

# Rosemont Last Known Copy Initiative: Guidelines for Participating Libraries

**Collection Scope:** The Rosemont Last Copy Initiative is scoped to unretained titles held by only one Rosemont Alliance participating library, with only one copy appearing in OCLC (U.S. holdings).

To review the actions requested of participating libraries, please see the [initiative invitation](#).

## Steps to Take

1. Explore the Rosemont Alliance Last Known Copy Dataset in [Tableau](#)
2. Download your institution's data from the Rosemont Alliance Last Known Copy following these [instructions](#)
3. Review your institution's last known copy titles as makes the most sense for your institution
  - a. Possible scenarios
    - i. An institution decides to do no review and opts to commit to all identified last known copies with the option to correct any mistaken last known copies as they are revealed over time
    - ii. An institution targets its review to account for known issues in local cataloging (e.g. to identify mis-cataloging or titles the institution cannot commit to retain based on local collection policies)
    - iii. Any other degree of review! For example, an institution could run their list through the [PAPR Comparison Tool](#). This would control for mistakenly identified last known copies and provide back information on those titles that appear in trusted digital repositories, such as Portico, CLOCKSS, HathiTrust, or JSTOR.
    - iv. Interested in the kinds of review processes and issues that emerged in the Last Known Copy Initiative Pilot? See [Appendix A](#)
4. The Rosemont Alliance encourages the retention of last known copies held in special collections. Retained material in all cases is eligible for lending per the holding library's lending relationships and policies.
5. Recommended criteria to reject a commitment
  - a. Monographic series that is cataloged as a serial
  - b. Titles found to be entirely missing, lost, or damaged beyond repair
  - c. Titles found to be designated as last copies in error
  - d. Questions about in-scope materials? See [this Q&A](#)
  - e.
6. Commit to the titles your institution agrees to retain
7. Record retention notes for all committed last known copies
  - a. Follow Rosemont's [metadata best practices](#) using the local program standards fields including program name (e.g. \$f WEST, \$f Scholars Trust) and action interval
  - b. Additional metadata to add in the 'Committed to Retain' retention note:

- i. 583z “Rosemont Last Known Copy”
  - ii. For an example LHR, please see Appendix B
8. Disclose the retentions following local guidelines to PAPR and OCLC WorldCat
  - a. OCLC [registration webinar](#) and [additional guiding documentation](#).
9. Provide access following [Rosemont Alliance Access Principles](#) and institutional resource sharing policies and practices

*If you have questions or observations to share, please feel free to add them to the [Rosemont Last Known Copy Initiative Q&A Google document](#).*

## Appendix A. Last Known Copy Initiative Pilot Participant Review Feedback

### Reports from each participating library

**Institution A** - Completed review of 63 titles. Ran list against PAPR. About 30 titles will be committed for retention. Problems: found subsets of monographic series, split holdings, and at least one title that is widely-held in Europe but the institution’s copy is the only one in the US in OCLC.

**Institution B** - In total, 17 titles are assigned to this institution. Five are no longer under consideration as they have been withdrawn or have recently moved to Special Collections. Our library is in the middle of moving books and journals to offsite storage from the main library. I have to wait to check the volumes of a few titles at the new location. We should be able to commit to keeping the other 10 titles. The list in Tableau includes one title that 1,123 libraries hold according to OCLC. We are not going to include this title in our Rosemont list.

**Institution C** - 29 titles so relatively easily to investigate and analyze. Two are not the last copy, of which one was an annual report (with multiple title changes) that was cataloged differently by other libraries and the other was a reprint. Lots of college and student publications with the majority already in special collections & college archives. Will retain everything that is unique.

**Institution D** - only 3, checked shelf, agreed to retain all 3. All are high-density or non-circ.

**Institution E** - The quality of the list was good. Most of the 203 titles had already been flagged as unique locally and out of circulation. Expect to retain all.

**Institution F** - Initially, this institution plans to commit to retain all and review later to weed out out-of-scope titles. However, they did a sample and a lot don’t have item records. Have asked the IT department to run reports for the titles for item records and location information. They are in the midst of an ILS migration, so this may not be a top priority.

**Institution G** - Staffing issues meant not able to review list yet. Sees no reason not to commit. Working with EAST and CRL on submitting data to test whether these are truly last copies.

**Institution H** - Had a manageable 131 titles. Quite a few in special collections (decide to exclude them as couldn’t circ). Also some transferred to Five College repository so they would need to

decide on retention. Some monographic series. Some no item records. After review about 40 titles were committed.

**Institution I** - In midst of furloughs so staffing shortage. Many appear to be mono series, abbreviated titles & errors, special collections. Going to use location date. Hoping they won't need a physical check. Default to commitment after initial cleanup looking at catalog.

**Institution J** - 3k titles on list. Library staff appreciated having this project while working-from-home. Several brief records probably not rare. Quite a lot of Georgia specific which would retain. And fanzine collection in SC. Out of 3k, 2k had a single item record, 220 had no item, but not that surprising as only just started circulating, so might be there. Some oddities including microform. Feel confident about retaining remainder on the list.

**Institution K** - 12,000 items. Surprisingly, most were in circulation, not in Spec Coll. About ½ were errors, not last copies. Lots of monographic series or chose the wrong OCLC record. Willing to commit to retain if truly a last known copy.

**Institution L** - over 1,400 titles on their list so they have not done a complete review yet. Some monographs, others using a different OCLC record & treating as a serial. Still, some of them are rare, even though they may not be the last copy. ⅔ appear to be last copy. Many foreign titles with few issues. With so many titles, they want to do an automated project and retain as rare even if not unique.

## Appendix B. Example record (Alma ILS Output)

```
LDR          02039cas a2200565 i 4500
001          2234500610003421
004          9910550009703421
005          20200625104028.0
007          ta
008          1107210u\\\\\\8\\\\\\1001aaeng0110728
022          \\$a0014-2565
035          \\$a (OCoLC)1763869
561          \\$aABC
583          \\$aCommitted to retain$c20190621$d20351231$fWEST$fWEST
              Bronze$uhttp://www.cdlib.org/services/west/docs/WESTProgramStatement.pdf$zRose
              mont Last Known Copy
852          1\\$82234500610003421\\$aABC$bMAIN$hQP31$i.A28
853          33\\$82234500610003421.1\\$81$av.$i (year)
853          33\\$82234500610003421.2\\$82$av.$bno.$i (year)
853          33\\$82234500610003421.3\\$83$av.$i (year)
863          3\\$82234500610003421.4\\$81.1$a50-73$i1953-1959
863          4\\$82234500610003421.5\\$82.1$a74$b1-4,6$i1959$wg
863          3\\$82234500610003421.6\\$83.1$a75-159$i1959-1980$x1953-1958, 1959 (incomplete),
              1960-1980$zCANCELED v.159(1980)
```