

**Collections Working Group
Summary: Final Report
January 2016**

Executive Summary: The Collections Working Group (CWG) was charged with developing several collections scenarios balancing the diverse interests of library users, reviewing them with the Program Committee (PC) to establish priorities, and refining recommendations based on community feedback. In accordance with the CWG charge, we developed a collections philosophy and principles. We initially generated five possible collections scenarios; after all the feedback was distilled – and working within the framework of the collections philosophy – we developed a sixth scenario, summarized below. We further created a document with policy and practice recommendations to be considered by the Committee on the Library and other appropriate organizational bodies as necessary, including the Library Leadership Team.

Process: The CWG met ten times through fall 2015 and into early January 2016. We participated in four primarily faculty-focused engagements. Each engagement yielded direct feedback in the form of note cards, worksheets, emails, and formal letters. Additionally, the CWG received feedback from the Committee on the Library and librarian liaisons. In total, ninety-eight (98) documented responses were received by end of the year 2015. Through the worksheet, participants were asked:

1. How would you rank the scenarios?
2. What aspects of the scenarios do you like the most?
3. What aspects of the scenarios do you like the least?
4. Which scenario do you think best meets the needs of Smith? If none, please propose a 6th scenario for the Collections Working Group to consider
5. Other Comments

Many individuals and departments opted not to rank the scenarios completely, but rather indicated a top and/or bottom rank or an amalgamation of the scenario parts accompanied by comments. Only those that explicitly ranked scenarios were counted in the rankings and the comments collected into a digest.

Scenario 1: No Change	Scenario 2: Prioritizing Age	Scenario 3: Prioritizing Use	Scenario 4: Percentage reduction	Scenario 5: Prioritizing LC
---------------------------------	--	--	--	---------------------------------------

Engagement	Event	Outcome
October 15, 2015	Faculty engagement luncheon	Critique of the CWG draft philosophy and guiding principles; 11 responses using note cards.
October 21, 2015	Chairs and Directors luncheon	51 individual and group responses using a worksheet; scenarios 2, 3, and 5 ranked highest, 1 and 4 lowest, with comments.
November 12, 2015	Library Liaisons	8 individual responses using the worksheet; scenarios 2, 3, and 5 ranked highest, 1 and 4 lowest, with comments.
(Assigned October 23) December 7, 2015	Chairs and Directors feedback from departments	24 department and 4 individual responses; scenario 5 ranked highest, 1 and 4 lowest, some using the worksheet.

Final recommendation: Based on feedback received from faculty – with additional feedback from library staff – the Collections Working Group offers the following scenario as a synthesis of the strengths of earlier scenarios. Scenario 6 offers a high-low range of criteria for maximum flexibility in decision making by the Program Committee and architects in the design process. It supposes 5 years of growth and 50/50 compact/static shelving percentage. We consider this a fluid recommendation, subject to further refinement as conceptual and schematic design for the project is fully developed. The core elements of that recommendation are as follows:

- Library of Congress (LC) books stay onsite, with the exception of those LC books older than 15-20 years that have circulated fewer than 3-5 times since 2006. (Approximately 217,100 - 277,000 volumes remain onsite.)
- All Dewey's go offsite with the exception of those Dewey's that have circulated more than 3-5 times since 2006. (Approximately 13,300 - 21,500 Dewey volumes will be re-classed as LC and housed on-site.)
- For journals, keep current issues plus a maximum of the previous 10 years on campus.
- Special Collections is all onsite, with the exception of some records management and long-term restricted manuscript collections.
- Compact shelving could service journals, oversized, and some LC monographs. Recommend some static and/or curated collection shelving for browsing/intensive browsing purposes.

Faculty Involvement and Selection Process: Another core element of the CWG recommendation is that faculty will be invited to review all volumes recommended to go off-site (i.e., all Dewey plus LC monographs older than 15-20 years that have low/no circulation). Faculty members will have access to an interactive database, Curate the Collections, that allows them to:

- Search for a specific work by author or title
- Produce lists of titles by LC or Dewey call number
- Sort results lists
- Display circulation figures for specific titles
- Link out to Five College holdings for specific titles
- Link out to WorldCat holdings for specific titles
- Flag items for retention by clicking on a "Recommend" button

CWG has also recommended monitoring the use of titles housed off-site; any title that is requested three times will be transferred back to Neilson; any Dewey titles that fall into this category will be reclassified into Library Congress. After 5 years the current usage will be reviewed to create capacity for new holdings.