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• Collective collections
• OCLC Research: Understanding the Collective Collection
• Collective collections & monographic shared print
• Futures: Evolving scholarly record & stewardship of collective collections
• Impact & questions for academic consortia
Collective collections

Collective development, management, and disclosure of collections across groups of libraries at different scales

Aggregate collection of distinct materials held across collections of a group of institutions.

Combined holdings of a group of institutions, with duplicate holdings removed.
Looking “above the institution” …

- Networks of collaboration and coordination
  - Decisions taken in system-wide context
  - Focus on resources of “system” (digital curation, shared print, shared discovery, …)

- Collective collections increasingly important:
  - Activities/services extend across collection boundaries
  - Growing interest in gathering and exposing aggregate library resource
  - Optimize system-wide supply and demand

- Key part of collaborative library environment
OCLC Research & collective collections

- Understand characteristics of collective collections at variety of scales: size, distinctiveness, distribution …
- Provide evidence base & intelligence to aid strategic planning, policy & service development
- Detect patterns and trends in the scholarly and cultural record
- Powered by WorldCat
OCLC Research:
Understanding the Collective Collection

Understanding the Collective Collection: Examples

Not Scotch, but Rum: The Scope and Diffusion of the Scottish Presence in the Published Record

Brian Lavole
Research Scientist
OCLC Research
Shared print
Right-scaling Stewardship

- Explore regional-scale cooperative print strategy from:
  - Institutional (OSU) perspective
  - Consortial (CIC) perspective
- Based on shared, centrally managed collection & network of local collections
- Analysis based on WorldCat data
- Findings …
  - Do not necessarily reflect intentions of OSU or CIC
  - No recommendations; evidence base to inform strategic planning
  - Specific to OSU/CIC; patterns of analysis of broader interest

http://www.oclc.org/research/activities/right-scaling.html
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## Bilateral overlap

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State or Institution</th>
<th>% of OSU's Print Book Collection</th>
<th>% of Comparison Institution Book Collection Also Held by OSU</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Michigan</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>Purdue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illinois</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>Nebraska</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chicago</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>Penn State</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wisconsin</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>Mich State</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indiana</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>Iowa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minnesota</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>Northwestern</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iowa</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>Indiana</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Penn State</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>Minnesota</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michigan State</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>Illinois</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northwestern</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>Michigan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nebraska</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>Wisconsin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purdue</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>Chicago</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

OSU vis-à-vis CIC

CIC vis-à-vis OSU
## Comparison to CIC collective print book resource

% of local collection held by at least 1 other CIC member

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th># of Books</th>
<th>Overlap w/CIC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PURDUE</td>
<td>0.9m</td>
<td>0.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEBRASKA</td>
<td>1.2m</td>
<td>0.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IOWA</td>
<td>2.1m</td>
<td>0.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MICH STATE</td>
<td>2.0m</td>
<td>0.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PENN STATE</td>
<td>2.1m</td>
<td>0.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NORTHWESTERN</td>
<td>2.0m</td>
<td>0.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>OHIO STATE</strong></td>
<td><strong>2.7m</strong></td>
<td><strong>0.83</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INDIANA</td>
<td>3.0m</td>
<td>0.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MINNESOTA</td>
<td>2.9m</td>
<td>0.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WISCONSIN</td>
<td>3.9m</td>
<td>0.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ILLINOIS</td>
<td>3.8m</td>
<td>0.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MICHIGAN</td>
<td>3.9m</td>
<td>0.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHICAGO</td>
<td>4.1m</td>
<td>0.76</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Uniqueness/scarcity is relative*
OSU: Rare & core print book assets

- **OSU’s “core” print book asset** (~400K books)
- **OSU’s “rare” print book asset** (~1 m books)

### Total # of CIC holdings
- **4 to 7:** 30%
- **3 or less:** 38%
- **8 to 10:** 18%
- **More than 10:** 14%

Percent of OSU collection
CIC: Rare & core print book assets

- 3 or less: 76%
- 4 to 7: 16%
- 8 to 10: 5%
- More than 10: 3%

CIC’s “rare” print book asset (~9.4 m books)
CIC’s “core” print book asset (~400K books)

Total # of CIC holdings
Percent of CIC collective collection

Scale adds scope and depth
Print Management at “Mega-Scale”

Characteristics and implications of a North American network of regional shared print book collections

- Regions common scale in shared print
- Regions operationalized using mega-region concept

North American print book resource: 45.7 million distinct publications
889.5 million total library holdings
Char-lanta

5th largest collection by # of publications: 10.2 million
3rd largest collection by # of holdings: 60.1 million

Covers 22% of publications in North American print book resource
Includes more than 700K publications unique to Char-lanta
Intra-regional stewardship

Char-lanta

43% of ASERL members located in Char-lanta mega-region
• Account for 31% of regional print book inventory
• Monographic preservation program limited to less than half of ASERL would secure almost a third of regional print book holdings
• What about the other two-thirds? Coverage requires cooperation

UNC Chapel Hill alone holds 25% of titles in Char-lanta regional collection – but is it solely responsible for stewardship of this resource?

Broadening cooperative infrastructure enables broader distribution of stewardship
ASERL/WRLC collective collection

~50 libraries spanning four mega-regions

9.36M print book publications; 44M holdings
ASERL/WRLC print book collective collection

~75% held by less than 5 libraries in group

Scale adds scope & depth

Compared to WorldCat ...

~15% held by less than 5 libraries in WorldCat

Scarcity is relative
Futures: The evolving scholarly record & stewardship of collective collections
Scholarly record: Evolutionary trends

**Formats shifting:**
Print-centric to digital, networked

**Boundaries blurring:**
Articles/monographs, but also data, computer models, lab notebooks, blogs, e-mail discussion, e-prints, interactive programs, visualizations, etc

**Stakeholder roles reconfiguring:**
New paths for the scholarly communication “supply chain”
Stewardship of the scholarly record

Key characteristics impacting stewardship …
- Increasing volume of content
- Increasing diversity/complexity of content
- Increasing distribution of custodial responsibility

“local copies” of scholarly record becoming increasingly partial
Speculations …

• Changing stewardship models
  – Distributed (beyond traditional collecting institutions)
  – Specialized (not everyone can collect everything)
  – Collective collections: fundamental principle of stewardship

• “Conscious coordination” more important
  – Cooperation at margins → cooperation as core strategy
  – More explicit stewardship responsibilities
  – Cooperative infrastructure; policy & “trust networks”
  – Data is key:
    • Support both local & cooperative decision-making
    • Virtual aggregation via data & service layers

• Collective collections as shared resource, services, shared infrastructure, robust cooperative arrangements
... and raising questions

• Can academic consortia support coordinated collective collection management and access?
  – e.g., shared print, enhanced ILL

• Should consortia deepen collaboration with other regional partners?
  – e.g., non-member academics, public libraries

• Should consortia extend collaboration to include other consortia?
  – “Right-scaling” cooperation
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