (lost items, withdrawal from the program)
- For the SCELC program, a general sense that the CSU Libraries and SCELC consider this mutually beneficial
- Review GreenGlass for Groups and confirm its ability to support a CSU-only or SCELC-CSU shared print program

What about gov docs, microfilm, RapidILL, e-books, etc.?

Shared print monograph, journal, and monograph-journal programs have succeeded in part because of the simplicity of their program designs and the focus on one or both formats. This is not to say that the CSU Libraries should not pursue programs to help depository libraries move to shared/printless models, to improve resource sharing, build ebook repositories, create a CSU RAPID pod, and so on. It is a caution against introducing mission creep into fulfillment of a strategic objective.