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### Vision Sessions

**Linked Data and Libraries**

*Eric Miller, Zepheira, LCC*

Reported by Mary Bailey

Eric Miller describes linked data as the “next phase of the web.” When asked what it is, he says the answer is the same as early descriptions of the web: “vague but exciting.” In a fascinating presentation, Miller shared a vision of using the web to manage open data around which anyone can build other features. His vision is about collaborating and sharing the content that already exists.

After providing some historical background, Miller shared that some websites such as [BBC](https://www.bbc.com), [NPR](https://www.npr.org) and [data.gov](https://www.data.gov) are already making their content available for others to remix and deliver in new ways. The premise is that the data never leaves its location, but anyone using that data can build applications, to provide new ways of...
viewing or creating new meaning from the data. The focus is on generating good content and letting someone else frame it.

Digital preservation repositories are another area where discussion is taking place about opening up data so users can remix it to meet their needs. Doing so will require new ways of cataloging, archiving and supplying content. Linked data allows users to select only what they are interested in and use it in new ways that originators of the data may never have considered.

Miller’s premise is that libraries already have data. Since librarians organize data, and understand tagging, identifiers, and control points, they are the ideal group to work with linked data. By exposing the raw data in linked data platforms and creating identifiers, a primary key URL is created that becomes a persistent identification or control point. So far, no one group is willing to trust another’s control points, but Miller believes the obvious group to create a “trusted control point” is librarians. Already a trusted entity, librarians can leverage that trust and get involved from the start.

Discussion is already ongoing with the World Wide Web Consortium (W3C) and librarians need to get involved now. Librarians must make others aware of their ability to work with this product while the field is new and evolving. Linked data can empower users to build a community around data.

**Publishing 2.0: How the Internet Changes Publications in Society**

*Kent Anderson, CEO/Publisher of Journal of Bone and Joint Surgery*

Reported by Mary Ellen Kenreich

Anderson began this informative, thought provoking and entertaining session by talking about how medicine has evolved. To illustrate the primitive beginnings of medical practice, Anderson shared a story of a common treatment for influenza in 1837, application of leeches to the patient’s chest. Around the same time the medical journal was established as a professional correspondence instrument. While medicine continued to evolve, the journal hadn’t changed much, until recently. Traditionally, the journal consisted of a combination of text and line art to be read under reflected light. Now the journal has taken a more abstract form, including videos, online forums and other ways of communicating. Traditionally producers controlled the flow of information and readers simply consumed the product. With the advent of Web 2.0, consumers have access to the same publishing tools as the producers.

Television shows could create groups with a shared experience, but without the internet, could not support conversations. The Internet creates both groups and conversation. Web 2.0 brings people together online and has implications for the evolution of publishing. As people become accustomed to forming groups and conversations online, they will expect the same experience from scholarly information.

Information and access have the potential to replace the scarcity economy. When there is no scarcity, you replace hierarchy with heterarchy. Anderson talked about the term “apomedia” and how a scarce economy requires “intermediaries.” In an abundant economy we need guides, or apomediators. Anderson asked, “What is an apomediary? If you have written an Amazon review, you are an apomediary.” As an apomediary, you are a source of information or opinion. The web allows your information/opinion to get directly to the people who want it.

Anderson used the following five movies as metaphors to describe what is shaping the future of Publishing 2.0. *Look Who’s Talking* points out how producer and consumer roles in the information chain are equalizing. Users have just as much to say producers. *Reservoir Blogs* reminds us to rethink our biases against blogs. Since the mainstream media cannot always report everything we find interesting we need blogs to broaden our access to information. *Toy Story* illustrates that we are in the age of toys, devices, and various media tools. For the first time in history, consumers
own the infrastructure. *The Matrix* highlights the emergence of the real-time web and publishers must be there. *Transformers* reflects the change in media from sources of information to sites of coordination. Our audiences expect digital, immediate information, and mobile connectivity. We need to follow our customers and ask if we are where they are daily.

There were several interesting questions from the floor. When asked about the future of the book, Anderson commented that he supports serialization of fiction. He said he likes e-book readers, and that there are environmental incentives to stop reading books made of paper. He was asked how long before New England Journal of Medicine and Journal of Bone and Joint Surgery will be solely online. Anderson replied that print drives awareness, but most journals will be online in the near future. He says the “article container” (the PDF) and the layout process is useful. But he also said the periodical release of print would change. When asked how he establishes pricing, Anderson answered, “What the market will bear,” and added that pricing is full of compromises. It is a fact of economic life that you treat your best customers the worst, and your loyal customers don’t object. Someone asked if we are headed toward an epidemic of Attention Deficit Disorder. Anderson referred to an article written in 1867 that complained about the overload of information and said we need good products and filters to control information.

**Serials Management in the Next-Generation Library Environment**

*Robert McDonald, Indiana University*  
*Jonathan Blackburn, OCLC*  
*Bob McQuillan, Innovative Interfaces Inc.*

Reported by Amy Carlson

Libraries rely heavily on their integrated library systems (ILS) and separate software and services to purchase, track, and activate a variety of materials for their users. With decreasing budgets and increasing accountability, the need for data both drives and inhibits libraries. Jonathan Blackburn, Robert McDonald and Bob McQuillan addressed their visions of the next-generation library systems and services; highlighting both the needs exposed today in libraries and the current innovations setting the groundwork for the future.

The workflow complexity necessitated by budgets and the increased need for data requires a more flexible set of systems. McDonald suggested that we might see a more flexible, unbundled ILS. Blackburn and McQuillan echoed that strategy, describing the changing nature of workflows and the need for interoperability to reveal a clearer view of the big picture. Cloud computing could provide a shared infrastructure and promote sharing and cooperation. While the notion of working “in the cloud” may seem foreign to some libraries, McQuillan pointed out that the trend has already begun for even the traditional ILS in bibliographic coverage metadata services, consortia, and shared catalogs.

**How will the challenges of today help to shape the future systems and services in relation to serials management?**

All of the panelists addressed difficulties in workflows and the tensions produced by integrating traditional print workflows with the ones necessitated by electronic products. Many people participate in making decisions on how to process or use these resources. Librarians must piece together disparate information from a variety of systems in order to make effective decisions. Greater flexibility in these systems and a more holistic approach to the process could provide libraries with the data required for decision-making. With more flexible systems and service components, libraries can integrate data into other places such as, learning management systems or university enterprise systems.

Interoperability would promote efficiencies in workflow. Eliminating the need to re-key information and aggregating information from different systems would assist in analyzing and reporting. Reporting tools that could address both print and electronic formats,
which were traditionally siloed separately, would also help. Workflow is not a linear process. The next-generation system should enable a variety of workflows. Blackburn noted that libraries should be working beyond format and focusing on quick delivery of materials. Communication strain, exacerbated by a difficult workflow, slows the library from moving forward. McDonald envisioned a future where different types of software or data components, such as toolkits, will pull together the right information needed by a local community. Libraries could mold these tools to fit the institution. He noted that the cloud offers flexibility and creativity by scaling services, allowing the library to purchase infrastructure on a needs basis. To achieve interoperability, the panelists encouraged participation in setting standards and working with vendors.

Strategy Sessions

Digital Preservation: The Library Perspective

Colin Meddings, Oxford University Press

Reported by Janet Arcand

Colin Meddings discussed the results of a Library survey on digital preservation conducted by Oxford University Press (OUP) in February 2010. A 2008 ALPSP survey of publishers found that a majority believed long term preservation was critical. However, there was some uncertainty about the effectiveness of publisher planning, and a significant number of publishers preferred other groups or institutions to be responsible for this access.

In a 2009 internal report, OUP discovered that none of their current preservation arrangements could fulfill all of the anticipated needs: supply/cessation scenarios, format transfer due to obsolescence, and provisions to supply all of OUP’s customers. They decided to survey their library customers to learn their concerns. Although post-cancellation access was specifically described as being outside the scope of the survey, OUP noted that many of the responses were directed to it.

Of the 475 individuals who started the survey, 385 finished it (ranking questions may have been off-putting). There were responses from every continent and most library types however, the majority of respondents came from North American and European academic libraries. Although a majority rated the issue as important, less than half felt that their library was taking steps to ensure long-term digital preservation. The most prevalent archival access resources were Portico, locally loaded content, LOCKSS, CLOCKSS, and OCLC ECO. MetaArchive, HathiTrust, and national libraries were also mentioned. Meddings indicated that most license agreements mentioning perpetual access couldn’t guarantee it because they don’t specify how access will be granted. He also pointed out that while some responses indicated that print format was used as a preservation method, this would not be feasible for born-digital content.

The conclusions drawn from the survey were that digital preservation is important to customers but significant numbers of libraries are either not taking action or are relying on others to do it. There was some confusion about the issues, but it was clear that cost was more important than any technical issues, and that collaboration among publishers and libraries is preferred. As a result of the survey, OUP will not drop any of the preservation efforts it is currently undertaking. They also plan to conduct follow up interviews to further investigate the issue.

Not for the Faint of Heart: A New Approach to “Serials” Management

Jonathan Blackburn, OCLC
Sylvia Lowden, OCLC

Reported by Sanjeet Mann

“If you’re faint of heart, this would be a good time to leave,” warned Jonathan Blackburn and Sylvia Lowden at the beginning of their strategy session on the nature of serials management. Blackburn and Lowden conducted an ethnographic study of public and academic acquisitions librarians to understand why they
do what they do and to improve the design of the OCLC Web-Scale Acquisitions module. In this session, they presented their findings, invited the audience to critique and expand on their work, and closed with a lively discussion of the serials management trends they had uncovered.

Lowden began with a brief overview of the goals and methods of user-centered design. Karen Holtzblatt’s work on rapid contextual design and Indi Young’s mental models matrix were particularly influential as Lowden and Blackburn developed their study. They approached acquisitions librarians at eleven public and academic libraries to observe the work environment, document serials workflows, and conduct interviews. They used the data to construct a mental model that would reflect how serials librarians understood their work and their relationships with other stakeholders, such as library users, subscription agents, and vendors.

Blackburn reported that interviewees thought of serials management occurring in four distinct spaces: selection and ordering, negotiation and licensing, receiving and maintaining, and paying and invoicing. Blackburn and Lowden’s affinity map envisioned the librarian at the center of a dense web of relationships with stakeholders, each with their own agenda and demands on the librarian. Serials workflows depended on collaboration among these disparate groups, and frequently broke down at one or more “pain points”:

1. Libraries often lack a single authoritative list of held materials.
2. It is unclear who, inside or outside the library, has authority or expertise for various tasks required to start a subscription.
3. Expenses vary unpredictably from year to year, forcing libraries to shift funds around.
4. Communication between various parties slows the activation of e-journals.
5. Catalogs, knowledge bases, discovery layers, etc. each have separate silos of holdings data that must be updated concurrently.
6. Payment may involve maintaining and releasing encumbrances.
7. Negotiation and licensing can occur before, during or after the monetary transfer.
8. Agreed-upon license terms need to be communicated to all stakeholders, including vendors and the user community.

After reviewing this list, Blackburn and Lowden turned the floor over to audience members, who annotated the affinity map and added extra “pain points,” including evaluation of e-journal platforms and managing e-books, among others.

Blackburn and Lowden offered concluding thoughts about tracking costs, which many libraries reported as a significant challenge. Whether an item had recurring or one-time costs had more bearing on its perceived difficulty than delivery format (print versus online) or receipt pattern (monographic versus serial). Ideally, ILS products could simplify this type of task by uniting data from disparate sources, allowing serials librarians to do all their work in one place. Currently, however, lack of interoperability often turns timesaving library tools into additional stressors.

In response to an audience question, Blackburn noted that their research had helped OCLC prioritize development on the acquisitions module. This rich contextual information can also help serials librarians face, without faint-heartedness, the daily chaos and be able to describe it to their colleagues.

**It’s Time to Join Forces: New Approaches and Models that Support Sustainable Scholarship**

*David Fritsch, JSTOR; Rachel Lee, University of California Press*

Reported by Jessica Lewis

Presented by David Fritsch of JSTOR and Rachel Lee of the University of California (UC) Press, this strategy session focused on the relationships JSTOR is building with university presses and societies. The presenters covered how and why the partnerships make sense in the rapidly changing world of publishing, where...
university and society presses find it difficult to sustain their operations with ever fewer library and individual subscriptions. The presentation focused on the benefits of the partnerships for both not-for-profit organizations and libraries.

**Objective of the Program**

The objectives of the program from JSTOR’s point of view are to enhance partnership with scholarly publishers, implement a shared technology platform that meets the expectations of today’s user, ensure long-term access by preserving all content in Portico, and create a business model that helps secure sustainability of smaller presses.

**How it Works**

JSTOR will manage the licensing, accessing, and maintenance of UC Press’s journal collection including current and past issues. UC Press and other participating publishers will no longer accept orders directly from customers or agents; they will manage individual subscriptions only. JSTOR will handle both print and online ordering and access issues. Although subscriptions will be made available only through JSTOR, UC Press will continue to set subscription prices and select, shape, and ensure high quality scholarship in their publications.

JSTOR will be redesigning its platform to accommodate the collaboration, including drastic changes in its interface and re-branding of web pages to reflect the individual publisher.

**Benefits to UC Press**

UC Press benefits in many ways through partnering with JSTOR, including expanded digital platform functionality, adding multimedia content, increased personalization and features, improved navigation, increased sales both domestic and international, expanded customer service within a larger network, and seamless access to the complete run of a title.

The risks UC Press is taking in establishing this partnership with JSTOR include a potential loss of identity as their titles are merged onto the JSTOR platform, less autonomy in management and development of the platform, and less direct communication with subscribing libraries. Overall, it was argued that the partnership is overwhelmingly beneficial when compared to the potential risks.

**Benefits to Libraries**

Libraries benefit from this partnership because it allows for transparent pricing and access to more information to fuel discovery, specifically to current content. It will also reduce the number of licenses to be secured and maintained. JSTOR will not add a surcharge to the subscription prices set by UC Press.

While some risks are evident in beginning this partnership, it was clear that both JSTOR and UC Press would benefit from this collaboration, as would library subscribers. They hope to create a model for other university and society presses to follow as they move forward in this program. As of July 1, 2011, JSTOR will be the only place to access UC Press online content.

**What Counts? Assessing the Value of Non-Text Resources**

*Stephanie Krueger, ARTstor, and Tammy S. Sugarman, Georgia State University*

Reported by Jennifer O’Brien

Many libraries collect usage statistics, and these numbers are based on a multitude of criteria – provider, price, format, etc. Methods for collecting usage statistics run the gamut from hash marks on graph paper to complicated electronic systems. All are imperfect, and many can be unreliable when it comes to determining true usage. Collecting usage statistics on e-resources can represent a significant challenge, particularly when the e-resources are not based on traditional textual formats, such as, monographs and journal articles. While most vendors are equipped to
provide COUNTER statistics, these metrics do not provide a complete picture of usage for electronic multimedia resources.

Usage statistics allow libraries to make informed decisions about purchasing, provide more accountability, and grant librarians some insight into how patrons utilize resources. Justifying the investment for higher priced resources typically requires a high return. Because usage statistics may significantly impact collection development decisions, the data must be consistent and credible. COUNTER statistics can provide such information for multimedia resources if vendors are willing to change how the statistics are collated and displayed.

Librarians at Georgia State University were asked by administrators to provide information on measurable use outside of the basic usage statistics: outcomes, results, usage, disciplines, and information about the types of patrons using the resource(s). All of these criteria affect the library’s ability to assess value and would significantly impact collection development decisions. To meet the needs of collection administrators, ARTstor responded by approaching COUNTER and initiating an experiment to evaluate the metrics used for provision of statistics.

By way of example, a typical COUNTER report can relay any of the following:

1. Number of successful full text article requests by month and journal
2. Turn-aways by month and journal
3. Number of full text article requests by year and journal
4. Total searches and sessions by month and database
5. Turn-aways by month and database

While these statistics are more than adequate for textual resources, multimedia resources are only adequately represented by the fourth metric: total searches and sessions by month and database. When the material is not a textual resource, the metric must change to provide usable information. Terminology must change, and “use” must be re-defined.

The majority of ARTstor’s use stems from image requests, not textual resources. Multimedia databases carry images, audio, and video; traditional usage statistics do not adequately reflect image views, downloads, and/or streaming.

In addition, the majority of users of non-text resources incorporate material into classroom instruction sessions and lectures, and may load the material into third party resources (Blackboard, etc.). These uses are not counted by any kind of statistical report. If trying to make the case to retain a certain resource, it may behoove libraries to formulate plans for acquiring statistical information about these different types of use. This kind of plan may involve significant contributions from administration (e.g. asking teaching faculty to contribute information about resources utilized, methods of access, and preferred formats).

Textual resources use different metrics and terminology and have unique frameworks that must be modified for fully non-text resources. COUNTER’s tech advisory group (TAG) is actively working on this issue. In the meantime, libraries will be left to evaluate multimedia/non-text resources using statistical reports that do not provide detailed usage information.

When Jobs Disappear: Results of a Survey of the Staffing Implications of the Elimination or Significant Reduction of Check-in, Claiming and Other Print Serials Management Tasks

Sally Glasser, Hofstra University

Reported by Sanjeet Mann

As academic libraries shift their collections from print to online resources, how do these format changes affect the staff members working with the materials on a daily basis? Sally Glasser addressed this question in early 2010 by surveying libraries that had experienced a
“significant reduction” in print materials (defined as a decrease large enough to impact staff workloads). Glasser presented the results of her study and led a far-ranging discussion about the challenges of managing serials staff during such a dramatic change.

In her questionnaire, Glasser asked respondents to identify specific tasks in their serials/e-resources workflows that were recently eliminated or significantly reduced, and describe what happened to the staff positions and the individuals responsible for those tasks. She also asked whether positions were protected by a union and, if so, whether they were part of print or e-resources workflows.

Glasser received sixty-six responses to her survey, evenly split between small (1200-2500 FTE), medium (2500-10,000 FTE) and large (20-30,000 FTE) libraries. Binding was the task most frequently eliminated or significantly reduced; respondents also mentioned cutting back claiming, check-in, and periodicals stacks maintenance. Most respondents explained they were taking these actions as a natural result of dwindling print collections.

One or two positions were affected at most libraries. 85 percent of respondents managed to keep these positions within the library, often by formally reclassifying positions or asking staff to do different tasks. 72 percent of affected staff stayed in the library, but most needed retraining, especially if they were working exclusively with print resources before the reduction. A minority of staff either retired or left for a different job. Two-thirds of responding libraries did not have a staff union.

Changing from print to online formats requires staff to accept new, unfamiliar roles and enter into inherently complex e-resource workflows. Convincing staff to participate in the change and to develop the skill sets they will need to thrive in this environment is a significant managerial challenge, requiring transparency and collaboration with affected staff. Glasser concluded her presentation by urging her audience to document the library’s continuing need for staff despite decreases in print materials, to write flexibility into staff job descriptions, and to draw on the wealth of experience and knowledge of continuing resources that print serials staff have developed.

The Q&A session included discussion about the impact of unions on position reclassifications. Serials librarians contemplating staffing changes at a unionized library need to be familiar with clauses in the labor agreement stipulating percentages of duties that can be changed and criteria for triggering a change in grade. Personnel discussions that could lead to action against staff need to be carefully documented. HR staff is a valuable source of advice in these situations.

Other audience members offered suggestions for coping with resistance to change. Sometimes resistance is caused by “tunnel vision,” and if librarians display respect for staff members’ opinions and involve them in decision-making, it can help them come on board. Support from supervisors is essential; as one librarian observed, “trust starts at the top with the director.” Staff who “just don’t get it” despite multiple attempts at retraining can be isolated on special projects, and consider that sometimes “change comes one retirement at a time.” But waiting is often not an option, and in this time of rapid change when print materials – if not always jobs – are disappearing, serials librarians need to hold difficult conversations with their staff, appealing to shared goals and promoting flexibility and resilience.

“We’ve done great work,” one librarian paraphrased, “but the situation is changing. How can we help you get through this? Because this is what you have to do differently…”

CONSER Update


Reported by Marie Peterson

Les Hawkins, Cooperative Online Serials (CONSER) program coordinator, briefly outlined the session and introduced the first speaker. CONSER program
specialist, Hien Nguyen, gave an overview of CONSER’s history, membership, standards, and its programs, products and publications. A serials cataloging component of Library of Congress’s Program for Cooperative Cataloging (PCC), CONSER began in the early 1970s to convert manual records to machine-readable format. Membership includes national libraries of three countries, ISSN centers, academic, public and special libraries, and corporate affiliates. CONSER’s workshops, webinars, guides and manuals aim to increase the pool of knowledgeable serials catalogers and keep them current.

Les Hawkins followed with an update of the 2010 CONSER Operations Committee (OpCo) meeting held in Washington, DC in May. Among the topics at that meeting, OpCo representatives discussed workflows, approaches to title changes, and how to deal with records created under different cataloging rules, such as RDA. The Open Access Journal Project, by increasing the use of CONSER records for open access journals in e-packages, will cut down on duplicated work and ensure access to reliable records. Hawkins continued with recent cataloging changes and upcoming RDA testing. Recent changes include indicator coding in the 246 variant title fields. Linking entry fields having a one-to-many relationship (e.g. one “mega disc” with contents from many journals) would use 787 fields rather than 776. MARC 21 changes include the use of the 588 source of description note, and adding form of item (008/23 and 006/06) “o” online and “q” direct access to the current “s” electronic.

The RDA testing timeframe, based on the RDA Toolkit release in June 2010, allows for free access to the Toolkit through August 31, 2010 for any registered libraries. U.S. testing will end December 31, 2010. The first quarter of 2011 is reserved for analysis and decision-making by three U.S. national libraries: Library of Congress (LC), National Library of Medicine (NLM), and the National Agricultural Library (NAL).

During the testing period some LC records are being created according to CONSER Standard Record (CSR) guidelines, and some using RDA. Once testing ends, and assuming RDA is implemented, will some libraries still create records according to AACR2? Also, will guidelines need to be adjusted for the CSR and PCC provider neutral record?

Adolfo Tarango presented The Work Segment Record: A Practical Approach to Applying FRBR Concepts to Cataloging Serials. By defining a work segment as “all expressions and manifestations of a serial work issued under a specific title,” –assuming that the researcher, or user, wants above all to access information online, but also still wants it if it is not online – we know that content is the foremost goal. Hence the cataloger’s objectives: maximize access to content, facilitate navigation, capitalize and expose relationships, and accomplish all of this as quickly and economically as possible.

Work segment cataloging guidelines would follow AACR2 (RDA), but with such additions as: repeated 022 fields, the original manifestation title in 245, all other title variants in 246 fields with subfield “i” for clarity, and publication data for the 245 in 260, with data for all other formats in 533 fields. A ceased specific format would be recorded in a 500 note. One record accommodates all manifestations, maximizing access to content.

ERMs and Impact on Technical Services

Panel moderator: Susan Merrill Banoun, University of Cincinnati

Panel members: Deberah England, Wright State University; Angela Riggio, UCLA; Sharon Purtee, University of Cincinnati

Reported by Jennifer O’Brien

While there is a great deal of information available in respect to implementation, management, and data sharing with Electronic Resource Management (ERM) software, there is little to be found in respect to the impact on employees. Staff from three different libraries participated in a panel discussion of the impact
of ERM on the workflows in their respective technical services departments.

In November of 2008, the University of Cincinnati installed the Innovative Interfaces Inc. (III) ERM. III provided them with three days of training to assist with implementation of the module. In July of 2009, they reorganized in order to create an Electronic Resources department. Two additional staff members were hired, an electronic resources librarian and a collections librarian. Because one was an internal hire, there was a net gain of only one position. Subsequently, the main library absorbed the Health Sciences library and staffing in the Electronic Resources department shrank from 5 FTE to 1.5. While the Health Sciences library had originally operated as a separate entity, with its own technical services operation, it is now part of the larger library, with technical services “outsourced” to the main library.

Since the reorganization, the only traditional activity performed in the Health Sciences Library is periodicals check-in. The department also provides troubleshooting, but the majority of the technical services work has been eliminated. All of the new responsibility associated with ERM implementation had to be absorbed by employees throughout the department; workflows have been significantly affected. As time elapsed, the staff members concluded that ERM training was inadequate and scheduling was an issue. The information relayed in the training sessions was good, but documentation is scarce; they have come to depend heavily upon the systems staff, who must contact III when necessary. Goals for ERM implementation were set prior to training, and were not re-evaluated once implementation began. Staff believes goals should have been established after training, when they were more familiar with the ERM and its capabilities.

Currently, all ERM records for the Health Sciences library are hidden from the public; the decision to make the records viewable in the OPAC is dependent on a number of things, but specifically whether performance of a coverage load is warranted given the number of resources in the ERM. The module remains visible only to staff; the ERM is used for generation of statistics, tracking of subscription periods, cataloging information, management of username and password combinations, and instructions for accessing resources. Staff would like to add more information about holdings and trial resources.

Wright State University installed and implemented III’s ERM while reorganizing the library’s computing services department. Webinar training was provided, but was insufficient for the library’s needs due to problems with the coverage load. In order to fully implement ERM, instructions were gathered from the Internet, staff conducted site visits to other III libraries, and a student employee was hired to assist in the ERM implementation. Upon the student’s graduation, however, the position became vacant, and has remained vacant. At this time, only one person is responsible for managing the ERM.

Troubleshooting, records management, and accessing financial information have been greatly improved by implementation of the ERM. Batch record loads are easy to process and resource packages are easily managed. Staff makes great use of ticklers for management of subscription periods, and updating of the A-Z list. Once records are populated, statistics are easily generated.

There are issues, however, with manual inputting and updating, poorly defined workflow, and time management. While staff considers the ERM to be a worthwhile resource, all scheduling efforts were seriously affected by implementation, and finding time to work on the module is a challenge.

When UCLA library made the decision to implement an ERM, it was using a proprietary system developed in-house. After evaluating many options, UCLA is now implementing the Serials Solutions resource management product. Multiple staff members are responsible for implementation and staff members anticipate different people will be responsible for specific tasks within the resource management system.
For implementation, they have taken a distributive approach, with more than forty staff members developing new workflows and data structures. Only a limited number of staff members, however, are populating the system. One person will ultimately be responsible for the management of the new ERM system.

Training sessions were provided for select staff and were found to be sufficient. The concept of “train the trainers” worked well in this situation. Staff members believe, however, that wide scale training for the rest of the library staff will need to be significantly focused to ensure people get the intensive training they require. Based on what they have seen, staff members anticipate the new system will meet their expectations, with the caveat that ERM systems were developed in response to requests from libraries. If changes are needed, librarians must advocate for change.

Some staff members want the new resource manager to mimic the old one. This has been the most difficult part of the transition. While staff want the transition to be seamless to the end user, with the same or very similar discovery layer, the amount of time it is taking to fully implement the system in a manner which best serves the end user is considerable.

In short, ERM implementation and management at these libraries is inadequately supported. Staff numbers are commonly too low to allow for full scale, timely utilization of the product(s). Goals for electronic resource management should be established after training is complete – setting goals prior to seeing the module can create issues with workflow and project sustainability. The full potential of ERM systems will not be realized until adequate personnel resources are devoted to robust implementations.

Reported by Megan Curran

Roger Schonfeld works for the strategy and resource (S&R) arm of Ithaka, the not-for-profit organization that also houses JSTOR and Portico. His presentation is mainly concerned with ensuring the enduring preservation of print collections as physical formats continue to transition to electronic. Since 2000, Ithaka S&R have conducted surveys tracking faculty’s perceived value of library collections and services over time. The survey employs purposefully strongly worded questions to elicit emotional, gut-reactions to these issues. In 2003 and 2006, 20 percent of the 3,000 faculty surveyed said they agreed strongly that hard copies of journals should be discarded; in 2009 that figure doubled to 40 percent. Schonfeld cites economic concerns and increasing familiarity with electronic journals as potential reasons for this change.

The sciences and social sciences were most likely to feel strongly about this issue. The humanities felt less strongly but were still increasingly more amenable to the idea (health sciences faculty were not surveyed).

Pressure on librarians to use less space for collections or to justify expenses for less popular resources has been increasing. Schonfeld stresses the importance of planning strategically for print collection preservation instead of acting on an ad hoc basis and potentially losing access to valuable resources forever. The Ithaka S&R preservation tool uses a scientific framework to identify the preservation community among libraries and calculate what materials can be safely withdrawn from a library without putting greater preservation goals at risk. Print journals need to be preserved somewhere to serve as base materials for fixing scanning errors, to compensate for previously inadequate scanning standards, or to replace a lack of digital preservation. A University of California Berkeley
operations researcher concluded that today the library community needs two perfect, uncirculated copies to keep for 20 years for proper preservation. Libraries can use the tool Ithaka S&R developed to identify which of their titles is well-preserved elsewhere. Schonfeld warns that the tool cannot substitute the decision-making process but can be used as a source of information.

The tool was released in the fall to positive feedback. Going forward, Ithaka and College & Research Libraries (CRL) hope to produce service agreements for institutions that will act as repositories for preserving certain print journal titles. They also plan on introducing a cost-sharing model for borrowing preserved items among libraries.

**Tactics Sessions**

**Core Competencies for Electronic Resources Librarians**

_Sarah Sutton, Texas A&M University_  
Reported by Eugenia Beh

Sutton’s presentation focused on her research interests including: electronic resources librarianship as a profession, definitions for electronic resources, electronic resources librarians, and competencies. She discussed her prior research, methodology, limitations, and her results.

The purpose of Sutton’s research is to identify a definitive set of core competencies for electronic resources librarianship, as so far, no national or international serials/electronic resources professional organizations have adopted competencies for electronic resources librarianship. Her primary research question involved discovering what competencies library employers seek for electronic resources librarian positions. Prior research in this area focused on the identification of core competencies, changes in competencies over time, and the degree to which competencies for electronic resources librarianship are taught in MLS programs.

Using content analysis to code words or phrases used to describe a competency, Sutton analyzed 246 job ads for electronic resources librarians published between January 2005 and December 2009. In her results, Sutton identified 76 competencies sought by employers in job ads, including, ranked highest to lowest:

- ALA-accredited MLIS (1st)
- experience with an integrated library system (2nd)
- the ability to work collaboratively (3rd)
- familiarity with industry trends (4th)
- customer service orientation (5th)

Competencies unique to electronic resources librarianship included:

- analytical and problem solving skills (7th)
- experience managing/maintaining e-resources (9th)
- experience with, knowledge of, or skill using technology (12th)
- experience with link resolvers and knowledge of OpenURL standards (13th)
- experience licensing e-resources (15th)
- flexibility in the face of change (16th)
- experience with or knowledge of serials/e-resources acquisitions (17th)
- cataloging related skills and/or experience (23rd)
- experience with or knowledge of electronic resources management systems (ERMS) (24th)
- experience working with e-resources vendors (25th)

Additional competencies included: experience troubleshooting e-resources, experience with or knowledge of federated search engines, experience with or knowledge of the administrative functions of library subscription databases, and the ability to incorporate new technologies and innovations into existing operations.

The significance of Sutton’s research includes legitimizing electronic resources librarianship and strengthening its jurisdiction as a profession, providing employers with competent professionals, and providing educators with an understanding of the competencies
Integrating Usage Statistics into Collection Development Decisions

Linda Hulbert & Dani Roach, University of St. Thomas, St. Paul, MN

Reported by Megan Curran

Linda Hulbert and Dani Roach presented methods for "happy harvesting" of usage statistics and ways to apply them to principles of collection development. The presenters focused on cost per use as the best way to justify collection development decisions to non-librarian stakeholders. Librarians collect usage data in a variety of ways, but might be at a loss about how to analyze that data. Impact Factors (IF) and Return on Investment (ROI) are potential measures, but libraries are seeing that the highest IF journals in a field still might not be appropriate for their collection needs, and ROI is too time consuming to calculate in an efficient manner.

The University of St. Thomas (UST) subscribes to Serial Solutions' 360 COUNTER service to gather usage statistics. They add cost information to the tool and use that to calculate cost per use, which is then used by their library liaisons and subject affinity roundtables to decide which databases to keep, cancel, or add. UST librarians also apply a formula they call the “fairness factor,” as they had noticed some subjects' collections budgets were eating up the budgets for others. In this formula, National Library of Medicine and Library of Congress statistics are weighted against the numbers of an institution's users in a subject and the intensity of their use. They are applying this formula for new acquisitions going forward; they could not retroactively apply it because of the negative impact on the science collection, where the resources tend to be far more expensive.

"I try to remind myself that usage statistics were never black and white," said Roach, "It's never going to be perfect, and usage statistics are only one factor in decision-making." The presenters see their statistics-driven collections process as a way to engage the faculty community by publishing lists of resources in danger of being cancelled, and putting resources on probation. They say they rarely encounter faculty who are unwilling to drop low-performing resources. Currently they gather usage statistics annually, but they predict what they count will get increasingly more granular as time goes on. They see interoperability between systems relevant to statistics and cost gathering becoming a growth area where vendors should respond. They also look forward to the continuing development of usage statistics tools like 360 COUNTER, Scholarly Stats, and Thomson Reuters' Journal Use Reports and standards like SUSHI and CORE to make the gathering and assessment process continually easier in the future.
where users were failing in the online catalog. Using verbal protocol analysis, questions were read to students and their actions were observed. Results indicated that using the catalog is a major barrier for many users. Participants experienced failed search results due to confusion about the use of initial articles and punctuation; holdings statements were not understood, and advanced searching was not used.

The library made changes to the catalog based on the focus group results, and a second round of testing showed an improvement of 11 percent. However, there were still problems with library jargon. Users didn’t understand the use of terms like “recall,” “on hold,” “series” and “returned.” Holdings were still baffling and brief and long views of bibliographic records caused confusion. The library instituted another round of OPAC changes and convened a third focus group. There were still problems. Participants searched titles in the author index, for example, or were looking for articles. As a result of the focus groups, the library learned that students rely heavily on the A-Z list of publications that, at the time, only included e-journals. They also learned that students understand e-book, e-journal and full-text, but these terms aren’t used in the OPAC. Based on these outcomes, the library decided to investigate the option of implementing a discovery layer.

Montgomery continued the presentation by discussing the process of selecting and implementing a discovery layer product. The first requirement was to find a tool that would interoperate with Voyager. They evaluated Primo (Ex Libris), Encore (Innovative Interfaces) and AquaBrowser (Serials Solutions). When the evaluations were completed, the staff of forty chose to implement Encore.

There are known risks to working across platforms for this type of product. First, there was a serious need to “de-jargon” the displays. Availability of items is determined by a real-time query to item records in the Voyager catalog. Bibliographic record updates have to be loaded into Encore via the use of change files. The holdings are still not displaying as hoped. There is also a problem where records suppressed in Voyager are displaying in Encore. This is because the suppress status in Voyager is not a MARC value.

Safley concluded with a list of what they like about Encore: it solved the initial article problem in searching, the spell checker helps users get more results, and search results are cleanly displayed. Staff like the cloud tags and the search forgiveness. One issue to note is that Encore relies on many of the attributes of the MARC format, making cataloging even more important. For the future, the next release of Voyager is slated to contain many discovery layer features. The library will have to evaluate that new release to determine whether or not they will stay with Encore or switch to a different product.

**Shelf-Ready? An Alternative for Library Checking In and Claiming Print Journals?**

*Julie Su, San Diego State University Library; Jose Luis Andrade, Swets Americas; and Bob McQuillan, Innovative Interfaces Inc.*

Reported by Laura Secord

As libraries face budget limitations, traditional serials functions and processes such as check-in, claiming, and binding are being evaluated for potential efficiencies. This session presented an example of using a “shelf-ready” service for print serials. Current print issues are delivered to the library shelf-ready from the vendor (e.g. Swets) ready for automated batch check-in and with claims already processed. Julie Su of San Diego State University (SDSU) Library opened the session, reviewing the factors that led her institution to explore this alternative. Despite serials cancellations and exponential growth of e-journals, the library still had print subscriptions to manage. They considered what they could do differently in light of dwindling staff resources. Shelf-ready serials presented a win-win situation: outsourcing labor-intensive claiming, batch-receiving journal issues (eliminating physical processing), and automating check-in. SDSU selected 200 titles to test with the Swets Consolidation system. They set up bi-weekly delivery, with journal issues
arriving with a SISAC barcode and a hard copy packing slip. SDSU feels that they had a successful outcome with outsourced claiming, with an over 95 percent fill rate and significant staff time savings.

Jose Luis Andrade, Swets Americas, presented the vendor’s perspective, describing in detail how the Swets Consolidation Service works. The system uses predictive patterns to track when the next issue should arrive. Claiming is done automatically. Issues can be checked in through the library’s ILS. Benefits to the library include receiving print journals in one consolidated shipment, the ability to determine the frequency of shipments, selecting only those value-added services (e.g., adding security strips to issues) that the library wants to pay for, and freeing up staff time for other tasks. Andrade demonstrated how shipments are tracked and shared examples of the types of data available to the customer. He explained that if the library has an ILS batch electronic check-in module, when the library receives the shipment, they pull the FTP file from the vendor site and load the check-in data into the ILS system. The records match on the SICI (Serial Item Contribution Identifier) code found on the bar codes added to each issue.

Bob McQuillan of Innovative Interfaces Inc. (III) shared the perspective of the ILS vendor. The III Serials E-Checkin Server provides automatic, batch check-in processing for print and e-journal shipments by uploading electronic packing slips from a serials vendor such as Swets or EBSCO and integrating the data with the Millenium Serials package. McQuillan demonstrated the steps involved in the check-in process. The Serials E-Checkin Server provides a centralized tool to electronically receive journals and automates the check-in process.

Several challenges and considerations were presented by the panel, including irregular publication patterns, title changes, and publication pattern changes; the software’s ability to deal with a non-match; issues related to multiple library locations; and dealing with inconsistencies in data within check-in records. Despite the challenges, shelf-ready services have the potential to provide time and cost-savings to libraries that choose to use them.

**What Can the Cataloger Do with an ERM?**

*Steve Shadle, University of Washington*

Reported by Jennifer O’Brien

While the Innovative Interfaces Inc (III) Electronic Resource Management module (ERM) is intended for the management of electronic resources, it is robust enough to manage a multitude of other tasks. The University of Washington library decided to use the module to load and track cataloging records. The electronic systems librarian, working closely with ERM implementation efforts, believed it could be used for management of cataloging record sets.

Before ERM implementation, the cataloger had been using file folders to manage the licensing and cataloging record sets. Each folder contained multiple notes with instructions for tagging catalog records, set numbers for loads, associated resource record numbers, bibliographic record numbers, and special notations for the III loader. Procedures for handling the record sets were poorly documented, licensing information associated with the MARC records had not been adequately stored, and tracking of financial information (vendor selection, purchasing price, etc.) was not available. Vendor cataloging contacts were unknown. These problems became far more acute once electronic resources were added to the catalog.

In order to ensure information was readily available to staff, the decision was made to incorporate it into the ERM. The ERM’s record structure is robust, and allowed linking to both collection level and analytic bibliographic records using soft links. This allowed for easier identification of bibliographic set records with associated resource records. Utilizing the fixed and variable length fields in bibliographic, resource, and contact records they established a framework for storing and extracting cataloging management information from the ILS. Most fields used were not
changed from default, though some were re-labeled, and a local contact field was added.

Bibliographic source was added as a fixed-length field to all records. Contact records were added for individual record vendors. Using contact records to assign five letter codes representing bibliographic sources simplified workflows. In addition to adding contact records for record vendors, they also created a contact record for in-house cataloging. Should a particular record have more than one associated bibliographic source, information was noted in the cataloging note(s) in the resource record.

Cataloging status was added as a fixed-length field. This field contained a single code to identify the status of a particular set (evaluation, first load, update, ongoing, completed, etc.). Staff throughout the library could now track the status of individual record sets.

Cataloging notes were added to resource records. These notes contained information identifying persons responsible for record loads, bibliographic set numbers, bibliographic source identification, selector information, load dates, and any other critical information.

In addition to using these fixed and variable length fields, staff added additional information in the form of ticklers. This allowed them to keep track of continuing resources and irregular records, format changes, and vendor issues.

The management of set cataloging, facilitation of communication among staff, and the maximization of e-resource investment(s) has been improved through utilization of the ERM.

Can’t We Write a Little Script for This? Managing Serials Data and xISSN

Roy Tennant, OCLC; Mike Beccaria, Paul Smith’s College; Adam Traub, St. John Fisher College

Reported by Margaret Hogarth

xISSN: An OCLC Web Service

Roy Tennant of OCLC gave an overview of a suite of OCLC Web Services available to member libraries, most free of cost. These services include the Search WorldCat API, the institution registry, WorldCat Identifiers, the QuestionPoint knowledge base (for reference questions), and xID Services.

xID Services are based on identifiers such as xISBNs for books, xISSNs for serials, LCCN, and the OCLC number that allow mapping between systems. Using the basic metadata for the work (title, author, URL, etc.) the application can group alternate identifiers for the same work, such as different editions or print and electronic versions. Using the metadata, the application can link to other systems such as Google Books or HathiTrust.

xID Services are based on REST-style Web Services as opposed to SOAP-style. REST stands for Representational State Transfer, which most simply means that each unique URL is a representation for an object. REST uses HTTP GET, POST, PUT and DELETE, and the results are human readable. REST works well with XML, JSON, and plain text, and supports JSON callback.

xID Services mine WorldCat bibliographic data, which is updated monthly.

xISSN relates alternate editions and formats of serials, including predecessors and successors, mergers, and splits, indicates peer review status, and returns serials metadata that is parsed for human use. Tennant demonstrated the xISSN tool at http://xissn.worldcat.org/xissndemo/index.htm, (figure 1), which like a family tree, shows the relationships between related titles, their formats, and ISSNs.
Tennant pointed out that the WorldCat API is well documented at [http://www.worldcat.org/affiliate/tools?atype=wcapi](http://www.worldcat.org/affiliate/tools?atype=wcapi). xID is incorporated into many sites, products, and projects including LibX, the Python WorldCat API module, xISBN bookmarklet, AquaBrowser, Koha, SFX, Bookchaser.com, Bookmooch.com and more.

To see xISSN in action, go to the [Ibsen Society of America’s Survey of Articles 1996-2006](http://www.ibsen.org/survey/). xISSN is employed to indicate a journal's peer review status. xISSN checks against a list of 63 peer review sources that OCLC put together and returns the peer review status. If a title is peer reviewed, a green check appears to its left. The developer wrote the script for this xISSN function while on site at the Ibsen conference, showing how simple it is to implement.

Regina Reynolds, director of the U.S. ISSN Center, noted that while this was an incredible tool, she cautioned against using it to solve cataloging problems due to the high number of duplicate or incorrect ISSNs in WorldCat. ISSNs from the U.S. ISSN Center are accurate, but ISSNs from other sources may be incorrect. Roy encouraged participants to correct any errors found in WorldCat, emphasizing that we all need to work together to improve the accuracy of the data. Adam Traub reported that, in his experience, ISSN errors are fixed quickly in WorldCat.

**Peer-Review and xISSN**

During research instruction students are taught the difference between popular, scholarly and trade journals. Adam Traub noticed that students had to go back and look up journals in Ulrichsweb to be sure their sources were peer reviewed. To remedy this, Traub added about forty lines of code to the library’s electronic journal portal. Using xISSN, the code checks the journal metadata against OCLC’s list of peer
reviewed journals, and returns “Peer Reviewed” in green and a checkmark for those that are scholarly (figure 2).

**Figure 2. Peer-reviewed in E-journal Portal**

*Nature (London)* (0028-0836) **Peer Reviewed**

The code can be added to e-journal lists, OpenURL linkers, and catalogs; it works on any JavaScript enabled page.

Traub noted that of OCLC’s sixty-three sources for peer review status, not all agree, so he would like to choose which sources to consult. He wishes that the setup handled off-site users better. Essentially, there are two pools from which an institution’s users draw from. Each ISSN sent to the xISSN service counts as one request. In Traub’s case, they have one hundred requests available for unauthenticated users and 10,000 for authenticated users. Unfortunately, whether or not a user is on campus (for the IP authentication), xISSN uses up all one hundred requests available for unauthenticated users first. While on-campus users are for the most part unaffected, off-campus users do not get a peer-review check for any ISSN once those one hundred requests have been used up. Requests are used up before 10 a.m. on a normal day, earlier during finals. Traub would like the service to allow authenticated users a larger allocation, check IPs, or change the order of allocation use by sending the request to the authenticated user allocation first.

**Using xISSN to improve the Browsability of our E-Resources**

Mike Beccaria agreed with Traub that implementing xISSN is easy. Additionally, Beccaria has developed a prototype using OCLC’s xISSN and WorldCat’s API that allows students to browse similar journal titles from the library’s e-journal A-Z list. Libraries have a tremendous amount of data, but patrons don’t always realize the scope of what they are seeing. As a solution, Beccaria’s script allows patrons to see related resources in the local context. As Morville said in *Ambient Findability*, “Findability precedes usability in the alphabet and on the Web. You can’t use what you can’t find.” Find Similar Journals is an example of findability for e-journal A-Z list in action (figure 3). See also: [http://lg8eg4nk4x.search.serialssolutions.com/](http://lg8eg4nk4x.search.serialssolutions.com/)

**Figure 3. Find Similar Journals A-Z List**
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Behind the scenes (figure 4), a MySQL database is used to store the ISSNs and subjects for the journals. A Python script gathers the data from OCLC and stores it in the database. On the front end, a PHP script displays the titles to the patron, and JavaScript adds links to the Serials Solutions A-Z list. Working from related OCLC numbers and using MarcXML, the script queries WorldCat and returns the ISSN, title, and subject headings. When the link is clicked, the patron is taken to the link resolver.

![Figure 4. Findability A-Z List Behind the Scenes](image)

The WorldCat API grabs the 650 field and subfields a, x, y, and z. Initially, Beccaria’s script draws only from the 650|a field. He analyzed the data to see how many records have the 650 field with a, x, y or z subfields in them. In the future, Beccaria would like to develop a better algorithm so that the script delivers better results. He would also like to include 650 |x, y and z subfields. In addition to improving the visual appearance, Beccaria would like to see if the data is useful for other applications.

In order to implement this script, a library needs its own server, MySQL, PHP, Python, JavaScript, and a list of ISSNs and titles. Lists like these can be obtained from vendors. The code can be found by entering the search: Google Code: getrelatedissns or at http://code.google.com/p/getrelatedissns/

An attendee suggested pulling the call number from the OCLC record in addition to the subjects. Beccaria agreed this could provide better results and would be a worthy experiment. When asked if he could just pull the ISSN from his catalog, Beccaria clarified that the script can pull the ISSN from anywhere on a Web page. Attendees asked the presenters more about OCLC’s peer review source page. Tennant explained that the site will be redesigned to enhance functionality. The data is not part of the MARC record and is compiled from various sources, including vendors. If the peer review data quality is an issue, why not ask Ulrich’s if they have an API? While the accuracy of the data is a valid concern,
the advantage of OCLC’s peer review list is that it is free. When asked how OCLC deals with discrepancies in the peer review data, Tennant explained he was unfamiliar with the process, but will forward the question to someone with relevant expertise. It was noted that xISSN must be run at intervals; it is suggested monthly. Tennant was asked if the Title History Tool will display date ranges for journals. Date information is included in the xISSN query, but it is not displayed in the results. Tennant reminded the audience that OCLC is open to enhancement requests. When asked about reciprocal fields, (continued by and continues) Tennant wasn’t sure exactly how the y were handled by the algorithm, but another staff member could answer the question. Christie Degener recommended an article by Melissa M. Bernhardt 2 which proposes a way to “program the online catalog to retrieve and display related serial records, by using the current accepted practice of successive entry cataloging and MARC bibliographic fields unique to a successive entry record.” Results would be graphically displayed.


Industry Initiatives - What You Need to Know

Ross MacIntyre, Mimas, The University of Manchester

Reported by Christine E. Manzer

The focus of this session provided basic education on new industry initiatives: KBART: Knowledge Bases And Related Tools (KBART), Transfer Code of Practice, and the PIRUS2 Project (PIRUS2), which stands for Publisher and Institutional Repository Usage Statistics and is sponsored by JISC, the United Kingdom Joint Information Systems Committee. Education and an overview are necessary before uptake and implementation can begin.

The morning of the session, a timely press release had been issued about KBART (the newest of these initiatives), announcing the first organizations to publicly endorse the Phase I recommendations.

Discussion of KBART among serialists and electronic resources professionals was lively. If recommendations are endorsed, it will be valuable to ask a publisher or database provider of full text for a title list with all the fields in KBART format. It will fall to those in the serials and electronic resources positions to remind publishers that endorsement and application of the recommendations would make everyone’s lives easier.

Transfer Code of Practice is further along. The presenter clearly explained the initiative and indicated that it has gained broad acceptance since September 2008. Publishers are being asked to adopt the code.

PIRUS2 attracted the attention of session attendees responsible for usage statistics for online resources who are already familiar with the COUNTER Codes of Good Practice. The possibility of keeping a better handle on article level statistics will be on their minds as a result of this presentation.

Further information provided by the presenter can be found via web links on the 2010 Conference site, which also includes the KBART Glossary. The more consistent terminology use becomes, the better for all. MacIntyre’s presentation expressed his trust in the industry as represented in the room to see the value of these initiatives and to support them.

Let the Patron Drive:
Purchase on Demand of E-Books

Jonathan Nabe & Andrea Imre, Southern Illinois University – Carbondale

Reported by Sanjeet Mann

Two librarians at Southern Illinois University – Carbondale (SIUC), Jonathan Nabe and Andrea Imre, shared their library’s experience as an early adopter of
patron-initiated e-book purchasing. SIUC subscribed to the MyiLibrary e-book platform in 2008 through a consortial offer from the Greater Western Library Association (GWLA). Putting down a deposit of end-of-year funds gained their library access to a customized subset of Coutts’ 230,000 titles hosted on MyiLibrary. SIUC received batch loads of MARC records and monitored monthly usage – how often library users clicked the “Open Now” link in MARC records to view the e-books. On the third time a given e-book was viewed, the item was automatically ordered with the purchase price charged against SIUC’s deposit. Monthly invoices allowed acquisitions staff to create traditional purchase orders and track spending in their ILS. Collection development librarians used Coutts’ OASIS ordering website to add access to additional titles as desired.

Nabe reported that since November 2008 SIUC has added 8,456 MyiLibrary titles to their catalog, and users have purchased 470 titles at an average cost of $115.30. Nabe described this as quite reasonable, considering most of these purchases are STM (Science and Technology Materials) texts. An additional 1,116 titles have been viewed, but not frequently enough to trigger purchase. The books are used substantially, with an average of ninety-five pages viewed per title. And 100 percent of the e-books ordered on demand have circulated, compared to 23 percent of print books bought during the same time period.

Imre advised libraries considering acquiring e-books to read license terms carefully for ILL and course pack rights, how the vendor will employ Digital Rights Management (DRM) technology, and how many simultaneous users will be allowed. With patron-initiated and traditional librarian-initiated collection development occurring simultaneously, there is the risk of placing duplicate orders, though MyiLibrary can indicate in OASIS which titles have already been purchased on demand. E-books also lack support on mobile devices and many licenses do not outline provisions for digital preservation.

In the Q&A session, audience members dove into the details of implementation, asking whether there was a fixed cap on the size of the deposit account and what would happen if the fund was depleted, whether it was possible to tell who had checked out an e-book, what would happen if two people tried to read the same e-book at once, whether SIUC used single or successive entry methods to catalog e-books, and what constituted a “click” when recording e-book usage. The enthusiastic response demonstrated that e-books are very much on librarians’ minds and patron-initiated purchasing models have a viable future.

**Licensing Electronic Journals through Non-Subscription-Agent "Go-Betweens"**

*Betty Landesman, NIH; Pinar Erzin, Accucoms, Inc.*

Reported by Janet Arcand

Betty Landesman began the presentation by relating an interesting experience in setting up an online subscription. After expending much effort attempting to contact a particular publisher and receiving no reply, she was eventually informed the publisher was represented by the Accucoms agency.

The Accucoms representative was helpful in negotiating terms and setting up a contract with the publisher. Ms. Landesman later contacted IOS Press and Maney Publishing, and in each case she was given the name of the same representative from Accucoms. After a similar experience in contacting three other societies, and in each case being referred to a member of the SPCnet staff, Ms. Landesman realized a trend. Some publishers are using non-subscription agents to handle electronic resource licensing.

Pinar Erzin is the founder and managing director of Accucoms and was able to inform the audience regarding the reasons why some publishers prefer to use companies like hers as a “go-between”. Erzin’s employees come from a wide range of countries and have expertise in a variety of languages.
Accucoms represents nineteen publishers for the North and South American and the European markets, and there is some interest in developing markets from Middle East publishers. Accucoms exists as a “middle man” because business dealings between companies from different cultures can be hindered when cultural differences create misunderstandings. Some societies expect bargaining to be part of the process while in others polite agreements are important. The Accucoms staff members have the cultural fluency to understand local markets. Libraries benefit from these go-betweens by having fewer contacts to maintain and because the companies offer customer support in local languages and time zones in case problems arise which must be effectively dealt with as soon as possible. Additionally, in the current bad economy, some publishers have chosen not to hire staff for business contacts and instead outsource this type of work to companies like Accucoms.

Erzin envisioned Accucoms as having a differentiated boutique approach. Unlike big box stores, boutiques have fewer goods, but have personnel who are more knowledgeable about the goods they have, and know which goods can be targeted to an appreciative customer group.

One Identifier: Find your Oasis with NISO’s I² (Institutional Identifier) Standard

Tina Feick, HARRASSOWITZ; Helen Henderson, Ringgold

Reported by Linda Pitts

Libraries and institutions now use many different self-identifiers for different purposes. They will, for instance, have one identifier for ILL, another for a consortia membership, another for their NUC symbol, and yet another for their institutional repository, as well as internal acronyms. With the growth of digital information, the proliferation of identifiers is becoming a critical issue. In July 2008, the National Information Standards Organization (NISO) convened the Institutional Identifier (I²) Working Group to tackle the problem. Tina Feick from Harrassowitz and Helen Henderson from Ringgold, two members of the working group, presented this session about the I² standard.

Feick first provided some background on the group and its mission. In the information delivery chain, the institution placing the order is a critical piece, but
because identifiers for them are not global, there can be a breakdown in trying to identify a particular one.

Standard identifiers would be useful in establishing entitlements to digital information and would ensure, through the institutional affiliation, that the recipient is authorized to receive the information. Identifiers should be global, interoperable from system to system, unambiguous and unique, as well as able to integrate into existing workflows. They should support seamless access to information and would ensure that the information can be trusted as authentic. I² objectives include developing compelling cases for use and developing strategies for unique identifiers that are interoperable, scalable, and require little maintenance.

The group will identify existing standards and see how they would satisfy requirements in various scenarios. Issues of granularity—how far down in an institution one should go in assigning identifiers—are still being discussed. The group will also identify a core metadata structure and an implementation and sustainability model.

The goal is to have a standard identifier for each institution that can be used across publishers, agents, and platforms, etc. This will require defining hierarchies and combinations, like consortia, as well as defining publishers, agents, online hosts, etc. An institution would use the same identifier with all publishers, making publisher cooperation essential, and would use the same identifier in each step along the information supply chain.

Phase I of the working group brought together various stakeholders from libraries, archives, consortia, subscription agents, distributors, publishers, hosting services, bibliographic utilities, and institutional repositories. The group divided the work up into three scenarios: the information supply chain and issues surrounding delivery of electronic resources, (the scenario that Feick and Henderson are working on), institutional repositories, and internal library workflows.

“Pain points” in the information chain include missing issues, subscriptions not starting, loss of access to e-journals, and problems with renewals or with titles moving to a new publisher. Standard identifiers would help in resolving such issues and would help ensure accurate and timely entry of the order. They would also be useful for agency and platform changes and for updating IP ranges.

For e-resources, this scenario group developed a metadata scheme that includes the institutional identifier, a variant identifier, the actual name, variant names, location, URL, domain, and related institutions.

There is a clear need for standard institutional identifiers. The scenario group working on institutional repositories sent a survey to relevant listservs to identify trends and found that many repositories have identifiers for the repository and for subordinate units, although they are generally not used in other contexts, such as for ILL or ERM systems. Respondents also thought that participation should be voluntary and cost-free. Institutional repository metadata would include elements for the institution name, the parent institution, and URL.

The scenario group working on library workflows sent a survey out to various library listservs to get feedback on the metadata elements needed to support workflows. The majority of respondents thought it would be important to include the formal name of the institution, the country, state, region, and/or city where it was located, and variant identifiers. There was also strong support for including a website URL, variant names, a relationship type (e.g. parent institution, consortium, department, etc.), and former names for the institution. For questions about a library workflows registry, about half of the respondents said it was important to provide initial metadata, although only about a third thought it would be important to be able to make changes whenever they were needed. Slightly over a quarter of respondents said it would be important to review the metadata at least annually.
Henderson then took the floor to talk about the current work in Phase II. There is agreement on the need for institutional identifiers, but questions remain about how this will happen and whether the identifiers will actually be used if they become available. Ongoing work includes developing a purpose, environment, and structure, identifying existing standards in this area, developing business scenarios for financing implementation, drafting metadata, and circulating a consultation document. The group’s timeline for 2010 involves working on the final recommendation and reporting out by September.

Work on the environment and structure involves developing business scenarios and concepts for a central registry. There would also need to be decentralized business-specific registries. The scenario group is looking at similarities to the existing International Standard Organization (ISO) standard, the International Standard Name Identifier (ISNI), and is working on what features would be expected for institutional identifiers and the central registry.

There are already a number of standards that could potentially be adapted for use as institutional identifiers. These include the ISO ISNI, MARC organization codes, the NISO Standard Address Number (SAN), Dun and Bradstreet’s DUNS Data Universal Numbering, OCLC Institution Identifiers, and DOCLINE LIBID. Of all of these, only the ISNI, which is still in draft, supports all of the features outlined in the paragraph above, as well as such requirements as the ability to include alternate identifiers and the ability to define and maintain basic relationships between organizations. Because of this fortuitous overlap, the scenario group has considered joining ISNI, but no decisions have yet been made.

There is now a first draft of the metadata requirements which lists the data elements and sub-elements, as well as their definitions and functions. The next steps are to evaluate and select an identifier standard, which includes reviewing existing standards, finalize the I² metadata, work out an implementation and maintenance strategy, and get stakeholder feedback.

Distribution lists for gathering feedback include Lis-e-resources, ACQNET-L (Acquisitions), ERIL-L (Electronic Resources in Libraries), LibLicense-L, Lis-LINK, various LITA lists, SERIALST, ALCTS-eRes, and the NASIG discussion forum. The goal is to have the work completed by December 2010. More information about I² can be found at www.iso.org/workrooms/i2.

Knowledge Bases and Related Tools: A NISO/UKSG Recommended Practice

Jason Price, Claremont Colleges and SCELC Consortium

Reported by Margaret Hogarth

Jason Price introduced KBART: Knowledge Bases and Related Tools (KBART), a standard for holdings list format. Backed by UKSG and NISO, KBART is “a set of practical recommendations for the timely exchange of accurate metadata between content providers and knowledge base developers.” Working group members include knowledge base vendors (ExLibris, SerialsSolutions and EBSCO), content aggregators, publishers, subscription agents, libraries, and consortia. The full list of members is available at http://www.uksg.org/kbart/members. Publishers, aggregators, knowledge base vendors, and libraries will benefit from KBART, which enables better, more accurate access through a fully standardized holdings list format.

Without KBART, tracking title and ISSN changes is difficult and labor intensive for each organization along the supply chain. The number of titles in lists from publishers and providers often doesn’t match the library’s list. Connections to earlier title versions aren’t necessarily made in knowledge bases.

The KBART initiative was launched in January 2008. Challenged to find a single solution for sharing holdings data across the scholarly content supply chain, the working group analyzed knowledge bases, vendor practices, compliance, licensing, title relations, date coverage, link syntax and granularity, and data and transfer practices to determine common elements. It
wasn’t a simple process; often each piece of the complicated relationship branched out to many other pieces (figure 1).

### Figure 1. Typical Supply Chain

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Publisher provides object to:</th>
<th>Content Host, full text database, A&amp;I database, search engine, gateway</th>
<th>User (Tools automatically checking against appropriate knowledge base)</th>
<th>Desired object is provided</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>=&gt; OR</td>
<td>=&gt;</td>
<td>=&gt;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional discovery tools (catalog, A-Z list, link resolver)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Each step of the supply chain often involves transfer of metadata describing the holdings content. That data must be correct in order for the results to be accurate. The KBART standard can drastically improve each of these transactions.

The working group’s efforts resulted in a set of fields with definitions and a basic set of requirements for describing holdings, expressed as title level coverage by date, volume, and issue. The Phase I report, completed in January 2010, is available at [http://www.uksg.org/kbart](http://www.uksg.org/kbart), and includes the first set of recommendations, KBART 1.0. The included fields are shown in figure 2.

### Figure 2. KBART 1.0 Included Fields

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Field</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>publication_title</td>
<td>Publication title</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>print_identifier</td>
<td>Print-format identifier (i.e., ISSN, ISBN, etc.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>online_identifier</td>
<td>Online-format identifier (i.e., eISSN, eISBN, etc.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>date_first_issue_online</td>
<td>Date of first issue available online</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>num_first_vol_online</td>
<td>Number of first volume available online</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>num_first_issue_online</td>
<td>Number of first issue available online</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>date_last_issue_online</td>
<td>Date of last issue available online (or blank, if coverage is to present)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>num_last_vol_online</td>
<td>Number of last volume available online (or blank, if coverage is to present)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>num_last_issue_online</td>
<td>Number of last issue available online (or blank, if coverage is to present)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>title_url</td>
<td>Title-level URL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>first_author</td>
<td>First author (for monographs)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>title_id</td>
<td>Title ID</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>embargo_info</td>
<td>Embargo information</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>coverage_depth</td>
<td>Coverage depth (e.g., abstracts or full text)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>coverage_notes</td>
<td>Coverage notes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>publisher_name</td>
<td>Publisher name (if not given in the file’s title)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Knowledge bases have problems of their own. Price manually checked 1400 titles in a knowledge base and found 1226 matches. Common problems in matching included: titles not listed (85), uncertain accuracy (59), over-reported access dates (31), under-reported access dates (14), and title changes not reported (7).

KBART will help with problem identification and resolution. Maintenance of accurate package content supports link resolvers and MARC record delivery services, and enables automatic updating by knowledge base providers. This standard also addresses common holdings list inadequacies such as the reuse of ISSNs, ambiguities in embargo periods and inconsistent date or enumeration formats.

Widespread adoption of KBART would end librarians’ role as translators by addressing the best practice for including former titles and ISSNs. There would be no need to wait for the knowledge base data team to translate and update this data. Once the format is standardized, automated ingest would be possible. Librarians would no longer need to deal with out-of-date title lists, as publishers would regularly update their knowledge bases.

Librarians can help by lobbying publishers to adopt KBART practices, and by learning about KBART and its goals. Librarians can insist on the principle of knowing what we are buying. As a practice, require delivery of a usable holdings list before you pay and ask for the list annually going forward. When librarians receive an inadequate list, point the publisher to KBART. Enable publisher sales staff to make the case for adopting KBART to their company and continue to request KBART-compliant lists.

Price then described two case scenarios for American Institute of Physics (AIP) and A Big Publisher (ABP). AIP self-initiated KBART as an early adopter whose data was already in KBART format. AIP is driving expansion into other formats such as conference proceedings. While recognizing the problem, ABP needs to establish the priority of the change to the KBART standard and needs to get their hosting service to program the ability to export KBART-formatted datasets. It will take pressure from many customers to make these changes happen. Price then showed screen shots of AIP’s Service Center with clearly marked KBART-compliant files available and an example of a file. KBART files easily export to Excel.

At this time the KBART working group is building a self-check tool so that information providers can easily check their holdings lists to make sure they comply. Publishers wanting to comply to the standard can review metadata requirements on the KBART transition site http://www.uksg.org/kbart/s5/transition to see if any changes are needed. Once e-book and e-journal data is formatted to meet the requirements, the publisher can self-check their data and make corrections. Publishers will want to ensure they have a process in place for regular data exchange as outlined in section 5.2 of the KBART report. Then they can register their organization on the KBART registry site, which will provide a link to download the newly formatted dataset(s). The registry records basic information about the organization and serves as a clearinghouse for KBART formatted files.

KBART Phase 2 will involve more content-type coverage. Price hopes that Phase 3 will allow consortia and institution-level holdings metadata distribution based on what is accurately accessible from a particular IP.

Questions from the audience were insightful and showed unmet needs. When asked to elaborate on the “earlier title” problem, Price suggested that knowledge base providers need to build in the capacity to track earlier titles in their databases. He pointed out that we don’t need publishers to re-design their sites, just their access lists. Posting access dates and what resources libraries purchased would be very useful. When journal information on the publisher’s site is inadequate, Price encouraged us to direct the publisher to KBART. When free promotional access is pulled for a journal, does KBART recommend anything? KBART has not discussed this yet. When asked about gaps in coverage, Price mentioned the difficulty of policing compliance. However, he is confident that many publishers will register with KBART. When asked how to make a case
with a publisher, Price recommended explaining how their data is affecting access. Data helps; many publishers have analytics to show where their users are coming from. The importance of including available selected text was noted.

When asked if standardized URLs are in the future, Price reported that Adam Chandle, who is working to increase OpenURL transparency, had worked with KBART in the first phase, and has now re-joined the group. Price is hoping to add a standardized URL question into the registry. He is excited about the registry becoming a source for the industry. The KBART working group started to look at Open Access, but it quickly became too complicated. It is possible to add a note in the coverage note field to indicate Open Access.

Price was asked if KBART has addressed non-Roman materials. KBART has not as of yet, but he pointed out that since knowledge base providers are able to handle non-Roman material KBART should provide similar functionality. Libraries frequently need a list of URLs for proxies. Price responded that a script shouldn’t be too difficult to write that takes a feed from major catalogs, knowledge bases, and proxy providers to then create the list of necessary URLs.

Dublin Core allows authors to initiate the metadata, while editors and librarians enhance the metadata to ensure better access for users of databases or search engines. Open access articles are indexed for scholarly content.

Texas A&M University is a founding member of the Texas Digital Library (TDL). The TDL hosts nineteen higher education institutions and state agencies in Texas, and provides an open access publishing platform for faculty’s new e-journals or open access journals. Procedures for new journals include securing licenses, developing market promotion, and establishing an ISSN.

Popular open journal publishing systems include DSpace and Open Journal System (OJS).

Librarians can help the digital process by hosting and distributing open access publishing and explaining contracts to authors. Librarians also must make authors aware of authority control, ISSNs, and DOIs (digital object identifiers) for retrieval of articles or journals. Data sharing of open access material has become increasingly important, not just for retrieval of articles, but also in the preservation of this material.

**Metadata Value Chain for Open Access**

*Holly Mercer, Texas A&M University*

Reported by Evelyn Brass

The metadata value chain for open access scholarly journals expedites the use of independent single-title society journals and small non-commercial journals. These journals may originally have been published in print and are now being digitized, or these journals may have started as digital publications. The metadata chain is part of the larger scientific communication value chain. A value chain is defined as a chain of activities. Metadata for an article gains value as it goes through various activities of the chain. Metadata for an article has more value in an Internet search engine or a citation database than it did for the author writing the article.