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What is the Virtual Library of Virginia (VIVA)?

- 72 academic libraries - including doctorals, four years, two years, and specialized institutions.

- Central funding provided by the Commonwealth of Virginia, additional cost-sharing by members.

- Grounded in the coordinated collection development of online resources and an extensive resource sharing program.
Background

• Virtual Library of Virginia
  – VIVA Steering Committee

• Collections Committee
  – Monographic Collection Analysis Task Force
Task Force Makeup

• 12 participants
Task Force Approach

- Sustainable Collection Services (SCS) selected to analyze data
  - Previous work with VIVA members
  - Experience with consortial level analysis
  - 6 million records
Project Goals:

• Pilot a coordinated, consortial approach to collection assessment

• Use data and analysis to inform future, collaborative collection development

• Identify scarcely-held titles in need of protection

• Discuss approaches to reducing consortial title duplication & local space savings through weeding
A Different Approach

• Not just about weeding and preservation!

• **Primary** interest was to inform collection development!

• Use the analysis to figure out the “where’s” and “how’s”
Included in the Analysis

• All circulating print monographs
• English language only
• Main library (no law libraries, medical libraries, etc.)
• LC classification only
• 6 million records
Initial Analysis

• Examine widely held and highly and recently circulated titles
• Examine shelf life to inform e-book acquisition models
• Examine use patterns of print holdings of publishers acquired by the consortium in e-format
• Identify parameters and approach for scarcely-held titles.
• Look for local disciplinary strengths to inform future collaborative collection development.
Looking for Intersections

Highly circulated titles

Widely held titles

Identified Top Publishers
Widely held – highly circulated

• Proquest Title Matching: 
  space savings, access for distance learners, ILL savings

• Historical number of publisher titles held by year: 
  inform future e-purchasing options

• Examine circulation patterns of “top” publishers: 
  overall and by discipline
Holdings and Usage for Top Publishers

- Univ Press 'A'
- Univ Press 'B'
- Comm Pub 'A'
- Comm Pub 'B'
- Comm Pub 'C'
- Univ Press 'C'
- Univ Press 'D'
- Comm Pub 'D'
- Comm Pub 'E'
- Comm Pub 'F'

1 or More Recorded Uses
0 Recorded Uses
Examining Shelf Life

- Looked at average number of years between publication year and last charge date
- Informs lease vs. purchase of ebooks
- DDA program could support trigger-to-purchase level decisions by discipline

Average number of years between Publication Year and Last Charge Year
Looking for Local Strengths

• What does the subject distribution of the whole collection look like distributed across the pilot libraries?

• What do our uniquely held titles tell us about our collections?
Results – Subject Distribution

Classes where the percent distribution of total collections is widely (more evenly) shared

B – Philosophy, Psychology, Religion
C – Auxiliary Sciences of History (General)
D – World History (except American History)
E – American History
F – Local History of US & British, Dutch, French, & Latin America
G – Geography, Anthropology, Recreation
H – Social Sciences
J – Political Science
L – Education
M – Music
N – Fine Arts
U – Military Science
Results – Subject Distribution

Classes where the distribution of total collections is not as widely (less evenly) shared

A – General Works
P – Language and Literature
Q – Science
R – Medicine
S – Agriculture
T – Technology
V – Naval Science
Z – Bibliography, Library Science

![Graph showing distribution of shared collections across different classes]
Distribution is Key!

• Pilot libraries had **wide** distribution of subject areas across the state!

• Distribution of collection **depth (uniqueness)** was the second piece of the puzzle.
Results – Local Strengths

• Wide ranging examples of institutions with high percentages of unique titles by LC class!

• If unique titles *are* an indicator of collection depth, this was great news for consortial collection development.
Results – Local Strengths

Class S

George Mason  James Madison  Old Dominion  Radford  Richmond  UVa  VCU  Germanna  Reynolds  Mountain  VA Tech  Wash & Lee

% of shared collection  % of unique titles
Why does this matter?

- Consortial confidence in building on existing subject strengths

- Potential for formal collection development on behalf of other institutions

- Imagine what we could do....
1. A Memorandum of Understanding to protect over 72,000 unique and rare titles that had been found in the main stacks of the participating libraries

2. Focus VIVA e-book acquisitions on publishers with widely and highly and recently used print titles

3. A Memorandum of Understanding for the cooperative retention of widely-held monographs, allowing for safe deduplication within the consortium

4. Establish a voluntary recommended threshold for new print monograph purchases
Challenges

• Different reasons for participation
• No shared ILS/Discovery Layer
• No history of thinking as a “collective collection”
• Staffing
• Budgets
• Data can only be used for so long
Strengths

• Culture of trust
• Simple and flexible MOUs
• Low barrier entry
• Distributed “repositories”
• Voluntary threshold
• Clear resource savings
Results

• Analysis supported a vision for a shared collection

• Clearly defined, implementable initiatives

• Cultural shift – beginning to think of VIVA as one collection (*with many local personalities*)

• Data-driven identified areas for consortial collection development

• Clear strategy for where/how to build collaboratively
Thank you!

-Genya O’Gara on behalf of the VIVA Monographic Collections Analysis Task Force