What’s Your Why?

Questions posted to group:
1. What helps or hinders your library’s ability to make local decisions based on what’s been retained?
2. How does shared print fit into your overall strategy for local collection management?
3. What role do you envision for shared print in local collection management moving forward?

Please add your thoughts below or in the chat directly:
- I believe it's useful to help us identify any potential unique titles and also to determine when we might be able to safely free up some space.
- ISSN is often an imperfect match point, as title changes and cataloging practices can result in ISSN not providing a direct one-to-one match to a specific title.
- Gap analysis for serials titles can be challenging as institutions can vary in enumeration standards and practices. (and binding)
- Constantly changing staff makes it difficult to ensure that retentions are honored and that the local collection needs don’t change - we rely on shared print programs to be able to maintain promised holdings
- Concerns about physical condition of retained copies
- Concerns about complete contents of retained copies (e.g., missing/damaged issues within bound journals)
- Safe to discard = if in trusted digital repository. Our library would be happy to donate any print serials to fill gaps in established shared print initiatives.
- Would like to know if retained item is in open or closed stacks (secure environment with environmental controls) -- same for onsite Vs offsite collections
- We currently consider shared print a long-term commitment that we will support up to x percent of collection space. When that space is reached, then we will not be able to retain other titles
- How does the increase in electronic journals affect this tool and journal retention?
- With increasing cost of “Big Deals” does it make more sense to rely on shared print and ILL?
- It will be great to combine this tool with the shared print best practices work currently underway, so we can interpret what a specific retention commitment means in detail
(e.g., requirements for physical condition, validation, storage conditions, availability for ILL, etc.).

- For Q2: We consider local print repositories as part of our weeding strategy. If we can obtain article from local institution who has committed to shared print program, we withdraw our copy
- Identify print holdings that are available as e and can be purchased as e-backfile
- Identify print holdings that are not widely held for commitment in shared print program, move to more secure location and take additional preservation measures
- Decisions on withdrawals are made more difficult by not being able to compare print and e holdings as they frequently have different issns.
- Here’s an issue locally, and I’m curious if other institutions have this: My limited understanding is that cataloging practice on “title changes” can vary- so we have one library at our institution that tracked several title changes, while another didn’t… so our records didn’t even conform in our own system. :S (<- not a cataloger)
  o We didn’t have that issue specifically, but we do have different journal/serial families described in different ways (i.e. one family on one record vs. each new title on its own Bibliographic record) within the same local system. Point is, you are not alone :).

Q&A

1. Does the first report include the PROGRAM name or just the archiving/retaining library?
   a. Answer: It does contain the program name (whatever is in 583F)
2. Are there limits in the number of records you can submit to the system for comparison?
   a. Answer: Upload files up to 1G, which may be up to 500,000+ rows in a csv file with 2000 characters each row
3. For ISSN- Is there a preference of Print vs EISSN, and/or are they both searchable?
   a. Answer: Believe the default is print ISSN, but will verify with the tech team.
4. Can you share the webinar beyond the PAN listserv?
   a. Answer: It will be shared via PAN, but we also plan to post it on our representative websites. Attendees can also email Amy, Alison or Heather to get it too.
5. How do you envision the community helping to guide this work beyond these webinars?
   a. Answer: We really want to provide an ongoing activity of facilitating a conversation and sharing knowledge. Webinars are the first step. We will also be reaching out to the community to find testers for the tool.
6. Follow up to #3. Assuming just one ISSN per row, right?
   a. Answer: That is correct.
7. How current will the data be?
   a. Answer: This is still being worked on in deployment and development that will influence how up to date the data is, but in general you can think about it in regards to how up to date PAPR currently is (on-going submissions).
8. How do OCLC and ISSN work in the report?
a. Answer: If there is an OCLC number and it matches on that, it moves on. If it does not match or there is not one included, it moves to ISSN.

9. Will CRL or the project be tracking any data on uniqueness vs. retained/archived titles in order to give the larger community a sense of “what’s left”?  
   a. Answer: The initial tool will not store data but the tech team is discussing the potential of this but there are concerns with storing data.
   b. From chat: Maybe libraries could choose to opt in or out of sharing their data as part of submitting it?

10. Will the report include any high-level summary data (e.g., X% of your library's titles are not included in any participating program/repository)? I could imagine that data being kept by the CDL/CRL/HT team without much concern about privacy issues.
    a. Answer: At this time we do not have a report that exists like this, but it is an interesting idea to discuss more with the teams.