FORT WORTH 2014

NASIG

TAKING STOCK & TAMING NEW FRONTIERS

# 29th Annual Conference

## May 1–4, 2014

## Ft. Worth, Texas

North American Serials Interest Group

# NASIG Newsletter

Vol. 29, no. 3 | September 2014 | eISSN 1542-3417

## Conference Reports



## Preconferences

### Big Deals and Squeaky Wheels: Taking Stock of Your Stats

*Angie Rathmel, University of Kansas*
*Lea Currie, University of Kansas*

Reported by Stephanie Viola

This program was a combination of a presentation and a workshop in order to guide electronic resource and/or serials librarians in gathering, standardizing, assessing, and presenting Big Deal usage statistics for making the best possible collection development decisions in the face of increasing costs and decreasing budgets.

Approximately twenty-five attendees came prepared with laptops and/or tablets. The speakers began with a brief history and literature review of libraries' experiences with Big Deals, including studies done by various university libraries in the first decade of the twenty-first century. Libraries that cancelled Big Deals were able to lower their costs and remove low use journal titles from their collections without any major increases in interlibrary loan (ILL) spending. The disadvantages found in cancelling Big Deals included increases in a-la-carte prices and/or low representation of discipline-specific content, which created difficulties at some institutions in attaining accreditation.

The presentation continued with a look at University of Kansas' (KU) demographics and a discussion of recent assessment activities there related to collection development strategies. Collection assessment data at KU includes COUNTER-compliant usage statistics for electronic journals, information stored in the electronic resource management system (ERMS) and integrated library system (ILS), and turnaway statistics. Excel spreadsheets are used for processing and data dissemination.

The presenters reported on their own study at KU concerning two of their Big Deals. Using both usage statistics and pricing data, they were able to create a forecast of spending for their Springer and Wiley packages. They used this information to compare the cost of their current Big Deals with keeping only the regularly used titles and fulfilling ILL requests for the cancelled titles. They found that breaking up the Big Deals would result in steep price increases over a period of five years; however, keeping the Big Deals in place would mean a much more gradual increase over the same period. The presenters noted that this may have been largely due to the high use rate of KU's Wiley package – 98% of all titles in the package received some use over the past two and a half years.

The program then changed its focus to hands-on practice with forecasting. Attendees were provided with two spreadsheets. The first was a visualization example where usage data could be transformed into graphs to easily share findings with administrators. Unfortunately, the spreadsheet failed to appear on the projector, so attendees could not perform the exercise during the session. The presenters, did, however, include an example in their slides.

The second spreadsheet was an example of downloaded usage statistics that needed to be normalized, processed, and analyzed to perform forecasting for various scenarios. Again, the spreadsheet was not able to be displayed, but, with the help of formulas from the presentation slides and one-on-one assistance from the presenters, attendees were able to work through the exercise. The results were a forecast of spending for the next four years on both Big Deal package subscriptions and related ILL costs for five scenarios:

1. Keeping the Big Deal in place
2. Cut journals with less than 200 uses at 1% ILL borrowing
3. Cut journals with less than 100 uses at 1% ILL borrowing
4. Cut journals with less than 200 uses at 10% ILL borrowing
5. Cut journals with less than 100 uses at 10% ILL borrowing

A cancellation scenario based on cost-per-use was also discussed, but not presented.

The exercise proved difficult, but useful, in projecting costs and providing decision-makers with meaningful data. Small mistakes in calculations or formulas will result in incorrect data, as demonstrated in the spreadsheets provided by the presenters. After the session, a new, corrected, and completed spreadsheet was provided to the attendees.

The major takeaways from this preconference were that usage statistics can be made more meaningful when analyzed and used for forecasting, as well as the very good advice to adapt the presentation of Big Deal usage information to each unique audience.

## *Vision Sessions*

### Critical Moments: Chance, Choice and Change in Scholarly Publishing

*Dr. Katherine Skinner, Educopia Institute*

Reported by Esta Tovstiadi

The opening vision session focused on how chance, choice, and change can guide information professionals in transforming the current scholarly publishing landscape into one that is beneficial for all stakeholders. Skinner began the session with a discussion of the current information landscape, focusing on a number of "field formation principles" that emerge during times of change. The first principle was to "Beware changes in the modes of communication," because this often leads to the formation of new fields. As an example, she discussed how printed communication, made possible by the invention of the printing press, drastically changed society.

The second principle she discussed was that "Innovations don't come from the center; they come from unexpected locations." To illustrate this point, she discussed the phonograph, a technology that became less popular in the United States after the radio became common, and the Great Depression made it more difficult for individuals to purchase records. However, thanks to the jukebox, this technology made a comeback. Additionally, the jukebox featured more African-American music which brought "new voices into the national conversation."

Finally, the last field formation principle discussed was that "Cultural processes of production, distribution, and reception depend upon networks of people." She elaborated on this by using the example of Barcelona castellers (human towers) who rely on "closely integrated chains of interdependence."

Skinner then discussed how the internet has revolutionized communication in modern times, creating more challenges, opportunities, and innovation in scholarly publishing. She stressed the importance of engaging all stakeholders, aligning key players, and connecting systems and communities in order to continue to support and sustain access to scholarship. She asserted that scholarly publishing is currently in a "crisis mode," where chance and choice matter, and encouraged all stakeholders to make choices that support the values of everyone involved in scholarly publishing.

Skinner concluded with several ways in which we can make changes to the current system. She noted the opportunities offered by library publishing, and highlighted the work of the Library Publishing Coalition's *Library Publishing Directory* as an example of growing support for this. Additionally, she challenged librarians to play a more strategic role in web archiving and preservation of all content, noting that current mechanisms in place are insufficient for capturing the scholarly record. Another possibility discussed for changing the current system was exploring and participating in innovative open access funding models, such as Knowledge Unlatched.

Questions from the audience included how to address the controversy of open access in regards to the tenure process; the role consortia might play in changing the scholarly publishing landscape; the relationship between library presses and university presses; and how the library community might coordinate large-scale web archiving projects.

## Reaching New Horizons: Gathering the Resources Librarians Need to Make Hard Decisions

*Jenica Rogers, State University of New York at Potsdam*

Reported by E. Gaele Gillespie

Rogers began her presentation with a quote she has heard from numerous librarians – "I could never do what you did," in reference to her institution's decision to cancel their American Chemical Society package (and "several other things [she's] done in [her] career"). She asserted that anyone can do what she did, and that librarians as a community need to work together to bring about bold, thoughtful change.

Rogers noted that the ability to make hard decisions with confidence requires knowing both yourself and your environment. Several components of one's environment to be aware of include the technology horizon, user needs, changes in publishing and scholarly communication, and trends in higher education. She reiterated that knowing who you are and being confident in yourself and your goals is fundamental to taking the first steps towards making the hard decisions that need to be made.

Once environmental, personal, and professional frameworks have been defined and detailed, the next step to bringing about change is to consider all resources available. Specific advice included:

- Hold on to your capital, including your expertise and authority.

Claim and demonstrate your expertise and authority. Pay attention to your demeanor, your presence, your sense of humor, your passion for scholarship, and your conversations. You can draw on all of this later. You need a reputation that will allow others to believe in you.

- Gather data.

Be the expert on your problem. Knowledge is power, and facts are ammunition. You must be able to back up your assertions with solid data.

- Make friends.

Other people are also important resources. Make friends. Such friends can include faculty, vendors, administrators, other librarians – not only at your own library, but also at other libraries. It helps to connect with people, and build friendships as a support system.

Rogers then moved on to tactics for bringing about thoughtful change. Specific tactics included:

- Start immediately.

There is no such thing as too early, but too late is real, and it can have a negative effect on all that you've carefully constructed. Usually when people say they cannot do a particular thing, they mean they can't do this yet. It takes a conscious effort, consistency, and thoughtful steps to lay out your tactics.

- Find common ground.

Where do your issues touch your allies' issues in meaningful ways? To find out, ask questions about what they do and what matters to them. Compare their responses with what matters to you, and find the places they intersect.

- Communicate effectively.

Knowing yourself and knowing how to approach a person is important, as is how to do the talking. Having said that, realize that finding and approaching the right person is more important than the tactic. Always remember to keep the medium and the audience in sync. Find a way to resonate with the audience you're speaking to.

Rogers noted that any actions taken will produce reactions, and that how one reacts is important. She recommended that the audience embrace serendipity and be prepared to be surprised, and to respond well, and with compassionate, reasonable, knowledgeable decisions. She also advised that change requires us to evolve, even though it can be uncomfortable and unexpected. She emphasized that change needs to be based on the local community, the local climate and environment, and local goals. The more or the bigger the changes, the more important it is to be ready.

Rogers' final advice was to release fear. She noted that fear does not enable smart decisions – it supports safe decisions. She reiterated that her decisions are based on what is in the best interest of her library within her community, and nothing else. She concluded her presentation stating that there are no easy choices, but it's almost always worth making the hard decisions. As Mahatma Gandhi said, "Be the change you want to see in the world."

## Conference Sessions

### 10,000 Libraries, 4 Years: A Large Scale Study of Ebook Usage and How You Can Use the Data to Move Forward

*Michael Levine-Clark, University of Denver*
*Kari Paulson, ProQuest*

Reported by Marsha Seamans

Paulson was charged with merging EBL and ebrary at ProQuest and brought Levine-Clark in to analyze the available usage data. Levine-Clark's analysis differs from previous research on this topic in that the data being analyzed for this presentation looked at worldwide usage in 2013, across academic, public, and special libraries.

The study includes approximately 270,000 ebrary titles and 406,000 EBL titles, with ebrary having a larger percentage of titles in the arts and humanities, and EBL a larger percentage in the social sciences. Levine-Clark pointed out that some aspects of the ebrary and EBL packages are not comparable, such as the size of the collections; variations in title availability; and platform differences.

This presentation focused on usage in academic libraries. Analysis of the usage data sought to provide answers to whether libraries are collecting the right material; whether the quality of the resource matters; if there are there patterns of use related to subject and/or discipline; and if those patterns can help us improve our collections and services.

A variety of graphs were presented to try to answer these questions. Several were used to compare the availability of e-books within specific disciplines to the use (e.g. sessions) of the e-books within those disciplines. To assess whether the quality of an e-book mattered, the data was analyzed using the criteria of the publisher being a university press. The study also looked at intensive versus extensive use (breadth versus depth) by looking at the percentage of titles used within subject areas compared to the average length of time spent in a single session.

A number of conclusions were presented from the current study:

- Quality matters—university press titles were used more heavily than the overall collection.
- Social sciences outperform humanities and STEM titles in percentage of e-books used and average amount of use.
- STEM books show more actions per session
- E-books in the humanities show longer session lengths.
- There are clear, but nuanced differences by subject. For example, users spend the most time using history e-books while users view a lot of pages in technology e-books in a short amount of time.

Levine-Clark will soon be publishing a white paper that will include the data presented at this session along with additional data that will help answer the question of how we use the observational data to build better collections and provide better service. The white paper will be available on the EBL and ebrary websites.

### Acquisition and Management of Digital Collections at the Library of Congress

*Ted Westervelt, Library of Congress*

Reported by Linh Chang

This presentation gave an overview of what the Library of Congress (LC) has done, and is currently doing, with its digital resources. The Library's mission with regard to developing digital content deals primarily with custodial collections. (Custodial collections are materials for which the library is taking on curatorial responsibility; they are not licensed databases, subscription resources, or content that the library has digitized from print sources.)

Westervelt began by talking about the different methods the Library of Congress uses in acquiring digital resources for its collections, including through the library's transfer services from other agencies and organizations. The largest component of this cooperative program is the National Digital Newspapers Project. Web archiving is another means for the Library to add digital resources to its collections. In addition, updated copyright deposit regulations include online-only serials, so the Library now automatically collects these e-serials. Through a related program, the Library collects e-books as well. The Cataloging in Publication Program is another way for the Library to acquire digital content. Finally, the Library of Congress also purchases digital resources from various publishers, and receives a large volume of gifts in digital format.

Westervelt then discussed the volume of the digital resources the Library acquires from these different sources. Through the library partnership transfer services, there are currently 116 million unique files, consisting of 274 petabytes of content. This content is growing at fifteen terabytes per day. Through web archiving, the Library has collected 8.6 billion files of 534 terabytes.

To accomplish large-scale acquisition and maintenance of its digital resources, the library's original approach was to start slowly, and to focus on the first steps in getting digital content into the library. The very first step was to identify what was out there. Westervelt emphasized the importance of initially identifying the intellectual content of resources, discovering the best place from which to get the content, and also of obtaining the right type of file format.

Next, Westervelt introduced the document "Recommended Format Specifications." It provides recommended file formats best suited for preservation and for long-term access. The goal of this document is to provide some parameters and standards for the greater community, especially libraries and vendors, to consider so that contents can more easily be preserved and accessed long term.

The presenter also identified a suite of tools that play a key role in preserving and managing incoming digital content, including the integrated library system, the Electronic Copyright Office (ECO), and Bagger, which ensures the safe transfer of digital contents. Another product, Digiboard, manages licenses for web archiving. Content Transfer Services is an inventory management tool that stores all of the Library's digital content and tracks it. Delivery Management Services was developed for e-serials that the Library of Congress receives under copyright, and allows staff to input serials metadata, such as volume, issue, article, and author. In addition, the Library now has a central inventory tool to track what has been received and provide metadata links to the content, which allows patrons to access it.

The Library is currently tackling issues resulting from providing access to patrons. There are many unanswered questions about rights access for digital content. However, despite some of these unanswered questions, Westervelt thinks the Library of Congress is in a good position to bring in digital content and to add it to the collection.

In addition to problems associated with developing and maintaining the digital repository and providing access, Westervelt talked about the complex issues the Library needs to work on with digital resources generally, including developing a digital collection with breadth and depth across all subjects and formats, and a better collection development policy to maintain the continuity of the collection, whether it's print or online. Westervelt also strongly advocated for the use of automated workflows which should provide greater efficiency and allow staff to work on difficult materials or formats that require manual processing.

The presenter offered some great tips and sound advice for any library starting a digital collection or getting further involved in digital collecting. First and foremost, the library needs to define its mission in digital collecting. At the Library of Congress, its mandate in digital collecting is set as broadly as possible to ensure the inclusion of various subjects across the board.

Westervelt also noted that librarians need to define their role in the digital process. Developing new relationships with others in different departments is a must and librarians in their new role need to be prepared to be heavily involved with people working in technology. He advised librarians to work within the basic workflows and to integrate new tasks with existing ones. He also warned that one should expect complications and tight resources. However, he feels his experience in informing management regarding his projects has been very positive, especially as it helps them to make better-informed decisions.

In order to succeed, the presenter advises that librarians need to cooperate better and to learn from experience so that we can educate each other. More importantly, we need to become more efficient. For example, he suggests that we try not to reinvent the wheel when it comes to digital collections, but to build on the existing tools and workflows. Lastly, he urged the audience to focus on integrating everything, including workflows and systems, and to standardize formats, workflows and tools, while leaving room for needed variations in your own situation.

## Actions and Updates on the Standards and Best Practices Front

*Nettie Lagace, NISO*
*Laurie Kaplan, ProQuest*

Reported by Stephanie Viola

Lagace began the presentation with an explanation of how ideas become either standards or best practices. NISO's major goals with regards to published standards or best practices are to facilitate commerce, reduce costs, and support integration. Around 95% of the projects that NISO works on are recommended practices and are often for emerging topics. These differ from standards, as their adoption is not compulsory and the rules surrounding them are more lenient.

Ideas or reported problems are documented as a work item that is referred to a NISO committee. Voting members approve or deny the work item for further action. For approved work items, a NISO working group is created to perform interviews, and conduct surveys and discussions. Next, draft proposals are created and the community submits comments. The working group then responds to those comments. This process can take a long time. After those steps, the recommended practice is published. Then, a NISO standing committee is created to ensure the practice is being adopted and remains relevant.

The speakers then discussed four current projects – KBART, PIE-J, ODI, and OAMI.

KBART – Knowledge Bases and Related Tools Recommended Practice – The second phase (Phase II) was published in March 2014. KBART aims to eliminate problems with the OpenURL protocol by offering a standard metadata exchange format. Phase II incorporates file fields for the identification of open access metadata, as well as e-book and conference proceeding metadata. It also recommends that purchased packages via consortia be identified as such in the file names and/or knowledge base entries. Publishers have six months to become KBART Phase II compliant.

PIE-J – The Presentation & Identification of E-Journals Recommended Practice – This became a recommended practice in March 2013. PIE-J addresses the clarity of information related to electronic journals, such as recommending that the e-journal's ISSN be listed somewhere on the website. The published document includes many real-world, positive examples of clarity in e-journal presentation. The PIE-J Standing Committee has created a template letter that librarians can use to contact vendors or publishers who are not in compliance with PIE-J (http://www.niso.org/apps/group_public/document.php?document_id=12536).

ODI – Open Discovery Initiative Recommended Practice – This was in its final stages of approval at the time of the presentation. This initiative was split into subgroups to propose best practices for discovery platform providers to describe what is inside (i.e. full-text v. abstract-only), describe what is being linked, and the exchange of usage data. Upon publication, the document should include simple checklists that libraries can send to providers to gage compliance.

OAMI – Open Access Metadata and Indicators – This recommended practice has received the most comments that Lagace had ever seen. The working group will be reviewing the many comments and preparing responses. Open access metadata continues to be a complex issue involving many stakeholders.

## Are We There Yet? Moving to an E-Only Collection Development Policy for Books

*Kate Moore, Indiana University Southeast*

Reported by Mohamed Berray

Moore's presentation gave an extensive overview of the literature on e-preferred collection development policies in libraries through an examination of the current impetus for acquiring e-books, hindrances in adopting e-preferred collections policies, and current library initiatives in line with predicted directions of e-books.

According to the *Ohio-Link-OCLC Collection and Circulation Analysis Project* (2011), 6% of library collections account for 80% of usage. Moving beyond serving as a warehouse for books, libraries have transformed themselves into collaborative learning spaces, not defined by the set of materials they hold, but by the mindset of community partnerships and collaboration. E-books have fed into these considerations by limiting the need for shelf space in libraries, and have allowed libraries to reinvent their spaces in ways that facilitate teaching and learning. According to the Wiley's *2013 Librarian Survey* key findings, 26% of current book collections in libraries are digital, and although spending on print books still exceeds digital, expenditures on the two material formats are expected to be even in three years' time.

E-books also provide remote access and ready availability of library books, which support the upsurge of online education. ACRL'S *Standards for Distance Learning Library Services* (2008) compels libraries to ensure that the distance-learning community has access to library materials equivalent to those provided in traditional settings. At Indiana University Southeast alone, the percentage of students taking an online course has grown from 1.9% in fall 2012 to 7.8% in spring 2014, and there are now sixteen fully online degree programs offered through the Indiana University system.

Notwithstanding all of the above, surveys about the use and preference of e-books indicate that print books are still preferred over their online counterparts. User preferences vary by book type (e-course reserve books are popular), subject (business and law students tend to prefer e-books the most), age of the user, and the purpose for which the book is used. According to a Voxburner survey in the United Kingdom, 62% of 16 to 24-year-olds prefer print books over e-books. Users in this age group noted that they have difficulty in retaining information read on a screen, and face multiple distractions while using an e-book on a portable device. E-books are also mainly used for quick perusals compared to print books. A JISC study found that 85% of e-book users spend less than a minute per page, and only 5.5% students have read an entire book online.

There are other issues associated with e-books, such as restrictive DRM, insufficient ADA compliance, inability or difficulty in downloading to multiple devices, limited functionality of the user interface, privacy concerns, lack of front file titles on aggregator platforms, and lack of preservation to ensure continual access to purchased materials. Libraries and publishers have adopted varying business models to suit their budget and user needs as well as their preference for vendor/publisher platform.

Moore concluded with items that should be addressed in an e-preferred collection development policy, including a discussion whether duplication with print resources is acceptable, guidelines for weeding, and whether the library will activate and provide access to open access e-book collections. While there is no universally accepted best practice for e-book collection development, having an e-book collection development policy in effect can assist with handling the changing landscape of books.

## Converting Your E-Resource Records to RDA

*Richard Guajardo, University of Houston*

Reported by R. Lundberg

Richard Guajardo detailed the University of Houston's (UH) ambitious RDA implementation project which not only involved the conversion of millions of bibliographic records, but also authority control processing for a more user-friendly catalog. Both vendor and in-house solutions were used to convert and clean up data. The project removed the general material designator (GMD) and replaced them with customized content type, media type, and carrier type (CMC) fields in bibliographic records. It also created a new suite of material type icons for the discover layer.

Librarians laid the groundwork for the RDA conversion by cleaning up data (OCLC Number Match Project); configuring load tables for new RDA fields; installing automatic authority control processing to automatically update access points when name authorities were updated; and implementing material type changes to replace the GMD. Also, UH had a task force for mapping material types. The task force consulted with the RDA implementation team and the OPAC Advisory Group. Guajardo said that this evaluation paid off because materials type codes (BCODE2) directly related to CMC fields which were used by the vendor in the conversion.

They outsourced the machine RDA hybridization of about 2 million records of physical materials, databases, electronic government documents, and electronic music scores to MARCIVE. The process, from grappling with the important "tax return" style profiling form, to loading the tested converted records into the ILS was very rapid and time-consuming. Guajardo reported that the MARCIVE conversion service changed as many of the data elements as possible using machine changes based on best practices. By combining RDA conversion and authority processing, UH paid one time per title.

Due to cost and the source of records, e-books and e-journals records were converted (hybridized) in-house via global updates. Load tables were also used post conversion to insert RDA fields (e.g., 040 $e, CMC fields) and replace abbreviations. In addition, the ILS vendor created customized material-type icons. They were able to reuse icons and change background colors to create new icons covering their range of material types including DVDs and Blu-ray.

Conversion work has culminated in bibliographic records with fewer abbreviations, more consistent access points, and customized icons for RDA material types.

UH has completed their elaborate plan, which also coincided with migrating to a new ILS. Guajardo remarked that keys to a successful conversion included ILS configuration, local policy, training, and communication of changes in the catalog and the system as project tasks were implemented. Guajardo also presented some of the challenges which can help librarians decide if this level of conversion is a must, or something to add to their wish list.

Richard Guajardo's slides are available on SlideShare and he also gave a presentation on RDA implementation at ALA 2013 (http://home.marcive.com/wp-content/uploads/2010/08/ALA2013-RDA-Guajardo-Final.ppt

## Core Competencies to the Rescue: Taking Stock and Protecting Institutional Knowledge

*Paula Sullenger, Auburn University*
*Shade Aladebumoye, Auburn University*
*Nadine Ellero, Auburn University*

Reported by Susan Boone

After Auburn University Library's Electronic Resources and Serials Services Department Head, Paula Sullenger, reviewed *NASIG's Core Competencies for Electronic Resources Librarians*, she recognized an opportunity to review and implement her long-standing goal of a systematic coverage of operational tasks. Technical services staff had been reduced by 40% through attrition, which left the department at risk for gaps in the necessary skills and background to effectively run their operations. Their department is comprised of a staff of four with very specialized knowledge, and initially no policies and procedures manual. The ultimate goal for the department is to have at least two people able to perform every task—a primary person and one to serve as backup.

In July 2013, the department's staff used the *Core Competencies* as a checklist to self- assess their knowledge of electronic resources management tasks. They ranked their level of understanding of the tasks in the seven different areas: lifecycle of electronic resources (acquisitions/collection development), technology, research and assessment, effective communication, supervising and management, trends and professional development, and personal qualities. Their rating scale for the sets of tasks or competencies associated with each area was weighted from: complete mastery (I can do this task), confident in this task (I could fill in and perform this duty), I understand what this task is (but I wouldn't be able to do it), to Blank (I haven't the slightest idea how to do this task). What emerged was that eighteen of the seventy-four individual competencies were covered by the unit head only. Forty-three tasks were fully covered within the department. The self-assessments verified gaps where skills were under developed or staff members needed more fluency in terminology, tools, or techniques.

Shade Aladebumoye, Library Associate for Serials, had complete mastery of acquisitions processes. Her extensive background with print serials gave her full confidence in those associated tasks. As their $6,000,000 collections budget edged up to where 85% were electronic resources expenditures, the process of tracking access and maintenance was not as familiar to her. Beginning with troubleshooting access, Aladebumoye took the initiative to learn how to manage access issues in their link resolver. Her confidence grew through putting her observation of helpline responses and some basic training into practice.

Nadine Ellero, Serials Acquisitions Librarian, had extensive experience in standards and NISO which gave her complete mastery of the link resolver, metasearch tools, bibliographic utilities, cataloging, taxonomies, and various aspects of metadata. Her self-assessment identified a need to expand her fluency in acquisitions and licensing. In order to accomplish this, she began to draft flow charts to illustrate local fund accounting structures and workflows. She has also attended training workshops, and is drafting a manual to document the department's processes.

Sullenger mentioned that her staff's skills were stronger than they gave themselves credit for in the first self-assessment. The *Core Competencies* provided a structure and focus for expanding staff knowledge and confidence. The most recent, comprehensive self-assessment completed this March shows positive progress in expanding knowledge of terminology, tools, and techniques. With Sullenger's imminent departure, the library has put a research and assessment team together to address collection development analysis which had been handled by Sullenger, as many of the tasks are best learned by direct experience.

In conclusion, the *Core Competencies* helped facilitate teamwork within the department by setting a framework to discuss and address areas for training and development.

## Facing Our E-Demons: The Challenges of E-Serial Management at a Large Academic Library

*Marlene Van Ballegooie, University of Toronto Libraries*
*Juliya Borie, University of Toronto Libraries*

Reported by Sanjeet Mann

In this session, Marlene Van Ballegooie and Juliya Borie of the University of Toronto Libraries explained how metadata supply chain problems impact academic libraries. They reviewed relevant initiatives and standards, and shared results from their investigation into the accuracy of their knowledge base.

E-resources are the fastest growing segment of University of Toronto Libraries' collections and absorbed 57 percent of their 2012-2013 acquisitions budget. Van Ballegooie and Borie cited research suggesting that investing in e-resources leads to better support for campus research, as long as libraries also invest in technical infrastructure such as link resolvers or Electronic Resource Management (ERM) systems. To this end, University of Toronto Libraries replaced their home-grown ERMS with the full Serials Solutions suite of discovery and management tools in 2011, and established the E-Resource Management Group (ERMG) in 2013 to collaboratively manage e-resources. These changes are resulting in stronger and simpler workflows, bringing a wider range of staff into e-resource management, and providing them with easier access to the information they needed.

As e-resources come to dominate library collections, libraries increasingly depend on accurate metadata flows between publishers, knowledge base vendors, and subscription agents. Recently, NISO and UKSG developed initiatives such as KBART, TRANSFER, and PIE-J to address common problems that prevent users from accessing needed content and leave librarians uncertain whether their knowledge bases accurately reflect their subscriptions.

To determine the accuracy of their knowledge base, Van Ballegooie and Borie requested lists of subscribed titles from twenty vendors and compared the titles and access dates against their Serials Solutions holdings. Out of 12,121 total titles, they discovered 1,048 titles from package deals and 52 single-title subscriptions that were not accurately represented in the knowledge base. Many of the missing package titles had not been activated or were missing short runs of access, because those titles had recently ceased, transferred or experienced a title change. Most of the missing single-subscription titles were "comes with", meaning they accompanied a paid subscription title, or were open access titles that the library was not aware of its entitlement.

Van Ballegooie and Borie concluded with recommendations for publishers and librarians. Perpetual access to content requires a perpetual supply of related metadata to knowledge bases and discovery services. Librarians may need to stipulate metadata availability as a condition of signing license agreements – model licenses can help librarians negotiate for these terms. As vendors automate metadata flows, librarians may need to "trust but verify" the accuracy of their metadata, archiving title lists on a shared network drive and taking periodic snapshots of knowledge base holdings. Vendors should fully implement relevant standards and allow librarians to improve the contents of knowledge bases. Publishers who value title lists as more than simply sales and marketing tools could see increased customer retention. Overall, the demons of e-resource management may be legion, but they can be exorcised by a commitment to collaboration and communication.

## The Impact of Reorganization on Staff: Using the Core Competencies as a Framework for Staff Training and Development

*Rachel Erb, Colorado State University*

Reported by Rob Van Rennes

Rachel Erb, electronic resources management librarian, related her experiences with reorganizing personnel at Colorado State University. Faced with an increasing emphasis on electronic resources and the departure of several staff members, the library administration realized changes needed to be made to better reflect the current work environment. The process began with the formation of a committee of key library staff who met on a weekly basis to analyze position descriptions and review workflows. By dissecting the operations, members were able to determine whether certain work activities should be continued, merged, or managed with automation. To help foster a sense of transparency and to maintain harmony in the workplace, staff members were invited to participate in the discussions concerning proposed changes. Additional meetings provided the opportunity for individuals who were directly impacted to express their work preferences which encouraged buy-in.

During the process, one specific library technician position which focused on serials and electronic resources was closely compared with the *NASIG Core Competencies for Electronic Resources Librarians*. After careful study, it was determined that the expected duties associated with the position justified a reclassification to a professional level appointment as many of the activities were above grade.

Once the staff person was hired for the newly envisioned position, a training plan involving formal and informal instruction was arranged. The internal hire had a monographic background so there was a fair amount of new information to absorb including learning the life cycles of electronic resources, licensing, and the department's role in the acquisitions process. To enhance the training, process maps were used extensively to provide visual assistance to help with understanding the workflows. Frequent meetings were scheduled to provide coaching, support, and encouragement, but the person also learned from a certain amount of hands-on training involving trial and error.

In the end, the reorganization not only resulted in the creation of a more effective staff that was better positioned for the current work environment, but it also led to the merger and restructuring of two library divisions. Staff members now have more flexibility to do a variety of activities and have a better understanding of all of the aspects of library operations as previous boundaries and silos have been knocked down. Although most of the plan has been implemented, ongoing refinement and training, especially in regards to technology, will need to continue in order to achieve the desired long-term success.

## Lassoing the Licensing Beast: How Electronic Resources Librarians Can Build Competency and Advocate for Wrangling Electronic Content Licensing

*Shannon Regan, Mercer University*

Reported by Annette Day

As a starting point, Shannon Regan showed Section 1.2 of NASIG's *Core Competencies for Electronic Resources Librarians*, that specifically addresses licensing. The presenter noted this is the biggest block of text in the competencies, indicating the complexity of licensing and the difficulty of being able to clearly and succinctly articulate the needed skills. She also highlighted a study from 2007 comparing terms used in Library Information Studies (LIS) curriculum and LIS position descriptions, which revealed licensing is frequently mentioned in job descriptions, but not in the LIS curriculum. Her presentation aimed to provide information and resources to help fill this knowledge gap.

Regan's presentation then moved to a list of questions that one may ask during the first day on the job if undertaking licensing. The questions covered learning about the review process, who is authorized to sign licenses, the relationship between the library and campus general counsel, and if there are any specific state or country laws that need to be considered in the license negotiation process. She also recommended shared key texts, model licenses, listservs and training opportunities. These are all collated in a library license toolkit created by the presenter: https://sites.google.com/site/librarylicensetoolkit/

The presenter explained the importance of having the library active in the licensing process through three scenarios. In the first scenario, "Educate to Advocate: Administrators", the presenter described how when first starting in her current position, she learned the administration was skeptical about the library's role in the licensing process. Campus had a general counsel that signed licenses and checked for legal red flags. The library's role, however, was unclear. There are critical issues for libraries in licensing that general counsel did not notice such as interlibrary loan and perpetual access rights. The presenter had to find a role in the licensing process and illustrate the importance of that role to the general counsel. She began by reviewing each license and creating a memo explaining clauses that were of concern to the library and suggesting changes to the agreement. The general counsel appreciated the efficiency of the memo and began to value the input they received and understand the importance of the library's role in the process.

In the second scenario, "Educate to Advocate: Colleagues", the presenter described being asked to purchase an electronic resource near the end of the year, which meant this needed to be accomplished within a brief amount of time. It was clear to the presenter that her colleagues did not fully understand the complexities of the process and the many parties involved. This gave her the perfect opportunity to educate them on all that is required when purchasing an e-resource and demonstrate it in a real life scenario, which is described in Section 4.3 of the *Core Competencies*.

The final scenario, "Educate to Advocate: Library Users", highlighted the importance of understanding what our users want to do with electronic content and factoring that into purchasing and licensing decisions. The presenter concluded with a description of the day to day realities of being an e-resource librarian. The ability to be flexible and change priorities while maintaining focus on long range goals is an essential quality for success.

## The Licensing Lifecycle: From Negotiation to Compliance

*Eric Hartnett, Texas A&M University*
*Jane Smith, Texas A&M University*

Reported by Tessa Minchew

Hartnett and Smith gave their audience a thorough overview of the current licensing workflow and tools at Texas A&M University Libraries (TAMU), including details about their licensing team, a license terms checklist, the electronic resources management (ERM) system, their approach to breach resolution, and some sample licensing documents. TAMU's electronic resources licensing team was created in 2008 and manages all license negotiations for the University Libraries, and provides support for members involved in unfamiliar or problematic negotiations. Communicating through monthly meetings, shared spreadsheets, and a wiki page, the team consists of eight librarians, seven who process licenses. In fiscal year 2013, the TAMU licensing team processed sixty-two licenses for a wide range of electronic resources.

The license team uses a checklist to ensure that all team members are negotiating standardized terms that are beneficial to the library and its users. While remaining open to negotiation, there are clauses that TAMU cannot accept in any license, such as a requirement to monitor patron use or supply patron records to the licensor upon request, or the stipulation that all materials must be destroyed upon termination of the contract.

Should negotiations fail, TAMU will make notes for their contract administration office and then either subscribe under the unfavorable terms or walk away. While walking away may prompt the vendor to make some concessions, the presenters acknowledged that sometimes TAMU may simply lose access to the resource. The license team has dealt with some issues in recent negotiations, including a vendor who was not honoring a previously negotiated inflation cap, another who wanted a multi-site license for three sites located on the same campus, and one who would not allow interlibrary loan of a purchased physical item.

After license negotiations are finalized, the contracts are sent on for necessary signatures. The Dean of University Libraries can sign a license for any resource under $5,000, but purchases over that amount have to be sent to the Contract Administration Office for further negotiations. In addition, the Contract Administration Office must forward contracts for purchases over $50,000 to the Office of General Counsel for further review.

For management of electronic resources metadata, TAMU uses CORAL, an open source ERMS developed at the University of Notre Dame's Hesburgh Libraries, and the system has been meeting their needs very well. CORAL allows TAMU to store all license documentation in a single place, compare clauses across licenses, and easily isolate licenses that are up for renewal.

In conclusion, the presenters discussed procedures for addressing license breaches. Presently, most breaches involve either excessive or systematic downloading. After receiving notification of a possible violation from a vendor, a license team member will work with the vendor and the libraries' IT department to identify the source of the breach and resolve it as quickly as possible. The audience also offered some interesting examples of recent breaches.

## Meeting the E-Resources Challenge though Collaboration: An OCLC Perspective on Effective Management, Access, and Delivery of Electronic Collections

*Jill Fluvog, OCLC*
*Maria Collins, North Carolina State University*
*Dawn Hale, Johns Hopkins University*
*Andrew Pace, OCLC*

Reported by Marsha Seamans

Fluvog introduced the panel discussion by reporting that by 2020, it is predicted that 80% of academic library expenditures will be on e-resources, yet 94% of librarians are still relying on spreadsheets to track those resources. Some of the ways in which OCLC is attempting to help manage e-resources is by generating research and reports; short term advisory groups for service introductions; one-on-one publisher relations teams; the Content Provider eQuality Group; and the Electronic Resources Advisory Council. Fluvog referred to an OCLC report, *Meeting the E-Resource Challenge* (2013). OCLC aims to provide services that are shaped, informed, built, and improved by the efforts of their global community.

Collins discussed the challenges of establishing an electronic resource management (ERM) system that is efficient, system-supported, and without silos of data. The challenges she identified included mainstreaming the ERMs, creating workflow-centric design, achieving scale, shifting to a global knowledge base, the need for best practices documentation, doing more with less, supporting local needs, living with siloed ERMs, and industry readiness. Collins stressed the need for global community investment and iterative design.

Hale continued the discussion of managing e-resources, noting the evolution in the tools used from spreadsheets to locally- developed databases, to stand-alone disparate systems, and finally to web-scale systems. Some of the e-management challenges include retaining perpetual access rights when resources move from vendor to vendor, local workflow management and internal communication, and problem tracking. Libraries are dealing with an ever-increasing publishing output due to self-publishing, content aggregation, consortia purchasing, and shared collections.

Additionally, libraries are managing the transition to open access, addressing questions such as subsidizing author open access rights charges, negotiating and managing hybrid open access agreements, and enhancing open access metadata to facilitate discovery. Collectively, libraries are struggling with budget constraints, the increased scale of e-resources, and user expectations for "instant access." For ongoing success there is a need to navigate the transition from an institution-centric to a user-centric networked world with ERMs that are based on the dynamic exchange of data to connect users to content.

Pace wrapped up the panel discussion by expressing the need for a purpose-driven ERM, rather than one that is driven by technology, standards, or current workflows. He suggested that the solution is intelligent workflows, connected to a global data network and powered by the library cooperative. The basis of the workflows would be a knowledge base that allows for selection, acquisition, description, discovery, and access and that shows availability right up front. Pace noted that the WorldCat global data network, as the largest supplier of library data and with an already established ethos of cooperation, could provide the solution for cooperative data management and intelligent workflows.

## Opportunities beyond Electronic Resource Management: An Extension of the Core Competencies for Electronic Resources Librarians to Digital Scholarship and Scholarly Communications

*Angela Dresselhaus, University of Montana*

Reported by Katherine Eastman

Dresselhaus, a manager of seven staff members and a fledgling institutional repository, began by citing Jennifer Adams and Kevin Gunn in their definition of digital humanities as "an emerging field revolving around the intersection of traditional humanities disciplines and technology." Dresselhaus proceeded to provide examples showing how librarian encounters with digital humanities are shifting from a supporting role to active engagement as principal investigators.

Dresselhaus emphasized the key role that data visualization and information retrieval play in digital humanities, and provided examples of visualization and non-traditional research projects which contribute to the body of scholarly communication that tenure and promotion portfolios might include. She cautioned the audience to remember that digital humanities researchers are often fiercely independent and unlikely to approach the library for assistance, and therefore, an emphasis must be placed on offering opportunities for partnerships with librarians without the appearance of overstepping boundaries, stepping on toes, or alienating researchers from potential collaborative efforts.

After providing a brief overview of the range of scholarly communications – print materials, e-books and journals (fee-based and open access), databases, and interactive websites– Dresselhaus stated that the role of the institutional repository is shifting from widening access to elevating the profile of an institution, providing visibility for individual researchers, preserving at risk materials, and enhancing cross-disciplinary collaboration. She mentioned the use of WordSeer, a service from UC Berkeley that bills itself as a text-mining and analysis environment for humanities scholars. Dresselhaus also noted that throughout the years, presentations on institutional repositories at NASIG have shifted from initial workshops on how to begin the implementation process to assessing the success of institutional repositories at meeting end-user needs.

A quick overview of NASIG's *Core Competencies for Electronic Resources Librarians* led Dresselhaus to posit potential opportunities for publishing and data curation as essential components of librarian involvement with digital humanities. "Librarians could use their skills to curate datasets, which represent a growing and quickly evolving need in our organizations. Take a role as advocates. Encourage faculty members to care what happens to their article after publication…" She exhorted librarians interested in digital humanities to shore up gaps in their existing knowledge, such as informational statistics.

Dresselhaus proposed that the success of a transition into a more active role in the digital humanities hinged on the ability to have a high level of tolerance for complexity and ambiguity, remain flexible, and retain the ability to function in a dynamic, rapidly changing environment. She encouraged library managers to avoid the potential pitfall of discounting the potential technical contribution of older staff members as digital conversions make more of the tasks initially assigned to technical services obsolete. She also added, "Don't indulge stereotypes about your thirty-year employee not being able to do technology." She provided an example from her own staff of a long-term employee who, once assigned to the institutional repository, felt empowered to promote that service to faculty directly and became a strong advocate for self-archiving.

To quote Miriam Posner, "the success of digital humanities in libraries depends on the energy, creativity and good will of a few over-extended library professionals and the services they can cobble together." The distilled message of this presentation can be decanted as such: words like "cobble" and "over-extended" should not comprise the sum total of our contribution to digital humanities. To that end, Dresselhaus suggested that the board members present take her presentation as a motion for NASIG to define core competencies for digital humanities librarians.

## ORCID Identifiers: Planned and Potential Uses by Associations, Publishers and Libraries

*Barbara Chen, Modern Language Association*
*Gail Clement, Texas A&M University*
*Wm. Joseph Thomas, East Carolina University*

Reported by Lynn R. Shay

This session centered on how ORCID is being used by librarians, associations, and publishers to assist with scholarly communications. Thomas began the session with an explanation of ORCID -- an open, non-profit organization that provides a registry of unique sixteen digit numbers for researchers (http://ORCID.org/content/about-ORCID). When this persistent identifier is embedded in research workflows and becomes a core part of the metadata associated with a researcher's work, then discovery of scholarly communications improves. Use of ORCID helps scholars claim their works and eliminates the name ambiguity problem in research and scholarly communications. For members, ORCID has an API that enables the exchange of information between systems. ORCID also provides help services and webinars, and works as a team with implementing organizations.

Chen spoke about the implementation of ORCID at the Modern Language Association (MLA). Chen wears three hats—she represents a publisher, an association, and a database producer. MLA is a scholarly communications organization that advocates for member's scholarship. Authentication and identity management is important; therefore, the organization enthusiastically endorses the use of ORCID.

ORCID more easily identifies members, enabling leaders of MLA to do a better job in advocating for members' scholarship. In addition, the MLA's role of assisting member scholars in making their works easily findable is where MLA, as a publisher, runs into problems. Chen illustrated the problem of author identification when creating the annual meeting program. MLA receives over one thousand submissions for the program and, with 2.5 million authors in their scholar database, disambiguation is a problem. Chen and her IT department tried to create an author/name variant file, but that is as far as they got.

MLA is encouraging members to get and/or add ORCID when they renew their membership online, supplying a link from the MLA website to ORCID. Then, MLA will be able to automatically populate the author database with MLA members' ORCIDs. Members with an ORCID identifier will be able to use the MLA bibliography to import their works from the bibliography to ORCID, creating a permanent record of their endeavors. MLA has taken steps to educate association members about ORCID. The association created and disseminates fliers, and conducts webinars to educate scholars.

Next Clement, a scholarly communications librarian at TAMU, spoke about a program at her university. Clement is the principle investigator for the ORCID Adoption and Integration Program at TAMU. They have a long legacy of research and service, so they wanted to implement ORCID for the entire campus. Clement is working with over 10,000 graduate students, post-doc students, medical residents, and interns. The goals of this effort are to: establish scholarly identity at the start of the scholar's or professional's career; position new researchers for success by creating the identification needed for research support systems (grant applications and manuscript submission to publishers); and develop an infrastructure for tracking student success. The libraries work to help students establish and curate their scholarly identity. ORCID is a linchpin in this. Use of ORCID will also assist in assessment because it allows the tracking of scholars and the outcomes of their scholarly efforts.

TAMU has a membership/subscription to ORCID, which has additional benefits. Because of these benefits, Clement was able to use the ORCID API to create ORCID records and to manage records on behalf of the students and employees. There were some university administration hurdles, but 10,334 ORCIDs were minted for graduate students. ORCIDs were sent via email, and, so far, 2,138 ids have been claimed.

Clement noted that automation of ORCID is not enough; outreach and training are also important. ORCID is integrated into the library public services' website where there is an ORCID LibGuide and an ORCID cookbook. She will continue her efforts to better implement ORCID.

Wm. Joseph Thomas serves as assistant director for research and scholarly communication at East Carolina University (ECU). He wrapped up the session by describing the efforts to implement ORCID at ECU. While recognizing that large scale efforts of implementing ORCID are worth the effort, instead ECU concentrated on outreach to individual faculty. Thomas explained he contacts individuals, is available at departmental meetings, and makes ORCID part of other scheduled presentations. For example, when working with a faculty member he will let them know they can access *Nature* articles with their ORCID.

A key related project at ECU is REACH NC, which is a portal that connects users to thousands of experts and assets within North Carolina higher education and research institutions. Scholar profiles within Reach NC are created using SciVal Experts which in turn is populated by Scopus. Thomas showed an example for a faculty member who has published using two names. Because of this the profile misses many publications. With an ORCID, the author would be able to associate all his/her publications with that profile.

For Thomas, success at ECU comes from understanding that administrative support is key. He also advised that you need to connect ORCID to something the faculty member cares about; for example, measuring their research impact. He concluded by sharing the realization that by spending more time on your implementation will be slow down the uptake of the service.

## Personalizing the Library Service to Improve Scholarly Communication

*Elyse Profera, Taylor & Francis Group*
*Renee N. Jefferson, The Citadel*

Reported by Gaele Gillespie

Profera began by stating that while she works for the publisher, Taylor & Francis Group, she does not work in sales. Instead, she works in the Library Communications-Academic area, which provides services to academic libraries to help them meet their users' needs and find the best ways to facilitate access to and promote research sources across their campuses. Jefferson introduced herself as a librarian at The Citadel with a background in educational research and statistics. She is interested in bridging the gap between users' preference for convenience and speed when doing research, and finding ways to provide them with quality research results without losing the personal touch. The Citadel, a military college, has a student body made up of resident cadets and non-resident, non-cadet students. Except for a few week-end passes during the year, the cadets are restricted to campus, much like a military base.

Since The Citadel's library resources have evolved from print to mostly online, there has been a shift in user behavior effected by the physical and virtual spaces on campus. Although researchers do not need to step foot into the library to do their research, Jefferson wondered if they are actually finding the best resources to suit their needs. She also wanted to find out what would make the physical space in the library more appealing and the virtual space more effective. She decided to see how those factors could be discovered and assessed.

The library began with a global survey of all their users to obtain information about physical space and user behavior. They received 397 responses to the survey and followed up with focus groups that included librarians, faculty, graduate and undergraduate students. The outcomes are as follows: 96% wanted individual study spaces; 95% wanted collaborative spaces; 93% wanted computer labs; 90% agreed that space considerations and position of that space is important; 89% agreed strongly that as print declines, the resulting space should be reconfigured for users. As for social media use, eighty-five faculty and 167 students responded that they regularly use social media sites, with Twitter being the most popular.

The library's research also provided information about their virtual space and user behavior. Students use computers in the library more than elsewhere on campus due to printing capabilities. Students pay the most attention to something they need for class, and anything offered beyond that is not considered. Students do not understand how to effectively search for content in the virtual library, and cannot comprehend the quantity of electronic content that exists. Survey results found that professors prefer that information about library resources be given in class because students, especially the resident cadets, must attend class, and they look to their professors for information. Also, the classroom is the place where cadets talk to people the most, and it's the ideal place to discuss both subject-specific and general resources that best support their subject areas.

As a result of these findings the library defined a case study wherein subject librarians would consider the following approaches: create subject-specific newsletters; conduct one-on-one meetings with faculty; conduct instructional sessions; and do course-specific classes. As a result, 90% of subject librarians scheduled a meeting with faculty, and library resource usage increased 45% after implementing such meetings. The most important goals of the meeting plan implementation were: to educate users on the breadth of resources available and how to use them; to increase usage of library electronic resources across all end users; and to raise awareness of paid-for electronic resources. According to their findings, the most popular methods to meet these goals are library-hosted webinar tutorials (55%), electronic ads placed on the library website (53%), a newsfeed on the library's website (52%), e-mail campaigns (43%), and e-newsletters (43%).

From the publisher perspective, Profera reported that 73% of publishers use web-based training for their content platforms. Publishers also can provide other approaches to help libraries raise awareness about their content to end users by providing publisher-library workshops (77% of publishers offer this), quarterly newsletters by subject (73%), offers of free-access months for products (65%), offers for print and electronic promotional items for library distribution (61%), and e-mail campaigns to end users (45%). Taylor & Francis uses several promotional efforts for individual journals or subject-group journals, promoting these via e-mail, e-promotionals, and social media. Since article collections often drive usage, publishers offer an e-journal or a bundle of e-journals free for three months. This approach, however, gets mixed reviews from librarians and end-users, because it causes frustration when the promotion is over and the e-journals are no longer accessible.

Some of the most important findings from the library's self-study and Taylor & Francis' promotional assistance were that physical library space and virtual library space are important and need to be made as inviting and useable as possible. Both Jefferson and Profera advised that you need to know who your consumers are, and then educate and engage with them on their terms in order to best meet their needs. They also recommended that you measure results to find places for improvement, leverage relationships with friendly publishers to reach desired marketing goals, and promote library resources by using mobile technology.

## Planning for the Budget-ocalypse: The Evolution of a Serials/ER Cancellation Methodology

*Todd Enoch, University of North Texas*
*Karen Harker, University of North Texas*

Reported by Michael Fernandez

Faced with a flat budget in 2011, the University of North Texas (UNT) Libraries began their first round of cuts to resources. The UNT Libraries were able to reach their goal of cutting expenditures by $750,000 through a combination of methods. These included a deactivation of approval plans, a 71% reduction of monograph allocations, and a conversion project to drop print subscriptions in favor of electronic. While the cuts were easy to implement, they were mostly one-time actions that could not be subsequently repeated.

A second round of cuts was made in 2012 with a target of $1 million. During this stage more complex identification criteria was utilized such as looking at titles that were duplicated in other resources, including aggregator databases, analyzing usage statistics and cost-per-use, and considering cancellation of titles with embargoes of a year or less. In collaboration with subject liaison librarians, input was gathered from faculty who helped to review proposed cancellation lists and rank titles in order of importance. The UNT Libraries were able to make its targeted cuts in spite of the target being raised to $1.25 million.

In 2013 there was a reprieve from cuts and the Libraries received a one-time lump sum of money to cover inflation. This allowed more planning for a third round of cuts in 2014. With another $1.25 million targeted, the Libraries looked to focus on subscriptions greater than $1,000. Additionally, data would be collected and analyzed to break down costly big deal packages.

For the data analysis, the UNT Libraries looked at common measures such as usage, costs, and calculated cost per use. The Libraries also considered other criteria such as title overlap, inflation factor, as well as input from librarians regarding perceived value and relevance. These varied measures were applied to different types of resources, such as single e-journal titles, databases (full text, and abstracting and indexing), Big Deal packages, and reference sources. Given the variety of resource types, some metrics were applied universally while others pertained only to specific resources. For example, usage could be defined as full-text downloads for e-journals and some databases, whereas with abstracting and indexing databases and some reference sources, record views would be a more accurate gauge of use.

In order to assess the value of Big Deal packages, the Libraries looked at the distribution of usage. A determination was made on what percentage of titles accounted for 80% of usage for all packages analyzed. A wider spread of title usage meant a higher value for the package; while a greater concentration of usage among fewer titles meant a lower value. Big Deal cancellations were considered with comparable alternative models evaluated based on the list price of individual subscriptions to high use titles.

A scalable scoring metric for every type of resource was ultimately determined based upon the following: cost per use, the weighted sum of liaison ratings, and inflation factor. Using this composite score, appropriate actions were determined for every resource being considered for cancellation. The current round of cuts is still in progress and awaiting faculty feedback.

## The Power of Sharing Linked Data: Giving the Web What It Wants

*Presented by Richard Wallis, OCLC*

Reported by R. Lundberg

Library materials are not highly exposed on the web where information seekers go first, partly because machines have trouble reading data in MARC records. Linked data is one solution to increase the exposure and discoverability of library materials in the evolving web of data. Wallis encouraged libraries to register with aggregators such as OCLC to harness their size, and linked data technologies and capabilities to expose libraries collections on the web of data.

Wallis explained how libraries can join the web of data to expose their collections by giving the web what it wants: size (aggregation), familiar structures (e.g., linked data, *Schema.org*), networks of links with no restraints (referrals), and stable entity identifiers (e.g., URIs, VIAF). Libraries are already satisfying many of these wants, but more needs to be done.

Wallis requested that libraries register into a network so data can be aggregated to achieve size and exposure. This is a key starter. For some libraries, registration will be business as usual: add holdings, bibliographic records, and name authority records. After registering with OCLC, Richard said they will do the rest. (Linked data in WorldCat can be viewed by opening “Linked Data” at the bottom of the record.)

The Bibliothèque Nationale de France (BnF) is already reaping the rewards of its investment into linked open data. Over 80% of their visitations to the detailed record view come via search engines. Linked data will also create opportunities for new services and products. Library data stored as entities (works, places, concepts, people, organizations and events) can be connected (graphed) in new ways. Wallis gave the example of library “knowledge cards” that can be created on the fly to support user tasks. This raised the question of where BIBFRAME fits into the bigger picture, given that Schema.org was created by Google, Yahoo!, Bing, and Yandex. Wallis admitted that Google will not adopt BIBFRAME, but they will complement each other. Wallis is chair of the Schema Bib Extend Community Group which aims to "to discuss and prepare proposal(s) for extending Schema.org schemas for the improved representation of bibliographic information markup and sharing.”

Wallis’ slides are on SlideShare, and the core of this presentation can also been seen in OCLC’s webcast, *Data Strategy and Linked Data,* presented by Ted Fons, Executive Director of Data Services, on (http://www.oclc.org/data.en.html).

## The Quick and the Dirty: The Good, the Bad, and the Ugly of Database Overlap at the Journal Title Level

*Karen Harker, University of North Texas*
*Priya Kizhakkethil, University of North Texas*

Reported by David Macaulay

Karen Harker and Priya Kizhakkethil maintained an appropriately western theme in their presentation on methods for investigating journal-level overlap in abstracting and indexing (A&I) and full-text databases, outlining "the good, the bad, and the ugly" aspects of various tools and methodologies that have been employed for this purpose at University of North Texas (UNT).

The presenters started by noting that duplication in the coverage of different databases is natural, since the subject areas on which resources focus themselves overlap. The increasing prevalence of web-scale discovery and federated searching means that duplication of coverage amongst databases is no longer a "necessary evil" to ensure discoverability of relevant content. As budgets tighten up, librarians are more apt to consider dropping database subscriptions to save money and want to know what unique coverage would be missed or retained if something is canceled. The presenters described two attempts at systematic database overlap analysis at UNT.

The first exercise focused only on abstracting and indexing (A&I) databases, and the overlap analysis was performed in the following manner: Title lists were obtained from resource vendors and loaded into a local database; pairs of lists were compared (by matching on ISSNs) to determine which titles covered by one database were also covered in another. When the overlap was 75% or more, a list of the unique titles covered by the database being considered for cancellation was presented to a subject librarian, who determined whether losing this coverage would be acceptable.

This exercise was considered successful because suspicions were confirmed regarding the dispensability of certain databases with high overlap and low usage, and these subscriptions were consequently dropped. Up-to-date title and coverage information was readily obtainable from the relevant vendors. The analysis, however, turned out to be a very time-consuming effort. The process was limited to comparing pairs of databases. In some cases, the title lists supplied by vendors were in PDF format, which was difficult to manipulate and enter into the database. In addition, some title lists also had missing ISSNs.

The second attempt involved a comprehensive assessment effort covering A&I databases, full-text aggregator databases, and journal packages by using three different automated analysis tools: the JISC Academic Database Assessment Tool (ADAT); the Resource Comparison component of the CUFTS open source serials management system; and the Serials Solutions Overlap Analysis tool. Each of these tools was used to collect two pieces of data for a range of resources, both full-text and A&I: the number of overlap titles and the number of unique titles. The resulting numbers were copied into an Excel spreadsheet to calculate percentages based on the total number of titles covered by each database. The presenters illustrated the process with screenshots of the various tools. This data gathering process was characterized as being "quick and dirty". The process was "quick" because the tools involved were easy to use and the information was relatively up-to-date. In the case of ADAT and Serials Solutions, results were presented in easily readable summary tables. On the other hand, the process was "dirty" because CUFTS suffered in comparison to the other two tools in that it was slow to return results, it did not provide clear summaries, and the data required tweaking. Also, there were discrepancies in the numbers used by the different tools for a given database, and in some cases, the data was also observed to change over time. While the automated approach to the overlap analysis was quicker than the manual one, the question remained as to whether the use of automated tools was an improvement on the manual method of overlap analysis.

The presenters offered an assessment of the pros and cons of each tool, classified as "the good, the bad, and the ugly." JISC ADAT provided results clearly in the form of a simple table, but there were a few limitations such as few databases were available for analysis, only pairs of databases could be compared, and there was no graphical presentation of results. The worst feature, the "ugly", of ADAT was the inability to download or export results for manipulation in another tool. The CUFTS Resource Comparison tool offered a more extensive list of databases for analysis than ADAT, allowed for comparison of up to four databases (either A&I or full-text), and permitted downloading of results. However, some relevant databases were not available, and updating of coverage information was not consistent. The Serials Solutions Overlap Analysis tool was found to be easy to use, could compare any number of databases, and offered clear summaries as well as the ability to download the results. Unfortunately, only full-text resources were available for comparison. This tool was judged to be the best of the three tools used for overlap analysis. The automated approach to overlap analysis was determined to be "good" in requiring much less time than the manual method, "bad" in that not all databases could be analyzed, and "ugly" in that the data involved was sometimes unreliable or inconsistent. Ultimately, all four of these "wheels" were necessary to drive the "wagon" of overlap analysis.

## Rounding Up Those Prices: Do You Know What You Are Paying For?

*Tina Feick, Harrassowitz*
*Anne McKee, Greater Western Library Alliance (GWLA)*

Reported by Stephanie Viola

Tina Feick, of Harrassowitz, was decked out in a conference-site-appropriate cowboy hat which set the tone for the presentation. Joined by Anne McKee, they clarified the presentation title's meaning -- they were not suggesting one should overestimate journal prices, but used the song "Rawhide" to liken price gathering to rounding up cattle.

Feick presented a slide laying out the timeline of the journal pricing season. It was interesting to note that subscription agents tend to send out renewal notices to libraries and consortia during June or July, but the majority of vendors' prices are not communicated to agents until September or October. This means that many title renewal decisions are made before pricing is known.

As a way to streamline the process, audience members were encouraged to enter the renewal phase with the following details in hand: licensing requirements, FTE numbers (for the entire campus, as well as by discipline), IP ranges, and appropriate electronic resources contact information. Also, renewing institutions should be prepared to share any consortial arrangements on subscribed titles with subscription agents. Subscription agents offer many tools to aid in the renewal decision process such as price comparison reports, price increase notifications, pricing option changes, pricing studies, electronic data interchange (EDI), and standards development.

McKee encouraged the vendors in the audience to submit offers to the Greater Western Library Alliance (GWLA) and other consortia during March or August for best results. Also, no matter when the offer is submitted, member libraries need at least 90 days to review and respond. Additionally, McKee advocated for the participation in Shared E-Resource Understanding (SERU) or the basing of licenses on GWLA's model license located here:
https://docs.google.com/a/gwla.org/viewer?a=v&pid=sites&srcid=Z3dsYS5vcmd8Z3JlYXRlci13ZXN0ZXJuLWxpYnJhcnktYWxsaWFuY2V8Z3g6NTIwNTdiZTI0YmEzODA4MA

The audience posed many questions to the speakers, specifically in relation to how GWLA handles renewals, and librarians were encouraged to ask their subscription agents about any concerns over transparency of service fees to libraries.

## Taming the Information Frontier

*Jane Skoric, Santa Clara University Library*
*Carol Seiler, EBSCO*

Reported by Maryśka Connolly-Brown

The turnout for this final session of a long conference weekend was surprisingly robust. Skoric and Seiler's topic resonated with many of the attendees as lean budgets force many libraries to take long, hard looks at their resources and determine what is actually needed and what may be eliminated.

What is often missing in the vast frontier of content management are step-by-step accounts of what has to be done to tackle momentous undertakings, such as the comprehensive examination of journal subscriptions that comprised the heart of the Santa Clara University Library's journal subscription review project. This project was a massive one, involving EBSCO, the cataloging and metadata librarian, subject librarians, technical services staff, and many others. There is little doubt that taking the time to create and implement a flexible, well-thought out plan allowed them to not only save money by eliminating the "low-hanging fruit" such as duplicate serial coverage and overlaps between subscribed titles, open access, and print and online; but also to tackle more complicated issues, including whether to maintain a subscription or rely on interlibrary loan and whether to keep content specific to the curriculum or specific to instructors.

In some cases, the librarians were surprised to discover that many – and sometimes expensive – titles were retained year after year, not because they were being used significantly or supported the curriculum or accreditation, but out of habit. In the end, this housekeeping effort lead to leaner, more conscientious journal content and subscription practices that serve as an example to other libraries, lean budget or not.

## Techniques for Tracking Perpetual Access

*Chris Bulock, Southern Illinois University—Edwardsville*

Reported by Karen Tyrell

Bulock examined the systems used to track journal perpetual access and gave features and examples of these systems. He noted that libraries should track perpetual access because they need this information to make decisions regarding renewals, and cannot rely on publishers to notify them. He also gave several scenarios that could give rise to the need for perpetual access, such as the cancellation of a journal subscription, cessation of publication or the publisher goes out of business, a journal that is sold or transferred to another publisher, and/or if a journal changes hosting platforms. He added that libraries need to know the terms of licenses, including perpetual access provisions, the penalties for post-cancellation, and allowances for archiving and self-hosting. He also noted that libraries should know whether perpetual access applies to all issues accessible during the agreement, to issues published during the agreement, or if it's a bundle package, to all journals in the package. Some other questions include: "Does it apply to all journals or subset? What happens if it's a print item when there is a new edition?"

From the results of a survey conducted in March 2014, Bulock described several systems used by libraries to track journal perpetual access. These systems include using the electronic resource management (ERM) system to track license information (current status of the resource, specific packages, and title level relevancy and year-to-year title list variation, etc.). This method had a 33% response rate of usage in libraries. The integrated library system (ILS) was also identified and utilized by 25% of the survey respondents. The ILS is more specific and gives detail from the journal's bibliographical record that can be suppressed when the subscription is canceled. 24% of respondents indicated the use of spreadsheets for tracking license information. One of the key attributes of spreadsheets was its ability to provide a listing of providers and individual purchases. Using the Open URL link resolver knowledge base (KB) was a reported method by 32% of respondents; the presenter argued that this can be used solely for access and also for tracking journals. Other methods were employed by 4% of the respondents. Next generation management systems were not used at all for this purpose.

Three potential obstacles in tracking perpetual access were highlighted by the presenter. He noted that publishers sometimes do not comply with Presentation and Identification of E-Journal (PIE-J) guidelines (PIE-J was approved in March 2013 by National Information Standards Organization). He highlighted another obstacle, which is the reluctance by a new publisher to honor perpetual access when a transfer had occurred. He concluded by imploring librarians to be vigilant in managing and providing perpetual access to their users.

## To Boldly Go Where Few Have Gone Before: Global Research Management in the Cloud

*Rene J. Erlandson, University of Nebraska at Omaha*
*Jeff Kuskie University of Nebraska at Omaha*

Reported by: Jana Brubaker

Erlandson and Kuskie discussed their experience implementing and using OCLC's WorldShare Management Systems (WMS) at the Criss Library at the University of Nebraska, Omaha. WMS is an integrated suite of cloud-based library management applications. The library holds over 1 million e-resource titles and manages one hundred license agreements. Prior to the implementation of WMS in 2013, they used three different vendors for their ILS, discovery platform, ERMS, link resolver, A-Z list, and remote access authentication, and they had to create, maintain, and manage e-resource records locally.

WMS has a unified framework, and replaced the various separate components that the library was previously using. This means they now have access to global information that can be shared, including vendor information, resource metadata, and coverage updates. They added their e-serial collections to the WorldCat knowledge base through the PubGet program, which harvests institutional holdings information from providers' sites. OCLC also has a partnership with EBL that provides holdings updates every two weeks. Previously, library staff had only been able to update holdings twice a year. Erlandson said that they have been particularly pleased with the global license manager, which allows them to derive licenses from global templates and provide access to license information to staff.

The advantages to using WMS include that since it's a unified service platform, library staff does not need to maintain coverage or manually load MARC records, and there is a large community participating in data quality assurance and maintenance. Improvements that they would like to see in the future include the ability to move from one function to another more easily, more relationships with vendors like EBL and PubGet, and the addition of a usage statistics dashboard with the ability to link usage data to cost data elements. The OCLC representative in attendance said all of those improvements are coming. Erlandson and Kuskie emphasized that WMS is being enhanced on an ongoing basis.

If a library is contemplating moving to WMS, Erlandson and Kuskie recommended that they determine which data should be shared globally and which data should be private. They should also decide which staff members should have access to what data and work on user credentials to supply to PubGet. Finally, they suggested that potential WMS users begin to educate library staff and faculty. For example, there may be some lag time between automated updates and actual access to the resource. It is better if staff and patrons are aware of the access delays from the onset if considering WMS implementation.

## The Unbearable Insecurity of the Electronic Resources Librarian

*Stephen Buck, Dublin City University*

Reported by Michael Fernandez

With the *NASIG Core Competencies for Electronic Resources Librarians* as a basis, Buck used his presentation to contrast theoretically desired skill sets with the daily realities of electronic resources librarianship. Drawing from his professional experiences as an electronic resources and periodicals librarian, Buck sought to demystify many of the processes that comprise e-resources management.

Using a good amount of humor and self-effacement, Buck outlined some of the anxieties he confronted as a librarian new to e-resources management. Buck admitted to not being formally trained in some areas and detailed how much of his knowledge and skills have been gained on the job. For some competencies such as licensing and knowledge of information standards and protocols, Buck was able to develop an understanding through continuing education and conference attendance.

At this point in the presentation, Buck, with some assistance, performed a skit of a dialogue between a vendor and a novice e-resources librarian. The dialogue progressed from some basic questions about the librarian's institution, to a complex inquiry about metadata mapping and culminated with an escalating price quote. While exaggerated for comic effect, the skit served to illustrate genuine concerns that can confront a fledgling e-resources librarian. When starting a new job, an e-resources librarian may have to quickly become adept with their institution's ILS or ERM as well as be able to recall FTE and other information offhand. Additionally, they may lack knowledge of metadata standards or the ability to negotiate with vendors.

Buck continued to outline more aspects of librarianship he had to learn on the job. For example, Buck described the need to determine the start of the institution's fiscal year and the process for prepaying subscriptions and then reconciling balances at the end of the year. Other competency areas can be anxiety-inducing, such as effective communication, supervising, and management. Again, Buck used on the job experiences to illustrate these. In one example, he had to explain to a government official why a vendor was not awarded a contract. Another example entailed a misunderstanding between Buck and the team of assistants he supervised. This demonstrated the importance of making sure all affected parties are included in email communications. Much of an e-resources librarian's work depends on the communication chain--whether it's between faculty and librarian or librarian and vendor. Here, Buck emphasized the *Core Competencies'* call for "a high level of tolerance for complexity and ambiguity" as an important personal quality for a librarian to have.

Buck concluded his presentation by listing the duties that comprised his job description when he started and contrasting them with his actual daily work. While the initial job description detailed a large number of varied tasks, much of Buck's actual work is more focused and consists of responding to e-mail, troubleshooting access issues, and gathering usage statistics. Concluding, Buck assured e-resources librarians that they could make a difference at their institutions by streamlining workflows through their strategies and ideas.

## Why Can't Students Get the Sources They Need? Results from a Real Electronic Resource Availability Study

*Sanjeet Mann, University of Redlands*

Reported by Sharon K. Scott

Mann spoke a bit about his early background in computer science and his work in IT on college campuses. In meeting and speaking with librarians on campus, he became interested in the field, and during this time decided to get his library degree. Combining his two interests, he became interested in availability studies. At his own institution, he confidently predicted that users have only a 41% success rate in finding the electronic resources they need.

Availability studies for systems have existed for a long time. When this form of study is performed by trained library staff it is known as a "simulated availability" study. Another form of study is the qualitative approach, which is more of a usability study than an availability study. In this research method the user is observed by library staff as he/she attempts to locate the needed item. This research focuses less on the technical side and more on user behavior.

Mann has done three availability studies - two simulated availability studies, and one study in which students participated. The methodology Mann employed with students was a combination of the two research types. Quantitative methods were used to determine the overall availability of resources. The usability research method, which is more user-focused, was employed to compare the way the student subjects attempted to retrieve full text as opposed to an "ideal" process developed by the University of Redlands librarians.

There are significant differences in the way library staff, who are more familiar with the databases and interfaces, perform a search, and the method by which a typical student may attempt to find the same item. For example, Mann demonstrated this difference by having the test group each search for the full text of a book chapter about the popular character, Buffy the Vampire Slayer. The student in his test group failed to find what he needed and moved onto the next item. The chapter was available, though finding it required a high level of understanding of how information in the library's resources is structured.

The test sample of seven students was given two searches with ten results each, culminating in 142 interactions. During this study, *Jing* (screen capture software) was used to capture interactions. The students were given a general set of guidelines for how to proceed, but were not monitored to see if they followed these steps completely; this provided a more realistic view of how students actually search.

General results of the study showed that 25% of the users did not get the item, 43% went through interlibrary loan (ILL) to obtain the item, 3% did locate a physical item, and 29% were able to download the correct item. The error rate was about the same for system-error and user-error: 31% for system-error and 35% for user-error (there was also a 16% crossover with both system- and user- error). Severe examples of system errors were the following:

- A database was missing the OpenURL link, refused the OpenURL, or had bad/missing metadata.
- The knowledge base linked to only the title of the article, not the full text.

There were also a few user errors such as the link was not tested, the local system was not used correctly, important information was overlooked, and/or the student gave up searching out of frustration.

Availability studies can be used to examine various questions: How often do errors occur? Should changes be made in the technical infrastructure? How often do users need ILL? Is there enough full-text in the collection? Are users being taught what they need to be successful finding electronic resources?

## Yer Doin' it Wrong: How NOT to Interact with Vendors, Publishers, or Librarians

*Anne McKee, Greater Western Library Alliance*
*Katy Ginanni, Western Carolina University*
*Jenni Wilson, SAGE Publications*

Reported by Katherine Eastman

Beginning the session by sitting in three mismatched arm chairs taken from the hotel lobby, McKee, Ginanni, and Wilson, set the tone for an informal, back-and-forth discussion of negotiation etiquette. Each speaker introduced themselves, and then McKee explained the discussion-style format. She requested that participants remain respectful and anonymize their examples by "filing off the serial numbers and identifying features."

McKee began by reading the list of potential questions. The first group of questions focused on interactions from the librarian perspective. The following were some of the featured questions: Is it fair for librarians to give business to whoever wines and dines them the best? Can one discontinue business with a vendor due to hating the sales representative? Is it okay to not to inform vendors after selecting another product? The second group of questions focused on the purchasing interaction from the vendor point of view and included questions such as: Is it fair for a vendor to go over the head of a librarian and approach a dean, provost, or even a well-known alumna to get them to reverse a collections decision? Can the vendor quietly allow non-members into a consortium deal without first asking the consortium's permission? Is it reasonable for the vendor to employ guilt tactics in order to coerce the purchasing librarian into selecting their product (my child/mother/panda is sick and I'll lose my job if I don't meet my quota)?

The panelists began alternating between both groups of questions and provided anonymous examples of poor behavior and presented their opinion on the correct ways to handle these situations. The panelists concurred on many of their suggestions. They suggested we abide by the golden rule and be courteous and fair. However, some questions elicited a more raucous debate. For example, the panel addressed the following question: Is it fair for librarians to issue an RFP that is so narrow in focus that all vendors know it was written with a specific vendor in mind? While McKee considered this unfair, since new products and services that might serve users better would be missed by such an RFP, Ginanni proposed that often an RFP is red tape, and a library may not want to change their vendor. Several members of the audience stepped forward to affirm that they had to demonstrate due diligence in researching the most efficacious platform/product/service for their library, which included issuing an RFP. McKee suggested that those creating an RFP might consider an RFI because it does not have a mandatory award expectation.

One question was related to a previous presentation regarding license negotiation: Is it fair for publishers to retroactively change or add to an existing contract? McKee asked Jane Smith and Eric Hartnett from Texas A&M University to discuss their experience with a vendor retroactively changing the agreement terms. Several attendees offered their experiences with similar situations. Notable insight came from the question: Is it fair to refuse to do business with a vendor because they're making a profit? McKee presented the idea of a "fair profit", i.e., that librarians need publisher content in order to provide the best services for their users. Vendors are in business to make a profit, but there are acceptable and unacceptable levels of profit, and librarians are encouraged to negotiate prices to reflect fair market value.