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WEST Refresher

What we do

Collaborate across the western regional United States to build a shared, retrospective print collection of journals.

Our objectives:

- Preserve the scholarly print record through distributed retention commitments and targeted consolidation of journal holdings
- Provide access to retained materials
- Create opportunities to reallocate library space

How we do it

- **Analyze** our collective serial holdings using WEST’s custom-built decision support tool, AGUA, to identity titles for retention
- **Target our effort and resources** based on risk for loss of content:
  - Higher risk titles are physically validated and consolidated in optimal storage environments
  - Lower risk titles are retained in-place as they are
- Explicitly **record** the retention in the local metadata for the titles; **disclose** what has been retained internally to WEST members and through public registries
- Provide tools for local decision-making and comparison against WEST-retained titles
- **Collaborate** with the wider community to develop policies, practices, and technology that support the responsible management of our collective
Who we are:
Membership update

66 institutions west of the Mississippi
• 6 Archive Builders
• 33 Archive Holders
• 27 Non-Archive Holders
  o 5 Past members who remain Archive Holders
Archiving Progress

Cycle 8 Archiving
FY2018/2019
Disclosed Spring 2019

Total Unique Titles:
Bronze: 454
Silver: 769
Gold: 786

Cycle 9 in Progress
Disclosure in Spring 2020

Total Archiving

Total Unique Titles:
Bronze: 15,318
Silver: 7,425
Gold: 7,076
Total: 29,819 titles
What’s left to archive

What’s been archived:

Total Unique Titles:
- Bronze: 15,318
- Silver: 7,425
- Gold: 7,076
- Total: 29,819 titles

What’s left to archive:

Total Journal Families:
- Bronze: 670
- Silver: 3,369
- Gold: 16,987
- Over 25x more than Bronze
AGUA Development Update

• Phase 4 highlights
  – New holdings ingest process and location review
  – Local call number added to reports
  – Enhanced journal family matching
Thank you to testers!

- Christina Hennessey
- John De La Fontaine
- Wen-ying Lu
- Nancy Hunter
- Richard Jackson
- Andy Kohler
- Greg Yorba
- Susan Boone
- Denyse Rodgers
- Carol Boyse
- Deborah McCarthy
- Vitus Tang
- Deborah Kulczak
- Sion Romaine
- Natalee Vick
- Debra Spidal (x3!)
- Ryan Finnerty
- Marcia Barrett
- Jodi Haire
- Lynne Grigsby
- Jian Wang
- Allison Yanos
- Joel Smalley
- Karl Pettitt
The Vision: To ensure the preservation and availability of print journal literature.

The Mission: To collaboratively develop, manage and coordinate the identification, retention, registration, discovery of and access to a shared, distributed collection of print journals in the United States.

Member Programs
- BTAA
- EAST
- FLARE
- Scholars Trust (ASERL & WRLC)
- WEST
WEST and Rosemont

What happened in 2019
• Decision support service explorations
• Reciprocal retentions
• Last Copy Agreement & Transfer Guidelines
• OCLC/CRL Mellon-funded grant to enhance shared print infrastructure (registration, shared print API)
• Rosemont-retained title analysis

What’s coming up in 2020
• Last Copy Initiative
• Decision support service and analysis
• Shared policies (metadata, validation, condition)
• Collaboration with other programs like the Partnership for Shared Book Collections
• Expanding communication
QUESTIONS AND COMMENTS
Overview
Key findings
Next steps

2019 WEST PROGRAM ASSESSMENT AND STRATEGIC PLANNING
Assessment and strategic planning as an ongoing, collaborative process

Questions, comments, reactions at any point throughout
Past Program Assessments
(supported by Phase 2 grant funding)

2014 Program Assessment
- Member Survey
- Disclosure Audit
- Evaluation of Member Fees

2014 Strategic Planning
- Collection model and analysis adjustments
- Business model adjustments to reach sustainability
- Potential new services

2016 Program Assessment
- Member Survey
- Disclosure Audit

Themes:
- Value of WEST
- Areas for change to the current program
- New directions and services

Themes:
- Value of WEST
- Satisfaction with existing services and possibilities for change
- New journal archiving services
2019 Program Assessment

Instruments

**Member Survey**
- Value of WEST
- Membership satisfaction & areas for change
- Potential new services

**Focus Groups**
- Archive Builders
- General

**Analysis Projects**
- Deselection
- What’s left to archive
- Membership fee structure

*Not looking at disclosure rates this time around...*
Timeline

January – June: planning

June – July: survey

August: focus groups & analysis

September: report writing

October – November: review & strategic planning

December - January: finalize recommendations & engage WEST members on results and recommendations
2019 Assessment – Key Themes

• Value of WEST
• Membership Satisfaction and Areas for Change
• Potential New Services
• Archive Building
Assessment

- Value of WEST
- Co-investment
- Communication
- Existing Services
- Access
- Disclosure
- Deselection
- Collections Model
- Potential New Services
- Archive Building
- What’s Left to Archive

Findings (brief)

Preservation is most important objective to members
- Membership type and total collections expenditures are relevant criteria for cost share
- Members favor active communication
- Active archive creation, collections analysis, and collection comparison reports rate as the most important services
- Members generally view WEST archives as “just in case” / Lack of clarity around lending/borrowing guidelines and practices
- Disclosure in national registries is most important in the long term
- Deselection from Silver and Gold categories appears to be gradually increasing
- Members value distribution of archive
- Digitization remains important potential new service to members, but the primary work of archiving should not be impacted
- Further distribution of Archive Building may be valuable
- Ongoing storage is less of a concern than maintaining metadata
- There are areas of the archiving guidelines and policies that should be expanded or refined

Strategic Recommendations

1. Articulate vision, mission, and guiding principles
2. Restructure website
3. Allow Bronze archiving to slow, consider new ways to expand collective archiving efforts
4. Recruit 2-4 additional Archive Builders
5. Working group to explore expanding WEST’s scope beyond journals
6/7. Maintain WEST’s budget; establish a program reserve fund
8. Reissue WEST’s cost share; convene Member Advisory Group to provide input and oversight
9. Review and revise WEST’s borrowing, lending, and lending statistics guidelines
10. Review and revise WEST’s disclosure and validation standards
Findings – Value of WEST
Most importantly because we are committed to the preservation of the print record.
- Director, Non-Archive Holder

We strongly support this kind of collaborative collection management/shared print. It is central to how we expect to make lesser used journal content available to our users in the future.
- Primary Contact, Archive Holder

Preservation was the most commonly cited reason for participation, but space planning, the importance of collaboration and shared responsibility, and access were also commonly cited reasons.
WEST’s three primary objectives continue to be extremely or very important to members, but preservation remains the most important of those objectives.

Most importantly because we are committed to the preservation of the print record.
- Director, Non-Archive Holder
Members continue to value WEST and most responding Directors (96%) indicate that they are likely to be members three years from now.
Findings – Member Satisfaction and Areas for Change
Based on the value gained, members reported feeling that their fees are:

- Just right: 48%
- A little high: 26%
- High: 7%
- I don’t know: 19%
- Low: 0%

Time & resources devoted to WEST activities based on value gained:

- Just Right: 71%
- Low: 7%
- I don’t know: 11%
- A little high: 7%
- High: 4%
Co-investment

- Current cost share model: IPEDS Total Library Expenditures define how members are categorized into tiers
- Criteria of most interest per the survey – type of membership and library materials expenditures
- Survey comments and focus group discussion also indicated:
  - The type of institution is of interest as well (R1, etc.)
  - There may be a disconnect between how members are categorized into types and members’ desire to participate

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Suggested Criterion</th>
<th>Overall Rank</th>
<th>Total Respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Type of membership (full vs. supporting)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library materials expenditures</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institution FTE enrollment</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total archived titles retained at the institution</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Communication**

Shared print is something we talk about to show how we are thinking and acting at the network level rather than in isolation. Faculty are most interested in access, so that is what we focus on, but we also talk about the savings from shared print initiatives and how they will allow us to expand access while reducing costs. -Primary Contact, Archive Holder

We have done little to push notices about shared print. We have posted blog posts/news. Would like to hear how others do this. -Primary Contact, Archive Builder

“Other”/what else would members like to see?
- Annual financial statements
- What other libraries are doing to maximize membership
- Generally, making metrics and statistics more findable for WEST
- How many libraries are contributing to WEST archives and how many volumes are contributed
- Improved WEST usage statistics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Metric</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total titles archived for WEST</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policies developed and implemented to ensure the effective management of the collective collection</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of titles archived locally for WEST</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demonstrated advocacy in the broad print management community</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of titles or items withdrawn on the strength of WEST commitments</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linear feet reallocated</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total volumes archived for WEST</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of volumes archived locally for WEST</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We don't draw on any metrics</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total comprehensive runs archived for WEST</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of comprehensive runs archived locally for WEST</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How often WEST archived materials are loaned or borrowed</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other - Write In</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I don't know</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Please rate the importance of the following WEST services and reports

- Regular collections analysis to determine which print journals should be archived next and by who
- Active archive creation at six storage facilities in our region
- Annual Collection Comparison Reports to help my library safely deselect print journals
- Creating opportunities to collaborate with other shared print programs (e.g. the Rosemont Shared Print Alliance)
- On Demand Collection Comparison Report functionality to allow my library to generate “on the fly” comparisons between local...
- Facilitating journal-related services with other organizations (e.g. registration services with OCLC and CRL)
- Relationship building and facilitating archiving as a shared activity among WEST member libraries
- Gap-filling opportunities through the JRNL (Journal Retention and Needs Listing) tool

- Very Important/Important
- Moderately/Slightly Important
- Not Important
- I don't know
Select the statement that is most true. "For our institution, the value of access to the WEST archives is..." (N =46)

- Primarily based on a “just in case” model
- Primarily based on immediate need
- Fairly even balance of “just in case” and immediate need
- I don't know

How WEST could consider better supporting future access needs (common open response answers):

- Improve **discoverability** of WEST titles (including where libraries can see shared print retentions and ensuring holdings data is clear and up to date) (4)
- **Improve documentation**, expectations, and, potentially, mechanisms for borrowing/lending (4)
- Reciprocal or free lending (3)
- Pursue digitization of shared print titles (2)
Deselection

✓ 83% of respondents report either having deselected in the past two years or planning to deselect over the next 2-5 years.
✓ Only 9% of respondents indicated that they plan to complete deselection over the next 2-5 years.
✓ About 80% of respondents report taking WEST archives into consideration when deselecting (16% do not and 5% do not know)
  ✓ For those who do take WEST archives into consideration the vast majority are not taking archive type into account (Bronze)
✓ The majority of those comparing to WEST archives are finding the content they wish to deselect has been archived
✓ The most important criteria in deselection is electronic access
Deselection

Analysis of WEST deselection statistics from Cycles 2-7 indicate:

 ✓ The majority of deselection, where specified, falls under the archive type Bronze (titles preserved in Portico, CLOCKSS, JSTOR)

 ✓ Deselection falling under the archive types Silver and Gold is gradually growing

 ✓ Ratio of volumes to titles has decreased over time (early deselection of “low hanging fruit” and common, long runs)
Disclosure

Where should WEST archives be recorded 10 years from now?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>OCLC WorldCat</td>
<td>80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CRL PAPR Registry</td>
<td>64%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The JRNL retention and needs listing tool</td>
<td>49%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A WEST-managed archived titles report</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I don't know</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other - Write In</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In an amendment to the WEST member agreement</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I think the efforts that are being made to register retention commitments at OCLC is a good step, however that information needs to be available at the ILL and public WorldCat level… -Primary Contact, Consortium
In principle, WEST members agree that it is important to distribute the archives.

However, members do not believe that the majority of WEST members have an obligation to serve as archive holders (85%).

Members remain satisfied with intentional in-place retention (low risk material retained in open stacks).

Less than half of members think that all shared print should be stored in closed stacks.
## Collection Model

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Future of Bronze archiving</th>
<th>Count (n=46)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Maintain current collection model and allow Bronze archiving to slow</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expand the content categorized as Bronze by deprecating what is currently considered Silver</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seek additional copies of Bronze journal families within the WEST collaboration</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I don’t know</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
What’s left to archive?

Analysis

✓ WEST has made significant progress in archiving Bronze and Silver journal families in the membership
  ✓ WEST could “finish” Bronze in the next two cycles
  ✓ What next?
✓ Some Builders are coming to the end of their Silver journal families as well
✓ WEST has archived a great deal of the medium-high overlap journal families in the membership; the majority of the remaining journal families are Gold with overlap of 10 or fewer copies across WEST
Findings – Potential New Services
Digitization continues to appeal the most to members as a possible new service

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potential new service</th>
<th>Overall Rank</th>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Total Respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Digitization of print-only titles</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prospective shared print (e.g. leveraging common, active</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>subscriptions to retain runs through the present)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A system for verifying Bronze archives</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

When discussing potential new services, participants in both general focus groups reaffirmed the primacy of “Archiving more titles” as WEST’s core activity and one that should not be adversely impacted by the pursuit of other projects.
Please select the following statement that is most true:

- Our institution subscribes to 0-100 print journals: 28%
- Our institution subscribes to 100-500 print journals: 39%
- Our institution subscribes to 500+ print journals: 24%
- I don’t know: 9%
Findings – Archive Building
Value of Serving as an Archive Builder

We absolutely believe that our participation in the WEST Trust increases our effectiveness for our local efforts to make scholarly works available for the long term. We would be doing this work anyway, but we believe that we are more effective by being an Archive Builder in terms of both our own local holdings, as well as contributions to this larger community.

✓ Value associated with WEST’s three primary objectives: preservation, access, opportunities to reclaim space
✓ Reviewing local holdings in detail and building complete runs of journals
Capacity over the Next 3-5 Years

Archive Builders anticipate being able to maintain their current capacity for the next 3-5 years – both in terms of physical storage capacity and the staffing resources necessary to engage in this work.

The per volume subsidy supported by WEST member fees continues to be an important aspect of how Builders resource the significant work that goes into building validated, complete archives of higher risk titles.
Looking into the Future

✓ Builders see potential value in recruiting additional institutions to serve in the same capacity
✓ Ongoing maintenance of the physical archives is less of a concern than maintaining and disseminating associated metadata
✓ Currently, borrowing requests for WEST materials is manageable and Builders express an ability to adapt to increased borrowing if they continue to be able to manage access according to their local policies
✓ WEST’s supporting documentation for archiving is a valued resource, but we have reached a point where review and updates are advised
✓ Builders are open to receiving last or scarce copies they do not already own
Assessment Thanks

All WEST members who have made this possible by completing surveys over the past 10 years, submitting annual statistics, contributing their time in 2019 focus group discussions, and generously sharing feedback with the project team.

The WEST Executive Committee and Operations and Collections Council members who guided 2019 assessment. Members of the governance groups engaged in many a discussion, reviewed multiple drafts of instruments and reports, and tested instruments (and then participated in the survey and/or focus groups!).
Strategic Planning – Outcomes
The WEST Executive Committee and Operations and Collections Council met in-person in Oakland, CA

- Program history and reflection
- Assessment findings discussion
- SWOT analysis
- Recommendations
Themes

✓ Resilience / flexibility / adaptability
✓ Visionary
✓ Value
✓ Collaboration and the Collective
✓ Trust
Recommendation 1: WEST should develop a distinct vision statement, mission, and guiding principles that acknowledge WEST’s regionality and highlight its commitment to collaboration at the network level.

   **Recommendation 1a:** Convene a working group of project team staff and governance committee members to develop these components for review with the membership.

**Recommendation 2:** Assess and update WEST’s website, curation of documentation, and communication strategies. Pursue migration from the current California Digital Library-structured site to a more standalone WEST-branded site.
Recommendations – Archiving and Collection Model

**Recommendation 3:** In the near term (Cycles 10/11, extending through spring 2022), allow Bronze archiving to slow.

**Recommendation 3a:** Prioritize development/analysis to surface Silver and Gold titles that are invisible because they are not held by any of the six Builders.

**Recommendation 3b:** Seek out, assess, and tag as appropriate, Bronze titles that have been ‘elevated by stealth’ - that is, Bronze that has received validation at the level of Silver or Gold.

**Recommendation 3c:** Compare WEST Bronze titles against holdings in other shared print programs to determine overlap and uniqueness, with consideration that unique titles may need additional validation work, even if they are Bronze.

**Recommendation 3d:** Explore mechanisms that signal and create space for a more expansive and flexible model of archiving participation (taking into account both the framing of new models and incentivizing or refining existing models).

**Recommendation 4:** Recruit 2-4 additional members to participate in Cycles 10 & 11 analysis as Archive Builders.

**Recommendation 5:** Convene a working group to take up the question of expanding WEST’s scope to include non-journal formats (analog or digital) and/or to collaborate with non-journal shared print programs.
Recommendations – Business Model and Financial Stability

**Recommendation 6:** Maintain WEST’s baseline annual budget of approximately $800,000 to continue to support existing program activities and scope. Any new projects or improvements are supported through buffer funds or reallocation of existing funds.

**Recommendation 7:** Pursue the development of a program budgetary reserve.

**Recommendation 8:** Reassess and reissue WEST’s cost-share model based on inputs gathered from the 2019 assessment and internal analysis.

**Recommendation 8a:** Convene an advisory group of WEST members to review and provide input on new approaches to WEST’s cost share model. Development of models will still sit primarily with the Executive Subcommittee for Membership.
Recommendations – Policies and Practices

**Recommendation 9:** Convene a dedicated working group to review and revise, as necessary, the WEST borrowing and lending documentation and lending statistics reporting practices.

  **Recommendation 9a:** Include members of the OCC as leaders for this working group and seek wide participation from WEST members.

**Recommendation 10:** Convene a dedicated working group to review and revise as necessary the WEST Disclosure Policy and Validation Standards.

  **Recommendation 10a:** Include members of the OCC as leaders for this working group and seek wide participation from WEST members.
Getting involved...

Expressions of interest – email anna.striker@ucop.edu.

Full charges and estimated time commitments forthcoming.
Thank you!
Please stay in touch with your questions and feedback.

https://cdlib.org/services/consortial-partnerships/west/

Alison Wohlers
WEST Program Manager
alison.wohlers@ucop.edu
510-987-0095

Anna Striker
WEST Shared Print Operations and Collections Analyst
anna.striker@ucop.edu