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Michigan Shared Print Initiative (MI-SPI)

Overview

In 2011, the libraries at Michigan’s publicly-supported universities sought to devise a way to share collections among themselves. As facilitator and fiscal agent, MCLS brought together 15 libraries to identify titles that are commonly-held but little-used. Participating libraries used serv Collection Services (SCS) to identify such titles in their respective individual collections. The pilot project continued through April 2013. Because of its success, the program li
History and Background

Guiding principles:
- Decisions be data driven
- Guarantee 24 hour delivery of materials
- Coordinate acquisitions to eliminate all but the most critical duplications AND Maximize local budgets
- Commitment by senior administration

Second Steps:
- Hired SCS for collection and usage analysis
- Per library set-up fee, plus .03 per bibliographic and 20% Group Project Charge
- MOU signed summer 2013 just 6 months into the project
MOU (Memorandum of Understanding) Patterned after Michigan Shared Print Initiative (MI-SPI)

Elected to create two addenda to the MOU to deal with specific and unique issues related to ILL and acquisitions

Goals of the Collaboration

First, to responsibly reduce the size of local print collections by **reducing duplication** 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 as well as other libraries.

Third, to **coordinate acquisitions** with the goal of developing a “shared collection” among the participants to reduce duplication, leverage acquisition funds, and to reduce the frequency for the necessity to do data refresh.

Fourth, establish an environment where exploration and development of **additional areas of collaboration** can flourish (e.g., technology, etc.).
- **Other Elements**
  - Ten year agreement
  - Governance
  - Provisions for release from the agreement and addition of new members
  - Outline of responsibilities for and ownership of the collections.

- **Acquisitions Addendum**
  - Acquisitions Taskforce
  - MARC 583
  - Maximum of 2 holdings/title
  - Common vendor

- **ILL-Delivery Addendum**
  - ILL-Delivery Taskforce
  - 24 hour delivery
  - common ILL practices i.e. 10 week loan period
Step 1: Data-Driven analysis of participant libraries’ collections

- Sustainable Collections Services analysis of CI-CCI bibliographic records and circulation history.
High level view of the group data

- 1,069,926 Unfiltered bib records
- 1,048,251 Filtered bib records
- 526,526 Unique bib records
# Uniqueness of CI-CCI Shared Collection (not very!)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>WorldCat Counts - US - Specific Edition</th>
<th>Title Holdings</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2 Unique in the US</td>
<td>2,804</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 2-4 Holdings in the US</td>
<td>7,327</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 5-9 Holdings in US</td>
<td>10,822</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 10-19 Holdings in US</td>
<td>19,452</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 20+ Holdings in US</td>
<td>1,007,213</td>
<td>96%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 50+ Holdings in US</td>
<td>953,539</td>
<td>91%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 100+ Holdings in the US</td>
<td>875,579</td>
<td>84%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 200+ Holdings in the US</td>
<td>728,019</td>
<td>69%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## CI-CCI Overlap
### Based on SCS Matching

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Overlap within the 5 CI-CCI member libraries</th>
<th>Title Holdings</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2 Unique in group</td>
<td>526,526</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Title-holdings in 2 libraries</td>
<td>280,360</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Title-holdings in 3 libraries</td>
<td>154,351</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Title-holdings in 4 libraries</td>
<td>68,681</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Title-holdings in all 5 libraries</td>
<td>18,333</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Holdings and Usage Levels Compared

Number of Title Holdings

Average Uses per Title-Holding
Scenarios (multiple factors):
Calculating the opportunity
Numerous Scenarios Considered, involving:

- Recorded uses (circulation and other)
- Publication and/or acquisition date
- Holdings within the CI-CCI group
- Other holdings in Iowa (statewide, UNI, IPAL)
- Retention commitment within the group
- Equitable distribution of retention commitments and withdrawal opportunities
Scenario Chosen by CI-CCI Group

- Published before 1991
- Zero recorded uses since 2005
- At least 1 non-CI-CCI library in Iowa also holds an edition
- Retain 1 title-holding within the group
Step 2: Develop Retention Lists

- Each school needs to verify that they have the items on their assigned retention list (INVENTORY)

- CI-CCI agreed to complete by Aug. 2014

- An interactive database was developed by Drake.

**Round 3 - Scenario 2**

- Published < 1991
- Keep 1 title holding within CI-CCI
- Zero recorded uses since 2005
- At least one non CI-CCI library in Iowa also holds the title (any edition)

*This allocation method maintains a consistent withdrawal and retention ratio for all member libraries. Other allocation methods are possible, but no library can withdraw more than their number of Eligible Title Holdings.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Eligible Title Holdings</th>
<th>Allocated Withdrawals</th>
<th>Allocated Retentions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Central</td>
<td>56,426</td>
<td>29,992</td>
<td>26,434</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Drake</strong></td>
<td><strong>97,149</strong></td>
<td><strong>51,637</strong></td>
<td><strong>45,512</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand View</td>
<td>31,906</td>
<td>16,959</td>
<td>14,947</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grinnell</td>
<td>98,129</td>
<td>52,158</td>
<td>45,971</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Simpson</td>
<td>44,930</td>
<td>23,881</td>
<td>21,049</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>328,540</strong></td>
<td><strong>174,626</strong></td>
<td><strong>153,914</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Progress

Total Progress

74986 / 144619

Progress By Institution

Central

23643 / 24740

Drake

37614 / 38471

Grand View

9103 / 14511

Grinnell

0 / 46754
About CI-CCI

The library directors of Central College, Drake University, Grand View University, Grinnell College and Simpson College announced the formation of the Central Iowa Collaborative Collections Initiative (CI-CCI) in the summer of 2013. The directors signed a Memorandum of Understanding to formalize the initiative. The group met again in early August to begin to develop print retention scenarios.

CI-CCI has four immediate goals:

First, to responsibly reduce the size of local print collections by reducing duplication 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 titles to ensure that circulating copies of them are retained within the group.

Third, to coordinate acquisitions with the goal of developing a shared collection among the participants to reduce duplication and to leverage acquisition funds.

Fourth, to establish an environment where exploration and additional areas of collaboration can flourish.

By launching this shared print initiative, each library can free space for more pressing local and institutional needs such as student study space, learning commons, classrooms, etc. A key component of this initiative is a focus on developing a shared collection development approach to allow the participants to make better use of acquisitions dollars. For many items it will eliminate the need to duplicate book purchases within the group since the collections will be shared. This will allow the libraries to offer a greater depth of materials. Additionally, the collaboration lays the framework for more targeted future collaboration among the participants.
The Simpson College Experience

- Opportunity: space & academic resources
- True collaboration: openness, input, planning
- Commitment: funding & staff
- Shared print: saving, loaning, withdrawing, adding
Future Considerations & Issues

- OCLC Shared Print Retention symbol
- Discovery (GACs and WorldCat Local)
- Process for Bringing in New Members
Decision to Register Retention Titles with OCLC

- CI-CCI has decided to record retention titles with OCLC.
- Each school will get a second OCLC code. Drake’s would be: IOD-sp.
- ILL ramifications: would necessitate a second ILLiad satellite license for the second OCLC code. And, of course, workflow issues.
- Benefits: Ease of identification of retention titles, easy to add to this list as we acquire unique items.
Cooperative Collection Development: Considerations

- Workflow issues (e.g., Common vendor)
- Format (print books only, ebooks only, combination?)
- Patron Driven Acquisitions
- Subject Specialization by institution?
- Budgets
Issues

- Disparity in members’ size and budgets
- When to re-fresh the data given cost ramifications
- Ensuring that all members adhere to the tenants of the MOU in both spirit and practice
- Method for determining group leadership roles
- At what point does the group need, and how to pay for a “Project Manager”
Discussion

- Questions
- Comments