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• The Big Shift - *why shared print, why now?*
• Emerging infrastructure - *shared repositories*
• Shared print service provision - *opportunities, challenges*
• Minnesota in perspective - *maximizing MLAC value*
What once made us great no longer matters

Declining return on assets
Brand loyalty on the decline
A workforce that’s lost its passion
Fewer leaders, with a precarious hold on the top
Digital infrastructure is driving change

Sound familiar?
A ‘Big Shift’ in attention, resources
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Academic libraries in the large-scale regional libraries announced as W. Mellon Foundation-West. The grant is about university librarian at the

Designed to save works for several years consortia took part in planning partners inclu

OCLC has an interesting role here. It provides infrastructure, or a platform, which supports a large network, or networks, of libraries. This shared capacity removes the need for multiple explicit bilateral or group agreements: libraries benefit from the network OCLC facilitates as they participate in its services. So libraries participate to share the effort of cataloging, to make other libraries’ collections available to their users, or to share question-answering capacity. Because of the number of libraries participating, OCLC, libraries, and others, can leverage the power of this network for discovery, collection analysis and other services. For example, OCLC can provide access to the library network for users of Google Book Search. It provides access to the network as a service.

I have been reading Networks, crowds and markets by David Easley and Jon Kleinberg. (OK, to be honest,
Shared Print: what’s the problem?

Shift in scholarly attention from print to electronic means low-use retrospective print collections are perceived to deliver *less library value*

Competing demands for *library space*: teaching, learning, collaborative research vs. “warehouse of books”

Among academic libraries, a *shrinking pool of institutions with mandate, capacity* to support print preservation

As transaction costs for managing legacy print collections decrease, libraries will seek to *externalize print operations* to shared repositories.
Shared print is a prime example:

a core operation that is moving “outside” institutional boundaries

University of California
Orbis Cascade
WEST
CIC
Hathi Print
CAVAL, UKRR, JURA etc.
Active portfolio of work since FY2007:

  - ~70M volumes in storage; further capital investment unlikely
- Policy requirements shared print repositories (2009)
  - critical need: disclosure of print preservation commitments
- Leveraging infrastructure: MARC21 583 Action Note (2009)
  - copy-level retention, condition statements are required
- Cloud-sourcing research collections (2010)
  - mass digitization of monographs accelerates shift to shared print
Aggregate off-site capacity has increased exponentially
+ 70 million volumes

Derived from L. Payne (OCLC, 2007)
“No room, no room” in MLAC (and elsewhere)

Total contributions from UMTC

From other contributors

Derived from MLAC Statistical Overview, 2010.
Projected growth of HathiTrust Digital Library

June 2010 - June 2020

- Growth in volumes
- Growth in titles

- Harvard University Library in constant 2008 volumes
- Library of Congress in constant 2008 volumes

OCLC Research. June 2010
Of 68 storage facilities identified in Payne (OCLC, 2007):

- 2 are visible in WorldCat today: UC NRLF & UC SRLF
- Proxies: CRL, LC?

Among 9 ASERL storage collections profiled in 2004:

- 80% of monographic titles held in a single storage facility

Titles in ‘shared print’ collections

- More widely held
- Less widely held
Shared Print value proposition(s)

1) Ensures long-term survivability of ‘last copies’ and low-use print journals and books

*Extension of traditional repository function; limited motivation to subsidize*

2) Enables reduction in redundant inventory for moderately and widely-held titles, facilitating redirection of library resources toward more distinctive service portfolio

*Strategic reserve provides a hedge against disruption in the marketplace, rapid fluctuations in scholarly value & function of print; provides tangible value to participant*
Emergence of large scale shared print and digital repositories creates an opportunity for strategic externalization of traditional repository function

- Reduce total costs of preserving scholarly record
- Enable reallocation of institutional resources
- Support renovation of library service portfolio
- Create new business relationships among libraries

A bridge strategy to guarantee access and preservation of long tail, low use collections during ongoing p- to e- transition
Shared infrastructure: books & bits

25 years  +70M vols.
15 months  +5M vols.

Will this intersection create new operational efficiencies?

For which libraries?

Under what conditions?

How soon and with what impact?
A global change in the library environment

Academic print book collection already substantially duplicated in mass digitized book corpus

June 2010
Median duplication: 31%

June 2009
Median duplication: 19%

OCLC Research. June 2010
A mirror of the academic print collection

Distribution of Titles in HathiTrust Digital Library by Subject and Copyright Status (June 2010)

N = 3.64M titles

C. Malpas Cloud-sourcing Research Collections (OCLC, 2010)

Foreshadows a shift in humanities scholarship?
An opportunity and a challenge

>50% of titles are ‘widely held’

>80% of titles are in copyright

An opportunity to rationalize holdings, but…

library print supply chain will be needed for some time

OCLC Research. June 2010
Mass-digitized books in print repositories

~75% of mass digitized corpus is ‘backed up’ in one or more shared print repositories

~3.5M titles

~2.5M

Mass-digitized books in Hathi digital repository

Mass digitized books in shared print repositories
Within the next 5-10 years, focus of shared print archiving and service provision will shift to monographic collections

• *large scale service hubs* will provide low-cost print management on a subscription basis;

• *reducing local expenditure* on print operations, *releasing space* for new uses and facilitating a *redirection of library resources*;

• enabling *rationalization of aggregate print collection* and *renovation of library service portfolio*

Mass digitization of retrospective print collections will drive this transition
Shared print service provision . . .

WHAT WILL IT TAKE?
Shared Print provision: capacity varies

OCLC Research. Analysis based on HathiTrust and WorldCat snapshot data. Data current as of February 2011.
Comparison of Potential Shared Print Provision Options for NYU Bobst Library (June 2010)

- ReCAP: 29% titles duplicated
- UC NRLF: 30% titles duplicated
- UC SRLF: 36% titles duplicated
- Union of Shared Print Providers: 59% titles duplicated

C. Malpas Cloud-sourcing Research Collections (OCLC, 2010)
Or, reconfigure resource to maximize value

NYU Bobst Titles Duplicated in ReCAP Partner Libraries & Hathi

C. Malpas Cloud-sourcing Research Collections  (OCLC, 2010)
UMTC could provide just-in-case print fulfillment for almost 30% of titles in the HathiTrust Digital Library.

OCLC Research. Analysis based on HathiTrust and WorldCat snapshot data. Data current as of February 2011.
738,556 MSU Mankato (MNM) holdings in WorldCat; 1.2M volumes

~213K duplicated in HathiTrust Digital Library

Represents at least 1.9 miles of library shelving @ MSU

[not held by UTMC]

OCLC Research. Analysis based on HathiTrust and WorldCat snapshot data. Data current as of February 2011.
Management Perspective: How Much is Enough?

Shared Print service must deliver
- Space recovery equal to “one floor” at outset
- Volume reduction equal to X years of print acquisitions
- Cost not to exceed current storage options
- Minimize (visible) disruption in operations

*If management of mass-digitized monographs could be externalized to large scale providers today:*
  - average space recovery of 20,000 ASF per ARL library
  - cost avoidance of ~$1M for new storage module
  - cost avoidance of $1M per year for on-site management
Staff Perspective: What’s Good Enough

Shared Print service provision must equal or exceed

- Turnaround/delivery from local storage (<2 days)
- Local loan period
- Local access/availability guarantee, ability to recall etc
- Discoverability of local resource

Local retention mandated when title held by <10 libraries

No one mentioned . . .

- Home delivery option ➔ direct to patron
- Acceptable loss rate ➔ repository viability
- Penalties for late return ➔ impact on other clients
A small number of repositories may suffice for ‘global’ shared print provision of low-use monographs.

Generic service offer is needed to achieve economies of scale, build network; uniform T&C.

Fuller disclosure of storage collections is needed to judge capacity of current infrastructure, identify potential hubs.

Service hubs will need to shape inventory to market needs; more widely duplicated, moderately used titles.

If extant providers aren’t motivated to change service model, a new organization may be needed.
Example 1: MLAC as collection of record

One of 26K volumes MSU Moorhead has deposited in MLAC

- a relatively scarce edition, 13 holdings in WorldCat
- 17 editions published between 1910 and 1960, a ‘popular classic’
Example 1: MLAC as collection of record

Available in full-view from HathiTrust

- Satisfactory surrogate for at least some use cases
- May reduce demand for MLAC copy, improving chances of survival
- Retain in MLAC as state-wide preservation asset
Example 2. MLAC as surrogate print source

One of the 800K titles UMTC has on deposit in MLAC

- this edition held by more than 2000 WorldCat libraries, including 33 in MN
- low network demand; 42 WCRS requests since 2007, none in Minnesota
Example 2. MLAC as surrogate print source

In copyright, search-only version available from HathiTrust

- end of the value chain?
- not quite . . .
Example 2. MLAC as surrogate print source

• searching in this text can tell me if the book is really the one I want

• restores a level of browsing access

MLAC can offer partner libraries the opportunity to winnow local holdings safely, for thousands of low-use titles delivering real value to library network

• can moderate ‘just checking’ demand from MLAC, keeping operational costs down
Shared print in perspective . . .

LOCAL CONTEXT
The next few years are critical

Where is the regional infrastructure to support this change?
Diversity of educational mandates

Academic Libraries in Minnesota

- Less than 4-year: 35%
- Bachelor’s: 27%
- Master’s: 20%
- Doctor’s: 16%

Less reliant on traditional library infrastructure

Circulation per FTE student is on a decline

Declining ROA?

A long term, system-wide trend

US Academic Library Expenditures vs. Total Spending on Post-Secondary Education

- Aggregate US Spending on Post-Secondary Education
- US Library Operating Exp. as % of Ed. Spending


$6.8 billion in 2008
Shift in provision of higher education

Distribution of Post-Secondary Educational Institutions in the United States by Source of Funding

Increasing privatization of higher education

Academic Libraries in Minnesota by Control & Funding

Public  Private

- 2000: 52% Public, 48% Private
- 2004: 52% Public, 48% Private
- 2006: 44% Public, 56% Private
- 2008: 43% Public, 57% Private

Higher Education funding cuts in 43 States
$370M cut in higher education spending for FY12-FY14

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>University of Minnesota</td>
<td>-44,606</td>
<td>-44,606</td>
<td>-89,212</td>
<td>-89,212</td>
<td>HF 130 Conference Committee Report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minnesota State Colleges &amp; Universities</td>
<td>-47,921</td>
<td>-47,921</td>
<td>-95,842</td>
<td>-95,842</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal - Higher Education</td>
<td>-92,527</td>
<td>-92,527</td>
<td>-185,054</td>
<td>-185,054</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Basic Care Services - Additional 1.5% Reduction</td>
<td>-3,786</td>
<td>-4,370</td>
<td>-4,370</td>
<td>-4,370</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MLAC ~3% of MINITEX budget</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Impact on MINITEX?

http://www.house.leg.state.mn.us/fiscal/files/11HF130.pdf
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Moving forward: maximizing MLAC value

Leverage MINITEX ‘brand’ as resource-sharing partner to build confidence in MLAC as regional source of surrogate supply

- *FY10 saw decline in request activity; might centralization of (some) supply help reduce overhead?*

Life-cycle costs of managing print in MLAC less than a third of costs on campus

- *Is total value of MLAC collection being realized?*

MLAC serves diverse clientele of HE, public and private libraries, some of which may opt to ‘outsource’ print management services

- *Will an existing partners help model a new set of behaviors?*
A closing thought

If we don’t demonstrate a little backbone

*developing shared print solutions*

the future of legacy print may look something like this

*A swift end of life*

*or a scandalous spectacle?*
Thanks for your attention.

Comments, Questions?

Constance Malpas
malpasc@oclc.org