



NASIG NEWSLETTER

Vol. 32, no. 3

September 2017

eISSN 1542-3417

Conference Reports

Preconference Workshops

[A Beginner's Guide to MarcEdit](#)

Conference Sessions

[Beyond COUNTER-Compliant](#)

[BIBFRAMEing for Non-BIBFRAMErs](#)

[Mapping Continuing Resource Vocabularies for](#)

[Linked Data Discovery](#)

[Capturing and Analyzing...Data for Collection](#)

[Development](#)

[Ch...Ch...Changes: Restructuring Through Change](#)

[Competencies for E-Resource Librarians Redux](#)

[Using a Narrative to Reflect on a Data Purchase Pilot](#)

[Program](#)

[Evaluating User Experience and Access Data](#)

[Performing an E-Resources Accessibility Review](#)

[Preparation & Transfer of 1,000,000 Volumes to an](#)

[Off-Site Storage Facility](#)

[Partnering with Vendors](#)

[Promoting OA and OERs to Faculty](#)

[The Road from Millennium to Alma](#)

[The Serials Business](#)

[A Marriage of Two Repositories](#)

[Technical Services and the Virtual Reference Desk](#)

[Usage Data as a Measure of Library Services &](#)

[Outreach](#)

[How Collections Metrics Are Changing](#)

Preconference Workshops

A Beginner's Guide to MarcEdit

Terry Reese

Reported by Karen Ross

Terry Reese gave an eight hour workshop for beginners needing an introduction and overview of the software suite, MarcEdit. He split the workshop content into five different sessions: an Introduction, Working with Data, Primer on Regular Expressions, Editing Data in the MarcEditor, and The Future of MarcEdit which focused on the features in MARCNext. He began with an overview of MarcEdit, defining it as a software editing suite that he developed in 1999. It was originally created to convert MARC to plain text for his personal use at Oregon State University (OSU), but after utilizing it for a project at OSU involving call number flipping, a colleague convinced Reese to make MarcEdit available to the public. The tool is designed to provide workflow solutions for libraries, and it has been updated and enhanced over the years to create MARC records and to interact with various metadata platforms, schemas, and formats. MarcEdit was developed for Windows but is also almost fully functional for Mac users. There are a few exceptions to this, including the absence of some plugins. MarcEdit has roughly 50,000 unique users currently and many are not in North America. For this reason it is vital that MarcEdit be MARC-agnostic. It has a near universal character set support, and supports metadata standards beyond MARC.

Reese gave an overview of the existing version, 6.3, which is written in C#, with information on the upcoming version 7, which will be released in the fall of 2017. Existing features that will remain with version 7 are the MARC-agnostic platform, and the ability to work

with XML, JSON, Resource Description Framework (RDF), and linked data. Major changes from version 6.3 to version 7 will include, but are not limited to, no longer supporting Microsoft XP, and adding native RDF and Graph support, which means changing the .net version to .net 4.6. There will also be an introduction of an XML and JSON profiler.

After giving an overview of how the main features of the current version will change or stay the same with version 7, and explaining his development philosophy, Reese elaborated on the various features and functions of the existing program. He gave examples and illustrations of many of these features and functionalities, from how to download the program and set your preferences to crosswalking from different data schemas, and setting a defined task list for automation. Next, he went over Microsoft's Regular Expression language and how to use it to make changes to records in MarcEdit. Regular Expressions are most often used to make mass edits like adding or changing punctuation in fields, splitting one field into two, or switching the case of words within fields. Reese went over specific use-case scenarios for Regular Expressions and answered questions from workshop attendees. The next section of the workshop was devoted to performing some exercises with sample data in the MarcEditor. Reese introduced the various functions of the MarcEditor, which he described as similar to Notepad. The MarcEditor contains various templates and settings that can be customized by the individual and is most frequently used for functions like globally adding or deleting fields, editing indicators, generating call numbers, and deduplicating records.

Reese finished the workshop with a discussion of the future of the application suite including the MARCNext lab space where you can experiment on things like BIBFRAME with records from your own institution. The lab space contains a JSON object viewer, a SPARQL browser, a BIBFRAME testbed, a space to resolve access points in linking fields within a set of records that are being converted, and a space to experiment with OpenRefine data migration. Reese has been working to ensure that MarcEdit is a tool that will be extremely

helpful with the next phase of cataloging and metadata work in libraries, and much of this progress is available in the MARCNext lab space. He continues to develop MarcEdit for regular use in libraries and he is dedicated to helping colleagues via the MarcEdit listserv, YouTube videos, direct email questions, and future updates to the application. A complete list of areas that one can use to find help with MarcEdit are available here: <http://marcedit.reeset.net/help>.

Conference Sessions

Beyond COUNTER-Compliant: The Importance of Assessing E-Resources Reporting Tools

Kelly Marie Blanchat

Reported by Marcia Lee

Kelly Blanchat, the electronic resources support librarian at Yale University, offered attendees insights related to workflow, raw COUNTER data and its integration with Intota, and useful tools when facing discrepancies between data reports. In an effort to minimize staff time spent harvesting usage data, Yale decided to outsource this work through the utilization of 360 COUNTER's Data Retrieval Service (DRS) in 2015. After the first retrieval of Yale's usage statistics for the first half of 2015, Blanchat found that the 360 COUNTER raw data differed from the Intota Assessment consolidated reports. In order to identify what was causing the discrepancies between input and output, from COUNTER to Intota Assessment, the librarians launched an investigative project.

Phase one of the comparison and analysis process was completed at the title-level, and allowed Blanchat to identify specific reasons for the varying data. Her findings were as follows:

- Duplicate titles had the same ISSN, but with distinct titles, usage is picked from only one version
- Titles that have variant data points (DOI, ISSN) over time or titles display multiple times
- Duplicates with matching ISSN and title, usage is merged into a single entry

Phase two of the analysis moved away from the title-by-title approach, and examined totals between the reports. To aid in the analysis process, Blanchat created a template to identify carrying data between COUNTER and Intota Assessment. She provided the URL for anyone to use and tailor for their institution's workflow purposes: <http://tinyurl.com/y7bvlg27>.

Phase three moved the project forward by beginning the process of transforming COUNTER reports into a data source for Tableau, a data visualization tool. Also, this stage included a pilot project with Association of Research Libraries (ARL) statistics. Testing began within Microsoft Access and Tableau during this stage, and proved to be mostly successful.

Moving forward, Yale and Blanchat hope to continue to move away from manual harvesting and analysis to a more automated and robust process utilizing Python and SQL. Additionally, data visualization, self-service for renewals, and no further questions about data built on COUNTER standards are all sought after. In closing, she acknowledges that the phases completed in the process are merely the tip of the iceberg and that more work still needs to be done.

**BIBFRAMEing for Non-BIBFRAMErs:
An Introduction to Current and
Future Cataloging Practices**

Kevin Balster

Reported by Melissa Randall

The session was given by Kevin Balster, ERM/continuing resources metadata librarian at UCLA. The presentation was a higher level overview of the Bibliographic Framework Initiative (BIBFRAME). Balster provided a brief history of the current state of content standards, encoding levels, and exchange formats. He then explained how Machine Readable Cataloging (MARC) encoding is limited by being library specific and he described Resource Description Framework (RDF), and Functional Requirements for Bibliographic Records (FRBR).

As he sees it, the vision of future cataloging is a browser-based interface with profiles by format that includes prompts for aiding data entry. Description mapping would be content neutral, and while generic, would include granular mapping. Bidirectional mapping will be difficult, but not impossible to do; it is easier to map MARC to BIBFRAME than the reverse.

MARC isn't dead yet and RDA will be frozen in August 2017. RDA will be revised with BIBFRAME and the IFLA conference in mind. This may help with the next steps of creating the vision: forming specialized cataloging committees and developing best practices for both BIBFRAME and the Library Reference Model. Additionally vendors, providers, and IT need to be brought into the conversation to make a Linked Data technological infrastructure. Balster stressed that partnerships are necessary and important as we move forward.

The graphic features the Springer logo and 'springer.com' in the top corners. The main image shows three men in 19th-century attire gathered around a chess table. Text reads 'SPRINGER CELEBRATES 175 YEARS' and 'Springer – Driving academic publishing since 1842'. Below this, a text block commemorates Julius Springer's passion for chess, noting that the knight chess piece was the natural choice for the company logo. A timeline shows four iterations of the logo: 1842, 1864, 1900, and 2016. A QR code and the hashtag #springer175 are at the bottom.

Bringing It All Together: Mapping Continuing Resources Vocabularies for Linked Data Discovery

Andrew Senior

Reported by Karen Ross

Andrew Senior, coordinator for e-resources and serials at McGill University, spoke about the continuing resources vocabularies that are emerging as primary possibilities for linked data, and some of the challenges the serials community should be aware of regarding the extent to which these vocabularies work together in a linked data environment. He discussed BIBFRAME 2.0, PRESSoo (a set of related concepts interconnecting bibliographic information about continuing resources), RDA, and Schema.org.

Senior started by giving a brief overview of the many working groups performing ongoing modeling and mapping work for linked data, such as the Library of Congress, the PCC (Program for Cooperative Cataloging) BIBFRAME Task Group, OCLC, Zepheira, and Casalini. The results of these working groups may help to expose areas where serials do not fit into existing models within the current linked data landscape for continuing resources. Senior stressed that there has been a paradigm shift to a more open graph framework for continuing resources. He explained areas to focus on that include future-proofing data by choosing the right ontology, and building in mapping for data storage. Senior posed the question of whether we will be able to find equivalencies in continuing resources vocabulary mapping that will be vital for success in a linked data environment.

He gave some background on the many existing models, ontologies, vocabularies, and schemas currently used in the serials community, and stressed that we need to be able to look at data relationships outside of the context of the triple store. Much of the existing data is in string format, and therefore, it is important to make this data actionable as linked data. Current strategies involve RDF triples, where the subjects and objects are modeled as classes and subclasses, and predicates are modeled as properties and sub-properties; URIs (uniform

resource identifiers) replace strings and properties can be searched independent of the triple store. Senior acknowledged that linked data models limit how properties can be used. He gave some examples, such as when the domain prescribes subject class usage for a property, and the range prescribes object usage for a property.

Senior also described mechanisms for mapping between different ontologies like OWL (W3C Web Ontology Language), RDF, Schema, and UMBEL (Upper Mapping and Binding Exchange Layer). Senior stressed that if there is any doubt that vocabularies do not intend the same meaning for an object or a property, then we cannot accurately use the ontology. This begs the question: if there is any chance of a grey area, how do we map those differences in our ontologies? Referencing Euzenat and Shvaiko (2013), Senior detailed the differences between terminological and conceptual heterogeneity. He defined 'terminological' as using different words for the same concept, and 'conceptual' as when we use the same term/word to mean different concepts. It is challenging have various ontologies "to talk to each other" when they operate differently and have different rules and meanings.

Senior next highlighted areas where the composition of different vocabularies might pose problems. Where BIBFRAME and RDA allow greater freedom from domain-range constraints, it can result in a loss of semantic operability and compromise the ability to reason across our data. PRESSoo and Schema.org have challenges like the Generic Data Model and allowing multiple domains and ranges. We need to be able to capture the diversity of our metadata without losing meaning. He gave an example of this by comparing 'frequency' terms from RDA and PRESSoo, as well as BIBFRAME and Schema.org. Senior was careful to stress that alignment can break down with particular ontologies. He observed that various controlled vocabularies are handling known challenges. Examples given were around the concept of a "work," preferences for the ISSN or the ISSN-L, title change relationships, and the differences between chronology and enumeration.

To close, Senior stated that multiple ontologies will be used by experts in different fields. Equivalencies between ontologies allow for greater linkages, but there are still areas where we need to strengthen the models. Reaching out to experts and asking for input in every community is probably be a good way to start this work.

A few questions at the end of the session involved the basics of linked data and whether it is truly linked if everyone is using different ontologies. Senior responded by stating that as soon as different ontologies are added, interoperability is the end-result. Working groups are a great way to discuss the interchange and movement of content from one area to another. Another question was asked about the sticky area of the concept of a “work” and how we plan to address and define a “work” in linked data. Should we consider every issue a “work”? Would this simplify things? There is no answer for this question yet, and Senior closed the session by acknowledging that there will be future discussions.

References

Euzenat, Jerome, and Pavel Shvaiko. *Ontology matching*. Berlin, Heidelberg: Springer Berlin Heidelberg, 2013. <https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-642-38721-0>

Capturing and Analyzing Publication, Citation, and Usage Data for Contextual Collection Development

Joelen Pastva, Karen Gutzman, and Jonathan Shank

Reported by Diana Reid

Galter Health Sciences Library serves a community of researchers at the Feinberg School of Medicine (FSM) at Northwestern University (NU). In the current atmosphere of rising journal prices and budgetary pressures, Galter librarians Joelen Pastva and Jonathan Shank sought a means to demonstrate the value and impact of their collections beyond traditional usage metrics (e.g. COUNTER reports) and cost-per-use measures generated from them.

The COUNTER JR1 report provides the number of “full-text article requests,” but it is difficult to draw any conclusions from a “request” metric alone. Each count represents an unknown level of engagement, and some of these requests may not be meaningful because this is dependent on the platform design. We know that the resource was possibly accessed, but we cannot fit the number of accesses within the broader context of scholarly activity at our institutions. To address these limitations, Pastva and Shank combined citation analysis with COUNTER JR1 data for a multi-dimensional approach to collection development decisions. Unlike a single full-text “use” recorded in a COUNTER report, a cited reference immediately situates the use of a resource in the scholarly communication process, providing relevancy, context, and a clear indicator of actual value.

For the citation analysis, Pastva and Shank used Web of Science (WOS) as their data source; it was selected due to its robust search features (in particular the ease of filtering by affiliation, and batch exporting of full citation records). They chose the programming language Python in hopes of making the work of this project reproducible in the future for both themselves and others. Python is an accessible scripting language with a substantial community of users, to automate the data cleaning, parsing, and analysis as much as possible (the project’s GitHub page can be found here: <https://github.com/jpastva/galter-WOS-citation-analysis>).

Five sets of citation data were obtained for analysis. Two data sets encompassed ten year (2007-2016) spans, one for FSM as a whole, and one for a dermatology subject set of FSM publications. These data sets were analyzed independently to glean insights about citation patterns. The analysis showed that the number of publications per year increased steadily. Also, the number of cited references per publication rose over the time period. Half of all cited references in both groups had publication dates within five to six years of the paper citing them, and most had publication dates within two years. They concluded that

the availability of recent scholarship is critical to FSM researchers.

The three other data sets obtained – 2016 data for FSM, dermatology, and all of NU – were analyzed in conjunction with COUNTER JR1 reports. The 2016 JR1 reports for all resources relevant to FSM (about 30,000 titles) were downloaded and collated, and titles were matched to those in the cited reference data. In this analysis, Pastva and Shank elected to compare the top thirty cited journals for all of NU, and the top fifty cited journals for FSM and dermatology to the COUNTER data.

The results were “all over the place” for the NU set. With so many disciplines combined in a large set, meaningful distinctions were lost. For the FSM data, they were pleased to see that no gaps were identified, i.e. there were no highly cited titles without active subscriptions. No low-use titles showed up in the fifty top cited journals, as they did in the dermatology data set. In the dermatology data set, there were three titles with relatively low JR1 figures (under one hundred per year) on the list of fifty top cited journals. Their value was demonstrated due to their high cited reference counts, but this fact might be overlooked if only utilizing traditional usage statistics. Also, in the dermatology set five gaps were identified – highly cited but unsubscribed titles, or (more frequently) subscribed titles but outside access entitlements. These findings revealed the difficulty of using COUNTER data alone, in particular for discipline-specific collection assessment. It also showed the benefit of limiting the scope of the data set, so that these distinctions are not lost. Potential platform issues also surfaced in the analysis. For example, some BMJ (British Medical Journal) titles were near the top in cost-per-use, but had a very high cited reference count that revealed potential reporting problems with this COUNTER data.

Other potential uses for cited reference analysis were discussed, such as evaluation of open access titles, or to contextualize interlibrary loan (ILL) data, much as it was used here to contextualize COUNTER report data. For collection development decisions, it was suggested that

COUNTER reports could be used to identify potential titles for cancellation, followed by a cited reference analysis for a more complete picture prior to making final decisions. In the case of ILL, adding cited reference data could provide an argument for not adding a title. This type of approach provides a holistic, institutionally relevant understanding of usage reports and other metrics, and also helps identify outliers warranting further investigation.

Ch...Ch...Changes: Restructuring Through Change

Kathleen Bailey and Valeria Hodge

Reported by Derek Wilmott

Kathleen Bailey and Valeria Hodge gave an insightful presentation on the Technical Services restructuring at the University of Tennessee at Knoxville. The University, founded in 1794, and the library started with five hundred print books from the President’s personal collection. Originally, volunteers staffed the library. Today, the University of Tennessee at Knoxville (UTK) boasts of three libraries: John C. Hodges (main campus), Pendergrass Agriculture & Veterinary Medicine Library, and the George F. DeVine Music Library. The libraries contain over 2.5 million titles with an \$11 million budget.

Over time, the UTK Libraries transformed from user experience, hand-held technology, and patron services to video rooms, purchase on demand, cloud storage, cloud hosting, virtual reality systems, data visualization, digital humanities, and data curation. All these new services and resources required new space for student services and study areas, as well as redefined positions in technical services. The Technical Services Department faced ten retirements within a three-year period, seven of which occurred in the past two years. All these changes presented an opportunity to reorganize the unit. Administration employed external consultants to review employee positions and workflows. The consultants’ report suggested a total restructure of the department. The report generated further discussions among staff who then made steps to transition from inefficient workflows, and train for new

responsibilities. A team was assembled to lead the transition process. They met with staff in their offices and cubicles to gather information on how to facilitate the process. The administration increased support for travel and educational opportunities to assist staff in learning skills for their new positions. Still, some staff resisted the changes. The issue was that many of the positions had not changed in over thirty years. In addition, a generational divide existed between very recent and late career staff which posed unique challenges.

Task groups were created to incorporate staff in the reorganization process. This included a novel approach to training where some staff members were chosen to serve as trainers and to serve as leads for others in their unit. Staff members with an aptitude for writing created documents to include on the library wiki page and served as the gatekeepers to update the information as needed. As the transition progressed, a Customer Services Task Force was created to measure and develop new workflows, reassign tasks as needed, and measure communications between staff and the public. Staff moved to new spaces on another floor which had the sensation of leaving the past and embracing change.

The result of all these changes was not only a rebranding of Technical Services to the new Acquisitions & Continuing Resources Department, but also resulted in streamlining workflows and an increase in the following areas: collaboration among staff, staff skill sets, and responsiveness to external customers. Even though there have been improvements in the distribution of services, problem resolution, and position definitions, Bailey and Hodge ended the presentation by pointing out their unit is still evolving. Currently their unit is seeking more assistance from vendors to streamline their Interlibrary Services. They are also in the process of realigning their fund structure. They are looking to further streamline ordering workflow, and continuing to reassign tasks for greater efficiency.

Competencies for E-Resource Librarians Redux: What Do They Look Like in 2017?

Sarah W. Sutton

Reported by Sarah M. Paige

Sarah Sutton, assistant professor for library & information sciences at Emporia State University (ESU) and chair of the first NASIG committee which created the Core Competencies for Electronic Resources Librarians, decided to revisit the original NASIG competencies by studying job advertisements posted in 2016. The goal was to identify areas in NASIG's core competencies that might need revision.

She and her research assistant Rachel Collinge started with these research questions:

- Where (what types of libraries) were electronic resources librarians (ERLs) employed in, in 2016?
- What qualifications did employers of ERLs seek in 2016 job ads?
- Have the job qualifications changed since 2010?
- And finally, how – if at all – should the NASIG Core Competencies be revised?

Sutton and Collinge started their research assuming that employers prioritized the competencies they really wanted in their ERLs and that they accurately conveyed in their job ads the required and preferred skills that job applicants needed.

The two collected 2016 ERL job ads from listservs and websites, including those published by national specialized professional organizations like NASIG, from state-level library associations, and from the ESU School of Library & Information Management (SLIM) jobs-list. Their final sample included 106 positions advertisements. Their next step was to create a code book for the qualifications to be assessed. They examined ten job ads from the 2016 set and created categories for the qualifications and competencies they found in the ads. Then, they each applied these categories to the 2016 set of 106 job ads. Sutton and

Collinge found there was 95% inter-coder reliability after assessing all the job ads.

The first research question, “In what types of libraries were ERLs employed in 2016?” showed that 88% were employed by academic libraries which was not surprising. Data also showed that 6% of the job ads were for positions in public libraries. Sutton and Collinge also found that 46% of the job ads were for Carnegie Classification Research 1 institutions; 22% for Carnegie Classification Masters 1 institutions; 10% for Carnegie Classification Research 2 institutions; and 10% for Carnegie Classification Research 2 institutions.

The job ads in this group often had the words “electronic resources” or “e-resources” in them (48% of the time). Other terms used regularly in the job ads included “acquisitions” (19%); “digital” (9%) and “director” or “head” (12%). Sutton and Collinge also discovered that 29% of the job ads were for dual-title positions.

The next research question was “What qualifications did employers of ERLs seek in 2016?” Sutton’s conclusions based on their research were the following: most libraries require a Masters in Library Science (MLS) degree; most academic library positions required experience in a library; most libraries preferred some experience with the library service platform they owned; and in almost half of the academic job ads, personal skills were required. Sutton created some word clouds showing the varying personal skills that were requested in job ads including: communication, interpersonal, collaboratively, oral–verbal–written, team, independently, service, analytical, solving, problem, complex, initiative, flexibility, adapt, and creativity. Based on these results, Sutton said that the most frequently sought qualifications were the same among all sizes of libraries.

The third research question was “Have the qualifications for the job changed since 2010?” Sutton answered this question first by clarifying that the 2009-2010 results all were from her own research (not that of the Core Competencies for Electronic Resources

Librarians Task Force), so any errors in the data were her own. She observed that 2009-2010 qualifications were very similar to the 2016 qualifications, with the ALA-accredited MLS degree still the most-often-sought qualification. Sutton specified that the increases seen in the e-resources management and licensing skills for the 2016 data might be accounted for by the fact that these skill sets were not as new to the position as they once were and that more librarians were entering the job market with some ERM coursework or experience. Sutton also mentioned that the new code book for the 2016 data set had some categories differing from the 2009-2010 set, with results showing some differences in granularity.

Sutton posed the final research question: “How, if at all, should the Core Competencies for Electronic Resources Librarians be revised?” Sutton did not think that they should be revised according to the size of the library. She also mentioned that public libraries seemed to be seeking technologies, applications, and project management skills, but it was still too early to tell if library type matters. Sutton’s final conclusion was that “no, it’s not yet time to revise the core competencies.”

References

Sutton, Sarah. “Identifying Core Competencies for Electronic Resources Librarians in the Twenty-First Century Library” (doctoral dissertation, Texas Woman’s University, Denton, TX, 2011).

Verminski, Alana, and Kelli Marie Blanchat. *Fundamentals of Electronic Resources Management*. Chicago: Neal-Schumann, 2017.

Data Stories: Using a Narrative to Reflect on a Data Purchase Pilot Program

Gene Springs and Anita Foster

Reported by Virginia Martin

Anita Foster and Gene Springs spoke about the university and library activities that led to a data purchasing pilot program at Ohio State University

Libraries (OSUL). They described the process of the acquisition and licensing of these data collections to illustrate issues libraries should consider when starting to purchase data.

In 2014, Ohio State University announced translational data discovery would be a theme for 2017. A new interdisciplinary program on translational data would begin in 2015. A new university president also arrived in 2014 with an interest in datasets analysis as a core skill. A new director started in the library, as well the creation of a new Research Commons that opened in 2016. It offers statistical data software, a data visualization lab, and has evolved into a point of service location for students and faculty working with data. OSUL hired a research data management librarian, three new subject librarians and a collection strategist. In 2016, a task force including subject specialists, the collection strategist, and staff from the Research Commons, Acquisitions, and the Institutional Repository was formed to work on data purchases. The task force also documented the data purchasing process to record what lessons were learned.

The first data purchase described by Foster and Springs was two purchases from Info Group: the Historical Business Data and the Historical U.S. Residential Data. In examining the licensing, Foster realized OSU would have to host the files. Auditing language in the original license sought to enable vendor access to campus servers. There were also issues about where and how the library could advertise the data service to patrons.

The next data purchase was from Gallup Analytics that included two products, a web portal and micro data files. This required two licenses. The Gallup license first had an “export control” clause, banning individuals in specific countries from accessing the resource. For the Web of Science Core Collection data set, the product included a terabyte of data for which OSU needed to create a front end interface.

Lessons from the data purchase narratives included “know what you’re buying.” Some vendors were unfamiliar with selling to libraries, and the data

required large amounts of server storage space. They also learned that planning data purchases cannot be accomplished by one individual. OSUL’s data purchasing taskforce will continue to look into future questions, such as how to measure usage, what is the impact on Research Commons staff and services, and how to promote these resources.

Evaluating User Experience and Access Data to Reveal Patrons' Print and Digital Serials Preferences

Karen Stafford and Stephanie Fletcher

Reported by Lynsay Williams

Karen Stafford, head of Technical Services, was unable to attend, but Stephanie Fletcher, e-resources and reference librarian, began the session with some background about the Ryerson and Burnham Libraries at the Art Institute of Chicago. This was important because these libraries serve a diverse population of people due to its connection with the Art Institute of Chicago and the School of the Art Institute of Chicago (SAIC). Electronic serial usage has decreased 8% since 2014, but library staff wanted to know more about patrons’ digital and print serials preferences. This was particularly important for this institution because of the unique challenges of working with art-related resources and because there are different types of people using the library such as museum curators, research associates, docents, interns, volunteers, faculty and students of SAIC, museum visitors, and outside researchers. The combination of users from the Art Institute and SAIC adds to the complexity of wading through usage data.

The library staff combined usage statistics, and user survey and interview data to draw conclusions about its users’ preferences. There were seventy-three survey respondents. Most respondents (72.6%) claimed they use print serials at the Ryerson and Burnham libraries and 90.3% of respondents said they use electronic resources provided by the libraries. When asked about their preference of print versus electronic resources, 54.8% of respondents indicated that it depends on the

project. This illustrates the unique needs of art library patrons. This was supported in the open response survey results and interview results with comments such as: “I prefer to read using a print copy, but digital is helpful for images and archive materials;” “I’m in the stacks for provenance research;” and “Often decide on print vs. electronic based on image quality for illustrations.”

The Libraries concluded that both print and electronic resources are used by patrons because patrons like the convenience of the online resources, but they use print resources to view art objects and in some cases where they deem online scans are inadequate. In the future, the Libraries plan to streamline discovery services, reach out to and connect with museum staff and school patrons (Fletcher recognized the lower percentage of school patrons as respondents in the survey), and begin tracking usage statistics in Alma.

How Accessible is Our Collection? Performing an E-Resources Accessibility Review

Michael Fernandez

Reported by Sandra Quiatkowski

Michael Fernandez is the electronic resources librarian at American University (AU) in Washington, D.C. American University has an FTE of approximately 12,000. The library budget is \$5.5 million, of which \$4.5 million is spent on electronic resources. The Electronic Resources Management (ERM) Unit comprises of Fernandez and two full-time specialists.

In July 2016, a memo from the AU president started the process of revising all AU web content by prioritizing accessibility. The memo cited some recent legal cases. In response, all AU webpages were being checked. The library also had ongoing revisions to its webpages, but the ERM Unit realized that e-resources were not included, so they began an e-resource accessibility project.

Fernandez then provided a definition of accessibility and mentioned some accessibility benchmarks, including sections 504 and 508 of the Rehabilitation Act, and Web Content Accessibility Guidelines (WCAG) 2.0, which is issued by W3C. The Voluntary Product Accessibility Template (VPAT), a fillable form that breaks down every guideline in Section 508, was also discussed. A VPAT Repository houses VPATS that are posted with vendor permission (<http://uniaccessig.org/ua/vpat-repository/>).

Fernandez also mentioned an e-book audit completed by several institutions in the United Kingdom: (<https://sites.google.com/site/ebookaudit/2016/>).

Fernandez then discussed how they looked for some common accessibility indicators so they could provide an overview of accessibility access. The first indicator was an accessibility statement that is often located on a vendor’s website. The second indicator was the VPAT. The third was the license language. Some caveats that were discovered include the following: not all VPATS are created equally; some vendors supply data while others do not; there are no requirements stipulated by a governing body; and there is a lack of consistency in detail and completeness.

Next, Fernandez explained how the inventory was compiled. Initially, they generated a list of 528 resources. These were sorted by vendor because some had numerous titles on the same platform. They also checked accessibility statements that were either linked from the homepage or the “Terms of Use” section. Lastly, they looked for language on usability, and compliance with Section 508 and WCAG.

Fernandez then described how they gathered the VPATs. This was accomplished in several ways: they were linked from accessibility statements, found in the VPAT repository, the team googled the vendor name and “VPAT,” or they contacted the vendor.

Then, licenses were reviewed. They looked for any language related to accessibility. Unfortunately, many

did not have any accessibility statements because most were ten years or older.

Next, they wanted to represent accessibility in the ERMS so they used custom notes in Serials Solutions 360 Resource Manager. Fernandez stated that it would be helpful to integrate this information with any other licensing data for all ERM systems. There are currently no defined fields for accessibility or VPAT check boxes in their ERMs product. Fernandez noted that AU is moving to ALMA and that license records do have a compliance indicator.

When considering e-resources, they found that 64% of the vendors had accessibility statements, 55% had VPATs, and 4% had language in their licenses pertaining to accessibility. About 71% of the vendors had at least one measure, 52% of the vendors had two or more measures, and only 0.6% had all three measures.

Results by vendor found that 31% of the vendors had accessibility statements, 27% had VPATs, and 3% had language in their licenses pertaining to accessibility. About 40% of the vendors had at least one measure, 19% had two or more, and 1.5% had all three.

A resource to vendor comparison illustrated that the portion of vendors with accessibility statements and VPATs were roughly half compared to e-resources. A small number of vendors account for a disproportionately large number of e-resources. Larger vendors were more likely to have accessibility measures. There are some vendors who do not have these measures. For example, smaller vendors providing specialized resources are less likely to have knowledge of bandwidth for accessibility. This is also the case from vendors that provide resources that are not designed for academic use.

The inventory provided a snapshot of collection accessibility. The measures represent what vendors should be doing at a minimum. Accessibility statements and VPATS do not equal compliance. So basically, accessibility is a moving target. AU asked their legal counsel to review language in contacts and develop

language to be presented to the vendor if it was missing. Fernandez also noted that LibLicense Model License has suggested verbiage under Section 5.1 Licensor Performance Obligations.

They learned some valuable lessons by engaging in this project. For example, the vendor legal counsel may not agree to a compliance guarantee and may instead use terms like “reasonable efforts” or “where possible.” Also, the license should include the right to adapt or modify materials so they will meet the needs of users with disabilities.

Their recommended future steps included requesting VPATs and accessibility statements from vendors. They will also consult with institutional accessibility services staff on usability testing. They will request the addition of accessibility verbiage into new licenses. Finally, they will review the e-resources from the inventory with no accessibility measures and prioritize based on usage.

How to Move a Mountain: The Preparation and Transfer of One Million Volumes to an Off-Site Storage Facility

Anastasia Guimaraes and Jared Collins

Reported by Scott McFadden

In 2013, Hesburgh Libraries at the University of Notre Dame (Notre Dame) embarked on a project to renovate its historic building. This led to a pressing need to reduce the physical footprint of the library’s print collection. Notre Dame thus embarked on a project to prepare and transfer approximately one million volumes to an off-site, high-density storage facility. The climate-controlled facility is a warehouse about fifteen minutes from the Notre Dame campus, and is also used for storage by other university departments in addition to the library.

The project began with Skype interviews with five other libraries and on-site visits to two facilities. From these discussions, Notre Dame was able to determine techniques that work well, and things that should be avoided. In contrast to other libraries, which had used a

vendor product, Notre Dame created a home-grown inventory management system (IMS). The locally developed inventory management system featured a clean design and was able to interface with both the ILS and the library's ILL/document delivery request form.

There was a goal of transferring one million volumes that would require a two-phased approach. They determined that the focus of the transfer should be print serials not currently received, serial titles that were duplicated in JSTOR, and monographs with zero circulations or touches within the last ten years.

The project proceeded with the appointment of a full-time project manager to oversee the process. Notre Dame hired a moving vendor to perform the actual physical relocation of items, as well as six temporary staff members, whose main responsibilities involved barcoding materials. The library also recruited volunteers from all departments.

Collections preparation teams, consisting of one of the six temporary staff paired with an experienced cataloger, were equipped with a laptop, mouse, and scanner. These teams performed the preliminary work of creating reports of materials to be transferred, identifying items to be transferred, barcoding those materials that lacked barcodes, reviewing the condition of materials and noting those requiring repair, and identifying cataloging problems that required further attention. A system of color-coding was used to track progress.

Cataloging problems encountered included issues such as uncataloged titles, serials with changed titles linked to the wrong bibliographic record, multiple titles bound together into a single physical volume, and partially analyzed titles, in which serial issues having a distinct monographic title were linked to a serial record.

The first phase of the transfer was given a very short and unrealistic six-month timeline to prepare and transfer 450,000 items. This short time frame was complicated by inexperienced staff, the need to figure out the new process, and a concentration on "low

hanging fruit"—items which needed only barcoding and limited maintenance work. The second phase offered a more realistic deadline, allowing for more detailed review of materials and more comprehensive training of staff. Processing assistants were trained to fix basic cataloging problems during the preparation process, thus reducing the need for professional cataloger intervention.

A temporary storage location was created for "rejects"—problem items that either the IMS or ingest personnel at the storage facility refused to accept. Reasons for rejection included the barcode not being found, items requiring updating or linking of the appropriate bibliographic record, items mistakenly transported to the facility, and items with cataloging problems that had been missed during the preparation process. There were also items that were intended for transfer, but had been mistakenly left behind by the moving vendor. Library staff had to search for, gather, and transfer these forgotten items at a later time.

Having successfully completed the transfer project, Notre Dame has now transitioned into an enduring commitment mode with the goal of annually transferring 30,000-40,000 items to the storage facility. This has led to a refining of the workflow to accommodate transfers as a daily routine. With no moving vendor, prep staff must now pull and box books for transfer themselves. Prep staff can also make item and holdings updates themselves. The library is working to enhance its home-grown IMS, and to improve faculty understanding of the function of off-site storage on an ongoing basis.

Notre Dame reported a number of lessons learned from the experience, including early preparation, hiring temporary workers, establishing straightforward criteria for item selection, reviewing lists of items before transferring, and maintaining quality control of the moving vendor's work. The transfer has also resulted in many positive outcomes such as increased access to materials, increased accuracy of the catalog, increased visibility for cataloging staff and opportunities for cross-training. Perhaps the greatest positive outcome is the

off-site storage facility itself, which allows for better overall preservation conditions for Hesburgh Libraries' collections.

Partnering with Vendors to Limit Compromised User Accounts

Richard Guajardo, Peter Katz, and Don Hamparian

Reported by Dejah Rubel

Richard Guajardo from the University of Houston opened this session by describing the form letter institutions receive when they are notified that a content provider has to block an IP address due to excessive downloading. He emphasized that the blocked address might be your institutional proxy address, which will limit access for your entire campus until the problem is resolved. He also noted that although systematic downloading always results in excessive use, such excessive use is not always intentional. For example, some kinds of legitimate research may be considered excessive use because each vendor has their own threshold. These thresholds are usually based on the number of downloads within a specific time frame, file size, etc., but the specifics may not be publically shared. Systematic downloading is often scripted, and therefore, is intentional and can affect multiple platforms simultaneously. It is also less likely to be a patron and more likely to be caused by a compromised account without the patron's knowledge. Common triggers for compromised accounts include but are not limited to: patrons sharing login information, phishing, a compromised workstation, and unsecured or open WiFi.

Guajardo also offered some helpful advice to quickly restore access once you receive an excessive use notice. The first tip was to respond to the notification by requesting additional information, such as the date, time, and activity log. These details will allow you to query your proxy logs and determine who (or whose account) is causing the problem. If the account is compromised, you should block the patron's account in the proxy server and notify library and campus IT immediately. Then, campus IT can contact the patron and query other university systems to determine if they

have also been hacked. Once campus IT has notified you that the patron's account is no longer compromised, you can unblock it in the proxy server. Once they are certain the problem has been fixed, vendors will restore access to their content.

Peter Katz from Elsevier presented a content provider's perspective on preventing and limiting excessive use. He described a rising trend in patron password sharing, stealing, and selling. These practices are often justified under the guise of making information more accessible to the layperson. He also noted that 90% of incidents are generated by unaffiliated users who have gained access to a university's network to steal content. Even with prompt notification from a vendor, there are still time delays before the library can locate the source of the breach and block that account. Thieves tend to attack libraries with large collections. Even when one patron is blocked, the individual will use another login, and therefore, it can be difficult to stop malicious activity. He recommended that libraries work with vendors to set up IP address tracking, which would help catch the offenders by linking a location to the activity.

Finally, Don Hamparian from OCLC described some best practices to prevent unauthorized access via EZProxy that would also apply to other proxy server services. He recommended a four-part strategy to secure access: protect and prepare, detect and close compromised credentials, educate, and collaborate. For content providers, he recommended that they work with customers to resolve unauthorized or excessive use in addition to working with OCLC to define their database, host sites for testing, create and distribute MARC records, and create KBART data. For institutions, he recommended strong password policies, multi-factor and/or SSL authentication, transaction log retention and backup for at least 6 months (preferably one year), regular server OS and EZProxy maintenance, and ensuring your system time is correct. To be proactive against potential threats, he also suggested reviewing transaction logs frequently to see which accounts are top content consumers and have the longest session lengths. You should also check for locations or countries from which your patrons would not normally be

accessing the system. If you have EZProxy, OCLC can link dates, times, and URLs to find active sessions and obtain the username, but the institution still needs to block the account and follow up with campus IT as described by Guajardo.

Hamparian concluded by stating that we all need to collaborate with each other to prevent and block unauthorized access and excessive use. Education on information security needs to be improved at the staff and patron level. Library IT staff need to work more closely with campus IT to find other access solutions beyond IP authentication. To that end, STM and NISO have a joint initiative, RA21 (<https://ra21.org>), to align and simplify pathways to subscribed content by providing best practices for potential alternatives to IP authentication.

Promoting Open Access and Open Educational Resources to Faculty

Heather Crozier

Reported by Eimear Evans

Heather Crozier is the electronic resources librarian at Ohio Northern University. Her session explored the benefits of Open Educational Resources (OERs) and Open Access (OA) to publications but also highlighted the challenges faced by librarians when trying to promote these concepts to faculty.

For those unfamiliar with the area, Crozier used the William and Flora Hewlett Foundation definition of OERs as “teaching, learning, and research resources that reside in the public domain or have been released under an intellectual property license that permits their free use and repurposing by others.”ⁱ

OERs offer the potential to reduce course costs for students. This is particularly compelling at a time when textbook prices have risen at quadruple the rate of inflation since 2006. This price increase is prohibitive for students and Crozier highlighted a 2016 survey conducted by Florida Virtual Campus, which revealed

that many students are simply unable to purchase the required textbooks for their course.ⁱⁱ

The rising cost of textbooks has a direct impact on student success rates. Being unable to access course materials can force students to take fewer classes. It can also cause them to achieve a poor or failing grade because they may opt out of purchasing textbooks.

Most people associate OERs with open textbooks, but Crozier’s session revealed many types of OERs available such as: lectures, lesson plans, interactive modules, videos, and entire online courses. In addition, research has shown that there are similar or better levels of student learning from OERs. With such a wide variety of resources available surely faculty should be in favor of incorporating OERs into their teaching.ⁱⁱⁱ

Unfortunately, this isn’t always the case. Some of the barriers to OERs include a lack of awareness about what they are, a lack of time to investigate their potential, limited understanding of the reuse licenses associated with them, and most crucially, apprehension about their quality. There is a similar perception with OERs as OA publications in that because OERs are a free resource they are not valuable and not good quality.

During Open Access Week 2016, Ohio Northern University ran a workshop on OERs; unfortunately, it was not well-attended. The facilitators decided that a subject specific workshop would have more potential for success, so they approached the Nursing Department and organized a session. They used Moodle to store information about OERs, Open Access, and customized resources for the department. They opted for Moodle instead of creating a LibGuide because they felt if faculty had editorial rights over the material in Moodle, they would take ownership of it and become more involved.

The session was well attended. The Nursing Department was very engaged and displayed interest, but the faculty did not add content to Moodle. This highlights the fact that OER and OA education cannot be achieved through the delivery of one workshop, but must be built up over

time through general library promotion and recruiting library liaisons.

OERs have great potential for integration into current courses and can be used to ease the financial burden that students experience. However, faculty perception of such resources must be improved. Promotion and advocacy on an ongoing basis are the key to embedding OERs within the University.

References

ⁱ "Open Educational Resources," William and Flora Hewlett Foundation William and Flora Hewlett Foundation, accessed May 19, 2017, <http://www.hewlett.org/strategy/open-educational-resources/>

ⁱⁱ "2016 Student Textbook and Course Materials Survey," The Orange Grove, <https://florida.theorange Grove.org/og/items/3a65c507-2510-42d7-814c-ffdefd394b6c/1/>

ⁱⁱⁱ John Hilton, "Open Educational Resources and College Textbook Choices: A Review of Research on Efficacy and Perceptions." *Educational Technology Research and Development* 64 (4): 573-590, <https://link.springer.com/sharelink/10.1007/s11423-016-9434-9>

The Road from Millennium to Alma: Two Tracks, One Destination

Kristin D'Amato and Rachel Erb

Reported by Martha Hood

Both Colorado State University (CSU) and Central Connecticut State University (CCSU) made a decision to migrate to Alma and shared their challenges and success stories with the audience. CSU consists of approximately 24,000 students on three campuses, one of which is a virtual campus. CCSU, is a mid-size regional university of approximately 9,300 students. Their catalog includes not only CCSU materials but also

consortial materials from the state library and seventeen state college and university institutions.

For both universities, their present ILS, Millennium, needed to be upgraded and the consensus was to migrate to Alma. Ex Libris provides their customers a very firm six-month timeline which begins with migration and ends with going live. It is critical for libraries to plan ahead and set aside time for pre-migration cleanup, although some of these tasks will inadvertently take place during the migration process. A very real challenge which was shared, involves not only analyzing data, but also making new policy decisions as part of the migration process.

The speakers also shared their experiences with the management of communication between Ex Libris and their libraries. The cloud software Basecamp was used to communicate between campuses and with the Ex Libris project leads. It was also the primary source for sharing files and delegating tasks. Communication was often tediously slow due to the fact that all questions had to go through Basecamp, including general questions about tutorials. In addition, Salesforce, the Ex Libris ticketing system, was used to communicate with the company. Only the local implementation team leader could communicate through Salesforce during the first phases of the migration project, making the communication again very arduous. In addition to the Ex Libris' instance of Basecamp, Basecamp was also set up to be an internal communication tool between campuses, and in the case of CSU, within the library. Additional communication tools used included organizing weekly meetings or email updates, creating a migration LibGuide, conducting an open forum with staff, and utilizing an ongoing online survey which addressed staff concerns during the migration process. Between all the different avenues of communication, there was a lot to process, track, and organize.

Another area discussed was training which was a large time commitment. WebEx training videos were available in Alma along with supplemental documentation. The Alma Sandbox has preloaded records so that staff could practice what they learned.

However, it was rather limited in its functionality and did not alleviate the stress of learning as hoped. Onsite training sessions called “workflow workshops” were also provided, but had some shortcomings. These workshops were described as very general and very similar to the online tutorials. Training received from Ex Libris was a very basic demonstration of acquisitions, resource management (which covers metadata, cataloging, knowledgebase management, e-resources), and fulfillment services (which includes circulation). Generic processes were shown during these visits, and concerns voiced about institution-specific processes were not covered. In the case of CSSU, their consortium purchased premium service, and therefore, received two on-site visits in addition to the workshop. One was a three-day course called “Train the Trainer.” Ex Libris also administers an administration certification which is a four-week training course where one commits six-eight hours a week of training along with taking a final exam. This certification is ideal for system librarians, but certainly should be considered for others who have a more complete understanding of workflows and roles which need to be assigned to librarians.

Next, a detailed discussion on the technical aspects of migration was covered. This involved completing field mapping, migration, configuration, and link resolver forms. One takeaway from this discussion was about the inaccuracy of the validation tool on the forms. In addition, the speakers shared an example of each form and revealed that libraries should expect this process to be time-consuming.

Rachel Erb from CSU, also spoke about building the P2E (print to electronic) file and why it is such an important part of the migration process. This file only includes electronic records: databases, DDA e-books, streaming media, electronic government documents, and e-journals. It is important to note that if your institution utilizes the SFX bibliographic record service, because these records should not be in the P2E file unless the records have an attached order record. Each listing in this file can only be identified by three designations--portfolio, database or package--so a careful understanding of each type is needed.

The speakers also shared specific advice on migrating the III’s ERM (CCSU decided not to) and what to expect when you go live. Post migration data clean-up was discussed along with the opportunity to change and design new workflows for staff. Both speakers shared specific unique problems which they encountered after going live and how they successfully resolved issues.

In conclusion, the speakers shared with the audience some of the things they really liked about Alma such as analytics, knowledgebase management, ordering, invoicing, license records, and internal collaboration. A lively discussion with several questions followed the presentation.

The Serials Business: Things They May Not Have Covered in Library School

Jesse Holden, Kittie Henderson, and Justin Clarke

Reported by Iris Garcia

Presenting from the vendor perspective, the speakers discussed different components of the business aspects of serials management and the library-vendor relationship. Kittie Henderson began the presentation with the question, “What is a serial?” She discussed print and non-print options, packages and bundles, and explained the distinction between subscriptions and standing orders. She described the challenges of publisher-direct purchasing such as the associated cost-per-transaction for libraries that can include staff time, the need to pay multiple invoices by different suppliers, and the handling of international currencies.

Jesse Holden introduced the concept of the agent as intermediary and agent efficiencies. Vendors are able to provide a consolidated point of service by handling orders, cancellations, renewals, and invoicing (including EDI) as well as claiming, delivery of reports, and notification of relevant changes (title, publishers, platform, pricing).

Justin Clarke followed by emphasizing the benefits of having a single contact point and explained how most vendors submit payment to the publishers before they

have received it from libraries, ensuring that renewals are not effected by payment delays.

For vendors, subscription renewals are a continuous process spanning throughout the year. They begin working with vendors long before they submit renewals to the library. Issues that impact renewals include consortial participation, timing of library decisions, and release of publisher pricing. Renewals must be timely, otherwise service implications can result in loss of access, missing print issues, or delayed invoicing.

Vendors do not set prices or licensing terms, control access to e-journals, or earn high profits because margins are slim. So how do vendors make money? Henderson answered this question by explaining the role of publisher commissions and discounts and the assessment of library service charges. Before providing a simplified example, she reminded the audience that vendors must cover their operational costs that include personnel, facilities, technology, and communication costs.

When a publisher provides the vendor with a commission or discount, the savings are passed on to the library. Otherwise, the library may pay more in service charges. Other factors that affect the calculation of these charges are average subscription cost, mix of the title list, service requirements, total volume, and length of contract. Vendor profits are about six percent.

Clark acknowledged that sometimes libraries want or are required to request bids from vendors. He suggested that the library first determine whether they really need a bid, what they hope to accomplish and ensure that they have the time available to complete the process. It is also labor intensive for the vendors so some may decide not to participate. A request for information (RFI) is a good starting point. It is the least formal and regarded as a survey of the market. A request for quotation (RFQ) is more of an environmental scan and is non-binding. The request for proposal (RFP) is the most in-depth and usually based on a point system. The RFP results in a formal contract.

Henderson concluded the presentation by stressing the relationships between vendors and libraries. Citing that clear and direct communication is the key to success, she encouraged librarians to take advantage of vendors' onsite visits to discuss challenges or remain abreast of new developments and suggested promptly making representatives aware of any problems with suppliers. She stressed that vendors and libraries should consider each other partners and not adversaries. Together they share one common goal--the delivery of content to users.

Something Old, Something New, Something Bold, Something Cool: A Marriage of Two Repositories

Carol Ann Davis and Jason Boczar

Reported by Sharon A. Purtee

Carol Ann Davis and Jason Boczar, from the University of South Florida (USF), presented on the recent merger of two units in their library: Scholar Commons and Digital Collections. Boczar provided a brief background about USF; it was founded in 1956, has approximated 50,000 students, many of whom commute, and there is not a large emphasis on collections.

The "Something Old" from the presentation title represents the former organizational structure of the two collections. Digital Collections was founded in 1995 and had spent its history being moved organizationally between a few departments such as special collections, the digital repository, and administrative services. The Digital Repository opened in 2007 with the publication of Numeracy, USF's first Open Access (OA) journal. It continues to house OA materials such as journals (including eighteen published by USF) and textbooks.

"Something New" represents the most recent reorganization that has combined these two units into one larger department now known as Digital Scholarship Services. Each group continues to manage copyright, rights management, and content management for the resources that are included in their repositories. The department is currently working to align their mission statements for greater efficiency, as

well as review current projects, create effort grids (high effort/low impact), conduct SOAR [Strengths, Opportunities, Aspirations, Results] analyses, identify stakeholders, and develop strategic directions. Additionally, they are cross-training staff and obtaining new equipment.

“Something Bold” represents an intentional focus on faculty and research, creating new and unique information, and applying better description and metadata. They are collaborating with faculty on special projects such as multi-modal data analysis of collections and analyzing context of artifacts, texts, and text mining. They also working on a university-wide open access policy, looking particularly at process, implications, operationalization, and organization.

“Something Cool” represents projects coming into fruition. The E-Books for the Classroom initiative (<http://ebplus.lib.usf.edu/faculty/>) that came out of the Textbook Affordability Program was successful. They also published an OA textbook. Lastly, they made the Dion Boucicault collection available.

After the honeymoon period that accompanies many mergers, Davis and Boczar determined there needs to be more staff with diverse skills, including graphic designers, video and audio editors, individuals who understand ADA web standards for all formats, and programmers. They also realized there needs to be consistent digital backup of digital collections, as some of these collections are stored in cabinets on campus, some are on CD, and some are stored on servers that are not regularly backed up. A portion will be stored in the Florida Digital Archive. They are also investigating Amazon Glacier as a possible solution for backing up content. The content in Scholar Commons is in good shape as most of it is in LOCKSS or Portico. They admitted that they still struggle with deciding where content will ultimately reside; currently, both coordinators get together and look at the format and content and make a decision.

The audience was intrigued by the idea of one department, Digital Scholarship Services, which contains

two distinct repositories – one for digital collections and the other serving as the university’s digital repository. When asked about funding for new equipment, the speakers said that the dean had tapped foundation accounts. They also responded to a question about metadata and said that a cataloger devotes half time to digital collections.

Technical Services and the Virtual Reference Desk: Mining Chat Transcripts for Improved Electronic Resource Management

John Kimbrough

Reported by Diana Reid

Georgetown University uses LibraryH3lp as their chat software to interact with patrons in real time. This chat box is present in many places on the library website, and chats are responded to by public services staff, or, particularly during weekends, student assistants. Electronic resources (ER) staff may occasionally engage via chat if requested, but do not have a routine presence. This project was driven in part by a desire to answer the question of whether the amount and type of electronic resources related questions would justify regular participation in chat shifts by ER staff.

Kimbrough obtained all chat transcripts – nearly 2,000 – for the Fall of 2016, which covered August 1st through December 31st. Text files were run through MS Access and Excel and ultimately exported into a more readable PDF file of 700 pages. Findings were recorded in an Excel spreadsheet.

The next step was deciding what would qualify a chat as being relevant to electronic resources, and then going through the transcripts to identify them. Two criteria were used: was a specific online database or resource referenced? Or, was a specific journal title or article asked about? It was presumed that in the latter instance electronic access was preferred unless they stated otherwise. Likewise, chats referencing books were presumed to be about print books unless an e-book was specifically mentioned. Both these decisions were informed by what Kimbrough knows about

Georgetown patrons' preferences and by the fact of Georgetown's robust and growing print monograph collection. Chats determined to be relevant were reviewed to identify what resource(s) was involved, and what the outcome of the chat was – was the patron's need resolved? Was the chat referred to electronic resources staff, or should it have been? Lastly, he sought to identify whether any potential improvements to ER procedures could be gleaned.

Out of 1,898 chats reviewed, 551 or 29% of the chats from Fall 2016 were deemed relevant to his analysis. The vast majority were questions about known items. There were also alumni or visitors wanting off campus access, general usability questions, and a few requested resources or provided other feedback. Kimbrough found himself both "pleased and frightened" that three hundred different resources were referenced, indicating to him that many of their resources were used, and also that people had problems using many of their resources. The top twenty-two most frequently mentioned resources were looked at more closely. Lots of news sources made it into this group, revealing a hunger for these sources and also a lot of trouble using them. RefWorks is used and taught extensively at Georgetown, so it was unsurprising to see it in the list, but a citation management tool that Kimbrough had never even heard of (NoodleTools) also popped up several times. EBSCO/EBSCOhost was the next most mentioned resource – though notably not a particular database on the platform.

Viewed through the lens of whether a chat was "successful," 390 of the 551 were deemed so. In these cases, either staff was able to get patron directly to the item or resource they needed (207 chats) or was able to identify that the item was available only in print or would require a request through Interlibrary Loan (183 chats). Of particular interest to Kimbrough were the ninety-one chats that revealed access problems – something that either the library needed to fix, or that required contacting a vendor. The miscellaneous remainder were cases where the patron was not entitled to access resources, the patron dropped the chat (or a busy staff member was unable to return to it),

and a small handful of staff errors. Forty-two chats were referred to ER staff, and an additional twenty-seven were identified as chats that should have been. In terms of the question of whether ER staff should have an active presence on chat, it was determined that it was not necessary.

For fun, the chats were run through Voyant, a free web-based text analysis tool. Most notable from this endeavor was the number of verbs in patrons' requests, indicating that they are actively engaged in a process when they solicit chat help. This prompted Kimbrough to contemplate the value of the long LibGuides, lists, and tutorials we librarians often provide hoping to preemptively answer these questions.

Though not surprising, it became clear that patrons don't care about category distinctions (e.g. A-Z list for databases, journal finder, catalog) and that forcing them to choose is confusing. Patrons may ask for a resource in a way that is familiar to them such as "How do I access Taylor and Francis online?" This prompted consideration of whether to link to certain journal platforms by name. A revamped LibGuide for news sources is underway, including references to what they don't have access to (nyt.com, wsj.com) and where and how to browse and search for that content on licensed databases. Also discovered was the fact that certain resources need clearer lines of support. Those that have support through different departments, in particular desktop software installations, often leave staff confused regarding to whom a problem should be referred. Small fixes to holdings or proxy stanza updates were identified and updated on the spot or in the context of routine cleanup procedures.

A migration to Alma/Primo is in the works for Georgetown this summer. Kimbrough is hoping some identified problems will be fixed in the course of this change, such as occasional confusion about e-book holdings due to the consortial catalog and the presence of a link for any 856 in a record such as a link to a table of contents or, more disappointingly from the patron's perspective, a digital donor bookplate.

Some questions that technical services staff continue to ponder are whether they should provide referral links to frequently requested resources that they don't own (e.g. NoodleTools referral to RefWorks), and how to better communicate with and assist public services staff in answering chats. The results of this analysis provided a quantitative argument for being more involved staff training and, as a result, Kimbrough will provide more formal training at an upcoming all-staff meeting. Should that go well, it will be followed up with training for student assistants. This outcome is viewed very positively as previous training was always ad-hoc or resource specific.

Kimbrough ended on a high note by sharing two instances of patrons using chat simply to provide very positive feedback, reminding all that the work we do in the background matters.

They Searched What? Usage Data as a Measure of Library Services and Outreach

Melissa Gustafson

Reported by Sandra Quiatkowski

Melissa Gustafson is the electronic resources librarian at Indiana State University (ISU) in Terre Haute, Indiana, and has been at ISU for three years. ISU is a public university in west central Indiana with about 13,565 students, 11,257 of which are undergraduates. ISU has a very large number of first-generation college students and a large foreign student population, although this number has decreased by ten percent last year.

Gustafson began by discussing why she and her colleagues began to look at usage data – she noted that there was little to no cross collaboration between departments and they felt that there was a need for a more holistic approach to reviewing usage data.

Gustafson mentioned that reference outreach was almost exclusively tool-based and one-shot instruction sessions with little one-on-one instruction. In addition, there was not a standard collection method for usage

data, and what data was collected was mainly for renewal decisions. Therefore, there was no real behavioral analysis.

Gustafson stated that they were wondering what they could do with the data available in Serials Solutions Summon to help the reference librarians to better help their users. To begin, the electronic resources staff had some informal discussions with the reference librarians and attended reference department meetings. They wanted to identify the challenges reference librarians encountered while teaching and determine what type of usage would best inform what they do. They took notes and looked for common themes in the data.

They found the important components for reference librarians were the discovery search, user behavior trends, e-resources used, and the website/LibGuides. Top Summon searches included drag racing, hypnosis, and motor-sports. Most patrons used subjects such as motorsports, nursing, and psychology. In addition, they used LibGuides on topics such as finding research, instruments, and tests, and literature reviews. Preferred browsers included Chrome (slightly over half), Firefox (about three-fourths of the remainder), and Safari (about one-fourth of the remainder). IE had a negligible share.

They also found that the average number of searches per visit were decreasing, while the number of visits increased. The positive aspect of this was that the users are using Summon, but the negative aspect was that their first search was generally unsuccessful. They also found that there was a need for more on the fly or best bet creation. In addition, LibGuides needed more tag refinement and they needed to review the placement of information on the library page.

For the future, they plan to do e-resource highlights semi-annually and as needed to inform reference outreach and instruction. Continued refinement is part of their plan, including looking forward to Counter 5 compliant statistics. They also plan to use more data visualizations with Tableau. The third item in their plan is creating user personas, which includes gathering

qualitative information about their users. The end goal is to move towards a more proactive approach to building their services.

**Turning the Corner at High Speed:
How Collections Metrics Are Changing
in a Highly-Dynamic Environment**

Steve Oberg and Marija Markovic

Reported by Lisa Gonzalez

Marija Markovic and Steve Oberg presented an overview of how applying usage metrics in performing collection assessment has changed during the past five years. The presenters described how this evolved from the vantage point of their respective library types - corporate and academic. While COUNTER data and Google Analytics remain important, Altmetrics and other types of end-user data also can demonstrate usage and the value of library resources. Other sources of collection data regarding use include interlibrary loan (ILL) data, Google Scholar, and citation analysis. Markovic noted that corporate librarians must be highly focused on Return in Investment (ROI) to demonstrate both cost avoidance and cost savings. Articles obtained via either pay-per-view or ILL must demonstrate value to the end user. Managers in a corporate setting respond well to data visualization so the manager can view usage at as granular a level as possible. It is also

important for librarians to be prepared for even more demanding questions to be asked of the usage data once it becomes more comprehensible through visualization tools.

In an academic library setting, Oberg noted that his library moved from gathering data from disparate sources such as COUNTER reports and link resolver reports to implementing a specific plan for gathering fixed sets of data from standard sources for a set period of time. Usage data in an academic library must also demonstrate ROI. This is accomplished by building trust with administrators to demonstrate that the library is a wise steward of funds, illustrated by usage statistics gathering. Specifically, the library can show an acceptable cost-per-use for specific resources. At Wheaton, the library has developed a template of standard data points to collect, including COUNTER data, a narrower set of data from their link resolver than in previous years, and pay-per-view data. Selected data points serve as the template for the library's annual report. The data also assists the collection team in annually reviewing renewal decisions. Wheaton is less focused on differentiating between owned and subscribed resources and emphasizes showing ROI and value for their end users. Visualizing data for stakeholders is also important in an academic library setting and can be useful for developing a compelling story about the importance of investing in library resources.