



The Transformation of Academic Library Collecting:

A Synthesis of the Harvard's Library's Hazen Memorial Symposium

Constance Malpas and Merrilee Proffitt



The Transformation of Academic Library Collecting: A Synthesis of the Harvard Library's Hazen Memorial Symposium

Constance Malpas

Strategic Intelligence Manager & Research Scientist

Merrilee Proffitt

Senior Program Officer



© 2017 OCLC Online Computer Library Center, Inc.

This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License.

<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>



August 2017

OCLC Research

Dublin, Ohio 43017 USA

www.oclc.org

ISBN: 978-1-55653-530-7

doi:10.25333/C3J04Z

OCLC Control Number: 994165424

ORCID iDs

Constance Malpas  <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-9312-8294>

Merrilee Proffitt  <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-2322-8337>

Please direct correspondence to:

OCLC Research

oclcresearch@oclc.org

Suggested citation:

Malpas, Constance, and Merrilee Proffitt. 2017. *The Transformation of Academic Library Collecting: A Synthesis of the Harvard Library's Hazen Memorial Symposium*. Dublin, OH: OCLC Research.

doi:10.25333/C3J04Z.

FOREWORD

Dan Hazen wanted to live. He had important ideas he wanted to develop and share with a community of colleagues and the larger world. Following a diagnosis of cancer in the autumn of 2014, Dan underwent a series of treatments which kept him out of his office in Harvard's Widener Library for weeks at a time. His drive to contribute to the future of libraries was strong. Even when he wasn't well enough to don his favored uniform of a forest green pullover and white polo shirt, he continued to evolve his thinking about collections, the center of his life's work.

Over the winter and through the spring, in periods of focus amidst the distractions of experimental therapies, Dan continued to draft and revise a paper which he first sent to me in a post-Christmas email on December 27, 2014. Titled "Strategizing Harvard's Collections: A Dual Response to Transformative Change," the 26-page paper paces through the nuances of change and shines with Dan's erudition. He systematically elucidates "Nine models for collections and content." Ranging from "Maximize local acquisitions" to "Cultivate niche collections of strength" to "Collaborate and cooperate" to "Embrace discovery and analysis as today's collection development," Hazen blueprints the library of the future.* He considers two approaches to change: incremental and radical.

The conclusion of Dan's paper muses on the disruption occurring in the academy and society. He notes: "The transformational changes affecting knowledge, education and research libraries also call for new conceptual foundations and fundamentally different responses. Our collections and content strategy must therefore build space for very different kinds of thought and action. Only these radically distinct approaches will position us for a profoundly different future."

When Dan's time ran out, in June 2015, his colleagues at Harvard and in the collections and Latin American community of scholars with whom he had worked were bereft and devastated. Over 40 years he had influenced their thinking, beguiled them with his wit, and earned their warm affection. A memorial at Harvard was mellow and full of laughter as people recalled his passion and his foibles. But there was a void, and unfinished business. Would it be possible to convene those who had known him over the decades and who had worked with him on valuable, groundbreaking initiatives, plus others focusing on charting a path to new approaches to collections? In celebrating a life in a way that interwove threads from Dan's writings and practice into new narratives for libraries, the Hazen symposium was an opportunity to reflect and to renew. We framed discussion in terms of "What would Dan do?"

The responses are contained in the papers that follow. They honor Dan C. Hazen in the best possible way, through the spirit of exceptional and original scholarship. Looking back, we can see the progress we have made, with "collective collections" and "inside out" libraries becoming more widespread year by year. The contributions of many have paved the way for adoption and implementation of new collaborations. Those of us who worked with Dan Hazen feel especially privileged to have been guided and inspired by him. We are grateful to the Arcadia Foundation for sponsoring the Hazen symposium, and to OCLC for publishing the summary of the proceedings, enabling Dan's legacy and the ideas expressed at the symposium to find a wider audience and impact.

Sarah E. Thomas
Vice President for the Harvard Library and University Librarian &
Roy E. Larsen Librarian for the Faculty of Arts and Sciences

* 1. Maximize local acquisitions. 2. Focus on immediate user needs. 3. Privilege collections that support teaching and learning. 4. Cultivate niche collections of strength. 5. Collaborate and cooperate. 6. Work with like-minded organizations and groups. 7. Rethink scholarly communication. 8. Embrace the digital as today's collection development. 9. Embrace discovery and analysis as today's collection development.

CONTENTS

Introduction.....	5
Collective Collections	5
Two Collection Directions	6
Rightscaling	7
Facilitated Collections.....	8
Conscious Coordination	10
Leadership	11
A Focus on Unique and Distinctive Collections	12
Toward “Speculative” Collections	13
Seeing Patterns with Scholar Partners.....	13
Toward Convergence, Avoiding Collision.....	14
Toward a Collective Future	15
Notes	16

INTRODUCTION

In October 2016, a group of eminent library leaders, research collections specialists and scholars gathered at Norton’s Woods Conference Center in Cambridge, MA, to commemorate the career of Dan Hazen (1947–2015) and reflect upon the transformation of academic library collections. Hazen was a towering figure in the world of research collections management and was personally known to many attendees; his impact on the profession of academic librarianship and the shape of research collections is widely recognized and continues to shape practice and policy in major research libraries.

A specialist in Latin American history, Hazen had a broad view of the research enterprise and the challenges of building and preserving collections capable of sustaining scholarly analysis and continuous interpretive renewal. Through his writings and his actions, he helped to design and realize an approach to cooperative collection development that has shaped generations of library practice.

The report presented here is not a comprehensive summary of *The Transformation of Academic Library Collecting: A Symposium Inspired by Dan C. Hazen*, but a selective examination of some central themes that are (we think) important to a broader conversation about the future of academic library collections. We explore two primary themes from the symposium: collective collections and the reimagination of what have traditionally been called “special” and archival collections (now commonly branded as unique and distinctive collections). These two themes are closely intertwined, as the emergence of collaborative strategies for managing shared collections helps enable the strategic reorientation of attention and resource toward increasing specialization and differentiation of local inventory. Our reflections are organized around these two themes, drawing from presentations and audience discussions at the event.

Collective Collections

Hazen’s career spanned three decades in which a central construct of modern university librarianship—the premise that institutional library collections are best managed in the context of inter-institutional, “collective” collections—was transformed from a conceptual heuristic to an operational reality.¹ The significance of this transformation, which Hazen examined, challenged and ultimately championed, is not generally recognized. In part, this is due to the fact that some of the fundamental changes in university library operations are obscured from public view: many academic research libraries look much as they did a century ago, with a long room–style reading area lovingly preserved alongside modern collaboration spaces and “fab labs,” a familiar and venerable symbol of the library as an essentially autonomous organization, operating in relative isolation in support of a local clientele of students and faculty members. In practice, major research institutions are increasingly reliant on cooperative infrastructures, including formal resource sharing and collaborative stewardship of library materials, to support a growing range of interdisciplinary scholarship. In the popular imagination (and university marketing), however, the size of the library collection remains a marker of institutional quality and prestige. The symbolism of the Hazen memorial event, organized and hosted by the Harvard Library, could not have been more fitting—or provocative.

Symposium attendees were encouraged to read from a selected bibliography of Hazen's writings in advance of the conference and many of the speakers incorporated concepts and themes introduced in these papers, which assisted in elevating the conference discussions and increasing the overall coherence of the event.² A recent publication by Lorcan Dempsey, Vice President of Membership and Research and Chief Strategist at OCLC, provided the conceptual scaffolding for a series of presentations exploring the changing paradigm of university research collections and the operational challenges of managing collections at group scale. Speakers addressed the ever-widening scope of research collections, including efforts to build more inclusive global collections; the competing imperatives to build locally distinctive institutional collections while achieving economies of scale in managing core collections; the importance of leveraging shared data and collections intelligence to increase coordinated management; and the critical role of institutional and library leadership in moving shared collections from the periphery to the center of library operations.

TWO COLLECTION DIRECTIONS

In the opening keynote, Dempsey introduced a framework for understanding the transformation of academic collections, organized along two key directions.³ The first is the reconfiguration of research and scholarship in the networked digital environment, which encourages a shift in library attention "from outside-in, to inside-out." The second is the reconfiguration of the information space in the digital environment, which results in greater reliance on collection sharing and on-demand fulfillment models (the "facilitated" rather than locally owned collection), and encourages greater specialization of local curatorial effort.

The redirection from "inside-out" results in a library service portfolio focused on actively supporting researcher workflows, rather than cumulating content produced outside the university and expecting the collection to exercise gravitational pull on students and researchers.⁴ This pivot encourages a renewed focus on traditional special collections, as well as increasing specialization and improved alignment of collections with institutional priorities and brand differentiation. There is greater attention to library roles in managing researcher and institutional reputation; for example, supporting institutional open-access mandates, providing expertise around research data management or guidance on managing researcher identities in the web. As evidence of this, Dempsey pointed to the example of MIT Library's strategic deployment of research guides to highlight specialist subject matter expertise of library staff. Research guides provide course-specific support to students and researchers, often by pointing to resources that are not part of the local library collection. He further noted the growing engagement of libraries in research information management: aggregating metadata about researcher publications for profiling and networking services like VIVO, for instance, and supporting a growing range of workflow support tools (electronic lab notebooks, data-sharing platforms, online disciplinary workspaces, etc.).

The transition from locally owned to facilitated collections is revealed in the growing importance of consortium-scale resource-sharing networks, increasing library engagement in shared print and shared digital stewardship, and integration of open-access and public domain content in the local discovery system. Dempsey characterized this transition as a shift from an underlying "print logic" aimed at cumulating content locally, toward an emerging "network logic" based on just-in-time fulfillment. He acknowledged that libraries have variable investments across the spectrum of owned and facilitated collections: for an institution like Harvard, a strategy of deepening engagement in collaborative collection development serves to increase the scope of what is available to Harvard students and researchers, not to replace or reduce institutional collections. It is nonetheless significant that all the major research libraries present at the conference (including Harvard's peers in the Ivy Plus Libraries⁵ group) are involved in an increasingly complex array of cooperative arrangements intended to reduce cost and frictions in collective collection management. Dempsey enumerated an array of structural changes in the organization of the library, the university and

collaborative infrastructures that complicate efforts to achieve economies of scale in the discovery, delivery and preservation of research collections. Citing John Wilkin, Juanita J. and Robert E. Simpson Dean of Libraries and University Librarian at the University of Illinois, Dempsey cautioned that the proliferation of multi-lateral collaborative agreements may result in “radical scatter”—with increased coordination costs and loss of focus—rather than scalable solutions.⁶

As Dempsey observed, Hazen recognized the importance of these transitions and their impact on the university library. Writing in 2009, Hazen acknowledged that “collections no longer lie at the center of research libraries and operations” and rightly perceived that this shift reflected an important change in research workflows in the digital environment, where social and technological networks displace traditional library-based discovery, and more information is available outside the library than within it.⁷ A long-time champion of collaborative collection development, Hazen was also reasonably skeptical about the limits of institutional cooperation, especially among universities competing for attention and resources. While he praised the abundance of collaborative library ventures, he regretted the lack of robust success metrics. When called upon to articulate a collections strategy for the Harvard Library in a period of severe university financial constraints, Hazen did not slip into the easy fallacy of believing that high costs can be simply redistributed across a greater number of partners, but instead proposed a rigorous assessment of internal organizational inefficiencies, recognizing that the university’s capacity to benefit from collaboration was highly dependent upon reliable institutional workflows. Notably, while he recognized the potential benefit of deeper collaboration with peers in the BorrowDirect network, Hazen foresaw that with more “consciously coordinated collection development and processing operations,” the partnership would ultimately yield greater benefits.⁸

RIGHTSCALING

One of the issues that interested Hazen especially was the role of agency (institutional agency, cultural agency, bibliographer agency) in collection building. As an area-collections specialist, he was sensitive to the historical contingency of curatorial decisions about what is collected and preserved, and he felt a responsibility to empowering and equipping communities—especially under-represented communities and cultures—to participate in the work of collection building. Deborah Jakubs, Anne R. Kenney and Bernard F. Reilly, all librarians who worked closely with Dan Hazen over decades, recalled his dedication to supporting archivists and curators within and outside the United States in compiling primary source collections. Jakubs, Rita DiGiallonardo Holloway University Librarian and Vice Provost for Library Affairs at Duke University, remembered his passion for “endangered archives” and preserving “voices not heard in the mainstream.” She commended his commitment to establishing “enduring collaborative structures” capable of sustaining distributed, inter-institutional action over many years, and she called on the audience to heed Hazen’s example by upholding the institutional responsibility of research libraries to collect broadly: “circulation statistics be damned.”

Kenney, Carl A. Kroch University Librarian at Cornell University, recounted Hazen’s many years of service to the Standing Committee on Cuban Libraries, an international collaborative focused on capacity building among libraries and archives in Cuba, where historical collections are equally vulnerable to the hazards of political and environmental change. Among the notable projects to which Hazen contributed, Kenney singled out the Cuba Libro 19 program, which helped to restore the nation’s literary heritage by sourcing bibliographic descriptions for lost and damaged books from partner libraries in the United States to create a machine-readable version of Carlos Manuel Trelles’s authoritative bibliography of 19th-century Cuban literature.⁹ This multi-institutional partnership was emblematic, she said, of Hazen’s commitment to preserving endangered cultural heritage by establishing partnerships between expert curators and scholars.

Reilly, President of the Center for Research Libraries (CRL), likewise emphasized Hazen's respect for the curatorial expertise of specialist bibliographers. "At a time and in an industry where decisions are increasingly driven by quantitative metrics and shaped by algorithms," he said, "Dan Hazen's accomplishments attest to the importance of the human intellect." Echoing Dempsey's earlier remarks, Reilly observed that while Hazen respected the integrity and coherence of institutionally curated collections, he recognized that libraries are increasingly operating in a "post-custodial" environment, where a large share of cultural heritage is entrusted to the cloud, and libraries exercise less direct control over the boundaries of what is discoverable and desired by researchers. Hazen was a long-time contributor to the Global Resources Network—one of the "enduring collaborative structures" to which Jakubs alluded—which was ultimately absorbed by CRL. Thus, while it was not explicitly acknowledged, the panelists' discussions about the scale of bibliographic and curatorial activity—institutional, disciplinary, consortial—illustrated the challenge of rightscaling collection management in an environment where stewardship responsibilities are being renegotiated with ever increasing frequency.

FACILITATED COLLECTIONS

A primary goal of the symposium was to examine how research libraries are addressing the challenge of managing "facilitated" collections, which are not part of locally owned inventory but nonetheless constitute part of the scholarly record. Research libraries feel a special responsibility for preservation of the scholarly record and increasingly recognize that institution-scale approaches to stewardship of anything approaching a comprehensive, or at least substantially representative, scholarly record are no longer sustainable. Organizers of the event, including Sarah Thomas (Vice President for the Harvard Library, University Librarian and Roy E. Larsen Librarian for the Faculty of Arts and Sciences) and other directors of Ivy Plus Libraries, recognize that university librarians are presiding over a fundamental transformation in curatorial practice, in which the scale of stewardship is shifting from individual institutions to collaborative networks. In addition to honoring the contributions that Hazen made to the field of academic librarianship, the symposium provided a venue in which leading institutions could articulate a shared vision for the future of collections management at local scale and at group scale.

A panel of librarians from Yale University provided an excellent case study in how a major research institution is reshaping its local collections strategy in the emerging facilitated collections environment. Julie Linden, Director of Collection Development, began by acknowledging that the "print logic" that has shaped curatorial strategy for centuries continues to exercise powerful influence in academic libraries, where institutions continue to boast about the scale of local collections and compete on total collection size and spend. She noted that Hazen had perceived, as early as 1992, that an impediment to increasing the scope of research collections is not budgetary constraints but an archaic view of the library as an "essentially and necessarily autarchic" entity, perfectly self-contained and entirely self-sufficient.¹⁰ In the years that followed, Hazen's views on the interdependence of research libraries crystallized into a vision for a shared BorrowDirect library, comprising the collective collection of the 13 Ivy Plus Libraries. Linden and her colleagues proceeded to describe how Yale was beginning to operationalize that strategy, a process guided and inspired by Hazen's original action plan and informed by a variety of data analyses.¹¹

Daniel Dollar, Associate University Librarian for Collections, Preservation, and Digital Scholarship, provided a wide-ranging view of library collection spending at Yale University, playfully invoking the iconic cathedral-like stained glass windows of Yale's Sterling Memorial Library as a metaphor for the way libraries typically present collections spending data: with a dazzling display of translucence, but limited transparency. Pointing to a graph representing the growth of the Yale University Library's collection spending over time, he noted that the majority of collections funding is derived from endowment income, and that of the total collection expenditure, 40 percent represents special collections, mainly the Beinecke Rare Book and Manuscript Library. Removing the Beinecke spend

from the overall collection expenditures produces a picture that is much more in line with spending patterns in other academic libraries, with the largest share (nearly 70 percent) supporting licensed electronic resources. Against the spending and acquisitions graphs, Dollar counter-posed a series of analyses of collections usage revealing an overwhelming disparity in use of print and electronic resources. Over 15 years, he reported a 33 percent decrease in total circulations, with a particularly dramatic decline in borrowing by undergraduate students. While efforts to reduce frictions in local fulfillment of print materials (through a campus-wide “Scan and Deliver” service, replacing physical fulfillment with on-demand digital fulfillment) have met with moderate success, the overall demand for print is in decline.

While faculty and student demand for print inventory at Yale has decreased, borrowing requests from other libraries (including BorrowDirect partners) continue to grow. Dollar reported that resource sharing transactions had increased by 144 percent during the same 15-year period in which local borrowing decreased. According to Yale’s analysis, a quarter of all circulation transactions at Yale are facilitated through resource sharing networks. Here, Dollar introduced a question that crystallized a key concern evoked by previous speakers at the symposium: what is the university library’s responsibility to stewardship of external, “facilitated” collections? Given the evidence of declining local demand and growing network demand for Yale’s print inventory, how should the library balance investments in local and shared collections? Dollar did not presume to answer these questions, but instead highlighted important confounding factors: the transformation of discovery and delivery in the digital environment and the challenge of comparing demand statistics for physical and licensed resources. In an illuminating comparison, he presented evidence of declining demand for an “intensive use” print collection (course reserves and core curricular resources) alongside growing e-journal and e-book downloads from a core e-resource collection. Although the overall composition of the two collections is similar with respect to size, language and disciplinary scope, the historical demand curves move in opposite directions: circulations in the Bass Library have dropped by 45 percent over five years, while downloads from the licensed collection grew by 170 percent.

Sarah Tudesco, Assessment Librarian, provided an in-depth look at usage of German-language monographs. Hazen was a graduate alumnus of Yale with a deep appreciation for the scope of the library’s area studies collections, and would have recognized familiar outlines in the portrait Tudesco sketched: a legacy of institutional investment in specialist resources with a declining readership.¹² Over a period of 13 years, the German language monographic collection at Yale grew by almost a third; circulation of the collection to graduate students (primary consumers of non-English-language materials) decreased by 38 percent. Less than a fifth of the German language material acquired in 2003 has circulated to any patron; even allowing for slow germination of scholarly interest and demand, this suggests that only a small fraction of the print material acquired in the last year will find a reader in the next decade. Echoing Dollar, Tudesco affirmed that student and researcher engagement with the physical library collection is changing. After years of steady growth, demand for the shared BorrowDirect collection has plateaued and appears to be in decline. Tudesco challenged the audience to consider what this might mean for the future: if the demand curve for the facilitated collection starts to mirror the steadily declining demand curve for locally held inventory, will the BorrowDirect model be sustainable?

Thus far, the tradeoffs of participation in BorrowDirect have been overall positive: commonly held collections move efficiently through the network, reducing friction in local fulfillment, and access to specialized long-tail resources improves. The partnership has proved to be a remarkably successful approach to managing library logistics. Yet, as Tudesco noted, there are asymmetries—net borrowers, who borrow more than they lend, as well as net lenders—within the partnership. Over 15 years, BorrowDirect has grown from three to 13 libraries, simultaneously expanding the scope of the collective resource and introducing new uncertainties about how to manage the flow of resources across an increasingly wide geographic area. Tudesco concluded her presentation with a series of

analyses examining the sources of supply and demand for BorrowDirect titles requested by users at Yale. Predictably, graduate students—the heaviest users of Yale’s own print collection—account for more than two in every three BorrowDirect requests. Further analysis showed that, despite an overall decline in demand for print across faculty, graduate and undergraduate students, a growing share of demand within each group was fulfilled through BorrowDirect. This was perhaps the most powerful analysis of the panel’s presentation, as it laid bare the fact that meeting the (diminishing and difficult to predict) demands of Yale’s primary stakeholders for print resources relies to a growing extent on the facilitated BorrowDirect collection.

In BorrowDirect, Yale has found an efficient solution to the challenge of predicting where researcher interest will be directed. By leveraging peer collections for on-demand fulfillment, it has reduced the costs and risks of acquiring (even more) local content with low to no circulation potential. Indeed, as the data showed, nearly half of the BorrowDirect titles requested by Yale represent content that is not locally held. The remaining titles represent content that is held by Yale but could not be fulfilled locally (i.e., BorrowDirect absorbed the excess demand that Yale could not meet). Yet, faced with evidence of declining demand for print and uncertainty about the optimal scale (and composition) of resource-sharing partnerships, Ivy Plus Libraries must consider whether the efficiency gains of a “shared borrowing” collection will deliver sufficient benefit in the future, or if the scope of their consciously coordinated activity should grow.

The presentation by Yale librarians closed with a recapitulation of the four questions that motivated their data analyses:

1. How do we understand and support the needs of our user communities?
2. In light of declining circulation, how do we determine what to collect in print individually and collectively?
3. How should we approach collecting Western European-language materials? Are they becoming a type of special collection?
4. Are there efficient, scalable methods for building facilitated collections?

While the speakers did not provide definitive answers to these questions, it is not difficult to imagine how Hazen might have responded. His 2009 action plan for Harvard advocated for a more rigorous, evidence-based approach to collection management, informed by data analysis and engagement with the faculty and students who use (or don’t use) library resources. He would have urged Ivy Plus Libraries to scale analysis and action beyond the scope of the facilitated BorrowDirect collection—which is a subset of the aggregate resource—to the entirety of the group’s collective collection. He would have encouraged member libraries to follow Yale’s good example and engage in transparent data sharing and open debate about the appropriate scale of stewardship and governance.

CONSCIOUS COORDINATION

In 2016, guided in part by Hazen’s vision for a more consciously coordinated BorrowDirect collection, Ivy Plus Libraries directors jointly funded a new staff position to articulate and operationalize a shared collections strategy.¹³ Just a few months into this role, Galadriel Chilton, Ivy Plus Libraries Director of Collections Initiatives, was prepared to outline a broad range of activities intended to increase the scope and coherence of cooperative stewardship within the consortium. Chilton credited Hazen’s foresight and direct advocacy by the Ivy Plus Libraries Collections Group with the creation of her position, noting that efforts to organize an above-the-institution strategy for collections management dated back to 2014. The Collections Group recommended that Ivy Plus Libraries move beyond the successful BorrowDirect resource sharing

program and undertake a programmatic approach to shifting collection management activities to group scale. These ambitions are memorialized in the Ivy Plus Libraries' Vision Statement, which characterizes the aggregate library resource of Ivy Plus Libraries members as "one great collection" to be managed collaboratively, with growing attention to the larger network environment in which it is embedded.

In identifying areas where collaborative action is most needed, the Ivy Plus Libraries Collections Development Group is guided by the human intellect of expert selectors, and informed by data analysis of the kind described by Yale librarians. Chilton reported on work underway to develop a conceptual model for collective collections analysis, incorporating materials in all formats. Echoing the overarching theme of "facilitated collections" built around the needs of individual researchers, rather than extant inventory, Chilton argued that the Ivy Plus Libraries collection should be understood as more than the sum of Ivy Plus Libraries' holdings. Instead, it must be understood to comprise the entirety of what is discoverable by students and researchers, and susceptible to library-facilitated fulfillment. Chilton pointed to the economic imperative for libraries to do more with less, leveraging collaborative partnerships to supplement diminishing institutional purchasing power.

Yet, even if collaboration is necessary to support the continual expansion of the library's stewardship and access mission, it is by no means an inevitable outcome. Pointing to recent scholarship on the psychology and sociology of knowledge formation, Chilton observed that librarians will need to craft new collective collection narratives. While libraries have data pointing to the necessity for a significant change, human nature is to question or refute data that goes against our preexisting philosophical structures, mental models and personal stories. Thus, when it comes to our collections, if data about our collections is counter to our current narratives, then it is time to change the narrative, rather than relying on evidence and data alone to effect a transformation in traditional, institution-scale practice.¹⁴ To achieve this paradigmatic shift, an entire community of collections specialists will need to commit to behavioral changes that would be generally rejected as risky and irrational. Chilton challenged members of the Ivy Plus Libraries community to face the uncomfortable truths revealed in data about collections use (declining use of print, increased reliance on materials held outside the local institution) and embrace a cooperative, group-scale approach to meeting the information needs of students and scholars. Cooperation, she observed, confers a selection benefit—i.e. collective survival—that outweighs the benefits of competition.¹⁵

LEADERSHIP

Following Chilton's presentation, a panel of Ivy Plus Libraries directors reflected on the strategic and political challenges of implementing group-scale collection management practices in institutions that are accustomed to competing with another for prestige, research funding and highly selective student enrollments. Chris Bourg, Director of Libraries at Massachusetts Institute of Technology, wryly characterized her position as the doubting Thomas among the 13 Ivy Plus Libraries directors and observed that there was "a little too much agreement" in the symposium discussions. She offered a series of deliberately provocative remarks about the responsibility of library leaders in operationalizing shared collections. In response to calls for "more action, less talk," Bourg countered that talk—i.e., public pronouncements—is an important aspect of leadership and essential to crafting the new narratives that make transformational change possible. While institutional resource constraints are an important driver for expanding cooperative stewardship arrangements, external messaging should focus on the social value that libraries are generating. Leadership demands that directors promote operational efficiency while simultaneously articulating a vision of increasing excellence.

Kenney agreed that the first business of the academic library is protecting the public good by preserving and providing access to information. Citing WikiLeaks and Sci-Hub as examples, Kenney reminded the audience that the value of openness has gained new prominence in social and political

discourse. In addition to acquiring and preserving print materials, libraries have a responsibility to stewardship of disciplinary data repositories and scholarly social networks.¹⁶ Preservation of this evolving scholarly record, she suggested, will require both collaborative networks and strong institutional leadership.¹⁷

Jakubs concurred and revealed that her most recent appeal to donors focused on BorrowDirect and the value the Ivy Plus Libraries network delivers to Duke students and alumni. The letter of appeal was an opportunity to affirm that “no one [library] has it all” and to promote the strategic advantages of a collaboration that makes the aggregate collection of Ivy Plus Libraries available to members of the Duke University community. Jakubs recalled that Ivy Plus Libraries were the primary architects of the Conspectus, an early effort to inventory the distinctive strengths of individual research libraries to better inform collective collection development.¹⁸ Thirty years on, Ivy Plus Libraries finally have the “technology, determination and mindset” to make collective collection management a reality. Jakubs concluded by noting that while good progress has been made in collaborative management print collections, there is much work to be done—by Ivy Plus Libraries and others—to develop successful models for sharing licensed electronic resources, which remain the single largest library materials expenditure in research universities.

Susan Gibbons, University Librarian and Deputy Provost for Collections and Scholarly Communication at Yale, noted that Ivy Plus Libraries presidents and provosts recognize the value that BorrowDirect delivers, but occasionally seek reassurance that the universities will continue to “compete on special collections.” She challenged her peers to expand the scope of collective collection management to include unique and distinctive resources, but allowed that efficiency gains in this area would be challenging to obtain given the intrinsic scarcity of rare books and manuscripts, and the lack of incentives for shared stewardship. Gibbons asserted that while sharing data on collection expenditures (as her collections staff had done) may cause some discomfort, it is “absolutely necessary” for informed decision-making. In a collective collections context, the risks to “harming the ecosystem” through uninformed de-selection of holdings, or changed acquisition profiles, are real. Greater accountability is called for.

Thomas concluded the panel discussion by distilling a key leadership challenge for Ivy Plus Libraries. Directors must decide whether to focus on solving problems from the past or planning for the future: managing large legacy print collections or modeling new approaches for sharing licensed collections. In a world of flipped classrooms, she observed, it may be time to consider flipped collections, i.e. placing greater emphasis on the “inside-out” collections that contribute to institutional differentiation, while seeking to reduce operational expenditure on traditional “outside in” collections. Here Thomas deftly redirected attention from the up-front costs of materials acquisitions to the lifetime costs of ownership, observing that at Harvard—as at other Ivy Plus Libraries institutions—the total cost of managing very large print collections is unsustainably high, especially in view of diminishing use. Operationalized at the scale of the Ivy Plus Libraries, a collective collection management strategy would enable individual libraries to focus on the future, while continuing to preserve and provide access to print resources acquired in the past. Thomas observed that far from reducing the visibility and value of print, a collective collections strategy would create new opportunities for marketing and promoting the aggregate collection as an institutional differentiator, distinctive with respect to scope and scale, as well as increasing efficient discovery and delivery. In closing, she reaffirmed the need for a new narrative about research collections and libraries, to assist in normalizing cooperative management in the eyes of faculty, students and university administrators.

A Focus on Unique and Distinctive Collections

Throughout his career, Hazen was a tireless advocate not only for building strong library collections but also for developing and supporting the archival collections that bring depth to the printed record.

Three presentations at the Hazen symposium spoke to the importance and future of archival and special collections. Themes that came out most strongly from these speakers' remarks helped to focus attention on the needs of scholars and those that engage with "small data." They outlined strong reasons for engaging those who use archival and special collections in their work—staying in touch with end users helps us gain a better understanding of how records and materials are created and constructed, and where omissions are likely to occur. The speakers also drew attention to the bias inherent in collecting and challenged the audience to reengineer practices so that we engage with diverse communities and reimagine what access to collections means. Finally, research libraries may benefit from extending special collections practices, including archival appraisal, to the larger (and expanding) universe of research library collections.

TOWARD "SPECULATIVE" COLLECTIONS

Bethany Nowvickie, Director of the Digital Library Federation at the Council on Library and Information Resources and Research Associate Professor of Digital Humanities, University of Virginia, urged the Hazen audience to consider the temporal orientation of library collections, and whether a fundamental "design problem" may lead users to see them "as memorializing, conservative, limited, and suggestive of a linear view of history [rather] than as problem-solving, branching, generative, [and] non-teleological."¹⁹ While certainly noble and impressive in their scale and scope, current research library collections reflect the viewpoint of the prevailing culture during the time that the scholarly record was produced and collected. Library practices of selection and description and even public service, are, noted Nowvickie, "decidedly non-neutral expressions of dominant, sometimes oppressive ideologies."

Nowvickie urged us to consider future collections through the lens of "speculative collections," drawing on the genre of subaltern speculative fiction. Our collections can be futuristic or even otherworldly. She drew a parallel between the kind of research collections we might imagine and Afrofuturism. In Afrofuturism, a minority culture has created alternative or speculative storylines where archives are not "content to be received but technology to be used" and in which alternate conceptions of time and cultural heritage can become a salve for the pains of the past and the present. In an imagined future, how do we "position digital collections and digital scholarly projects more plainly not as statements about what was, but as toolsets and resources for what could be?"

To work toward building collections that not only acknowledge but also serve non-dominant and oppressed cultures, libraries and other institutions need to cede power and control and enter into partnership with previously excluded communities, "toward the project of repair." Nowvickie suggests our goal should be that marginalized groups have the ability

...not just to access their own content in archival and library systems, and not just to control access to it (as radical as that idea may be in some circles)—but to set the terms for the infrastructure itself, actively configuring classification systems, search-and-discovery interfaces, and visualization tools in our shared digital libraries to express independent theories of the world—the world as it is for them, and the world as it should be.

SEEING PATTERNS WITH SCHOLAR PARTNERS

Jane Kamensky, Professor of History and Carl and Lily Pforzheimer Foundation Director of the Schlesinger Library at Harvard University, reminded us that in an era where it is fashionable to talk about the power and promise of "big data," much scholarship is still "tiny data," gathered by hand,

and involves touching and noticing small details. Her work looking at women's letters, and specifically the correspondence of daughters, reveals much about historical collection trends. The letters of "great" men were saved for scholarship in "serious" repositories, and women's letters were judged to be of purely social interest (and were preserved, fortunately, at the Massachusetts Historical Society). Just as important as patterns in the dissemination of correspondence and records are the patterns that Kamensky sees in who takes responsibility for ensuring that this historical record is preserved. In families, it is usually the daughters, nieces and granddaughters who play this role of handing down or passing on records to repositories (she noted that Hazen himself played the role of "niece," bringing the papers of his great aunt, Presbyterian missionary Mae Chapin, to the Schlesinger Library in 2008). But what happens in families that are daughterless, or do not happen to have a librarian or an archivist looking to hand down records?

Kamensky encouraged us to pay attention to the patterns that form: not only to look out for gaps in collections (such as those discussed by Nowviskie) but to also be alert and aware of patterns of transmission. These dynamics are only obvious when closely observed. Those of us who collect and preserve the records may not notice the small but important details that reveal themselves when closely observed by scholars whose work involves doing both big and tiny data. Particularly in the lab of the humanities, scholars are essential partners in building collections and understanding what may not be in plain sight.

TOWARD CONVERGENCE, AVOIDING COLLISION

Thomas Hyry, Florence Fearrington Librarian of Houghton Library and Director of Arts and Special Collections of the Harvard College Library, took the audience on a speedy tour through the basics of archival appraisal theory, which he believes could be applied to the practice of managing modern library collections including those in "general collections."²⁰ Archivists learn early on that "the theory and practice of archives are not about saving records as much as they are about acknowledging and managing loss." Beginning in the 1950s, archivists began to engage seriously with the realities of records abundance, developing tools and practices relating to appraisal of collections. Key concepts in appraisal theory involve understanding functions and structures of the originator of the records (be it an institution, organization or community) and basing decisions on that understanding. Various flavors of appraisal theory also place value on collecting in areas that reflect conflict and disagreement; others place value on the opportunities for institutions to act collectively to document broad-ranging topics or particular regions as well as the engagement of researchers and communities.

In an era where library collections appear, in the observations of Hazen, as "massive accumulations of raw data" and when we see special collections moving "from Siberia to Shangri-la,"²¹ are we now at a point where we can see Hyry's suggested future "where the missions and approaches of special and general collections can become more closely aligned in more productive ways"? As the provocative title of the talk "Convergence or Collision" suggests, an expanded role for special collections in an era of collections abundance is not without risks. Hyry suggests three areas in which special and general collections differ, which may inhibit convergence: scope of collections, where lifecycle costs fall, and relationships with other institutions. If research libraries are able to navigate these waters of difference, "embracing the need for selection, thinking collaboratively with other institutions, and fully weighing, understanding and sharing long-term stewardship costs" this would "represent the way forward for more general collections to participate in enhanced acquisition of archives and special collections materials. Success in this endeavor will give us a greater impact on research, teaching and learning on campus and on the preservation and understanding of cultural heritage now and into perpetuity."

Toward a Collective Future

The Hazen symposium helped to foreground various themes playing out in research libraries—the shift from individually held print collections to collections managed by networks being one of those major themes. However, grappling with the hows and whys of shifts in where investment and emphasis is placed is a challenge. The Yale presentation on collection assessment illustrates the effort necessary to understand patterns of use and spending (see p. 8). The Ivy Plus Libraries presentation helped to show how a group of institutions are beginning to carefully rethink their future together. However, a presentation by MacKenzie Smith, University Librarian at UC Davis (which mostly focused on the findings of the Mellon-funded University of California “Pay it Forward” initiative) reminded the audience of the difficulties of moving forward at a scale. As Smith quipped, “simultaneous worldwide cooperation” is unlikely; success will likely emerge from (quoting Hazen) “focused efforts among groups of limited size.”²² Knowing how and where to draw the boundaries for collaboration and where to focus investment for various efforts can be difficult. As Karla Strieb, Associate Director for Collections, Technical Services and Scholarly Communications at The Ohio State University pointed out, research libraries have local, regional and national options for investing time and effort.

At the same time, libraries are also challenged to consider the nature of what is in our collections: Which voices are represented, and which have been oppressed or are missing? What corrective actions can be taken to bring balance to our collecting practices? Nowvskie and Hyry called for more radical inclusion and participation from under-represented communities and perspectives, in collecting, collaboration and ceding power. We see the beginnings of this work in projects such as “Umbra Search, African-American History” from the University of Minnesota, which has worked in partnership with Black community organizations not only to identify collections but to shape the project.²³ The special collections and archives communities in particular are investing in sharing knowledge and experiences at upcoming meetings. Examples include a special forum at the 2017 Society of American Archivists meeting focused on building community archives (as cited in Hyry’s talk) which promises to go “beyond good intentions to explore how archivists might partner with the public to repurpose the archive as a site of social transformation and radical inclusion.”²⁴

While the discussions around reconsidering and diversifying the records seem more advanced in special collections and archives, we can also begin to see the beginnings of rethinking general collections. The clearest outward expression of this reconsideration is expressed in the MIT Libraries Collections Directorate’s Diversity, Inclusion, and Social Justice Task Force Report.²⁵ We may see other related initiatives going forward, particularly as institutions rethink their print holdings and imagine the future of print and shared print in a collective collection fashion.

In reflecting on how to make progress with open-access initiatives, Smith emphasized that library action can only be part of the solution—a good portion of the future of scholarly communication rests with the scholars themselves. Being open to engaging with and connecting to those who are at the other end of our collections is clearly a part of our collective future. We see libraries investing in stepping back from what we “know” about those who use our collections to discovering anew what needs we might meet, by employing ethnographic and other methods. To better gauge and deploy efforts, this community might consider connecting work on collections with work being done chiefly around reimagining library spaces and services.²⁶

As research libraries move forward into a future that we are shaping together, community gatherings like the Hazen symposium help to signpost both our achievements as well as our challenges and questions. Thanks are due to Sarah Thomas and the team at Harvard for artfully designing a program that allowed for exposition, response, reflection and discussion.

NOTES

1. Lorcan Dempsey is generally credited with socializing the notion of a “collective collection” comprising the aggregate resource of libraries in a given system, around which economies of scale can be achieved and new business intelligence can be derived. See: Dempsey, Lorcan. “Discovery, Delivery, Distributed Inventory Management” (blog post 28 November 2006). In Dempsey, Lorcan. 2014. *The Network Reshapes The Library: Lorcan Dempsey On Libraries, Services, and Networks*, edited by Kenneth J. Varnum. 31-32. Chicago: ALA, American Library Association. <http://www.oclc.org/content/dam/research/publications/books/dempsey-network-reshapes-library.pdf>. OCLC has had an active program of research on collective collections since 2005.
2. Links to these readings, along with presentations, papers, videos and various other materials can be found at the Hazen symposium website: <http://library.harvard.edu/hazen-symposium>.
3. This framework is described at length in Dempsey, Lorcan. 2016. “Library Collections in the Life of the User: Two Directions” *Liber Quarterly* 26 (4). doi:10.18352/lq.10170.
4. While the “inside-out” collection is a focus of Dempsey (2016) [See note 3], the distinction between outside-in and inside-out collections has been a theme in Dempsey’s writings since 2010. See for example, “Outside-in and Inside-out (11 January 2010)” pp. 117-119 in Dempsey and Varnum (2014) [See note 1] and Dempsey, Lorcan, Constance Malpas, and Brian Lavoie. 2014. “Collection Directions: The Evolution of Library Collections and Collecting” *portal: Libraries and the Academy* 14,3 (July): 393-423. http://muse.jhu.edu/journals/portal_libraries_and_the_academy/summary/v014/14.3.dempsey.html.
5. The Ivy Plus Libraries group comprises 13 research universities that collaborate on a variety of strategic initiatives. Members include Brown University, Columbia University, Cornell University, Dartmouth College, Duke University, Harvard University, Johns Hopkins University, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Princeton University, Stanford University, The University of Chicago, University of Pennsylvania and Yale University.
6. Wilkin’s views on the “radical scatter” of US research infrastructure are summarized in a presentation made at the joint JISC/CNI conference held at the University of Oxford on 6 July 2016. See: <https://www.jisc.ac.uk/events/jisc-and-cni-conference-2016-06-jul-2016#resources>.
7. Hazen, Dan C. 2011. “Lost in the Cloud: Research Library Collections and Community in the Digital Age” *Library Resources & Technical Services*. 55(4): 195-204. <https://dash.harvard.edu/handle/1/5342093>.
8. Hazen, Dan C. 2010. “Rethinking Research Library Collections: A Policy Framework for Straited Times, and Beyond.” *Library Resources & Technical Services*. 54(2): 115-121. <https://dash.harvard.edu/handle/1/4111039>. The concept of “conscious coordination” is further developed in Lavoie, Brian and Constance Malpas. 2015. *Stewardship of the Evolving Scholarly Record: From the Invisible Hand to Conscious Coordination*. Dublin, OH: OCLC Research. <http://www.oclc.org/content/dam/research/publications/2015/oclcresearch-esr-stewardship-2015.pdf>.
9. The bibliography was originally published in eight volumes between 1911 and 1915. Trelles, Carlos M. 1911-15. *Bibliografía cubana del siglo XIX*. Matanzas: Impr. de Quirós y Estrada. [Spanish]

10. Hazen, Dan C. "Is Money the Issue? Research Resources and Our Collections Crisis," *Journal of Academic Librarianship*. 18 (1992):13-15.
11. Hazen (2010). See note 8.
12. Hazen, Dan Chapin. 1974. "The Awakening of Puno: Government Policy and the Indian Problem in Southern Peru, 1900-1955." PhD dissertation. Yale University.
13. <http://web.library.yale.edu/news/2016/07/ivy-plus-libraries-appoints-director-collections-initiatives>.
14. As examples, Chilton cited Kahan, Dan M., Hank Jenkins-Smith and Donald Braman. 2010. "Cultural Cognition of Scientific Consensus." Yale Law School, Public Law Working Paper No. 205. doi:10.2139/ssrn.1549444 and Biss, Eula. 2015. *On Immunity: An Inoculation*. Minneapolis: Graywolf.
15. Here Chilton drew from the work of animal behavior specialist, Mark Bekoff. Bekoff, M. 2007. *The Emotional Lives of Animals: A Leading Scientist Explores Animal Joy, Sorrow, and Empathy—And Why They Matter*. Novato, CA: New World Library.
16. Cornell University Library subsidized operations of the popular arXiv disciplinary preprint repository for two decades before shifting to a business model that distributes costs across the University Library, member institutions and sponsors. Landgraf, Greg. 2010. "Cornell Seeks Sustainable arXiv Support." *American Libraries*. 18 February. <https://americanlibrariesmagazine.org/2010/02/18/cornell-seeks-sustainable-arxiv-support/>.
17. While the boundaries of the evolving scholarly record are subject to dispute, there is an emerging consensus that the scope of the scholarly record has enlarged substantially in the digital environment, due in part to improved discoverability and reference-ability of a wide variety of research outputs. See Lavoie, Brian, Eric Childress, Ricky Erway, Ixchel Faniel, Constance Malpas, Jennifer Schaffner, and Titia van der Werf. 2014. *The Evolving Scholarly Record*. Dublin, OH: OCLC Research. <http://www.oclc.org/content/dam/research/publications/library/2014/oclcresearch-evolving-scholarly-record-2014.pdf>.
18. See: OCLC Research, "Creating the Conspectus," which details the history of the Conspectus from the 1980s forward. <http://www.oclc.org/research/activities/conspectus.html>.
19. The text of Nowviskie's talk is available on her blog. See "Speculative Collections." Posted 27 October 2016. <http://nowviskie.org/2016/speculative-collections/>.
20. Hyry's 2016 talk is available on the Hazen symposium website: *Convergence or Collision? Archival Appraisal and the Expanded Role of Special Collections in the Research Library*. Paper delivered at The Transformation of Academic Library Collecting: A Symposium Inspired by Dan C. Hazen, 21 October 2016. http://projects.iq.harvard.edu/files/hazen/files/convergence_or_collision_hyry.pdf.
21. Here Hyry is drawing on Sarah Thomas's notion of the transformation of special collections being either a remote territory (Siberia) or a paradise for research (Shangri-La). First introduced at Building on Strength: Developing an ARL Agenda for Special Collections, a symposium on the future of special collections in research libraries sponsored by the Association of Research Libraries and held at Brown University on 27–29 June 2001.
22. Hazen (2010). See note 8.
23. See <https://www.umbrasearch.org/>.

24. Society of American Archivists “The Liberated Archive: A Forum For Envisioning and Implementing a Community-based Approach to Archives.” Archives 2017, Society of American Archivists Annual Meeting, July 23-29, Portland, Oregon.
<http://archivists.org/am2017/program/liberated-archive-forum>.
25. Baildon, Michelle, Dana Hamlin, Czeslaw Jankowski, Rhonda Kauffman, Julia Lanigan, Michelle Miller, Jessica Venlet and Ann Marie Willer. 2017. *Creating a Social Justice Mindset: Diversity, Inclusion, and Social Justice in the Collections Directorate of the MIT Libraries*.
<http://hdl.handle.net/1721.1/108771>.
26. Relevant resources in this area include: the UXLibs Conferences in the United Kingdom since 2015, “Exploring Ethnography, Usability and Design in Libraries.” <http://uxlib.org/>; the IDEO led, and Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation funded “Design Thinking for Libraries” project <http://designthinkingforlibraries.com/>; and *The Library in the Life of the User* work by Lynn Silipigni Connaway (OCLC Research), Marie L. Radford (Rutgers University), and others.
<http://www.oclc.org/research/publications/2015/oclcresearch-library-in-life-of-user.html>.



For more information about our work related to digitizing library collections, please visit: oclc.org/digitizing



6565 Kilgour Place
Dublin, Ohio 43017-3395

T: 1-800-848-5878

T: +1-614-764-6000

F: +1-614-764-6096

www.oclc.org/research

ISBN: 978-1-55653-531-4
DOI: 10.25333/C3J04Z
RM-PR-215889-WWAE-A4 1707

