Updates from Print Archives at ALA Midwinter 2013

Reports shared with PAN by print archiving programs from around the country

1. ASERL Scholar’s Trust Cooperative Journal Retention Program (Includes ASERL/WRLC cooperative agreement) http://www.aserl.org/programs/j-retain/ P.1-3

2. Committee on Institutional Cooperation (CIC) Shared Print Repository
   http://www.cic.net/projects/library/shared-print-repository/introduction P.4

3. Five Colleges Library Depository Program https://www.fivecolleges.edu/libraries/depository P.5-6

4. Florida Academic Repository (FLARE) http://csul.net/node/774 P.7-9

5. Maine Shared Collections Strategy (MSCS) http://www.maineinfonet.net/mscs/ P.10-13

6. Ohio Library and Information Network (OhioLINK) Print Archiving
   https://www.ohiolink.edu/ostaff/depositories/ P.14-15

7. Research Collections and Preservation Consortium (ReCAP) http://recap.princeton.edu/ P.16

8. University of California Shared Print (California Digital Library) (UCALSP)
   http://www.cdlib.org/services/collections/sharedprint/ P.17-18

9. Western Regional Storage Trust (WEST) http://www.cdlib.org/west P.19

ASERL and WRLC – have signed an agreement to create “Scholars Trust.” The Trust will combine the contents of their respective shared print journal collections under a single retention and access agreement.

- [www.scholarstrust.org](http://www.scholarstrust.org) | [www.scholarstrust.us](http://www.scholarstrust.us)
- The combined title list exceeds 8,000 journal titles and more than 300,000 volumes, making Scholars Trust one of the largest shared print journal repositories in the United States.
- ASERL’s Reciprocal ILL Agreement expanded to include WRLC members as of February 1.

Participating ASERL libraries and the number of titles contributed (just under 4400 titles):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Library</th>
<th>Titles</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Auburn</td>
<td>(44)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duke</td>
<td>(842)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Carolina</td>
<td>(10)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emory</td>
<td>(67)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgia Tech</td>
<td>(537)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louisiana State</td>
<td>(64)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mississippi State</td>
<td>(3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NC State</td>
<td>(7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tulane</td>
<td>(9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U-Alabama</td>
<td>(126)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U-Florida</td>
<td>(985)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U-Kentucky</td>
<td>(93)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U-Louisville</td>
<td>(40)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U-Memphis</td>
<td>(143)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U-Mississippi</td>
<td>(27)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNC Chapel Hill</td>
<td>(546)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNC Greensboro</td>
<td>(37)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U-Tennessee</td>
<td>(96)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U-Virginia</td>
<td>(21)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VCU</td>
<td>(150)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virginia Tech</td>
<td>(343)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wake Forest</td>
<td>(172)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William &amp; Mary</td>
<td>(7)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: U-South Carolina is currently reviewing/selecting titles for retention.

Program Highlights -

- **OCLC Symbols for Shared Print:** The Steering Committee unanimously agreed not to require participants to create a secondary OCLC symbol to identify their shared print collections. There was broad consensus that, at this time, obtaining additional OCLC symbols did not justify the additional costs and workload.

- **Bibliographic Notation:** Participating libraries will note the title’s retention status in their local catalogs through the use of the MARC 583 action note. At minimum, a base level statement (“committed to retain”) will be used. If the library is not retaining their complete run of a title, a second 583 “completeness” action note would be required to document the exceptions. Steering Committee members agreed to update their local holding records for their retained titles by December 31, 2016.

- **Subject Designations:** LC Class headings have been added to the title list. Participating libraries agreed to submit this information by August 9, 2013.

- **A publicly-accessible list of titles** retained under this agreement is maintained on the ASERL website so others can easily access the information. [http://www.aserl.org/programs/j-retain/](http://www.aserl.org/programs/j-retain/).

- **Participation in CRL’s PAPR registry** under development.

Next Steps

- The current title list (Excel) is in the process of being migrated to the Journal Retention and Needs List (JRNL) Gap-filler software, housed at the University of Florida. A recording of the May 9, 2013 webinar - “Demonstration of JRNL Software for ASERL’s Journal Retention Program” is available on the ASERL website at [www.aserl.org/archive](http://www.aserl.org/archive).

Focused retention initiatives –

- **Ag Journals** – Land Grant Institutions. Title selection is behind the anticipated schedule.
- **Other well-described (and space-consuming) sets** – e.g., Chem Abs, Thomas Register, NUC, NYT Index, etc.
FOR IMMEDIATE RELEASE

Contact:  John Burger  |  jburger@aserl.org  |  919-681-2531
         Mark Jacobs  |  jacobs@wrlc.org  |  301-390-2031

ASERL and WRLC Create Scholars Trust

(WASHINGTON, DC) -- The Association of Southeastern Research Libraries (ASERL) and the Washington Research Library Consortium (WRLC) have signed an agreement to create “Scholars Trust.” The Trust will combine the contents of their respective shared print journal collections under a single retention and access agreement. As a result, the combined title list exceeds 8,000 journal titles and more than 300,000 volumes, making Scholars Trust one of the largest shared print journal repositories in the United States. In conjunction with the formation of Scholars Trust, WRLC and ASERL libraries have agreed to extend reciprocal priority Inter-Library Loan (ILL) services across the group.

“We are thrilled to join forces in partnership with ASERL to make Scholars Trust a reality,” commented Mark Jacobs, Executive Director of the WRLC. “Through informal conversations, it became clear that we shared the same goals and long-term needs for the programs each consortium had under development. It made good sense to combine our efforts into Scholars Trust. The priority ILL service agreement is icing on the cake.”

“ASERL and WRLC are distinct organizations providing many unique and valuable services to their member libraries,” added Lynn Sutton, President of ASERL and Dean of Libraries at Wake Forest University. “These partnerships are wonderful examples of a new level of cooperation among libraries to provide cost-effective service to our users and also meet the operational needs of libraries in a rapidly changing environment.”

The Scholars Trust agreement requires the archived materials to be held until at least December 31, 2035, possibly longer. The materials archived by WRLC are housed in a central facility in suburban Maryland. The materials being archived by ASERL members are held at various locations across the Southeast. A large majority of the print archive contents is readily available online from many sources, so the need to access the archived items is expected to be quite low.
“Today’s library users expect access to content anytime and anywhere,” noted John Burger, ASERL’s Executive Director. “The libraries in ASERL and WRLC are continually expanding ways to deliver content to users quickly and easily. Scholars Trust is a fail-safe means of providing content when a researcher needs an original printed journal – an ‘artifact,’ if you will – should the digital surrogate be somehow insufficient for their needs, or not be available.”

About ASERL
Founded in 1956, the Association of Southeastern Research Libraries is the largest regional research library cooperative in the country, with 40 members in 11 states. ASERL operates numerous projects designed to foster a high standard of library excellence through inter-institutional resource sharing and other collaborative efforts. By working together, ASERL members provide and maintain top quality resources and services for the students, faculty, and citizens of their respective communities. More information about ASERL can be found at www.aserl.org.

About WRLC
The Washington Research Library Consortium was established in 1987 to support and enhance the library and information services of universities in the Washington, DC metropolitan area. Today, the WRLC enables the success of learning and scholarship among its nine partner universities by creating coordinated collections, creating a robust infrastructure for discovery and access, ensuring the long-term preservation of physical and digital information resources and sharing expertise. Learn more about the WRLC at www.wrlc.org.

# # #
Update on Committee on Institutional Cooperation’s Shared Print Repository (CIC-SPR)

June 2013

The CIC-SPR is a centralized print repository serving fifteen member institutions. A program of the Committee on Institutional Cooperation’s Center for Library Initiatives, the CIC-SPR is committed to providing print access to a shared collection of journal backfile volumes. The first phase of this initiative is now underway, with plans for securing some 250,000 volumes over five years.

Recent Activities

- Indiana University has moved some 56,000 journal volumes into the designated CIC-SPR storage in their Auxiliary Library Facility, the first designated host site of the project.
- The first transfer of materials from a campus to a secondary host site was completed in May, when Ohio State University shipped approximately 11,500 Elsevier backfile volumes to Indiana.
- A third partner university has been approached to provide further Elsevier backfile content.
- Planning is underway to begin processing Springer and Wiley backfile content.
- The OCLC symbol “IULSP” was reserved for this location, and the first batch upload of OCLC records with this symbol have been processed.
- Cataloging and technical specifications guidelines have been drafted and approved by the steering committee.
- Access and discovery guidelines have been drafted, and will be approved in upcoming months.
- Issues under current consideration include identifying and locating missing volumes; identifying next content and viable suppliers; and establishing a pilot program to determine recommendations for withdrawing stored content.

For more information please contact Rebecca Crist at rcrist@staff.cic.net or visit the project website, http://www.cic.net/projects/library.
Update on the Five College Library Depository
June 2013 PAN meeting

Chris Loring/Jay Schafer
June 27, 2013

The Five College Library Depository (FCLD) is a high density storage facility (commonly known as the Bunker) for the lesser-used materials from the libraries of Amherst College, Hampshire College, Mount Holyoke College, Smith College, and the University of Massachusetts Amherst. The Depository also provides affiliate memberships to more than 180 libraries for specific journal collections such as JSTOR.

With current holdings of approximately 530,000 volumes, the Bunker is very near its estimated capacity of 570,000 volumes. For the past three years, the Five College Librarians have been working with Neal Abraham, Executive Director of the Five Colleges, Inc., to determine how best to expand the capacity of the Depository. Since structural and zoning issues make it impractical to expand the Bunker or to build at the Bunker site, we have been exploring site options and now have two possibilities – both located very close to the Bunker. We have also been exploring funding models for a new facility and hope to have funding in place by early fall.

Northeast Regional Library Print Management Planning Project

With the discussions about expanding the FCLD, we also wondered about how best to continue or expand the Affiliates Program. In July 2011, the Five College Librarians convened a meeting of librarians from the Northeast to discuss options for shared regional action on print management, including possibilities of a shared repository/depository (centralized or dispersed). The meeting drew 45 participants, including direct representatives from 34 separate libraries as well as representatives from Five Colleges, Incorporated, ConnectNY, the Massachusetts Board of Library Commissioners, Ithaka, the Center for Research Libraries Global Resources Network, the Massachusetts Library System, and the Boston Library Consortium. Lizanne Payne was the keynote speaker on "Emerging Regional Efforts for Shared Print Management," offering insights on various shared print programs, on developing a national shared print infrastructure, and on issues related to planning regional shared print programs.

To continue the conversation, we held a conference call on August 21, 2012 with 15 participants. Our goal was to design a series of regional conversations that would lead to an inventory of needs and interests in paying for one or more shared print management approaches. To support this work and to hold wider discussions based on the data collected, that we sought and received support through an officers’ grant from the Mellon Foundation.

The Northeast Regional Library Print Management Planning Project will be an 18-month planning activity to develop several clear strategies for developing and managing regional print collections of monographs and to document willingness of libraries to participate in one or more of the well-developed models.

The project activities will be comprised of a survey of library needs and interests and a series of meetings of representatives from college and university libraries at the end of which we will have identified groups willing to move forward to implementation of one or several models for shared management of print materials.
monographs. Work will be directed by the two Project Directors and managed by a project coordinator Kathryn Leigh of the University of Massachusetts Amherst Libraries.

We will need to invest time for thorough discussions and deep thinking to define what we should mean by "unique" elements of a monographic collection in this situation (editions, marginalia, etc.). We will build one or more models for a jointly managed monograph collection (whether collectively owned or jointly owned), gaining trust of the skeptics by working together to define how we will handle the materials that we incorporate book-by-book.

To start the work of the project we have engaged Lizanne Payne as our project consultant, whose first responsibilities will include collecting information from a significant sample of the interested participant libraries (72 at this writing) about their collections and their needs that could be addressed through a cooperative print monograph management strategy – what materials they would be willing to share (through shared management or shared ownership) and what interest there is in participating financially in one or another of the possible joint projects – to allow us to better identify possible shared solutions.

We will convene a day-long Planning Meeting, on July 9, 2013, to kick-off the program with discussions of the possibilities for collaboration. The consultant will have survey responses from the prospective participants to report. The consultant will facilitate this meeting and prepare presentation and related materials and a post-meeting summary. One of the outcomes of the meeting will be the establishment of four or five Working Groups which will be charged with addressing issues raised at the meeting, such as developing or adapting business models to suit the needs of all or a portion of the libraries’ holdings that they seek to manage regionally. The working groups will meet, in person at different campuses, and via conference calls, in the fall and winter 2013. Working group meetings will be attended by the project coordinator, monitored by the consultant and Project Directors, and facilitated by a group leader appointed by the Project Directors in consultation with the Steering Committee members; each group will deliver final reports of findings and recommendations to the Steering Committee. The Project Directors and the Steering Committee will monitor the reports from the Working Groups and offer suggestions and adjustments to the group memberships as needed.

In early spring 2014, the Project Directors in consultation with the members of the Steering Committee will appoint and convene a Summarizing Panel to combine the working group reports into a cohesive plan (or sets of plans). The consultant will facilitate the Panel’s first meeting and assist with development of recommendations and preparation of a summary document. The following summer, we will hold a final meeting of representatives from the participant libraries to discuss the plan and next steps toward implementation.

More information about the Project is available at:

https://www.fivecolleges.edu/libraries/regionalproject
June 2013

Update on Florida Academic Repository (FLARE), the statewide shared academic print collection

The Florida Academic Repository (FLARE) is the statewide shared collection of low use print materials from academic libraries in Florida. By establishing this centrally housed collection, the Council of State University Libraries (CSUL) provides new options for sharing the costs and effort of long term retention of low use library materials. Under the FLARE memorandum of understanding, the materials designated under this agreement will be retained and made available as long as the need for them exists, thereby allowing participants to consider withdrawing duplicates of these items from their campus collections and to rely with confidence on access to the centrally retained copies. Eventually FLARE will be housed in an environmentally controlled, carefully inventoried and secure high density facility (HDF) located in Gainesville, operated by the George A. Smathers Libraries at the University of Florida (UF) on behalf of the participating libraries. Until construction is complete, FLARE will be housed in a leased Interim Library Facility (ILF) and in the UF Libraries Auxiliary Library Facility (ALF), both of which support appropriate environmental and security conditions. In addition to the libraries in the 11 State Universities and the University of Miami, partners in FLARE will include libraries of the Independent Colleges and Universities of Florida and the Florida College System.

High Density and Interim Facilities

- The 100% construction documents and construction cost review were completed in early May for the UF 366 High Density Facility (HDF) and Auxiliary Library Facility (ALF) Renovation building project. Funding is anticipated in FY2014-2015. The project has strong support from the State University System (SUS) Council of Academic Vice Presidents (CAVP). Assuming funding as of July 1, 2014, the construction manager anticipates starting by late August or early September. In preparation for construction, staff will continuing to tray monographs, develop a planograph for the HDF shelving configuration, and develop a project plan for the initial load of trayed materials from the current storage facility to the HDF.

- University of Central Florida is preparing a shipment of 70,000 volumes of journals and monographs to FLARE. They are working closely with UF during the planning phase to avoid duplicates and assure effective processing of cataloging records.
Shared Collection Activities

- In April UF released the survey about JRNL (Journal Retention and Needs Listing), the journal storage software, to the State University System (SUS), Florida College System (FCS) and Independent Colleges & Universities of Florida libraries (ICUF) and Association of Southeastern Research Libraries (ASERL). Thirty-six responses were received by the deadline. Of these, 22 respondents participate or plan to participate in ASERL, FLARE or both print archiving programs. The majority of the 22 plan to upload data to JRNL (16 Yes, 6 Maybe, 0 No). UF is making recommendations based on these responses to the Statewide Storage Task Force (SSTF) and the ASERL Steering Committee for clarification of the definitions of storage conditions and circulation status.
  - On May 9 the JRNL software was demonstrated in a webinar to the ASERL j-retain group by Dean Russell and Winston Harris, lead programmer, UF Libraries (www.aserl.org/archive). Currently, six ASERL institutions are using the software. UF has added a limited number of titles, but will begin adding holdings records to the software in late June 2013.

- Removal of duplicate monographs from ALF has reached 97% completion of the 78,000 duplicate monographs identified in the collection. Target end date for this phase of the work is July 2013. The process continues to include condition assessment to retain the best copy and evaluation of digital access either through HathiTrust or another trusted repository or digitization. The next phase will focus on deduplication of journals.

- 33%, or 333,335, of the 1 million low use monographs, journals and government documents in the UF stored collection have been processed for transfer to the high density facility. This is a 7% increase since January 2013, and due primarily to increased staffing and familiarity with the process.

- The Florida Virtual Campus (FLVC) is working closely with UF on the development of a separate catalog (ADM) for the FLARE project, due in late June 2013. The test ADM continues to be developed as requirements are clarified and refined. The FLVC Wiki page with the FLARE specifications is available at: http://sharedbib.pubwiki.fcla.edu/wiki/index.php/FLARE

Policies and Guidelines

- Last Monograph Copy policy for inclusion in FLARE collection:
  - With an approved policy for Last Copy of a Monograph at an Academic Library in Florida, the Statewide Storage Task Force (SSTF) drafted a procedure for donating last copies and a cover letter for transfer of ownership. These two documents were sent to the Cataloging, Authorities, and Metadata (CAM) Committee for further review and were subsequently approved.
• Full text of policies addressing collection materials and environment, physical and intellectual
access, and operating cost assessments is available at http://csul.net/node/774.

Contact: Judith C. (Judy) Russell
Dean of University Libraries
University of Florida
jcrussell@ufl.edu

Ben Walker
Head, Shared Collections and Conservation
University of Florida
bwalker@ufl.edu
Contracting with Sustainable Collection Services
After agreeing that OCLC WorldCat Collection Analysis was not going to meet MSCS needs the Project Team began researching available collections analysis tools. The MSCS Project Team subsequently agreed that at this time only Sustainable Collections Services (SCS) could provide the type of collections analysis services required; of particular importance is SCS’s consulting support and data reporting. SCS will be assisting MSCS with the analysis of monographs only; MSCS is still to address the analysis of journals.

In February 2013, SCS and MSCS agreed to work together and have worked hard to produce a quick turnaround on the preparation and processing of data to be analyzed. MSCS have been able to make real progress on analysis and decision-making.

Data pull & cleaning
In late February MSCS provided SCS with 2.9 million bibliographic records with associated circulation and holdings data from the partner library catalogs. The following data elements were identified as being necessary:

- Item record number
- Created date
- Barcode
- Itype (value in the item that defines how it circulates)
- Volume and copy
- Item call number
- Location
- Total checkout and total renewal
- Year to date circulation
- Last year circulation
- Last checkin
- Out date
- Last out date
- Reserve notes
- Internal use count
- Icode2 (Contributed to union catalog)
- Circulation Status

Using this record set SCS:
- Filtered out-of-scope bibliographic records including: Government Documents, non-monographic material, Non-language material, non-print resources, records missing OCLC numbers, Bibliographic/author mismatches with OCLC and multiple OCLC numbers per record
- Eliminated duplicate bibliographic records
- Normalized call numbers
- Eliminated trailing spaces in control numbers
- Validated OCLC numbers
• Matched bibliographic records on OCLC numbers (with title string check)
• LCCN/title-string lookups for records lacking OCLC numbers
• Identified and accommodated unusual implementations of MARC
• Mapped item-level data and interpret codes
• Provided Dewey Decimal numbers for records that lacked them

SCS matched titles to external data sources:
• OCLC WorldCat including both US and State Holdings
• HathiTrust Public Domain and In-Copyright items
• Internet Archive, which was a first for SCS

Because of the OCLC reclamation project, the data set was very clean and SCS found fewer anomalies than normal. Also, because this was the second time MSCS had performed a data pull (first time for WCA) it was a relatively smooth process. However, one issue was the late inclusion of Bangor Theological Seminary (BTS), an entire additional library collection, which is currently being subsumed into Colby’s collection. BTS were not OCLC members and their data had not been through the reclamation process, which meant it was non-corrected and had missing data. Another issue is that some MSCS libraries (particularly Bates) are doing withdrawals, so the data set being used by SCS is static, which is never representative of reality.

SCS data reports
The results of SCS’s data compiling, manipulation, and cleaning were presented in the collection summaries provided to MSCS in March. The summaries are categorical overviews of the group data set and have been used to guide retention scenario development. SCS also provided a number of graphs and charts which allowed MSCS to see and then focus on a smaller, more manageable subset of data.

The collection summary reports were in both Library of Congress and Dewey Decimal Classification, with an augmented version in both schemes. The use of both classification schemes was a new challenge for SCS. SCS devised a mapping scheme to assign broad LC and Dewey matches where needed.

Retention scenario development
MSCS partners have decided to begin analysis and decision-making with the group of titles published or acquired before 2003 and held by only 1-2 partners. This universe consists of just under 1.5 million title-holdings (approximately 1.6 million items) and constitutes 50% of all title-holdings in the MSCS data-set, a much higher than expected proportion. The following criteria for making decisions on these titles were developed:

• Retain copies if any circulation or reserve activity
• Retain “protected” category copies even if no circulation (Maine and/or institution specific items)
• Retain Special Collections/Archives copies even if no circulation
• Retain unique in OCLC (only 0-9 copies in OCLC) even if no circulation
• Compare remaining O circulation copies with both HathiTrust and Internet Archive

SCS ran a scenario based on these criteria and produced corresponding retention counts for each library. The set of resulting "Commitment to Retain" titles contained just over a million title-holdings or 73% of the eligible universe of titles. Since then MSCS have agreed that Scenario One “Commitment to Retain” (1,076,188 titles/1,258,195 items) should be split into two parts:

• Titles with a single item record per bib record approximately 900,000 items (about 91% of the titles and 78% of the items)
• Titles with multiple item records per bib record approximately 100,000 items (about 9% of the titles and 22% of the items)
• Divide these further into multi-volume sets and multiple copies and add to “Needs further examination” group
This has left just under 400,000 title-holdings, or 27%, that "Needs Further Examination" for those titles that are available electronically in the HathiTrust and Internet Archive. MSCS are still evaluating situations where MSCS libraries are willing to rely on digital surrogates if the item has zero circulations.

The remaining 50% where items are held by 3 or more libraries is where more in-depth collection analysis work is required. MSCS have yet to decide how circulation rates will affect retention decisions. The average circulation rates for items were higher because of the public libraries. This will have to be factored in when looking at thresholds for circulation rates. Other factors being considered include: available storage space, subject strengths, and existing preferential loan periods. Colby has built a new storage facility which may allow them to keep a larger share of materials. Colby, Bates, and Bowdoin have common preferential loan periods so they may choose to retain an additional copy if these loan periods cannot be guaranteed by other partners. The public libraries are more likely to build on their strength in fiction and may choose to ingest fiction from other partners.

**Disclosing retention commitments**

Having agreed retention commitments for approximately 900,000 items (see above), MSCS is currently working on the display of those commitments in both local and union catalogs, in the MARC Subfield 583, and in OCLC WorldCat using both 583 and the OCLC Shared Print Symbol. SCS has provide MSCS spreadsheets containing lists of those items each library are committing to retain.

For the local INN-Reach systems the SCS lists will be used and retention statements will be added using global update. As a result of variances in how 583 is displayed in local catalogs, MSCS have decided to allow each member institution/group/consortium decide the how (webpub.def or OPAC message) and where to display the retention commitments themselves as long as they use common language provided by the MSCS Project Team.

MSCS have encountered issues with the display and transfer of 583 to the central union catalog, MaineCat. III have informed MSCS that this issue will be fixed within 12 months. In the meantime as a work-around Maine InfoNet staff and the MSCS System Librarian Sara Amato have managed in MaineCat to use the OCLC WorldCat API and JavaScript to perform a check of OCLC and display when an item is in shared print, which seems to solve the issue of non-transfer from local catalogs. With the API MSCS is achieving a big portion of what is required -- basically retained items will have a note saying that they are retained and by whom, with a link to MSCS retention policy information. But the API will not allow MSCS to see the retention on a brief results display list, or get the retention commitment end date -- the API will only grab and display the information on the full results page for a single item.

The MSCS Systems Librarian has submitted a batch loading request to OCLC for updating the Local Holding Records for those items designated as shared print. As a result of MSCS Library Director opposition to the ILL fees associated with using the OCLC Shared Print Symbol in both ILLiad and WorldCat Resource Sharing, MSCS have decided that until a more acceptable model can be developed to use two symbols on the records in OCLC, both the main symbol which will remain requestable, and the Shared Print symbol which will be a non-supplier. MSCS have already been testing the ILL implications of the shared print symbol using Bowdoin (BBHSP) and Bangor (BYNSP), and now have shared print symbols for the remaining MSCS partner libraries.

**HathiTrust membership investigations**

A MSCS goal is to deliver a service model for both Print-On-Demand and E-book-On-Demand. In May, the MSCS Directors Council met with Jeremy York from HathiTrust and agreed to form a consortial HathiTrust partnership known as Maine Shared Collections Cooperative. However, HathiTrust’s requirement of Shibboleth for authentication makes it impossible for public library to fully participate. Shibboleth implementation has not been completed at all of the academic libraries.

MSCS is currently starting to load 1.6 million MARC records for the HathiTrust public domain titles into MaineCat for the purposes of making the downloadable electronic copy requestable. Loading records into local catalogs was briefly considered but discarded as an option due to the fact that a) these titles are usually accessible via a
discovery layer such as Summon and b) the quality of the records is highly variable. In order to load the records into MaineCat a new agency will be created in SOLAR specifically for the purpose of centrally loading electronic resources. This allows the records to flow into MaineCat while alleviating any single library from the burden of maintaining the records, which vary in quality, in their own systems.

To date a small number of titles have been test loaded. MSCS are currently exploring the requesting functions and also a mechanism for keeping these records up to date.

**Presentations/Outreach**

In 2013 MSCS Project Team members have presented at the IMLS WebWise Conference, Maine Larger Libraries event, and Timberline Conference.

MSCS Project Team members will be presenting at the: ALCTS “Shared Print Monographs” pre-conference event and the Print Archive Network forum at the ALA 2013 Conference in Chicago, June 27th & 28th respectively, IFLA Conference in Singapore on August 19th, and New England Library Association Conference in Portland, ME on October 21st.

Library Journal published an online article on MSCS titled “Major Maine Libraries, Public and Academic, Collaborate on Print Archiving Project” which resulted in a number of references to MSCS in library and partner institution news sources. MSCS received a further mention in the April 4th Library Journal editorial piece titled “Kudos for Print Archiving”. MSCS Program Manager Matthew Revitt was a panelist on the Library Journal’s June 6th webcast “Data-Driven Libraries Part 1: Analyzing Data to Manage Print Collections”.

MSCS also featured in the ACRL environmental scan section “Radical Collaboration in Large Regional Print Repositories” and in a sidebar article in the Maine Policy Review May edition on Maine libraries.

The MSCS website and Twitter feed are continually updated with news, project updates, meeting summaries, and reports.

**Advisory Board visit**

The MSCS Advisory Board Bob Kieft, Constance Malpas and Lizanne Payne visited Maine in May to attend MSCS committee meeting and present on shared print related subjects.

**Business model**

In May the MSCS Directors approved the Maine Shared Collections Cooperative Memorandum Of Understanding. The MSCS libraries are currently in the process of getting the MOU signed by an institutional representative (rather than the library’s director), for example a Board of Trustees or Provost.
OhioLINK Print Archiving Report

The Ohio Library and Information Network (OhioLINK) is a consortium of 89 academic institutions and the State Library of Ohio. Part of OhioLINK’s responsibilities is overseeing five regional depositories that support the print and media archiving of the collections of our 13 state supported universities. Three of these five depositories are shared facilities among multiple universities while two are supporting just a single university.

The directors of the 13 state supported universities make up the Regional Depositories Governing Council. This council serves as an oversight body of the five depositories and sets policies and approves guidelines for preserving print and media collections. The depositories are involved in an ongoing de-duplication effort to reduce the amount of duplication among the serial collections in the depositories. The decision was made this year by the Regional Depositories Governing Council to participate in OCLC’s Shared Print Management Program as part of the de-duplication project. These efforts are discussed below.

De-Duplication Efforts in OhioLINK

OhioLINK completed two pilot projects in which we have honed our procedures and established guidelines and standards for de-duplicating serial titles in the five depositories. During that time we also created a shared catalog system that represents the holdings of two of shared depositories and one library of the third shared depository.

Since we maintain a full electronic back file of Elsevier titles, it was decided by the Regional Depositories Governing Council that we would de-duplicate four of the five depositories of their Elsevier titles. The fifth depository is maintained by Ohio State University which is participating in the CIC de-duplication project for Elsevier and thus is not participating in the OhioLINK project. Guidelines for de-duplication were established by the Regional Depositories Governing Council.

https://www.ohiolink.edu/ostaff/depositories/DeduplicationAgreement.pdf
Chief among these guidelines was the recommendation to keep only one print copy among the four depositories of each Elsevier title.

To gain more space more quickly, it was decided to focus first on the Elsevier titles with the most duplicate volumes held in the depositories. Searches were performed against the OhioLINK Library Catalog and the Ohio Depository library catalog to determine these titles. De-duplication procedures which had been honed with the first two pilot projects were further refined as we started the project. [https://www.ohiolink.edu/ostaff/depositories/RegionalDepositoriesDe-Duping.pdf](https://www.ohiolink.edu/ostaff/depositories/RegionalDepositoriesDe-Duping.pdf)

Each Elsevier title is added to a Google Doc spreadsheet indicating the volumes held by each depository. A “keeper” run is identified as the being the run that is the most complete. This run may be held in a single depository or may occur across multiple depositories. Once the keeper run is identified, the depository staff pull each volume off the shelf and verify completeness. Once completeness is verified, the volumes are coded to reflect that this title has been de-duped and volumes are the keeper copies. This information is reflected in OhioLINK’s central Library Catalog. Once the keeper run has been correctly coded, then depository staff are free to withdraw the non-keeper copies from their stacks.

**OCLC Shared Print Management Program Participation**

As noted, the OhioLINK Regional Depositories Governing Council elected to start participating in the OCLC Shared Print Management Program beginning with the de-duplication of the Elsevier titles. As we identify keeper copies and code the titles, we are entering a retention statement in the 583 field of the Local Holding Record (LHR). This retention statement indicates OhioLINK’s intent to maintain a print copy of this Elsevier title until June 30, 2036. Once these LHRs are coded, OhioLINK will batch load these records into OCLC for record keeping.

**Questions?**

If you have questions or comments concerning this report, please contact Anita Cook, anita@ohiolink.edu, 614-485-6753.
ReCAP Shared Collection Project
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Submitted by Lizanne Payne, Planning Consultant

Since early 2012, the Research Collections Preservation Consortium (ReCAP), consisting of library partners New York Public Library, Columbia University, and Princeton University, has been conducting a planning project to define a ReCAP Shared Collection and design the architecture for a Discovery to Delivery system to provide integrated access for partner library patrons.

The ReCAP Shared Collection planning project is nearing its end and the Planning Committee is considering the following recommendations (but not yet approved by the ReCAP Board):

- The Shared Collection would consist of many monographs and serials already held at the shared ReCAP storage facility (or transferred there in the future)
- Shared Collection items would remain the property of the depositing library
- Partner libraries would agree to retain Shared Collection items in the ReCAP facility for so long as the ReCAP consortium exists (i.e. “indefinitely”)
- Partner libraries would have the opportunity to give individual ReCAP holdings a status other than Shared, e.g. “Open Collection” (available to partners but no retention commitment) or “Restricted Collection” (available primarily to the owning library)
- No new duplicates would be allowed in the Shared Collection (but duplicates could be added to the partner library’s Open or Restricted Collection)
- Volumes will be reviewed for “minimum acceptable condition” upon transfer to ReCAP, but no explicit review will be performed on volumes already at ReCAP.

It is worth noting that no more specific selection criteria for the ReCAP Shared Collection are under consideration at this time. That is, under the current recommendations, Shared Collection items do not need to be represented in Hathi Trust, or circulate fewer than X times, or have other special characteristics. Many items at the ReCAP facility were deposited there because they were older and low-use, but many others are newly-acquired materials that may have a higher usage profile.

An important part of the planning project has been to design the architecture for a Discovery/Delivery system to make the ReCAP Shared Collection visible to library patrons. Currently, ReCAP holdings are recorded in each library’s individual catalog but there is no discovery system to reveal them all to searchers. The proposed design will create a separate middleware system and database accessible from the partners’ individual discovery systems and will support unmediated patron requests.

The ReCAP Board is expected to consider the recommendations and proposed business model this summer, and, if approved, will initiate planning for implementation.
This year, the University of California Libraries have initiated a strategic planning effort to define a current vision for shared print collections and services. UC Libraries expect to complete the strategic planning process this summer.

The UC Libraries have engaged in the explicit development of shared print collections for eight years, during which, several major shared collections and governing policies have been developed. These collaborations have made significant progress toward UC’s vision of a 21st Century Library Collection that is “integrated, shareable and user-centric” and “whose strength is derived from the diverse nature of the individual campus library collections.”

The environment for print collections has evolved considerably since the inception of the shared print program, encompassing a widening array of collaborative activities and partnerships among many types of libraries. Several key areas for collaboration at various stages of exploration or implementation that have motivated this planning effort include:

- Hathi Trust’s Distributed Print Monographs Archive
- Mega-regional collaboration around print monographs
- Multi-consortia federal documents digitization and its relationship to cooperative print management

As part of UC’s strategic planning for shared print, the Council of University Librarians and CDL Shared Print are developing a multi-year plan that will:

- Define a current vision for shared print collections at the UC Libraries
- Outline shared principles and goals
- Identify new directions, key projects, and avenues for further research
- Establish key performance indicators by which progress in meeting shared print objectives can be measured
- Chart a general scope of institutional partnerships

To facilitate this process, white papers or similar planning documents have been developed on several topics:

- Shared print monographs
- Federal documents
- Existing projects, policies and methods
- The “Persistence Policy” which governs certain deposits to the Regional Library Facilities

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Additional Information</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Website:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Shared Print Policies:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Shared Print Agreements:</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Western Regional Storage Trust (WEST)

Update for Print Archives Network (PAN) meeting

6/28/2013

The Western Regional Storage Trust (WEST) is a distributed shared print program designed to preserve selected print journals throughout the Western United States. As of 2013, WEST has 109 member libraries in 18 states, including 64 consortial members via the University of California System’s California Digital Library (10), Orbis Cascade Alliance (30) and the Statewide California Electronic Library Consortium (SCELC, 24).

A distinctive feature of WEST is its focus on risk analysis in which member holdings are analyzed annually against risk factors and preservation priorities to identify journals for preservation and assign levels of archiving effort to be performed. WEST uses the Center for Research Libraries’ PAPR system to perform its customized holdings analysis. WEST Archive Holders and Archive Builders record archiving commitments in OCLC WorldCat (using new Shared Print symbols and LHRs) and CRL’s PAPR system.

During the three Archiving Cycles planned for WEST Phase 1, seven major Archive Builders are actively consolidating and validating higher risk titles ("Silver" and "Gold"): Arizona State University, University of California’s Southern and Northern Regional Library Facilities, University of Kansas, University of Oregon, Rice University, and Stanford University. More than twenty Archive Holders also agreed to retain lower risk titles ("Bronze") in place in campus libraries or other facilities without additional validation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cycle</th>
<th>Journal Families</th>
<th>Volumes</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cycle 1 (2011-2012)</td>
<td>4,300</td>
<td>160,000 (38,000 validated Silver/Gold)</td>
<td>Complete, disclosed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cycle 2 (2012-2013)</td>
<td>2,753</td>
<td>94,500 (48,000 validated Silver/Gold)</td>
<td>Finishing June 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cycle 3 (2013-2014)</td>
<td>3,000</td>
<td>95,000</td>
<td>Proposed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>10,053</td>
<td>349,500 volumes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

WEST is making plans for Phase 2 which will encompass two additional Archiving Cycles and strategic planning and assessment to review the collections model, business model, and possible new services. Effective in October 2013, Emily Stambaugh will become WEST Program Manager with Lizanne Payne as Planning Consultant.

More information:

Website: http://www.cdlib.org/west
PAPR registry: papr.crl.edu
Contacts: Lizanne Payne <lizannepayne03@gmail.com>
          Emily Stambaugh <Emily.stambaugh@ucop.edu>
Update on WRLC’s Shared Print Archive for the June 2013 PAN meeting

Bruce Hulse
June 26, 2013

- American University
- The Catholic University of America
- Gallaudet University
- George Mason University
- The George Washington University
- Georgetown University
- Howard University
- Marymount University
- The University of the District of Columbia

The WRLC enables the success of learning and scholarship by creating coordinated collections, creating a robust infrastructure for discovery and access, ensuring the long-term preservation of physical and digital information resources and sharing expertise.

**WRLC Shared Collections Facility**

The WRLC operates a 24,000 sf shared collections facility (some people might think of it as a storage facility) on behalf of our partner universities. We completed construction of a second module in fall 2010 and now house 1.9M volumes and 44,000 archival boxes.

Our Board of Directors has approved construction of a third module, intended to meet our members need through 2020. Design and permitting work is far along at this point. Our expectation is that our third shared collections facility module will be ready for occupancy in September 2014.

**ASERL – WRLC Archive Partnership**

This week the Association of Southeast Research Libraries (ASERL) and the Washington Research Library Consortium (wrlc) have formally launched their shared print retention initiative, Scholars Trust (www.scholarstrust.org). The project will combine the contents of their respective print journal archives under a single retention and access agreement. As a result, the combined title list exceeds 8,000 journal titles and more than 300,000 volumes, making this one of the largest print journal archives in the United States. WRLC and ASERL libraries have also agreed to extend reciprocal priority Inter-Library Loan (ILL) services across the group. At least one WRLC member
library has reported they have seen a significant reduction in their overall ILL costs since the ASERL/WRLC agreement went live last January.

Print collection management

While our agreement with ASERL represents an important step towards effective management of space in our Shared Collections Facility, it is focused on avoiding redundant retention of periodicals. We have long recognized the monographic collection as needing similar consideration, but have struggled with the imprecision inherent in the MARC data supporting that collection. WRLC has recently agreed to work with Sustainable Collections Services to develop a better understanding of our monographic data. One goal of this project will be eliminating unnecessary duplication and identifying unneeded materials for withdrawal. Another, more important goal, is identifying materials which are not widely held as candidates for long term preservation. We expect to provide SCS with data for their analysis in late August.