Maine Shared Collections Strategy (MSCS) Advisory Board Update Report

Summary

MSCS have made significant progress in the past six months:

- MSCS libraries have made retention commitments on over a million monograph items and are in the process of disclosing this in local and union catalogs (including OCLC WorldCat).
- MSCS are in the process of making retention commitments for journals and serials.
- Two MSCS libraries have become HathiTrust partners.
- Print-On-Demand and E-book-On-Demand services have been implemented in the union catalog MaineCat.
- Representatives from MSCS have continued to promote and report on the work of the project at conferences (including the 2013 IFLA conference) and articles in various publications.
- All MSCS institutions have signed the Maine Shared Collections Cooperative (MSCC) Memorandum Of Understanding. The Project Team is actively planning the activities of MSCC post-grant, with the aim of developing a sustainable business/funding model.

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

Deciding how many copies to retain of CTR titles

In Retention Step One titles (those held by only 1-2 partners) MSCS agreed on the following retention criteria Commit To Retain (CTR) if:

- Any circulation, internal, or reserve use OR
- "Local interest" title-sets OR
- Special Collections items OR
- Specific edition is held in nine or fewer libraries in the U.S. (according to OCLC)

Titles that didn't meet the above criteria were not committed to retain and thus libraries are free to deaccession these titles (see below).

The MSCS Directors' Council made the decision that they wanted the MSCS Collection Development Committee to look separately at titles with multiple item records per bib record because of concerns that libraries could be committing to retain multiple copies. This accounted for about 9% of the titles and 22% of the items in the original CTR lists of 1,076,188 titles/1,258,195 items.

MSCS agreed that in most cases libraries are only required to retain one copy of a CTR title, but that for ease of implementation, all copies will have retention commitments recorded in the 583 field. Therefore, libraries are free to decide in the future that they will only commit to retain a specific circulating (all special collection copies are

CTR) copy (for example, the one in best physical condition should they conduct condition checking) and remove the commitment in the local catalog for the other copies.

The exception to the one copy rule is in cases where libraries have commitment to retain special collections copies and there are also additional circulating copies of the same title: in this case each library is required to retain one circulating copy to ensure that patrons still have access to a circulating copy. This means that copies which previously had not received a CTR (because the title-holding they didn't meet any of the retention criteria) were also retained.

Applying different retention rules to multi-volume sets

The MSCS Directors' Council decided that for Retention Step One titles (those held by only 1-2 partners) they wanted the MSCS Collection Development Committee to look separately at multi-volume sets and whether the large amount of real estate they occupy warranted a separate, less conservative, retention policy that would reduce the amount of multi-volume sets the libraries were required to CTR. Therefore, MSCS requested that SCS divide the titles with multiple item records further into multi-volume sets and multiple copies to be analyzed separately. The Committee were provided with title lists of multi-volume sets to review with the goal of making a group decision on whether they should be treated differently. After much debate and title level analysis (particularly at UMaine) the Committee agreed to be consistent and continue to apply the same retention criteria.

Removing and adding retention commitments

From the outset, partner libraries have recognized that when making retention decisions at scale there are going to be titles which, if you conducted title by title reviews, would probably not receive a CTR. However, following the title level analysis conducted for multi-volume sets (see above) and the review of lists of single-item bibs (before the 583 commitments were added to local catalogs), the Collection Development Committee provided specific examples of titles their institutions were being expected to CTR for 15 years that they felt were inappropriate. Also, when seeing actual lists of titles the Committee and the MSCS systems librarian realized that there were some errors/anomalies.

Initially, there was some debate about whether the retention criteria should be altered to be less conservative; particularly the criterion that titles will be CTR if they had any usage in their history. One proposal put forward by PI Deb Rollins was that if "any circulation or internal use" or "any reserve use" were the ONLY factors among criteria for the commit to retain titles, and the titles are available as HathiTrust Public Domain, MSCS may not want to CTR (the total amount of titles that fall into this subset is about 40,000). However, the majority of the Project Team felt that because the criteria had been agreed by the partner library representatives they recommended the decision not be revisited.

Instead of changing the criteria, the Project Team and Collection Development Committee decided that some fine-tuning of the CTR lists was required to reverse commitments on specific categories of titles and to correct mistakes/anomalies. The following batch criteria were developed to identify items that should have their commitments reversed:

- Items which were deleted after SCS were provided with the collections data in February 2013.
- Items which are missing or lost.
- Title-holdings which were mistakenly included in the analysis e.g. locations that should have been excluded like a career service library.
- Title-sets of specific publishers that the MSCS Collection Development Committee agreed did not warrant a CTR. The goal of this work was to pull out outdated and superseded textbooks, manuals, test preparation, guides, and some paperback versions of popular fiction. The partner libraries wanted the freedom to deaccession these titles in the future.

The Project Team did not want the reversal process to delay the disclosure of retention commitments, particularly in OCLC, but at the same time wanted to ensure that the commitments disclosed would last. Therefore, the

Committee was given a window of opportunity to identify categories of titles that should have their CTR reversed. Agreement was reached with the Collection Development Committee that post-grant libraries will have the chance to revisit reversals and more granular analysis may be required.

The MSCS systems librarian Sara Amato completed the work of removing commitment statements already disclosed locally. To enable libraries to be able to make agreed reversals themselves post-grant Sara also produced a set of procedures for removing retention statements in local catalogs. The procedures also include guidance on how to add retention statements, which was included because some partners already want to proactively make retention commitments both for titles they haven't been assigned a CTR (for example, the State Library will CTR all local protected category titles they hold) and new acquisitions (for example, a gift of a rare, non-digitized volume).

Drowning in data

A lesson learned from the experiences of Retention Step One is that MSCS requests for data to be divided and subdivided into multiple lists placed unnecessary demands on SCS, served to delay decision-making, increased the risk of errors into the data wrangling process, and complicated the disclosure of retention commitment statements.

Analyzing titles held by three or more MSCS libraries

The MSCS Collection Development Committee have been analyzing the remaining title-holdings that are held by three or more libraries. The Committee decided that title-sets in the HathiTrust Public Domain category will be pulled out of this group for further examination. The Committee agreed to first look at titles that meet the following criteria:

- Publication Year < 2003
- MSCS Institutions holding > 2
- Circulating Titles only
- No Special collections
- No HathiTrust Public Domain
- No title-sets with zero aggregate uses
- 10+ U.S. Holdings in OCLC

HathiTrust Public Domain title-holdings, which were withheld from this round of consideration, will get separate analysis.

The Committee decided that these titles should be committed to retain because they had recorded uses. The Committee then looked at usage ranges to help decide how many title-holdings should be committed across the MSCS group. The Committee agreed to retain ONE title-holding across the MSCS group for each CTR title-set with 0-3 uses and TWO title-holdings across the MSCS group for each CTR title-set with 4 or more uses.

Having decided how many title-holdings will be retained the Committee is currently working with SCS on algorithms for how retention responsibility will be allocated across the libraries. The Committee have debated a number potential allocation factors, for example: the disparity in partner loan periods (which means a CBB library always retains a title-holding where they have one), subject strengths, Colby's extra storage space, and the State Library's desire to CTR all local protected category titles. The Committee agreed that MSCS's first attempt at an allocation algorithm for titles, where one title-holding is required to be retained will be: for every title-set where Colby own a title-holding they will always be assigned the retention responsibility. In cases where Colby don't own a CTR title-holding, but either Bates or Bowdoin do then they will be allocated to one of those libraries. SCS will provide MSCS with data showing how their allocation algorithm would work for these holdings and the Committee will decide if it meets MSCS needs. The Committee still needs to agree how to allocate responsibility for those titles that are not held by Colby, Bates and Bowdoin. Based on some preliminary numbers from SCS of the approximately. 97,000 title-sets that the policy is to keep one title-holding 97% are held by CBB, with 63% held by Colby. Of the 97,000, 61,000 are held by Colby. Bates and Bowdoin are split between them approx. 33, 000 and the

remainder between the other MSCS libraries is only approximately 2,700. Therefore, this algorithm would assign responsibility for most in-scope titles.

The Committee have also agreed that to be consistent with Step One and CTR:

- 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.
- All special collections copies and at least one accompanying circulating copy.

The next work will be deciding how retention responsibility for these titles should be distributed fairly across the partner libraries.

Analyzing journal/serial/series titles

MSCS has also begun analyzing journal/serial/series titles. Because SCS don't provide collection analysis services for journals/serials/series MSCS have been utilizing the considerable data wrangling skills of the MSCS systems librarian Sara Amato. As with monographs the focus of MSCS is on retention and preservation of material. However, MSCS also does not wish to duplicate existing preservation efforts of repositories such as Portico that can be trusted to preserve the content and take the necessary preservation steps that individual libraries might not have the resources to complete. The Directors' Council also wanted to ensure that MSCS libraries did not make blanket commitments without first looking title-by-title at what the libraries would be expected to retain. The intention is to filter down to those titles which should be committed to retain.

The systems librarian extracted anything coded as a serial in the catalog based on a combination of MARC fields. Specifically:

- Leader position 07 (bib level) = s (serial)
- Leader position 06 (type of record) = a (language material)
- Not electronic (usually determined by location code)
- Not suppressed
- Numeric 001 (e.g. not ssj###)

The varying local cataloguing practices of what titles are coded 'S' for serial has meant that MSCS are not only analyzing journals and serials, but also monograph series. The Committee agreed that titles that had been excluded from the monograph collection analysis should be included in the journal/serial analysis to ensure they didn't 'fall between the cracks' of what is considered a journal and monograph. Titles that fell into the local protected categories (as developed for print monographs) and also titles stored in special collections which will automatically receive a CTR. The Collections Development Committee have been provided with lists of titles that fall into these categories and are currently deciding which titles should receive a CTR.

The systems librarian compared the remaining titles against title lists from PORTICO, JSTOR, Proquest and American Antiquarian Society Historical Periodicals 1-5 (UM). Titles in these repositories have been taken out of consideration for retention. Finally, the systems librarian compared the remaining titles with OCLC WorldCat holdings to pull out for review titles where there are less than 50 holding libraries in OCLC WorldCat. The Collections Development Committee have been provided with lists of titles that fall into this category and are currently deciding which titles should be CTR. The Committee is also investigating opportunities for making group level retention decisions where there is holding overlap.

Disclosing retention commitments

SCS provided MSCS with spreadsheet lists containing items each library is committing to retain. The MSCS systems librarian has used these lists to add retention statements to just over a million items (from Retention Step One) in the local systems of partner libraries in the MARC fields 561, 583, and 852.

After much debate on the location and wording of the public display of the retention statement in the OPAC of local systems MSCS agreed to display "MSCC" (Maine Shared Collections Cooperative) in the message field, which will be a link to an explanation of MSCC retention copies on the MSCS website. The OPAC message is currently live in the URSUS catalog (used by the MSCS partners University of Maine, University of Southern Maine, Bangor Public Library and the Maine State Library) see: http://ursus.maine.edu/record=b1043690~S1. Portland Public Library have been discussing with the MSCS systems librarian the process for displaying the statement in their OPAC. Colby, Bates, and Bowdoin Colleges have decided to wait until their new shared catalog goes live (February 2014) before they start the process of displaying the message.

In November 2013 the MSCS systems librarian submitted a batch loading request to OCLC for loading retention commitment into Local Holding Records for the items designated as shared print. The request includes 265,181 University of Maine titles that are being used a test case before the other MSCS library holdings are loaded. MSCS hopes these commitments will soon be publically viewable. 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 practical model is developed to use two symbols for each holding in OCLC: both the main symbol, which will remain requestable, and the Shared Print symbol, which will be a non-supplier.

MSCS have encountered issues with the display and transfer of 583 to the central union catalog, MaineCat. In May, the system vendor Innovative Interfaces, Inc. confirmed that they would fix the issues within the next 12 months. As a short-term work-around, Maine InfoNet staff and the MSCS system librarian 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. An example can be seen here: http://mainecat.maine.edu/record=b1156722~S0.

The disclosure of retention commitments for journals and serials will be a more manual process, as holdings will need to be individually encoded for those titles that do not already have closed holdings in the record.

CRL have added MSCS to their PAPR directory of shared print projects and MSCS have been put on the waiting list to add holding information for CTR journals and serials.

MSCS eventually decided that any potential benefits of recording in a internal note field in local catalogs that a title was 'Not selected for MSCC retention 2013' were outweighed by the amount of work required to implement it and the possible complication caused. The MSCS Technical Services Committee were unanimous in their opposition to the note believing it would only serve to add extra 'clutter' to the record. The consensus was that a lack of a retention statement on older material de facto indicated that it had been considered in the MSCS analysis and did not require retention.

Deferred access to OCLC WorldCat Collection Evaluation tool

In May 2013 MSCS received a proposal from OCLC for MSCS to receive deferred access to their new Collection Evaluation service once group functionality is available in late 2013/early 2014. The Project Team reviewed the proposal and requested changes were sent to OCLC in June 2013. Changes in personnel and communication issues at OCLC meant that messages requesting feedback on the proposal revisions were not returned. In November 2013 contact was made with Kathryn Harnish who informed MSCS that OCLC have implemented some of the group functionality for which MSCS were waiting in their most recent release of Collection Evaluation. Kathryn and the new product manager for analytics Sara Randall met with Project PI Clem Guthro and Collection Development Committee member Becky Albitz (Bates College) at the 2013 Charleston Conference to go over the latest developments with the Collection Evaluation tool. Based on discussions at this meeting it appears that some of the group functionality is operational, but the tool is not ready for MSCS to use at this time.

Access to the new analytics product may allow MSCS to report on comparisons between the services of Collection Evaluation and Sustainable Collection Services. Also, depending on the terms and conditions of access, the tool might be of use in collection analysis activities post-grant because it is unlikely that libraries (including new members) will have the financial resources to contract with SCS.

Print/digital management model

Surrogate digital copies

At the request of MSCS, SCS divided those titles in Retention Step One that didn't meet the retention criteria into four categories for further examination:

- Titles not available electronically
- Titles in the Internet Archive only
- HathiTrust Public Domain titles
- HathiTrust In-Copyright /Copyright Undetermined titles.

The Collection Development Committee were provided with title lists to review and were set the task of deciding which if any of these categories of titles MSCS as a group would CTR.

The Committee agreed that MSCS will not CTR titles that didn't meet the Step One criteria. Some felt this decision was based on MSCS having sufficient trust in digitally available copies that they don't need to make group commitments to retain title-holdings, others felt the overriding factor was that the titles had zero circulations and there are more than 10 holdings in OCLC. Concerns were raised about relying on a HathiTrust copy when not all MSCS libraries are likely to become HathiTrust partners (see below) with full download rights. Another issue identified by the MSCS systems librarian Sara Amato during her research into extracting HathiTrust records (see below) was that titles go on and off HathiTrust's lists of available titles because of changes in copyright status. MSCS libraries placed less trust in relying on copies available in the Internet Archive because of a number of factors, including that while the Center for Research Libraries have completed audits of Portico and HathiTrust, they have not done one of the Internet Archive.

HathiTrust partnership investigations

A MSCS goal is to deliver a service model for both Print-On-Demand and E-book-On-Demand. At the MSCS Directors' Council meeting in May 2013, the Council agreed to become consortial partners of the HathiTrust. However, it became clear during subsequent discussions that HathiTrust's legal counsel had issues with the fact that the consortium (which would be known as Maine Shared Collection Cooperative) was not a legal entity with one counsel and one insurance. MSCS tried to address their concerns by having Maine InfoNet (which is a legal entity) sign the agreement on behalf of the consortium with the MSCC library directors co-signing, which initially satisfied their requirements.

However, in July 2013 the MSCS directors were in the process of reviewing the agreement with HathTrust in preparation for signing when MSCS were informed by HathiTrust that they were not willing to accept MSCC as a consortium partner with single holdings. After all the time and investment (including Shibboleth and InCommon installations), this was extremely disappointing news. HathiTrust would accept MSCC as a consortium in name, but libraries would pay individually and not have Section 108 and print disability access to each other's materials. The cost would have been $9,200 per institution, presuming all 8 institutions joined. This figure was a big leap from the $3,800 cost per academic library MSCS would have been charged in the original consortium (the academic libraries were paying the costs of the public libraries). It was an even bigger leap to what completely individual membership would cost each partner.

Under the original consortium agreement, the public libraries and the Maine State Library were going to be able to log in via IP address to download Google-digitized volumes. However, as individual members they were expected

to have their own installations of In-Common and Shibboleth, which meant they were not able to join. That left the academic libraries to decide if they wanted to become individual partners, or join as a consortium (with the above caveats). An added complication was that in the revised MSCS budget there was a matching cost sharing contribution of $26,000 for Colby to become an individual member of the HathiTrust in grant years 2 & 3. However, because of the investigations into consortial membership, Colby had not joined. Therefore, now that MSCS is in year 3 of the grant (and based on the price quote) at least two libraries needed to join in the grant period to meet the $26,000 cost sharing contribution. In August 2013, the University of Maine and Colby College agreed to become individual members.

In October 2013, after completing the partnership checklist, Colby College went live as a HathiTrust partner. The University of Maine is still to complete the process because of delays in their installation of Shibboleth which HathiTrust require for authentication purposes.

Service delivery model for EOD & POD

Ebook-On-Demand services

The MSCS systems librarian is currently in the process of loading 1.6 million MARC records for the HathiTrust Public Domain titles into the union catalog (MaineCat) and include links to a viewable/downloadable (depending on rights restrictions) copy in the HathiTrust online catalog. MSCS are also loading Google Books links (where available), allowing users to fully download Google-digitalized titles that can only be downloaded from HathiTrust one page at a time. See test example of links: http://mainecat.maine.edu/record=b11505253~S0

Print-On-Demand service

MSCS is about to begin testing Print-On-Demand services to evaluate the demand for such a service and develop an ongoing business model. MaineCat records for HathiTrust Public Domain titles include a "Request Print Copy" link which takes users to a form where they can submit a request for a print copy. The requests will be routed to the MSCS PI Deb Rollins and the head of the University of Maine's Interlibrary Loan department to review before a print copy (using HathiTrust PDF copies) is printed by the University of Maine's Printing Services. The POD copy will be delivered directly to the requestor, who must have a Maine postal address. During the testing period there will be no fee for the service as costs will be covered by allocated MSCS grant funds. See test example of the form: http://ursus.maine.edu:2082/screens/mscspod.html?OCLC=3967141

Presentations & outreach

To communicate the work of MSCS project representatives have presented at numerous professional conferences and had articles published. Since May 2013 MSCS Project Team members have presented at the: ALCTS "Shared Print Monographs" pre-conference event and Project PI Clem Guthro gave a update on MSCS at the Print Archive Network forum at the ALA 2013 Conference in Chicago in June, in addition to the written report submitted. MSCS Program Manager Matthew Revitt presented with Project PI Deb Rollins at the New England Library Association Conference in Portland in October. Deb and Collection Development Committee member Becky Albitz (Bates College) delivered a presentation at the Charleston Conference in November and will have a paper published in the Conference Proceedings.

Matthew Revitt and Clem Guthro presented their paper "Together We Are Stronger: A Cooperative Approach to Managing Print Collections" at the IFLA Conference in Singapore in August 2013. The paper was also published by IFLA online and may be recommended by the Acquisitions & Collection Development Section for publication in the *IFLA Journal*. If not, it will be published by Emerald. MSCS were also included in another IFLA presentation paper titled "Rethinking Library Resource Sharing: New Models for Collaboration" as an example of shared print projects.

MSCS plan on submitting a paper to the Acquisition Institute at Timberline Lodge for their 2014 conference. MSCS would also like to use the wrap-up of the grant as an opportunity to organize a national event to use the

experiences of MSCS and others involved in shared print as a building block for future work. The Project Team have been discussing with the Advisory Board and representatives from CRL the possibility of MSCS using underspent grant funds to co-organize an extended full-day PAN pre-conference session at the 2014 ALA Conference in Las Vegas. MSCS hopes this event could be an opportunity to do a larger event with perhaps speakers from abroad that could inform the thinking of current shared print projects, and also allow the PAN community to broaden its influence/impact on the larger library community. In November 2013 CRL confirmed that they are willing to partner with MSCS to co-organize a full-day shared print session. This event is to certain extent dependent on the no-cost extension being approved by IMLS (see below).

Since March, when the *Library Journal* published an online article on MSCS titled "Major Maine Libraries, Public and Academic, Collaborate on Print Archiving Project" LJ has continued to monitor the work of MSCS and have published updates in their *information docket*. Matthew Revitt was also a panelist on the Library Journal's June 6 webcast "Data-Driven Libraries Part 1: Analyzing Data to Manage Print Collections". Matthew Revitt's article on MSCS that originally appeared in the *Maine Policy Review* was published in August 2013 by the *Bangor Daily News*. MSCS also featured in the column "Curating Collective Collections" in the September 2013 edition of *Against the Grain* and in an October article on shared print in the *Chronicle of Higher Education*.

MSCS project representatives have been 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. Representatives from MSCS partner libraries also attended the project's kickoff meeting in July 2013.

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 Maine Shared Collection Cooperative (MSCC) Memorandum Of Understanding was approved by the Maine InfoNet Board and MSCS Directors' Council in June 2013. Since then, the MOU has been signed by an institutional representative, for example a Board of Trustees or Provost, at all of the MSCS partners.

The Project Team are working on developing plans for the sustainability of MSCC beyond the grant period and the process for other libraries to join. Specifically: governance structure, staffing, timeframe for extending membership, membership requirements, collection analysis, and ongoing retention commitment disclosure.

At the suggestion of MSCS Advisory Board member Bob Kieft, MSCS have also begun drafting a teaching document on shared print with advice to others about the issues MSCS have experienced with monographic shared print.

Budget and grant extension

MSCS continue to be under budget and at projected spending rates are likely to not have spent awarded IMLS funds. Having underspent funds was a major factor in MSCS's decision in September 2013 to submit a request to IMLS for a no-cost extension until August 31, 2014. In mid-November MSCS received a response from IMLS requesting more information about the financial details of the extension, which MSCS are currently compiling.

MSCS want the extension to pay the costs of organizing and delivering a national shared print event (see above) and producing a teaching document (see above) since these activities are best done once other grant activities have been completed. The contract of the Program Manager Matthew Revitt will also be extended from June 1 to August 31, 2014. Matthew will be responsible for organizing and presenting at the event and for producing and disseminating the shared print teaching document. Matthew will continue to oversee the transition from the grant

period to the formation of the Maine Shared Collections Cooperative, including speaking to libraries about joining the Cooperative and putting in place what is hoped will be sustainable business model.