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Libraries motivated to acquire and retain as many volumes as possible

Researchers could only use volumes they could physically reach

Large book collection meant broad scope and long history
Libraries Face Hard Choices

“Libraries have a certain amount of space and a certain amount of money...

It's easy to argue that some of these books are ... important...

But if you're the library, how many of those snapshots can you keep, at what cost?”

“No single library can or should acquire and retain everything.

To do so would be to disregard our home institution’s mission and to squander its resources.

However, collectively we should be concerned with the survival of the print record broadly conceived.”

Key Trends Driving Change

- Print publication still strong, 2 million new titles published annually
- Libraries are at capacity and unlikely to expand
- Campus master plans favor student-oriented space
- Keeping print books on the shelves is expensive
- Secure digital versions provide viable alternatives for many print volumes
The Scope of the Issue

Almost 1 BILLION volumes

Over 980 million volumes in academic libraries in North America

About 70 million volumes in library storage facilities

About 25 million volumes added each year

NCES ALS + ARL statistics 2008
There are no good options

More feasible

Less space

More space

Mass Weeding

Stop Buying

High Density Shelving

Expand Library

Less feasible
High-density facility: a separate building purpose-built for long-term housing of very large quantities of library materials

80+ library storage facilities, most built in the last 15 years

More than 50% of all ARL libraries have separate shelving facilities
High-Density Library Facilities in the U.S.
Harvard-Model Library Facility

Design goal: cost-effective shelving

Volumes stored by SIZE for maximum density

Order picker for retrieval

Usually built off-campus

Scheduled book delivery and online article delivery

Construction cost per volume approx USD $3
Automated Storage/Retrieval System (ASRS)

- Design goal: Fast retrieval
- Volumes stored in metal bins, retrieved by robotic mechanism
- Built on campus
- Book delivery in minutes
- Construction cost per volume approx USD $10

University of Chicago Mansueto Library
Permanent Migration from Open Stacks

University of Chicago
  ✗ Underground ASRS, opened May 2011
  ✗ 3.5 million volumes (almost 50% of collection)

San Francisco State University
  ✗ Building new library with ASRS, to open in spring 2012
  ✗ Only about 250,000 volumes will return to open stacks, about 1 million to remain in ASRS

University of Denver
  ✗ Moved 100% of library collection to high-density offsite facility in summer 2011 during 18-month remodel
  ✗ Determining how many will return to open stacks
Growth of Mass Weeding

- Mass Weeding
- High Density Shelving
Mass Weeding (or “Deselection”)

“...for a librarian

it's like your best friend just got bitten by a zombie

and you're the only one with a gun.”

S. Peter Davis. “6 Reasons We're In Another 'Book-Burning' Period in History” Cracked, October 11, 2011 http://www.cracked.com/article_19453_6-reasons-were-in-another-book-burning-period-in-history.html
Stopgap Measures

- Selective weeding:
  - Donate to other libraries
  - Book sales
  - Donate to Better World Books (but doesn’t accept bound journals, no market)

- Patron-Driven Acquisitions
  - Buy what users ask for

- *These solutions are useful but don’t scale*
The Annual Cost of Keeping Books

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Open Stack (traditional library)</th>
<th>High Density</th>
<th>Hybrid (10 years in Open Stack)</th>
<th>Hybrid (20 years in Open Stack)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Annual average cost per volume</td>
<td>$4.26</td>
<td>$0.86</td>
<td>$1.53</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Includes amortized building construction, utilities, staffing


$4.26 * 25 million new volumes = over $100 million annual investment in North America just to keep up with new accessions
Libraries Invest Heavily to Support Low Use

- OhioLINK OCLC Collection and Circulation Analysis Project 2011 reviewed use of 30 million items across 89 libraries *

- Found “80% of the circulation is driven by just 6% of the collection”

- Thus, a library with 2 million circulating volumes in open stacks invests over $8 million annually to support circulation of 120,000 volumes (using Courant figures)

Major Weeding Projects in the News

UC San Diego

- Removing 150,000 volumes (4% of collection) after state budget cuts forced closure of four campus libraries
- Criteria: not checked out in 10 years, available in digital form, or duplicates in regional storage facility

Sustainable Collections Services company

- 12 major deselection projects completed or underway in 2011
- Libraries from small (200,000 volumes) to large 2 million) including University of Vermont and James Madison University
The Cost of NOT Keeping Books

“There is a very real risk that so many copies may be discarded as to threaten the availability of certain materials in their original format.”

Another Option

- Mass Weeding
- High Density Shelving
- Shared Print Collections
“...in an environment where there is widespread digital access, libraries could share their print storage, keeping only several copies nationally or regionally...”

Shared Print Journal Programs in the U.S.

Shared Storage Copy
- UC RLFs
- OhioLINK
- PASCAL
- WRLC
- Minnesota MLAC

Library-Nominated Titles
- ASERL Journal Retention
- TRLN Single Copy Archive

By Publisher
- CIC Shared Print Repository
- UC Shared Print
- Orbis-Cascade Alliance
- PALCI
- Five Colleges (MA)

By Title Risk
- Western Regional Storage Trust (WEST)
# Shared Print Operating Policies (A Template)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Questions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Selection Criteria</td>
<td>• How are items chosen for retention</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Archive Locations</td>
<td>• Centralized or Distributed?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Storage facilities and/or libraries?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retention Commitment</td>
<td>• Perpetual, 25 years, 10 years, unspecified?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ownership</td>
<td>• Original library? Or archiving group or library?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Validation</td>
<td>• Review for completeness, condition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Volume, issue, page, none</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access/delivery</td>
<td>• Who can borrow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Access/Delivery methods</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Western Regional Storage Trust (WEST)
CIC
ASERL
ReCAP

More than 50% of all ARL libraries participate
WEST Membership: 103 Libraries in 17 states

- 44 individual libraries
- 3 library consortia
  - University of California (10 libraries)
  - Orbis Cascade Alliance (30 libraries)
  - Statewide California Electronic Licensing Consortium (SCELC) (19 libraries)
- 25 members of ARL
- 30 members of CRL
- 16 libraries > 3 million volumes
# Key Features of WEST, CIC, and ASERL Plans

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>WEST</th>
<th>CIC-SPR</th>
<th>ASERL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Members</strong></td>
<td>~ 100</td>
<td>10+</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Archive facilities</strong></td>
<td>Libraries and storage facilities</td>
<td>Indiana U. storage facility</td>
<td>Libraries and storage facilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Selection</strong></td>
<td>By risk profile</td>
<td>STM from Elsevier, Springer, Wiley</td>
<td>Library-nominated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ownership</strong></td>
<td>Archive Holder</td>
<td>Original Owner</td>
<td>Original Owner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Retention</strong></td>
<td>25 years (to 2035)</td>
<td>25 years</td>
<td>25 years (to 2035)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Access</strong></td>
<td>Digital preferred; physical in-library only</td>
<td>[TBD]</td>
<td>At owning library’s discretion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Business Model</strong></td>
<td>Share upfront costs of ingest</td>
<td>Share upfront costs of ingest AND ongoing retention</td>
<td>No cost sharing, libraries absorb own costs</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Sharing Other Materials

- Government documents
  - ASERL program to consolidate gov docs among Regional Centers of Excellence
  - CIC libraries preserving gov docs scanned by Google

- Monographs
  - Last-copy programs e.g. CARLI in Illinois
  - Maine Shared Collections program in development
  - Hathi Trust
Hathi Trust partnership provides “a comprehensive digital archive of library materials converted from print”

Endorsed “establishment of a distributed print archive of monographic holdings corresponding to [digital] volumes represented within HathiTrust” (October 9, 2011)

Working Assumptions:
- Distributed archive based on holdings of Hathi members
- Compensation or partial subsidy for libraries that retain
- Available to Hathi members
Hathi Collection Overlap

75% of Hathi titles stored in print repositories

45 - 50% of typical academic library collection matches Hathi titles

Analysis courtesy OCLC Research “Cloud Library Project”
Copyright issues
- Only ~27% of Hathi titles in public domain

Searchers more likely to want full print version
- Keep more copies available?
- Print on demand?

How to make monograph deselection cost-effective
- By subject?
- By branch?
**Shared Print: Getting to Scale**

1. Disclose holdings that have been digitized or committed to shared print

2. Develop community standards and agreements to preserve print
Disclosing Shared Print Holdings

**OCLC**: WorldCat

**CRL**: Print Archives Preservation Registry (PAPR)

- **Archived Holdings**: (MARC Holdings)
- **All holdings for analysis**: (MARC Holdings)

**Library Catalogs**

**Testing approach and metadata standard**: Fall 2011

**Developing system with California Digital Library**: 2011-2012
Shared Print Community Forum

- Shared Print discussion group Fridays at ALA (informal but longstanding)

- Print Archives Network (PAN) listserv hosted by CRL

- CRL’s new Global Resources Forum offers community discussions via web meeting. Coming up: Dark archives, light archives, and optimal copies (Dec 7)

- Preconference on Nov 2 at Charleston Conference
Neither a Dinosaur nor a Philistine Be

“To husband our collective resources effectively, we need to respect both of these viewpoints.”

“Dinosaurs”
- Print still has enormous value.
- Not everything is available digitally.
- Sufficient copies of print must be retained to assure that no content is lost.

“Philistines”
- Print use actually is declining.
- Low-use books limit space and resources available for other uses.
- It costs serious money to retain volumes

Rick Lugg. Sample and Hold blog
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