Post-Conferences

**Introduction to Name and Title Authorities for Serial Catalogers, Part 1 & 2**

Les Hawkins, Library of Congress  
Hien Nguyen, Library of Congress

Reported by Heylicken “Hayley” Moreno

Hawkins and Nguyen’s workshop gave an overview on name authority records (NARs) in Resource Description and Access (RDA). The type of NARs that were discussed in the post-conference focused on those that are commonly found in serials. These NARs include works, expressions, corporate bodies, conferences, and personal names.

First, the workshop introduced the principles and benefits of authority records. The presenters then described the three underlying RDA principles that must be followed with NAR creation:

- Differentiation (how entities must be distinguishable from other entities);
- Representation (how preferred name or title must be based on its most commonly known form);
- Relationships (where associations should be made between entities).

By following these principles library users and librarians can benefit from their NARs, which support catalogs in collocating these entities and create precision in searching for serials.

Nguyen proceeded with a discussion about the foundation of RDA name authorities. RDA is a set of cataloging guidelines that indicate how to record data and define attributes in entities. While RDA is a set of
instructions, the Functional Requirement for Bibliographic Records (FRBR) is a conceptual model of the bibliographic universe. FRBR is based on an entity-relationship model used in databases. In this model there are three concepts:

- Entities (elements that exist in the bibliographic universe);
- Relationships (associations between two or more entities);
- Attributes (the characteristics that identify the entities or their relationships).

Hawkins continued the workshop with instructions on how to formulate an authorized access point (AAP) for works and expressions. The AAP is the authoritative form of writing titles and names in bibliographic records. With titles, catalogers must answer the following questions: Is the work created by one person? Is it a collaborative work or a compilation of works?

Each scenario requires the cataloger to formulate the authority differently. If the creator does exist, either personal or corporate, the AAP must include the author first, and then the preferred title.

On the other hand, an AAP for expression must always begin with the work and continue with the translated language or edition. Works and expressions can also have relationships. In RDA, relationship designators have been created to explicitly state the type of association one authority has with another.

Then, Nguyen elaborated on the selection process for choosing the AAP of corporate bodies. This type of entity requires a cataloger to distinguish the parent-subordinate hierarchies that may exist. The preferred name must distinguish between a body and entities. If the preferred name does not suggest a corporate body, there must be an addition to the AAP that would allow users to identify it appropriately. Subsequently, Nguyen discussed conference NARs which are usually identified by the institution that organized the event. Elements that may be included in the AAP are the conference number, date, and location.

Finally, personal names were mentioned briefly. The AAP should be based on the most frequently used name in publications; the exception being a change in name, in which case the latest version of the name is then considered to be the preferred form.

The final portion of the workshop was dedicated to attributes, which allow for a richer description of authority records. For instance, works have form, place of origin, and history as attributes. In expression, there is a content type attribute which specifies the medium being used to communicate the subject. Corporate name attributes include types of bodies, jurisdiction, address, field of activity, and history. Personal names have title of the person, his/her profession, as well as field of activity as attributes. All NARs share date, language, and identifiers as attributes.

Hawkins concluded by stating that the most important concept to remember is that authorities should be created to help users find and distinguish entities. RDA offers catalogers more options to perform this important function and make resources more discoverable. The new cataloging guidelines allow description to be enhanced through attributes and relationships which are showcased in today’s NARs.

**Vision Sessions**

**Ain't Nobody's Business If I Do (Read Serials)**

*Dorothea Salo, University of Wisconsin-Madison*

Reported by: Esta Tovstiadi

Salo, from the iSchool at the University of Wisconsin-Madison, began her presentation by connecting issues in reader privacy to Billie Holliday's song, "Ain’t Nobody’s Business if I Do." She noted that while data collection about readers is useful because the data offers opportunities for revenue generation and improvements based on usability, it is also in violation of the 3rd article of the *ALA Code of Ethics.*
Then, Salo explained how the "Internet of things" has begun to permeate our lives. For example, many products that previously functioned independently from the Internet, such as thermostats, toys, and televisions can now be connected to it to provide enhanced capabilities. However, she warned, these tools offer "creepy" insight into individuals' behavior. For example, thermostat data could inform burglars whether or not a house is occupied, or could be used against individuals in rental or loan decisions. Salo also pointed out that now there are Barbie Dolls that record what a child says and sends it to Mattel which, in turn, can be used by the company.

Salo explained that this issue is important for NASIG, pointing to many past and current problems in e-resource reader privacy. She attempted to find privacy statements from various organizations in the information resource chain, and found that groups such as the Committee on Publication Ethics and the Society for Scholarly Publishing, as well as many others, lacked statements regarding reader privacy. Additionally, a 2012 content analysis of library vendor privacy policies found that while many vendors had policies, those policies were not equal to the ALA Code of Ethics. Finally, Salo described a study that found that sixteen out of twenty major research journals allowed advertising networks to "spy on their users."

Pointing out the current NISO effort to construct a framework for supporting patron privacy in digital libraries, Salo called for NASIG to join in and support this initiative. She challenged librarians to consider the ALA Code of Ethics when using patron data to improve services, using the question, "Would we do this in a physical library?" as a litmus test for whether or not the use of data is ethical. Additionally, libraries need to consider user privacy when sharing data with companies such as Google, Facebook, and course management systems. Salo also encouraged libraries to respect patron privacy even when patrons are unaware or not concerned with it.

As a possible solution to these privacy concerns, Salo suggested that librarians understand these risks and try to mitigate them. Information that is personally identifiable or uncommon enough to lead to identification, as well as large pools of data about a user's breadth of use, is the most risky. Furthermore, while some data gatherers want to use data for harmless ventures, others are looking to profit from data they collect, at the expense of users' privacy. Salo proposed that libraries should engage in policy work, as well as work with content providers, to ensure reader privacy. Most importantly, she concluded, libraries should refuse to participate in data collection that violates the right to privacy outlined in the ALA Code of Ethics.

**Conference Sessions**

'And Other Duties as Assigned':
Expanding the Boundaries of the E-resource Life Cycle to Get Things Done

Marcella Lesher, St. Mary's University
Stacy Fowler, St. Mary's University School of Law

Reported by: Erin Finnerty

Lesher began with a comparison of various occupational responsibilities to the structure of the e-resources lifecycle. She described how NASIG’s Core Competencies for Electronic Resources Librarians (http://www.nasig.org/site_page.cfm?pk_association_webpage_menu=310&pk_association_webpage=1225) applies to each position and pointed out which standards have become the most important. She explained that both she and Fowler work in a hybrid environment, and the NASIG e-resources life cycle chart and the TERMS chart (Techniques for E-Resource Management) created by Jill Emery and Graham Stone are integral to their success.

Lesher then outlined the size and scope of the St. Mary's University collection, and then provided her job description. It included many diverse areas of responsibility, including acquisitions, serials, liaison work, supervisory roles, and vendor communications.
Lesh described one project that involved weeding bound journals and children’s literature to create space for a new café and open learning commons area. The discussion and planning phase ran from 2008-2010 and the project began in 2011. The library opted for further JSTOR participation instead of expensive compact shelving to house older journals. The café and learning commons opened in September 2012. Lesh related how elements of this project fit in with the e-resources lifecycle by citing various investigation, review, and implementation procedures.

Lesh described a second project that involved collaborating with Special Collections on the collection of old school newspapers dating back to 1924. These items were in fragile condition and there was no money for digitization. Lesh was able to secure a grant through the Rescuing Texas History program at the University of North Texas. She realized elements of this project reflected the e-resource life cycle since there was a need to review licensing terms from other offices on campus, and she had to obtain authorization to apply for the grant.

Fowler began her presentation by providing her job description. Her various responsibilities included acquisitions, serials management, automated library system support, supervising staff, website maintenance, faculty research requests, interlibrary loan, and technical services.

The project she described involved rearranging 42,000 books on the first floor of the library. They needed to reorganize the space for better flow and organization, and to create additional study space. An unexpected push in the scheduling of the project resulted in rushed decision-making about the collections. Fowler explained that in this case, the e-resource life cycle helped to determined what could be safely discarded.

Garlock began with a brief overview of Classroom Readings (http://labs.jstor.org/readings/), a tool developed by JSTOR to enable teachers to find articles frequently used in the classroom. This tool was developed based on usage data and is free up until the point of opening the article. The original concept for Classroom Readings was to help participants gain more use from the collections in JSTOR. Initially the plan was to create a list of JSTOR sources based around curricula for core college-level courses (based on syllabi), but several discoveries influenced a decision to develop a different approach. An analysis of usage patterns from
2011-2013 identified a “teaching use,” by employing an algorithm showing short use surges of a particular resource during a two-week period at a single institution. The study identified over 9,000 articles with “teaching use” patterns. Other findings indicated substantial use in humanities and thematic patterns across institutions, despite a lack of overlap in particular articles assigned.

After creating a basic search index and applying topic modeling to articles, JSTOR decided to use a flash build to quickly develop the Classroom Readings prototype. This involved five days of intensive testing with ten teachers from various levels. Teacher participation enabled JSTOR to identify high-value features for particular types of institutions, such as reading level indicators for high school teachers. Additionally, this helped differentiate content needs for varying education levels; for example, secondary schools placed a higher emphasis on relatedness while higher education institutions placed a higher value on authoritative content. The success of the flash build led JSTOR to perform several more since the initial study, and improvements are still being made to this tool. JSTOR is considering several ways in which to improve the dataset, such as the possibility of allowing educators to contribute to the content.

One interesting tool mentioned was developed by a partnership between Folger Shakespeare Library and JSTOR. This tool, referred to as Understanding Shakespeare (http://labs.jstor.org/shakespeare/), connects the digital texts from FSL with related articles on JSTOR. Readers can view each Shakespeare play line by line and see corresponding JSTOR articles. Early data collection suggests Hamlet is the most heavily researched Shakespeare play, based on usage in this particular tool. This was unsurprising given that Hamlet is also the most frequently purchased of all Folger Shakespeare Library Editions and has the highest number of publications about it by a large margin.

Johnson closed on a humorous note, showing a bar graph comparing the bar revenue as a percentage of ticket revenue in different genres; histories had the highest percentage of bar revenue, followed by tragedies, then comedies.

But is My Resource Included? How to Manage, Develop, and Think about the Content in Your Discovery Tool

Monica Moore, University of Notre Dame

Reported by: Marcella Lesher

Monica Moore, an electronic resources librarian at the University of Notre Dame (Notre Dame), presented on content representation in Notre Dame’s discovery tool, Primo Central, and how users at her institution engage with the content made available through that tool. She questioned if the pursuit of total resource inclusion in discovery tools is more important than the newsworthiness of the discovered record. She noted that a search in a discovery service will not necessarily retrieve the same set of records as a search in a source database. She also wondered how one would be able to tell if the records of the source database are totally included and how frequently its contents are updated. She felt that it is better for the institution to concentrate on managing “newsworthy” records rather than trying to include everything in the discovery system.

Eric Johnson of Folger Shakespeare Library (FSL) transitioned into a brief history of his institution and discussed several other avenues of readership, the first of which was Folger Digital Texts. Folger Digital Texts (http://www.folgerdigitaltexts.org) was formed by a partnership between FSL and Simon & Schuster, and offers the complete works of William Shakespeare for free, non-commercial use. These digital editions are taken from the Folger Shakespeare Library editions but lack the additional content provided by the print versions, such as notes and summaries. Johnson also discussed Shakespeare Quarterly, a peer-reviewed journal published by Johns Hopkins University Press for FSL. This journal’s article views were significant, with the most frequently viewed article averaging around 140 views per month since publication.
Notre Dame has certain criteria for deciding on when to activate content in their discovery tool, including analyzing content relevancy, content delivery, checking to see if the resource can be found through basic metadata, and looking for overlap so that only unique metadata is used in the search algorithms. In their usage studies, Notre Dame has used Google Analytics Event Tracking methodology. The resource collections in Primo Central are tracked as record sources to find out which resources the users are actually being guided to in their discovery searches. She has discovered that 58% of the “search events” were coming from local catalog records.

Her research has also found that a small number of collections drive most of the usage. Ten of their activated resource collections (out of approximately 150) get the most usage. She showed data which measured finding and then acquiring full text versus discovery or exploration. “I want it events,” where users accessed the full text accounted for 62% of the analyzed data. “I’m interested events,” where the user looked at the details, the titles, or the citation accounted for 34%. “I want something like it events,” where users took advantage of linking to related topics only accounted for 3.6% of the events. She also noted that items that had been coded as reference were actually being treated differently than primary literature. She hypothesized that students were not actually going to the full text of resources such as Encyclopedia Britannica and were using the abstract as the reference source instead.

This research as well as other data points discussed in her presentation provided the information needed to better and more efficiently curate the contents of their discovery system. Not all of a library’s holdings need to be “turned on” in the discovery system. Moore indicated the need to provide maximum coverage for known-item searches, that pointer resources such as LibGuides should be discoverable in searches, and that known databases such as MLA or Web of Science should also be discoverable as separate records.

Comparing Digital Apples and Oranges: A Comparative Analysis of E-Books across Multiple Platforms

Esta Tovstiadi, University of Colorado Boulder
Gabrielle Wiersma, University of Colorado Boulder

Reported by: Erin Finnerty

Wiersma began by outlining e-book purchase considerations from both the collection development and end-user perspectives. Some of these factors included digital file format, print versus e-book availability, pricing, platform functionality, and e-book formatting. She also explained the main differences between the most common e-book formats (.xml, .epub, .pdf), and the impact of digital conversion methods, quality of metadata, and search algorithms.

The methodology for Tovstiadi and Wiersma’s study involved using a random sample of approximately one hundred English language e-books published in 2014 from academic publishers. All were available on both the native publisher platform as well as three aggregator sites. In total, they evaluated about twenty different platforms, including: EBSCO, Brill, ABC-CLIO, Credo, Springer, Wiley, Taylor & Francis, IGI, Gale, and MyiLibrary. The College and Research Libraries (CRL) Academic Database Assessment Tool provided a basis for their e-book platform evaluation rubric (http://adat.crl.edu/ebooks).

Wiersma explained that they used Google Sheets to collect the data, and found the side-by-side comparison format helpful. Points of comparison across the different platforms included, but were not limited to: bibliographic information, permanent linking, pagination, table of contents, download options, printing options, social media integration, citation tools, and page navigation. She emphasized that accurate pagination seemed to be a specifically problematic element across the e-book platforms. The e-book pagination on a given platform did not always match the original pagination of the published text, and page breaks were often in the wrong place. Incorrect
pagination can cause problems for searching and citing resources.

Tovstiadi then continued discussing their findings, and specifically focused on search functionality and search results. Most platforms allow searches across the platform and searches within a book, and some platforms also allow searching within results. Tovstiadi noted that the digital conversion process can affect the ability to keyword search.

Tovstiadi and Wiersma made some recommendations based on their findings. They suggested that platforms that provide e-books in .epub format seem to have less errors, and that aggregators and publishers should provide both .pdf and .epub versions of e-books (like EBSCO). Their next step is to do a larger scale test, discuss the results with e-book vendors and publishers, and perform usability testing with students and faculty. They believe that it is necessary to continue educating users about correct citing practices, and to further investigate the accuracy of optical character recognition (OCR) and other digital conversion techniques. Tovstiadi and Wiersma felt that their rubric can be used again, and is suitable for providing good feedback to vendors and publishers.

E-Book Collection Development: Formalizing a Policy for Smaller Libraries

Ria Lukes, Indiana University Kokomo
Angie Thorpe, Indiana University Kokomo
Susanne Markgren, SUNY Purchase College

Reported by: Stephanie Spratt

Ria Lukes and Angie Thorpe of Indiana University Kokomo (IUK) Library presented on their experience adapting an existing collection development policy for demand-driven acquisitions (DDA) of e-books. While the IUK Library has a collection development policy that is reviewed annually, the policy was not considered when e-books were introduced into the collection. Initially, they selected e-book collections based on attractive big deal e-book packages; however, they felt the need to expand their collection development policy to e-books due to an increase in digital education at IU; fiscally beneficial acquisition models; the volume of off-campus students; and faculty requests for e-book purchases. Despite these reasons that would encourage the use of e-books, interactions at the reference desk indicated that many students still preferred to use print books.

In order to draft a collection development policy for e-books, the Library started by asking colleagues for examples of their existing policies, but soon discovered that many libraries lacked formal policies. The presenters discussed format duplication issues as well as ownership versus DDA. The decision was made to move forward with a librarian-mediated DDA program as it appeared IUK would get “more bang for [its] buck.” The DDA program in place now is fully mediated (both at the discovery and purchase levels) by librarians and is subject to review based on fifty-eight selection criteria publically available at http://iuk.libguides.com/nasig. The presenters are moving forward with the next steps of tackling workflow issues such as the possibility of altering the organizational structure of the Libraries’ Technical Services Department, MARC record maintenance, and e-book weeding.

The third speaker, Markgren of SUNY’s Purchase College Library, discussed her library’s project of using a DDA e-book provider, ebrary, as an alternative to keeping their more than five thousand title reference collection. An interesting decision in the implementation was to wait to put e-book records into the catalog until after a purchase was triggered, which would occur after two short-term loans on the title. It is Markgren’s hope that this limitation on access points can be reduced by the appearance of the e-book discovery records in the EBSCO Discovery Services system in use at SUNY Purchase, but the process of getting the e-book records to display has not been simple.

Questions from the audience included marketing strategy and tracking turnaway reports to determine the need to increase e-book titles to more than one simultaneous user. The speakers all indicated that they also rely on library instruction sessions for users to find
e-books. The speakers from IUK indicated that they do review turnaway reports, but are more likely to buy a print complement to the e-book in lieu of increasing the simultaneous users allowed for particular titles.

The Future is Flexible, Extensible, and Community-Based: Stories of Successful Electronic Resources Management

Steve Oberg, Wheaton College
Andrea Imre, Southern Illinois University Carbondale
Scott Vieira, Rice University

Reported by: Tessa Minchew

Prior to accepting his position with Rice University, Vieira was with Sam Houston State University, a public institution in Huntsville, Texas. Upon starting at Sam Houston, Vieira received the charge of populating their existing ERM product, though he had no prior experience with electronic resources management. He soon discovered that his task would be made even more challenging by a lack of existing documentation and the need to do a fair bit of research to even gather the data needed to populate the ERM. He also discovered that some of the library’s resources had not even been activated or made discoverable for patrons.

Oberg currently works at Wheaton College, a liberal arts institution in Illinois. The library staff was interested in streamlining the maintenance their Databases A-Z list, which is the most heavily used portion of their website. During this process they decided to expand the definition of what would be included on the Databases A-Z list to encompass a number of things that really weren’t databases at all. He found that database metadata was being managed in as many as six different systems, resulting in unavoidable inconsistency. In addition, database metadata was being manually entered into Wheaton’s website CMS (Drupal), a process that was becoming less and less sustainable with the continuing addition of new databases.

At another institution in Illinois, at the public Southern Illinois University Carbondale, Imre and her colleagues were looking for ways to manage the workflow associated with a 5.6 million dollar budget; 90% of which was devoted to e-resources, with only four library staff members managing this format.

In all three cases, these libraries turned to CORAL (http://coral-erm.org) to address their e-resources management needs, and they were all very pleased with the results. CORAL (Centralized Online Resources Acquisitions and Licensing) is a free, flexible, open-source ERM originally built at the University of Notre Dame’s Hesburgh Libraries. Current development and technical support are managed by a multi-library steering committee that is welcoming of new members.

Over the course of their session, Vieira, Oberg, and Imre each walked the audience through how they used CORAL to address their various electronic resources management concerns, including efficiently populating and maintaining an ever-expanding A-Z list, delegating and tracking different steps of a complex workflow across several different staff members, and usage statistics tracking and reporting. All presenters were satisfied with CORAL’s performance in managing non-linear workflows, reducing duplication of effort, and otherwise streamlining electronic resource management activities. They highly recommended it to others seeking a cost-effective and flexible electronic resources management tool.

Get ‘Em In, Get ‘Em Out: Finding a Road from Turnaway Data to Repurposed Space

Nikki DeMoville, California Polytechnic State University

Reported by: Marsha Seamans

DeMoville described a project to recover linear shelf space while expanding online access and improving discovery to targeted content. The project was in response to a 5-10 year master space plan, along with $125,000 funding for collection development, which needed to be spent within six months.
The goals for the project were established working within a short timeline and a small staff of five. The first goal was to get the “biggest bang for the buck” by spending the allocated funds before the deadline to acquire content with a proven need, and that allowed for the removal of print materials. The second goal was to improve access by identifying what users were trying to access online. The third goal was directed at reducing the impact of withdrawing print. This was accomplished by checking digital preservation in the Western Regional Storage Trust (WEST) which is a print storage repository; arranging for recycling of print to minimize environmental impact; and supporting interlibrary loan through back file purchases. The fourth goal was to increase discovery by aligning indexes between the catalog and the ERM. Finally, the fifth goal was to practice evidence-informed decision making to identify, justify, and evaluate access.

In order to develop an identification tool, a lot of data was combined from a variety of sources, including vendor title lists, Serials Solutions, Innovative’s online catalog, Thomson Reuter, and West. ScienceDirect was chosen for the initial evaluation because of its high usage, significant front file holdings, easily identified turnaways, strong correlation with print holdings, and clean, easily available usage and holdings reports. A template was developed with many formulas to minimize copy and paste.

The decision criteria used to determine the purchase of electronic back files included: turnaways, back file depth, existing front file subscriptions, match with print holdings, and price of packages. Twenty-four packages were evaluated for possible purchase, with eleven selected, plus two individual titles. The decision criteria used to determine withdrawal of print volumes included: print circulation statistics, dustiness, and preservation in trusted repositories.

Utilizing Excel to combine data from COUNTER JR2 Access Denied reports, print and online holdings information, and print circulation data, six hundred linear feet of space was replaced by online back files. New coverage includes 4,568 years across 252 title families and resulted in more than 3,300 uses in the first year. The project was considered successful, as the library has had no complaints regarding the withdrawn print volumes.

How We Used to Build the Future: 30 Years of Collection Development Trends

Betsy Appleton, St. Edward’s University
Justin Clarke, Harrassowitz
Dani Roach, University of St. Thomas
Moderated by Laurie Kaplan, Proquest

Reported by: Nancy Hampton

In light of the thirtieth anniversary of NASIG and the shift from print to electronic serials collections, a panel of librarians took a historic look back at collection development trends and practices. The panel gave a historic overview of what library collections looked like in the late 1980s and how online evaluation tools of the early 2000s had an impact on libraries. They also discussed collection “best practices” today and where future collections will focus.

Using statistical data from Ulrich’s Periodicals Directory and similar tools, the presenters considered how the changing landscape of serials publishing over the years has impacted the ways in which librarians evaluate, select, and assess their collections, from the days of print directories to today’s e-resource management offerings.

Introduction

The moderator, Kaplan, introduced the session, explaining that Roach would present the first twenty years of collection development during NASIG’s existence. Appleton would then present the last ten years of collection development from the perspective of the library. Clarke would present the last thirty years of collection development from the point of view of the vendor.

Kaplan described the evolution of UlrichsWeb over the past 30 years in order to set the scene for the panel. In
1932, the chief of the Periodicals Division of the New York Public Library published the *Periodicals Directory: A Classified Guide to a Selected List of Current Periodicals Foreign and Domestic*. It was innovative for its time because it gave an overall serials title list for librarians. The directory is still being published today, however, it is much more expensive than its initial price of ten dollars.

The *Ulrich’s Plus* CD-ROM became available to libraries in the 1980s. In the 1990s the online third party links for *Ulrich’s* became available. In the 2000s Ulrich’s Serials Analysis Systems was released, and in 2010 Ulrich’s redesigned its website, UlrichsWeb, based on input from librarians and other clients.

The relationship between Ulrich’s and the Library of Congress ISSN Center has changed since the early days (pre-1990s) when Ulrich was able to directly access ISSN numbers from the Library of Congress and the ISSN Portal. During the 1990s, the Library of Congress and Ulrich worked with Bowker to assign ISSN numbers. Today the Library of Congress works with ProQuest MARC to issue ISSN numbers.

Statistically, Ulrich has tracked different things over the years from referred titles to electronic titles. The new phase of UlrichsWeb is INTOTA Assessment which focuses on the lifecycle of library resources.

**First 20 Years of NASIG (1985–2004)**

Roach discussed the early years of NASIG. In 1985, the collections of most NASIG librarians consisted of print books, print journals, VHS tapes, laser discs, LPs, micro formats (microfilm and microfiche), and indexes and abstracts. Many transitory formats were still being used at that time, such as 8-track cassette tapes. The library’s multiple formats required multiple pieces of equipment.

Micro opaque cards were widely used and considered to be great space savers during the 1980s. VHS tapes were relatively new to most librarians, and libraries were being built or renovated with the idea that library shelving would need to expand over time in order to accommodate growing bound periodical collections. Librarians at early NASIG conferences compared binding company prices and efficiency.

In the 1990s, librarians initially began to shift to the use of CD-ROMs before Dialog and e-resources became widely available. Changes since then include dense websites that host e-resources and a move owning collections to managing access to collections.

In 1985, collections were assessed by counting the number of items owned. Librarians kept track of the number of volumes they had acquired. The amount of money spent on a collection was used as a way to assess the value of the collection. Circulation statistics were used to measure the usefulness of titles. The number of times a print journal was reshelved was counted in order to measure its usefulness.

The tools used for assessment have also changed. In 1985, librarians used date stamps and library cards to measure how many times a title had circulated. In addition, punch cards were used for tracking circulation statistics. By 2004 COUNTER reports and network statistics were being used to assess library collections. We could also measure e-book usage by this time.

Vendor promotion of library materials also changed over the years. From 1985 until the early 1990s, print catalogues and visits from vendors were used promote library materials. By 2004, email was a standard way to send advertisements, catalogues, and vendor information. Library vendors regularly asked librarians to visit their websites for product information.

**Last 10 Years of NASIG (2005-2015)**

Appleton examined the changes that have occurred in libraries this past decade. In 2005 The St. Edward’s University Scarborough-Phillips Library website had no distinguishable search box. Google was available during the 2003-2004 academic year and no one knew the impact it would have on libraries. A decade later, libraries use the search box model promoted by Google
and the St. Edward’s University Library’s website is no exception.

Libraries currently measure the usage of materials using all of the tools they used ten years ago (what we license, COUNTER statistics, network statistics) as well as open access sources, website analytics, altmetrics, and user experience/user behaviors.

What we own has changed this past decade. Open access has become a viable publishing model. COUNTER is far more than the general report 1, as it now considers how users use our websites.

The tools libraries use now have also changed. In 2004 libraries used tools such as link resolvers, electronic resource management systems (ERMS), A-Z lists, federated searches, integrated library systems, record sets, and model licenses. Until 2008, no one knew how to use their ERMS, and federated searches were not as ubiquitous as they once were. Libraries began to use library service platforms, discovery services, knowledgebases, and Shared Electronic Resource Understanding (SERU). These tools are still used, but now they are hosted in the cloud. Librarians also needed to manage these tools. In 2005, the management of electronic resources was thought to be something librarians could do in their spare time; this has now become a full-time occupation.

In 2005, the idea that print would become obsolete was still being considered but at this time print is thought to be permanent and not something that will go away entirely. There are new roles in libraries as librarians promote open access publishing in libraries and experimenting with new forms of advocacy and outreach.

**Collection Development: A Vendor Perspective**

Clarke began working fifteen years ago at Temple University’s Library before becoming a vendor. Over the past five years, he has observed that librarians are requesting more than just a journal title and an ISSN, but rather they also need the eISSN. It is anticipated that electronic journal titles will increase as publishers are creating fewer print runs. More often librarians are asking whether or not the title they need is available electronically, and if so, what the subscription covers. There are many issues associated with subscribing to electronic resources, such as back file availability, platform hosting, IP-authenticated resources versus the dreaded username/password option, IP ranges, post-cancellation access rights, licensing information, FTE, Carnegie classification, and license agreements. Another layer of complexity includes multiple institutional sites, proxy server information, consortial participation, license cycles, and individual contract details. All of these concerns are shaping the way librarians make collection development decisions.

Individual contact details may be tedious but they are used so that vendors can send information specifically to those who need it. Tools such as online catalogues rather than print catalogues are intended to help expedite ordering, renewing, claiming, sharing financial data, and cancelling. The renewal process is moving away from paper renewal. Claiming is just as important as ever. Librarians are also asking about price projections. In addition, librarians should ask about automation EDI standards, because vendors should participate and be aware of these standards, and request management reports from vendors, to assist with analysis. These issues are becoming prevalent with e-books as well.

**Question/Answer**

There was general consensus among the presenters and the audience that federated searching never delivered all that it initially promised. The idea was good but it was so slow it never panned out. There was also agreement among audience members who worked during the 1980s that time was wasted binding print issues, preparing issues for the bindery, and then tracking bound periodicals. Yet, they never imagined that all of that work would have become unimportant with the emergence of e-journals. Roach emphasized that preservation and binding was crucial during the 1980s and 1990s. Appleton commented that her first
library job was to discard bound periodicals found in JSTOR.

Several audience members expressed concern about the redundancy and multiplication of the tools for measuring usage. They agreed that libraries may be over measuring at this point and using tools with shortcomings. The publishers’ perspective is that having a consolidated system to track things makes it easier as data can be pulled out, used, and analyzed faster and easier.

The audience reflected on the implication of resource sharing and how it has become faster yet more complex. In half a decade, students have gone from waiting three days for an article, to gaining access to it instantly. Publishers, however, are not embracing the concept of resource sharing in the electronic age. Clarke suggested that librarians need to advocate for continued resource sharing and affordable access.

Introduction to USUS, a Community Website on Library Usage, and a Discussion about COUNTER 4

Anne Osterman, Oliver Pesch, and Kari Schmidt, USUS Supervisory Board Members

Reported by: Adele Fitzgerald

Schmidt kicked off the presentation by explaining what the USUS organization is and what it does. USUS (“usus” is Latin for usage) was founded in 2014, and is a community-run organization that provides a formal virtual space for discussing usage reports and disseminating information to the community about updates to relevant standards. The USUS website serves librarians, library consortium administrators, publishers, aggregators, repository managers, and individual scholars. While USUS is community-run, it also receives support from COUNTER.

Schmidt gave the audience a tour of the website, which offered a clear overview of USUS functionality (http://www.usus.org.uk/) (see Figure 1). She also pointed out that there is a new feature for an RSS feed (http://www.usus.org.uk/feed/) to push out information on updates.

Figure 1. “USUS Homepage”

The “Hints & Tips” page lists known issues, standards information, and new updates. Visitors can troubleshoot their own issues by reading about known problems posted here (see Figure 2).
The “News & Opinions” page offers news and trends, training, publications, and publisher and vendor communities (see Figure 3).

Figure 3. “News & Opinions”
The “Useful Links” page provides links to relevant external resources such as SUSHI, COUNTER, and NISO, as well as links to the Lib-Stats listserv, tools, and templates (see Figure 4).

Figure 4. “Useful Links”

The “Usage Report Issues” page is by far the most active page on the website (see Figure 5). Issue reports are posted here. (To report an issue, one should click on the enveloped-shaped icon labeled “get in touch” found on the top right of the webpage (see Figure 1). This will present the user with a “Contact Us” form. The troubleshooting process is initiated after the form is submitted. USUS reviews the submission and determines if it is a local or community-wide issue. If necessary, they will work with vendors and publishers to resolve. They will respond to the issue by posting the problem and resolution on the website, pushing the details out on the listserv, and replying to the originator to close the loop.

Figure 5. “Usage Report Issues”
The second presenter, Pesch, described in detail some of the tools and templates that are available on the “Useful Links” page. He explained that errors sometime occur when trying to load data into a system. The tools and templates that are available on the website provide the user with a means to flush out errors from the data. Pesch strongly encouraged the audience members to report any errors they encounter during data collection to assist USUS in identifying and solving problems.

Pesch discussed two of the tools that he has developed and made available on the “Useful Links” page. The first tool is the Compliance Testing and Data Analysis Templates for COUNTER Reports. This tool runs twenty-three validation tests to identify compliance issues, and flags any errors and warnings. The second tool is the COUNTER JR1 R3 to R4 Conversion Template. As its name implies, this tool converts JR1 release 3 reports to JR1 release 4 reports.

The third presenter, Osterman, led a discussion on COUNTER 4. She explained that COUNTER 4 is a living standard, and summarized several of the changes from COUNTER 3 to COUNTER 4. Changes included:

- In DB Report 1:
  - Sessions were dropped
  - Record views and result clicks were added
- DB Report 3 was renamed Platform Report 1
- In Book Report 2, vendors must now define type of section
- Inclusion of Journal and book report identifiers
- Inclusion of DOIs for books and journals
- Ability to include proprietary ID for journals
- Multimedia reports added (e.g. audio, video, images)
- Addition of the optional Journal Report 3 Mobile, which tracks journal usage by mobile device
- Addition of Journal Report 1 GOA (gold open access), which tracks usage of gold open access (not green open access)

Pesch returned to discuss the work being done on the SUSHI-Lite protocol. There is a working group preparing to release a NISO Technical Report which will explore the adaptation of the SUSHI standard to accommodate present day development tools and usage needs related to retrieving snippets of usage via HTTP-based services. This report is currently in the reviewing phase, and is almost ready for public viewing. Finally, the presenters concluded with a lively question and answer dialogue with the audience.

The Path of Least Resistance: Using Available Tools to Support the E-Resources Lifecycle

Tessa Minchew, North Carolina State University
Sofia Slutskaya, Georgia Perimeter College

Reported by: Janet Arcand

Tessa Minchew (North Carolina State University) and Sofia Slutskaya (Georgia Perimeter College) joined forces to present a description of how their differing institutions were able to use open source or low-cost products to help their libraries support aspects of the complex electronic resource lifecycle. North Carolina State University (NCSU) encompasses three physical campuses and the electronic resource management work is done by five librarians and seventeen staff members, who manage 470 databases, 8,100 electronic journal subscriptions and over 800,000 e-books. In addition, NCSU has access to more electronic resources through membership in NC Live. Georgia Perimeter College (GPC) is a community college with five physical campuses. The electronic resource work is performed by one librarian who manages the acquisition of twenty-three databases and over 100,000 e-books. GPC has more electronic access through participation in GALILEO, a consortium. Even though their colleges have different missions and collections, both Minchew and Slutskaya use the same products to help manage electronic resource collections.

NCSU uses Microsoft Access (MS Access) for administration, cancellation, and package management, and it formed the basis for a journal cancellation project database in 2014-2015. They also used MS Access to create a package change database to record ordering, licensing, set-up, maintenance, title change, and
renewal information which had formerly been in Excel.
Seven staff members were assigned work within these
databases. GPC uses ERMeS for e-resource acquisitions,
administration, and management purposes, which is a
freely available MS Access database, and is ideal for a
small organization. It does not require server space for
hosting, and works well for managing journal packages.
One drawback to ERMeS is that it lacks an alert system.

At NCSU, Confluence Wiki is used as an electronic
resource hub to contain information formerly spread
over many wikis, paper files, and drives. It took
between three to four months to set-up, and enables
staff to track or link to all information related to
electronic resource purchasing and management. At
GPC Confluence Wiki provides the front-end of a library
e-resource selection guide. Specifically, staff can see the
past history of trials and renewals, and can obtain
harvested usage statistics.

Trello is a cloud-based management software used by
GPC for the back end of their selection guide. The
structure of boards, lists, cards, and data is used to
manage renewals, cancellations, and new database
orders. It also supports alerts and flexibly-organized
checklists. Trello is used at NCSU for acquisition,
administration, and package management. Minchew
gave a live demonstration of Trello, displaying the
package management board and the license team
board, which contains templates useful for creating new
records. NCSU uses Trello’s free version, finding its
structure and framework flexible enough to handle the
needed complexity.

Re-Envisioning E-Resources Holdings Management

Marlene van Ballegooie, University of Toronto Libraries

Reported by: Susan Wishnetsky

Marlene van Ballegooie began the presentation with
the observation that e-resources have descended upon
libraries “like an avalanche” since the time of the
founding of NASIG in 1986. E-resources have

necessitated major changes in the way librarians
manage collections. Van Ballegooie observed that
during the early days of experimentations, predictions
about the future of libraries varied wildly. Some
dismissed electronic publishing as a fad that would
never take off and were “wildly off-the-mark;” others
were more prescient and envisioned an efficient future
in which librarians would no longer create catalog
records for their own libraries, but instead, would
manage and organize widely-shared metadata
produced by publishers or other agents.

Today, with the huge collections acquired in "Big Deal"
packages, the notion of title-by-title cataloging by each
individual library is nearly unthinkable. The era of
shared, outsourced cataloging has indeed arrived, but
the dream of automated efficiency has yet to be
realized. Publishers send files of entire collections to
knowledgebase providers, but librarians still find
themselves repeatedly selecting their subscribed titles,
entering or correcting edition information, dates of
coverage, concurrent user, and license data. New titles
or packages may be slow to appear in knowledgebases,
necessitating repeated follow-ups by librarians to
ensure access and accuracy. Publisher or platform
changes, title changes, and cessations may not appear
promptly. Sometimes subscribed titles are completely
missing from all the collections in a knowledgebase.

OCLC and Proquest began collaborating in late 2013 to
alleviate these problems by automating the process of
entering library-specific holdings into the WorldCat
knowledgebase. The experiment began with two of the
largest e-book aggregators, Proquest’s E-book Library
(EBL) and ebrary; later, other content providers
including MyiLibrary, JSTOR, Stat!Ref, and Elsevier’s
ScienceDirect began automatically loading holdings
information. Participating publishers must submit four
types of KBART-formatted, standardized spreadsheet
files to OCLC: the "collections file" with metadata for
titles in each package, a "collections description file"
with package-level metadata, a "customer map" which
identifies customers by OCLC ID numbers, and a
"holdings data file" which identifies the subscribed
content, access restrictions and other library-specific
information of each customer. Automatic delivery of MARC records from OCLC can be enabled, and if patron-driven acquisition (PDA) is an option for a particular vendor, titles available on that basis can also be identified in the spreadsheets.

As the metadata librarian at the University of Toronto Libraries, van Ballegooie wanted to find out about this new and potentially valuable service. Beginning in September 2014, van Ballegooie signed up for all the available content providers' automated holdings feeds, which at that time consisted of ebrary, MyiLibrary, EBL, and ScienceDirect. Each time a feed was loaded into OCLC, she obtained a report of the feed from OCLC and the content provider's site; the data was adjusted for purposes of comparison between the content providers and then loaded into a MySQL database.

The results were promising, but far from perfect. All four content providers promised either weekly or bi-weekly loads into OCLC, but none actually achieved that frequency. All claimed that at least 95% of their book titles (and 91% of ScienceDirect journals) were in OCLC, and indeed the match rate to OCLC records was generally quite good (and improved over the course of the study), but in some cases, large numbers of the library’s subscribed titles were simply left out of the feed. In one case the missing titles had still not appeared in any subsequent feed even nine months later. ScienceDirect was a particular problem because of its multiple publication types and collections. Elsevier considered its customers to be "subscribed" to its free and complimentary content, so the feed reports provided by Elsevier included non-subscribed titles along with the subscribed titles, which presented an immediate problem. There was also a problem with duplication of titles classified as more than one publication type, or which appeared in multiple collections. The classifications of publication types were changed mid-study, which may have simplified the reports, but complicated van Ballegooie’s data entry. But once those difficulties were resolved, it was apparent that Elsevier performed better than the other content providers in terms of the frequency of their loads and the percentage of her library's holdings correctly loaded into WorldCat.

Overall, the feeds provided to OCLC seemed to be a big improvement over the data contained in most traditional electronic resource management systems, where the titles in subscribed packages often do not match the titles in any package in the ERM, and changes to titles and packages tend to appear long after the fact, if ever. Van Ballegooie reported that this service is "particularly well-suited for those cherry-picked collections" for which manual selection would otherwise be necessary. She noted that the service is available to any library with a subscription to OCLC cataloging and does not require an additional fee. A big drawback of automated feeds is that errors must be corrected "at the top of the chain," with the content provider; manual editing of holdings data is not necessary, since it is merely overwritten by subsequent feeds. A simple way to report and correct errors is needed to ensure accuracy of the data.

Surprisingly, libraries receive no notification when a new feed has been loaded into OCLC, and must periodically check to see if any new activity has occurred; a notification feature, it seems, could easily be added. In addition, the upload reports from OCLC contain no titles or standard numbers, but only "OCLC entry ID" numbers, which much be looked up to identify the titles. Van Ballegooie pointed out that another fairly simple piece of data excluded from the system is concurrent-user limits, which is important information for faculty, and for managing user expectations. Van Ballegooie further noted that nightly updates, as opposed to weekly or biweekly loads would be beneficial. Among van Ballegooie's highest priorities for automated e-resource holdings management is single-journal subscriptions, which are among the most difficult and time-consuming to manage.

Generally, van Ballegooie would like more content providers to participate in this service. Since the service currently has only 6.5% of the e-resource holdings at the University of Toronto, van Ballegooie hopes that it
will quickly expand. She encouraged libraries to convince their content providers to join this service.

**Representing Serials Metadata in Institutional Repositories**

*Lisa Gonzalez, Catholic Theological Union*

Reported by: Melody Dale

In this session, Lisa Gonzalez gave practical information on making metadata decisions for the implementation of an institutional repository (IR). Gonzalez relayed her experience in examining article-level metadata in a sample of IR platforms and displayed samples of metadata from the different IRs. The data gathered was used to assist the Catholic Theological Union in selecting a platform, choosing a metadata schema, and creating policies for the institutional repository that is currently in the pilot stage.

The library at Catholic Theological Union (CTU) currently publishes an open access journal through Open Journal Systems (OJS) and has been an active proponent of open access (OA) for several years. Because of CTU’s strong commitment to OA, a decision was made to implement an institutional repository for electronic theses and dissertations. Gonzalez had recently read about “invisible IRs” which are institutional repositories with low discoverability in Google Scholar due to inadequate indexing. This phenomenon led her to research methods of indexing to develop a more useful tagging strategy. Google Scholar guidelines promoted the use of Highwire Press tags, EPrints tags, bepress tags, and PRISM tags, as opposed to Dublin Core tags because they do not index as effectively for articles.

Initial research by Gonzalez involved gathering data from OpenDOAR, the Directory of Open Access Repositories. One chart from OpenDOAR detailing metadata reuse policies indicated that 85.8% fell into ambiguous categories such as undefined, unknown, unstated, or other. This problem indicates a need for IRs to offer more explicit information about metadata reuse. Other data from OpenDOAR indicated journal articles as the most frequently used content type in IRs. DSpace was the chosen platform for over 40% of the IRs listed in OpenDOAR, with the remainder using EPrints, Digital Commons, or others.

Gonzalez explored the platforms and characteristics of several IRs, including University of Michigan (DSpace), University of Queensland (Fedora), Columbia University (Fedora), eLIS (EPrints), University of Nebraska Lincoln (Digital Commons), Bielefeld University (LibreCat), and UPEI (Islandora). After comparing different platforms, CTU chose CONTENTdm and began working on local adaptations for their data dictionary. Additionally, CTU began developing good practices which were largely based on the *UIC Data Dictionary for CONTENTdm and Best Practices for CONTENTdm and Other OAI-PMH Compliant Repositories*. The Dublin Core Generator ([http://www.dublincoregenerator.com/generator.html](http://www.dublincoregenerator.com/generator.html)) was also discussed as a useful tool for practicing the application of Dublin Core Metadata.

In developing an institutional use case, CTU compared Zotero’s functionality across several IRs. Several issues were noted, one of which included Zotero’s tendency to identify articles as webpages when embedded metadata was used, and issues with retrieving metadata for PDFs, which is highly dependent on Google Scholar. Gonzalez noted the importance of using embedded metadata in PDFs to enable discoverability across the IR platform as well as Google Scholar. Gonzalez closed the session by encouraging other librarians to start with use cases developed for particular institutional needs, to use OpenDOAR policy guidelines to evaluate institutional policies, and to share metadata and documentation with others.
Space Case: Moving from a Physical to a Virtual Journal Collection

Rhonda Glazier, University of Colorado, Colorado Springs
Stephanie Spratt, University of Colorado, Colorado Springs

Reported by: Mary Bailey

Glazier and Spratt began their session with the reasons why their library moved from a primarily physical to a primarily virtual journal collection. Glazier noted that their current statistics show over 70,000 journals are now online with over 15,000 open access journals. At their library, online is considered the preferred format for scholarly articles, and consequently, print has much lower use. In addition, budget cuts resulted in the cancellation of many print journals. In addition, during the past few years, the University of Colorado, Colorado Springs (UC-CS) campus has had 5% student population growth, and a student survey in 2013 confirmed more collaborative study space was needed.

Thus, the campus library’s priorities have shifted from shelving print journals to creating collaborative spaces. Since there were no options available for offsite storage, a weeding project was planned. Glazier was the lead on a project that reviewed titles available in JSTOR for possible weeding. For the project, print usage was reviewed, the collection was evaluated, and data was gathered and then analyzed. Exceptions to weeding were permitted with the Dean’s approval.

Spratt shared how Excel helped in working with the data. She provided step-by-step instructions on how she took the list provided by JSTOR and compared it with her print holdings list to find duplications and remove titles that did not need to be reviewed. She used Excel functions to remove “The” from titles, matching titles and ISSNs, and compared the holdings from the two lists. Her detailed instructions provided ways to eliminate hours of spreadsheet work.

The latter part of the presentation detailed campus collaboration, including working with the Sustainability Office, to remove withdrawn items from the library, updating the catalog for both print and online access, and then what the library did to create new space for students.

Lessons learned included: knowing your catalog records won’t be perfect and understanding that a lot of database work (holdings and purchase order records) must be done; determining how to calculate collection statistics before you start the project; verifying the counts are correct before removing items; remembering to determine a new base count when you finish; making campus faculty and students aware of the project by creating an effective communication channel before you start the project.

Strategies for Expanding E-Journal Preservation

Shannon Regan, Columbia University

Reported by: Laura Secord

Inspired by a 2012 Keepers Registry study of e-journals that concluded that only 22-27% of the e-journal holdings of Columbia, Cornell, and Duke Universities were preserved by preservation agencies, Columbia and Cornell Universities (2CUL) launched a project to evaluate strategies for increasing e-journal preservation.¹ Funded by the Mellon Foundation, the project had the following three major goals:

- Identify what is not preserved;
- Identify why it is not preserved;
- Evaluate strategies for expanding e-journal preservation.

Regan, the e-journal preservation librarian from Columbia University Libraries, began the presentation with an overview of the major serials preservation agencies, including Portico, LOCKSS, and CLOCKSS. She also noted the important roles of The Keepers Registry and the HathiTrust. She noted the difference between perpetual access (access to content from the years that a library had a subscription) and preservation or archival access (which guarantees that content is available for a library to exercise its perpetual access rights).

The study by 2CUL determined that Portico and LOCKSS combined preserved just 26.1% of Cornell’s e-journal titles with an ISSN, EISSN, or both. The content that is often not preserved by preservation agencies includes aggregated content, titles without ISSNs or EISSNs, titles published by academic institutions, open access journals, and foreign language titles. The study concluded that a number of factors affect preservation, including time, money, lack of understanding of the purpose and methods of preservation, and questions about who has the right to preserve the content.

Regan shared a number of strategies for expanding e-journal preservation and encouraged session attendees to take action by:

- Integrating preservation into license negotiation
- Participating in preservation initiatives through funding and outreach
- Evaluating preservation policies of current and new publishers
- Identifying at-risk titles and re-negotiating licenses
- Stressing the importance of preservation when working with subscription agents and publishers
- Discussing preservation with publishers, vendors, consortia members, faculty, and institutional repository managers.

Thirty Years of NASIG:
A Retrospective Look at Conference Programs, Publications, Workshops, and Webinars

Angela Dresselhaus, University of Montana, Missoula

Reported by: Scott McFadden

Angela Dresselhaus began with the first NASIG Conference that took place in 1986. After a reminder of the historical and cultural background of that year, including the presidency of Ronald Reagan and the explosion of the space shuttle Challenger, Dresselhaus noted some of the topics included in that first conference. Presentation topics included automation, the future of serials, journal pricing, OPACs, and the need for standards. In these early days, membership in NASIG was marketed to the serials community largely by word of mouth.

Closer examination of specific presentations revealed a focus on standards as a crucial element of serials automation. It was also noted that the sociological issues related to the implementation of new technology were important topics at this time in NASIG’s history.

The tenth annual NASIG Conference was held in 1995, during the presidency of Bill Clinton, and the time of early Internet services such as America Online and Prodigy. This year also saw the advent of the DVD format. Topics discussed at the tenth conference included Electronic Data Interchange (EDI), Gopher sites, and Internet security. Several specific presentations were also examined, and one idea which emerged was the notion of how publishers add value to the scholarly process. It was at this time in NASIG’s history that the idea began to emerge that presentations and individual members should endeavor not to denigrate publishers.

The twentieth annual NASIG Conference was held in 2005. Significant cultural events that year included the presidency of George W. Bush, the founding of YouTube, and the death of Pope John Paul II. Topics
discussed at this conference included professional development, article linking, metadata, FRBR, license negotiation, and open access journals. Examination of specific presentations noted the changes brought about by new technologies such as blogs, and the lack of interest in privacy among many bloggers. Other presentations revealed that the third generation cataloging code, AACR3, would not be forthcoming, having given way to a new code that would become RDA.

Finally, the most recent NASIG conferences were the twenty-ninth and thirtieth, held in 2014 and 2015. The presidency of Barack Obama, the Ebola outbreak, and increasing support for same-sex marriage are important cultural issues at this time. Topics presented at these conferences included RDA, HathiTrust, the “Big Deal,” and pre-paid access. Presentations dealt with “electronic only” collection development policies, mobile applications, core competencies, and ORCID identifiers. By this time, NASIG was able to hold a joint session with the Society for Scholarly Publishing. This and the increasing availability of webinars for instruction and information sharing indicated how far the organization has come since its beginnings.

Dresselhaus noted certain trends that have recurred throughout the history of NASIG conferences, often appearing earlier than one might imagine. Various aspects of automation appear frequently, though specific terms may change from year to year. Likewise, many presentations began with the words “The Future of...” which indicated an ongoing interest in the evolving nature of the profession. Journal pricing and the related phenomenon of open access journals have also been topics of continued interest.

In conclusion, Dresselhaus found that NASIG and its sister organization, UKSG, are unique organizations that have promising futures to look forward to.

Troubleshooting Electronic Resources with ILL Data

Beth Ashmore, Samford University Library

Reported by: David Macaulay

Beth Ashmore’s presentation described ways in which Samford University Library used information about canceled interlibrary loan (ILL) requests to help troubleshoot problems with OpenURL linking to the library’s electronic resources. After Samford implemented a new link resolver and knowledgebase system a few years ago, it was found that problems were occurring with greater frequency than usual, though users were submitting relatively few specific reports that would allow the library to identify and fix them. Many users who were unable to access a resource online would proceed to submit an ILL request. If the requested resource was determined to be available to library users, the request would be canceled, and the user notified with an email containing the correct citation for the item and instructions on how to ask for help in accessing it. Such situations can indicate systemic failures, such as errors in OpenURL linking. ILL began to copy Samford’s Electronic Resources Department on emails that were sent to users when their requests were canceled so these requests could be examined.

Personnel in the Electronic Resources Department would test various ways to access the citations in these emails, using the three most common pathways employed by users: the library catalog, the library’s discovery layer, and Google Scholar. Additionally, at the end of the school year, all data in the ILLiad system about relevant canceled requests were analyzed with the aim of identifying significant patterns.

Three main types of problem with OpenURL linking were identified:

1. The data used to make the link were incomplete or inaccurate.
2. The bibliographic metadata used by the link resolver and the library's holdings data were not synchronized.

3. Metadata were in incorrect formats.

An example of the first problem was a case where elements of date information were omitted when a citation was passed from the database to the link resolver. The link resolver filled in the missing element before accessing the target, but the added information was incorrect, leading to a failed link. Another example involved correct metadata being searched incorrectly in the target resource: information about an article in a journal that was enumerated only at the issue level was correctly passed via the link resolver, but the target database interpreted the issue number as a volume number when searching for the article. Problems of this type can be addressed individually as they are reported, but may still occur in the future depending on the vagaries of the metadata involved. Ashmore colorfully regarded this as "landmines" that will continue to exist.

For particularly troublesome databases, a potential compromise solution is to turn off article-level linking, and link only to the journal title.

The second type of problem, resulting from the lack of synchronization between bibliographic metadata and the library's holdings data, was exemplified by issues experienced with Google Scholar – a popular resource for faculty and students, which can be configured to display links to a library's holdings next to search results. Sometimes, it was discovered, these links are not displayed in the expected place, but are rather hidden under the "More" link below the citation, where they would be if the item was not found to be in the library's collection. This issue, which occurred intermittently even with items that had been listed in the library's knowledgebase for a long time, can only be resolved by a better synchronization of Google's service with library holdings metadata.

The last example showed a problem with metadata harvested by the library's discovery service from an open access database. While all the necessary information appeared to be present in the discovery service record, the elements were mislabeled so that, for example, the article title was also passed as the source title. Using this mismatched information, the link resolver was unable to find the article. This kind of issue could be resolved if more consistent data formats, such as KBART, were employed by resource providers.

The presentation finished up with an overview of the workflow that was developed for Samford's Electronic Resources staff to access the ILLiad system on a daily basis, permitting examination of more extensive information about canceled ILL requests than was provided in the emails from ILL to patrons. This allowed them to see the source of the citation involved when a problem was encountered, making it easier to troubleshoot the issue. In the case of particularly persistent problems, the user could be contacted directly with more information, and occasionally a copy of the desired item, while the issue was being addressed.

Beyond enabling identification and resolution of issues with the link resolver, Samford's analysis of data from canceled ILL requests has brought benefits in other areas:

- Instruction and outreach: efforts can be targeted to demographic groups that are found to be consistently making ILL requests for locally available materials.
- Collaboration between departments: with the Electronic Resources Department receiving valuable data and providing ILL with links to include in emails to users when requests are canceled.
- Interface design: by suggesting the potential for enhancements to the link resolver window.
- Promotes thinking about ways to provide information about "random" open access materials and print holdings in the link resolver.
- Training of staff in troubleshooting electronic resources.

Questions included an inquiry about users' response to the assistance they were provided in accessing material. Ashmore estimated that while 75% of users contacted
remained silent, the other 25% responded very positively, confirming for her that the process represented a good way of establishing positive relationships with users.

Why Using a Subscription Agent Makes Good Sense

Deberah England, Wright State University
Tina Feick, Harrassowitz
Kimberly Steinle, Duke University Press

Reported by: Delphia Williams

The session began with a discussion of the benefits of using subscription agents for both libraries and publishers. Libraries can benefit from subscription agent services in the following ways: the ability to have one point of contact for many subscriptions; electronic ordering and invoicing; savings through discounts; and added services to improve workflows. Publishers also benefit from working with subscription agents as their intermediary in handling, as they serve as a communication channel for customers, and therefore, allow publishers to reduce staff costs.

Much of the session was devoted to the effects the Swets bankruptcy had on the community. Tina Feick, of Harrassowitz, outlined the warning signs apparent to the commercial community. Other subscription agents could not openly discuss Swets’ slow demise due to maintaining professional confidentiality. There were warning signs as early as 2007 about problems, such as the buyout by a private equity firm, declining revenues, and high employee turnover. The bankruptcy resulted in many losses: 30 million Euros, many jobs, trust in the community, and a competitor from the market place. Also, agents and publishers received payment late due to subscribers divesting from working with Swets.

The panel gave several recommendations for keeping on top of subscription agents. It is important to conduct periodic performance reviews of subscription agents and vendors and set Google Alerts to be notified of any changes involving commercial business partners. They also recommended learning to understand how publishers and agents work together to establish pricing models. For libraries that prepay their vendors they suggested bank guarantees to insure prepayment funds. Bank guarantees would cost libraries a little more money but if an agent were to go under money could be recovered. Networking with other institutions and maintaining strong relationships with agents is of utmost importance. Lastly, teaching financial management in library programs was highly recommended.

Wrangling Cats: A Case Study of a Library Consortium Migration

Steve Shadle, University of Washington

Reported by: Marsha Seamans

Shadle’s presentation focused on the experience of the Orbis Cascade Alliance in migrating to ExLibris’s Alma and Primo. The consortia is comprised of thirty-seven members representing both public and private schools in Oregon, Washington, and Idaho, serving 275,000 students and 280 staff. The Alliance is a nonprofit corporation of ten staff and has no direct funding. The University of Washington (UW) is the largest of the institutions, with University of Oregon being the second largest at about half the size UW. One of the issues of having a diverse membership is that the concerns of research universities and smaller institutions differ widely.

The Alliance has a shared collection, with direct patron borrowing, shared e-resource purchasing, a courier service, and some shared collection development. Prior to migration, collaborative technical services was minimal with the exception of sharing language expertise among technical services librarians.

The strategic agenda for migration was directed at reducing duplicate efforts, working smart for efficiency, designing for engagement and innovating to transform. The thirty-seven colleges, universities and community colleges were to migrate to ExLibris’s Alma for their ILS
and Primo for discovery. The implementation would replace a multitude of ILS systems, discovery systems, ERM software, link resolvers, knowlegebases, standalone proxy servers, and local servers in favor of the cloud environment.

Implementation involved the following four big projects at once: moving legacy systems to a next generation system; combining thirty-seven institutions’ data into one; implementing a shared discovery system; and planning for collaborative technical services. The ExLibris representative was responsible for overall project management, training and consulting support, creating the initial configuration, and data migration. The Alliance responsibilities included project management, configuration decisions, data extracts from non-ExLibris systems, review of configuration and data, and training support for later cohorts.

The project structure included seven working groups with 6-10 members each and an implementation team of eight members (heads of each working group and an Alliance member). Working groups were Discovery, Cataloging, Circulation and Resource Sharing, Training, Systems, Acquisitions, and Serials/ERM. There was a strong focus on training which was strategically critical to the project’s success. The first cohort went live in July 2013, and the fourth and last cohort went live in January 2015.

Shadle wrapped up his presentation with lessons learned. Cohort-based migration is not ideal but was required due to system limitations and development. The burden for implementation fell on earlier cohorts and extra effort was required to support the longer transition. There were too many working groups; communication and coordination were difficult. In addition, burnout and turnover among participants occurred. It is important to be able to let go of old practices and to embrace change and ambiguity. Also, beginning data cleanup as soon as possible is critical. Collaboration results in good things such as a better shared understanding; a unified voice in working with ExLibris; an understanding that Alliance work is part of someone’s job, not an extra assignment; and a recognition that distributed work is possible. The final lesson learned is that consortial work can be difficult; institutions were not as similar as they thought in terms of policies and systems.