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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

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