Shared Print Policy Review: Preliminary Report

RLG Shared Print Working Group
ALA Annual, Anaheim
28 June 2008

Aim and Intent

- Empirical study of policy requirements for cooperative management of library print collections

- Not 'what is ideal' but 'what is acceptable' as it is embodied in current agreements

- Identify common (frequently recurring) elements and terms, areas where consensus opinion has emerged

- Identify gaps that may prevent shared print initiatives from achieving scale, producing beneficial network effects

Scope of Investigation

- Policy documents for 18 "single, shared or last copy" initiatives
  - Ranged in length from a single sheet of principles (last copies) to a handbook several hundred pages in length (FDLP)
- Broad geographic scope: United States, Australia, Canada and the United Kingdom
- Wide range of institution types: public and private universities, liberal arts colleges, public libraries, state libraries, national library
- Agreements covering more than 100 institutions in total
  - 7 of these are participating in multiple shared collection efforts

Shared Print Initiatives Included in Study

Library Group or Facility	Document Reviewed	Publication Date
Preservation and Access Service Center for Colorado Libraries	*PASCAL Policies*	N/A
University of Georgia	*Last Copy In Georgia Policy*	1997
University of Wisconsin*	*Recommendation on Last Copy*	1999
Center for Research Libraries	*Distributed Print Archive Model Agreement*	2003
Five Colleges of Massachusetts	*Five College Library Depository Archive Agreement*	2003
Five Colleges of Ohio	*Five Colleges of Ohio Memorandum of Understanding Regarding Sharing of Library Materials*	2003
Northeast Ohio Regional Library Depository	*Statement of Agreement Regarding Duplication of Material at the Depository*	2006
Consortium of Academic and Research Libraries in Illinois*	*CARLI Last Copy Guidelines*	2006
University of California	*Persistent Deposits in UC Regional Library Facilities*	2006
Tri-University Group of Libraries (Canada)	*Tri-University Group of Libraries Preservation of Last Copy Agreement*	2006
CAVAL Archive and Research Materials	*CARM Centre Collection and Services Policy Manual*	2007
Indiana Light Archive for Federal Documents	*Indiana Light Archive Collection Stewardship Guidelines*	2007
UK Research Reserve	*UK Research Reserve Retention Agreement*	2007
Chesapeake Information and Research Library Alliance	*CIRLA Distributed Print Preservation Pilot Project*	2007
Group of Eight (Australia)	*Memorandum of Understanding Regarding Last Copy Collection Retention*	2007
Virtual Academic Library Environment of New Jersey	*VALE Last Copy Guidelines*	2008
Washington Research Library Consortium	*WRLC Off Site Storage Policies: Shared Copy Policy*	2008
US Federal Depository Library Program	*FDLP Handbook*	2008

Process and Timeline

- Sub-committee of 8 working group members, including several with direct experience in shared print policy formulation and implementation (February)

- Drafted and tested review template (March)

- Assigned documents for review (March)

- Independent review process (April, May)

- Preliminary results compiled and tabulated (June)

- Draft report (in process)

- As of 2008-06-20, 16 reviews completed

Review Template

- Project and document status
  - Draft or approved, implemented or not, publication date
- Governance
  - Ownership, management, legal status, retention commitment
- Selection
  - Serials/monographs, retrospective/prospective, storage collections/campus collections, duplication policy
- Cataloging
  - Registering preservation/access status of items, collections
- Collection Management
  - Environmental requirements, conditions of recall, de-selection
- Access
  - Availability and conditions of use

Key Findings

- **≥80% of policies reviewed**
  - Published or revised within last 5 years
  - Include explicit retention commitment (10 years – "forever")
  - Have been implemented

- **≥70% of policies reviewed**
  - Allow for exemptions to retention/access commitment
  - Apply to monographic *and* serial holdings
  - *Lack* any requirement to disclose preservation status

- **≥60% of policies reviewed**
  - Require systematic conditions assessment
  - Permit conditional recall of contributed content
  - *Lack* a definition of duplication

Limitations and Challenges

- Focus on publicly available documents skews results toward acceptable norms; says little about clauses or terms that are challenging or controversial

- Level of institutional endorsement is unknown; requirements for agreements negotiated at a higher administrative level may be substantially different

- Review template embodied expectations that extent policies were not intended to meet: high frequency of "N/A"

Not generally required (yet?)

Certain elements may raise confidence in the quality or level of preservation /access guarantees, but do not appear essential to endorsement or implementation *under current circumstances:*

- Explicit requirements for specific environmental controls, collection arrangement or location
- Explicit definition of duplication and the baseline against which it is measured

The value of these is likely to increase as collection-sharing initiatives achieve network scale

Significant gaps

- No mandate to disclose preservation status beyond immediate collection-sharing group (75%)
  - Disclosure mechanisms ill-adapted to network requirements: UKRR Retention Registry, JerseyCat
- No business arrangement to ensure long-term sustainability and growth of shared collection (70%)
  - New ownership models may be required to create institutional incentives
- No shared vocabulary to describe the extent of institutional rights and responsibilities (70%)
  - Need common definitions of duplication, recall, withdrawal, item condition

Implications for Shared Print Management

A rapidly changing information environment is creating new demand for shared print management schemes that meet institutional *expectations for autonomy* while providing assurances adequate to *s*upport *new inter-institutional dependencies*.

Threshold policy requirements for print-sharing partnerships of modest size (5-10 institutions) are *surprisingly low*, suggesting that *lightweight approaches* may be adequate in many circumstances.

Additional requirements may be needed *to support cooperative collection management "at scale."* Effective *network disclosure* of institutional retention and access policies may enable loosely-coupled modes of cooperation.

Minimum Requirements to Achieve Scale in Cooperative Print Management

- Transparency of intent
    - Explicit retention commitment
- Transparency of terms
    - 'Last' in what collection?
    - Duplication against what measure?
    - What constitutes 'good faith'?
- Transparency of conditions under which agreement may be breached or contravened
    - Recall or temporary withdrawal of contributed titles
    - Specific exemptions (special collections, etc)
    - Exit strategy
- Transparency in governance model
    - Ownership interests and assignment of liability