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What is MI-SPI?

- 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
Member Libraries by Carnegie Classification

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

MI-SPI Bib Records per Library

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Library</th>
<th>Records</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>
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
GVSU’s Experience

Change in Philosophy:
From Building Collections to Curating Access
GVSU’s Experience

Change in Philosophy:
From Building Collections to Curating Access

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

Change in Philosophy:
From Building Collections to Curating Access

• It’s expensive to keep these things on our shelves
  – $4.26 per year per volume
  – Costing us time, space, money and opportunity
GVSU’s Experience

Change in Philosophy:
From Building Collections to Curating Access

• Trueswell—80/20
• Updated by OhioLINK—80/6
GVSU’s Experience

Change in Philosophy:
From Building Collections to Curating Access

• Trueswell—80/20
• Updated by OhioLINK—80/6

• Users need immediate access to 6% of our collections. For the rest…?
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
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 consorital model
Moving the Idea Forward

• Driving factors for participation
  – Space issues for a minority of libraries
  – Desire to collaborate on collection management
    the primary driver
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
  – Ultimately agreed to cooperatively manage a subset of collective collection
Scope of the Project

• Monographs only
• Multi-volume monographic sets
• No serials
• No “Special” collections
• No Gov Docs, Reference, Reserves, etc..
Deliverables

- Collection overview
- Actionable unique title list
- Withdrawal List
- Retention List
Unique Title List

- Unique locally held titles
- Criteria for identification:
  - Pre- 2005
  - Zero circs since 1999
  - More than 50 US holdings in OCLC or Hathi Trust match
- Individual library decides how to handle
Allocated Withdrawal List

• Books with:
  - 3 or fewer circulations since 1999
  - Pub date or add date prior to 2005
  - Held by more than 2 libraries
Retention List

- A list for each participating library, generated by SCS’s algorithm, identifying titles to be retained on behalf of the “collective collection”
- Retention assignments tied to circulation as much as possible
Michigan Shared Print Initiative

Project timeline

Data wrangling

Data-driven decisions

http://sustainablecollections.com

http://mlc.lib.mi.us/cms/sitem.cfm
Project timeline

• July 2011: Shared print storage goals established

• September 11, 2011: MCLS/SCS contract signed

• October 10, 2011: Last data extract received at SCS

• October 25, 2011: Bibliographic, item, circulation, and holdings data filtered, normalized, matched, and loaded into SCS databases and tables

• October 31, 2011: SCS presented preliminary findings at MCLS in Lansing, Michigan
Project timeline

- Nov - Feb 2011: Discoveries, discussions & decisions
- January 2011: Uniquely-held title lists (national context)
- February 2011: Withdrawal candidates defined
  Allocation algorithm implemented
- March 2011: Name change from MCLS Pilot to MI-SPI
- April 2011: Withdrawal candidate lists delivered to libraries
  MI-SPI Allocation Database delivered to MCLS
- May 2011: Retention lists delivered to libraries
The SCS Team

Rick Lugg & Ruth Fischer

- R2 Founders, principals
- Recognized as experts in:
  - Selection-to-access workflows
  - Integration of vendor and library systems
  - Adapting library organizations for the 21st century

Eric Redman

- Former Chief Architect and Director of IT at Blackwell North America
- Led Development of Blackwell’s Collection Manager 7 application
- Deep knowledge of bibliographic data, search, and information architecture
- 28 years IT experience

Andy Breeding

- Focus on content-management, web and search solutions, user experience
- Most recently: User-Experience Team Manager at Harvard Business School
- 20+ years in special libraries
DATA INGEST AND NORMALIZATION
Data preparation: bibliographic

• Filtered out-of scope records
  – serials, gov docs, non-books, e-resources, etc.
• Normalized call numbers and enumeration data
• Eliminated trailing spaces in control numbers
• Validated OCLC numbers
• Matched all bib records on OCLC number
  – to create a list of MCLS unique titles
Data preparation: circulation

- 4 libraries on Millennium; 3 on Voyager
- Total charges
- YTD charges
- Historical charges (carried from previous system)
- Internal use? (reshelving counts vs. process control)
- Interlibrary loan?
- Reserve charges?
- Premise: any use should be counted
Many definitions of “circulation”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Library</th>
<th>Column</th>
<th>Definition</th>
<th>Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Central</td>
<td>locally_defined_internal_uses_1</td>
<td>Park Library uses</td>
<td>945</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central</td>
<td>locally_defined_internal_uses_2</td>
<td>Clarke Library uses</td>
<td>945</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central</td>
<td>locally_defined_code_1</td>
<td>suppress/delete</td>
<td>945</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastern</td>
<td>add_date</td>
<td>mfhd record create date</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastern</td>
<td>total_charges</td>
<td>circ transaction file</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastern</td>
<td>total_renewals</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastern</td>
<td>year_to_date_charges</td>
<td>circ transaction file</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastern</td>
<td>locally_defined_internal_uses_1</td>
<td>in-house uses since January 2005</td>
<td>item file</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GVSU</td>
<td>add_date</td>
<td>item record creation date</td>
<td>945</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GVSU</td>
<td>total_charges</td>
<td></td>
<td>945</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GVSU</td>
<td>total_renewals</td>
<td></td>
<td>945</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GVSU</td>
<td>year_to_date_charges</td>
<td></td>
<td>945</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GVSU</td>
<td>locally_defined_internal_uses_1</td>
<td>circs between 1998 and June 2011</td>
<td>945</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GVSU</td>
<td>locally_defined_code_1</td>
<td>suppress/delete</td>
<td>945</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# Circulation data in common: 11+ years

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Library</th>
<th>Total charges</th>
<th>Scope of Total Charges</th>
<th>Year to Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CMU</td>
<td>1991-1997, 1998-present</td>
<td></td>
<td>945</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EMU</td>
<td>12/1997 to present</td>
<td></td>
<td>In transaction file, to be derived</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GVSU</td>
<td>1998 to present</td>
<td></td>
<td>945</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MTU</td>
<td>7/1995 to present</td>
<td>Historical charges field includes in-house use</td>
<td>In transaction file, to be derived</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SVSU</td>
<td>5/1997 to present</td>
<td></td>
<td>945</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WSU</td>
<td>Late 1999 to present</td>
<td></td>
<td>945</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WMU</td>
<td>1998-present</td>
<td></td>
<td>In transaction file, to be derived</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Data preparation: items and holdings

• Again, a great deal of variety
• Different record structures for Millennium and Voyager
• Location field especially lively
  – Wide range of uses
  – Hundreds for some libraries
  – Some special collections inadvertently included in original extracts
• Item type, status, item ID
• Validation needed with each library
### Combined MCLS database: October 31, 2011

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Unfiltered</th>
<th>Filtered</th>
<th>Libraries</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bib records</td>
<td>4,559,485</td>
<td>3,822,527</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item records</td>
<td>4,807,297</td>
<td>4,234,263</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unique Titles</td>
<td>1,360,948</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bib records where local holdings are not set</td>
<td></td>
<td>202,009</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Data preparation: Match to external sources

• Performed OCLC WorldCat™ lookups - WorldCat ™ API
  – Combined holdings symbols for one library
  – FRBR on? FRBR off? (initial default to edition-specific matches)
  – To identify holdings in other libraries: national, state

• Hathi Trust and CHOICE matches
  – Hathi: to determine whether title was digitally archived
  – CHOICE Reviews Online (CRO): to identify titles reviewed in CHOICE
SCS COLLECTION SUMMARY: DATA AND CONTEXT
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MCLS Library Title Counts</th>
<th>All Libraries</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Wayne State</th>
<th>Western Michigan</th>
<th>Central Michigan</th>
<th>Eastern Michigan</th>
<th>GVSU</th>
<th>SVSU</th>
<th>MTU</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All Records - Filtered</td>
<td>3,823,327</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>1,169,157</td>
<td>971,995</td>
<td>597,046</td>
<td>529,502</td>
<td>226,280</td>
<td>167,707</td>
<td>161,640</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Circulation Counts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Charges = 0</td>
<td>1,746,608</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>538,486</td>
<td>424,284</td>
<td>221,828</td>
<td>259,402</td>
<td>153,375</td>
<td>67,629</td>
<td>81,604</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Charges = 1 or less</td>
<td>2,401,064</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>721,941</td>
<td>588,741</td>
<td>328,917</td>
<td>350,896</td>
<td>195,424</td>
<td>102,650</td>
<td>112,495</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year-to-Date Charges = 0</td>
<td>3,654,632</td>
<td>96%</td>
<td>1,115,062</td>
<td>933,814</td>
<td>562,286</td>
<td>499,877</td>
<td>226,046</td>
<td>162,657</td>
<td>154,890</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WorldCat Counts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt; 100 holdings in USA</td>
<td>2,366,515</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>541,951</td>
<td>611,428</td>
<td>430,967</td>
<td>379,881</td>
<td>170,939</td>
<td>123,534</td>
<td>107,815</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt; 50 holdings in USA</td>
<td>2,937,455</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>750,401</td>
<td>769,740</td>
<td>499,997</td>
<td>452,609</td>
<td>194,831</td>
<td>139,938</td>
<td>129,939</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt; 20 holdings in USA</td>
<td>3,338,916</td>
<td>87%</td>
<td>928,063</td>
<td>870,487</td>
<td>539,713</td>
<td>493,804</td>
<td>212,224</td>
<td>150,944</td>
<td>143,681</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt; 10 holdings in Michigan</td>
<td>976,253</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>181,336</td>
<td>218,153</td>
<td>187,867</td>
<td>172,428</td>
<td>93,426</td>
<td>71,500</td>
<td>51,543</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt; 5 holdings in Michigan</td>
<td>1,915,519</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>402,238</td>
<td>468,459</td>
<td>361,520</td>
<td>326,391</td>
<td>153,830</td>
<td>111,666</td>
<td>91,415</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt; 10 holdings in USA</td>
<td>272,270</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>143,257</td>
<td>53,839</td>
<td>33,608</td>
<td>16,174</td>
<td>7,360</td>
<td>7,120</td>
<td>10,912</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt; 5 holdings in USA</td>
<td>203,515</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>110,547</td>
<td>39,872</td>
<td>24,946</td>
<td>10,821</td>
<td>3,973</td>
<td>4,612</td>
<td>8,744</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt; 5 holdings - MCLS Pilot Group</td>
<td>173,957</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>26,397</td>
<td>31,527</td>
<td>28,773</td>
<td>27,492</td>
<td>19,263</td>
<td>21,654</td>
<td>18,851</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt; 3 holdings - MCLS Pilot Group</td>
<td>989,604</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>173,311</td>
<td>218,904</td>
<td>189,146</td>
<td>179,301</td>
<td>96,063</td>
<td>72,370</td>
<td>60,509</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt; 1 holdings - MCLS Pilot Group</td>
<td>2,456,460</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>546,918</td>
<td>638,520</td>
<td>443,520</td>
<td>404,101</td>
<td>178,514</td>
<td>127,226</td>
<td>117,661</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unique Titles in MCLS Pilot Group</td>
<td>1,363,047</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>622,239</td>
<td>333,475</td>
<td>144,728</td>
<td>125,401</td>
<td>52,744</td>
<td>40,481</td>
<td>43,979</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Date related counts        |              |         |             |               |                |                |       |      |     |
| Publication Year before 2005 | 3,430,618 | 90% | 1,099,755   | 842,941       | 530,610        | 467,682        | 187,107 | 151,881 | 150,642 |
| Publication Year before 2000 | 3,061,615 | 80% | 1,030,797   | 725,169       | 481,396        | 402,442        | 144,239 | 137,875 | 139,697 |
| Publication Year before 1990 | 2,381,396 | 62% | 871,575     | 547,126       | 368,927        | 280,338        | 89,136  | 107,289 | 117,005 |
| Added before 2005           | 3,097,504   | 81%   | 1,069,578   | 805,774       | 499,860        | 445,830        | 0      | 137,080 | 139,382 |

| Electronic Surrogates      |              |         |             |               |                |                |       |      |     |
| Hathi Trust Public Domain Match | 131,447 | 3%   | 51,939      | 28,109        | 20,157         | 17,784         | 2,667   | 2,453  | 8,338  |
| Hathi Trust In-Copyright Match | 1,571,907 | 41% | 470,391     | 396,657       | 246,440        | 226,209        | 84,628  | 72,106 | 75,476  |
Total filtered bib records: 3,822,527

- 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
Total unique bib records: 1,360,948

Wayne State: 622,239
Western Michigan: 333,475
Central Michigan: 144,728
Eastern Michigan: 125,401
Grand Valley: 50,645
Saginaw Valley: 40,481
Michigan Tech: 43,979
Year of publication

- Wayne State
- Western Michigan
- Central Michigan
- Eastern Michigan
- Grand Valley
- Saginaw Valley
- Michigan Tech

- Pub Year <2000 (80%)
- Pub Year <2005 (90%)
- All Titles
MCLS overlap

- Titles held by 6+ MCLS libraries (180,660 or 5%)
- Titles held by 4 MCLS libraries (500,574 or 13%)
- Titles held by 2 MCLS libraries (812,888 or 21%)
- Total titles (3,822,527)
Overlap with all Michigan libraries

- **Titles held by more than 10 Michigan libraries**
  - (1,112,999 or 29%)

- **Titles held by more than 5 Michigan libraries**
  - (1,912,886 or 50%)

- **Total titles**
  - (3,822,527)

### Libraries
- Wayne State
- Western Michigan
- Central Michigan
- Eastern Michigan
- Grand Valley
- Saginaw Valley
- Michigan Tech
Overlap with all US libraries

- Titles held by more than 100 US libraries (2,363,414 or 62%)
- Titles held by more than 50 US libraries (2,933,340 or 77%)
- Total titles (3,822,527)
INITIAL MODELING OF WITHDRAWAL AND RETENTION SCENARIOS
Initial withdrawal scenarios – US holdings

- Publication year < 2005; and 0 circulations; and > 100 US WC holdings (816,854 or 21%)
- Publication year < 2005; and 0 circulations; and > 50 US WC holdings (1,058,014 or 28%)
- Total titles (3,822,527)
Initial withdrawal scenarios – state holdings

- **Publication year < 2005; and 0 circulations; and held by >10 Michigan libraries (331,299 or 9%)**
- **Publication year < 2005; and 0 circulations; and held by > 5 Michigan libraries (668,351 or 17%)**

**Total titles (3,822,527)**
Initial withdrawal scenarios – MCLS holdings

- Publication year < 2005; 0 circulations; and 3+ MCLS Holdings (578,616 or 15%)
- Publication year < 2005; < 5 circulations; and 3+ MCLS Holdings (1,184,983 or 31%)
- Total titles (3,822,527)

Wayne State, Western Michigan, Central Michigan, Eastern Michigan, Grand Valley, Saginaw Valley, Michigan Tech
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Retaining 3 copies in MCLS</th>
<th>ZERO circs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pre-2005 titles w/6+ holdings</td>
<td>60,218</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre-2005 titles w/5 holdings</td>
<td>106,966</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre-2005 titles w/4 holdings</td>
<td>166,913</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre-2005 titles w/3 holdings</td>
<td>218,720</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre-2005 titles w/2 holdings</td>
<td>303,630</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre-2005 titles w/1 holding</td>
<td>644,845</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retaining 3 copies in MCLS</td>
<td>5 or fewer circs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre-2005 titles w/6+ holdings</td>
<td>173,801 x 3 = 521,403</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre-2005 titles w/5 holdings</td>
<td>240,885 x 2 = 481,770</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre-2005 titles w/4 holdings</td>
<td>378,192 x 1 = 378,192</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre-2005 titles w/3 holdings</td>
<td>486,836</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre-2005 titles w/2 holdings</td>
<td>618,107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre-2005 titles w/1 holding</td>
<td>1,088,327</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Decisions needed: thresholds and copies

• How many copies should be retained within the group?
  – For titles that have never circulated?
  – For titles circulated within the last 24 months?
  – For titles widely held in the collective collection?

• Archival copy and service copies
  – Can a Hathi Trust version serve as the archival copy?
  – Does the group need both an archival copy and a service copy?
  – How should this regional collection relate to the national collection?
Decisions needed: deselection criteria

• Should state or national holdings be a factor in the decision-making process?

• What date ranges should be used for publication date and date added?

• Should a title’s Hathi status impact local decisions about retention?

• Should titles reviewed in CHOICE be protected?
Decisions needed: retention

• Who will retain what? When 5 copies exist and only 3 are wanted, who keeps and who discards? Need for predictability and rules/policies.

• How will the benefit be shared? Based on collection size? Based on available space? Subject strengths? Number of withdrawal candidates?

• Unique titles: need for a last-copy policy? Regional or national context?
Data-driven decisions

- To focus regionally rather than nationally; rely on local print copies
- To retain 3 copies within the pilot group
- To exempt the newest items – acquired or published after 2004
- To design withdrawal allocation scenarios that allowed libraries with most space pressure to remove more
- To view uniquely-held copies in a national context
Data-driven decision: the 3-3-3 starting point

• Consider for withdrawal:
  – All holdings/copies in excess of 3 within the MCLS pilot group
  – For titles that have circulated 3 times or fewer
  – In the last 3 years* (later changed to 11 years; data would not support)

• Potential yield: 800,000 withdrawal candidates*

• SCS committed to developing this model – which included a “proportional allocation” of withdrawal candidates.

• *BUT WE STILL HAD SO MUCH TO LEARN!
REFINING WITHDRAWAL AND RETENTION SCENARIOS

- NEW CONCEPTS EMERGE -
How to define a title?

1. Title Set

Western  MTU  Eastern  Central  Wayne  SVSU

2. Title Holding
Distinguishing between title sets and title holdings

1. Criteria for eliminating a **title set** from consideration
   – Circulation behavior of the title across the seven libraries
     • Circulation threshold all individual holdings have to meet?
     • Circulation threshold the aggregate title set has to meet?
   – Publication and/or acquisition date of title
   – Title set must have 3 or more title holdings

2. Criteria for eliminating a **title holding** from consideration
   – Circulation of a specific library’s holding
   – Last item add date for a specific library’s holding
   – Location filters are satisfied (Western, Central)
Over the next several months, we all had plenty of cold compress moments
No library can remove their candidates without factoring in other libraries removing the same titles.
Withdrawal candidates represent all holdings that meet the criteria for withdrawal, independent of any holding requirement. For a given library, this means all the titles that meet withdrawal criteria. We have also referred to this as the maximum potential withdrawals a library could make if they were freed from the obligation of keeping any.

while

Allocable withdrawal candidates represent the withdrawal candidates that can be removed after the 2 holding requirement is satisfied. This will always be a smaller number.
Retention commitments?
RECALCULATING THE OPPORTUNITY
FEBRUARY 2011
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Retaining <strong>3</strong> holdings in MCLS Pilot Group</th>
<th>3 or fewer circs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pre-2005 titles w/7 holdings</td>
<td>5,589 X 4 = 22,356</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre-2005 titles w/6 holdings</td>
<td>24,230 x 3 = 72,690</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre-2005 titles w/5 holdings</td>
<td>63,670 x 2 = 127,340</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre-2005 titles w/4 holdings</td>
<td>120,375 x 1 = 120,375</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre-2005 titles w/3 holdings</td>
<td>196,280</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retaining <strong>2</strong> holdings in MCLS Pilot Group</td>
<td>3 or fewer circs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre-2005 titles w/7 holdings</td>
<td>5,587</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>x 5 = 27,935</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre-2005 titles w/6 holdings</td>
<td>24,210</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>x 4 = 96,840</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre-2005 titles w/5 holdings</td>
<td>63,544</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>x 3 = 190,632</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre-2005 titles w/4 holdings</td>
<td>119,994</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>x 2 = 239,988</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre-2005 titles w/3 holdings</td>
<td>195,052</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>x 1 = 195,052</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>750,447</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
How to define **3 circulations**?

3 or fewer circs at any given library versus 3 or fewer circs across the group versus an average of 3 circs per holding

Does it matter *where* the circs occurred?
### 3 ways to think about “3 circs per holding”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scenario</th>
<th>Title Set Inclusion Criteria</th>
<th>Title Holding Inclusion Criteria</th>
<th>Allocable Holdings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Each holding &lt; 4 circs</td>
<td>Each holding &lt; 4 circs</td>
<td>266,190</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Average circs per holding &lt; 4</td>
<td>Each holding &lt; 4 circs</td>
<td>433,199</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>No restriction on aggregate circulation</td>
<td>Each holding &lt; 4 circs</td>
<td>535,970</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For all these scenarios:
- Titles sets have 3 or more holdings
- Title sets are excluded with publication year > 2004
- Title holdings are excluded with item add date > 2004
- Title holdings are subject to location filters
Candidates
Final definition established in February 2012

- **Title sets** have 3 or more holdings – intention to retain 2
- **Title sets** are excluded when publication year > 2004
- **Title holdings** are excluded when item add date > 2004
- Fewer than 4 circulations **per title holding** since 1999
- No restrictions on aggregate circulation

Final withdrawal opportunity: **534,067** title holdings while retaining 2 holdings of each title within the pilot group
ALLOCATION OF WITHDRAWAL CANDIDATES AND RETENTION COMMITMENTS
Decisions needed: retention

• Who will retain what? When 5 copies exist and only 3 are wanted, who keeps and who discards? Need for predictability and rules/policies.

• How will the benefit be shared? Based on collection size? Based on available space? Subject strengths? Number of withdrawal candidates?

• Unique titles: need for a last-copy policy? Regional or national context?
What if we elected to not withdraw candidates from libraries with plenty of space

... to let libraries with known space issues withdraw the extras?
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Withdrawal Candidates Maximum potential Withdrawals</th>
<th>Allocable Candidates Distributed by % of withdrawal candidates</th>
<th>Allocable Candidates Distributed by collection size</th>
<th>Allocable Candidates Agreed to via “horse trading”</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Western</td>
<td>193,321</td>
<td>111,179</td>
<td>134,416</td>
<td>126,059</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michigan Tech</td>
<td>60,729</td>
<td>34,925</td>
<td>22,354</td>
<td>46,135</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central</td>
<td>168,808</td>
<td>97,082</td>
<td>82,556</td>
<td>67,145</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastern</td>
<td>212,452</td>
<td>122,182</td>
<td>77,960</td>
<td>67,145</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wayne</td>
<td>169,844</td>
<td>97,678</td>
<td>161,621</td>
<td>129,723</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GVSU</td>
<td>53,809</td>
<td>30,946</td>
<td>31,976</td>
<td>45,186</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SVSU</td>
<td>69,684</td>
<td>40,075</td>
<td>23,184</td>
<td>52,673</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>928,647</td>
<td>534,067</td>
<td>534,067</td>
<td>534,067</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Final definition of withdrawal candidates required development of a weighted allocation scheme

1. A **title set** was identified as a candidate
2. **Title holdings** within the set were identified as candidates
3. The number of allocable **title holdings** in the set \( = \) the number of withdrawal candidates that can be withdrawn while keeping 2 title holdings.
4. The allocation algorithm assigns allocable holdings to libraries based (to the extent possible) on:
   – Allocating lower circulating holdings for withdrawal first
   – Rank ordering institutions on the allocation of holdings with the same number of circulations – to adjust allocations to meet targets
5. 14 attempts to find a workable approach
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OCLC Nbr</th>
<th>Bib Sour</th>
<th>Candidate</th>
<th>Candidate Rank</th>
<th>Pub Year</th>
<th>Valid</th>
<th>MCLS Charge</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1009301</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1974</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1009303</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1974</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1009303</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1974</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1009304</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1975</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1009304</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1975</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1009304</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1975</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1009304</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1975</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1009304</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1975</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1009305</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1975</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1009305</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1975</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1009305</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1975</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1009307</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1975</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1009307</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1975</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1009308</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1973</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1009308</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1973</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1009309</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1974</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **5 title holdings**
- **3 title holdings allocated for withdrawal**
- **candidate rank**
- **individual library circs**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OCLC Nbr</th>
<th>Bib Sour</th>
<th>Candidate</th>
<th>Candidate Rank</th>
<th>Minutes</th>
<th>Pub Year</th>
<th>Valid</th>
<th>MCLS Charge</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1009301</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1974</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1009303</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1974</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1009303</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1974</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1009303</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1974</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1009303</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1974</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1009304</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1975</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1009304</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1975</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1009304</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1975</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1009304</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1975</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1009304</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1975</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1009305</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1975</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1009305</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1975</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1009305</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1975</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1009305</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1975</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1009307</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1975</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1009307</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1975</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1009308</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1973</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1009308</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1973</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1009309</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1974</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3 title holdings allocated for withdrawal

2 retention commitments
Retention responsibility some libraries absorbed to increase the opportunity for others.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Library</th>
<th>Withdrawal Count</th>
<th>Retention Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Central</td>
<td>37,438</td>
<td>204,686*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastern</td>
<td>67,221</td>
<td>172,423*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GVSU</td>
<td>49,654</td>
<td>45,497</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MTU</td>
<td>48,655</td>
<td>24,899</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SVSU</td>
<td>53,724</td>
<td>30,094</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wayne</td>
<td>165,858</td>
<td>86,633</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Western</td>
<td>111,607</td>
<td>172,004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>534,157</td>
<td>736,236</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Producing actionable lists

• Withdrawal candidates
• Retention candidates
• Preservation candidate
• Uniquely-held titles
• Data remediation lists

• A story for another day...
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location Name</th>
<th>Call Number</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Enumeration</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Publisher</td>
<td>Series</td>
<td>Pub Year</td>
<td>Last Item Date Added</td>
<td>Catalog Record</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York: Macmillan, 1913.</td>
<td></td>
<td>1913</td>
<td>8/17/1995 0:00</td>
<td><a href="#">Catalog Record</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Charges</td>
<td>US Holdings - WorldCat</td>
<td>State Holdings - WorldCat</td>
<td>Hathi Trust In Copyright</td>
<td>Hathi Trust Public Domain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WorldCat OCLC Number</td>
<td>Bib Control Number</td>
<td>Item Control Number</td>
<td>Barcode</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34015</td>
<td>29570</td>
<td>52835</td>
<td>31714003580</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1416321</td>
<td>15130</td>
<td>352059</td>
<td>31714004042</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2772</td>
<td>26968</td>
<td>50240</td>
<td>31714004042</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
So the work and the learning continues, with development of the MOU... to formalize these data-informed decisions.

http://sustainablecollections.com
Developing a Shared MOU for MI-SPI

Barbara J. Cockrell
Assoc. Dean for Collections and Technical Services
Western Michigan University Libraries
Aims of MOU

• Ensure **common understanding** among participants

• Provide a record of **expectations** and agreements for the **long term**

• Allow libraries to **proceed confidently and responsibly** with pressing deselection projects

• Provide **flexibility** for change over time

• **Communicate effectively and consistently** with other constituencies
Ensure Shared Understanding

• MOU was developed post-hoc (during)

• Libraries entered project with different motivations

• Ranging discussions during development

• Various iterations of criteria
Provide Flexibility

• Pilot project – unchartered territory (plan for the unknown)

• Changing print environment – need assurances for the present but also adaptability for the future

• Possibilities of future data refresh and revised criteria

• Allow for additional participants to join
Communication with others

• Internal library constituency

• University administration & community

• Broader library community (other potential participants and beyond)

• Our own successors
Some Useful Sources

• Center for Research Libraries - Print Archiving Service Agreements
  http://www.crl.edu/archiving-preservation/print-archives/service-agreements/
  [Sample MOUs and agreements. Particular reference to Orbis Cascade Alliance; Triangle Research Libraries Network; Tri-University Group (Canada)]

• Cloud-sourcing Research Collections: Managing Print in the Mass-digitized Library Environment *
  Constance Malpas, OCLC Research
  * The Executive Summary is an excellent overview to print storage issues and initiatives. http://www.oclc.org/research/news/2011-01-06.htm [project overview]
MOU Elements

• Participation requirements
• Duration and nature of the commitment
• Define deselection criteria
• Ownership and location
• Facilities and maintenance conditions
• Damage and loss
• Circulation and preservation
• Bibliographic and physical identifiers
Concerns/Sticking Points

• Duration of the agreement
• Costs of interlibrary loan
• Replacement obligations and expenditures
• Inventory obligations (including already missing items)
• Identifying retention titles
• Applying existing workflows/procedures to retention titles
• Local vs. global practices
• Integrating additional participant libraries
• Nature of the commitment (pilot vs. long-term; one-time vs. ongoing)
Resolution

- **Retention lists** – define scope of responsibilities; reduce replacement obligations and extend weed options

- Focus on providing *access over preservation* as main purpose

- Develop guidelines and best practices that *build trust* but provide *flexibility* while remaining *true to the spirit* of the project

- Enable *integration into existing local procedures* and workflows

- Keep reminding ourselves these are low use titles widely available in the US and elsewhere in the state
MOU Project Goals

The project has two distinct goals:

• First, to responsibly reduce the size of local print collections by reducing duplication of low circulating titles among the participating libraries so that library space may be freed up for other uses.

• Second, to create and maintain a distributed, shared collection of these identified monograph titles to ensure that circulating copies of them are retained within the group, readily accessible to group participants and other Michigan libraries.
MOU Guiding Principles

Participant libraries are committed to work together collaboratively to meet the Project Goals for a minimum of 15 years (with options for review, renewal and dissolution as outlined below). We recognize that some of the specifics of this collaboration including the number of print titles covered, the participating libraries involved and details of responsibilities are likely to change over time and that adjustments will be desirable.

The MOU commitment is to work in consultation with each other for 15 years to responsibly, collaboratively and transparently manage the shared print collection that is a result of our joint withdrawal and retention actions.
Some Other Elements

• Duration of the Agreement: 15 years (regular 3 year review)

• Libraries not *required* to refresh data

• Release from MOU in circumstances beyond library’s control but will work with group to minimize impact

• ‘Best effort’ to maintain, house, preserve, and make retention titles available

• Circulation according to local library policy and institution’s standard ILL practices
Replacement

- Follow *usual workflows and procedures* for identifying, repairing and replacing titles .... make a *good faith effort* to respond to badly damaged (unloanable) or lost titles in a way that *displays sound judgment* in the context of the particular title and its availability to other libraries in the state.

- Where general practice is to replace a title with the most recent edition this procedure may be followed
Notification

• If a participating library knowingly elects *not* to replace a lost or badly damaged retention list title or if it replaces a retention title with a later edition it must **notify the other participant libraries through an agreed standard notification mechanism**. This will allow other participants, or the group as a whole to determine if they want to take further replacement actions.
Still to Address (July +)

• Pin down a mechanism and procedures for notifying the group about lost retention titles

• Adopt an agreed on standardized bibliographic identification (e.g. to MARC 583) for retention items

• Determine details for equitably integrating new participant libraries into the mix
Benefits (2012-2027)

• Share experiences, data, ideas, strategies, successes, pitfalls and solutions

• Provide managed, useful collections – not warehouses

• Open our library spaces and collections to new possibilities

• Proceed boldly but responsibly with informed confidence

• Evaluate and adjust MOU as change demands
Thanks

Doug Way
dway@gvsu

Rick Lugg & Ruth Fisher
Sustainable Collection Services LLC
rick@sustainablecollections.com

Barbara Cockrell
barbara.cockrell@wmich.edu

Questions?

http://www.flickr.com/photos/horiavarlan/4273168957/