Swarthmore College

Works

Library Staff Works   Library & Information Science

2016

Reports Of Conferences, Institutes, And Seminars

K. Blythe

Jessica Brangiel
Swarthmore College, jbrangi1@swarthmore.edu

E. Finnerty

S. Larrison

A. Rathmel

See next page for additional authors

Authors

K. Blythe, Jessica Brangiel, E. Finnerty, S. Larrison, A. Rathmel, B. Webb, and T. Wick

ACCEPTED MANUSCRIPT

Serials Spoken Here

Reports of Conferences, Institutes, and Seminars

Kurt Blythe Column Editor, Jessica Brangiel, Erin Finnerty, Stephanie Larrison, Elizabeth McHugh, Angela Rathmel, Katherine Ryner, Breanna Webb, Tiffanie Wick, Contributors

Serials Access Librarian, Davis Library, University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, Chapel Hill, NC 27514, USA; email: kcblythe@email.unc.edu

Abstract

This quarter's column offers coverage of multiple sessions from the 2016 Electronic Resources and Libraries (ER&L) Conference, held April 3-6 in Austin, TX. There is also a report from the UKSG Annual Conference and Exhibition, held April 11-13 in Bournemouth, UK and another from the Acquisitions Institute at Timberline Lodge, held May 14-17 in Timberline Lodge, OR. Topics in serials acquisitions dominate the column, including reports on altmetrics, cost per use, and demand-driven acquisitions; scholarly communications and the use of subscriptions agents; but also ERMS, access, and knowledgebases.

2016 Electronic Resources & Libraries Conference

Jessica Brangiel

Electronic Resources Management Librarian, Swarthmore College, Swarthmore PA, 19081, USA; email: jbrangi1@swarthmore.edu

The role of choice in the future of discovery evaluations

In this presentation Neil Block, (vice president for discovery innovation, EBSCO), Marshall Breeding, (founder and editor librarytechnology.org), Robert H. McDonald, (associate dean/deputy director, Indiana University), and Curtis Thacker, (director of discovery systems, Brigham Young University) came together to discuss the merits of interoperability and factors that either encourage or hinder choice in today's discovery ecosystem.

Breeding began by providing an historical overview of the library automation market and how the integrated library system (ILS) became the tool for comprehensive management of library system functionality. Breeding provided a quick overview of the development of the Open URL (uniform resource locator) link resolver tools, which have traditionally been stand-alone tools providing services in tandem with integrated library systems (ILSs) but not bundled with the ILS. Breeding mentioned the development of the ERMS, or electronic resource management system, which was designed to manage burgeoning electronic resource collections separately from print. Responses to these ERM systems indicated that they were difficult to use and required too much staff time for minimal added value. Further development in the discovery space included the opportunity to separate the front end online public access catalog (OPAC)

from the back end ILS with the introduction of new discovery layers such as VuFind and AquaBrowser. Web-scale discovery systems were the next developments to enter this arena. This new approach to academic research provided libraries with a centralized index that worked with already established knowledgebase and link resolver tools. Recent developments in the market have seen a shift from the integrated library system to library service platforms (LSP) such as Alma and Intota. These systems combine print and electronic resource management into the same interface and consolidate backend workflows. Breeding asks whether this consolidation of functionality increases efficiency across technical service units. Is there an advantage to selling these library service platforms as a bundled all-inclusive platform or to offer modules a la carte? Breeding noted that two advantages to a bundled system are the utilization of one common knowledgebase, plus the full support by one vendor. The bundled approach is dominating the market in products such as OCLC WorldShare Management and Ex Libris' Alma.

Neil Block of EBSCO reiterated that EBSCO is not in the ILS business, but that EBSCO has partnered with all ILS platforms in the past and plans to continue. Block postulated that the bundled LSP tools might limit choice for libraries. He questioned whether a bundled system with its limited flexibility could provide the best metadata, relevance ranking, and user experience. Block raised the idea of discovery systems interacting with other systems found across campus such as the learning management system or the institutional repository. Can these bundled library service platforms integrate elsewhere or would a more modern extensible system provide for both the traditional functions of the library while offering the opportunity for the library to extend into new areas of campus services?

Robert H. McDonald of Indiana University stated that libraries must be more agile in how fast they change systems over time. Indiana currently uses more application program interfaces (APIs) for integration between different systems, allowing them to make a change to another provider at a moment's notice. McDonald is in favor of building communities around open source software. Libraries and open source software developers have mutual goals, and collaboration between these two communities makes sense.

Curtis Thacker of Brigham Young University (BYU) detailed BYU's in-house system that they developed when they could not find a commercial discovery system to meet all of their needs. Thacker's goal as a developer is to hide the complexity of its discovery system from the user. Thacker is also a supporter of open source software and reiterated the shared values across these two communities.

More than a VPAT: Getting accessibility into licenses

In this short talk Martha Kelehan (head of collections, Tufts University) discussed her efforts to include issues of accessibility in electronic resource licenses. Most licenses are silent on this issue, and Kelehan is interested in going beyond just the collection of VPAT, or voluntary product accessibility template, in trying to address accessibility of electronic resources. Kelehan's work aligns with Tufts' plan for a substantial survey of accessibility issues across campus looking at buildings, software and electronic resources. To begin, Kelehan reviewed licenses as renewals arrived and used that as an opportunity to add license terms regarding accessibility. She advised not waiting for the perfect starting point, instead viewing all attempts to address accessibility as better than nothing. For example, drafting language that the licensor

shall provide and comply with the VPAT is a good place to start. The V in VPAT stands for voluntary, and just because a vendor has a completed VPAT does not mean their product is accessible. Questions Tufts are addressing in conversations with vendors include whether the product can be utilized through the keyboard and not require a mouse at all, if the product works with screen readers, if video content comes with transcripts or captioning, whether every image in a product has an alternative text tag, and if these tags are descriptive and complete. Kelehan reminded the audience to raise these issues with consortia to make sure they are advocating for this issues on behalf of their member libraries.

Alternative avenues of discovery: Competition or potential

Panelists for this presentation included Michael Levine-Clark, (interim dean and director, University of Denver Libraries), Ido Peled (vice president, solutions & marketing, Ex Libris) and Jason Price (director of licensing operations, SCELC). The presentation discussed recent studies of the impacts of library discovery solutions and their overall use by library patrons.

Levine-Clark started with the question of whether library discovery systems really make a difference. Statistics show that 39% of referrals from the University of Denver to content vendors come from the library. The rest come from Google, Google Scholar, and other unknown points. The goal of discovery systems was to improve user experience and to provide a more Google-like experience. Libraries want to provide one-stop shopping for patrons in a world of too many information resources. Additional goals of discovery systems included providing one starting point for research, to allow libraries the opportunity to reduce the number of individual abstracting and indexing databases to which they subscribed, thus reducing costs, and to increase

the number of users starting their research at the library's site. Levine-Clark next outlined a variety of evaluative questions for our discovery systems. Are discovery systems effective, providing accurate results, and are they efficient; i.e., are users finding what they need in less time?

Peled began by asking what can vendors such as Ex Libris do to ensure that the discovery services to which libraries subscribe will be utilized by library patrons. Peled suggests three inseparable components to making discovery systems impactful to patrons: first, reach students where they are in the platform of their choice; second, provide simple and intuitive design; and third, assess and analyze usage behavior to develop and facilitate better interactions with patrons in the future. Peled suggests libraries and vendors take risks and be adventurous regarding development. By reaching out to search engines such as Google or Bing, librarians are working towards making sure content is discoverable wherever patrons start their search. Peled stressed the importance of providing service anywhere, anytime, and through any device, focusing on responsively designed platforms that work well with tablets and smart phones. User experience must be intuitive across devices.

Jason Price presented on new emerging technologies in the areas of discovery. 1science offers three different tools to find and manage open access content. These tools include oaFindr, oaFoldr, and oaFigr. He describes oaFindr as a new open access discovery system enabling quick and efficient search and delivery of open access content. OaFoldr integrates with institutional repository products to assist libraries in the exposure of faculty research papers. Finally, oaFigr is

a decision support tool assisting libraries in subscription management providing analytics and data in support of evidence based decisions.

Price next explained how Google uses linked data, and he is excited about how libraries can start using linked data as well. Libhub via Zepheira with Library Link is using linked data to extend library catalogs to the web. Find more information about the Libhub initiative at http://www.libhub.org.

Finally, Yewno, described by Price as an inference engine, is supporting discovery by uncovering connections among concepts. Yewno is in beta at Stanford University. Yewno proposes to facilitate deeper knowledge extraction by connecting disparate yet related concepts through semantic relationships mimicking the human inference experience.

2016 Electronic Resources & Libraries Conference

Erin Finnerty

Electronic Resources Librarian, Temple University, 1210 Polett Walk, Philadelphia, PA, 19122, USA; email: erinf@temple.edu

Altmetrics in practice: Librarian and LIS faculty views

Sarah Sutton (assistant professor of Library and Information Management, Emporia State University), and Stacy Konkiel (outreach & engagement manager, Altmetric) presented Altmetrics in Practice: Librarian and LIS Faculty Views. Konkiel began by explaining that altmetrics demonstrate the volume and nature of attention that research receives by utilizing social media, news media, and web text mining. Data provided by Altmetric differs from usage

statistics and social media metrics, and focuses specifically on research and research outputs online. For example, how often are people talking about a piece of research, what are they saying, and who is saying it?

Konkiel asserted that Altmetric is a useful tool to fill in gaps left by traditional usage statistics. Altmetric provides immediate data, can be applied to resources other than published materials, understands diverse impacts, and can cover research that is still in development. Konkiel showed an example of the Altmetric "donut" using research from a *Nature Neuroscience* article. Altmetric is able to accumulate data on that research before it has a formal citation.

Konkiel then discussed the academic librarian and Library and Information Science (LIS) faculty survey that was completed. For the academic librarians' portion, they surveyed 150 R1 institutions (having a Carnegie classification of Doctoral Universities - Highest Research Activity), which included more than 13,000 librarians, and received 707 respondents (5.3% response rate). For the LIS faculty portion, they surveyed 55 American Library Association (ALA) accredited programs, which included approximately 2300 faculty members, and had 159 respondents (6.8% response rate). The academic librarian job titles fell into 32% liaison/subject librarians, and 39% as "other." The subject librarians were then broken into 31% in humanities, 33% in sciences, 16% in social sciences, and 20% in professions. Respondents also showed a range of experience levels. The LIS faculty skewed newer, and the academic librarians were more experienced and had spent longer on the job.

Sutton explained that they were interested in the respondents' level of familiarity with these types of metrics and how librarians and LIS faculty compared. They used a five-point Likert

scale: one means "I've never heard of them" and five means "I'm an expert." The first questions asked about familiarity with journal impact factor, citation counts, and usage counts. The results showed the most popular response to be a four for both survey groups in all three questions. The next analysis examined the subjects' familiarity with altmetrics using a chi-square test of independence. This showed a significant difference between LIS faculty and librarians. Librarians were more familiar with altmetrics, with more of the respondents considering themselves to be experts.

Sutton then explained how they further examined the respondents' familiarity with the more traditional metrics in relation to whether they were tenure track or not. There were only very slight differences in these results. When studying familiarity with altmetrics, survey results showed that non-tenure track LIS faculty possessed a higher level of familiarity than the tenure track faculty.

Sutton also described comparing the familiarity with the traditional metrics across the years of job experience. The ranges of years of experience were zero to five years, six to ten years, 11 to 20 years, and 21 or more years. There was not much difference between the librarians and LIS faculty in familiarity with these traditional metrics, based on numbers of years' experience. It did seem that the LIS faculty members with six to ten years' experience have a slightly greater level of familiarity with usage counts. Librarians with less experience have more familiarity with altmetrics than the more experienced librarians do.

The next series of survey questions asked how academic librarians and LIS faculty are using research impact metrics: instruction and teaching, evidence for promotion and tenure, selecting a

publishing venue, or choosing what to read. The research impact metrics surveyed were journal impact factor, citation counts, author h-index, expert peer review, altmetrics, and qualitative measures. The trends between academic librarians and LIS faculty were again similar, in that they generally do not mention these metrics while teaching. Sutton then discussed asking respondents about the use of these metrics to support tenure and promotion. Journal impact factor was the most popular choice with LIS faculty on the tenure track (42.9%). Qualitative measures came in second at 33.7%, and altmetrics were the lowest at 11.2%. However, 22.3% of academic librarians on the tenure track utilize altmetrics.

The next question asked how often LIS faculty consider the following indicators of research impact when selecting where to publish their research. Relatively few LIS faculty used any of these metrics, and more than 60% of them never used altmetrics for this purpose. Twenty-five percent of LIS faculty did use journal impact factor to make that determination, and almost 30% relied on qualitative measures. Sutton then discussed responses to how often LIS faculty use these research impact indicators in the course of conducting library research and literature reviews. More than 60% never used peer reviews or qualitative measures, more than 50% never used altmetrics, and more than 40% never used journal impact factors.

The survey then returned to the academic librarians, asking how often they evaluate materials using these indicators of research in the context of collection development. Forty-five percent never used altmetrics. More often, they use journal impact factors, citation counts, and qualitative measures. Sutton wondered why there was such a disconnect between the factors

faculty use to choose where to publish and the factors librarians use for collection development purposes.

Achieving the holy grail of electronic resource management: Automated holdings feeds in a knowledgebase

This panel presentation included Sandy Cahillane (electronic resources librarian, Bay Path University), Jozef Paulik (senior product manager, Platform Integration, Elsevier), Charlie Remy (electronic resources and serials librarian, University of Tennessee at Chattanooga), Jabin White (vice president of content management, ITHAKA), and David Whitehair (portfolio director, Metadata Services, OCLC). They presented "Achieving the holy grail of electronic resource management: Automated holdings feeds in a knowledge base" to explain how content providers, a knowledgebase, and libraries are working together to ensure accurate and updated knowledgebase holdings via institution-specific automated feeds.

Cahillane acted as moderator, and explained how she beta tested the WorldShare Management System (WMS) product for OCLC. She found WMS seamlessly integrates automatic holdings into her catalog. She suggested a valuable objective for librarians is to try to get data providers on board with these types of services so the information stays current and relevant.

Remy then provided a basic profile of University of Tennessee Chattanooga. They have a $1.5 million materials budget, and approximately 11,000 students. Remy discussed setting up Elsevier feeds for journals and books in the summer of 2014 via OCLC's WorldCat. This product also acts as their link resolver. The Elsevier feed would cover all ScienceDirect content, including open access. OCLC support sent Remy the necessary Elsevier token and customer number. He

also started using OCLC's automated feeds for their EBSCO ebook collection; however, this was not as significant a change as setting up the Elsevier feed. Remy asserted that these feeds are accurate and updated weekly. They are institution specific, saving staff time and frustration. Accurate feeds ensure that patrons have access to valuable content, which likely also means increased usage. Remy noted that most providers do not offer feeds, and it can take months to obtain accurate title lists. Even then, there are frequent inaccuracies. For example, users cannot access newer titles. These problems may mean lower usage, and title lists can be outdated shortly after loading them. He explained that it is time consuming to maintain custom knowledgebase collections. These shortfalls also impact interlibrary loan staff. They may receive requests for items already owned by the library. Remy wanted to encourage publishers to work with OCLC to provide automated feeds.

Whitehair then spoke about WorldShare Collection Manager. He explained that the benefits include timely new titles updates and deletes and library specific holdings. Whitehair showed a current slide of participating partners that included Ebook Library (EBL), Ebrary, EBSCO, Elsevier, Federal Depository Library Program (FDLP), Ingram, JSTOR, and Teton Data Systems (TDS). He stated that ProQuest's eBook Central and Odilio were forthcoming. Whitehair explained that if librarians want to start using direct holding feeds, they will need a Collection Manager account. Interested publishers can contact publishing@oclc.org to determine how to make their collections available via OCLC feeds.

Paulik's portion of the presentation was titled, "Look Ma, no hands: Holdings information, automation, & APIs." Paulik explained that he is on the platform integration team. He works

with technology that allows systems to work together and makes automation possible. Such features are normally invisible to users until they break. ScienceDirect was one of first products to offer holdings reports, and version 2.0 of this service came out in 2014. Paulik stated they have always been flexible, providing granular reports with multiple file formats and "up to the minute information."

Version 2.0 has a robust API infrastructure. ScienceDirect has always had a commitment to improvements and automation, and supported the various standards (such as Knowledge Bases and Related Tools, or KBART). Paulik explained that the version 2.0 architecture is performance driven, and supplies reports on demand. Version 2.0 was developed with scalability in mind, with a focus on cloud-based solutions. Paulik explained that the KBART product and package reports in ScienceDirect provided a list of KBART formatted project-level package reports. However, this can become complex since ScienceDirect has hundreds of content packages. Paulik discussed the electronic holdings report offered by ScienceDirect on the account level. This report is based on KBART recommendations, and is entirely tailored to each specific library. The report pulls data from same place that the web interface does to expose only what each library or account holder can access.

White began his presentation with a JSTOR slide of facts and figures. He explained they are currently not as advanced as Elsevier. However, they can send an ebooks holdings feed in KBART to OCLC for enrichment and distribution via Collection Manager. White explained that the JSTOR journal KBART files are currently available on their website, but automated updating

is not yet available. JSTOR's future plans include a commitment to automation, with progress scheduled for later in 2016.

Give them what they want: Articles on demand as a subscription alternative

Tina Baich (head, resources sharing & delivery services (RSDS) / bibliographic & metadata services (BAMS), Indiana University Purdue University Indianapolis (IUPUI)) presented a session called "Give them what they want: Articles on demand as a subscription alternative." Her presentation reviewed the implementation of IUPUI's Articles on Demand service that allowed unmediated article purchases to replace some low-use journal subscriptions. She outlined the implementation process, discussed challenges they encountered, and reviewed faculty feedback.

Baich began the presentation by providing some basic information about IUPUI -- that it comprises 19 schools and approximately 30,000 students. She also explained that there was a restructuring of departments in August 2014, which made RSDS and BAMS each into their own department, reporting to the dean of collections. In January 2015, the dean released a strategic directives document outlining a three to five-year plan that would, in part, shift the collections philosophy to increase "just in time" resource access while focusing selection on areas and disciplines unique to IUPUI.

In addition to the strategic document indicating a desired increase in articles on demand, there was also a need to cut some science subscriptions. Baich explained that they pitched these changes as "conversion instead of cancellation." The goal was to reduce science-related subscription costs by $200,000 to 250,0000 to cover inflation for the remaining titles. Baich investigated the economy of these subscriptions, looking at cost per use, subscription cost, and

individual article cost. They used thirty dollars as the average expected price for articles on demand. Using this analysis, the titles that would generate the most savings were those recommended for cancellation. When conferring with the science faculty, Baich broke potential cancellations into four tiered groups, explaining that the more titles they were able to cut now meant fewer cancellations in the future. The library selected a total of 72 titles for cancellation, totaling $179,000 in savings.

When investigating articles on demand services, they were looking for an unmediated and fast provider model to pilot with the science faculty. Baich explained that IUPUI chose Get It Now as their provider because they had already been using the mediated model with their interlibrary loan services, and it would provide a single interface and user authentication to cover the multitude of publishers involved in the cancellations. They developed a pilot program, and initially limited the Articles on Demand service just to science faculty. The librarians worried that using the unmediated articles on demand service would be too costly, and would spend their allocated budget too quickly.

The pilot program ran from September 2014 to September 2015, and there was initially an issue with creating a customized Get It Now holdings collection within Serials Solutions. This aspect was not in place until January 2015. Most titles in their Get It Now holdings were activated to cover content from 2015 to the present. They also made sure to add in those titles that were already available for articles on demand from September 2014 to January 2015, before the Serials Solutions collection was in place. Baich explained that they took steps to create an intermediary web page with information indicating that the Articles on Demand service was only

available to School of Science faculty. This web page would display to the user during the Articles on Demand request process. Additionally, a specific School of Science faculty user group had to be created as a custom group in the centralized system for authentication purposes. If someone who was not a member of the School of Science faculty tried to submit an article on demand request, they were instead automatically directed to the interlibrary loan login page. Requested articles arrived within two to eight hours as a Portable Document Format (PDF) attachment in an email.

Baich discussed how she communicated information about the pilot to applicable faculty. She created documentation including instructions and screenshots, and had the dean of the department distribute it via email. She also created an online feedback form, but did not receive a significant amount of responses due to its inconvenient placement in the article request process. The September 2014 to September 2015 pilot resulted in 99 total purchases and 54 unique users. Articles were delivered in an average of two hours and seventeen minutes. Baich distributed a survey to the 54 users, and received a 31% response rate. When asked, 41% of the respondents indicated that they did not know if they had received the documentation distributed by the dean, but those that did found it to be clear and understandable. Baich also asked if the Get It Now service was not available, whether they would pursue the content using interlibrary loan, and 70% of respondents strongly agreed.

When expanding the pilot into a regularly used program, Baich explained that the internal authentication solution of creating a specific science faculty group was too much for the library to handle. Instead, they worked with higher level IUPUI computer services to formally establish

a faculty group that could be automatically updated, which took five months to complete. Baich also described creating a new intermediary web page that outlined two options for the user: accessing the article via Get It Now for approximately thirty dollars, or requesting the article via interlibrary loan for approximately three dollars. The outlined options also included information about how long it would likely take to receive the content. This was in part an effort to better educate the users about the true costs involved in an articles on demand service.

Baich discussed how they have since expanded the Articles on Demand program at IUPUI to include adding titles outside of scientific disciplines, adding cancelled journals from the last five years, and adding titles frequently requested via interlibrary loan. They have not advertised this expansion, and expect to make additional cancellations in the areas of business, economics, and science. Comparing subscription costs against the Articles on Demand costs showed that they saved $179,000 in 2015 subscriptions, and spent $2650 on articles via Get It Now during that same period. For a successful program, Baich advocated finding the right collaborators, recruiting advocates, creating project and workflow plans, and keeping constituents informed. She also recommended being prepared for technical setbacks, being present for faculty negotiations and being patient.

Maximizing management: Getting more out of your e-resources management strategy

This panel presentation brought three speakers together: Athena Hoeppner (electronic resources librarian, University of Central Florida Libraries), Roen Janyk (web services librarian, Okanagan College), and Oliver Pesch (chief product strategist, EBSCO Information Services). Hoeppner's section was titled "E-resources pain management," and she began by outlining the importance

and desire to connect users to content. All of the necessary library services must work correctly to make access available, including discovery, authorization, communication and organization, linking and access, and management and assessment. Hoeppner explained that electronic resource management systems (ERMS) were designed to try to help with workflow and eresources management, and showed the 2004 Digital Library Federation (DLF) Electronic Resource Management (ERM) data identifiers, master data mapping standards, and typical workflow examples. She also included a slide of the top fifteen ERM priorities based on librarian surveys, and highlighted workflow management and acquisitions functionality.

Hoeppner explained that she is currently using a combination of email, EBSCONET, spreadsheets, and other data organization methods in place of a traditional ERMS and expressed that she likely misses necessary tasks as a result. She gave an example of a typical title change task received via email, and then outlined a larger project of trying to assess the value of access-only collections. For that project she had to compare list prices with invoices, and also brought in COUNTER statistics so she could calculate cost per use. This required normalizing the title lists between the different data sources -- a very time-consuming task. Hoeppner wondered, "How will an ERM help with this?" ERMS can organize data and workflow, but are they worth the work to implement? Hoeppner outlined some tasks that ERMS cannot generally handle, including normalizing data, smoothly tracking perpetual rights, and managing multiple price points.

Hoeppner asserted that standards are the way forward, and showed a slide citing KBART, COUNTER, and others. She would like to see price lists given the same treatment as KBART

title lists and more integration between ERMS and external tools. Some examples of possible integrations were adding a password management system for vendor sites (similar to Last Pass) and vendor contacts with email address books.

Janyk's portion of the presentation was titled "E-resources management and user behavior: 'Cause you can't have one without the other." She stated that her library uses EBSCO Discovery Service (EDS) in combination with the open source product, CUFTS. Janyk asserted that librarians should not underestimate the potential influence of user behavior on resource management. Generally, users can scan web pages quickly for information; however, that is not a helpful skill if they are unfamiliar with the content. Janyk wondered what would happen if our library systems were designed around the current content delivery problems, and stated that user tendencies can teach librarians how to better manage eresources. Based on data collected from Google Analytics on their EDS searches, Janyk learned that the average session lasts 8.5 minutes, and that users do not go past the second page of results. The goal of their users is to find relevant information as quickly as possible. Bad linking discourages users and discredits the library, and it is questionable who should be responsible for providing the necessary metadata and corrections -- the library, the publisher, or the vendors?

Janyk asked how librarians might utilize user data to enhance the search experience. She pointed to responsive design, ease of off-campus access, ease of reporting linking issues, and creating more visual interfaces as potential solutions. Janyk showed an example of how they present licensing terms to their users, showing clear green checkmarks and red "x" icons as indicators. Details like this make the page more visually scannable for the user. Janyk also proposed some

ideas for "ideal world" interface improvements, including definitions that appear when you hover over terms like "academic journal" and cover images for sources that appear when you hover over the image. Janyk also asked what we might need from our various library systems, and cited flexibility and interoperability. She stated the importance of being able to update holdings and make customizations on the fly. She agreed with Hoeppner that an increased focus on standards could allow all library systems to eventually work together. Janyk mentioned linked data as an important development for resource management and access over the next five years. She declared there is value in assessing the impact of resource access, through analytics and statistics, and reiterated the importance of considering the impact on users when editing ERMS or workflows.

Oliver Pesch's presentation was titled, "Optimizing e-resource management: Integrating decision data into the workflow." He began by discussing the challenges of providing necessary decision support data to librarians. Librarians work within systems that are optimized for their workflow, but the decision data are usually housed elsewhere, in spreadsheets, publisher sites, filing cabinets, or financial systems. Pesch explained that a potential solution would be to make usage and holdings data available within the other library workflow services via API. One example showed a subscription management system (EBSCONET) that used an API to harvest A-Z knowledgebase title information and usage statistics. Combining those data sets would provide cost per use, package performance, and other valuable reports. This type of integration would bring librarians closer to managing their data in one place but using it in many others, while allowing them to continue working within only one system at a time.

Pesch outlined how this type of arrangement could be useful for package-level analysis as well. A librarian could break out the usage per title, overall package performance, and more easily manage the annual title drops and title swaps. Analysis reports could also utilize the cost per fund code and title per fund code data. Pesch reiterated what both Hoeppner and Janyk said, stating that more emphasis on eresource data standards would unlock the potential for these types of system integrations. Pesch discussed SUSHI-Lite, a technical report in development by the National Information Standards Organization (NISO) Standardized Usage Statistics Harvesting Initiative (SUSHI). It is a more lightweight approach to deliver COUNTER report data, and can provide snippets or full reports using a more web services centered approach. Pesch also mentioned a proposal to extend KBART that is currently in review with NISO. This proposal focused on adapting for the exchange of library holdings, specifying an API for automated harvesting, and allowing for single title filtering. Pesch asserted that librarians need to push vendors to adopt these standards to keep things moving forward.

2016 Electronic Resources & Libraries Conference

Stephanie Larrison

Electronic Resources Librarian, Texas State University, San Marcos, TX 78666, USA; email: larrison@txstate.edu

Needle in a haystack: Promoting core journals in the age of discovery

In this presentation, Jenifer Holman, (electronic resources & periodicals librarian, University of Wisconsin -- La Crosse) discussed the difficulties with identifying core journals in today's

academic library. Fifteen years ago, librarians handpicked all journals to fit with the institution's curriculum, ensuring core journals were covered with title lists organized by subject or discipline, which highlighted the core journals of those collections. In contrast, the same task is almost impossible in the present day for a number of reasons -- the primary problem being the volume of academic journals, which jumped from hundreds of handpicked print journals to hundreds of thousands of ejournals that come with packages and databases. With the increasing number of journals, Holman realized that patrons need more help than ever to identify the best sources. Knowledgebases and discovery systems may help users locate some journals by discipline, but they are unable to identify the core journals. Holman tried to address the problem by using BrowZine (https://browzine.com/), which indexes only scholarly journals and provides deep levels of subject classifications to narrow down a list of journals to a very specific area. Unfortunately, the service does not include the capability for libraries to highlight particular journals and does not include every publisher. Holman also found that creating web pages of handpicked lists was unmanageable and labor intensive. She asked the audience if anyone had found a better method to identify core titles from their collections, but no one had. However, an audience member who was new to LibGuides recalled that the software allows dynamic creation of database lists based upon subject and uses icons to designate the recommended resources. Perhaps a similar strategy could be applied to journals. It is definitely worth checking out!

Transfer today: Updates on the Transfer Code of Practice

Nancy Beals and Jennifer Bazeley, members of the Transfer Standing Committee, began with a quick overview of the history of the Transfer Code of Practice. Transfer began as a working

group set up by United Kingdom Serials Group (now UKSG) in 2006 to investigate and recommend a standard for journal transfers, driven by stakeholders in the publishing and library worlds. From 2007-2014, Transfer was a UKSG initiative, but in 2014 it moved under NISO's umbrella. The Transfer working group became a NISO Standing Committee when version 3.0 of the code was republished as a NISO Recommended Practice (NISO RP 24 2015). They are currently exploring possible collaboration with the CHORUS (Clearinghouse for the Open Research of the United States) suite of services and best practices, to identify how Transfer could assist agencies and publishers in providing public access to articles resulting from research funded by United States grants. To finish, Beals and Bazeley encouraged librarians to use the Enhanced Transfer Alerting Service (http://www.niso.org/workrooms/transfer/notifications/) to receive updates about journal transfers.

GOKb collaborations: Enhancing knowledgebase data through crowdsourcing

GOKb, Global Open Knowledgebase, is a community-managed knowledgebase available to all libraries, academic publishers, library service providers, and the public. In this session, librarians from Minnesota State University, Mankato and the University of North Carolina at Greensboro discussed how they use GOKb.

Kate Hill (electronic resource and distance education librarian, University of North Carolina at Greensboro) uses GOKb in conjunction with OCLC WorldShare to create better data in MAchine Readable Cataloging, or MARC, records. For example, she downloads an ejournal package from OCLC using KBART data fields then uses OpenRefine to identify and clean up the data. The corrected list is imported into GOKb where additional data such as title and

publisher changes can be associated with the title. A cleaner copy of the package can then be submitted to OCLC for others to use.

Nathaniel Gustafson-Sundell (journal acquisitions and reference librarian, Minnesota State University, Mankato) edits and uses GOKb for identifying correct International Standard Serial Numbers (ISSNs). Tools such as Ulrich's, issn.cc, OCLC Connexion, and Google help to verify the various ISSNs for the same title in different formats, but none of these tools provide a comprehensive view of the entire title history and all associated ISSNs. GOKb is the only place where all of the data can be stored and easily viewed. In addition, GOKb allows for the inclusion of a publisher's Proprietary Identifiers (IDs).

Zorian Sasyk (electronic access/UX librarian, Minnesota State University, Mankato) discussed how GOKb could facilitate cost per use analysis. Electronic resource librarians know that the title list from a vendor does not match the title list from a knowledgebase provider, nor the titles in a COUNTER report. There is no data point that is consistently used and shared among each of the lists, so time-consuming data massaging and manual matching is the only way to bring all lists together. GOKb can fill in the gaps in each title list and be the single unifying source.

Everyone is invited to get involved in GOKb. More information about volunteering is at http://gokb.org/get-involved/.

2016 Electronic Resources & Libraries Conference

Angela Rathmel

Head of Acquisitions & Resource Sharing, University of Kansas, Lawrence, KS 66046, USA;

email: aroads@ku.edu

Beyond cost per use for database decisions: Usage, uniqueness, and the 'Do we care?' factor

Betty Landesman (head, Technical Services and Content Management, University of Baltimore) demonstrated how to go beyond simple cost per use analysis of databases to determining value through the unique titles within the databases. Despite the benefits that data analysis tools -- EBSCO usage consolidation and ProQuest Serials Solutions (ProQuest) overlap analysis, in this case -- offer by collecting cost and use data, Landesman confessed that one winds up comparing lists of titles in Microsoft Excel (or another spreadsheet tool). The bulk of Landesman's presentation covered how she and staff migrated and manually normalized the data pulled from EBSCO and ProQuest systems. This included a basic Excel overview, then moved into more advanced features, such as conditional formatting, text clean up tools, and other functions like COUNTIF, which counts the number of cells in a range that match the supplied criteria.

As she presented some text formatting tips for ISSN conversion, Landesman reminded the audience that not all titles from the providers include ISSN or each ISSN version. This may require title or other normalized field matching instead. In those cases, Landesman demonstrated how to use the TRIM function to eliminate extra spaces and the SUBSTITUTE function to remove leading articles, although she noted the latter function proved difficult with the leading "a" and "an."

Landsman's detailed presentation left little time to discuss the answer to the "do we care" question in depth, but made clear the necessary path to its asking. Her insight into the pitfalls of

existing analysis systems, the demonstrated need for manual normalization expertise, and pro-tips for using Excel were all very well-received by the audience.

Data-informed decision making for digital resources

Showcasing three case studies of assessment and evaluation programs in libraries, Athenaeum21 consultants Christine Madsen and Megan Hurst presented the use of different modes of data gathering and analysis. The projects and their approaches revealed an interesting historical perspective of how assessment and analytics has evolved in libraries. The session offered these open projects as a way for libraries to build on this work.

Madden (principal and co-founder, Athenaeum21) specializes in digitization -- especially special collections digitization -- and assessing what is effective in digitization and users' research. Hurst's specialization is in user experience design and assessment, and he has previous experience working in product management at EBSCO Information Services. Driven in part by a Forbes.com statistic that only 14% of employees understand the organization's strategy and less than 10% execute it successfully, the presenters and their current consulting center focus on helping organizations align goals, strategies, and outcomes by putting users first. The three case studies of programs in which Madsen and Hurst were involved utilized different modes of information gathering and approaches for meeting user needs in unique ways.

The first project, Open Collections Program, aimed to make Harvard's primary sources more available to users. Spanning from 2002 to 2007, the project intended to increase availability and use, while also supporting specific teaching needs using a new digitization model. Because the Open Collections Program was available to the entire world, the project prioritized developing a

website for the collection that included the ability to assess its use. When the program started,

libraries operated from the "build it, they will come" mentality; assessment and user experience

in libraries did not exist. Much of the project website's development involved using a

combination of available web analytics, referral analysis, homegrown digital circulation tracking,

and qualitative user research methods. The homegrown circulation tracker mapped time spent in

the books and the number of pages viewed. This allowed user qualitative surveys to dig deeper.

Outreach and marketing experimented with search engine optimization by adding normal

language keywords used to find the content by searches rather than library subject areas.

Lessons learned in the project included using multiple methods, the concepts of iteration and

triangulation, and the importance of understanding data in context. For example, repeated

visitors at Elmore were more important than overall visits. Understanding the distinction and

connection between counts revealed that inbound links from other sites are valuable for driving

use. Quality of use though understanding users helped address impact. The effect of the

evaluation program on website traffic showed a marked response to marketing and a deeper dive

across the long run in visits and page views. This revealed a direct connection between each

effort and collection usage, and it guided enhancements to digital services overall, even several

years later when compared to a collection that lacked outreach.

The second project, Toolkit for the Impact of Digitised Scholarly Resources (TIDSR), occurred

at a time when the Oxford Libraries had less than half the collection electronically catalogued

and no single discovery solution in place or planned. This user needs assessment was just one of

five strands of research involved. The project employed interview and think-aloud protocol

methods focused on undergraduates, graduates, faculty, researchers, staff, and alumni. Because this was a long-term project, a graphic method of assessment and pattern recognition proved important for coding and analyzing responses.

The third project, Open Library Assessment Dashboard & Toolkit for the University of California, Davis, provided the opportunity to step back and decide what information is important for libraries (and directors) to make good decisions. This project focused on tying strategy to actual library actions in executing that strategy. This project provided an interesting glimpse into how assessment methodology changed over time; assessment librarians are everywhere and using various tools. Some of the driving motivations for this project included understanding how to communicate the "big picture", how to deal with data overload, and what assessments are most useful. This started with inventorying data sources and identifying dashboard tools across industries. Tableau is one example of a common tool libraries are beginning to use to create data dashboards.

Madsen and Hurst then led an open question and answer discussion by asking what the audience is measuring at their organizations and whether the ISO 11620 Library Performance Indicators were resonating. Many responded that they spend a lot of time collecting data without time to ask good questions of the data collected. Some noted the benefits of systems that force the collection of data, relieving a librarian of that burden. Some expressed the value in having conversations with other libraries about which data points to impact and value. For example, one academic librarian found the most impressive homegrown management dashboards come from a public library service driven by motivations of budget cuts and their users' needs. On the topic of

measuring value for students and their investment in the university, audience responses point to libraries connecting their services to higher-level strategic initiatives. The presenters ended with an urge for libraries to use and replicate these open projects.

Not as easy as 1-2-3: Capturing usage statistics with an ERM

Librarians from the University of Texas, Arlington presented an in-depth look into an extensive ecollections review project using ProQuest's 360 Counter and generating analysis reports in Intota Assessment. The session detailed the pain points that still exist for loading COUNTER usage statistics.

University of Texas (UT), Arlington was among the beta partners for ProQuest Intota. Holly Talbott, (librarian, University of Texas, Arlington) and Ashley Zmau (eresources librarian, University of Texas, Arlington) reported on the ins and outs of ProQuest's 360 Counter and Intota assessment module. Zmau admitted avoiding the 360 Counter module (the back engine for the Intota assessment module) as long as possible. With Talbott's hire, the library has the staffing resources necessary to more comprehensively load current and historical usage with cost, a need prompted by a major serials review of over $600,000 worth of content. Initially, this work had been done by hand for three months, which ultimately proved faster than overcoming 360 Counter's quirks. Despite the jest that the primary difference between 360 Client Center module and Intota module is color -- literally, one is blue and the other is green -- Zmau remains hopeful that ExLibris will overcome the limitations she presented here of the 360 Counter and Intota systems.

Zmau began by explaining ProQuest's Data Retrieval Service (DRS), which allows libraries to give credentials for each vendor from whom ProQuest can then gather usage. The service can be scheduled either manually, twice a month, or automated monthly using the SUSHI protocol. UT, Arlington elected not to collect through SUSHI. Within the input form there is a place to select the vendor, enter credentials, add notes, and select choices for which reports to retire. Notes are intended for ProQuest staff to assist in peculiarities of loading the data, and are also useful for library eresource staff managing vendor information and troubleshooting. These notes can contain simple way-finding for loading the data, but other notes require careful investigation of the URL, specific detail of the screen that the ProQuest or library staff may be seeing, and even conditional logic troubleshooting and formatting instructions. Problems occur with some providers who will not allow non-authorized Internet Protocol (IP) addresses (those outside the university's IP range) to use the institution's username and password. This requires adding ProQuest's IP to a particular provider's administrative website. Occasionally, and possibly for security reasons, that new IP will be wiped from the system and needs to be re-entered. With DRS data populated, librarians can access these details from the Vendor Statistics Metadata page. This page displays green arrows for those details that have been completed and orange for incomplete.

The DRS is set up to retrieve current and future reports, but some current and historical reports still require manual upload by the institution. Alternatively, the library can pay ProQuest to get historical reports, but they will only load what remains available on the provider's website. The display in 360 Counter and Intota shows the email of who uploaded it.

The most difficult part of the process is formatting actual reports for ingest into Intota. Tab delimited challenges and date formatting are the biggest offenders. COUNTER reports that are not actually COUNTER compliant are additional challenges (e.g. JR1 duplication with zero-use titles). Of the many formatting challenges, some can be overcome with Microsoft Excel, either by cutting and pasting, or by saving and importing as a .txt or MS-DOS (Microsoft Disk Operating System) file. Something to keep in mind, however, is that ISSNs also may reformat to dates, especially those that start with zeros, and changing the field to a number format will drop the zeros. Zmau also recommends avoiding extra spaces, and shared a useful tool, Notepad++, in which these spaces can be visualized in the .txt file before importing.

Zmau then shared common errors seen in 360 Counter and Intota. In this respect, 360 Counter and Intota helpfully show whether a report loaded correctly or not, as well as what may have contributed to the error. A common error code is "Counter report layout not valid." Sometimes 360 Counter and the Intota system itself overloads, resulting in "Internal error, try again later." In addition to these explicit error messages, Zmau shared other, less visible quirks of Intota, like the "Run Date," which is the date the report is generated and when a user uploaded it. When downloading the same report for multiple years and those reports have the same run date, the reports will load together, which is only evident by the resulting inability to find the individually expected reports. The only solution is deleting and reloading the reports with intentionally different run dates. The available report range is also quirky: 360 Counter and Intota produce semiannual summary reports, but they arrive a few months after the expected timeframe and sometimes still require a prompt.

When asked if the ProQuest system saves time, Zmau was emphatic: "No, it takes more time." When asked if she would do it again through automated system, she also replied, simply, "No." As other audience members echoed problematic experiences with other systems, including EBSCO and Alma, Zmau emphasized that the bigger problem is with COUNTER and vendor provided statistics. During the serials reviews at UT, Arlington, Zmau found many inconsistencies and tiles missing from COUNTER's JR1 report. Zmau also noticed some vendors are releasing COUNTER 3 reports, even though they are reportedly COUNTER 4 compliant. Final thoughts from the both presenters and audience suggested ways for holding vendors accountable, including posting to relevant listservs. Zmau donned a custom-made "COUNTER POLICE" badge (figure 1) and distributed them as well, deputizing audience members they exited into the Austin sunset.

Relatively speaking: Fostering productive library-vendor communications

Kirsten Ostergaard, (electronic resources and discovery services librarian, Montana State University) and Doralyn Rossmann (head, Collection Development, Montana State University) presented results of their survey about library and vendor communication expectations. Tim Strawn (director, Information Resources, California Polytechnic State University) presented overall recommendations for how libraries should shift thinking about their role and shoulder more of the communicative responsibility, followed by a lively question and answer (Q&A) session.

Ostergaard began by sharing some of the literature that speaks to information needs libraries and vendors have of each other. This lead Ostergaard's and Rossman's exploration in two surveys

about those needs and how they are communicated. One survey was intended for vendors, the results of which Rossmann reported. Ostergaard presented results from the survey of libraries.

Vendors indicated they use databases for tracking communication and face pressures that may be unknown to librarians. Over half of vendors surveyed expressed the pressures of meeting different library needs, travel, and sales. The survey found that 90% of vendors obtain information about libraries by going to internal systems in their own company and by talking with libraries, while 83% review library websites. Some of the detailed information vendors are seeking relate to programs, full-time equivalent (FTE) counts, and personnel contacts. By contrast, nearly all libraries surveyed reported they communicate over email (99%), telephone (98%), or during conferences or visits (86%). Librarian preferences for communication are, not surprisingly, predominantly via email. The least preferred methods are telephone and postal mail. For troubleshooting with vendors, however, email and telephone methods are tied.

Regarding vendor meetings as a communication tool, both vendors and libraries agree that these meetings inform sales and offer an opportunity for feedback. However, librarians emphatically prefer not to use such meetings as a socializing venue. Unfortunately, the survey found that librarians do not unilaterally communicate their preference for how vendors communicate, and vendors do not ask.

The presenters then shared some recommendations from the survey for establishing guidelines to manage time and maximize what is important to each group. Setting up meetings once a year for visits and creating a website for vendors that includes key quick facts about the organization, community, and contact points were two examples. Vendors suggest a "For our Partners" link

under a library's "About the Library" section with information relevant to vendors. Libraries could also use a shared email alias as a way to reduce the workload of communication responses. This way multiple people see the messages in one place and avoid duplicating responses. Creating vendor email folders to filter all incoming messages, while time consuming to set up, improves the ability to search and respond.

Strawn then illustrated some of the pressures felt on both sides, using the situational example of a license negotiation, to emphasize why improving relationships is so important. Both could benefit from explaining respective pressures, like fiscal periods, budget circumstances, and sales goals.

Strawn also highlighted ITHAKA surveys that find repeated and overwhelming faculty agreement on the libraries' role as resource providers. Strawn posited from this that the relationship with publishers and vendors is the most important relationship for libraries -- more important than administration, faculty, and deans who have already clearly stated what they want.

Strawn suggests improved relations begin by recognizing that vendors and libraries are not opponents. Strawn emphasized this point by declaring that libraries are not vendors' customers. He suggested libraries and vendors are partners in a business relationship with a shared customer, the library user. Given this business relationship, both have shared goals to meet the needs of their respective partners. Pointing out that library work is less library and more business these days, Strawn suggested both partners develop professional skills and relationships accordingly.

During the Q&A, library representatives in the audience recommended two ways vendors could use email more effectively: improve subject line information and move away from requiring individual contacts. Instead, vendors should figure out the ability to maintain shared email as the contact of record, rather than relying on tracking multiple individual contacts. Vendors pleaded with librarians to reply to their email messages, even with an acknowledgement if an answer was not available. Making contact prevents the constant circling back around, which is inefficient on both sides. Overall, libraries need to directly communicate about their expectations. Vendors can ask, record, and respect librarian preferences.

2016 Electronic Resources & Libraries Conference

Breanna Webb

E-resources Management Librarian, Southern Methodist University, Dallas, Texas; email: bdwebb@smu.edu

COUNTER point: Making the most of imperfect data through statistical modeling

Lindsay Cronk and Jeannie Castro (absent), University of Houston, used data modeling of usage trends to obtain a time-series analysis of selected resources. While it seemed a bit overwhelming, it appears this kind of project or modeling could be done by someone who took the time to learn to input numbers and use applications available to help plot reserve predictive analysis. At University of Houston, the librarians utilized Excel for data collection and cleanup, R for data analysis, and Tableau for data visualization. By doing this with packages, they were able to look at the usage curve versus just the numbers, which is important to note; not all packages are

created equally, and some can contain many more or many less titles than another. They found

the results sufficient. The findings showed consistent usage across vendor platforms (based on

four JR COUNTER report selections), usage trends manifested across vendor platforms, and

usage can, in fact, be predicted. As they used historical data to predict future use, they were able

to confirm that actual usage fell into the predicted range. As a future goal, they would like to take

a hands-on approach to look at the five least used databases and/or databases with the worst

search ratios and apply the techniques used in the initial statistical modeling project.

Simplifying e-resource management: The benefits and challenges of unifying acquisitions, ERM

and activation workflows

Andrew French (solutions architect manager, ExLibris Group, Ltd.) highlighted ways a unified

system, specifically the one he has been working with for several years, Alma, can help simplify

eresource management. It can automate tasks, reports, and alerts, creating more streamlined and

enriched purchasing and activation workflows. It also allows for embedded notifications, as well

as vendor, license, and trial management. The knowledgebase for titles, coverage, and linking are

updated automatically, along with global authority updates performed by vendors. The unified

system allows for better understanding of the collection by allowing the license terms to display

to the end user (display options being configurable), and customizing reports and analysis. Alma

is a true unified system, as it is task driven and can easily perform bulk routines on the

ecollection. The unification present in Alma makes it easier to set up serials in step-by-step

processes. There are templates that can fill in fields automatically, but the user can also override

those fields, if revisions are needed. It is not always necessary to click, and the user can enter

codes for a quicker workflow. Additionally, each dashboard is personalized for each user, making it easier to help with claiming, renewal notifications, and activation notifications. Having the tasks parsed out when workflows are created during implementation helps to streamline the system. The worry of going back and forth between several systems is dramatically minimized, as Alma is a one-stop solution in comparison to previous integrated library systems (ILS), electronic resource management systems (ERMS), and link resolvers. In the unified system, all aspects of these are built into the workflow system, essentially replacing the need for separate systems. Print and electronic workflows are no longer separate. French noted, "Moving to the next gen is more than just a technical shift; it's also a philosophy shift. It's more of an opportunity than a challenge."

Cost-use and more: Providing actionable data for an electronic-journal subscription review

Sara Colglazier and Kate Zdepski from Mount Holyoke College discussed their second major ejournal review completed in 2015, based on 2014 cost per use. Through the review they were able to cancel 98 of the 130 total titles they reviewed, which was more than 75%. This saved them more than $86,000, allowing them to manage with a flat materials budget for the next fiscal year. In narrowing down which journals to examine, they excluded subscriptions that 1) were not part of packages or aggregators, 2) were already selected for cancellation, 3) were "too new", and 4) did not have usage data available. Essentially, they looked at individual journals in which they had a direct, current subscription. This gave them a little over 350 journals to review. Of the 350 titles, only 146 of them had high cost per use, and of those 146, 16 of them were too recently acquired or had 40+ uses. The final review included 130 ejournal subscriptions, in which

departments and faculty at the college participated. The faculty review process was as follows: 1) librarians distributed departmental lists, 2) the departments had 30 days to review the high cost per use titles in their respective areas, 3) all faculty campus-wide then had 30 days to review all titles with a high cost per use, and 4) a faculty meeting commenced to discuss the final list of pending cancellations. Sixteen out of the 23 departments consulted provided feedback. It was important for each department to review the list but then for faculty from all departments to see the compiled list, because some journals are multidisciplinary, even though a fund code may be associated with a certain department.

Evaluating the consortia purchase: When you can't get statistics for your own institution, can you extrapolate from other sources?

Elsa Anderson (Icahn School of Medicine at Mount Sinai), Stephen Maher (New York University Health Sciences Library), Bill Maltarich (New York University), and Laura Schimming (Icahn School of Medicine at Mount Sinai) presented this session on evaluating consortial purchases. They reported that in the past, Icahn School of Medicine at Mount Sinai, New York University (NYU), and New York University Health Sciences Library (NYUHSL) had shared resources and payments for those resources. They had a nesting-doll type of relationship but have since disassociated and become separate entities. As such, they tested the hypothesis of comparing usage from similar publishers to extrapolate usage from consortial products when institution-specific statistics were not available. There were some "Big Deals" that had their accounts broken out, such as by IP address or openURL. This made it easier to parse out information for each unique entity of the whole. Other products were not as easily

identifiable for these separate entities, but the vendor supplied the information on a one-time basis. Throughout the process, the three libraries discovered the importance of letting vendors know what you need and why. There may be some solutions that do not involve as much heavy lifting if they know separate usage is one of the things the libraries are worried about. Through the process of examining different packages, they learned several things. They can do the kind of analyses they are doing because they have long-standing, collaborative relationships. Had it turned out any of the shared collections were not functioning properly, they would be able to work out solutions for all the institutions collaboratively. Additionally, the analyses gave the libraries a starting place for discussing value with their institutions, and when asked to justify a collection, they can prove it is a good deal. If libraries divide out accounts at all the publishers by institutions for which they are trying to track usage, that would facilitate gathering data going forward. That means libraries must know what data they wanted to collect ahead of time. There is an inaccurate assumption that all publishers could separate statistics by a master account and sub-accounts; they cannot.

2016 Electronic Resources & Libraries Conference

Tiffanie Wick

Electronic Resources & Serials Librarian, Western State Colorado University, Gunnison, CO 81231, USA; email: twick@western.edu

A proxy for success

Libraries use proxy servers to connect remote library users to restricted access resources. With an ever-increasing number of remote users, what does one do with the data generated by each proxy server login request? Tiffany LeMaistre (electronic resources and discovery librarian at Nevada State College) presented on a pilot program to securely harvest their institution's EZproxy login data and demonstrated how that data was shown to correlate library resource use with student success factors, such as grade point average (GPA) and long-term retention rates. The project team consisted of Marydean Martin Library staff and Nevada State College Institutional Research and Information Technology Services departments. Library staff collected, cleaned, and interpreted EZproxy log data, including IP address, date and time of login request, blank fields, requested URL, digital object identifier (DOI), and user ID. Institutional Research created a Structured Query Language (SQL) database to anonymize and aggregate data. The department was also responsible for making the data visually impactful utilizing Tableau software and determining statistical significance. Information Technology Services ensured security using data encryption, data parsing, secure storage, and secure movement.

Privacy, always a matter of concern, was also addressed in the presentation. LeMaistre weighed the relative importance of preserving user privacy against the value of the data and considered the ethics of not using such information to improve student outcomes. With user confidentiality firmly in mind, LeMaistre and team referred to the National Information Standards Organization (NISO) Privacy Principles (http://www.niso.org/apps/group_public/download.php/16064/NISO%20Privacy%20Principles.p

df), whose tenets include using encryption, anonymization, aggregation, transparency, and training as a guide toward preserving privacy. Another avenue pursued in upholding users' privacy was the placement of a data collection statement on the Nevada State College EZproxy login web page, which allowed users the ability to opt out of data collection. The Information Technology Services department removed opt-out patron data and then loaded remaining information into an SQL database to anonymize that data, such as changing user ID and IP address. Marydean Martin Library staff members run SQL rules to clean up the data so that Institutional Research could match results to student information, such as library use and GPA. The project has received campus recognition. The presenter ended with an expressed satisfaction in their success in creating a system to utilize EZproxy log data and associate library resources to student success. LeMaistre also voiced gratification in the meaningful, interdepartmental relationships created in the process.

Hack the link resolver: A DIY, tailored approach to full-text linking in PubMed

Jonathan Shank (acquisition and electronic resources librarian at Galter Health Sciences Library, Northwestern University) presented his fix for problematic full-text linking from the PubMed platform. Galter Library is administratively independent of Northwestern University Libraries with two developers on staff. In 2015, Galter Library and the rest of the Northwestern University affiliated hospitals and libraries migrated to Alma, with the difference being that Galter Library manages their Primo discovery service and library website. Not surprisingly, Shank found that as a health sciences library, the majority of his users access library resources through the PubMed site rather than the library's website. Switching to a new library management system (LMS)

created user interface issues concerning Galter Library-PubMed communication, interlibrary loan link visibility, garbled records, and full-text linking. The presenter stressed that this was likely due to Galter Library's environment and not the LMS specifically. With user experience and web behavior in mind, Galter Library chose to integrate a PubMed search into the library's website via the PubMed API (protocols that decide how one application interacts with another). In this case, Galter Library queried a search using the PubMed API, creating a scoped index using a customized Rails application. This process allowed users to select PubMed in the library's search box and view PubMed results alongside library's holdings in the Primo results list. Lacking the ability to make changes in the shared ILS and with the framework in place, Shank reconfigured the PubMed administrative interface for Galter Library's needs. PubMeds' Outside Tool allows institutions to place a link on every PubMed record redirecting users to the desired institutional record or resource. Shank also customized Outside Tool, to clarify where users were being redirected. Rather than "fix" Alma, Shank and Galter Library chose to leverage PubMed's Outside Tool by using the article PubMed Identifier (PMID) to query their local PubMed search and display the desired result. This was accomplished by running the PMID number against their Alma link resolver via Outside Tool, directing users to Galter Library website. Lacking an ExLibris API for their purposes, a Galter Library developer reverse engineered their Alma link resolver to determine where to place the PMID to run the query in the Rail application. Shank stated that takeaways from his successful project were that it is likely better to fix out of the box link resolvers first, if possible, to benefit all systems involved. Shank closed with thoughts on possibly using this process with other databases, despite running the risk of additional work fixing "messy" URL data.

A tale of two DDA programs

A Demand Driven Acquisition (DDA) program, sometimes referred to as Patron Driven Acquisition (PDA), is one method libraries employ to grow ebook collections, leveraging user interest to trigger purchases. "A tale of two DDA programs", presented by five different academic institutions, illustrated how Demand Driven Acquisition programs and their management can differ among libraries. In this case, presenters offered their experiences managing a large consortial DDA program versus smaller independent programs. Reporting on their involvement with a consortial DDA program were Stephanie J. Spratt (electronic resources and serials librarian) and Rhonda Glazier (director of collections management) from the University of Colorado, Colorado Springs; Denise Pan (director of technical services) from the University of Colorado, Denver; and Gabrielle Wiersma (head of collection development) from the University of Colorado, Boulder. The University of Colorado DDA program, launched in 2010, uses the MyiLibrary platform to service five independent and separately administered libraries across four campuses. The agreement to share cost and resources allowed the libraries to respond better to patron needs and leverage individual resources. In the course of managing ebook collections, the group noticed a distinct change in the DDA purchase point by December 2014. Presenters cited a reduction in availability along with rising short-term loans (STL) costs, in addition to new content embargoes, exclusivity, and title withdrawals. This trend begged further examination, according to the presenters. The researchers began asking how libraries budget for DDA program. To answer that question, the University of Colorado team drew from historical costs and usage data. They also created a deposit account to control spending and assist in DDA budgeting. In order to assess cost and prepare data analysis by discipline, presenters

calculated DDA purchase and turnover rates. Purchase rate was explained as the number of records discovered related to the number of titles purchased, while the turnover rate was calculated by taking total usage and dividing it by the number of purchased titles. For added granularity, campuses broke down both rates by subject. Liability, also discussed, was defined as the number of titles not yet discovered or purchased. In answering the second question of how libraries compare DDA programs across disciplines, presenters created a performance scorecard. Turnover rates broken down by subject areas were used to identify Key Performance Indicators (KPI), which visually ranked usage into three tiers via color-coding. KPI was defined as a measurable value that quantifies effectiveness and success for reaching target goals. Using a scorecard and KPI allowed the presenters to quickly identify underperforming subject areas within individual libraries. The results of the University of Colorado DDA program study prompted presenters to consider regularly evaluating their MyiLibrary profiles using KPI scorecards and reducing liability in underperforming disciplines. Presenters also plan to collect and analyze user format preferences and examine ebook availability within subject areas.

As counterpoint to the larger, consortial DDA program, Tina Herman Buck (electronic resources librarian) from University of Central Florida and Sara Hills (collection development librarian) from St. Edwards University offered their experiences of managing a single site DDA program. Their biggest driver for adopting a DDA program was limited staffing and juggling collection management with other responsibilities. Presenters also wanted to accommodate university needs with scholarly, front-list titles and multi-user access to ebooks. Finally, and reasonably, presenters expressed the desire to pay only for material accessed. Buck and Hills chose the EBL DDA program and utilized a variety of purchasing models, including short-term loans initially

set to trigger a purchase on the fourth STL. Presenters stated that their DDA program provided users greater access to ebooks than the library could have purchased outright. As with the larger consortial DDA program, Buck and Hills noticed a significant rise in STL pricing in 2014. Hills described changes in content as well. Vendors introduced short-term loan embargoes, and DDA eligibility reductions occurred. Some publishers disallowed short-term loans, embargoed STLs for newer content, or pulled titles from the DDA program entirely. Presenters also noticed that some titles triggered purchase after the first use. In response to cost increases and changes in content and DDA program structure, Buck and Hills reviewed and updated their EBL profiles. They began by changing purchase triggers to one short-term loan with a purchase triggered upon the second request. The presenters also addressed liability by regularly deduping title lists against other ebook vendors and tightening EBL auto-weed criteria. Presenters configured EBL to remove titles from their profiles older than two years with zero usage in one year. As part of their cost-control efforts, they established a price threshold to mediate high-value purchase requests. Buck and Hills considered their efforts a success with a 33% savings over the previous fiscal year, and they plan to continue reevaluating DDA as a collection development tool, along with access-to-own models, one-time purchases, and evidenced-based acquisitions.

Access denied!

Have you received messages rife with statistical data regarding how often your users have been turned away from unlicensed content? Julie Linden (associate director of collection development), Angela Sidman (electronic resources librarian), and Sarah Tudesco (assessment librarian) from Yale University asked the question, "How useful are COUNTER turnaway

reports?" in response to just such publisher turnaway data. COUNTER Reports provide

statistical information on electronic resource usage including turnaway data for journal content

(JR2), database content (DB2) and ebook content (BR3 and BR4). To register as a "turnaway,"

users must attempt to access unlicensed content from a university IP address. Why are users

denied access to content and how are they finding it? The presenters found that over half of

referring traffic came from Google, Google Scholar, and PubMed. While users may have landed

on a publisher's website with library branding, not everything in the results list may be

accessible based on licensing and subscriptions. Presenters allowed that turnaway data are useful

and can hint at collection gaps or platform problems. In interpreting turnaway data, presenters

offered suggestions for interpreting the numbers. First, look for patterns within the data, such as

regular usage patterns over time that can be corroborated with additional data, like patron

purchase suggestions and interlibrary loan requests. The Yale University presenters

recommended comparing results to understand true demand, since they found that only about

40% of turnaway titles also appeared on interlibrary loan requests. One may also draw from

electronic resource problem report logs. Secondly, look for outliers. In addition to looking for

expected traffic patterns, investigate random ones as well. Examples offered were heavy demand

in any given month or unusually high usage of a title not tied to the curriculum. Presenters

recommended digging deeper into these values to determine their cause, whether it may have

been a security breach, platform outage, or something else altogether. Visualizing data can help

put information into context and make it easier to analyze. Another option offered was to ask

vendors for additional information, such as more granular turnaway data broken down by IP

address or by day or week. Vendors can also provide information regarding platform issues,

changes, or data representing actual users. The presenters found that vendors typically respond to such queries in a reasonable amount of time. The Yale University Library team found that the answers to their questions regarding COUNTER turnaway reports was that, yes, that information could be extremely useful, provided one is willing to dig a little deeper to interpret the data.

2016 UKSG 39th Annual Conference and Exhibition

Elizabeth McHugh

Electronic Resources Manager, University of the Highlands and Islands, Inverness, Scotland, UK, IV3 5SQ email: Elizabeth.mchugh@uhi.ac.uk

The UKSG 39th Annual Conference and Exhibition took place in the Bournemouth International Center (BIC) from Monday, April 11 to Wednesday, April 13, 2016. The UKSG Conference attracts exhibition vendors and delegates from across the scholarly community who are engaged with the "publication, distribution and use of scholarly and professional information"[1]. In 2016, there were over 900 delegates at the Conference, many of them from outside of the United Kingdom (UK). The Conference consists of a mixture of plenary sessions, breakout sessions, and lightning talks. Conference sessions covered aspects of scholarly publishing and communication between publishers and librarians, statistics, open access, and serials agents.

Investing in scholarly futures: Communities, funding and the reimagining of research communications

---

[1] http://www.uksg.org/about

Cameron Neylon (professor of research communication, Center for Culture and Technology, Curtin University, Western Australia) presented "Investing in Scholarly Futures: Communities, Funding and the Reimagining of Research Communications" on the Wednesday morning of the conference. He presented from the perspective of an individual researcher and the researcher community. Using an example from Australia regarding culture and how it can be appropriated from other cultures, Neylon observed that different scholarly communities will discuss the scholarly communication process and processes from their own perspectives. His talk centered around two cultures and how those two cultures are, as he sees it, no longer communicating with one another.

The first culture he discussed was the culture of researchers. He said that researchers believed they were always busy and were focused on being better than everyone else, comparing the rank of their work, institutions, and disciplines against that of others. Researchers also concentrate on their particular area of research. What is common across all researchers is a sense of business, commitment, focus, and rankings.

The next culture he discussed was that of publishing. Neylon told the delegates that within the publishing community, from his perspective, there is a focus on money, "financial rectitude" or doing things properly, and the bottom line. There is also an emphasis on quality assurance in the sense of process and system, areas that do not really map onto the world of the researchers. He went on to discuss how publishers concentrate on property and view themselves as a service industry. However, he sees publishers as focusing on balance sheets and assets -- keeping track of those assets and looking after them. Given this, how can researchers and publishers

communicate with one another when they are viewing scholarly communication from different perspectives? Neylon discussed two examples of where researchers and publishers think they are talking about the same things when they actually are not.

His first example centered around the editorial board who used to edit Lingua (an Elsevier journal) who moved to edit Glossa[2] which resides at the Library of the Humanities. Different people would use different words to describe the move the editors made. The editors believe they have taken the important assets of the journal with them -- the prestige they bring, the editorial capacity, skills, and knowledge they have built over time. The editors see the journal as the community of themselves as editors and the authors that the editors have built up over time. Elsevier, the publisher, believes it controls Lingua in terms of the asset, the intellectual property of the journal, the journal trademark, and the journal masthead. The publisher believes it can continue to deliver the important processes and quality control. Elsevier did not agree with the conditions editors wanted to impose because the company did not believe that those conditions would keep the publication financially viable. Unlike the editors, Elsevier did not see the community of editors and authors as an asset. The publisher and the editorial board mean two different things by the word "community."

His second example was Sci-Hub. Neylon proposed that researchers desire access to content by whatever means necessary. Property and copyright, he suggested, are less important to researchers because they are not topics that are part of their focus. However, property and

---

[2] http://www.glossa-journal.org/

copyright are definitely the focus of the publisher. Many researchers view Sci-Hub as a means to provide ease of access. Publishers talk about Sci-Hub in terms of theft, appropriation, and piracy.

Researchers, according to Neylon, are less interested in money than publishers are. Neylon suggested that researchers are more interested in prestige and time taken to access materials. Therefore, there is a disconnect between the two groups. Neylon suggested that profit margins equal success for the publisher and that researchers view profit margins as money being stolen from their community. As a result, researchers want control of scholarly publishing, whereas publishers might see that as a form of piracy or invasion.

How can this be resolved? Neylon proposed the following: take publishing back into the community by, perhaps, reversing the industrialization of publishing. One solution could be a return to smaller publishers, with publishing by societies or universities. Another solution, he suggested, would be to admit that the two communities, researchers and publishers cannot speak to one another without a boundary object, which is any object found in different communities that may facilitate communication between those communities. However, they need to find boundary objects that would help them manage the interaction, such as the journal or article. There could be a market system put in place where publishers would have to "go big" on platforms and compete with the large platform players like Google or Microsoft. The existing players may not survive this, and the researchers might, on some level, dislike the result.

Neylon believes the commonality between the two cultures of researches and publishers is knowledge. When first created, knowledge is exclusive and requires an investment make it public. Publishing, arguably, serves this role. Originally, researchers and publishers formed a

partnership, aided by the technology available at the time, to make knowledge public. However, this partnership needs to be of a particular size and scale to work effectively. In answer to the problem of too-small operations not reaching a wide audience and too-large operations insufficiently featuring discrete examples of knowledge, Neylon suggested investing at the community level. Do this by communicating the knowledge of the community, and how it is created, from the group to other places. The alternative is to build the platforms that this knowledge is being communicated on though Neylon observed that it is hard to be both platform provider and community provider.

Neylon stated that, in order to see a future for scholarship and scholarly communication, researchers must understand the capital investment of the publishers, and publishers must understand and support the time and effort spent by the researchers in developing articles for publication. Neylon finished his talk by suggesting that both communities, researchers and publishers, find the common elements that matter to everyone in order to further the discussions around the scholarly communication process.

The raw and the cooked: Hard and soft metrics in an Irish university

In a breakout session Hugh Murphy (senior librarian, Collection Management Services, Maynooth University Library, Republic of Ireland) presented an engaging talk about the usage of journal metrics within a university library setting.

In his presentation, Murphy discussed the usage and management of serials by reviewing full-text downloads (a largely quantitative process) within the usage of the library as a whole -- a more holistic way of evaluating serials usage. Hard metrics should be viewed within the broader

narrative of what is happening in a library. Librarians cannot rely completely on statistics, because instinct can still be important. It is also necessary to understand the individual institution and how it works.

In 2015 Maynooth University Library brought together a cross-sectional group of library stakeholders to gather and interpret data relating to the library and library services as a whole. Maynooth's 2012 addition of a new library section to the 1984 building was one of the drivers for doing this exercise. The library service wanted to be able to publicize their achievements and critically evaluate areas where there might be room for improvement. They felt that a cross-sectional group would allow for more objectivity in examining the results of the metrics. The group planned to bring together hard and soft metrics (both quantitative and qualitative) to assist and inform decision-making processes about the whole library. The library hoped that by using this method, services could then be more closely aligned with the needs of users.

Maynooth library felt a need to create benchmarks for themselves and against other institutions. As Murphy acknowledged, many libraries make use of metrics tools such as LibQUAL[3]. Murphy stated that, although every institution is different in terms of their academic disciplines and strengths, there can be some scepticism across institutions about statistics and how they can be or are used in evidence-based decision making. At Maynooth they believe there is a balance to be achieved between making evidence-based decisions and using instinct to improve the services to library users, including decisions on which serials should be purchased or retained. When considering metrics Murphy suggested considering the previous metrics gathered and their

[3] https://www.libqual.org/home

efficacy. Metrics have a currency on campus and beyond and can tell stakeholders about what is happening within the library. He said that, properly applied, metrics can change the perception of the library both on and off campus. This can apply to all areas of the library, including serials usage -- or non-usage.

Maynooth Library noted that in theory, electronic resources, including serials, are tailor made for metrics. However, the staff observed problems because some publishers do not provide statistics, or the publisher provides statistics that are not COUNTER[4] compliant, or the way the publisher gathers the data appears strange to the library. Are serials metrics easy to understand? Metrics can have varied usage for the stakeholders in the institution and the library must understand what the stakeholders might be seeking from the metrics and present the information accordingly. This would highlight the information required by different stakeholder groups.

When considering why the usage of serials is going up or down, there might be a number of factors. Serials metrics should not be examined in isolation from other metrics about the library and the institution as a whole. For example, there might be a need to compare the COUNTER statistics with the courses being taught at the institution.

Murphy posed the question about resource discovery solutions and their impact on usage, along with the resultant statistics. Does putting in a link resolver make a difference to serials usage statistics? Does the particular link resolver matter in the context of the serials collections held in an institution? Link resolvers can recognize collections in different ways. If the link resolver is

---

[4] http://www.projectcounter.org/

changed, the number of collections remains the same, but the new link resolver might recognize more collections, resulting in an increase in usage. The way publishers present usage data might vary from publisher to publisher. Librarians must understand how publishers are presenting the data and how to interpret it in order to properly reflect usage and avoid data appearing skewed.

The online serials metrics can be viewed against print collection usage. Maynooth investigated their print collection usage and found that while the number of items they borrowed from other universities had decreased, the number of items that they were sending out to other universities had increased. In Ireland there is a consortium[5] that deals with serials purchasing across Irish institutions, so there are commonalities of content across collections. The decrease in requests for materials outside of the library could be due to an increase in materials within it. The increase in lending items to other institutions could be because of a greater awareness of Maynooth inventory across the consortium.

Collaborative purchasing such as that which happens in Ireland can increase the visibility of each institution's collections to one another, with collections that had been hidden now being visible, and requested to be borrowed, by other institutions. Seen from this perspective, statistics in this area emphasize the need to consider staffing implications. Librarians should also highlight anomalies in the statistics and understand where the issues are.

Murphy asked what happens if the data are wrong or incorrect. He reminded people to check and re-check the data. It is important to interpret the previous data and understand what people are

---

[5] http://www.irelibrary.ie/about.aspx

being asked to collect currently versus previously, and why. Librarians must consider the changes from print to electronic and the issues and impact on spending if a subscription agent goes bankrupt.

Murphy discussed the appropriate usage of social media data. While the information can be easily garnered, the data can sometimes be rigged, cooked, or inaccurate---for better or for worse. Looking at different types of statistics for journal usage can be a large cultural shift. When dealing with serials collections, it is important to build good business cases for resources. For example, how many people will a specific resource help? Murphy acknowledges that data driven collection development has a place, and trials can establish a need in terms of the number of logins, searches and downloads. But how much do trials really tell you from statistics? They could be held at the wrong time of year. It is a balancing act. The hard metrics will show the tangible evidence, but there must be latitude to try things differently such as a longer trial or different promotion methods.

In conclusion, librarians should consider the external and the internal exposure of the data. The key audiences in terms of benchmarking can be important, but decide which stories to tell and how to tell them.

With or without you: subscription agents and the scholarly supply chain

This breakout session had contributions from four participants: Paul Harwood (general manager for the UK, South Africa, and the Nordics, EBSCO Information Services), Anette Schneider (senior officer, Office for Innovation and Sector Services, DTU [Technical University of

Denmark]), Claire Grace (head of content and licensing, the Open University, UK), Jan Donnelly (country manager, LM Information Delivery UK Ltd).

In a wide-ranging discussion about subscription agents and their place in the scholarly supply chain, Harwood began the session by posing the following questions: what are subscription agents and how do libraries see them? Is it a zero sum game? What are the challenges for libraries of working with agents and/or working direct with publishers? Libraries frequently have to tender for agents and have done so, in the UK at least, since the mid-1990s. Since then, while libraries have achieved some savings, there has been a cost to the libraries in terms of choice of agents and the range of suppliers available to libraries. This (lack of) choice has commodified the agency service. Other developments in serials purchasing have also come into place since the 1990s: the growth in consortia purchasing; disintermediation from the agents; the increase in purchasing and usage of ejournals; and the consolidation taking place in the scholarly publishing sector, where fewer publishers control more content. Harwood posed the question of how much all of these areas will change, and considered what the role of the serials agent might be in this new business world.

Harwood also discussed what is happening to the relationship between subscription agents and publishers. Are agents merely "order takers", playing no part in serials costs negotiations for the libraries, or are they "order makers", where they play a part in negotiating the prices of serials to the benefit of libraries? What are agents doing to reduce the costs of the journals? How are the agents helping libraries control their costs? As a point for consideration, Harwood noted that publishers are playing a part in this discussion because publishers want to bypass the agent and

go straight to the libraries to sell their journals. This impacts the subscription agent's work, because the role of the agent has been to work with the publisher to get efficiency savings from the publisher that can then be passed on to the libraries. In the current business climate, publishers might not want to work with agents unless agents can prove their worth.

Harwood also raised the topic of gold open access, and discussed the possible role of the subscription agent in the world of gold open access. He dared to ask the question: has gold open access stalled? How might open access play out in the future and what might be the prevailing business models across the sector? Harwood referenced the article[6] from the Max Planck Digital Library that detailed a "flip" model for open access, where, in theory, it should be possible to move library serials budgets away from a journal subscriptions economy to an article economy, based around article processing charges (APCs) for open access journals.

Finally, the nature and extent of academic libraries, and the librarian's roles within these libraries, are changing. Agents, publishers, and libraries would have to consider how subscription agents fit into the new roles that libraries and librarians might be undertaking and whether agents are necessary. It might be difficult for agents to survive; remember the collapse of SWETS as a serials agent and the resulting consequences for libraries. Libraries contract with subscription agents and must perform due diligence regarding the agent's financial stability.

Harwood's opening points were followed by a presentation from Claire Grace (head of content and licensing at the Open University, UK), "A UK view on with or without you: Subscription

---

[6] http://pubman.mpdl.mpg.de/pubman/faces/viewItemOverviewPage.jsp?itemId=escidoc:2148961

agents and the scholarly supply chain." At the start of her presentation, Grace pointed out that she was representing a viewpoint that may not be that of many UK institutions, because the Open University delivers courses on a completely distance learning basis, has at least 10,000 students registered as living outside of the UK, and has over has over 21,000 students who have registered as having a disability.

With the demise of SWETS, the Open University was concerned about the relationships that had been lost along with the SWETS knowledge of the serials supply chain. As an agent SWETS had provided support that was outsourced from the Open University, and the SWETS staff added value to the workflows of the serials department in the Open University. Grace believed that SWETS saved time and money for the librarians and the Open University as a whole, and that it was more efficient to use SWETS as their journals agent than for the institution to do the serials processing and sourcing themselves.

Nevertheless, Grace noted that the demise of SWETS brought about a re-evaluation of the role of the serials agent within the institution. Grace asked: in the move towards "e-only" for serials are serials agents still needed? Post-SWETS, the level of risk in terms of financial commitment from an institution to a serials agent is now a concern. Grace expressed concern about the current lack of competition in the serials agent market and the purchasing processes of agents and libraries.

Grace discussed how open access (OA) publishing might develop, with the possibility of micro-payments, and how academics and publishers might build up direct relationships that bypass the serials agent. There are problems for institutions with paying APCs and chasing researchers for

compliance with funders' mandates and publishers' publishing policies. What are the implications for publishers and libraries in this area?

In the UK, partly as a result of research funding, there are universities that receive greater or different levels of research funding from one another. Where some universities are research intensive, other institutions are more teaching intensive. Both types of institutions must consider the affordability of content. Academic libraries and their institutions recognize that serials content should now provide value to a wider range of demands across an institution, such as research, teaching, and independent learning. Grace asked the audience (librarians and agents) to consider what happens when there is less public money to fund research. How is research and teaching funded? What are the costs?

There are questions regarding how library content contributes to the success of the individual. How do libraries add value to the work of individual researchers and their institutions? What about quality assessment? Who will the publishers be? Will universities be publishers? Is there an increasingly national focus to gain access and manage (serials) content on a national scale? What about serials collections' Big Deals versus low content use? What about the duplication of effort across librarians, institutions, and consortia in dealing with these collections, whether it is purchasing or negotiating for content and making it accessible? Could this effort be done at a higher level and bring together institutions of further education (FE), higher education (HE) and public libraries and add value by improving access as a model? Would this lead to improved learning? These are all questions that, increasingly, universities and their libraries have to consider, along with the implications of open learning and partnerships with other institutions.

There are problems associated with accessing published resources in serials in discovery systems. The speaker noted the need to consider the quality of the metadata and the lack of interoperability of the content outside of the library systems. Data must flow better between publisher systems and library systems. Systems, automation, metadata, and standards should coincide. Further, there is a need for value for money, return on investment, and an understanding of what is happening with and to serials content in the sector.

There are systems, workflows, and processes that have to send accurate and timely data between one another. These are high volume, low value workflows. People must interpret and understand what is happening. Libraries, their institutions, and agents need to understand where everyone, including the agents, add value. Can these groups analyse and use the data to meet the changing demands of stakeholders? Will the resulting analysis underscore a role for agents in the serials content world? Grace raised many questions and provided food for thought. She was followed by Anette Schneider (senior officer, Office for Innovation and Sector Services, DTU [Technical University of Denmark]), discussing "With or without you: Subscription agents and the scholarly journal supply chain -- from a Danish perspective." Prior to 1998, university libraries in Denmark purchased all their serials via agents, mostly as single title purchases and subscriptions. However, in the 1990s the "Big Deals" of serials collections started to appear. Denmark signed its first consortia agreement in 1998 leading to the formation of DEFF (the Danish Electronic Research Library). All licenses signed allowed for the cancellation of print titles, and the universities cancelled their titles or paid the deeply discounted print price to the agent. At the present time, all non-DEFF/non-Danish titles are bought via journal agents.

However, Schneider noted that the universities want the agents to negotiate better discounts on serials content. In an environment where institutions are becoming increasingly geographically distributed, with campuses in different countries as well as within multiple parts of the originating country, there is a need for site definitions. Schneider asked if agents could work with publishers to resolve this so that neither side feels financially cheated. She noted that libraries, publishers, and agents need to understand serials prices, the need for users to have remote and perpetual access, and how these issues might impact usage and costs. There is increasing demand from the general public for walk-in use for serials content. Perhaps subscription agents could assist the libraries and publishers in this. The libraries want the agents to provide one large invoice and help track self-archiving requirements of researchers.

Schneider finished her presentation by discussing what institutions and libraries expect from serials agents in the future. She posited that libraries and institutions will use agents as long as it adds value and is profitable for their own workflows, saving time and money for the institution and the staff involved in serials procurement and processing. However, to any agents in the room she pointed out that if libraries could do it cheaper by themselves then they would do so. Schneider offered areas for the agents to consider working on as areas to provide value, such as negotiating on behalf of the universities for better pricing --- including for open access publication (in hybrid and other journals) --- and permanent and archive access. Agents can provide assistance where the exchange rate is an issue and keep track of the subscription history --- perhaps even keep track of APCs. She asked agents to consider text and data mining and how they could provide value in those areas. Finally, she asked if agents might have a role in assisting consortia.

Schneider was followed by Jan Donnelly (country manager, LM Information Delivery UK Ltd), in Donnelly's presentation, "The Agent: Back to the Future?" Donnelly opened her talk with a quick review of the history of serials agents. She argued that when libraries were dealing with print serials, the agents reinvested the libraries' money on behalf of the libraries to improve services. This was also a time, it seemed, when library budgets were stable, and libraries had money to spend. Publishers increased prices year after year, libraries paid agents for the service provided and the content they needed, and everybody was satisfied.

Donnelly noted that once serials started to become predominately electronic the profit margin available to agents shrank. At the same time the library budgets reduced, prices paid to the agents were forced down, while publishers were still increasing their pricing. Agents invested in electronic resource management although they had less profit to invest in customer services. In the meantime, libraries were and are still expecting the same level of customer service from their agents.

From Donnelly's perspective, serials agents, both now and in the future, need to return to basics by working on the added value that they can provide through consolidation and management of subscriptions. This includes print as well as electronic serials, and agents should be considering how they might play a part in the open access environment. Agents should focus on improving their customer service and enable libraries and their institutions to streamline and reduce the costs of electronic resources management. Donnelly posited that if libraries outsource their subscription management to the agents, the agents could work with publishers to create packages in a way that would benefit the library and the publisher.

The agents should consider the challenges libraries are facing and with whom they might end up working. For example, could library purchasing consortia displace the role of the agent to take more control of the situation? Donnelly acknowledged that there must be trust on all sides for the working relationship to progress. For example, the problems with the exchange rates pose difficulties for both agents and libraries. There needs to be an open exchange of information between the libraries and the agents so that there is transparency on both sides. The exchange rate can fluctuate and this can benefit or disadvantage institutions or sectors. Donnelly acknowledged the difficulties of getting the exchange rate fixed as close to the time of the order as possible. Donnelly proposed that agents can provide reports about the impact of exchange rates from a higher level perspective.

To highlight their value to the subscription workflows, agents should maintain close contact with customers and publishers. Agents ought to work to reduce costs for their customers. The libraries could then pay for the services of the agent on the basis of value and not price.

Donnelly recognizes that agents must deliver value and flexibility. They need to present technology that can aid but not replace person-centered customer service. For agents it is important to focus on delivering good customer service with one person looking after a library account and doing it in a way that benefits the library. It is important to deliver both value and flexibility for institutions and libraries so that libraries, institutions, publishers, and agents can, as Donnelly put it in her final slide, move into the 21st century but with customer-centered values retained from times past.

Lightning Talks

A feature of the UKSG Conference is the Lightning Talks, which last half an hour and give each speaker the opportunity to speak between five to ten minutes on their particular topic.

SafeNet: improving the provision of post-cancellation access

Adam Rusbridge, (project / service manager, Edina, University of Edinburgh, United Kingdom)

Rusbridge explained that the Jisc SafeNet project[7] was established as a way to examine issues around ejournal archiving, the infrastructure that might support it, and how continuity of access might be delivered to UK HE institutions in the area of post-cancellation access (PCA). This objective would be achieved via the UK archive collection of content and PCA clauses in existing publisher licenses. The project began in August 2014 and will continue until July 2016. EDINA, Jisc, Research Libraries UK (RLUK) and the Lots of Copies Keep Stuff Safe (LOCKSS) program at Stanford University have all contributed to the SafeNet project. The project focuses on outcomes that will improve library workflows and minimize the need for library staff to clarify rights and negotiate access.

Perpetual access to ejournal materials remains a significant concern for libraries, with a SafeNet survey finding that a significant proportion of respondents were concerned about loss of access to content after cancellation. The survey also found that institutions would welcome a UK managed perpetual access solution consisting of a content archive. Libraries report that license clauses are inconsistent and hard to manage, and entitlement rights are unclear, whether it is in

---

[7] http://edina.ac.uk/projects/safenet_summary.html

the area of post-cancellation or following the transfer of journals. This can cause problems for librarians trying to clarify these issues. Libraries would like to see secure perpetual access via a publisher's platform or via ejournal archives as it helps with their collection development processes. However, there is limited capacity within the library community to deal with any problems that might arise in this area.

Approximately twenty librarians were consulted as part of the project to form an idea of the problems they were encountering in the area of PCA. Three possible solutions emerged: a rights registry, an entitlement registry, and a national archive collection. Rusbridge noted that finding licenses and interpreting the perpetual access clauses is consuming significant time for librarians. This can cause issues around the annual collection development review process. It is often difficult for librarians to understand their entitlements if a title is cancelled. Librarians may not know what the supplier should make available to them or what content they should be activate in their resource discovery systems. This means librarians have to go back and forth with publishers to obtain the information. There is also a lack of confidence among librarians that they will receive access to the paid-for material and so a UK solution would be useful to them.

The project has built a rights registry as a reference tool for publisher licenses to articulate the terms. There is a link to each license and issues around perpetual access have been highlighted, such as whether the publisher permits perpetual access and how access to content might be enabled. At the time of UKSG in April 2016 it had been populated with 189 licenses from 152 publishers. The project found 100 publishers who did not seem to have a perpetual access policy -- a problem identified by librarians who are having difficulties in finding that information. The

project is approaching these publishers to ask if they have a perpetual access policy and whether it can fit into the registry. The project is being tested by librarians to see if the rights registry works and is attracting interest from both librarians and publishers.

Rusbridge then stated that the registry examines events such as a subscription or journal transfer. The project aims to develop mechanisms to improve the quality of the data in this area of PCA and the rights attached to that. The project hopes to develop a system whereby further evidence can be requested to improve the information available to librarians. The project intends to produce an actionable source of authorisation for an archive collection. For this, there should be expression of rights about the license -- what it allows librarians to do. It also hopes to produce a title list to which the rights apply and evidence of subscriptions showing that this has happened. The viability of this feature is currently being tested, and the project is working with KB Plus, librarians, and publishers to move the project forward.

Rusbridge showed how a National Archive Infrastructure might work, where the publisher deposits material into the SafeNet archive (based around the LOCKSS platform) and adds support at a consortial level along with Shibboleth integration. There is also integration with an entitlement registry and reporting at an institutional level. Publishers would continue to supply access, and the institution would only use SafeNet if the publisher cannot supply access, and the entitlement registry gives permission.

SafeNet aims to clarify how post cancellation access is implemented. The service would offer a context where ambiguity in licenses could be resolved. The project also allows for the service to work with publishers to get specific rights. Where entitlement is unclear, there would be the

opportunity to negotiate an agreed position. The project has shown that such a service would help to clarify rights and entitlement issues, and a national archive could become part of the research infrastructure. It could allow for more control over collection management and access decisions and highlight and encourage best practice in this area, allowing for a discussion between librarians and publishers.

Input from the community would be welcomed. Further information can be found at http://safenet.blogs.edina.ac.uk/UKSG/.

2016 Acquisitions Institute

Katherine H. Ryner

Associate Director of the Library & Head of Collections Support Services, St. Mary's College of Maryland, St. Mary's City, MD, 20686, USA; email: khryner@smcm.edu

The 2016 Acquisitions Institute at Timberline Lodge was held on May 14-17 on Mt. Hood in Oregon. Serials-related conference sessions were held on subscription agents and on re-thinking serials budgets.

Taking aim at an old problem: Serials management at the University of Oregon Libraries, aka journal management in the cross-hairs

Mark Watson (associate dean for research services, University of Oregon) discussed how his library adopted a new approach to managing scholarly journal and database subscriptions. Watson first explained that his institution has suffered constant rounds of budget cuts since the 1960s: the university has reduced recurring expenditures every five years on average for the past

fifty years. He reminded the audience of some of the many factors that contribute to the current scholarly publishing climate, including increases in journal prices and decreases in library budgets. Scholarly journals and databases (SJ&Ds) are meant to run indefinitely, and scholars come to depend on them; as an SJ&D builds a reputation and rises to prominence, faculty come to depend on it as a venue in which to publish their scholarship as part of the promotion-and-tenure process. Faculty sign away their copyright to publishers and then publishers in turn sell journal subscriptions back to university libraries. This structural imbalance is an ongoing problem, and the solution will require changing how the academy disseminates and rewards new knowledge.

The escalation in subscription costs and subsequent pressures on library budgets has turned libraries into, as Watson put it, "perpetual beggars of their administrations." He asked, "Can we break the cycle of beg -- spend -- cut?" He then proceeded to explain how his library implemented a two-year plan designed to reduce the need to beg the university for ever-larger sums of money each year just to cover inflation.

Recognizing the need to widen the conversation about the scholarly publishing cycle, Watson and his colleagues designed their plan to increase the involvement of subject librarians and their faculty. The main element of the new model is that they now treat funds devoted to subject-specific SJ&Ds as fixed, rather than ongoing, allocations. There are no more separate pots of money to buy new books versus new serials or databases. In other words, a subject-specific request is now allocated out of a single subject-specific discretionary fund. If a new purchase request requires an ongoing commitment, the subject librarian must agree to have the money moved from their discretionary fund to a recurring-obligation fund. The reverse is true when a

recurring obligation is canceled. Inflationary increases are covered through cancellations or by moving discretionary funds; that choice is left to the subject specialist. In this way, subject specialists and the faculty in their areas are assuming more responsibility for managing inflationary increases.

Other elements of the new model include addressing high-inflation titles on a case-by-case basis, providing usage data to subject librarians in a timely fashion, and keeping an eye out for SJ&Ds with price increases that are higher than projected. Multi-year package deals are treated separately.

In conclusion, Watson related that the coming fiscal year presents a worst-case scenario for his library: unlike past years, they are not receiving any funds to cover inflation. Discretionary funds in some subject areas have already run dry; for example, the subject librarian for business has already moved all of her discretionary money into the recurring-obligation fund. He does not know how this major fund restructuring will work in the long run. The hope is that librarians and faculty will work together to solve problems rather than the library trying to hide the problem until forced to do disruptive cancellations.

Figure 1. COUNTER POLICE Badge