

Shared Print in Place Task Force

Report

March 22, 2011

Sam Dunlap, UCSD (Chair)

Colleen Carlton, UCLA/RLF

Jan Carter, UCB

Karleen Darr, UCD

Brad Eden, UCSB

Vince Novoa, UCR

Kerry Scott, UCSC

Emily Stambaugh, CDL

Lucia Snowhill, SOPAG Liaison

Contents

Introduction	3
Vision for Shared Print in Place Collections	5
Shared Print in Place Definition	6
Persistence and the Extension of Persistence to “in Place” collections. Relationship between “in Place” and Stored Collections.	7
Goals and Directions for Shared Print in Place	8
Recommendations	11
Table 1: Summary of Recommendations.....	12
Policy and Standards of Practice Recommendations	13
Prospective Recommendations	13
Retrospective Recommendations.....	14
Conclusion.....	16

Introduction

This report is submitted against the backdrop of unprecedented state budget shortfalls across the campuses, which are assessed to the libraries in varying degrees of severity. This fact, coupled with impending space challenges as the Regional Library Facilities reach capacity, further reinforce the importance of developing shared “in place” collections at the campuses. Indeed, we can soon envision the day when such in place collections are the new norm.

The SOPAG Shared Print in Place Task Force was charged to recommend policies and infrastructure to support shared print collections held in place (on site in full-service libraries) as well as near term and longer term actions to facilitate the development of such collections, particularly where such actions may achieve space savings for the libraries.

The Task Force met weekly and developed recommendations as a group and in smaller subgroups as needed. The Task Force consulted with other groups and individuals, including:

- Jim Dooley (CDC)
- Ann Frenkel (HOPS)
- Lizanne Payne (WEST and CRL)
- Colleen Carlton, Scott Miller, Tin Tran (NRLF and SRLF)
- Patricia Martin (CDL Discovery and Delivery)

The Task Force’s work is also informed by several *internal* UC reports and recommendations, including the University of California Libraries’ Priorities for Collective Initiatives, 2011-2014 (endorsed by the Council of University Librarians and updated 20 January 2011); CDC’s Strategy for Developing Prospective Shared Print Journal Archives (22 December 2010); CDC Shared Monographs Coordinating Group Charge (13 December 2010); the Preliminary Results of the SLASIAC Library Planning Task Force (9 February 2010); and CDC’s document, The University of California Library Collection: Content for the 21st Century and Beyond (revised and endorsed by the University Librarians, July 2009).

The Task Force’s work is also informed by several *external* developments, research and trends in shared print collection development, including:

- The Western Regional Storage Trust, a retrospective print journal repository service. As contributing members of the Trust, UC Libraries will archive certain print journal backfiles and depend on the archiving commitments of several other Trust members. The Trust will create opportunities to reclaim significant amounts of space in UC’s Libraries and RLFs. Some backfiles will be held on-site in full service libraries (e.g. Bronze Archives) as shared print in place and some backfiles will be compiled and held in storage (Gold, Silver, Platinum Archives). Strategically, the Trust will force new alliances for print collection management among research libraries in the western U.S. which may be leveraged in the future for additional shared print initiatives, including coordinated shared-print-in-place in the region and cloud-sourcing services.

- Collaborative Retention of Print Monographs.¹ Lyris sponsored a two-day think tank in October 2010 to develop a national framework for the retention and management of print monographs. Participating library leaders outlined the characteristics of a national framework to coordinate long-term preservation and storage among research libraries and provide services to coordinated archives including digitization, access services, and retention registries. The task force's Cloud Sourcing recommendation aligns with this emerging national framework for print monograph archiving and envisions a period of initial focus (for UC libraries) on coordinating stored monographic collections and incubating the infrastructure needed to support services to a broader community, after which, shared print in place collections would be included (and could leverage the new infrastructure).
- Cloud-Sourcing Research Collections: Managing Print in the Mass-Digitized Library Environment.² The "Cloud-sourcing" report suggests that the aggregate holdings of a small number of existing shared storage facilities, if federated, could provide print collection services to a significant number of research libraries, allowing such libraries (and UC's) to significantly rationalize their collections. The federation of stored collections (aka "the cloud") could depend upon digitized print, when available and accessible (e.g. Hathi), and would need to satisfy market demands for collections and access services. The cloud has significant implications for the future vision of UC's shared print collections (in place and in storage). The Task Force has developed a cloud-sourcing recommendation to position UC and a few selected institutions in a leadership role to develop a cloud-sourced collection service. UC's shared monographic collections in storage are recommended as an initial collection set followed by shared print in place collections.
- On the Cost of Keeping a Book.³ Paul Courant and Buzzy Nielson analyzed the longer-term costs to retain a book in print and digital form and conclude that storage is the lowest cost option for long-term retention of physical books. UC's Shared print in place collections are envisioned as collections that are permanently "eligible" for storage, portions of which may eventually be stored in order to reduce long-term carrying costs as much as possible.

¹ Core components of a national framework for collaborative print monograph management would include a distributed archiving model, explicit retention and access agreements, and new or enhanced systems infrastructure for disclosure, discovery and delivery. Assuming these things, three major monograph collection categories were identified for initial incorporation into a shared archiving framework 1) monographs held in storage facilities, 2) digitized print monographs, 3) monographs in particular domains. Three major collection categories were identified as initial collections to "seed" a broader framework; each collection category satisfies different internal and external needs: political (domain-based selection), technical (digitized print in Hathi) and strategic (location-based selection, starting with stored collections.) For more information: <http://www.lyris.org/Products-and-Services/Grants-and-Special-Projects/Collaborative-Print-Monograph-Retention.aspx>

² Malpas, Constance. "Cloud-Sourcing Research Collections: Managing Print in the Mass-Digitized Library Environment." Research Report. OCLC Research, January 2011.

³ Courant, Paul and Buzzy Nielson. "On the cost of keeping a book" chapter in The idea of order: transforming research collections for 21st Century Scholarship. Washington, D.C.: Council on Library and Information Resources, June 2010. Publication 147. <http://www.clir.org/pubs/reports/pub147/pub147.pdf>

Vision for Shared Print in Place Collections

This report outlines a vision for Shared Print in Place collections and services. The vision identifies where we are now and where we want to be in terms of shared physical collections held on site. Shared Print collections are also envisioned in the context of broader national efforts to coordinate print collections.

The report includes the following components:

- Definition of “Shared Print” “In Place”
- Persistence and the extension of persistence to “in place” collections
- Goals and Directions for Shared Print in Place (where we are now; where we want to be and next steps)
- Recommended policies and standards of practice to support Shared Print in Place collections
- Specific recommendations for programs and projects that can be undertaken

Shared Print in Place Definition

The concepts of “shared print” and “in place” each require definition.

Shared print collections are broadly defined as collections of physical resources that are acquired and/or managed cooperatively; behaviors are explicitly formalized to ensure inter-institutional dependencies. The formalization of behaviors is essential when “sharing” physical resources and is accomplished through systemwide policies. Adherence to the policies instills trust in the ongoing collection development and management of resources such that libraries can make informed choices about future acquisitions and retention of duplicates. One of the major recommendations of the Task Force is for SOPAG to adopt the *Shared Print in Place Policy* in the Appendices.

Shared print collections are ***intentionally developed as a shared resource with the endorsement and participation of multiple institutions***. Shared collections include ***an explicit commitment to acquire, retain and provide services for certain resources*** on behalf of the collective and ***the collective agrees to depend on that commitment*** when making local decisions to acquire or retain. Such commitments are formally disclosed in catalog records and more broadly, in some form of program statement or agreement (e.g. the Shared Monographs Planning Group’s “initiative statement”). As the SMPG aptly noted in its report, shared print collections differ from the collections that are routinely developed by each campus:

“One could say that every print monograph in the UC system is a shared monograph—visible to all UC users via Next Generation MELVYL (NGM) and MELVYL, and retrievable via interlibrary loan....[but for] “shared monographs” ...there is collective access and deliberate coordination. Monographs are “shared” when there has been a commitment and notification of intent to acquire and to retain content so that other campuses can rely on these commitments when making collection-related decisions.”⁴

In terms of location, Shared Print ***“in place” specifically refers to shared physical collections that are held on-site in a full-service library*** (as opposed to storage.)

And in broader terms, the types of physical resources that can be included under the rubric of shared “print” can be broadly construed as resources held in print, microform and other physical supports (e.g. DVD, VHS tapes).

⁴The CDC Shared Monograph Planning Group report (October 2010, page 6) makes this distinction between local collections and shared collections. [http://libraries.universityofcalifornia.edu/cdc/protected/Shared_Monographs_Planning_Group_Report_20101011.pdf] (password-protected)

Persistence and the Extension of Persistence to “in Place” collections. Relationship between “in Place” and Stored Collections.

In many ways, UC Libraries are far ahead of other consortia in shared print collection management. The long standing policies and operating procedures that govern the Regional Library Facilities have effectively created a “permanent” collection within UC. The collection management behaviors for such resources are predictable and transparent, systemwide. The core elements of UC’s “persistence policy” are

- **No withdrawals** (recalls are okay)
- **Responsibility for maintenance is borne by the depositing campus**
- **Single copy**

Aspects that are not explicitly written but are strongly implied or currently in practice are

- **Shared governance and ownership.** For persistent deposits, governance and ownership are effectively shared in the UC context. From an asset management perspective, the parent institution (the University of California) recognizes library collections as assets that are owned by a single entity (UC Regents.) Equally important, from a behavioral standpoint between libraries, non-depositing libraries withdraw in lieu of deposit creating an expectation of collective decision-making about stored resources. At an operational level, such decision-making effectively transfers to the RLF Board of Directors and Council of University Librarians. The value of a persistent resource increases as copies are reduced systemwide, effectively “uping the ante” on collection management expectations. Furthermore, for journal backfiles and other resources for which holdings are compiled from multiple institutions, the “resource” becomes a consolidated set and the notion of historical volume-level ownership becomes less relevant. The backfile is effectively a shared resource that is only meaningful to scholarship as a whole.
- **Hierarchy of access to physical resources.** The RLFs currently triage requests for shared, persistent resources in the following order 1) direct the user to the online resource; 2) provide electronic document delivery (including color scans when appropriate); 3) provide photocopies; and 4) loan the issue or volume (in some cases for building use only). Resources that have been validated (e.g. JSTOR volumes) are re-validated upon return of the physical piece(s).

The Task Force recommends extending all of these behaviors to shared print in place collections by adopting two new policies and two new standards of practice, discussed later. As space in the shared storage facilities becomes more precious, it is imperative that shared collections held on site be eligible for future deposit at an RLF and that behaviors are adopted to ensure that depositing libraries check for shared copies in place before sending other duplicates to storage. The proposed policies include all of these aspects.

Goals and Directions for Shared Print in Place

The following are general observations of where we are and where we want to be. More finely articulated observations are included as part of each specific Recommendation contained in the Appendices.

Where we are

- Most shared print collections are held in storage facilities.
- There are no policies to govern shared print resources held outside of storage facilities (e.g. a persistence policy, or common behaviors for access, cataloging or acquisition of shared print resources).
- Shared print collections are not disclosed in union catalogs as shared collections. Systemwide collection management decisions are difficult to make absent this visibility as is the ability to forge future partnerships with extramural partners.
- Shared print collections are currently little used. Various library practices can positively or negatively affect use of shared print copies. The lower the use, the less libraries are inclined to change collection management practices or to continue to develop shared collections or to develop services around them, seriously affecting their sustainability.
- Shared print collections are developed in the context of UC Libraries but benefit a broader range of research libraries that are interested in and willing to help sustain the collections.
- Storage facilities are not only filling, but the value of their assets in the library community is increasing.
- Campuses are very hesitant to prioritize or dedicate any human or financial resources to develop collaborative print efforts; campuses that are willing to contribute don't want to be the only ones
- Certain business practices create disincentives to participation in shared print initiatives precisely at a time when more collaboration is needed: management of shared collections is not prioritized at campuses or storage facilities; shared resources are subject to the same financial "taxation" as campus deposits.
- Campuses may not be fully leveraging vendor's selection visibility capabilities or similar tools in the marketplace; when visibility is there, campuses may not be making choices based on evidence of duplication rates.
- Campuses may lack incentives to deselect and reclaim space even in the presence of shared print collections
- If the libraries do not find partnerships and solutions for its space needs, university administrators are likely to "figure out the space problem for us"
- Radical transformation in print collection development and management often requires new modes of collaboration beyond the consortia, new roles for storage facilities, startup capital, and enhanced infrastructure.

Where we want to be

UC Libraries want to create an environment where

- Some shared print collections are developed locally, on-site.
- Multiple campuses develop shared print in place collections, thereby distributing the responsibility for collection management.
- Shared print becomes an integral part of campus' collection management activities.
- Shared print collections are fully discoverable, accessible and used; systemwide use is channeled to them by policy, practice and technical capabilities.
- Collection development, acquisition, cataloging, discovery and delivery behaviors for shared print in place are transparent and predictable across the system.
- Shared print collections interoperate seamlessly with shared stored collections. Transfers for in place collections to storage facilities are routinized, prioritized and incentivized. Sufficient space is allocated and/or created through coordinated deselection of lower risk duplicate materials to accommodate shared print collections.
- Storage of shared print collections is encouraged and prioritized in order to reduce carrying costs and to position resources for extramural partnerships.
- Shared print in place resources are not taxed when deposited and do not count against the annual campus allocation.
- Campuses and storage facilities deselect and reclaim space as soon as shared print collections are disclosed. Campus duplicates are kept to support local use-driven activity (i.e., for instructional purposes/reserves).
- Campuses fully leverage vendor selection visibility tools and agree to principles for reducing duplication and sustaining the breadth of the collections.
- CDL Shared Print and the RLF Board of Directors are formally included within systemwide leadership structures and are encouraged to develop extramural service agreements around shared resources.
- Bibliographer group agreements for print resources are coordinated and formalized within systemwide collection and technical service structures.

In a broader context, UC Libraries want to create or participate in an environment where

- Shared print in place collections are envisioned as collections that benefit a broader constituency and are chosen, developed and supported as such.
- UC Libraries are positioned as *archivers and providers* of shared print resources in the national network of print collections; UC Libraries want to be positioned to receive support for its stewardship commitments to scholars and to seek support from extramural partners to sustain such collections and provide access to them.
- UC libraries lead the development of cloud-sourced print collection services and partnerships. Such services would begin with shared-stored collections at multiple storage facilities and

eventually incorporate UC and other libraries' shared print *in place* collections. Such collections and services would be designed to provide ready access to users at many research libraries while ensuring stewardship and preservation of the scholarly print record at the lowest possible cost and creating significant opportunities for space reclamation.

- Experimentation with delivery options is undertaken to enhance user access to shared physical collections and make it possible for campuses and partner libraries to reduce duplication while ensuring ready access to the collections.

Recommendations

The Task Force came up with thirteen (13) recommendations grouped into three major categories: policies, prospective and retrospective activities. The recommendations focus primarily on policies and infrastructure needed to support shared print resources held *in place*. When there is a relationship between shared collections in place and in storage, the recommendations address both.

An overall weighted priority has been identified for each recommendation. Emphasis is placed on transformative potential, space reclamation potential and potential for extramural collaboration.

The recommendations and options are described in detail in this report for SOPAG's consideration. The Task Force assumes that SOPAG will choose recommendations to advance to the Council of University Librarians for review and endorsement, and identify recommendations for further revision by expert groups. The task force has suggested timelines and next steps for each recommendation; SOPAG may wish to revise those and formulate specific charges, when needed.

Each specific recommendation appears in the appendices. The following table and section briefly summarize the recommendations.

Table 1: Summary of Recommendations

#	Recommendation	Material Type	Priority
Policies and Standards of Practice			
1a	Adopt the Shared Print in Place Policy for Prospective Collections	All	1
1b	Adopt the Common Access Policy for Shared Print Resources	All	1
1c	Adopt the Bibliographic Standards for Shared Print Monographs (2-6-2011) provisionally, appoint nimble group to revise	Monographs	1
1d	Adopt the Standard Acquisition Practices for Shared Print	All	1
Prospective Programs/Projects			
2	Develop principles for when to establish a Shared Print collection in place	All	3
3	Develop principles for when to acquire, transfer and withdraw microform materials	Microform	5
4	Call for and implement shared print proposals for monographs	Monographs	4
5	Blue ribbon task force to coordinate prospective acquisition of Federal Documents	All	4
Retrospective Programs/Projects – Preservation and Access			
6	Develop cloud-sourcing partnerships and services, initially for print monographs	Stored monographs initially, followed by SPIP monographs	2
7	Campuses adopt practices of contributing holdings when called for by WEST or JSTOR	Journals	3
8	Encourage libraries to declare print resources that are mass digitized as shared print	Monographs, Journals	3
Retrospective Programs/Projects – Deselection			
9	Deselect duplicate JSTOR print journal holdings systemwide	Journals	3
10	Campuses deselect print monographs held at campuses that are also housed at NRLF, SRLF, or both	Monographs	3
11	Deselect print journal backfiles for Bronze Archives declared by WEST partners	Journals	3
12	Campuses and storage facilities adopt an annual practice of deselecting duplicates of Silver and Gold journal backfiles as they are declared and disclosed in WEST		4
13	Campuses adopt an annual practice of deselecting print duplicates as shared print in place resources are disclosed	Monographs initially	3

Policy and Standards of Practice Recommendations

When developing shared print collections in place, it is imperative that campuses adopt a common set of policies and practices to ensure trust and transparency about archiving and ongoing collection development commitments. Each institution wants (and needs) to depend upon the collections built elsewhere, in a network of interdependencies. To ensure this trust and to facilitate adjustments in local practices as a result of such commitments, the task force recommends the adoption of two policies and two standards of practice.

These policies and standards of practices have been vetted extensively; they represent the most urgent, most important and highest priority recommendations. The text of each policy is provided in the appendices along with background information about the review process among campus experts and recommended timeline for adoption.

1. **Shared Print in Place Policy for Prospective Collections.** This policy extends the “Persistence Policy” to collections that are collaboratively identified, agreed upon and built at full-service libraries. It effectively establishes a “permanent” collection at campuses, similar to the Persistence Policy. The policy applies to prospective acquisitions and interoperates with the Persistence Policy, when such holdings are moved to storage.
2. **Common Access Policy for Shared Print in Place Collections.** This policy governs access to shared print collections by library users and other organizations. The policy addresses access, forms of delivery and liability for loss of shared print collections held in place.
3. **Bibliographic Standards for Shared Print Monographs.** This set of standards is used to disclose shared print monographs and archiving commitments in union catalogs, establish cataloging service requirements when working with vendors and prioritize cataloging efforts for shared print monographs in relation to other copies.
4. **Standard Acquisition Practices for Shared Print Monographs.** This set of standards outlines the responsibilities of a managing campus for acquiring and processing Shared Print monographs, working with vendors and prioritizing processing in relation to other copies.

Prospective Recommendations

The task force prepared several recommendations for collaborative collection development of print resources (i.e., current imprints.) The collaborative development of prospective print collections can contribute significantly to the maintenance of breadth of UC library collections and preservation of the scholarly record, when print is the only format of publication. And to varying degrees, the recommendations for prospective coordination may generate opportunities for space reclamation (though always to a lesser degree than can be achieved by coordinating retrospective collections.)

The prospective recommendations include:

- **Develop principles for when to establish a Shared Print collection in place.**
- **Develop principles for when to acquire microform.**
- **Call for and implement shared print proposals for monographs.**
- **Blue ribbon task force to coordinate prospective acquisition of Federal Documents.**

Retrospective Recommendations

The task force prepared several recommendations for coordination and/or consolidation of retrospective print collections. Collection management decisions are made in the context of the aggregate holdings of research libraries (UC libraries and other libraries in the network) but are necessarily a local decision. Each UC library wants and needs to know about the archiving commitments of other institutions (in the system and beyond) in order to make informed local decisions.

The scale of the space demands on UC libraries and storage facilities require us to make archiving decisions in place and to disclose those commitments in transparent ways to facilitate informed decisions about duplicates. UC Libraries have extensive experience with making print archiving commitments and continue to provide significant leadership through UC Shared Print activities to coordinate such activities internally within the UC system, externally in the western region, and beyond.

The task force has made two kinds of recommendations for retrospective collections: 1) recommendations to support *archiving* commitments and 2) recommendations to support *subsequent deselection* of duplicate holdings in response to an archiving commitment somewhere in the system.

Programs and projects that focus on retrospective holdings tend to yield the highest opportunities for space reclamation. The extent of the space opportunities created by any recommendation is dependent upon the size of the collection identified for archiving, existing duplication, and local willingness to act on the archiving commitments, once made.

The retrospective recommendations that involve *archiving commitments* include:

- **Develop cloud-sourcing partnerships and services, initially for print monographs.** A recommendation to make archiving commitments to stored print monographs and to federate multiple storage facilities to offer a cloud-sourced services to a broad community of research libraries.
- **Encourage libraries to declare print resources that are mass digitized as shared print.** A recommendation to identify and disclose print resources that are or have been mass digitized as shared print (starting with RLF copies and extending to campuses, as needed). Such resources would be managed according to the policies for shared print

recommended in this report. This recommendation could be accomplished quickly and would create a ready collection for systemwide decision-making about duplicates as well as a ready collection to support cloud-sourced services.

- **Campuses adopt practices of contributing holdings when called for by WEST or JSTOR. Fill gaps in those archives.** A recommendation to contribute holdings, when called for, to shared print archiving activities to ensure the persistence of these holdings and ensure their completeness and condition over time. Campuses already generously contribute to the UC JSTOR Shared Print archive and the recommendation is to continue to sustain campus efforts to review and contribute print holdings as soon as they are called for to keep systemwide operational costs low. To the extent possible, we seek to avoid the need to seek holdings from extramural partners to fulfill our obligations when content exists within the system (i.e. avoid having to issue “calls for holdings” to many extramural partners.)

The retrospective recommendations that involve *deselection*, subsequent to those archiving commitments, include:

- **Deselect duplicate JSTOR print journal holdings systemwide.**
- **Campuses deselect print monographs that are also held at NRLF, SRLF or both.**
- **Deselect print journal backfiles for Bronze Archives declared by WEST partners.**
- **Campuses and storage facilities adopt annual practices of deselecting duplicate print holdings for Silver and Gold Archives as they are declared and disclosed by WEST partners in OCLC.**
- **Campuses and storage facilities adopt annual practices of deselecting duplicate print holdings as shared print in place resources are declared and disclosed in OCLC.**

Conclusion

The recommendations of the Shared Print in Place Task Force will undoubtedly elicit a variety of reactions and responses across the system and we recognize that some campuses may be better positioned to begin action on some of the recommendations sooner than others. We recognize that the UC libraries have unique histories, cultures and campus roles, and that they are separated by great distances across the state. Campuses may wish to take advantage of their geographic proximity in the north and south in order to begin both with the weeding of retrospective collections and to begin work on developing prospective shared print collections in place. We also recognize that geography plays a major role in collaboration, especially given the proximity of UC Berkeley and Stanford in the north, and their ongoing efforts to coordinate prospective print collection development.

We also know that we, as UC, can no longer do it all alone and that we must seek out extramural partnerships, such as with JSTOR, WEST, and Lyrasis, that will allow us to share resources across the emerging cloud. The recommendations provide a framework whereby we retain the collective broad historic record of print resources retrospectively and consortially. At the same time, the recommendations will enable UC to maintain our collaborative purchasing strength across the system for prospectively acquired shared and sharable print resources. By so doing, this will allow us to maintain the collective depth and breadth of resources that we require as a research institution of such distinction as the University of California.