



A brief overview of the findings of a survey about the potential for extending UKRR into monographs.

By Theo Stubbs: November 2018

# Contents

|                                                                                                      |    |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----|
| A BRIEF OVERVIEW OF THE FINDINGS OF A SURVEY ABOUT THE POTENTIAL FOR EXTENDING UKRR INTO MONOGRAPHS. | 0  |
| EXECUTIVE SUMMARY .....                                                                              | 2  |
| TENTATIVE RECOMMENDATIONS FOR THE SHAPE OF A UKRR-M. ....                                            | 5  |
| FINDINGS OF THE SURVEY .....                                                                         | 8  |
| DEMOGRAPHICS OF RESPONDENTS.....                                                                     | 8  |
| USE OF CLOSED-ACCESS STORES .....                                                                    | 8  |
| COLLECTION OVERLAP BETWEEN INSTITUTIONS.....                                                         | 8  |
| INTEREST IN POTENTIAL MODELS FOR A UKRR-M .....                                                      | 8  |
| IMPORTANCE OF THE VARIOUS BENEFITS POTENTIALLY ACHIEVABLE THROUGH A UKRR-M .....                     | 9  |
| ACCEPTANCE OF POTENTIAL FINANCIAL COSTS FOR A UKRR-M .....                                           | 9  |
| INSTITUTIONAL SUPPORT FOR A UKRR-M.....                                                              | 9  |
| CURRENT DESELECTION PRACTICES.....                                                                   | 9  |
| HOW CAN DIGITAL SURROGACY SUPPORT A UKRR-M? .....                                                    | 10 |
| CURRENT ISSUES WITH HOLDINGS DATA .....                                                              | 10 |
| RECOMMENDATIONS FOR PREPARATORY WORK FOR A UKRR-M .....                                              | 11 |
| APPENDIX 1 - SURVEY INSTRUMENT .....                                                                 | 12 |
| APPENDIX 2 - FULL LIST OF RESPONDING INSTITUTIONS .....                                              | 24 |

This report is a much-condensed version of *An extension of UKRR into low-use monographs: does appetite exist?* by Theo Stubbs.

This work is licensed under the Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License. To view a copy of this license, visit <http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>.

# Executive Summary

During June and July 2018, the author, working on behalf of UKRR (UK Research Reserve - a national journal deduplication project), surveyed senior academic library staff about practice and attitudes related to collaborative management of monographs. The work wished to understand whether there was appetite and need within the community for an extension of UKRR into monographs, what would be the desired benefits of such a project, and whether the idea of 'rareness is common', first suggested by Malpas & Lavoie (2016)<sup>1</sup> and applied to the UK research collections, is starting to be accepted across the community. This condensed version of the full report explains the findings of this survey, and uses this to make some recommendations about the potential shape of a mooted UKRR for monographs, as well as recommending some necessary pieces of work.

Listed below are the key findings of the report:

## **1 There is appetite within the community to extend the UKRR project into monographs.**

There is more appetite among RLUK (Research Libraries UK - a consortium of research libraries) than non-RLUK libraries. This is from both from the self-selecting nature of the sample (25 RLUK respondents, 17 non-RLUK), and from responses to survey sections which imply greater positivity (e.g. stronger interest in all the models, more likely to have management support) and greater need (e.g. existing complex storage arrangements, and a greater acceptance of costs).

## **2 However, this appetite is theoretical, and cannot yet be considered commitment.**

There is a need for further information to get academics, senior university management, and library decision makers on board. There is thus a need to do a few pieces of work: surveying academics, creating interim guidelines defining collections and scarcity to ensure that nothing rare is thrown away, analysing potential models to get a clearer understanding of what the benefits and costs might be, and doing further overlap work.

## **3 This preparatory work needs to clarify a range of aspects of a shared collection.**

74% of libraries indicated they were unsure whether they would be willing to pay costs, and so the type of costs involved need to be clarified. There was some difference between RLUK and non-RLUK libraries, suggesting that RLUK libraries are more likely to accept financial costs for other benefits, such as improved preservation and access to better collections. Thus,

---

<sup>1</sup> Malpas, C., & Lavoie, B. (2016). Strength in numbers: the Research Libraries UK (RLUK) collective collection. Retrieved from <http://www.oclc.org/content/dam/research/publications/2016/oclcresearch-strength-innumbers-rluk-collective-collection-2016.pdf>

clarification is needed of the benefits, scope, aims, and mechanics of a shared collection in order to balance this against the costs.

#### **4 There is an acceptance of rareness is common - with caveats.**

There is growing acceptance of the idea that rareness is common (i.e. that overlap among collections is less than expected), with 67% of respondents agreeing or strongly agreeing, and this acceptance is slightly stronger among RLUK libraries (72%). However, 83% of respondents believed more work around overlap needs to be done to understand whether rareness is indeed common, and to get a deeper understanding of the situation across the UK.

#### **5 There is no clear preference for a particular model of collaboration.**

The survey ascertained the opinions on five different common models of collaboration, and all of them had similar levels of interest (around two thirds of respondents in each case). This implies that the solution is to develop a model, before offering it to the community. This will not be of unanimous interest, but should be of sufficient interest for at least a pilot project. This report proposes a hybrid national solution, combining shared storage and a shared collection.

#### **6 There are some potential benefits which should be considered non-negotiable in the development of a model.**

The benefits that the community saw as most important were collaboration for the common good (88%), improved interlibrary loan (83%), other (i.e. not for collection growth) library space use (83%), improved holdings data (81%), access to larger collections (79%) and improved preservation practices (74%). Any model needs to consider and incorporate these benefits.

#### **7 Even with the context of 'rareness is common', space continues to be a critical consideration for many libraries.**

The general acceptance of this term does not appear to affect libraries attitudes towards their space, with 79% of respondents needing to release space regardless of whether it transpires that this statement is factual. The issue of space manifests itself in a reliance on closed-access storage space.

#### **8 Deselection is extremely complex.**

The survey looked at deselection along the axis of publication date, but this is only one of many criteria used. However, it is a useful marker to consider what is likely to be submitted (or not) to a shared collection or to shared storage, and allows the focus of any UKRR for monographs to be 20<sup>th</sup> century monographs. There should be promotion and guidance to encourage scarcity checking.

#### **9 Improving holdings data is of utmost importance.**

This not only includes upgrading older records, but also ensuring that information such as the currency of data and retention statuses are available on the NBK so libraries have more data

points that they can use to guide decision making. Better data will allow for greater trust in any collaborative solution.

**10 The National Bibliographic Knowledgebase (NBK) is going to be key to the success of any UKRR.**

A vital cornerstone of UKRR will be the NBK. Something that was not a finding, but has been an implicit assumption of this work, is that the British Library, with their space and their expertise, are a vital partner.

# Tentative recommendations for the shape of a UKRR-M.

In a 2012 paper, Kieft and Payne<sup>2</sup> define nine attributes of shared print agreements, described below, with the descriptions verbatim from the original paper, with a brief and tentative recommendation for a UKRR-M.

## **Selection - How materials are identified or chosen for the shared print collection. Examples: by publisher, by individual title nomination, by presence in storage facility.**

### *Shared collection*

- Material submitted based on the deselection/relegation criteria of the contributing library.
- This is likely to be 20<sup>th</sup> century material, and the submission of this should be encouraged.
- Partner libraries mandated to submit anything at risk of permanent deselection.

### *Shared storage*

- Material submitted based on the criteria of the submitting library.

## **Location - Centralised or decentralised location(s), in high-density facility or campus library space, required environmental conditions.**

### *Shared collection*

- Three copies kept for posterity, at least one held at Boston Spa, with two further held either at a designated holding library or at Boston Spa, at the holding library's discretion.
- Multiple copies in a central store brings down stewardship costs as low as possible.
- Fewer copies to be retained if a trusted, nationally accessible, digital surrogate is held, e.g. in HathiTrust

### *Shared storage*

- Submitted material held at the British Library's Boston Spa site

## **Validation - Level of review for completeness and condition.**

### *Shared collection*

- Initially, libraries to submit lists of materials and the British Library to check and send retention information.
- Everything certain for disposal can then be disposed, and everything else sent for retention.

---

<sup>2</sup> Kieft, R. H., & Payne, L. (2012). Collective Collection, Collective Action. *Collection Management*, 37(3-4), 137-152. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01462679.2012.685411>

- Some material would need further checking before potentially being disposed, the emphasis would be on doing as much as possible at the submitting libraries to avoid a bottleneck at the British Library.
- Non-members encouraged to offer scarce material they are deselecting to the collection.

#### *Shared storage*

- Validation is not a necessary step in submission to shared storage, although the submitting library has a responsibility to ensure it is sending what it claims to have sent.

### **Disclosure and Discovery - How and where the shared print status of materials will be identified, and what mechanisms will be provided.**

#### *Shared collection*

- Retention status entered into the 582 field.
- Information on submission date of data available through NBK.
- NBK as main discovery system, with members potentially having a shared collection catalogue built into their own discovery systems.

#### *Shared storage*

- Materials discoverable through owning library's catalogue and through NBK.

### **Access and Delivery - What access and delivery services will be provided from the shared print materials, and to whom.**

#### *Shared collections*

- Contributing libraries will have preferential access to material, according to current BL delivery standards and at a new delivery-to-owner rate.
- Institutions can lend this material according to standard institutional circulation policies.
- Requirement to standardize delivery across all holding and partner libraries.
- Non-contributing libraries can request material according to standard ILL terms.

#### *Shared storage*

- Owning library received material according to current BL delivery standards and the new delivery-to-owner rate.
- Non-owning libraries continue to request this material as standard ILL material.

### **Retention - Commitment to time period to retain (most important). Often 25 years.**

#### *Shared collections*

- Reviewed at 25 years to assess whether infrastructure at that time could mean that there is a need to hold fewer copies.

### *Shared storage*

- Unnecessary, except if material held by the owning library in BL storage is actually also part of the shared collection, in which case it is subject to retention as above.

## **Ownership - Who owns the shared material.**

### *Shared collections*

- The partner library transfers ownership and all three copies become owned by the shared collection.
- This is a permanent change of ownership, submitting libraries cannot request the return of material. .

### *Shared storage*

- The submitting library maintains ownership, except anything they store which is actually part of the shared collection.

## **Business Model - What costs are supported by the participants and how divided.**

### *Shared collections*

- A membership fee pays for stewardship, and a reduced delivery-to-owner fee pays for the delivery of shared collection material.
- Non-members pay standard interlibrary loan costs.

### *Shared storage*

- Libraries pay rent for the space they require, based on BL pricing for public good.

## **Governance - How decisions will be made in the future.**

- The whole project will use similar auspices to the current UKRR, with a centrally managed project and a project governing board.

# Findings of the survey

## Demographics of respondents

- 25 RLUK and 17 non-RLUK libraries responded, giving 42 responses.
- Responses came from all regions of the UK, with the exception of Northern Ireland, with most coming from London and the South East (7 each).

## Use of closed-access stores

- A large majority (83%) of libraries are already using closed access storage.
- Current storage usage is more complex at RLUK libraries, with there being a greater inclination to having multiple storage spaces.
- A slight majority of respondents (52%) deliver items from storage in under 24 hours, and 12 institutions in 24-72 hours, the latter being broadly in line with current British Library interlibrary loan delivery times.

## Collection overlap between institutions

- 67% of respondents accept the idea that rareness is common, but there is still a need for further work to be done.
- RLUK libraries primarily saw a need for studies with a larger group, and non-RLUK libraries primarily saw a need for studies including a broader group.
- Institutions have already started doing work on collection overlap, but this is often small scale, only in its initial stage, and the breadth of types of work done suggests a need for guidance.
- Space remains an important concern, with a minority of libraries able to retain (45%) or grow space (12%) if rareness is common proves to be correct.

## Interest in potential models for a UKRR-M

- There are similar interest levels in each of the models suggested in the survey<sup>3</sup>, with around two-thirds in each case indicating interest or strong interest, and slightly stronger interest in each model from RLUK than non-RLUK libraries.
- However, improving bibliographic data was of interest or strong interest to 90% of respondents, meaning it is a crucial aspect of any UKRR for monographs.
- Although the responsibility of a UKRR for monographs should be a national solution, and to these ends, a hybrid model of national shared storage and national shared collections is proposed, there were some pockets of interest in local collaborative solutions.

---

<sup>3</sup> The models offered were national shared collections, national shared storage, local shared collections, local shared storage, and shared subject collections.

- National shared collections and national shared collection were simultaneously of most interest to RLUK libraries (76% and 72%, respectively) and of least interest to non-RLUK libraries (47% and 41%, respectively).

## Importance of the various benefits potentially achievable through a UKRR-M

- There is a group of six benefits that more than 30 of the respondents considered important, and are non-negotiable deliverables of a UKRR-M. These are collaboration for the common good (88%), improved interlibrary loan (83%), other (i.e. other than for collection growth) library space use (83%), improved holdings data (81%), access to larger collections (79%) and improved preservation practices (74%).
- There were, unsurprisingly, some benefits of greater interest to RLUK than non-RLUK libraries, and vice versa. An example of the former was space for collection growth (72% to 47%) and an example of the latter was improved interlibrary loan (94% to 76%).

## Acceptance of potential financial costs for a UKRR-M

- The majority of respondents (74%) were only maybe prepared to pay costs. On the other hand, many libraries indicated that they would be prepared to pay particular types of costs.
- The types of cost most frequently likely to be acceptable were a membership fee (69%) and an increased spend on interlibrary loans (52%). RLUK libraries were also prepared, in most cases, to pay stewardship costs (68%) and rent for storage space (52%).

## Institutional support for a UKRR-M

- A slight majority of libraries (52%) would have the support of senior university management, although support is stronger among RLUK libraries (68%). Those that were unsure primarily indicated a need to deliver a business case with strong benefits and to ensure it aligned with institutional priorities.
- 62% of respondents said they were unsure if they would have the support of academics. This indicates a clear need to consult with them prior to any work taking place.
- Libraries indicated that there was a lot more that they also needed to know, including but not limited to: costs, commitment, aims and scope, and benefits.

## Current deselection practices

- Although publication date is certainly not the only criterion on which items are deselected, there is a clear split in terms of whether institutions consider items for

deselection, a shared collection, or shared storage along the lines of age, with 20<sup>th</sup> century material far more likely to be a candidate for deselection or relegation.

- Only 43% of respondents were doing any scarcity checking at present, and so support needs to be available about best practice in terms of this type of activity to ensure that collections are not put at risk.
- Only 2 libraries that deselect do not have any dialogue with academics around deselection. This means that the fact that deselection is going on should not be a surprise, and that institutional communication channels will exist to manage this.

## How can digital surrogacy support a UKRR-M?

- Checking for digital surrogacy is done in a small majority of cases (52%), with a greater proportion of non-RLUK libraries (68%) doing this than non-RLUK (44%).
- The most trusted digital source, considered so by 32 respondents, was availability as an institutionally owned ebook, indicating a lack of trust in other alternatives.
- It is necessary to promote and clarify the potential role of HathiTrust. Only 29% of respondents considered this a trusted surrogate, but it has the potential to be useful.
- There is a need for work around long-term preservation of digital sources and in improving publisher and supplier formats and policies.

## Current issues with holdings data

- Respondents wanted to have access to some additional datapoints, most frequently retention information and information about the currency and reliability of data.
- There are significant issues with data quality at most UK institutions, primarily inadequate records, varying practices, and blocks of uncatalogued material.

# Recommendations for preparatory work for a UKRR-M

The NBK is vital foundation upon which collaborative collection management will be built, and the hopefully enhanced data that it should have will go some way to fully satisfying the need for better bibliographic data. It is thus imperative that any solution waits until the community knows the full extent of the NBK's capabilities, and that the community feed into its development in the meantime. It really cannot be underestimated how complex the mechanics of matching might be.

There is a need to conduct a larger scale overlap study. A number of survey respondents were happy to be involved in further work, so the number of participants is not by a lack of interest.

There is a need to consult academics to understand general appetite, what benefits they would be interested in, and disciplinary differences. This can then feed into the development of the model.

There is a need to develop guidelines covering deselection best practice and setting some national definitions of collections for use in the interim prior to any full-scale project, coordinating nationally to ensure that nothing is deselected which shouldn't be. A perhaps separate set of guidelines or community of practice could be set up to assist local collaborations, which would not be within the scope of the national solution. This should also involve a further development of a recommendation from the 2017 White Rose Libraries' report<sup>4</sup>, about finding ways for institutions to improve their catalogue records.

There is a need to develop a model, including a cost/benefit analysis, addressing as many of the points raised about what the community needs to know as is practicable. This should be, as mentioned, a hybrid model, combining a national storage facility and a national shared collection. The British Library must feed into the development of this model to ensure that what this model expects of them is realistic, before the community can make a decision on buy-in.

An offshoot of this work, which would help to make collaborative collection management easier in the long term, is around working on digital surrogacy, improving digital preservation advocating with suppliers and publishers, and improving engagement with HathiTrust. This is perhaps a longer-term aspect of the work, and is not a prerequisite to taking steps towards collaborative collection management.

---

<sup>4</sup> White Rose Library staff. (2017). *Understanding collections overlap: an investigation into White Rose Libraries collections using Collection Management Tools*

# Appendix 1 – Survey instrument

A study of academic library priorities for a possible extension of UKRR into monographs.

**Start of Block: Information Sheet**

**Start of Block: Consent form**

1 Participant Consent Form

Title of Research Project: A Study of Academic Library Priorities for a Possible Extension of UKRR into Monographs. Name of Researcher: Theo Stubbs

2 Declaration of Consent

You are advised to read the research information sheet, which is found at the following link, before continuing: <https://drive.google.com/file/d/1VsRN98t1dsOi3M9FdVJAa4sCVgH2rYHr/view?usp=sharing>

Once you have done this, please read the following statements before checking the box below to continue with the survey. You confirm that you have read and understand the description of the research project found in the information sheet, and that you have had an opportunity to ask questions about the project. You understand that your participation is voluntary and that you are free to withdraw at any time without any negative consequences. You understand that if you withdraw you can request for the data you have already provided to be deleted, however this might not be possible if the data has already been anonymised or findings published. You understand that you may decline to answer any particular question or questions. You understand that your responses will be kept strictly confidential, that your name or identity will not be linked to any research materials, and that you will not be identified or identifiable in any report or reports that result from the research, unless you have agreed otherwise. You give permission for all the research team members (including the dissertation supervisor and UKRR) to have access to your responses. You give permission for the research team to re-use your data for future research as described in the information sheet. You agree to take part in the research project as described in the information sheet.

By ticking this box you indicate that you agree to the above statements and wish to continue to the survey.

3 Note: Further information, including details about how and why the University processes your personal information, how we keep your information secure, and your legal rights (including how to complain if you feel that your personal information has not been handled correctly), can be found in the University's Privacy Notice <https://www.sheffield.ac.uk/govern/data-protection/privacy/general>. If you have any difficulties with, or wish to voice concern about, any aspect of your participation in this

study, please contact Dr Jo Bates, Research Ethics Coordinator, Information School, The University of Sheffield (ischool\_ethics@sheffield.ac.uk).

**End of Block: Consent form**

**Start of Block: About your institution**

4 About your institution.

This section will ask for some background information about you and your library.

5 What is your job title?

---

6 Which institution are you from?

---

7 Which groups is your library a part of? Please click as many as apply.

CONUL

M25

Northern Collaboration

North West Academic Libraries (NoWAL)

Research Libraries UK (RLUK)

Scottish Confederation of University and Research Libraries (SCURL)

South West Higher Education Libraries (SWHEL)

Wales Higher Education Libraries Forum (WHELF)

White Rose

Other (please specify) \_\_\_\_\_

8 Does your library have a closed-access store for physical materials?

Yes - owned and onsite

Yes - owned and offsite

Yes - outsourced to storage company or rented

No

Other (please elaborate) \_\_\_\_\_

9 If your library has a closed-access store, what is the delivery time from it on normal working days?

Under 3 hours

Under 6 hours

Under 12 hours

Under 24 hours

24 - 48 hours

49-72 hours

More than 72 hours

No store/not applicable

Don't know

#### **End of Block: About your institution**

#### **Start of Block: National situation**

10 Assessing collection overlap and the national situation.

This section considers collection overlap around the UK, and asks questions around the necessity of doing further investigatory work into levels of overlap.

A key context to this section is that two studies (links below) have suggested that rareness among academic library collections is more common than originally thought, with a key finding from the RLUK report being that 88% of the nearly 21 million book titles in RLUK libraries are held by less than 5 members.

Malpas, C., & Lavoie, B. (2016). Strength in numbers: the Research Libraries UK (RLUK) collective collection. Retrieved from:

<http://www.oclc.org/content/dam/research/publications/2016/oclcresearch-strength-in-numbers-rluk-collective-collection-2016.pdf> White Rose Library staff. (2017). Understanding collections

overlap: an investigation into White Rose Libraries collections using Collection Management

Tools. Retrieved from: [https://blog.ccm.copac.jisc.ac.uk/wp-](https://blog.ccm.copac.jisc.ac.uk/wp-content/uploads/sites/13/2017/09/Understanding-collections-overlap-final-report-July-2017-including-appendices.pdf)

[content/uploads/sites/13/2017/09/Understanding-collections-overlap-final-report-July-2017-including-appendices.pdf](https://blog.ccm.copac.jisc.ac.uk/wp-content/uploads/sites/13/2017/09/Understanding-collections-overlap-final-report-July-2017-including-appendices.pdf)

11 To what extent do you agree with the following statements:

Strongly agree    Agree    Neither agree nor disagree    Disagree    Strongly disagree    Don't know

I believe the assertion that 'rareness is common' across the UK academic library collections.

If the evidence that 'rareness is common' is credible enough, I would be able to use it to retain library space.

If the evidence that 'rareness is common' is credible enough, I would be able to use it to grow library space.

Regardless of whether the assertion is correct or not, I need to release space anyway.

I believe that further work needs to be done to assess collection overlap.

12 If you believe that further work on assessing collection overlap needs to be done, please tell us what type of work. Please click as many as apply.

More extensive studies (please elaborate) \_\_\_\_\_

Improved tools (please elaborate) \_\_\_\_\_

Other (please elaborate) \_\_\_\_\_

13 Has your library already done any work on assessing collection overlap?

Yes (please elaborate) \_\_\_\_\_

No

Don't know

14 Would your library be willing to take part in further work on assessing collection overlap?

Yes (please elaborate) \_\_\_\_\_

No (please elaborate) \_\_\_\_\_

Unsure (please elaborate) \_\_\_\_\_

15 If you are interested in taking part in further preparatory work, and would like us to possibly contact you about this, please leave your email address here.

\_\_\_\_\_

**End of Block: National situation**

**Start of Block: Drivers for collaboration**

16 Collaboration on legacy print monograph collections.

This section will attempt to understand whether your library might be interested in collaborating on monographs, and what outcomes you are most interested in.

17 Given that studies have shown that rareness may be common, to what extent are you interested in the following forms of collaborative collection management?

Please note, within this question:

- 'shared storage' means libraries maintain sole ownership of titles, and share a storage space
- 'shared collections' means libraries cede and thus take collective ownership of contributed collections, which might either be stored centrally or distributed between members or a mixture of both
- 'local' means within a geographical region

| Very<br>interested | Interested | Neutral | Uninterested | Not at all<br>interested | Don't<br>know |
|--------------------|------------|---------|--------------|--------------------------|---------------|
|--------------------|------------|---------|--------------|--------------------------|---------------|

**Better bibliographic data**

**Shared nationwide  
storage**

**Shared local storage**

**Shared subject  
collections**

**Shared local collections**

**Shared nationwide collections**

18 If you are interested in other forms of collaborative collection management, please elaborate on this below.

---

19 How important to your institution are the following potential access benefits?

|                                                                        | <b>Very important</b> | <b>Important</b> | <b>Neutral</b> | <b>Unimportant</b> | <b>Very unimportant</b> | <b>Don't know</b> |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------|------------------|----------------|--------------------|-------------------------|-------------------|
| <b>Improved access to larger collections</b>                           |                       |                  |                |                    |                         |                   |
| <b>Better and more standardised preservation practices</b>             |                       |                  |                |                    |                         |                   |
| <b>Better preservation conditions (i.e. climate controlled stores)</b> |                       |                  |                |                    |                         |                   |

20 How important to your institution are the following potential infrastructure and collaborative benefits?

|                                                        | <b>Very important</b> | <b>Important</b> | <b>Neutral</b> | <b>Unimportant</b> | <b>Very unimportant</b> | <b>Don't know</b> |
|--------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------|------------------|----------------|--------------------|-------------------------|-------------------|
| <b>Institutional collaboration for the common good</b> |                       |                  |                |                    |                         |                   |
| <b>Greater institutional collection focus</b>          |                       |                  |                |                    |                         |                   |
| <b>Improved document delivery</b>                      |                       |                  |                |                    |                         |                   |
| <b>Improved holdings data</b>                          |                       |                  |                |                    |                         |                   |

21 How important to your institution are the following potential financial and space benefits?

Very Important    Neutral    Unimportant    Very unimportant    Don't know

Financial savings on stewardship (i.e. by potentially having less items on open shelves in libraries)

Other financial savings

Space for collection growth

Other library space use

Non-library space use

22 Are there any further potential benefits you feel have been missed out from the three previous questions?

---

23 Would your institution be prepared to bear any costs associated with collaborative collection management activity?

Yes

Maybe

No

24 What types of costs would your institution potentially be willing to bear towards collaborative collection management activity? Please click as many as apply.

Scheme membership fee for central functions

Stewardship costs (i.e. for distributed storage of a shared collection)

Rent for storage space

Increased spend on interlibrary loans

Local staff costs

Other (please elaborate) \_\_\_\_\_

25 Do you believe you would have the support of senior university management for institutional involvement in any collaborative collection management activity?

Yes

No

Don't know (please elaborate) \_\_\_\_\_

26 Do you believe you would have the general support of the academic community for institutional involvement in any collaborative collection management activity?

Yes

No

Don't know (please elaborate) \_\_\_\_\_

27 What additional information would be required prior to your institution taking part in any collaborative collection management activity?

\_\_\_\_\_

**End of Block: Drivers for collaboration**

**Start of Block: Current Deselection Practices**

28 Current deselection practices and collection age.

This section will attempt to find out more about deselection (weeding) practices at your institution, what is currently ongoing and criteria used, as well as your attitudes towards different parts of your collection by age.

29 Considering your monograph collections by publication date, please tell us about:

- Your current and future deselection practices and plans
- Your attitudes towards collaborative storage and shared collections

As in an earlier question, within this question:

- 'shared storage' means libraries maintain sole ownership of titles, and share a storage space

- 'shared collections' means libraries cede and thus take collective ownership of contributed collections, which might either be stored centrally or distributed between members or a mixture of both

Please click as many as apply.

|                                                              | Pre-<br>1800             | 1801-<br>1850            | 1851-<br>1900            | 1901-<br>1969            | 1970-<br>present<br>(i.e. items<br>with ISBNs) |
|--------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|------------------------------------------------|
| Currently deselect                                           | <input type="checkbox"/>                       |
| Would like to start to deselect/will continue to<br>deselect | <input type="checkbox"/>                       |
| Would not deselect                                           | <input type="checkbox"/>                       |
| Would definitely consider for shared storage                 | <input type="checkbox"/>                       |
| Would possibly consider for shared storage                   | <input type="checkbox"/>                       |
| Would not consider for shared storage                        | <input type="checkbox"/>                       |
| Would definitely consider for a shared collection            | <input type="checkbox"/>                       |
| Would possibly consider for a shared collection              | <input type="checkbox"/>                       |
| Would not consider for a shared collection                   | <input type="checkbox"/>                       |

30 If you have any comments about the above, please add them here.

---

31 Considering the same publication date groups of monographs, please rank them in order of how difficult making deselection decisions about them is (or would be), with 1 being most difficult, and 5 least difficult.

\_\_\_\_\_ Pre-1800  
 \_\_\_\_\_ 1801-1850

- \_\_\_\_\_ 1851-1900
- \_\_\_\_\_ 1901-1969
- \_\_\_\_\_ 1970-present (i.e. items with ISBNs)

32 Does your library have a one-in-one-out policy?

Yes - strictly enforced

Yes - flexibly enforced

No

Other (please elaborate) \_\_\_\_\_

Don't know

33 How often does your library run deselection operations for monographs? Please click as many as apply.

On an ongoing basis

Annually

More than once a year

Less than once a year

As and when necessary

Do not run deselection operations

Various practices (please elaborate) \_\_\_\_\_

Other (please elaborate) \_\_\_\_\_

Don't know

34 When was the last time you ran a deselection operation for monographs?

Currently ongoing

Within the last three months

Within the last six months

Within the last year

Within the last three years

More than three years ago (please specify) \_\_\_\_\_

Do not deselect

Don't know

35 What criteria do you use for deselection at your institution? Please click as many as apply.

Number of years since last loan (please specify and add comments as necessary)

\_\_\_\_\_

Number of years since acquisition (please specify and add comments as necessary)

\_\_\_\_\_

Number of other holding libraries (please specify and add comments as necessary)

\_\_\_\_\_

Other (please elaborate) \_\_\_\_\_

Do not deselect

Don't know

36 Beyond the criteria above, do you use any of the following checks? Please click as many as apply.

Number of citations

Availability as a trusted digital surrogate

Other (please elaborate) \_\_\_\_\_

Do not deselect/not applicable

Don't know

37 What constitutes a trusted digital surrogate to you? Please click as many as apply.

Availability as an ebook owned by your institution

Availability on Hathi Trust

Availability on Google Books

Availability through a print on demand supplier

Other (please elaborate) \_\_\_\_\_

Don't know

38 What further work, if any, could be done to build trust in digital surrogates?

\_\_\_\_\_

39 Do you have dialogue with academics around the deselection of stock?

Yes - managed by library management

Yes - managed by liaison librarians

No

Different practices (please elaborate) \_\_\_\_\_

Do not deselect

Other \_\_\_\_\_

Don't know

40 N.B. The following two questions cover similar ground to a recent Jisc survey feeding into the National Bibliographic Knowledgebase. They are being asked again in this survey for our analysis purposes.

Are there any additional data points you would wish to have access to in order to help make deselection decisions?

\_\_\_\_\_

41 Are there any known issues with holdings data at your institution? i.e. specific historical cataloguing practices, uncatalogued collections etc.

\_\_\_\_\_

**End of Block: Current Deselection Practices**

## Appendix 2 – Full list of responding institutions

|                                  |                                            |
|----------------------------------|--------------------------------------------|
| Aberystwyth University           | Newcastle University                       |
| Bath, University of              | Northumbria University                     |
| Birmingham, The University of    | Norwich University of the Arts             |
| Bristol, University of           | The Open University                        |
| Cambridge University Library     | Oxford, University of                      |
| Cardiff Metropolitan University  | Queen Mary, University of London           |
| Cardiff University               | Reading, University of                     |
| Coventry University              | Royal Holloway University of London        |
| Durham University                | Senate House Library, University of London |
| East Anglia, University of       | SOAS University of London                  |
| Edinburgh, University of         | Southampton, University of                 |
| Glasgow, University of           | St Andrews, University of                  |
| Huddersfield, University of      | Surrey, University of                      |
| Hull, University of              | Sussex, University of                      |
| Imperial College London          | Swansea University                         |
| King's College London            | UCL                                        |
| Kingston University              | Wales Trinity Saint David, University of   |
| Lancaster University             | Warwick, University of                     |
| Leeds University Library         | Wolverhampton, University of               |
| Leicester, University of         | York, University of                        |
| Liverpool John Moores University |                                            |
| Manchester, University of        |                                            |