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CI-CCI key facts:

- Formed in 2013. UNI joined in 2014.
- Initial focus: Monograph retention
- No shared catalog
- Characteristics:
  - Small, Private Academic libraries (FTE’s: 1,388-4,400)
  - UNI=Regent University. FTE=11,000
- Holdings (1,000,000 without UNI), with UNI = 2,000,000-ish
- Hired SCS for collection analysis
Why Validate?

• Only one retention copy among the group
• Relatively small number of titles to verify (around 154k total, Drake=45k)
• **Important to faculty** (they didn’t want to withdraw books unless guaranteed another CI-CCI school would **FOR CERTAIN** retain)
• Web app developed to facilitate process (faculty involved in this process)
Purpose of Survey

• Validation requirement added to MOU in 2015
• Determine extent and perceived value of validation in other shared print programs
Survey Development

• Selected participants after consulting the Print Archives Preservation Registry (PAPR) list and talking with Ruth Fischer (SCS)

• Targeted programs performing monograph retention (all or mixed)

• Short Qualtrix survey with focused questions, emailed to program contacts
Level of Validation Performed

- Other: 8
- None: 4
- Sampling, completeness only: 1
- Sampling, including condition: 1
- All titles, completeness only: 1
- All titles, including condition: 1
“Other” Level of validation performed:

- Verification is limited to observing the book completeness and preservation (e.g., no visible mold).
- We’re deciding how to handle sampling right now but nothing has been done to this point.
- New members that are being asked to retain on average 58 titles are checking their shelves to ensure the title is present...But this level of validation was just not feasible during the original group analysis.
- As of current planning stage, no physical verification is anticipated, but could change.
- No plans at this point but do not rule out verification work.
Reasons for Validating

• Respondents were asked to rank factors, with 1 being the most important
• Loss of access and few retention copies both received the highest rankings
• Survey choices could have been more clearly delineated
Reasons for Not Validating

• Respondents were asked to rank factors, with 1 being the most important.
• Cost vs. benefit was the highest ranked factor (4 programs ranked it 1 or 2).
• Multiple copies held within the group was the second most important factor.
Lessons Learned - Comments

• “Our statistical consultant was integral to the success of our validation sample study.”
• “Use a data collection tool, such as Sara Amato’s at EAST.”
• “You need to consider the ROI of validation.”
# CI-CCI Web App

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Local</th>
<th>Call Number</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Author/Editor</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Verified On Shelf</td>
<td>B158.7.M3</td>
<td>Great twentieth century Jewish philosophers: Shestov, Rosenzweig, Buber, with selections from their writings.</td>
<td>Edited and with introductions by Bernard Martin.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor Condition</td>
<td>B162.I52 1985</td>
<td>Guide to Buddhist philosophy</td>
<td>Kenneth K. Inada, with contributions by Richard Ch/ Shotaro Iida, and David Kalupahana.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B179.W48</td>
<td>Early Greek philosophy and the Orient</td>
<td>M. L. West.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B181.S513</td>
<td>The discovery of the mind: the Greek origins of European thought</td>
<td>T. G. Rosenmeyer.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

[Done? Get More Items](#)
### CI-CCI Sampling (6,000 volumes) vs. Full Validation Success Rates

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Random Sampling</th>
<th>Random Sampling, including withdrawals</th>
<th>Full Validation (# of volumes)</th>
<th>Full Validation, including withdrawals (# of volumes)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Institution A</td>
<td>98.1%</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>98.1% (20,143)</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institution B</td>
<td>99.4%</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>99.4% (46,754)</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institution C</td>
<td>97.1%</td>
<td>91.9%</td>
<td>97.1% (23,415)</td>
<td>91.9% (24,741)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institution D</td>
<td>98.8%</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>98.8% (14,511)</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institution E</td>
<td>97.3%</td>
<td>91.3%</td>
<td>97.3% (38,471)</td>
<td>91.3% (40,971)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Conclusions

• Value of verification depends upon number of retention copies and, to a lesser extent, collection size.

• 8 of 13 respondents consider validation to be “Moderately to Extremely Useful”

• Sampling may be sufficient for programs retaining multiple copies.

• Full survey results: https://tinyurl.com/cicci-validation