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The First C
Change
Unprecedented Era for Academic Libraries
Many of the Changes are Out of Our Control
Hyperinflation
Faculty Advisory Council Memorandum on Journal Pricing

Major Periodical Subscriptions Cannot Be Sustained

To: Faculty Members in all Schools, Faculties, and Units
From: The Faculty Advisory Council
Date: April 17, 2012
Re: Periodical Subscriptions

We write to communicate an untenable situation facing the Harvard Library. Many large journal publishers have made the scholarly communication environment fiscally unsustainable and academically restrictive. This situation is exacerbated by efforts of certain publishers (called “providers”) to acquire, bundle, and increase the pricing on journals.

Harvard’s annual cost for journals from these providers now approaches $3,781M. In 2010, the comparable amount accounted for more than 20% of all periodical subscription costs and just under 10% of all collection costs for everything the Library acquires. Some journals cost as much as $40,000 per year, others in the tens of thousands. Prices for some content from two providers have increased by about 40% over the past six years, which far exceeds not only the consumer price index, but also the highest education and the library price indices. These increases have been passed along to Harvard as rapidly as the scholarly output continues to grow and publishing can be expensive, profit margins of 25% and more suggest that the prices we must pay do not simply result from an increasing supply of new articles.


*Includes electronic resources from 1995-2000 onward.
Hyperinflation

If Harvard Can’t Afford Academic Journal Subscriptions, Maybe It’s Time for an Open Access Model

Last week, Harvard’s Faculty Advisory Council revealed that the school now spends $25 million annually on academic journal subscriptions. Why so much? According to a memo the council sent out, some journals cost the school up to $840 per article. The price for an article has increased by 15% over the last six years. This is troubling for a number of reasons. First, in an age where the public can browse nearly million articles for free on Wikipedia, a curious person looking to nerd up on the latest scientific research can expect to spend nearly $30 to $50 for a single article. Second, publishers such as Elsevier and Springer charge so much for subscriptions that the school can’t afford to subscribe to even the most prominent journals. Third, the journal industry is in crisis. This year, with the two top publishers increasing the price of content 14%, over the last six years.

---

Monograph and Serial Expenditures in ARL Libraries, 1986-2004*
Explosion in Scholarly Output

U.S. Library Spending, R&D Spending, and Journals 1995-2007

From Outsell’s Open Access Primer (Public Version), December 2009
Changes in User Behavior
Changes in User Behavior

Total Circulations
4 Year Colleges and Universities

Changes in User Behavior

Circulations per Student
4 Year Colleges and Universities

State Budget Cuts for Research Universities Imperil Competitiveness, Report Says

By Emma Roller

States have cut funds for public research universities by 20 percent in constant dollars from 2002 to 2010, according to a report issued on Tuesday by the National Science Foundation.

The report, "Science and Engineering Indicators 2012," is a compendium almost 600 pages long of scientific trends in the United States and around the world. The agency releases such data every two years.

The findings in this year's report demonstrate a continuing trend in scientific innovation. While countries like China and India have increased their spending on technology and education, the United States has found itself hamstrung by a weakened economy since 2008.
Smaller Piece of the Pie for Academic Libraries

Library Expenditure as % of Total University Expenditure
(Average of 40 US Institutions Reporting Since 1982)
But, at the same time...
Opportunity is Knocking
Opportunity is Knocking

Technology:

Internet

Mass Digitization

Proliferation of Electronic Resources

CC BY-NC-SA 2.0 / Sarah Macmillan / http://www.flickr.com/photos/essjay/3757635390/sizes/l/in/photostream/
In the Past:

Frenzied finance

Lawson, Thomas William, 1857–


3 p. l., v–xix, 559 p. front. (port.) 21 cm.

Reprinted from Everybody's magazine.
No more published.


Library of Congress

HG4061.L42

5-40043 Additions

Copyright A 132011
In the Past:
We Built Stand-Alone Collections
Difficult to Know what Others Owned
Expensive and Time Consuming to Get Items from Other Libraries
Purchased Just in Case...

• Attempted to anticipate needs
• Tried to build comprehensive collections
  – Why volume count was so important
The Problem

We’re not good at guessing...

- Kent Study: **40%** of books never circulated
- Cornell: **55%** of books published since 1990
- GVSU: **30%** of our collection
  – $200,000 per year


CC BY-NC 2.0 / Liam Gallagher / http://www.flickr.com/photos/23026122@N07/2209377175/sizes/l/in/photostream/
The Problem

And it’s expensive to keep these things on our shelves

• Myth of the one-time cost
  – $4.26 per year per volume
  – Costing us time, space, money and opportunity

Complicating Things: How Collections are Used

The Long Tail

Why the Future of Business
Is Selling Less of More

CHRIS ANDERSON
Complicating Things: How Collections are Used

• Not a new concept in libraries
  – Trueswell’s 80-20 rule
  – Updated in 2011 by an OhioLink study
• 80-6 rule
Complicating Things: How Collections are Used

6% of books in Academic Libraries account for 80% of the use
Instead of Building Collections...

Libraries today must figure out how to provide access to the resources people want and need.
Six Ways Libraries are Doing This
Exploiting eBooks

- Overcome limits of time and place
- Can be more cost effective
- Not without limits
  - DRM
  - Licensing restrictions
  - User preference
Moving Away from Title-by-Title Selection

• Just-in-case collecting not effective
• Increasing and emerging demands on librarians
• Technology making this model obsolete
Moving Toward Just-in-Time Purchasing

• Purchase on Demand
  – Libraries have been doing this for a long time
    • Patron Requests
    • ILL Requests

• Technology is the difference
Just-in-Time Purchasing
Just-in-Time Purchasing

- Ebook Patron-Driven Acquisitions
  - Current content
  - Immediate & seamless access
  - Cost effective
Just-in-Time Purchasing

- Ebook Patron-Driven Acquisitions
  - At GVSU
  - 10,800 books used 22,000 times
    - $852,000
  - We spent: $109,000

CC BY 2.0 / Arbron / http://www.flickr.com/photos/arbron/56216464/sizes/l/in/photostream/
Harnessing Mass Digitization

Immediate and easy access

Free up space

Meet users’ expectations
Harnessing Mass Digitization

Digitized in seven years what would have taken libraries hundreds of years.
Harnessing Mass Digitization

10.6 million volumes*

3.2 million volumes in the public domain*

Enhancing

Preserving

Full-text searchability

* Source: HathiTrust Digital Library Update on December Activities
http://www.hathitrust.org/updates_december2012
Abandoning Ownership Imperative

- Relying on third-parties for access
  - For books and journals
Abandoning Ownership Imperative

• Relying on third-parties for access
  – For books and journals
• Databases like Academic Search Complete for journals or ebrary’s Academic Complete for books
But what about print books?
Two Percentages...

- **37%**
  - Even if we wanted to, we cannot solely rely on ebooks
  - Print remains necessary
Two Percentages...

• 6%
  – We need to make sure users have immediate access
  – For the rest...?
Collaboration
Nothing New

• Resource Sharing
• Union Catalogs
• Delivery Systems
• Not done in a systematic fashion
• Still...the foundation for the fourth C
The Fourth C
Coordination
Coordination

• No longer serendipitous
• Deliberate cooperation and coordination
• Entire life-cycle
  – From Selection to Withdrawal
Start at the End

Programs for Management of Legacy Collections

CC BY-SA / Andrew Hurley / http://www.flickr.com/photos/andrewhurley/6254409229/sizes/l/in/photostream/
Programs for the Management of Legacy Collections

Two categories

– Preservation

– Access (Two Goals)
  • Maintain access
  • Create space (withdrawal)
Programs for the Management of Legacy Collections

- Journals
  - Easier
  - Print preservation (WEST, CIC, CRL, JSTOR projects)
  - Electronic preservation
    - Portico, LOCKSS, CLOCKSS
Programs for the Management of Legacy Collections

- Monographs
  - Trickier
  - Digital surrogates not available (for access)
    - Copyright an issue
  - Opportunity is huge
Opportunity

System-wide distribution of library holdings for titles in HathiTrust Digital Library (June 2010)

74% of books in HathiTrust are held by 10 or more libraries

Constance Malpas, Cloud-sourcing Research Collections: Managing Print in the Mass-digitized Library Environment
Shared Print Projects

- Maine Shared Collections Strategy
- 2CUL
- CIC
- University of California System
- Michigan Shared Print Initiative (MI-SPI)
Michigan Shared Print Initiative

- A collaborative effort among members of the Michigan Council of Library Deans and Directors (COLD) to manage legacy print collections.

- In conjunction with
  - the Midwest Collaborative for Library Services (MCLS)
  - Sustainable Collections Services
Member Libraries

Central Michigan University
Eastern Michigan University
Grand Valley State University
Michigan Technological University
Saginaw Valley State University
Western Michigan University
Wayne State University
Member Libraries

Central Michigan University
Eastern Michigan University
Grand Valley State University
Michigan Technological University
Saginaw Valley State University
Western Michigan University
Wayne State University
Oakland University
Ferris State University
Member Libraries by Carnegie Classification

- Masters Large: 3
- Doctoral / Research Universities: 1
- Research Universities-High Research: 2
- Research Universities-Very High Research Activity: 1
Included Collections by Member Library

MI-SPI Bib Records per Library

- Wayne State: 1,169,157
- Western Michigan: 971,995
- Central Michigan: 597,046
- Eastern Michigan: 529,502
- Grand Valley: 225,480
- Saginaw Valley: 167,707
- Michigan Tech: 161,640
Focus of MI-SPI

Distributed shared print monograph management project
Focus of MI-SPI

• Low-use legacy monograph collections
• Subset of libraries’ collective collections
  – Monographs only
  – Multi-volume monographic sets
  – No serials
  – No “Special” collections
  – No Gov Docs, Reference, Reserves, etc.
Focus of MI-SPI

• Low-use legacy monograph collections
• Subset of libraries’ collective collections
  – Of that subset, we focused on:
    • Books with 3 or more holdings in the group
      – Retained two copies of each book in the group
    • Published or added prior to 2005
    • 3 or few circulations at a library since 1999
Focus of MI-SPI

- Emphasis on eliminating duplication and creating space
- Desire to maintain access to these works in the Michigan
- Commitment to collaborative management
Collaboration in Michigan

• Some history of working together
  – Michicard
  – MeLCat
  – RIDES
    – Consorital ejournal and database purchasing

• No one forcing further cooperation
  – State universities are all independent

• So why take it a step further?
GVSU’s Experience

• Changing collections philosophy, but not really impacting legacy collections

• Two events led us to look at these collections differently...
GVSU’s Experience

- The Great Mold Incident of 2010
  - 129 damaged books
  - 128 were held by libraries in state-wide union catalog
GVSU’s Experience

• Storage Weeding Project
  – Pilot library working with Sustainable Collections Services (SCS)
  – Rules-based, data-driven approach to deselection
  – Reviewed 38,000 books, withdrawing 33,000
GVSU’s Experience

• Storage Weeding Project
  – One criterion commonly used by librarians was how many libraries in the state held the book
  – Operating in a vacuum
    • We assume other libraries will hang onto books we’re withdrawing
GVSU’s Experience

• What if we stopped acting independently?
  – What is the level of duplication among our collections?
  – How many of those books are in the long tail?
  – What kinds of opportunities would that information create for libraries?
  – Could this lead to other areas of cooperation?
Moving the Idea Forward

• Gauging interest from COLD libraries

• Getting MCLS involved
  – Needed infrastructure
  – Needed experience
  – Needed leadership

• Beginning to work with SCS
  – Bringing same data-driven model for weeding to the consortial model
Factors Driving Participation

• Space issues for a minority of libraries

• Desire to collaborate on collection management the primary driver
Original Scope of the Project

• SCS to analyze member collections, identify overlap, and titles that are commonly-held with low to no circulation history

• Member libraries to determine how (and whether) to collectively manage collections
Where did we End Up?

- Ultimately agreed to cooperatively manage a subset of collective collection
  - 534,000 titles
  - Libraries received lists of books they were to retain and books they could withdraw
Where did we End Up?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Library</th>
<th>Retention Count</th>
<th>Withdrawal Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Central Michigan</td>
<td>204,686</td>
<td>37,438</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastern Michigan</td>
<td>172,423</td>
<td>67,221</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Valley State</td>
<td>45,497</td>
<td>49,654</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michigan Tech</td>
<td>24,899</td>
<td>48,655</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saginaw Valley State</td>
<td>30,094</td>
<td>53,724</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wayne State</td>
<td>86,633</td>
<td>165,858</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Western Michigan</td>
<td>172,004</td>
<td>111,607</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Timeline

• Fall 2010
  – COLD Libraries discussed concept and began to gauge interest
  – Initial conversations with MCLS and SCS
• Spring/Summer 2011
  – Finalize participants and begin data exchange with SCS
• Fall 2011
  – Initial meeting of participants to discuss data and options
• Winter 2012
  – Data refinement, project parameters finalized and MOU agreed upon
• Spring 2012
  – Distribution of retention and withdrawal lists
Take-Aways from Project

You don't need everyone

Perfect is the enemy of good

Take advantage of existing infrastructure and knowledge
Take-Aways from Project

Libraries want to work together
You can move quickly with this kind of project
Next Steps

- Integrating new libraries
- Data refresh
- Exploring integration with union catalog
- Investigating additional areas of collaboration
  - Looking to avoid this level of duplication
Changing Acquisition Models

Coordinating acquisitions

Relying on partners for access
Changing Acquisition Models

Colby-Bates-Bowdin

- Shared Approval Plan
- Shared catalog
- Regular delivery
- Common check-out periods
- Just-in-case collecting model
Changing Acquisition Models

Orbis-Cascade Alliance

- Limiting number of copies purchased in Alliance
- Shared vendor (YBP)
- Not a hard cap
- No way of identifying high-demand titles
What Should We Be Looking Toward?

• Data-driven approach
  – Identify high demand titles (The 6%)
  • Within a consortia or at libraries with a similar profile
What Should We Be Looking Toward?

Consortium Makes Radical Shift Away From ILS

By Michael Kelley on December 19, 2012

The deal struck in September between the Orbis Cascade Alliance and Ex Libris may be the most forceful illustration to date that the integrated library system (ILS) is facing the same fate that ultimately befall card catalog cabinets.

Over the next two years, the 37 academic libraries in Oregon, Washington, and Idaho that constitute the Alliance will abandon their discrete ILS systems based on local servers in favor of a single, shared, cloud-based system from Ex Libris that will employ the next-generation library services platform Alma for all back office functions (selection, acquisition, metadata management, digitization, and fulfillment) and Primo as the discovery layer. The deal was a coup for Ex Libris, and a sign that the Alliance remains at the forefront when it comes to resource sharing and collaborative technical services.

MOVING BEYOND THE ILS

“This is big,” said Mark Triest, the president of Ex Libris North America. “The Alliance is breaking down the silos of the past. They are moving everything to the cloud. They will shut down the legacy systems of the past, and in doing so they will realize the opportunity to truly benefit from rich collaboration and resource sharing across the consortium.”
What Should We Be Looking Toward?

• Data-driven approach
• Tighter Integration
• What we gain, not what we will lose
  – Libraries are our own worst enemies
    • Unwillingness to give up local control
    • Fear of the unknown
Cold Hard Facts
Libraries at a Crossroad

We can continue on the same path

or we can chart a new course
Charting our Course
Taking Advantage of Technology
Being Willing to Take Risks
Embracing More Efficient Collections Practices

High Efficiency
Working Together to Provide Access to Resources
Charting our Course

• Make better use of our resources
  – Time, Money & Space

• Creating opportunities for the new and unknown
Thank you

the end
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