



SURVEY RESULTS

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Introduction

SPEC Kit 253, *Networked Information Resources*, was published by the Association of Research Libraries (ARL) only a little more than 10 years ago, but it appeared in a vastly different world, one in which the majority of academic and research libraries still operated on a growth economy. The developments in the ensuing 10 years have included the rise to ubiquitous preeminence of Google and its various offerings, economic recessions in 2000 and 2008, and the significant administrative and organizational restructuring of the majority of academic research libraries. Accompanying all of these changes, and perhaps changing to accommodate them, has been the way in which electronic resources are acquired, assessed, and served to library users.

This survey on Evaluating E-resources was designed to re-examine the ways in which ARL member libraries have (re)structured themselves to identify the availability of new e-resources in the market; evaluate them for acquisition; decide to acquire/purchase them; evaluate them prior to renewal; and publicize or market them. Nearly identical questions were posed regarding purchasing/licensing by consortia and by individual libraries, enabling comparisons in process to be made. For the purposes of this survey, networked information resources were defined as “commercially available electronic information resources (databases, e-texts, e-journals, datasets, and information resources) funded or enabled by the library, which are made available to authorized users through a pre-existing network.”

The survey was conducted between 1 February and 8 March 2010. Seventy-three of the 124 ARL member institutions (63 US academic, 9 Canadian academic, and 1 nonacademic) completed the survey for a response rate of 59%.

The survey began by asking respondents if their libraries had policies specifically addressing commercially available e-resources. Of the 72 respondents, slightly more than half (38 or 53%) reported they had such a collection development policy. The comments indicated that the answer may really be yes and no. Several respondents explained that e-resources are broadly addressed by or integrated into either an overall or discipline-specific policy. Others reported that the collection policy is format neutral, though there may be guidelines that address e-resources. A number commented on their preference for selecting electronic or e-only modes of access. A few respondents are in the process of developing policies or plan to do so.

The responses were more clear-cut with regards to use of an Electronic Resource Management system (ERM); 68% of the respondents (49 of 72) use an ERM. A significant percentage of these indicated the ERM is used for all components of the e-resources process, including licensing, holdings management, usage tracking, overlap analysis, cost data, data feeds, link resolvers, automated reminders, OPAC features, vendor statistics, and contact information. A number of comments indicated a preference for Ex Libris's Verde ERM. One respondent indicated that the ERM received minimal use because it is “time consuming and labor intensive.”

Purchasing/Licensing E-resources through Consortia

The survey next asked about the process for purchasing or licensing e-resources through a consortium. The 73 respondents indicated that they belong to between one and five different kinds of consortia to acquire or license commercially available e-resources. The vast majority (90%) belongs to a research library consortium, such as GWLA, NERL, OCUL, etc. Most also belong to a state-wide/province-wide multi-type library consortium (73%) or a regional multi-type library consortium (70%). Fewer belong to a university system consortium (32%) or a national consortium (19%). Three respondents also work through a law or medical library consortium.

All but two of 72 respondents belong to at least one consortium “for the primary purpose of acquiring commercially available e-resources.” The mean number of memberships per institution is 3.18.

Number of Consortia	Responses
1	8
2	15
3	22
4	11
5	5
6	7
7	2

Consortia Purchasing/Licensing: Identifying and Evaluating New E-resources

For the next set of questions the survey asked respondents to base their answers on the one consortium through which their library spends the most on e-resources. Respondents indicated that they use a mixture of methods to identify new e-resources for purchase or licensing within the consortium. Most frequently, a consortium member suggests a product or vendors submit proposals. It is also common that a consortium manager or consortium group/committee identifies prospects. One respondent described an annual bibliographer survey that is vetted by one or more system-wide committees.

Likewise, a mixture of individuals and groups are responsible for evaluating new e-resource(s) for

purchase or licensing. In most cases, it is the joint responsibility of individual consortium members and consortium staff, frequently in conjunction with a group of consortium members dedicated to the evaluation of potential purchases. In a few cases, it is solely the role of a dedicated evaluation group or consortium staff.

Within the library, responsibility for the evaluation of new e-resources is broadly distributed, with a slight distinction between multidisciplinary vs. discipline/subject-specific purchases. The evaluation of multidisciplinary products is most often the responsibility of all selectors and/or the chief collection development officer (67% of respondents). For evaluation of discipline/subject-specific resources, the primary parties shift to selectors with relevant subject expertise/responsibility (90%) and the chief collection development officer (62%). Lesser involvement was indicated for an e-resources working group/team/committee (34 respondents) and only 18 respondents have dedicated selector(s) for e-resources. One respondent noted that “we have not had an ‘e-resource evaluation team’ in years. This is probably unfortunate.”

Twenty-nine respondents identified another individual or group from virtually all organizational areas of academic research libraries, including reference librarians, academic liaisons, bibliographers, technical services resource librarians, deans, and directors. In addition, faculty and students also have a part in the decision-making processes.

Consortia Purchasing/Licensing: Selection Criteria

This section of the survey addressed the importance to libraries of various selection criteria and licensing terms when evaluating e-resources for consortial purchase/licensing. It also covered the activities that are part of the assessment process.

Respondents were asked to rate a list of 17 selection criteria on a five-point scale ranging from Not at All Important to Deal Breaker. Cost was chosen as a deal breaker by half of the respondents and as very important or important by the other half. Apart from cost, there was little consensus on what constituted a deal breaker. Only compatibility with library systems, chosen by 17 respondents (24%), was rated as a deal breaker by more than 5% of respondents. The next

most highly rated criteria were uniqueness/completeness of content, anticipated usage rate, user-friendly interface, and relevance to faculty research. The least important criteria were whether all or most consortia members were likely to subscribe and the e-resource's potential accessibility through such mobile devices as BlackBerry, iPhone, Kindle, etc.

Sixteen comments listed other selection criteria for the purchase and licensing of a consortial e-resource. Four indicated the importance of perpetual access and interlibrary loan rights. Additional criteria included the capacity to swap and/or cancel material and stable pricing. One respondent stated in part that, "...some aspects that are very important to users (bibliographic export, interface) do not normally play a large role in making an acquisition decision, which is driven most strongly by content relevance so long as cost or access are not prohibitive aspects."

Sixty respondents (83%) reported that the consortium uses standard licensing terms or model licenses for e-resources. Only 15 (22%) reported that the consortium has used the National Information Standards Organization Shared E-Resource Understanding (NISO SERU) for any e-resources. Respondents commented that few publishers have accepted SERU, yet. They also indicated that use of SERU is more a local, rather than a consortial, practice.

As with selection criteria, respondents were asked to rate a list of 14 licensing terms on a five-point scale ranging from Not at All Important to Deal Breaker. Applicable law was rated a deal breaker by 23 respondents (32%) and 41 others (56%) rated it very important or important. Walk-in users was rated a deal breaker by 21 respondents (29%) and very important or important by 47 others (64%). No other licensing term garnered more than 5% of responses as a deal breaker. The next most important licensing issues were electronic reserves, level of support, cancellation restrictions, and interlibrary loan (86% to 89% of respondents). Seventy percent of respondents rated consequences of unauthorized access to the database and consequences of unauthorized use of the database content as important, very important, or deal breaker. A number of these reiterated in their comments that any requirement for the library to indemnify the licensor is a deal breaker. Other very

important license terms include archival and perpetual access rights, access by IP, and use of licensed content in course packs. Compensation for service failures and obligation of the library to train users were the least important issues.

The survey asked respondents to indicate how frequently specific activities were performed as part of the assessment process for new consortial e-resources. The top five activities that most respondents (74% to 90%) report are always or usually part of the process include comparing the title or other content to e-resource products already held by the library, reviewing the vendor/publisher preservation arrangement, conducting a trial use of the e-resource, checking the e-resource's compatibility with library systems (e.g., link resolver), and reviewing the product license against pre-existing organizational criteria. Only three respondents report usually contacting existing subscribing institutions for evaluations.

Consortia Purchasing/Licensing: Acquisition Decision

In all but a few cases, the decision to enter into a contract with a vendor is made by consortium staff or committee based on feedback from members. Feedback may be in the form of a vote or it may simply be a decision to opt in or out of the deal.

Within the library, responsibility for the final acquisition decision is somewhat different than the responsibility for e-resource evaluation. While the chief collection development officer and selectors have equal responsibility for evaluating multidisciplinary e-resources, the chief collection development officer is twice as likely to make the final acquisition decision in consultation with selectors and an e-resources working group/team/committee. Subject selectors have primary responsibility for evaluating discipline/subject-specific resources, but the chief collection development officer is the primary final decision maker in consultation with selectors and others. Other individuals or groups who make or contribute to the final acquisition decision include the University Librarian/Dean/Director, AUL, Acquisitions Team Leader, Collection Development Council, Administrative Council, Licensing and Negotiation Librarian, consortial staff, and Provost.

Consortia Purchasing/Licensing: Evaluating E-resources for Renewal

Fifty-eight respondents (82%) reported that there is a routine review cycle for consortial e-resources. The comments generally stated that reviews occurred at renewal time. Depending on the length of the contract, that could be annually or every few years. In all but a few cases, consortium members—either individually or in a dedicated renewal evaluation group—have primary responsibility for evaluating consortial e-resources for renewal in conjunction with consortium staff. In seven cases, consortium staff and/or a renewal group have this responsibility. Other renewal evaluators include bibliographer groups, system-wide collection officers, and library directors.

Respondents were asked to rate the importance of 10 renewal criteria on a five-point scale. Overall cost was again the reigning issue; a deal breaker for more than half of the respondents and very important for the rest. A significant majority of the respondents rated each of the criteria very important or important. The highest rated were uniqueness of content, cost per use, relevance to current curricula and faculty research, and inflation history. Less important was the effect of institutional withdrawal on the consortial contract.

The survey asked respondents to indicate how frequently specific activities were performed as part of the renewal evaluation process for consortial e-resources. The activities that most respondents report are always or usually part of the process include evaluating the cost increase over the previous year, a review of past usage statistics, evaluating the inflation history, and comparing titles (or other content) to e-resource products already held. Least frequent was collecting opinions of users.

Half of the respondents indicated they record and maintain e-resource evaluations. Of these, all but one indicated there were circumstances under which an evaluation might be revisited. The comments about such circumstances primarily concerned price increases but also included changes in research patterns, previously undetected usage, and platform and curricular changes.

Library Direct Purchasing/Licensing: Identifying and Evaluating New E-resources

This section of the survey repeated many of the questions about e-resources acquired through consortia, but asked about the ways in which research libraries, using their own resources and staff, identify and evaluate new e-resources for direct purchase or licensing.

The survey distinguished between multi-disciplinary vs. discipline/subject-specific purchases; however, with a few exceptions, the library staff responsible for identifying new e-resources for direct purchasing/licensing is the same for both categories. Librarians with mixed collections, teaching, and/or reference responsibilities topped the list (93%), followed by those dedicated to collection development in all formats (66%), and a general collection development group (63%). Only 19 respondents (26%) reported having an e-resource group to identify new products. Other individual(s) or group(s) that identify new e-resources include faculty, students, staff, and other users, and the Head of Collection Development. The responses for who evaluates new e-resources were nearly identical. Library senior administrators are slightly less likely to evaluate than to identify new e-resources. An e-resource group is slightly more likely to evaluate than identify, particularly to determine “technical compatibility with the libraries’ network.”

The most frequently used method of identifying new e-resources is through requests from faculty (43 responses or 60% of usually or always). A distant second method is by requests from other library users (29 or 40%). Slightly more than a third of respondents usually or always identify new products through vendor visits to the library or at vendor exhibits at library conferences. The least used method is visiting other research libraries and discussing networked resources.

Direct Purchasing/Licensing: Selection Criteria

The most important criteria for directly purchased/licensed e-resources mirror those for consortial purchases. Thirty-eight respondents (52%) indicated that cost was a deal breaker and an additional 33 rated it as very important (45%). Compatibility with library systems was again a distant second deal breaker. The next most highly rated criteria were uniqueness/

completeness of content, relevance to faculty research, anticipated usage rate, and user-friendly interface. The least important criterion was the e-resource's potential accessibility through mobile devices.

Individual institutions are somewhat less likely than consortia to use standard licensing terms or model licenses for e-resources (68% vs. 83%). They are more likely than consortia to be willing to use the NISO SERU agreement (37% vs. 22%), but comment that too few publishers and/or vendors are interested.

The important licensing terms for directly purchased/licensed and consortial e-resources are the same. Applicable law and walk-in users are the top two deal breakers. The next most important licensing issues are electronic reserves, interlibrary loan, level of support, and cancellation restrictions. Seventy-five percent of respondents rated consequences of unauthorized access to the database or use of the database content and consequences of withdrawal of content as important, very important, or a deal breaker. Respondents' comments reiterated that any requirement for the library to indemnify the licensor is a deal breaker. Other very important license terms include archival and perpetual access rights, access by IP, author rights for e-journals, and use of licensed content in course packs. Compensation for service failures and obligation of the library to train users were the least important issues.

The top five activities that are performed most frequently as part of the assessment process for new e-resources are the same for both libraries and consortia, though their order is somewhat different. Comparing the title or other content to e-resource products already held by the library is the most common activity for both. Libraries then check the e-resource's compatibility with library systems, review the product license against pre-existing organizational criteria, and conduct a trial use of the e-resource. Reviewing vendor/publisher preservation arrangements is less important for libraries than consortia. As with consortia, the least frequent activity for libraries is contacting existing subscribing institutions for evaluations.

Direct Purchasing/Licensing: Acquisition Decision

Though there are some differences in the responses by each institution, the pattern for who makes the

final acquisition decision for consortial and directly purchased/licensed e-resources is the same: The chief collection development officer is the primary final decision maker in consultation with selectors, an e-resources group, and others, including committees and senior library administrators.

Direct Purchasing/Licensing: Evaluating E-resources for Renewal

Fifty of the 73 respondents (68%) report a routine review cycle for both consortial and directly purchased/licensed e-resources; the review frequency is the same regardless of the acquisition channel; typically annually. Seven institutions report there is a routine cycle for consortial products but not for directly purchased ones; five report the opposite.

A variety of library staff with collection responsibility review e-resources for renewal. With a few exceptions, the same staff are responsible for evaluating discipline/subject-specific and multidisciplinary e-resources. Reviewers are most often librarians with mixed collections and/or teaching and/or reference responsibilities (51 or 71%). Librarians dedicated to collection development in all formats are slightly more likely to review discipline/subject-specific e-resources (61% vs. 51%), while a general collection development group is more likely to review multidisciplinary e-resources (58% vs. 46%). Roughly a third of the respondents report that senior library administrators, dedicated e-resources librarians, and an e-resources group also review products for renewal. Other reviewers include the Head of Collection Development, the library's Business Services office, and faculty and students.

The renewal criteria rankings for directly purchased/licensed e-resources were almost exactly the same as for consortial products. The primary deal breaker remained overall cost (55%), followed distantly by compatibility with library systems (17%). Criteria most often rated very important or important were uniqueness of content, relevance to current curricula and faculty research, and inflation history. Cancellation restrictions and preservation arrangements are only somewhat important.

There were no surprises about the frequency of activities used by the library to evaluate directly

licensed e-resources for renewal. The most frequent activities were the same as for consortial products: evaluate cost increase over previous year, review past usage statistics, evaluate inflation history, and compare title (or other content) to e-resource products already held by the library. Least frequent was to collect opinions of users.

Just over half of the respondents indicated that evaluations were recorded and maintained. With only six exceptions, respondents had the same answer about whether an evaluation might be revisited by either the consortium or the library. Thirty-four reported that there were such circumstances (47%); thirty-three that there weren't (45%). The comments indicated that reevaluations would be necessary if funds, pricing, or budgets change.

Publicizing New E-resources

The last section of the survey asked about the methods libraries use to publicize new e-resources and which are most effective. All of the respondents have used a multitude of methods. The two most frequently used and deemed most effective are having e-resources records in the library's catalog and liaison meetings, consultations, or individual contacts with faculty and/or graduate students (99% used and 64% effective). Announcements on the library's Web site are used as often but were rated less effective (36%). Also frequently used and highly effective are targeted communications sent to relevant schools, department, faculty, and graduate students. Least used and rated least effective are announcements or links in social networking and Second Life sites. Several respondents indicated that Twitter and blogs are used to publicize and announce e-resources, and others use press releases, articles in campus newspapers, and RSS feeds. Several made use of video and flat screen television displays. One has used "door hangers, coasters/beer mats, book marks, handouts, [and] brochures." Nevertheless, a significant number of these comments indicated that successful publicizing of e-resources was a concern and remained an ongoing issue, one respondent going so far as to state, "Very difficult to reach users. Biggest challenge. We spend 10M a year and most do not know what we have."

Additional Comments

Several respondents indicated that the ubiquity of e-resources had changed the acquisitions process. A number indicated a desire to find better methods or processes to acquire and publicize e-resources. Several made reference to the present economic climate, indicating that while identifying and evaluating e-resources for acquisition was relatively easy, identifying and evaluating e-resources for cancellation was not so simple.

Conclusion

Both consortia and libraries deploy large amounts of staff resources to build e-resource collections. Identification and assessment activities are not partitioned, rather they are conducted as communal activities. Consortial staff work in concert with member libraries. Librarians with collections, teaching, and reference responsibilities share duties with collection development groups, librarians dedicated to e-resource management, and/or library senior administrators. Final decisions about the acquisition of purchased or licensed e-resources, while most often performed by chief collection developers, are also the duty of individual selectors and teams.

There is a strong and somewhat surprising correlation between the ways in which research libraries use consortia to acquire and evaluate e-resources and the ways in which they directly acquire and evaluate e-resources. There is also a strong correlation in the ways in which these libraries are acquiring and evaluating highly specialized and multidisciplinary e-resources.

Yet, despite considerable and widespread involvement of staff, the survey uncovered weaknesses in the procurement processes, policies, and procedures. Consortial and library staff conduct a slate of activities and consider numerous criteria when examining resources, yet many libraries do not have collection development policies specifically addressing e-resources to guide their decisions. Evaluations, once complete, are often not recorded by either libraries or consortia for future reference. Further, about one-fifth of consortia and libraries do not have routine review cycles for resources once they are purchased.

Various licensing terms are considered important to libraries; however, seventeen percent of consortia and thirty-one percent of individual libraries do not use any standard licensing terms or model licenses for e-resources. Also, despite various legal and other considerations in licensing, cost was the only criterion considered a deal breaker by a significant percentage of survey respondents. Further, about one-third are not yet using an electronic resource management system and the majority of individual libraries do not use the National Information Standards Organization Shared E-Resource Understanding (NISO SERU), which could provide a valid alternative to a license agreement.

These shortcomings not only open the potential for wasted staff time and poor decision making, they also carry potential legal ramifications, due to the nature of contractual licensing.

If ARL member libraries' expenditures on e-resources were negligible, the deficiencies mentioned above might not be important or worth mentioning, but preliminary 2008–2009 data shows that the university libraries spent well in excess of \$741,000,000 on e-resources. However, the lack of established policies, processes, and procedures for the overall assessment of e-resources puts libraries at risk for financial loss in terms of finances and staff time. Also, by entering into contracts without first negotiating and, if necessary, establishing and/or removing issues concerning applicable law, deal-breaking language, indemnification issues, renewal periods, and so forth, libraries are rendering themselves vulnerable and putting themselves at the mercy of vendors. Legal crises and lawsuits concerning contract violations do not appear

to have occurred, but this should not let these libraries become complacent.

The findings of the *Evaluating E-resources* survey should be considered a call for concerted communication, organization, and action among those responsible for the acquisition of e-resources in ARL libraries. In order to improve operational efficiencies and to maximize their effectiveness, research libraries must recognize as essential – and establish as their highest priority – the need to:

- Develop and create policies for the acquisition of e-resources, both those acquired through consortia and those purchased directly;
- Create standardized methodologies that meaningfully accommodate the assessment of those resources described above;
- Train all library staff who manage and engage in contractual relations with vendors in the importance of contract negotiation;
- Share their assessment strategies with other research libraries;
- Collaborate and cooperate in sharing not only policies and strategies but also relevant operational and best practices data;
- Coordinate in the development of system-wide evaluative standards.

Should these tasks be undertaken successfully, it is hoped they will move research libraries to a future defined by a shared understanding and a consistent implementation of best practices in evaluating e-resources.

SURVEY QUESTIONS AND RESPONSES

The SPEC survey on Evaluating E-resources was designed by **Richard Bleiler**, Humanities Librarian, and **Jill Livingston**, Liaison to Allied Health, Kinesiology, and Physical Therapy, University of Connecticut. These results are based on data submitted by 73 of the 124 ARL member libraries (59%) by the deadline of March 8, 2010. The survey's introductory text and questions are reproduced below, followed by the response data and selected comments from the respondents.

This survey reexamines the issues recognized and assessed by SPEC Kit 253, *Networked Information Resources* (December, 1999). In order to permit a meaningful comparison of the 1999 and 2009 responses to this survey, the definition of "networked information resources" first proposed in 1999 and the structure of the earlier SPEC KIT are partially reused. To reflect current reality and situations, sections have been dropped, amended, and expanded.

The definition of 1999 stated that, "a networked information resource is defined as a commercially available, electronic information resource (library database, full-text service, e-journal, etc.) funded or enabled by the library, which is made available to authorized users through a network (LAN, WAN, dial-in, etc.)." As the events of the last decade have shown, this definition is dated in several respects. Many research libraries:

- developed their own networked electronic information resources rather than relied on or waited for the development of commercial products;
- routinely acquire e-resources that have no print equivalent;
- offer e-resources via Web interfaces rather than loading vendor-supplied databases or offering LANS, WANS, and dial-in resources;
- would rather subscribe to the packaged content of a vendor or publisher than license a single e-journal or database;
- will not consider subscribing to an e-resource unless the vendor or publisher can provide statistical data concerning its usage;

and there are high quality, freely available online discovery resources (such as PubMed, ERIC, WorldCat, Google Scholar, etc.)

Nevertheless, for all that portions of the original definition have become dated, the core of the definition remains sound. For the purposes of this survey, networked information resources are thus defined as "commercially available electronic information resources (databases, e-texts, e-journals, datasets, and information resources) funded or enabled by the library, which are made available to authorized users through a pre-existing network."

This survey remains designed to re-examine the ways in which ARL member libraries have (re)structured themselves to:

- identify the availability of new e-resources in the market;

- evaluate new e-resources as candidates for acquisition;
- decide to acquire/purchase the e-resources;
- evaluate e-resources prior to their renewal to determine their continued utility; and
- publicize or market the new e-resources.

BACKGROUND

1. Does your library have collection development policies that specifically address commercially available e-resources? N=72

Yes	38	53%
No	34	47%

Comments

Answered Yes

Collection development policies are written for each subject area. E-resources are addressed in each.

E-resources are part of the overall collection development policy. The discipline-specific collection development policies address e-resources.

E-resources are addressed as an integral part of each discipline's collection development policy.

Our collection development policies are format neutral.

Our collection development policies that describe our treatment of specific subjects or disciplines do not address e-resources. Rather, we have a general policy that guides selectors to prefer electronic over print for periodicals. We do not have such a policy in place for print books.

Our collection development policy addresses electronic resources in the context of our overall collection development. We also have a separate e-only policy for journal subscriptions (assuming the e-only version is available). We do not have a detailed policy that addresses specific e-resources collection development.

Policy is old and has not been revised recently.

Related to accessibility.

The answer is really yes and no. Some subject areas have addressed this (in particular health sciences and engineering) while some policies have not yet been revised.

These policies are not comprehensive. Individual selector policies refer to electronic resources but this is uneven. There is not an overarching policy toward e-resources but our procedures and practices certainly infer that electronic is increasingly the preferred mode of access for our users.

We do not have a lot that we have formally documented at this point, but there are some key policies. For example, we will only purchase e-resources that are available for campus wide use, and we do not purchase items that are only accessible by username and password.

We have a Guidelines & Principles document that broadly addresses this.

We have an "electronic only subscriptions policy" that simply states our goal to convert the majority of print journal subscriptions to e-only within three years.

We have an e-only journal exceptions policy.

Answered No

Addressed within general selection policy.

Although the University Library does not have a general policy covering commercially available e-resources, it does have specific policies, e.g., E-Only Journal Policy and Guidelines for Journal Review that governs the move to e-only and states under what conditions corresponding print subscriptions will be continued. As a rule, any e-resource can be purchased so long as the licensing/contract terms are acceptable and there are no technical difficulties in accessing the product.

Central Library doesn't have a collection development policy that specifically address e-resources but the University Law Library does.

Currently developing them.

However, we just developed a policy for e-books.

In some cases that are general references to format.

Our collection development policies are format neutral.

Our policy is incorporated in our mission statement.

So far, we have been doing without any kind of comprehensive CD policy.

We have a few checklists of criteria that we consider when evaluating resources, but no collection development policy.

We have guidelines for when we can go to online only. We hope to update the policy this year.

We plan to have one.

2. Does your library use an electronic resource management system (ERM)? N=72

Yes	49	68%
------------	----	-----

No	23	32%
-----------	----	-----

If yes, which functions are used?

Contact, Licensing function. So far, haven't integrated statistics.

Contact, resource, and license records are created using Innovative Interfaces ERM module. E-resources are added to topical categories.

Coverage load, license data, statistics, overlap reports, OPAC features.

Data feeds.

Database descriptions; Terms of license (how it is accessed, who can access, ILL rights); Provider; Consortium; Contact; Renewals.

For licensing agreements.

Home grown system, vendor and tech support contact info, license renewal data, consortial or other joint licensing.

ILL system; utilize resource record and license record.

Import MARC Records; Used as a discovery tool by staff and patrons; Track Licensing Information.

Just implemented.

Licensing; Acquisitions; Renewal; Contact Information; Usage; Access.

Licensing, administration, vendor statistics, contacts, costs, passwords, MARC records.

Licensing, Evaluation (usage statistics). Package monitoring. Managing public display lists (journals and databases). The NCSU ERM is a home-grown system.

Licensing, trials, overlap analysis, cost-per-use, coverage tracking, renewal alerts, troubleshooting.

Link resolver; MARC records; Overlap analysis; Cost data; License data; E-resource portal.

Link resolver (SFX); in implementation process with Verde.

Linking to scanned licenses (staff access); central repository for information regarding administrative & statistical site URLs, logins, and passwords; public display of use permissions & restrictions.

Links to use data; contact info; post digital image of license; administrative logins registered; track titles owned; cost & invoice info; selector info — which librarian is responsible for acquiring resource; consortia info; track items on trial, on order, cancelled, etc.

Locally developed database to manage license information and acquisitions details, as well as a public interface to e-resources powered by SFX.

Meridian, not fully implemented. Library is switching to Verde in Summer 2010.

Minimal use of ERM — its use is time consuming and labor intensive.

Our ERM is locally developed; we have reviewed and decided against commercial ERM systems. We use our local system for selection initiation, workflow check off, contact information, access terms or restrictions, licensing document management and access to selected terms. We manage expenditures through a separate data reporting tool where data is extracted from the ILS.

Payment information, licensing information, connection management.

Resource, License and Contact Records, Coverage database. Use a different system for open URL resolver.

Resource, license, contact, order info records; coverage information.

Search/Resource Manager/COUNTER/A-Z Title List.

System did not meet needs for interoperability with ILS or our expectations for reporting.

Usage tracking, holdings management, link management.

We are one of 8 institutions using a consortial instance of Ex Libris's Verde. Although some consortial licenses have been loaded, we are not currently using many of the ERM features of the software.

We display for the public (and staff) information such as description of a digital product, other titles in serials bundle, general terms of use, ILL rights, and number of simultaneous users.

We have an in-house developed ERM. Features include: Ability to browse all products/titles; Search all products/titles; Gather number of subscriptions by type or location; Run reports to i) correct MARC records; ii) check for duplicate ISSN's; iii) list expenditure by fund; iv) import titles from EXCEL into a specific product; v) import titles from a MARC file into a specific product.

We have just purchased Serials Solution.

We use Ex Libris's Verde ERM, however, it is not fully implemented. We're contemplating whether we want to continue using Verde or explore other options.

We use the ILL ERM. We use all functions. We plan to bring the system live for public use in the autumn.

Answered No

Actually, we do use an ERM to manage our subscriptions for the University System schools but we are currently investigating one for [just us] since the implementation of Verde was unsuccessful.

Again, this is really a yes and no. We started, along with our OCUL colleagues, but the project has been put on hold because the vendor is developing a new version. At the moment we are evaluating the potential of using with a different provider.

We will be implementing Ex Libris's Verde ERM later this year.

E-RESOURCES PURCHASED/LICENSED THROUGH CONSORTIA

3. What kinds of consortia does your library work with to acquire commercially available e-resources? Check all that apply. N=73

Research library consortium (e.g., GWLA, NERL, OCUL)	67	92%
State-wide/Province-wide multi-type library consortium (e.g., VIVA, OHIOlink)	53	73%
Regional multi-type library consortium (e.g., Lyasis, AMIGOS, ORBIS-CASCADE Alliance)	51	71%
University system (e.g., University of Illinois, CDL)	24	33%
Multi-state/National consortium (e.g., BCR, Canadian Research Knowledge Network)	17	23%
Other type of consortium	3	4%

Please specify other type of consortium.

NELCO [New England Law Library Consortium]

Ontario Medical schools: COAHL

SCAMEL [South Central Academic Medical Libraries Consortium]

4. To how many consortia does your library currently belong for the primary purpose of acquiring commercially available e-resources? N=72

Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Median	Std Dev
0	7	3.2	3	1.63

PURCHASING/LICENSING BY CONSORTIA: IDENTIFYING AND EVALUATING NEW E-RESOURCES

Answer the following questions based on one consortium through which your library spends the most on e-resources.

5. How are new e-resources identified within the consortium for possible purchase/licensing? Check all that apply. N=73

Consortium member suggests a product	69	95%
Vendors submit proposals	67	92%
Consortium manager identifies resources	55	75%
Consortium group/committee identifies prospects	52	71%
Other process	2	3%

Please describe other process.

In normal budget years, new resource proposals are formally solicited via an annual bibliographer survey and then vetted by one or more system-wide committees. Proposals can also be put forward independently by campuses; vendor proposals are followed up only rarely.

Bibliographer Groups --> Joint Steering Committee on Shared Collections --> Collection Development Committee

6. Who within the consortium is responsible for evaluating new e-resources for consortial purchase/licensing? Check all that apply. N=73

Individual consortium members	61	84%
Consortium staff	51	70%
Group of consortium members dedicated to evaluate potential purchases	38	52%
Other individual or group	3	4%

Please specify other individual or group.

Business and licensing terms are generally evaluated (i.e., negotiated) by the system-wide office. Quality and interface issues may be evaluated through variety of means depending on the nature of the product.

For the University System Consortium, Associate Dean for Collections & Services and the Head of Collection Development Operations & Acquisitions Services.

The consortium typically takes the lead on evaluation of purchase and licensing terms, but individual members are often asked for feedback along the way, especially if the e-resource is quite expensive and if there seem to be negotiable options.

7. Who at your library is responsible for evaluating new e-resources for consortial purchase/licensing? Check all that apply. N=73

	N	Discipline/ Subject-specific N=73	Multidisciplinary N=72
Selectors with relevant subject expertise/responsibility	68	66	40
Chief Collection Development Officer	50	45	49
All selectors contribute to evaluation	50	22	49
An e-resources working group/team/committee	34	29	33
Dedicated selector(s) for e-resources	18	16	18
Other individual(s) or group(s)	29	26	28

Please describe the "Other" individual(s) or group(s) who is responsible for evaluating new e-resources for consortial purchase/licensing. N=29

Acquisitions and technical staff

Administrative Council; faculty; students

Associate Director for Library Services; Acquisitions & Electronic Resources Management staff

Bibliographers

Bibliographers Advisory Committee

Collection Development Committee

Collection Development Council (do not have a Collection Development Officer)

Collection Development Council and E-Resource Acquisitions & Licensing Unit

Collection Management Committee

Electronic Resources Coordinator (2 responses)

Electronic Resources Librarian, Electronic Resources Management Working Group

Faculty

Faculty and students

Faculty Department Representatives

Fund Group Leaders

Groups of reference or information services librarians

Head of Collection Development Operations & Acquisitions Services

Liaison subject teams

Library encourages and at times solicits faculty to suggest needed e-resources and provide purchase justification; it also provides print and online request forms for patrons to do so.

Licensing and Negotiation Librarian

Non-library faculty

Reference and Liaison Librarians, who do not select in a subject area, will often identify, evaluate, and then recommend the purchase of resources.

Reference Librarians

Technical Services Resources Librarian

The Dean of Libraries approves all purchases.

The Licensing Librarian may have some level of input into evaluation and purchase, although most influence/decision rests with subject librarian and the Associate Director for Collections.

These decisions happen at the consortial level; our library director has input but not the subject selectors.

University Librarian

Please enter any additional comments about who evaluates new consortial e-resources for your library. N=15

Acquisitions & Electronic Resources Management staff work as a team and meet regularly (i.e., weekly scheduled meetings and often in ad hoc meetings) to discuss and evaluate e-resources.

A Contract Specialist reviews all license terms and issues. Selectors and groups usually do not work with licenses.

Faculty and students may also participate in evaluation.

Individual subject selectors have the major responsibility for identifying relevant resources, although the Coordinator of General Collections and/or the Associate University Librarian for Collections and Services usually take the lead in identifying major e-resources that cover a wide subject spectrum, e. g., publisher e-journal backfiles offers, omnibus e-book packages, or on-going acquisitions such as new components of JSTOR. The library also responds to offers from the consortia to which it belongs. While individual selectors can purchase any e-resource that their specific budgets can cover, expensive e-products typically are submitted to the Electronic Resources Selection Committee (ERSC) for collective evaluation and recommendations to fund. Finally, a Collection Development Council makes the actual funding decisions, essentially based on the recommendations of the ERSC, and the Council uses a central funds to pay for them.

Not all individuals/groups checked above participate in all evaluations. The process is "flexible" to a degree.

Selectors recommend purchases over a certain price. A collection committee deliberates on a number of proposals and makes determination based on need and budget. Chief Collection Officer reserves right to acquire larger, multi-discipline resources on occasion.

Serials/ERM Librarians assist in the evaluation process by contributing support data such as pricing and usage.

Technical Services Librarian monitors licensing and effectiveness of package.

Technical specifications are reviewed by the Information Technology Division. Licensing terms are reviewed by the Electronic Resources Coordinator.

The AUL Collections or University Librarian make decisions for the most expensive resources: ScienceDirect, etc.

The Collection Development officer makes final decisions with relevant bibliographers and may consult with the Bibliographers Advisory Committee on large, multidisciplinary packages.

The electronic resources coordinator evaluates technical compatibility with library network features, and license terms.

The protocol is pretty casual. Usually if a selector doesn't express interest in a resource, an evaluation will not occur. We primarily try to meet faculty needs and interests as part of our selection criteria. We try to queue things up for a few times each calendar year so that we can prioritize.

Until the current fiscal year, we had an e-resources working group who evaluated and recommended purchases from a central fund for digital resources. That group was disbanded and this function adopted by another collection management group with some overlapping membership.

We have not had an "e-resource evaluation team" for many years. This is probably unfortunate.

PURCHASING/LICENSING BY CONSORTIA: SELECTION CRITERIA

8. How important are the following criteria to your library for evaluating potential e-resources for consortial purchase/licensing? Please make one choice per row. N=73

	N	Not at All Important N=31	Somewhat Important N=68	Important N=73	Very Important N=69	Deal Breaker N=47
Anticipated usage rate	73	—	6	37	28	2
Length of contract	73	6	22	32	13	—
Disabilities compliance (e.g., ADA)	73	5	26	30	9	3
User-friendly interface	73	—	7	29	35	2
Relevance to specific course(s)	73	2	18	27	23	3
Support for Counter-compliant usage statistics	73	1	7	27	35	3
Preservation arrangements (e.g., LOCKSS compatible or participating in Portico)	73	1	11	24	34	3
Accessible through mobile devices (Blackberry, iPhone, Kindle, etc.)	73	11	40	20	1	1
Capacity to export data to bibliographic management software	72	5	19	35	11	2
Ability to provide MARC or metadata records	72	1	11	32	27	1
Availability of content archive	72	—	13	28	28	3
Relevance to faculty research	72	—	4	26	37	5
Uniqueness of content	72	—	1	22	45	4
Compatibility with library systems	72	1	11	19	24	17
Cost	72	—	—	7	29	36
Completeness of content	70	—	6	24	39	1
All or most consortium members likely to subscribe	70	19	18	20	11	2
Other criteria	12	—	—	4	6	2

Please describe other criteria. N=16

Important

Faculty requests.

ILL rights with e-copy, perpetual access in some cases.

License terms acceptability or ability to negotiate. Related resources clustered on same platform.

Potential for transforming scholarly communication.

Very Important

Agree to consortial license language, reliability of access.

Interlibrary loan/document delivery ability, to print without restrictions; durable URLs; targets in open URL resolvers; stable pricing with less than 4% annual increase. Other: alumni access.

Perpetual access provisions that allow print weeding.

Perpetual rights for appropriate content; interlibrary loan arrangement; other licensing terms.

Perpetual rights for appropriate content; interlibrary loan arrangements; other licensing terms.

We also consider duplication across existing collections and how the collection or product complements existing collections. In addition, we prefer platform neutral products.

Deal Breaker

As the library serving a land-grant institution, we seek license terms that allow walk-in users and support ILL.

While none of the criteria listed above would individually be a deal-breaker, the library takes all of these factors into consideration to various extents when deciding which products it would acquire. (The cost of needed and potentially useful products always exceeds available funding!) Within the context of these factors, e-resources that support instruction generally are acquired before those that only support research. The library's ability to acquire expensive e-resources could to some extent be predicated upon the willingness of selectors to contribute some of their specific funds to help cover the cost of an e-resource. Support for mobile devices has not been used as a criterion in the past but is becoming important.

Unspecified

Inflation rates/caps.

Post-cancellation access rights; site-wide access; scholarly sharing/fair use provisions; cancellation and/or swap allowance in multi-year agreements; back-out clause in multi-year agreements due to fiscal exigencies.

Some aspects that are very important to users (bibliographic export, interface) do not normally play a large role in making an acquisition decision, which is driven most strongly by content relevance so long as cost or access are not prohibitive aspects. Mobile interface is just becoming more important, but not yet a decision factor. Preservation arrangements are finally becoming more important (although Very Important may be too strong in terms of whether the lack of such arrangements would be a deal-breaker). COUNTER statistics have mixed importance--there are times where the library wants to evaluate value in this way, but it is understood that even counter-compliant statistics can be very much open to interpretation (and manipulation).

The resource must be available for campus wide, IP authenticated access.

9. Does the consortium use any standard licensing terms or model licenses for e-resources? N=72

Yes	60	83%
No	12	17%

10. Does the consortium use the NISO Shared E-Resource Understanding (SERU) for any e-resources?
N=68

Yes	15	22%
No	53	78%

Comments

Answered Yes

In some cases.

NISO SERU used when provider will accept it.

TRLN (Triangle Research Libraries Network) uses SERU, but do not know about others.

Unsure of extent of application by consortium.

We have registered for SERU but it is only minimally used for consortial licenses at present.

Whenever possible, the library encourages publishers to use SERU in lieu of a formal license/contract. This approach has been most successful with new and small publishers and, to a lesser extent, publishers from the developing world.

Answered No

Consortium has signed on as willing to use SERU but has not yet had occasion to do so.

Most use their own standard licensing based on SERU model.

No examples of any of our consortia using SERU but if the need arose, I imagine SERU would be acceptable.

Not aware of the use so answering no.

Only a very few publishers are currently using SERU. Of all the materials that we license, there is only one vendor using a SERU license. SERU is from our standpoint little more than a nice idea at this point.

Our library uses SERU when possible (still few cases), but the consortium we work with do not.

The AULC (Arizona University Libraries Consortium) uses standard "Arizona provisions" required by statute.

UCB, UCI, UCSD, UCSF, UCSB, CDL all belong to the registry.

We have used NISO a few times locally, however.

You refer to "the consortium." We use these understandings and licenses but are not aware of the consortium using them.

Not sure, but rather doubt that our consortia do such. We as individual subscribers (outside consortia arrangement) do use NISO SERU (e.g., for Duke U Press e-journals).

11. How important are the following licensing terms to your library when evaluating potential e-resources for consortial purchase/licensing? Please make one choice per row. N=73

	N	Not at All Important N=34	Somewhat Important N=62	Important N=70	Very Important N=69	Deal Breaker N=42
Level of support	73	1	9	37	24	2
Consequences of unauthorized access to the database	73	1	15	22	29	6
Electronic reserves	73	2	4	21	43	3
Compensation for service failures	73	9	36	21	6	1
Nondisclosure of licensing terms	73	10	22	19	13	9
Interlibrary loan	73	2	6	19	37	9
Applicable law	73	3	6	17	24	23
Walk-in users	73	1	4	10	37	21
Cancellation restrictions	72	—	10	25	34	3
Early termination	72	2	21	24	23	2
Obligation of the library to train users	72	22	28	14	7	1
Force majeure	71	9	23	28	8	3
Consequences of withdrawal of content	71	1	20	26	23	1
Consequences of unauthorized use of the database content	71	1	13	24	27	6
Other licensing term	28	—	—	2	16	10

Please describe other licensing term(s). N=28

Important

Alumni remote access; long-term access when e-resource is cancelled.

We prefer license terms granting perpetual access, and backed up by third-party archiving.

Very Important

Ability of the vendor to provide local loading of data.

Archival and perpetual access rights, definition of user community.

Author rights for e-journals.

Course packs; research data sets downloading; archive rights.

Definitions of authorized users and sites/locations covered.

In licenses we also look for: use of license content in course packs; use of Canadian/international copyright law; broad range of user rights; inclusion of access for small, non-local campuses; access by IP; scholarly sharing; mutual indemnification.

Inclusion of all university facilities regardless of location.

Indemnification, copyright, open access provisions.

Indemnification.

License must include be IP accessible anytime/anywhere, digital copy, fair use, print copy. Would like the license to include course pack, electronic link.

Meeting legally required state licensing terms.

Perpetual Access; Post-Cancellation; Fair Use.

Remote access; number of simultaneously users; course packs.

Terms that include: Indemnification, nondisclosure clauses, requires the monitoring of patron use, ...these are examples of deal breakers.

Use of Usage Data reports; Fees and Payment Terms.

We really prefer the ability to locally load the content.

Deal Breaker

Any clauses that require us, the licensee, to indemnify the licensor are deal breakers. Indeed, as is the case with other public institutions, indemnification and applicable law are two factors that would prohibit the library from signing a license/contract.

Inclusion of Arizona Provisions; definition of authorized users; indemnification.

Indemnification clauses.

Indemnification is a deal breaker.

Indemnification language, whereby library is asked to agree to indemnify vendor/resource provider is a deal-breaker. We can't agree to such per Massachusetts statute.

Indemnity clauses.

Mutual indemnification clauses from third party claim required by UC Regents.

Requirement for library to indemnify licensor is a deal breaker. Requirement for library to take responsibility for user behaviour is a deal breaker. Perpetual access and archival provisions are very important. Fair use rights are important.

Site-wide campus license: if not an option, 95% of the time, that is a deal breaker. Also, "reasonable efforts" language is important to us. That is, that the licensee is granted "reasonable efforts" in fulfilling our obligations.

We absolutely insist on being protected from claims arising from wrongful acts of our users (or hackers) who access the

materials we license, so long as we did not condone, assist, or knowingly allow the abuse to continue. NERL has very good language to this effect in all their contracts.

Other

Level of (vendor) Support is very important but is rarely actually considered in terms of 'licensing terms.' If support is actually needed and hard to come by, the resource will no doubt be canceled. Cancellation restrictions would be very important if they were felt to be a problem, but the assumption is that the library can almost always decline to renew a resource. Only in long-term expensive contracts would cancellation restrictions be considered a problem. Consequences of unauthorized access or use would be very important if they failed to allow a cure of breach period, but harsh consequences are almost unknown. Limit on cost increases is sometimes important.

Post-cancellation access rights; explicit acceptable use terms; entire agreement provisions (i.e., no passive assent or click-through agreement.)

12. Please indicate how often the following activities are part of the assessment process for new consortial e-resources. Please make one choice per row. N=73

	N	Never N=21	Sometimes N=72	Usually N=68	Always N=58
Trial use of the resource	73	1	13	43	16
Title (or other content) comparisons to e-resource products already held by the library	73	—	7	32	34
Review of vendor/publisher preservation arrangements	73	1	12	31	29
Title (or other content) comparison to print resources held by the library	73	1	24	25	23
Check for compatibility with library systems, e.g., link resolver	73	2	13	25	33
Call for input from library staff outside the selecting group or designated selector	73	3	40	23	7
Title (or other content) comparison to freely available e-resource products (e.g., WorldCat, PubMed, Google Scholar)	73	3	30	21	19
Check for reviews in professional literature or review sources	73	7	47	17	2
Review of product license against pre-existing organizational criteria	72	5	14	15	38
End-user testing of the resource	71	5	51	13	2
Contact existing subscribing institution for evaluation	72	7	62	3	—
Other activity	5	—	3	1	1

Please describe other activity. N=5

Sometimes

Call for input from potential users.

How many other institutions in consortium are participating in deal (if it affects cost).

Vendor visit or online presentation.

Usually

Evaluation of MARC records.

Always

Faculty input and support for the resource is absolutely essential. The Consortia license may be attractive, but we only subscribe as an institution if there is demonstrated demand for the product.

Please enter any additional comments about the assessment of new consortial e-resources. N=10

Again there are few hard and fast rules. Where content overlaps with other consortially licensed products is likely we attempt to assess it. Consulting external reviews, contacting other subscribers, and/or involving end users are rarely done.

An important thing that I always ask for if I license a product prior to the establishment of a consortial deal is that if such a deal is struck, my spend will count toward the consortial spend.

E-archiving arrangements only come into play with purchased e-resources: that is, when it is a question of e-ownership rights/perpetual access; they never are a factor with leased products. Cost also plays a critical role in determining how significant are some of the criteria listed above. As a rule, the more expensive an e-resource the higher are the standards of evaluation and the more significant are the criteria listed above.

E-resources are becoming more the norm and, except for those activities noted above, are treated and considered as other resources....important or not to our research and curriculum needs.

Get pricing from multiple consortia.

Platform comparisons; reviews of trial usage statistics; vendor demonstration.

Note: All of the responses above are from the perspective of the NCSU Libraries and not the consortia.

OCUL has created a new position for one of its members: Scholars Portal Evaluation + Assessment Librarian. This person will assist in developing new assessment activities for e-resources purchased through OCUL

The two most important factors are overlap with existing content, and the academic/research need the new resource would fill.

Where content overlap with other consortially licensed products is likely we attempt to assess it. Consulting external reviews, contacting other subscribers, and/or involving end users are only done at a consortial level if necessary.

PURCHASING/LICENSING BY CONSORTIA: ACQUISITION DECISION

13. How does the consortium decide to enter into a contract with a vendor? Check all that apply. N=72

Consortium staff decide based on member feedback	47	65%
Consortium committee/group decide based on member feedback	37	51%
Members vote	33	46%
Other process	21	29%

Please describe other process. N=21

Consortium staff will do an informal poll of interest. Each member chooses whether they wish to participate. The vendor may set a minimum threshold of participation. If it's not met, the deal doesn't go through.

Generally if there is enough interest we move forward.

If enough members are interested, negotiations begin. If negotiations are successful to the participating members, a contract will be signed.

In some cases, individual consortium members work directly with the vendor: in other words, unanimous participation may not be necessary to secure benefits such as consortial discounts.

Many if not most consortia to which the University Library belongs can best be described as "buying clubs." Consequently, each member library acts independently--although the consortial discount is often conditioned by the number of participants who buy the e-resource.

Member input but not necessarily a vote.

Members do not vote, but there is usually a call to opt in and out. If not enough members opt in, the deal falls through. Discounts usually apply as well, based on number of participants.

Minimum participation threshold must be met for the deal to go forward.

Most licenses are flexible so members can opt in or opt out.

Most of our consortia purchases or subscriptions are opt-in decisions by library. A few need a threshold of a certain number of libraries in order for a deal to go forward.

Not all members need to participate. The consortia we belong to have no funding so all products decision are made by the participating library.

Often there is simply a minimum number of members interested to reach a price break.

OhioLINK Cooperative Information Resources Management Committee (CIRM) has also used the 'bid' process to determine whether a resources can be funded based upon collective contribution shares.

Participants have authority to enter into single agreements.

Regional representatives solicit feedback from all members.

Review of cost for institutions involved.

There are different levels of participation - full (Tier 1) and partial (Tier 2).

There is a minimal numbers of institutions required by some consortia.

This is true for NERL; I'm not familiar with the process when it is WALDO or Nylink.

Usually requires a certain number of participants willing to enter the contract.

Varies by type: whether it is an all-in or % of group that determines cost.

14. Who at your library makes the final decision about acquisition through the consortium? Check all that apply. N=73

	N	Discipline/ Subject-specific N=73	Multidisciplinary N=68
Chief Collection Development Officer	54	51	50
Selectors with relevant subject expertise/responsibility	42	42	21
An e-resources working group/team/committee	28	23	28
All selectors contribute to final decision	23	7	23
Dedicated selector(s) for e-resources	14	13	12
Other individual(s) or group(s)	17	16	16

Please describe the "Other" individual(s) or group(s) who makes final purchase/licensing decisions for new e-resources for consortial purchase/licensing. N=17

Administrative Council

Associate Director for Library Services; Acquisitions & Electronic Resources Management staff

Collection Development Committee

Collection Development Council (2 responses)

Consortial staff

Dean

Dean & AUL make final decision after recommendations from an e-resources working group.

Director for Collections Services and Director for Acquisitions and Bibliographic Access

Director, Provost

Fund Group Leaders

In some cases, the Dean makes final decisions.

Library director

Licensing and Negotiation Librarian

Team Leader, Acquisitions Team

The Dean of Libraries approves all purchases.

University Librarian

Please enter any additional comments about who makes final purchase/licensing decisions for consortial e-resources for your library. N=10

After input, final decision always rest with the Chief Collection Development officer.

All above contribute to final decision; however, ultimate authority rests in the Associate Director for Library Services.

All selectors, particularly those with relevant subject expertise, contribute, but the final decision rests on the licensing terms brokered by the Team Leader of the Acquisitions Team. These include cost. Failure to reach agreement is a deal breaker regardless of selectors' decisions.

Although administrators responsible for collections and/or the Collection Development Council make the final consortial acquisition decision, input from selectors with relevant subject expertise/responsibility plays an important role in arriving at that decision. Conversely, it is difficult to imagine a situation where the University Library would make a consortial acquisition in the face of selector opposition.

Assistant Dean for Systems and Technical Services authorizes purchases decisions.

If pricing high enough, final decisions rests with the Associate Librarian for Library Services.

In some cases (known in advance), such as joint acquisition of e-journal or e-book packages, staff at the consortium office may make a decision on behalf of the group.

Licensing Librarian and Technology Support group may weigh in on potential considerations such as access support or question about licensing terms.

Selectors are expected to provide justification for the resource, based on faculty demand, classes or research being conducted, and the use of the product at peer institutions. The Dean, in conjunction with the Director for Collection Strategies, reviews these recommendations and makes the final determination.

Selectors contribute to find decision but do not make actual decision.

PURCHASING/LICENSING BY CONSORTIA: EVALUATING E-RESOURCES FOR RENEWAL

15. Is there a routine review cycle for consortial e-resources, such as at renewal time, annually, every three years, etc.? N=71

Yes	58	82%
No	13	18%

If yes, please describe the review cycle. N=51

A subset of e-resources are reviewed annually by each of the subject teams.

About a year before renewal.

According to individual contracts.

Acquisitions and E-Resources Management staff compile and analyze usage stats and share such with subject specialists prior to annual renewal. Cost, use, and continued relevance are all part of the consideration process.

All licenses for the consortium upon which my answers are based are for 3 years, so the review cycle for each resource is every three years.

Annually (2 responses)

Annually and/or at renewal time if that is not done annually. (4)

Annually at renewal time. Review new pricing for renewal and look at use data to make our decision. Again, this is from the library's perspective and not the consortia's.

As a rule, the review cycle takes place during the final year of a license/contract.

At renewal (11)

At renewal or end of contract term.

At renewal time, we consult the disciplinary librarians.

At renewal time, which varies from product to product.

At the time of renewal, usage figures and other reports on activity are circulated by the consortium.

But really depends on the resource, some are reviewed at renewal time and others annually, some just continue.

Evaluations based on contractual renewals.

Follow renewals.

If a license has a common expiration date for the entire consortium, then the license needs to be re-negotiated.

Many CRKN licenses are negotiated for a 3-year term. Members re-evaluate the resources at the expiration of the term.

Most are reviewed annually: renewal quotes are received and members can join, renew, or drop.

Most larger purchases are multi-year deals (and reviews). Library is reviewing renewals as appropriate.

Multi-year contracts are reviewed for renewal; others are reviewed periodically but not on a strict cycle.

On an annual basis, renewals received from vendors and signed by Chief of US Anglo Division.

Prior to renewal, each participating institution is contacted by the consortia with the terms of the new license.

Renewal period plus standard sunset review of all e-resources (every 2–3 years).

Renewal time and as a part of the annual collections review process.

Semi-annual renewal time.

The review cycle is largely ad-hoc. As renewals come in they are always checked for unusual price increases. If a

resource is relatively expensive or there is some other reason to question its utility, usage statistics will be checked and/or selectors questioned about current appropriateness for the collection.

The review is more of an informal discussion at renewal time rather than a formal review process.

They are renewed annually - subject selectors are responsible to do so.

Typically renewal time although recently we have had special reviews due to budget cuts.

We always ask at renewal time when we call for the payment.

We have a 3-year review cycle for all databases, (which would include databases purchased thru a consortium).

We typically review when we are in the last year of a contract.

With NERL, renewal is assumed unless a member self-identifies as wishing to cancel. But the opportunity or occasion is always announced via e-mail.

Answered No

Renewal is a normal review for expensive multi-year deals, or simply very expensive or overlapping resources, but 'core resources' are rarely reviewed in this way. Less expensive and narrowly focused resources may only be reviewed at the selector preference.

Very few resources are reviewed at renewal. Reviews occur at the time of budget analysis.

16. Who is responsible for evaluating consortial e-resources for renewal? Check all that apply. N=71

Individual consortium members	62	87%
Consortium staff	43	61%
Group of consortium members dedicated to renewal evaluation	19	27%
Other individual or group	9	13%

Please describe the other individual or group. N=9

An ad hoc group may be appointed to evaluate a consortial acquisition.

Bibliographer Groups (system-wide)

Consensus of all members

Currently, it consists of team members from Collection Development Operations & Acquisitions Unit.

Library directors

Our selectors give input as to value and consider price increase in relation to our needs and budget.

Selectors

Subject bibliographer groups and system-wide collection officers. Consortium staff participate and make recommendations from business/pricing/licensing perspective. (2 responses)

17. How important are the following criteria for your institution in evaluating consortial e-resources for renewal? Please make one choice per row. N=73

	N	Not at All Important N=9	Somewhat Important N=38	Important N=63	Very Important N=71	Deal Breaker N=48
Uniqueness of content	73	1	2	18	48	4
Cost per use	73	2	4	21	43	3
Relevance to current curricula	73	2	4	19	44	4
Inflation history	73	—	7	22	41	3
Cancellation restrictions	73	3	11	19	32	8
Overall cost	73	—	—	1	33	39
Preservation arrangements (e.g., LOCKSS compatible or participating in Portico)	73	2	10	29	31	1
Compatibility with library systems	73	1	9	22	29	12
Effect of institutional withdrawal on consortial contract	73	5	12	29	23	4
Relevance to current faculty research	72	1	4	16	47	4
Other criteria	1	—	—	—	1	—

Please describe other criteria.

Very Important

Value and impact on enhancing research (ROI).

Additional comments

Fundamentally the same evaluation criteria as evaluating electronic resources for purchase, with added metrics such as usage statistics and citations.

Uniqueness of content is considered in relation to other e-products that the library has rather than absolutely. E-archiving arrangements only come into play with purchased e-resources: that is, when it is a question of e-ownership rights/perpetual access; they never are a factor with leased products.

Use in itself can be important.

We have just begun to look at contract language that protects institutional author rights as a criteria for consideration.

18. Please indicate how often the following activities are part of your library's process for evaluating consortial e-resources for renewal. Please make one choice per row. N=73

	N	Never N=36	Sometimes N=71	Usually N=71	Always N=56
Title (or other content) comparisons to e-resource products already held by the library	73	—	18	44	11
Check availability of e-resource through an alternative platform or package	73	1	26	35	11
Calculation of cost per use	73	1	20	33	19
Review of past usage statistics	73	—	8	32	33
Evaluate inflation history	73	—	16	28	29
Title (or other content) comparison to freely available e-resource products (e.g., WorldCat, PubMed, Google Scholar)	73	4	39	24	6
Title (or other content) comparison to print resources held by the library	73	3	37	22	11
Evaluate cost increase over previous year	73	—	8	19	46
Check availability of resource material from Interlibrary Loan/Document Delivery suppliers	73	22	40	6	5
Opinions of users collected at such service desks as the reference desk, individual contact, meetings, consultations, questionnaires, focus groups, or some formal survey	73	18	48	6	1
Comparison of cost per use to other resources in collection	72	4	42	17	9
Review history of tech support issues	72	13	44	14	1
Call for input from library staff outside the selecting group or designated selector	72	8	54	8	2
Other activity	3	—	2	1	—

Please describe other activity.

Sometimes

Above reflects current activity. Many of the above answers are in the process of being elevated to usually or always.

There are resources that we subscribe to jointly with our Medical and Law libraries. If one of them cannot afford their share at renewal, that can kill the renewal even if this library would have been willing to go forward. We are forbidden by upper administration from subsidizing those other schools.

Usually

Try to look beyond cost/use which is only one point in an evaluation of a resource. For journals, look at faculty activity in publishing. Also try to look at the overall importance of the resource in the field, where we have overlap and if that uniqueness is in areas we support. It is a complicated process to evaluate.

Additional comments

Balance of above activities is important, and they all become *more* important in combination if a resource appears to have little use or is very expensive.

Evaluations occur when the cost increase is substantial.

Note re question about comparing titles to print resources held by the library. We never do this for renewals since when we initially purchase an e-resource we immediately discontinue any print subscriptions that we might have had. So when it's time to renew, print is irrelevant.

19. Are e-resource evaluations recorded and maintained? N=73

Yes	37	51%
No	36	49%

If yes, are there any circumstances under which an evaluation might be revisited? N=37

Yes	36	97%
No	1	3%

Comments

Does Record E-resource Evaluations

Evaluations are maintained annually and we would review past evaluations for future decisions to re-subscribe to a canceled resource or consider cancellation.

Evaluations are recorded informally: e-mail correspondence is stored. We reevaluate resources when package prices increase dramatically, or when new products supersede old.

Funds become available.

If funds become available, for example, or if an e-resource has gained a following among faculty (who hear about it). Or, the platform has been improved; content added, etc.

If there has been a long delay after purchase recommendation.

Large-scale evaluations of major resources are retained. Decisions might be reversed based on faculty or user input, changes at the provider that mitigate prior concerns, etc.

Major changes in the product itself, its cost, and/or needs of the library can and often do result in a re-evaluation.

New computing product becomes available.

Previously undetected campus use of a product might lead us to reconsider a cancellation.

Price.

Selective evaluation criteria such as cost per use is maintained. Title comparisons and in-depth evaluation are use only for titles under consideration for cancellation or in RFP situations.

System-wide or local surveys/trials have been recorded, but trials among subject bibliographer groups may have been inconsistently captured. Some trials should have been opened up to a broader audience. An evaluation might be revisited if, for example, an item is cancelled but we receive requests for its reinstatement; new program; change in coverage, pricing model, or platform, etc.

They are renewed annually - subject selectors are responsible to do so.

Upon request of bibliographer. Resource may have been rejected due to cost so may be reviewed in new budget cycle.

We have no formally planned mechanism for recording and maintaining e-resource evaluation; however, we save email correspondence; record decisions in our ILS, in spreadsheets, and notes we place in paper files.

Yes, if funding becomes available or disappears or programs/faculty members change.

Yes, if platforms change or offerings of same content from other provider.

Does Not Record E-resource Evaluations

A low use resource may be vital to a particular academic program.

ALL decisions are routinely revisited, situations change.

Changed budget situation and/or vendor developments.

Changes in research.

Errors in data comparison; cost adjustments.

They are not formally recorded, but there normally is an e-mail opinion trail. Decisions are often revisited if an area becomes more important, more funds become available, or faculty express specific interest.

This might happen if the price jumped considerably.

DIRECT PURCHASING/LICENSING BY THE LIBRARY: IDENTIFYING AND EVALUATING NEW E-RESOURCES

20. Who at your library is responsible for identifying and evaluating new e-resources for direct purchase/licensing? Check all that apply. N=73

	Identifying		
	N	Discipline/ Subject-specific N=73	Multidisciplinary N=73
Librarians with mixed collections and/or teaching and/or reference responsibilities	68	64	64
Librarians dedicated to collection development in all formats (e.g., bibliographers)	48	48	45
General collection development group	46	38	45
Library senior administrators – Deans/directors/AULs	41	36	41
Librarians dedicated to e-resource management	33	32	31
E-resource group	19	16	18
Other individual(s) or group(s)	11	11	10

	Evaluating		
	N	Discipline/ Subject-specific N=73	Multidisciplinary N=73
Librarians with mixed collections and/or teaching and/or reference responsibilities	65	61	62
Librarians dedicated to collection development in all formats (e.g., bibliographers)	48	48	46
General collection development group	45	40	44
Librarians dedicated to e-resource management	36	34	34
Library senior administrators – Deans/directors/AULs	31	28	31
E-resource group	24	24	21
Other individual(s) or group(s)	11	11	10

Please describe the "Other" individual(s) or group(s) who is responsible for identifying or evaluating new e-resources for direct purchase/licensing. N=13

Acquisitions Department; Faculty requests

Campus faculty

Collection Development Officer

Electronic resource coordinator (evaluation only)

Electronic resources coordinator, faculty and students during trials (evaluation only)

Faculty frequently identify new items. Faculty and student opinions are frequently gathered on new resources.

Faculty; students; staff

Head of Collection Development (2 responses)

Patrons

Subject-specific collection development teams

Users

We almost never move forward without faculty input and endorsement.

Please enter any additional comments about who identifies and evaluates new e-resources for your library. N=5

Collection Management Librarian and subject librarians identify while evaluation extends to other groups such as teaching faculty, reference librarians.

E-Resource group plays a role only in terms of technology and access issues. In this respect they do play a role in evaluating all e-resources.

Requests for new products do come from faculty and senior administrators as well as the occasional student.

The electronic resource coordinator evaluates products for technical compatibility with the libraries' network, and for acceptable licensing terms.

There is no protocol in place whereby one librarian would say to a group, "Hey everyone, have a look at this." A librarian would identify a resource, ideally as a result of faculty contact, and then request a trial.

21. How often do these individuals/group(s) use the following methods to identify new e-resources?
Please make one choice per row. N=72

	N	Never N=23	Sometimes N=71	Usually N=47	Always N=18
Requests from faculty	72	1	28	27	16
Requests from other library users	72	1	42	23	6
Vendor visits to the library	72	1	46	23	2
Vendor marketing via e-mail	72	3	51	17	1
Calls, e-mail, or communications from colleagues	72	2	51	11	4
Product reviews and announcements in professional publications	72	5	54	11	2
Vendor marketing via regular mail	72	9	56	6	1
Vendor marketing via telephone	72	7	59	5	1
Vendor exhibits at local, national, or international library conferences	71	1	46	23	1
Requests from library employees not responsible for e-resource selection	71	6	48	14	3
Web sites, blogs, and professional discussion lists	70	1	54	13	2
Visiting other research libraries and discussing networked resources with them	70	13	53	3	1
Other method	1	—	1	—	—

Please describe other method of identifying new e-resources.

Sometimes

Consortial offers.

Other Comment

Selector knowledge of professional societies with whom our library has had print standing order arrangements.

DIRECT PURCHASING/LICENSING BY THE LIBRARY: SELECTION CRITERIA

22. How important are the following criteria for evaluating potential e-resources for direct library purchase/licensing? Please make one choice per row. N=73

	N	Not at All Important N=23	Somewhat Important N=65	Important N=72	Very Important N=73	Deal Breaker N=44
Uniqueness of content	73	—	—	14	53	6
Relevance to faculty research	73	—	8	17	46	2
Completeness of content	73	—	4	26	42	1
User-friendly interface	73	—	7	25	40	1
Anticipated usage rate	73	—	5	29	38	1
Cost	73	—	—	2	33	38
Preservation arrangements (e.g., LOCKSS compatible or participating in Portico)	73	1	11	27	32	2
Relevance to specific course(s)	73	3	10	29	30	1
Availability of content archive	73	—	11	33	27	2
Compatibility with library systems	73	1	13	28	19	12
Ability to provide MARC or metadata records	73	—	16	34	20	3
Capacity to export data to bibliographic management software	73	3	18	35	17	—
Length of contract	73	7	18	35	13	—
Accessible through mobile devices (Blackberry, iPhone, Kindle, etc.)	73	10	40	16	7	—
Support for Counter-compliant usage statistics	72	2	10	26	33	1
Disabilities compliance (e.g., ADA)	72	3	30	25	13	1
Other criteria	2	—	—	1	1	—

Please describe other criteria.

Important

Supports large undergraduate research needs.

Very Important

Perpetual rights for appropriate content; interlibrary loan arrangements; other licensing terms.

Additional comments

Again, usage statistics, available records, and user interface ARE all important, but in the end they don't determine a decision as much as content and cost.

We have just begun to look at contract language that protects institutional author rights as a criterion for consideration.

While none of the criteria listed above would individually be a deal-breaker, the library takes all of these factors into consideration to various extents when deciding which products it would acquire. (The cost of needed and potentially useful products always exceeds available funding!) Within the context of these factors, e-resources that support instruction generally are acquired before those that only support research. The library's ability to acquire expensive e-resources could to some extent be predicated upon the willingness of selectors to contribute some of their specific funds to help cover the cost for an e-resource. See previous comment about new importance of support for mobile devices.

23. Does your library use any standard licensing terms or model licenses? N=73

Yes	50	68%
No	23	32%

24. Does your library use the NISO Shared E-Resource Understanding (SERU) for any e-resources? N=69

Yes	26	37%
No	44	63%

Comments

Answered Yes

I try - publishers usually will not allow.

Mainly we work with vendor agreements by necessity, but we have preferred replacement terms to suggest when needed.

On occasion.

We believe that SERU could be used more often than is currently true. Too few vendors rely on it.

We have only one.

We refer to model licenses during license negotiations with vendors. We encourage NISO SERU use when the publisher is willing to participate.

We're willing and we've suggested it on occasion but no publisher or vendor has agreed to use SERU.

Whenever possible, the library encourages publishers to use SERU in lieu of a formal license/contract. This approach has been most successful with new and small publishers and, to a lesser extent, publishers from the developing world.

Answered No

Again, SERU never had enough publishers sign on so that it was a useful tool for us. The only publisher we are interested in that is a member is Lyell, and we only have one title from them, and they are not requiring a signed license, so we are on a handshake. SERU is a great idea, but it is a party to which no one came.

Although we would be happy to use SERU if more vendors supported it.

Don't use it at this time.

Model license under development.

NISO used Occasionally.

No, not yet. UCB, UCI, UCSD, UCSF, UCSB, CDL all belong to the registry, not sure if they use SERU.

Not yet, but we are part of the SERU registry.

Only when there is a single title involved with small cost.

We are actively looking into SERU.

We have signed on as willing to use SERU but have not yet had an opportunity to do so.

We look to the NERL generic license and principles for guidance.

We served as a pilot library for the SERU beta period, but had no success with convincing publishers to adopt it for use.

We tend to follow the NERL standard license.

25. How important are the following licensing terms when evaluating potential e-resources for direct library purchase/licensing? Please make one choice per row. N=72

	N	Not at All Important N=28	Somewhat Important N=58	Important N=68	Very Important N=68	Deal Breaker N=43
Interlibrary loan	72	2	6	17	42	5
Electronic reserves	72	1	3	25	40	3
Walk-in users	72	1	3	10	38	20
Cancellation restrictions	72	1	11	22	31	7
Consequences of unauthorized use of the database content	72	1	16	23	26	6
Consequences of unauthorized access to the database	72	1	17	23	25	6
Level of support	72	1	9	38	24	—

	N	Not at All Important N=28	Somewhat Important N=58	Important N=68	Very Important N=68	Deal Breaker N=43
Early termination	72	2	18	24	23	5
Consequences of withdrawal of content	72	1	17	32	20	2
Applicable law	72	2	8	18	19	25
Nondisclosure of licensing terms	72	7	19	23	15	8
Force majeure	72	8	20	30	10	4
Compensation for service failures	72	6	37	23	6	—
Obligation of the library to train users	71	16	31	17	6	1
Other licensing term	22	—	—	2	11	9

Please describe other licensing term(s).

Important

Indemnification.

Required state licensing terms.

Very Important

Archival and perpetual access rights, definition of user community.

Author rights for e-journals.

Course packs, IP authentication, perpetual access, usage statistics.

Course packs; archive rights.

Definitions of 1) authorized users and 2) sites/locations covered.

Inclusion of all university facilities regardless of location.

Indemnification.

Indemnification provisions, copyright provisions, open access provisions.

Perpetual access backed up by third-party archiving is very important. The option for unlimited simultaneous users is important in many cases.

Post cancellation access; fair use.

Remote access; simultaneous users; course packs.

Deal Breaker

Any clauses that require us, the licensee, to indemnify the licensor are deal breakers. Indeed, as is the case with other public institutions, indemnification and applicable are two factors that would prohibit the library from signing a license/contract.

Arizona Provisions, definition of authorized users, terms to correct an alleged contract breach, indemnification.

Availability of a site-wide (campus-wide) license is critical.

Cannot include limitations of use to a single location. We will not indemnify a provider.

Indemnification clauses.

Indemnity clauses.

Library indemnification of licensor is a deal breaker. Requirement for library to take responsibility for user behavior is a deal breaker. Termination without notice or recourse is a deal breaker. Perpetual access and archival rights are very important. Fair Use rights are important.

Mutual indemnification clauses from third party claim required by UC Regents.

We cannot agree indemnification language whereby we are asked to indemnify a vendor/resource provider per Massachusetts statute.

Additional Comments

Access from our university's multiple campuses at no extra charge is very important. If there are additional fees, it could be a deal breaker.

Direct library decisions are the same whether we purchase a resource from the consortium or individually. Consortium answers for this set of question apply.

Document delivery.

In licenses we also look for: use of license content in course packs; use of Canadian/international copyright law; broad range of user rights; inclusion of access for small, non-local campuses; access by IP; scholarly sharing; mutual indemnification.

Post-cancellation access rights; site-wide access scholarly sharing/fair use provisions cancellation and/or swap allowance in multi-year agreements back-out clause in multi-year agreements due to fiscal exigencies.

Some licensing issues such as nondisclosure and force majeure have not come up.

We have just begun to look at contract language that protects institutional author rights as a criteria for consideration.

26. Please indicate how often the following activities are part of the assessment process for new directly purchased/licensed e-resources. Please make one choice per row. N=72

	N	Never N=22	Sometimes N=72	Usually N=68	Always N=62
Trial use of the resource	72	—	14	37	21
Title (or other content) comparison to print resources held by the library	72	1	18	34	19
Title (or other content) comparisons to e-resource products already held by the library	72	—	6	30	36
Title (or other content) comparison to freely available e-resource products (e.g., WorldCat, PubMed, Google Scholar)	72	2	26	28	16
Check for compatibility with library systems, e.g., link resolver	72	3	7	27	35
Call for input from library staff outside the selecting group or designated selector	72	5	40	18	9
Look for reviews in professional literature or review sources	72	3	51	18	—
End-user testing of the resource	72	5	48	15	4
Contact existing subscribing institution for evaluation	72	11	59	2	—
Review of vendor/publisher preservation arrangements	71	1	12	33	25
Review of product license against pre-existing organizational criteria	71	2	10	13	46
Other activity	3	—	2	1	—

Please describe other activity.

Sometimes

Call for input from potential users.

Vendor visit or online presentation.

Usually

Scope: simultaneous users versus IP range.

Please enter any additional comments about the assessment of new directly purchased/licensed e-resources.

Direct library decisions are the same whether we purchase a resource from the consortium or individually. Consortium answers for this set of questions apply.

E-archiving arrangements only come into play with purchased e-resources: that is, when it is a question of e-ownership rights/perpetual access; they never are a factor with leased products. Cost also plays a critical role in determining how significant are some of the criteria listed above. As a rule, the more expensive an e-resource, the higher are the standards of evaluation and the more significant are the criteria listed above.

For the past two years, we have been restricted in the number of new e-resources we can acquire. Highly specialized, unique resources have been added; some general ones have been cancelled.

DIRECT PURCHASING/LICENSING BY THE LIBRARY: ACQUISITION DECISION

27. Who at your library makes the final decision about the acquisition of new directly purchased/licensed e-resources? Check all that apply. N=73

	N	Discipline/ Subject-specific N=73	Multidisciplinary N=72
Chief Collection Development Officer	56	51	56
Selectors with relevant subject expertise/responsibility	52	52	33
An e-resources working group/team/committee	30	23	29
All selectors contribute to final decision	25	10	25
Dedicated selector(s) for e-resources	15	12	13
Other individual(s) or group(s)	16	15	16

Please describe the "Other" individual(s) or group(s) who makes the final decision for acquiring new directly purchased/licensed e-resources for your library.

A standing committee that reviews all subscriptions

Administrative Council

Associate Director for Library Services; Acquisitions & E-Resources Management staff

Bibliographers Advisory Committee

Collection development committee

Collection Development Council

Collections management committee

Dean

Dean & AUL make final decision after recommendations from an e-resources working group.

Director (sometimes), Provost (rarely)

Director for Collections and Services and Director for Acquisitions and Bibliographic Access

Fund Group Leaders

Library director

Occasionally, the Dean

The Dean of Libraries approves all purchases and subscriptions.

University Librarian

Please enter any additional comments about who makes the final decision for acquiring new directly purchased/licensed e-resources for your library.

Associate Director for Library Services has ultimate authority over decision.

Associate Librarian for Library Services, depending on cost of resource.

AUL Collections must be involved when a cost threshold is reached.

Collection Development Council

Depending on the type of resource, the AUL for Information Resources may be involved in working with academic deans or department heads to finalize a decision.

Essentially the selectors who can provide money make the decision. No money often means no decision. Therefore, the selectors with money, in combination with the Associate Director for Collections who has 'special' money, make final decisions. Subject specialists are most able to make subject decisions on their own because of their dedicated funds.

For expensive e-products, individual subject selectors submit requests; the Electronic Resources Selection Committee evaluates these requests and makes recommendations in priority and ranked order; and the Collection Development Council makes the actual funding decisions.

Selectors Contribute to final decision but do not make a final decision.

Special funding from Provost or other new library funds are an important determinant in some acquisitions.

Subject Librarians recommendations are always considered in conjunction with funding possibilities.

The Collection Development officer makes final decisions with relevant bibliographer and may consult with the Bibliographers Advisory Committee on large multidisciplinary packages.

DIRECT PURCHASING/LICENSING BY THE LIBRARY: EVALUATING E-RESOURCES FOR RENEWAL

28. Is there a routine review cycle for directly licensed e-resources, such as at renewal time, annually, every three years, etc.? N=72

Yes	56	78%
No	16	22%

If yes, please describe the review cycle.

3 years.

A subset of e-resources are reviewed annually by each of the subject teams.

Acquisitions and e-resources management staff compile and analyze usage stats and share such with subject specialists prior to annual renewal. Cost, use, and continued relevance are all part of the consideration process.

Annual renewal

Annual review of databases and large e-journal packages. Individual e-journal subscriptions are not reviewed annually.

Annually

Annually — a minimal review of price, may trigger a more complete review.

Annually and renewal signed by Chief of US Anglo division.

Annually at renewal time for a product. Review the new pricing and look at use data and any comparable resources to make the renewal decision.

At invoice time.

At renewal or end of contract term

At renewal time (9 responses)

At renewal time selectors often review usage and cost for consideration of renewal.

At renewal time there is an informal discussion rather than a formal review process.

At renewal time, selectors are typically asked if they wish to renew.

At renewal time, usage statistics are reviewed as well as access issues, cost and content.

At renewal time, we consult the disciplinary librarians.

At renewal time, which varies from product to product

At time of renewal, we review pricing, usage, cost per use, and continued relevance to the mission of the libraries.

E-journals are usually renewed automatically. If there is a budget reduction or desire to purchase something else, e-journals are reviewed. Before databases are renewed, questions are often asked of subject bibliographers and usage stats are reviewed.

E-resource subscriptions are reviewed at renewal time, i.e., annually.

Fiscal Year change is the most common time for review with renewal being second.

If price increase is over 5 %, the library business services office brings the title to the attention of the subject librarian.

If the e-product is on a contract with a termination date, the review cycle takes place during the final year of a license/contract. Otherwise, e-resources subscriptions are not reviewed on a regular cycle.

It varies, based on vendor procedures and schedules resources are automatically renewed unless scheduled for review or flagged for potential cancellation decision.

Many e-resources are not questioned or reviewed. However, the need to cancel to fund new acquisitions causes us to consider the utility of classes of resources (e.g., abstracting and indexing databases).

Often but not always at renewal time

Renewal plus every 2–3 years by formal group.

Renewal time; annual collections review process

Renewal time, usually based on a fiscal year (1 July – 30 June) subscription cycle.

Renewals or when cancellation surveys must be undertaken.

Review occurs at renewal.

Sometimes, irregular and not across the board at renewal time, or otherwise during cancellation projects.

The review cycle is largely ad-hoc. As renewals come in they are always checked for unusual price increases. If a resource is relatively expensive or there is some other reason to question its utility, usage statistics will be checked and/or selectors questioned about current appropriateness for the collection.

Titles are renewed annually as part of journal review cycle.

Usually at renewal time.

We engage in an annual budget evaluation which includes identifying electronic products to cancel for budget savings; otherwise, renewal decisions are made on a product-by-product basis prior to renewal time.

We have recently begun reviews based on pricing increase - if a price hits a threshold for cost and for % increase, we now review prior to renewal. We've also established a new routine for reviewing use stats, cost per use, etc.

Answered No

Reviews are ongoing and initiated when new or updated resources are introduced, print subscriptions need to be replaced, cost increase or collections funding is reduced.

These questions are the same response as 'consortia' decisions. Please refer back to consortia answers for the corresponding question.

We are in the process of putting one in place. This will likely be the role of the committee previously tasked with identifying resources. We no longer really need a team to identify resources but we do need a team to work out how to review those resources we already have.

29. Who is responsible for evaluating directly licensed e-resources for renewal? Check all that apply.
N=72

	N	Discipline/ Subject-specific N=72	Multidisciplinary N=71
Librarians with mixed collections and/or teaching and/or reference responsibilities	56	51	51
Librarians dedicated to collection development in all formats (e.g., bibliographers)	44	44	36
General collection development group	42	33	41
Library senior administrators – Deans/directors/AULs	29	27	28
Librarians dedicated to e-resource management	27	23	27
E-resource group	24	21	23
Other individual(s) or group(s)	11	11	11

Please describe the “Other” individual(s) or group(s) who is responsible for evaluating directly licensed e-resources for renewal.

A standing committee that reviews all subscriptions

Acquisitions librarian contacts e-resources group if renewal costs exceed a predetermined percentage over the last contract.

An electronic resources librarian leads the review of databases.

Business Services office (Library)

Collection Development Head

Collection Development Officer

Electronic resources coordinator

Faculty; students

Head of Collection Development

Head of collection management and acquisitions librarian

Head, Collection Development

Please enter any additional comments about who evaluates directly licensed e-resources for renewal at your library.

Fundamentally the same as consortia new purchases, consortia renewals, and direct purchases.

Subject librarians and senior administrators are often drawn into the evaluation process, but the renewal evaluations are mainly initiated and managed by the e-resources librarian.

The Collection Development department identifies worrisome renewals for subsequent review by standing committee.

The Director for Collection Strategies will usually ask librarians for their opinions and reactions and big ticket items, or less expensive but little used items come up for renewal. The DCS will provide usage and cost data in these instances.

The electronic resources coordinator contributes crucial information about usage, technical problems, and any change in licensing.

These questions are the same response as 'consortia' decisions. Please refer back to consortia answers for the corresponding question.

30. How important are the following criteria for your institution in evaluating directly licensed e-resources for renewal? Please make one choice per row. N=72

	N	Not at All Important N=2	Somewhat Important N=34	Important N=60	Very Important N=70	Deal Breaker N=46
Relevance to current curricula	72	1	3	16	49	3
Uniqueness of content	72	—	—	21	46	5
Relevance to current faculty research	72	—	3	18	47	4
Cost per use	72	—	8	19	42	3
Cancellation restrictions	72	1	11	21	31	8
Preservation arrangements (e.g., LOCKSS compatible or participating in Portico)	72	—	12	29	31	—
Compatibility with library systems	72	—	9	26	25	12
Inflation history	71	—	5	19	43	4
Overall cost	71	—	—	2	30	39
Other criteria	1	—	—	—	—	1

Please describe other criteria.

Deal Breaker

We would continue to expect and insist upon favorable license terms (ILL rights, walk-in users, perpetual access, third party archiving).

Additional comments

Uniqueness of content is considered in relation to other e-products that the library has rather than absolutely.

E-archiving arrangements only come into play with purchased e-resources: that is, when it is a question of e-ownership rights/perpetual access; they never are a factor with leased products.

31. Please indicate how often the following activities are part of your library's process for evaluating directly licensed e-resources for renewal. Please make one choice per row. N=71

	N	Never N=34	Sometimes N=69	Usually N=69	Always N=56
Title (or other content) comparisons to e-resource products already held by the library	71	—	17	38	16
Review of past usage statistics	71	—	11	35	25
Evaluate inflation history	71	—	15	31	25
Title (or other content comparison) to freely available e-resource products (e.g., WorldCat, PubMed, Google Scholar)	71	4	31	32	4
Calculation of cost per use	71	1	25	29	16
Check availability of e-resource through an alternative platform or package	71	—	25	28	18
Title (or other content comparison) to print resources held by the library	71	3	29	26	13
Evaluate cost increase over previous year	71	—	1	22	48
Comparison of cost per use to other resources in collection	71	3	39	20	9
Call for input from library staff outside the selecting group or designated selector	71	5	51	14	1
Check availability of resource material from Interlibrary Loan/Document Delivery suppliers	71	21	38	9	3
Opinions of users collected at such service desks as the reference desk, individual contact, meetings, consultations, questionnaires, focus groups, or some formal survey	71	12	49	8	2
Review history of tech support issues	69	9	41	17	2
Other activity	3	—	2	1	—

Please specify other activity.

Sometimes

In regard to these ILL questions; we always have in the back of our mind the cost/benefit nature of purchase vs. acquiring through ILL. We don't check to see if something is available; we generally have a pretty good idea.

Number of simultaneous users.

Usually

Subject bibliographers and collections committees are usually aware of anecdotal experience of patron experience with the product—via reference transactions, consultations, etc.—but we do not formally seek patron feedback for renewals.

Additional comments

Evaluations are triggered by specific events or initiatives but not routine workflow.

32. Are e-resource evaluations recorded and maintained? N=73

Yes	37	51%
No	36	49%

If yes, are there any circumstances under which an evaluation might be revisited? N=36

Yes	36	100%
No	0	—

Comments

Answered Yes

After a couple years if the resource is requested again.

Budget constraints, content changes, user demand, research or curricular needs.

Budget reductions; Changes in product such as platform, content, or vendor.

Certainly faculty members can always request that we re-evaluate a product.

Change in price, content, curriculum, platform.

Changes in content, pricing, technical access.

Changes in product Increased cost Changes in curriculum/research.
Content changes, funding changes, faculty requests, research needs change.
Continued need not being met by other products.
Data errors; cost adjustments.
For more in-depth analysis during budget reduction.
Funding becomes available.
If funding became available or disappears, if faculty/courses changed.
If the cost fluctuates significantly, if the interface improves, if technology improves, if terms of use change (i.e., ILL, e-reserves, course packs, etc.)
Individual selectors are responsible to evaluate and revisit if necessary. They would keep their own documentation.
Item is cancelled but we receive requests for its reinstatement; new program; change in coverage, pricing model, or platform, etc.
Major changes in the product itself, its cost, and/or needs of the library can and often do result in a re-evaluation.
Multi-year agreements.
Patterns of campus use sometimes do not reveal themselves until after cancellation of a product: in such cases, we would reopen the evaluation and decision in light of new information.
Same as previous answer.
Selected evaluation criteria are maintained, such as usage statistics and other metrics
Upon request of bibliographer. Resource may have been rejected due to cost so may be reviewed in new budget cycle.
Usage statistics and cost.
Very seldom.
We have no formally planned mechanism for recording and maintaining e-resource evaluation; however, we save e-mail correspondence; record decisions in our ILS, in spreadsheets, and notes we place in paper files.
When new products become available.

Answered No

All decisions are routinely reviews at 2–3 year sunset intervals.
Change in research focus.
Changed budget situation and/or vendor developments.
Evaluations might be revisited when there is a product change, change in curriculum, or funding capabilities.
If the price jumps considerably.
These questions are the same response as 'consortia' decisions. Please refer back to consortia answers for the corresponding question.

The primary problem with reviewing the history of tech support issues is that there are some databases, such as natural product communications, that can be highly problematic but their content is unique. So, as much as the person who has to “clean up the mess” would like to cancel, it isn’t always easy.

PUBLICIZING NEW E-RESOURCES

33. Which of the following methods has your library used for publicizing new e-resources? Which were the most effective? Check all the methods you library has used and select up to five methods that have been most effective for your library. N=73

	Used N=73	Most Effective N=64
Cataloging networked resources in the library catalog	72	47
Liaison meetings, consultations, or individual contact with faculty and/or graduate students	72	47
Announcements on the library’s Web site	72	26
Targeted communications sent to relevant schools, department, faculty and graduate students	70	44
Group training sessions for schools, departments, faculty, and/or graduate students	68	28
Information sent via broadcast e-mail, or electronic bulletin boards	51	12
Articles in library newsletter(s)	51	1
Linking from course management software (Blackboard, WebCT, etc.)	50	18
Signs posted around the library	28	3
Announcements or links in Social Networking and Second Life Sites	27	1
Other method	15	7

Please describe other method(s) your library has used to publicize new e-resources.

Used and Most Effective

Announcements in university newsletter. We have not studied effectiveness of publicity methods.

Blog with e-mail contact or RSS feed.

Inclusion in the A-Z list and/or targeting the resource in the library’s meta search engine.

Linking through link resolver.

Press releases; Web-based news service.

Use of door hangers, coasters/beer mats, book marks, handouts, brochures.

We conduct ongoing training for public services staff (reference and library instruction work) to be sure they are aware of all new e-resources.

Used

Blog

Blogs

Displays on plasma screens in high-traffic areas of the library.

Flat screen TV monitor displays computer workstation screensavers in public areas research guides rotating visual display of database icons at our Web site.

Interpolation in general library instruction and training sessions

PR pieces appearing in the campus newspaper

Twitter

FaceBook, Twitter, RSS feed

Additional comments

Did not select five most effective methods for publicizing e-resources because we have not done any formal assessment; any response would be based purely on anecdotal evidence.

I did not check off any of the options under Most Effective since we have not done an assessment of the effectiveness of our publicity methods.

It is difficult to assess which methods are effective; we generally take a scattershot approach.

Not sure that we have a true measure of effectiveness.

Record loads and link-resolver activation for each title within an e-resource. (Cataloguing one parent title for a database isn't particularly effective, but exposing the content at the item level is. Data is then exposed via Open WorldCat and Google.)

The only aspect that is effective is to have quality and easy to use content, everything else is a waste of time.

This is an area in which we really struggle. We hope to spend more time thinking about the promotion and marketing of our e-resources.

Very difficult to reach users. Biggest challenge. We spend 10M a year and most do not know what we have.

We feel the need for improved communication about new e-resources.

We have found that point-of-need and focused presentations to specific audiences are most effective.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS

34. Please enter any additional information about the identification, evaluation, and acquisition of e-resources for your library that may assist the authors in accurately analyzing the results of this survey. N=14

Again, the evolving ubiquity of e-resources has changed our methods of selection and evaluation. However, the significant cost of some of them, coupled with the ability to monitor usage, allows and encourages us to continue to evaluate their value as ongoing subscriptions.

As the size of e-resource packages increases, along with their price and the benefits of purchase "in bulk" from any one vendor, there is a tendency for decision making to become more concentrated higher up the administrative chain, or even at the consortial level. While individual subject specialists remain most familiar with the needs of campus library users, they are less often in a position to decide to acquire a product on their own, and instead need to take part in discussion and priority setting with other subject specialists, supervisors, and administrators.

Consortial relations are very important.

E-resources are now the norm, so few groups or policies are dedicated specifically to e-resources—they are integral to all aspects of the collection management process.

Library of Congress' answers may not conform with typical responses from other institutions due to our mission to serve Congress and the American people.

Our decisions are all made locally, with the exception of the state consortium which provides a limited number of resources to all (e.g., Ebsco, Worldcat). In general our decision practices are identical for local or consortium decision making due to their opt-in nature. Because individual subject selectors have dedicated funds, they play the most important role in decision-making. The AD for Collections has veto power, or the power to 'make it so.' We do not take much advantage of decision groups for e-resources.

Overall budget constraints limit our ability to acquire new products or at a minimum force us to cancel another resource of equal cost.

Regarding policies, we maintain a checklist for technical staff and a list of guidelines for public services staff in connection with evaluating e-resources. In general, we expect that any resource will undergo a trial before a purchase decision is made. We have a form that staff can fill out to request a trial. Every trial has a subject librarian sponsor who is responsible for writing the database description for the library Web page, marketing the trial and gathering staff and user feedback. Librarians collect and save comments or evaluations of e-resources that they receive from students or staff (usually via email) and attach that information in their request to subscribe to a new e-resource. We experimented with gathering librarian evaluation through a form and on a blog, but we decided that it wasn't worth the time work involved reminding people to fill out the form or comment on the blog. We maintain minimal details about trials that we have run, but this doesn't include evaluative information. It is accomplished by hiding the record of the trial in the databases system from public view when the trial is over. It only acts as a reminder that we have trialed the resource on a certain date in the past.

Routine evaluation and consistent assessment of data remain a weakness. Increased multi-disciplinarity of e-resources makes determining responsibilities increasingly difficult.

The library has a combined print and electronic book approval plan. Both components, print and electronic items, are patron driven selections.

The more expensive the e-resource, the more likely its acquisition will be evaluated and decided upon within a multi-stage collective context and centrally funded. For centrally funded e-acquisitions, the Electronic Resources Selection Committee evaluates requests and makes recommendations, while the Collection Development Council makes the funding decision.

The presence of Portico has helped allay fears in going online only; we need better ways to find and catalog and expose individual titles of online monographic series (cataloging analytics).

The same criteria and responsibilities apply whether we are purchasing/subscribing independently or through a consortium. We are committed to mainstreaming e-resources and only creating specialized workflows and criteria when required.

While we are pretty good at identifying and evaluating e-resources for acquisition, we discovered, in the economic downturn, that we were not as prepared to identify and evaluate e-resources for cancellation. We are now working on providing our librarians with tools and methods.

RESPONDING INSTITUTIONS

Arizona State University	University of Missouri
Boston University	Université de Montréal
Boston College	University of Nebraska–Lincoln
Brigham Young University	University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill
University of British Columbia	North Carolina State University
University at Buffalo, SUNY	Northwestern University
University of Calgary	University of Notre Dame
University of California, Irvine	Ohio University
University of California, Los Angeles	University of Oklahoma
University of California, Riverside	Oklahoma State University
Case Western Reserve University	University of Oregon
University of Colorado at Boulder	University of Pennsylvania
Columbia University	Pennsylvania State University
University of Connecticut	Purdue University
Cornell University	Rice University
University of Delaware	University of Rochester
Duke University	Rutgers University
University of Florida	University of South Carolina
Georgetown University	Syracuse University
University of Georgia	Temple University
University of Illinois at Chicago	University of Texas at Austin
University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign	Texas A&M University
University of Iowa	Texas Tech University
Iowa State University	University of Toronto
Johns Hopkins University	University of Utah
University of Kansas	Vanderbilt University
Kent State University	Virginia Tech
University of Kentucky	University of Washington
Library of Congress	Washington State University
Louisiana State University	Washington University in St. Louis
McGill University	University of Waterloo
McMaster University	Wayne State University
University of Massachusetts, Amherst	University of Western Ontario
Massachusetts Institute of Technology	University of Wisconsin–Madison
University of Miami	Yale University
University of Michigan	York University
Michigan State University	