

Shared Print Program

Tue, 4/27 11:19AM 57:56

SUMMARY KEYWORDS

libraries, collection, shared, titles, print, institution, retention, materials, commitments, atla, question, program, glenn, weeding, worldcat, retain, linda, denominational, bit, lmu

SPEAKERS

Linda Wobbe, Ana Cackley, Pete Zeimet, Gillian Harrison Cain, Glenn Johnson-Grau



Ana Cackley 00:00

Good afternoon, everyone. Thank you for joining us today. My name is Ana Cackley and on behalf of Atla, I'd like to welcome you to today's program, What Shared Print Means for You. Before we get started, I just like to point out a few features of the webinars interface. By default, you're going to be listening in using your computer's speaker system. But if you would like to join by phone, that's perfectly fine as well. At the bottom of your screen, you should see a control panel, it will contain a chat box, you can type in your questions for the speakers there and contact us about any technical difficulties. You can send in your questions for the speakers at any time during the presentation, and we will collect those and address them at the end. We now have live transcription for Atla Webinars, you can find the live Transcript by going to the red button in the top left corner of your screen labeled live on custom live streaming service. If you just click the carrot, and then click View live streaming service, it'll open up the transcript in a new browser window. We will make this transcript available on our on demand learning page. Today's presentation is being recorded and that recording will also be available on the on demand learning page. everyone who registered for today's webinar will receive an email notification when it's available. And now I'd like to introduce our speakers today. First, we have with us Glen Johnson grow who is the head of acquisitions and collection development at Loyola Marymount University. We also have our very own gillean, Harrison Kane, who is the director of member programs here at Atla. And we have Pete Simon, who is the product specialist at OCLC. And with that, I am going to turn it over to them. Thank you so much for your patience, folks while we switch presenters.



Gillian Harrison Cain 01:46

Thanks, Ana, you all might notice that there's no more slides on the screen. And that is deliberate. We aren't going to be sharing slides during this presentation, we thought we'd do a little bit more of a conversational format. So you're going to be able to see and hear us speak. And we do want to make this very much a conversation. And so while we have lots of questions and things that we've planned to discuss, we do invite you to submit your questions via the chat. We will be monitoring that throughout the session. And we do invite you to participate as well. We are going to ask you a few questions throughout this. So please do respond to those questions in the chat so that we can help make certain that we cover the things that are most of interest and most important for you. So today we're going to discuss on helping people understand exactly what shared print means, why it matters to some libraries, and why it might be something that your library might want to consider in the future. So the first question that I'm going to ask you all to respond to is, when you hear the word shared print, what do you think of? Do you consider yourself very familiar, a little bit familiar or not at all familiar with what a shared print program is? And so please do enter those responses into the chat. But we're going to go ahead and I'm going to ask Glenn while we're waiting for folks to put information in the chat. Could you describe really at a high level what a share program is?



Glenn Johnson-Grau 03:16

Sure. Um, so SharePoint programs are collaborative initiatives to with the goal of providing broad availability and long term sustainability of collections. They can be shared print monographic collections shared print serials collections, some programs cover both. skulk is assess shared print monographic collection. So protecting the scholarly record is in the collective collection is the primary goal and really what the the framing mechanism to think about why these things exist, lots of things flow from that about individual libraries being able to participate, and then make local decisions based upon that. But the overall principle is that these this collaborative work between institutions to come make a plan to protect the collections on a larger scale, whether regionally, nationally, North America worldwide.



Gillian Harrison Cain 04:16

Great, Glenn, thank you so much. And thanks to all of you for putting in some responses in the chat. It sounds like several folks aren't very familiar with shared print. And so I think we might get a little bit more into some of the details of what that means. One person responded that shared print, when they hear that word, it means I allel to them, which is not a connotation that I had heard a connection between. Can you talk a little bit about how that might fit together or the differences between ILL and shared print Glenn.



Glenn Johnson-Grau 04:48

I'm sure there is a substantial overlap and as we'll talk about in, in the sculpt program in a bit, the code the resource sharing and the the shared print collections are very much aligned. But in general, for shared print, it is the agreement about what people are going to retain. And then from there, it's okay, how do you share that and then sharing can happen in lots of different ways, using existing resource sharing models. It can involve digitization, different share print programs do it different ways. Within scalp, there is a an expectation that if you are committing to retain materials that you are willing to share those materials to that comes as part of the program. But how that actually happens, the actual resource sharing mechanism varies by institution, and certainly with skulk, being covering, you know, being primarily focused in the West, but covering libraries everywhere, and Atla. Libraries being everywhere, the local mechanisms for resource sharing are going to vary a lot by individual library, and there's enough flexibility built into the system to allow that. But libraries do commit to retaining titles, and sharing them if requested.



Gillian Harrison Cain 06:04

So I think that that goes into the next connotation that somebody had, when they hear shed print, they think shared collection, which I think you kind of referred to a little bit Can you talk about that a little bit more?



Glenn Johnson-Grau 06:18

Right. So again, different programs are set up different ways the SCEL program is Library's retaining materials in place. So you're retaining your own collections in your own storage facilities and your libraries or our off site or semi off site collections. So there's not a central repository as there are with, with some, with some programs on so big collection, the titles that you retain remain your titles, you have ownership of them, there's ability to move titles, we have a library no longer wants something and offers it to other libraries in the program that's certainly allowed and happens in skulk it hasn't happened widely. But there's also the possibility, you know, down the line as libraries close, or drastically reduce their footprints are changed their missions. There's one of the nice things about a shared crud program is it establishes the relationships to be able to have those conversations before the crane join, when libraries frequently have to make those very quick decisions locally. So it's not a and then the other, there are other things that can flow from from it too, as far as collaborative collection development, which is more of a shared collection idea. But that's not inherently required in in shared print, certainly not as the way the scout program is set up right now.



Gillian Harrison Cain 07:41

Great, thanks, Glenn. Jamie, I just want to acknowledge that I do see your question about controlled digital lending. But I'm going to defer that for a little bit while I asked Pete to jump in. And tell us a little bit about OCLC GreenGlass and how it's used in the context of shared print.



Pete Zeimet 08:03

Oops, I was muted. Yeah, Glenn did a really nice job, I think capturing the I mean, the funny thing is the word shared is in shared print. Right. So there is kind of an assumption that there'll be some lending available. Also, I mean, we're in a lending business. I mean, that's what libraries do. So it's a big part of our core culture. That said, you know, there are times when I mean, sharing isn't a requirement, you can be in a shared program where you're securing the scholarly record, and ensuring access. But sometimes that could be with a non lending collection, you know, where you're making sure that you're preserving certain titles, but there might be in a non lending collection so that a user or a researcher may have to go to you to, to see it. I mean, that's certainly possible. I don't know if we've actually had that happen. I think in all cases, so far. One of the requirements in spelled out in the mlu is that you'll agree to share as needed. And it's usually through things like I II or it could be other sorts of arrangements. So I just wanted to make that distinction. And let me see. So I think I might have lost sight Gillian of your of your question. We, maybe I could ask you to repeat that.



Gillian Harrison Cain 09:18

Yeah. Could you talk about green glass and the underlying technology that it provides and how it supports shared print?



Pete Zeimet 09:24

Yeah, asking me about the very product I represent. So I guess. Yeah, so green glass was really undeveloped, with collection management in mind. We're in an era where a lot of libraries are having to revisit and relook at their use of space and figure out what level of print makes sense for them, because we are seeing a lot of declines in use of print circulation numbers have been going down over the last 20 years. And so libraries are always re examining how can they best serve their constituents and further the mission of their institution, their educational mission, and that's sometimes involving offering other sorts of services that demand space and so on. So we develop GreenGlass really around a collection analysis setup for making collection management decisions. What do you do

with what the materials you already have in your collection? But very quickly in that process libraries realize that, hey, if we get together as a group, and several of us do an analysis, we can compare what we what we have with each other, and who has what and where we have redundancy. One of the difficult problem many libraries have is what do you do about important works of scholarship that haven't circulated in 20 years? That's a hard that's a difficult problem. These might be important works of literature, they might be seminal works in a certain field. But the No one's really using them. And so that's a tricky question. So it may not be important that every library hold those titles. But it is important that some libraries hold those titles. And that's the very value proposition of shared print. So we develop tools to enable technologies in GreenGlass to make it very easy to identify where you have uniqueness or titles that are scarce or at risk, and develop a sort of a structure around coming up with criteria for who will keep what and balancing that with each other and making those far more retention commitments.

G

Gillian Harrison Cain 11:22

Great, thanks. So we're gonna shift and talk a little bit more about the SCEL C shared print program specifically. And I want to address a question that I get asked all the time. So why is Atla partnering with SCEL C rather than developing its own shared prep process. And there's a couple of reasons why that we've chosen to take this path, we have a long history of working with SCEL C on licensing readers resources, and to expand that relationship just makes sense, especially when they have a well established program. They already have several Atla members who are participating in that program. And it takes a lot of work and effort to develop all of the underlying documentation and governance structures, and all of those kinds of things that I'm sure Glenn can tell us more about. And so leveraging an organization that's already done that hard work, and who is completely willing to have conversations about the unique experiences and needs of Atla libraries really made sense to me. And so that's why we've chosen to go a partnership route rather than looking to do something unique or different. And we also know that SCEL C really understands and respects, small libraries, and libraries that have specific focuses in collections, which many of the Atla libraries do. And then SCEL C has experience working with partners, they've worked with the California State University system on shared print. And so just having Atla be another group that they collaborate with on shared print made sense. And so that's why we're working with them on this rather than striking out on our own or looking to partner with other large shared print collections that you might be familiar with. So Glenn, you have a unique role since you work at an Atla member library, as well as the SCEL C member library, Loyola Marymount and you serve as the SCEL C shared print consultant. Can you describe what that means a little bit more? Why your role exists and what you do in that role?



Glenn Johnson-Grau 13:13

Sure, sure. Um, so yes, so my day job is head of acquisitions and collection development at Loyola Marymount University. We were one of the libraries that was involved in planning the shared print program for SCELC starting in 2012, 2013. And then when the initial basically we started in a kind of a cohort program, and we were part of the first cohort in 2016. So I personally been involved in it from the beginning. And I was involved in the implementation and all the questions about how we were going to deal with for my institution and in scalp and the selection of by SCELC green glasses as software to help us to build the collection and make those those collection decisions. So I was kind of involved in that all along. After the initial cohort started, I pulled back from that and was doing other things but I still was maintaining the aspects of at my own institution, including doing reading and the selection projects based upon after we had made our retention commitment. So all this stuff related to collections, and then as the program started to grow, then that will be who I'm from, with the scout staff member who is also the liaison to the our shared print committee and kind of manages the share there's there's like that I joined as the program started to grow scalp felt like they needed Linda needed support the program needed support. And, and I had that, that experience until I was bought in so I work some hours a week every week on sculpt related sculptured print related topics. And really it's supporting the program supporting Linda supporting our shirt print committee, we can talk about governance In a bit, but all of those things, so that's kind of the two hats that I wear related to it. But I do have the experience of how to implement it and how to make the decision to participate at an Atla Library, which is, as you were saying, that's kind of already built into the base of the scalp, initial cohorts, were up to 35 institutions involved, and include a number of so LMU is a Jesuit institution. USF University of San Francisco, another just judgment institution in California is also a member. But we have a bunch of different denominational and different religious, religiously affiliated institutions. So we kind of see this as both structurally administratively a natural fit and building upon our strength. And increasingly, our collection, the collective collection of sculpture print is reflecting those collections. Because as a collections person, I mean, the thing about what the local collection that you have at your institution is it reflects 1000s of decisions over decades about how to meet local needs, and is going to reflect that the local conditions over an you know over the life of your institution. And we can talk more about this, one of the things that we know, is there is a significant, there's two, two different ends of the spectrum, there's a significant body of literature that is widely held, and we is not at risk of, of not being available in the collective collection. But there is also very unique material at individual institutions. And we always talk about how every institution can contribute. even the tiniest tiniest of institutions has material that is not widely held, and we want you the institutions to be able to, to, to retain those things and protect them. But also it strengthens the entirety of the collective collection, and reduces the risk that those materials ever become completely unavailable in print, which is

something we all want to avoid.

G Gillian Harrison Cain 17:18

Pete, do you want to talk a little bit to what Glenn was talking about the uniqueness of collections? And?

P Pete Zeimet 17:24

Yeah, that's a really interesting point. Because I think we often assume, and I'm a librarian, too, by the way, but we often assume that you know, from one academic institution to another, especially, like size and purpose institutions, so let's say Catholic colleges, or, you know, four year universities, or we know, whatever it may be, we often think, well, there must be a pretty big body of titles that we all have in common. And, and what we find out is, when you get a group of, you know, 10 libraries together, there's very few titles they all have in common. And it's counterintuitive in many respects. But the data bears that out. And I think that's really fascinating. That doesn't mean always that those same titles are particularly rare in the US. But it just means that folks are doing very individual collection development. And as Glenn pointed out, we've all seen every library has some at risk, if not unique materials in their collection. So they all have something to contribute to this concept of shared print. The other thing that I think can sometimes be a misconception is sometimes libraries think, well, I don't want to get involved in shared print, because I need to weed my collection, I don't want to be responsible for making retention commitments, I'm trying to draw down my collection. And but the reality is, you can actually weed more when you're part of shared print, than if you're not because you're taking advantage of even with your own retention commitments, you're able to take advantage of the fact that a lot of other libraries are going to be keeping materials on your behalf. And you don't have to keep those titles you can actually be more aggressive with weeding and do it with the peace of mind of knowing that the scholarly record is being secured.

G Glenn Johnson-Grau 19:06

Adding to that one of the things that we that we think about at the program level, both for sculpture print, and we can talk about the national and North American level as well is that we are by telling people by making retention commitments and committing to those things and then giving permission or giving support for libraries to make individual the selection and weeding decisions. We are increasing scarcity, right? We are taking titles that were widely held, or at least potentially, that were reasonably widely held and saying, okay, there are some titles, we don't need as many in the national picture if you're local institution. And one thing to keep in mind is we are never telling libraries, what they should

keep. We are telling them we are working with them to make retention commitments, and then every decision on the selection is of course they're moving forward. But as we are making a possibility of scarcity, we want to nail down that those retained collections and really work to make sure that those are certainly well represented in every individual shared print collection. But then in multiple shared print collections across North America as well.

G

Gillian Harrison Cain 20:18

Something that I have talked about with groups of Atla members that I think might be unique is because there is this shared subject focus, there's a assumption or perception that there will be more overlap and collections, especially if you look across like a denominational aspect or something like that. Whereas if you're looking solely from a regional point of view, you might have institutions that are so different, that their collections may not necessarily align as well. And so, you know, I think that that they have a perception that it would be valuable for institutions and Atla, to come together as denominational focused, and possibly come together and participate in shared print at the same time, so that they are looking at that slice of a subject area across a denominational focus. But then I've also heard of library say, Well, I'm concerned to come in to share print, because if there aren't a bunch of other Methodist or Catholic or whatever kinds of institutions participating, that my retention commitments might be much more significant. because there aren't other institutions like mine, in the program, can you speak to those kind of the benefits of looking at it from that denominational slice, and also those concerns?

G

Glenn Johnson-Grau 21:36

I'm sure there are definite benefits of coming in kind of, especially the early the library's first coming in, in the cohort system. So us coming in with other Catholic institutions, University of San Francisco and other Jesuit institution, St. Mary's College, University, San Diego, so having those other Catholic institutions, even from different branches of Catholicism was was, was useful. As the pool gets larger, there's probably a little bit less of that. But again, as you said, there are going to be going on national and, and religiously affiliated institutions may not yet be particularly well represented, but a lot of the other areas of religion are going to be represented. So one of the things that we do is try to make sure that that titles are represented within or within the parameters of how we frame the retention model. So every library when it comes in either as a group as a part of court or individually, we basically make a retention model based upon what is already in there, and what what, what they will be asked to retain SCEL C libraries are almost all between the required retentions is between 20 and 25%. So it is not the majority of the

collection, individual libraries are, are allowed and support and actually encouraged to make additional retentions voluntary retention commitments. But that's what where the base is. And the way that we want to help people think about it is that yes, that is saying 20 to 25% of your collection, you would be expected to retain, but that means 75 to 80% of your collection, then becomes eligible for deeper review and possible D selection based upon your local needs. amount of space you have. And and but again, we're never saying that you have to withdraw this material, we're saying that these titles are already generally going to be represented in the in the in the shared print program.

G Gillian Harrison Cain 23:52

Pete, did you have any comments on that?

P Pete Zeimet 23:55

I think Glenn said it really well. If these projects generally become more and more valuable, the larger the more people who participate, the more libraries that participate. And you can imagine that when these were very new, you know, and you had two libraries or six libraries, I mean, our first shared print program. Who was it? I mean, they might have been Washington, research library Consortium. And, and that, you know, they were very conservative with their retention commitments. And they were they were making formal retention commitments on 50 60% of their collections. But that has evolved because more and more libraries are participating in these types of projects. So there's less of a need for a very few number of libraries to make formal retention commitments on so many titles. So now, I think the average is between 20 and 25%. And these would be titles that they would typically be keeping anyway, so it's not like a not like an extra burden. But, but yeah, that can happen. I mean, if you have one, say, say a group of four year public colleges and then a one dental school, you know, it's going Look like the dental school has a lot of rare materials, Well, not really rare. They're just they're just dental based materials. And the same would be true with certain denominations. If you have an Evangelical Lutheran collection or Catholic colleg, you know, there's going to be some variation there. And certainly as you have more and more libraries, in those denominations, it'll be a little bit more clear where you have when you have materials that are truly at risk, or if there may be just pertain to those those denominations, right. So. But as Glenn said, the fact that the body of these has grown to, you know, 20, some million formal retention commitments across the USA, that becomes less and less of an issue.

G Glenn Johnson-Grau 25:47

I'm going to tell me one thing, there's a great question done, but for Pete, to talk about,

that just came in. But one of the strengths of GreenGlass as a user, both for my institution and for SCELIC, is, it doesn't just show you what is retained, you know, the scarcity or the light, how widely held something is just within the program, it shows it at lots of that you can slice it lots of different ways. So you can look at by state, you can have peer, your self selected peer institutions that you're comparing your collection to, you can certainly do it across the the the share print program for us SCELIC, or you can do it across all of North America or worldwide. So you can really see that something maybe widely held, nor in North America, but very scarcely held in California or in the Shared Print program, and then make a decision both for your retention commitments and then own for your own library. I mean, when LMU was doing weeding projects has done the selection projects, we're looking to say, to see both, especially in our core focal focus areas that Jasmine, and Catholicism and California and Los Angeles, we're looking to see if those things are widely held anywhere, not just in the in the our program.

G

Gillian Harrison Cain 27:06

Thanks, Glenn. I think that that's a really important point to make, especially as we look at Atla being a national organization, and actually International, we do have members outside of the US. Because often the library down the street or the library, even within 100 miles of you doesn't look like your library in the Atla membership, your closest peer might be seven states away or in Canada. And so being able to look at that larger scale, I think is so important. And Linda, I'm sorry, I think I cut you off, I'll let you say what you were

L

Linda Wobbe 27:37

with a really good point. I mean, this idea that you can create your own compareur groups. And the current version of green glass allows libraries to choose six up to six different compareur groups in addition to our standard six. So that gives libraries a lot of flexibility. Graduate theological union, who is just finalizing the retention commitments as we speak, they created a competitor for Atla member libraries. So that was one of the ways. And then the other thing that I wanted to mention is we also have a competitor for a other retention commitments. So not just galax retention commitments, but retention commitments made by other libraries throughout other North American GreenGlass projects. So that's that additional level of security. And knowing somebody has made a retention commitment, that one isn't enough, really. But it's, it's, it's nice to be able to see the other retention commitments that are made. And, you know, this idea of a specialized library, we've got a couple of arts school libraries. And it turned out that really large libraries like the University of Southern California, or even the CSU use larger California State University Libraries actually had more art stuff than the specialized art schools. So it was like, well, it, you get to choose, you know, what you think, you know, if I'm a Methodist

school, there's a slice of Methodist materials I'm going to retake is going to be available locally. But there's, you know, that general religion, stuff that I may be collecting that's more widely held, historical material that I could rely on other libraries, owning and sharing with us that I have one thing to say about the resource sharing aspect of it one little thing. So, SCELCL also has a program of reciprocal free Interlibrary Loan that's limited just our members and so libraries that are participating in shared print. So shared print participants get to join our huge now. Well, it's 72 libraries. And it's all of our large libraries. And we use load balancing. So it gives an opportunity to participate in a pretty big reciprocal interlibrary loan. program.

G

Gillian Harrison Cain 30:31

Thanks, Linda. So Pete, I'm going to turn it over to you, I'm going to ask you to kind of do a 10,000 foot view of how green glasses used for shared print, and then asked you to delve into Greg's question about how green glass handles varying manifestations?

P

Pete Zeimet 30:46

Yeah, oh, let me I'll mention Greg's, because I might forget, if I wait, I'll get dressed Greg's first. So Greg, that's a really, that's a real strength of green glasses, I believe it's the only tool out there that will do this. But it's taking advantage of an OCLC coding called the work ID number. So it's able to identify work families. So you could have one of the examples I use in my demo is you might have, I don't know Huckleberry Finn, or something. Now, that really common work, it's maybe been republished multiple times. And you might have multiple versions of that title. Now, that's another form of duplication. And there could be good reasons to keep multiple editions or certain additions or you know, or rare editions. But what green glass can tell you is that it can identify, you know, here's where you have multiple additions of a title. And then you can decide what to do with that. For instance, in colleges and universities, you know, you could have an edition where one of your faculty members wrote up foreword in it, you know, you don't want to, you know, you don't want to leave that one. Or you might have a rare edition of a work of literature that might be good to keep. But in other cases, it's just another form of duplication. And it's really difficult for a library to find those on their own, because you can't just go by title, the different editions are going to have different ISB, ends and OCN. So it's a really valuable way to find leading candidates without really getting at unique content. But with that said, the high level view here is ultimately at GreenGlass, we will, there's a few core strengths, we take the library's data directly from their iOS, we're not working strictly from what's in W, Ms. Sorry, in WorldCat. And, and we do a lot of ETL work or data processing, the ETL stands for extract, transform load. So one of the strengths is that we're doing a lot of massaging and cleanup and normalization of

the data. And in turn, that produces much better match results. So you're getting a much cleaner, better, you know, sort of service. In the end. We're also then able to leverage the known holdings in WorldCat, which is the closest thing we have in the US to a union catalog. And, you know, we all know world cats not perfect, but it's it when you find out you have a title that might be only owned by five libraries in the US. Even if that under reports, the real number, maybe it's seven or eight, it still gives you a pretty good clue that this is an at risk, or a scarcely held title, as opposed to one that might be held by 300 libraries in the US. So you can kind of make your own decisions based on holdings, but we're leveraging are able to sort of get at that information from WorldCat. And that's ultimately what many academic libraries want to do is know where do they have rare materials, where do they have commonly held materials, and base a lot of their collection management decisions on that, even more than circulation, circulation becomes important, but more of a secondary component. I mean, you might keep a title that no one's ever checked out, if you know it's scarce, or even unique. And then I think the third point is that we have agreed less so this isn't a green glass demo, obviously. But the green glass has an interface that is optimized for all this work. For you know, doing queries, you don't have to know any, you know, SQL language. You don't have to know any programming. It's not like doing queries in your own iOS, it's really a point and click a very simple interface for doing powerful queries. Now on the shared print side, you get everything you get for an individual analysis. But we also have a whole set of screens and visualizations around the collective collection and seeing where libraries have overlap with each other and help you with model building, which is a little bit in the weeds for this conversation. But in other words, coming up with what criteria makes sense for your group to base your retention commitments. So yeah, there's kind of a big answer, but that's kind of a high level. I hope that kind of got what you were asking for Gilian.

 Gillian Harrison Cain 34:53

And no, that's great. So I think Glenn, if you can talk about kind of like how decentralized software and collect analysis happens, how does that translate into how the group functions together and the governance structure and what retention commitments look like and the Mo, you have those kinds of components.

 Glenn Johnson-Grau 35:15

For I'm Linda, I shred cannon, we'll jump in with some some on this as well, I think one of the advantages and killing you mentioned this at the very beginning of participating is with SCEL shared print is it's an existing program, you do not have to you meaning Atla, or you are an individual, Joel library does not have to figure this out on their own, the governance structure exists, mru exists, other libraries have gone through it and having

that, that that peer group of other institutions that have gone through the process is really valuable, whether it comes to, you know, loading data, or working with OCLC, which is really very helpful all the way along. They are they have trainers, they have people who basically are going to shepherd your project all the way through to get your data into the system, because it does require an initial load, and then an analysis to for that model building that Pete was just talking about. And then your institution has some time to look at the titles and make some determinations. Again, scalp is never saying you have to retain these titles in that model building part or in the retention development, then you have individual institution makes their their commitments for, as we said, usually 20 to 25% of their collection, plus any voluntary retentions that they would like to hold, and then you're locked in, I mean, then those are the titles that you're committed to retain. Obviously, titles, get lost, titles get damaged, and we have a system in place for you to be able to let us know when titles go missing and are, you're asked to take reasonable measures to replace titles that you're committed to retain. But each individual institution and literally each individual book is, is going to mean a different thing. And so you we have a way for you to report that a title that you had previously committed return to retain is no longer party. So all that is, is in place on the because we the our agreement that mlu is for a 15 year retention period. But that is for a fixed date of July 2032. So libraries coming in now have less than 50 years, because the program's already been going for a while. Another important way to participate in it is that we have a shared print committee, and we have representatives from lots of different libraries. So that's an opportunity. If your institution, if you or your institution wants to become more involved in SharePoint as part of scalp. It's not a huge commitment, but it's a good way to get to hear from other libraries talking about, you know, practical, procedural and, and, and process oriented questions, but really kind of thinking about shared print at the, at the as the North American collective collection. Our program is doing that too. And one of the ways that we do that is through the shared print Committee, which is part of SCELIC's regular committee structure.

P

Pete Zeimet 38:15

Glenn. If I could just jump in on something you said, I have a funny anecdote, which is about you know, libraries who make maybe, maybe some titles fall into the model for retention. But they might want to challenge that because something might have been lost or damaged or something like that. We had, I don't I no longer remember what library it was. But I remember the story. They had a whole bunch of materials in the technology, one of the technology, LC classes, and they had a real a lot of commitments, because they had a lot of rare materials. And they took a look at those and found that they were TV repair manuals from the 1950s. And the reason they have them is, you know, in an earlier iteration of the college, they were a community college who eventually sort of

evolved into a four year, a four year college. And so somewhere along the way, nobody ever weeded those they were no longer academically or programmatically relevant to anything they did. So they, they requested that they were they not be obligated to keep those titles. And of course, there's mechanisms for that sort of thing. But I just thought that was a pretty hilarious example.

G

Gillian Harrison Cain 39:19

That's great. So something that we hear a lot about from Atla members are space considerations. I think that's something that you mentioned earlier, Glenn, you know, I think a lot of our libraries are being asked to give up or repurpose their space. You know, whether that's for collaborative work to be done or something else is happening with that library space. You know, and especially in the pandemic is folks are looking to properly socially distance folks. But this has been a trend long before the pandemic. Many of our libraries having to think differently about space and unfortunately within our community, we've also had some libraries that are closing, or other libraries who are looking to collaborate with each other. And that might be that institutions are coming together to work in a different way. And so it seems to me that shared print is kind of a no brainer when you're looking at a community that that has the space considerations. And that these kinds of tools, and this kind of working together would help to preserve the scholarly record, which we know is so important to religion and theology, professors, they love that paper monograph to a large extent. And so they would like to know that that's going to be available to them, because so can you speak to that a little bit how this kind of program plays into those kind of space considerations that are really top of mind for so many libraries right now?

G

Glenn Johnson-Grau 40:51

Absolutely. So, as mentioned before, one of the, one of the strengths is, is that by going through this process and developing your through this iterative process of developing your local retention commandments, you're beginning the analysis that you would be getting be doing anyway, as part of any major weeding project. Again, 20 to 25% of your collection becomes those those commitments, but that opens up 75 to 80%. For for, for review. There are Yes, there are numerous issues that have to be dealt with. And I and I talked about and written about the issues related to the political issues of having a conversation with camp, your campus community and your faculty and your administration about withdrawing materials, I'm going to put a link in the in the chat for describing LMU sustainable, what we call our sustainable collection growth project, which was goes into a lot of detail about how we talked about it on our campus community. Because yes, a liberal arts college with a strong theology and philosophy collections we

have, we have constituencies that the thought of withdrawing a single book is anathema. Let's just put it that way. So but but those collections have those discussions have to be undertaken and can be done successfully, we have done so successfully. But the other thing about it is the power of GreenGlass lets you do so much analysis about what you where you can make good decisions. And so being able to look at your the totality of your collection and say, these are the areas which are core to our collection, we're going to focus on either through our retention commitments or voluntary commitments or things we're just going to keep anyway, focus on keeping those but back then opens up the analysis of the entirety of the rest of the collection where materials become dated and are no longer useful materials are our you know, we all have decisions that made sense in previous eras that no longer made sense. And you no longer need to keep that 1957 sociology textbook, and be able to do that and say, not only do I not want to keep this, but it is widely held everywhere else, I can very confidently for myself, know that I can withdraw it, but also make that argument to the campus community that this is well well supported this title, this title or this area can be pretty thoroughly reviewed on weak LMU engaged in a fairly consultative some institutions are basically we're going to decide and, and, and, and don't have that posture toward their campus communities, we've decided to have some level of consultation, and it was really successful. Being able to say to your campus community that you are part of a program, and you are collaborating with other institutions is greatly reassuring to administrators and to faculty that you're not they, they should trust us, but they trust more of us than us individually. And being able to point to the mlmu and the resource sharing and all those other things, the totality of the package is greatly reassuring to the campus community.

G

Gillian Harrison Cain 44:18

Thanks. And I just want to point out to folks that a little bit earlier in the chat, I had posted the link to this SCELC page where there's all sorts of information about the shared print program and there's an opportunity to fill out an interest form. If you are interested in talking with Linda or Glenn a little bit more and I'm sure Pete is always available to talk to you if you have questions specifically about green glass. I want to circle back to Jamie's question about control digital lending and how that is different or interacts with shared print.

G

Glenn Johnson-Grau 44:53

So right now very different but potentially more aligned moving forward. So control digital lending. where an institution does not lend so lends a digital surrogate of something in their collection by holding their print copy out of eligibility. So is basically you can't lend in print and digitally at the same time, but if you protected the copy from circulating, then it

becomes eligible for circulating digitally. Some of the biggest examples of this would be the the Internet Archive and their their collection, and then the hockey trust. ETS emergency is the emergency temporary access service collection that that ATI did at the beginning of the pandemic, where libraries are are doing that process of not circulating their print to allow their, their digital surrogate to circular scalp has not done anything officially related to this yet. But we are. There's a lot of interest in in that we did some recent polling of our members. And a lot of libraries are interested in seeing that connection. And again, this gets to the whole research showing the intersection of the shared print collection. The traditional itll resource sharing both kind of a mixture of digital and is fully digital resource sharing model is something that I think a lot of libraries are looking at and shared print. Makes sense, because there is that that collection and and the collaboration and relationships related to these other topics should help us to be able to talk about controlled digital lending as well.

G

Gillian Harrison Cain 46:41

Great, thanks, Glenn. And Pete, I was wondering if you could address Greg's question around perspective on the value of shared print to a library that has recently gone through a construction project, and doesn't face collection space limitations in the near to mid range feature? And how lucky you are, Greg, but I'll let Pete address your question. Well, it's

P

Pete Zeimet 47:02

a great question, really, I mean, as I've traveled around, I've talked to hundreds of libraries, your it's very difficult to a lot to find a library that doesn't have some space issues of some sort or need to weed. However, it sounds like in your case, you might have just gone through that. So at least for a while, you might be good to go. But certainly a project would help you uncover more information about your collection that you might not have known, you might find some candidates that you can withdraw that you didn't know you could and frankly, you know, weeding even without space considerations and space concerns is a best practice in our profession. It's good for the it's good for the users, not just who are browsing the stacks, but also in your online catalog to not have so many extra, you know, records in there that maybe aren't relevant anymore. But there's a lot of other uses of GreenGlass that I mean, we weeding D selection, responsible dispensation, I've heard a lot of language for that. Some of it's a little political, but that is certainly far and away the most common use case and preservation and shared print and so on. That is sort of part and parcel of the same idea. But why is it found a lot of other really exciting and valuable ways to use GreenGlass data for, you know, in their libraries, for instance, learning how distinctive their special collections really are. They have special collections

or maybe a rare book collection that and they might have built it thinking that these are, these are really scarce. rimmed glasses can help confirm that yes, indeed, these are quite scarce. Or maybe the opposite that you know, 50% of your rare book collection is actually titles that are held by more than 200 libraries in the US, maybe they don't really need to be in the rare book collection. Or another really fun one is finding a rare addition of something you didn't know about in your in your collection. And new to me, nobody can spend, you know, time running every title through WorldCat to see how common or rare it is. But as I've done analysis with various libraries, every library will have these, you know, works of literature, and they have a really rare edition they didn't know of in their collection. That's pretty exciting to find. But another thing, libraries are using the data for finding digitization candidates if they have digitization projects, or sometimes it's not so much about weeding, but just about moving materials around. So you might take some titles and move them to your mobile shelving or to off site storage, you're not actually leading them or getting rid of them. But you might be you know, just optimizing some of the space in your, you know, your main library, for instance. So really a number of different. One library even told me that they've used some of the discoveries of bring less to help build their annual reports, or their Dean used it in fundraising conversations. That's a real example. So that one's kind of fun, too. So there are, we have seen a lot of libraries, finding other creative and valuable uses which reading, you know, reading we know is important, but it's not always very fun. So some of these other uses can be a little bit more exciting.

G

Glenn Johnson-Grau 50:14

I would add to that, that any library that does that, and this makes some sense, especially related to denominational or specialized libraries, is looking to see the compareur with your other institutions for your own benefit as a collection development tool, in addition to a deselection or retention tool to be able to say, Okay, these, this other library, that is my peer, or my aspirational institution has more or strengthen these particular areas, or my library has strengthened these particular areas that could be sheerly for your own local needs. But it can also lead to greater collaborative collection discussions, you know, including up to true collaborative, you know, true collaborative collection development, where you are focusing on a particular area and letting another institution focus on another area moving forward with your collection.

L

Linda Wobbe 51:10

If I can pop in here, what, and to also make retention commitments on behalf of the scholarly community to be part of a shared prep program, you can identify those materials that you would be retaining anyway. And, and make a retention commitment,

make it official in WorldCat. And, and be part of this effort to ensure that materials don't disappear. And one of the things about control digital lending, of course, there has to be a digital equivalent. And so many publications that are in our libraries have no digital equivalent at. And if you explore those materials, between what is it now 1925, and 97, is a huge number. And in a specialized denominational situations where the small publishers, specialized publishing, that haven't had the funds, or other types of wherewithal to digitize those materials. So we're relying so much on the print. I think one of my fears is, you know, all the libraries that are saying, well, all new acquisitions are going to be electronic, and what are we going to share with each other? So I think that that's one one thing that I would hope that people would be motivated to participate in this effort.

G

Glenn Johnson-Grau 52:58

Just one thought on top of Linda's, that, again, there has been so and then we hear this in SCELCL as well. And in the CSU says, Okay, we're gonna depend on the big research libraries to retain these materials. Those libraries have so little of these specialized religious material. And all I know all your members know that and but we, it's, it becomes really obvious whenever you do an analysis that these titles are not being held in California by the UCS, they're being held by SCELCL Members.

G

Gillian Harrison Cain 53:32

I think that's really important to note, what you're talking about in terms of electronic versions of these copies. In the religion and theology, subject area, many publishers actually aren't publishing ebooks now. And print is the only way that those titles are available. I would, I would say that ebooks are still a relatively new phenomenon for many of the publishers in this subject space. And so I'm thinking about making certain that Atla libraries are working together to preserve that scholarly record of this material, that it's so important. And that's where it starts to be a little bit more about the community and a little bit less about just your institution. And so I think that's why we keep talking about does it make sense for a group of Atla libraries to go through this process at the same time, because then you'll be looking more across your peers, who might have those titles from publishers that, you know, haven't made electronic copies available, or are just now getting into ebooks and in recent years, and so I think that that's, you know, thinking about it at that larger collective level is really interesting. So I noticed that we are coming quickly up on the hour This is flown by, but has been such a lovely conversation. And so I want to offer an opportunity for any of our attendees who might have Question, to go ahead and throw that in the chat, I am going to put the link to where you can find more about the SCELCL shared print program, and Atlas, libraries participants into the chat there. So that if you are interested in learning more, he certainly can do that you can

reach out to the folks here at Atla. You can reach out to Pete if you're more interested in green glass. And I'm sure, Linda and Glen would welcome you completing that SCEL C interest form, and they can work with you if we have additional questions there. I'm not seeing the chat bubbling up with any questions. So I just want to thank Glen and Linda for Pete for being a little bit creative and how we approach to this webinar today. It does look like we've got one question here. How is the ease of access to materials maintained, if those within the group we'd materials based upon the idea that non-group libraries have a lot of copies retained and are in distant locations, for example, shared group on the east coast and not on the West Coast or in a different country.



Glenn Johnson-Grau 56:09

There is definitely collaboration between the shared print programs. The shirt with a partnership for shared book collections is the national organization or North American organization it is trying to collaborate. A lot of this is working right now figuring out how to make best practices within individual programs. And and also collab making greater collaboration between those programs. But as Linda said, the fact that GreenGlass shows retention commitments anywhere is helpful and making sure that a title and even it is not currently, retention commitment in your local Consortium, or your local program doesn't mean that you can't see that it is not retained somewhere else. But as again, as Linda said, one copy is not enough. So we need to be able and we are actively working both Linda and I serve on on, on on partnership, working groups and committees trying to build that redundancy and figuring out some of it is research to figure out how many copies are necessary to safely preserve a title or a particular monograph in the in the North American regional picture. So that's part of this too is we don't have all the answers yet. But people are lots of people are actively working on this together.



Gillian Harrison Cain 57:33

Thanks so much for that answer, Glenn. All right. We are one minute over the hour. So I'm going to abruptly end and say thank you all for attending. And thanks to Pete and Glenn and Linda for participating. And again, get in touch with any of us if you do have questions about participating in this shared print program. Thanks so much. Bye