Maine Shared Collections Strategy (MSCS) May 2014 Advisory Board Update Report

Summary

MSCS have made significant progress in the past six months:

- Completed collection analysis of monographs, serials and journals.
- Agreed a set of rules to allocate retention responsibility across the MSCS group.
- Loaded and display over one million commitments in local, union and OCLC WorldCat catalogs. MSCS became the first shared print project to have retention commitments for monograph titles disclosed in OCLC WorldCat.
- Completed HathiTrust partnership process for UMaine.
- Worked with HathiTrust on the creation of a "Maine Collection" in the digital library.
- Completed loading 1.4 million MARC records into MaineCat containing links to the HathiTrust, Google Books and Print-On-Demand (POD) request form. Completed testing a POD service and plan for its future.
- Widely publicized the work of MSCS.
- Organized 2014 ALA Annual Conference session titled "Looking to the Future of Shared Print".
- Produced draft of shared print teaching document.

Collection and use analysis & collection management, stewardship and preservation model

Allocating retention responsibility for titles held by three or more MSCS libraries

The Collection Development Committee agreed that for retention step two titles (those held by three or more MSCS libraries) MSCS will retain:

- One title-holding for each Commit To Retain (CTR) title-set with one to three uses.
- Two title-holdings for each CTR title-set with four or more uses.
- Two title-holdings of all local protected category title-sets.
- All title-holdings where the specific edition is held in nine or fewer libraries in the U.S. (according to OCLC).
- All special collections/archives copies and at least one accompanying circulating copy if available in a participating library.

Based on our experiences of looking at step one titles (those held by only one or two MSCS libraries), we did not seek to split the titles into multiple lists for further analysis as this had just served to delay and complicate the decision-making process. But as in step one, the CTR lists were filtered to remove commitments for publishers of outdated and superseded textbooks, manuals, test preparation guides, travel guides, and some paperback versions of popular fiction. The partner libraries wanted the freedom to de-accession these titles in the future. The Committee agreed on the following allocation rules to assign retention responsibility across the MSCS group:

1. **If Colby holds a title, titles were marked Commit To Retain (CTR).**

   Colby has a new library storage facility and because of this, they were willing to be allocated a larger percentage of CTR titles.

2. **If a title is held by any of the Colby, Bates and Bowdoin College Libraries then at least one of these libraries had their holding marked Commit-to-Retain (CTR). If a Colby holding is marked CTR per rule 1 then this rule will be satisfied.**

   Colby, Bates and Bowdoin have a consortial ILS and shared, preferential loan periods which cannot be guaranteed by other MSCS partners. Therefore they were not willing to rely on copies outside of the three libraries for access to titles they were committing to retain.

3. **Given that Rules 1 & 2 are satisfied, the remaining Commit-to-Retain (CTR) allocations were done in an "equitable" fashion, where equity is defined as maintaining a constant ratio of CTR allocations to non-CTR allocations among libraries.**

   MSCS considered a constant ratio of retention commitments to analyzed titles a fairer way to allocate responsibility than overall collection size.

4. **ALL Maine State Library's local protected title-holdings were marked CTR.**

   In keeping with the Maine State Library's mission to "facilitates access to and delivery of library services and collection resources for the State of Maine" they made the decision to CTR any local protected category title-holdings.

SCS reported that these rules were the most complex and difficult allocation they have had to run to date.

Although rules one and two meant Colby, Bates, and Bowdoin had a higher proportion of commitments in retention step two, overall, across both retention steps, the commitments were still equitable across the group. Some filtering (see above) of the retention lists is still being carried out, but the following will be close to the final title allocation figures:

- Bangor Public   159,253
- Bates   184,711
- Bowdoin   219,827
- Colby   267,336
- Maine State Library   63,262
- Portland Public Library   96,304
- University of Maine   311,382
- University of Southern Maine   128,182
- **Total:**   **1,430,257**

The allocation decisions marked the end of MSCS's analysis of monographs and our work with SCS. Without SCS's support MSCS would not have been able to successfully analyze and make retention decisions on almost three million title-holdings.

Preserving committed to retain titles

Having made commitments to retain titles, the Collection Development Committee moved on to considering what steps are necessary to ensure items are preserved for the long-term. In addition to the libraries' routine workflows and procedures for identifying, repairing, and replacing retained materials the Committee agreed to look at categories of committed to retain titles that could be digitized, both as preservation method and as a way to make

items more widely accessible. The Committee took into consideration the following factors when deciding which titles to digitize:

- Copyright status
- Likely demand for digital access
- Existing digital availability
- Rarity of material
- Existing digitization priorities
- Availability of scanning equipment

MSCS decided to focus potential scanning efforts on public domain titles not already digitized in the HathiTrust. MSCS libraries were provided with lists of titles that met these criteria and so far, the Maine State Library and Bangor Public Library are using their lists to identify digitization candidates. The Maine State Library has decided to start digitizing town histories and have identified nearly 100 titles. The other libraries did not have the resources to carry out this digitization work at this time.

The Collection Development Committee also considered whether there were categories of items that should be transferred from circulating areas to special collections. The Committee decided to focus efforts on 'rare' titles, defined as those titles where the specific edition is held in nine or fewer libraries in the U.S. (according to OCLC). MSCS libraries were provided with lists of titles that met this criterion and used the following factors to decide whether an item should be transferred:

- Collection priorities of special collections
- Available space in special collections
- Existing copies available in special collections
- Available staff time to carry out transfer
- MSCS policy of ensuring all special collections/archives copies and at least one accompanying circulating copy are retained

So far the University of Maine and Maine State Library are the only two libraries that have identified items to transfer, and the numbers involved are small—only 11 items for the University of Maine.

Analyzing journal/serial/series titles

Unlike the SCS supported analysis of monograph titles the analysis of journals, serials and series titles involved manual analysis. MSCS agreed that libraries should only be expected to commit to retain titles that were not being retained and preserved elsewhere. The Collections Development Committee members were provided with two sets of lists of journal/serial/series titles and asked to filter these lists to only include titles they agreed to commit to retain:

- Titles in the "local protected" categories (that were developed for print monographs) and those stored in special collections
- Titles "not in the vendor set" of PORTICO, JSTOR, Proquest Periodicals Archive Online, Proquest American Periodicals, ProQuest British Periodicals and American Antiquarian Society Historical Periodicals 1-5 repositories or databases, for which there are fewer than 50 holding libraries in OCLC WorldCat

The following factors were taken into consideration when reviewing the lists:

- Judgment as to content's value for MSCS and other libraries' patrons
- Online availability
- Missing/incomplete holdings information
- Superseded works which either didn't have historical value or were on subjects that had low institutional value

● Large volume of commitments already made for monographs

MSCS also investigated the opportunity for making group retention decisions. MSCS PI Deb Rollins reviewed a list of 129 titles in the "not in the vendor set" category (see above) which were held by two or more MSCS libraries. Once Deb decided a title should be retained (based on above factors) she used holdings information including which library had the more complete collection to allocate retention responsibility. Libraries who stored a title in offsite storage were generally assigned the retention responsibility. Where holdings were split between two or more libraries each library was assigned a CTR for that title to ensure no holdings were lost from the MSCS group. Except for some minor alterations the Committee agreed to Deb's allocation decisions.

The Committee reviewed a spreadsheet that of 383 titles that were in the "local protected" category (see above) and had been assigned a CTR by two or more MSCS libraries to identify opportunities for making group retention decisions. After reviewing the list of titles the Committee agreed these were works that MSCS libraries were going to want to retain regardless, especially as many of the items were stored in special collections. Also, based on Deb's analysis of 129 titles it would have been a lengthy process to compare holdings information for 383 titles.

MSCS's collection analysis of journal, serials and series titles is now complete. However, the process of adding retention commitments to library catalogs (see below) has brought to light a number of titles which MSCS library staff felt should not be committed to retain, including those with an existing local retention policy (e.g. the library keeps only the current year), where only one volume is held, or the majority of the run is being preserved in microfilm. In hindsight it would have been better to either have the holdings in the database that generated the spreadsheet lists, or to have imported the lists to Innovative Interfaces before distribution so that they were easier to review in context. The Technical Services Committee should have also been consulted during the spreadsheet review to look at holding records and flag issues earlier on in the process. As the process of adding retention commitments is still in progress the following totals for title retention commitments may change slightly:

- Bangor Public   533
- Bates   200
- Bowdoin   1,200
- Colby   55
- Maine State Library   580
- Portland Public Library   655
- University of Maine   1,684
- University of Southern Maine   264
- **TOTAL:**   **5,171**

Disclosing retention commitments

In January 2014 the MSCS systems librarian Sara Amato completed the loading of just over a million items (from step one) into the local systems of partner libraries in the MARC fields 561, 583, and 852. The retention message "MSCC" also now displays in the OPACs of all partner library systems (see example from new shared CBB catalog http://cbbcat.net/record=b3152728~S19). In April 2014 the MSCS systems librarian began filtering the step two committed-to-retain lists to remove the works of publishers that MSCS agreed libraries wouldn't commit to retain (see above) in preparation for disclosing retention commitments. The step two commitments will be finalized by the end of May 2014.

In March 2014 after a wait of 90 plus days, MSCS were notified by Bill Carney (OCLC Shared Print Liaison Officer) that OCLC had begun processing the MSCS request for loading retention commitment into Local Holding Records for the items designated as shared print, which means that MSCS became the first shared print project to have retention commitments for monograph titles disclosed in OCLC (see public display example using OCLC Shared Print Symbol http://www.worldcat.org/title/allen-hex-socket-screw-handbook/oclc/13506959). OCLC has now completed the loading of just over a million items (from step one). MSCS have been informed by OCLC that

because the project parameters have been set up it should mean quicker turnaround on future loads. The MSCS systems librarian expects all the loads to be completed by July 2014.

MSCS have encountered issues with the display and transfer of 583 to the INN-Reach central union catalog, MaineCat. As a short-term work-around, MSCS are using the OCLC WorldCat Search API and JavaScript to perform a check of OCLC and display when an item is a shared print holding, which meant that once the commitments started to appear in WorldCat they automatically appeared in MaineCat. As with public display of retention commitments in local systems, there was some debate about the location, wording and prominence of the public display of the retention statement in MaineCat (see example http://mainecat.maine.edu/record=b1156722~S0).

MSCS representatives have continued to communicate with Innovative Information Solutions our requirements for the 583 field. In May 2014 MSCS Project Team members Clem Guthro and James Jackson Sanborn met with representatives from Innovative to discuss the enhancement for their next software release, due later this year (as part of the INN-Reach Print Management capability), to support loading of 583 retention fields from the local system into the union catalog and display within the OPAC.

The MSCS systems librarian is close to completing the load of retention statements into URSUS (University of Maine, Bangor Public Library, State Library, and University of Southern Maine) libraries' commitments for journals and serials. The retention commitments also appear in the public display of the catalog (see example http://ursus.maine.edu:2082/record=b1673965). Sara is currently working on loading commitments for Portland Public Library and has been speaking to representatives from Colby, Bates, and Bowdoin about loading retention statements into their new merged catalog. The disclosure of retention commitments for journals and serials has been a more manual process, as holdings needed to be individually encoded for those titles that do not already have closed holdings in the record. This has meant more local technical services staff involvement than was required for disclosing commitments for monographs.

MSCS and CRL representatives have been communicating about the process for adding holding information for committed to retain journals and serials to the Print Archives Preservation Registry (PAPR). In May 2014 MSCS began submitting to CRL holding information for committed to retain journals and serials for adding to PAPR. CRL hope to have some MSCS example holdings to present at the Print Archive Network forum at the 2014 ALA Annual Conference.

De-accessioning based on retention decisions

So far only Bowdoin have de-accessioned selected titles that were not allocated a commitment to retain (approximately 60 items). Of the other MSCS libraries only the Maine State Library and Bates have reported that they are actively investigating de-accessioning opportunities.

Deferred access to OCLC WorldCat Collection Evaluation tool

In January 2014 MSCS Program Manager Matthew Revitt spoke with Sara Randall (product manager for the OCLC WorldCat Collection Evaluation tool) and Andy Noonan (OCLC Product Analyst) about MSCS functional requirements for group access. MSCS have not heard from OCLC since then about the status of the release of group functionality.

Print/digital management model

Surrogate digital copies

Although MSCS considered digital availability in its collection analysis the Collection Development Committee came to the conclusion that unlike serials and journals, digital copies of monographs are not currently an adequate replacement for print. Therefore no retention decisions were based solely on the fact that a title was available in either the HathiTrust or Internet Archive.

HathiTrust partnership investigations

In May 2014 the University of Maine officially became a partner of the HathiTrust. The joining fee will be counted towards MSCS's cost sharing commitment. The joining process took longer than anticipated because of the continued delays in the implementation and testing of UMaine's Shibboleth connection which is required for authentication purposes.

HathiTrust Print Archives Monograph Archive

MSCS Project PI Clem Guthro has been appointed to serve on the HathiTrust Print Archives Monographs Archive Planning Task Force which is charged with developing plans for a distributed print monographs archive on behalf of HathiTrust.

Maine HathiTrust collection

MSCS representatives worked with the HathiTrust to create a "Maine Collection" of Maine-related items in the HathiTrust. Maine became the first state to have their own HathiTrust collection, a fact reported by the *Library Journal* in their May 3rd "Information Docket".

Service delivery model for EOD & POD

Ebook-On-Demand (EOD) services

In January 2014 the MSCS systems librarian completed the loading of 1.4 million MARC records for the HathiTrust public domain titles into the MaineCat union catalog and included links to a viewable/downloadable (depending on rights restrictions) copy in the HathiTrust. Google Books links were also added when available, allowing users to fully download Google-digitized titles that can only be viewed in HathiTrust one page at a time. See example of links: http://mainecat.maine.edu/record=b12677018~S0

There was a positive reaction on Maine library listservs and Twitter to the news of the HathiTrust public domain record load. However, use has been low. Google Analytics from January to April 2014 showed only 35 clicks per month to the online resources of Google Books and HathiTrust on average. This was more than clicks to the Print-On-Demand (POD) request link (see below) which there were an average of 15 clicks per month over the same period. Interestingly, between March 1 and April 10 (just before the POD links were disabled) clicks to POD links were closer in number to those for EOD, with 117 clicks to the POD request form, and 141 clicks to HathiTrust and Google Books links combined. It would be interesting to know on a given day how clicks to the EOD/POD records compared to clicks to other bibliographic records in MaineCat, but having looked into this for MSCS, Sara Amato did not think it was possible to create a filter in Google Analytics that would just get bib displays. We are also tracking clicks to records for specific items to see which titles had the most clicks, but this data has proved less useful because the figures get easily distorted once a record is used as an example in a meeting or presentation.

MSCS investigated the possibility of including links to Internet Archive items in MaineCat records, alongside those of Google Books and HathiTrust. However, the Internet Archive records were found to be not uniform and thus more complicated to prepare and load. Also, the items available include a range of formats, many of which are not supported by Maine libraries. Because of these reasons, MSCS decided not to proceed with loading links to Internet Archive items.

Print-On-Demand (POD) service

MSCS tested the Print-On-Demand service from January to April to evaluate the demand for it and develop an ongoing business model. During the testing period there was no fee for the service, as costs were covered by allocated grant funds. Communications with HathiTrust indicated that neither they nor Google Books would approve of a formal distribution strategy between libraries for Google-digitized materials, such as print-on-demand to supply interlibrary loan requests. Books were shipped directly to requesters and the copies were theirs to keep. We sent a survey to requesters to get feedback on the service and to get more information about how and why the service was being used.

Some interesting findings from the test period and survey include:

- 61 titles were requested in total.
- 37 individuals made requests. One individual requested a total of ten books during the test period.
- 24 titles requested were already available as print copies in MaineCat.
- There were a diverse range of titles requested, but the LC Classification F "Local History of the United States and British, Dutch, French, and Latin America" received the most (19).
- The vast majority of titles were available from commercial vendors directly from links in the Google Books and HathiTrust viewer. In many cases the cost of the commercial vendor copy was less than what the University of Maine Printing and Mailing Services charged.
- Source of POD PDF files was split between Google Books (37 titles) and HathiTrust (24 titles)
- 45% of responders found out about the service after searching in MaineCat when their local catalog didn't have the title. 45% were using MaineCat and noticed the option and 10% had library staff point it out to them. Zero responders had heard about the service and thus sought out a sample title in order to make a request.
- The vast majority (96%) of responders requested a print copy because they prefer to read books in print. 4% were curious about what would happen if they requested the book.
- The academic reading vs. recreational reading split was 56% vs. 44%.
- Comments from requesters showed they were pleased with the service and many were pleasantly surprised that they received the book, at its quality, and also that they got to keep it.

The volume of requests received and feedback from requesters showed there is a demand for the service. We have discussed various business model options, including the service being funded by MSCS libraries, but the library directors felt it was not their responsibility nor a sustainable solution to be providing free books, especially when only 14 of the 60 requests came from patrons of their libraries. MSCS are currently investigating partnering with the University of Maine Bookstore to administer the service on a cost recovery basis which we hope will ensure it can be sustainable. It will be interesting to compare how many requests are received once fees are introduced. MSCC will continue to monitor the POD service and investigate possible business model options (e.g. providing links to commercial POD vendors in MaineCat).

Presentations & outreach

In March 2014, MSCS Project PI Clem Guthro presented at the CLC/CIC – Regional Print Management Symposium in Dublin, OH on the work of MSCS. All MSCS presentations are available on our SlideShare page. As of May 5th there had been a total of 7,000 views and more than 350 downloads.

Clem was interviewed for a whitepaper on shared print released by Innovative Interfaces in April 2014 (see http://www.iii.com/sites/default/files/ServicesWhitePaper2014.pdf). MSCS Program Manager Matthew Revitt has been asked by the ALCTS Monographs Series Editorial to write a chapter on the work of MSCS for a monograph on library shared collections that is due to be published in 2015. MSCS representatives will also feature as guest editors in the *Against the Grain* column "Curating Collective Collections".

Matthew Revitt has been working with the CRL and MSCS Advisory Board member Bob Kieft on the organization of the shared print pre-conference session "Looking to the Future of Shared Print" which will be held on Friday June 27th at the 2014 ALA Annual Conference in Las Vegas, NV. The agenda was developed with MSCS's experiences in mind and features an interesting range of speakers (see http://www.maineinfonet.net/mscs/ala2014/)

MSCS project representatives continue to be actively involved in the planning stages of the Northeast Regional Library Print Management Project. Clem Guthro is on the Project Steering Committee and Monograph Working Group and Matthew Revitt is a member of the Journal and Serials Working Group. The development of this regional project may well impact on more localized initiatives like MSCC.

The MSCS website and Twitter feed are continually updated with news, project updates, meeting summaries, presentations, guidance, and reports. MSCS news is also published on the University of Maine Fogler Library's Facebook page.

Business model and sustainability

The Project Team and Directors' Council have been debating different business model ideas and potential services for the post-grant period of the Maine Shared Collections Cooperative (MSCC) including collection analysis and project management. Joyce Rumery is looking into University of Maine options that could support continuation of post-grant MSCC activities and the MSCC Program Manager role (e.g. part of a temporary or existing position).

In order to fully reach our goal of preserving the critical print collection in Maine, we need to attract new members. However, we foresee difficulties in persuading other libraries in Maine to pay to join the MSCC; particularly in these difficult economic times. Although libraries might agree that shared print is the right thing to do and will like the insurance of knowing MSCS are retaining a title, that might not be enough of an incentive enough for them to pay to join; especially when the MSCS libraries are committing to retain titles regardless and will continue to make them available via ILL.

In an effort to find out more about libraries' interest in cooperative collection management in March we sent out a survey to the directors of 326 public and academic libraries in Maine. From the results there did appear to be interest in potential MSCS elements with collection analysis as libraries main interest for joining, followed by commit to retain and store specific materials within their library as part of MSCC, followed by participate in a shared centralized storage facility managed by MSCC, and perhaps unsurprisingly the least popular was to subsidize the storage of materials by other member libraries. The full results of the survey can be found here: http://www.maineinfonet.org/mscs/cooperative-collection-management-survey-results/.

In terms of collection analysis, MSCC still need to agree on how this service will be provided. It's unlikely that new MSCC members will have the funds to pay for the services of commercial vendors such as SCS or OCLC. MSCS have been discussing with Sara Amato the possibility of adapting a database she created to run queries on MSCS collection data developing into an in-house collection analysis tool. This probably would not involve going into the level of detail MSCS conducted during the grant period, but could allow libraries to identify overlap with current MSCC members. A goal would be to be able to provide a library with lists of committed-to-retain matches and de-accession candidates, based on MSCS libraries' retention commitments. Such a collection analysis tool or service might attract new members, but libraries can already see what MSCC have committed to retain by looking in MaineCat, albeit on a title-by-title, labor-intensive process. MSCS plan on organizing a session in late summer/fall time to discuss more the services of MSCC as part of a Maine InfoNet Collection Summit.

MSCS libraries have also been debating their role in the Maine Shared Collections Cooperative. The consensus is that the next round of collection analysis for MSCS libraries should not be until five years' time because of the demands the work places on library staff and also so it includes more titles in the analysis that weren't analyzed as part of MSCS. At least initially (until other libraries join) the MSCC committees will be comprised of representatives from MSCS libraries. In April 2014, the Maine InfoNet Executive Committee appointed the MSCC Board of Directors. The members are: Clem Guthro, Chair (Colby College), Linda Lord (Maine State Library), Barbara McDade (Bangor Public Library), David Nutty (University of Southern Maine), and Joyce Rumery (University of Maine). The Board will appoint members of the Collections and Operations Committee who will be staff from the existing MSCS Collection Development Committee. Until any new libraries join the Committee will be responsible for:

- Any tweaking of retention policy that is required
- Issues around transferring and reversing retention commitments
- Planning future work (e.g. digitization work)

- Discussing issues with retention commitment disclosure

To assist libraries with a range of processes post-grant (including adding and removing retention commitments in catalogs) MSCS are working on policies and procedures.

The MSCS program manager Mathew Revitt has produced a first draft of a practical guide on shared print with advice to others about the issues MSCS have experienced with monographic shared print. The document has been shared with the different MSCS committees for review and comment. Matthew plans to have a final version of the document ready for release by the "Looking to the Future of Shared Print" session at the 2014 ALA Annual Conference (see above).

Budget and grant extension

In December 2013 IMLS notified MSCS that they had approved our no-cost extension application. IMLS only provide extensions of 12 months, so the official end date of MSCS is May 31, 2015 and we will be required to submit reports through this extended period. However, grant funds are projected to be exhausted by the end of August 2014, so MSCS are using the date of August 31st 2014 as the end of grant activities and as of September 1st the project will transition to the Maine Shared Collections Cooperative.

Unspent grant funds have been used to extend Matthew Revitt's contract as MSCS Program Manager until August 31st and to pay Sara Amato for her systems librarian work until August. The only remaining grant expenditure are for state travel to MSCS meetings, out of state travel and equipment and room booking hire costs for the 2014 ALA Annual Conference.