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Our World in a Word...
Many of these Changes are Out of Our Control
Hyperinflation

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

- CPI (+73%)
- Monograph Expenditures (+63%)
- Serials Purchased (+42%)
- Monographs Purchased (-9%)
- Serial Unit Cost (+188%)
- Serial Expenditures (+273%)

*Includes electronic resources from 1995-2000 onward.
Explosion in Scholarly Output

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

Serial Spending (HEPI Adjusted)
Total Library Spending (HEPI Adjusted)
US R&D Spending (Total)
No. Refereed Journals (Ulrich's)
Global Journals Published (NSF)
US Journals Published (NSF)

+60%
+30%
+10%

From Outsell's Open Access Primer (Public Version), December 2009
Declining use of Physical Collections

Total Circulations
4 Year Colleges and Universities

Declining use of Physical Collections

Circulations per Student
4 Year Colleges and Universities


Declining Support for Higher Education

25 Years of Declining State Support for Public Colleges

March 3, 2014

Explore how state and federal support has declined as a share of overall revenue—putting a greater burden on students—at more than 600 four-year public colleges and universities since 1987.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Share of revenue coming from state support</th>
<th>Change in state support: 1987-2012</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>St. Mary's College of Maryland</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Mary's City, MD</td>
<td>69.3%</td>
<td>-28.5 pts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baccalaureate colleges</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Baltimore</td>
<td>62.0%</td>
<td>-25.0 pts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baltimore, MD</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master's colleges and universities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Maryland at Baltimore</td>
<td>57.4%</td>
<td>-24.6 pts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baltimore, MD</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Smaller Piece of the Pie for Academic Libraries
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 Online resources

- Providing us the opportunity to think differently about collections.
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
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
- SCS Monographs Index: 40%
  - 75% 3 or fewer circs


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
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.
How are some libraries 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

• Beyond 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
Just-in-Time Purchasing
Just-in-Time Purchasing

• Ebook Patron-Driven Acquisitions
  – Current content
  – Immediate & seamless access
  – Cost effective
Harnessing Mass Digitization

Immediate and easy access

Meet users’ expectations

Free up space

[STOR logo]

[Springer logo]

[ELSEVIER logo]
Harnessing Mass Digitization

Bigger impact on users to date

Just beginning to figure out how this will impact libraries

- 3.5 million volumes in the public domain
- Role of digital surrogates in access and preservation
Abandoning Ownership Imperial

• Relying on third-parties for access
  – For books and journals
  – Has taken form of electronic surrogates in most libraries

• 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...?
Cooperative Collection Management

- Nothing New
  - Resource Sharing
  - Union Catalogs
  - Delivery Systems

- Not done in a systematic fashion
What’s Been Missing is Coordination

• Deliberate cooperation and coordination
• Not serendipitous
• Entire life-cycle
  – From Selection to Withdrawal
Start at the End: Managing Legacy Collections
Programs for the Management of Legacy Collections

Two categories

- Preservation
  - “Last copy” opportunities
  - Taking advantage of digital collections

- 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
Opportunity

2013 Monographs Index

57 Libraries

26 million holdings

77.6% of titles held by more than 100 libraries

2.1% of titles held by fewer than 5 libraries
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
Original Member Libraries by Carnegie Classification

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Library</th>
<th>MI-SPI Bib Records per Library</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Wayne State</td>
<td>1,169,157</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Western Michigan</td>
<td>971,995</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central Michigan</td>
<td>597,046</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastern Michigan</td>
<td>529,502</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Valley</td>
<td>225,480</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saginaw Valley</td>
<td>167,707</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michigan Tech</td>
<td>161,640</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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
A Little Background
Collaboration in Michigan

• Some history of working together
  – Michicard
  – MeLCat
  – RIDES
    – Consoritodal 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
GVSU’s Experience

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 statewide 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
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
Factors Driving Participation

• Space issues for a minority of libraries
• Desire to collaborate on collection management the primary driver
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
• 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-Bowdlin
- 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?

- Data-driven approach
- Tighter Integration
  - Policies & Loan Periods
  - Systems

CC BY-NC-ND 2.0 / Tobias Leeger / http://www.flickr.com/photos/61212260@N00/1098106984/
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
The Reality:
We’re at a Crossroads
Taking Advantage of Technology
Being Willing to Take Risks
Embracing More Efficient Collections Practices
Working Together to Provide Access to Resources
Make Better Use of Resources
Make Better Use of Resources
Make Better Use of Resources
All of Which Adds up to...
All of Which Adds up to…

OPPORTUNITY CENTER

FOLLOW PATH
Opportunity for the New Unknown Services Spaces
Questions?

dway@library.wisc.edu
works.bepress.com/doug_way

the end
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