NASIG Newsletter

Vol. 34, no. 3 September 2019 eISSN 1542-3417

Conference Reports

Pre-Conference Workshops

Contract Construction: Creating an Effective Licensing Toolkit in an Academic Library Setting

Stephanie Hess and Megan Kilb

Reported by Stephanie J. Adams

Stephanie Hess from Binghamton University and Megan Kilb from the University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill, are both responsible for licensing electronic resources at their respective institutions. During the workshop, they guided participants through various licensing concepts, helping them to identify important clauses and develop strategies that can be applied at their home libraries. They incorporated several group activities that allowed participants to apply the material presented.

The workshop consisted of six parts: an overview of standard terms, communication and stakeholders, determining priorities, negotiations, workflows, and records management. The presenters related the content throughout the workshop to the relevant sections of the NASIG Core Competencies for Electronic Resources Librarians (https://www.nasig.org/site_page.cfm?pk_association_webpage_menu=%20310&pk_association_webpage=7802).

Kilb began the overview of standard terms by defining a license agreement and describing typical license components. She also mentioned SERU (Shared Electronic Resource Understanding) as a possible alternative to standard license agreements in some situations. Standard terms included the parties referenced in licenses (licensee, licensor, authorized users, etc.), copyright, fair use, interlibrary loan, scholarly sharing, perpetual access rights, and ADA compliance. She cautioned participants to be aware of the contents of "forbidden" clauses, or those that can be objectionable to university counsel and contract offices. These included arbitration, indemnification, jurisdiction and governing law, and library responsibility for user behavior. Hess provided some advice and sample alternative language for managing these "forbidden" clauses. In a small group exercise, participants were tasked with identifying and analyzing specific terms within a sample license.

Stakeholders can include people and departments in the library, on campus, and outside your institution. Participants collaborated to compile a list of possible stakeholders from each group. The presenters then discussed when it might be advisable to contact each group during the licensing process. Communication with these groups is essential for negotiating a license in order to find out what is important to each stakeholder and make sure it is reflected in the terms. Handouts for the session contained a negotiation exercise that presented two scenarios. Participants were directed to discuss how to best advocate on behalf of the stakeholders and address their concerns.

The priorities of each group of stakeholders can vary. For example, the library may be concerned with the types of authorized users, permissibility of interlibrary loan, and discovery issues, while campus priorities may focus on auto-renewal and accessibility. If the college is a state institution, there may be additional priorities determined by state laws and regulations, such as allowable governing law, indemnification, and limitation of liability. Due to the extent of these different priorities, it is important to categorize them in preparation for negotiations. Licensing guidelines or checklists for your institution should contain the following categories:

- Business and access terms (ownership, authentication method, pricing model, etc.)
- Required elements
- Strongly preferred elements
- Unacceptable terms
- Contingencies/special situations
- Language to watch for

Participants were given time to complete a categorization activity where they decided how clauses referencing governing law, fair use rights, and authorized users would be categorized at their home institutions.

Categorizing institutional and stakeholder priorities helps to inform the negotiation portion of the licensing process. The presenters advised asking for the ideal first when approaching a negotiation, but preparing an acceptable fallback position. They also discussed deal-breaker terms and the possibility of using mitigating language to counter them. License negotiators should have a plan in place for handling deal-breakers. The plan should identify which stakeholders must be involved when these situations arise. A group activity handout on licensing exceptions described two scenarios involving deal-breakers and participants were asked to provide possible solutions.

Establishing workflows for the licensing process helps to track handoffs among staff, balance workload, and address bottlenecks. Kilb shared a sample flowchart for one-time purchases and renewals, a staff responsibility matrix, and a review checklist used at the University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill, for managing licensing workflows. Suggested project management planning tools were Asana, Microsoft, Planner, and Trello.

Hess concluded the workshop by discussing the importance of records management that consists of version control during negotiations, storage and accessibility of documents, and development of a retention schedule. It is important to develop a retention schedule for all documentation created during the negotiation process including emails, as records can be involved in liability issues. Formulating a retention schedule may involve others on campus and there may be state requirements to uphold.

The Future of Scholarly Communications

Lisa Hinchliffe

Reported by Kristen Twardowski

In this pre-conference workshop, Lisa Hinchliffe, professor/coordinator for information literacy services and instruction in the University Library at the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, gave participants the tools to explore changes to the landscape of scholarly communications. These futures planning exercises included the futures wheel, trend analysis, creating guided discussion prompts, and exploring black swan events.

The futures wheel is a visual method for examining potential consequences of an event. For example, the wheel might explore what would happen if a library had 20% of its budget cut. Branching off that would be the first order effects, the immediate consequences of that cut. Then users of the future wheel would look at second order effects based off the first order effects. In the case of a library budget cut, a first order effect might be that a freeze is put in place on new acquisitions. The second order effect of that freeze could be dissatisfaction from faculty about the lack of new resources.

Though the futures wheel requires little advanced preparation, the next methodology explored in the workshop, trend analysis, involves previously collected data. Trend analysis delves into specific, already established scenarios. The pre-conference used trends identified in the 2019 SSP Charleston/ATG Trendspotting Trend Lab to explore how trends manifest, their impacts, and the best-case and worst-case scenarios for them.

The pre-conference participants also learned how to create discussion prompts as a future strategy. As part of the University of Illinois, Urbana-Champaign's strategic planning process, Hinchliffe led library faculty and staff through a series of prompts aimed at improving their exploratory thinking. The prompts started with a short observational statement and then went into focused questions.

Black swan events were the final future strategies tool presented. A black swan event is an occurrence that people could not anticipate. Thinking about that impossible event allows individuals to work backwards to identify unlikely but still possible events and to prepare for them. One sample black swan event is considering what if a major publisher were to be sold to a Chinese company. That may not happen any time soon, but Chinese companies are purchasing many individual journals. What effects will that have on the publishing industry?

Faculty and staff at libraries can use all of these strategies not only to identify possible futures but also to pinpoint the most desirable outcomes and align themselves to increase their likelihood. Of course, any futures study is not a prediction, merely a possibility. Unexpected events will happen, and people should adjust their actions accordingly. Though substantial changes can appear to have a single triggering event, multiple steps were always taken to lead to a particular future.

Library Leadership Your Way

Jason Martin

Reported by Stephanie J. Adams

Dr. Jason Martin, the interim dean of the James E. Walker Library at Middle Tennessee State University, distributed a workbook via his website (http://drjasonmartin.info/professional/service/nasig2019/) prior to the pre-conference workshop. Each participant was asked to complete various sections of the workbook throughout the session. The contents of the session were based on Martin's upcoming book entitled *Library Leadership Your Way*.

After giving a brief overview of the workshop agenda, Martin discussed the abundance of existing definitions for leadership and the importance of developing not only your own definition, but also a theory of leadership that explains how you will make your definition actionable. He explained that there are a variety of ways to lead and everyone has their own approach. Participants were asked to craft their own definitions and theories of leadership in the workbook and share them with the group. Elements of leadership definitions focused on motivating others both in completing organizational goals and in reaching their full potential, as well as the qualities of successful leaders. Commonalities in the participants' theories included the importance of listening and communicating as a leader so that you know your team and are working to keep them happy by being present (not ruling from afar).

The presenter then examined the leadership/followership process, specifically how leaders, followers, and organizational culture influence each other. Meaning is made in the interactions between leaders and followers. Participants were asked to reflect on how the romance of leadership, the idea that leadership is the main force in an organization's success or failure, has affected them.

Leaders must have a purpose founded on their personal and professional values, as well as a focus in order to stand out. Activities in the workbook for this section included listing personal and professional values, developing a leadership vision, and listing likes/dislikes about leadership. Martin emphasized that you must love your craft stating, "If you do not love it, then you cannot lead it."

Leading others requires building relationships and modeling desired behaviors. Martin urged participants to develop and practice a "people first, mission always" mindset within their organizations. He covered a number of leadership theories and philosophies including Theory X, Theory Y, Theory Z, transformational leadership, leader-member exchange, and servant leadership. The group discussed the strengths and shortcomings of each and were encouraged to consider which aspects of each theory and philosophy they could incorporate within their own leadership practices.

At the conclusion of the workshop, participants were asked to revisit their original definitions for leadership and make changes based on the concepts discussed throughout the workshop. They were challenged to put leadership concepts into practice by developing their unique selling proposition; defining leadership goals; and creating a leadership plan that incorporates a timeline, assessment/feedback, and reflection.

Recommended reading:

Martin, J. (2019). *Library leadership your way*. Chicago: ALA Editions.

Martin, J. (2019). The leadership/followership process: A new understanding of library leadership. *Journal of Academic Librarianship, 45*(1), 15-21.

Roll, R. (2012). *Finding ultra: Rejecting middle age, becoming one of the world's fittest men, and discovering myself*. New York: Three Rivers Press.

Willink, J., & Babin, L. (2017). *Extreme ownership: How U.S. Navy SEALs lead and win*. New York: St. Martin's Press.

Conference Sessions

An Accessibility Survey of Libraries: Results, Best Practices, and Next Steps

Beth Ashmore, Jill Grogg, and Hannah Rosen

Reported by Dave Macaulay

Jill Grogg and Hannah Rosen presented the results of a survey conducted by the LYRASIS consortium on accessibility policies at member libraries; Beth Ashmore gave an account of what is being done in this area at North Carolina State University. The survey asked about library policies on accessibility, the tools and training provided to assist in interpreting and implementing these policies, and the mandates that informed their creation. The questions distinguished between policies for acquisition of content created outside the institution, for creation of content internally, and for implementation of systems used for hosting content.

The majority of respondents indicated they did not have an accessibility policy addressing content acquisition, while over half had either a formal or informal policy covering content creation. Over half had no policy regarding accessibility in systems used to host content. The takeaway here was that libraries are most progressive in this area when they have control over content. With respect to training about accessibility policies, self-training and webinars were the most common option where content acquisition and systems were concerned, while in-person training was common for content creation. WCAG, ADA, and Section 508 were much more frequently cited as mandates informing accessibility policies than were internal or state-level mandates. Responses to a question about who is in charge of updating accessibility policies were split evenly between uncertainty, university-level responsibility, and library-level responsibility, indicating that responsibility for accessibility policy is a significant issue.

Conclusions drawn from the LYRASIS perspective centered on the need for more investment in fostering a community of practice around accessibility policy resources, which could include a clearinghouse for VPATs, policy documents, and training opportunities. A single body might be able to handle assessment of VPATs and vendor remediation efforts for the community. To help with day-to-day decisions, it was recommended that libraries create their own policies even in the absence of state or institutional guidance. A white paper on this topic was scheduled to be published in June 2019.

At NCSU, the library works from accessibility mandates and policies established at the state and university level. Their institutional information technology department provides useful resources covering the creation of accessible content, as well as for assessing accessibility of resources during the procurement process. The library provides services and technology to patrons who require help in accessing library materials. Partners in the accessibility area include campus IT and the purchasing office, who help with training; consortia such as LYRASIS; state networks such as the NC LIVE shared purchasing group, which maintains a page with accessibility information about acquired resources; and the library community, as tools for accessibility audits are developed and shared. Accessibility-related work is distributed throughout the library. In terms specifically of metadata, projects have focused on treating accessibility issues as “malformed metadata” - locating missing “alternative text” elements for web graphics, fixing initialisms that may be misinterpreted by screen readers, and generally creating and documenting best practices for creating metadata that are optimized for accessibility, along with procedures for efficiently identifying and remediating deficiencies.

The Authentication Landscape in 2019: One Does Not Simply Walk into Order

Jeff Arsenault, Angela Dresselhaus, and Shoko Tokoro

Reported by Kristen Twardowski

In this session, Jeff Arsenault, senior account executive at EBSCO, Angela Dresselhaus, head of electronic resources at Eastern Carolina University, and Shoko Tokoro, electronic and continuing resources librarian at the University of North Carolina, Charlotte, explored how access authentication has changed in recent years as well as the potential and pitfalls found with using OpenAthens. Arsenault began with an overview of various e-resource access management types including IP authentication, referring and embedded URLs, barcode patterns, and user accounts with publishers.

Though IP authentication rose to be the dominant method, it is imperfect. RA21, a NISO initiative, seeks to standardize single sign-on solutions both to improve the discovery experience and to improve security protocols.

From there, the session moved into authentication case studies at the University of North Carolina, Charlotte (UNC-Charlotte), and Eastern Carolina University (ECU). Tokoro discussed UNC-Charlotte's experience moving from EZproxy to OpenAthens. EZproxy had served the university well since 2010; managing it was straightforward using stanzas, and an established community of users existed to help troubleshoot. However, the university decided to move to OpenAthens because it would provide more personalization to users, more easily prevent IP blocks, and allow for better control over which users are allowed access to which content. Struggles of moving to OpenAthens include the fact that not all publishers support OpenAthens, occasionally some DOIs fail to resolve, and that there is no established support community for OpenAthens. Despite these barriers, the benefits of OpenAthens outweigh the challenges for UNC-Charlotte.

Angela Dresselhaus then described why ECU also made the decision to move from EZproxy to OpenAthens. Under EZproxy, ECU experienced significant problems with data breaches, and usage data had to be heavily manipulated to account for illegal downloads. The university also has to manage access for a large contingent of off-site users from the local hospital that acts as ECU's teaching institute partner. By switching to OpenAthens, ECU could better segment resource access and offer a more user-friendly platform.

As of the time of the session, both UNC-Charlotte and ECU were still in the process of transitioning from EZproxy to OpenAthens, and Tokoro and Dresselhaus agreed on one main takeaway for a successful switch; campus IT had to be involved as soon as possible in the process. Other strategies such as maintaining account info, vendor contacts, and authentication training were important, but without campus IT support, the entire process would fall apart.

Bridging the Gap: Sustaining Publication of a Newly Created Undergraduate Research Journal

Melissa E. Johnson

Reported by Maria Stanton

Melissa E. Johnson, the Assistant Director of Reference and Education Services at Augusta University, shared the organization's experience launching and supporting *Arsenal*, an Open Access (OA), academic journal dedicated to publishing manuscripts from resulting undergraduate research. Augusta recognized that an early experience of writing and publishing would give students interested in an academic career a greater understanding of the overall research process.

A team was formed in 2015, and they reviewed existing publications in this space. The University of Pittsburgh's *Forbes & Fifth*, which publishes creative works along with student research, is still actively published. The team found that other publications appeared to be having difficulty. The University of North Georgia's *Papers & Publications* had not published since volume 6, 2017, at the time of the conference. However, volume 7, 2019, is now available. *Paper & Publications* is unique in that the journal accepts submissions from researchers outside the institution. Most of the examples, including *Arsenal*, are dedicated to promoting the research conducted at the institution.

The team encountered several early challenges, including faculty apprehension, insufficient submissions, changing publication boards, and graduating students. The faculty were concerned that students involved in faculty-lead research projects would publish results related to that work. In addition, this concern was further compounded by the fact the journal is OA. The journal typically receives fewer than four submissions per issue; the team was hoping for more. *Arsenal* is a student-led publication, and therefore the publication board turns over more frequently than would be ideal for managing an academic journal. Also, much of the work ended up being done by one student who was also trying to graduate. Finally, one of the submissions was still in the peer-review process at the time the author was graduating. With the student losing access to their university account, they encountered difficulties finalizing changes for publication. The team persevered and the first volume was published in 2016.

With a few issues now published, the team has also uncovered other concerns, including compliance with the mandates of the Internal Review Board (IRB) regarding research. The journal had to reject a submission because the IRB related to the research had specifically covered conducting research for a class and explicitly stated that the student was not allowed to publish the results.

The team has developed tools to help overcome some of these challenges. For example, they developed faculty mentor forms. The faculty are made aware the student wants to publish the research, and they give permission for the publication. Also, the team is working on greater visibility for the IRB process to ensure approval of publication. To manage the problem of changing personnel on the review board, the team works to ensure they have replacements in place.

Jennifer Davis, the scholarship and data librarian, and Sandra Bandy, the assistant director for content management, also contributed to the presentation. However, they were unable to attend the conference.

Arsenal is accessible at https://www.augusta.edu/curs/arsenal.php

Challenges of Collection Management: Analysis, Staffing, & Space

Lisa Adams, Michael Hanson, Ali Larsen, Melanie J. Church

Reported by Kristy White

Ali Larsen, serials and web resources librarian at Siena College, presented on "Managing the Unknown: Planning for the Uncertain Fate of Bound Periodicals." With two hundred active print subscriptions, Larsen found herself called into a meeting to discuss the need for space on campus and required to defend the periodicals collection. Larsen had to undertake a complete analysis of the library's serials collection, both current and bound journals, and the amount of space consumed by the two, as well as determine a process to ensure she could "defend the space" as necessary.

Facing not only the many challenges of print titles but trying to transition titles from print to electronic when possible, based on budgets and need, collection management librarians are often forced into a defensive stance, due to the typical, if not necessarily valid assumption that spaces with bound periodicals are under-utilized and better used by other campus entities. Knowing your collections and having policies and procedures manuals in place aid the process of defending your space.

In "Keep the Work Flowing: Managing Student Assistants in Deselection Projects," Melanie Church, content services librarian of Rockhurst University, started with approximately 100,000 volumes that needed to be weeded. Several smaller weeding projects had previously occurred but nothing on this scale. With a relatively small full-time and part-time staff, Church efficiently and effectively managed the large deselection project with student employee involvement. After developing a plan, Church and the liaison librarians were able to present the university faculty with lists of items in their collections suggested for deselection and a proposed plan of action for each department.

After undertaking the first part of the project, Church developed a set of processes for her student employees and delegated a significant part of the non-automated work. All student employees were trained in the same manner. She managed this project through a SharePoint website where trainings, documentation, schedules, and notification boards were always available.

With upcoming building renovations on the horizon at Sam Houston State University's library, Michael Hanson, head of library technical services, had to make quick and efficient decisions for weeding the print collections. Not only did the students desire some of the library space for a different use, but other academic departments were being moved into the library and at least three collections were being relocated. The print collection had not been weeded in three decades and in order to make good decisions, a quick, effective, and efficient method for analyzing usage statistics and data was needed.

"Employing Data to Right-Size" explains this context and the tools used to achieve these ends. Hanson found OCLC's Greenglass Innovations and data visualizations extremely useful for collating data into a single downloadable file, giving the librarians an easy way to manipulate the data however they wanted.

Compelling Evidence: New Tools and Methods for Aligning Collections with the Research Mission

Joelen Pastva

Reported by Marsha Seamans

Joelen Pastva reported on a 2017 citation analysis research conducted by a project team that included Bart Davis, Karen Gutzman, Stacy Konkiel, Ramune Kubilius, and Aaron Sorensen. The project addressed the question, "Outside of traditional scholarly communication, how can Galter Health Sciences Library & Learning Center best support the research needs of Northwestern University Clinical & Translational Science (NUCATS) and the Feinberg School of Medicine (FSM) community?"

Galter Library became a development partner for Dimensions, a linked research data platform with enriched and interlinked data aimed at reimagining discovery and access to research. Dimensions data includes clinical trials, publications, grants, policy documents, data sets, and Altmetrics. The data is enriched to include institution identification, concept extraction, categorization, researcher disambiguation and reference extraction.

Utilizing the Dimensions Plus version and the Dimensions API, the researchers investigated two topics: Northwestern-affiliated clinical trials in dermatology, and patents with file dates between 2008-2017 with Northwestern as the assignee. Results for clinical trials yielded a list of 730 journals with counts of the number of times cited. The top 20 most-cited journals were all accessible in the library.

For patents, a spreadsheet of patent-level descriptions joined with cited reference metadata identified 1,163 journals cited from 2008-2017. The data was filtered based on the presence of Dimensions-applied disease categorization (RCDC) code, analyzed using Excel and Python, and visualizations created using Excel and Tableau. Results indicated 43% of the journals were OA, and 80% of the citations were in the top 30% of journals.

Pastva offered some data caveats and collection development applications. The clinical trials search was a pilot run, waiting on improved API functionality. Patent data is impacted by filed year versus publication year, and the patent process itself muddies the origin of citations. Observations related to collection development include: no gaps in collecting were identified; usage versus citation shows some variation, but a strong positive correlation; older articles maintain significance; there is a different set of "core" journals in the patent universe; and there is a strong OA presence, perhaps impacted by research funding.

The research project began as an attempt to replicate traditional citation analysis using Dimensions but ended with investigating new resource types and new data fields for potential further research such as patent-patent, OA status, article metrics, RCDC and other classification systems.

Connecting the Dots: Reader Ratings, Bibliographic Data, and Machine-Learning Algorithms for Monograph Selection

Jingshan Xiao and Wenli Gao

Reported by Kate Seago

This presentation was a collaboration between two librarians, but unfortunately Jingshan Xiao was not able to be at NASIG. Wenli Gao started by outlining how big data developed. Big data along with machine learning allows recommender systems to operate in both library and non-library settings. She cited several statistics that demonstrated that users clearly respond to recommendations. Two non-library systems that rely heavily on recommender systems are Netflix and YouTube. She also mentioned library systems such as Harvard's Hamlet that recommends theses for users as well as Elsevier's article recommender. Furthermore, a library in the United Kingdom was able to demonstrate that use of a recommender system increased borrowing and that with a small personalization, the borrowing based on recommendations increased again.

The two basic recommender techniques are using a collaboration filter that bases choices on the opinions of other people who share similar interests and content method that relies on the metadata of the item plus what is known about the user. Their project drew more on the content method using sources that identified best sellers such as the *New York Times* and Goodreads, as well as WorldCat for bibliographic data. Gao outlined the programing and algorithm used to arrive at their recommendations. There are some limitations in using recommender systems such as availability and integrity of the data, privacy issues, and clarity of algorithms used.

Wenli finished the presentation with some questions to the audience about where they saw the usefulness of machine learning and if this presented a threat to their jobs. Discussion followed with consensus that there would always be a role for librarians to make sure data is clean and that if machine learning could do some of the routine tasks then that leaves more time for humans to handle the more complex issues.

Connections of Evidence: Using Best Practices of Assessment in an Ongoing Serials Analysis Project

Cynthia Kane

Reported by Heidi Card

Cynthia Kane, of Emporia State University, gave a constructive, relevant presentation on best practices in a serials assessment project, illuminating the current landscape of changing user needs, budgeting realities, and the challenges of collecting data, set within the context of an ongoing assessment project at her library.

Beginning with the demographics of Emporia State University, Cynthia noted details affecting their analysis, such as a student population with almost one third classified as off-campus. This group included both undergraduate and graduate distance programs. However, the majority of undergraduate majors were in programs located primarily on campus. A familiar situation was outlined—students are using the library spaces at a higher rate so print is removed to make room for students, but the knee-jerk response to move towards predominantly electronic collections conflicts with the higher pricing in electronic resources. Cynthia used the example of University of California's cancellation of Elsevier, as well as the University of Iowa, who made news with their own significant cancellations, to illustrate that bigger change can indeed be made with more defined assessment practices, highlighting a key element: transparency with stakeholders.

The presentation returned to ESU and how they faced their own assessment project to deal with the rising serials costs, noting a specific caveat: print use had decreased with both students and faculty, and the access conundrum creates raised expectations for electronic resources—patrons expect full text to be immediately available and are frustrated when they learn that ESU is not subscribed to every journal on their website or that there are barriers like embargos. Cynthia then outlined her plan to move their assessment ahead with all these considerations, while creating assessment themes using the ACRL framework of "searching as strategic exploration" and the idea that assessment has three clear steps: goals, information, and action.

Cynthia provided a brief historical illustration of previous Emporia Library serials analysis to contrast their current project—noting specifically how they learned the importance of educating faculty on embargos, subscription overlaps, and assurances that despite the analysis and discussions about cancellations, core journals would not be cancelled. Above all, she noted transparency in conversations with academic departments was key to keeping the lines of communication open.

The presentation closed with a demonstration of assessment goals, specific usage reports, cost-per-use calculations, and a benchmark for cancellations. Cynthia shared a template she created for documenting the data with a reminder of the potential data challenges that can skew usage stats.

This presentation was a clear illustration of one library's experience with an assessment project, complete with background information, the context of the school, demographics, and the methodology that was used. Specific tips such as "befriending anyone in the research office" for easy access to university demographics rounded out this very personable and informative presentation.

Demystifying Digital Preservation

Shannon Keller

Reported by Mary Wimer

Although the digital era has its upsides, publications owned by less than three libraries are at risk and could cease to be available. The Digital Preservation Task Force makes recommendations for NASIG to raise awareness and develop tools reducing the risk of losing important scholarly content. Committee members include Chair Shannon Keller (New York Public Library), James Phillpotts (Oxford University Press), Wendy Robertson (University of Iowa), and Heather Staines (hypothes.is).

On NASIG's website, the task force published key documents including Digital Preservation 101 and the Guide to the Keepers Registry. With the Keepers Registry, you can enter titles and run a report of what is at risk in your collection. Additionally, the task force surveyed the NASIG community and found that people know Portico, CLOCKSS, and LOCKSS but not the Keepers Registry, which has much potential.

Additionally, the survey identified that people are unsure of how to participate in digital preservation. Part of the reason is the ambiguity between born digital and digitized. Financial support was the most popular response to how we can help with digital preservation. When asked about lack of involvement, survey respondents cited lack of budget, time, and staff, as well as the difficulty to show value to administrators. Academic libraries are mostly neutral for CLOCKSS because many do not understand it. One reason the task force encourages involvement is that the Digital Preservation Network closed its doors in 2018. To better explain the importance of digital preservation, Ithaka published "The State of Digital Preservation in 2018: A Snapshot of Challenges and Gaps".
How can you help? Committee work is an option. Learning from digital preservation networks going forward is imperative. We can identify licensing suggestions and convince publishers about the importance of preservation. As librarians, we need to know what we can and cannot do with digital files. The task force stresses that institutions need a digital preservation policy.

Education and outreach are a necessity. We can teach about the Keepers Registry and conduct workshops on talking to administrators. Advocating preservation can be incorporated into workflow processes and planning. Administrators will want to understand the need to prepare for costs. Digital storage is not cheaper than physical storage, and storage can take up a lot of staff time.

Currently, libraries and communities proactive with digital preservation initiatives include the New York Public Library, France, and the Netherlands. The United Kingdom implements laws supporting digital preservation. The Library of Congress is working on guidance and policies. The task force urges librarians to be proactive and to start with understanding by reading the publications mentioned in this article.

"Mary Wimer contributed to this article in her personal capacity. The views expressed are her own and do not necessarily represent the views of the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention or the United States government."

EBA Is Not for You, or Is It?

Louis Houle

Reported by Kristen Twardowski

Using data collected from five years of e-book package purchases, director of collections at McGill University, Louis Houle, examined whether e-book acquisition through packages or evidence based acquisition (EBA) was the right choice. McGill is a large university of over 40,000 students, the libraries have a budget of approximately $42 million, and historically, the university has purchased the bulk of its e-books through large packages.

To determine whether that was a good purchasing practice, Houle analyzed the use of titles in e-book packages purchased from Elsevier, Springer, and Wiley between 2014 and 2018. Houle was interested in answering several questions: What portion of the packages was used? What was the cost-per-use of each package, and how did that compare to the list price? Moreover, what would the cost of these collections have been if McGill had purchased titles using EBA instead?

Though usage from each of the publisher packages varied over the five years, each package saw over 90% of titles used, resulting in a cost per use well below the list price of the titles. Had McGill purchased through EBA instead, the university would have had to acquire fewer titles at a higher price per title, and some usage would have been lost as a result of having smaller overall collections.

Houle concluded that for McGill University, continuing to purchase large e-book packages is the most cost effective option. It provides a better average cost per title, access to more content, less time spent on selection, easier overall management, less user frustration, no missing titles over time, and no extra costs over the year. However, for institutions with a different student make up or smaller budget, EBA is still a good option, as it has lower yearly costs and more flexibility when choosing titles. Ultimately, different e-book purchasing models best suit different institutions, and libraries should carefully consider their own situations when choosing how to acquire e-books.

Ebooks: Access vs. Ownership

Alexis Linoski and Sofia Slutskaya

Reported by Carol Robenstine Miller

A fundamental choice for libraries is whether to own the electronic books in their collections or purchase access to the content. In this presentation, Sofia Slutskaya, metadata strategist at Georgia Tech Library, discussed the advantages and disadvantages of these two approaches to collection development and the factors that may influence a library's decision. She described key characteristics of the Georgia Tech Library environment and the acquisition models used to provide access to e-books in the library's collection, discussed factors that influenced the library's decisions about e-book acquisition methods, and explained how the selected models meet specific needs of her organization.

The technical services department at the Georgia Tech Library is comprised of nine staff members. Slutskaya explained that the library currently purchases print resources only when electronic versions are unavailable. Electronic books and journals comprise over half of the collection, and usage of the library's e-resources far exceeds that of its print resources. All print books are stored offsite, which makes it critically important that patrons be able to discover resources through virtual browsing.

The Georgia Tech Library collection includes both purchased e-books and subscribed content. The library uses several methods to purchase e-books. Some titles are acquired as part of a collection (e.g., a package of frontlist titles) that is purchased from a vendor. Individual titles may be purchased either by firm order or through Demand-Driven Acquisition (DDA)/Access-to-Own (ATO) or Evidence-Based Selection (EBS) plans.

The suitability of fit between these acquisition models and the library environment was an important consideration in the evaluation of their features. Due to the importance of resource discoverability, high levels of metadata quality and access granularity were the decision points for selection. Other factors that influenced the choice of models include availability of MARC records in the library service platform (LSP) knowledge base, ease of providing and maintaining access, permanence of retention in the catalog, frequency of updates, and staff comfort level with workflows. Slutskaya emphasized that aspects of the library environment such as its priorities or access to financial and staff resources sometimes shift, and the e-resource environment itself is subject to frequent changes. She reiterated that decisions about e-book collection methods are never permanent, and evaluation of the factors that influenced the library's choices are part of an ongoing conversation.

The purchase of an e-book is a one-time expenditure that ensures perpetual access to content. The downside is that expenditures for e-book purchases vary from year to year, which can make budget planning and cost management somewhat challenging. Deposit accounts, if available, may simplify matters, but the budget may not always be able to accommodate unanticipated purchase requests.

Vendors offer a wide variety of purchase models, and new or hybrid models are frequently introduced. The availability of multiple options increases the likelihood that a library will find a plan that satisfies its requirements. Purchase models are designed to simplify and streamline the process of acquiring e-books, but each plan has a different workflow, and almost all purchase plans require local management of acquisition plans, purchases, cataloging, and collection maintenance.

Purchased e-books are cataloged at the title level, and the quality of their MARC records tends to be high, making them easy to discover through virtual browsing. Titles acquired as part of a package are cataloged at the collection level and have a lower level of access granularity.

Subscription access to e-book content requires payment of an annual fee. Although the cost of access typically increases each year, paying a set fee simplifies budget planning and cost management. Access to content is lost if the subscription is not maintained. Collection subscriptions typically allow unlimited access to all content, as do some other subscription models. Some plans limit the number of concurrent users or impose other restrictions on access. Models that offer purchase options charge a short-term loan (STL) fee to access content. E-books are purchased automatically after a set number of STLs, so a library may inadvertently buy titles it does not want or incur unanticipated expenses. EBS plans may also force the purchase of unwanted titles.

Subscription access requires a low level of local management, and catalog maintenance is uncomplicated. Technical staff manage the cataloging workflow for DDA/ATO plans, and the vendor manages all acquisition and catalog processing for subscription collections. Local management is required for only a portion of acquisition and cataloging workflows for other subscription models.

Content that is accessed by subscription may have a low level of access granularity. Subscription collections are cataloged at the collection level. DDA/ATO and EBS e-books are cataloged at the title level, but the quality of their MARC records typically is low. Most vendor-provided MARC records are discovery records that contain minimal descriptive metadata, and the quality of records found in knowledge bases frequently is poor.

E-book ownership requires a single payment, ensures perpetual access to content, and provides a high level of resource discoverability. Access to subscription content requires payment of an annual fee, access is lost if the subscription is not maintained, and content that is accessed by subscription is less easily discovered than owned content. Purchase model workflows are labor-intensive and require a high degree of local management and staff expertise. Subscription access workflows are relatively simple and require minimal local management. Subscriptions provide access to a larger volume and wider variety of content at a far lower price than purchase of the same content would entail. Despite the advantages that e-book ownership provides, subscription access may be a better acquisition model for libraries that have small technical services departments.

Getting More Bang for your Buck: Working with Vendors in the Age of the Shrinking Staff

Sara Bahnmaier, Bill Sherfey, and Maria Hatfield

Reported by Kate Seago

This presentation provided perspectives from the library and from vendors about when and why libraries would want to use vendor services and how to make the relationship productive for all involved. Sara Bahnmaier led off with a discussion on what led the University of Michigan to look at vendor services and see what made sense in their current environment. Bahnmaier outlined that librarians and staff had been shifted away from traditional serial and technical services duties in order to accommodate growth in new areas such as data management, metadata, accessibility, etc. Vendor services were able to fill in the gaps by handling access issues, providing EDI invoicing, and package management as well as online databases with a wealth of information about titles and tailored reports. A key point Bahnmaier mentioned that would be echoed by both Bill Sherfey and Maria Hatfield was that good communication and a clear understanding on what is possible is essential.

Using the history of Harrassowitz as an example, Bill Sherfey provided a solid overview of the sort of services that a vendor could provide to a library, as well as covering the history of how library vendors got started. Just as libraries have adapted to changes, library vendors have adapted their services to the changing needs of libraries. Vendors started by providing accurate orders, follow up to claims, assisting in title renewals, and providing payment options friendly to libraries. These services continue, but have shifted to include electronic delivery of invoices, online renewal options and reports, and management of electronic packages.

Building on the previous two presentations, Maria Hatfield concentrated on the steps for starting a relationship with vendor. She outlined how W.T. Cox has a team in place to assist the library in walking through the steps of setting up the account. She emphasized communication between the vendor and the library as key to a successful transition. There is a lot of information that needs to be exchanged about account structures, EDI protocols, title lists, and special instructions. Both sides need to figure out the optimal way to communicate with each other whether it is via phone, email, etc. as well as making sure it is clear what is needed for the next step. Many questions are asked and a lot of data is exchanged, but at the end of the day it a good working relationship between the vendor and library that ensures continued success for both.

Inside-Out and Outside-In: A Holistic Approach to Metadata Assessment for an Off-Site Storage

Marlene van Ballegooie and Juliya Borie

Reported by Shannon Keller

In their presentation titled, "Inside-Out and Outside-In: A Holistic Approach to Metadata Assessment for an Off-Site Storage Collection," Marlene van Ballegooie and Juliya Borie from the University of Toronto described their approach to a metadata review of serials data for materials stored in the off-site storage facility, Downsview. The speakers detailed their total reliance on metadata to serve users with material from

Downsview. They assessed their serials metadata to improve service, facilitate comparison across partner library collections, and to prepare for an upcoming system migration to a new library services platform. Their methodology involved multiple approaches including: reviewing local vs. community managed records vs. CONSER records, recording perceptions of staff and library partners, surveying library users, and conducting focus groups with librarians and graduate students. They utilized Bruce and Hillmann's metadata quality measurement and metrics in their assessment, including completeness, accuracy, conformance to expectations, logical consistency and coherence, timeliness, and accessibility. At the conclusion of the presentation van Ballegooie and Borie provided details about their assessment. They concluded that serials metadata is dynamic and keeping up with serials metadata is challenging. In addition, indexing is important and metadata and systems are intertwined to the point that system interface design can impact discoverability. In addition, they observed that users are format neutral and the metadata needs to be flexible to meet user expectations. Their next steps include devising a strategy to improve records to improve discoverability, and building assessment into the process.

Bruce, Thomas.R. and Diane I. Hillmann, "Metadata in Practice," in *The Continuum of Metadata Quality: Defining, Expressing, Exploiting*, 238–256. (Chicago: ALA Editions, 2004).

Interactions between Technical and Public Services: Perceptions from Three Different Librarians

Heidi Zuniga, Xiaoyan Song, Raymond Pun

Reported by Chris Vidas

Academic librarians continue to strive to eliminate departmental barriers that exist within libraries. A strong library should be comprised of departments that work together seamlessly while demonstrating open and consistent communication, but it is not always as clear how that reality should unfold. In truth, it should be expected that specific operational functions will differ from institution to institution. For that reason, it was beneficial to hear the perspectives of three librarians offering ideas and solutions surrounding the ways in which technical services departments engage with public services units.

Heidi Zuniga was the first presenter from the trio of librarians, and she offered insight into how her position as Electronic Resources Management Librarian impacts public services at Colorado State University. She was fortunate to have served previously as a subject liaison where she witnessed database problems from a user's perspective. By conducting research with an array of e-resources, it quickly became clear that resolutions may demand time and patience, and more importantly, improvements may not occur unless public services librarians are diligent about reporting problems as they are discovered. Heidi came to appreciate that the library ecosystem requires widespread participation to improve working relationships through activities such as joint projects, lunch and learn events, task forces, and even acknowledging colleagues with casual greetings. Her concluding words of wisdom reminded attendees that improved communication builds stronger working relationships and that mutual respect and independence are possible across library units.

Xiaoyan Song discussed efforts to build a more outward facing technical services unit at North Carolina State University. She referenced a quiz that was utilized to determine if the unit was more inward or outward facing. Inward facing units focus more on specific tasks, whereas outward facing units engage users, work collaboratively to address issues, and ultimately create a culture of communication and teamwork. She emphasized that an outward facing unit focuses more on results and strives to witness progress over time rather than obsess over processes.

The session concluded with Raymond Pun discussing his dynamic role at the Alder Graduate School of Education where he performs both public and technical services responsibilities. While his independent role may eliminate the need for communication between librarians, it also provides an enlightening perspective from which to learn about the impact that technical services responsibilities can have on public services. Raymond oversaw many recent changes that affected the website, EZproxy, the collection development policy, library outreach, and more. Juggling these many responsibilities inspired Raymond to share his experiences, specifically focusing on the importance of regularly engaging faculty and students from both a public and technical services standpoint.

Each presenter offered unique solutions to common problems, and the common theme was communication and collaboration. While each library will identify unique techniques and workflows for accomplishing specific tasks, the way in which separate units engage can have a dramatic impact on morale and productivity. Each presenter suggested that improvements in communication and collegiality bolstered attitudes amongst the staff and produced better outcomes for both librarians and the populations they serve.

Managing Open Content Resources from Discovery to Delivery

Danielle Bromelia and Rhiannon Valaine Bruner

Reported by Maria Stanton

Danielle Bromelia, Product Analyst from OCLC, and Rhiannon Valaine Bruner, librarian from Wesleyan College, discussed challenges and strategies related to managing and promoting open access content.

The team started by outlining that one of the greatest challenges libraries currently face is simply defining open access content. Another challenge they addressed is that availability does not equal discoverability.

To overcome these challenges, libraries need clear collection development policies and workflows for open content. Open content often lacks consistent metadata indicators; it is variously described as freely available or open or not even given a proper metadata tag to support discovery. As a side consideration, could this be a standards opportunity?

While some institutions publish the selection criteria, it appears that OA may be under greater scrutiny at times than licensed publications. For example, some institutions limit OA holdings to titles indexed in online databases or ones included in a knowledgebase.

Best practices for collection development include the involvement of librarians from across the e-resources workflow, and clearly defined selection and evaluation criteria. The examples cited included the University of North Texas's *Collection Development Policy for Open Access and Born-Digital Resources*, which includes clearly stated goals, selection responsibility and guidelines, access, copyright compliance, and collection maintenance. Examples of Emory University and Duke University collection development and management policies were also discussed.

The talk discussed the importance of enabling open content for users coming from various sources, e.g., discovery layers, A-Z lists, and the local OPAC. OCLC demonstrated how to enable the "open content filter" for WorldCat.org and WorldCat Discovery.

Minding your Ps and Qs: Predatory Journals, Piracy, and Quality Questions

Marydee Ojala and Regina Reynolds

Reported by Kay G. Johnson

Marydee Ojala, Editor-in-Chief of Online Searcher, and Regina Reynolds, Director of the U.S. ISSN Center, described the challenges of identifying predatory journals, and the dangers of the proliferation of low-quality research. What makes a predatory journal? Ojala's Online Searcher is a non-peer reviewed magazine instead of a peer-reviewed scholarly journal, which falls outside the scope of guidelines that characterize predatory publishing. However, Online Searcher is definitely not predatory. Reynolds sees the term "predatory" as painting all journals with the same brush, and that there are fifty shades of gray with publishing and predatory publishing terms. A new journal may be amateurish; a different journal may be fraudulent. The spectrum of predatory publishing includes totally false journals; pseudo-scholarly publications that make false claims about impact factors or peer-review; hijacked titles that deceive by looking like legitimate journals; and scams where money is taken from authors or subscribers, but nothing is published.

Scholars publish in predatory journals because of publish or perish pressure, ease of getting articles accepted for publication, fast publishing turnaround, and growing support and requirements for Open Access (OA) publishing. The current system to publish in legitimate, peer-reviewed journals is a disadvantage to the increasing numbers of researchers in Global South countries; mainstream journals may not want to publish articles from these countries.

Other ways researchers fall prey to scholarly predation is by predatory conferences, and by token editor or editorial board positions where no editing is performed. Conferences and author page charges (APC) are moneymaking opportunities for predatory publishers. "Editors" of predatory journals may have no expertise or background in the journal topic.

Good science can be published in predatory journals, and non-predatory journals may publish fake science. The issue of high quality vs. low-quality research is the crux of the matter. Ojala and Reynolds describe resources such as *Think. Check. Submit.* and the *CRAAP Test* to help researchers identify trusted journals and sources of information. Cabell's fee-based *Blacklist* and several free websites offer lists of predatory journals. The ISSN role is to identify a publication, not to determine whether a journal is fraudulent. It is the responsibility of academia to raise awareness of predatory practices and low-quality journals, remove incentives to publish in these journals, and scrutinize editorial boards and publications more carefully in making tenure, promotion, or hiring decisions. Librarians have a role in educating faculty to discern between predatory and legitimate journals and publishers. OA journals should be assessed for their inherent value. Dealing with the inconvenience of predatory publishing today is changing the publishing and research environments towards a future permanent improvement in the scholarly landscape.

Resources:

CRAAP Test: https://library.csuchico.edu/help/source-or-information-good

Think. Check. Submit: https://thinkchecksubmit.org/

NASIG Core Competencies: Building a Bridge to the LIS Curricula and Job Responsibilities

Cris Ferguson and Caitlin Harrington

Reported by Carol Robenstine Miller

Cris Ferguson, Assistant Dean of Libraries, Murray State University, and Caitlin Harrington, Electronic Resources Librarian, University of Memphis, presented the findings of two recent studies that focused on different aspects of electronic resource management. The NASIG Core Competencies for Electronic Resources Librarians enumerates a range of competencies required to manage the responsibilities and processes that comprise each stage of the electronic resource life cycle. One study sought to determine the extent to which these competencies are taught in Library and Information Science programs, and the other examined how electronic resource management responsibilities are distributed in small- to mid-sized academic research universities.

Ferguson reported on a study that examined the degree to which content related to electronic resources, either as the primary subject of a course or as part of a course related to technical services, is included in the curricula of ALA-accredited Library and Information Science Master's programs. Cataloging courses were not addressed in this study.

Researchers found that only 16.67% of programs in the study sample offered courses on electronic resources. They observed that technical services courses and those that focus on technology and automation were grouped separately in the curricula, with the result that course content from both groups was needed in order to address all of the Core Competencies. Ferguson noted that awareness of and interest in electronic resource management typically develops after library school. Overall, the study data indicated that the competencies typically expected of an entry-level electronic resources librarian are not taught in library schools.

Filling electronic resource management positions is challenging, and a formal structure for learning the Core Competencies is not readily available to potential and early-career electronic resources librarians. Support for this career path might be provided through post-graduate internships and alternatives to formal instruction such as webinars and online courses that target the Core Competencies.

Harrington discussed the findings of a study designed to determine how responsibilities for managing the acquisition, access, administration, support, and evaluation of electronic resources are distributed among staff members at small- to mid-sized academic research universities. The study was limited to institutions categorized in the [Carnegie Classification of Institutions of Higher Education]() as small or medium R2 and D/PU doctoral universities. Core Competencies listed as personal qualities were excluded from this study because they are not related to specific job responsibilities.

The NASIG Core Competencies provide a useful overview of the large number and wide variety of responsibilities and processes that comprise the electronic resource life cycle. The workflows and number of staff members employed to manage electronic resources varies significantly among institutions of different types and sizes. While all electronic resource management responsibilities in smaller libraries may be assigned to one librarian, in larger libraries the acquisition, access, administration, support, and evaluation of electronic resources are often managed by different librarians.

The small- to mid-sized universities included in the study sample typically did not have a dedicated electronic resources librarian. Often, responsibilities for managing electronic resources were shared by staff members in R2 institutions, while more librarians in D/PU universities were solely responsible for electronic resource management.

Open Educational Resources: OER, Building Collaborative Bridges

Sarah W. Sutton

Reported by Scott McFadden

Sarah Sutton presented a case study of the experiences of the Open Educational Resources (OER) Task Force at Emporia State University, particularly their collaborations with internal and external stakeholders. Emporia State is a public institution in central Kansas with 3,569 undergraduates and 2,227 graduate students. It is the smallest of the six universities governed by the Kansas Board of Regents.

In Fall 2018, the Provost and Dean of Graduate Studies at ESU convened a task force to study current and future OER efforts at ESU. The task force began by adopting an operational definition of OER, "Open Educational Resources are teaching, learning, and research resources that reside in the public domain or have been released under an intellectual property license, such as Creative Commons, that permits their free use and re-purposing by others. OER include full courses, course materials, modules, textbooks, streaming videos, tests, software, and any other tools, materials, or techniques used to support access to knowledge." This definition was adapted from the William and Flora Hewlett Foundation.

Complications with this definition became clear as discussions with various stakeholders revealed varying levels of understanding of OER. For example, faculty and students both failed to realize that library resources are not actually free, and thus saw no distinction between traditional library materials and OER. Parents and students also tended to regard textbooks as a nonessential cost of higher education. Another problem was that the task force did not make enough effort to market this definition to the university community. As a result, many of the faculty were unaware that a definition had been adopted and were resistant to efforts to incorporate OER into their promotion and tenure guidelines. In retrospect, greater efforts to publicize the definition would have been useful.

The task force also recommended incorporating OER as an initiative in the ESU strategic plan. Students are clearly seeking an increased use of OER, as indicated by a student government survey and by course evaluations. In addition, OER is high on the agenda of the Kansas Board of Regents. This sort of inclusion within institutional strategic plans and other documents gives the proposal added strength.

Developing and using OERs places a burden on already busy faculty. There is a need to create incentives for faculty to create OERs, although the more traditional incentives of promotion and tenure may still take precedence as faculty allocate their time. In addition, intellectual property rights relating to the creation of OERs are often not entirely clear. As for students, while many are interested in OER, there remains a substantial percentage (close to 50 per cent) who prefer to purchase a hard copy textbook rather than use a free online version. Involvement of librarians is central to the success of OER initiatives.

The work of the task force resulted in a successful road map for moving toward increased creation and adoption of OERs. Steps included surveying the OER terrain, building networks, developing OER infrastructure, institutionalizing OER, and finally marketing OER success.

Optimizing Discovery: Developing a Holistic Approach to Managing a Discovery Service

Seth Sisler

Reported by Julia Palos

Seth Sisler, from Ohio University Libraries, presented a framework for approaching the management of a discovery service. Throughout the presentation, he used his institution’s recent experience with updating their discovery service for illustrations. He began with a brief history of Ohio University’s discovery platform and then moved on to the method librarians had used to update it: a holistic approach, combining the perspectives of users, technical services personnel, and public services personnel.

Sisler highlighted three primary elements of developing a holistic approach to managing a discovery service:

1) Actively manage your service through understanding the back-end functionality, performing routine maintenance and troubleshooting, and being able to answer questions about the platform. Be ready to research solutions and communicate with vendor representatives and colleagues at other institutions.

2) Communicate and collaborate with colleagues outside your unit. Don’t allow yourself to become isolated. Knowing how to make changes is different from knowing what changes are necessary or useful to others, and every change you make could break something for another area. To increase collaboration, Ohio University formed a working group composed of personnel from several different library departments in order to strategize big-picture improvements to the system.

3) Understand your users and their search behaviors. Sisler noted that technical services librarians often don’t interact directly with users, instead relying on second-hand reports of problems. He recommended combining quantitative data (e.g. usage stats, reference chat logs) with qualitative feedback (e.g. surveys, usability studies) in order to form a full picture of user-preferences.

The speaker concluded his presentation by reporting some of the notable changes the working group made to their discovery service based on discussions and testing. He also listed some of the next steps for Ohio University Libraries, such as establishing an assessment cycle to catch problems early and conducting staff usability testing.

Out with the Old, in with the New: Revising ERM Workflows in a Time of Change

Kailey Brisbin and Hana Storova

Reported by Chris Vidas

Managing electronic resources in a large academic library is a daunting task, especially when utilizing outdated workflows. This was the challenging scenario in which Kailey and Hana had found themselves preceding migration to Alma, the selected library services platform (LSP) to be shared by institutions within their consortium. Their enlightening discussion offered insight into how they managed their electronic resource management (ERM) workflows at the University of Guelph in Ontario, Canada.

Kailey and Hana jointly manage the Electronic Resources and Metadata Team. Relatively recent staffing changes within their library allowed the dynamic pair to seize upon an opportunity to improve the way that their team functioned. Prior to their leadership, ERM workflows had not been updated in many years, having been generated at a time when the university possessed far fewer e-resources and systems. In addition, many workflows had not been previously documented, a problem that their revitalized team continues to work to rectify.

One of the primary goals of their work was to provide clarity to the tasks that their team completed. That process involved eliminating duplication of effort and introducing the ability to claim specific tasks. Their team referred to *Techniques for Electronic Resource Management* (TERMS) and *NASIG Core Competencies for E-Resources Librarians* for additional guidance. Throughout the process, communication was a major key to success so that team members understood individual roles within each workflow. Once this improved system was introduced, it became possible to prioritize tasks and to estimate the time and effort required to rectify an issue.

Ultimately, Kailey and Hana crafted new policies and procedures that enhanced communication and streamlined specific tasks. As the team revised its workflows, it became increasingly obvious that the strong leadership provided by Kailey and Hana had proven to be a major boon. By focusing on user experience, they established a solid foundation for their team's work heading into the migration to Alma. Their efforts yielded noticeable benefits pre-migration and will continue to do so post-migration. By sharing their experience, they have provided attendees of the enthusiastic audience with the tools necessary to begin dissecting and improving their own ERM workflows.

Predicting Potential Serial Use

Matt Jabaily

Reported by Kate Seago

This was an exploration about whether librarians have any valid method to predict potential serial use.

The presenter outlined several reasons why this would be useful such as identifying good value for new subscriptions, highlighting poor performing subscriptions, considering the opportunity cost when evaluating current subscriptions. In addition, this would be a data-driven method rather than relying on the perceptions of faculty or others about how critical a journal is to the collection.

The presenter provided a review of the literature on predicting potential serial use. There is very little out there and most rely on usage data. However, as most electronic resources librarians know, usage is very murky and may not be the most reliable method. However, it is often the only data available. He pointed to "Garbage In, Gospel Out" by Bucknell (2012) as the classic discussion of this issue. Other potential ways to predict serials use might be the impact factor, ILL requests, turnaway reports or failed link resolver requests.

The presenter outlined what an ideal study might include: selecting a resource based on indications of demand, purchase access, review usage then seeing if there was a correlation between the indication of demand and actual usage. Since the perfect study rarely appears in the real world, the presenter outlined two case studies done at his home institution at Colorado Springs.

The first study was an upgrade from *CINAHL with Full Text* to *CINAHL Premium*, which increased the number of journals available and the depth of coverage for others. After the upgrade had been available for a year, neither a comparison of usage nor ILL requests presented positive evidence of meeting demand.

The second study was the expansion of their JSTOR Arts and Sciences Collection from access to sets I to VIII to sets I to XI. Again, there was not a clear indication from usage or comparison of ILL requests that this strongly met an unmet need or demand.

While a definite method for predicting potential serial use was not identified, the presenter explored what had been attempted and demonstrated some of the issues in applying different methods to real life situations.

Prioritizing Accessibility in the E-Resources Procurement Lifecycle: VPATs as a Practical Tool for E-Resource Acquisitions and Remediation Workflows in Academic Libraries

Kerry Falloon and Faye O'Reilly

Reported by Jean Sibley

Professor Kerry Falloon, Acquisitions Librarian, CUNY – College of Staten Island, and Faye O'Reilly, Digital Resources Librarian, Wichita State University Libraries, presented on how their respective universities are approaching VPATs in a workable and time-effective manner during e-resources acquisitions and remediation workflows.

In 2016, CSI Library began collecting VPATs (Voluntary Product Accessibility Templates) in CORAL, an open source electronic resource management system. In 2017, they received a grant to evaluate the accessibility of library resources regarding ADA compliance and AA standards. They used California State University's ATI (Accessible Technology Initiative) as a model for accessibility documentation, compliance and workflow. Falloon mentioned other tools for compliance, such as AIM's WAVE tool and Color Contrast Checker, PDF Accessibility Checker, EPUB Validator, AChecker, and Deque reports. Falloon used an E-Resources Accessibility Conformance Tool (ER-ACT) and user questionnaire for the project to evaluate e-resources with a three-prong approach. Falloon created a questionnaire and a Rating Accessibility of E-Resources Competency Rubric (RAE-CR) to map, evaluate, and rate the e-resource performance for 20 databases. A visually-impaired employee helped with the testing.

The CSI Library study recommends that VPATs be updated every two years at minimum. User testing is important. Vendors should be able to provide reasonable alternatives and be partially compliant with standards for level AA accessibility. Libraries need to think of access in other ways as well, such as DRM-free content. Future database evaluations should be benchmarked against similar platforms that comply with AA.

The Wichita State University Libraries conducted a 2017 audit of the university's websites and e-resources. It was determined that there was a need for more accessible digital spaces. A taskforce was formed to redesign the library website. A notes field was added to the catalog records and an ADA icon in Springshare – which links to vendor access documentation for the databases. O'Reilly created an Accessibility Remediation Guide (ARG) with 10 criteria from VPATs for WSU Libraries' accessibility goals. Discussion of screen reading software and tools including EPUB and PDF Accessibility Validators, WAVE, and AChecker followed. This helps identify accessibility issues to vendors and users. WSU Libraries used the ARG in licensing, tracking issues and communicating concerns to vendors.

The presentation illuminated how VPATs can be used as a negotiation tool to justify e-resource procurement. They can influence vendors to be compliant with Title II of the *Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990* and Sections 504 and 508 of the *Rehabilitation Act,* which requires federal agencies to make their electronic and information technology accessible to people with disabilities.

Project ReShare: Building a Community-Owned Resource Sharing Platform

Kristen Wilson, Jill Morris

Reported by Sara K. Hills

What's ReShare? It's a community project that includes libraries, consortia and software developers who are building an open access resource sharing platform to support resource sharing between consortia members. When complete, Project ReShare will have a shared index for content discovery, ILL request management, and, where possible, unmediated request fulfilment. Morris stated that Project ReShare's shared index could benefit content discovery more generally and provide data for collection analysis.

Pennsylvania Academic Library Consortium (PALCI) is the driving force behind the idea for Project ReShare. Building on the information architecture of Folio, PALCI is working closely with Index Data to build Project ReShare. PALCI, originally founded as a resource-sharing consortium, sees Project ReShare as the next step in resource sharing – a way to leverage the diversity of their institutions' collections to support collaborative collection development, data-informed decision making, and to address gaps in the marketplace for resource-sharing software.

The only question addressed how PALCI was managing its relationship with commercial vendors. Morris stated that they have a community charter and a memorandum of understanding that clearly outlines each community's responsibilities. Morris additionally stated that PALCI recognized early on that a service provider, such as Index Data, would be necessary for success. Based on the memorandum of understanding and the community charter, Index Data, by participating, would have the first opportunity to offer the services out to the community.

Project ReShare and Index Data plan to have mockups available for Project ReShare members in Spring 2019, and minimum-viable product in Fall of 2019. Software testing and pilots will occur in Spring 2020. If you would additional information, visit https://projectreshare.org or email info@projectreshare.org

Publisher Platforms and NISO's PIE-J: Working Together to Improve E-Journal Access

Sarah (Sally) Glasser, Julie Zhu, and Heather Otrando

Reported by Brad Reel

Sally Glasser, Chair of NISO PIE-J Standing Committee, provided an overview of PIE-J (the Presentation & Identification of E-Journals) and its origin as a National Information Standards Organization (NISO) 2013 published recommended practice. PIE-J addresses issues of discovery and access related to how journal records are displayed online. Glasser provided a PIE-J handout identifying seven areas where issues arise, with recommendations to address each issue. Glasser focused on the first three recommended practices: Journal Title & Citation Information, Title Changes/History, and ISSN. Title and citation history should be linked and display as the actual citation source for a given article. Any changes to title should be accompanied by request of a new ISSN, and title history should include at least one immediately preceding and/or succeeding title. ISSNs should display for both print and online formats for each historical title. Glasser provided examples of properly displayed records for each recommended practice.

Julie Zhu, Discovery Service Relations Manager, IEEE, discussed how IEEE identified issues of PIE-J non-compliance, the challenges faced while addressing said issues, and initiatives taken for remediation. A three-year project (2016-2018) to remediate journal ISSNs addressed missing or incorrectly displayed ISSNs for current and legacy titles displayed in IEEE's search engine. Hyperlinked title history, with corresponding dates ranges, now display in the journal, browse, home, about and table of contents pages. Additionally, each title in the history displays unique print and/or online ISSN. Challenges inherent in this project included the requirement of nine different internal IEEE departments/teams to sign off on an addition or change of ISSN on the website. Zhu provided slides showing changes to journal displays in response to PIE-J recommendations. Ongoing efforts include providing dynamic ISSN on journal "About" pages, as well as redesigns of journal home pages for further clarity and discovery of true cited sources.

Heather Otrando, Academic Product Support Manager, Cambridge University Press, grouped title change history, challenges and the goals of Cambridge Core (formerly Cambridge Journals Online - CJO) into three journal display scenarios. Using the CJO interface, Otrando demonstrated how the older process of updating title names effectively "erased" previous titles and all prior history. With the advent of Cambridge Core (2016), a second scenario created a new display page and identifier for new title change. This step technically created compliance with PIE-J but did not associate new titles with older naming on the public display. The most current manifestation creates one landing page with the most current title displayed at the top and hyperlinked title history displayed on the page. Ongoing challenges include bringing pre-2016 non-compliant titles into compliance whenever possible. Best practices include linked former titles in both the title history and A-Z journal list result pages, and the ability to search within current and previous title history simultaneously. Predictive text search capabilities also assist in finding both current and past journal titles.

Presenters encouraged attendees to visit the PIE-J website and to continue providing feedback to vendors that PIE-J compliance does help users find their resources.

Pushing on the Paywall: Extending Licensed Resource Access to External Partners to Enhance Collaborative Research

Juleah Swanson and Steven Brown

Reported by Sharon A. Purtee

Juleah Swanson and Steven Brown reported on a pilot program that has been in effect since the signing of an MOU between the University of Colorado, Boulder (CUB) and the University Corporation for Atmospheric Research in partnership with National Center for Atmospheric Research (NCAR) in October 2017. The goal of the pilot is to explore extending resources licensed by CUB to researchers located at NCAR who have dual affiliations; paywalls silo research and researchers by their home organization, but research is not done in isolation, and many researchers hold multiple appointments. The parameters included extending the access only from the NCAR facilities, and the titles would have to integrate into the existing discovery system in place at NCAR.

Swanson stated that the first issue was user credentialing. Patrons were confused when confronted with registration or login requirements. Another challenge was the variety of ways by which vendors define who may or may not have access to the licensed content. For example, one vendor permits access to "full and part-time faculty, students, staff, researchers, contractors…" while another states that only "individuals serving in the capacity of **employee** faculty and other teaching staff, students, and other instructors…" have access to content. These variances led her to read every contract to each resource that would be made available to NCAR researchers.
Brown relayed the initial set-up took place in November and December 2017 with implementation in January 2018. The set-up included title matching from Serials Solutions 360 to SFX and getting the EZProxy systems at each site to handshake. However, in January 2018, the NCAR researchers had access to over 6000 CUB journals, over a 300% increase to content.

At the end of the first year, the staff assessed the use and user satisfaction.

- Discovery and access pathways to content is significant to users; expecting researchers to login to obtain content requires a significant behavior change that many will not make
- A consistent user experience across platforms is expected, and when content "behaves" differently from vendor to vendor, patrons lose patience
- Increased access does not necessarily equate to increased use of materials
- Some titles that had been getting high use saw large declines due to access changes

The MOU is for a term of five years. The staff at CUB is looking at ways to enhance the user experience for the remainder of the time. Some ways they are/will be exploring include:

- Providing a more streamlined means to access licensed content
- Exploring tools for better statistics/assessment such as EZProxy Analytics, since Counter has proven unhelpful
- Engaging the NCAR library staff more regarding patron education

They concluded their presentation by reminding the audience that collaboration is complex and pervasive in research, but that paywalls, license agreements and identity management create confusion and are an unfriendly means of accessing content. Librarians are challenged to improve the status quo.

In response to audience questions:

- NCAR patrons have a classic e-journals page populated by SFX that lists the journals to which they have access.
- The American Chemical Society would not extend the license to include NCAR; a new license was purchased and NCAR paid for it.
- As licenses get near expiration, vendors are requested to expand their definition of allowable users of the content.

Trial by Fire and Then Some for Electronic Resources: Connecting the Community Through Customer Service

Mary E. Bailey, Christina Geuther, Michelle Turvey-Welch

Reported by Charlene N. Simser

Disaster planning is nothing new for libraries, and most have created plans to deal with physical collections. A fire in May 2019 at Kansas State University Libraries pointed out the critical need for ensuring the management of electronic resources is included in the library's disaster plan.

"It's in the cloud - no problem!" Guess again. Turvey-Welch described the fire on the main library's fourth floor, the 500,000 gallons of water that poured into the building and the tremendous smoke and soot damage that has made most of the print and non-print formats housed there - some 1.5 million items - inaccessible. The university data center, in the basement of Hale, had only recently begun moving to the cloud. The servers were soaked, which shut down web services, email, telecomm, payroll, student information systems, and more for the entire university.

Acquisitions and financial services staff were in the throes of last-minute invoicing prior to fiscal year roll over. More critical, the disaster brought to light that library and university IT staff had no current and accessible back-up of the locally-hosted proxy server configuration files. There could be no authentication for off-campus access.

The presenters described the prior fall's implementation of a "triage team" for troubleshooting e-resources, and how cross-training meant more individuals were familiar with e-resources issues. They had seen improvement with the new model, but the fire created new challenges. Staff had no offices; some had no computers and/or no internet access from home except via cell phone.

Getting off-campus access working was the main priority. Within five days of the fire, an old proxy configuration file was found, and the team began using it to contact vendors and publishers to inform them of the disaster and resulting IP change. Working through 900 lines of the configuration file took four weeks. Harrassowitz, their main subscription vendor, helped where they could, though many publishers required direct contact from library staff.

The work provided everyone a lesson in the hazards of siloed information, and led to better documentation, improvements to ticketing system workflows, and more empathy for the end user. The disaster brought people together to work, exemplifying the concepts of library as community and vendors as allies.

Upcycling a Schol Comm Unit: Building Bridges with Creativity, Reallocations, and Limited Resources

Andrea Wright and Peter Whiting

Reported by Andrea Conboy

Andrea Wright and Peter Whiting of David L. Rice Library at the University of Southern Indiana (USI) discussed their library's experience in developing a scholarly communications department. The aim of their talk was to describe the development of the unit, explore opportunities and challenges, provide a model for other resource-restricted institutions, and to discuss their work with creating an institutional repository. They prefaced their discussion with an overview of their institution and library. USI is a public 4-year college with approximately 11,000 students. It has both undergraduate and graduate (master's) programs and is a Carnegie Foundation Community Engaged University. Rice Library, which boasts 26 employees, started the development of the Scholarly Communications Unit when the library experienced a re-structuring and re-evaluation of staffing. They identified gaps in staffing and realigned existing personnel. The Scholarly Communications Unit was then created and consists of Andrea Wright and Peter Whiting. Wright reported that her previous experiences included public services, copyright, instruction/teaching, open access funding, institutional repositories, and outreach/engagement. Whiting reported that his previous experience includes metadata/cataloging and serials. Given his longstanding career at USI (20 years), he held a large professional network of faculty, but also librarians at other institutions who also perform scholarly communications work.

When the Scholarly Communications Unit was created, their initial work began by revamping the library's website, creating and leveraging the use of Libguides, and re-considering internal communications. Wright and Whiting qualified their unit's approach as faculty-oriented, with a strong focus on the dominant undergraduate studies. While they hold weekly departmental meetings, they also hold bi-weekly meetings with the four research and instruction librarians. These four librarians act as liaisons to the four colleges on campus. They have a strong focus of bringing their work 'outside the library' by attending faculty and employee meetings, committee and council meetings, and college and departmental meetings. They have launched new programs such as 'lunch and learns,' offering copyright courses for graduate students and advisors, and providing publishing support. They recommend networking with other scholarly communications units at other libraries and urge others to strongly consider accessibility and equitability.

Wright and Whiting report that in conjunction with other staff at Rice Library, their work has also focused on developing and implementing an institutional repository. The Institutional Repository Team began their work in August 2018 with a goal of launching during Open Access Week 2019 (October 21-27th, 2019). They began in Fall 2018 by gaining insight for the process from *Toyota's Secret: A3 Report.* Before participating in demos of different platforms, they developed a rubric and general demo feedback form. Following demos, a platform was identified and recommended. In Spring 2019 they proceeded by creating a sandbox of the platform, branding and creating a logo, creating a submission agreement, guidelines, and FAQ, and performing outreach on campus. They sighted the following resources as helpful to the process: SPARC, Open Access (Suber, 2012), Copyright for Educators and Librarians (Coursera), OER: A Field Guide for Academic Librarians (Wesolek, 2018).

Usability Beyond the Home Page: Bringing Usability into the Technical Services Workflow

Kate Hill

Reported by Julia Palos

Kate Hill, Electronic Resources Librarian at the University of North Carolina at Greensboro, presented on usability testing for technical services librarians. She noted that the primary audience for the presentation is those who know a little about usability testing but don't have significant practical experience. Then she moved on to a brief definition of usability and a justification for its relevance to technical services librarians. Since librarians are experts in library tools, they can miss usability issues encountered by users who do not have this expertise and often use online materials without professional guidance. Therefore, usability testing can allow librarians to identify problems unique to the user's perspective. For databases and other platforms for online materials, usability testing is particularly useful for technical services librarians, who are accustomed to troubleshooting problems with these platforms, are familiar with their limits, and are comfortable working with vendors to resolve problems.

After establishing usability testing's value for librarians, Hill moved on to some tips for usability testing, covering topics such as choosing an appropriate group of testers and facilitating sessions. She also outlined several different methods of usability testing: classic usability tests, heuristic testing, card sorting, A/B comparison, and prototype testing. Following this "Usability Testing 101", the speaker described how she got into usability testing and offered some tips for getting started, such as starting small and low tech, finding allies and support, collaborating with colleagues outside your area, educating colleagues on the value of usability testing, and sharing results.

She concluded by discussing a usability study she had performed on her institution's A to Z page, which resulted in the decision to move the library's A to Z page to a more user-friendly platform.