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Solving the Print Issue

Assessing and Reducing the Print Footprint of a Large Academic Library

BRENT APPLING

Abstract

In the Fall of 2019, the University of South Carolina Libraries underwent the renovation of a floor of their main undergraduate library, the Thomas Cooper Library. This project required many print materials to be moved so that more space could be dedicated to student group and individual study. Though the renovation was successful it did present an even larger issue, the print issue. University Libraries maintains 3.2 million print volumes. The floor renovation project shined a glaring light on the need to manage the print collection across all University Libraries. The library Annex was 85% full so the solution could not be to simply send items from the campus libraries to the Annex. Therefore, starting in the Spring of 2020, University Libraries began coordinating an ongoing, multi-method project for holistically evaluating the print collection. This presentation will detail the coordination of this large assessment project that included collaboration with faculty and staff throughout the libraries and required the creation and deployment of several methods of assessment. The methods used included culling print serials from the Annex and Thomas Cooper Library that the library has purchased digital perpetual access for, reviewing current print subscriptions and standing orders, and targeted deaccessioning of monographs and outdated materials from campus libraries and off-site storage facilities. This presentation will illustrate how the benefits of this project go beyond reducing...
the print footprint of University Libraries to also help in reducing the budget dedicated to print subscriptions and in reducing the staffing hours required for the processing and maintenance of print materials. This presentation will also highlight the challenges of a large project carried out with few human resources and will encourage discussion of the problems and concerns inherent in managing the print footprint of an academic library.

Introduction

The University of South Carolina Libraries (University Libraries) is an Association of Research Libraries (ARL) library system that serves the University of South Carolina, Columbia Campus, an R1, doctorate granting, research institution. University Libraries is made of five libraries including the Thomas Cooper Library, the main undergraduate library, and an off-site storage facility called the Library Annex. Between all the libraries and the Annex, University Libraries maintains approximately 3.2 million print volumes. Over the last several years, physical space in the Thomas Cooper Library has emerged as a prioritized issue as students have needed more areas for group and individual study.

In response to student needs, the Thomas Cooper Library secured funding to renovate level four of the library. This level of the library contains print titles within the Q–Z call number ranges and is informally known as the science floor. Before renovation, this level contained more than 230,000 print volumes which resided on shelves that took up most of the floor's space. Under the supervision of the Associate Dean for Collections, several librarians and staff members, including relevant subject liaisons and the Collection Assessment Librarian, created criteria and methodologies for determining what materials to move off of the floor. In addition to the renovation funding, the Dean of Libraries also solicited funding from University Administration to lease a facility for temporary
storage of the materials that would be moved from level four. The group led by the Associate Dean for Collections determined that they would focus primarily on print serials to move into the temporary storage facility. Using data such as historical usage along with estimating the linear feet of large serial runs, the group were able to identify around 100,000 items that would be moved from level four. With help from a contracted moving company, all the identified print material was moved to the temporary storage facility. With the materials moved, the shelving was able to be broken down and moved to the storage facility as well, and the floor was clear for an additional company to bring in and assemble new furniture to accommodate much more study space for students to utilize. The level four renovation project was not only a resounding success, but it also highlighted a larger problem for the Thomas Cooper Library; the print collection had simply become too large.

The Print Issue

Once the level four renovation project was completed, the Collection Assessment Librarian began investigating the broader print collection of the Thomas Cooper Library and the holdings that reside at Library Annex, the official, climate-controlled, off-campus storage facility for University Libraries. It was discovered that the shelves of Thomas Cooper Library were so full that even simple shifting projects were difficult to complete and that newly acquired print materials were often had to be squeezed into their place on the shelves and many volumes could be found stacked on top of other volumes rather than in its proper place on its assigned shelf. To compound this problem, the Library Annex was also 85% full at the time and was not able to absorb large numbers of volumes that would ease some of the shelf space in Thomas Cooper Library. Therefore, University Libraries had to lease a temporary storage facility for the level four materials, rather than just send those to the
Library Annex. Additionally, circulation statistics revealed a steady decline in print check outs during the previous three years. There was a 25% decrease from 2019 to 2020 and then 72% decrease from 2020 to 2021, though that dramatic decrease was due to the COVID-19 pandemic when print check outs were greatly restricted. All this information, coupled with the discovery that University Libraries had never performed a comprehensive assessment of the print collection, inspired the Collection Assessment Librarian to coordinate several projects to assess portions of the print collection and to determine further future projects, all of which were designed to help reduce the print footprint of the Thomas Cooper Library and the Library Annex. These projects included analyzing digital coverage of print holdings, reviewing current print periodical subscriptions and standing orders, and setting into motion methodologies for ongoing print assessments.

Perpetual Digital Access for Print Periodicals

The first project to help ease the print footprint was to assess the print holdings of journals for which University Libraries had purchased perpetual digital access for. These were found by way of JSTOR collections and digital backfiles from the publishers Sage and Elsevier. The Collection Assessment Librarian compiled spreadsheets of titles available in the JSTOR Arts and Sciences I –VII collections as well as the Business III and Life Sciences Collection that had all been previously purchased by University Libraries. These electronic holdings were then checked against physical holdings that were identified by searching Alma, the current ILS for University Libraries. Of the 1,223 titles that were available via the JSTOR purchases, 503 of those titles were held in physical format. In collaboration with Acquisitions staff and the manager of the Library Annex, data needs were established as well
as a workflow that allowed for the withdrawal of 20,686 print volumes from the Annex and 12,755 volumes from Thomas Cooper Library. A similar methodology was applied to withdrawing print holdings of the titles provided by purchases of Sage and Elsevier backfiles as well. The main difference with this endeavor is that the Collection Assessment Librarian was able to get the titles within the backfile purchases directly from Alma. Though ongoing, 5,567 print volumes covered by Sage have been identified for withdrawal and an additional 7,921 volumes covered by Elsevier will be withdrawn. In all total, 46,929 print journal volumes have been identified for withdrawal. This will significantly help in freeing up shelf space for both the Library Annex and the Thomas Cooper Library. This work also helped to establish methodologies for similar work to be performed in the future.

Current Print Subscription Assessment

The next project that was developed to help ease the print footprint was to review University Libraries’ current print subscriptions and print standing orders. This assessment project required collaboration with all library liaisons to create criteria for making cancellation or renewal decisions. The methodology for this task included gathering subscribed print titles that are managed for University Libraries by EBSCONet and Harrosowitz, gathering circulation, cost, and holdings data from Alma, and creating subject-specific lists of titles that could be shared with liaisons. Nineteen lists were created and were used in collaboration with subject liaisons to make decisions to cancel, keep, or switch to an online-only format for all print serials that were reviewed.

Criteria for making decisions on print subscriptions considered current cost, any online coverage via publishers or database aggregators, and historic print usage data. Appended image Figure 1 provides a sample of the spreadsheet used to document the data.
gathered according to these established criteria. Working with liaisons on this endeavor for calendar years 2020 and 2021 resulted in the cancellation of 357 print periodical subscriptions which not only cut down on the amount of print that University Libraries receives but also removed $67,169.25 of subscription cost from the Collections budget.

Beginning in the spring of 2021, and in collaboration with library liaisons, the Collection Assessment Librarian began a review of all standing orders that University Libraries receives. As of October 2021, 377 monograph standing orders and 393 serial standing orders had been reviewed. The process of making final decisions in conjunction with library liaisons was still ongoing, but it was apparent that a significant number of cancellations will be made within each standing order category. This constitutes the first formal review of standing orders at University Libraries and, much like the print serial reviews, will help ease the amount of print that the library absorbs and will further ease the financial commitment to print serial publications.

**Conclusion**

The benefits of the work highlighted will have a significant impact on reducing the print footprint, both currently and in the future for University Libraries which will have a positive effect on off-campus storage facilities and within the main undergraduate library. These projects have established methodologies and workflows that will allow for regular reviews of print materials. These efforts have also helped to reduce annual spend on print materials, freeing up funds that can be rededicated to electronic resources. These processes have also informed University Libraries on some important future activities that can help with managing their very large print collection. These activities include continuing regular reviews of standing order and print subscriptions, expanding categories of
review to include print plus online subscriptions, and to create criteria for ongoing monograph and serial weeding efforts. Another endeavor that University Libraries would benefit from would be to communicate this type of work and its benefit to stakeholders outside University Libraries, such as university faculty, administrators, and students. Communication of this type of work would help to highlight University Libraries’ ongoing efforts to responsibly manage their collections and their collection budget.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title Name</th>
<th>Alternative Formats</th>
<th>Renewal Total</th>
<th>Online Only Price</th>
<th>Current Online Coverage</th>
<th>Call Number</th>
<th>Number of Loans</th>
<th>In House Use</th>
<th>Last Loan Date</th>
<th>Last in House Use Date</th>
<th>Notes/Decision</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Estudios de Lingüística Apliquéza</td>
<td>Online</td>
<td>$176.70</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>P 1, A2 G5</td>
<td>P 121, S458</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2/27/2020</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southern Journal of Linguistics</td>
<td>Online</td>
<td>$61.18</td>
<td>EBSCO, 2010-present</td>
<td>P 9, 479</td>
<td>P 121, S458</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2/27/2020</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revista Espanola de Lingüísticas</td>
<td>Online</td>
<td>$54.24</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>P 3, 470</td>
<td>P 121, S458</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>2/27/2020</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Museum Helvetica</td>
<td>Online</td>
<td>$163.61</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>P 121, S458</td>
<td>P 121, S458</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>2/27/2020</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Modern Language Studies</td>
<td>Print + Online, Online</td>
<td>$79.60</td>
<td>JSTOR, 1971-4 yr FT delay</td>
<td>P 121, S458</td>
<td>P 121, S458</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>2/27/2020</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revue de Linguistique Romane</td>
<td>Print + Online, Online</td>
<td>$174.64</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Project Muse, 2010-present</td>
<td>P 121, S458</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>2/27/2020</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>French Review</td>
<td>Print + Online, Online</td>
<td>$48.52</td>
<td>$85.00 delay</td>
<td>Project Muse, 2010-present</td>
<td>P 121, S458</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>2/27/2020</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Journal of Teaching Writing</td>
<td>Print + Online, Online</td>
<td>$48.86</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Project Muse, 2010-present</td>
<td>P 121, S458</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>2/27/2020</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Muttersprache</td>
<td>Online</td>
<td>$124.69</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Project Muse, 2010-present</td>
<td>P 121, S458</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>2/27/2020</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Adaptive Cruise Control

*Developing Digital Initiatives Throughout Changing Times*

SCOTT D. BACON

**Introduction**

Coastal Carolina University’s digital initiatives have expanded during the past several years into a full-fledged suite of initiatives with only one full-time librarian at the wheel. How do we not only maintain but expand services as we work to fill key staff positions? This paper will outline how Kimbel Library manages multiple digital initiatives such as the digital repository, journal publishing, conference planning, digital collections, archiving, and digital preservation. The paper will also describe how the library has adapted through reorganization by merging our information technology and systems department with our technical services department. This merger has already allowed us to identify and eliminate duplication of labor while seeking more efficient workflows to accomplish our goals. The paper ends with suggestions for how to manage multiple digital initiatives with limited staffing.

**Background**

As Coordinator of Digital Initiatives at Kimbel Library at Coastal Carolina University, I am responsible for many of the library’s digital initiatives. Maintaining multiple concurrent initiatives is difficult,
but even more so when an institution is dealing with limited staffing.

This paper is based on a presentation that used the metaphor of adaptive cruise control to explain how to balance the need of keeping multiple concurrent digital initiatives running while endeavoring to keep them up to date and useful to our constituents while not having to use much high-touch or manual maintenance or administration. There is no “set it and forget it” solution to this issue as there may be with cruise control, but there are several helpful ways you can mitigate potential issues through strategic planning and organization. Strategic scheduling is a key factor in keeping multiple projects in some state of concurrent growth. If projects are thought of as being set on “cruising speed” for a time, or as being “lightly maintained,” an institution can keep multiple digital initiatives running throughout the year without letting them fall into disrepair or neglect.

The University and Library

Coastal Carolina University is in Conway, South Carolina, about eleven miles inland from Myrtle Beach. CCU is a midsize M1 institution with an enrollment of nearly 10,000 students. As of fall 2021, the library has eight faculty employees and seventeen staff employees. This staffing is on the lower end of the scale regarding total library faculty and staff among our university’s self-selected peer institutions. Also, all of CCU’s peer institutions have multiple positions dedicated to coordinating the digital initiatives I will discuss in this paper, so our institution looks forward to the time when we can hire more staff members to further increase our reach in the digital initiatives space.
Digital Initiatives

For those with multiple positions assigned to managing digital initiatives, imagining downsizing to only one or two positions is a scary thought. Maintaining previous production would likely not be possible, so a ramping-down of services would need to occur. This is an important thought to keep in mind as we determine how to engage with our initiatives just enough to keep them highly performing in the interim between the hiring of digital initiatives staff.

Our digital initiatives operations are affected by minimal staffing in that we currently have one full-time library faculty member devoted to digital initiatives. We also have about a third of another staff member's time devoted to community digital collections. We are planning to hire several key positions in the near future, which will greatly impact the growth of our service offerings.

As Coordinator of Digital Initiatives, I am currently responsible for the following initiatives. I will briefly introduce each one and then go into more detail to describe how I manage them with limited staffing.

CCU Digital Commons

CCU Digital Commons is our university’s institutional repository. The repository was purchased using grant funding from our institution for projects related to student achievement and success. Therefore, the repository contains mostly student scholarship at this point. Plans for faculty programming and outreach are ongoing; these duties would constitute a large part of the work of a future Digital Initiatives Librarian position. This is one case where we have spent a fair amount of time in getting the repository up and running but now have to move to other initiatives to keep them all in some state of useful production.
Kimbel Library produces two kinds of digital collections: (1) those involving items of historical importance to the university; (2) those involving items of historical importance to the City of Conway, Horry County, and the surrounding region. The former collections are mostly contained either in campus spaces or in the University Archives collections. The latter are the purview of our local history expert, the director of the Horry County Archives Center. This partnership allows the university to be one of the centralized collectors of archives and special collections materials in the county and also leads to a plethora of digital collections materials that can be uploaded to CCU Digital Commons. I initially handled all of the technical details of the collections, from systems administration and configuration to metadata to digital file processing. But recently I have been able to share more of the technological tasks with the archives center director thanks to his increased experience working on projects, and thanks to our regular digitization working group meetings, where we plan projects and strategize about how to complete them most efficiently.

This work describes the approximately one-third of the director’s time noted above that is devoted to digital initiatives. The director position is not under the control of the digital initiatives area yet is critical in helping us obtain local history materials that we may have never gained access to due to the trust established between the center director and local citizens. These materials also become digital collections such as photographic collections and community oral histories. As I help him with the systems and technological aspects of local collections, the director helps me with obtaining release forms and with many other modes of communication with locals. Likewise, he helps me with some processing of university archival materials, so it is a lucrative partnership that helps the university maintain its presence in the area as an important resource to local history.
Journal Publishing

CCU Digital Commons uses the Digital Commons system, which can manage the entire cycle of online journal publishing. The system can handle article submissions, the double-blind peer review process, and eventual hosting of published articles and issues. I now publish two journals regularly on CCU Digital Commons: *The Journal of Political Science*, the official journal of the South Carolina Political Science Association; and *BRIDGES: A Journal of Student Research*, which is devoted to the annual publication of outstanding selected articles from undergraduate CCU students. And I am currently planning to go live with our third journal, the *Coastal Business Journal*, which is an international peer-reviewed journal published by our Wall College of Business.

Conference Planning

The Digital Commons system also can manage many conference needs: presentation and paper submissions, the double-blind peer review process, hosting of the conference schedule during the conference, and hosting of published conference sessions, proceedings, and other digital materials afterwards. We host several conferences on the IR, including the International Gullah Geechee and African Diaspora Conference, The South Carolina Conference on Innovations in Teaching and Learning, and the Undergraduate Research Competition, our annual showcase of undergraduate student scholarship.

Digital Preservation

The Kimbel Library Digital Preservation Program has as its goal the preservation of items of interest to the university and the surrounding community. The program currently consists of hosting
our digital items on redundant cloud storage, along with a separate mechanism for hosting items locally on distributed hard drives. We currently have several terabytes of master files, but we hope to develop this program to include storage of digital materials that are currently stored externally to the library. CCU administrators understand the importance of preserving and providing access to items of interest to the history of CCU and Horry County and have set aside funding to enable this program's growth.

Data Management Services

Early in 2020 a faculty member requested data management services from the library. I quickly got a working group together to create policies and procedures for data management that Kimbel Library could then promote to other faculty members. I developed our services based on a bespoke research data life cycle model. We then divided the management of each of the services based on best departmental fit. I am in the process of adding Shibboleth authentication to the DMPTool service, a service of the California Digital Library, that allows institutions to create templates that enable researchers to quickly fill out Data Management Plans with institution-specific information preloaded. We now have a strong infrastructure that enables us to conduct best practices in data management services to our faculty members.

Strategies and Planning

So how do we accomplish all of the above with limited staffing? I now will list several approaches that I use to maintain our digital initiatives.

Our institution identified one system, bepress Digital Commons, to host multiple initiatives. Before we moved to Digital Commons,
we had purchased the Islandora system, hosted by Lyrasis, for our digital collections. This involved extensive configuration and troubleshooting, which was mitigated somewhat by our move to Digital Commons. We saw the increased amount of work that was necessary in order to run two different systems, so we are pleased with the consolidation of our institutional scholarship and digital collections programs onto one platform. We now save time with configuring, administration, support, vendor relations, and new product development. Moving to this particular system also allowed us to expand our service offerings into journal publishing and conference hosting.

Consolidating initiatives can result in some unexpected consequences. Many libraries use digital asset management systems such as CONTENTdm or Omeka to showcase digital collections. We now have all of our digital collections on CCU Digital Commons. Moving to Digital Commons for our digital collections caused us to lose control over some aspects of system configuration, which can extend the timeline of projects in the back-and-forth communications between the institution and the systems support team. The interface for digital collections is also outdated relative to Islandora, making for a less than stellar browsing experience for digital collections users. But I have been participating in the Digital Commons Exhibit Solution testing group, where bepress works with user groups to come up with a solution to the outdated look and feel of the repository's digital collections interfaces. Hopefully these issues will be lessened as the exhibit solution becomes more functional. If you can use one system to host institutional scholarship, digital collections, conference hosting, and journal hosting, I recommend this system, especially for smaller libraries with minimal staffing.

One recommendation that saved time and money was moving from the running of open-source systems at the institution to outsourcing those systems to a software host or vendor. Relying on vendors can save a great deal of time in configuration, implementation, and server maintenance and administration.
Smaller institutions end up paying hosting subscription funds so that they do not have to hire a position, such as a systems analyst, who would need the skill set to run an open-source system from top to bottom. My proposal for implementing an institutional repository at CCU had Digital Commons as the top choice for the reasons stated above, but DSpace was a second potential option I considered recommending. Choosing DSpace would have necessitated that our institution hire a systems analyst to run the system, maintain the server, run updates, contribute to or create plugins, and periodically perform migrations to new versions. So for smaller libraries with minimal staffing, I recommend opting for third-party hosting of systems instead of running open-source systems at their institution, at least as an interim solution until staffing issues can be resolved.

Strategic scheduling of projects allows me, by way of a series of work periods, to devote intensive time to one project and then to move onto the next project. Strong planning, and following best practices, minimizes having to reinvent the wheel each time you delve into another project. For example, after I go live with a journal, I can move directly to processing an oral history collection because initial preparation allowed me to have set metadata schema for each project and to follow available best practices. Thus, I can follow a script of sorts to push the project quickly through to completion with minimal time spent on each one. The trick is to learn how to move quickly across multiple types of initiatives, all with competing timelines, functional and technical needs, routines, and outcomes.

Another event that has aided me in running several digital initiatives with minimal staffing is the merger of my former department with another library department. This created a more streamlined and focused department that includes technology and collections staff. The merger helps us minimize duplication of effort. We can now exchange tasks that are better suited to other departmental members, and we can then assign new duties to fill in gaps. We have been holding biweekly meetings to look for points of synergy between the newly merged department’s staff members.
This merger allows us to hire candidates who can hit the ground running, as we continually communicate about impending collections management and archivist hires. It allows me to increase my focus on the development of our digital collections and allows us to begin to scale our services as we save time by reorganizing key duties.

A very important concept in project management is knowing when to say “No” to new projects. You have to know your limits to ensure you can be successful in accomplishing tasks with a large amount of work in the queue. I like to frame this concept more as “Not yet” rather than “No.” It is important to me to at least have one meeting about a potential project, even if it’s to say “Not yet.” This keeps your potential collaborators informed as to what you can provide when time permits and keeps them interested as potential future partners. Saying “Not yet” can be detrimental, however. Sometimes there are opportunities to create lucrative partnerships that are based on a limited window of time. Situations like these need to be dealt with on a case-by-case basis. Sometimes you serve the institution and your constituents better by declining a project than by saying yes if it is the case that you cannot fully support the project under discussion.

Strong budget planning is critical to the success of managing multiple concurrent projects. Our library administration works hard to ensure that we have budgeting for our digital initiatives, and we have included select initiatives as part of our library assessment plan to ensure that the budget items remain as a priority to our unit when necessary. Collaborations, partnerships, and other potential fundraising opportunities can contribute to the advancement of some projects that require funding external to the library.

To wrap up this discussion of strategies and planning, remember to do the best with what you have. I do not recommend having one or two staff positions responsible for all digital initiatives if it can be helped. But do what you have to do in the interim between now and when you can hire new positions. It is also crucial to do the best with what you may get in terms of planning. Our library has two
major building projects coming soon, which will expand our services even further. It is important to plan ahead and to communicate throughout the organization to determine how to best offer services to your community.

**Considerations**

Now that we can see some strategies and plans that help in managing multiple initiatives, I have a few final considerations that can help libraries implement a strong digital initiatives program.

**Fluid Position Descriptions**

I was first hired at CCU as a Web Services and Emerging Technologies Librarian. Library administration has been flexible in allowing my position description to be relatively fluid, based on my interests and on the library’s needs as they shift through the years. My move to digital initiatives coordination would not have been possible without migrating some of my former tasks to others in the library.

**Everyone as a Content Provider**

It is very important to support the growth of all library faculty and staff into content provider roles. Encourage them to be content creators, to be administrators of their own systems to whatever extent they can handle. We have had success with this form of distribution of duties with our Springshare products, coordination of our social media platforms, marketing and outreach, and webpage content curation. Training is a key factor to success with
this type of administration. I have found that technology is less scary to staff the more they interact with the systems.

Hiring the Right People

This seems obvious, but often a candidate search ultimately does not turn up the right candidate. In cases such as these, I recommend closing the search and beginning another one to see if a more lucrative candidate pool materializes. I have even experienced failed searches that resulted in the revision of position descriptions. Sometimes candidates are not right for the job, sometimes the job itself needs to be rethought. And in my experience, hiring staff with little experience is okay if they are willing to learn new things. It is important to have ambitious and dedicated staff who are eager to make your initiatives better.

Standards

I want to emphasize that you should spend crucial time early in any digital initiatives project in choosing and then adhering to standards and best practices, and in developing workflows specific to each project's needs. Doing this important work early in the project will save you much time in avoiding future management issues.

Vendor Relations

When contemplating entering into a business relationship with a vendor, ensure you have what you need from them. Documentation can help you to understand what you are getting into. That documentation probably did not exist until a user needed it, so that type of document will be illuminating to browse to see what others have had issues with. Also, you may not always be able to
talk a colleague through a task and may have to refer them to the vendor documentation, so it is helpful to have solid documentation that is easy to read and understand. I also suggest that you pay for the proper tier of dedicated support, which is largely dependent on available staff time and the technical prowess of your staff.

Key Collaborators

The Horry County Archives Center is a partnership between the university and local community. I work closely with the director, who is like a historian and county archivist. He has gained the trust of the community through decades of work with individuals and groups. This is not someone who is easily replaceable, so relationships with key collaborators like these must be carefully cultivated. To continue this collaborative approach in the interim between hiring of a new archivist, I have been appointed to the Coastal Educational Foundation Ad Hoc Committee on Archives. This collaboration consists of monthly meetings with locals and foundation board members who are extremely interested in the success of the university and are dedicated to helping in any way they can. The foundation can work with us if we need funding for specific projects, so this is another important collaboration to cultivate. One of the members of this group is a former archives staff member from our institution, so she helps me to fill in gaps in archival and special collections management until we can hire an archivist. In another case of “Not Yet,” we have several University Archives initiatives waiting in the wings that we occasionally meet about, if only to keep the conversation fresh in people’s minds in the interim between hiring an archivist.

Small Teams

One of the reasons we get a lot done at Kimbel Library is because
our administration trusts us to do the work without a lot of interference. Many of us have worked at places where you need to have a meeting to see whether to have a meeting, which usually results in a lot of wasted time. An important working group for our purposes is the Preservation and Digitization Working Group. The team is small, composed of just the director of the Horry County Archives Center and me. This small team structure allows us an increased amount of control over decision-making and also increases our rate of production. You should consider carefully the structure of your teams and keep them small if possible.

Planning for the Short-Term with an Eye on the Long-Term

Kimbel Library has the same system for our scholarship and digital collections for now. But when we have the opportunity again for new hires, we can potentially support a separate system for digital collections again. The key factor in managing multiple digital initiatives is to be flexible in the fallow times, but to never stop planning, keeping an eye to future possibilities for growth and cultivation.

Ask for Help!

Don’t be afraid to ask others for help in bringing your projects to fruition. We used to have an archival staff member who would go around campus collecting items of interest such as pamphlets, magazines, and flyers. We are now asking stakeholders to be mindful of sending the library any items that may be of interest to the history of CCU. We are working towards mandating that unit heads have the responsibility of preserving items such as these. Campus collaborators can contribute to the library’s success by adding tasks to their routines that benefit the library and save library staff time.
Conclusion

Management of multiple digital initiatives at smaller institutions with limited staffing is indeed possible. Library managers should remember to be flexible with their staff. They should ensure that assessment practices are designed to work for their institution's specific circumstances. They should trust their staff and be there for them when they identify the need for more funding and for staff of their own. Help staff members by distributing time-intensive tasks throughout the group, which will allow staff to focus on being more broadly productive.

Our institution is currently putting these practices to good use. And we are in the process of hiring several positions that will be influential parts of our growing suite of digital initiatives services. The future looks bright. We are keeping our initiatives at cruising speed in the interim between now and when our new staff arrive, which will allow staff to hit the ground running. They will be able to scale up our digital initiatives from their current tightly controlled schedules to help each initiative reach its full potential.
This was the text of my public debate with Kevin Smith held during the Charleston Conference 2021 in the session titled Hyde Park Debate: Copyright and the Public Good.

Against:

U.S. copyright law no longer meets its fundamental purpose to serve the public good.

Hello and thank you for being here today. I think I have the easier job because I’m guessing that most of you agreed with the statement that “US copyright law no longer meets its fundamental purpose to serve the public good.” I mean, you’ve heard of the Copyright Term Extension Act and you have probably heard of the Disney Company, so who wouldn’t be against the current version of U.S. copyright law? Not to mention the small claims court that is on the horizon as well as the myriad copyright troll horror stories.

Thus, my job is to convince you that copyright law does still serve its fundamental purpose to serve the public good—specifically by balancing the rights of authors against the opposing rights of the general public as well as rights of specific groups, such as librarians and educators. And, who serves the public good more than librarians and educators—right?

So, I am up for the challenge.

To be clear: I’m a copyright librarian. A lawbrarian, if you will. I
get to engage with U.S. copyright law every single day at my job in the interest of the library, librarians, and my patrons—faculty and staff of the University of Illinois. And, as you know, copyright law in the United States goes a long way to help libraries and educational institutions. In fact, we are the envy of much of the world with the amount of exceptions we have built in to copyright law—with the exception, maybe of Singapore, where they have a law that does not allow libraries to waive any of their rights by contract—which I do wish our copyright law had.

But, barring Singapore—which I will return to later—we are the envy of the world. While I do agree that copyright law lasts too long—to be clear, I, too, am unhappy about the Copyright Term Extension Act and wish copyright law did not last for 70 years after the death of the author—I think the long length of copyright is balanced out by the many ways that the public can make use of copyrighted works during the copyright term. How? All of the following exceptions to copyright law built into the law:

- Section 107—the fair use limitation on the rights of authors
- Section 108—the exceptions and limitations for preservation, copying, and interlibrary loan for libraries and archives
- Section 109—the first sale or exhaustion doctrine
- Section 110—face-to-face and online teaching exceptions
- Section 504(c)(2) provides limitations on damages for good faith fair use determinations by employees of nonprofit libraries and archives

And more! Let me dive into just a few of these provisions to give you a better idea of why I think U.S. copyright law is still meeting its purpose of serving the public good.

Let’s begin with Section 108, which provides specific exceptions to copyright law for libraries and archives to make copies of copyright-protected works for preservation and for patron use. Although Section 108 is not perfect, in that unnecessarily limits the number of copies librarians can make and it does not include museums in the provisions, it is also a lifesaver for libraries and archives on a daily basis. If you search in case law to see how
many published opinions exist under Section 108—or how many times libraries have been successfully sued in court—you get the satisfying answer that there are still only two decisions, and neither found liability for a library/archive for making copies. Not only that, but Section 108 is a model law for other countries, such as those in South America, which have no similar exceptions to their copyright laws for libraries and archives. One final thing to note about Section 108 is that it explicitly states that nothing in the section prevents libraries or archives from relying on fair use. In other words, where Section 108 ends, fair use begins. As such, some of the flaws of Section 108—such as the limit of making three copies for preservation, are cured by the ability to rely on fair use.

And, since I’ve already mentioned fair use, let’s consider whether fair use is working for libraries and archives. We need to look no further than the HathiTrust decision to see that fair use is working for libraries and archives. Libraries are empowered under the HathiTrust decision to make copies of entire books to allow for text searching and access to print for disabled patrons. In fact, in that opinion, the court said “the creation of a full-text searchable database is a quintessentially transformative use.” Libraries like the Georgetown University Law Library have been relying on fair use to also provide controlled digital lending for quite some time.

All of this is only further bolstered by the Creative Commons, which utilizes author's rights through licensing to balance out the public good. Creative Commons licenses permit an author to immediately designate an in-copyright work as part of the public domain or to permit others to use the work with minimal limitations—such as by attributing the author of the work.

Starting back in 2001, Creative Commons has worked to make intellectual property and copyright laws better serve the public good – drafting full legal licenses that allow authors and creators to share their work with the public and supporting efforts to port these licenses for countries around the world.[1] Creative Commons licenses are not “anti-copyright” but rather work with copyright laws to allow creators “to offer certain usage
rights to the public, while reserving other rights. Without copyright, these tools don’t work.”[2] So, destroy copyright and you destroy fair use, Creative Commons licenses, Section 108 exceptions for libraries and archives and all of the great balancing tools that are built into the Copyright Act as it currently stands.

Why don’t we just change copyright law to make it better, you ask? Well, that is one way to better serve the public good. The issue with trying to change the Copyright Act is that recent proposals for change, including the new small claims copyright court, are not furthering the public good but instead making the system better for big publishers. And, if you read some of the proposed amendments coming from Senator Tillis, you will see how much he wants to destroy the perfect balance we currently have in the Copyright Act by adding permanent take-down provisions to the notice and take-down sections of the Act, for example. And one need look no farther than the TEACH Act provisions to see how our legislature can get together to ruin an otherwise good thing. The TEACH Act provisions are so difficult to manage that most Universities, including my own, would simply prefer to rely on fair use for online teaching materials.

I would argue that the thing that is troubling us most today is not the Copyright Act, but rather contract law. Why do I say this? Well, look at the pending legislation on the East Coast which would require e-book contracts to public libraries to be “reasonable” in price. What we’ve lost is the ability to do many of the things that copyright law provides, such as exercise fair use, engage in inter-library loan, and more due to terrible licensing agreements. So, instead of scrapping copyright law altogether, what we really need is what Singapore already has: no way to breach our exceptions through contract.

What we really need is a provision in our copyright law stating that libraries and archives and museums cannot license away our copyright rights—such as fair use. That would go a long way to fixing what is broken—which is not the Copyright Act itself, but rather abusive licensing practices by big publishing companies. However, because of legislators like Senator Tillis, as I said earlier, I am very
wary of proposing any changes to the Copyright Act at the moment. Even my Senator, Senator Durbin, who is usually quite progressive, wholeheartedly supported the CASE Act, establishing a small claims court for copyright liability. In essence, I do not trust our legislators to modify the Copyright Act in helpful ways at the moment—at least not at the federal level. I think the State fights about e-book licensing are moving the conversation in the right direction and, as such, we should likely try to leave the Copyright Act, which has a unique set of exceptions and limitations balancing the rights of authors against the public good, alone—at least for now.

Rebuttal

I admire Kevin’s foray into the historical nature of copyright and I, too, have struggled to find who owns the copyright of an orphaned work, but I do not think that his arguments about copyright are strong enough to destroy the entire system which has lasted since, in Kevin’s own words, the seventeenth century. And, as a sidenote, often when dealing with an orphan work I rely on fair use to share the work, as do many of my colleagues engaged in controlled digital lending practices.

My response to his points about the supposed failure of copyright to protect both the interests of the authors and the general public is to ask: if not copyright, then what? Would he propose to have simply a world full of licenses? Because, of course, copyright would not be irreplaceable, but rather would be replaced by another legal regime—that of contract law. (A sidenote here is to point out that typographical fonts are not copyrightable, but, as we all know, are subject to licenses.)

I applaud the creators and authors who produce creative works with no expectation of remuneration. But, I think we can all agree that a world without the TV Series “Stranger Things” would be a sad world, indeed, and those particular creators were definitely
incentivized by the ability to make a profit (I say this as my daughter is currently shopping for Halloween costumes to look like the character Robin wearing a Scoops Ahoy outfit).

As I noted earlier, the world of licensing is already problematic, but take away copyright exceptions and fair use and it would become disastrous. Publishers would have no incentive to print physical books at all when they could be copied at will without repercussion. When I look into a crystal ball to predict a future with no copyright what I see is a world full of digital books with restrictive licensing and no print books at all. In addition, digital rights management would become even more stringent because if those protective measures were broken the publisher or author would own absolutely nothing—so their incentive to share their works with the world would be diminished absent ultra-protective DRM measures.

In other words, what Kevin sees as a utopia looks more like a dystopian nightmare to me.

My utopia would be a world where academic journals all flip to open access, librarians are unable to waive copyright exceptions and fair use through contracts, controlled digital lending becomes the norm, and more and more professors are incentivized through grant programs to create and adopt open educational resources. The more we use the copyright exceptions, fair use, and open access tools we’ve already got at our disposal, the closer we will come to a balanced copyright system that adequately accounts for both the rights of authors as well as the public good.

Thank you.


Introduction

Dear Reader,

We invite you to pause and think about digital preservation, particularly if you feel this is a solved problem for books and journals. As we will explain, 42,700 journal titles indexed by DOAJ and/or CrossRef are not preserved.

The truth is that there remain so many strategic challenges if academics of the future are to be ensured access to the scholarly record.

Each year the Digital Preservation Coalition publishes a list of “digitally endangered species” called the BitList. This crowdsourced exercise is to identify information at risk. Published research information is listed as a vulnerable species. This signals that formal research outputs are at risk of extinction without good preservation practices (www.dpconline.org/digipres/champion-digital-
In this paper, we shine a light on some key challenges. It's a paper that captures a conversation during the 2021 Charleston conference between four experts. Denis Galvin presented from the perspective of an Assistant University Librarian for IT and technical services. Vida Damijonaitis presented from the perspective of a scholarly publisher with a long history and commitment to archiving. Gaëlle Béquet presented from her unique international viewpoint at the ISSN International Agency. Alicia Wise, the Executive Director of CLOCKSS, facilitated the strategic discussion.

The Perspective of an Assistant University Librarian

I'm Denis Galvin, AUL for IT and technical services at Rice University. I'm not the head of digital scholarship services, which takes care of our IR and our dark archive. Nor am I the head of special collections, which creates and manages our digital assets. So, if there are questions in those areas, they are not something I can answer. My role has historically been operational, and that's somewhat true regarding digital archiving.

I've worked on digital archiving projects at different levels, from collecting digital assets and storing them to migrating projects across servers. I've been at the library at Rice for about seventeen years, and I have worked on numerous digital archiving projects during that time.

I think it's important to talk about Rice University. We're a research university. We're a top-twenty ARL library, and I would describe us as having access to good resources, maybe fantastic resources. I went to a small private college in Vermont at one point in my life. They had the exact needs of Rice University in terms of digital archiving, but they did not have access to the same
resources. It’s actually since closed, and I would bet that anything they had in digital assets is probably complicated to find.

What is digital preservation? It is managed, it is continuous, and it’s probably distributed. It’s worthy to note that there are no specific approaches on which digital preservation strategy to implement or how to implement it. Digital preservation is likely to adopt different models based on the assets involved and the available resources.

Rice has been a member of LOCKSS for fifteen years, and I have worked on that project the entire time it has been at Rice. When we first started using LOCKSS, it was released as a distribution on a CD, which would install LOCKSS along with Linux. The history of the project has been one of an ever-increasing need for storage. The initial PC that LOCKSS was installed on quickly filled up with data. We moved the project to a server, and it didn’t take long before it also filled up with data. We bought an external hard drive which also filled up with data. We purchased another server, and it is currently full. The latest iteration of our LOCKSS server will be about seventy terabytes, and that is probably a little bit small.

Rice is an active supporter of CLOCKSS, and we are founding members of the network. We run both a node and an ingest server. The node is an archival server in the CLOCKSS network, and the ingest server pulls content in from publishers. The digital assets in our local systems and the holdings in CLOCKSS are different in how they are preserved. Locally we maintain content created by our academic community. CLOCKSS contains content licensed by publishers, so we're better off partnering with those publishers to preserve the content. The content kept in CLOCKSS is mirrored at twelve major academic institutions worldwide, and the preservation of this content uses a well-managed digital archiving scheme. This form of archiving is resistant to threats from potential technological, economic, and political failures.

As far as digital assets, Rice has an Institutional Repository, Dspace, that has six terabytes of data, and we have a dark archive. The dark archive is not readily available to the public. The servers
for these systems are located in a cluster-based storage array in our data center. The assets on the servers would be wiped out if something happened to the data center, like a tornado or a hurricane. We have regular backups for business continuity, but that is not digital archiving. We recently lost access to our high-density storage server during a systems patch, and we immediately replaced it without anyone noticing because we take good backups. However, the local copy would not be recoverable if we had a major disaster. We also push backups off to Amazon Web Services (AWS) and Amazon Glacier. We use the same backup scheme for our digital assets in the IR, but we also do twice yearly pushes to DuraSpace. These copies need to be in separate geographic locations from a strategic perspective. Our digital preservation strategy can be summed up as: different assets, different resources, different strategies.

The Perspective of a Scholarly Publisher

My name is Vida Damijonaitis and I am the Director of Worldwide Sales for the JAMA Network. The JAMA Network is the journal publishing arm for the American Medical Association. The AMA was established in 1847 with very specific goals of scientific advancement, creating standards for medical education, launching a program of medical ethics, and improving public health.

After 174 years of existence and hundreds and hundreds of projects, the AMA has its own deep culture of archiving and preservation. Physically we maintain over ninety historical collections that include photographs, film documents, artifacts, and other memorabilia. If you ever came to the AMA for a meeting and walked around all of our conference rooms, you would find many old medical devices on display that are both fascinating and horrifying. They really show how far medical science has come.

We maintain digital archives of documents going back to 1847.
These contain information about various meetings, past policies and positions, speeches, and other information.

The JAMA Network is a collection of thirteen journals. JAMA is our flagship title. We publish eight specialty hybrid journals and two fully open-access journals, JAMA Network Open and JAMA Health Forum.

In the mid-2000s, JAMA, like many other publishers at that time, started a project to look at digitizing our back files back to volume one, issue one.

As I was preparing for this panel discussion it really struck me how much these digitization projects changed how our industry viewed digital preservation in general. Almost all publishers had their own websites, which meant we started getting much better at creating digital assets. However, those digital assets started at a specific point in time and went forward.

Entities like CLOCKSS and Portico were coming into existence, and slowly publishers were beginning to start working with these entities and depositing content as it was published for long-term preservation.

At the time most of our archives were still in print. The AMA has always maintained at least a single print copy of every issue published in its own archive, and we were very dependent on libraries around the world for maintaining print copies in their collections. Over time, a problem started to emerge. As old content was sent to remote storage facilities in order to make room for new content, it became inaccessible to end-users. We were confident that our content would be preserved in many institutions around the world in perpetuity; however, people could not easily see the content. The backfiles digitization projects taken on by publishers at the time changed that. Not only were publishers able to make thousands of years of cumulative content available to customers, but we were also able to start depositing this backfile content into long-term preservation services to really ensure that that content would remain easily accessible in the future, regardless of what happened to our journals.
Today, everyone looks at preservation very differently. Any publisher that currently works with institutional customers knows that institutions licensing publisher content very often require long-term preservation for anything their libraries pay for. Open access is obviously growing quickly in our industry, and many funder mandates are also requiring robust long-term preservation of research articles.

One thing I really want to stress to everyone: open access does not equal preservation. Just because content is published on an open-access basis does not mean that content is going to be available to the public in ten years, much less in 100 years. If a publisher cannot financially maintain its publishing operations or maintain their electronic platforms, the content is vulnerable unless they’ve made arrangements to make sure that content is preserved long term with third-party archives. That content could disappear any day.

The JAMA Network joined CLOCKSS in 2006 and we were one of the early adopters of CLOCKSS. While we certainly did not expect it at that time we joined, we underwent a very large transition of our electronic platform in 2012. That meant a complete redesign of both the front and back end of all of our journals. It was financially unfeasible for us to transition some journals that had been out of print for a very long time to our new platform. Upon our request, CLOCKSS triggered the release of Archives of Family Medicine and JAMA Français and made this content digitally available to everyone in perpetuity. I’m both happy and sad to say the content is relatively heavily accessed through CLOCKSS.

A year and a half ago, we would never have expected that a pandemic would keep many of us working from home indefinitely; however, it has demonstrated that we have to expect the unexpected. As a publisher, we have to accept that our journals may not exist in perpetuity and working with a long-term archiving service to secure our content is part of our responsibility.

No one really knows what’s going to happen in the future, and as a former Girl Scout I really want to send a message to my fellow
publishers. Always be prepared. We don't know what's going to happen in the world. We don't know what's going to happen with our organizations. We have no idea what new disruptors the publishing industry is going to face. Our organizations put a lot of time, effort, care, and money into producing the content that we publish, and it is our responsibility to make sure that content is preserved for the future so that it is accessible to users in perpetuity.

**The Perspective from the ISSN International Centre**

My name is Gaëlle Béquet and I am the Director of the ISSN International Centre. First of all, I would like to thank the conference organizers for inviting me to present the activities of the ISSN International Centre in relation to the digital preservation of journals. You may be surprised to learn that the ISSN International Center is involved in these preservation efforts. Let me explain this.

The ISSN International Centre is responsible for the implementation of the international standard identifier for journals and continuing resources. The ISSN is defined by ISO 3297, the sixth version of which was published in 2020. This identifier is assigned by the ISSN International Centre and ninety-three national centers around the world (more information at www.issn.org).

In 2021, the ISSN database contained approximately 2.8 million ISSNs. Of these, nearly 300,000 were assigned to digital resources. The ISSN portal (portal.issn.org) is the single point of information providing free basic metadata for the identification of a resource. For professional needs, full metadata is available on subscription.

The identification of resources via ISSN is the cornerstone of the suite of services offered by our portal, including the Keepers Registry, that is, the registry of digital resources bearing an ISSN and archived by partner digital archiving agencies. The ISSN International Centre cooperates with a dozen archiving agencies
that share their preservation metadata with the Centre, which aggregates them in Keepers Registry. By 2021, there were 70,000 titles archived. Keepers Registry thus provides publishing and library professionals with concrete information on the extent of resources preserved at the international level and overlaps through its statistics. For example, 13,000 titles are held in common by CLOCKSS (USA), Portico (USA), and Scholars Portal (Canada) and approximately 9,000 titles are held by both the Library of Congress (USA) and Portico (USA). On the other hand, Cariniana (Brazil), Gallica (France), and Hathi (USA) archive titles that are little or not kept by the other partner agencies. There is still much to do regarding digital preservation: the statistics show that 42,700 journals indexed by DOAJ and/or CrossRef are not preserved according to Keepers Registry.

The goal of preserving the diversity of the scholarly record is particularly crucial for open-access journals and you may have heard of two recent studies focusing on this issue. The first study was published by Laakso et al.[1] It shows that 174 open-access journals disappeared from the web between 2000 and 2019. The second study by Bosman et al.[2] shows that only 30% of non-APC open-access journals listed by the Directory of Open Access Journals (DOAJ) have an archiving policy. This proportion rises to 68% for journals requiring APCs.

In response to these alarming findings, a partnership was formed between DOAJ, CLOCKSS, the Internet Archive, Keepers Registry, and the Public Knowledge Project to initiate a preservation project for open-access journals that have no sustainable archiving policy. The JASPER project (doaj.org/preservation) began in late 2020 and its goal is to provide different archiving options for open-access journals. In this initial project, which will serve as a proof of concept, three archiving options will be offered starting 2022:

- Public Knowledge Project for journals in the DOAJ using the OJS application
- CLOCKSS for titles recorded in DOAJ that can provide detailed metadata
Internet Archive for titles registered in DOAJ that cannot provide metadata.

Ultimately, these partner agencies will share information with Keepers Registry to assess the progress of the preservation effort compared to the global output of open-access journals. Based on the JASPER prototype, the five partners will seek funding to expand the project to other journals and other agencies.

Discussion Session

Sizing the Digital Preservation Challenge

A total of 42,700 journal titles indexed by DOAJ and/or CrossRef are not preserved by organizations contributing to the Keepers Registry. Readers, please pause and reflect on this figure and the fact that the digital preservation of journals is not solved. Books, unfortunately, are in worse shape because nobody quite knows how many have been preserved. There is a lot of important, valuable content that is part of the scholarly record that must be preserved in order to be accessible for long-term access. Systematic attention is required.

Random efforts to preserve random parts of the scholarly record throw up new challenges. With the 26th UN Conference on Climate Change currently underway in Scotland, we’re all (hopefully!) thinking about the environment. What is the digital footprint of all of our distributed digital preservation services? This is a future frontier in strategic preservation issues.

Environmental Challenges

Gaelle noted that, on this issue, and if we read the digital preservation handbook[3] published by the Digital Preservation Coalition, we see that it contains no recommendations on the
calculation and mitigation of the environmental impact of this practice. More recently, no presentation on the environmental sustainability of digital archiving was included in the program of the iPres 2021 conference, where all the researchers and practitioners in the sector are gathered.

However, this issue is emerging in the wake of numerous reports on global warming due to fossil fuel consumption. In 2019, a seminal article identified the need for paradigm shifts in the appraisal, permanence, and availability of digital content (Pendergrass et al.[4]). The authors recommended improved selection of archived content rather than over-extensive preservation, acceptance of information loss and spacing of automatic file integrity checks, and file availability that responds to express user demand rather than constant availability. The evolution of digital preservation practices toward greater sustainability thus seems to be based on the evolution of professionals’ perception of the technical, economic, organizational, environmental, and individual risks associated with digital preservation.

Rebecca Frank goes in this direction by estimating that research in information sciences has emphasized the technical, economic, and organizational risks of digital archiving but underestimated the factors affecting the individuals involved in this process (Frank[5]). She concludes that the longevity of digital information is a social process in which risks are interpreted by individuals during daily interactions in a complex setting. The perception of risks differs according to the individuals involved, their level of expertise, their position in the organization, the information they have, their political culture, etc. This variable perception between individuals has a great influence on subsequent decision-making. It is important to understand these mechanisms in order to improve practices in this field. We can only agree with the assumption that digital preservation will require less emphasis on the technical aspects of preservation and more on the necessary human elements (Sandy and Corrado[6]).

Denis explored this environmental challenge from an economic
standpoint. He assumed it’s possible that moving digital archiving to the cloud (and it’s a big assumption) eases some of the environmental problems; however, it’s much more expensive than the distributed approach taken by CLOCKSS for example. Amazon’s S3 storage is currently $23 per terabyte per month. CLOCKSS boxes currently store 150 terabytes of data, and at the same rate it would cost over $40,000 per year per server. The system runs twelve servers so the cost would be into the hundreds of thousands of dollars. It’s not economically sustainable to move this network over to the cloud and that’s assuming the cloud is better from an environmental perspective. The same is true for our local preservation efforts. I can buy a server to store seventy terabytes for about $8,000 and a cloud service would want to charge us about $9,000 a year for that.

Changing Preservation Practices

There doesn’t appear to be a shared strategy in the library and publishing communities about how to solve this challenge. What are some ways we might begin to address this?

The NASIG digital preservation committee is developing a model preservation policy aimed at university libraries and academic publishers who want to put in place, perhaps for the first time, a digital preservation policy. That’s a great place to get started and the model policy will be launched at the NASIG 2022 conference.

Second, a library that is licensing, purchasing, or paying to publish in journals or books can be very powerful by requiring evidence that the content is preserved in at least three long-term archives. That’s a really tangible step to take.

Vida explained that it is a responsibility of the publishers to make sure the content is preserved in perpetuity. If funders are paying to help authors publish their content, the expectation that that content is going to be preserved in some way in perpetuity is important as well. Authors probably assume this is happening
automatically, and that their publications will be safe in 500 years. Librarians can helpfully have conversations with researchers on their campus and encourage them to ask the journals where they are publishing and what their long-term access arrangements are. I’ve published some articles before and when I do see that it’s preserved by CLOCKSS, I think, “Oh that’s cool”. We need to market this value added by publishers to authors.

Geographic Diversity and Preservation Practices

Thanks to the Keepers Registry, Gaelle noted that the resources best preserved by partner agencies are published in the following countries: Germany, Japan, the Netherlands, the United Kingdom, and the United States, where the most important commercial publishers operate. It appears that the agencies specialize in titles published in their country of operation or those available in English or in the local language, as is the case for Cariniana (Brazillian) and Gallica (French). However, one agency is an exception to this rule. Public Knowledge Project (Canada) distributes an open-source application, that is, Open Journal System (OJS) and this application is used by many publishers around the world. OJS is coupled with an archiving service, that is, PKP Private Network (PN), where Indonesian, Brazilian, Italian, Spanish, etc. journals are archived. PKP PN epitomizes the need to preserve cultural, linguistic, and scientific diversity for future generations, especially when it is less durable, which is the case for many open-access journals.

The importance of actively supporting cultural and linguistic diversity of library resources through digital archiving has been understood. However, Keepers Registry statistics show overlaps between titles archived by partner agencies. In 2004, L. Dempsey and B. Lavoie[7] wrote that digital archiving was a cooperative effort to minimize redundancy:

The characteristics of digital information are such that relatively few archived copies of a digital resource will likely be required
to meet preservation objectives. [...] The ease with which digital information can be replicated and shared over networks suggests greater scope for preserving a particular digital resource in a single location, rather than preserving copies in multiple locations.

(Lavoie and Dempsey)

In effect, Keepers Registry has defined a minimum retention ratio set at three archival agencies for a single resource. However, one could question the relevance of exceeding this ratio if one were to examine all the costs incurred by digital preservation, including the environmental cost.

Conclusion

Our discussion confirms that librarians and publishers need to work together for the digital preservation of scientific and cultural content. When a publisher archives all its output, it not only protects its assets and therefore its revenue, but also attracts subscribers with the promise of long-term access to materials. Publishers must be transparent about their archiving practices in order to gain the trust of librarians who subscribe to their services. Librarians, on the other hand, can focus on preserving content produced by their communities by assessing the opportunity to either internalize or outsource this preservation based on the skills and means at their disposal. The goal of digital preservation should be to diversify the type of content archived, whether locally, nationally, or internationally, by relying on cooperation rather than competition to build archiving services that are non-duplicative, non-monopolistic, resource-efficient, globally distributed, and sustainable. Archiving a significant part of our scientific and cultural heritage for future generations is a tremendous task and we need to promote public forums for exchange and coordination to meet this challenge. The Charleston Conference is an ideal venue for such discussion as it is a meeting place for librarians and publishers with
a shared interest in the long-term digital preservation of scholarly content.


Liaison Librarianship in the Sciences

LIS Education Informed by Practice

BRADLEY WADE BISHOP; DAVID EBY; CLAIRE JORDAN; AND KATERINA OZMENT

Abstract

Today's scientific researchers are facing large-scale challenges as they try to navigate massive quantities of digital data, work across disciplinary boundaries, and keep pace with the requirements of data management plans and preservation needs. As a result, some academic librarians are facing rapidly evolving roles and innovative roles as liaisons within the science community. In these roles, librarians are active participants in the research process rather than just supporters, working directly with science professionals and researchers and taking on leadership duties to build bridges between libraries and scientists.

Curriculum in LIS master's degree programs must keep pace as each liaison’s roles change to match the rapidly changing needs of the research community. This session focused on a specialized program, funded by the Institute for Museum and Library Services (IMLS) which supplemented an existing master's program with additional instructional and research components to provide students with mentoring, practicum, and experience in science agencies. A total of sixteen Library and Information Sciences Masters students completed the American Library Association-accredited degrees with specializations in Science Liaison
Librarianship at the University of Tennessee and the University of Denver.

The specialized educational program was created using job analyses of existing science liaisons to assess the knowledge, skills, and abilities needed as well as studies of the scientists' information needs. This session focuses on the outcomes of this specialized program with presentations describing the program, curriculum, and science practical experiences, providing attendees with insights into the process of submitting an education-focused proposal for funding and how real-world workers inform curricular choices. This paper presents all aspects of the program. The study is funded by the IMLS (RE-13-19-0027-19).

Introduction

The Collaborative Analysis Liaison Librarians (CALL) master's-level instructional project was awarded in 2019 by the Institute of Museum and Library Services' (IMLS) Laura Bush 21st Century Librarian grant program (RE-13-19-0027-19). CALL has been developed at the University of Tennessee’s School of Information Sciences, working with the University of Tennessee Libraries, and the University of Denver. The goal of this project is to expand knowledge of science liaison librarianship through four objectives.

- **Objective 1.** Educate a cohort of sixteen future collaborative liaison librarians to improve the processes of scientific research.
- **Objective 2.** Conduct a job analysis of the knowledge, skills, and abilities required for current science liaison librarians.
- **Objective 3.** Study scientists' information needs to facilitate collaborative analysis.
- **Objective 4.** Disseminate study findings related to the other objectives.
The project funded a cohort of sixteen leaders in science library liaison roles. The project also developed a model of experiential learning and a science liaison librarian course as the result of job analysis. Through three cohorts, students gained liaison skills to better collaborate with researchers in science-focused agencies. Each student benefited from an immersive practicum in a participating science agency explained in further detail in this paper with examples.

Developing a Curriculum

The Developing a Curriculum (DACUM) approach creates a list of knowledge, skills and abilities, operationalized job descriptions, and eventually learning outcomes for use in continuing education (Raymond, 2001). The DACUM approach assumes job incumbents know their job better than anyone else, and therefore they are the best at describing what it is that they do. Also, the DACUM approach assumes the best way to define a job is by describing the specific tasks that are performed. Like any other intellectual work, those employed in libraries routinely have tasks that may be difficult to describe. The DACUM approach used for CALL included a qualitative, semi-structured interview method as well as a larger survey. Earth science data managers and librarians interviewed from a recruitment through the Atmospheric Science Librarians International (ASLI), Federation of Earth Science Information Partners (ESIP), and at other science conferences with data managers in attendance, which included some that worked at Woods Hole Oceanographic Institution (WHOI) and the Lamont-Doherty Earth Observatory at Columbia University. All twelve participants managed earth science data as at least part of their position, but for most it was their entire job (Bishop, Orehek, & Collier, 2021). The interview schedule consisted of ten questions, gathering information on:
(1) current job title and work setting;
(2) total years working in current job and with earth science data;
(3) credentials, degrees, and other applicable education or training;
(4) daily, weekly, and less frequent tasks associated with job; and
(5) tasks not associated with the job.

Interviews were recorded, transcribed, and coded in NVivo. These interviews and results informed the recent survey validation study. The survey took common responses for the tasks from the two prior interview studies and created questions related to job demographics, communication tasks, collaboration tasks, outreach tasks, data-specific tasks, research tasks, teaching and learning tasks, that include frequency and additional questions about associations, programming languages, software, and tools. Recruitment emails were sent out in late November and early December 2020 to the electronic mailing lists of ESIP (esip-all@lists.esipfed.org), which at the time had 545 members. Ultimately, fifty-five responses were received (10% response rate). More detailed results are published in another publication forthcoming.

The full results of the interviews and survey were used to inform the course Science Liaison Librarianship offered in Spring 2021 open to all students and required for all CALL students. The weekly topics for the semester-long course were as follows: Liaison Librarianship; Science, Scientists, and Scientific Information; Outreach; Soft Skills and Community; Ethnography; Data Librarians and Research Misconduct; Research Data Management; Modes and Models of Instruction; Scholarly Communication; Domains, Disciplines, and Data; Organizational Communication; and Collaborative Analysis. The following assignments addressed needs discovered through prior job analyses and included: Interview with a Librarian; Summary of a Community; Instructional Component; a Final Paper as well as many activities and discussions.
Student Perspective: Piloting the Curriculum

Current library and information science students inclined to scientific librarianship tested the proposed curriculum and completed related grant requirements involved in understanding science-specific liaison roles and duties. The mission of the class was to inform students of the specific needs of liaison librarians serving scientific domains. This included building liaison skills identified by the research to better collaborate with researchers in science-focused agencies. Each student benefited from an immersive practicum in a participating science agency, complementary to their class experience, fulfilling the identified need to mentor relationships with experts in STEM librarianship and science information services.

Informed duties, roles, and responsibilities of liaison librarians discovered in the research phase of curriculum creation are echoed in the respective course piloted to students. The educational experience consisted of training in collaborative work practices, such as attending a soft-skills-centered training session to refine technical communicative skills. Students also attended and participated in workshops and sessions where scientific liaison librarians describe their positions and practical application of their scientific liaison role. Students also reflected their learning through research assignments and presentations related to a field of their interest regarding scientific liaison librarianship. Outside of coursework, all students participated in technical educational workshops with the intention of learning technical skills that scientific liaison librarians commonly encounter in their positions. Common technical skills of scientific liaison librarians consisted of knowledge and ability to use computer software such as “R,” “R” Studio, Python, and other common STEM applications used for data manipulation. Students were exposed and participated in a practically informed, well-rounded educational experience related to the duties and responsibilities of scientific liaison librarians.
through coursework, extracurricular learning experiences and sessions, and individual practicum experiences.

Student Project: The Bredesen Center

In the Spring 2021, a team of six CALL students and three supervisory faculty and staff members developed a research impact strategy for the Bredesen Center at the University of Tennessee Knoxville. The Bredesen Center for Interdisciplinary Research and Graduate Education generates high-impact scientific research through innovative interdisciplinary education and close collaboration between the University of Tennessee and Oak Ridge National Laboratory. The goal was to develop strategies for translating the Bredesen Center’s publication data into an Information Support System for leadership that could be analyzed for strategic insight and used to share the Bredesen Center’s story with prospective students, funders, and other stakeholders.

This project was broken into three stages: a needs assessment consisting of a client profile and client interviews, an environmental scan of tools, and an analysis and presentation of the more useful tools. Tools were evaluated on how well they could be used to convey the Center’s traditional impact, subject interdisciplinarity, or collaboration. The process began with gathering information on the story of the Bredesen Center through a client interview with the director and exploring their website and social media channels. This showed us what the Bredesen Center prioritizes in their communication and what they aren’t already showcasing. From there we explored the connection between the Bredesen Center’s story and the metrics by investigating options for measuring the scholarly impact of student and faculty publications. In addition to traditional metrics like article and citation counts, we analyzed the scholarly data sources and services best suited to highlight the strengths and aspirations of the Bredesen Center, including the
extent of local, national, and international research collaboration, and the breadth of interdisciplinarity in research topics. We then developed product options that showcased the connection between their story and the metrics. A variety of tools were evaluated with three options chosen. A Scopus API was holistic but harder to implement. It had the best search precision and most visualization and integration options but required high technical expertise to use. Requiring less technical expertise, using Scopus and their SciVal Platforms provided many different types of visualizations. These were quick to create but had less flexibility. Finally, a Scopus export to VOSviewer, a network analysis tool, provided unique but limited visualizations. The tool provided an easy way to create network visualizations, but only created these visualizations.

Lastly, we gave a demonstration of these products and our process to the Bredesen Center director. The project findings and project report were presented to the Bredesen Center in May 2021. The report presented the tool options along with two tiers of solutions: low-effort and intermediate-effort, as well as future directions.

Practicum Experiences

Student Practicum with the U.S. Geological Survey

CALL Student Claire Jordan is participating in a year-long practicum experience with the Science Data Management (SDM) team in the U.S. Geological Survey (USGS). This practicum was established in collaboration between faculty at the University of Tennessee Knoxville and USGS staff with the intention being the student would work on a year-long project spread out over two semesters. This gives the student an opportunity to become integrated into the project and gain experience in a government information setting working with earth science data. This practicum began in August
2021 and will conclude May 2022. The overarching project is a data consultation service for the SDM team and USGS data managers to implement in their work with USGS scientists. USGS scientists must ensure all their data follows FAIR data principles in order for their research to get published, and many come to their respective data managers or the SDM team at late stages of the process. This data consultation service would help to address that issue by tailoring it to the needs of both data managers and scientists and encourage collaboration earlier on in the research process.

The practicum objectives developed in the Spring 2021 were as follows:

- To understand the information needs of scientists and what issues they may be facing by conducting interviews and administering a survey.
- To become familiar with the operation of a government library, or information professionals in a government setting, by observing procedures, participating in meetings, understanding decision-making, and through hands-on experience.
- To gain experience working with scientists as an information professional by observing the interactions of my supervisors and connecting with scientists during the interviews and survey phases.
- To gain hands-on experience in developing a data consultation service that is informed by the needs of scientists and aids USGS staff in assisting scientists earlier on in the research process.
- Increase and enhance experience with developing, administering, and analyzing a survey through participation in development of a data consultation service.

Those objectives have evolved to reflect the status of the data
consultation service and to incorporate new skills the student is interested in learning.

The fall semester was spent working on aggregating existing data on the roughly 113 existing science centers at USGS. This data came from multiple sources and included information on location of the science center, what information they had on who the data manager(s) are at each science center, what contact information was available, whether or not those data managers opted into customization options for publishing their scientists' data releases, and other notes. USGS scientists publish their research and data in the USGS trusted digital repository ScienceBase. There are a number of customization options on the back end of ScienceBase that the SDM team manages for each science center. There are additional customization options for the end of the publication process, also managed by the SDM team, but not handled through ScienceBase. The purpose of this fall semester's work was to check in with data managers on what information we had about their center and whether or not the customization options they opted into were still working for them. This allowed us to ensure that what we thought was happening on our end was actually happening for the data managers.
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The Workflow Librarian

Understanding Researcher Experience

REBECCA BLAKISTON

Introduction

As part of the broader panel discussion titled “The Workflow Librarian: Reaching Library Users Where They Are,” this paper focuses on understanding the researcher experience. From a user experience (UX) perspective, this paper encourages librarians to think about what researchers are trying to do, how they are going about it, what their expectations are, and how we might try to align with those expectations.

Understanding the Researcher Journey

How might we understand the researcher journey as it exists today? Figure 1 is a visual of how we might imagine the researcher journey. As we imagine it, the researcher clearly defines their research topic, identifies a useful place to search for that topic, starts their search using advanced searching and filtering features, finds a relevant source or two, then accesses and reads that relevant content that they found. Finally, they incorporate the new knowledge into their research project. Quick and easy, almost like magic, the researcher has accomplished their research goals.
We can all agree that while this is a nice idea, in reality it is much messier than this. The search process is rarely linear. It is more organic, and it tends to involve a lot more than one clearly articulated research question and more than one search tool.

Figure 2 is a potential journey map for just the first phase in the research process. The researcher might be exploring a topic, getting advice, and iterating on their topic. They might interact with a lot of touch points, including people, library websites, publisher websites, and maybe databases. They might struggle over whether their topic is too big or too specific, or if they need to learn more about it. They are likely to experience a whirlwind of emotions from curiosity to confusion to angst. Sometimes we envision the “ideal journey” and forget the messy nature of it all.
There is value in questioning our assumptions about the researcher experience, including our assumptions about how people are discovering and accessing content. Doing research helps us gain a deeper understanding. We ought to be looking at data, talking with people, observing researchers' behaviors, and always be learning.

Understanding User Expectations

How might we better understand researcher workflows and researcher expectations as they're going through the research process? While we should all do our own UX research for our particular audiences, there is some foundational understanding of the existing state of things we could all agree upon. First, the library is not the center of most people's universe. Their journey begins outside the library. For many, Google Scholar is their starting point, or just Google, or their favorite database they have bookmarked. This is okay. The library doesn't have to be their starting point. We can meet our mission at the same time that researchers can get access outside the library.

Figure 3 is a photo of a talk-back board at the University of Arizona Libraries in the Main Library lobby. It asks passersby what tools they use for research and to add stickers to up-vote other responses. There are no big surprises here, but it is still interesting and validates some of what we've heard anecdotally. Google is in first place with close to thirty votes, and Google Scholar, Library Search, and JSTOR are in a close race for second place with 10–15 votes each. Granted, this is a convenience sample of people in the physical library, so we likely have more library users than the broader campus population.
User expectations are formed in people’s daily lives, as they go about their academic, professional, and personal lives, doing much of it online. Subconsciously, they are developing expectations around their experience as they are searching for content, discovering new content, and interacting with content. Many researchers are familiar with the experience with video and audio content through providers including YouTube, Hulu, Netflix, Prime Video, Disney+, Spotify, and Pandora. Researchers may also be used to the article and news content experience they get with Google Scholar, Wikipedia, news websites, and social media. Finally, researchers may regularly discover image and graphical content through Instagram, Pinterest, Unsplash, Pixabay, and Canva.

Librarians and publishers may benefit from considering all the things they have searched for in just the past week, perhaps films to watch on the plane, podcasts to listen to, stories on news websites, or graphics for conference presentations. People are searching, accessing, and integrating digital content into their lives all the time.

So how have these experiences shaped user expectations? What features of discovery and access are people used to in their world outside of libraries? Consider those interfaces people interact with regularly and don’t think much about. Examples of features include personalization, integration, tagging, save for later, and mobile friendliness. Are publisher and database vendors providing these familiar experiences, and meeting evolving user expectations?
Mental models can be a helpful concept to consider. Mental models reflect how people think about how things work out in the world, and they impact user behaviors and expectations (Nielsen, 2010). Humans are constantly building and refining their own mental models based on their own experiences.

Given that people have all these experiences out in the world, daily, they have a clear mental model around how search and access works. Many of them believe, “I should be able to search and retrieve relevant results fast. And I should be able to access and use content from anywhere, including on my mobile device.” People believe this is just how the world works, and how things are.

While there are these generalities around mental models for search and discovery, diving deeper it becomes clear it is not that simple, as humans are complex. How people approach the world, their research, and their decision-making is not simple and is not consistent. User expectations and experiences change rapidly.

UX researcher Indi Young talks about “thinking styles” (Young), which reflect the various mindsets and approaches people might have. She discusses how thinking styles are an important consideration in your design decisions. For researchers, two thinking styles come to mind. A more exploratory researcher might say, “I’m curious, exploratory, and building my knowledge.” A more task-oriented researcher might say, “I’m focused, task-driven, and on a deadline.” These are very different approaches, and we ought to consider them both as we’re considering ways to improve both of their experiences.

To illustrate this further are some quotes inspired by recent conversations I’ve had with researchers. I asked an Information Science grad student, who is graduating with their MLIS this December, where they start their research. They said they always start with Google Scholar, then go down the rabbit hole. They get lost in the rabbit hole but kind of love it, as that is their process. You can see how the person with this thinking style is intellectually curious and engaged in the process of building new knowledge.

As a second example, a PhD medical student said “I have PubMed
on speed dial ... I basically just use PubMed for everything.” This is an example of someone whose workflow is almost entirely in just one search tool, because of their specific area of research and because it’s what they’re used to. The person with this thinking style is usually focused and task-driven. They want to get what they need then move on to other things.

Undoubtedly, the journey will vary, because not all researchers are the same. Figure 4 demonstrates the variations we can expect. Some researchers will use navigation and browsing options (e.g., filters, headings, advanced searching features), whereas others will use purely keyword searching. Some researchers will use one tool, like PubMed, whereas others will use many tools along their journey. Some researchers will dive deep into content, whereas others will skim to find the answer to their question or relevant snippets of information they can use in their research paper. Some researchers will manage their content in a tool like Mendeley or Refworks, whereas others will save all the articles they find in tabs in their browser. Some researchers don’t consider privacy aspects and happily accept cookies when prompted, whereas others use private browsers and question anything that’s asking them for their data.

![Figure 4. Variations in user behaviors.](image)

**Opportunities to Explore**

This is hard. How do we design for these emerging expectations and all of these possibilities?

There are some UX principles to keep in mind as we make
decisions around designing experiences related to discovery and access. As illustrated in Figure 5, we want things to be useful, usable, findable, accessible, inclusive, and valuable.

![Figure 5. UX principles.](image)

In order to do this, we need to practice some things. We need to be:

- Curious about researchers’ existing experiences.
- Humble in knowing what we don’t know.
- Deep listeners committed to learning more.
- Experimental and willing to try some new approaches, test them, and see how they do.
- Adaptable to the changing environment.
- Proactive rather than reactive, to continue to meet our mission in the new landscape.
- Systems thinkers who recognize those interdependencies and connections between various systems researchers might encounter.

We know we need to adapt our services, our discovery systems, and how we provision access to align with the mental models of today’s researchers and their approaches, expectations, and experiences. How might we do this?
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Cutting the Cord

Open Access and Demand-Driven Acquisition for Journal Content

SHELBY CARROLL AND SARAH GUY

Introduction

This poster presentation explored Carolina University library's adoption of CloudSource+, an open-access discovery solution that integrates with SirsiDynix Enterprise.

Carolina University is a small university of around 850 Full Time Enrollments (FTE), offering sixteen bachelor's programs, fifteen master's programs, as well as three doctoral programs. The university was founded in 1945 as a Bible college and has since grown and merged with six other universities, adding twelve degrees in a wide range of academic disciplines in the past two years, with an exceptional focus on STEM programs.

With all the recent program additions, the university is changing at an accelerated rate and the library is facing the challenge of finding ways to keep up with the growing needs of a rapidly diversifying student body and faculty. While the needs of the university continue to grow exponentially, the library's budget is not growing at the same pace. Many of the new programs are best served by annual subscriptions to academic journals and subject-specific databases, which creates an additional cost barrier. Likewise, the university's history as a Bible institution provides minimal existing materials that provide support to these subjects.
Problems and Solutions

In response to these challenges, the library began to evaluate our resources and if there was a more efficient option, both economically and ergonomically, to get quality materials to the user. After a thorough investigation, the library identified open access as a means of supporting the new academic programs, faculty, and students. However, the library analyzed the current discovery service and identified five main problems that hindered our solution (Table 1).

Table 1: Problems Identified

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Problem</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Due to the expanding size of the university, the library needed new ways to stretch its budget to meet the needs of new faculty members and students in new disciplines.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>The library's current discovery service lacks streamlined access to high-quality open-access content.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Because the library's discovery service is from a different provider and the library's OPAC was integrated into that discovery service, the user wasn't able to access their patron account to view or renew checkouts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>The library's newly cataloged books had a delay before appearing in the discovery service.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Links from the library's discovery service looked different for open-access articles as opposed to articles from database subscriptions.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The library also asked two main questions. Question 1: What is the most economical way to increase the availability of scholarly articles? Question 2: How will open access benefit?

These issues prompted the library to consider new discovery services that would alleviate these problems. CloudSource+ offered the solutions the library needed (see Table 2).
Because many top journals are hybrid, publishing both open access and paywalled articles, CloudSource+ provides high-quality research from those top journals without the high cost of a subscription. Switching to an OA-forward resource delivery platform allowed the library to acquire a large amount of content at a fraction of the cost, leaving money for shaping the collection.

CloudSource+ will integrate the library’s paid subscription content with open-access content, providing a better discovery service experience that takes full advantage of open access.

The OPAC will be the main user platform, with the physical collection, e-resource subscriptions, and open-access resources together where the user can also renew books online.

With CloudSource+, cataloged items will appear immediately because it is part of the OPAC.

CloudSource+ has a uniform “View Article” button for all article content, resulting in a seamless user experience.

### Analysis and Results

CloudSource+ proved to be a cost-efficient solution that could replace the current discovery service while adding a significant amount of materials. The library provided SirsiDynix with a comprehensive list of paid subscription journal resources, containing over 200,000 unique titles. SirsiDynix evaluated the title list against the CloudSource+ open-access list of content and analyzed the overlap between the two. SirsiDynix found that 71% of the resources in the library’s collection published 2017 and after are currently available as open access and 49% of resources across all dates are currently available as open access. A breakdown of the content in CloudSource+ by subject can be seen in Figure 1.
Conclusion

The librarians used a systematic approach to make a decision about implementing a new discovery service. The previous discovery service was evaluated for content availability and user experience, which was then compared to the new discovery service, CloudSource+.

Carolina University chose to implement CloudSource+, an open-access discovery layer, to help provide quality content for a number of new and growing programs with a limited budget.

CloudSource+ allows patrons to find both open-access academic resources and paid subscription resources directly from the OPAC, streamlining the process of getting materials to the users. The technology also solved some of the other challenges the library was facing with the previous discovery service, including patrons having access to their accounts, turnaround time for newly cataloged materials, and linking. The Carolina University library is currently in
the process of implementing CloudSource+ and heading into a trial phase of the final product.
Funding Open Access

Models, Experiments, and the Future

ANGELA CARREÑO

Introduction

The Latin American Research Resources Project, administered by the Center for Research Libraries (CRL), endorsed the exploration of an Open-Access Book Project in 2015 and approved a Latin American Council of Social Sciences (CLACSO) open-access book pilot in 2019. CLACSO is a nonprofit mission-driven organization that publishes approximately 100 titles per year of high-quality scholarly content. The CLACSO frontlist was identified as a quality-controlled collection of open-access books of priority, ideal for exploring collaborative open-access stewardship services for libraries in the areas of hosting, deposit, quality assurance, dissemination, and digital preservation.

In year one a collaborative investment made by seven research libraries made it possible to process the 2018 and 2019 CLACSO OA Books for full discovery via Books@JSTOR. In year two a collaborative investment by ten research libraries made it possible to process the 2020 and selected 2021 CLACSO OA Books. JSTOR provides metadata and full text for these titles to ProQuest Summon; Ex Libris Primo and Alma; EBSCO Discovery Service; and OCLC WorldCat Discovery Services. These discovery services added a target/package for JSTOR Open-Access Titles to their knowledge bases that includes the JSTOR processed CLACSO OA Books. The collaborative investment also opened options for a MARC record in local catalogs. None of this enhanced discovery would have been
possible without the support of the seven research libraries in year one and the ten research libraries in year two.

In January 2022 Latin Americanist Research Resources Project (LARRP) established a Matching Fund to incentivize additional libraries to participate in the partnership led by the LARRP in collaboration with the CLACSO, JSTOR, and the Latin American bookseller García Cambeiro. The goal in year three is to expand collaborative library support for the CLACSO Open-Access Book Project. Funds raised in 2022 will support the third phase of a project to expand Latin American OA e-books accessible through Books@ JSTOR and to explore further opportunities for developing this model with an additional CLACSO-affiliated Center if funding permits.

Statement on Overall Value to the Latin Americanist Research Community

The current Chair of LARRP Advisory Committee emphasized the importance of values-based collecting to the success of the LARRP endorsed CLACSO Open-Access Book Project during the 2021 presentation at the Charleston Conference[1] She listed three shared values that motivate and align with the mission of LARRP and the mission of CLACSO:

1. The importance of the specialized monograph to scholarly communication, especially in the humanities, and the need to explore sustainability in partnership with mission-driven publishers that embrace knowledge as a public good.
2. The importance of supporting stewardship efforts that give voice to the marginalized.[2]
3. The importance of an even playing field in scholarly communication between the global north and the global south.
These values drive the project. Sócrates Silva, Latin American and Iberian Studies Librarian for Columbia and Cornell and Past-President of SALALM, described the project’s importance for bridging a critical gap in the scholarly communications system in a recent JSTOR News Release:

Despite established OA publishing models for scholarly works in Latin America, monograph discovery and preservation infrastructure for this important content in US libraries is virtually nonexistent. This multi-partner, horizontal, and librarian-led pilot is testing out sustainable partnerships that take into account the monograph lifecycle from publisher to library.[3]

The impact of the stewardship is evident in usage data. The 341 published titles have generated over 863,961 chapter views and downloads through November 2021. These titles have been used by more than 4,500 institutions across 220 countries and territories.

Partner Libraries

For year three of the project representatives from participating libraries will:

Contribute to the pooling of funds to support the workflow and process associated with the publishing, access, discovery, and preservation of 100 titles from CLACSO, including the 2021 copyright year and available titles from the 2022 copyright year.

Engage as members of an Advisory Group for the project;

Advocate for an increase in the number of supporting libraries;

Work with the stakeholders on an assessment of the project and report back to LARRP/SALALM on the business model, technical services, discovery services, usage, and overall contribution to scholarly communication;

Establish a three-year plan for growth to increase the number of Latin American open-access books. The plan will seek to broaden
the work with stakeholders and focus on sustained work on the output of CLACSO and its affiliated Centers.

JSTOR and Garcia Cambeiro will work with the Advisory Group to estimate the costs to publish and preserve the OA titles based on stakeholder experiences with the project. This will help the Advisory Committee to determine the estimated number of OA titles that can receive treatment each year satisfying the stewardship concerns. The goal is to develop a scalable and sustainable model for collaborative work on open-access books of significant scholarly interest published in Latin America Studies. We seek to establish an annual membership pricing model to cover the costs of future targeted OA Book publishing.

The Advisory Group will make an effort to be transparent on the costs associated with the stewardship of OA books. JSTOR will also provide detailed usage data to assist with the review of how the titles are used at institutions around the world and how the titles are used to support research across key subject areas that are searched on JSTOR.

About the Project Partners/Stakeholders

LARRP is a consortium of research libraries that seeks to increase free and open access to information in support of learning and scholarship in Latin American Studies. LARRP is administered by the CRL.

CRL is an international consortium of university, college, and independent research libraries. Founded in 1949, CRL supports original research and inspired teaching in the humanities, sciences, and social sciences by preserving and making available to scholars a wealth of rare and uncommon primary source materials from all world regions.

CLACSO is an international organization that brings together 680 research and postgraduate centers in the social sciences and humanities across Latin America and other continents.

JSTOR is a not-for-profit digital library for discovering and connecting research, images, and primary sources.

García Cambeiro is an Argentinian bookseller that specializes in
locating, selecting, and supplying Latin American academic publications.

**Background**

In 2015 the LARRP representative from New York University submitted to LARRP a proposal for a pilot project to provide stewardship for a set of open access scholarly e-books from Argentina. In October 2015, the membership of LARRP voted to endorse this exploratory Latin American Open-Access Academic E-book pilot project, which would

- Further explore information on Latin American open-access e-books
- Create a steering committee to prioritize materials for inclusion in the pilot project
- Negotiate permissions from publishers and relevant content producers to download and deposit content in a trustworthy repository
- Produce metadata necessary for long-term discoverability of materials
- Promote the accessibility of materials included in the pilot project.

In 2019 the LARRP representative from New York University, by then a member of the LARRP Advisory Committee and Chair of the Resource Discovery Working Group, submitted a proposal for a Proof-of-Concept Project as a follow-up to the endorsement. The content focus of the proposed project was on the open book content published by CLACSO.

Several LARRP colleagues worked on the proposal. The group included Angela Carreño—NYU (convener); Melissa Gasparotto—NYPL; Socrates Silva Reyes—Columbia; Lynn
Shirey—Harvard; and Fernando Acosta-Rodríguez—Princeton. The Chair of LARRP, Melissa Guy—UT Austin, received periodic updates on our work. The group focused on books published by CLACSO. The goal of the pilot project was to test the processes identified by LARRP as crucial for the stewardship of open-access books. Three parties were stakeholders in the project: CLACSO, JSTOR, and Garcia Cambeiro. The approach to stewardship was fully vetted by CLACSO representatives, endorsed by Dominique Babini, CLACSO’s Open-Access Advisor, and approved by a CLACSO Committee as a model for open-access availability of the CLACSO frontlist of books. During the Latin American Studies Association Conference held in Boston in 2019, Lynn Shirey (Harvard) and Angela Carreño (NYU) met with the CLACSO representatives. They presented a letter signed by the Chair of LARRP and a copy of the proposal to Karina Batthyány, the Executive Secretary of CLACSO. Fernando Genovart from Garcia Cambeiro also attended the meeting.[4]

Soon afterward JSTOR signed an agreement with Garcia Cambeiro making it possible for them to jointly provide services associated with open-access books.

In year one seven libraries invested $10,000 in order to handle the workflow and process required for the stewardship of the 2018 and 2019 CLACSO frontlist. CLACSO publishes 100 titles per year. A minimum of $70,000 needed to be raised to fund the Pilot. The seven libraries that contributed $10,000 to the Pilot Project in year one were:

NYU
NYPL
Harvard
Columbia University
Princeton University
UT at Austin
Pittsburg University

The stakeholders, in year one, used book-level calculations setting the cost of treatment for each book at $350. Each stakeholder received a portion of the total raised (JSTOR—$25,000;
Garcia Cambeiro—$30,000; CLACSO—$15,000). All three stakeholders regarded year one as a year for assessment purposes. Both JSTOR and Garcia Cambeiro reported that the actual costs incurred exceeded the dollar total received.

In year two of this initiative, ten libraries invested in the project (nine at the $10,000 level and one at $5,000). The year one libraries continued their annual investment of $10,000 in year two and three additional Libraries (UCLA, University of Illinois and the University of Michigan) contributed an additional $25,000. The partner libraries welcomed support at a lower level from any institution that wanted to strengthen this collaborative effort. The payments to stakeholders in year two were distributed as follows.

Distribution of Partner Library Investment in Year Two of Project

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>US$</th>
<th>per title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>JSTOR</td>
<td>350</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLACSO</td>
<td>75</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>García Cambeiro</td>
<td>250</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>675</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A total of 341 books have been processed to date.

Have more questions? Interested in joining this collaborative effort? Please contact:

Angela M. Carreño
Chair, LARRP
Email: angela.carreno@nyu.edu

Melissa Gasparotto
AD, Research Services and Institutional Partnerships
The New York Public Library
Email: melissagasparotto@nypl.org

[2] During the virtual LXVI SALALM Conference there was a session free and open to the public titled The Right to Communication: Supporting Indigenous and Afro-Descendant Communities in Latin America highlighting the recent publication of a CLACSO Open-Access Book. This session, live streamed on (https://youtu.be/4vWrAPjJ1FQ), was an effort on the part of LARRP to give a bullhorn to the voice of the marginalized. Solano, X. L., & Köhler, A. (Eds.). (2020). La situación del derecho a la comunicación: con énfasis en las y los comunicadores indígenas y afrodescendientes de América Latina: Vol. tomo VI. CLACSO. https://doi.org/10.2307/j.ctv1smjn8
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Abstract

The purpose of this paper is to provide an overview of a textbook affordability project implemented during 2020–2021 at East Tennessee State University (four-year public doctoral institution with over 14,500 students). The project involved an acquisitions librarian, electronic resources librarian, and digital scholarship librarian who worked together to identify and acquire institutionally licensed textbooks utilizing campus bookstore data. The library created customized textbook permalinks for instructors to insert into their course Learning Management System for tracking and support purposes. In addition, the library provided a searchable list of course textbooks on their website using the Springshare E-Reserves module. Near the end of each semester, surveys were sent to students and instructors to assess their satisfaction with the service and impressions of using e-textbooks.

The overview includes our project workflow, including implementation, faculty communication, acquisition, discovery, and ongoing support. We will also highlight issues encountered and offer best practices for ongoing support and management of the program. In addition, we will provide summaries of the student and instructor surveys.
Overview

Charles C. Sherrod Library at East Tennessee State University (ETSU) launched a pilot e-reserves program (fall 2020, spring–summer 2021) to identify and acquire institutionally licensed electronic textbooks (e-textbooks). Other academic libraries have launched a similar initiative within the last few years, including East Carolina University, University of North Carolina Greensboro, and Virginia Commonwealth University (Kirschner & Miller, 2021; Thomas & Bernhardt, 2018). The primary objective of our project was to investigate implementing institutional licensed e-textbooks to assist with lowering the cost of educational materials at ETSU. The secondary objective was to develop a partnership with instructors regarding textbook affordability.

The program was funded by ETSU’s Instructional Design Grant ($2,500) and Student Library Fee. The expenses included the cost of the e-textbooks ($11,093) and the Springshare E-Reserves subscription needed to implement the e-reserves program. During the three semesters, 77 e-textbooks were purchased for 64 courses and 126 e-textbooks from subscriptions and previous purchases were identified for 113 courses. As a result, 177 courses potentially used e-textbooks available through Sherrod Library. The courses were almost evenly split between graduate (49%) and undergraduate (45%) courses with a small percentage (6%) being hybrid courses. The courses were from a wide range of disciples. Most courses were from the arts and humanities (31%), medicine and health sciences (24%), education (19%), and social and behavioral sciences (18%). There were also courses in physical sciences and mathematics, life sciences, and business. This resulted in 3,456 students receiving access to at least one book and a potential savings of $237,799 within the first semester that the e-textbooks were implemented in the courses during the pilot. Savings will increase each subsequent semester the e-textbooks are used in the course.
Usage was determined by calculating the total amount of times a permalink was clicked or accessed. For FY20–21, we recorded 11,085 uses across all three semesters. This number may be understated due to an instructor not utilizing their permalink and instead referencing a direct link from the textbook vendor (e.g., chapter-level links, etc.). In addition, if the textbook is DRM-free, the user can download the entire textbook at once onto their device. While the vendor provides use statistics as well, we are unable to determine if all traffic comes from one or more courses. Figure 1 shows usage by month. Usage is higher during the first two months of a semester, and then gradually decreases further into the period.

Figure 1. Total permalink clicks.

Workflow

In FY20–21, we requested copies of the fall 2020, spring 2021, and summer 2021 textbook lists from the ETSU Bookstore. These lists were provided to the library approximately two to four weeks before each semester began. From each report, we extracted pertinent data fields such as ISBN, course code, and instructor. We first utilized ISBN data to compare titles against existing electronic holdings from the library. This first comparison provided matches to e-book titles that had been previously purchased or made available through one of our subscription model collections. Second, the remaining ISBNs were checked against matches in GOBI, which is
one of the leading providers of e-books to academic libraries. This comparison provided us with a list of titles that were available to purchase. Due to limited funds and the desire to reach as many courses as possible, we primarily limited our selection to titles with unlimited use licenses that had perpetual ownership. The perpetual ownership model provides the best return on investment, as the textbook remains available for future semesters until the instructor retires it.

With this data in hand, we matched the available textbooks to the course code and instructor. We reached out individually to each instructor via email and informed them about the textbook availability. For titles not previously owned, we formally requested the instructors' participation in the e-textbooks reserves program before any purchases occurred. Program participation involved advertising the textbook availability to students and assisting with a student and instructor survey at the end of the semester. Once the instructor agreed to participate, the library acquired the textbook using grant or library funds.

Since the library does not have access to the instructor's D2L course, we wanted to keep the textbook implementation as simple as possible and ensure that the textbook vendor access link never expired or changed. With those goals in mind, we developed an internal permalink system. The instructor receives a permanent link (e.g., https://libs.etsu.edu/ereserves/COURSE-CODE/ISBN) for them to insert into their course D2L site and any other necessary means of communication to students. These permalinks redirect the user to the textbook by matching against a list of library managed URLs modified to support off-campus access. If a textbook link changes in the future, the library can make the necessary edit to the redirect URL without any instructor intervention. One additional feature of the permalink system was that we could monitor and record permalink usage while keeping users anonymous. This allowed us to determine utilization and usage patterns for ongoing semesters.

In addition to course-level implementation, the library wanted
to make these e-textbooks discoverable through our website. In summer 2020, we purchased and implemented a course reserve product called Springshare E-Reserves. This allows library users to view, search, and access textbooks from any of the 200+ participating courses (URL: https://libraries.etsu.edu/er.php).

Once the textbook is fully implemented and ready for course use, the library’s primary objective until the end of the semester is providing end-user support. Sherrod’s Technology and Content Services unit fields any access problems reported by the student and/or instructor. Staff will work one-on-one with the user to help identify any issues ranging from user authentication to navigating the textbook platform. This support model aims to alleviate any instructor concerns about adoption of e-textbooks.

In the last two to three weeks of the semester, the library distributed surveys to assess student and instructor perspectives of the service. Surveys were only distributed where usage of the permanent link was evident. In normal circumstances, instructors would have the option to assist in distributing the survey to their students either in person or online. Due to COVID, all surveys were administered online during the fall 2020 and spring 2021 semesters. The library initially sends an email to instructors asking them to forward the survey to their students either in email, D2L, or any other way they communicate with their students. After the student surveys have been distributed, the instructor receives an email requesting that they respond to a survey. After the semester is over, the instructors receive a copy of their students’ responses.

Survey Responses

Sherrod Library surveyed students and instructors whose e-textbook(s) had been used based on our usage data of the permanent links. During fall 2020, 43 instructors and 1,631 students in 51 courses were surveyed. During spring 2021, 47 instructors and
1,361 students were surveyed in 49 courses. A total of 219 students (7% completion rate) and 40 instructors (44% completion rate) completed a survey on the effectiveness of the e-textbooks during the fall and spring semesters. The student responders were split between undergraduate and graduate students with most of the undergraduates being juniors or seniors.

Based on the survey responses, there is both a need and want to continue the e-textbook reserve program. Like most colleges and universities, there is a financial need to offer affordable alternatives. For example, 73% of students reported not buying a textbook throughout college due to their cost. The general feedback about the program was positive. Ninety-five percent of instructors found the support from Sherrod Library helpful. Sixty-nine percent of students and instructors reported the process of using, accessing, and/or implementing the e-textbooks as easy, 25% as neutral, and 6% as difficult. Ninety percent of students supported using funds from the student library fee to purchase e-textbooks. Similarly, all instructors stated that they would support continuing the e-textbooks program with 92% supporting their department contributing funds.

Despite the support for its continuation, the responses illuminated some of the weaknesses in the program. Through the survey’s responses, we noticed that the e-textbooks were not utilized by all students. Sixteen percent of students reported never accessing the e-textbook. In comparison, only 2% of students stated that on average they never use their textbooks. This may be due to the students already owning a copy. Twenty-four percent of students reported purchasing their own copy of the textbook, which rendered access to the e-textbook moot. Based on their comments, the students who purchased their own copy may have preferred print and/or did not realize that an e-textbook was available. Seventy-three percent of students who purchased their own copy choose a print version, 16% choose electronic and print, and only 12% choose an electronic version. For those that prefer print, printing could be a suitable alternative. Only 8% of students
reported printing the e-textbooks. However, this may be an issue for platforms that do not allow the printing of an entire e-textbook. Three students reported issues printing the e-textbooks, and two of them reported the limited amount one could print as the issue.

We also learned that instructors were not always aware of the resources we have, while the library is not always aware of the resources they need. Forty-four percent of instructors never consulted the library catalog to see if access was available when selecting materials. The same percentage of instructors were not aware that e-textbooks were available or could be purchased through the library. This is not surprising, as only 26% of instructors reported using a library e-textbook in their course before this semester. Similarly, the instructors were not always in communication with the bookstore, which is how the library knows what books to purchase. Sixty-two percent of instructors reported always submitting their textbooks on a regular basis to the bookstore with 31% responding sometimes and 8% stating never. Instructors seemed willing though to learn more about our library services with 67% of instructors expressing interest in attending such workshops.

Lastly, students provided useful comments on what affected their experiences, positively or negatively.

It should be noted that there was not a large consensus with the comments. These observations are based on 10–20 similar comments. First, students commented on how easy or difficult it was to access the e-textbooks based on the instructions provided by the instructor. Students mentioned having a positive experience when the link was simply shared with them in their course communication such as through D2L. About half of the instructors’ comments said how easy it was to provide the link (from the library) to their students. Second, student experiences were affected by the availability of features (searching, annotating, highlighting, downloading/saving, zooming) and the interface of the e-textbook. When reviewing the comments that mentioned features being unavailable, the librarians discovered that they were available. This
could be due to a lack of familiarity with library resource interfaces, as students reported being familiar with the library website helped them when accessing and using the e-textbooks. Third, downloading was a pain point for students, because some platforms did not allow the full e-textbook to be downloaded like the issue with printing. Downloading is an important feature because students do not have to be online to view it. Accessing the e-textbook anywhere at any time was mentioned by students as being a positive attribute of e-textbooks. For example, while 98% of students reported accessing the e-textbook on their personal computer, a sizable portion accessed it on their tablet (17%) and phone (28%). Other negative experiences students reported were associated with accessibility, number of steps it takes to access the e-textbook, and other technological issues (e.g., logging in).

Most of these issues could be solved to a degree with better communication between the library, the bookstore, the instructors, and the students. How we plan to better the e-reserves program through better communication will be explored further in the next sections. The complete student and instructor surveys, including the results, are available in Appendices A and B. Some questions were adopted or adapted by Bliss et al. (2013).

Lessons Learned

During this pilot project, we learned many lessons through the process of managing and accessing the e-textbooks reserves program. The following is a summary of these lessons.

Continued development of the e-reserve program is dependent on the consistent delivery of the ETSU bookstore data before the start of each semester. Without this data, Sherrod Library will be unable to analyze the required textbooks to identify potential purchases and compare selections to current holdings. Due to the program’s goal of significantly reducing textbook spending by
students, we feel the partnership between Sherrod Library and the ETSU bookstore is fragile. During the pilot, we found that instructors prefer to be notified regarding the availability of the e-textbook for their course at least three weeks before the start of the semester. Maintaining the support of the ETSU bookstore is essential for the continued success of the e-reserve program. In addition, the connection between instructors and the bookstore is also important. The library needs the instructors to submit their required textbooks to the bookstores in order to identify the e-textbooks' availability.

Our survey data shows that many instructors do not consult the library or review current library resources when choosing course materials. To help the library better assist with textbook affordability we need to learn more about the instructor’s decision-making process and the stakeholders involved. An important lesson learned is the library’s need to further promote that we can assist instructors to identify affordable materials available at no cost to students. In addition, courseware options such as Follett ACCESS may not provide the best cost savings for students when the library can provide unlimited use licenses. Additional data would be necessary to compare costs.

Another hindrance is the lack of collaboration in D2L courses. We rely exclusively on the instructor to integrate the library provided course materials into their courses. We feel some instructors may lack the skills or not feel comfortable embedding resources. Investigating course reading list systems that could integrate with D2L courses could help automate this process and give the library a true picture of the resource and collection needs of the campus. In addition, offering to come to classes to address any issues students are having using and accessing the materials may also help identify and address issues students are having.

An insight learned that is unfortunately out of our control is that textbook publishers such as Pearson, Cengage, and McGraw-Hill do not commonly provide the library options to purchase an institutional-wide license. If one is available, the cost is two to
five times higher than the average license and concurrent user restrictions are applied.

Finally, increased funding would allow the library to invest in additional textbooks that have concurrent license restrictions. The library would need to pay closer attention to course enrollment and promote smart textbook use to determine user license requirements. We feel there are significant cost savings here, especially if the textbook is used for multiple semesters. Placing the library as a stakeholder in campus-wide course materials initiatives will provide the campus with better insight into alternatives and cost savings for students.

**Future Plans**

The pilot program has allowed us to verify that there is a need for and strong interest in the e-reserve program. For the e-reserve program to continue to grow we have identified four key goals for the future. The goals include hosting focus groups, workshops, presentations to stakeholders, and exploring new funding avenues.

To further develop our partnership with instructors regarding textbook affordability we plan to host a focus group to learn more about course material selection and experiences with the past implementation of open access and institutionally licensed course materials. Through these focus groups, we hope to gain insight into ways the library can be more involved earlier in the textbook/course material selection process.

One area of the program we feel could be improved is the user experience. To assist with this moving forward, we plan to offer workshops to instructors on finding and implementing open and affordable course materials. In addition to instructor workshops, we will be informing instructors during the implementation process of the availability of librarians to provide students with a demonstration of how to effectively use the e-textbook.
In addition, to promote the success of the pilot program we plan to present the data to our stakeholders at avenues such as the Student Government Association, Academic Council, and college/departmental meetings. This will allow us to promote the successes of the program and identify new partners across campus to collaborate on the promotion and funding of the program.

To continue offering the program it will be necessary to identify additional funding sources to allow for expansion of the e-reserve offerings. The primary areas we will be exploring include additional support from the library budget and departmental support from across campus. According to our survey results, 92% of participating faculty support their department contributing funds to the program. We are also interested in beginning discussions with university leadership regarding the possibility of course fees providing funding, specifically the online course fee. Through the continued funding of this program, we believe that the library can make a significant impact on textbook affordability. Furthermore, this program contributes to student success and increases awareness of the importance of including the library as a partner in ongoing and future initiatives.

Appendix A: Student Survey


What is your age?

Total Count (N): 219
Counts/frequency: Under 18 (0, 0.0%), 18-22 (100, 45.7%), 23-29 (92, 42.0%), 30-39 (18, 8.2%), 40-49 (6, 2.7%), Over 50 (3, 1.4%), Prefer not to say (0, 0.0%)
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What is your student classification?

**Total Count (N):** 219

**Counts/frequency:** Undergraduate Freshman (0-29.9 credits earned) (4, 1.8%), Undergraduate Sophomore (30.0-59.9 credits earned) (15, 6.8%), Undergraduate Junior (60.0-89.9 credits earned) (38, 17.4%), Undergraduate Senior (90.0 and up credits earned) (52, 23.7%), Graduate (109, 49.8%), Prefer not to say (1, 0.5%)
Are you a first generation college student?

**Total Count (N):** 219

**Counts/frequency:** Yes (68, 31.1%), No (147, 67.1%), Not sure (2, 0.9%), Prefer not to say (2, 0.9%)
Do you receive any kind of financial aid? (check all that apply)

**Total Count (N):** 219

**Counts/frequency:** Loans (97, 44.3%), Grants (54, 24.7%), Work-study (36, 16.4%), Scholarships (140, 63.9%), Other (28, 12.8%), None (8, 3.7%), Prefer not to say (5, 2.3%)

---

What is your cumulative college Grade Point Average (GPA) on a 4.0 scale?

**Total Count (N):** 218

**Counts/frequency:** 0.0 – 1.4 (0, 0.0%), 1.5 – 2.0 (1, 0.5%), 2.1 – 2.5 (2, 0.9%), 2.6 – 3.0 (10, 4.6%), 3.1 – 3.5 (46, 21.1%), 3.6 – 4.0 (141, 64.7%), This is my first semester (18, 8.3%)
In general, how often do you purchase the required textbooks for the courses you take?

**Total Count (N):** 218

**Counts/frequency:** Never (6, 2.8%), Rarely (23, 10.6%), About Half the Time (34, 15.6%), Often (72, 33.0%), Always (83, 38.1%)
For a typical course, how often do you use the required textbooks?

**Total Count (N):** 219

**Counts/frequency:** Never (4, 1.8%), 2–3 Times a Semester (33, 15.1%), 2–3 Times a Month (63, 28.8%), 2–3 Times a Week (104, 47.5%), Daily (15, 6.8%)
How much do you typically spend on textbooks each semester?

**Total Count (N): 219**

**Counts/frequency:** Less than $100 (22, 10.0%), $101 – $200 (69, 31.5%), $201 – $300 (70, 32.0%), $301 – $400 (32, 14.6%), $401 – $500 (16, 7.3%), More than $500 (10, 4.6%)
How have you acquired textbooks for your courses? (check all that apply)

**Total Count (N):** 219

**Counts/frequency:** I bought textbooks through the ETSU bookstore. (125, 57.1%), I rented textbooks through the ETSU bookstore. (116, 53.0%), I bought textbooks through a third-party online source (e.g. Amazon, Chegg). (170, 77.6%), I rented textbooks through a third-party online source (e.g. Amazon, Chegg). (151, 68.9%), I’ve borrowed or shared a textbook from my peers. (92, 42.0%), I’ve borrowed a copy from the library (course reserves). (55, 25.1%)

How often did you access the e-textbook?

**Total Count (N):** 215

**Counts/frequency:** Never (35, 16.3%), 2-3 Times a Semester (24, 11.2%), 2-3 Times a Month (51, 23.7%), 2-3 Times a Week (96, 44.7%), Daily (9, 4.2%)
Rate the level of difficulty to access and use the e-textbook.

Total Count (N): 209

Counts/frequency: Very Difficult (6, 2.9%), Difficult (6, 2.9%), Neutral (60, 28.7%), Easy (82, 39.2%), Very Easy (55, 26.3%)
Why did you choose this rating?

**Total Count (N):** 163

[Qualitative data]

What devices did you use to access the e-textbook? (check all that apply)

**Total Count (N):** 202

**Counts/frequency:** Personal Computer (198, 98.0%), Shared Personal Computer (e.g. friend's computer) (9, 4.5%), Shared On-Campus Computer (e.g. library or lab computer) (18, 8.9%), Tablet (35, 17.3%), Phone (57, 28.2%)

Did you print any of the e-textbook?

**Total Count (N):** 212

**Counts/frequency:** Yes (17, 8.0%), No (195, 92.0%)
How much of the e-textbook did you print?

**Total Count (N): 17**

**Counts/frequency:** One to two chapters (15, 88.2%), About half of the textbook (2, 11.8%), All of the textbook (0, 0.0%)

Were there any restrictions that prevented you from printing what you needed?

**Total Count (N): 17**

**Counts/frequency:** Yes (3, 17.6%), No (14, 82.4%)
What restrictions did you encounter?

**Total Count (N):** 2

[Qualitative data]

Did you purchase your own copy of the textbook?

**Total Count (N):** 213

**Counts/frequency:** Yes (51, 23.9%), No (162, 76.1%)

What type of format did you purchase the textbook?

**Total Count (N):** 51

**Counts/frequency:** Electronic (6, 11.8%), Print (37, 72.5%), Both (8, 15.7%)
How much did you spend on the textbook?

**Total Count (N): 51**

**Counts/frequency:** $0-$50 (26, 51.0%), $51-$100 (12, 23.5%), $101-$150 (10, 19.6%), $151-$200 (2, 3.9%), More than $200 (1, 2.0%)

Would you have purchased your own copy if you didn’t have access to the e-textbook through the library?

**Total Count (N): 162**

**Counts/frequency:** Yes (111, 68.5%), No (51, 31.5%)
Did having access to the e-textbook help you to study more effectively?

**Total Count (N):** 212  
**Counts/frequency:** Yes (149, 70.3%), No (32, 15.1%), Unsure (31, 14.6%)

Would you support using funds from the Student Library fee to purchase e-textbooks?

**Total Count (N):** 213  
**Counts/frequency:** Yes (192, 90.1%), No (21, 9.9%)
Do you have any additional feedback?
Total Count (N): 91
[Qualitative data]

Appendix B: Instructor Survey

Some questions were adopted or adapted from a survey under a [CC-BY 4.0 license](http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0) featured in Bliss, T., Robinson, T. J., Hilton, J., & Wiley, D. A. (2013). An OER COUP: College teacher and student perceptions of Open Educational Resources. *Journal of Interactive Media in Education*, 2013(1), Art. 4. [http://doi.org/10.5334/2013-04](http://doi.org/10.5334/2013-04)

How long have you been teaching at the college level?

**Total Count (N): 40**

**Counts/frequency:** Less than 3 Years (7, 17.5%), 3 – 6 Years (5, 12.5%), 6 – 9 Years (4, 10.0%), 9 – 12 Years (4, 10.0%), 12 – 15 Years (4, 10.0%), 15 – 18 Years (3, 7.5%), More than 18 Years (13, 32.5%)
What is your rank?

**Total Count (N):** 39

**Counts/frequency:** Assistant Professor (9, 23.1%), Associate Professor (7, 17.9%), Professor (11, 28.2%), Adjunct (4, 10.3%), Instructor (5, 12.8%), Lecturer (3, 7.7%), Senior Lecturer (0, 0.0%), Other (0, 0.0%)
What is your average teaching load during a regular length semester at your institution?

**Total Count (N): 40**

**Counts/frequency:** 1 Course (4, 10.0%), 2 Courses (7, 17.5%), 3 Courses (23, 57.5%), 4 Courses (4, 10.0%), 5 Courses (2, 5.0%), More than 5 Courses (0, 0.0%)
Are you actively involved in the initial selection or review of textbooks for your courses?

**Total Count (N):** 39

**Counts/frequency:** Always (34, 87.2%), Sometimes (5, 12.8%), Never (0, 0.0%)
Do you submit textbooks on a regular basis to the bookstore?

**Total Count (N): 39**

**Counts/frequency:** Always (24, 61.5%), Sometimes (12, 30.8%), Never (3, 7.7%)

When selecting materials, do you consult the library catalog to see if access is available?

**Total Count (N): 39**

**Counts/frequency:** Always (3, 7.7%), Sometimes (19, 48.7%), Never (17, 43.6%)
Based on the email you received in the beginning of the semester, were you aware these titles were already available or could be purchased through the library?

**Total Count (N): 40**

**Counts/frequency:** Yes (18, 45.0%), No (17, 42.5%), Some titles yes, some titles no (5, 12.5%)

Did you find the emails from the library beneficial?

**Total Count (N): 39**

**Counts/frequency:** Yes (39, 100.0%), No (0, 0.0%)

What communication channels did you use to inform your students of the access to the e-textbook(s)?
Total Count (N): 40

Counts/frequency: Email (33, 82.5%), D2L (37, 92.5%), Course Syllabus (26, 65.0%), Other (4, 10.0%), None (1, 2.5%)

Rate the level of difficulty to implement the e-textbook(s) in your course(s).

Total Count (N): 39

Counts/frequency: Very Difficult (0, 0.0%), Difficult (3, 7.7%), Neutral (3, 7.7%), Easy (10, 25.6%), Very Easy (23, 59.0%)
Why did you choose this rating?

**Total Count (N):** 32

[Qualitative data]

Rate the support from Sherrod Library.

**Total Count (N):** 39

**Counts/frequency:** Very Unhelpful (1, 2.6%), Unhelpful (0, 0.0%), Neutral (1, 2.6%), Helpful (10, 25.6%), Very helpful (27, 69.2%)
How did your students’ preparedness compare to previous semesters?

**Total Count (N):** 39

**Counts/frequency:** Students were Less Prepared (2, 5.1%), Students were Equally Prepared (32, 82.1%), Students were More Prepared (5, 12.8%)
How often do you think students used the e-textbook(s) throughout the semester?

**Total Count (N): 36**

**Counts/frequency:** Never (0, 0.0%), 2–3 Times a Semester (10, 27.8%), 2–3 Times a Month (11, 30.6%), 2–3 Times a Week (15, 41.7%), Daily (0, 0.0%)

What feedback, if any, did you receive from students about accessing and using the e-textbook(s)?

**Total Count (N): 30**

[Qualitative data]

Did having access to the e-textbook(s) alter your course(s) in any way?

**Total Count (N): 34**

[Qualitative data]
Have you used an e-textbook accessible in one of your courses through Sherrod Library before this semester?

**Total Count (N):** 39

**Counts/frequency:** Yes (10, 25.6%), No (29, 74.4%)

Would you support continuing the e-textbook program in which Sherrod Library facilitates the purchase of required e-textbooks for courses?

**Total Count (N):** 39

**Counts/frequency:** Yes (39, 100.0%), No (0, 0.0%)

Would you support your department contributing funds to the e-textbook program?
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Total Count (N): 36

Counts/frequency: Yes (33, 91.7%), No (3, 8.3%)

Would you be interested in attending a workshop to learn more about open educational and low-cost resources for your courses?

Total Count (N): 37

Counts/frequency: Yes (25, 67.6%), No (12, 32.4%)

Do you have any additional feedback?

Total Count (N): 26
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Beastly Breakfast

All Things Open

MICHELLE E. COLQUITT AND JENNIFER A. MEZICK

Questions:

How has your use/reliance upon open access changed over time?

Would you ever choose to drop journals/packages in favor of Open content?

What are some favorite fields/disciplines using open access? Or favorite resources?

What is your perception of Open, and has this changed over time?

What do you think the librarian’s role is concerning open access?

On Friday, November 5, 2021, Michelle Colquitt hosted the Beastly Breakfast: All Things Open for the virtual Charleston Conference. The conversation generated was outstanding for an event held on a Friday morning at 7:30. While this breakfast was sparsely attended by only the coauthors of this paper, a very informative and robust discussion was covering a variety of open-access topics, replete with multiple Gilmore Girls references, and complete with a budding professional friendship.

When posed with the question of how our use of, or reliance upon, open-access materials changed over time, we concurred that both our awareness and use of open-access materials have only increased. We have similar backgrounds, moving from community colleges to large academic libraries at public land-grant institutions, Clemson University and the University of Tennessee-Knoxville (UTK). The experience working in community college libraries has only strengthened our understanding of the importance of open-
access resources. Producing research is not one of the primary goals of a community college. Still, those institutions rely on access to scholarly research to support their larger communities, including their teaching and outreach initiatives, while also teaching students how to locate and evaluate research. In *Gilmore Girls*, Chilton Preparatory School allowed Rory the advantages that come with superbly funded education, but her character would have been unrelatable to a generation of young women if it was not formed by the commonality of attending public school for most of her life. Academics too often take for granted the resources available at large research universities and forget that most of society does not have access to the same body of scholarly work. Land-grant universities further disservice the larger communities they were created to support by actively participating in the standard publishing model that puts scholarly output behind a paywall.

With the ever-increasing costs of electronic resources in mind, Colquitt asked Mezick whether she believed there would ever be a point when a free or inexpensive open-access resource or journal package could replace a more costly electronic resource? The response we discussed was affirmative but with awareness that costs to create resources remain. The issues libraries face with most pricing models exist because of the clashing missions between libraries and publicly owned for-profit companies. When an electronic resource package costs as much as a mansion in Hartford, it’s high time to evaluate the effectiveness of this package. Why should we continue to subscribe to a large package of content when only 20% of that content is used? It is like the Hartford mansion that is used significantly less than a two-bedroom in Stars Hollow when considering total square feet. Most times, the knowledge gained inside the Stars Hollow house is also substantially more than what is accumulated inside the mansion. We agree that continually assessing library resources is vital to maintain the excellent collections at our institutions. Standard measures we both use are cost per use and overlap of content, as well as a variety of measures that cannot be quantified, such as use cases and quality
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of content compared to similar collections. We observe a shift in what is considered an “excellent collection” at RI university libraries. In 2006, Rick Anderson predicted libraries would “continue to misjudge our patron’s current needs and to mis-anticipate their future needs” (Anderson, 2006, p.90). Based on current conversations across the country related to breaking up big deal packages and addressing physical space issues, we think libraries might just be moving into a time when collection decisions using evidence-based approaches are the standard driver, and there is less caution for what users may want.

Much like Rory at Chilton, a “serious” school calls for both serious papers and serious collections. Colquitt asked Mezick about favorite resources or fields and disciplines where she recommended open-access content. Mezick mentioned two new initiatives that seek to fund open-access publishing and resources in different ways and with an emphasis on equity. Colquitt highlighted librarianship resources as well as several potential local history resources. We discussed different funding models and where they work and do not work, and how a successful model may look different at each institution. We decided that conducting an open-access journals/resources scan directly related to our institutions’ academic programs and author output would be beneficial to determine available resources to support through our access and discovery systems and promote through teaching and learning initiatives. We also discussed the ethical importance of publishing our research findings in open-access journals.

When posed with questions about the quality of open-access information, we cited a belief that the quality of information available openly has only improved over time. That said, we agreed that it is essential to conduct thorough evaluations of open-access materials. Colquitt highlighted the research that several of her Clemson University colleagues are conducting in creating a rubric to evaluate open-access materials, paying specific attention to “predatory” publishing practices. Mezick followed up with UTK’s process for evaluating new resource requests and how the same
process has successfully handled requests to fund open-access content. In addition to the routine assessment of information, patrons must be mindful that there can be underlying factors, specifically monetarily related, that impact the quality and authenticity of published information.

One of Lorelai Gilmore’s famous quotes is: “I hate when I’m an idiot and don’t know it. I like being aware of my idiocy” (Sherman-Palladino & Seidel, 2000). We pondered the librarian’s role in patron education related to a world where more resources are available openly and patrons need a library less often to access scholarly content, particularly thinking about the last two years and how destructive misinformation is to society. How do librarians further their reach in an open-access landscape and divide local communities to help users build those skills to evaluate published information for authenticity and quality? We must find a way to walk a delicate line in helping our patrons understand how to evaluate information critically while not coming off as snobbish academic elites by pointing out any perceived “idiocy” or spoon-feeding them in an attempt to locate the “correct” answer. After this Beastly Breakfast, we view the landscape of open-access materials with renewed optimism. As with everything in the library world, there are broad and long-reaching implications with a shift to open access. Lorelai Gilmore summed up the shared journey librarians are currently on when she said, “We're almost there and nowhere near it. All that matters is that we're going!” (Sherman-Palladino & Palladino, 2001).
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On the Road but Where Are We Going?

Insights, Predictions, and Questions from Four Liaisons Serving Business, Data, and Social Sciences

STEVE M. CRAMER; SUMMER KRSTEVSKA; COREY SEEMAN; AND SARA F. HESS

Introduction

What will be the long-term impact of the pandemic on academic liaison work? Four liaisons for business, data, and social sciences from four different campuses describe issues they are facing and try to predict the future.

Steve Cramer, UNC Greensboro

UNC Greensboro (UNCG) began life in the late nineteenth century as the state women’s college, since women were not allowed to attend the two older public university campuses (now called UNC Chapel Hill and North Carolina State University). Of course, people of color couldn't attend any of these three schools back then. In 2022, UNCG is a co-ed, doctoral-granting, social mobility campus, with a slight majority of minority students, and a slight majority of first-generation students among the undergraduates. Among the business school student body, many of the students work twenty or more hours each week to support themselves and/or their families while also attending school full time.
Funding of UNC system campuses is based on enrollment. When enrollment drops, state funding goes down. Enrollment did drop a bit during the pandemic. The biggest segment decline was in transfer students, reflecting the huge drop in enrollment at community colleges. The declining population of high school-aged students across the country is also a factor, although at least the total population of North Carolina continues to grow, due to in-state migration to our urban areas.

So far, the UNCG University Libraries (UL) have been able to limit our budget cuts to the operations budget and the labor budget, since we could give up some open positions. Therefore, we have protected collections. We still need to cover inflation, but almost all our vendors—including the “big deal” publishers—agreed to 0% increases in the pandemic year. In general, the UL have been well-served by the big deals, with low cost-per-use and low inflation. In the next fiscal year, however, the UL will probably not be able to fully protect collections.

UNCG already had robust offerings in distance education, including two purely online PhD programs. When the pandemic began, our liaison librarians were well-trained in supporting online classes and degree programs, via online instruction and consulting as well as video tutorials. Our collections strategy had already moved to “e-preferred” with monographs, utilizing e-book packages and our long-established data-driven acquisition programs. We also were early adopters of streaming video and open education resources (OER), which often get embedded in Canvas. The forced ending of physical classes (including my own three-credit entrepreneurship/economic development research class) in Spring 2020 did not seem to have much impact on access to collections.

The pandemic allowed us to accelerate the movement to e-only. For example, we canceled all remaining print subscriptions—even magazines. Meanwhile, firm order budgets for monographs were cut even further to cover the small inflationary increases in e-subscriptions.

Since enrollment and retention are vital concerns, the notion of
“student success” becomes increasingly important. Student success is now a major factor in collections decisions. Within business collections, we could distinguish between “undergraduate & MBA resources,” in contrast to “faculty and PhD student resources” or “faculty recruitment resources.” These distinctions have strategic implications regarding funding priorities, since not all fall under “student success.”

The “undergraduate & MBA” distinction includes market, industry, and competitive intelligence databases used to support the community-engaged, experiential learning classes. These are often capstone classes in which the student teams use research and data to solve a problem or make a recommendation for a client (usually a local small business, entrepreneur, or nonprofit). The other two distinctions typically concern very expensive datasets (usually financial) in which the data is analyzed using statistical software.

While our library has always focused on cost-per-use data to justify subscription renewals, a strategy that favors the undergraduate/MBA resources, our campus emphasis on student success justifies an even greater emphasis on those experiential learning resources. This focus has the potential to alienate faculty or business school leaders who might also have a priority on recruiting faculty and growing faculty prestige. Library liaisons in this situation have to be prepared to explain the library’s priorities for subscription databases. Sometimes a library shares the costs of the datasets with the business school, or the business school pays for all the costs (Price, 2021).

In the last two years, my library had a large amount of one-time funds to spend at the end of the fiscal year (May–June). This money came from unspent operations funding after the pandemic shut down, as well as unspent labor costs, from both the UL and the Provost’s office. Historically, our library has used one-time money to purchase journal backfiles, digital history archives and other humanities-centered archives, and e-book packages. And we did buy more of those products in the last two years.

However, my GIS/Data Visualization Librarian colleague and I
proposed that our collections team also consider data sources that would support social science and business students and perhaps also natural science students. Some vendors are willing to negotiate multi year access to their subscription products. Of course, there is a question of sustainability for using one-time money to subscribe to products. My colleague and I readily admitted that we can't know what will happen after a five-year deal runs out. Would we have funds to continue the subscription? We argued, however, that we would have usage data and could compare the five-year subscription to other subscriptions. Perhaps the five-year subscription would prove more useful than a database we had been paying for annually. Then we could cancel that annual product to shift its funding to the five-year product for ongoing access. Our collections team agreed to fund a statistical product using one-time money for five years of access, and also a new market and industry database for five years.

Finally, some business vendors do sell products outright. I successfully (and accurately) characterized a collection of business cases as an OER database. OER is a priority at UNCG, as at many libraries. The collections team agreed to that purchase, and I have begun to promote the business plan package as an alternative to faculty forcing students to purchase cases from the Harvard Business School. There are details about our use of one-time money to fund datasets and business databases in a blog post (Cramer, 2021).

So what is next for collections at UNCG, from the perspective of this subject liaison? We expect more budget cutting due to the ongoing pandemic and the national enrollment decline. Our collections budget will probably be hit in 2022, and so I will have to prioritize our current mix of business research databases. Cost-per-use, total use, the importance to specific degree programs, and student success will be my main decision factors.

We received good news in late 2021. Our new state budget provides UNCG with $81 million to expand my library. Of all the sixteen UNC campuses, ours has gone the longest without major
capital investment in its main library (fifty years, since our tower was built). The tower will be made ADA-compliant, resulting in a 35%–40% reduction in stack storage space. We will have to weed 250,000 books or more. Like almost every academic library in the country, the circulation of print books has been steadily declining for twenty years at least. Usage of that collection is minuscule and continues to dwindle.

Meanwhile, the library now provides access to far more e-books than print books. Removing a quarter of million print books will not result in a much smaller collection, given the growth in access to e-books. Most faculty will not be affected by this change—certainly not business school faculty. Nonetheless, our collections team is preparing talking points to explain our collections strategy and trends with faculty. The pandemic and the building project seem to be accelerating collections strategies already underway at UNCG.

**Summer Krstevska, Wake Forest University**

Wake Forest University is a small private university located in Winston Salem, NC. Founded in 1894, Wake excels at providing a liberal arts education to its 8,000+ students. Though reporting to the main campus library, myself and the second business librarian are fully embedded in Wake Forest’s business school. We have our own space that we call the Business Information Commons. Our space is modest in size, and fully utilized as study space as our business collections are almost entirely digital.

At Wake Forest University, we are in a unique situation, especially when compared to the other institutions spoken of on this panel/in these proceedings. In regard to our business resources budget, these circumstances are due to early cuts at the beginning of the pandemic. We unfortunately had to cut Euromonitor due to the timing of the contract renewal. We were told if/when the budget recovers, we would have the money, the equivalent of the costs to
Euromonitor, to either resubscribe or spend on other resources. This ended up being a blessing in disguise! When the time came, it was late 2021 and this allowed us the opportunity to reflect on the changing needs of our students and the business world at large. For example, we didn't know last year that Virginia was going to legalize marijuana or how drastic the increased dependence on online shopping would be. We then subscribed to more appropriate resources and reports such as Mintel's e-commerce and cannabis reports and MRI-Simmons digital life data.

Especially after the height of the pandemic and remote learning, our users have come to expect remote access. At Wake Forest, Bloomberg continues to be our one business resource we are not able to provide remote access to. To use Bloomberg, traditionally you have to be physically present at one of their terminals. Bloomberg was offering various models of remote access, none of which we considered feasible fiscally. We did constantly promote the remote access to their training modules, Bloomberg Market Concepts. Otherwise, we ended up promoting a similar product we subscribe to, S&P Capital IQ that allows for remote access via VPN when accessing off-campus. While still providing access, VPN-only access poses another barrier when accessing critical resources and databases. As we continue to navigate providing library resources and services through the pandemic, we anticipate working with vendors to reduce VPN-only off-site access.

Our users’ expectation for remote access, as well as for formats they are more familiar with, can be seen with our recent all-campus access subscriptions to the Wall Street Journal and the New York Times. Though Wake is already subscribed to both newspapers in a variety of ways, users prefer to access them through their websites or apps as they are used to doing.

Recently, at Wake Forest, we have received a lot of requests for large datasets and ESG data. In our case, our only ESG data is on Bloomberg and as a favor to readers I won't go into the challenges we have with access related to Bloomberg again (see above). As ESG data becomes more popular and you can purchase add-ons
with this type of content (e.g., Capital IQ has offerings), the lack of standardization in ESG ratings across platforms is frustrating for librarians and our users. Figuring out how they differ between resources is a struggle. There is pressure to create more packages and content, but that does not always align with our budgets! We may not be able to purchase until next year and this topic may not be in demand then. Other emerging content areas for Wake Forest are digital marketing and digital user data, which leads us often to seeking out corporate resources that have providers that don't offer academic subscription terms.

It is more important than ever for business liaison librarians to be able to understand and explain both the real-world application and the interdisciplinary appeal of business resources. Understanding and being able to explain the relevance and value of a resource's real-world application can only help gain faculty champions of a resource and when proposing potential cost sharing with the business school. At Wake Forest's main campus library, we have recently created what we call “superfunds.” These are interdisciplinary groups that share funding for monographs, amongst other things. On the topic of business resources, rarely do we get to use “one-time money” because many business resources are on a subscription model. Being able to explain the interdisciplinary use to my colleagues in the social sciences superfund builds demand and leads to business resources to more likely get purchased.

Ultimately, our focus at Wake Forest is to make it worth wild for students to come to campus. At the time of writing this, Wake Forest has returned to in-person operations. This choice reflects our culture, campus, and in-person mission. We have to focus on the benefit(s) of in-person learning that you may not be able to experience online, with the caveat that many business resources are expected to be, and are engaged with, fully online. I believe that many librarians are more concerned than ever with how these online resources may or may not enhance the in-person educational experience and the physical space of the library. These concerns are
invariably intertwined with selection and curation decisions as we move forward in these ambiguous times.

Corey Seeman, University of Michigan

Finding a Path Forward—Exploring the joys of budgetary woes during uncertain times.

Every university and college felt an impact during the ongoing COVID-19 pandemic that ranged from disruptive to destructive. For many schools, the problem was not only in the delivery of instruction and library services, but also in a critical budgetary manner that could impact an institution for years. This was the case at the University of Michigan and in particular, the Ross School of Business where the Kresge Library Services operates. Corey Seeman, Director of Kresge Library Services, shared a brief presentation about how they responded to the COVID-19 budget issues and how they were able to work with many, but not all, vendors.

At the Kresge Library, the budgetary woes did not start with the pandemic. Since FY15 (covering 2014–2015 academic year), the budget for resources has been fundamentally flat, with a minor increase moving to FY16, but basically not growing since then. The timing was difficult as it was the moment when Kresge became a digital-only library, relying more and more on electronic resources. So, in an effort to manage with flat budgets, we normally had to cut databases or scale them back. However, the one benefit is that by virtue of moving away from print, we did save some money related to print reference items that were no longer needed. Needless to say, we were not in the best financial shape (in regard to materials budgets) when the pandemic began.

In regard to higher education, especially in the United States, the financial news was mixed. Early on, all the news looked negative
and much of it was. In regard to higher education, especially for business schools, we saw a number of problems related to COVID-19. Early in the pandemic—this is all we saw! These include:

- Fewer students meant less revenue. And since most schools operate as a non profit, there was little cushion to ride out a rainy day.
- At the Ross School of Business, while the undergraduate population was stable, the graduate population was down 10%. Fewer international students were able to attend and many deferred the start of programs until it could be more residential.
- At Michigan, we deferred a great deal of maintenance and construction projects.
- On the expense side, we had three areas where we had to spend more. There was more money spent on technology, on PPE (personal protective equipment), and cleaning.

Conversely, there was some positive financial news that came out of the pandemic for higher education. This good news was enough to help reduce our budget in FY22. These include:

- Less expenses overall, especially with hosting (food) and travel. It is not surprising what a business school spends in these areas.
- Hiring freezes were put into place and salary increases were suspended for Fall 2020.
- A very conservative and cautious approach to spending for FY 21, along with enrollment that was actually better than projected, led to a modest surplus at the end of the year, which was put back in to replenish the school’s contingency funds.

As our budgetary constraints came into focus, we set aside to control our biggest non-salary expense. Like every library everywhere, that is with electronic and print resources purchased
by the libraries for their campus, community, company, or firm. We explored our holdings and made a number of tough and non-so-tough decisions on controlling expenses to remain under budget. This project was focused on right-sizing our resource spending. There are times when the term “right-sizing” can come with political baggage, but this was not really one of those times. Large universities, like the University of Michigan, have the capacity to use almost everything offered. We are reminded of Dr. Ranganathan’s 2nd Law, “Every reader his or her book” as a goal to acquire a broad and comprehensive collection. However, no library can afford or should purchase everything and be good stewards of the university or college resources.

Prior to the pandemic, vendors have not always been keen on reducing spending packages. They wanted to maintain spending levels, sometimes adding content to sweeten the fact that we had to pay more for the resource. We see that over and over again with our own personal subscriptions to resources like cable, satellite radio, or subscription video services. Price increases often coincide with added content—that may or may not be beneficial to you. One element for stability that we have used for years is long-term deals with vendors. These types of deals provide stability to both sides, ensuring that the vendor has reliable income and the library has reliable expenses. These are mutually beneficial deals that can help anytime. But during this quick pivot to the world of COVID-19, we needed more options. Here are four cases of ways that we were able to work with vendors to find a mutually beneficial path to wellness. The names of the vendors have not been included.

Case 1: Slice and Dice

As with the example provided above whereby vendors can offer additional content to offset increases, libraries can end up with content that is not as critical for their collection. In addition, you can determine that some resources are redundant and are not
critical for you to support research from your community. Two vendors worked with us to look at our content and usage to make better decisions.

We canceled segments that were not used often and were able to renew at a lower price. As I said in a discussion with vendors, we were not looking for something for nothing. Instead, we were hoping to get less and pay less. This brought us real savings in our budget and kudos to the vendors who supported this process.

Case 2: Flat

A few vendors let us go flat for renewals, a fairly common approach for renewals in the summer of 2020 into the end of that year. Some vendors, also no double to short up reliable income, let us go flat for multiple years. When your budget is flat, any increase can only be accommodated by cuts. So the more resources that are flat enabled us to cut less. Kudos also to the vendors who recognized the gravity of the situation and enabled us to renegotiate existing licenses.

Case 3: Flat and Added Benefit (Content and Cost)

A few long-standing vendors acted with great empathy as we were finding a common group for a new contract. Two vendors deserve recognition as being a bit more generous than those in Case 2 (Flat). One vendor offered us a three-year flat deal and added new content that we did not previously have. For this particular vendor, we had a long relationship and they were looking at the big picture. Another vendor offered a multi year flat deal at a lower cost than we paid in 2020, when we were in the last year of our contract. They looked closely at our usage and decided that they wanted a long-term connection with Michigan and this was a good way to find a middle ground. This was very appreciated by the library for obvious reasons.
Case 4: NMP (Not My Problem)

While I could point to three scenarios where vendors worked with us and acknowledged the financial constraints we were operating under, there were occasion vendors who shrugged their shoulders and were not willing, able or interested in finding a middle ground. One vendor asked to remove content from the contract, but offered very little if anything in return. That was fundamentally all the concession we were going to get. For vendors like this, they were focused on the short-term and not the long-term relationship that could provide year after year of revenue.

Through these four cases, along with cuts to resources altogether, we were able to operate within our budget. Once many of these deals expire, I will expect a more difficult renewal. However, the vendors who worked with us in an empathetic manner enabled us to keep more content for our community. It will be interesting to see where the finances of higher education are next year, the year after and the one after that. These are changing times for sure.

Sara Hess, Pennsylvania State University

The Pennsylvania State University is a public, land-grant, research university with an enrollment of over 80,000 students at twenty-four campuses throughout the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania and globally through Penn State World Campus. Penn State’s structure is distinct from many state university systems in that all locations are governed as one university. The UL reflect the structure of the university: while the administrative center of the Libraries is geographically located on the University Park campus, all library locations share a common mission, set of strategic goals, and budget.

Penn State saw a decline in enrollment during the first year of the COVID-19 pandemic. That decline—as well as the loss of non-tuition
revenue streams, such as hospitality services—resulted in budget reductions across the university. In addition to suspending hiring for open positions, the Libraries announced in July 2020 that we would need to reduce our collections budgets by about $2.2 million. Some of the remaining funds would be used for new purchases, including the purchase of electronic resources to support remote teaching and learning during the pandemic (Pennsylvania State University, 2020). Each unit across the Libraries was asked to reduce their budget by a portion of the $2.2 million that was equivalent to their portion of the overall Libraries budget.

The Schreyer Business Library, located on the University Park campus, is the primary funding unit for business information resources. To meet our budget reduction obligation, we canceled ABI/INFORM, a ProQuest database that has articles from business publications including newspapers, magazines, and trade journals. While this cancellation was painful in that ABI/INFORM was used across several assignments in core business courses, we prioritized retaining other business information resources that feature market, industry, financial, and other business data that is not easily substituted through our other electronic resources or cannot be obtained through interlibrary loan. In addition, our unit chose to “give back” a significant portion of the funds previously allocated for the purchase of business and economic monographs. Though this was not ideal, the demand for business information that reflects ongoing changes in the world of business from our students and faculty meant that we had this option.

Like many of our colleagues at Penn State and beyond, we have had to make tough choices to protect and ensure continued access to the most impactful resources in our collection. Those choices have been made by considering the needs and expectations of our users; the constraints on how we can use our funds by university and library policies; and the constraints on what information is available from vendors and how that information can be used. As we move through the acute challenges presented by the pandemic and reckon with ongoing trends in business information and libraries,
I find myself continually reflecting on how those needs, expectations, and constraints impact and influence my collection development activities and my broader practice as a librarian.

I am the business and entrepreneurship librarian in the Schreyer Business Library and serve as the library’s liaison to curricular, cocurricular, and community entrepreneurship programs on the University Park campus. I also collaborate with my colleagues across the university’s Commonwealth campuses. Academic entrepreneurship offerings at Penn State include an undergraduate major and a graduate degree in corporate innovation and entrepreneurship in the Smeal College of Business; an interdisciplinary minor in entrepreneurship and innovation (ENTI) for undergraduate students; several degree and nondegree programs centered at specific Commonwealth campuses; and a minor and graduate certificate offered online through Penn State World Campus (Center for Penn State Student Entrepreneurship, 2022). Students and community members are also able to apply to take part in accelerator programs and other opportunities through Invent Penn State, the university’s Commonwealth-wide initiative focused on entrepreneurship, innovation, and economic development (Invent Penn State, 2022). While there are faculty members across Penn State conducting scholarly research related to entrepreneurship, Penn State’s entrepreneurship ecosystem is dominated by classes and programs that aim to provide students with a practical foundation and hands-on experience that they can apply to launch their own ventures or in any other career path they chose.

As a result, my focus in collection development tends to lean more toward practitioner-focused resources rather than scholarly research on entrepreneurship. I prioritize business information sources that feature up-to-date, actionable market and industry information as that is most often the type of information that library users interested in entrepreneurship are seeking. Scholarly publications and historical information resources that researchers may be looking for are often contained in core, general business
information sources such as Business Source Premier; while it is imperative that we retain those resources, I have found that their broader appeal tends to make it less likely that they will be considered for cancellation in the face of budget reductions. Market and industry databases such as Mintel, BCC Research, SimplyAnalytics, and IBISWorld tend to be pricier and are assumed to have fewer interdisciplinary uses, making them more likely to be considered for cancellation.

It has been crucial to show that these key databases for entrepreneurship do contain information that has interdisciplinary appeal. For example, we have been able to retain SimplyAnalytics—a tool that can be used to map and visualize community demographics, consumer behaviors, and business locations—in part because the interdisciplinary nature of the ENTI minor lends itself to providing examples of the resource being used in nonbusiness classes. For example, I was asked to demonstrate SimplyAnalytics to two journalism classes during the Fall 2021 semester in which the course instructors asked students to use the maps they generated to visualize characteristics of the communities they were reporting on and to generate story ideas. I have had similar experiences in engineering, biotechnology, and hospitality management classes.

Being able to tell stories about how the resources that are important to the subject areas I am the liaison to have proven to be an important aspect of my job amid the uncertainty presented by the pandemic. Moving forward, I plan to continue building that evidence so that I can rely on it—in addition to traditional usage metrics—to make and support collections decisions.
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Collaborative Clusters

Rethinking User Needs and Breaking Down Barriers

JILL DAWSON AND LAUREL CRAWFORD

Abstract

This presentation sheds light on a universal problem in academic library collection development: discovery, communication, and application of information about user needs. Curricula and research are evolving rapidly beyond traditional subject areas and disciplines; likewise, providing resources to meet the needs of our diverse patrons is an urgent concern. University of North Texas Libraries established an innovative centralized system designed to increase transparency, evidence-based decision-making, and user-centeredness. A series of internal focus groups have revealed that traditional structures continue to silo and homogenize collections. How can libraries better design electronic collections to serve the needs of underserved users? This presentation offers a unique approach to discovering user needs and concrete ideas to find a local solution. We will challenge longstanding assumptions about the utility of traditional library collections and infrastructure.

Overview

The University of North Texas (UNT) is a large public Tier 1 research university with approximately 31,000 full-time students. In the past, UNT had a typical collection development (CD) setup for an academic library, involving subject librarians selecting books and
journals title-by-title, using a small subject budget allocated by formula and tradition. Librarians selected items based on what they, and their faculty, believed would be useful. However, subject librarians were isolated from other librarians and they were making collection decisions in a vacuum. CD personnel had little opportunity to act on knowledge about purchasing best practices. Some money was set aside for large, interdisciplinary purchases such as Academic Search Complete or the ScienceDirect journals. We measured success by calculating the expenditure of each budget and the size of the collection in each area, and emphasized a balance of funding and collecting across the curricula. Several years ago, we moved to a centralized CD that involves CD librarians taking title requests from subject librarians and faculty and selecting materials to purchase for collection enhancements or strategic purchases. The materials budget has been combined into one large fund and, for the most part, we do not earmark funds for specific subjects, except for subject enhancements.

Philosophy Behind Cluster Meetings

Several years ago, the UNT Libraries’ CD department established an innovative new system designed to increase transparency, evidence-based decision-making, and user-centeredness. An annual series of internal focus groups, or cluster meetings as we call them, have revealed that traditional mindsets and structures continue to silo and homogenize collections. Our question was how can libraries better design electronic collections to serve the needs of underserved users? The cluster meetings began as a way for the CD department to gauge user needs based on feedback from the subject librarians who were working directly with students and faculty. We wanted more transparency in our practices because we wanted subject librarians to understand how we make our decisions. In addition, we aimed to oversee the application of library
values on the collection as a whole and use holistic oversight that takes all concerns into account. Good selection requires that libraries should be flexible and adaptive in CD and not rely solely on traditional models. As the library field has changed, old models do not work as well. Likewise, we must adapt to new educational models and changes to scholarly communications. Input and analysis of both patron services and technical services librarian experts are needed to make wise decisions.

**Old Way versus New Way**

Initially, we organized cluster meetings by disciplinary groups, such as arts, humanities, and sciences, and we only invited librarians. Soon we realized that the wide-ranging interest in collections traditionally thought of as serving a narrower set of disciplines tells us we should not make assumptions about the utility of a collection based on librarians’ traditional understanding of needs. Unfortunately, CD personnel do not have a comprehensive understanding about user needs; it is difficult to glean this information from piecemeal requests and power requestors.

We changed our methods because we felt the more traditional way reinforced homogeneity and assumes that all patrons within the discipline have the same needs. Also, we found that we were excluding employees who work directly with patrons and could provide valuable information about patron needs. Now the cluster meeting topics are based on user needs, such as novice users, teaching assistants, and primary resource users, and we invite all library employees to get as broad a perspective as possible.

**What Happens at Cluster Meetings**

At the cluster meetings, we gather subjective evidence from the attendees to help us understand user needs. The clusters bring people together across administrative boundaries because we invite employees of every rank. We ask a series of questions about CD
and user needs designed to foster discussion among the attendees. From these discussions, we identify problems, gaps, and technical issues. Usually themes will emerge from meeting discussions that influence how we will prioritize our work for the year. This two-way communication at the meetings fosters synergistic problem-solving as the discussions often bring certain issues to light. The meetings also bring transparency to the selection process which leads to more buy-in from librarians and faculty.

Prior to the cluster meetings, we ask library employees for their input on how we should organize the meetings. All library employees are invited to attend, including student workers. We also send out a survey of anonymous questions asking for feedback on CD department procedures and decisions. Once we decide on topics for each meeting, we invite people to attend. Following the cluster meetings, we send out summaries of the discussion. Through these cluster meetings UNT's CD department has learned some important insights generalizable to other academic libraries, particularly relevant to diversifying electronic collections and making them more accessible.

What We Learned

We had several key takeaways from the summer 2021 cluster meetings. In terms of selection, there were some requests for specific types of resources. For example:

- Nontraditional scholarly information formats are needed by all areas of the curriculum and research. We should think more broadly and creatively about what constitutes scholarship and what belongs in an academic collection.
- We need to continue our efforts to collect resources from underrepresented voices and perspectives. Many vendors are
offering collections that support diversity and inclusion and we should prioritize purchasing these collections. Equity, diversity, and inclusion (EDI) should be a constant priority and a factor in all acquisition decisions at all times. We also need to find ways to identify gaps in our collection in these areas.

- Tangible collections (DVDs, print books, archives, games) are used in surprising new and creative ways. Tangible materials are still preferred and needed by many disciplines, such as visual arts, humanities, games studies, and media studies. They have their own discovery and access issues that we need to consider. We are currently having discussions about collection strategies in these areas as well as coordinating efforts with our Cataloging and Metadata Services and User Interfaces units to make them easier to find.

- We should consider collecting materials in additional languages besides the rather narrow selection of languages we currently collect. We will reconsider our current policy on collecting materials in other languages and look at making strategic purchasing decisions based on user needs in specific subjects.

- Accessibility, discovery, and usability issues were also a common theme throughout the meetings. For example, newspapers are difficult to find and use, because of the way they are packaged and sold by vendors. Users struggle to find articles in newspaper databases. We need to make a greater effort to document these issues and report them to vendors. We also need better coordination of accessibility issues across the library. In response, one of the priorities of our Library Accessibility Committee this year is to address library-wide management of accessibility services.

- Patron awareness of library resources, especially the many electronic resources that are available, was a common theme in some of the meetings. Many users simply don’t know about what we offer, or they don’t understand how a resource could be useful to their research because the title of the resource
does not describe the content or the database description is filled with library jargon. One of our projects this fiscal year is to systematically review and update our database descriptions to make them more understandable to all types of users. We are also exploring different methods for reaching users and promoting our resources.

**Plans for the Future**

Based on the information gleaned from the cluster meetings, the CD department came up with goals for how to better serve underrepresented users. We intend to continue our user-centered approach by dismantling traditional power structures, diversifying communication channels, and eliminating gatekeeping of both collections and patrons. This will involve more direct communication with patrons, such as working with undergraduate and graduate advisory boards. Our other plans include creating a website or LibGuide for the CD department to communicate our decisions as well as all the factors involved in those decisions. We hope greater transparency will lead to more support from librarians, faculty, and the Provost. We will also continue to practice evidence-based CD by diversifying the perspectives of sources and amplifying underrepresented voices.

We recently completed a review of our data resources after discussion at the cluster meetings revealed issues with discovery and use of the data resources in our collection. We reviewed our existing data resources to find issues or gaps in the collection. The review also included a search for possible data resources to add to the collection. As a result of the review, three new interdisciplinary data resource products will be added to the collection.

Another major priority for the CD department is the EDI collections investigations project. The African American studies minor at UNT has recently been revamped to become the Africana...
studies minor. The project will involve collaborating with history faculty to ensure the collection contains resources to support the minor program. CD also plans to work directly with diverse patrons to collect subjective feedback on how best to enhance the African American studies collection. A collection enhancement to support the African studies minor will also be funded to help fill gaps in the collection and add diverse perspectives to the collection. In 2022, the CD department will host more cluster meetings so that we can continue to bring greater clarity to our decisions, engage with library colleagues on how best to serve our patrons, and discover the needs of our users.
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Abstract

At the 2021 Charleston Library Conference, a panel of experts working across scholarly communication led a panel session exploring the pertinent question, “How has COVID affected how we discover, read, and publish research?” Bringing together data from recent content discovery primary research and on-site user behavior, the session covered trends in digital entry points, what people have been most interested in reading, and global publishing habits during turbulent times.
Introduction

It is no exaggeration to say COVID has changed how we behave in a myriad of ways, touching what has felt like every part of our lives since early 2020.

But how has COVID-19 affected journal content discovery, reading, and publishing trends? Has COVID shaken up all our digital search, reading, and publishing habits just as much as it has impacted the rest of our professional, and personal, lives?

The aim of this forty-minute session was to unpack this very question, featuring viewpoints from a publisher, institutional library, and product development expert. The virtual meeting room—a somewhat apt set up given the subject matter—was packed with over 100 guests and kicked off with enthusiastic introductions in the chat, physically distanced but socially connected.

What the Data Says: Search Habits

Elaine Devine from Taylor & Francis began by looking at what the data says about search habits, drawing on two sources. The first was self-reported data from a survey conducted by Renew Consultants in early 2021, “How Readers discover content in scholarly publications,” which explored trends in reader behavior from 2005 to 2021. And second, data from a publisher’s journal platform, Taylor & Francis Online (www.tandfonline.com).

Just to remind ourselves of the context, 2020 started with lockdowns being introduced around the world and by April 2020 half the world’s population had lockdown restrictions of some sort (Sandford, 2020). Elaine Devine recalled how, for academic publisher Taylor & Francis, the year started with an enormous drive to make sure libraries and their users had seamless remote access
to content—a key priority for serving customers as more and more researchers moved to working remotely.

So as people switched to being off campus, would there be a surge in usage to Taylor & Francis Online from other sources outside of the library, like Google Scholar and social media (Facebook, Twitter, LinkedIn)? While there was a temporary dip in the proportion of monthly usage coming from these sources in March and April 2020 as lockdowns rolled through specific countries, data from Taylor & Francis Online indicated there was no great overall effect across the year as a whole (see Table 1).

| Table 1. Proportion of Taylor & Francis Online usage coming from Google Scholar, Google, and social media, 2019–2021 |

And where were people starting their search for research? From 2005 to 2021, self-reported behavior from the Renew survey suggested there had only been incremental changes to search habits, with bibliographic databases still the most important discovery resource, growing in importance since 2018 (Gardner and Inger, 2021). In order of importance, this was followed by: academic search engines, general search engines, publisher’s website, and
finally library web pages, discovery tools, or search engines (Gardner and Inger, 2021).

Devine reminded us of the continued importance of sources such as PubMed as discovery tools and noted Google Scholar’s increasing in importance since 2018. So, for publishers like Taylor & Francis, maintaining accurate and consistent feeds of article metadata to discovery sources like this is key.

What Were People Reading?

Moving on from search, what happened after users got to their destination?

Devine shared data on article usage on Taylor & Francis Online from February to April 2020, the point where for many countries the first national or regional lockdowns began.

This showed a temporary dip in daily article readership in the last two weeks of March 2020, with figures retreating to near or at the levels of equivalent dates in 2019. This drop coincided with global readjustments to working patterns and conditions in the light of the accelerating development of the pandemic (see Table 2).

Table 2. Taylor & Francis Online daily article usage Feb–Apr 2019 and 2020

![Taylor & Francis Online: daily article usage, Feb-Apr 2019/2020](chart.png)
Looking at longer term trends at this point in time (November 2021), there is no evidence that the pandemic directly caused any sustained increase or decrease in usage, no matter the access type (OA, free to access, or subscription). The trend of growth in usage preceeded the pandemic and does not look as though it has been disrupted by it, based on patterns through 2020 and 2021.

And was it mainly COVID research that people were reading? During 2020, Taylor & Francis made a significant body of research articles and data relevant to COVID free to view, based on crawling for keywords within the content. Where content wasn’t already open access, this was to enable the rapid sharing of all relevant research to inform the public health response.

Articles on COVID did contribute significantly to overall usage growth throughout 2020, with a monthly high of 6% in December 2020 and January 2021. But overall usage growth was nevertheless largely driven by other kinds of usage, meaning there remained a strong and consistent appetite for all research throughout the pandemic (see Table 3).

![Graph showing contribution of COVID microsite usage to overall year-on-year monthly usage growth from Oct 2019 to Jul 2021]

**Table 3. Contribution of COVID microsite usage to overall year-on-year monthly usage growth from Oct 2019 to Jul 2021**
A Look at Publishing Trends

Devine noted a surge in article submissions during the pandemic. Comparing all submissions and non-COVID-19 related submissions shows that an increase in submissions was seen for all articles, not just those relating to the pandemic, with a year-on-year high of 39% growth in non-COVID submissions happening in June 2020 and then later peaks in March and again June 2021 (see Tables 4 and 5).

Table 4. % change in all Taylor & Francis submissions to 2019
Was medical research on COVID-19 cited faster? Devine noted that, as of November 2021, the answer, as far as they could see, was no. Humanities and Social Science and Science and Technology COVID articles saw more citations than Medical articles, when taking the top ten cited articles relating to COVID published online in July 2020 as an example month. From tourism to finance, politics to molecular biology and of course immunology, there was a wide spread of research being cited (see Table 6).

Table 5. % change in non-COVID submissions to 2019
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Citations</th>
<th>Article Title</th>
<th>Subject Area</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>155</td>
<td>Country Responses and the Reaction of the Stock Market to COVID-19?</td>
<td>Finance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A Preliminary Exposition</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>119</td>
<td>COVID-19’s Impact on Stock Prices Across Different Sectors?</td>
<td>Finance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>An Event Study Based on the Chinese Stock Market</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>115</td>
<td>Social Media and Vaccine Hesitancy:</td>
<td>Immunology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>New Updates for the Era of COVID-19 and Globalized Infectious Diseases</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>115</td>
<td>The use of the health belief model to assess predictors of intent</td>
<td>Immunology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>to receive the COVID-19 vaccine and willingness to pay</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>109</td>
<td>The impact of the COVID-19 pandemic on firm performance</td>
<td>Finance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>107</td>
<td>Impact of COVID-19 on Logistics Systems and Disruptions in Food Supply Chain</td>
<td>Manufacturing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Engineering</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>102</td>
<td>Classification of the COVID-19 infected patients using DenseNet201 based</td>
<td>Molecular Biology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>deep transfer learning</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>98</td>
<td>Effects of COVID-19 Pandemic on Hospitality Industry:</td>
<td>Tourism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Review of the Current Situations and A Research Agenda</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>93</td>
<td>Mobilizing Policy (In)Capacity to Fight COVID-19:</td>
<td>Politics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Understanding Variations in State Responses</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>92</td>
<td>The disease outbreak channel of exchange rate return predictability:</td>
<td>Finance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Evidence from COVID-19</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6. Top ten Taylor & Francis cited articles relating to COVID published online in July 2020
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Conclusion

This has been a snapshot of findings shared during the session looking at how user behavior has adapted during COVID. Taylor & Francis will be sharing further data sets throughout 2022, visit https://librarianresources.taylorandfrancis.com/ for the latest updates.

Following this presentation, the panel moved on to discuss perspectives from the library and product development team at Taylor & Francis.
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Introduction

Since early 2020 the COVID-19 pandemic has changed or even upended every aspect of life. There isn't an industry, institution, or activity not affected by the pandemic and the changes have been anything but uniform and predictable. Books provide a good example.

Bookstores were locked down like everything else early in the pandemic. Readers, confined at home, had more time for books. Many went shopping, online. By May 2020, the combined category of books, music, and video accounted for over 60% of all online retail ordering, according to the business intelligence firm eMarketer. Sales of eBooks and audiobooks surged, but so did print book sales, a trend that's continued. At the end of 2021, the leading tracker of retail bookselling, NPD BookScan, reported print sales up 9% over 2020.

Supply chains have been in the news throughout the pandemic, and the handling of print books in volume like this put severe strain on the manufacturing, transportation, and storage components of an infrastructure normally invisible to readers. But for anyone carrying out these tasks the strain is all too real. Major infrastructure for the book business is provided by the Nashville-based Ingram Content Group, whose distribution centers, print-on-demand business, digital storage and output capabilities, and marketing, distribution, and sales services touch publishers, online and physical booksellers, and libraries in North America and around
the world, for eBooks and for print books. Academic libraries who don't know Ingram well might be surprised to learn that books they buy from familiar publishers like Oxford University Press, Springer, and Harvard Business Publishing, no matter where a library places its orders, will first pass through Ingram.

For Ingram—and anyone else with a role in the supply chain for print books—the pandemic has meant following new health and safety regulations and procedures; extensive cleaning of facilities; periodic closings due to virus exposure; turnover of warehouse employees; paper shortages and printers going out of business; backlogs in every mode of transportation, air, land, and sea; and uncertain behavior on the part of customers. Early in the pandemic, it wasn't unusual when boxes brought to public library loading docks had to return to Ingram because no library staff were there to receive the books.

The Academic Library Book Market

For many academic libraries, in the early months of the pandemic print books became nearly irrelevant. As campuses emptied and library buildings closed, print collections were suddenly out of reach as classes, study, and research went online. Before long, most libraries restored some access to print. But print usage had dropped so dramatically, as eBook usage soared and the pandemic continued, that for some libraries, while readers in their own communities were ordering print books at record pace, print seemed all but dead.

This chart shows the trajectory of print book orders among academic library customers of ProQuest Books during the pandemic.
ProQuest’s two largest sales regions, North America and the UK/Ireland, are at the top and bottom, respectively. The dotted lines show print acquisitions, the colored lines, eBooks. The dates run from late 2019 through September 2021.

This graph shows that print was very strong at the outset of the pandemic, about 75% of library orders against about 25% for eBooks. Then, starting in March 2020, as the pandemic sent everyone home, the two formats rapidly changed places. At that point it wasn’t difficult to imagine the death of print.

But, print came back. While eBook usage has risen substantially from pre-pandemic levels, the death of print doesn’t seem imminent today. In North America, print book orders reached some 40% by September, while in the UK/Ireland, the two formats were nearly equal.

The graph distills the activity of a great many libraries, each with its own local experience. These experiences were by no means always the same, just as patterns in UK/Ireland and North America were not the same. What happened to print books at Ontario Tech University, for example, was not the same as what happened at the
University of Central Florida (UCF), two libraries whose case studies bring life to the numbers presented by the graph.

**Library Case Study: Ontario Tech University Library**

Our library is small but mighty! Our small team of eight Librarians and ten Library Technicians serve two distinct user groups. Ontario Tech University is a small, primarily undergraduate research university with a strong STEM focus and growing emphasis on Education, Social Science, and Humanities Disciplines. Ontario Tech has about 10,000 full-time students, and 90% are undergraduates. We also provide library services to Durham College, a primarily two-year college with a growing number of three- and four-year degree program offerings and a total FTE enrollment of about 12,000 students.

We operate three branches, with our main branch shared by both the University and the College. Our team serves a diverse group of users at various levels of academic study, from first-year university and college students, to graduate and postdoctoral researchers and faculty members.

Our users have long benefited from a shared print collection. While the library licenses online resources separately for the University and the College, all users have access to our shared print holdings in all three branch locations. This has allowed us to maximize the reach of a small print collections budget, since many disciplines have overlapping subject areas and our Liaison Librarians covered complementary portfolios for both the University and College. Our print collections in disciplines such as Engineering and Applied Science, Business and IT, Health Sciences, Law and Criminology and Education serve double duty, supporting both the University and College curricula.

We offered a popular print reserves service and had a large
proportion of print periodicals, standing orders and legal filings as part of our collection.

Prior to the pandemic, our Librarian selectors were selecting eBook material on the ProQuest and EBSCO platforms, without much demand for single title selection of eBooks from other vendors.

All this changed in March 2020, when COVID-19 shut down our normal library operations and closed our campuses. All courses shifted to online delivery and our entire staff began working from home. In the early days of the pandemic shutdown, our main focus was on the well-being of our team, as we all adjusted to the collective trauma of the global health crisis and struggled to balance the shifting demands of work and family care. We lost access to our print collection including our high-demand print reserves service. As things gradually recalibrated and we recognized that our new online reality would be with us for the foreseeable future, we moved to make some significant changes in our print collections strategy.

In the Spring of 2020 we moved from two eBook platform licenses in OASIS to sixteen, our selectors prioritized eBook acquisition over print, and we adopted new eBook acquisition channels including our first DDA program in OASIS and leasing of eBook content from textbook vendors for course reserves. In addition to these collection strategies, we launched new services to provide expanded access to our print collection including digitization on demand, free home delivery via Canada Post, and the implementation of an online course reserves service using Ex Libris Leganto. Our Librarians implemented Calendly for online appointment booking and began offering online research consultations leveraging a variety of platforms including Google Chat, Google Meet, Zoom, and MS Teams.

The impact of the pandemic on our eBook spending was significant. In 2019–2020 eBook purchases represented less than 20% of our monograph acquisitions. In 2020–2021, that proportion rose to nearly 60% of our monograph spending. The increased cost associated with eBook purchasing, especially for multi user licenses,
meant that our total monograph spending increased by 59% overall during the same period.

Chart 2.

In addition to the impact on our overall budget spending, this dramatic shift in our eBook purchasing patterns brought other challenges and opportunities. Projected enrollment declines early in the pandemic meant the entire University faced budget cuts that impacted Library collections and staffing budgets. We encountered difficulty replicating our textbook reserves service in an online environment, as many commercial textbook publishers do not license their eBook content to libraries. We found ourselves facing a disconnect between faculty and student expectations around eBook availability and the library’s ability to deliver content online.

As we move forward we anticipate an ongoing need to support hybrid and online course delivery and work from home flexibility for library staff. This year we expanded our University Ebook Central DDA program from Engineering to include Education disciplines. We are exploring publisher EBA options for future expansion of our
eBook acquisition options, recognizing that this will require budget support to ensure our EBA programs are sustainable.

Library Case Study: University of Central Florida

The UCF is a very large research university, with about 70,000 students. UCF has over 230 degree programs, of which 79 are doctorate programs. The main library is centrally located on campus, and there are three branch libraries and eleven joint use libraries around central Florida. About 20% of UCF students are first-generation college students, and UCF is federally designated a Hispanic Serving Institution. UCF libraries have a large number of programs to support, and those programs enroll a large number of students.

UCF has traditionally had strong support for print materials. The library has an active print approval plan, receiving about 200 titles a month. Subject librarians are encouraged to routinely review their approval profiles, and changes are typically made once or twice a year. Like many libraries, UCF is short-staffed and under-budgeted, so the subject librarians rely on the approval profile to get the materials they need, with a small allocation to purchase materials not covered by the plan. Some sections of the approval profile are e-preferred, but because print is oftentimes cheaper than eBooks, not many subject librarians have opted in for eBooks on the approval plan.

Space has not yet been a huge issue at UCF. The main library now has an automated retrieval center (ARC) connected to the building that stores much of the print collection. This means that the library has been able to reduce the footprint of the stacks in the library in favor of study spaces without reducing the size of the collection. Patrons can browse for items in the catalog, and once requested print items in the ARC are typically available at the desk for pickup within fifteen minutes.
There are also many cases where, even given an unlimited budget, UCF would continue to opt for print over eBooks. For example, in some areas such as art, eBooks haven't been able to compete with the quality of the print work. In addition, some publishers put restrictions on their eBooks that make it difficult for UCF’s large student body to readily access or download them. It is likely that even if the library decides to move toward e-preferred in approvals and firm orders, print would still be regularly acquired.

Though UCF was closed for a few months in 2020 for the COVID-19 pandemic, there were not many long-term changes. In Spring and Summer of 2020 the library reached out to vendors for temporary or limited online access, but by Fall 2020 that began to taper off as students returned to campus. The main takeaway from that time so far seems to be an increased acceptance of eBooks from some faculty that were previously wholly opposed. However, many of those faculty continue to prefer print.

Physical materials have continued to be used and requested at UCF.

![Chart 3](image)

This chart demonstrates that UCF’s numbers have not yet returned to their pre-pandemic levels, but are well on their way.
Conclusion: Is Print Dead?

Google’s Ngram Viewer enables word or phrase searching across all Google Books texts—and so against many millions of books—showing how frequently those words were used over a defined period. The graph below shows that the question “Is print dead?” was first asked long before the pandemic, when in the late 1970s some people began to imagine what an online world might look like. Futuristic thinking about books peaked around the millennium year 2000, then fell in the years that followed as the book world didn’t altogether transform itself. When the economy crashed in 2007–2008, however, everything was on the table. People again wondered, and as the graph shows, have continued to wonder, “Is print dead?” (Ngram searches can only be run through 2019 and so the graph stops short of the pandemic period, when still more people would surely have been asking the question.)

“Is Print Dead?” (Google Ngram Viewer)

Though the closures in 2020 for the COVID-19 pandemic certainly disrupted the print environment, it was by no means a nail in the coffin. Print numbers are now continuing to rise, and libraries
continue to value and request print materials. While it appears that the Google Ngram question, “Is print dead?” will always be with us, our presentation suggests that while local experience might vary greatly, print books will be with us too.
Hello Library? Where’s Your GPS App?

SUSAN GARRISON

Abstract

Having accessed library materials from their computer screens for nearly two years of remote learning, entering a physical library may feel overwhelming and intimidating to patrons. Compound this with library construction projects, collection shifts and physical pandemic adaptations, and it’s no longer easy for returning staff to know where materials might live. Virtual library orientations may have proved helpful for providing a quick snapshot; however, today’s in-person visits require a deeper dive into our library collections. No two libraries are the same in content or layout, therefore the need for an intuitive and flexible map to our resources has never been greater. Two libraries will discuss their use of StackMap to empower patrons and fast-track their comfort level using the library, by easily guiding them to the research materials, resources, and spaces they need, using maps integrated with the discovery/catalog, library site, and kiosks. In addition, attention will be given to the importance of StackMap during a long-term renovation project and how this tool has been a constant success in the midst of much change. The use of this mobile-friendly software engages patrons and provides them with a more equitable, accessible, contactless, and satisfying library experience.

Rice University’s Fondren Library was built in 1946 partially funded by a $1M endowment from the family of Walter W. Fondren, who
cofounded the Humble Oil Company, later bought by ExxonMobil. Over the years, the building was expanded to add an additional entrance (1969) and renovated to add space and greater access (2005–2006). In 2015, the library renovated its South Reading Room, providing students with varied study space options including high top and cafe style seating, and leisure, new books, newspapers, and DVD materials were placed in this high-traffic area. The building has nine staircases and four elevators, however, not all staircases or elevators go to all floors.

The collection, consisting of 2.8M volumes, 3M microforms, and 141K journals, is dispersed throughout five floors: basement, first, second, third, and fourth. Each floor also houses study rooms, staff offices, storage spaces, mechanical rooms, open study areas, and a system of closed and open carrel study spaces. Printers, bathrooms, lockers, and other amenities are on various floors of the six-floor building. As the building and collection grew, additional shelving was installed, and paper signs, arrows, and guides were posted on floors and walls to help patrons navigate the twists and turns of finding research materials.

In 2009 a group of psychology students conducted a wayfinding study in Fondren based on a 2007 LibQual+ survey in which Fondren patrons stated they found the building difficult to navigate. The students made several recommendations which were adopted by the library including posting directional signage with a “you are here” feature to help patrons find their way to books and spaces (Ajtai, 2012).

In 2010, Fondren’s IT department implemented an SMS feature via the library’s catalog. This feature permitted patrons to text themselves call numbers from a catalog search, which eliminated the need for patrons to jot down numbers with paper and pencil as they traveled from catalog to stacks searching for their items (Segal, 2010).

Always looking for ways to improve the library experience, Fondren sought a solution to simplify finding materials and resources for its patrons. In 2011, Fondren patrons were able to
search for materials via their mobile devices. Subsequently in 2011 Fondren purchased the StackMap system in order to map the library's materials, spaces, and resources.

In 2011, the two primary modules that StackMap offered were Collection Mapping and Room Mapping. Collection mapping is StackMap's most popular product. It allows a library to uniquely identify every item in its collection and make it discoverable similar to geolocation. Fast forward to the late 2010s when StackMap broadened its scope, adding Computer Mapping and the ability to provide interactive touchscreen location services via its Explore feature.

StackMap breaks down the process for implementation as follows.

Step 1: Provide Maps/Floor Plans (1 Week)

StackMap requires either maps or floor plans of the spaces they will need to map via good quality image files.

Step 2: Provide Call Number Data and Create Annotated Maps (2–3 Weeks)

StackMap requests a spreadsheet with call number data (range name, starting call number, ending call number, and location) for the floors to be mapped. Once the call number data has been created, StackMap requests an annotated map containing all of the shelving ranges they will be mapping for each floor (see Figure 1).
Step 3: Schedule Video Call for StackMap Dashboard Tutorial

Once the floor maps, annotated maps, and call number data have been provided, StackMap schedules a screenshare meeting to review basic functionalities of the StackMap dashboard and provide time for Q&A (Figure 2).
Step 4: Integrate StackMap Functionality into the Catalog

For the final step, StackMap provides detailed instructions to assist a library's IT with integrating StackMap functionality with a library's catalog. Once this step is complete, StackMap is available for patron use (T. Scott, personal communication, January 19, 2022).

At Fondren, the implementation began with a StackMap team member being deployed to the library for two days to map the library's stacks. Fondren's IT team tested call number searches, updated call numbers, adjusted ranges, and populated the call numbers for each of the floors. Then IT adjusted the background images for the maps and uploaded the files to the StackMap program, writing and tweaking code along the way. The library
provided map graphics to StackMap which helped set up the layouts in less than two weeks. Floors, locations, directions, ranges, and other assets were identified on each level of the building. Particular mapping attention was given to the library’s special collection areas including leisure books, audio books, and DVDs. Fondren’s Fine Arts collection, which has identical call numbers in two separate locations of the library, required careful attention to mapping (Galvin and Sun, 2013).

The program includes some easy to use features that allow for dragging and dropping ranges and other assets as you map each floor. Also as a library shifts its collection, the program provides the ability to upload entire ranges via a spreadsheet to quickly update material locations. A few initial drawbacks were that not every material type mapped correctly, leading to messages that stated the system didn’t know how to map the item and asked the patron to report the issue, and some LC call number overlap, as StackMap could only parse LC call numbers by two cutter numbers. These minor issues aside, the newly loaded maps were a much welcomed finding aid for the library.

The mapping service was launched just ahead of Spring semester 2012 and patrons embraced it quickly. Similar to patrons at Cairn University, Fondren’s patron base swiftly became adept at searching for an item using the library’s discovery system, and then clicking the “Map it” feature to independently find the stack and range to locate material. Additionally, besides improving the patron experience, library staff were freed from repeatedly addressing directional queries to work on higher level tasks (Figures 3–5).
Figure 3. Fondren Library’s first floor mapped on StackMap.
Figure 4. Fondren Library mobile catalog entry.
Figure 5. Fondren Library map it feature.

Utilizing a system that allows patrons to become self-sufficient in
searching and retrieving material, rooms, and resources in the library has provided greater inclusivity for patrons who may have previously experienced high levels of anxiety negotiating a busy, multitiered, hard-to-navigate research facility. With the rise in mobile technology use (i.e., smartphones and tablets), the library's collection and resources have become more accessible to our patrons and visitors, and have allowed for greater search independence. Fondren Library staff know that implementing this system has been a great success as Fondren's floor map pages are consistently in the top five most viewed web pages, and patrons mapped resources more than 22,000 times in 2019 (Figure 6).

![Figure 6. Fondren Library’s website analytics.](image)

Faculty, students, staff, and visitors have embraced the use of this system to the point of no longer needing paper guides. Librarians have even incorporated the use of StackMap in library instruction, having students look up items on their phones and then using StackMap to physically locate the item in the collection. The move to mapping Fondren's library collection and resources electronically...
has been a major win for patron accessibility and inclusion and provides Fondren’s patrons with a plausible path to locating materials and resources easily and autonomously.

Built in 1992, Cairn University’s Masland Library is a four-floor space with all of the nooks-and-crannies used to house an ever-growing collection of materials. When StackMap was added in 2016, the goal was simple: provide an intuitive and easy to manage finding aid from our Catalog and Discovery to locate materials in the building. After a quick implementation that included sending library plans to StackMap to create layout, completing an excel document to import into the admin app, and adding the script to the footer of pages, the library was live with a MapIt button. From the start, students, faculty, and staff would walk in, phones in hand, and navigate to the floor and row to locate desired materials. Similar to Rice University, the complicated signage and directionals were transformed into an easy to locate map of each floor (Figure 7).

As collections moved and new areas created, StackMap shined through as the go-to tool to keep the patrons aware of changes while allowing the small staff of four librarians to focus on the work at hand rather than creating signage and directionals every time the floor plan shifted—and our floor plans shift a lot (Figure 8).

Figure 7. Script added to EDS customizations and html pages for Sierra OPAC.
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In 2019, the Masland Library embarked on a four phase, build to cost plan to renovate the entire existing library that included plans to revamp the shelving configuration throughout the entire building. All of the moving, storage, and setup is on the shoulders of the library staff. StackMap is the nimble tool that allows the library to keep users up-to-date with constantly changing floor plans with temporary locations.

Since StackMap was implemented in 2016, changes/projects completed include:

- DDC to LCC migration accomplished in-house with lots of mini-shifts.
- Oversize collection (our dear orphan collection) moved at least six times before finding its forever home in June 2020.
- BT-BX methodically shifted to the same floor as the B-BS.
- Temporary shelving/storage set up throughout the library to allow for re-carpeting of an entire floor.
- Front desk moved three times between 2018 and August 2021 (not including temporary spots).
• Reference collection moved floors, configuration, etc. more times than we care to admit.
• And many, many more.

StackMap allows the library staff to rebuild floors as layout, collections, shelving, and offices are changed. It is used, in real time, as we shift, relocate, renovate, and reclassify and has become a part of our workflow as we plan each phase of the current renovation.

In short, StackMap changes as we change with a nimbleness appreciated by our small staff and our users because this tool is updated to direct where to go without the need for endless signage and is right at the point of contact. Not only is StackMap great for the initial set up but as construction/renovations happen, stacks move. All the while, users still need to get to the material. What we thought would be a good add-on quickly became our go-to tool to alert patrons of changes with a single click or tap.

Bibliography


Group, Inc. (COSUGI). Salt Lake City, Utah. Received file directly
from authors; available at www.cosugi.org/past-conference-archives.

In my position as the Academic Technology Librarian at The Daniel Library at The Citadel, The Military College of South Carolina, my primary duty is running the Citadel Makerspace, which is in the library, and is the primary location of this story. I love having a makerspace in the library because it provides access to a set of tools (3D printing, CNC Milling, Virtual Reality [in non-COVID years]), and more to the entire campus community. All students, staff, and faculty have access regardless of discipline. In this way we provide access to technologies and some instruction in their use to a wider range of students than those who would come across them as a matter of course in their studies. I love the idea of having Engineers, Artists, Business Majors, and more working in the same space. But what do you do when all those students have been sent home in the middle of a pandemic?

I’ve heard every year in recent memory declared the “worst year ever” by someone either in conversation or on social media. I tired of this trope quickly and had been quick to complain about it, but I reversed course and joined the consensus in the spring semester of 2020. I teach a class centered around makerspace technologies in the Fine Arts Minor here at The Citadel. As one would expect, it is a hands-on class and I panicked when classes went online during the mid-Spring semester. Sometime in the early Spring, a friend from DC reached out to me online wondering if I were able to do some printing of masks, as he’d seen news of others doing in other countries. This planted the thought in my head. I wasn’t the only one at The Citadel considering such a project.

Around this time, two other Citadel professors, Dr. Sarah Imam and Dr. James Bezjian from the schools of Health and Human
Performance and Business respectively, were thinking along similar lines. Dr. Imam is an MD, and Dr. Bezjian runs the Baker School of Business Innovation Lab. We all connected and began discussing the ways we might help out during the mask shortage.

Through their contacts at the Medical University of South Carolina, they learned a doctor there had developed a mask (the S.A.F.E. mask) that had been granted temporary, provisional approval for use in their hospital, as they had a severe shortage of personal protective equipment. Collectively we thought it would be a great idea to print and assemble as many of these masks as we could.

K Moody, citing Earl Lee, points out the tension that exists between public libraries as institutions that provide access even to anti-government information being funded by the government (Moody, 2005). There is a similar tension in libraries, which want to provide information and resources freely, but exist in a series of nested bureaucracies, from the library itself to the school to the state. The first hurdle, then, was to get permission. Makerspaces are by design flexible spaces that value the ability to adapt to solve new problems as they arise. This is, however, not the nature of bureaucracy. I immediately started printing the models to test our capability for the project. But we had to get buy-in for the concept, first from our library director Aaron Wimer then from the College.

I was not surprised that Aaron was on board if we could get permission from the college’s legal department. I feared this would prove a roadblock, but our legal counsel was onboard as soon as he heard about the masks. Aaron presented the project to the Provost as well who approved the moving of some funds around. In this case, I think the strength of the need for personal protective equipment and clear danger from the virus gave everyone involved the will to cut through any concerns or red tape. In other situations, it could be the most difficult.

While we waited to hear if we could proceed, we tested our capability for the project. We had some concerns about printing and assembly time after our initial test prints, so we considered trying to
improve on the design. We took a replica life mask of John Keats that I’d created from a plaster of paris replica using photogrammetry and used clay to try to shape a possible mask. Then using the Artec Leo scanner from the business school’s Innovation Lab, we scanned and printed it. We quickly determined this would not work for many reasons. Using Tinkercad, a very easy to learn computer-aided design or CAD software, I created a variation of an open-source model that printed flat, and therefore more quickly. This had dual impediments: the material we’d be using was too inflexible for it to fit a human face, and it did not have the emergency approval that the S.A.F.E. mask did. So, given that we had the capability to actually print the MUSC mask and the fact it could go into immediate use, we went with that option. Here we ran into issues with both the permissions and capability and were presented with a third; choosing a path forward quickly. In an emergency this is vital. We were ultimately happy with our choice to go with the S.A.F.E. mask, but we faced a further problem mentioned above: assembly time.

The masks themselves print in five parts. A set took about nine hours to print. I could get two sets of models per machine per day if I started one in the morning and one in the evening. I came in every day at least twice to switch prints. I had a grad assistant who relieved me some days. The assembly proved much more involved and time consuming than we initially suspected. This necessitated taking the project to a wider community than just the initial three of us and Aaron.

Word of the projects quickly spread beyond our campus. One of Dr. Bezjian’s students got Coastal Carolina University’s makerspace on board. They and other local makers started printing and sending us masks. We had an abundance of mask parts. Donations for supplies came in. Assembling those parts consisted of many steps; we had to cut flaps from rubber gloves, cut and fold HEPA filters from AC or air filters, fold them into shape, cut weather stripping, glue all of these into place, and tie on elastic straps. The HEPA filters are capable of filtering out viruses, but they have to be cut to
the right size and glued in properly, or they are ineffective, quality control issue as well; we wouldn't want to send MUSC faulty masks. We realized that we needed to establish a wider net of relationships.

The first group that helped us was the Rotary Club of Charleston. Some of their members started coming in a couple of times a week and, with socially distanced stations, they were of immense help assembling masks. They even provided some lunches. With that help, along with library staff working on the other days, we were able to begin to get assembly caught up with production. But my transition to line manager and quality control agent wasn't quite complete until the South Carolina National Guard stepped in. The guard was initially assigned to one twenty-day stint with us, but was renewed for several more. During this stage we were able to fully catch up. Brig. Gen. Brad Owens presented both Daniel Library and the Rotary Club of Charleston with plaques commemorating the project and a challenge coin to the Staff Sergeant who oversaw the Guard members who were assigned here.

In total we printed and/or assembled 1,001 masks between March and August. Through the process I saw firsthand how libraries, and makerspaces within them, can pivot in a crisis and help the community. I learned several things from the experience. While it won't happen every time, a crisis can really help cut through red tape. I saw the importance of choosing between several options quickly. Even if the design wasn't the most efficient, it was the one that we knew would work and would be allowed in the hospital. I learned the importance of establishing relationships both on and off campus. And on a personal note, having something helpful to do during the pandemic really helped me keep my anxiety in check. While I could never be grateful for the COVID-19 pandemic, I am grateful to Drs. Imam and Bezjian, Director Wimer and other library staff, The Rotary Club of Charleston, and the members of the South Carolina National Guard who helped show how a library can be a vital resource in a crisis.
Stepping Up Your EBA Game

Tips for Managing Your EBA Program

SHAWN HENDRIKX AND DAVID MCCORD

Abstract

This paper outlines content presented in a poster session at the Charleston 2021 conference. It examines ways to budget for Evidence Based Acquisitions (EBAs) and suggests approaches to selecting titles and evaluating EBA usage, taking into account Western University’s experience coordinating twelve concurrent EBA subscriptions. The approach at Western involves several librarians with subject responsibilities, as well as stakeholders at affiliate colleges who share collections with main campus.

Literature Review

Several institutions and consortia have shared their experience with EBA programs in the previous five years, similar to when Western Libraries started its first EBA program in 2017. Orbis Cascade Alliance, a consortium in the northwest United States, reported a successful three-pronged approach for selecting titles in a multi-institution EBA (Abresch et al., 2017; Robbeloth et al., 2017). This contrasts with challenges that emerge when consortia attempt similar programs with Demand-Driven Acquisition (DDA), as reported by OCUL, the Ontario Council of University Libraries (Jurszyk et al., 2020). EBA programs are easier to budget for since the commitment is paid up-front.
EBAs can also offer flexibility in terms of format and content type. For example, the University of Arizona managed a primary source EBA (Elliot & Hazen, 2020), and the University of Colorado set up an EBA for streaming video (Spratt et al., 2017). No matter who manages the EBA and what content is included, usage reports are crucial for measuring a program’s success. However, librarians often select titles outside the top used titles. At the University of British Columbia, the library intentionally selected to own EBA titles with no usage, and only front-list titles were selected to own going forward (Armstrong et al., 2017). EBA programs offer a great diversity in approaches to commitment, content, and selection.

Ways to Budget Your EBA

A budget can determine the breadth and long-term viability of an EBA program. New EBAs can be funded through pooled contributions from library funds dedicated to individual subject and collection areas. One-time and special funds are helpful in starting EBA pilots, and a portion of subject monograph funds or other recurring budgets can be reallocated to a new EBA fund for sustained commitment. Affiliate libraries and consortia can also be sources for collaboration and funding, but remember that outside contributions can run a risk of being withdrawn in the future.

Once an EBA pilot is concluded, usage statistics can inform future contributions from stakeholders and subject areas. For example, usage collected over the past year may indicate a strong demand for one subject area, but less so for another (i.e., STEM titles vs. Law titles). As a result, adjustments can be made to future contributions, even exempting discipline areas from contributing the next time contributions are being considered. To ensure consistency and avoid internal budget negotiations for each EBA, establishing a central dedicated EBA fund is recommended sooner rather than later. Once an EBA program matures, it is important for librarians
and stakeholders to trust the process and focus less on each area’s “fair share.” An EBA budget also needs flexibility as new publishers and new opportunities arise.

### Setting Up an EBA Fund

At Western, the Collections and Content Strategies Team identified the need to establish an ongoing, centralized EBA fund. With no bottom-line increases to the collections budget, permanent (or ongoing) allocations from monograph funds were required. Librarians agreed to contribute the following amounts from their budgets towards the new EBA fund (Figure 1). The rationale for the contributions was loosely based on funds that were available in each subject’s monograph budget, as well as the perceived value the current EBAs would bring in the subject areas, thus decreasing the need for monograph funds.

Figure 1. A breakdown of contributions by Disciplinary Area to create centralized EBA fund (May 2021).
### PERMANENT CONTRIBUTIONS

#### Disciplinary Area

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Disciplinary Area</th>
<th>Contribution (U.S. dollars)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>STEM, Health and Medicine</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arts and Humanities, Social Sciences</td>
<td>$55,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Law</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Music</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal</td>
<td>$195,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contributions from Affiliate Colleges</td>
<td>$71,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special one-time funding</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Grand Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$551,500</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Selecting Titles to Own

Reviewing usage statistics is a key part of managing an EBA program (Spratt, 2017). EBA programs offer flexibility when it comes to choosing selections at the end of a subscription period. Titles can be selected strictly according to usage, or they can be selected according to any other criteria considered to be of value (i.e., subject or discipline, collection, date of publication, imprint/press, etc.). To make meaningful selections, EBAs require an agreed-upon approach in order to satisfy the needs and objectives set out by the collections team. Considering the needs of librarians and other stakeholders is key to creating buy-in for the program, especially if team members are contributing funds from other budgets.

The various “pros and cons” of two different approaches are described in the following table (Table 1).

Table 1. “Pros and cons” of two approaches to EBA selection

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Selecting by Usage</th>
<th>Selecting by Librarian Commitment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pro</strong></td>
<td>Simple</td>
<td>Librarians involved in the selection process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Demand-driven and user-centered</td>
<td>Small programs or disciplines with high enrollment or preference for e-books</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Selections demonstrate value to most users</td>
<td>Selections may not be spread evenly across disciplines</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Con</strong></td>
<td>Discipline agnostic</td>
<td>Not user-centered</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Skews selection toward programs with high enrollment or preference for e-books</td>
<td>Leaves out some titles with high usage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Selections may not be spread evenly across disciplines</td>
<td>Inefficient use of funds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Extra workload</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Selecting titles based on usage is by nature evidence-based and is, therefore, a common method of making selections. This approach
can be very simple, efficient, and user-centered. Selections align with material that is the highest used throughout the year. A disadvantage is that this approach fails to take into consideration subject area or discipline, which may skew selections toward programs with high enrollment or users with a preference for e-books.

An alternative approach can involve subject and collection librarians, who may choose titles independent of usage, based on a predetermined dollar amount (usually based on a contribution amount). A benefit of this approach is that librarians stay involved in the selection process. In addition, small programs or disciplines with lower use aren’t necessarily disadvantaged when it comes to making the final decisions on selections. Involving librarians this way can also plead the case for additional contributions and reallocation of funds if evidence shows there is a need. A disadvantage of this approach is that it can be time-consuming, placing workload pressures on librarians. It can also leave out highly used titles and, as a result, can be an inefficient use of funds.

As Western’s EBA program has matured, the Collections and Content Strategies team has changed its approach to selections. Initially, while the program was still funded by subject fund contributions, librarians used usage statistics combined with subject expertise to select titles up to their contribution amounts. In early 2020, Western established a centralized fund for EBA independent of subject contributions. The centralized fund also included contributions by affiliate libraries who also saw a benefit from titles being accessed in the program. Since then, selections have been by-and-large selected based on usage. Final selections are still reviewed by librarians and affiliates who still have an opportunity to make changes and requests before the final list is submitted. Preparing a report by usage and making initial recommendations beforehand saves the team time when librarians select and make additional requests or recommendations. Western’s hybrid approach demonstrated over the last two years has proved to be both effective and efficient.
What to Consider When Selecting Titles by Usage

Vendors must be able to provide Counter5 compliant reports with the “Unique Title Requests” metric. This metric counts one use when a unique user downloads the full-text title or one or more chapters. Other metrics can inflate usage because they count each download from the same user or each chapter download. Publishers present usage reports differently and often omit key pieces of information which can also be useful when making selections. Publication date, pricing, and subject headings are all helpful information when deciding on titles to own.

Remember that e-books are used differently than journals. A journal with ten uses in a year is often a candidate for cancellation, but an e-book with ten uses is often considered to be high-performing. Good usage also varies by discipline, depending on how users interact with the content. An e-book in Medicine may be accessed repeatedly to meet a specific information need in one chapter, but a title in English may be downloaded once and read cover to cover. Over time, the medical book’s value diminishes as the information becomes outdated, but the English book may retain its value to readers and will continue to be used for a longer period.

Other considerations should also be taken into account when selecting titles by usage. Titles slated to be removed from the EBA pool at the end of the EBA term should be prioritized, and the most expensive titles should be deprioritized if they continue to be accessible when the EBA is renewed. Removing expensive titles allows for more overall selections, producing a better return on investment. Likewise, vendors may offer deeper discounts for EBA titles owned in print, which can further increase the EBA’s purchasing power.

Selecting titles with zero usage is generally discouraged unless there is a justification. For instance, (i) if the title demonstrated use in previous years; (ii) if it’s included in course syllabi next term; (iii) if
the title has been requested by a user; (iv) if the title is authored by a researcher at the institution. Selecting zero-use titles is especially difficult to justify when titles continue to be available upon renewal of the EBA.

No matter the approach, final selections often (if not always) exclude some titles with high use. This should not be a cause for concern when the EBA is renewed. If an EBA is not renewed, the institution should consider whether and how access to remaining titles of value should continue.

**Evaluating Your EBA: Some Examples**

The decision on whether or not to renew an EBA is based on an EBA's performance as well as the library's available budget. One comparison is to estimate the cost of setting the same titles to a DDA program (Demand-Driven Acquisition model). In a DDA program, a standard threshold for triggering a full purchase of a title is three uses. Looking at the cost of purchasing all books with three or more uses is a good starting point for estimating an absolute maximum price to pay for an EBA. At any higher price, the library is usually better off setting the titles to DDA. Keep in mind, however, that the estimated cost of DDA may be unsustainable too.

As a result, the library may want to determine a second threshold for determining a more reasonable cost for an EBA program, based on the average return on investment seen in other EBAs. This can vary according to the library's available budget and the performance of other EBAs within the budget. At the moment, Western considers five uses or more (5+) to be a good benchmark for determining a competitive value of an EBA (Table 2).

Table 2. Estimating maximum value and competitive value of an EBA
Looking at Some Other Examples

1. A renewal quote for “Publisher A” exceeded the cost of purchasing all titles with three or more uses. Western declined the renewal of the EBA based on usage. The vendor then offered a significant price reduction ($15,000), bringing it in line with the value of purchasing all titles with five or more uses. Based on this metric, the quote was accepted and the EBA was renewed. However, the revised quote is still greater than Western’s historic spend for the publisher, so future sustainability is in question. A higher threshold may be required upon the next renewal.

2. A previous EBA with “Publisher B” was expanded to include backlist titles at no additional cost, in order to provide additional digital access during the pandemic. Upon renewal, the new cost including the backlist exceeded Western’s regular budget, and backlist titles were used less than front-list during the period of evaluation. Western removed the backlist upon the EBA’s renewal to keep in line with the budget. Western focused selections on backlist titles as well. After one year, backlist turn-aways indicated higher demand, so Western upgraded to the complete collection with step-up pricing over three years to reduce pressure on the EBA budget.
Developing a Game Plan for When an EBA Isn’t Renewed

Not renewing an EBA isn’t necessarily a sign of wasted money or a failed attempt. In fact, many EBAs have a natural expiry date, given that ongoing selections continually remove content from an EBA’s offerings. The amount of valuable content, overall cost, and the addition of new content all factor into the viable lifespan of an EBA. In some cases, subscribing to an EBA over two to three years gives libraries a chance to purchase the most requested and valued content and walk away; in other EBAs this may take longer.

When an EBA renewal isn’t possible, either for evidence-based reasons or because of budget, the library needs a strategy for titles that will no longer be accessible. Setting lost titles to DDA is one alternative to maintain access, but this will also add additional pressure on the DDA budget. One way to estimate this additional cost is by looking at titles with three or more uses after final selections have been made. This can estimate the potential cost in the coming year of setting the remaining titles to DDA.

Placing firm orders based on usage and librarian discretion is also an option, but costs can add up quickly. Another strategy is simply to wait for purchase requests from faculty and students, which librarians and budgets need to be prepared for. In some cases, bulk purchases above certain quantities offer deeper discounts. No matter which strategy is used, it is crucial to update records immediately after the end of the EBA program so that links aren’t left behind pointing to inaccessible content.

Conclusion

Western’s EBA program continues to evolve, and the library is well-positioned to maintain current programs and explore new
opportunities with a centralized EBA fund. Recently, the collections team chose not to renew an EBA, but Western Libraries is now expanding its EBA program to include streaming video as well. While Western’s EBA experience has informed the arguments put forward in this paper, it is important to recognize that each academic institution is unique, with different organizational structures, budgets, and user needs. Schools are encouraged to consider and adopt these suggestions where it makes sense to do so. EBAs are a useful method of content access and selection but only one of many tools libraries can use as part of a robust collection development strategy.
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One of the most consequential questions academic library professionals working with entrepreneurs face is the question of who is authorized to use the library's licensed electronic resources and for what purposes those resources may be used. Whether an entrepreneur is a student, university employee, or community member, more questions than answers tend to arise when considering the user's research need and intention for the information they find. Many online library resources related to entrepreneurship and business more broadly include clauses in their license agreements limiting the use of the resources to those who are current students or employees of an academic library's parent institution. While some licensed resources do allow for use by walk-in users, vendors of specialized business information do not always allow unaffiliated users access on a walk-in basis (Aagaard & Arguello, 2015). In addition, the license agreements for business information resources often limit authorized users to those which are educational or noncommercial in nature. Because student, alumni, and community entrepreneurs are often working toward
a goal that is for-profit or commercial—that is, starting their own business—the point at which library professionals may need to close the door on access to these resources can be murky.

Library professionals’ concerns about how electronic resource licenses apply to entrepreneurial uses have been raised in discussions among business librarians and others who work with these users as well as in the literature. The description of a 2014 preconference held at the American Library Association’s (ALA) Annual Conference and sponsored by ALA’s Business Reference and Services Section (BRASS) centered on library support for entrepreneurs promised attendees would “… learn what constitutes acceptable use of subscription business e-resources by entrepreneurs and how to work with vendors to avoid infringement claims” (BRASS, 2014). Prior to the preconference, participants were surveyed about their familiarity with licensing electronic resources for entrepreneurial and general uses; the overwhelming majority of respondents indicated that they had moderate knowledge or less of these concepts (Aagaard & Arguello, 2015).

I am not a lawyer, an expert in interpreting license agreement terms, or directly involved in negotiating license agreements for my institution. I am, however, the subject liaison to a wide range of academic, experiential, cocurricular, and community entrepreneurship and innovation programs at my campus. During instruction sessions, workshops, and research consultations, I am regularly asked about who can access and use our licensed information resources for entrepreneurial activities by students, faculty, and community members. More often than not, my answers to these questions feel jumbled, unclear, or contrary to my intended message that my colleagues and I are there to help our users find and use the information they need. I want to improve how I communicate about these terms and restrictions.

As one step toward reaching this goal, I decided to examine
whether my colleagues at other universities communicate these restrictions to their users on entrepreneurship research guides. I also decided to look at whether they feature publicly accessible information resources on these guides either as an explicit or implicit alternative to licensed resources. While previous research and conversations have centered on negotiations and relationships with vendors—undoubtedly an important and necessary response to this challenge—discovering effective ways to communicate access restrictions on licensed resources is key to maintaining a positive user experience. With that in mind, I aimed to work toward answering the following questions: (1) How do academic library websites communicate restrictions on accessing and using licensed, online resources to student, alumni, and community entrepreneurs? and (2) What alternatives to licensed resources are presented on entrepreneurship- or small-business-focused research guides?

Method and Findings

In order to examine how academic library websites communicate restrictions on accessing and using licensed, online resources to students, alumni, and community entrepreneurs, I started by creating a list of American Association of Universities (AAU) and Association of Public and Land-Grant Universities (APLU) member institutions. I chose the member institutions of these associations because of their size; the likelihood that their libraries would have the budget to acquire one or more resources related to entrepreneurship; and the likelihood that their libraries would have the personnel to maintain a research guide related to entrepreneurship. In addition, APLU member institutions were included because of the outreach and community engagement mission of land grant universities (Doney, 2019). Non-US institutions were excluded from the sample. Rather than including university
system members, I opted to include each member campus with its own library system; for example, each institution in the University of California system that is listed as a member of the APLU was included in the sample rather than the entire university system. A total of 219 institutions meeting these criteria were identified.

Next, I searched each institution’s library’s website for a research guide related to entrepreneurship or small business topics. When possible, I located a full list of research guides available through each library and used my browser’s Find function to search for the following four terms in order: entrepreneurship, small business, new venture, and startup. Guides that were related to a specific course were excluded. If multiple guides were identified, the first relevant guide listed was chosen. If a full list of guides were not available on a library’s website, I entered each of the terms in the website’s search function. A total of 107 guides were identified. I excluded my own institution’s guide from the sample, bringing the final sample to 106 guides.

Once the sample was established, I examined each guide for notes detailing access requirements and restrictions. I recorded whether each guide included any sort of information about who could access what resources under what circumstances. I noted whether access notes were applied to the entire guide; to a specific section of the guide, such as a given page, box, or list of resources; or to a specific resource. Nearly all research guides in the sample included a guide-wide access note or an access note applied to one or more sections or resources. Of the 106 guides examined, 92 guides (86.8%) had at least one type of access note.

Across the guides, access notes that were not attached to a specific resource were less common than access notes that were. Forty-seven guides (44.3%) had access notes that were not attached to a specific resource, with twenty-two guides (20.8%) featuring access notes applied to the whole guide. Whole guide notes often established that resources were only available to the institution’s students, faculty, and staff or indicated that a university login would be needed to access some or all of the resources featured on the
guide. Section-specific access notes apply to a given box, page, or list of resources within the body of the guide and were typically either similar in messaging to the guide-wide notes or indicated that a given list of resources were “free.” Thirty-four guides (32.1%) included such a note.

At least one access note attached to a specific resource was found on twenty-three guides (68.9%). Two types of resource-specific access notes were found: notes in the title of a resource and notes in the description of a resource. Forty-three guides (40.6%) placed an access note in the title of one or more resource. Included in that figure are guides that use icons to indicate whether a given resource is accessible by current institution affiliates or members of the public as well as whether a resource is open access. Fifty-six guides (52.8%) included an access note in the description of at least one resource. Any guide that indicated that at least one resource is “free” is included in this figure.

Many of the guides that included resource-specific access notes were not consistent in how they applied these notes across resources. Of the forty-three guides that utilized access notes in the titles of resources, twenty-seven (62.8%) used an access note for more than half of the licensed resources listed and five (11.6%) used an access note for more than half of the publicly available resources listed. Of the fifty-six guides that included an access note in the description of at least one resource, three (5.4%) used an access note for more than half of the licensed resources listed and one (1.8%) used an access note for more than half of the publicly available resources listed.

In addition to examining each guide for access notes, I also determined whether each guide featured publicly available resources. I created a list of twelve topics based on a preliminary examination of twenty guides randomly selected from the overall sample; these topics are listed in Table 1. I recorded whether each guide included a link to at least one publicly available resource as well as which topic(s) those resources addressed.

Most guides (102; 96.2%) linked to at least one publicly available
resource. The most common topics addressed by publicly available resources were market research, getting started with entrepreneurship, industry research, and local resources. Over half of the 106 entrepreneurship guides examined also included links to resources related to the topics of business planning or funding. Full results for the number of guides featuring one or more links related to each topic area are provided in Table 1.

Table 1. Number and percentage of entrepreneurship guides that include links to publicly available resources by topic
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Number of guides</th>
<th>Percentage of guides</th>
<th>Examples of commonly featured publicly available resources</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Market research</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>62.3%</td>
<td>US Census Bureau</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>US Bureau of Labor Statistics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Pew Research Center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Getting started</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>59.4%</td>
<td>US Small Business Administration (SBA)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Small Business Development Centers (SBDCs)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Service Corps of Retired Executives (SCORE)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industry research</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>58.5%</td>
<td>US Census Bureau</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>North American Industry Classification System (NAICS) industry classifications</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local resources</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>57.6%</td>
<td>Local chapters of SCORE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Local SBDC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>State or city information about starting a business</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business planning</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>53.8%</td>
<td>US SBA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Bplans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Carnegie Library of Pittsburgh Business Plans and Profiles Index</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University resources</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>52.8%</td>
<td>University-managed incubator and/or accelerator programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Centers for entrepreneurship research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Commercialization and technology transfer offices</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Funding</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>51.9%</td>
<td>National Venture Capital Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>US SBA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intellectual property</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>41.5%</td>
<td>US Patents and Trademarks Office (USPTO)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Google Advanced Patent Search</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Finally, I examined each guide to determine whether it linked to resources provided through a different library or library system. A handful of guides (twenty guides; 18.9% of guides examined) linked or referred to the Library of Congress; a state library; a public library located in a metropolitan library that provides electronic resource access to all residents of a state; or a local public library as a potential source of additional resources. Fifteen of these twenty guides (14.1% of all guides examined) referred users to a local public library while twelve pointed users to the Library of Congress’s Entrepreneur’s Reference Guide to Small Business Information.[1]

Next Steps

This research establishes that entrepreneurship guides across AAU and APLU member institutions’ libraries vary widely in terms of how they address access restrictions. In addition, publicly accessible resources are common on entrepreneurship research guides at these institutions, but there is quite a bit of variation in what topics are addressed by these resources as well.

As I continue working to improve my own communication about
restrictions on online resources to students, alumni, and community entrepreneurs, I plan to engage in a deeper dive into how my colleagues at other libraries address these issues. I will take an in-depth look at the content of the messages that are presented and seek to establish a set of best practices for communicating access and use restrictions. I intend to look at whether there are commonalities among institutions with guides that address access and use restrictions: for example, are guides produced at public universities more likely to include this information than those produced by private universities? Does an institution’s status as a land-grant university correlate with information about how community members can use the library’s licensed entrepreneurship resources? Finally, I plan to refine the data I have collected on which publicly accessible resources appear most often in relation to each topic in order to create a resource that can be used by library professionals to better serve entrepreneurs regardless of affiliation.
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Assessing the Needs of Children’s and Young Adult Collections for Academic Libraries

ASHLEY HOSBACH AND BRITTANY KESTER

Understanding Collection Needs from Education Schools

College and university Education school libraries require unique collection development strategies to meet the needs of their students, staff, and faculty. With a wide patron base that spans from researchers to practitioners, these collections stray from traditional university library parameters. Education schools merge theory, clinical work, and practice. As a result, their library collections can contain traditional research books, P-12 textbooks, manipulatives like puppets and board games, makerspace materials, and children’s and young adult (YA) literature. These collections, at first glance, may seem more suited for a public library or school library setting. But, it is important to understand the context behind this patron population. Education schools prepare and support educators, counselors, administrators, researchers, and clinicians in the field. These collections need to serve patrons both inside and outside of the traditional academic classroom to set them up for success beyond campus borders.
The children’s and YA literature collections that support Education schools are designed for research and practitioner use. A popular discussion among collection development librarians is that children’s literature collections in academic libraries should not mirror the children’s literature collections in public libraries as they don’t serve the same purpose. The patrons who use children’s and YA collections in academic libraries frequently tend to be teacher education, school counselor, and speech therapy students. Public libraries collect broadly and closely follow trends in popular culture. School libraries are often limited in what they can collect due to financial and political constraints. Academic libraries are privileged in that they can, perhaps, collect aspirationally and more progressively than their counterparts.

Often these collections mimic the curricula from Education schools in that they are idealistic and push for change. They tend to include materials that are more left-leaning and promote equity, diversity, and inclusion in the hopes that students will be able to incorporate them in their future classrooms. However, there is the understanding that not all students will have the freedom to do so once they leave the university setting. In the United States, the past two years spiked an increase in political tension, widespread book banning, and systemic persecution of educators (Waxman, 2021). While some states are advancing with forward-thinking changes to state standards in the teaching of Black History, Asian American and Pacific Island (AAPI) history, and Native American history others are turning to extremism (Donyéa, 2022). As the authors are writing this paper, many states are attempting to enact legislation against teaching about the Holocaust, racism, and LGBTQ+ people that echo mandates from the early 1900s (Kennedy, 2022). It's more imperative than ever that academic librarians should collect resources that support equitable lesson planning, particularly in states where their
school and public library counterparts face pushback on acquiring these materials.

Notably, Education schools are preparing their students to work in diverse P-12 environments. Today’s P-12 classrooms are more diverse than ever (Projections of Education Statistics to 2028, 2020). Syllabi in children’s and YA literature courses often include assignments like diversity audits, identifying books that defy social norms, challenging white-centered literary canon, selecting bilingual texts for translanguageing, and curating diverse classroom libraries by identifying authentic voices texts. It’s crucial for academic libraries to collect beyond traditional award winners and mainstream publishers to better support future educators in these courses.

Challenges and Limitations

However, fine-tuned collection development plans aren’t enough. Children’s and YA collections suffer from a severe lack of online discoverability within standard academic library catalogs. This is due to inconsistent and inaccurate metadata. Education librarians are forced to create workarounds, often in the form of extensive LibGuides listing individual titles, so their students can access the materials they need. But, it’s not just online access that is limited. Physical browsing is next to impossible because most academic libraries use the Library of Congress classification for cataloging. In comparison, public libraries and school libraries tend to use the Dewey Decimal System or alphabetize their holdings. While the Library of Congress classification works well for traditional academic texts, it leaves much to be desired for children’s and YA collections. Simply put, students’ methods of searching don’t line up with these frameworks. This paper explores two projects that propose alternative approaches to creating enhanced metadata for improvements in discoverability.
University of Florida’s Metadata Assessment

The University of Florida’s (UF) Education Library undertook a metadata assessment project as a response to survey and verbal feedback from students that they could not locate books in the library catalog that they needed for their children’s literature classes. The Education Librarian, Brittany Kester, conducted trial searches and discovered that there were books that could not be located in the library catalog using predictable search terms. For example, if a student needed a bilingual book and searched the term “bilingual” only a fraction of the bilingual books held by the library appeared in the search results.

It was decided that to solve this problem the metadata of the children’s and YA collection may need to be enhanced to include subject terms that more closely match what students would use to search for the books. Kester began with a pilot project that would analyze the metadata of a section of the children’s and YA collection. The award-winning/honor books were selected as a realistic section of the collection for a pilot study. The total number of books was reasonable and it was known that the metadata of these books should include the award won and subject terms related to the award. The end goal was to, hopefully, improve the discoverability and usability of the award-winning/honor books in the collection.

A Qualtrics survey was used to create the collection instrument. Student employees and staff were recruited to assist with the project and input of this information. The instrument collected:

1. Title
2. Author
3. Publication year
4. MARC001 Number
5. Education Library owns a copy of the title?
6. All awards/honors the title has won
7. Award(s) listed in UF Libraries’ catalog metadata?
8. Subject metadata corresponding to the award(s) theme?

A total of 1,336 books owned by the Education Library were analyzed using the instrument. It was found that 989 books (74%) have some type of mistake regarding the awards, such as the award is not listed or a correction is needed (e.g., incorrect year or name of award), and 212 books (16%) are missing information in the metadata subject field that correspond to the reason the award or honor was given.

At this point the plan was to work with Library Cataloging and Discovery Services to enhance the metadata of these books; however, before this could happen the UF Libraries transitioned to a new integrated library system (ILS). Now public college and university libraries in the state of Florida all use the same ILS. As a result of this change some catalog entries were combined or deleted, meaning that a second review of the metadata was needed. Currently, Kester is in the middle of this process and, once complete, will work with Cataloging and Discovery Services to address problems and add information to the metadata. After the enhancements are made, Kester plans to conduct a study with the College of Education’s Children’s Literature courses that will evaluate student usage and satisfaction of the changes to the catalog records of the award-winning/honor books. This data will inform if an expansion of the metadata assessment project is needed for the rest of the children’s and YA collection.

Mapping University of Virginia’s COVID-19 Pandemic Education Collection

Thanks to generous funding from the University of Virginia’s (UVA) Jefferson Trust, Ashley Hosbach, UVA’s Education and Social Science Research Librarian, established the first Pandemic Education Children’s Book Collection in the country (Farish, 2021). Hosbach identified a need to support P-12 educators, counselors, parents,
and administrators with public health education for COVID-19 safety and prevention. The collection currently contains 150+ titles and continues to grow as more books are published in this area. As the COVID-19 pandemic approaches its third year, its impact on P-12 education persists. Many issues have risen to the surface because of this instability. Students struggle with establishing new social norms with the return to school, adjusting to emergency pivots to online learning, and an alarming increase in mental health issues due to isolation and prolonged grief. Based on these needs, this collection is mapped across three frameworks: a public health crisis response, Social Emotional Learning (SEL), and COVID-19.

Hosbach designed a public health crisis framework to formulate a collection development plan and map the books for P-12 use based on best practices for public health. The framework includes four areas to acquire titles that are (1) pro-vaccination, (2) normalize face masks, (3) promote good hygiene practices, and (4) establish doctors and scientists as trusted figures. In addition to the framework, Hosbach and a student assistant will be mapping the collection to the Virginia Department of Education Health Standards of Learning for easier classroom integration for UVA Education students and educators across the commonwealth of Virginia.

Hosbach found that locating a substantial amount of pro-vaccination books was surprisingly difficult. In addition to a small number of books about COVID-19 vaccines, she identified titles related to polio, the measles, and overcoming fear of going to the doctor and needles. As vaccines become accessible to more populations and age groups, Hosbach anticipates that more pro-vaccination books will be published. Books that promote mask-wearing, however, are in abundance and offer a diverse variety of characters and settings. For promoting good hygiene practices, titles were selected that were published prior to and during the COVID-19 pandemic to help children lead healthier lives. These books included picture books on handwashing and understanding how germs spread from person-to-person contact. Finally, Hosbach identified books that portray doctors and scientists in a positive and
authoritative manner. Due to the polarized political climate with health literacy during the pandemic, there is an urgent need to build back trust in the medical and scientific community.

The mental toll of the COVID-19 pandemic also poses a significant threat to the P-12 population. In October 2021, the AAP, AACAP, and CHA declared a national emergency in children's mental health (American Academy of Pediatrics, 2021). Additional findings indicate more than 140,000 children have experienced the death of a primary or secondary caregiver due to COVID-19 (Hillis et al., 2021). Hosbach knew that Education schools preparing counselors to go out into the field would not only need materials to tackle these tough topics but would also require an easy way to identify books based on students’ Social Emotional needs. With the assistance of her SEL Student Cataloger, Mary Lihong Peng, Hosbach mapped the collection to the CASEL 5 Framework and created additional categories on managing fear and anxiety, grief and loss, and processing traumatic events (What Is the CASEL Framework?, n.d.).

These frameworks were necessary both for formulating a strong collection development strategy and for increased discoverability. While examining the newly acquired titles' subject headings and metadata, Hosbach noted there was a lack of consistency in identifying titles about COVID-19 and basic health practices in the catalog. Running a search in the catalog for “COVID-19” with the juvenile collection filter would only return eighteen titles. Some books about COVID-19 were also mislabeled with the subject heading “epidemic” instead of “pandemic,” which is an error in classification at this point in the timeline of the disease (Columbia Public Health, 2021). Books about normalizing face masks varied with subject headings as well. Some were labeled as “masks” and others used the term “protective clothing.” Upon further investigation, Hosbach discovered that, perhaps, due to the rapidly shifting terminology surrounding COVID-19, subject headings automatically loaded into the catalog at the time of purchase are now outdated (Kotter, 2020). Regarding SEL, there are currently no Library of Congress subject headings that adequately cover this
topic for Education course use cases. By mapping to the CASEL 5, the books will be discoverable using terminology discussed in Education classrooms versus predetermined library language.

Conclusion

For future directions, Hosbach and Kester recommend education liaison librarians cultivate strong relationships with their cataloging and metadata librarian colleagues to better convey their patrons' discoverability needs. By documenting specific use cases, like locating award-winning titles or matching books to state standards for lesson planning, education librarians can advocate for more user-friendly metadata in academic library catalogs. This will increase circulation and ensure collection use across Education school curricula.
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Are Big Deal Cancellations a Big Deal for OA Publishers?
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A growing number of academic libraries have cancelled or unbundled Big Deals, or journal package contracts, in recent years (SPARC, 2021a). Analytics tools such as Unsub made it easier for libraries to subscribe only to individual journals that are cost-effective, resulting in little immediate impact on interlibrary loan requests (Ohler et al., 2019; Simard et al., 2020). Given the increasing interest in promoting open access (OA), libraries might consider shifting their funds toward OA publishing using the freed-up money from cancellations. The Pennsylvania State University Libraries recently participated in an Ithaka S+R study that explored how researchers are navigating changes to journal access (Cooper & Rieger, 2021). The author participated in the study as a strategic partner and was invited to be part of the panel discussion on Big Deal cancellations and OA publishing opportunities at the 2021 Charleston Conference.
Factors Driving Big Deal Cancellations

While Big Deals provide benefits for libraries such as reduced cost per title, reduced processing time, increased content, and increased predictability, they have also created challenges for libraries. For example, Big Deals usually require a significant financial commitment for libraries, leaving little money for other purchases. Additionally, these deals usually require multiyear commitments. Moreover, price increases of these deals have outpaced library budgets (SPARC, 2021a).

The number of OA articles is increasing, and libraries naturally try to avoid paying reading fees for the open content. At the same time, libraries are also expected to support researchers who are interested in publishing their articles in OA journals, which often require article processing charges (APCs) payments. Delta Think, a scholarly communications consulting firm, estimated that approximately 36% of all scholarly articles were published as paid-for OA in 2020 (vs. 30% in 2019), accounting for about 9% of the total journal publishing market value (vs. 7% in 2019) (Delta Think, 2020, 2021). Many other articles are available in OA format for free although their versions might vary: the accepted manuscript, a preprint, or the final formatted publisher's version. These OA articles can be found in different ways, for example, using browser extensions such as Open Access Button, through Google Scholar, and through open, preprint, and institutional repositories. In case the user still needs access to a paywalled article, interlibrary loan can provide it usually in 24 to 48 hours at relatively low cost to the library. Commercial document delivery services provide even quicker turnaround. These OA-related factors encourage libraries to reconsider allocating a large portion of their budget to Big Deals.

Additionally, some of the recent publisher negotiations and showdowns have been widely publicized (e.g., MIT Libraries, 2020; The Regents of the University of California, 2019) and raised awareness of scholarly communications issues. As these large
research libraries have survived without subscription contracts, although the long-term impact on researchers is difficult to assess, other libraries might have felt encouraged to look at their bundled packages more carefully and negotiate more persistently.

Challenges with OA Transformation

Libraries might have an opportunity to advance OA if they successfully negotiate large-scale journal renewals and achieve cost savings. However, the freed-up money might not necessarily be invested in OA immediately because libraries have competing needs. For example, during the COVID-19 pandemic, the Penn State Libraries needed to set aside a special central fund for electronic textbooks and streaming videos to support students and faculty, as these resources’ demand increased significantly. Penn State is a member of the Big Ten Academic Alliance (BTAA) and participates in collaborative collection development with other BTAA members. This means that collection decisions are sometimes made at the consortial level.

Additionally, the pandemic caused budgetary uncertainty. OA publishers’ offers need to match with libraries’ budgetary realities and institutional priorities. It is difficult when publishers encourage faculty to contact libraries to increase OA investment because faculty might not know that libraries have competing needs and budgetary challenges. At Penn State, budget reductions have been announced twice so far for the fiscal year 2021–2022 (The Pennsylvania State University, 2021), and the Libraries needed to determine what can be cancelled in order to cope with the challenging situation, while supporting organizational priorities. As a result of the budgetary uncertainty, committing to large-scale inflexible contracts has become difficult for libraries, including OA investment.

The number of OA-related publisher offers is increasing, and
negotiation of these deals takes time. They are all different and more complicated than subscription agreements. Some are read and publish agreements and require extensive data analysis. Some are “subscribe to open” (S2O) offers which rely on existing library acquisitions processes without APCs. Some are collaborative without APCs, as seen in PLOS Community Action Publishing. Some read and publish deals include hybrid OA but not gold OA journals, or exclude some titles. Some allow for unlimited OA publishing while others have ceilings, in terms of OA publishing or the cost. Libraries and publishers tend to look at past publishing output data to formulate proposals, although it is difficult to estimate the research community’s interest in OA. Some faculty choose to publish behind the paywall even with OA transformative agreements for various reasons, for example, to save time or to avoid spending their grant money on publication charges through a multi-payer model (Poynder, 2020). Additionally, APC-based agreements can create equity issues, administrative burdens, and user service challenges. It is also difficult for libraries to manage the author approval process and handle user inquiries when their staff size has not increased.

Moreover, it is challenging for libraries to cover fees for OA publishing, in addition to other ongoing fees for other resources. At the same time, most of these OA transformation offers assume that “publishing institutions” with high research activities such as Penn State would have to pay more, while those that publish nothing or a small amount might pay less or nothing (Poynder, 2020), although some encourage “read institutions” to contribute in OA efforts in different ways (SPARC, 2021b). It is challenging for libraries to come up with a process to get reimbursement from individual authors for the invoiced APCs or incorporate grant funding through a multi-payer model. All this shows that libraries’ paid-for-OA agreements are much more complicated than the status quo where the authors pay through their own units or funds. Libraries need to answer the following questions: whose work can be funded for OA publishing? who processes the payments? what budgets or funds cover the
cost of OA transformation? who tracks these activities? and how do we assess the outcome? Additionally, libraries need to ensure that OA-related spending is equitable across different disciplines and consider diversity, inclusion, equity, and accessibility to meet the needs of all users.

The culture of the organization also matters. For some academic institutions, promoting OA is more clearly recognized as an effort directly related to advancing research and increasing knowledge. For other institutions, their research activities’ focus might be more short-term oriented due to budgetary, structural, and other reasons. Although librarians generally care about accessibility, affordability, and equity, their host institutions and faculty might care more about prestige. Creating and sharing knowledge for the public good and serving the needs of the institution are both important. Libraries need to align their priorities with their institutions’ strategic priorities.

Changes happen slowly in higher education. Structural inertia exists due to internal and external pressures (Hannan & Freeman, 1977). Internally, decision-making takes time and involves shared governance. Shifting financial resources from one department to another sometimes creates internal conflict. Incorporating grant funding to OA publishing can be difficult for this reason. Externally, higher education institutions tend to do benchmarking when there is uncertainty. OA transformation might be one of those situations, resulting in mimetic isomorphism (DiMaggio & Powell, 1983). Elite institutions have the responsibility to promote OA in a sustainable manner because their decisions and approaches can impact others and the scholarly communication ecosystem.

**Strategies to Promote OA Publishing**

Interest in paid-for OA publishing is increasing at Penn State. Gold OA is simpler for researchers if the cost is covered by the library or
the institution. It does not require researchers to deposit accepted manuscripts to institutional repositories, nor does it result in multiple versions of the same article. To increase the awareness of the benefits of publishing OA, libraries sometimes need to appeal to researchers' self-interest and say more about what librarians can do to help them. For example, with OA publishing, researchers can share their research findings more broadly, and their work becomes more visible. With OA, their work gets cited more frequently (Antelman, 2004; Eysenbach, 2006). Many grants require that funded published work be open and accessible to the public. Additionally, researchers have opportunities to influence public policies.

Penn State Libraries publicize negotiated gold OA deals broadly on the Web, at various University meetings, and through subject/liaison librarians. Additionally, the Libraries provide a variety of OA publishing support for Penn State authors so they can make publishing decisions effectively and retain copyright in their articles. Subject librarians' roles now include outreach related to OA publishing and research data management, in addition to traditional roles such as reference, instruction, and collection development. As OA publishing increases, they need to be familiar with tools necessary for journal selection, compliance, and research impact maximization so they can effectively support faculty and researchers. Subject librarians have understanding of different disciplines, have relationships with instructional faculty, and lead efforts in increasing faculty awareness of OA publishing opportunities.

Libraries and publishers can collaborate on developing and publicizing OA publishing agreements, incorporating researcher input. As the number of OA publishing opportunities increases, libraries will need to develop their own criteria for evaluating these offers. Each library is different. Libraries can start small by piloting with publishers with relatively small expected publication output so that financial risk for the library and the publisher can be minimized.
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With new leadership and new strategic directions, Boston University (BU) Libraries in early 2020 was already in a space of change. In March 2020 we abruptly shut down our campus and
moved to an online learning environment. At the end of that semester, we were starting to get a better sense of what the immediate future would look like. While the staff at BU Libraries did a great job responding to a sudden shift during the semester, we were aware of the reflexiveness that wouldn’t necessarily serve us going forward. We were like cars in Boston traffic: everyone going to the same destination, but in their own individual vehicles. Public transportation is a great way to tackle traffic, but it only works if people can be picked up near where they reside and transported together. Basically, we needed a map. So, how do you go about making a map? In our practice, we asked two simple questions that we continue to use today: What are we trying to solve and is it ours to solve.

So, What Were We Trying to Solve?

First, too many cars. Our service model was very distributed which means that many different people within the library were doing the same kind of work. While this effectively answered questions quicker it did mean we were missing larger vision.

Second, too many maps. Communication was either coming in through individual emails or through many individual emails at once which sometimes resulted in missing important communications and uneven response. Having many different individuals stewarding pieces of information made it hard for us to collectively see the big picture.

Third, we didn’t always have the right maps. While we did have documentation on our activities, it was sometimes outdated or held by an individual or a department. We felt we could benefit a clear plan for documentation that is shareable and updated regularly.

Now that we had determined what we were trying to solve, we needed to look at if it was ours to solve. Service is such a core component of our profession that it's easy to forget to step back
and ask ourselves who else might need to be included in the conversation. Quick response is excellent but if you aren’t involving the right partners, it’s difficult to see what we could be solving together.

So, once we looked at what we were trying to solve and who we could work with, we started looking at the how. We began looking at commonalities in service to find what pieces across the service points could benefit from collective process so that we could shift our energy to the exceptions. Second, with communications running in all different directions, we needed a process to see the larger landscape. And lastly, we identified other stakeholders to work with on collaborative relationship building.

Once we identified campus partners and stakeholders, we were able to more fully answer which portions of problems were ours to solve, and better aligned our services to the business practices and strategic plan of the larger University. Relationships were made more robust with Identity and Access Management Group of IT, Sourcing and Procurement, Accounts Payable, and the College of Arts and Sciences. Now that these relationships are forged, these campus entities now also turn to us as trusted partners and have also become other vehicles traveling together on the same pathways.

Within the Libraries, we worked to better define the types of materials we collect and services we provide aligned with the Libraries’ and University’s strategic plan and created SMART goals to chart our progress on our journey. New structures in the form of a coordinated Business Services Unit to manage the budget and coordinate with Accounts Payable on the payment of invoices, and a Collections Response Team (“CRT”) to information share and better align Liaison and Instruction staff with Collections staff were begun, as we also forged deeper engagement with our consortial relationships for professional development, group licensing and negotiation, and shared infrastructure.
So, Are We There Yet?

While our work continues to iterate, we learned through this process that sometimes slowing down to reflect and build back better helps us focus on the most important aspects of our work. We also learned that library work is ultimately the business of stewardship—stewardship of relationships on campus, internally, and beyond and stewardship of our resources, our staff talent, and our time.
Seize the Data

Tracking an Academic Library’s Electronic Resource Information Using Springshare’s LibInsight

MARC JAFFY

Abstract

Like many libraries, the Franklin University Library needs to track information about electronic resources. Although the acquisitions librarian and systems librarian primarily use and maintain this information, other library staff may need to access it. Therefore, the library needs an electronic resource information tracking system which multiple librarians can access and edit.

The library initially used an Excel spreadsheet to track electronic resource information, but found the spreadsheet cumbersome and difficult to use. Next, the library created an Access database, but syncing issues resulted in conflicting databases and the potential for lost information.

These issues led the library to investigate other options. After reviewing standalone Electronic Resource Management (ERM) programs, the library decided to create a system to track its electronic resource information using a non-ERM program it already subscribed to: Springshare’s LibInsight.

The library decided to use LibInsight for tracking e-resource information due to concerns over cost, as well as the ability to create a custom LibInsight dataset to track the specific electronic resource information the library wanted. Since the library’s staff already have LibInsight accounts, any staff member can view and edit information in LibInsight. After deciding to use LibInsight, library staff determined what categories of information to track and
uploaded its eresource information. After the initial upload, library staff are able to update records when necessary.

While using LibInsight for eresource information storage causes some issues since LibInsight is designed for data analysis rather than tracking electronic resource information, the LibInsight electronic resources information dataset works better for this purpose than the Excel spreadsheet or Access database the library previously used. As a result, the library decided to continue to use LibInsight to track this information.

Keywords: Electronic Resource Management, electronic resource information, LibInsight, academic libraries

Introduction

The need for libraries to track information about their electronic resources (“eresources”) has led to the development of a variety of “tools for managing the license agreements, related administrative information, and internal processes associated with collections of licensed electronic resources,” known as Electronic Resource Management (“ERM”) programs (Digital Library Federations Electronic Resource Management Initiative, as cited in Duranceau, 2004, 91). Since “[l]ibraries all have unique needs” (Fournie, 2020) when it comes to managing their electronic resource information, “no single approach to the management of electronic resources prevails” (Breeding, 2018, 21). In addition to using specialized programs for managing electronic resource information, libraries also manage this information by using “informal lists, spreadsheets and databases” (Breeding, 2018, 18).

This paper explains how after unsuccessfully tracking information using a spreadsheet and a database and investigating dedicated ERM programs, the Franklin University Library decided to use Springshare’s LibInsight program, which is designed for data analysis, to track information about the library’s electronic
resources. The paper also discusses how the library created and uses a custom LibInsight dataset to manage its electronic resources information.

The Library’s Previous Methods of Tracking Eresource Information

The Franklin University Library tracks the following types of information about its electronic resources:

1. Resource information (name, vendor, account, proxied url),
2. Login information (for administrators),
3. Contact information (for both sales and technical contacts), and
4. License information (usage limits and restrictions).

Although the library’s acquisitions librarian and systems librarian are the primary users of this information (for managing and troubleshooting access), any member of the library’s staff may need to access the information to troubleshoot access issues when the acquisitions and systems librarians are not available. As a result, whatever method the library uses must permit multiple staff members to access, edit, and find the recorded information.

Initially, the library used an Excel spreadsheet stored in a shared folder on SharePoint to track eresource information. While multiple staff members could access the spreadsheet to view or record information, library staff found the spreadsheet difficult to work with due to the large number of resources and information included on the spreadsheet—the library’s final eresources tracking spreadsheet had 333 rows and 37 columns.

The library attempted to replace the eresources tracking spreadsheet with an Access database. Although the database’s format and search functionality did make it easier to find
information, the Access database caused problems when accessed by multiple users. Because the database could not be opened directly in SharePoint, each employee who used the database had to load it on their local drive and sync through SharePoint. Issues with syncing led to conflicting databases when changes made by one user did not properly save, and the possibility of lost information. Due to the issues with syncing the Access database, the library needed to find a different method of tracking eresource information.

Investigating Software to Use for Eresource Management

The library needed a program that would (1) track and record eresource data without syncing issues, (2) be accessible to any staff member who needed it, and (3) provide an ability to search for and find information in a way that would be easily viewable. A number of dedicated ERM programs exist that provide these features. The library considered several dedicated ERM programs: FOLIO (an open-source program), CORAL (an open-source program), and ROAM (a proprietary program).

As open-source programs, FOLIO and ROAM could, theoretically, be implemented at no cost to the library. However, the library's staff does not have the technical expertise to manage these open-source programs. The library would have needed to pay to outsource the implementation/support of these programs. ROAM, a proprietary program, would have required the library to pay an annual subscription fee. [1]

To avoid these costs, the library decided to create its own system for managing eresource information using Springshare's LibInsight program instead of using a dedicated ERM system. Because the library already had a subscription to Springshare's LibInsight which
permits creation of unlimited datasets, using LibInsight to manage eresource information would not cost the library any money.

**Springshare’s LibInsight**

Springshare’s LibInsight “is a data analytics platform built especially for libraries” (Springshare, n.d.b) which provides “a centralized place for multiple datasets to be kept, managed and analyzed” (Sewell & Cowell, 2020, 17).

LibInsight is organized around datasets, which are “where you store the data that you want to analyze” (Springshare, n.d.b). Libraries use datasets to input and record the data they want to analyze in LibInsight. In addition to providing predefined datasets “that focus on e-resources usage, circulation and acquisition analytics, budget analysis, and gate counts” (Springshare, n.d.b), LibInsight provides users the ability to create “[c]ustom datasets [which] allow you to design your own dataset from scratch” (Springshare, n.d.a). These custom datasets “can handle any number of fields and field types” (Springshare, n.d.b). Our previous experience with LibInsight custom datasets led us to believe that we could create a custom dataset for eresource information.

LibInsight “allows libraries to keep all of their data in one secure place, in the cloud, that can be accessed from anywhere, on any type of device and at any time of day” (Sewell & Cowell, 2020, 18). Because each member of our library’s staff has a LibInsight account, every staff member can access and, if necessary, edit eresource data stored in LibInsight.

An issue with using LibInsight for tracking eresources information occurs because datasets are meant for “time-based or transactional data” (Springshare, n.d.a) since LibInsight is designed for data analysis. The eresource information the library wants to track in LibInsight is not time-based or transactional, and our interest is in storing/accessing the data instead of analyzing it.
Even though our proposed use of LibInsight to store/manage electronic resource data differs from LibInsight's purpose, and our data is not time-based, the accessibility, search, and storage features offered by LibInsight met our needs and we believed that we could work around the date requirement and use a LibInsight custom dataset to manage our electronic resource information.

Using Springshare’s LibInsight to Track Electronic Resource Information

Because Springshare did not create LibInsight to track eresource information, it did not have a predefined eresources dataset. To track eresource information we needed to create a custom dataset. This requirement benefitted the library because, unlike the dedicated ERM systems which would have required the library to follow their predefined formats for recording information, the custom dataset let the library identify the specific data it wanted to record.

Preparing to Create the Eresources Information Dataset

Before we could begin this process, we needed to decide what eresource information we wanted to track. Because LibInsight can import data from Excel, we exported the contents of our Access eresource information database into an Excel spreadsheet.

Once we had a spreadsheet with all of the categories and eresource information we had previously recorded, library staff reviewed the eresource information the library tracked to decide what information we should record going forward. After discussion, some categories were added, some deleted, and others renamed. Appendix lists the final categories of eresource information the library decided to include in its LibInsight eresources dataset.
After determining what categories to include, we edited the spreadsheet by renaming categories, and deleting and inserting columns as necessary. We then reviewed the data to correct any obvious mistakes and moved on to creation of the eresources dataset.

Creating the Eresources Information Dataset

We created the dataset using LibInsight’s manage dataset screen. This screen gives users the option to indicate the type of dataset (custom) and define the content that the dataset will record. Although LibInsight permits creation of a number of different field types, almost all of our data used the “text” field.[2] The main exception involved the required system date field. Because, as mentioned above, LibInsight is designed for analysis of transactional data, data must be tied to a specific date and datasets have to include a system date field. Our previous methods of tracking eresource information recorded the date we last updated a record, so we designated last update date as the system date field. The requirement that each individual record in a dataset be tied to a specific date has implications when using the dataset to find or edit eresources information, as discussed below.

Initial Data Upload

Information is added to a dataset using the LibInsight record data screen. In addition to permitting individual entries, this screen provides an option to upload and import records from a spreadsheet.

Because of the large amount of information we needed to load, we wanted to use this data import function to load the information we had previously tracked so that we did not need to manually reenter the data. Unfortunately, the data upload did not go smoothly.
Attempts to upload the eresources spreadsheet we exported from our Access eresource information database to populate the LibInsight eresource information dataset resulted in repeated error messages and a number of emails to Springshare support. Ultimately, Springshare determined that the spreadsheet we had included line breaks for data, and LibInsight was unable to process the line breaks. Doing a search/replace to change the line breaks to semicolons solved this problem and we successfully uploaded our existing eresource information to our new LibInsight eresources dataset.

Managing Records

The library can either add information about new resources or edit information about existing resources from the record data screen. When we add a new resource, we can use the form on this screen to manually input information.[3] The screenshot in image 1 shows a partial view of the record data screen (which is too large to fit on a single screenshot).

We can also use the record data screen to edit a record. The record data screen provides an option to manage records where users can either scroll down all entries to view the records and find a record or search for a record.

The system date feature discussed above does cause an issue when using the search function in the manage records screen: When searching for a record, LibInsight searches within a specified date range. The default range does not include all records. To avoid problems finding records, users need to set the date range to include the entire available date range. However, it is easy to forget to do so, resulting in a search which does not find a record which exists, but is outside of the searched date range.
Finding Eresource Information

Librarians who need to find information stored in the eresources dataset can do so using either the manage records screen or the analyze screen. Both methods search within a specified date range and may fail to show records if the user forgets to expand the date range.

A search in the manage screen searches the entire record. This could be helpful if a librarian needs to search for a term but does not know which field records the term. However, more frequently, it causes a problem when a term in the title is also used in other records. For example, the library has only four records with “Sage” in the title. However, a search in the manage records screen for sage provides twenty-six results because it includes records which contain the word “usage.”

The other option is to use the analyze screen to search. Although the purpose of this screen is to analyze statistical data, it can be used simply to display records. The advantage of using the search option from the analyze screen is that it contains search filters which permit the user to filter by name and search only the name field. A search on this screen for “sage” with the name filter applied finds five records (the four sage records, plus one additional one which contains the word “usage” in the name). A screenshot showing the analyze screen with the name filter applied is shown in image 2.

Conclusion

Overall, using LibInsight to record the library’s eresource information has worked better than the alternatives. The information is searchable and accessible to all staff members. The screens displaying information make it easy for users to find the information they need about a resource, which is an advantage over
our previous Excel spreadsheet. Since the LibInsight datasets are maintained in the cloud, we do not have issues with conflicting or missing data which occurred when we stored this data in an Access database.

The biggest problem with using LibInsight for managing our electronic resources information relates to LibInsight’s requirement that records be tied to a specific date. It is easy for a librarian searching for information will to forget to update the date range being searched to include all available records, which means that the record they are looking for will not display. However, it is easy enough to expand the date range and rerun the search when this happens.

LibInsight lets the library record eresource information in a custom dataset that all library staff members can access. The system makes it easy for staff to find and view recorded information (as long as they remember to expand the date range). Given the difficulties the library had when recording information in the Excel spreadsheet and Access database, these factors, combined with the cost (free, since the library already had an unlimited dataset subscription to LibInsight), have led library staff to determine that the overall benefits of using LibInsight to track eresource information outweighs the difficulties caused by the date range requirement.

Appendix: LibInsight Eresources Dataset Categories

We track the following information in our LibInsight eresources dataset:

- Last Updated—system date field
- IP Address—system field
- Internal Notes—system field
- Entered By—system field
1. Name—text field
2. Currently subscribed/owned? (i.e., we SHOULD have access)—single select field
3. Account Number—text field
4. Vendor (Who we pay or how we get)—text field
5. Platform—text field
6. User limits—text field
7. Proxied URL—text field
8. Stats Portal—text field
9. Stats Password—text field
10. Admin portal—text field
11. Admin password—text field
12. Technical Contact Name—text field
13. Technical Contact Number—text field
14. Technical Contact Email/Portal—text field
15. Sales Contact Name—text field
16. Sales Contact Number—text field
17. Sales Contact Email—text field
18. License Location—text field
19. Auth users—text field
20. Copyright mentioned in license?—text field
21. Use in Course Reserve?—text field
22. Use in CMS?—text field
23. Use for ILL?—text field
24. Use in Coursepack?—text field
25. Scholarly sharing?—text field

Z1. Multilingual component—text field

Z2. Notes (if cancellation provide date/reason)—text field

[1] After the library’s initial development of the LibInsight eresources information dataset, the OhioNET consortium reached a deal with ROAM to provide ROAM to all consortia members. As a
member of OhioNET, the Franklin University Library gained access to ROAM.

Although the library did experiment with ROAM, the library determined to continue using the LibInsight dataset described in this paper to manage e-resource information due to the customizability of the LibInsight dataset. While the LibInsight interface is not as user-friendly or attractive as ROAM’s, ROAM records data in a fixed format which did not match the library’s format. Switching to ROAM would have required the library to reconfigure its data, and use multiple screens to view data which could be viewed on a single LibInsight record.

[2] In addition to the “date” field discussed in the following paragraph, the other field which we did not designate as a text field required a “yes/no” answer. We set that field up as a “single select” field.

[3] The library created the layout and order of the fields on the record data screen when we created the dataset, and LibInsight permits modification of the layout and order of fields on the record data screen in the manage data screen.
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It’s a Jungle Out There!!

Weeding an Overgrown Garden

MAUREEN JAMES, CAROL MACHEAK, AND DONNA ROSE

Introduction

For many academic libraries, weeding physical collections is rarely a top priority. At the University of Arkansas at Little Rock (UA Little Rock) Ottenheimer library, weeding has always occurred, but at a basic level and sporadically. The entire collection, like an overgrown garden, was due for a major overhaul. External factors that served as the impetus to weed were the results of a library-sponsored student survey that reflected a need for individual and group study space, and a directive from the campus administration to make collaborative learning spaces available. The most compelling internal factors were a growing appetite for electronic resources and a dated and rarely used print collection.

In 2019, the library administration created the Collection Assessment and Downsizing (CAD) task force. The library director signed a contract with OCLC in July 2020 to purchase access to GreenGlass (a collection assessment tool) to enable the library to review, analyze, and weed its physical book collections in a structured, systematic way. The first step was sending OCLC detailed metadata on the library’s book holdings. In return, the library would receive a data set that could be manipulated to reveal usage, duplication of titles with other libraries, the age of the collections, and other data that would help in making informed weeding decisions.

While waiting for the GreenGlass data set to arrive, the CAD task force met to create workflows, spreadsheets, and templates for
weeding the smallest of collections—the VHS tapes, music CDs, and DVDs. These collections would not be included in the GreenGlass analysis. The task force used them as a pilot project in developing procedures and workflows for other collections. Ultimately, 85% of those titles were weeded from the collection. The main reason was obsolescence, low use, or no use.

In early March 2020, the COVID-19 pandemic triggered a three-month building closure, reduced hours of operation, and created staff and student shortages. Although staff and students could work from home, the weeding momentum slowed. Once the library reopened in August 2020, the task force was compelled to shift its focus from weeding the media collections to weeding the Special Collections titles to make room for the imminent relocation of the UA Little Rock Multicultural Center which would occupy the same space.

In 2021, the task force redirected its focus yet again. This time the group started to weed bound print periodicals to make room for the construction of new library staff space. This work is ongoing—approximately one-third of the collection has been removed so far—and progress has been good.

From the start, the weeding project has been plagued by setbacks that have slowed its progress and prevented full use of the GreenGlass analysis. These setbacks include the remodeling of the library building to create a learning commons and new office space for displaced library staff, the COVID-19 pandemic, staff and student worker shortages, and the installation of a new library system. This last setback was particularly challenging as weeding created an increased workload for the metadata department and library staff in general who were learning the new system.

Next Steps

In 2022, the task force has finally begun to focus fully on the data
provided by GreenGlass and begin the process of weeding the physical book collections. It may be necessary to continue using the data set well into 2023.

There are challenges ahead. The collections management librarian and a key member of the task force staff announced their retirements at the end of 2021. A new collections manager has been appointed and the transition of duties has begun. However, the support staff position has been eliminated, prompting the reassignment of duties to other library staff.

No matter what the future brings, the task force and the library administration maintain their commitment to prune the collection in order to make it current, relevant, and accessible.
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Next Steps in Collection Management

CHARLOTTE M. JOHNSON, BOAZ NADAV MANES, LINDA WOBBE, AND HEATHER MCMULLEN

Introduction

Shared print is becoming much more than a method for intelligent collections management. It is changing the dependencies libraries have on one another. Collections shared among groups of libraries are creating the need for new and changing workflows. This panel session examined some of these workflows and associated challenges, in particular those related to Collection Management and Resource Sharing. Panelists included Linda Wobbe from the SCELC Shared Print Program and the Partnership for Shared Book Collections, Heather McMullen (Queen's University), who sits on several shared print committees including HathiTrust and Keep@Downview, and Boaz Nadav Manes (Lehigh University), an executive member of the PALCI, EAST, and FOLIO consortia, as well as Project ReShare, and the Controlled Digital Lending Implementers Secretariat group. Moderation was provided by Charlotte M. Johnson (University of Pittsburgh), who sits on the Partnership for Shared Book Collections and Rosemont Shared Print Alliance’s Communications and Advocacy Joint Working Group.
Resource Sharing Communities and Shared Print Programs

Shared print programs have become a rapidly evolving area in recent years, due to effectively shrinking collections budgets and the increasing demands on library spaces for uses other than collections storage. Through shared print, institutions make commitments to retain certain titles for use by other libraries, distributing the burden of commitments with those same other libraries. It has become apparent that shared print, beyond existing as a space management tactic, intersects with existing library services of access, preservation, digitization, and resource sharing. Shared print is also a commitment to preserving the print scholarly record, both journals and monographs. With these extended functions, it is vitally important for shared print to collaborate with other parts of the library ecosystem, particularly resource sharing.

Resource sharing departments and shared print programs are inextricably linked, since resource sharing is a founding principle of the shared print effort. Therefore, resource sharing departments should also be aware of and involved with developments in shared print. Throughout the course of their work, resource sharing staff may be called upon to send lending statistics of certain materials, yearly shipping costs, and other collection use statistics, all of which are useful to broader shared print programs. It is similarly important for shared print programs to be aware of the daily operations of resource sharing departments, since they are ultimately the ones carrying out the services shared print provides. Resource sharing networks have additionally established behavioral standards and ethos that can highlight and exemplify ways by which shared print communities can function. With these two similar services collaborating more closely, or even merging, they can overcome the several challenges the panelists identified.

Resource sharing staff can and should add their voices to the conversations that shared print is having with vendors. They have
the expertise, and they know what they need and what works. This is especially important as shared print scales up, and libraries start needing to take load balance into consideration. By participating in shared print, resource sharing staff can promote the value add that resource sharing brings to shared print: improved access for patrons, cost savings for acquisitions, and responsible stewardship of the scholarly record. Supervisors should encourage and empower staff to do so.

Already, there is guidance for resource sharing and access services in shared print programs, such as the community of shared print programs in North America, from the Print Archive Network meetings at ALA to the newly launched Partnership for Shared Book Collections and the recent collaboration between the California Digital Library, the Center for Research Libraries, and HathiTrust. The Partnership for Shared Book Programs at SharedPrint.org has a wide range of best practices posted including one specifically for Resource Sharing and Access.

**Future of Shared Print in Resource Sharing**

Panelists identified digital lending as one of the spaces to watch for new developments in shared print and resource sharing. Controlled digital lending (CDL) is a big focus area, but other issues surrounding digitization deserve attention as well, such as on-demand digitization services for materials held in retention, or other similar means of leveraging broad access within existing copyright structures. Vendors and libraries have already begun developing CDL services, such as Ex Libris’ Alma Digital; IndexData (Project ReShare), and others. These conversations are already happening in other areas of libraries, but they all have an impact on shared print programs.

As issues like the need for reporting, analytics, and good metadata rise to the surface of shared print discussions with vendors and
programs, it is likely we will see more developments on the vendor end for flagging shared print retention commitments in ways that are open and visible to other libraries. Having open access to retention commitments in reporting is also something panelists hope to see. Access to actionable statistics, and the system interoperability of such data sets not only of the home institution, but of other institutions in the consortium, is important to both resource sharing and for collection data analysis, especially if programs pursue intentional shared collection development (raising further questions of ownership vs. access).

We may also see more vendor development of automated lending and “smart fulfillment” in the resource sharing field. This could be a good opportunity for shared print programs to take advantage of, since user expectations we see for resource sharing also apply to shared print—library users may or may not be aware of shared collections as a separate entity from something like interlibrary loan.

Challenges of Shared Print in Resource Sharing

Presently, uncertainty surrounds copyright and digitization-on-demand, which has only been exacerbated by COVID-19-related restrictions on lending. Libraries need policies, interoperable standards, and the infrastructure and services to achieve the next level of resource sharing at scale, within the framework of shared print. That could be CDL or other interpretations of copyright rules to reassert libraries’ rights to lend materials to patrons without new restrictions imposed due to format.

Shared print is an emerging practice, particularly where monographs are concerned, and the infrastructure is still in the process of being evaluated and developed in support of this new effort. For example, is lending materials covered by shared print fall under typical circulation or is it interlibrary loan? How do these
new ways of sharing material fit into existing workflows? In order to scale up these services, libraries will have to rethink policies, infrastructures, and services in order to meeting changing user expectations. COVID-19 has revealed the need to be flexible in delivery information regardless of location. Patron expectations are changing, and we need to rethink our services in light of these changes and adapt our services.

 Perhaps the answer lies in considering resource sharing from a perspective of past practice rather than reconceptualizing a service and its place in the organizational structure. Many of our ILL services were built on regional proximity when ILL only involved physical materials. We are not necessarily tied to this concept anymore, especially if digitization can be successfully implemented into resource sharing programs.

 It could be argued that barriers to the growth of shared print exist because shared print is not yet systemically integrated into the resource sharing workflow in libraries. But conversations like this, collaboration with vendors and providers, experimenting and developing pilot projects all will help us remove these barriers and develop the future where shared print retention commitments are identified and leveraged by resource sharing specialists. We have the option to think internationally, as well, bringing more voices and resources from around the world, and expanding shared print programs beyond large research institutions. Potential DEI benefits are extensive in deliberately applying shared print collection building toward areas of cultural and geographical priority or in response to certain pollical or environmental risks. Finally, we cannot determine value if we don't have operational statistics, which relies on the proper technology being developed.

 Since shared print is still so new, programs need to decide together what they want moving forward and which commercial partners are adequate to pursue our ambition with. We have the capability to talk about what technology we need to go where we want to go. Libraries will need to take a more active entrepreneurial role, developing and experimenting with potential solutions.
Programs need a way to gather statistics about the lending and borrowing of materials with retention commitments to understand the volume of resource sharing activity and to assess the value and necessity and the impact of shared print programs in general. For a CDL-like service to work at scale, we also need to understand the total number of owned print copies at play, preferably on a global scale. The infrastructure and standards for gathering that information is only now being imagined and fine-tuned in order for the development of that infrastructure to be rolled out. For example, while commitments are registered in WorldCat, they are not visible in WorldCat.org, nor are they flagged as such in OCLC’s resource sharing tools, so there is no way for a program to have access to that information except by asking each participating library to provide it—no simple matter, depending on which system individual institutions use.

Libraries must view systems upgrades in the larger context of collections writ large in academic libraries and their related goals to get materials to patrons quickly. Currently, shared print is lacking analytics, true interoperability between software and systems, codified shared print collection policies, and solidified goals. The Infrastructure Working Group of the Partnership for Shared Book Collections has met with many vendors and providers to understand the potential resource sharing tools and the discovery methods that could be used to facilitate sharing of retention commitments and has learned that there are many options that could be optimized for this purpose given time and resources.

Conclusion

Panel members are very excited about potential and emerging pilots around the intersection of resource sharing and shared print. The alignment between such programs is apparent and can lead to further innovation of relevant collection lifecycle services reliant
on the well-established and proven resource sharing networks and workflows. The work-around standards, interoperability, and systems to support such movement are well underway but these should be aligned and supported by a unified vision and an inclusive governance. We seek greater unison between operators and programs as well as a stated vision to create a forward-looking framework for shared print to truly flourish.
The Open Road

Mapping Your Library’s Path Through the OA Publishing Landscape

ANNIE JOHNSON AND KAREN KOHN

Introduction

Throughout 2020 and 2021, Temple University Libraries and University Press (TULUP) undertook a multipart, participatory project that culminated in guidelines and priorities for the organization to use in evaluating open-access publishing initiatives. The project involved staff discussions and a collaboratively written report called “Advancing the Transition to Open Publishing at Temple University Libraries.” While the primary goal was to create guidelines for the organization, secondary goals were educating staff and building consensus within the organization around open. As many institutions are faced with similar choices regarding which open-access publishing initiatives to support, this presentation, by project leads Annie Johnson and Karen Kohn, focused on lessons that could apply to any institution interested in undertaking a similar process.

Background

Before the Advancing the Transition project began, the Libraries and Press were already supporting open access in many ways. TULUP has an institutional repository and a library publishing program for open journals and books. The Libraries’ collections budget supports
an Open-Access Publishing Fund and membership in BioMed Central, which both help researchers pay article processing charges (APCs). It also funds a number of crowdsourced publishing initiatives, such as book collections from Knowledge Unlatched and journals from Open Library of the Humanities and SCOAP3 (the Sponsoring Consortium for Open-Access Publishing in Particle Physics). In addition, Temple offers grants to encourage faculty to use open education resources and contributes to open infrastructure projects.

While Temple had many existing commitments to open access, the number of initiatives that the Libraries could potentially support was growing quickly. In recent years publishers have increasingly been contacting Libraries staff to talk about new funding models that they are developing. In their roles as Assistant Director for Open Publishing Initiatives and Collections Analysis Librarian, respectively, Annie Johnson and Karen Kohn had been involved in discussions of new initiatives and wanted to be in a position other than simply reacting to offers that came to the institution. Johnson and Kohn felt that thinking more broadly about what kinds of initiatives the organization should support would allow TULUP to make quicker, informed decisions about specific new initiatives.

**Process**

The two presenters proposed a plan to write a report that would contain principles the Libraries could use when evaluating open publishing initiatives. The project intentionally involved as many of the Libraries and Press staff as possible, with the rationale that everyone needed some understanding of the changes that were going on in the scholarly publishing world. In addition, the involvement of a wide range of staff helped build the level of buy-in necessary to produce a statement of library-wide priorities. Staff
were involved at varying levels, according to the degree of knowledge and input that their roles required.

The first phase of the process was a series of discussions open to all Libraries and Press staff. The four discussion topics were: introduction to open access, transformative agreements, the impact of COVID-19 on open access, and open infrastructure. The first two sessions were held in-person in early 2020, and the series continued over Zoom in the spring and summer. Before each event Johnson and Kohn sent one or two articles to staff to read in preparation for the discussion. Lisa Janicke Hinchliffe, of the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, spoke to Libraries and Press staff about transformative agreements. The other three events in the series were internal discussions, which Johnson and Kohn facilitated. The discussions in both formats were fairly well attended, with roughly twenty-five people coming to each one, or about a quarter of the staff.

After the discussion series concluded, the process of writing the report began. For this stage, the project leads were joined by the members of the Scholarly Communications Strategic Steering Team, a group of reference librarians and other staff who contribute to scholarly communication education and outreach. In addition, the Collections Strategy Steering Team, a group of department heads and other staff whose roles relate to collections in various ways, reviewed the document. Finally, the Head of Acquisitions and Collection Development, Brian Schoolar, and the Executive Director of Temple University Press/Scholarly Communications Officer, Mary Rose Muccie, also reviewed drafts and provided feedback.

In order to make the scope of the report manageable, Johnson and Kohn decided it needed a somewhat narrower focus than the staff discussions. As a result, the report focuses on three strategies for funding open-access publishing using the collections budget:

1. Entering into a transformative agreement (which TULUP has not done before).
2. Continuing to fund faculty APCs via the Open-Access
Publishing Fund and Springer Nature shared support membership (which includes BioMed Central journals).

3. Continuing to support collaborative funding initiatives, and possibly contributing to new schemes as well.

The writing process was educational for all involved. Team members had varying levels of knowledge regarding these different ways to fund open access, and all members expanded their knowledge through researching and thinking about different types of funding initiatives. For the Open-Access Publishing Fund in particular, the report became an opportunity to assess the current fund and see how it was working. Specifically, who among the faculty was it funding, and which publishers were getting the money?

**Final Report and Recommendations**

“Advancing the Transition to Open Publishing at Temple University Libraries” is online and freely available in Temple’s institutional repository, TUScholarShare. The report provides four overarching priorities that the authors would like to see the Libraries follow. These priorities are: non-APC or BPC-based models, a focus on disciplines that are less likely to have grant funding, a focus on university presses and/or scholarly societies, and initiatives where the cost is comparable to a similar paywalled product and/or the change in cost over time is predictable. The focus on university presses was particularly important to the group, because TULUP is a combined organization with the Press reporting to the Libraries.

It is important to point out that these are priorities and not requirements. Requirements would not be feasible because of the many different circumstances that come into play when evaluating an open-access publishing initiative. These decisions are often situation specific. In addition, none of the people who wrote the
report have the final say about the collections budget. The group was working in more of an advisory role.

The report also includes specific recommendations for each type of publishing initiative (transformative agreements, the Open-Access Publishing Fund, and crowdsourced funding initiatives). The goal for these recommendations was not to choose one type of funding over another but rather to provide ways to evaluate instances of each initiative.

Lessons Learned

Johnson and Kohn learned a lot throughout the process of writing the report. The first lesson was the importance of scoping the project appropriately. The original plan was for a broader report that would discuss all the ways the Libraries support open, including through staff time, infrastructure, and other activities. The project leads quickly realized that focusing on open publishing initiatives specifically would be more manageable as well as more immediately helpful for the organization.

Another lesson learned was that TULUP needed to think more deeply about its motivations as an organization for supporting open access. In the process of writing, the team noticed that some funding schemes would make Temple faculty’s work open, while others would not necessarily affect Temple faculty. That raised the question of what TULUP’s goals were. Why spend money on these initiatives? Is it to change scholarly publishing? Or to support the publishing needs of the institution’s faculty? Johnson and Kohn felt that both of these motivations were valuable.

The final lesson learned was that trying to involve a broad swath of people within the organization in these decisions is not easy. The project offered all staff the opportunity to voice their opinions about this topic so there could be broad consensus. However, not everyone had time to be involved or the level of expertise necessary
to form an opinion on these initiatives. Ultimately, the attempt to get as many staff involved as possible was beneficial, but also made the process much longer and more intensive from a project management perspective.

In the end, the project accomplished its goal of creating a framework for decision-making within TULUP around open publishing initiatives. The framework proved its usefulness almost immediately, and TULUP expects to continue to build on it in the future.
A Tale of Two Catalogs

It Was the Best of Times, It Was the Worst of Times—How Two Integrated Library Systems Serve One Campus

Jillian Kehoe

Abstract

SUNY Maritime College’s main library is the Stephen B. Luce Library, but unbeknownst to many is our second library onboard the training ship Empire State VI. This paper will describe a three-phase project to integrate the ship’s collection from OpenBiblio into Alma/Primo, officially making it a branch library that patrons can request material to be paged from and picked up on shore.

Introduction

SUNY Maritime is part of the state university system of New York and the oldest maritime academy in the nation. The shore library (Stephen B. Luce Library) is housed in historic Fort Schuyler, built in 1833. Stephen B. Luce Library occupies the entirety of the north wing. The majority of students are in license programs, so at the end of their four years, in addition to their bachelor’s degree they will receive a Coast Guard license after successful completion of the licensing exams. One of the requirements for the license exams is a certain amount of sea time, thus the training ship Empire State VI.

The training ship is not something you encounter at most college campuses. The students live, work, and learn onboard during
Summer Sea Term, when the ship is underway on domestic and international training voyages. Ordinarily during the Fall and Spring semesters, the ship is moored at the college pier, but the U.S. Maritime Administration has the authority to activate the ship for humanitarian aid worldwide. Some domestic examples: In 2005, she travelled to Louisiana to house port and petroleum workers while they repaired damaged infrastructure after Hurricanes Katrina and Rita; in 2017 she travelled to Key West and Puerto Rico after numerous hurricanes ravaged the areas to house FEMA workers. More locally, she housed FEMA workers after the September 11 terrorist attacks, and again after Hurricane Sandy hit New York in 2012.

The Empire State VI sets sail each year on Summer Sea Term, embarking on domestic and international voyages that take you back to a time before many current students were born: a time without the internet. When the ship is underway, there is no internet access, so the Ship's Library collection is relied on by students, faculty and crew for their course material, as well as for leisure reading and entertainment. In addition to print material, we also have DVDs and board games onboard. The Ship's Library uses OpenBiblio, an open-source integrated library system, to manage the collection of approximately 5,500 items. It is housed on a local server, with an intranet page running the patron facing catalog. The server has limited connectivity to shore: select library staff can remote into the server only when the ship is at the college’s pier and connected to the network. The ship's collection is not reflected in Alma/Primo, which is used at Stephen B. Luce Library, which renders the collection not discoverable by patrons, and therefore sits unused for nine months of the year.

OpenBiblio was implemented in 2017, prior to my arrival. It is a very simple ILS and works perfectly for our needs. It lives on a local server and is completely separate from the shore catalog on Alma, which is internet based. The items that need to move from shore to ship each year are added to OpenBiblio prior to Sea Term and removed at the conclusion. Since it is on a server, the catalog is
searchable from the computer terminals on the ship, and when the ship is at the college pier and it is attached to the campus network we are able to remote into the server to work on the cataloging. Alma/Primo was launched at Stephen B. Luce Library in June 2019.

The goal of this project is the migration of our ship catalog records into our shore catalog, with the items being requestable and the ship serving as a branch collection during Fall and Spring semesters, instead of inaccessible storage as it is now. The project will be conducted in three phases, with phase three to happen in 2023 when SUNY Maritime College welcomes a new training ship:

- Phase One: Setting up the library and collections in Alma, importing the brief records, and configuring terms of use.
- Phase Two: Identify match points to merge the ship records with more complete records that may already exist as part of the Stephen B. Luce Collection, or within the Network Zone.
- Phase Three: A complete inventory of the ship’s collection, which will coincide with the collection moving to the new training ship, the Empire State VII in 2023.

Prior to Phase One, I needed to take note of the collection locations on the ship to recreate them in Alma. More importantly, the ship’s holdings needed to be exported before the ship left in April of 2021. I was only able to export as an excel workbook, and then I converted that into a marc. I ran the excel file through MarcEdit, using a MarcEdit template that pulled from the excel document to create a very brief marc record.

**Phase One**

Phase One was conducted during Summer 2021. It was broken into two parts: on land and at sea.

On land, we:
Set up the collections in Alma (currently suppressed)
Imported the brief records
Configured terms of use/fulfillment unit rules so items will be requestable via Alma

At sea, our Student Librarians:
Scanned item barcodes/ISBNs into a spreadsheet by location to later

- ... perform a baseline inventory
- ... identify match points

While importing the brief records, I hit an unexpected hiccup of duplicate barcodes with ship items and shore items. The offending shore items were pulled and re-barcoded.

Phase Two

Phase Two is scheduled to be completed during the 2021–2022 academic year and relies on the scanning that our students completed on the ship during Summer Sea Term 2021. During Fall 2021, I ran their document of barcodes through Alma to run an inventory and have removed items that no longer exist on the ship from Alma and OpenBiblio at the same time. Now we have an accurate accounting of the collection and we’ll be able to un-suppress the locations so they are available to the maritime community. During Spring 2022, I will begin merging the ship records with existing records in the IZ or the NZ based on their ISBNs. The plan is to export the records from Alma as an excel workbook, add the ISBNs to the spreadsheet using the barcodes as the match point, then create a new template in MarcEdit to run them through to recreate the marc records that will now include the ISBNs in the 020 field. I will take that new set of marc records and run them through an updated import profile that points to barcode
and ISBN as the match/merge points. This will be tested in our Alma sandbox before doing it in our live environment.

Phase Three

Phase Three is planned for Summer 2022 and academic year 2022–2023. During Summer Sea Term, the ship's librarian will conduct a string measurement of the collection and a basic condition assessment report. He/she will also run a circulation report to determine high-use titles. We know we are going to have less shelf space on the new ship, but it has not been made clear to us how much less. We are anticipating needing to withdraw, either permanently from the ship's collection or bring items back to shore and transfer select titles from shore to ship each year. When the titles are all in Alma, we will bulk-update the items to be in the appropriate temporary location. Currently, the shore items are checked out to a dummy account when they are going temporarily onto the ship, and we make a note of which collection they went into.

This project will culminate with packing up the ship's collection, which will again serve as inventory (which at the time of Phase Three will have been done two sea terms prior), we will manage the physical move, and the setting up of the new ship prior to Summer Sea Term 2023.

Conclusion

To conclude, the ship will be transformed from a floating storage container with no access during the year to a branch library whose collection will be available by request to the maritime campus community.
On the (Open Access) Road Again

Is the Value of the Big Deal Declining?

MICHAEL LEVINE-CLARK

Abstract

Faced with declining budgets and ever-increasing costs for journal subscriptions, academic libraries are reconsidering their approach to journal collection development. Big Deal packages are often the main target of cancellation decisions, at least partly because of the perception that a growing proportion of their underlying articles is freely available—on the publisher site or elsewhere. If this is the case, then we would expect to see trends toward declining value (i.e., increasing cost per use [CPU]) in CPU metrics that take freely available articles into account.

Building on recent presentations on proportion and/or value of open access, aggregator access, and post-cancellation access, we'll present data that examines three to four-year trends in CPU for two major journal publishers across a range of institutions. In addition to traditional CPU, we'll examine cost per controlled use (which eliminates publisher-hosted OA from the denominator) and highlight differences in the direction of these trends. While we found evidence for a decline in the value of the Big Deal for one of the two publishers, nearly identical trends in CPU and cost per controlled use suggest that the rapid increase in open-access publishing in recent years has had little impact on the value of the traditional Big Deal to date.
We have been doing a series of studies and presentations about the value of the Big Deal, broadly speaking. We did a presentation at Charleston[1] in 2020, where we looked at journal-level usage data within Unsub and tried to understand how the various factors that are measured in Unsub, again at the journal level, contribute to the value of the Big Deal and thinking about what unbundling might look like. In March 2021 at ER&L,[2] we pivoted our research a little bit, and we focused on the question of post-cancellation access and, specifically, how valuable post-cancellation access is after you cancel. Along with that, we added aggregator access in that study. Now we’re asking another question about the value of the Big Deal in the context of the increasing publication of open-access content.

We’ve all seen headlines over many years about the growth in open access, and there’s no doubt that that’s happening. But overall growth across the entire scholarly publishing landscape doesn’t necessarily have any impact on an individual Big Deal. And the question we really want to understand is: how does the growth of a particular publisher’s open-access content factor into the relative value of a Big Deal?

Heather is at Delta Think, and Delta Think is doing really deep dives into the scholarly publishing marketplace with a focus on open access. There’s a lot of really valuable information, much of it publicly available on their website. They have measured the open-access market in a couple of ways, and any way you look at it, it shows tremendous growth. From 2019 to 2020, the market value of open access increased by 25%, and the number of OA articles increased 20% across the entire scholarly publishing landscape.

There’s good detailed information here, but I want to focus on a couple of things. One, that this 25% increase from 2019 to 2020, in terms of market value, is much larger than the underlying growth of the scholarly journals market. So scholarly journal publishing is also going up, but not nearly at that level. It’s down in the single-digit range. The other item of note is that around 36% of all the scholarly articles published in 2020 were published as a paid open-access model of some type, either hybrid or in fully open journals.
But that accounts for just 9% of the overall market value. So 36% of publications, but only 9% of the value in terms of revenue.

Here’s more data from Delta Think. We’re at the journal level here (Figure 1), and this is a graph showing the growth in the number of open-access journals from 2009 to 2020 from different sources, DOAJ, Ulrich’s, and others. The numbers themselves aren’t what I’m trying to show you here, but whichever one you’re looking at, it’s significant growth every year, with a steady upward trajectory. And that’s the number of journals.

What about articles? In 2020, 1.1 million articles were published in a paid open-access model. That includes hybrid or fully OA. A total of 947,000 articles published in fully open-access journals, and 171,000 open-access articles published in hybrid journals. The numbers are steadily increasing for all of those and are projected to continue to increase into 2022 and 2023.

In 2020, 36% of the publishing market was open-access articles, 30.5% were open-access articles in fully gold open-access journals, and 5.5% were in OA in hybrid journals. By 2023, almost half of the articles published will be open access in one form or another.
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But we're interested in the Big Deal, and the Big Deal, in some ways, is the size of the market. The overall publishing volume doesn't really matter. What matters is what's published by a particular publisher (Figure 2). Our study looks at trends over a four to five-year period for twenty libraries and two large publishers. We contacted libraries to ask for data about their usage from these publishers, and we have eight libraries that are Carnegie Research 1 (or Doctoral Very High Research Activity) and twelve others that range from R2 (or High Research Activity) down to small baccalaureate. For one publisher, we used five years of COUNTER data (2016–2020) and for the other we used four years (2017–2020) of COUNTER data. The difference is due to the data available from their platforms.

Here's information about those two publishers, also from Delta Think (Figure 2). Publisher 1 on the top is the one for which we have five years of data. For Publisher 2 on the bottom, we have four years of data. These show some trends over that four and five-year period. The takeaway from this slide is that, for these two publishers, the option to publish open access is available in somewhere between 85% and 95% of the journals. The orange in the middle shows the percentage of journals that are hybrid. So, if you want to publish with Publisher 2, you can almost certainly publish open access, if you can pay for it.
In terms of the number of articles that are actually published, the percentages are lower, not surprisingly (Figure 3). For Publisher 1, over this five-year period, the percentage of articles published in fully gold open-access journals ranged from about 23% up to about 25%. The hybrid percentage went from about 4.4% up to about 9.3%. For Publisher 2, it’s the same pattern but with smaller percentages. They’re down at 6.5% to 11.5% fully gold and 4% roughly across the board for hybrid. There’s actually a slight decline in hybrid publication as a percentage for Publisher 2. There’s a slight increase in hybrid for Publisher 1. Both publishers are increasing their gold article publication. This context is important because the question that we really want to ask is how usage is changing, or whether it’s changing, and, therefore, is the value changing?

**Figure 2. Journal model distribution 2016–2020.**
Figure 3. Proportion of OA articles published 2016–2020.

We asked libraries for their COUNTER reports, COUNTER release five, the Title Master Report. If you know your COUNTER, those are the elements that we incorporated into the dataset (Figure 4). But the one that I think it’s important to mention specifically is Access Type, which breaks it down into Controlled and OA gold, and, therefore, allows you to look at usage of gold or open access and licensed content separately.

Usage Data: COUNTER R5 TR -Title Master Reports

Building the dataset
- COUNTER 5 Report Parameters
  - Platform: (Main Platform Only)
  - Data_Type: Journal
  - Access_Method: Regular (No TDM)
  - Metric_Type: Total_Item_Requests (Not Unique_Item_Requests)
  - Access_type: Controlled and OA Gold (separately)

Figure 4. Usage data: COUNTER R5 TR—Title Master Reports.
We had to clean up the usage data to avoid undue influence from gold OA journals and outliers. We decided to exclude fully open-access journals because they are available on the publisher’s website regardless of whether you have a Big Deal or not. We used the fully gold OA title lists from each publisher to then compare to our large dataset of usage. Across these twenty libraries we removed 10,290 open-access journals by institution pairs, which accounted for about 1.4 million uses. We retained the gold titles that had controlled usage also indicated, because our assumption was that these were titles where maybe only a year or two of that title was open with the rest behind a paywall. We also kept all hybrid journals in the dataset.

We also removed outliers (Figure 5). These five made-up journal names are examples with actual usage data from real institutions. At the first university, there was a title that had 20,000 uses in one year and almost none in the rest of those years. What is interesting is that these are probably breaches of some sort, right? Something unusual went on with these titles. None of these institutions said, “Oh, we can’t send you data from this publisher, because we know we had a breach.” This was not something that any of these institutions shared. That’s an aside, but I think it’s important to have a better understanding of this.

### Cleaning up the data

**Excluded Outliers:** watch out for breaches? 863 outliers removed (0.6% overall)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>University 1</td>
<td>Journal of Something</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>20190</td>
<td>163</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University 2</td>
<td>Journal of Something Else</td>
<td>489</td>
<td>14754</td>
<td>523</td>
<td>470</td>
<td>559</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University 3</td>
<td>Int Journal of Something</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8142</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University 4</td>
<td>Journal of Something</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6670</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University 1</td>
<td>Acta Somethingca</td>
<td>271</td>
<td>6442</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 5. Excluded outliers.
We removed outliers based on this sort of extreme pattern: 863 university-by-journal combinations in all, which accounted for about 0.6% of the total usage. Here's a more detailed look at the content that we removed, in declining order from the institution with the highest amount of outlier usage down to the lowest amount (Figure 6). You can see that it's across many different years at these institutions. Our criteria were that we took out any title that had over 1,000 requests in one year, but fewer than 100 in the preceding or ensuing year, or any time when one year was greater than two times all other years' requests combined. For example, if there was a title that had 4,000 uses in one year, but the other four years added up to less than 2,000, we removed that title as well. And again, it accounted for a relatively small number of titles.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>CountOfTitle</th>
<th>SumOf2016</th>
<th>SumOf2017</th>
<th>SumOf2018</th>
<th>SumOf2019</th>
<th>SumOf2020</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>316</td>
<td>48478</td>
<td>36588</td>
<td>15295</td>
<td>19555</td>
<td>47304</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>485</td>
<td>10401</td>
<td>4518</td>
<td>3331</td>
<td>2474</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70</td>
<td>7140</td>
<td>13741</td>
<td>25367</td>
<td>28118</td>
<td>23803</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>10097</td>
<td>11024</td>
<td>7005</td>
<td>3663</td>
<td>2369</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>26321</td>
<td>23205</td>
<td>1054</td>
<td>404</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>5509</td>
<td>39516</td>
<td>3860</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>7888</td>
<td>7061</td>
<td>11807</td>
<td></td>
<td>45271</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>1942</td>
<td>18825</td>
<td>9922</td>
<td>6717</td>
<td>13662</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>1275</td>
<td>9800</td>
<td>2319</td>
<td>2902</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>1455</td>
<td>6761</td>
<td>4447</td>
<td>5235</td>
<td>19206</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2821</td>
<td>7506</td>
<td>2194</td>
<td>11431</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>3990</td>
<td>761</td>
<td>1032</td>
<td>7299</td>
<td>31765</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>860</td>
<td>667</td>
<td>1677</td>
<td>756</td>
<td>971</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>631</td>
<td>1531</td>
<td>531</td>
<td>114</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>3108</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>908</td>
<td>2660</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>1657</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>594</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>31</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>710</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 6. Outlier calculations.

Here we take a glimpse at usage at the broad level of Carnegie class (Figure 7). We had a group of eight libraries in the R1 Very High Research activity category. Their average student FTE is 37,000. The R2+ group with the smaller institutions includes twelve with an average student FTE of 8,700. The R1 group had a higher average usage per student FTE. There were 38–42 uses per student FTE.
across the R1s, while the R2+ averages were only 13–15 uses per student. In both cases, the open-access gold usage was roughly 10% of the controlled usage.

### Average Usage per Student FTE in Two Categories of Library

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Avg Student FTE</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2019</th>
<th>2020</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>R1</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Controlled</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>37,209</td>
<td>42.1</td>
<td>42.1</td>
<td>40.2</td>
<td>38.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OA_Gold</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>4.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>R2+</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Controlled</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>8,716</td>
<td>15.5</td>
<td>15.4</td>
<td>14.1</td>
<td>13.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OA_Gold</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Figure 7. Average usage per student FTE in two categories of library.*

Now we'll move on to the question of whether the value of the Big Deal is declining.

The standard metric of package value is cost per use (CPU). If there is an increase in total cost or a decrease in total usage (or both), CPU increases, indicating a decline in package value. However, to take into account the underlying usage of freely available publisher-hosted gold open-access articles, we need to remove that usage from the denominator. Cost per controlled use (CPCU) does just that (Figure 8).
Is the value of the big deal declining?

\[
\begin{align*}
\uparrow \text{Total Cost} & \quad \Downarrow \text{Total Usage} \\
\cdots & = \uparrow \text{CPU (Traditional Cost per use)} \\
\downarrow & \cdot \text{(Gold OA usage)} \\
\uparrow \text{Total Cost} & \quad \Downarrow \text{CPU (Cost per *controlled* use)} \\
\cdots & = \uparrow \text{CPCU (Cost per *controlled* use)} \\
\downarrow & \cdot \text{(Total Usage - Gold OA usage)}
\end{align*}
\]

Figure 8. Calculating cost per controlled use.

The next set of slides address each of these three factors: total cost, total usage, and gold OA usage, showing a detailed view and a summary view of each trend over the five years of the study. The final set of slides brings them back together, comparing CPU and CPCU over time. In the detail view for each factor, Publisher 1 is on the left and Publisher 2 is on the right. Each line represents an individual institution, and their colors are consistent throughout. The dashed lines are the Carnegie Very High Research institutions (or R1s for short). The solid lines include High Research Intensity (R2s) on down to baccalaureate institutions.

I doubt it’s a surprise to anyone that most institutions’ costs increased over time. Figure 9 also reveals that Publisher 1 shows more variation in the cumulative change in cost. A couple of R1 institutions experienced massive increases, and a couple saw cost reductions. The two institutions that had reductions for Publisher 1 also had decreased prices for Publisher 2.
Summarizing these same data (Figure 10), we can see that Publisher 1’s package cost (in purple) increased 4% to 6% per year and Publisher 2’s package cost (in red) increased 2% to 4% per year with the error bars reflecting Standard Errors. So no real surprises here, but it does appear that Publisher 1’s cumulative cost increased more than Publisher 2 in 2019 and 2020. These rising costs create downward pressure on package value.

Change in cost (Summary)

Figure 10. Change in cost (summary).
Moving on to usage, we plotted Total Item Requests on a log scale to make it easier to see trends across three orders of magnitude (Figure 11). Perhaps it’s no surprise that the large, research-intensive institutions (dashed lines) had the highest usage for both publishers. Even after removing outliers, we can see that some institutions showed large fluctuations in usage from year to year.

For Publisher 1, fourteen of the twenty institutions’ usage increased from 2017 through 2020, despite the start of “work from home” in March 2020. In contrast, for Publisher 2, fifteen out of twenty institutions’ usage declined over the same period of time.

**Change in total usage over time (Detail)**

![Figure 11. Change in total usage over time (detail).](image)

Looking at average usage for each publisher, we can ask whether total usage is declining (Figure 12). For Publisher 1 (in purple), the answer is no. In fact, the increase from 2017 to 2020 was almost 40% or an average of 13% increase per year. Usage of Publisher 2’s content declined about 15% over the same period, starting in 2019 and resulting in an average decline of about 5% per year. So, for Publisher 2, both an increase in price and a decrease in usage contributed to declining value.
A third factor that can impact the value of journal packages over time is the proportion of total usage that’s freely available within the packages. As you can see, that proportion is fairly small and fairly consistent across the libraries. We’re showing these data on a 0% to 100% scale to remind you that 85% to 95% of usage is still coming from paywalled or controlled content (Figure 13).

Figure 12. Is total usage declining? (summary).

Figure 13. Is the proportion of hybrid open-access usage increasing? (detail).
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But when we zoom in on the same data, we can see different trends in hosted open-access usage between the publishers (Figure 14). Publisher 1 shows a clear increase in the proportion of OA usage, while Publisher 2 is less clear and some institutions’ proportion of hybrid usage appears to peak midway through.

Looking at the averages, the differences are clear (Figure 15). Proportional use of Publisher 1’s hybrid open-access articles is increasing by about 1% to 1.5% per year (in purple), whereas Publisher 2’s profile is effectively flat. On the right, here’s a second reminder that these exact same data plotted on a 0% to 100% scale show that the annual average change in hybrid OA usage has been quite small.
Figure 15. Is the proportion of hybrid open-access usage increasing? (summary).

Now we can move on to CPU (Figure 16). Putting costs and total usage together to calculate that, we see that institutions tend to experience flat or decreasing CPU for Publisher 1 and flat or increasing CPU for Publisher 2. Are you ready for CPCU? (Don’t blink or you’ll miss the differences!) (Figure 17). The lines move up a smidge, reflecting the removal of hybrid open-access use from the dominator, but there is very little change in the shape of the lines. The differences are minor because the change in the proportion of hybrid use is so small.
In the summary, we can compare CPCU and CPU more directly (Figure 18). As we’d expect, CPCU, shown by the solid lines, is always higher than traditional CPU (dashed lines). And the difference is dictated by the proportion of hybrid open access. To the extent
that transformative agreements lead to more rapid increase in the proportion of hybrid OA content and use, these lines should diverge, with CPCU increasing faster than traditional CPU over time. For this reason, we suggest that CPCU should be used as a standard measure going forward.

Is Cost Per Use & Cost Per Controlled Use Increasing? (Summary)

When we bring CPCU from the two publishers together on the same axis, the difference in their multiyear trends is clear (Figure 19). The purple line (Publisher 1) shows a slow decrease in CPCU, whereas Publisher 2 shows a pretty rapid increase in 2019 and 2020. Then we can flip CPCU on its head by reversing the y axis to acknowledge that increasing CPCU is equivalent to declining value. So, we can see that, while Publisher 1’s package (in purple) is slowly increasing in value, Publisher 2’s (in red) showed a precipitous decline. Thus, we can conclude that value did decline for one of the two publishers.

To review: (1) average cost increased 2% to 6% per year, (2) average usage changed by between +10% and −5% per year over a four-year period (and it was by far the most variable across institutions), and (3) the average proportion of hybrid OA usage changed by about 1% per year.
Some final thoughts: (1) The change in value was more strongly influenced by overall usage than by the small changes in the proportion of hybrid OA article usage. (2) There wasn’t much difference in the proportion of the open versus controlled usage across the site-licensed institutions for either publisher, despite the wide range of research activity they represent. (3) These trends were likely to have been affected by COVID, but its impact was unclear. Did COVID help the usage go up or drive it down? Did it impact usage of one publisher’s content differently than the other? Our data can’t be used to address that since we have no “non-COVID” control. (4) If these trends were influenced by the impact of transformative agreements on the rate of hybrid OA article publication, the effects were quite small. Nevertheless, as more libraries enter into transformative agreements, CPCU will increase more quickly than CPU, as long as the proportion of OA articles and usage in publisher packages continues to grow. Either way, this new CPCU metric will improve libraries’ ability to track the return on investment from their traditional Big Deal subscription payments.

[1]https://tinyurl.com/LMP-Unbundle
A New Wild West

Understanding and Communicating the Impact of Open Access?

TIM LLOYD, TRICIA MILLER, AND SARA SCHEIB

Abstract

Continued growth in open-access (OA) resources has left us all struggling to understand and communicate their impact—a challenge that we need to solve in order to justify the funding needed to sustain momentum. Understanding impact is complicated by the lack of standards; we’re all experimenting with various approaches but which one(s) should we adopt? Communicating impact is complicated by the diverse range of stakeholders involved in OA. This session brings together three diverse perspectives to explore the issues, raise questions and help us all start to make sense of this space.

One of the challenges facing our industry is building on standards like COUNTER to support the much more diverse range of use cases and stakeholders wanting to understand the impact of OA publishing. Traditional reporting focuses on how resources are used, but for many funders it’s also critical to understand which audiences are engaging with content and how those align to funding priorities—a particular challenge as usage patterns shift off-campus and privacy becomes ever more important online.

As more publishers transition their publishing models to support OA, we are seeing usage soar. While an increase in global usage is something to celebrate, increases in unauthenticated use, new patterns around who and where content is accessed from, and how patrons are engaging are emerging. How do publishers demonstrate
these changes and understand the impact to libraries, authors, funders, and new kinds of users? How do libraries communicate the value of OA resources to our scholars, administrators, and communities?

In this paper, we will look at OA challenges and opportunities from different perspectives. What are libraries doing to embrace changes in publishing, what are publishers doing to support them, and what can data providers do to bring the needs of each together?

Introduction

This paper documents a panel discussion about understanding and communicating the impact of open access (OA) between a librarian (Sara Scheib, Director of Scholarly Impact, University of Iowa Libraries), an OA publisher (Tricia Miller, Institutional Marketing Manager, Annual Reviews), and a service provider generating OA usage reporting (Tim Lloyd, CEO, LibLynx). The paper is structured around the following four key questions:

1. What is “impact” in the context of OA publishing?
2. What problems and gaps are we already experiencing?
3. What are the emerging solutions?
4. What does the future hold?

Each section explores these questions from the library, publisher, and service provider perspective.
1. **What Is “Impact” in the Context of OA Publishing?**

1.1. **What Do Libraries and Their Stakeholders Want to Know?**

*Library Perspective*

Librarians, authors, and administrators all want to know more about the impact of OA publishing. Some questions are relevant to all journals: What impact does this journal have on the scholarly community? Others are specific to OA and may be related to compliance: Are the publications resulting from our funded research available to the public in compliance with funding agency requirements? How does the impact of OA journals compare with closed-access journals?

Different business models present different questions. For “subscribe to open” journals, we want to know how it’s being used by our community. Do our researchers cite these journals in their own work or use them in their classes? For “read & publish” agreement journals, we need to see return on investment through article-level citation and Altmetric data. And for journals with tokens or other limited forms of OA support, how do we decide which manuscripts to fund?

1.2. **What Changes (and Challenges?) Are Publishers/Data Providers Seeing?**

*Publisher Perspective*

There are many changes publishers are seeing, and challenges they are facing, when assessing the impact of OA usage. Some of the
major challenges include increases in unauthenticated or unattributed usage and increases in overall usage, including higher engagement by those outside of the academic institution.

There is confusion and disagreement about how OA impacts usage in general. Together we question whether usage outside of the academy is or should be weighted as much as that which is used within. Does it matter? There are many pieces of data available to us to understand usage and engagement that publishers and libraries can gather, but there isn’t a consensus about what is actually useful to faculty, students, and administrators that see this data as just part of the story. We need to keep in mind that the data we offer needs to be inline with our customer’s goals and overall strategic plan.

Finally, database and search providers are offering users the option to log in to associate their institution with their queries through new technologies, such as GetFTR integration options. But do those work? And do they lead to new challenges or conversations about privacy?

1.3 How Can COUNTER (Altmetrics and Other Data Sources?) Demonstrate OA Impact?

Service Provider Perspective

Key questions to help understand the impact of published content are Who, Where, What, When, How, and Why. COUNTER metrics can give us valuable insights into these:

- **Who:** OA content obviously doesn’t have a paywall and so the identity of a user or their organizational affiliation typically isn’t known (unless they’ve registered an identity for other reasons, such as personalization). However, it’s possible to anonymously associate a significant minority of usage with a registered organizational IP address to determine a user’s organizational affiliation. This provides valuable insights into
the communities engaging with OA content

• **Where**: IP addresses can also provide insights into the geographical source of usage, and particularly whether OA content is reaching more geographically diverse audiences. For example, institutions with funding tied to a particular region, such as a state, may want to understand whether their publications are accessed by their local community. In addition, many institutions fund research specifically to ensure it’s accessible to parts of the world that traditionally lack equitable access.

• **What**: COUNTER metrics associate usage with a particular title or item of content, providing granular insights into what’s generating user engagement. The Data Type field can also provide more insights into the nature of the content, for example, article vs. dataset vs. dissertation.

• **When**: While COUNTER reports aggregate usage by month, the underlying data can be broken down into much more detailed analysis of how content is accessed over time.

• **How**: COUNTER reports allow usage to be broken down by Access Type (such as OA, Gold OA, controlled) as well as Access Method (e.g., text and data mining vs. browser access). You can also analyze events in other ways such as mobile access or device type.

• **Why**: This is usually the most valuable aspect of understanding impact, and the hardest to discern from a distance, but you can piece together valuable clues from the other attributes.

**Publisher Perspective**

Altmetrics and other data sources are able to show a connection to how content is used beyond the download, and where it is being used. The data sources are enhanced tools for communicating the value of journals for publishers, researchers, institutions, policy, and public consumption. Again, these data sources support
understanding of the significance of scientific literature in applied environments.

2. What Problems and Gaps Are We Already Experiencing?

2.1. How Does Our Metadata Need to Change to Account for Transformative Agreements?

Publisher Perspective

In the scholarly communications industry, the pathway that electronic content takes after it's published by a content provider to the ultimate end user of the information passes through many different systems. From depositing metadata to KBART metadata, accurate detail about every published element needs to be clearly passed along and continuously updated.

Understanding entitlements and access rights are central to the role of an information provider. Accuracy is not only important to the end user for access but also for the institution to manage their collection. When some or all of the content is reported as open, it is also important to report why.

Innovations in OA publishing models at the journal level should be included in KBART metadata. Within the current constraints of the Phase II KBART reporting data elements, each title-level element with OA rights can be reported. The KBART Style Guide section 6.6.26 describes how OA content should be indicated and the repetition required for hybrid access scenarios. Additionally, publishers who publish titles with different access options between volumes or years due to publishing model, funding, or creative commons licensing changes can utilize position twenty-five of the KBART metadata report. The extra field is applicable if there are
additional identifiers needed to transmit and provides a needed opportunity for consistent reporting to describe various OA scenarios.

2.2 What Existing Impact Metrics Do We Already Have that We Can Adjust or Reframe for New Uses or Audiences?

Service Provider Perspective

It’s worth recapping how COUNTER addresses usage reporting for open content. COUNTER reports have been around for almost twenty years, since the first COUNTER reporting standard was issued in 2003. The emergence of hybrid journals offering a mixture of paywalled and OA content led to the addition in 2013 of a dedicated “Gold OA” journal report (JR1 GOA) in Release 4 of the COUNTER Code of Practice. This enabled publishers to break out usage of OA journal articles accessed as part of a paywalled collection. From January 2019, Release 5 of the COUNTER Code of Practice added an Access Type attribute that allowed reports to identify the license under which content was accessed (Controlled, OA_Gold,[1] OA_Delayed,[2] Other_Free_to_Read). The definition of Gold OA explicitly recognized content that could be in hybrid of fully OA publications.

As a result, COUNTER already provides a framework for capturing relevant usage metrics and reporting usage by institution (or non-attributed) and by content. However, there are a number of other interesting areas where we have scope to understand impact. I wouldn’t characterize them as “gaps” in COUNTER, as standards naturally evolve to address new emerging trends—but they are certainly opportunities to build a better understanding of impact. Examples we are actively exploring include:

- Impact in terms of the type of organizations that users are affiliated with (say, academic, government, or corporates) or
which sectors of the economy are engaging with the content (e.g., finance vs. healthcare).

- Impact in terms of the subjects and topics that users are engaging with, which is typically a more relevant and accessible entry point than discrete titles.
- Impact in terms of the end result for funders—did they achieve their funding goals. For example, enabling greater access to certain regions of the world, or driving engagement from organizations traditionally excluded from access to this sort of research.

What Internal Changes Are Required in Libraries to Support OA?

*Library Perspective*

The biggest change required in libraries is a shift in perspective from gatekeeping, controlling access to published content, to seeing ourselves as publishing partners by facilitating free and immediate access to the work produced by our researchers. Because the world needs our research! But that shift in perspective comes with difficult questions: How do we fund this? Most transformative agreements are not cost-neutral and there is resistance to using collection funds to pay for article processing charges (APCs). How do we measure success? We can no longer rely on usage and citation metrics to make decisions. We need to use a whole suite of metrics to evaluate OA at multiple levels and the staffing and infrastructure to create custom analyses to demonstrate impact to our stakeholders, whether they are individual authors, research groups, departments, or the institution as a whole.
What Are the Emerging Solutions?

How Are Best Practices Evolving to Reflect the Greater Emphasis on OA Usage?

*Service Provider Perspective*

COUNTER have signaled their intent to evolve the current Code of Practice to provide better support for reporting on usage of OA content. The most recent update to Release 5 (5.0.2,[3] effective September 28, 2021) added support for additional optional elements to break aggregate usage down by geolocation, using the existing ISO-3166 standard for Country and subdivision names and codes.

One minor change relates to attributing OA usage to organizations. When the current standard was developed in 2017–2018 there was no expectation that usage of OA content would be attributed to institutions and so the standard used the term “The World” to capture non-attributed usage—which looks odd when combined alongside usage attributed to institutions. Recent consultation documents[4] from COUNTER have suggested using “All other usage” instead.

COUNTER are planning more significant changes for reporting open content in release 5.1, which is scheduled for consultation in mid-2022. It takes time for emerging practices to be identified and assessed before new best practices can be determined, so we should rightly expect best practices to lag behind innovation in this area.

What Is the Use and Understanding of New Platforms such as OA Switchboard[5] to Support Library Administrators, Authors, and Funders?
Service Provider Perspective

The OA Switchboard was formally founded as a project in 2020 with the aim of helping manage the increasingly complex network of agreements between publishers and institutions. This complexity is being driven by:

- Growth in the number and diversity of OA business models (some with or without individual publication fees, some through agreements with publishers, some through sponsorship models)
- Funders and institutions expanding their publication requirements
- Complex relationships: there can be multiple authors involved, each with multiple institutional affiliations and funder arrangements
- Complex processes: manual vs. automated; central vs. decentralized; inconsistent terminology; inconsistent use of identifiers, etc

The OA Switchboard’s goal is to act as a neutral, independent intermediary, providing shared infrastructure, standards and back-office services for funders, institutions, and publishers. It is a tool that can be called when needed or integrated in stakeholders’ own systems and workflows to achieve automation and scalability. Publishers, institutions (including library administrators), and funders participate directly via accounts with the OA Switchboard. Authors benefit indirectly.

Publisher Perspective

There are some emerging OA publishing models that are non-APC dependent, such as Subscribe to Open that is being practiced by nonprofit publisher Annual Review, among others. These models are
not currently supported by OA Switchboard because the process by which an institution supports the journals is unchanged from the traditional way. It would seem beneficial for all OA publishing models to be represented in this space regardless of complexity of the model.

What Systems Are Libraries Using to Track Impact?

*Library Perspective*

At the University of Iowa Libraries, we're pulling information from several systems to create a more complete picture of OA impact. We receive valuable information about how our funding is being used from publishers. Many of our agreements use RightsLink[6] as the management interface and it’s useful to have all the information from different publishers in a standard format. We try to use our ILS and its analytics module (Alma Analytics) to get COUNTER-compliant usage statistics, when available. We’re tracking OA publishing at the institution level using SciVal.[7] Last year, we went live with Esploro[8] from Ex Libris, which is helping us track impact at the college, department, research group, author, and article levels. And of course, we leverage information available in our subscription databases. At the journal level we get impact metrics from Journal Citation Reports[9] and Scopus.[10] At the author level, we use SciVal/Scopus and occasionally Google Scholar.[11] At the article level, we primarily use Scopus and Web of Science.[12] It’s a lot of data wrangling and we’re still experimenting, but we have a new data analyst on staff who’s been a huge asset.
What Does the Future Hold?

What Needs to Occur for Sustainability and Equity?

Publisher Perspective

OA publishing is shifting our relationships with institutions from one of selling a product to one of a collaborative service. Publishers need to show that the pathway to OA that is in practice also has benefits for the library, the authors, the funders, and other stakeholders and that it can be sustained over time.

Sustainability has many different meanings, but all of them are related to the ways in which we communicate about OA and the evaluation of how usage is consumed. Sustainability can encompass financial transparency and stability, equity and diversity of global publishing output, and collaborative decision-making between funders, authors, libraries, and publishers but critically, it denotes that the agreements we choose to enter into are transparent about how they’ll achieve a path to OA.

Current challenges are becoming apparent with so many OA publishing models that involve more stakeholders than have traditionally participated. Again, this is a communication and engagement challenge. We need to communicate what OA is, as well as what it is not, to more communities. Dialogue about transformative agreements, funding mandates, and institutional policy are all different factors that impact OA but for some, we need to take a step back to explain the impetus for change. There are some commonly overlooked considerations about OA including:

- OA does not mean free access
- OA does not mean low quality
- OA does mean less restrictive copyright
- OA does mean a library and institution has an opportunity to
engage their broader community

Lastly, but certainly not least, licensing, legal, and mission-driven policies are changing rapidly in response to OA initiatives and not all in parallel. Communities of practice for many different types of OA publishing models are making strides to work in partnership to address many of these challenges. We know that OA publishing is, and is sure to continue, surpassing paywalled publishing. We need to focus on how we can communicate more effectively to make OA initiatives work for everyone.

**Library Perspective**

In my opinion, we need to reframe the conversation. OA publishing is about contributing to an equitable and sustainable future for scholarly communication. We’re in the midst of a paradigm shift and there are multiple business models on the table. It’s by finding creative new ways of understanding and communicating impact that we can make informed decisions about the best way to move forward as a community.

**Service Provider Perspective**

We see three medium-term trends influencing the delivery of reporting on usage of OA content:

- Greater complexity, arising from continued growth in the range of OA business models and innovation in the nature of reporting. This will increase demand for scalable solutions and all that entails, for example, automation, standardization.
- Greater diversity in practice, as usage reporting needs to address the needs of stakeholders beyond the library. It’s interesting to see how different institutions are addressing these challenges, with some leveraging expertise within the
library, and some building separate centers of excellence outside the library (e.g., Senior Research Officer). It will be a while before a consensus emerges on best practice, and in the meantime we'll see a lot more experimentation.

- Greater need for unified reporting that can sit across all these diverse publishing models to more comprehensively capture an institution's engagement with the content that supports their mission.

[1] Content immediately and permanently OA because an APC applies or the publication process was sponsored by a library, society, or other organization. May be hybrid or fully OA publications.

[2] Content OA because publisher's embargo period had expired (delayed Open Access).


[8] https://exlibrisgroup.com/products/esploro-research-services-platform/


Print and E-Books

How Are Strategies for Academic Libraries, University Presses, and Vendors Driven by the Current Necessity of Online Access? Notes from the Field Twelve Months on

ARIELLE LOMNESS, ROB TIESSEN, DEAN SMITH, AND MICHAEL ZEOLI

At the 2020 Charleston Conference, Arielle Lomness, Collections Librarian at the University of British Columbia’s (UBC) Okanagan Campus, Rob Tiessen, Collections Librarian at the University of Calgary (UCalgary), Dean Smith, Director of Duke University Press, and Michael Zeoli, Senior Advisor, Publisher Strategy at De Gruyter Publishing gave a panel presentation titled Print & eBooks: How are Strategies – for Academic Libraries, University Presses, and Vendors – Driven by the Current Necessity of Online Access? (CharlestonConference, 2021). Sharing the perspectives of library collection development, university press publishing, and book distribution raised lively discussion and many questions among participants.

The twelve months since then were turbulent and disruptive. The panel reassembled for a “seething and bubbling” discussion of what had transpired in the last twelve months. The proceedings below reflect the changes at the UBC and the UCalgary.

From the Perspective of UBC Library

Looking back to our presentation last year, UBC’s focus during the first year of the pandemic was to address whether our Library was prepared for the move to online learning and research, minimal
and at times closed off access to our print collections, and taking a deeper look at our own e-book acquisition practices. We asked ourselves the question: “were we really e-preferred?” This entailed the consideration of evidence-based acquisition (EBA) models and package purchases, our title-by-title selection approaches, temporary access collections offered by the multitude of publishers, university presses, and HathiTrust, as well as the impact e-books had on many of the unique acquisitions needs of our institution (e.g., non-English language and Canadian university press titles).

We learned there was no going back and that e-books would become more of a priority than they had already been for us. Similarly, we began to hear others voicing the same opinion of e-preferred momentum (Watkinson, 2021). But of course, this all meant continued learning about the long-term needs and wants of our users, and what publishers would be willing to do post-pandemic for their customers. The following outlines some of what UBC has seen play out over the last year, as we settled into our new acquisition routines, and showcases some bridging points to what we were seeing last year.

New Offerings and Lessons Learned

*Multilingual and Non-English Language Titles*

We were able to add a few more multilingual packages (e.g., Classique Garnier, Maruzen eBook Library, JapanKnowledge, and KinoDen) and saw others being released as well, which is fantastic as our institution has high non-English language research and teaching needs. But with this comes some challenges, especially with instances of poor metadata practices. Some publishers are selling the e-book titles without packaging them with appropriate discoverability and access of the content. This bares similarities to how print is sold, where the publisher believes that the content is enough and that we will always be able to do custom cataloging.
In other cases, they want to sell us a frontlist with no impending publication list, leaving us to question how we will track entitlements as content is released. More work needs to be done to ensure all publishers, large and small, understand that selling e-books is a holistic practice: content, as well as marketing, discovery, and access are all needed.

New Publisher Agreements

More direct publisher agreements are also popping up, such as new EBA models with publishers where we are the first customer. This can prove daunting at times, especially in situations where there is a lack of MARC records for imprints included in the EBA, leaving usage to rely on who finds the content on the platform rather than the Library’s catalog or discovery layer. Additionally, we had to pivot to renew certain resources that were acquired with the intention of being one-time funded during the start of the pandemic, but continued to see usage and need with the return to on-campus learning. Overall, we are seeing shifting needs and are attempting to meet them as usage, requests, and funding align.

Faculty as Open-Access (OA) Publishers

Shifting faculty needs around OA have also come to the forefront this year. Some of our faculty are making the shift themselves, prioritizing OA publishing initiatives and even leading the way by doing it themselves. They know they want their work open, and they aren't going to wait for a publisher to fill that need in their discipline. Some are creating new OA journals, while others are starting their own publishing platforms that will accept, peer-review, and publish multi-format publications (e.g., articles, reports, podcasts, multimedia). Furthermore, this is prompting conversations around criteria for tenure and promotion, breaking down stigmas of OA
and promoting greater flexibility in what is being produced and released into the world. Anecdotally, these initiatives are also asking questions around discoverability and metadata and how best to get their content out to libraries—clearly there is a need for wider education on what these workflows look like.

**User Needs**

**Hybrid Teaching, Learning, and Research**

With the move to returning to campus, we quickly saw some classes reverting to being online or using a hybrid model. This meant constantly being on our toes when it came to electronic offerings and continuing to prioritize e-books for use in student research, as many chose to remain off-campus or at a distance and unable to pick up print loan requests. If in-person learning isn’t prioritized moving forward, we sense that a continued effort to maintain electronic access will be the norm, which may also include more digitization and copyright requests from our users.

**Faculty Hiring Sprints or Cluster Hires**

There are also many new programs starting and a greater investment in equity, diversity, and inclusion (EDI) initiatives. For example, many universities are seeing Black faculty cluster hires, and UBC specifically is seeing hiring sprints to bring on more Indigenous faculty members across all programs. This has meant that there are many new research and teaching needs that need to be addressed in our collections. University presses offer a lot of this content and we are glad to be able to support these new hires with existing resources and investment in more university press packages and initiatives, including OA initiatives such as MIT Press'
Format and Publisher Preferences

Many of our users continue to show their preference toward certain publishers and formats, such as a strong preference of university press content for research purposes. While we have seen declining print circulation, much of what university presses publish is still actively sought out and requested directly of us. University press content is also what faculty turn to much of the time to populate their own personal collections, so we need to meet them where their desired need is. They collect it for themselves and then they use it in their classes, and then students want to find it and read it more. We need to better understand what the information-seeking behaviour is of our faculty and how that is influencing course readings and research materials used by students.

E-Textbooks

As many institutions are pointing out lately on listservs and at conferences, we have seen an increased desire for academic libraries to support the purchase or subscription of e-textbooks in some way. Unfortunately, it isn’t simple and doesn’t appear to have the right conversations taking place yet. The Okanagan Campus of UBC is currently running a Textbook Affordability Pilot Project to investigate which publishers are willing to work with libraries in Canada and how having a funded e-textbook can shape the student experience in a course. So far, we’ve found that most publishers are still unwilling to work with libraries directly and will only work through third-party sellers like VitalSource, which our institution will not manage (although other libraries do). More work needs to be done to address the financial burden on students, and the pandemic
should have been a good time to start this but things are falling short, at least in Canada. Maybe the best or temporary answer comes back to the use of general e-books as textbooks, since this would ensure that libraries can support the students, who we are primarily responsible for supporting in the work we do.

Trade Publications

A final area of consideration for user needs is around the many course requests and personal requests we see for trade publications, as it is common for them to cover EDI and current events topics of interest. Sadly, most publishers don't sell e-books in Canada to academic libraries (only public libraries). There are always talks in the works to fix this, but it constantly stalls or solutions are slow to present themselves. Having these titles as e-books would greatly affect how many print titles we still buy. Hopefully with the addition of some trade publisher e-book sales in Canada, other publishers will follow, but next we will need to turn our efforts to ameliorating access beyond 1-user options for this content. The work is never done when it comes to acquiring trade publications for our users.

Financial Considerations

Renewals

Some renewals for packages and EBA's came in flat for a second year, which was greatly appreciated as we are still not “through” this pandemic and the shifting needs of hybrid learning isn't fully understood. Understanding that this isn't forever, flat or minimal increase renewals are still a huge way that publishers can build
trust and relationships with libraries. Unfortunately, there are some publishers, not university presses, that are trying to recoup what they didn't receive last year by jumping to 4% or more this year for increases on e-book packages. Usually, they are still open to negotiation, but this is concerning as a practice without an open conversation about what the publisher's reasons or needs are in doing this.

Relicensing

Canadian institutions saw a relicensing of a serials big deal earlier this year that allowed for some breathing room at fiscal year-end in March 2021. UBC could address desiderata and urgent one-time needs for e-book backfiles and other resources that had direct ongoing post-pandemic need. However, budgets at academic institutions are still status quo across much of Canada, or decreasing, so this one-time option isn't a huge help in the long run and is just a band-aid. While financial considerations could be argued for any and all Library resources, as we see a decline in monograph use overall this is concerning for what it means to acquire e-books going forward.

Conclusions

Our question for the year pondered: how can we balance listening to our users and trying new things? As classrooms continue to evolve into hybrid learning environments and the offerings from publishers on the market are more than any one budget can assume, it is important to invest in what our users are asking for and being asked to use in their courses, in support of growing EDI initiatives, and of course in initiatives that align with the values and ethics of the institution and librarianship, such as OA and new models of
publishing. All parties (e.g., publishers, libraries, and faculty alike) need to be aware of these changes and be ready to have the difficult and productive conversations that will help to pivot us into a post-pandemic era of learning and resource acquisition.

One Year Further into the Pandemic: Print and E-Book Trends at the UCalgary

Like many peer institutions, before the pandemic the UCalgary was working to transition away from print books and toward e-books. A number of other challenges got in the way of that goal and Calgary had difficulties maintaining spending in the book part of the collections budget. In 2015, the value of the Canadian dollar dropped by 17% vis a vis the U.S. dollar in three months and by 23% over the entire year. Given that 85% of Library collection expenditures are in U.S. dollars, this was a major hit. The Canadian dollar still has not recovered to its pre-2015 value. Given budget problems over time, more and more of the book budget ended up being shifted to cover problems with the serials side of the budget. Despite the desire to shift the book collection to be more digital, the Library still ended up buying many print books because of issues around cost and availability.

Despite the pandemic, 2021 was a good year for our collection’s budget. In 2020, the average annual exchange rate for the Canadian/U.S. dollar was 74.5¢. From April to August 2021, the average of the monthly exchange rates ended up being 80.6¢. The improved exchange rate significantly expands our ability to buy books, journals, and everything else we buy.

Relying on number crunching from a blog post by Alex Usher (Canadian Higher Education Consultant) (2021), a large number of Canadian universities rode out the first year of the pandemic 2020 to 2021 in good fiscal shape. The first pandemic year was a better year financially for most Canadian universities than recent pre-
pandemic years. Canadian universities cut their budgets in anticipation of a fall in revenue (lower enrollment and government cutbacks) and then the fall in revenue didn't happen. Savings from keeping campuses closed and teaching online offset growth in salary costs. In the specific case of the UCalgary, our institution lost money but much less than anticipated. At the end of the fiscal year, one-time money became available to the Library for things like book purchases.

It is useful to compare the Fall semesters from 2020 and 2021. In 2020, the main Library reopened to students, faculty, and staff on August 10, with no access to the stack floors. All the branch libraries remained closed. Twenty percent of courses were face to face (all of these were small courses with less than twenty students). There were no print reserves because of quarantine issues. We started the year not purchasing print books, but over time made more and more exceptions. In the Fall of 2021, 86% of students were either attending in-person classes or were hybrid students that had a mixture of in person and online courses. Hybrid students place heavy pressure on the Library and all parts of campus to provide space for hybrid students to take their online courses while on campus in between their in-person courses. Fourteen percent of students still exclusively take online courses. Most faculty and staff are on campus. Libraries are still restricted to students, faculty, and staff. Some of the branches have reopened. Print reserves are discouraged by not forbidden. We still make exceptions for buying some books in print. And of course, Omicron may cause significant difficulties for our Winter Semester.
As outlined in Figure 1, our book buying essentially doubled because of the one-time money that the Library received toward the end of the 2020/21 fiscal year. Digital is still heavily preferred. Our print expenditures continue to slowly decline. Most of our print books come from firm orders. The Library has been under pressure to buy streaming video to support online courses and we are spending much more in that area. We are also under pressure to buy textbooks, which the Library mostly resists. We have restarted our approval plans, but are heavily restricting what we will accept in print. Most of our one-time money went into EBA’s with large academic publishers, though some of it also went into front list purchases.

Where does this leave us? On the whole, the EBAs are very popular. The problem with EBAs is that of course they are a hybrid of book acquisitions and a subscription model. We have a long tail of books that we receive via the EBAs that we will not be able to acquire via this model. Even though the EBAs will enable us to own many titles, if we are unable to renew the EBAs there will be many disappointed users, not to mention gaps in our book collection.
The other issue is that we continue to be worried about long-term budget issues.

The one-time money that flowed into our budget over the last third or quarter of the 2020/21 fiscal year was very welcome. The trend before that year was a slow budget squeeze. Will that come back? Will the pandemic over the long haul make the budget squeeze even worse? Only time will tell.
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Navigating the Road Ahead

The 21st Health Sciences Lively Lunchtime Discussion

ELIZABETH LORBEER, KAREN GAU, TIM BUTZEN-CAHILL, AND LINDSAY BARNETT

Note: During the conference session, Irene Lubker (Medical University of South Carolina) and Ramune K. Kubilius (Northwestern University Feinberg School of Medicine) provided brief spotlights; Andrea McLellan (McMaster University), co-author of Lindsay Barnett, participated virtually and was available to field questions.

In the past year, many detours and rest stops were made, but as the 2021 Charleston Conference theme proclaimed, we were “On the Road Again!” The 21st Health Sciences Lively Lunchtime Discussion session, with some presenters taking advantage of the hybrid conference venue, highlighted not only developments but also shifts in thinking and practices as interconnected areas of the health sciences scholarly publishing and collection management landscape were navigated. The no holds barred session that was supported by conference sponsor, Rittenhouse, included a longer presentation, some briefer spotlight presentations and updates, as well as time for audience questions and discussion.

Trends in Textbooks in Academic Medical Education

Elizabeth Lorbeer launched the session by sharing some trends to springboard a brief discussion on evolutions and libraries’ roles in the area of textbooks in academic health sciences education. In
some cases, transition and pivoting was needed due to the changing landscape precipitated by the COVID-19 pandemic.

The first article spotlighted was by Louie and Wilkes (1), a study that looked at imagery in preclinical textbooks used in medical schools across North America. Conclusions included: overrepresentation of light skin tone and underrepresentation of dark skin tone, absence of skin tone diversity, and marginalization of racial minorities in medical education. Works in the sample were: Atlas of Human Anatomy (2014), Bates’ Guide to Physical Examination and History Taking (2013), Clinically Oriented Anatomy (2014), and Gray’s Anatomy for Students (2015).

The second article identified in short as “Homeschooling for Quarantined Residents” spotlighted work of Sielicki A et al. (2), a study reporting on the creation of an online curriculum for Emergency Medicine residents to replace canceled rotations and furloughed PUI (patients under investigation) in Spring 2020. Zoom sessions and Google Classroom were used to discuss chapter readings and to complete an educational activity. The eight-week program was completed by twelve residents. Works assigned included Rosen’s Emergency Medicine and Roberts & Hedges’ Clinical Procedures in Emergency Medicine.

“Anatomy: the textbook dilemma” was described by Leung BC et al. (3). The authors looked at how learning has changed over time in anatomy in UME (undergraduate medical education) programs. A surveyed first year medical students, M1s (n = 140), had a 54% response rate. What resources did they find most useful when learning anatomy? Responses were: anatomy websites (30%) and textbooks (13%). What resources did they find least useful when learning anatomy? Lectures (22%) and textbooks (18%). It was noted that students favored anatomy websites.

“OER (Open Education Resources) in Nursing Informatics”, written by Riley and Carmack (4), was a study that reported on the effectiveness and student satisfaction of adopting OER content. The main drawback to relying on a textbook is the rapidly evolving technology and software-based innovations in informatics. OERs
are preferred ways to disseminate new knowledge about health care information systems and emerging technologies. OERs allowed instructors to adjust content for specific learning objectives. Just-in-time learning to “serve learners with varying informatics knowledge base.”

Lastly, findings were spotlighted from the Rutgers University on Open-Access Textbook Program, as reported by Bridgeman (5). The library provided $1,000 incentive awards to faculty who committed to redesigning or developing a course to use open or affordable course materials. The program included replacing the traditional textbook with OER, library-licensed materials, course reserves, self-developed materials, or combination. The really successful model saved health sciences students a total of $285K in 2020.

Developments: Interesting and Noteworthy Trends Since the 2020 Charleston Conference

In a brief update, Ramune Kubilius invited participants to review a curated landscape review of trends announced, reported, and observed since the 2020 lively lunchtime discussion (handout in: [sched]/DOI: 10.18131/g3-txse-ky26, 1). The past year included professional awards and initiatives in health sciences collection development, publisher, and other anniversaries, Big Deals that moved to “Little Deals,” new platforms, owners, initiatives, and projects. The year also included new titles, products, collections, and enhancements. “Open” included increasing and continuing focus in the health sciences on OER (open education resources) and Transformative Agreements. Lastly, scholarly communication and health sciences collection development and management were invariably affected by the ripple effects of the COVID-19 pandemic, calls for DEI content, and the preponderance of preprints in the scholarly output arena.


MLA Education Domain Initiatives

Rena Lubker reported on two Medical Library Association (MLA) Education Domain working group initiatives (Lubker was a member of the first) that should be relevant even outside of MLA membership. An open repository home for education resources is being sought for both initiatives with that in mind. Reports on the
initiatives were first shared in the MLA annual meeting virtual poster session in May 2021.

The first project poster was entitled “Designing an Open Repository of Educational Resources for Health Information Professionals” in which twenty-two MLA caucuses provided input in the discussion that led to plans for the repository. The repository would collect, facilitate sharing as well as building on the work of others, and be open to others outside of MLA. (The poster is available for viewing in the Duke University Medical Center institutional repository http://hdl.handle.net/2193/CN69M460X (1)).

The second project poster was entitled “Creating a Directory of Information Literacy Mapping in Health Sciences Disciplines.” Librarians may be involved in information literacy curriculum development and integration. The goal of the working group is to create the resources for mapping information literacy concepts for specific educational programs. (The poster is available for viewing in the Duke University Medical Center Institutional repository http://hdl.handle.net/2193/VM40XS18C (2)).

Challenges shared about the use of the professional membership, MLA, website for these initiatives included the fact that the website was undergoing redesign and was focused on the needs of MLA membership. There was lack of the ability to customize by units such as caucus working groups, and there were questions about the site’s accessibility to MLA nonmembers and ability to convey comprehensibility of information about the initiatives.

Solutions being sought included undertaking a proposal to seek an external repository with MLA funding. Plans for the setup of the new website will include an initial setup phase with webmaster/designer, creation of the database/setting up timeline of repository activities, and maintenance of repository probably by-chair, webmaster, and a committee.

1. Medical Library Association, Workgroup of the Education Domain Hub (Kepsel, A., Andresen, C., Ansell, M., Desouky, V.,


eBook Availability: Growth Since 2002

In a brief presentation, Tim Butzen-Cahill spotlighted selected findings from an article published in “Against the Grain” (1) that was entitled Health Sciences eBooks in 2021: Availability, Challenges, and Trends. For their review, the authors included textbooks in their broader definition of “eBooks.” Using the 2021 Doody Core Titles list as a sampling for the study, authors compared an earlier study done twenty years ago when the Brandon/Hill list was the core list in the health sciences. The authors observed an increase in online availability (19% to 82%) of the sample core list reviewed, a growth in eBook licensing options, an increase in # of eBook licensing platforms, a rise of the third-party aggregator, commercial publishers that provided title availability in multiple licensing platforms, and a finding that society publishers have entered the marketplace with their own digital platforms.

eBook availability challenges were observed. Eighteen percent of Core Titles were not available as an eBook via popular licensing
platforms available to libraries (399 Doody Core titles from 76 publishers). The authors observed challenges in rising costs and great variation in acquisition models. eBooks needed for health sciences curricula sometimes could not be obtained through conventional library (institutional licensing), though platforms designed for individuals’ use sometimes offered online access to the titles for purchase or rental.

Trends observed by the authors included the need for (and availability) of expanded access to licensing platforms and eBooks throughout the COVID-19 pandemic, and a parallel increasing focus on diversity and social justice topics in health sciences (and general) eBook titles. Preexisting trends observed even prior to 2021 included increasing eBook feature enhancements, focus on Open Access, and consortial eBook initiatives.


An Analysis of Publisher DEI Policies

Lindsay Barnett spotlighted findings from a poster, coauthored with Andrea McLellan, that was first presented at the 2021 MLA annual meeting poster session (1). The project aimed to assess publisher DEI policies and was an initiative of the MLA UX (User Experience) Caucus of which the authors are both officers. To frame the project, the authors quoted the Coalition for Diversity in Scholarly Communications (C4DISC) “Joint Statement of Principles” and the Royal Society of Chemistry’s “Joint Commitment for Action on Inclusion and Diversity in Publishing.” They posed their research question and the methods they used to review the publisher and funder DEI policy and business practice landscape. The authors
described that significant degree of variation in publisher approach and commitment to this area and recommended more publishers actively engage in existing initiatives such as those created by RSC and C4DISC.

Since the MLA poster presentation, Barnett and McLellan continued to review the landscape and an update showed some progress, seen in updated website statements, expanded definitions, and strategic plans. Publishers are focusing on diversifying peer review and have created awards celebrating diverse authors. There are more signatories to industry-wide DEI efforts. Two publishers worth noting are SpringerNature and Cell Press that offer some of the best developed plans. It should be noted, however, that some publishers are falling behind, still using outdated concepts. The authors call for greater commitment to DEI in the publishing industry and more transparency around publisher operations to allow for community assessment.


Surfacing Current Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion (DEI) Content

Karen Gau reported on a local library initiative that in part moves in the direction of what a future local Diversity Audit would seek to identify. The library’s immediate, actionable approach to identifying and surfacing relevant content was to create a spreadsheet for recently acquired print and eBook titles, films, and other resources that have DEI-related content. The spreadsheet includes many items with titles that do not clearly indicate that they contain DEI content (e.g., Introduction to Sonography and Patient Care), but
because book summaries and chapter contents are reviewed by
the library, these titles are able to be surfaced by the spreadsheet.
Key elements to the project include liaison interest (buy-in),
brainstorming together by the library team, and a design for ease
of use by internal users. Focusing on titles acquired from 2020
forward, the collaboratively maintained spreadsheet allows not only
the collections team but also liaison librarians to add titles, edit
notes, and edit the disciplines to which the titles are assigned.

Discussion

On-site and remote audience questions (fielded by Nicole Gallo
of Rittenhouse) showed that interest continues in keeping current
on developments in the health sciences scholarly publishing,
educational resource, and textbooks landscape, ever evolving as
it is. (Presentation slides contain references, links, and more
information.)
Making an (im)PACT on Scholarly Publication at UMD

DANIEL C. MACK, MAGGIE Z. SAPONARO, AND LEIGH ANN DEPOPE

Abstract

Researchers at the University of Maryland (UMD) provide cutting edge solutions to problems on a variety of topics. However, the current state of scholarly publishing has made it challenging to make that research accessible, and licensing resources where research is published has become increasingly complex. To address these issues, in spring 2020, the Publishing, Access, and Contract Terms (UMD PACT) working group was formed. A subgroup of the University Library Council (ULC) and sponsored jointly by the ULC, the Office of the Provost, Faculty Affairs, and the Division of Research, UMD PACT is a cross-divisional group charged with developing and enacting a new rights-retention, open-access licensing policy based on the Harvard University model to support and encourage sustainable open access of faculty research. This paper provides background on how and why PACT was formed, its membership and timeline, its work to craft and adopt licensing principles and a new framework for licensing of scholarly content for UMD researchers and communicate these changes with campus researchers. The speakers will offer a model for successful campus engagement. Model elements include strategies to engage librarians, collegiate faculty, governance bodies, and college- and university-level administrators; to develop a strategic
communications plan; and to implement policies and procedures that effectively support new campus-wide initiatives.

**About UMD PACT**

(https://pact.umd.edu/)

UMD PACT (University of Maryland Publishing, Access, and Contract Terms) is a working group of the University Library Council (ULC), the governance body jointly charged by the University of Maryland’s University Senate and the Senior Vice President and Provost with providing oversight of the University of Maryland Libraries. The ULC’s role is advisory to the Dean of Libraries (https://senate.umd.edu/councilstaskforces/librarycouncil). UMD PACT is sponsored jointly by the ULC, the Office of the Provost, Faculty Affairs, and the Division of Research. UMD PACT was formed in Spring 2020 and has been working continuously since that time. Membership in UMD PACT includes faculty and administrators from across the University of Maryland, including several members from the faculty of the University of Maryland Libraries; see full list of members at: https://pact.umd.edu/about/membership.

UMD PACT is charged with advancing the movement for open research and scholarship. Representing the State of Maryland’s flagship institution and one of the nation’s preeminent public research universities, UMD PACT is committed to action that will make Maryland’s research more visible, accessible, affordable, and transparent; see UMD PACT’s charge at https://pact.umd.edu/about. UMD PACT’s work focuses on several issues:

- Review current and changing the University of Maryland’s scholarly publishing practices, licensing terms, and contracts.
- Consult with faculty and administrators via focus group interviews, surveys, and other means to gather input and
feedback about scholarly communication issues, ideas, and challenges.

- Consider how the Senate, Academic Affairs, Faculty Affairs, and the Libraries can lead and collaborate with others, including the University System of Maryland (USM), the Big Ten Academic Alliance (BTAA), and other consortia, to improve equitable access to the University of Maryland's research and scholarship.
- Recommend a new framework for licensing of scholarly content and the means by which more equitable access to the University of Maryland's scholarly publishing and data can be achieved.

UMD PACT Timeline and Activities

UMD PACT has been active since early 2020 in working toward its goal of advancing open scholarship at the University of Maryland. The group has consulted with external experts as well as the University of Maryland's Office of General Counsel, reviewed the professional literature, benchmarked against peer institutions, educated and updated its sponsors on key issues, conferred with and sought feedback from internal stakeholders, created recommendations, authored public statements, advocated for open and sustainable scholarship, and drafted policy for legislative approval by the University Senate. UMD PACT’s activities have followed several phases as outlined below:

- Phase 1 (March 2020 through Fall 2020): Review and consultation
  - Met with external consultants from consortia, publishers, and other libraries: see list of consulting sessions at https://pact.umd.edu/taxonomy/term/8
Website launched—https://pact.umd.edu/

Overviews of main issues to educate internal stakeholders:

- licensing principles and terms
- major collections expenditures
- scholarly publishing models and UMD Libraries’ related services
- Phase 2: Winter 2021: Information gathering

Library members of the group compile the data and information gathered during Phase 2 and prepare for Phase 3

- Phase 3: Spring 2021 through December 2021: Discuss issues and devise recommendations; draft report and get feedback

Drafted scholarly publishing principles based on work of MIT at https://libraries.mit.edu/scholarly/publishing/framework/

- Adopted core licensing principles: https://pact.umd.edu/key-issues/licensing-principles
- Drafted “Equitable Access to Scholarly Articles Authored by University Faculty” policy; reviewed by Office of General Counsel
- FAQ (Portions adapted with permission from the Harvard University FAQ on OA Policies): https://pact.umd.edu/key-issues/equitable-access-policy-faq
- Continue meetings with academic colleges and departments
- Bring policy to University Senate for deliberation and approval

On November 10, 2021, members of UMD PACT, including the Dean of Libraries and the Chair of the ULC, delivered a special-order presentation to the University Senate about its work. The presentation included a discussion of the draft “Policy on Equitable Access to Scholarly Articles” (www.senate.umd.edu/system/files/resources/meetings/materials/2021to2022/111021/UMD_PACT_Draft_Policy_Equitable_Access_to_Scholarly_Articles.pdf). UMD PACT has continued to meet with academic
departments and programs to discuss the policy. The group expects the University Senate to vote on the policy sometime in 2022.

UMD PACT Campus Engagement Model

In order to advance its work, UMD PACT has developed a robust program of campus engagement. This model consists of four components:

- Stakeholders
- Issues
- Methods
- Outcomes

Key stakeholders include:

- University of Maryland administrators: Provost and Vice President for Research, Deans of academic colleges, chairs and directors of academic departments, programs, institutes, and centers.
- Governance: ULC, an official council of the University Senate, and the Library Assembly, the University of Maryland Libraries' official governance body.
- Faculty: faculty of all types and ranks across the University of Maryland, including Libraries faculty.
- Students: undergraduate, graduate, and other students of the University of Maryland, including the Libraries' Student Advisory Group: www.lib.umd.edu/about/deans-office/student-advisory-group.
- Libraries: faculty, staff, and administrators in the University of Maryland Libraries

Issues within UMD PACT's charge include:
• Licensing: fighting for affordable and fair licensing of content.
• Authors’ rights: educating and advocating for the rights of University of Maryland authors to retain copyright, use, reuse, and disseminate their own research.
• Open-Access models: analyzing, assessing, and educating the University of Maryland on Open-Access models.
• Costs: advocating for fair and sustainable costs for access to content, article processing fees, and other expenditures.
• Funding: addressing how the University of Maryland Libraries allocate funds to support the curriculum and research enterprise of the University.

Methods employed by UMD PACT to promote its work include:

• Website: UMD PACT’s online web presence.
• Meetings: UMD PACT meets as a group regularly, as well as conducting meetings with various groups of stakeholders. UMD PACT’s work also appears as a regular item on the ULC’s agenda.
• Email: the main venue for internal communication.
• News outlets: items posted to the University’s and Libraries’ news outlets.
• Social media: posting to the University’s and Libraries’ various social media platforms; UMD PACT’s work has also appeared on various institutional and personal Twitter, Facebook, Reddit, and other accounts.

Outcomes of UMD PACT’s efforts include:

• Informed partners: both internal stakeholders and external partners, including vendors and consortia, understand our expectations.
• Advocacy support: develop a strong group of advocates for the proposed policy, and for open and equitable scholarship in general, among the students, faculty, staff, and administration
of the University of Maryland.

- Policy change: UMD PACT's goal is for the policy to come to the University Senate for a formal vote in 2022.
Let’s Make a Deal!

Empowering Small- and Mid-sized Universities to Participate in the Open-Access Movement

ALEXIS SMITH MACKLIN AND TIM SCHLAK

Abstract

Budget cuts—especially those resulting from the pandemic—are accelerating the appeal of leaving “big deals” to save money. This is happening while some of the most prestigious research organizations advance the national trend toward open access (OA). But will the cost savings outweigh any potential fallout as we make the transition? The risk is significant. As more institutions leave big deals, mid-sized research institutions, as well as a considerable number of read-only institutions, will have reduced access to affordable subscriptions before a scalable OA publishing model is realized. To address this matter, a cohort of small- and mid-sized university libraries, funded by the Institute of Museum and Library Services through a National Leadership Grant, are using their collective expertise around scholarly communications to create models for OA publishing and transformative agreements that are scalable, achievable, and sustainable.

Introduction

No one can argue the benefits of open access (OA); however, transformative agreements driven by larger research institutions are disrupting the stability of consortia-level purchasing power for
small- and mid-sized universities. At the same time, to save money, many of these universities are also canceling bundled journal packages negotiated through consortia. The impact is leaving smaller institutions like R2s, R3s, comprehensive regional publics, as well as a great number of read-only institutions such as baccalaureate and liberal arts colleges across the United States with a difficult dilemma: Substantially increase budgets to try and continue consortia-driven deals or cut access to much-needed content. What the larger institutions are not considering in their cost-saving efforts is the ripple effect on the scholarly ecosystem from the inability of consortia and smaller institutions to react and adjust accordingly at a particularly chaotic moment.

These two issues may seem conflated—but they greatly impact each other. OA offers the promise of not needing to rely on big deals because, at least in theory, everyone will have access to the content they want. In practice, these deals are being broken before an efficient and scalable model for OR is realized. This is creating equity issues including how smaller and mid-sized institutions will publish in peer-reviewed, academic journals if they cannot afford the article processing charges being charged. What difference will it make if content is freely accessible if researchers cannot afford to contribute to the scholarship? There’s also the bigger concern of subscription costs equaling the APCs. No model shows the long-term viability of this logic, in fact, just the opposite appears to be true (Shulenburger, 2016).

For some of the largest publishers, up to two-thirds of the funds that go toward big deal agreements come from institutions that publish less than one-third of the articles (Savova & Price, 2019). Moreover, the largest research institutions are simultaneously concluding that they cannot fully pursue offsetting agreements that benefit them while remaining in the big deals that they continue to need without the consistent and enduring participation of smaller institutions that foot a substantial percentage of subscription (pay-to-read) publisher revenue. As a result, the staff at the California Digital Library recommended at the Spring 2019 ICOLC conference
in Vancouver that libraries remain in their big deals to support this transformation. Two years later, we see budget cuts forcing the issue and the big deals going away.

What we are left with in academic libraries that are not Carnegie Classification Doctoral Universities—Highest Research Activity (R1) and/or Association of Research Library members is a broad yet vague gray space wherein we lack the agency that our consortia have given us until now to pursue our collective interests, where we can continue to save money by working together, and where OA opportunities are unknown to and among ourselves. Therefore, we need to take steps to understand and define the research profiles of our respective campuses, determine how to capitalize on our divergent interests, and find a collective voice to bring to discussions around OA and transformative agreements.

To address these issues, a community of practice (CoP) of leading library consortia and a representative group of members who could capture the needs of smaller read and publish, as well as predominantly read institutions formed in the fall of 2020. The two-year project included three goals:

1. Identify challenges and opportunities for small- and mid-sized universities to participate in OA;
2. Create agency for sustainable models for small- and mid-sized universities to publish in OA journals;
3. Explore new ways to work with consortia and other partners to build sustainable and equitable models for OA.

Unfortunately, the pandemic significantly changed the work of this group as priorities shifted and we moved to a virtual space to meet. The result was a larger cohort committed to learning how to navigate the changing publishing landscape together and provide a much-needed third pathway between maintaining big deals and engaging in transformative agreements. We are currently in Phase 2 of a 3 phase project—a full year behind schedule and hope to
conclude the work in fall 2022. Table 1 shows the anticipated timeline, goals, and outcomes.

Table 1 Anticipated timeline, objectives, and goals for completing the work

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phase 1—Looking</th>
<th>Phase 2—Understanding</th>
<th>Phase 3—Making</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2020—Build capacity</td>
<td>Spring 2021—Operationalize</td>
<td>Summer 2021—Groundwork</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Objectives:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Objectives:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Objectives:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Train in HCD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recruit CoP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gather initial data on OA policies</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Guiding Questions?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Guiding Questions?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guiding Questions?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How are we handling OA?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What concerns do we have?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Goal: |
| Goal: |
| Goal: |
| Shared understanding of TA/OA | Strategies for supporting OA | Sustainable OA/TA models |

Developing a Community of Practice

To build consensus and a shared vision for the work to be done, we are using a CoP model. Over the past two decades, communities of practice (Lave and Wenger, 1991) found their way into higher education to help faculty share knowledge, leverage connections,
and improve learning experiences. Many groups initially focused on ways to implement innovative teaching practices and provide professional development (Wilson, Wilson, & Witthaus, 2020), but they are increasingly being used to help manage change across campus. Some see the CoP as a holistic approach to responding to uncertainty and setting realistic goals and measuring outcomes as higher education evolves. At the core, a CoP is a group of people who come together over a shared problem to learn from each other and find solutions (Wenger, 1998). This approach is helping us learn from each other regarding OA and transformative agreements and to determine a way forward together.

We started by asking consortia leaders we knew who were coping with big deal cancelations to identify small- and mid-sized member institutions who were actively engaged in exploring OA and transformative agreements. There were five consortia, including the Academic Libraries of Indiana (ALI), the Statewide California Electronic Library Consortium (SCELC), Midwest Collaborative for Library Services (MCLS), Private Academic Library Network of Indiana (PALNI), and the Pennsylvania Academic Library Consortia, Inc. (PALCI) which identified a significant list of academic libraries to include. Invitations were sent, and we met with library leadership to gauge interest. There are about fifteen universities having the Carnegie Classification of high research (R2) that agreed to participate. The consortia also provided lists of smaller institutions representing both read-and-publish and read-only interests. Five such institutions joined the community and are actively engaged in discussions.

Implementing Human-Centered Design

The project was designed to host three, in-person, all-day forums in 2021: January, April, and August, with an optional session at the Charleston Conference in November to plan next steps and
continue the work post-grant. The first forum was intended to elicit an understanding of OA and assess the impact of budget cuts on decision-making, including big deal cancelations and pursuing transformative agreements. The second forum would be a deeper dive into identifying stakeholders and what information was needed to guide decision-making. We anticipated some strategies for supporting OA would come of this discussion. Finally, the third forum was to be used for launching initiatives like new roles for consortia and principles we could share for negotiating transformative agreements.

As the pandemic continued, and we moved to a virtual environment (Zoom; Mural), we decided to shorten the sessions from all-day to two to four hours to manage screen fatigue and other pandemic-related stressors. While the modality and length of the forums changed, the process remained the same. Each session was planned with the LUMA Institute’s approach to Human-Centered Design to guide our work. This framework includes thirty-six methods organized around three key design skills—Looking (observing the human experience), Understanding (analyzing opportunities and challenges), and Making (envisioning and prototyping future possibilities) to promote innovation and creative problem-solving. These methods can be combined in various ways to create “recipes”—or strategies—for productive work. Although the forums took a different shape than expected, we believe that the virtual environment allowed for more participation, especially from smaller universities with less travel money, leading to richer and more inclusive conversations.

**Phase 1—Spring/Fall 2020**

In preparation for our work together, we reviewed the OA guidelines and policies at each institution, if they had them, and how they are being used. While most of the participants offered some guidance
on OA, often in form of a LibGuide, there were few policies on OA, and nothing being enforced regarding negotiation practices or the use of institutional repositories to support OA content. Additionally, not all participants had institutional repositories or the ability to archive and share intellectual output. Those that did indicated they struggled with faculty buy-in and use for disseminating scholarship and noted the responsibility often falls on the librarians to populate the repository with citations of faculty publications. We used this information to prioritize the work and to start the discussion. Since we had a limited time window, we planned the initial session with two goals: identify our collective pain points and prioritize them.

The first recipe combination included “What’s on Your Radar” from the Looking skills to reveal what we were thinking about OA and transformative agreements across our respective campuses, and “Rose, Bud, Thorn” from the Understanding skills to analyze and prioritize the issues. Using the online whiteboard technology platform Mural as our real-time collaborative work space, we constructed a radar diagram as a template and asked the community to identify the primary, secondary, and tertiary concerns they had about big deals and OA. The primary concerns for nearly all participants included ongoing inflationary rates for journals combined with annual budget cuts between 3% and 10%. Secondary concerns were about OA and faculty-buy-in. While there is some interest in OA in the sciences, there are many faculty who equate it with predatory journals and are uninterested in learning more. Finally, participants indicated as a tertiary concern that they simply do not have the expertise on staff to support scholarly communications, including OA.

Once we understood the concerns, we moved on to the Rose, Thorn, Bud activity and asked the group to identify issues, insights, and ideas using colored sticky notes regarding OA. Each participant was directed to write one issue, idea, or insight per note. Positive aspects (Roses) would be on pink notes, issues/barriers (Thorns) on blue, and untapped opportunities (Buds) on green. These were then organized on the virtual whiteboard. It took a bit to get used
to working in this environment, but once we got the hang of it, the participants produced ample content. They had ten minutes to generate as many notes as possible. When we were finished, there were over fifty notes to review for key themes and observations. As we worked through the content, three areas clearly stood out: Budget, Strategy, and Culture.

Under Budget, it was easy to see the Roses—or positive aspects, in cost savings and more control over collection development. With the big deals going away, many were envisioning more targeted spending on the resources that were most beneficial to their campuses. Admittedly, this was also an opportunity because most of the participants stated that they were not yet doing mission-driven collection development. It was something they were anticipating doing as cost savings were realized. The Thorns in this area, however, were considerable. They included increased prices as bigger universities pull out of big deals and consortia renegotiate packages with fewer participants, resulting in a loss of negotiating power and less access to content.

The Thorns were also most apparent in Strategy. We all agreed that we need better data to understand the evolving needs on campus regarding resource use in general, and OA specifically. Vendor data and use statistics, which we rely on heavily to make decisions, are not enough to help guide strategic conversations about pursuing OA or to help make mission-driven collections decisions regarding what to keep and what to buy. Additionally, we recognized that there are competing priorities across campus and a lack of clarity about roles and responsibilities as we move forward with OA. If subscription costs do not equal article processing fees, who will be responsible for helping faculty pay to publish? Will these funds be allocated from internal and external grants? Will OA soon become the responsibility of the provost’s office or someone else on campus who is not in the library? Those were serious questions that led the conversation to culture.

Our work showed culture is hard hit by a lack of buy-in and support. The CoP could see opportunities in raised institutional
profiles by supporting OA for faculty scholarship but also understood the lack of awareness and agency on their campuses. Most of the participants could not see a way forward without support from the administration, and they expressed some concern that the sense of urgency was not shared even among librarians. We believe this to be something of a paradox. As major research universities move toward OA, will subscription-based journals cease to exist at some point? If hybrid options gain momentum, will researchers at small- and mid-sized universities be subject to inequitable embargoes? If so, what options will there be for small- and mid-sized universities to engage in scholarly dialogue that is timely and equitable? Some of the participants believe we are coming into the conversation late and need to make up for lost time.

As we closed out our work in Phase 1, the key takeaway was a need to invest in a culture of OA—which means that we need to invest in our own understanding of the process, including the impact of big deal cancelations, and spend more time on data analysis and build strategic relationships internally and externally to support the work. Table 2 shows how the CoP framed the problem and identified focus areas.

Table 2 Problem framing using Rose, Thorn, Bud from Phase 1 Forum

| Table 2 | Problem framing using Rose, Thorn, Bud from Phase 1 Forum |
Budget | Strategy | Culture
--- | --- | ---
**ROSE:**
- Cost savings/control
- Reshaped agreements
- Targeted spending

**ROSE:**
- Data-driven decisions
- Aligned values with plans
- Build relationships

**ROSE:**
- Increased interest in OA
- Library as partner
- Investment in infrastructure

**THORN:**
- Increased prices
- Lost negotiation leverage
- Less content

**THORN:**
- Need better data/analysis
- Competing priorities
- More work/less time/expertise

**THORN:**
- Impact factors (P&T)
- Buy-in/support
- Uncertain roles/responsibilities

**BUD:**
- Reallocated funds
- Transparent licenses/contracts
- Mission-driven collections

**BUD:**
- Greater awareness of needs/values
- Educated campus community
- More collaboration

**BUD:**
- More OA content
- Raised institutional profile
- Faculty/staff retention

---

**Phase 2—Spring/Fall 2021**

Action steps from Phase 1 prioritized relationships and stakeholders who are or are potentially driving decisions, and those impacted by the decisions. The goal for the second forum was to build a network of people who would need to be involved in changing the culture around OA. We created a recipe from LUMA’s methods in Understanding that included Stakeholder Mapping to identify the people and perspectives we needed to consider and Bull’s Eye Diagraming to rank the priorities. Participants were directed to work in groups and organize their list of stakeholders on the virtual whiteboard and begin to draw lines connecting them. On each line,
they were asked to describe the relationship and any mindsets the stakeholders might have regarding the relationship. For example, the Dean of the Library is connected to the Budget Officer with a fiscal responsibility and a mindset of “I need to cut the budget—again.” In this activity, we tried to take on the perspective of each stakeholder as we considered their roles and responsibilities.

The major stakeholders we all agreed on included librarians, faculty, administration (deans, provost), consortia, and publishers. They were grouped into categories including policy, budget, infrastructure, and education/outreach to frame their respective roles and responsibilities. We then began to prioritize the work using Bull’s Eye Diagram. By design, this diagram puts a limit on how much can be listed as critical work to be done, which forced us to deliberate about what we considered essential for success. Each successive circle is larger than the bull's eye and can include more of what is important to do, while the outer circle is work that is generally peripheral. We engaged in trade-off decisions but agreed that there was a core set of things to drive our work in Phase 3: Understanding our research profiles; Building relationships internally and externally to support the work; and Creating awareness (strategic communications tools for different stakeholders).

One group used a SMART goal (Specific, Measurable, Achievable, Realistic, and Timely) to show how focusing on the research profile of the campus would build relationships and create awareness. They outlined the following steps:

To understand the research profile of the university, we will conduct a SCOPUS report to measure scholarly output on campus; target (x) faculty identified in the SCOPUS report who have high research productivity (x) or more articles in OA journals; interview them regarding the value of the library in their research and publishing process; and share
an executive summary of the outcome of this study with the Dean of the Library.

Each activity in the SMART goal would have another set of achievable tasks that could be delegated and measured for success. This was one very tangible way to see through the enormity of relationship building and awareness raising listed as critical work in Phase 2. The group believed connecting to early adopters would accomplish two things: deepen their understanding of the needs on campus and build support for culture change.

The need for culture change was very clear by the end of the second forum, although that was not something we considered in our initial scope of work. We fully expected that we would have some tangible work products like a set of shared principles to use for negotiating transformative agreements, and we even considered the changing nature of consortia with big deal cancelations, but we did not anticipate the role of change management or strategic communications in the development of the grant proposal. Only after we identified the stakeholders, and saw the complexity in the relationships among them, did we see what was at stake in planning for transformative agreements. More importantly, we realized that some of the key decision-makers, like the provost, may have little to no knowledge of what OA is or its impact on the scholarly ecosystem. In hindsight, we can see that new models for academic publishing, and collection development decisions that result from OA and transformative agreements, naturally require a shift in perspective, as much as they require a shift in how the work is done.

**Phase 3—Spring/Fall 2022**

As the second forum closed, and culture change became the focus of the conversation, the community recognized the gaps in our
own understanding regarding OA and its impact on our respective campuses. Collectively, we know that changes in scholarly publishing are happening and will eventually impact small- and mid-sized universities, but we do not know to what degree. We can be proactive or reactive regarding these changes but there are risks either way. If we choose to be reactive, we may find academic libraries are losing value because we have less content, and we lack the infrastructure to support researchers who are moving forward with OA options. If we are proactive, we may find that we are overwhelmed by the amount of work to do and lack the resources and infrastructure to be useful in promoting scholarly output.

The value proposition is of great concern. As journal packages are unbundled, and collection budgets are cut, access to content is decreasing. Academic libraries that once were valued because they provided access to high-quality information are now competing with everything from Google to SciHub for discovery and access. Where is the value proposition when content is cut? This issue was recently addressed by Cooper and Rieger (2021) as they investigated the impact of big deal cancelations and the perception of the library among researchers. Not surprisingly, they learned that the discovery tools used to connect researchers to content are ineffective and, therefore, often bypassed by faculty. Most researchers who use the library portal are looking for books, monographs, and specific journal articles. The rest are availing themselves of professional connections and sharing platforms to find and use information. They conclude with a set of recommendations for shifting the terms of responsibility and value by addressing the ambiguity.

Some of the participants suggested we take these recommendations and use them to talk to administrators about the value and role of the library moving forward, but others did not feel empowered to even start the discussion. They were concerned that they lacked enough knowledge to frame the problem thoughtfully and that if they started the conversation, they should come forward with a solution of their own. This led us to ask the question—are
we solving a problem or addressing a polarity? A problem has a solution, where a polarity is an ongoing dilemma where there is truth and wisdom on more than one side of an issue. Each side is incomplete without the wisdom and input of the other (Johnson, 1992). If we focused exclusively on the results, we would fail to get the buy-in and support we need. If we overemphasized the role, we risked being seen as failing to meet the evolving needs of the campus.

Traditional ways of looking at change ask us to take an either/or approach but complex problems resist such solutions. “Both/and” allows us to look at complex problems to be managed rather than solved. Polarities tell us that we are caught between two sides, such as thinking versus feeling. Most managerial solutions move us from the downside of one side of the polarity, where a group is stuck, to the upside of the other side of the polarity. For example, when we're caught in the downsides of thinking, our solutions can be critical, cold, and blunt, people feel left out emotionally, and there's little engagement. When we move to the upside of feeling, we feel connected and in harmony, but we gain the downsides of feeling, as well, such as avoidance of conflict and reluctance to make difficult decisions. Organizations and leaders can repeat their perambulation around the polarity, striving to finally solve the issue in our either/or approach.

The polarity model in Table 3 walks us through the downsides and upsides of change as well as of staying where we are. So, for example, starting in the bottom left quadrant as polarity management technique tells us to, we can see that the uncertainty of the new/emerging model of OA and transforming agreements poses serious downsides and feels risk laden for us. This is stressful, and, in polarity terms, we move to the upside of staying where we are in the top right quadrant, which, at first glance, is not as stressful. When we stay there long enough, however, we realize that change is coming whether we like it or not, and we are now in the downsides of staying put in the bottom right quadrant. If we accept that change is coming, we can embrace the upsides of change in the
top left quadrant, but we can be cognizant that we are also getting the downsides of that change.

Table 3 Polarity model for open access and transformative agreements

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Upside of Change</th>
<th>Upside of Staying Where We Are</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• New models promise inclusion for all libraries</td>
<td>• Tried and true existing model</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• READ no longer subsidizes PUBLISH</td>
<td>• Predictable costs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• More sustainable means we own copyright</td>
<td>• Subscriptions are our value proposition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Library central in research/publishing</td>
<td>• Content is the foundation of libraries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Upside of Staying Where We Are</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Downsides of Change</strong></td>
<td><strong>Downsides of Staying Put</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Totally uncertain of new model</td>
<td>• Change is coming, like it or not</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Lack knowledge and expertise</td>
<td>• Decreased budgets means less content</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Conflicts with library cultural assumptions</td>
<td>• Less content means declining value of library</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Reinforces a lack of agency</td>
<td>• READ may be cut off from publishing</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Our goal, as we start Phase 3 is to embrace the change we know is coming and create toolkits for communicating effectively to the key stakeholders. We also want to invest in the professional development of librarians to further our own knowledge and expertise around OA, including the real and perceived needs on our campuses to engage in transformative agreements. We expect that comprehensive research profiles will highlight a core group of publishers across institutions and consortia that can begin thinking through transformative agreements with us. We anticipate these discussions will lead to negotiating principles we can use to pilot low-risk agreements, so that we can focus on building capacity for OA publishing.

Part of building this capacity is addressing the changing nature
of our consortia partnerships as the big deals go away. This might include opportunities for consortia to help with conducting and analyzing the research profiles across member institutions and identifying publishers who can pilot agreements. It may also mean that consortia help support the infrastructure needed to participate in OA, including running consortia-driven repositories for housing preprints and archiving scholarly content. Perhaps consortia will expand their services and participation in programs like Project Reshare that support mission-driven collecting and leverage resources through controlled digital lending. There are numerous ways we can build capacity through the consortia and, as we move into Phase 3, we anticipate these will include:

• Strategic communication tools for members to use to talk to stakeholders;
• A member-driven pilot program for testing transformative agreements; and
• Professional development opportunities to learn more about OA and transformative agreements.

We look forward to sharing an update at the 2022 Charleston Conference.
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Iterative Database Subscription Review Process

Rowan University’s Ongoing Battles

JENNIFER MATTHEWS AND CHRISTINE DAVIDIAN

Abstract

Rowan University, located in Glassboro, NJ, has had the fortunate opportunity to have continued growth over the past ten years. Because of this continued growth, the libraries were unable to engage common practices such as reviewing and canceling subscriptions. However, with the hiring of the Collection Strategy Librarian in 2017 the library finally had the capacity to start developing processes that would consider both the review and cancellation of subscriptions in the advent that the budget situation could change.

Rowan University Libraries consists of three libraries, the main campus in Glassboro, NJ, an allopathic medical campus in Camden, NJ, and an osteopathic medical campus in Stratford, NJ. With this varied mixture of resources and two disparate medical campuses, the review of resources such as databases is complicated by diverse accreditation needs. The libraries began their review in 2019 prior to the onset of the COVID-19 pandemic and conducted a subsequent review due to budget constraints in 2020.

This paper will discuss Rowan University Library’s database review process, how it started, how it ended, the planning process throughout, and the lessons learned from the two separate years of review. This process is not meant to represent or prescribe universal best practices of database reviews, but an examination
of Rowan University Library’s best practices and how that can potentially be generalized to other institutions.

Rowan University

Rowan University, a public university in southern New Jersey, serves 19,600 students and offers over 130 undergraduate, graduate, and doctoral degree programs across three campuses located in both urban and suburban communities. Rowan University Libraries consists of three libraries: the Campbell Library, the University’s main academic library in Glassboro, NJ; the Cooper Medical School of Rowan University Library, an academic medical library within Cooper University Hospital in Camden, NJ; and the Rowan School of Osteopathic Medicine Health Sciences Library, a second academic medical library in Stratford, NJ.

Rowan University has had the fortunate opportunity to have continued growth over the past ten years and because of this continued growth, the libraries were unable to engage common practices such as reviewing and canceling subscriptions. However, with the hiring of the Collection Strategy Librarian in 2017, the libraries finally had the capacity to start developing processes that would consider both the review and cancellation of subscriptions in the advent that the budget situation could change.

This paper will discuss Rowan University Library’s database review process, how it started, how it ended, the planning process throughout, and the lessons learned from the two separate years of review. This process is not meant to represent or prescribe universal best practices of database reviews, but an examination of Rowan University Library’s best practices and how that can potentially be generalized to other institutions.
In the fiscal year 2020, like many other higher education institutions throughout the United States, Rowan University found it necessary to cut expenses in a variety of areas as a result of the COVID-19 pandemic that was affecting the world. At Rowan University, these cuts manifested in a variety of ways through lower student deposits as a result of fewer students on campus (Freye, 2020), but also because Governor Phil Murphy delayed the collection of state taxes from April until July 2020 as part of his relief efforts for residents of the state of New Jersey (Official Site of the State of New Jersey, n.d.). For the first time ever, Rowan University Libraries had to contemplate deaccessioning resources rather than accessioning.

At the direction of the then interim Associate Provost Library Information Services, Robert Hilliker, the electronic resources team began to collocate data about all of the database subscriptions that the library subscribed to at the time. For this process, the review would be examining all current subscriptions to determine what should be renewed and what databases could be targeted for deaccessioning. As part of this process the subject liaisons for Campbell Library, the main library located in Glassboro, NJ, were directed to consider any program changes that have occurred recently or will be occurring in the immediate future while also considering database usage, accreditation needs, subscription cost, and faculty input on the products. All non-open access databases were to be reviewed that the library linked to in its database A to Z list. This included items that were technically mid-contract. For the purposes of this review, however, the two medical schools were not included as their resources were considered essential due to the pandemic.

The electronic resources team compiled the list of resources and created a Google spreadsheet listing the database names, their corresponding subjects, and usage statistics for the current two years, which was then shared with the liaisons. Liaisons added their
input which included the level of usage (high, medium, or low), whether the resource was required for accreditation, the URL where the accreditation requirement was documented, whether there was a better interdisciplinary or multidisciplinary resource than the one listed, level of impact or cutting the resource (critical, major, minor, none), recommendations (cancel, consider canceling, renew), comments, and librarian review (see Table 1).

2021

Following the review period, an assessment was completed of the fiscal year 2020 process. It was determined that the database review process would again be conducted for fiscal year 2021 as the library's budget was still reduced from previous years. Contrary to fiscal year 2020, this year's review would only be comprised of a smaller subset of databases. Following the review of the previous process, it was determined that it was not necessary to review database packages, multiyear licenses, or mid-contract subscriptions, subscriptions received from the State of New Jersey, medical resources, or resources deemed necessary for accreditation through the previous process as the library was unable to cancel a database that fell into any of these categories. As such, the list of databases for review was significantly smaller than in 2020. Also, just as in 2020, the medical schools did not review their database subscriptions.

The electronic resources team again compiled a Google spreadsheet that compiled the targeted database subscription for review to share with the Campbell Library subject liaisons. Subject liaisons were asked to review these subscriptions as before considering usage, cost, and faculty input. As before, there was an assessment following the review period to determine how the process went, how it compared to 2020, and how it could be improved generally.
Lessons Learned and Rowan’s Best Practices

After two years of conducting database subscription reviews, Rowan University Libraries has come to many of the same conclusions that others have and perhaps some that others have not. First, the database review process is burdensome when all databases are reviewed simultaneously. The contract life cycle has to be considered in the process for it to be truly effective. Second, the electronic resources team should include more information such as status changes for the various affected databases for future reference, for example, the decision behind why the database was canceled so that if it is proposed for subscription again these decisions can be reviewed for relevance. Third, during future reviews, there should be increased communication both internally among library staff and externally among faculty via a combination of methods such as email, wikis, or spreadsheets. The increased communication regarding the database deselection process will facilitate the review and determination of deaccessioning but also lessen the chance of miscommunication when a subscription is canceled among the faculty. Finally, the review process should be regularly scheduled to coincide with the contract life cycle process within the library's technical services department. This may mean that subscriptions are being reviewed monthly or quarterly in a timeframe well in advance of a potential renewal, but these smaller review groups would also affect fewer liaisons at one time.

Goals Moving Forward

As Rowan University Library moves forward and examines this process for the next iteration it has also established a list of goals for the next implementation. Since this process is quite intensive the library has determined that the database review should take
place every two years. As such, the next review period will take place in fiscal year 2023. During this next review, it will be important to include both medical schools as heretofore they have been left out of the two prior review processes. The inclusion of the medical schools will introduce a new level of complexity as their resources have a much more stringent accreditation need than some of the resources for the main campus. Nevertheless, it is important that all of the databases using recurring funding receive a regular review for appropriate library spending. Additionally, it will be important that Rowan University Library begin to implement a process that identifies and reviews databases that are under multiyear contracts. Since these cannot be considered under the currently developed process a new set of conditions will need to be implemented so that these databases can also become part of the regular review. Finally, the library needs to determine how best to implement the review process in light of the contract life cycle. Most likely a quarterly review of resources that is 120 days prior to the renewal of resources would be the adequate timeframe to allow for notification, review, and communication with faculty. The biyearly process will provide the library with the necessary time to discuss the above adjustments to the current process and ways to involve additional stakeholders while still considering the overall impact on the library’s budgetary resources.
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Table 1 Database review

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Liaison</th>
<th>Product</th>
<th>Vendor</th>
<th>Usage</th>
<th>Accreditation</th>
<th>Librarian Review</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Humanities</td>
<td>Database A</td>
<td>Humanities Vendor A</td>
<td>3,600</td>
<td></td>
<td>Keep—Highly used by faculty in the department</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science</td>
<td>Database B</td>
<td>Science/Medical Vendor A</td>
<td>13,856</td>
<td></td>
<td>Keep</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medical</td>
<td>Database C</td>
<td>Science/Medical Vendor B</td>
<td>28,578</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Keep</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Life Sciences</td>
<td>Database D</td>
<td>Science/Medical Vendor C</td>
<td>135</td>
<td></td>
<td>Cancel—Low usage, need Database X more</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business</td>
<td>Database E</td>
<td>Business Vendor A</td>
<td>1,750</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Keep</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* Generic table reflecting spreadsheet of information collected for review process.

Usage is for most recent two years. Includes searches and item requests.
A Year of Progress

Publishers and Libraries Collaborating in Crisis
Times and Planting the Seeds for Sustainable Ecosystems

ANTJE MAYS AND BRITTANY HAYNES

Abstract

Increasing volumes of published research, proliferating research infrastructures, the rise of the Open-Access movement, flat or declining library budgets, and inflexible purchasing and licensing models have led to growing fissures in the marketplace, especially exacerbated during the COVID-19 pandemic. Crucial for sustaining research, education, inquiry, and professional development, the information ecosystem faces a sustainability crisis from these pressures. Yet, some publishers have taken an innovative stance in partnering with libraries through flexible purchasing and licensing options, various access options and benefits as ways for meeting actual content needs without forcing bundle purchases, openness to custom packages, growing and diversifying support for Open Access, and listening deeply to libraries’ needs. The authors further frame innovative approaches in the context of COVID-related triaging of technologies and online access as learning and research shifted online on a massive scale. This paper outlines ongoing research and current library and publisher perspectives and summarizes the interactive exchanges from the 2021 Charleston Conference Lively Session. The session kicked off with a publisher representative and a librarian sharing ongoing research and current perspectives on content, access constraints facing libraries, examples of publisher collaborations with libraries, evolving Open-
Access frameworks, and new publisher trends toward acquisition flexibility and access benefits sensitive to library needs. Next, the interactive portion engaged participants in lively discussion and brainstorming how publishers and libraries can work together toward sustainable solutions to issues requiring flexibility and collaboration. The audience included librarians, publishers, vendors, societies, consortia, and more. Roles included collections, acquisitions, digital scholarship, research, and publishing. Three participants commented ahead of time through the authors' presession Qualtrics survey; sixty-two participants responded during the session via Mentimeter live poll. Participants cited trends including marked shifts toward digital content away from physical formats, continued rise of Open Access, publishers' efforts to provide access to content, exploration of flexible access models and the need for industry-wide flexibility, remote work and supporting infrastructures, loss of colleagues and effects on the organizations, and the pandemic's impacts on workers' and students' well-being. Cited obstacles include cost structures, insufficient flexibility across the industry, declining resources while costs and needs keep rising, sudden sharp budget cuts, short staffing and staffing losses. Among positive collaboration outcomes, numerous participants called out the good citizens among providers who opened digital content to libraries early in the pandemic, exemplary experimentation with flexible options, and more conversations across the industry, leading to greater mutual understanding. Recurring themes among the open-ended closing comments include the need for open research to safeguard researchers' rights to their own works, Open Access and equity, DRM-free access and world rights, appreciation for this conversation, and the need for more such conversations across the industry.
Librarians’ Challenges: Crisis Times and Beyond/
Antje Mays

Business Models

In addition to libraries’ shrinking purchasing power due to continuing price increases in a world of flat and declining budgets, the COVID-19 pandemic's economic impacts have spawned widespread sudden drastic library budget cuts (Rea 2021). As instructional needs undergo structural changes, libraries face place shifting and increasing demands, while also navigating long-time budget challenges spawned by macroeconomic trends. The pandemic-related cuts are deeply felt throughout communities, education, work, staffing, and information ecosystems, while pandemic safety protocols have interrupted human-to-human learning interactions (Jones 2020).

The Pandemic, the Online Pivot, and the Rush to Digital Resource Shifts

Framing the Crisis

Recognizing the ongoing impact and concerns of COVID-19, libraries have continually had to adapt to changes brought on by health and safety concerns and the limited access for in-person learning and research environments. These changes have also altered the evolving relationships between libraries and publishers to sustain the nature of these scholarly communities, requiring
libraries’ challenges to be addressed. For example, some librarians find “budgets overall are a source of concern ... [C]hanges in technology and user needs often require additional funding, but academic libraries don’t see that happening in the next five years” despite immediate need for change, exacerbated by the fact that “budgets will either stay the same or decrease,” locking scholarly material behind walls while health concerns remain (Rea 2021). This differs from other economic crises libraries have faced, because “[t]he pandemic has affected every aspect of the people, place, and platform value proposition,” removing the physical aspect of many libraries from the equation (Jones 2020). The added dimension of rising costs due to inflation further challenges libraries’ capacity to acquire research, and inflexibility in the publishing industry is poised to continue darkening the prospects of moving forward from these trying times. Several issues have surfaced within present business models, pointing to necessary industry shifts.

Hunting for Digital Content in Crisis Mode

Digital Content

The massive pivot to online instruction in March 2020, midway to semester’s end as activities shifted toward course completion deadlines, spurred widespread need for e-books on very short notice. Closings of academic facilities meant learners and instructors were unable to access the rich resources in the physical stacks, spurring the need for intellectually rigorous online equivalents of the suddenly inaccessible materials.

These shifts have required libraries to pursue digital content at a much higher volume and increased rush than previously anticipated (Dinkins 2021, Elwell & Fast 2021). This includes acquiring print-to-electronic conversions, which can require libraries to pay for access to the same content twice (sometimes without a discount
taking into account the ownership of the title in print) in order for students and faculty to have access to much-needed research. Some had been prepared for digital shifts, as some “libraries have spent the last two decades increasing and expanding their digital collections” that have enabled them to “nimbly shift resources from print to digital” with the system changes to which they had already committed. Libraries pivoted quickly and efficiently in supporting the suddenly online teaching and learning frameworks, through strategic movement toward digital content and emphasizing support for online services. The pandemic has accelerated shifts away from hardcopy content in favor of digital resources already underway—the scale of rapid response has spurred explorations of new licensing model (Jones 2020). As instruction shifted to remote and hybrid classes, libraries have taken the lead in challenging times with innovations and students and faculty have come to expect seamless online access (Rosato 2021a, 2021b).

Unfortunately, eBook provision is not universal as geography-based license restrictions and a dearth of eBooks in some disciplines thwart libraries’ aims of providing eBooks for their readers. And not all libraries have previously been able to shift toward digital content. Due to the pandemic, marginalized communities around the world face a lack of affordable or open resources that provide broad access to content. Because of this, many contend with an evolution that requires virtual and hybrid methods for accessing content. These factors feed into the challenge of finding other innovative methods for providing students and faculty access to research materials (Vogus 2020).

Streaming Videos

With these digital shifts, availability of additional formats beyond eBooks is also at issue. Pivoting to online instruction has led to sharply rising need for streaming videos, but market solutions have lagged far behind the rapidly expanding needs. In supporting widely
remote and hybrid classes, libraries have faced a limited and unresponsive marketplace that has proven ill-equipped to provide the breadth and range of streaming videos needed for classes.

When educational purchase gateways do not offer the needed films, libraries face fruitless title-by-title searches for rights holders, correspondence in pursuit of licensing frameworks appropriate to institutional settings, and encounter dead ends in locating rights holders. These searches largely do not result in finding library streaming purchase options. Geofencing further complicates the search for streaming videos, as some licensing arrangements and access permissions are limited and barred based on viewers’ geographic locations. Some films without purchase options may be found on free sites, but are subject to sudden deletion and thus lend unstable and unreliable teaching support. End users’ curricular-support needs are further stymied when their desired films are found in the ubiquitous streaming services tied to individualized personal accounts but offer no equivalent institutional licensing. These factors stymie libraries’ access to the streaming content needed for curricular support (Herther 2020).

Inflexible Pricing Drives Libraries to Seek Alternatives

Price rises continue to occur due to inflation from global supply chain issues and for other reasons including short-term profit prioritization. Instead of accommodating the limitations in library budgets, the marketplace is still fraught with legacy pricing and publishing models that increase the challenge for libraries to acquire new research or keep up with continuing resources, resulting in a choice between short-term benefits that pose risks to long-term development and more strategic long-horizon library-publisher relationships. Subsequently, libraries seek new methods due to unaffordable price hikes and lack of flexibility.
Earlier options such Demand-Driven Acquisition (DDA) have lost their effectiveness as cost structures have become prohibitive over time. Evidence-based Acquisitions (EBA), a more recently arisen eBook purchasing model, has grown preferable over DDA, as EBA plans offer libraries the flexibility to choose resources based on evidence of need as provided in usage reports and other criteria. With EBA costs established up-front, libraries benefit from predictable expenditure levels and the agency to choose content purchases to fulfill proven needs. EBA programs have gained prominence because they provide affordable, low-cost options and offer access to large quantities of content that helps ease the impact of the pandemic on limited library budgets and marginalized communities globally (Slutskaya & Linoski 2020, Tran & Guo 2021).

Forced bundling is another example of a purchasing model out of favor with libraries. Bundles require libraries to purchase prepackaged collections as the sole pathway to gaining access to a small number of needed titles not available elsewhere. Such inflexible bundling provides at best minimal value, thus presenting additional challenges to limited library budgets and forcing libraries to walk away from such arrangements. Such inflexible options drive libraries to seek viable alternatives for meeting their needs (Gatti & Mierowsky 2016, Rea 2021, Vogus 2020, Zhang 2020). Notably, IGI Global, Cambridge University Press, and Michigan University Press do not partake in this practice, as they offer all titles individually in print and electronic or within e-Collections.

Open Access: The Promise and Caveats

With many publishers neglecting libraries’ true needs, some libraries turn to Open Access (OA) as an answer. While the OA movement provides an option to access online content at no charge, OA is still in its infancy and the presence of predatory publishers and improperly vetted research are sources of concern (Ferris & Winker 2017, Gerberi et al 2021, Sariola 2021). At the same time,
options for OA publishing are growing as reputable publishers expand support options for OA research, including different models for OA research to grow and thrive. These frameworks also offer opportunities for publishing collaborations between research institutions and publishers (Asai 2021) and for libraries to support research from their institutions’ faculty as OA resources (Farley et al 2021, Fund 2021).

Some publishers and services have begun offering solutions to better suit library needs. One of these solutions includes transformative models, such as Read and Publish initiatives offered by both Cambridge University Press and IGI Global, among others. With Read and Publish initiatives, libraries that invest in a publisher’s collection receive discounts or waivers for article, chapter, and book processing charges to help their faculty publish in OA (Gatti & Mierowsky 2016, Ojennus 2017).

Similarly, Open Educational Resources (OER) are growing in number and variety as libraries, universities, and library–publisher collaborations curate licensed content created by experts as OER to broaden students’ access to intellectually rigorous learning resources (Warren 2021).

Provider Solutions in Crisis Times

Despite the challenges libraries have experienced in collaborations with publishers and aggregators during the pandemic, some content providers and publishers adapted quickly to smooth access to online content. Early in the pandemic, several providers extended a helping hand to libraries by opening digital content at no charge for months to a year. EBSCO and JSTOR opened eBook collections and Great Courses opened its collection of instructional films; VitalSource provided no-cost access to e-textbooks through its VitalSource Helps platform.

Also at the onset of the pandemic, several publishers including
Cambridge University Press, IGI Global, Sage, and Springer opened access free content on their platforms, including reference, research, eBooks on online course design, and e-textbooks (Rosato 2021a, 2021b).

**Publisher Solutions: Tangible Practices/Brittany Haynes**

Successful solutions involve flexible purchase options and pricing models, high discounts on print-to-electronic conversions, flat or sustainable agreement options, and more. Individual title acquisitions, customized collections, specialized collections by subject or publication date, and EBA exemplify the types of flexible options in which publishers and libraries can collaborate to provide the value and flexibility that libraries need. Their pricing models often include multiuser licensing, no DRM on publications, differential pricing, and flat-rate purchase pricing for research.

Additional publisher solutions benefiting libraries include discounted print-to-electronic conversions, increased and extended discounts on digital content, and discounted renewals and updates for current e-Collection customers covering, for example, content that IGI Global provided at the onset of the pandemic in the short term as well as sustainable, long-term solutions. Publishers also maintain constant contact to monitor any manufacturing disruptions at print-on-demand facilities in support of customers in need of physical copies. For print-on-demand publishers including IGI Global, it is necessary to remain in constant contact with the printing facilities around the world to safeguard against disruption of flow. Additionally, disseminating timely research on COVID-19 and beyond with an agile publishing process means that there can be fewer delays in researchers and practitioners receiving crucial research to further their fields and learn new methods.

Flexible long-term practices are also a focus within publisher
solutions with a view to satisfying library needs while sustaining the future of scholarly publishing. Some publishers' offers provide OA support, including covering matching funds toward OA publications. For example, IGI Global's OA Fee Waiver (Read and Publish) Initiative offers flexible agreements to increase research accessibility with support for full Gold OA, full OA Journals, and even Diamond OA publications, while bringing a greater focus to Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion (DEI) efforts, as Diamond publications do not require waivers from contributing authors. This allows researchers from organizations who may not have been able to afford the waivers to enter OA agreements, or from departments that lack OA funding support to publish research that will be widely viewed and garner citations. These agreements place the power of funding research in libraries' hands and subsequently provide all readers free access to research via the OA movement regardless of geographic location. Discounted print-to-electronic conversions and remote access ease the necessity of converting to digital content while learning continues remotely to mitigate the risks brought on by the pandemic. Lastly, flexible acquisition options and multiyear agreements structured with locked-in pricing mean that no further costs can be added regardless of the amount of content the agreement provides in the future while staying suitable for present-day library budgets.

Interactives: Conference Poll

The authors engaged the audience through discussion and a brief live poll with responses showing in real time on the presenters' screen. For additional pathways for weighing in, the authors gave participants an optional presession survey. The presession survey was designed with the mobile-friendly Qualtrics survey. The live poll deployed in during the session was built with Mentimeter Pro. Both intake tools asked identical questions. After the session, the three Qualtrics responses were
folded into the in-session Mentimeter Pro live poll response data to facilitate centralized data analysis within one tool.

The self-paced presession Qualtrics survey enabled interested attendees to respond ahead of the conference; the in-session Mentimeter Pro live poll was designed to enable attendees to move through the questions at their own pace during the session's interactive portion. Both tools thus helped session participants to reflect and share their thoughts at their own pace. Audience members responded to a total of eight questions, with a follow-up question in three instances where the respondents chose “Other” from the initial questions’ multiple-choice options. During the session, the anonymous live poll responses displayed on the presenters’ screen in real time. The presession survey and the in-session live poll asked the following questions: (1) What type of organization are you with? This multiple-choice question established attendees’ basic industry representation. (1a follow-up) If organization type is “Other,” please specify. This free-text question invited respondents to describe their industry positions in more detail by accommodating open-ended responses. (2) What best describes your role? This multiple-choice question established deeper detail on attendees’ roles within their organizations. (2a follow-up) If your role is “Other,” please specify. This free-text question gave respondents space to describe their roles in more detail by accommodating open-ended responses. (3) Industry trends and priorities: How have your priorities shifted since the pandemic? This free-text question invited respondents to describe their post-pandemic priority shifts in more detail by accommodating open-ended responses. (4) Resulting from the pandemic, in what priority order would you currently rank the following industry trends? This drag-and-drop rank ordering question facilitated respondents’ rank-order perspectives on each trend in order of importance. (4a follow-up) If your top priority is “Other,” please specify. This free-text question invited respondents to describe their top-priority industry trend if they answered “Other” in the preceding multiple-choice question. (5) What
industry trends and priorities did we miss? This free-text question invited respondents to add their own industry trends and priorities by accommodating open-ended responses. (6) Regarding library–publisher collaborations, what are some of the biggest obstacles you've faced? This free-text question invited respondents to describe their biggest obstacles by accommodating open-ended responses. (7) In library–publisher collaborations, what good and most impactful and positive outcomes have you seen? This free-text question invited respondents to describe their own positive outcomes by accommodating open-ended responses. (8) Your closing thoughts: free-form and open-ended. This free-text question invited respondents to share any additional thoughts by accommodating open-ended responses.

For production of the conference slides, images of the multiple-choice response charts and values were copied into the slides. For this proceedings paper, the multiple-choice responses were transcribed to Excel for further analysis. For the after-conference version of the presentation slides, the free-text responses were copied into color-contrasting speech bubbles. For this proceedings paper, the free-text responses were reported as spell-check-corrected text strings for clarity. Word clouds visualize predominant themes.

The live poll questions, multiple-response options, and session participants' responses follow below:

Q1: What type of organization are you with?—Question type: multiple choice.

Options:
• Academic library: 2–4 year college
• Academic library: research/university
• College/University—other office
• Corporate library
• Consortium
• Government agency/library
• Public library
• Publisher
• Society
• Vendor
• Other (free-text open-ended)

Table 1. Participants’ broken out by type of organization

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organization_type</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Academic library: research/university</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Publisher</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic library: 2–4 year college</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vendor</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College/University—other office</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consortium</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government agency/library</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Society</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corporate library</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public library</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>61</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 1. Breakdown of participants’ types of organization.

Follow-up question: If organization type is “Other,” please specify—Question type: free-text open-ended.
Two respondents described their “other” organization types as:
• Higher Ed commission
• Publishing services and preprint server
Additionally, six respondents elaborated on their categorical organization types as follows:
• One “Academic library: 2–4 year college” specified their library as academic four year.
• One “College/University – other office” elaborated with humanities institute and online project for the university press.
• Two publishers further elaborated: One self-described as nonprofit; the other as an independent publisher specializing in the social sciences (both books and journals).
• Two vendors further elaborated. One self-described as digital archive and not-for-profit aggregator. A second vendor self-described as digital archive.

Options:
- Administrator
- Acquisitions
- Collections
- Data librarian
- Digital scholarship
- OA curator
- Researcher/subject specialist
- Special collections
- Technologist
- Vendor
- Publisher
- Other (free-text open-ended)

Table 2. Participants' breakdown by roles

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Collections</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acquisitions</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Publisher</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrator</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Digital scholarship</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vendor</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Researcher/subject specialist</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data librarian</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OA curator</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special collections</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technologist</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>58</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Follow-up question: If your role is “Other,” please specify—Question type: free-text open-ended.

Three respondents who described their roles as “Other” indicated the following:

- Acquisitions and ER
- Comms Manager
- Library specialist

Additionally, three respondents elaborated on their roles as follows:

- Two vendors further elaborated on their roles: One self-described as sales director; another as outreach manager.
- One library administrator self-described as interim director.

Q.3: Industry trends and priorities: How have your priorities shifted since the pandemic?—free-text open-ended.
Fifty-nine session participants shared the following insights on priority shifts:

- More ER trials, bringing subject librarians into traditionally Tech Services duties (for transparency and much-needed support). eBooks became a bigger focus while students were off-campus and closed a branch, but now seems to be more even with print (even though that is an increase for us).
- As a publisher, we have looked at new ways to partner, removed in-person events as most folks in the industry. We are looking at new products and services that we can offer to meet our customers' changing needs.
- Focusing more on open science, OA, transformative agreements. Imperative to establish an academic infrastructure to support open scholarship. Need publishers to understand we have limited
budgets and lost money in the pandemic.
• We need transformative agreements that are sustainable for academic libraries and allow OA publication with no APC charges. Need a sustainable OA infrastructure for OA publications, so traditional publishing can be reevaluated by learned societies, and greater cost-benefit to societies is realized. Need to compensate scientists and researchers for their peer review and editorial work.
• Ensuring remote access to resources and people.
• Focused on development on Framework for Provider Agreements, then building out local workflows, trainings, and resources to facilitate our decision-making based on our institutional values.
• Our discretionary budget is smaller than pre-pandemic as we used some of that money to continue supporting our consortial and ER.
• Preference in acquisitions for e-content, thought it is unknown if that extends to selecting parties. Undergrads seem to prefer electronic resources anecdotally
• We have shifted from seeing and working with libraries in person to doing as much of that online as we can. We have also shifted from consulting to engagement.
• Much less print. Trying to reduce annual and multiyear commitments.
• Opening up more content for folks who lost access, getting more DEI content, etc.
• Shift to funding more digital content for monographs. We are restoring some print purchasing, but demand for eBooks continues.
• Much more e-resources sold.
• Equitable decision-making.
• In the short term, we are focused on e-preferred for back filling print acquisitions missed during pandemic closure. Long term, we are looking to OA partnerships and evaluating what content provides value to our collections.
• More access needed for eBooks.
• I’ve had to be very focused on remote work—research, meetings, events, etc.
• Priority to electronic format.
• Greater shift to OA.
• Supporting remote learning.
• Increased research projects = increased support.
• OA.
• More online focus/access, OA.
• Less physical; more electronic.
• No, we were already mostly virtual.
• Got more invested in values-based negotiations with consortial partners; collections as a service model etc.
• Cost is chief concern.
• E-resources.
• Away from Approval, more toward firm orders/requests.
• Similar to IGI, we have focused on providing more remote access options, including Shibboleth and OpenAthens. We’ve also expanded to include IP registry.
• No.
• Moving faster to electronic first.
• Not due to the pandemic but OA has been top of mind.
• We purchased very few print books during the pandemic, and continue to prefer e-books now that we are back in person.
• We’re focusing more on OA and copyright.
• More of my time is spent working with institutions on how to possibly save on their renewal rather than how to add titles.
• Less print.
• Openness, speed, and fairness in scholarly publishing.
• Provide more resources online.
• Need to find more agile business models to accommodate university budget realities.
• Digital shift, Just-in-Time approach in collection development.
• Yes.
• Need to add more virtual resources online.
• More emphasis on digital, less emphasis on print processing and handling.
• Less money, more needs.
• Prioritizing e-book conversion for backlist titles. Making content
available through more channels and sales models.
• Looking at more ways to provide access to subs and to improve online content.
• Looking more into OA, ADA compliance, EBA, online vs. print.
• No.
• More services moved online for good, more employees working from home for good.
• We need more stable pricing and more collaboration with publishers.
• Digital content is preferred, with an increasing emphasis to provide affordable or free-access to textbooks/teaching materials/OER for students.
• Managing cost of OA while allowing affiliated authors the opportunity to make their work open.
• Even more emphasis on electronic.
• We now prefer e over p formats.
• E-books and streaming media over print resources.
• More focus on electronic resources.

Q.4: Resulting from the pandemic, in what priority order would you currently rank the following industry trends? Question type: drag and drop rank ordering. Choices were initially sorted alphabetically to ease the ranking interaction for the participants.
1. Access vs. ownership
2. Consortium/library system deals
3. Digital scholarship/digital media proliferation/shift to e-resources
4. DEI
5. Flexible purchasing models
6. Licensing frameworks
7. OA/OER/scholarly communication
8. Publisher packages and e-Collections
9. Remote work, online access, and technologies
10. Other (free-text open-ended)

Fifty-four respondents revealed the following collective priority rank order.

![Figure 4. Industry trends as priority-ranked by participants.](image)

Follow-up question: If your top priority is “Other,” please specify—Question type: free-text open-ended.

Two respondents shared the following insights:
- Innovation for publishing multimedia and multimodal scholarship.
- Workload; staffing levels and loss of staff; sudden reductions to collection budget.

Q.5: What industry trends and priorities did we miss?—Question type: free-text open-ended.
Seventeen respondents shared the following additional trends and priorities:

• Effect of lost colleagues on libraries.
• Purchasing models along with textbook affordability still seem to have concerns from librarians about what publishers are doing to support them.
• I assume that licensing frameworks means transformative agreements. I ranked this very high because of its priority and importance. If licensing frameworks means something else, it would change my ranking considerably.
• Health and well-being of all staff.
• Innovation in publishing formats.
• None.
• Delayed print and backlogs created.
• Rise of data for research and text and data mining allowances.
• E-textbook.
• None.
• Not sure.
• None.
• Library access consolidation.
• Mental health of our students and employees and the impact on our overall mission.
• None.
• Being prepared for emergencies, rather than just having mitigation and recovery plans in place.

Q.6: Regarding library–publisher collaborations, what are some of the biggest obstacles you’ve faced?—Question type: free-text open-ended.

Figure 6. Word cloud showing predominant obstacles to library–publisher collaboration.
Thirty-one respondents described having faced the following obstacles:

- They need to involve broader than just the library, especially for transformative agreements with higher costs then regular subscriptions—need university involvement.
- Lack of library-wide collaboration.
- Short staffed in open scholarship areas and acquisitions.
- Note: prefer open to digital.
- Publishers needing to have more realistic options.
- Vendors seem to think budgets have “recovered” and are more emboldened to pursue higher annual price increases. For many libraries, budgets have NOT recovered, and likely never will (cuts began pre-COVID and have accelerated).
- Inability of large publishers to acknowledge our budget cuts.
- Books don’t have world rights, which is a requirement for our customer base.
- Long-term sustainability of EBAs. If EBA is a scoop-and-go, the relationship ends. Library support for OA with traditional publishers is also difficult without transformative agreements with minimal price increase.
- Budgets/pricing and licensing.
- Hearing from those with the loudest voices doesn’t represent the viewpoints of all librarians or libraries.
- Inflexibility from publishers.
- Trying to make sure everyone advocating for OA appreciates that publishing is a lot of work, and people should be paid for their labor in whatever new structures are devised.
- Lack of resourcing (both funding and people) at libraries to support transformative agreements. The only available option is a full R&P deal that requires little or no administration at a zero-sum increase, which isn’t feasible for small publishers.
- “The big deal.”
- Smaller institutions don’t have power in transformational agreements.
• Importance of offering OA without breaking our budget.
• Annual increases are not sustainable, but haven't we been talking about this issue since the 1990s.
• New internal licensing requirements. Vendors that normally do not negotiate for five or so years are now being asked to review licenses each year which has resulted in increased work for both parties.
• Purchasing models along with textbook affordability still seem to have concerns from librarians about what publishers are doing to support them.
• Engaging with publishers on cost corrections. We have paid too much for too long and radical cost corrections are needed for libraries to remain sustainable, and for scholarly communication to continue in a sustained manner.
• The second biggest obstacle is the publishers seeking to monetize academic publishing data. They have done this already with impact metrics for publications, and are now seeking to own data generated by academics, and to resell that data back to academia.
• Inability to understand that legacy pricing models don't work in our current environment and that we must cocreate the new models together for our collective survival.
• Multiple user licenses and e-access on texts—requested by faculty—that are not available in those formats.
• Data collection for negotiating TA deals.
• Increasing prices after pandemic.
• We are not a large research university or part of a state university so have limited leverage during negotiations.
• APCs.
• OA.
• Getting affordable discounts on expensive journals.
• Meeting the needs of our membership vs. meeting the needs of our institutional customers.
• None that I can think of.
• Library budgets being cut at the same time as publisher costs going up.
• Inflexibility, nonresponsiveness (running out the clock), increased
complexity in OA collaborations, complicated OA research dashboards.

• OA issues.
• Those who refused to bend during a crisis should reap what they sowed (thinking of OCLC, who is not a publisher, but still ...).
• No flexibility on pricing and access.
• Limits on staffing and reliance on remote work at the time when planning for transitions to more open digital access. Addressing issues such as “controlled lending” or the remote use of digital products.
• Fixed deals.

Q.7: In library–publisher collaborations, what good and most impactful and positive outcomes have you seen?—Question type: free-text open-ended.
Twenty-six respondents described having seen the following impactful and positive outcomes:

- Increased trial time during pandemic and extending trials seems easier now. Price increases ceased for a bit and didn't immediately jump up. Vendors being flexible with payments and license negotiations as they understood we are all facing difficulties.
- The amount of information that has been shared through webinars creating a forum for librarians to come together to speak about these challenges and how they continue to adapt their library services for their patrons.
- Encouraging transformative agreements have been reached with some European countries, with the University of California, and with MIT for example.
• Seeing flexibility during pandemic on expanding number of users etc.
• ICOLC tracked all of the publishers/vendors who eliminated and reduced price increases during COVID, which was very helpful.
• Read and publish deals with lower annual costs.
• Publishers opening up content for a set period of time, even though it could have meant lower sales.
• Willingness of publishers to make a deal work (within budget or reflects value of publisher’s resources for library users rather than publisher’s self-perception).
• Increased collaboration to determine what are the best options for libraries.
• Support from both (as well as authors, funders, and users) to understand how we can collaborate as a community.
• I have found it works well when librarians and publishers are working together on a specific publishing project.
• Where there are resources to support such collaborations, it has allowed for some really innovative solutions to support OA.
• Opening resources to help during the pandemic.
• Leaning on consortia relationships to get better deal terms.
• Better, more flexible pricing models.
• Stabilized pricing and annual uplifts.
• Publishers making content available OA at the start of the pandemic.
• Free trials.
• Willingness to work together on transformative OA models.
• Budgetary primarily.
• More direct communication and brainstorming around publisher meeting library needs, particularly in regard to e-book acquisitions.
• Library and country budgets.
• Some libraries understand that society publishers are hit hard by pandemic and cannot just cut prices as costs increased.
• Advances in supporting OA scholarship.
• More mutual understanding.
• The willingness of publishers to allow access to their resources
during 2020–2021 to address the remote work nature of academics. The question is to see how to find a sustainable future in remote work support.

• Working together to find an equitable solution for both parties.

Q.8: Your closing thoughts: free-form and open-ended—Question type: free-text open-ended.

Eleven respondents shared the following open-ended thoughts:

• Academia desperately needs to grow its open science, OA infrastructure to enable learned societies to publish their content freely, without requiring the services of a traditional publisher. This
would give scholars more control and ownership over their own work and research discoveries. We need a similar infrastructure for support of research data.

- Will you share the results from this poll? It would be great to see what others said!
- Thank you for asking for input.
- Would love it if more publishers had more rights flexibility. Such as DRM free, multiuser, world rights open.
- Thank you for the presentation!
- OA is a pervasive theme this year at Charleston. I think that global equity and inclusion are the greatest OA benefits; the greatest challenges still have to do with business models.
- OA is a social justice issue. You can't say you're advocating for social justice if you're not advocating for increased OA platforms and publications.
- This is a useful conversation but more publishers need to come to the table.
- COVID-19 in 2020–2021 presented an opportunity to learn new ways to work as academics. Future planning should take the better parts for inclusion.

- No more thoughts.

Discussion

Key themes encompassed the transition from physical to digital as preferred formats, remote work spawning implications for workflows and technology infrastructures, staffing losses exacerbating preexisting short staffing and resulting outsized workloads borne by remaining workers, the adverse organizational effects of lost colleagues, and the pandemic's effects on mental health and well-being among students and workers across the industry.

Obstacles observed across the industry included prevailing cost structures and lack of the needed flexibility across the industry,
rising costs and intensifying needs in a context of long-declining resources, sudden sharp budget cuts spawning industry-wide concern over hastening risks to the ecosystem's sustainability, short staffing, and staffing losses.

Trends cited by session participants across the industry included continued growth of preference for digital content over physical formats, the continuing rise of OA, DRM-free access, and world rights.

Among positive collaboration outcomes, numerous participants called out the good citizens among providers who opened digital content to libraries early in the pandemic, publishers' efforts to provide access to digital content, laudable examples of experimentation with flexible options, collaborative exploration of flexible access models, and more conversations across the industry, leading to greater mutual understanding.

Participants also cited OA and equity challenges, the need for DRM-free access and world rights, the need for open research to safeguard researchers' rights to their own works, the need for more such conversations across the industry, and appreciation for this conversation.

Conclusions and Implications for Future Research

Librarians, higher education, and providers alike cited digital content's rising predominance, OA, author rights, pandemic-related shocks to resources and infrastructures, concerns with sustainability, as well as recognition of need for flexibility and conversations across the industry. Libraries and providers share concerns over the constraining effects of shrinking resources while costs rise and needs continue to grow and broaden.

To overcome the budget challenges intensified by the pandemic, publishers must be willing to discuss and listen to libraries' needs and limitations. Flexible purchasing, OA options, and trials have become necessary to both accommodate and further the academic research community. Without these options, publishers are only harming the libraries that depend on them, as library–publisher collaborations are key to the survival of both. These evolving
challenges can only be resolved with healthy collaborations and relationships between libraries, consortia, and university systems with their publishers to not only provide much-needed support but also to foster the creation of new research endeavors. For this to happen, small- and medium-sized publishers need to be involved in these discussions as groups who can understand and accommodate library needs with specialized solutions, as they recognize the necessary collaboration and symbiosis that libraries need in times of crisis and beyond. There are steps being taken, such as IGI Global's efforts, to provide open resources across the globe, as well as products enabling affordable access to research and OA opportunities for marginalized communities. These actions create hope for the western world to adopt these models in order to provide affordability and accessibility to research for everyone around the globe.

The authors recommend follow-on research to continue this study on a larger scale to identify shared views and differences in perceptions between specific members of the information industry, with a view to widening solution-seeking collaborations across the industry in the quest for sustainable business models.
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Abstract

Those external to libraries aren’t privy to behind-the-scenes operations that occur in collection development (CD). It can feel like the only time users interact with CD employees is when they are having access issues or requesting a resource. Many users don’t understand how the library determines what resources to cancel or deselect. In addition, as traditional CD work shifts to include different subscription models, like Read & Publish agreements, focus on patron-driven acquisitions, and library material budgets
decrease while the cost of scholarly resources rise, it is imperative that CD departments develop outreach strategies to create awareness around these operations. This paper will discuss why CD-focused outreach matters. The authors share how they are approaching this and laying the groundwork for building awareness at their institution. They discuss how they developed “The MSU Library Revealed: A Learning Series for Faculty” to build relationships, create transparency, and eliminate surprises (i.e., the library no longer having access to a specific resource). The workshops in the series discuss, in-depth, topics such as the library collections budget; accessing and using online resources; teaching with library resources; the impact and value of collections; supporting the university's research agenda through CD; and Archives and Special Collections. The authors share their inspiration for this project, challenges encountered along the way, the timeline, specific content they are covering, promotion of the series, and how they collaborated with internal and external stakeholders such as their local Center for Faculty Excellence.

Introduction

There are numerous reasons that we focus on collection-development outreach and marketing at the Montana State University (MSU) Library and how it relates to our daily work. Our personal interest and work in this area peaked in 2020 through our examination of how libraries use physical and electronic marketing toolkits and resources provided by third-party providers (McKelvey & McLain, 2020). During our analysis, we assessed the contents included in the toolkits, surveyed libraries from across the nation on how they used these materials and analyzed the effectiveness of the toolkits regarding library users. In March of 2021, we virtually attended the Electronic Resources & Libraries (ER&L) Conference. Librarians from the Vanderbilt University Libraries presented a
session titled Building Trust through Transparency: Faculty Perceptions of Library Collection Spending (Glascock, Loree, & Peters, 2021). The presenters shared how they created a workshop series with the goal of increasing transparency and communication with their faculty and university administration. They wanted to educate their faculty on the rising costs of library subscriptions, how the library manages those costs, and advocate for funding. This session was intriguing to us, as like most academic libraries, we face a flat budget with the potential for a decrease every year—we have not seen a raise to our collections budget in six years. Using the ER&L session as inspiration, we decided to create a series of workshops for our own faculty to share our work. Our hope for developing our own workshop series is that MSU faculty would walk away with some understanding about how we make purchasing decisions and serve as advocates for the library.

Additionally, we regularly receive direct requests from faculty asking that we purchase resources such as an eBook or a streaming video license. When these requests come in, we must explain to requestors how these types of resources work. For example, requesters are often surprised to learn that eBooks typically cost more than a print version of the same titles. We must explain how eBook access can be limited to one simultaneous user, like a print book, or can have the option for unlimited user access, all depending on the publisher of the book. Explaining that a streaming video will expire after one year can be tricky, too. Again, during these interactions we try to emphasize that our options are usually dependent on vendor or publisher licensing restrictions. We spend a lot of time explaining that it isn't the library limiting user access, but rather following the provider's restrictions. On occasion, we have also had library users surprised to learn that the library has a specific collections budget from which we can spend each fiscal year.

Our internal library faculty and staff have always reacted positively to the work that collection development does. Our library holds an all-staff meeting once a month and our library dean has
always made it clear that anyone in the library can ask for time on
the meeting agenda and share the work they are doing. We've taken
advantage of that invitation and typically ask for time on the agenda
when we have a new topic we want to share with our colleagues
and have shared several endeavors including a webpage on resource
updates where we list new subscriptions, canceled subscriptions,
and subscriptions under review for cancellation. We often remind
our colleagues of our webpage that covers common access issues
and steps for troubleshooting them. Our library's public services
department welcomes our updates as it helps them assist our
patrons better.

All these interactions, experiences, and presentations led us to
convene with our Dean and Associate Dean at the start of summer
2021. We discussed the idea of creating a library workshop series,
specifically focused on collection-development outreach, with
them. Both were 100% supportive of our idea and urged us to go
forward with it. Out of this discussion, our Associate Dean strongly
suggested we try to partner with our campus Center for Faculty
Excellence (CFE). He also suggested, at that time, that we consider
creating a one-time presentation, covering the collections budget
and how we spend our money, for our Friends of the MSU Library
board members.

Project Overview

The workshop series that we developed is titled The MSU Library
Revealed: A Learning Series for MSU Faculty (Montana State
University, n.d.b.). The idea is to create sessions that build on each
other, but that do not necessarily need to be watched or attended
in a specific order. As we began discussing session topics, we were
clear that the focus of any of the sessions should be to offer insight
into how the library spends its collections budget, makes decisions
around collections, using and accessing collections, etc. In total,
we ended up creating six workshops led by employees from across the library; three of the sessions would be offered in fall 2021, and the next three would be offered in spring 2022. Each session would be offered twice, once in person and once virtually—the virtual session could then be recorded and added to a web portal for later viewings. Figure 1 provides a timeline for the sessions, and attendees that attend the sessions earmarked with a star are eligible to earn one credit toward the Teaching Enhancement Certificate (Montana State University, n.d.b.) offered by the CFE.

The six workshops and their respective descriptions are as follows:

1. **The MSU Library Collections Budget: An Overview of How We Spend Our Money**

Join library faculty for the first of six workshops in our series, The MSU Library Revealed: A Learning Series for Faculty, to learn how the Library uses its materials budget to acquire print and electronic resources, and how different subscription models are changing the ways that libraries spend money. This session will discuss how the library makes purchasing and cancellation decisions, the rising cost of scholarly resources, and how the MSU Library is evolving its spending to meet the needs of its researchers and students.
2. **Accessing and Using Library Resources**

Join library faculty for the second of six workshops in our series, The MSU Library Revealed: A Learning Series for Faculty, to learn how to access and use library resources through methods like connecting Google Scholar to the MSU Library, installing browser extensions that quickly connect you to library resources, etc. This workshop will also discuss how to search and borrow print items from other Montana academic libraries, alternative access methods for obtaining journal articles the library does not subscribe to, using interlibrary loan, and more.

3. **Teaching with Library Resources**

Join library faculty for the third of six workshops in our series, The MSU Library Revealed: A Learning Series for Faculty, to learn how to teach with library resources. This workshop will demonstrate methods for assisting students in finding the right resources for research, how to embed library resources into Brightspace, and more.

4. **Eliminating Barriers to Information Access**

Join us for the fourth of six workshops in our series, The MSU Library Revealed: A Learning Series for Faculty, to learn how the Library eliminates barriers to information access through library subscriptions to online journals and electronic books. We will demonstrate the value and impact of these subscriptions to the MSU community by sharing information about resource usage, return-on-investment data, and more.

5. **Advancing Research Through Library Collections**

In this session, we will discuss how the Library supports and advances the university’s research agenda through its Author Fund, Read & Publish Agreements, and more.
6. **Thinking Inside the Box: Supporting Transformative Learning Experiences for MSU Students**

MSU’s Strategic Plan Goal 1.3 calls for “Implement[ing] evidence-based high quality, high impact teaching and learning practices for every student,” including “high quality, high impact practices.” Learn how working with the faculty in Archives and Special Collections can help you offer the learning experiences that your students will find transformative, no matter your disciplinary area!

**Goals**

Ultimately, we have five goals that we hope to achieve through this workshop series: transparency, engagement, understanding, support, and awareness (Figure 2). We want to be transparent about our work and about how users get access to library resources. We also want to engage faculty around their use of library resources—we need their engagement to help us do our work. MSU faculty need to understand how and why we make decisions about library resources. We are also trying to create support from our campus community especially when it comes to decisions such as ending a publisher contract. Through all these goals, we will create more awareness, both by our faculty around library collections and for us as well—we will be more aware of how our faculty use resources and can use that awareness to make future collection decisions.

![Figure 2. Overview of workshop goals.](image)

378 | Our Work Impacts Your Work
Collaborations

As we were preparing this series, we were excited to have our campus CFE agree to help us promote our sessions. The CFE’s mission is to develop and provide experiences, opportunities, and resources that support the growth of faculty in achieving excellence in teaching, research/scholarship, and service (Montana State University, n.d.a). The CFE offered to promote our workshops in their biweekly newsletters; we could tag CFE in campus wide newsletters; they agreed to offer CFE membership credit for all our workshops; and credit toward two of the specific certificates they offer (the Teaching Enhancement and Research and Creativity Certificates). The draw for faculty at MSU to obtain CFE membership or to earn a certificate is that it can be included in their CV or retention and/or tenure dossier. In addition to partnering with the CFE, we were also able to get colleagues on board to participate from three other library departments, including our Library Dean. Seeing this willingness to participate from our colleagues is exciting and speaks to the importance of collection development-focused outreach, and the work that we do.

Reaching Our Audience

Marketing and Promotion

To reach our intended audience for this series, we leveraged all the promotional channels that we have access to. We worked with our two Library Events Coordinators to promote the workshops on our library’s social media channels, including Instagram (MSU Library [@msulibrary], n.d.) and Facebook (Montana State University Library, n.d.a, b). We have a campus-wide newsletter, MSU Today, that is distributed to all employees. The CFE has a biweekly newsletter that goes out to all faculty and includes links and information about our workshops. We added each workshop to our specific library workshops and events calendar (we use Springshare’s LibCal product). We also created a dedicated site for the workshop series that includes an overall series description as
well as information about each individual session, and it includes session recordings and slides (Figure 3).

Figure 3. Homepage for overall workshop series.

Assessment

We wanted to be sure we were reaching our audience following the workshops to gather assessment data, so we created brief follow-up surveys for each session that include identical questions along with open-ended questions tailored to each session. During the first three sessions of our workshop series, we have reached a variety of users including tenure and nontenure track faculty, staff, and a community member. There have been thirteen unique attendees from within the library and across campus (Figure 4). While attendance numbers seem low, we are hoping that those that did attend will help to spread information to their colleagues and students.
Our sessions have also included faculty and staff from six unique departments. Including the library employees that attended sessions, we also had attendees from English and Education; History and Philosophy and Modern Languages and Literature; and Native American Studies departments. One of the main reasons we are doing this work is to learn more about how to reach our campus community. We want to know how to reach our users, so we asked in the assessment survey how they learned about our workshops and their preferred communication methods going forward. Most attendees that responded to the survey said they had learned about the series directly from a library employee. Additionally, most attendees said they would prefer to learn about the library via existing MSU communication channels (e.g., MSU Today newsletter, CFE newsletter) even though that is not how most attendees that responded to the survey said they learned about our sessions (Figure 5).
Lastly, although we have only reached a handful of users through our sessions, the answers that we have received via the survey align with the goals of our projects. Some examples of comments from attendees include:

- Learning more about library support for open access (Read & Publish agreements, etc.)
- The high cost of library resources, especially journals
- The many factors that go into collections decisions
- A staff member noted that they now feel more confident in helping users
- An attendee suggested more education about resource access for non-MSU affiliates (possibly in partnership with the public library)

From the survey responses that we have received, it is clear that attendees do leave the sessions with an understanding of the cost of resources, how we make collection-related decisions, and how they
can use our resources, including those that are not affiliated with the university.

Challenges and Next Steps

Challenges

Although we feel that the workshop series has gone well, there have been challenges along the way. We were not expecting such a low turnout of participation. We have hosted several in-person workshops at MSU alongside our vendors and publishers, pre-pandemic, and have always seen decent turnouts and feedback from our users. Low turnout for the workshop series has impacted our enthusiasm for going forward. This is a good reminder to us that support and enthusiasm do not necessarily equal success, or at least the type of success we had defined for ourselves. However, that support and enthusiasm from our own library administration and from our colleagues is still inspiring and continues to spur us forward in continuing this work.

As we consider ways to improve attendance and interest in the spring, we have discussed what might be leading to lack of interest. Perhaps we have scoped the workshop series too narrowly by targeting a select audience only, faculty. Perhaps we should have been more inclusive within our promotional materials and invited any interested stakeholders, such as “grad students,” “staff,” etc., and, in general, been more inclusive as far as who we targeted our workshop series to. During one of our first workshops, one of the attendees even wanted clarification about whether adjunct faculty were welcome. That alludes to a problem, also.

We have considered that maybe this type of format does not work for the topics we are presenting, after all. It is possible that faculty do not want to spend a full 50–60 minutes on the topic of collections budgets and decisions. Another thought we have
considered is that our return to pre-pandemic behavior is still working itself out and continues to have an impact on people attending workshops—even though in the fall of 2021, our campus was fully back in person for classes. It is possible that maybe people do not want to attend in-person workshops, or that they do not want to attend, yet another online workshop. We have also heard, anecdotally, rumors that faculty and instructors are feeling very overwhelmed right now, so perhaps it can be chalked up to bad timing.

Next Steps

As for next steps, we have several ideas. One is that instead of relying on a 60-minute presentation, we consider creating a 5 to 15-minute presentation that we can share at different department meetings. We will reach out and ask if we can get time on various campus department meeting agendas. Based on the time allotted to us, we can create a roadshow-type presentation and shop it around.

We will continue to listen to our internal library feedback—we have had wonderful feedback from our public services colleagues! We enjoy our work and sharing it with our colleagues, and we are observing that employees feel empowered to pass that information onto the patrons they help. We are confident that some of our work has bridged silos among the library departments. Sharing our work at our all-staff meetings; attending other library department meetings for other library departments, mostly the public services department; presenting at conferences with colleagues from other library departments. We find that the outreach work we have done to our internal library stakeholders has led to our public-facing colleagues feeling empowered to answer questions they may have previously handed off to those of us in collection development. Previously, this would have caused a delay in a patron receiving help or caused them frustration as they are forced to navigate yet one more person to receive the answers they needed.
The website for the workshop series will remain in place, and the recordings and slides for each workshop will be available for anyone to view. We can continue to promote the website and refer users to it. We also think it is important to consider sending personal invitations and targeted emails to those you think should attend workshops. We do think that sending a personal email invitation to known library users on campus contributed to a higher turnout at the third workshop in our series. If a library does not have access to campus-wide email lists, this can be an effective option for reaching users.

Conclusion

One of the things we've talked about as a group is that so much of the time, the behind-the-scenes work we do is usually seamless. The only time we tend to hear from people is when they want us to buy something or if a database or a journal has gone down or, honestly, user technical difficulties that are preventing access to something. That is part of our jobs, right? We wanted to do this workshop series so that we could communicate to our users that we want to be transparent about our work and educate. We think it's interesting and meaningful, we know our work impacts other campus work. However, the lack of turnout to our workshops so far has us asking ourselves: should we just stay behind-the-scenes, plugging away, and continue our work to make access for our users seamless? Do they want to know the intricacies that we deal with, the amount of money we spend each year and on what, or do users just want access and they don't care how or where it's from?

At the conclusion of the Charleston presentation, we were pleased to learn that other academic libraries shared their encouragement and enthusiasm for collection-development-focused outreach. Unfortunately, we learned that other academic libraries share similar challenges when it comes to reaching their
audience. Many acknowledged that their own faculty are expressing how overwhelmed they continue to feel following the height of the pandemic and that it has been a struggle to launch their own library outreach work. Attendees agreed that this type of outreach to internal library colleagues is just as vital as branching out beyond the library. There was support for creating shorter presentations versus an hour-long workshop. Overall, attendees were overwhelmingly enthusiastic about the need for collection-development-focused outreach.
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Black Librarians and the State of Publishing in Librarianship
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Introduction

Much emphasis has and continues to be given to making various demographics surrounding library communities a part of the library. Libraries across the country have begun making more attempts to provide services to such underserved communities as the Black/African Americans, LatinX, indigenous communities, other communities of color, the LGBTQIA+, and persons with disabilities. While libraries attempt to provide services for these diverse communities by maintaining various collections of such groups, another issue is the inclusion and diversity in librarianship. Inclusion and diversity in the field of librarianship have long been an issue.

Despite many attempts to advance diversity and inclusivity in the library field, the field still has a problem with the inclusion of persons of color. Although it is not impossible to accumulate a diverse library collection without having a diverse library staff or staff members to represent each demographic represented in the collection, it is essential for the library staff to mirror the library's collections. Jaeger, Sarin, and Peterson note the advantage of having library community members knowledgeable of the community and various populations the library consists of (Larsen, 2017). Scholars note the historical need for minority recruitment, noting The
American Library Association Board of Educational Leadership's annual report in 1924, which shows the need for minority librarians. They also note the Association of Research Libraries' attempts at bringing awareness to market the recruitment of minority librarians (Kendrick, 2009). Data continues to confirm that about 80% to 90% of academic librarians are white, leaving about 10% to 20% of minorities as library professionals (Kung et al., 2020). There is an issue in the diversification of library collections and diversification of librarians in academic libraries. Still, it appears to be an issue with the inclusion of scholarly publication among academic librarians, particularly Black/African American Librarians, to which much attention has not been given.

**Literature Review**

Scholars note that historically the library field has been primarily female and white (Contreras, 2021). Black librarians and other library professionals of color play an essential role in identifying resources, materials, and other services that mirror the community's diverse experiences (para. 6). Yet, the lack of racial diversity in the library field remains a problem. Although it is essential for Black librarians (and other librarians of color) to play a role in the advancement of collections representing their communities, it is also vital for the black story or perspective to be told. This perspective can best be provided by those in the black community. However, as there is a lack of diversity in the field of librarianship, there is also a lack of diversity in the scholarly publication of Black academic librarians.

Scholarly communication includes traditional or formal publications, such as scholarly journal articles, scholarly chapters or monographs (single-volume books offering research into a specialized area of knowledge), and conference proceedings. It also includes continually emerging publications, such as data sets, data visualizations, working papers, and blogs (Berkeley Library, 2021).
Scholars note that a lack of diversity in academic fields, including the library field, affects the diversity in scholars pursuing publication (Metivier, 2018). In 2018 there were 5.4% of African-American library professionals in higher education, 4% of African-Americans in the publishing industry overall, and 1.66% of African-American professionals published scholarly publications (Bilby, 2020). This is a real problem in that when scholarly publishing does not mirror the diversity of readers, authors, and research questions, the authors who do not publish will not receive tenure and promotion, and researchers will not obtain access to many scholarship possibilities (Roh, 2016).

The Business of Publishing and the Reasons Behind the Lack of Black Authorship

The reasons for such low scholarly publication (or publications in general) among professional Black librarians, whether peer-reviewed articles or books, fundamentally point to politics and systemic racism. One such matter stems from these issues: publishers may publish books mainly for the dominant culture, often disadvantaging black and other authors of color (Barton & Parker, 2020). Some Black editors, such as Tracy Sherrod, assert that publishers hold certain beliefs about what they think is universal, and frequently the stories of Black people do not fit what they consider universal (Alter & Concepción de León et al. 2021). Sherrod asserts that what has changed or not changed in the publishing field is that there is more diversity pertaining to what is being published in the African-American marketplace, in terms of the variety of stories that are being told. However, Sherrod points out that only seven Black editors have absolute authority and power, and still, it's not the full authority and power needed to make a difference (para. 5). Marie Dutton Brown, a former Doubleday senior editor, now a literary agent, exclaims that “The presence of Black editors
is really important. But you need more than one at the table” (So & Wezerek, 2020). Kerri Greenidge, a Black historian and author of *Black Radical: The Life and Times of William Monroe Trotter*, exclaims that initially, she was told that no one would publish the book unless it were about slavery or unless she was writing about the busing crisis (Alter ., 2020). When she began submitting her manuscript, every place of submission's response was that no one would read a book in which white people were not the key or central figure. She was also told that “who was going to read a book about a Black man that nobody had ever heard about” (Alter., 2020, para. 14)? Vice President and executive editor of Pantheon, Errol McDonald asserts that “When I first started in publishing, the mantra was, “Black books don't sell. Black people don't read” (Alter & Concepción de León et al., 2020, para. 28). Linda Duggins, senior director of publicity at Grand Central Publishing, notes that there seemed to have been a shift in publishing certain books. She stated that Black authors and other authors of color were often published, and a change occurred. Publishers now ask the question, “Do those books work? If they do, great. If they don't, let's start phasing them out” (Alter & Harris et al., 2020, para. 17). Duggins notes that although there are books from authors from all walks of life in publishing, most are by white authors. Although many of the books by these writers don't do well, most of them do not get phased out. Duggins asserts that people of color should bring themselves to the publishing table and not exclude themselves. Black people and other persons of color have to be a part of the dialogue and part of the business culture (para. 20). She would also like to see more Black people and other persons of color at the executive level.

Ebony LaDelle, associate director of marketing at HarperCollins, asserts that when analyzing what are the most substantial assets of a book and engaging with the consumer, she and other marketers have to include the consumer in with some aspects that they feel would resonate with them in terms of the book para. 22). LaDelle notes how it's easy for white marketers to point those things out
from white authors, but there seems to be difficulty in knowing how to promote those same things that would resonate with consumers when it comes to books relating to Black matters. She also notes,

I think a lot of Black publishing professionals are becoming exhausted from being heard only when it benefits the company’s bottom line. I’m constantly giving myself, my voice, my thoughts when I shouldn’t have to prove myself or my knowledge over and over again. White colleagues are able to speak their mind, but when it’s my turn, I can’t be direct or forthcoming without coming off as aggressive. (, para. 24)

Conclusion

Whether in the publishing business or attempting to get published, many have found that some segments of the publishing industry are attempting to be more inclusive. Recently, there have been various initiatives involved in minimizing this issue. For example, the Coalition for Diversity & Inclusion in Scholarly Communications works with organizations and individuals to build equity, inclusion, diversity, and accessibility in scholarly communications (Coalition for Diversity & Inclusion in Scholarly Communications, 2020). The organization was formed by ten trade and professional associations representing organizations/individuals working in scholarly publishing. The organization was organized to discuss and focus on issues of diversity and inclusion within the industry. Some of the founding sponsors of the organization include the Association of University Presses, Council of Science Editors, Society for Scholarly Publishing, and Library Publishing Coalition (Coalition for Diversity & Inclusion in Scholarly Communications, 2020). The Society for Scholarly Publishing works to foster diversity, equity, and inclusion through leadership to expand the diversity of professionals working
in scholarly communications (Society for Scholarly Publishing, 2021). The organization’s Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion Committee’s plan is to “educate the membership on building communities that prioritize and value diversity, equity, and inclusion, support diversity, equity, and inclusion in scholarly publishing, and improve our ability to support diversity, equity, and inclusion initiatives within the organization” (Society for Scholarly Publishing, 2021, para. 3). SSP’s efforts in alleviating the lack of diversity in publishing include: curating a scholarly publishing Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion Resource Forum on the organization’s community platform, supporting research initiatives such as the Workplace Equity Survey to bring awareness to DE&I issues in the industry, and providing the Generations Fund, an endowment of $500,000 goal, established to provide “sustainable funding for the Society for Scholarly Publishing’s initiatives and programs ... [to] include the organization’s Fellowship Program, Mentorship Program, and the initiatives of the Diversity, Equity and Inclusion Committee.” Donations to the Generations Fund will continue SSP’s commitment to DE&I by funding future initiatives that will be responsive to the evolving issue” (Society for Scholarly Publishing, 2021, para. 6).

The Library Publishing Coalition is composed of academic and research libraries and library consortia involved in scholarly publishing (2021). Its vision is to have a scholarly publishing atmosphere that is open, inclusive, and supportive. The organization’s values are:

- **Professionalism**: It seeks to improve the quality and sustainability of library publishing through advocacy, professional development, and shared best practices.
- **Openness**: The organization believes that the products and processes of scholarly communication should be as open as possible, thereby increasing the reach and impact of scholarship worldwide.
- **Diversity**: Recognizing that library publishing has a unique
opportunity to amplify underrepresented voices in scholarly communication, the organization strives to promote inclusivity in all its professional activities.

- **Collaboration**: The organization leverages its collective knowledge and resources to enhance its publishing efforts and supports other libraries in developing scholarly publishing programs.

- **Innovation**: As research and scholarly communication continue to evolve, we explore and engage with new technologies and new models of publishing to better support the needs of the scholarly community (Library Publishing Coalition, 2021).

Perhaps the simplest and most common way to alleviate the problem of the lack of diversity in scholarly publishing and publishing in general (at least when it comes to books) is self-publishing. In addition, as previously stated, Black authors and other authors of color should also become more involved in the business of publishing.
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How New Open-Access Management Infrastructure Is Unburdening the Researchers

Lessons Learned from a National Collaboration in Luxembourg

IDA SOFIE REHER

At the Charleston Conference 2021, ChronosHub and the Luxembourg National Research Fund (FNR) presented on “How New Open Access Management Infrastructure is Unburdening the Researchers: Lessons Learned from a National Collaboration in Luxembourg.” The two hosts, Head of Business Development at ChronosHub, Martin Jagerhorn and Tom Jakobs from FNR, looked into central aspects of FNR’s and Luxembourg’s Open Access (OA) journey and how the collaborative partnership has helped address challenges for Luxembourg stemming from OA developments in the research ecosystem—an insightful “from problem to solution” walk-through.

En Route to Open Access

During the session, Tom Jakobs elaborated on FNR’s OA developments through the years. Before 2017, FNR had no OA policy and faced multiple issues. The administrative burdens were heavy for both institutions, in terms of collecting and encoding publication data, as well as for FNR as they needed to manually review all publications for eligibility. FNR had often a substantial number of ineligible requests due to researchers selecting the wrong license
or not paying attention to given embargo periods, ultimately leading to long, painful processes. Prompted to find a better, more practical solution to fund OA and ensure compliance, FNR carried out a successful pilot collaboration with ChronosHub in 2020 with the purpose of streamlining OA publishing and reporting processes. ChronosHub assisted FNR by integrating data, workflows, and systems between the publishers and the funder and institutions to help establish an infrastructure to unburden the researchers along the end-to-end process.

Open Access Through ChronosHub

In 2021, the pilot ended and FNR, the National Library Consortium, and ChronosHub moved on to sign a long-term operational agreement. This means that Luxembourg is now having a systematic approach and solution to drive OA, FAIR data, and Open Science. Everything starts with the authors who can easily search for eligible journals in an integrated Journal Finder and find a better overview of the APCs and how much will be covered by the funder. Authors can submit their work to the publisher directly through ChronosHub and upon acceptance, the articles are automatically checked if they are eligible for funding. If eligible, ChronosHub pays the full invoice on FNR's behalf and if the amount exceeds FNR's funding cap, ChronosHub collects a corresponding reimbursement from the institution. Ultimately, the collaboration contributes to an optimized and simplified communication between authors, institutions, publishers, and FNR. This simplified process has significantly contributed to tripling the OA publishing and APC expenditure in 2021 seen to FNR-funded outputs.

Four key aspects and learnings in navigating the challenges of OA were presented in connection to the ChronosHub–Luxembourg collaboration. Underlined by Martin Jagerhorn in the session, this includes “best practices” for developing an “author-centric OA
strategy,” “centralizing APC funds,” “standardization to ensure a common understanding between all stakeholders,” and ultimately, “automation” by ensuring FAIR data upon inception.
Seeing Far Enough Around the Curve Not to Crash

How to Make Good Consortium Collection Decisions When Representing Your Library and State

JAMES G. RHoades

Abstract

The following briefly discusses the responsibilities, opportunities, challenges, and rewards of representing a mid-sized university library on a state library consortium committee. It describes how the author was appointed to the consortium. It discusses strategies for those new to participating in such organizations, and it provides ideas and approaches for professionals responsible for collection coordination and others in similar representative roles. It focuses on the great importance of making good collection development decisions.

Library administrators often create, retool, or even eliminate personnel roles when making major changes to organizational structures. In many cases, reorganizations make it necessary for professionals to take on additional and unfamiliar responsibilities. But what do you do when this happens to you? Well two years ago, it happened at my academic library and to me—regarding the coordination of our collection development program.

Sit back, buckle up, and take a ride with me, while we take a quick trip around some of the curves and turns encountered during my
experience. I'll first tell you a little about my wheelhouse and then some about the consortium. After, I'll share some strategies on how to get up to speed quickly, to slow down around curves, to gain traction at slippery spots, while setting a winning pace. I hope this different perspective stimulates ideas—especially if you are newly assigned in representative role on a similar committee. I hope it also highlights the great importance of making good collection development decisions that impact many.

In 2019, my library administration had reached a crossroad, and it decided that the management of the collection development program needed to shift from a full-time collection development librarian to a rotating two-year appointment to a librarian in the Liaison Services department. This meant a liaison would now be tasked with coordinating collection development. Adding to the challenge, one of the responsibilities was representing the library on a very active state consortium collection development committee for the Virtual Library of Virginia (VIVA).

In January of 2020, I was appointed to be the newly developed collection development coordinator, which was in addition to my responsibilities as the social science librarian. This additional role meant leading the collection development team of nine librarians and work with a materials budget of over four million dollars. And even though that’s a large budget, we still face budget difficulties, which makes meeting everyone’s resource needs even more challenging as material costs continue to rise while budgets constrict. Despite these challenges, we try to make collection decisions that benefit our whole community rather than just one group. Even though such a goal is not always possible, we still try. My library and colleagues have lots of ambition, as we try to do a great deal with limited resources and do it well. This type of mindset highlights the importance of making smart and informed decisions when trying to achieve collection development success.

Adding to the institutional challenges, the new role entailed being a standing member on the state consortium's collection development committee, also known as CoCo. Virginia’s state
consortium VIVA started in the early 1990s to provide needed resources to the Higher Education Institutes throughout the Commonwealth. What started as a cooperative for book sharing quickly grew leaps and bounds over the years, and its collection development efforts are now second to none. A few things VIVA does are facilitating resource sharing for print and microform collections, providing access to online library resources 24/7, coordinating collection development of multiple electronic resources, leveling the academic playing field, ensuring over $500 million in cost avoidance, and helping reduce duplication of resources.

The committee responsibilities, which is a formal assignment, include making additional budgetary decisions with an additional annual budget just north of nine million dollars. There are differences in how the components of the budgets are broken down, but they both share a similar goal of deciding how to best allocate limited funds. Another similarity is trying to acquire and maintain the best resources to support as many users as possible. This is done by evaluating and recommending resources after careful analysis of access and use. Without the consortium's resources many institutional needs would go unmet, as individual organizations typically can't afford additional resources. This makes the support from a consortium important to the success of higher education libraries, as they increase the ability of libraries to meet resource needs of multiple communities. In the case of Virginia, the reach is quite large and spans a large scope to include thirty-nine state-assisted colleges and universities, twenty-four community colleges, and thirty-one independent colleges and universities.

The contributions of the collection's committee members are essential to the success of the consortium, as a consortium is only as good as the professionals that pitch in to do the day-to-day work. At VIVA the expectation for committee members is very high, regardless of the type of committee. Talk about pressure. Realizing the seriousness of the work, I decided, as anyone finding themselves in a similar position, to do as much homework as possible at the
onset of my assignment. This helps build confidence when transitioning into unfamiliar territory. There is a considerable transition serving on a consortium committee, if you find yourself in encountering a transition see William Bridges’ work *Managing Transitions Making the Most of Change* (2009). During change, how do you look around the curve and not crash?

There are many strategies one could adapt to be successful during a transition. The most important and most obvious is to become familiar with documents related to the organization. Get familiar with their website. Read all the documents you’re sent. Talk to your colleagues, as some of them may have served on the very same committee. Most importantly, consider utilizing Michael Watkin’s advice in his *The First 90 Days* (2013) by focusing on making a good first impression and starting off on the right foot. Consider combining it with the advice in Kate Murphy’s book *You’re not listening what you’re missing and why it matters* (2020) to take the early period of your assignment to listen. You will learn so much more when you attentively listen without thinking about what you to add to the discussion. Taking the time to listen will help accelerate your learning and assist you with mapping out the culture of the group.

Even when putting such advice to practice, reality will set in quickly as you truly realize the parameters of a new role. For instance, the annual material budget for my library is four million, but the consortium’s budget is significantly more. These types of facts highlight the unseen challenges new responsibilities entail. It also demonstrates why one should always read the fine print. Talk about pressure, now very costly decisions wouldn’t just affect my university but countless others.

Very much like Watkins, Patrick Lencioni, in his book *The Ideal Team Player* (2016), reminds us to keep in mind the importance of portraying yourself as a good committee member. This is part of establishing your first impression as an individual on a committee, which sets the tone on how your contribution will be received. Lencioni urges readers to utilize good social/emotional
intelligence, to be humble, and to be hungry. Of course, some may ask how can you be humble and hungry at the same time? The idea is not to be all knowing rather desiring to learn and contribute, despite your level of knowledge and experience. I believe taking this approach, at the team level, is critical when taking on a new committee role.

There are many other challenges to consider when being on a team. One challenge, the idea of integrating yourself within an already established group. Lencioni, in his book *The Five Dysfunctions of a Team* (2002), provides sage advice to anyone joining a new team. A person’s success will be determined in whole if not in part by focusing on many attributes like trust, commitment, and accountability. It’s important to be aware of the results the team seeks to achieve. It’s also important to always be professional, encourage teamwork and discussion, as these attributes will serve you well when confronted with difficult issues. Keeping these things in mind will help you get up to speed quicker.

Keep in mind, Rome wasn’t built in a day nor by one person. If you find yourself on one of these types of committees, you’re there for a reason. And if you try to be the best team player possible, then you’ll likely be more successful. That doesn’t mean be shy and say nothing, rather try to make positive contributions. Trust your team leadership, you are new, as they have probably been there a lot longer than you. This means slow down around curves by remembering it’s a collaborative effort. You will establish credibility by being smart in your decision-making. This includes appreciating other member’s knowledge and experience. Another important aspect, trust those behind the wheel by avoiding to backseat drive.

The key to success is remembering, on a consortium, you’re not just thinking of your institute. There’s a bigger picture, which is only achieved if everyone works together. It’s truly a time to be selfless and think about the greater good of everyone. In the end, it’s about the success of all not just a few, so put the brake on your ego. This is a time to accelerate with selflessness to gain traction at
slippery spots. This is also a time to establish clear expectations and identify important questions, which can be done by shifting down your eagerness to move to fast.

One thing is for sure, the relationships and knowledge established will be priceless, and they will become a part of all that you do in the future. There is great satisfaction taking on something new and feeling like you're helping so many, whether it's acquiring resources, collaborating with peers, participating in the bigger picture, for contributing to the success of others allows you to tell your institute's story. There are so many rewards representing your organization on state, regional, or national committees. Thank you for taking the time to look at this article, and good luck if such changes or transitions come your way.
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When Collection Development Roles Are Moved in New Directions

Developing a Collaborative Road Map to Thrive in Coordinating Collections

JAMES G. RHOADES AND ROB TENCH

Abstract

Two academic librarians, an Acquisitions Librarian and Subject/Liaison Librarian, share their perspectives of a new collection development coordination model implemented at their institute. They provide a snapshot of how collection development was done prior and after the new model. They share their perspectives to highlight objectives, challenges, and opportunities experienced over a two-year period. They believe different viewpoints of the new program will encourage a new appreciation for the benefits and complexities of collection coordination models.

Traditionally, a great deal of managing collection development is done on the technical services’ side of libraries. This typically includes administrative tasks such as coordinating print and digital collections, managing material budgets, and leading collection development committees. These types of responsibilities are highlighted in The Complete Guide to Acquisitions Management (Wilkinson, Lewis, & Lubas, 2015) when discussing the purpose and
organization of acquisitions. In such models, subject specialists and/or liaisons play a role but not necessarily in either collection coordination or budget management of the overall resources.

In 2019, the University Librarian at Old Dominion University, a mid-sized R1 university, in Norfolk, Virginia, decided it was time to move the Libraries’ collection development model in a new direction that would emphasize the shared knowledge and expertise of acquisitions and liaison services. It would focus on combining the coordination and budgetary functions of technical service areas, similar to processes mentioned in Gregory’s *Collection Development and Management for 21st Century Library Collections* (2011) when discussing the fiscal management of collections, more directly under the public service area. This undertaking would require a collegial spirit and inclusive determination from all to be successful. The University Librarian envisioned creating a new map to navigate the tricky terrain of collection development by adjusting who was behind the wheel of developing and coordinating collections. The shift required significant input and collaboration from all the liaison and technical services librarians.

Prior to the move, the coordination of collection development had been done by a full-time Collection Development Librarian with the support of liaisons and staff. The position was responsible for coordinating all aspects of the multimillion dollar print and digital collection with limited quasi-input from others. The position represented the Libraries on various state standing collection committees. The position led a group of internal Technical and Subject Librarians known as the Collection Development Team (CDT) that convened regularly to deliberate and contribute to collection decisions. See Table 1 for a comparison the models.

Table 1. Model personnel composition
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pre-model</th>
<th>Post-model</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Collection Development Librarian (Coordinator)</td>
<td>1. Collection Development Coordinator (Subject Liaison)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Six Subject Liaisons</td>
<td>2. Five Subject Liaisons</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Acquisition Services Librarian</td>
<td>3. Acquisition Services Librarian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Electronic Discovery Librarian</td>
<td>4. Scholarly Communications Librarian</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There was a one-year transition period between the old and new models. During this period, the Electronic Discovery Librarian served as the interim Collection Development Librarian, while performing duties in both roles. The coordination of resources continued in the traditional model throughout the interim period, which provided time for a learning curve, a workload shift, and scope adjustment. Like William Bridges describes in *Managing Transitions Making the Most of Change* (2009), the change was gradual to retain familiar processes while implementing new processes.

The implementation of the new model increased the responsibilities of Subject Liaisons, such as coordinating collections and material budgets with significant input and collaboration from Technical Service Librarians. The new team-based approach was a not a total departure from many processes of the past, but the gradual transition made the different components seem less drastic.

There was always a CDT, but now members would take a more prominent role to help with many of the collection development decisions and tasks. One difference, a Subject Liaison, on a two-year appointment, would serve as collection development coordinator, which entailed many responsibilities of the former Collection Development Librarian. Another difference, the new model required utilizing collaborative decision-making. This approach increased the workload of all and made success dependent on the shared knowledge, collaboration, and expertise of all team members.

Ultimately, the change encouraged people to reimagine roles and
existing processes, which happened over time when in the altering of the collection development program.

Admittedly during the transition, everyone perceived the new model in their own way, which will be demonstrated when considering the technical services or public services’ perspectives of the model. The following highlights the differing viewpoints by focusing first from the public services and then the technical services sides regarding objectives, challenges, and opportunities.

**Public Services Perspective**

The objective of the new model seemed to be, “do more with less,” and “do it better than before,” but with the expectation that the shift would be a new team-based approach. This approach would provide leadership opportunities for liaisons with clearer lines of communication regarding collection decisions among liaisons (as liaisons represent three-quarters of the CDT membership). In a sense, it placed liaisons in a steering position, but the view from behind the wheel is much different than from the backseat. Another objective was to have a liaison leading on a fixed two-year rotating appointment, but only as an additional duty. Such a setup would require a new perspective on collection coordination workflows and processes, for shifting the coordination role to a liaison might establish closer lines of communication and collaboration.

One of the biggest challenges was establishing cooperation with Technical Services, since there was a huge learning curve and knowledge gap. Like mentioned earlier, the view from the front seat was very different. This made it critical to achieve good collaboration with the Acquisitions Librarian. Another challenge, transitioning to a new coordinator every two years, would require training and relationship building. There was the challenge to quickly get up to speed on the nuances of the associated workflows and processes, the difficulty of understanding the vast complexity
of the material's budget, and learning how to juggle the management of the increased job responsibilities with limited reduction of primary duties. Not to forget, the coordinator was expected to get other liaisons and staff to accept the new model despite its meaning more work for them and others.

The new model provided leadership development for liaisons, since the process became more collaborative. The new system forced members to increase their collection and development knowledge base, for everyone had to be much more involved. The program has facilitated agility by creating more collaboration between the technical and public service sides, which created a more equitable approach with decision-making. Finally, it helped everyone realize how much work is involved in coordinating collection development.

Technical Services Perspective

For Technical Service staff members, the primary objective of the new model was to develop a simplified but clear collection development process that would allow all affected departments to obtain resources effectively and efficiently in a manner that maximized staff time and staff skills. Closely associated with that objective was the goal of creating a materials budget that accurately and transparently tracked material spending. A final objective for Technical Services was to educate staff not directly involved in collection development and resource fulfillment on the roles and responsibilities of the many people who select, order, catalog, pay, and process Libraries’ materials.

The primary challenges to achieving those objectives were compliance with University Finance and Procurement policies and procedures, adapting to turnover among liaisons and their changing roles, responding to challenges to the new model by other departments in University Libraries, and competing with those
departments for limited Libraries’ resources. Fairness, transparency, and balance when approving new purchases, reviewing existing subscriptions, and canceling resources were paramount for Technical Services staff.

The new model provided the opportunity to cross-train library staff, create viable succession plans, and build bridges between library departments, academic departments, and research/teaching faculty. Moreover, the new model set up a process whereby future workflows could be refined and improved more seamlessly. Other critical actions such as deselection and unbundling big journal packages were anticipated to be much less daunting under the new process. All in all, the new road map resulted in collection development being more collaborative, responsive, and transparent.

Conclusion

New models always include challenges and opportunities, which is part of the richness of working collaboratively with colleagues. The process allows you to discover the differing perspectives of colleagues, while adjusting one’s own perceptions. However, if you maintain a clear focus on your objectives, while seeking ways to find agreement with your colleagues, you’ll surely find more opportunities to help you thrive. Despite the direction your program is moving, finding ways to overcome challenges and unlock opportunities is what makes library collections and collection development such a worthy endeavor.
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Since 1993, the annual *Library Journal* Periodicals Price Survey has forecast the average increase in U.S. periodical subscription prices that will be charged to American libraries for the upcoming year. Originally started as a partnership between EBSCO Information Services and *Library Journal*, the survey grew out of a need for oversight of serials inflation rates. Lee Van Orsdel and Kathleen Born oversaw the annual survey through 2009, with Steve Bosch from the University of Arizona and Kittie Henderson from EBSCO taking over as coauthors beginning in 2010. In recent years, Barbara Albee from EBSCO and Sion Romaine from the University of Washington joined the survey. The Periodicals Price Survey is generally published in an April issue of *Library Journal*.

EBSCO plays an active role in the survey since they provide the pricing data. Historical pricing data provided by EBSCO is matched to large sets of periodical title lists from various indexes. The resulting data set, along with economic and industry trends, is then reviewed in order to generate the pricing predictions for the next renewal season. Methodology matters and is consistent year after year. The survey follows the guidelines of an ANSI/NISO standard, Z39.20, which gives the Criteria for Price Indexes for Print Library Materials. The standard describes how to prepare and compile price indexes to help measure the extent of price changes on a periodic basis for a variety of library materials.

Indexes are selected to show changes in pricing inflation by subject or discipline, as well represent title subscription lists typically held by different types of libraries (e.g., public and
academic). For example, titles from the Clarivate Analytics Indexes (i.e., Web of Science), when combined with EBSCO pricing data, provide insight for broad pricing changes in various academic disciplines. (Content from the five major publishers—Elsevier, Springer Nature, Wiley, Taylor & Francis, SAGE—continues to represent more than half (61%) of the titles in the merged Clarivate Analytics Indexes.)

Similarly, thousands of titles from the Clarivate Analytics Indexes, Elsevier’s Scopus, and EBSCO’s Academic Search Complete are combined with EBSCO pricing data to help us understand how a typical academic library might expect to be affected by serials inflation over the coming year. EBSCO’s MasterFile Complete is used to provide a typical title list for public libraries. Note that while titles in indexes do change from year to year, these changes are accounted for and are noted in the article. Predictably, while print pricing was preferred in the early years of the article, e-pricing has become predominant in the last ten years.

Ten tables in the survey provide readers with different sliced and diced views of the data. For example, Table 1 shows the cost history broken out by broad Library of Congress Subject Headings (LCSH). This table is based on the titles in the Scopus data set (which includes titles in general academic and public library collections) and includes foreign and domestic publishers. The 2020 average cost per title in one subject area is compared to that of the 2021 average cost per title to give the projected overall percentage increase for a particular discipline as well as overall. The overall inflation rate for 2021 was 3%–4%, the lowest in a decade.

Table 1. Titles indexed in Scopus—cost history by LCSH
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>Average no. of titles 2019–2021</th>
<th>Change 2019–2021</th>
<th>Average cost per title 2019</th>
<th>Average cost per title 2020</th>
<th>% of change 2020</th>
<th>Average cost per title 2021</th>
<th>% of change 2021</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Business and Economics</td>
<td>1,802</td>
<td>−13</td>
<td>$1,616</td>
<td>$1,701</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>$1,768</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fine Arts</td>
<td>372</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>472</td>
<td>506</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>528</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heath Sciences</td>
<td>4,522</td>
<td>−125</td>
<td>1,463</td>
<td>1,562</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1,627</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humanities</td>
<td>2,707</td>
<td>−25</td>
<td>450</td>
<td>473</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>492</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Law</td>
<td>386</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>651</td>
<td>687</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>719</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Life Sciences</td>
<td>2,483</td>
<td>−50</td>
<td>2,206</td>
<td>2,314</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2,375</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Sciences</td>
<td>3,101</td>
<td>−37</td>
<td>972</td>
<td>1,034</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1,075</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STEM</td>
<td>5,968</td>
<td>−85</td>
<td>2,269</td>
<td>2,407</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2,479</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total/average</td>
<td>21,341</td>
<td>−325</td>
<td>1,556</td>
<td>1,648</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1,704</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


For comparison purposes, the rate of price increase is also analyzed for more than 7,100 e-journal packages handled by EBSCO. Packages are a large part of periodical expenditures for many institutions so the rate of price increase for these collections is important data. For 2020, the average rate of increase was 4.3%. For 2021, the inflation rate for 2021 e-packages was 2.12%, reflecting the fact that many publishers held or minimized price increases, due to the pandemic.

One of the goals of the article is to facilitate understanding of how and why libraries are changing and how to better position the library to meet the needs and expectations of their institution and library users. In addition to crunching numbers, the article discusses issues, shifts and developments in the economy and higher education that are affecting library budgets. While for the past twenty years, the terrible twins of budget cuts and pricing...
inflation have been a constant, there is usually one theme or issue that predominates or rises to the surface each year. In recent years, open access and its effect on the scholarly communications ecosystem has become another constant. The Periodicals Price Survey, then, is one tool that collection managers and acquisitions librarians can use to help predict the budget and discover trends. Many libraries use the article to check inflation rates, assist with budget projections and collection development, justify a request for increasing funding, or determine the value of the collection for insurance purposes.

For related reading, the American Library Association's Library Price Materials Index Editorial Board annually publishes the U.S. Periodical Price Index (USPPI). The USPPI is designed specifically to measure price changes in serials distributed in the United States and can also be a helpful tool for planning purposes.
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Introduction

This article summarizes the content from the poster session “Managing Expectations by Managing the Message” presented by Laura Sill, Director, Metadata Services, the University of Notre Dame at the 2021 Charleston Conference. The conference online platform included access to the poster, a short accompanying video and slide presentation, and several use case files for download. The premise for sharing the visual communication model through the poster is that clear and concise messaging is especially critical when seeking administrative support during a time of change. The method assumes that administrators do not have time for lengthy explanations. They require efficiently organized and delivered information upon which to make decisions or provide support. Locally, the Notre Dame model introduced The Top 10 in this poster. Beyond use for administrative support, the model is a tool for communicating with technical services staff and key stakeholders. Due to the success of the first application of the visual model, Notre Dame technical services adapted the model a number of times since, including during the Libraries’ remote work, partial on-site, and fully on-site phases of pandemic staff and service management. “Managing Expectations by Managing the Message” Poster
The poster (Figure 1) has two main sections. The left panel introduces the Problem Statement and defines the Top 10 Services Model. The right panel includes a listing of key design elements for the model, instructions for creating this visual representation, and an explanation of how to read and interpret the information being conveyed through the model.

To create the Top 10 model itself, the poster suggests the use of Microsoft PowerPoint SmartArt Illustration “Group List” template. The root level of text entered in this template outline creates the listing of priorities that run along the top of the Top 10 presentation. Notre Dame listed service priorities as determined by technical services leadership in order from one to ten, with one being the highest priority item. In the case of its first use, the lower numbered columns, or highest priorities, represented technical services that directly impacted patrons, such as reserves ordering or ILL borrowing requests from faculty and students, aligning priorities with organizational values. The visual included all key work areas of technical services program with projects and some collection management work taking a lower priority on the chart.

The poster points out that under the list of high-level priorities
is a star and dotted line to remind the reader to read the priorities left to right. In each priority column, subtasks or services for the priority area define the higher-level priority area. Other design elements highlights add emphasis. For example, bolded columns were a critical part of the original use case and helped to make a key point to the library administration in addition to sharing the overall general priorities plan. Specifically, these bolded priorities, one, two, and five, illustrated where significant change was anticipated.

The Use Case that Gave Rise to the Top 10

With no real forewarning, in late 2018, the Hesburgh Libraries of Notre Dame learned about a University-wide staff retirement incentive program. Given the conditions of the program, it was predicted (and later it bore out) that a large number of technical services staff would participate in this opportunity. Staff were required to make retirement commitments by April 1, 2019 with a phased departure the following three summer months of June, July, and August. What this meant was that the true impact of the retirement program would not be known until April 1. From April 1 until the first wave of departures, services were adjusted, institutional knowledge of many long-term staff was transferred, training was completed to ensure as close to seamless a patron experience as possible.

As luck would have it, the Libraries participated in iterative organizational planning and a March 2019 meeting provided an opportunity to introduce the potential impact and plan for addressing anticipated losses and service support. The RAD (Resource Acquisitions and Discovery) Program seized this chance to pitch what was the first use of the Top 10 model to the library administration. The program required support for service adjustments and assistance with communication that only the
administration could provide. The Top 10 visual introduced the ideas around the transitional project for the planning period. The RAD Program Director had three minutes in which to present the need and seek support. While the program direct wrote careful notes to accompany the visual, it was the distribution of the one-page presentation of the Top 10 Services Priorities that allowed for the presentation of a complex situation in simple, clear terms. At the end of the three minutes, the managed message set expectations. The administration suggested a slight priority order adjustment, easily made using this visual approach, and supported the plan of action that would start on April 1 and run through the end of summer 2019.

Other Use Cases

Since its initial use case related to the 2019 retirements, the Top 10 model has been used to manage pandemic staff priorities. During each use, the focus and message changed. For example, shifting from patron services, the Remote Work Top 10 presentation, used by the newly formed Metadata Services Program, focused on adjusting to reorganization and new unit definition (the Libraries announced a reorganization as the COVID pandemic hit). Next came patron services that aligned with COVID protocols, then cataloging cleanup projects, and finally library-wide initiatives. Later that spring, a new version of the Top 10 showed that some staff had returned on site. Highlights show the main differences from the March 2020 period were newly added priorities included more processing of physical materials, including the creation of surrogates to assist those still working in a fully remote setting. Finally, in August 2021, a Q1–Q4 Top 10 visual reflected the many changes that were underway as staff returned to on-site work and adjusted to additional faculty retirements that came about toward the end of the pandemic. A
key addition with this version of the priorities is the addition of a column for “stop doing,” “on hold,” “as time allows” task articulation.

**Conclusion**

With each iteration of the Top 10 service priorities visual, the technical services staff at the Hesburgh Libraries have communicated the focus of staff resources. The tool was very successful in its initial presentation in securing administrative support. Subsequent uses have been effective at helping other key library stakeholders of technical services understand the collection processing and service priorities, creating a communication point of reference for negotiating changes in light of finite staff capacity created in large part by the retirement program of 2019. If a stakeholder felt strongly that their priority was not in a high enough position, the visual presentation invited a conversation about shuffling priorities or removing a priority area to make room for one found to be more important.

The Top 10 visual model has empowered technical services leaders. It has allowed for less reactionary management of valuable staff resources and more collective negotiation and ownership of priorities and resource allocation. It makes the extent of work transparent and shows challenges that technical services leaders face to meet organizational goals. Managing expectations through this visual model invites dialogue and results in shared agreement and understanding. Sharing the model as a poster at the 2021 Charleston Conference was a rewarding and informative experience for explaining how others might make use of this successful management innovation during times of change.
Electronic Resources for Alumni

A Case Study at Auburn University

GEORGE STACHOKAS AND REBEKAH LAHUE

About Auburn University

Auburn University is a land-grant, sea-grant, and space-grant institution located in Lee County in East Central Alabama, approximately 109 miles southeast of Atlanta, Georgia. Having acquired an R1 Carnegie Classification in late 2018, Auburn University continues to grow with a full-time equivalent enrollment of 28,249 in Fall 2021, a 2.1% increase from 2020, as well as a 9.3% increase in graduate full-time equivalent enrollment (Auburn University, 2021). A total of 40,000 freshman applications for Fall 2022 constitute an institutional record, a 68.5% increase versus Fall 2021 and a 155% increase from Fall 2020 (Sparks, 2021). Sustained growth in research continues as well with the Samuel Ginn College of Engineering bringing in $74 million in awards in the fiscal year 2020 alone (Anthony, 2020). Research funding for the College of Sciences and Mathematics increased from about $12 million in 2016 to around $18.2 million in 2020 as well (Gebhardt, 2021).

Charge: Provide Electronic Resources for Auburn University Alumni

The Dean of Libraries charged the collections strategist and
acquisitions librarian in late 2020 to develop a plan for providing online access to electronic resources for alumni. Some of the most important goals could be summarized as: (1) invest in postgraduate student success by providing helpful information resources, (2) enhance the visibility of the Libraries to alumni, and (3) recruit potential donors in collaboration with the Development Office and Auburn Alumni Association.

Our Approach as Informed by Research

Working first in consultation with the Head of Technical Services, the collections strategist devised a plan to revisit research previously undertaken for an article published about alumni access in 2016 (Stachokas, 2016). During this previous effort, the collections strategist reviewed 115 library websites, including all academic member institutions of the Association of Research Libraries (ARL) and Stanford University, to determine the number and type of paid electronic resources made available to alumni (Stachokas, 2016). Around the time of this same effort, the Libraries collaborated with the Auburn Alumni Association to offer five Adam Matthew Collections of primary source materials on the general topic of diversity to alumni. Launched in 2016 using a website provided by the Alumni Association, this initial program lapsed within a few years.

In this second effort, the Collections Strategist and the Acquisitions Specialist will thoroughly review all ARL academic library websites for the number and type of resources offered, but with a new focus toward collecting additional information, including web pages and LibGuides provided for alumni use, as well as any publicly available information regarding technology, research, and other support provided to this patron group by these institutions. To gather this more comprehensive set of information, the collections strategist collaborated with the acquisitions specialist
in Technical Services to divide the work of storing multiple screenshots, descriptive text, and other information in Box through the study of all 118 websites between November 18, 2020, and April 2, 2021.

Our general findings as reported at the Charleston Conference in 2021 include the following. A total of 109 of the 118 libraries provided a web page or LibGuide listing library services for alumni. Sixty libraries provided web pages or LibGuides that included links to electronic resources. Forty-eight libraries provided links to paid electronic resources, amounting to roughly 41% of libraries in the sample. Regarding the level of service provided, 39 libraries addressed alumni on their homepages via direct links or obvious references. Thirty-five libraries provided research support for alumni. Thirty-two libraries provided tech support information. Only 20 libraries provided unique links or separate web pages for library donation information specifically targeted or marketed to alumni.

Interestingly, we found that Canadian and private research libraries seem to offer more electronic resources for alumni than public universities in the United States. Canadian research libraries far outstrip U.S. research librarians overall in what they offer to alumni (Table 1).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Library Type</th>
<th>Number of Libraries</th>
<th>Number of Electronic Resources</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>141</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>141</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canadian Public</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>141</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US Public</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 1. Electronic Resources for Alumni by Library Type

We also discovered that the prominence of specific vendors or content providers had changed dramatically since the previous study published in 2016. Formerly, EBSCO and ProQuest accounted for most of the electronic resources offered to alumni, but Adam Matthew Collections constitute the single largest electronic resource made available. However, the overall number of electronic resources offered by ARL academic libraries and Stanford University, as based on publicly available information, has grown from only 190 in 2015/2016 to 1,014 in 2020/2021 (Table 2).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Vendor/Content Provider</th>
<th>2015/2016 Study</th>
<th>2020/2021 Study</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adam Matthew</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>319</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alexander Street Press</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Muse</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EBSCO</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sage</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ProQuest</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JSTOR</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2. Electronic Resources by Vendor/Content Provider

For Auburn University Libraries, we currently plan to provide online access only to electronic resources that are already available to alumni as per the terms of our license agreements. This will include 48 titles in our Annual Reviews, a Sciences package, all 77 Adam Mathew Collections currently shared by the ASERL library consortium, three CQ Press databases, 370 online journals in our Project Muse Standard Collection, 1,115 online journals in Sage Premier, Sage Research Methods including Sage Research Methods.
Video, and Sage Business Cases. We also plan to highlight or provide links to select freely available electronic resources for alumni such as the Directory of Open-Access Journals and PubMed.

We also plan to expand our ongoing research and assessment beyond our review of publicly available information. We plan to distribute a Qualtrics survey to the same 118 academic libraries in our sample to learn about different approaches in providing alumni services. This survey will indicate usage by alumni if known, how services for alumni are paid for and organized, the amount of work required by library personnel to provide information services to alumni, how these institutions assess their alumni services, their overall strategy for these services, and if any changes are planned or under consideration. Within Auburn University, we have reviewed our existing license agreements to determine the full scope of alumni access privileges, made plans to meet technical requirements for authentication and delivery of content, and coordinated our activities with the Auburn Alumni Association. Cooperation between the Libraries and the Alumni Association has been organized at a high level, with the Dean of AU Libraries attending the first project meeting on April 14, 2021. Providing library services to alumni has been a strategic goal of the Auburn Alumni Association for many years, and more recently a goal of the Libraries, so it is not surprising that overall communication and coordination has been excellent, not only between librarians and administrative staff but also IT personnel from these respective units.

To implement this effort, the collections strategist established a project team in the Libraries during April 2021. Members of this group include the acquisitions specialist, head of Technical Services, the Development officer for the Libraries, head of Systems, software developer, both IT specialists in Technical Services, the electronic resources and discovery librarian, and the head of Circulation, as well as four subject-specialist volunteers, which include the biology, forestry and wildlife sciences, and math librarian, the philosophy, religious studies, and women’s studies librarian, our English and
psychology librarian, and the communication and journalism librarian. The acquisitions specialist has collaborated closely with all four subject-specialist librarians, as well as the collections strategist and head of Technical Services in the creation of the AU Alumni Services LibGuide. We especially appreciate the efforts of our communication and journalism librarian colleague who also serves as the local administrator for LibGuides. While applying the same overall format of other subject guides for this LibGuide, we have also made extensive use of additional imagery and information provided by our Special Collections and Archives Department in the Libraries and the Libraries’ Marketing and Public Relations specialist.

As we work to complete the project with an anticipated launch in February 2022, we continue to inform the Dean of AU Libraries on progress, as well as coordinate closely with the Auburn Alumni Association, Marketing and Public Relations, our Web Advisory Group, the Collection Development Group, the Leadership Group, and our Office of Information Technology. Tasks ranging from confirming the existence of a separate user group for alumni within EZproxy authentication, editing the LibGuide, updating other web pages, and developing a publicity campaign continue. We anticipate using email, online newsletters, and publications of the Auburn Alumni Association to communicate directly with alumni while ensuring that all links and text on the respective websites of the Libraries and the Alumni Association are current and direct alumni users to the appropriate research information. Depending on overall usage by alumni, the availability of funding, and feedback received, the Libraries could expand this program in the future. We see electronic resources for alumni as providing not only a real benefit to the estimated 43,000 dues-paying members of the Auburn Alumni Association but also as a way to strengthen connections between Auburn University graduates and the Libraries. This effort may help to expand awareness among alumni of the ongoing work of the Libraries to support research and teaching at a growing university.
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Abstract

The Digital Object Identifier information that is carried within journal subscription article use data, and passed to borrowing services during Interlibrary Loan (ILL) transactions, includes the publication year for each article pull. This date-specific data, which is often not sent or used as part of the annual ILL and journal subscription review process, contains valuable information that provides opportunities for more sophisticated evidence-based journal subscription and alternative document delivery access method decisions. By carefully evaluating actual date-based use patterns, libraries may be able to, in some cases, migrate from journal packages and subscriptions to more flexible document delivery options that can provide equal satisfaction, reduced costs, and methods for customizing and projecting annual costs for these new patron-driven document delivery options.

Traditional Assessment of Journal Subscriptions and Alternatives

The Packages

The most common aspect of journal use or ILL review is assessment performed at the journal title or package level. Annual reviews frequently involve some form of cost-per-use evaluation. In many cases, basic cost-per-use analysis has determined which packages are worth renewing based upon gross calculations of value per dollar spent across an entire package. This rough assessment was adequate when there were few seamless alternative article-level delivery options, and when dollars were fairly stable. Only escalating inflation rates made librarians seriously question the efficacy of the standard cost-per-use assessment method. This type of package
prioritization and protection meant that smaller publishers and individual journals were more likely to be targeted, as such cuts were easier to assess, and replace with less negative impact through traditional ILL options.

However, as library budgets became tighter, and inflation rates continued to rise on large package plans (even if at lower rates than previously seen), Big Deal packages were increasingly being more carefully evaluated—because give-back dollars are required regardless of overall quality or relative cost-per-use figures. Depending upon package plan costs models and the number of lesser-used titles in a package, libraries have been able to replace some package plans with a combination of individual subscriptions and traditional reciprocal ILL document delivery. This new split delivery approach providing some immediate and some delayed access is viable when embedded delivery delays (and hidden staff and operating costs) are acceptable for at least some disciplines, or such changes are necessary since they can provide a level of acceptable service with reduced subscription commitments.

It is now possible to break big journal packages more easily and more widely due to seamless and immediate document delivery tools that can provide acceptable on-demand article delivery speeds and simultaneously reduce overall journal subscription commitments. However, this just-in-time hybrid approach must be carefully reviewed, as certain commercial document delivery options might expose libraries to unpredictable annual article delivery costs. In addition, traditional reciprocal document delivery layers can still be implemented as a substitute for journal subscriptions in certain disciplines when embedded delays are acceptable compared to fee-based delivery options.

When packages are being reviewed, or individually purchased titles are under review, it is possible to incorporate more granular title-level journal use analysis to determine the best suite of solutions.
Title-Level Analysis

Title-level analysis has traditionally been heavily based upon the Commission on New Technological Uses of Copyrighted Works (CONTU) document delivery fee guidelines. The projected annual title-level CONTU ILL costs are compared to subscription fees to determine when it is more advantageous to purchase a subscription rather than rely on alternative delivery options. This means that such renewal decisions are still traditional cost-per-use assessments at the journal title level.

The disconnect is that the cost for an annual subscription may be unfairly equated with previously published materials and archival article use that is not even covered by the subscription, or that is duplicated in other aggregator packages. A better assessment would be made if selectors could accurately compare use data to the publication years—and align these user needs with the corresponding platforms that actually contain these specific materials. Such analyses may determine that the majority of requested articles in a particular title are actually for back years, and these materials are located within less expensive aggregator alternatives to the current issue subscription option. In that instance, an existing embargo period is not really a major impediment to aligning delivery options with typical user needs.

The validity of CONTU guidelines has recently been called into question, primarily based upon the assumptions about equivalency of document delivery fees for ten uses per title compared to escalating subscription prices over the past few decades. Regardless of the underlying decision on when copyright fees should be imposed, a new granular level of use assessment for journal subscription use and ILL requests is required now that there are many new options for seamless and immediate delivery of particular articles. In this new scenario, the publication year information that can be easily captured is just one of many factors that should be considered when weighing appropriate solutions.

Now that immediate and seamless article delivery can be
disaggregated from journal tile subscriptions, viable alternatives to subscriptions might include reciprocal ILL, commercial ILL, modified publisher packages, selective publisher archive packages, aggregator content, and perhaps even the integration of other extra-library discovery and delivery methods (i.e., Unpaywall Open Access, scholarly network article sharing, etc.).

Article-Level Option: Aggregators

Seamless document delivery services now exist which provide equally immediate and satisfactory results for users at the article level without individual journal or package plan subscriptions. Alternative non-publisher-based content at the article level may be provided by aggregators that provide prepackaged materials across publishers within subject tools designed for a particular discipline (e.g., EBSCO's Education Research Complete), or for a particular population (e.g., an interdisciplinary undergraduate core journal collection such as EBSCO's Academic Search Complete). These services typically provide a fixed annual cost that can be easily budgeted, and annual title-level use data that can be assessed for efficiencies and effectiveness. Whether these article delivery tools are regularly reviewed at the title level is doubtful, as such evaluations are time intensive and alternative solutions are rather complex and fluid. However, if such assessments are performed, publication year title use data would be helpful in understanding patterns of use and priorities if alternative options must be considered for financial purposes. More on this later.

Article-Level Option: Resolver-based Traditional Document Delivery Services

A second article-level delivery option provides access to disaggregated articles using traditional reciprocal or fee-based ILL
networks. These services can designate partners’ options, thereby somewhat controlling costs by using reciprocal partners whenever possible. Decisions about free or fee-based solutions can be based upon user populations, selected disciplines, titles, years of coverage, and other parameters. While these services can be seamlessly integrated into resolvers to provide seamless requests, the article delivery will incur delays when compared to journal subscriptions. This approach may be adequate for many titles and can save significant dollars without creating significant negative impacts if planned correctly. Once again, if assessments are performed, publication year title use data would be helpful in understanding patterns of use and priorities when such alternative options must be considered for financial purposes.

Article-Level Option: Resolver-based Commercial Document Delivery Services

A very powerful alternative article-level delivery option provides immediate access to disaggregated articles on a fee-based ad-hoc basis by vendors such as the Copyright Clearance Center (CCC) or Reprints Desk. These services can be seamlessly integrated into resolvers to provide immediate article delivery that appears the same as underlying journal subscriptions. Vendors can customize options, and thereby somewhat control costs, based upon user populations, selected disciplines, titles, years of coverage, and other parameters.

The question for libraries considering such user-driven article-level delivery options is: How to develop predicable cost models for such random requests? A variety of options have been proposed, and some are being tested, that include annual tokens for use across a number of titles within a publisher, annually reviewed limits and caps by publishers on requests by the title or across titles, and commercially developed document delivery services that provide real-time monitoring—with possible mid-year revisions. These
agent-developed plans might include annual costs caps across publishers and titles, and the use of traditional reciprocal ILL supplemented by copyright fees when appropriate to reduce costs.

These vendors offer complex but powerful options when addressing the large sums of savings that can be released by breaking expensive package plans that contain many lesser-used journal titles. Within these services, the ability to redirect article requests to commercial options or reciprocal ILL networks based upon years of publication is another way to control costs. The ability to monitor actual publication year previous use at the title level would allow for implementation rules with more predictable costs.

**Alternatives to Journal Subscriptions: Choosing Wisely Based Upon Years of Use**

One key consideration for making decisions on the most effective and efficient access to particular titles among these options is understanding which years are being used and are potentially most desired. The understanding of such needs and priorities can lead to the selection of a suite of platforms and services at the discipline or population level that provide varying service expectation options and tailored satisfaction levels.

Let's take a look at how analyzing year-based journal title use data can provide important information that can lead to actionable knowledge.

**Years of Use: Important Data for Considering Your Options**

Depending upon patterns of journal usage, particularly involving the publication year at the title level, various article-level access options may offer the most cost-effective solutions that provide adequate satisfaction levels for your stakeholders. This analysis may discover
solutions at both the individual journal title level or across journals at either the discipline or the user population levels.

A suite of complementary delivery solutions may be designed that appropriately addresses the specific use patterns that are observed. Some of the key elements to be reviewed in making such decisions are (1) the time periods of the materials used, (2) the frequency of the use of these date-based materials, (3) the predictability of the requested domains, and (4) the acceptable delays for users.

Are most of the articles from a particular journal used written within the last year, within the last five years, within the past decade, or are they primarily archival in nature? Answers to these questions can help determine if you need a current subscription, if embargo access is adequate and necessary, if archival subscriptions are desirable, or if point-of-need access to random articles offers acceptable access at reasonable and predictable costs.

Are there use patterns across certain subjects, or across certain user populations, that easily fall into common behavior clusters that point to obvious delivery solutions? A matrix of delivery options, with associated delivery times and cost levels, can make the matching of discovered user needs easier to align with the set of possible service offerings and expectations.

Current Year Access

If your researchers have a frequent need for immediate access to current materials, then a current subscription to an individual journal may be important. This is especially true if the title has an embargo period—which can range from six months to five years. But remember that in many cases the current year may be found within aggregator packages, so you may not need an individual subscription. Be sure to understand the lag time involved in loading titles into such aggregators, as it may take a few months in some cases.

If the current year material is important, but the requests are
infrequent, perhaps a fee-based document delivery service may be an acceptable alternative.

If the current year material is important, but a slight delay may be acceptable, you might consider a traditional reciprocal ILL network as an adequate alternative for current year materials.

Previous Years

If your researchers have an infrequent need for immediate access to current materials, then perhaps a current subscription to an individual journal may be less important, and you could provide adequate access via either an aggregator package, a fee-based document delivery service, and/or traditional reciprocal ILL networks. If selecting an aggregator—remember that the content may be impacted by embargo periods and in some cases limited ranges of back years. In addition, it is not uncommon for publishers to change or remove years of materials from within aggregators; you will need to monitor the coverage of your frequently relied upon titles. This disaggregated access approach can be far less expensive for material with this pattern of use.

Of course, if many titles from a particular publisher exhibit heavy patterns of backfile use, a package plan may be the most cost-effective option if you can dedicate the required amount of funding on an annual basis. You will need to calculate expected annual inflation into this calculation. The advantage of a package plan is that it offers a predictable cost, stable content, and unlimited use versus some of the unknowns of many popular document delivery and/or fee-based services—even if the seamless and immediate delivery is equal under these other models. We will come back to the ramifications and possible cost projection considerations later in the article.
Archival Use/Years

If your researchers have an infrequent need for immediate access to current materials, and the majority of their use of a particular title is from older years, you might be able to provide adequate access via either an aggregator package, an archival publisher package, a fee-based document delivery service, and/or traditional reciprocal ILL networks.

These alternatives are often far less expensive than individual subscriptions, and a large number of these types of titles in a single publishing house can make the value of a package plan less than might it initially seem from a simple cost-per-use analysis. You can reevaluate the actual cost-per-use value of a package plan by giving lower weighting to the value of access to these lesser-used titles. Publication year use can and should be an important variable when deciding on maintaining or breaking a package plan under these conditions.

Cost Analysis of Various Options

So, let's say that a year-based use data analysis of certain journal articles shows patterns in which a number of alternative access options might be worth considering. Perhaps you can reallocate dollars to other services, find required dollar give-backs, or even improve seamless immediacy by switching some titles to more effective alternative article delivery models. In the worst case, at least you can demonstrate a greater knowledge of user behaviors and possibly reduce the negative impact of future collection allocation and alternative access decisions.

At the end of this analysis you have aligned your local use data with a matrix of possible document delivery methods across the continuum from full subscriptions with unlimited immediate access to systems that provide varying cost models and service...
expectations that strategically address random and unpredictable delivery scenarios. It is the ILL manager's job to find the best balance across these options that provides a customized balance of tools based upon actual use data and available resources. This final suite of tools may be surprisingly different from current services, especially across certain assumed to be strong or less research-intensive disciplines. Major modifications might be possible by substituting new disaggregated article-level delivery options when appropriate.

(Perhaps this might be the appropriate place to mention that one can also modify the costs somewhat by influencing the numbers and types of ILL requests based upon the default databases and options presented to specific populations. We made such modifications and were initially surprised by the counterintuitive results. After we were required to absorb a significant budget reduction, we cancelled a few in-depth journal indexes. Upon reviewing impacts with a focus group of users, and studying the use data six months later, we determined that our ILL requests went down but our user satisfaction went up. For beginning researchers, presenting only what was immediately available provided them with more reasonable options and also reduced our costs and efforts. Presenting a first screen that only contains immediate full-text articles has apparently not negatively impacted user satisfaction for this population. This limiting approach will obviously not satisfy advanced researchers, but it is a way to significantly reduce some unnecessary ILL costs. For advanced users, we instruct them that there is still the option to expand the results to show items that must be requested. Obviously, tailoring initial results is always a delicate decision, and not always a desirable option, but it can provide a partial solution when addressing resource allocation priorities. Using publication date information as a way to modify this selectivity is another reason to utilize this publication date information.)

One other consideration that bears scrutiny is the fact that traditional reciprocal document delivery via OCLC or other
networks has hidden costs (beyond delays). One must consider the costs of staff, equipment, training, annual analysis, and CCC copyright costs when calculating real costs. Traditional ILL also includes some level of unpredictable fees that must be honestly weighed against other more upfront fee-based costs. These unpredictable traditional ILL costs must be evaluated against competing up-front commercial token approaches, somewhat predictable per-article document delivery fees, or other annual cap and/or monitor-and-cut-off cost regulation options.

Three Examples

Expensive Journal in a Small College (e.g., Science)

The common expectation concerning high prestige journal titles is that all libraries should have current issues of these high-impact journals. But the realistic local question is: Do current issues of a particular journal receive much use—or are most articles from this title only used after a gestation period? If your local use studies show a delay in heavy use, perhaps accepting document delivery during the embargo period does not generate extremely negative consequences. These high-impact, and often very expensive, titles tend to be covered in aggregators after an embargo period, so that access solution may be enough if this approach is supplemented with occasional Pay Per View (PPV) commercial document delivery (or even reciprocal access if a short delay is acceptable). In this case, publication date use-based analysis may result in significant savings for many less research-intensive institutions.
Society Package in a Small College (e.g., ACS package vs. Individual Titles)

Studying use behavior across very specific society journal packages may reveal that only a few titles are heavily used during the first year, and some titles are rarely used over all publication years. On a cost-per-use basis alone, these packages may be worth reconsidering now that there are seamless and immediate disaggregated article delivery options. This would free up resources that have previously required constant subscriptions (with built-in inflation costs) for lightly used journal titles. Date-based use analysis may show that many titles within a package are used only in much later years, so perhaps moving away from expensive current packages toward only less expensive archive packages might be a more efficient approach. Or in some cases, switching to individual current subscriptions (plus perhaps archive subscriptions) for a few key journals may be a better option that offers savings and unlimited access to heavily used journals when appropriate. And remember that aggregators may cover some of these journal titles, even if they have embargo periods which could be adequately addressed through occasional PPV commercial or reciprocal document delivery for recent issues.

Big Deal in a School with only a Few Major Research Areas (Flexibility vs. Just-in-Case)

Assessment of big publisher deals as described for the society publisher above would also uncover particular titles use and identify patterns for years of use for particular titles. Once again, on a cost-per-use basis alone, these packages may be worth reconsidering now that there are seamless and immediate disaggregated article delivery options. As mentioned earlier, in some cases, switching to individual current subscriptions (plus perhaps complementary archive subscriptions) for a few key journals may be an option that
offers savings and unlimited access to heavily used journals when appropriate. At the same time, a library could also provide immediate document delivery options for occasional low-use materials through other means. In summary, making decisions about breaking a big package based upon publication date use could free up significant resources that historically supported large numbers of subscriptions (with built-in inflation costs) containing a large number of lightly used journal titles. Publication date use-based decisions could lead to tailored subscriptions and supporting services providing satisfactory and less expensive access to materials that address the actual use of particular journal titles in relation to frequency and currency concerns.

In each of these scenarios it is obvious that publication date-based use assessments provide opportunities to modify journal platforms and services, to save dollars, and still offer satisfactory article delivery to users. To make such wise decisions, the need is then to strategically obtain such publication year use data about both journal subscription use and ILL request transactions.

**Next Steps**

As responsible fiduciary stewards, we should consider these new delivery technologies and review a variety of granular local use data reports in order to make informed evidence-based decisions. We should request and evaluate both date-based ILL user behavior data and date-based journal title user behavior data in order to design the most efficient and effective services for our local populations. This means reaching out to publishers, aggregator platforms, ILL platforms, and commercial document delivery agents to obtain spreadsheets containing this granular publication year information for transactions.

In addition to simply using the new data that we obtain for making immediate collection decisions, we should also influence the
development and sharing of enhanced use reports and costs models that would allow us to more easily recognize and use this publication year use data to make wise choices. Of course, there will be push-back, as such detailed use analysis is in direct conflict with publisher and aggregator desires to keep decisions at the large scale, thereby reducing the interest and ability to customize selections based upon more granular knowledge of actual usage. Vendors recognize that these types of analyses would allow us to reconsider the value of various subscriptions and packages in relation to new seamless and immediate disaggregated document delivery options. The need to develop a range of costs models for levels of customized document delivery services will be a key step in promoting and adopting such a suite of solutions across the library landscape.

In summary, by evaluating actual publication date-based use patterns, libraries may be able to, in some cases, migrate from journal packages and subscriptions to more flexible document delivery options that can provide equal satisfaction, reduced costs, and methods for customizing and projecting annual costs for these new patron-driven document delivery options.
Moving Toward Reconciliation

Considerations in Creating and Re-Evaluating an Indigenous Resources Collections Policy

SANDY STIFT AND ROXY M. GARSTAD

Land Acknowledgment

We acknowledge that the land on which we gather in Treaty Six Territory is the traditional gathering place for many Indigenous people. We honour and respect the history, languages, ceremonies and culture of the First Nations, Métis, and Inuit who call this territory home.

The Land Acknowledgement, written in Cree and English, is placed at the center of the circular poster design. Such a formal acknowledgement is typically given at the beginning of a meeting or conference presentation, or placed at the start of a published work, as in this poster narrative. According to the Canadian Association of University Teachers, the Land Acknowledgment is a demonstration of recognition and respect for Indigenous peoples living in what is commonly known as Canada and is an important aspect of showing “healthy, reciprocal relations” (CAUT). Typically, each institution develops its own official Land Acknowledgement in English and in the language(s) of the Indigenous peoples of the land on which
the institution is built. MacEwan University developed a statement in English and Cree and created both shorter and longer forms. Collections librarians agreed that incorporating a Land Acknowledgement statement in the Indigenous Resources Collections Policy was essential. It marked the first time such a statement appeared in a library policy document. As we had no experience with incorporating Land Acknowledgement statements into policy documents, the placement of the acknowledgement quickly becoming a crucial point of discussion. However, it soon became obvious that its proper and rightful placement was at the beginning of the policy. The next decision to be made was whether to incorporate the short or long statement. The short statement is captured above, and the longer statement adds this additional content:

The First People’s connection to the land teaches us about our inherent responsibility to protect and respect Mother Earth. With this acknowledgement, we honour the ancestors and children who have been buried here, missing and murdered Indigenous women and men, and the process of ongoing collective healing for all human beings. We are reminded that we are all treaty people and of the responsibility we have to one another.

For considerations of space and precision of writing, it was decided that the shorter version would be utilized. It also seemed more impactful. Note that the Cree syllabics precede the English version of the statement.
Purpose

Having agreed on the central importance of the Land Acknowledgement statement, an examination of our motivation, goals, and purpose was essential. Why even consider writing a separate policy? First, a unique and separate policy would bring to the forefront our commitment on this matter. It would highlight and remind us of the importance of collecting and curating materials by, for, and about Indigenous peoples in Canada. It was also one of the first MacEwan Library responses to a pivotal document produced by the Canadian Federation of Library Associations (CFLA) in 2017, the *Truth and Reconciliation Report and Recommendations*. It contains a series of actions Canadian libraries can take to support Indigenous communities and library users. The report contains ten recommendations which were considered in crafting an early version of the Indigenous Resources Collections Policy. In particular:

**Recommendation Four:** Ensure accessibility moving forward by continually reminding stakeholders that material produced and programming planned in the future should be accessible to all Canadians. CELA (the Center for Equitable Library Access) and NNELS (the National Network for Equitable Library Service) are positioned to support these efforts.

**Recommendation Five:** Decolonize Access and Classification by addressing the structural biases in existing schemes of knowledge organization and information retrieval arising from colonialism by committing to integrating Indigenous epistemologies into cataloguing praxis and knowledge management.

**Recommendation Six:** Decolonize Libraries and Space by recognizing and supporting Indigenous cultures, languages, and knowledges through culturally appropriate space planning, interior design, signage, art installations, territorial acknowledgements of geographic-specific traditional territories and public programming in collaboration with local Indigenous stakeholders.
It was quickly determined that recommendation four was out of scope for the policy since it addressed accessibility issues. The fifth recommendation was given strong consideration, although work on the classification aspect was being conducted at a consortial, not institutional level. We interpreted the “access” component to also include access to works by, for, and about the Indigenous peoples living in Canada, which the library was committed to improving upon and which formed a basis for policy writing. Recommendation six was considered to be a Library-wide initiative that could take place in the future, not a collections-specific project. While the policy has the potential to include considerations of collections space, the original document focused solely on content.

The CFLA’s Truth and Reconciliation response was the primary supporting document for the policy, but library policy also needed to align with a university mandate around reconciliation and decolonization. MacEwan University’s establishment of a center for Indigenous knowledge keeping and healing, kihêw waciston, and articulation of the Land Acknowledgement statement were key components to the writing of the policy. For instance, staff at kihêw waciston provided feedback and support for the policy, addressed below. Using a common and accepted Land Acknowledgement statement served to unify and make relevant ours with other accepted university policies, procedures, and documents.

Policy Development

In developing the policy, collections librarians reviewed existing library policies and highlighted for library administrators the value in a separate collections policy for Indigenous content. It was determined that the Main Collection policy—and the collection itself, both print and digital—supported the acquisition of works written predominantly from the settler perspective. In addition, it became clear that some sections of the Main Collections policy were
problematic when considering works by, for, and about Indigenous peoples living in Canada, as demonstrated by the following excerpts:

“Intellectual Freedom and Challenged Materials”:

On occasion, a member of the MacEwan community may question the inclusion of content in the library’s collection for reasons of scholarly validity, or for personal, religious, political, moral, or other reasons ... It is important to note that while the library will review a resource that may be of concern to a member of the MacEwan community, the principles of intellectual freedom and academic freedom will be sustained.

“Selection Criteria”:

Preference for English language content (except material supporting Languages courses; bilingual works may be included so long as one language is English).

“Subject-Based Exceptions”:

History – Print monographs are preferred. Microform may be purchased or duplicated in the print collection. When deselecting, only titles that have not circulated within the past ten years will be considered. The following types will be retained: primary documents, classic texts, and books that reflect the attitudes of another era, regardless of the accuracy of the assumptions, in order to provide a historical perspective to the values and beliefs of previous generations.

The Indigenous Resources Collections Policy addresses these issues and more. For instance, regarding the sections on resources of concern and subject-based exceptions, the new policy may allow for these “problematic” works to continue to be available in the Main Collection but not necessarily in the Juvenile Collection, writing that “any outdated materials representing Indigenous peoples located in the Children’s Collection may be relocated to the Main Collection.”

Regarding language criteria, the new policy supports the
collection of works written in a variety of Indigenous languages, most notably Cree, which is spoken locally:

Materials in Cree and other Indigenous languages that support the curriculum will be collected selectively. Language-learning materials not directly tied to curriculum, in Cree and other languages such as Dene, Stoney and Anishinaabe, also may be added to the collection as available or when a need is expressed by members of the campus community.

It is expected that this portion of the policy will evolve rapidly as course offerings and priorities change.

Consultation

The new Indigenous Resources Collections Policy clarifies and expands on the original collections policy, while also offering a roadmap for future action. This includes extra consideration given to stakeholder consultation. A substantial consultation process was integral to the development of the policy. MacEwan Library governance structure requires any policy under development to include several internal consultation opportunities. However, a policy focused on the acquisition of materials by, for and about Indigenous peoples in Canada, written by a couple of settler librarians, also required robust consultation with the Indigenous community at the university. Sensitivities—political and emotional—had to be acknowledged in developing this policy, with the potential to be internally divisive and concerns about unintentional bias coloring the policy.

Staff from the kihèw waciston Indigenous Centre were generous with their expertise and their time. The latter was of particular concern to us in determining whether to consult at the early draft stage, or to wait until there was a more mature draft document before reaching out. With a university mandate to work toward reconciliation and the Truth and Reconciliation Commissions Calls
to Action, demands on the time of kihêw waciston staff are considerable and it was a priority to be respectful of their time in asking for input. Feedback from the liaison librarian to kihêw waciston suggested we could best do that by presenting staff with a more fully formed draft policy to react to.

The kihêw waciston Director and Community Engagement Coordinator shared insights on the draft policy, and recommendations for how the library could better support the Indigenous community on campus through library collections. They were honest in their feedback, including suggestions for not sugarcoating some of the language—for example, acknowledging the true history between Indigenous peoples and settler Canadians, rather than the more palatable difficult history. It was important that we prioritized incorporating their comments into the policy, rather than defending some of our choices due to existing library policy or practice.

Kihêw waciston staff also facilitated contact with members of the university's Indigenous Advisory Council. When an initial letter inviting feedback on the draft policy was sent to each member of the Council and yielded no response, the Director advised that Council members were highly unlikely to provide an emailed written response. We were advised that cultural preference would be to give an in-person response so we would be more likely to get feedback in person and this proved to be the case.

Internal library stakeholder consultation brought its own challenges. It became evident that our peers wanted a policy document that went well beyond the scope of collections alone. They were looking for a policy that spoke to the library's broader goals and responses to the CFLA Truth and Reconciliation Report and Recommendations document and university strategic directions. Consultation included reiterating for our peers that those worthy goals could only be met in (a very small) part as we were writing a collections policy. Expectations had to be balanced when much work around reconciliation remained and remains to be done.
Lessons Learned

Despite our efforts to consult within the Indigenous community at the university, as the work progressed, we were reminded that Indigenous members of the campus community are not a homogenous group. Represented within that group are various nations, faculty, staff, and students, first-generation students and those who have had exposure to postsecondary education opportunities prior to arriving, people who already speak an Indigenous language and those who wish to learn, and so on. Receiving policy approval or support from the campus Indigenous Centre does not mean universal support for the document.

The consultation process we undertook seemed to take a long time, and we felt some pressure to produce a product. Upon reflection, more time could have been taken. We did not even consider consulting our students—instead relying on input from kihêw waciston staff and the Indigenous Advisory Council. A revised version of this policy should take time to consult more widely.

We did not build accountability into the policy, and early discussions around evaluation fell by the wayside as the institutional impact of COVID-19 caused our attention to be focused on more immediate priorities. This needs to be addressed.

Further consideration had to be given to where we acquire resources under this policy, and how we pay for them. Existing acquisitions processes work well for mainstream publishers and vendors, but when seeking out works produced by small presses or independent artists, processes look different. Rather than ordering through a library vendor, a resource may be acquired directly from an author, musician, or filmmaker at a local cultural event. New payment processes had to be developed in consultation with university Accounts Payable, in order to allow Indigenous independent authors/musicians/filmmakers who are self-distributing and do not accept credit cards, to invoice the library.
in whatever way works for them—which might include a receipt handwritten on the back of a napkin!

Format challenges have also been a consideration. For example, Indigenous-authored e-books may not come with unlimited, simultaneous access, and independent Indigenous musicians may only release works for purchase as a streamed download or vinyl LP—neither of which can be managed through our existing collections practices. However, we are currently updating collections policy to allow for the acquisition of 33 1/3 RPM LPs in order to enhance our Indigenous music collection.

Re-Evaluation

In the more than two years since the Indigenous Resources Collections Policy was approved, we are still contemplating the following:

- Have we done the actual work we set out to do? Have we proactively collected as we said we would? We have added several digital primary source archives, our approval plan includes Indigenous content (by, for, and about) across all disciplines, and we developed the First Voices: Contemporary Indigenous Fiction Collection. This is a start.
- Any member of the campus community may suggest Indigenous material for acquisition, and the policy says, “the library will accept or solicit works suggested by community Elders and Knowledge Keepers as appropriate.” In truth, however, we have not kept the conversation going since the policy was approved. Renewed efforts toward this goal are necessary and must include the library’s liaison librarian to the Indigenous Education Centre, kihêw waciston.
- The language of the policy must continue to evolve as we continue to learn. An early draft of the policy referred to
“Canada’s Indigenous Peoples.” In writing the policy we came to understand that “Indigenous peoples in Canada” is more appropriate. Should it evolve further, such as “Indigenous peoples living in the country commonly known as Canada”? There is no consensus on such a change and some will find this language challenging.

- Referring to the policy as “supplemental” should be reconsidered. Perhaps it should be referred to as a core document at the heart of library collections policy.

This policy document, unlike many that are written and then left to gather dust, must go through regular review. As members of the library and campus communities, we have much to learn and must continue to seek out guidance and approach this work with humility, so as to ensure better representation of Indigenous voices and content in our library collection.
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Introduction

In many academic libraries, collections are developed and managed by Subject Bibliographers, Liaison Librarians, or equivalent who have selection of resources as a part of their job responsibilities. Although librarians may have collection development as a part of their job responsibilities, it seems that many librarians possess a lack of knowledge in the area of collection development and this may be a result of a variety of factors, including lack of collection-related course offerings in graduate school and lack of experience with working in an academic library. Even if a librarian has taken collection development classes, the classes cannot possibly prepare a student for the diverse activities involved in building a collection. In addition, the landscape of the academic library is going through many changes and collection development has become even more challenging.

Knowledge Gap

When a new librarian is hired at an academic library, it is vital to provide mentoring and training for the librarian. From an administrative point of view, it is important to have a plan for onboarding and establish clear expectations for responsibilities
related to collection development. The onboarding and expectations may depend on the reporting structure at the library. In any reporting structure, it is important to establish expectations. For example, at the University of Nevada, Las Vegas (UNLV) Libraries, Liaison Librarians do have collection development responsibilities; however, this is only one aspect of their job. The Liaison Librarians have responsibilities related to reference, instruction, and outreach. Due to the fact that collection development is one aspect of their job, Liaisons report to the Head of the Library Liaison Program. I collaborate with the Head of the Liaisons to outline expectations and we have regular meetings to discuss issues with collections. UNLV Libraries has a Liaison Responsibilities document that outlines expectations and best practices for each aspect of their job, including collection development. My Division Director and I provided input on the responsibilities document and during evaluation time, I provide feedback on the Liaisons’ work related to collection development.

Another important aspect is onboarding. When a new librarian is hired, there is a checklist of items related to collection development to go over. An introductory meeting is scheduled and topics discussed at the meeting include the collection development policy, responsibilities, processes, and workflow. The new librarian is also encouraged to schedule meetings with unit heads of acquisitions, Interlibrary Loan, and collection assessment so they can obtain an overview of the units and learn information related to workflows and processes. The meetings provide an opportunity to get a better idea of what experience the Liaison has in collection development. If the person is inexperienced, additional meetings are highly recommended. In addition, it is recommended that meetings be scheduled between the new librarian and more experienced librarians, either internally or externally. It is also recommended to identify resources to help the new librarian with their subject area, such as ALA or other professional organizations. UNLV Libraries has an internal staff site and the site provides links to the information covered in the meetings and the site provides access to a variety
of documentation, for example, the libraries gift policy. During the meetings, it is vital to establish open lines of communication and encourage the new librarian to schedule future meetings to go over topics or issues where they need more assistance or information. To help with this, UNLV Libraries is developing a Collection Development Forum, which will be a quarterly or bimonthly meeting to go over issues related to collections or discuss hot topics.

At the University of South Florida (USF) Libraries, there are similar challenges to when adding new faculty librarians and staff to collections and liaison roles. As the authors noted in their initial research into this topic, which roughly twenty years in the past, collection development courses have not always been a core requirement for library degrees. While most now include it in the core, or heavily recommend it as a part of a student's scholastic journey, there's no guarantee that the incoming professional has had coursework on this topic. And even if the class was part of their degree, there's no substitute for real-world experience, which is often excluded from said courses. One way that the USF Libraries have approached this is via defined projects and examples from previous colleagues, or similar topic areas. The more experienced librarian in history, for example, might help define how to determine the scope of the collections for the new humanities specialist. There is also leadership from collection and liaison managers and administrators to provide sample templates for communication, collection reviews, and other standard tasks.

Along with administrative onboarding, another important aspect is providing mentorship for the new librarian. As stated, USF has long employed informal sharing of knowledge and experience, but the libraries have also recently restarted their mentorship program. There is a formal committee, agreements, and established methods of communication and matching of mentors and mentees. A recent experience as a mentor by one of the authors was much more rewarding and beneficial (hopefully to both parties) than expected. As one often is, it's surprising and edifying to review the wealth of one's own knowledge by sharing it in a careful and detailed manner.
The libraries are hopeful that this mentoring effort will continue and prove to be symbiotically beneficial to all those that participate. The authors also noted other examples in the literature while preparing for the corresponding presentation. Please see the suggested readings at the end for more of these endeavors.

Collection Development Policies

The usefulness of a Collection Development policy in the onboarding and training of a new librarian may vary, depending on the depth and coverage of the policy document. From a strategic and management perspective, collection development policies can be useful.

Collection Development policies may establish a framework and set of parameters to help guide librarians with their collection development duties. The collection development policy can help with short-term and long-term planning and may tie in the aims and objectives of the organization with the collection. The policy may also establish priorities, outline budget, serve as communication with constituents, prevent censorship, and assist in overall collection management activities, including the handling of gifts, deselection of materials and serial cancellations. Depending on the detail of the policy, it can help with selection of materials, format preference, etc. However, not all collection development policies are created equal and vary from library to library. The usefulness of the policy depends on the detail of the policy—I have seen a variety of policies and some have more detail ... for example, those that may have detailed subject or LC information (for example, a “Conspectus” framework).
Communication Strategies and Liaison Work

One of the reasons the authors enjoyed this collaborative effort so much is due to the communication and the discussion of communication in their respective libraries. One author is a long-time liaison and project manager (USF), while the other is a collections manager and administrator (UNLV). When sharing information and preparing this text and presentation, the similarities and value of communication was immediately apparent. Both libraries employ several standard methods.

Primary methods of internal communication include departmental and faculty/librarian meetings, and this is a common practice in most academic institutions. These gatherings give ample opportunity for sharing of new projects and ideas, as well as interdepartmental efforts. The USF Libraries, like many, also employs a few types of client communication, including content managed newsletters to faculty from the liaison and individual communication via email and other electronic means. One thing not to overlook, though, is the benefit of physical visits to both internal and external partners in the collection building process. This has, of course, been limited in recent years by the pandemic, but there's an incredible value in the human connection to be gained from an in-person meeting. It's also wise to target new, or notable faculty with communication specific to their needs when seeking collections input. New faculty often get extra funds with which to begin their research and grants often come with funds for materials and/or publishing. These are excellent ways to transfer and garner information and hone the libraries' holdings.

Other Elements of Liaison Work

A crucial and often overlooked aspect of liaison efforts is time
management, especially for new or inexperienced professionals. The idea of evaluating even a part of the collection, or absorbing data to determine collection needs, can be overwhelming. At both USF and UNLV, data librarians in collections and acquisitions are always there to assist, as they are much less likely to be awed by the massive piles of data needed. It’s also a time of change in terms of resource selection. Mostly gone are the days of reading a publisher’s catalog from cover to cover or ordering mostly individual monographs. “Big deals,” patron-driven acquisition and demand/data-driven acquisition, and other electronic means of shaping collection decisions have changed the landscape drastically when it comes to item selection. This does not prohibit, however, the targeted purchase, especially in some monograph-heavy subject areas and remains part of the professional duties at most academic libraries.

The above makes collaboration with faculty on expanding, or cutting, items in the collection another continuing and essential practice. First, it helps faculty and students to understand the cost and value of these collections, possibly for the first time depending on their levels and types of academic experience. At the USF Libraries, for example, several of the liaisons have done “environmental scans” of the collection and the faculty and student efforts in research and publishing. This is then contextualized with the collection and helps the departmental chairs and student leaders to guide their financial efforts, if any, regarding the libraries. This is not to say that the largest departments get all the funding, or that resources are guided by number of users/downloads, but every bit of data helps. This has also often been coupled with a survey of faculty in a department, school, of group of related topical areas. This outreach is valuable in both collection and relationship building with essential clientele. It’s also a great way for a new librarian to get their name into their colleagues’ minds and keeps the libraries front and center (as long as you don’t over-survey!). It is extremely important to be tactful and mindful of the “time ask” and not to overburden patrons of any type with information requests.
Getting to Know the Collection and Discipline

Once a new subject librarian is hired, it is important to make time to get to know the existing collection and also learn more about the discipline(s). The first step for any new librarian should be to become familiar with the existing collection. There are several strategies to help gain familiarity including:

• Browsing the circulating and reference book stacks in your subject areas. It is recommended that librarians write down Library Classification Headings for the disciplines (and related disciplines) and browsing through the call numbers in the circulating and reference book stacks.
• Reviewing existing LibGuide or Research Guide for discipline and related disciplines.
• Reviewing journal and database lists on the Libraries’ website.
• Meet with staff in collection development/management and request information, which may include lists of items in the collection, or recent orders from the Integrated Library System.
• Review LibGuides, Research Guides, and collections of peer institutions.
• Setup calls with librarians at other institutions who are responsible for the same discipline. Sister institutions in your state and/or institutions in consortia with which the library is affiliated.
• Professional organizations often have subject-specific sections that provide webinars, etc. Also attending collection-related conferences such Charleston and Electronic Resources and Libraries.
• Check on the availability of any current subject bibliographies.
• Check the literature to see if there are articles or journals in the subject area.
Another important aspect for new librarians is getting to know the discipline:

- How faculty and students use information or what are their information needs?
- What type of information do faculty and students in the discipline use? Current, archival or both? Does the subject area use data?
- Research and get to know the major publishers and vendors for discipline

Due to the fact that universities are encouraging and promoting interdisciplinary research, it is vital to identify other subject areas in which your discipline overlaps or is currently collaborates with. It is recommended to meet with other subject librarians internal and external to the organization.

A fast evolving and growing area in collections is Open Access (OA). In the past few years, OA has become an important aspect in the area of collection development. It is vital for a new librarian to have basic information and be current in the area of OA. This is especially important if the librarian has liaison responsibilities and works with faculty. The need for knowledge and expertise will depend on the campus, library, and discipline. Some campuses have OA mandates and are providing a variety of services in this area, while other Libraries may be doing very little. Either way, Libraries will be dealing with OA materials in some capacity, so it is important for Librarians to have a basic understanding of OA, including:

- Types of OA (Green, Gold, etc.).
- Types of documents and how the documents are handled or processed (grey literature, data, and DOIs for articles).
- Understand the benefits of OA
- Understand copyright, OA terminology, institutional repositories, and software.
- Knowledge of the types of licenses that support OA. Have basic
information on transformative agreements (Read and Publish).
• Understanding of author processing charges.
• Ability to communicate OA principles with faculty and students. Recommend working with Librarian in the area of Scholarly Communication to create an “elevator pitch” on what the library is doing in the area of OA.

In addition to providing OA services, many libraries are “collecting” OA materials and making them accessible and discoverable. Libraries are adding more OA resources to the collection and a new librarian will need to perform a variety of tasks and have knowledge of:

• Ability to work with faculty to identify locally created content (white papers, etc.) to put in the Institutional Repository and/or the Integrated Library System.
• Open educational resources are becoming more available and being able to work with faculty to identify and incorporate open educational resources for teaching. This is extremely beneficial to students, given the high prices of textbooks.
• Having a framework for collecting OA resources like traditional resources. This would include evaluating OA content like traditional resources, such as usability, relevance, interface tools, and so on.

One of the most important aspects in the area of collection development is assessment. Assessing the collection helps with evaluating the effectiveness of the collection for a subject area. Collection assessment helps a librarian by assessing the usefulness of current collection, identifying gaps, strengths and weaknesses, and user needs. There are two major methods in collection assessment. The first method is user-centered assessment. User-centered approaches for collection assessment investigate how a collection is being used as well as the library users’ behavior, and perceived preference or use of materials in the collection. There
are a couple of useful methods in this area. One method is usage data. The usage data can be circulation of monographs, searches of databases, and full-text views of journals/serials. Another user-centered method is Interlibrary Loan data. Interlibrary Loan data can be useful because it provides data on what students and faculty are requesting and can help identify gaps and provide insight on if users need current or archival information. A second method in collection assessment is collection-centered, which focuses on the content of the collections to determine the quality and appropriateness of the materials to meet the needs of the library or stated goals and objectives of the institution. Collection-centered assessment can include comparing the library's holdings to core subject lists or compare holdings to peer institutions.

When conducting collection assessment and the decision has been made to conduct user-centered or collection-centered assessment, the next step is to identify the tools to capture the information needed. These include qualitative and quantitative methods. Qualitative methods for assessment include list checking, citation analysis, user opinion surveys, focus groups and interviews. Quantitative methods that can be used include ILL statistics, circulation statistics, expenditures by subject and collection size and growth, just to name a few. Depending on the library, the collections department may have tools or be able to run lists to help with collection assessment. For example, at UNLV, the Libraries has a dedicated unit that is responsible for collection assessment. The Collections Analyst provides usage data and meets with Liaison Librarians to see what information they need to help with their collection responsibilities.

Conclusions

It's often helpful to look back before you move forward, but not to get stuck trying to fix every mistake, or misstep of days gone by.
That has been a rewarding element of this project, as the authors have been able to track changes at two institutions over a longitudinal period. It may also be helpful that each author has been at their respective libraries, UNLV, and USF, for the entirety of their professional careers. This is not to say this type of stability is better, however, as new ideas often come with changes in role and location.

To close, the authors propose the following concepts and conclusions that they feel have shaped and will guide library collections and related liaison work going forward. Most of these ideas are common in practice and in the literature, but hopefully the value is in the brevity and overlap of this list.

- “Big Deals” are a way of life now, but they don't totally limit the work of skilled bibliographers and the review of specific titles
- OA will shape collections and collection management more in the coming years
- Constant assessment is important, but don't rush to judgment and be careful setting statistics and, especially, benchmarks
- Liaison roles will continue to change, but it’s still an effective model; their focus on communication is just increasing
- Training, mentoring, and good leadership are always helpful

There are countless more that could have been included, as is obvious to anyone in the field of librarianship. It is the authors' hope that this has been beneficial. For more, please consult the suggested readings below.

**Suggested Readings**


Two Sides of the Same Damaged Coin

Technical and Public Services Issues Following an SLSP Migration

CHRIS VIDAS AND BOBBY HOLLANDSWORTH

Abstract

In June 2020 the Clemson University Libraries implemented the switch from an Innovative Millennium ILS to an Ex Libris Alma/Primo shared library service platform. Never an easy task but doing so during a pandemic with a fifty-five-member consortium proved extremely difficult. Those difficulties as well as resolutions are explored from both the technical services and public services side.

Background

Clemson University is a public land grant research university located in Clemson, South Carolina, that was designated as a Carnegie R1 institution in 2016. Clemson University Libraries serve over 30,000 students, faculty, and staff. The library moved from an Innovative Millennium ILS to an Ex Libris Alma/Primo shared library service platform (SLSP) in June 2020. Leading this effort was the Partnership Among South Carolina Academic Libraries (PASCAL) consortium. PASCAL serves approximately 200,000 students at fifty-five colleges and universities across the state of South Carolina.
Why Change Catalogs?

The impetus behind the move to a shared library service platform came from the state higher education library consortium, PASCAL. Innovative was discontinuing our ILS Millennium and the majority of institutions in PASCAL had to find another ILS. We already had a shared catalog and print delivery service, so Alma/Primo just delivered on a next-generation version of what we were already doing as a consortium. Ex Libris secured the contract with PASCAL after a bidding and procurement process that involved all major ILS vendors.

Technical Services Issues

COVID-19

Migrating to Alma from Millennium was going to demand a difficult and prolonged process in a best-case scenario, but the emergence of a major pandemic derailed that possibility in March 2020. The COVID-19 crisis complicated our migration for multiple reasons, but perhaps most critically by not permitting any delay in our statewide migration timeline. Although Clemson Libraries had to adjust our expectations for nearly every other service, project, and obligation as we learned to work from home and collaborate from a distance, that adjustment had no bearing on the migration, thereby making the completion of the project a seemingly insurmountable undertaking.

The hurdles extended far beyond simply learning to adapt to our new home offices. It was no longer possible to have multiple rapid conversations with colleagues who were normally situated several feet away. We did not have the luxury of calling impromptu meetings where we could gather around a conference table and
rapidly iron out solutions to difficult questions. Even the tools that we had at our disposal were inadequate since so many individuals had not yet developed a reasonable level of comfort with virtual meeting solutions. Feeling isolated or separated from our colleagues while striving to properly understand and manage all the moving parts of the incredibly complex migration created a lot of anxiety and uncertainty about how our data would appear following the fixed deadline. Ultimately, when Alma went live, we witnessed many positive results, but we heard far more about the countless issues that ranged from minor corrections to widespread emergencies.

Training

It was not simply the breakneck speed at which the final stages of the migration seemed to take place, but we also lost opportunities for training due to the pandemic. We were eagerly anticipating a four-day training event that would have provided many of our staff with a better understanding of workflows in areas related to their daily functions. Unfortunately, those critical sessions were canceled and our uncertainty surrounding key workflows was amplified.

Once the Alma production environment was live, there was an immediate and substantial learning curve for all staff who were required to perform tasks in Alma. While Ex Libris does provide a wide array of training videos and a vast amount of written documentation, it can be overwhelming, especially for those users who are not adept at locating specific pieces of information. In addition, a focused training exercise may be less effective if there is a misunderstanding about the larger context within which that activity resides. It was not uncommon for staff to learn about a precise workflow, but experience a complete roadblock any time a workflow deviated in the slightest way from what the training demonstrated.

Because there was a struggle to locate Ex Libris instructions that
closely matched simple or complex tasks that we needed to accomplish, Libraries personnel began to develop internal workflows for common activities followed by internal training sessions or virtual discussions to help each other understand standard processes. The difficulty with those efforts is that the workflows may have produced the results that we desired, but they may not have aligned with best practices throughout the library community. That reality is potentially an ongoing problem that will continue to be addressed.

Although there is abundant documentation from Ex Libris and other institutions, it does not always perfectly align or provide a single approach to rectifying problems. That meant that personnel regularly engaged in trial-and-error tactics to learn what worked best for each scenario that was encountered. As expertise was eventually developed internally, individuals could transfer knowledge and concepts in a more reliable manner with concrete documentation that addresses specific problems faced by our institution.

**Ongoing Issues**

Although many of our initial hurdles have been cleared, we continue to experience negative effects from unexpected obstacles. One of those challenges relates to the loss of key personnel dating back to the months leading up to the pandemic and our migration. While initial efforts were made to replace some of those positions, it became impossible to successfully complete searches as we adjusted to working from home and understanding new rules and regulations at our institution. We eventually adapted to interview models, but a great deal of time had been lost in finding greatly needed expertise. The problem was amplified by the continuing trend involving personnel seeking new or different opportunities for a wide array of personal and professional reasons. That meant that
replacing one critical position often meant that another position or multiple roles simultaneously became vacant. While the loss of expertise or knowledge was detrimental, losing so many positions that basic tasks could not be completed was devastating.

Despite our losses of personnel, it was still important to accomplish wide-ranging projects related to the migration. Cleaning up our data or correcting linking issues could not be put on hold indefinitely, so morale and anxiety became concerns. Unfortunately, those effects on individuals occasionally resulted in the loss of more positions. On a positive note, those who continued to contribute toward clean-up processes developed a greater level of comfort and expertise.

Positions at all levels continue to be replaced with a great deal of progress toward increasing both the numbers and the abilities of our personnel. The difficult aspect of the process now is finding individuals to serve on numerous committees while still accomplishing expected goals related to day-to-day activities. While the pandemic continues to have an impact on these efforts, we are better equipped to address them and continue moving forward.

The final ongoing observation related to technical services and addressing Alma concerns is that widespread improvements have been occurring at a more encouraging rate. With new positions being filled, few individuals resigning their positions, and increased comfort with Alma workflows, things are moving in a better direction. There continue to be new questions and obstacles, but far more of those fires are being extinguished in an efficient manner.

Public Services Issues

Reliability

One of the major issues that caused confusion and frustration after
the migration was reliability in the new catalog. This happened while searching for books, DVDs, and journals. Fortunately, we had the old catalog still active to check against the results of searches done in the new catalog. This allowed us to help our students, faculty, and staff find material, but it also helped us document issues with the new catalog. As mentioned on the Technical Services side COVID-19 shutdown our ordering and receiving operation which led to a backlog of orders. Unfortunately, when this backlog started moving again, we were receiving physical items, but they were suppressed in Primo. This led to delays and frustration on the part of our users and library staff. The title information was available in Alma, but not in Primo so users could not see if items were physically at the library or if they were even ordered.

During this time, it was also difficult to teach classes or show students how to use the catalog when we had little confidence in the results we were getting from it. We received questions through email, chat, and during online classes that we frankly could not answer due to the irregular or missing results from searches. As a result, we began sending the link to our old catalog to users so they could get the most reliable information. At times, it felt like we had unleashed this new catalog on our students, faculty, and staff so they along with us could “crowd source” the issues related to performance and reliability.

This is more of a functionality issue but gone are the days of catalogs offering subject heading searches for discovery. Primo offers a subject search, which renders only titles of materials, not a visual alphabetical Library of Congress Subject Headings list of your subject search. Next-generation catalogs function more like Google than previous catalogs. It is all about results and not about the journey or serendipity of discovery. This is not just an Alma/Primo initiative, but a choice made by ILS providers of next-generation catalogs.
Once the library went live with the new Ex Libris Alma/Primo catalog, the public services side started to get multiple complaints about journal full text issues. After investigating the issue, we found that Elsevier’s ScienceDirect full text journals were not linking properly. This issue alone disabled over 2,500 full text journals and 300 e-books. Our team worked on this issue for over a year until it was eventually resolved. Fortunately, there were workarounds, and we were able to provide full text journal articles to our students, faculty, and staff during this time. But, even eighteen months after going live linking from let’s say an EBSCO database to full text within ScienceDirect still does not work and gives the user the impression we do not have full text for that article/journal. The exasperation that we feel is rooted in knowing three large companies in the library world that should work together do not. We have often wondered is this an issue among all libraries that use similar full text linking with Alma/Primo?

Early on after the migration e-book collections were difficult to navigate, not only for users but for librarians as well. The pandemic made it even more difficult because we were receiving more e-book requests and more students, faculty, and staff were relying on e-books because of online classes and work from home orders.

Another issue that plagued our access to full text was the link resolver and journal locator within Alma/Primo did not work as well as our previous one. Once again, we had to rely on our old system while the new one was being fixed. At one point linking was more reliable in Google Scholar than in Alma/Primo. Faculty members who had saved the old journal locator link were surprised when it no longer worked while they searched for full text. This required subject liaisons to reeducate faculty members on the new journal locator and explain why we changed systems.
Ongoing Issues

We still deal with ongoing full text linking issues like the ScienceDirect problem mentioned above under the Full Text heading. It’s also hard to discern if a full text issue is Alma/Primo related or just the normal full text problems that we used to encounter before the new system. The good news is the issues are not as prevalent or severe as when we first went live and throughout the first year of implementation.

Another issue with the migration that was touched on earlier under the Reliability heading was suppressed records. Meaning records that are in Alma, but do not display in Primo. These are hard to detect unless you are looking for something that you knew the library owned previously but could not find in Primo. This happened in our DVD collection when over 300 DVDs were in Alma but did not display in Primo. It was an easy fix to make them visible in Primo, but it makes your mind wonder what else could be suppressed in Alma and not showing up in Primo.

Although not an ongoing issue now, but it took over a year to get our online book ordering process (GOBI) to work with Alma/Primo. Not to mention the fund balances which were inaccurate and of no use to selectors trying to maintain a book budget. These delays caused stress to both the technical and public services side of the library. It also caused gaps in our ordering which will more than likely show up in the years to follow.

Resolutions

Ticketing System

With the myriad of issues mounting after the implementation of Alma/Primo a ticketing system was set up to document the problems and send them to the appropriate unit/department for
resolution. The ticketing system wasn’t perfect and had to be revamped several times, but it at least provided a platform to document Alma/Primo issues as they happened. Also, the Alma/Primo project manager and the Dean of Libraries were made aware of the public services issues in the implementation along the way.

Ex Libris Optimization Training

Because Clemson University migrated to Alma along with more than fifty institutions across South Carolina, the entire process was more complex than if we had migrated individually. With guidance from PASCAL, we received beneficial responses from their trained staff when we encountered problems with Alma or Primo. As helpful as that communication process proved to be, Libraries staff continued to feel that there were gaps in their knowledge or broad areas of understanding that remained unaddressed. For that reason, explorations began into alternative training opportunities.

The result of the investigations into enhanced educational opportunities was uncovering an option to obtain paid training from Ex Libris through an Educate and an Optimize program. One of these opportunities provided a customized educational series built around our needs, and the latter element provided personnel with a chance to engage with the trainers and ask detailed questions about specific scenarios. Those training series occurred in June 2021 and vastly enhanced employee understanding of and comfort with Alma and Primo. While gaps still existed in some areas, the overall ability to identify and correct problems was dramatically improved.

Creation of a Primo Optimization Task Force to Address Ongoing Issues

As Clemson Libraries navigated through the migration and post-migration hurdles, it was important to meet on a regular basis to discuss critical issues related to access or data clean-up. One of the ways that need was addressed was to form a Primo Optimization Task Force where ongoing issues were discussed and plans were
made to rectify existing problems. Many positive outcomes resulted from the creation of that group, including a more systematic method of creating and documenting workflows, a new ticket system to address both internally and externally reported problems, and a better process for determining which group or team was most appropriate to tackle and resolve an Alma or Primo problem. While the group has morphed a bit over time, the concept has continued, allowing us to more efficiently address any concerns that are relayed surrounding Alma or Primo.

Integration Profiles

While processes and documentation have come a long way since the initial migration, it would still be impossible to complete numerous projects without some of the advanced options embedded within Alma. Of course, it took time to learn about the intricacies of those functionalities too, and the Optimization training helped a great deal in that respect. Those features include the ability to create sets and run jobs, set up APIs, and the ability to generate import and integration profiles.

In the example of integration profiles, personnel now had the ability to target specific publishers and run a regularly scheduled process that would update holdings and coverage dates on a large scale. For example, a Springer or Elsevier integration profile updated all of Clemson Libraries’ holdings from those publishers in a single process. That was incredibly beneficial since we had vast numbers of problems with access, URL updates, coverage dates, and other related minor or major flaws. It may have taken months or longer to correct all of the problems with several thousand portfolios, whereas establishing the integration profile allowed them to be correct in the time it took the job to run. Despite the steep learning curve for many of the features in Alma, some of the built-in processes simplified otherwise complex tasks.
Conclusions

No library system migration will ever be easy, although each one comes with a unique set of challenges. While public services librarians will have one set of observations that may be very different from those made by technical services librarians, ultimately the goals of each group are identical.

From a technical services perspective, one of the most challenging aspects of the migration was not fully knowing what to expect once the data migration was complete. While some understanding of what would unfold was gleaned as a result of being a vanguard institution, it was not until things went live for an extended period that feedback began to be received from all users. That relates directly to the public services experience and impacts on the activities that researchers conduct.

From a public services perspective, it is hard to see in hindsight the value of moving from our previous catalog to Alma/Primo knowing the pain and frustration it caused on the library staff and our users. It is a much prettier interface with tons of bells and whistles, but aesthetics aside was it worth alienating our users to the point of losing their trust in our ability to fulfill their information needs? Especially during a pandemic when so many users and library staff were isolated. However, realistically we understand there wasn't really an option since our old catalog was being discontinued and the move benefitted our lending/receiving items from our state consortium, and it would provide more dynamic options on the technical services side of the library which in turn would help public services in the future.

For those who were accustomed to Millennium, its features, and the way that it functioned prior to migration, there may never be complete buy-in or appreciation of Alma, but it has unquestionably provided us with dynamic functionality that was never available before. Despite ongoing technical frustrations and continuing steep learning curves, once those hurdles are cleared, the result is almost
always better than our starting point. For that reason, many of the technical services personnel strive to be positive and optimistic about where we are and where we hope to go. Regardless of the level of satisfaction one derives from working with Alma, it is obvious that the Libraries are capable of doing much more following our migration, and we hope to continue to tap into the potential provided by Alma. We will always have some frustrations and elements that remain on our wish list for system improvements. We will also regularly desire better documentation and training opportunities, but when we learn and master a new and improved process, it benefits the entire body of Clemson University researchers, and we all must acknowledge and appreciate that positive outcome.
On the Roads of Transformation

Multiple Pathways to Opening Scholarship at a Large Research Institution

MAUREEN P. WALSH, GENE R. SPRINGS, AND ANITA K. FOSTER

Abstract

The Ohio State University Libraries promotes innovative research and creative expression and curates and preserves information essential for scholarship and learning. Making the research and scholarship of Ohio State's faculty, staff, and students openly available allows us to live our land grant mission—sharing knowledge and culture with the people of Ohio, the nation, and the world. Our poster introduces The Ohio State University Libraries’ “Transforming the Scholarly Publishing Economy” strategic initiative. Under our initiative, we are deploying a plan and set of priorities to inform and motivate decision-making around directing funds away from paywall subscription models and toward Open-Access publishing. These principles and roadmaps inform our collection strategy, while we also work to apply our equity values of advancing diversity, inclusivity, access, and social justice to scholarly collection building. Our broader goals include educating, informing, and building partnerships with stakeholders across campus to support actions that transform publishing economics, expanding avenues of Open Access to advance Ohio State research, and developing analytics capabilities to inform negotiations and monitor the impacts of new agreements. Our strategic investments in Open Access follow multiple pathways—a multipronged approach
to transform the Scholarly Publishing Economy across the full spectrum of Open Access and include financial support of open-source repository and publishing infrastructure, transformative and transitional agreements with publishers, and collective action with our consortial partners.

Keywords: scholarly publishing, scholarly communication, collection strategy, Open Access, transformative agreements

Transforming the Scholarly Publishing Economy

The Ohio State University Libraries (University Libraries) promotes innovative research and creative expression and curates and preserves information essential for scholarship and learning. Making the research and scholarship of The Ohio State University’s (Ohio State’s) faculty, staff, and students openly available allows us to live our land grant mission—sharing knowledge and culture with the people of Ohio, the nation, and the world.

The current scholarly publishing model creates barriers for researchers and has become unsustainable. In alignment with the university’s promise of operational excellence and resource stewardship, University Libraries is exploring partnerships to transform that model while also ensuring researchers have access to the tools crucial for their work. Under our Transforming the Scholarly Publishing Economy initiative, we are deploying a plan and set of priorities to direct funds away from paywall subscription models and toward Open-Access publishing. The guiding principles of our initiative are:

- Make the research and scholarship of Ohio State’s faculty, staff, and students openly available.
- Steward Ohio State’s financial resources.
- Create or advance sustainability for campus investments in research and scholarship.
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• Explore partnerships to transform the Scholarly Publishing Economy.
• Apply our equity values (Equity—We advance diversity, inclusivity, access, and social justice).

Our guiding principles inform our collection strategy and are aligned with Ohio State’s vision, mission, and values.

Our strategic investments in Open Access follow multiple pathways and leverage collective action with our consortial partners including the Big Ten Academic Alliance (BTAA) and OhioLINK. University Libraries provides copyright and author’s rights services for the campus, our diamond Open-Access Libraries publishing program is in its fifteenth year, and our institutional repository program (the Knowledge Bank) is in its twentieth year. We provide financial support to open-source repository and publishing infrastructure, including DSpace, Public Knowledge Project, Fedora, Dryad, Directory of Open-Access Journals (DOAJ), Directory of Open-Access Books (DOAB), OAPEN Library and Publication Platform (OAPEN), and arXiv. To advance the opening of scholarly monographs, we are a funding institution participant in TOME (Toward an Open Monograph Ecosystem), we host The Ohio State University Press open monographs, and we support the University of Michigan Press’s Fund to Mission and MIT Press’s Direct to Open. And to further bring the publishing system more under the control of academia, advance a more open system, and manage the overall costs of the publishing portion of the research enterprise, we are entering into transformative and transitional agreements with publishers.

The goals of our initiative include learning from and engaging with stakeholders across campus to support actions that transform publishing economics and expand avenues of Open Access to advance Ohio State research and scholarship. By engaging with researchers, we can better understand the diverse needs within our research communities, identify commonalities where possible, and explore potential solutions. It is in building new partnerships, and
strengthening existing relationships, that we can maximize value, cost savings, and uptake. If we are successful with both deeper engagements across campus, and sustained, enhanced partnerships, then any transformative or transitional publishing agreements University Libraries can negotiate and enter into on behalf of the university would be utilized to a greater extent and have maximum reach and impact.

Transformative and Transitional Agreements

Many publishers, from large commercial publishers to society publishers, and including fully Open-Access publishers, are creating new models and agreements where the opening of research is a priority. Pilot agreements that aim to combine institutional investments from across campus into more sustainable payments are often central to these models.

University Libraries has several current agreements with publishers to cover both the subscription costs for our readers and the Open-Access publishing costs for our authors. These transformative and transitional agreements include Read and Publish agreements where the subscription costs (the Read) and the Open-Access publishing costs (the Publish) are bundled together in single license, and a Pure Publish agreement where the Open-Access costs (the Publish) are covered in a license with a fully Open-Access publisher. We continue to engage in discussions with other publishers as well, both on behalf of our institution, and through our consortia partners.

Licensing Strategies and Guidelines for Transformative Agreements

The licensing process for supporting transformative and
transitional agreements is not substantially different from negotiating other library resources and subscriptions. If a library has an existing license, all that may be needed is an addendum to add the Publish specific terms. If a new license is negotiated, there should be two parts, one addressing the Read or content part of the agreement and one addressing the Publish part. In no case should the institutional agreement impact an author’s ability to negotiate rights for their work.

In a Publish section of a license, the following areas should be addressed. It should define what type of author is qualified to participate under the agreement. Most often it is the corresponding author (who may or may not also be the first author), but an institution may determine other types of affiliated authors as eligible. Additionally, include language defining what types of institutional affiliations submitting authors may have, for example faculty, graduate students and other institutional researchers could qualify, but not undergraduate students. The agreement should describe the available Creative Commons (CC) license the publishers works with, as well as what is the default CC license authors might see in a publisher’s submission system. Ideally a Publish license will identify approved repositories for posting Open-Access content, but some publishers manage that through the author agreement process. Finally, the Publish part of the agreement should detail the payment process for the Open-Access publishing fees. Some publishers may detail payment information for both Read and Publish in the same section.

Taylor & Francis Read and Publish Agreement

University Libraries and Taylor & Francis have a three-year pilot Read and Publish agreement through 2022. The Taylor & Francis Read and Publish agreement combines traditional subscription-based access to Taylor & Francis journals for the Ohio State community with immediate Open Access to Ohio State-authored
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articles. The agreement gives Ohio State ongoing access to Taylor & Francis’s collection of more than 2,400 journals as well as covering the Open-Access publishing costs of articles published by Ohio State corresponding authors in Taylor & Francis journals that offer Open Access (Taylor & Francis Open Select, Routledge Open Select, Taylor & Francis Open, Routledge Open, and Cogent OA). Ohio State corresponding authors can choose to publish their articles Open Access immediately upon publication without paying article processing charges (APCs).

With Taylor & Francis we had a demonstrated need to increase Read access. We were able to negotiate a Read and Publish agreement as a pilot to understand how it might work with a large publisher and how researchers publishing in their portfolio of journals would approach the choice of barrier-free Open Access. Entering into conversations with Taylor & Francis about a potential Read and Publish agreement, the diverse publishing portfolio of Taylor & Francis was intriguing. About 60% of its titles are in the humanities and social sciences, disciplines that may not have had as many opportunities to engage with Open Access, particularly in respect to funding in an author-side charge model. An objective of this pilot agreement is to examine Open-Access uptake across the humanities and social sciences. Prior to our agreement, Ohio State’s Open-Access publishing with Taylor & Francis was very low across all disciplines.

Royal Society Read and Publish 2021 Agreement

The Royal Society Read and Publish agreement combines traditional subscription-based access to Royal Society articles for the Ohio State community with immediate Open Access to Ohio State-authored articles. The agreement was a one-year pilot in 2021 that we are currently working on renewing for 2022, which gives Ohio State Read access to the full list of Royal Society journals and perpetual access rights for Read content published during the
agreement period as well as covering the Open-Access costs of articles published by Ohio State corresponding authors in Royal Society journals. Ohio State corresponding authors can publish their articles Open Access immediately upon publication without paying APCs.

The Royal Society approached us at renewal time about transitioning to their Read and Publish model. It is a low stakes investment that could have impact on how this society publisher structures their business model going forward. The one-year agreement also allowed for the expansion of Open-Access publishing options for our life sciences researchers.

PLOS All-In Unlimited Pure Publishing Agreement

University Libraries and Ohio State's Health Sciences Library have a three-year agreement with PLOS allowing fee-free publishing for Ohio State corresponding authors in all PLOS journals. PLOS is now working with libraries in a strategic, transformative way—engaging directly with libraries and library consortia in the marketplace—with several new Pure Publish agreement models.

Researcher authors at Ohio State had been inquiring about institutional discounts for PLOS APCs for several years. During our 2014–2015 Open-Access fund pilot, 25% of the funds were awarded to authors publishing in PLOS journals. In 2020, PLOS presented the BTAA with an offer for the PLOS Community Action Program, which at that time included uncapped, fee-free Open-Access publishing for BTAA member institution corresponding authors in two PLOS journals, PLOS Biology and PLOS Medicine; the consortium entered into a three-year agreement beginning January 2021. Later in 2021, PLOS presented the Center for Research Libraries, of which Ohio State is a member, and NorthEast Research Libraries with options to expand coverage for uncapped, fee-free Open-Access publishing. Beginning October 2021, in partnership with the Health Sciences Library, University Libraries expanded its agreement to include all
PLOS titles through the end of 2024. In addition to allowing all Ohio State corresponding authors to publish in any PLOS journal with no fees, University Libraries wanted to prioritize supporting a nonprofit, fully Open-Access publisher.

**Collective Action**

As members of two major library consortia, BTAA and OhioLINK, we have opportunities to engage across these distinct membership groups to facilitate more open scholarship and understand how the unique needs of individual institutions may work together as a collective to impact change in the scholarly publishing landscape. Additional partners include open infrastructure providers—the platforms, repositories, and related technologies that host and make accessible and discoverable various forms of open scholarship. Collective investing in open infrastructure provides support for community-supported services and open infrastructure that play an essential role in the creation of a sustainable model for the future of scholarly publishing. Working collectively with our consortia, and our peers, we are also supporting new funding models for scholarly journal and scholarly monograph publishing. Our poster highlights several of our collective action agreements that support open scholarly publishing and open scholarly publishing infrastructure.

**BTAA and Open Library of Humanities (OLH) Collective Action Agreement**

The BTAA and OLH announced a three-year collective action agreement in July 2021 that provides multiyear support for OLH from all fifteen BTAA member libraries.
BTAA Collective Action Agreement with DOAJ

The BTAA and DOAJ announced a three-year collective action agreement in February 2021 that provides multiyear support for DOAJ from all fifteen BTAA member libraries.

BTAA Collective Action Agreement with DOAB and OAPEN

The BTAA announced a three-year collective action agreement with DOAB and OAPEN in May 2021 that provides financial support from all fifteen BTAA member libraries.

TOME@Ohio State

University Libraries is participating in the TOME five-year pilot (2017–2022) to advance the wide dissemination of scholarship by humanities and humanistic social sciences faculty members through Open-Access editions of peer-reviewed and professionally edited monographs. TOME's mission is to harness the potential of digital publishing technologies to increase access to book-length research in the humanities and social sciences and ensure the long-term economic viability of the scholarly publishing system.

BTAA and University of Michigan Press Fund to Mission Agreement

The BTAA and the University of Michigan Press announced a three-year agreement in August 2021 that provides multiyear support for the University of Michigan Press's Fund to Mission from all fifteen BTAA member libraries.
The BTAA and the MIT Press announced a three-year collective action agreement in July 2021 that provides Direct to Open access for all fifteen BTAA member libraries.

**Conclusion**

After more than two years of strategic prioritization of work under the Transforming the Scholarly Publishing Economy initiative, significant progress has been made working within our guiding principles to approach and achieve our goals. We advanced the growth of open scholarship to directly benefit our researchers and scholars. Through our agreements and collaborations with publishers, authors, and campus stakeholders we provided purposeful experiential learning opportunities within Ohio State and our consortia. And where possible, we evolved past a traditional provider/customer model into true collaborative partnerships with publishers, with shared risk as an essential component of our agreements.

As we move into year three and beyond, in addition to working on several potential new transformative agreements as an institution and as a consortial partner, our focus will expand to further understand the impact of our in-progress work for our researchers, University Libraries, the university, our consortia, publisher partners, and the scholarly publishing ecosystem. Building out assessment criteria will be essential to not only understand impact, but also to evaluate the sustainability of what are largely still experimental models in the United States. We look forward to continuing to explore how best to meet the needs of our varied constituents while sharing our progress with our campus and more broadly across the library and publishing communities.
Foundations and Explorations

Engaging First-Year Students Through Microcollections

MARY WEGMANN, LAURA KRIER, AND HILARY SMITH

In October 2017, Arizona State University Library published a white paper, “The Future of the Academic Library Print Collection: A Space for Engagement,” exploring ways libraries could encourage engagement with print collections in response to declining circulation. The paper suggests a dynamic, curatorial approach to shelving and displaying print materials that emphasize collaboration with the community to showcase materials that reflect research, teaching, and cocurricular activities from across the university. They write that,

[t]o take full advantage of print’s possibilities, it is imperative that library collection management is approached in a deliberate rather than reactive manner. This means choosing the items that are kept close at hand, rather than letting inertia take over and remaining passive to what is kept in our collections.

(O’Donnell et al., 2017)

As in many libraries, the physical collections in the Sonoma State University Library dominate a significant part of the building we occupy. The library has an on-site automated retrieval system which houses approximately 56% of the collections, but the open stacks still take up about half of the floor space in the building. The stacks can appear imposing and difficult to navigate; librarians and staff frequently work with students who feel confused and intimidated when trying to find what they need. In addition, the collection is aging: The vast majority of titles in the print collection
were published between 1960 and 1989. They are dusty, old, and not necessarily visually appealing. Circulation rates have been steadily decreasing over the past decade and many books in the collection have been virtually untouched for over ten years.

As use of the print collection declines, we have begun to consider whether housing unused books is the best use of the building. The needs of the student population are changing and an increased emphasis on active, hands-on learning means that we need to provide more space for group work, maker activities, lectures and active events, while still preserving space for quiet study. We are searching for ways to make the best use of the facility while also enabling access to and engagement with the physical collections. Despite decreases in circulation, studies consistently show that students prefer to use print materials and perceive that they learn better from them (Baron et al., 2017). As librarians, we continue to evaluate our collection priorities, balancing the cost of e-books (often significantly higher than print), perceived patron preferences, accessibility and ease of use, and data about reading comprehension and performance outcomes. The ASU white paper provided us a new way to approach our collection, rethinking its role in the building and in our community. One of the approaches suggested by the whitepaper authors is to

develop collections that facilitate maximum engagement and keep those collections fresh by devising a resource-intensive but meaningful rotation of volumes from location to location for limited periods and specific purposes instead of limiting ourselves permanently to a small subset of the total.

(O’Donnell et al., 2017)

This approach would involve maintaining both an open stacks collection and a closed stacks collection, regularly rotating materials into the open stacks in a “fluid curatorial process where the print that users see in our libraries changes and responds to the
activities, interests, and trajectories of our communities over time” (O'Donnell et al., 2017).

In spring 2018, the librarians decided to implement a pilot project to create a “microcollection”: a smaller, curated collection of print materials shelved in a visible location. The project had two goals: We wanted to know whether shelving books outside of the main stacks would increase usage and we wanted to evaluate the amount of work that would be required to curate a collection like this. If the amount of work was reasonable and the use of materials increased, we would consider the possibility of creating several dynamic microcollections, their contents and focus reflecting community interest, interdisciplinary topics, and campus priorities and events. This could potentially allow us to house more of our print collection in the ARS and allow us to use our public spaces more strategically. This paper describes the collaborative process we engaged in to design and implement the microcollection and the data we gathered about use of the materials and proposes some possible next steps.

Planning for the Microcollection

In spring 2018, the Systems and Metadata Librarian, Research and User Services Librarian, and Collection Development Librarian met to discuss opportunities for developing a microcollection in the SSU Library. After considering several of the examples outlined in the ASU whitepaper, we determined that, in addition to the goals stated previously, the microcollection pilot had the potential to help address some of the navigational challenges lower-division students experience in the library. Many students enter Sonoma State with minimal experience navigating Library of Congress call numbers or knowledge of how academic library collections are organized. The microcollection could be a manageably sized browsing collection composed of a representative sample of the monographs held in the
general collection; the condensed collection would make it possible for students to gain a better understanding of the library's classification and organizational systems and the types of materials available. The authors of the whitepaper suggest that,

[a]s universities and colleges enroll students who may have little or no experience navigating the complexities of the library system, it is the responsibility of libraries to adapt and make the logic behind library systems of classification more transparent to our users.

(O’Donnell et al., 2017)

By including titles from across the Library of Congress classification spectrum, students would be able to see this organizational logic on a smaller, more comprehensible scale. Additionally, the microcollection could function as a starting point for lower-division research assignments by housing foundational texts, books exploring new research and creative activities, and materials related to various first- and second-year courses. Our intention was that the collection would inspire curiosity and serendipitous discovery in students when formulating research questions.

We were also interested in how microcollections could help us rethink open stacks and space use in the library to better facilitate teaching and learning. The majority of the library's circulating collection is located on the third floor of the building while the service desks and classrooms are on the second floor. We wanted to create a microcollection that was located near the library classrooms to see if ease of access facilitated more opportunities to incorporate monographs into library instruction. Additionally, the microcollection would be located near the reference collection, periodicals, and popular reading which would allow students to easily access a sampling of the physical materials that make up the library's collections. Finally, we wanted to see if books in the microcollection would see an increase in in-house use and loans. If the microcollection was successful in accomplishing these goals, we hoped that it could serve as a model for reducing or reimagining
the open stacks collections on the third floor. This pilot project allowed us to assess the workload involved in this more resource-intensive approach to collection curation and to determine whether it would be feasible to continue on an ongoing basis and whether the increased work would be justified by increased use of the collection.

After determining the initial goals for the pilot, the Systems and Metadata Librarian, Research and User Services Librarian, and Collection Development Librarian brought the pilot idea to the library faculty as a whole for discussion. The SSU library faculty make most programmatic decisions using a consensus-based approach and it was important to the lead librarians to get buy-in from the entire library faculty. The primary concern voiced was that adding a new physical location could be confusing for patrons and invite more opportunities for books to be misshelved. Despite these reservations, the librarians were enthusiastic about the idea and decided to pilot the microcollection for one semester and then assess how it was used and managed.

Since the target audience was lower-division undergraduates, we decided on the theme “Foundations and Explorations” to align with the General Education (GE) curriculum, which was being revised at the time. We thought that this title reflected what we were trying to accomplish with the collection and hoped that the clear connection to the GE curriculum would encourage faculty and students to use the collection in their courses. The metrics we identified for assessing the project included circulation statistics, how frequently the collection was integrated into library instruction or disciplinary instruction, the resources and time it would take to create and maintain the collection, and how often items were misshelved or misplaced.

After discussing general parameters for what to include in the collection, we scheduled a time when everyone was available to select materials in their liaison areas. While it was not necessary to select materials at the same time, doing so reinforced the collaborative and interdisciplinary nature of the project and
provided the opportunity for further informal discussion about the purpose of the collection. After this initial period of selection, librarians continued to select in their areas individually. The process of physically reviewing and pulling titles from the stacks presented an additional advantage in that librarians were able to construct a more comprehensive picture of the collections in their liaison areas, seeing where subjects might be over- or underrepresented, which areas were outdated, and where additional purchases might be beneficial. Overall, we pulled over 1,800 books to include in the microcollection. The Stacks Manager then updated the location code for the materials in the library management system to a new, temporary code, and reshelved them in their new location.

Microcollection in Action

The microcollection was located on the second floor of the library, away from main stacks, in a high-traffic student study area. This area also included the reference collection, popular reading display, and print periodicals. The area featured a “lounge” with comfortable seating and displays that encouraged browsing and reading. In addition, we positioned the collection adjacent to one of our two library instruction classrooms to facilitate integration with our first-year instruction programs.

Over the course of the pilot, the microcollection was incorporated into eighteen instruction sessions. In one example, Instruction Librarian Kaitlin Springmier used the collection to show students how to browse the library’s catalog, narrow their search and locate the physical item in the stacks. After an overview of the collection’s scope and purpose, students were encouraged to explore and find a title that “inspired” them, using it as a jumping-off point for their research. Back in the classroom students engaged with their book by responding to a series of prompts before expanding their research to other sources. These Foundations and
Explorations-themed sessions were enthusiastically adopted by a number of disciplinary faculty.

Although there were some initial concerns that creating an additional location, separate from the main stacks, would cause confusion, we did not note any significant issues for our users. Students, particularly first-year students, already had difficulty navigating our stacks. Our main stacks are spread over two wings of the building and navigating them can be a challenge even for experienced users. Rather than add to that confusion, the microcollection simplified access for this group and provided opportunities for more hands-on information literacy instruction. Students who might not otherwise have braved the main stacks could be introduced to an accessible snapshot of the collection, one which was small enough in scope for successful browsing. It is hoped that this introduction may have prepared students for further exploration in the main stacks.

Reviewing the Data

Although we initially planned to pilot the collection for only one semester, we decided to extend the pilot for the full academic year. Our loan period for students is sixteen weeks, so items that circulate in one semester will likely be unable to circulate again until the following semester; a full year provided items more of an opportunity to circulate. The Systems and Metadata Librarian created a set of reports in the library management system's Analytics tool at the beginning of the pilot, pulling historical circulation data for the titles selected. At the end of the pilot, the same data was pulled for the academic year and compared both to the historical data, and to data for the circulating collection as a whole.

Circulation of items in the microcollection was higher than that for items in the main stacks: 13% of the items in the microcollection
were loaned compared to 3% of items in the main stacks. We also learned, however, that circulation of items in display locations (a shelving display in the second-floor lobby of the library and a slatwall display area near the third-floor stairwell) was significantly higher than circulation in the microcollection: 46% of items on the second-floor lobby display and 27% of items on the third-floor slatwall display circulated. These displays also require time for curation and selection by librarians, as well as staff work to pull, recode, and reshelve materials. This data suggests that the work required to curate smaller collections of materials does increase use of materials, and that visibility has a strong impact on circulation. Comparing historical circulation data for the subset of titles in the microcollection reveals that loans for these titles increased by only about 4%. However, in-house use increased by 35%. This suggests that these titles were more heavily browsed, though not necessarily more frequently checked out.

Peak months for loans of microcollection titles in 2018–2019 were September 2018 (58 loans), followed closely by February 2019 (55 loans). This mirrors to some extent the peak months for loans of items in the main stacks: October 2018 (853 loans), followed closely by November 2018 (767 loans) and February 2019 (753 loans).

The Systems and Metadata Librarian correlated circulation data for the “Foundations & Explorations” microcollection with data reported by librarians about whether they used the “Foundations & Explorations” microcollection in their instruction. Librarians introduced the collection in five courses in Fall 2018 and thirteen courses in Spring 2019. Loan dates do not appear to be correlated with dates of instruction; however, introducing the collection in the classroom may still have led to use of the collection at a later date. Without qualitative data about discovery of these titles, it is not possible to know if there is a direct correlation.

Finally, reports were created to analyze the populations who checked out materials from the microcollection. Eighty percent of the borrowers of microcollection titles in 2018–2019 were undergraduate students, compared to 52% of borrowers of items in
the main stacks. The target audience for this microcollection was undergraduate students, and it seems as though we were successful in selecting titles that were appealing to and appropriate for these users. This also suggests that a smaller, more easily browsable collection might be easier for undergraduate students to navigate. Again, to verify this suspicion, further qualitative research would be required.

Additionally, feedback from the librarians indicated that the level of effort required to curate and manage the microcollection was not onerous and in fact provided a good opportunity to become more familiar with our print collection. Similarly, the Stacks Manager, Interlibrary Loan Coordinator, and Access Services staff had minimal issues with shelving and locating materials. The initial perception of the project as a potential burden changed after staff saw the increased use and acknowledged that their workload was not negatively impacted.

**Next Steps**

As indicated by the data, the microcollection was a success. Many of the issues that were flagged as barriers at the outset (workload and confusion over space) had unanticipated benefits. While the process of identifying and pulling titles for the collection required a significant investment of time, the library faculty found that the process provided the opportunity to review our collection. Librarians were able to identify gaps, note items that needed weeding and rediscover some gems. In our library, where librarians wear many hats, this kind of collection work can sometimes fall by the wayside. The process we used, collaborative in planning and implementation, also gave us the chance to share observations about our collection areas overall.

Given the success of the pilot, we plan to continue to experiment with microcollections, taking inspiration from the ideas outlined
in the ASU whitepaper. We hope to build on the instructional components of the microcollection by increasing informational signage and developing asynchronous instructional activities that could be integrated into courses. Additionally, microcollections could present opportunities for greater collaboration with instructional faculty by tailoring collections to department or program needs. Some potential collaborative projects include a collection focused on titles that are part of the English Master's degree program final exam and collections that align with second-year experience courses in the Arts and Humanities and Social Sciences.

Finally, the library is in the process of planning for a building revitalization initiative; the success of the microcollection has encouraged us to think more creatively about our open stacks and how we might curate our print collection so it is more engaging and integrated into the curriculum. There is potential for a wholesale revisioning of how we house and make accessible our print collections that could more meaningfully reflect the changing needs of our students and campus community.
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Collecting for Diversity in a Smaller Academic Library

GEORGE WRENN

Introduction

This brief narrative supplements a Charleston Conference poster session describing a grant-funded project to make diversity a focus of collection development at the Humboldt State University Library. The author led the project with support from five student service learners and library acquisitions staff. I explain the rationale for the project and describe project steps and outcomes.

Throughout the narrative, reference to diversity is shorthand for the widely used terminology: diversity, equity, and inclusion (DEI). The Charleston poster is reproduced in Appendix B.

The Project

In spring 2020, The Humboldt State University Library sought grant funding from the campus Office of Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion (ODEI) with the goal of diversifying our print and electronic collections. The Library has maintained a relatively small monographic book budget for the last two decades (typically $25,000–$50,000 per year). Our print collection is aging, with the highest percentage of titles in the collection published between the 1970s and 1990s. Most of our e-book offerings are made possible through annual subscriptions funded centrally by the California State University (CSU) system. Almost all of our print and electronic...
monographic acquisitions in recent years result from instructional faculty requests.

In applying for ODEI funding, we stated:

Building collections that support diversity, equity, and inclusion has been a goal of the Library for many years. Unfortunately, funding for materials is limited and we cannot acquire a great deal of the scholarship that we think would benefit students, staff, and faculty. [...] Although we acquire many titles in these areas, we would like to do more and include more students, faculty, and staff in the selection process.

The University's Center for Community Based Learning enthusiastically supported our efforts to recruit service learners to help with this collection development project. Humboldt State has a very strong culture of service learning, and the Library actively develops opportunities for students to gain professional skills through volunteer internship or employment. After being awarded $5,000 in one-time funding (for monographic acquisitions), we welcomed five student service learners to work on the project. All received course credit for their work, and two of the five earned additional course credit by serving as project coordinators.

We met regularly via Zoom over the course of the fall 2020 semester to conduct and discuss the project. For our first meeting, I developed a PowerPoint project overview and offered written guidance on each phase of the project (see Appendix A). My goal was to provide a framework within which students could explore diversity and engage in collection development based on their own inclinations and interests.
Defining Diversity and Each Student’s Areas of Interest

Following our orientation meeting, I asked the students to explore definitions of diversity, including the meaning of diversity in libraries, and to share their ideas as a group. What do we mean by diversity? What does it mean to diversify collection development? The students used this exploratory exercise to investigate and share ideas about diversity in general and how libraries operational diversity in collection development. I next asked students to choose their areas of interest. What aspects of diversity did they want to explore? Using the Library of Congress authority file and various LibGuides focused on diversity, students identified subject headings corresponding to their areas of interest.

For example, one student decided to focus on the topic of Police, and identified the following subjects:

- Police Brutality–United States
- Police–Supervision of–United States
- Police–Community relations–United States
- Police Questioning–United States
- Police Misconduct–United States
- Community Policing–United States

Other topics included gender, transgender people, minorities, and minority religion.

Our next goal was to use the Humboldt State, California State, and Library of Congress catalogs to look up subjects, compare search results, and develop a picture of the relative strength of HSU’s collections in diversity-related subjects.
Analysis: Gathering Statistics

Our statistical analysis counted search results for the HSU Library, the CSU libraries as a whole (including HSU), and the Library of Congress. The results revealed HSU’s weaknesses in almost every subject heading, measured by (1) the comparative number of items and (2) the publication date ranges of the results. Although not unexpected, the results confirmed that collection development would be beneficial in numerous areas. For example, for the Police subject headings, the following results were obtained:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject Heading</th>
<th>HSU Book Count</th>
<th>HSU Book Dates</th>
<th>CSU Book Count</th>
<th>CSU Book Dates</th>
<th>LC Book Count</th>
<th>LC Book Dates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Police–Supervision of–United States</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>1963–2020</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>1889–2018</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Collection Development

For this phase of the project, students used various collection development tools, including Choice Reviews, to identify titles for acquisition. Selections were compiled for review in the spring semester when acquisitions staff evaluated the student recommendations and developed a spending plan. Factors
influencing final selections included cost, appropriateness to the curriculum, and general interest. To supplement the selections of our service students, we surveyed faculty, staff, and students for additional suggestions and consulted various ODEI book and award lists. Vendors and publishers have been exceptional in their support for DEI in recent years; curated collections from EBSCO, ProQuest, and others provided additional opportunities for DEI exploration and selection.

When considering a project like this, it can be anticipated that librarians will have different levels of comfort with acquiring materials selected by students with little or no experience in library work or collection development. Building in a review process may help to alleviate concerns, but the project also benefited greatly from the variety of lived experience that students brought to the collection development process. Ultimately, we aimed to create a more inclusive collection development process that would reflect the Library’s strong commitment to diversity:

Acquisition of these materials becomes a tangible representation of our campus and library commitment to diversity, equity, and inclusion. A widely participatory selection process, followed by online and physical display of the new materials, will engage the HSU community, and raise awareness of the scholarship related to underrepresented groups. [...] This program continues the Library’s long-standing commitment to be an inclusive, safe, and welcoming space where all cultures, ethnicities, sexual orientations, and abilities are valued. Students, faculty, and staff will benefit from access to a range of materials that address diversity, equity, and inclusion.

(Grant Proposal)
Use of the acquired materials will become another gauge of success and help us to assess diversity-related collection development practices as we move forward with new projects.

Marketing and Presentation

An acquisitions list was developed in the 2021 spring semester. The results can be viewed in the Library’s “Diverse Collections – Recent Acquisitions” LibGuide. This has become an ongoing summary of diverse acquisitions in various categories, including those chosen by the project’s service learners. Electronic bookplates accompany grant-funded titles in the catalog. Other marketing has included onsite book displays and news items. With the support of the Library’s Marketing and Outreach team, additional promotions will be tied to calendar events supportive of diversity (e.g., Black History Month).

We look forward to building upon this grant-funded acquisitions project with the goal of infusing diversity into all aspects of collection development and transforming our collections to better serve and represent our increasingly diverse student population.

Appendix A

Library Collection Diversity—Project Guidance

If you need help with anything, please reach out!

Exploring Collection Diversity

The American Library Association and the Association of College
and Research Libraries have published statements and standards related to diversity. Diversity-related information is also available from various organizational committees, individual library statements and programs, and the professional literature of librarianship.

See what you can find on the web and through the library catalog. As you are searching, try to focus on information that relates specifically to library collections.

Things to keep in mind: some information may be geared toward public libraries. Some may be relevant to both academic and public libraries. Since we are a university library, information related to academic libraries will be most relevant to our project.

It would be helpful to have a brief summary of what you learned about diversity in collection development. It can be a paragraph or two. Share relevant links/citations to your sources of information.

We will assemble and summarize your research for our report to the Library.

Focus Areas

Your focus area will be a specific aspect of diversity. For example, you may decide to focus on gender. Or race. Or identity. Or an intersectional topic.

After you’ve chosen a focus area, the next step will be to translate your topic into Library catalog subject terminology so that we can relate your topic to the Library’s collections.

These library research guides will be of help:
Cornell: https://guides.library.cornell.edu/c.php?g=883781&p=6572087
Pacifica: https://library.pacific.edu/diversity/subjects.html
The Library of Congress provides a very useful list of subjects here:
+++Library of Congress: https://id.loc.gov/authorities/subjects.html [This tool is very helpful!]
These lists show diversity-related subject headings that are used in library catalog metadata. Subject headings can be a very powerful search tool, but they also reflect the culture’s norms, sometimes in a discriminatory way. A good example is the subject heading: illegal aliens.

You can also read about what librarians and others are doing to make Library of Congress subject headings more inclusive. A good place to start:


After reviewing subjects in the research guides, see if you can identify specific subject headings of interest to you. Some subjects can be very broad and some are narrower. You can go as broad or as narrow as you want but we will aim for a good mix because that will help in our collection analysis and development of purchase recommendations.

For example, I’m interested in the poet Claudia Rankine, who is coming to speak at HSU. Her book Citizen: An American Lyric has these subjects:

Racism — United States — Poetry
Racism — United States
United States — Race relations — Poetry
United States — Race relations

So, I could select Racism–United States to explore when we do our collection assessment.

To make the assessment more useful, I’d like each of you to select 10–12 subjects related to your focus. Remember to select topics that interest you!

Send your list of selected subjects to the Coordinator. Please
provide a brief justification for your choices. Remember that there are no wrong choices!

The Coordinator will compile the selections and see if there is any overlap. We will make suggestions as necessary if we need to broaden the mix of subjects.

These subjects will become the basis for our assessment work.

Assessment

The team will do subject searches in the HSU/CSU Library catalog and gather data on search results. George and the Coordinator will share detailed instructions on how to do this.

Data will include:
- Number of HSU results retrieved for each subject
- Number of CSU results retrieved for each subject
- Number of languages represented in HSU results
- Date ranges for HSU results
- Number of HSU results published in last five years
- Number of HSU results published in last twenty years

Coordinator will supplement this data with similar information from the Library of Congress catalog.

The end result will be a spreadsheet of data that will allow us to assess the relative strength and weakness of HSU’s collections in each subject. We will use this information to prioritize work in the next phase of the project.

Selection of New Materials

Team members will select one of four methodologies to identify materials for purchase:

1. Library selection tools: Choice Reviews, Publisher’s Weekly, Kirkus Reviews, GOBI.
2. Free-form exploration: Amazon and book lists on the web, academic publisher websites, social media for books (e.g., Goodreads or The StoryGraph), books awards and alternatives presses (many libraries like this one, and this one, create lists: Explore!).

3. Library catalog exploration: to see if we could build on authors already collected at HSU, across the CSU, or elsewhere.

4. Scholarship: look at CVs of professors at universities with CRGS programs, ethnic studies, Africana studies, etc.

It's important to consider a book's audience when making selections. Some books are directed at a general audience, some have a specific academic audience in mind. We tend to purchase books that will be of value down the road, not just this year. It's important to think about what is taught at HSU. We also want to focus (mostly) on more recent materials.

Marketing and Outreach

This will be a free-form exploration of ideas for marketing. How can we use social media, university channels of communication, news items, etc. to promote the materials that will be acquired and to share what we have achieved?

Finally, all of the above will be used to prepare a final report for the Office of Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion!
Appendix B

COLLECTING FOR DIVERSITY AT HUMBOLDT STATE
GEORGE.WRENN@HUMBOLDT.EDU
(COLLECTION DEVELOPMENT LIBRARIAN)

PROJECT GOALS:
1) TO SUPPORT DIVERSITY AND REFRESH AN AGING COLLECTION THROUGH PARTICIPATORY CDD.
2) TO SUPPORT A CULTURE OF SERVICE LEARNING.
3) TO ADVANCE THE UNIVERSITY’S STRATEGIC PLAN.

STEPS ALONG THE WAY:
1) OBTAIN $5,000 IN DEI FUNDING.
2) DEFINE DIVERSITY WITH FIVE-MEMBER STUDENT TEAM.
3) SELECT AREAS OF INTEREST AND COMPARE ANALYZE THE COLLECTION.
4) ENGAGE IN VARIOUS SELECTION ACTIVITIES (BOOKS AND VIDEOS).

PREPARATORY ANALYSIS:
1) IDENTIFY SUBJECT HEADINGS RELATED TO STUDENT AREA(S) OF INTEREST.
2) COLLECT STATISTICS ON NUMBER OF TITLES IN SUBJECT, PUBLICATION DATE RANGES, NUMBER OF INDIVIDUAL AUTHORS.
3) COMPARE HSU TO CSU-WIDE AND LLC HOLDINGS.
4) IDENTIFY FOCUS AREAS.

COLLECTION DEVELOPMENT:
FACULTY AND STUDENT SURVEYS, INDIVIDUAL SELECTION ACTIVITIES USING CHOICE, DEI LISTS, PUBLISHER AND VENDOR LISTS, AND SOME FREE-FORM SEARCHING.

ORGANIZE, PUBLISH, AND PROMOTE
DIVERSE COLLECTIONS LIBLUIDE (PLUS: ELECTRONIC BOOKS: NEWS ITEMS AND LIBRARY NEWSLETTER, DISPLAYS)

LESSONS LEARNED AND LOOKING AHEAD
PLACE MORE EMPHASIS ON INDIVIDUAL AUTHORS, LOOK MORE CLOSELY AT DIVERSITY OF PUBLISHERS, EMBRACE DIVERSITY IN EVERY AREA OF CDD.

“Diversity is the understanding that everybody is unique and that there are differences within race, gender, ethnicity, sex, etc. In terms of the library collection, it is making sure to include multiple viewpoints and perspectives.” – Munachi Ndigwe, student coordinator
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A Report from HathiTrust on Accessibility Initiatives

ANGELINA ZAYTSEV

Introduction

Libraries have increasingly engaged in accessibility initiatives, recognizing the important role that they play in providing resources to students and faculty with disabilities. Others have documented the work done in the library profession to evaluate and procure accessible electronic resources (Ostergaard, 2015; McKelvey, 2020; O’Reilly, 2020); how to negotiate for accessibility of electronic resources (Rodriguez, 2020); how to verify the accessibility of vendor resources (Falloon, 2020; Ostergaard, 2015); building accessible library websites (Riley-Huff, 2015; Lush, 2015); etc. I have previously written about accessibility services and work at HathiTrust (Zaytsev, 2015), and in this article, I provide an update reflecting on the work we’ve done since then. This includes enhancements to our major accessibility service, accessibility and usability improvements to our digital library platform, as well as exploratory projects we are involved in to improve the accessibility of texts and the findability of accessible collections. This article provides a more expansive version of my content in the panel presentation, “Accessibility and Scholarly Communications: Ensuring Access for All” from Charleston Conference 2021.

HathiTrust is a not-for-profit collaborative of academic and research libraries. We are governed and funded by our 210 participating member organizations, serving over 300 university
campuses at the time of writing. Our library collection is the largest noncorporate collection of digital materials at over 17 million texts, and it serves between 400,000 and 600,000 visitors per month. We serve a large variety of user groups, from university students and faculty to general members of the public, located throughout the world.

**Setting the Context**

HathiTrust exists in a landscape of information resources used by blind and print-disabled students, staff and faculty, as well as the university and library staff who serve them.

Blind and print-disabled patrons can use a variety of search strategies to find academic resources. Figure 1 (also available in Appendix as a hierarchical list) captures some of the more common techniques that blind and print-disabled patrons may use to find and acquire academic texts.

Text formats vary depending on the individual's needs, with some preferring electronic files in various digital formats (e.g., PDF, ePub), audio formats (e.g., audiobooks available through common services like Audible or YouTube; DAISY files), analog or electronic Braille formats, or print books. In cases where patrons are only able to find a print copy of the book, they may use a document scanner or their smartphone to capture images of the pages and convert the page images into a preferred electronic file.
Separate from whether the information resource is available to these patrons are questions of whether the resource or the website platform is accessible and easily navigable or whether the patron is even aware of these resources. In cases where a patron is unable to find a required text or navigate the platform, there are a variety of steps they can take. They may choose to reach out to their professor, their university library, or their campus disability office for further help. Disability services staff can use many of the same services that their patrons use, with the addition of expert search strategies, and are able to take advantage of specific services available only to disability services staff aimed at service providers. Inaccessible websites, however, can cause problems even for disability services staff, who may have their own disabilities.

HathiTrust is one such service that both patrons and disability services staff can use to access electronic resources. Anyone anywhere is able to search across the HathiTrust collection and access the public domain material in the collection. Depending on
the location of the patron (we distinguish access based on whether a user is located inside or outside the United States), a patron may have access to either 5.07 million or 6.91 million texts at the time of writing. Patrons with disabilities are able to use our accessible interface (more information about our platform is provided below) to read public domain books on our site, or if they are affiliated with a HathiTrust member institution, they can download public domain files for their own use. In addition, disabled students are able to submit requests for copyrighted books to a staff member on their campus who has registered for the HathiTrust Accessible Text Request Service (ATRS) (see below).

Accessibility Foci at HathiTrust

As a digital library funded and governed by its members, we prioritize the needs of our member institutions. We gather feedback from our members through a number of methods, including our governance structures, annual membership meetings, various surveys, user research, working groups that involve staff at member organizations, and through requests that come into our User Support team. Our work at this time is guided by our 2019–2023 Strategic Directions (HathiTrust, 2018), which were developed through a consultative process with the membership. In addition to more general goals to understand user needs and improve support for all users, the Strategic Directions affirmed HT’s longtime emphasis on serving print-disabled users and included the following two areas of potential investment:

- Extend the access program for print-disabled users in the general public to dramatically increase the volume of accessible materials.
- Streamline existing services for print-disabled users and amplify our focus on accessibility for all users of HathiTrust’s
services.

These collaboratively created goals and investments in new employees (we have grown from a staff of six full-time employees in 2018 to fifteen in 2022) and in new projects have refocused our attention on accessibility work as well as general user experience improvements, as discussed below.

Providing Access to Library Materials

The HathiTrust collection is a truly collective collection. Materials in our collection have been digitized from over sixty different library collections. Our collection reflects the holdings of many North American universities and libraries, but also includes materials from universities in other parts of the world, including Keio University, Universidad Complutense de Madrid, American University of Beirut, and the University of Queensland. We have collected materials in over 400 languages, and our collection spans a broad range of years, from a Coptic manuscript created sometime in the fifth century to scholarly monographs published in 2021.

Many other electronic databases feature recently published materials or carefully curated collections of historic publications. Because of the nature of mass digitization, in which library collections were scanned shelf by shelf, one building at a time, the HathiTrust collection reflects many academic library collections, indiscriminately digitized and deposited into HathiTrust. Consequently, the richness of the HathiTrust collection can serve as a valuable resource for those who are searching for more obscure historic or academic works, such as disability services staff on behalf of their patrons.

Through the ATRS, a staff member at a HathiTrust partner institution can register as an ATRS provider for their campus. After registering, they are able to log into HathiTrust to search for
materials requested by their patrons and to retrieve the item in a variety of different formats (PDF, the OCR as either plain text or packaged in an ePub, or image files). Registered staff are able to access the entire collection, regardless of whether it is copyrighted or not (HathiTrust, n.d. a, b). Depending on the needs of their patrons, the staff member may need to do additional remediation work to fix quality problems in the file or to convert the file into a different format before sending it to their patron.

Since I last wrote about this service (Zaytsev, 2015), we have extended the service and made a number of enhancements. The two most significant changes resulted in expansion of the service to more texts and more countries. First, we removed a restriction on the number of volumes that could be accessed through this service. Where previously, an ATRS provider was only able to access and download books from HathiTrust if the texts were also held in the print collection of the library, starting in 2016, providers were able to access all copyrighted and public domain books in the HathiTrust collection.

We had also carefully monitored the ratification process of the Marrakesh Treaty (WIPO), described by the United States Copyright Office (2020) as such:

The goal of this treaty is increase access to printed materials for these persons around the world. The Marrakesh Treaty requires its contracting member nations to create limitations and exceptions to copyright law that will make it easier for those with these kinds of print disabilities to access printed works in accessible formats such as Braille and digital audio files. It also establishes rules for the exchange of such accessible format copies across borders.

When the United States ratified the Marrakesh Treaty in 2019, this allowed us at HathiTrust to extend ATRS to member institutions in countries that have also ratified the treaty. Consequently, our member libraries in Canada, Australia, New Zealand, and the United
Kingdom have been able to sign up for the service and provide texts to their eligible patrons.

Other changes that we've made to ATRS have focused on improving the quality of the service. After reviewing the language used on the websites of disability services offices for inspiration, we rebranded the service from the clunkily named “Print Disability Proxy Service” to the Accessible Text Request Service. Influenced by the information technology service model (University of California Santa Cruz, n.d.), we updated our website documentation, splitting it into instructions for eligible patrons and for staff at our member institutions and providing comprehensive instructions for registering and accessing the service. We continue to seek improvements to this service through feedback from our ATRS providers, and we launched our first service assessment this past fall. That survey identified a number of areas for improvement, such as enabling direct access for users with print disabilities, adding more course materials to HathiTrust, modifying the interface to serve the unique needs of ATRS providers, and improving the quality of HathiTrust content. Some of these are discussed below.

Providing Content in an Accessible Interface

One major area of work we've undertaken in the past few years has been ensuring the accessibility of the HathiTrust digital library platform. Our library partners have been increasingly concerned about the accessibility of the electronic resources to which they subscribe. For example, the Big Ten Academic Alliance Library E-Resource Accessibility Group has developed standard language for negotiating accessibility into e-resource licenses and also has conducted accessibility testing of e-resource collections (Big Ten Academic Alliance, n.d.).

We began our work with an internal accessibility audit. Although we had ensured in 2013, at the time of our last major website update,
that our platform was accessible at WCAG level A (Zaytsev, 2015), the field of website accessibility had advanced in the years since then. A new version of WCAG (2.1) was released in June 2018, and more resources have been created to educate developers and designers.

In 2019, our accessibility specialist used a mix of accessibility tools and manual methods to review the digital library platform against the main accessibility guidelines:

- W3C WCAG 2.0 at Levels A and AA (World Wide Web Consortium, 2008)
- United States Revised Section 508 standards (U.S. Access Board, n.d.)
- European Union EN 301 549 standards (ETSI, 2018)

They worked first through the WCAG 2.0 Level AA guidelines and devoted specific attention to keyboard controls, reviewing how errors are handled on the platform, checking color contrast throughout the various kinds of pages, and then doing in-depth testing with two commonly used screen readers, NVDA and VoiceOver. This accessibility audit took approximately forty hours.

The results of this thorough accessibility audit surprised us. Our digital library platform had been stable since 2013, and we had not made major changes to it in the six years prior to the audit. Surely, the accessibility work that we had done at that time was still valid? But the audit revealed seventy-eight accessibility issues. We learned that by staying still and doing nothing, our applications had fallen woefully out of date. This lesson about the importance of staying current on web technologies is one that we’ve taken to heart.

Following the discovery of these accessibility issues, we re-prioritized our development projects to focus on an accessibility overhaul of our website, resulting in a major release in June 2019 (HathiTrust, 2019). In addition to improving the accessibility of our digital library platform for blind and print-disabled patrons, this major update allowed us to subsequently convert our platform to a responsive design and to sunset our separate, inferior mobile
website. Improving our platform for one set of users had a waterfall effect of improving usability for all users, as well as building internal staff competencies in development, design, and accessibility.

Our Voluntary Product Accessibility Template (VPAT) provides an up-to-date summary of the accessibility of our platform as well as known accessibility issues (HathiTrust, 2021). We have reviewed and updated our VPAT at significant moments, such as the release of WCAG 2.1 and when we updated our book viewer application in the summer of 2021.

In addition to improving the accessibility of our digital library platform to meet the primary accessibility guidelines, we've undertaken other strategies to support the needs of blind and print-disabled patrons. We've improved our public accessibility documentation (HathiTrust, n.d. a,b) to provide patrons with detailed information about accessibility problems, skip links used throughout the site, access keys, and tips for navigating the site and interacting with books. We've also implemented features specifically aimed at meeting the needs of blind and print-disabled users, such as adding additional download features (HathiTrust, 2020) and incorporating plain text improvements to our book reader application.

We've learned through this work that accessibility is a moving target, and that we must constantly work on improving both the usability and accessibility of our digital library platform. We'll never be able to achieve 100% accessibility—that is a false promise that presumes that we'll know the needs and website navigation strategies of all of our users and be able to build solutions to all of the problems we discover. Instead, our strategy is to constantly keep learning and constantly keep improving, with the goal of making obstacles smaller and smoother over time.
Improving the Usability and Accessibility of Digitized Print Materials

One of the main things that prevents us from achieving our accessibility goals comes out of how our materials were created. HathiTrust is a content aggregator, and most of the HathiTrust collection has been created via mass digitization processes. Library books and serials were scanned cover to cover as high-resolution images, and post-processing improved the readability of the scans. Plain text was created from the page images using automatic optical character recognition (OCR) and not reviewed by humans. At the time of deposit into HathiTrust, we receive a submission inventory package that contains the image files, plain-text OCR (one text file for each image file), and a METS XML file that describes the structure of the book. A separate MARC record is provided by the contributing library. Upon loading into the HathiTrust repository, we deliver the OCR and page images at a reduced resolution through our book reader application, and users are able to download content in a format that is created on the fly.

The process in which these books were created can result in usability and accessibility issues. Some of these affect all users, but certain problems exacerbate the readability of books for blind and print-disabled patrons. Following is a brief summary of some of the content problems we grapple with at HathiTrust:

- **General quality problems**: Books were scanned as is, and the scanning process replicated quality problems in the original print volume, such as torn or missing pages, patron defacements, etc. Certain quality problems were also introduced by the scanning process, such as missing foldouts, because early scanning equipment wasn’t able to accommodate larger page sizes.

- **OCR errors**: OCR has improved over time, but misspellings, language detection errors, and punctuation or character
problems appear in the plain text files. OCR quality is substantially worse for languages that do not use the Roman alphabet, particularly so for South and East Asian languages.

- **Lack of headings:** A common accessibility practice is to properly define headings in a text using HTML attributes. Some digitization post-processes have attempted to define section breaks in a book; however, these sections are defined at the page level in the METS metadata, rather than at the line level in the text of the book. In addition, the sections are often inadequately defined. For example, prefatory material may receive a section label of “Section 1” and then the first chapter is labelled “Section 2,” which confuses many users.

- **Missing or incomplete image captions:** Another common accessibility practice is to provide detailed captions for images, often in an Alt Text HTML attribute or in text next to the image. However, image caption practices in publishing have varied over time. Images may have a caption directly below an image or on an adjacent page, or a figure number next to an image may correlate to a description on another page. OCR processes may or may not accurately capture image captions.

- **Broken table structures:** Structuring tables for accessibility also depends on good HTML, but neither the page images nor the plain text files support HTML. OCR processing of a table in a published book often creates a file where all the text on the page is merged into curious arrangements of text, numbers, and arcane symbols.

- **Unidentified language and language of parts:** WCAG 3.1.1 and 3.1.2 specify that the language of a page and of its component parts must be programmatically determined, so assistive devices can render the text in the appropriate language. There are over 400 languages represented in the HathiTrust collection, but we have not figured out a solution to the problem of correctly indicating the language of a book to assistive devices. Thus, when a patron is trying to access a non-English book, they must manually change the language in
their device. In cases where a book contains multiple languages (e.g., a language dictionary that provides definitions in two different languages), this problem is exacerbated.

For some of the above issues, we have quality remediation practices that might resolve the problem when we are notified of it by a patron. A subset of the HathiTrust User Support team, the Digital Object Quality Corrections group can request fixes from our digitization partners or contributing libraries. At HathiTrust, we see our role as custodians of the content deposited into the collection, and our current policies and practices presume that the digitization partner or contributing library maintains responsibility for the quality of content. In some cases, we do have robust relationships, and content is improved one book at a time. In other cases, staff, equipment, and resource restrictions at our member libraries prevent them from fixing problem books.

Improving the quality, usability, and accessibility of books in the HathiTrust collection is and will be an ongoing challenge for us. One strategy we are exploring to solve these problems is through the Federating Repositories of Accessible Materials for Higher Education (FRAME) grant, a project funded by Mellon and led by the University of Virginia (2019). Through this project, staff at participating libraries and disability services offices can upload remediated and accessible files to a central repository. When originating from HathiTrust, these files are returned back to us and stored so that other disability services staff can download them. Hopefully, we will be able to slowly build up a collection of remediated and accessible files, one chapter, article, or book at a time.

Improving the Findability of Available Materials

The chart above, of the various methods that blind and print-
disabled users may follow to retrieve books, exemplifies another problem: the difficulty of finding content. There is a vast landscape of collections and resources, and navigating them requires time, patience, and knowledge.

At HathiTrust, we are well aware of the challenges that libraries, disability services staff, and patrons encounter when trying to find resources. We've increased efforts in the past few years to make our content discoverable by setting up regular metadata harvest processes with common discovery vendors (Summon, EBSCO Discovery Services, Ex Libris Primo, OCLC WorldCat Discovery, Innovative Interfaces Inc Encore, EBSCO's Knowledge Base, OCLC's WorldShare Collection Manager). With further efforts to expand internationally, we're continuing to put materials where patrons will be most likely to find them. Through our Emergency Temporary Access Service, we worked closely with library partners to incorporate links to HathiTrust content in their catalogs and build knowledge of wrangling our metadata among our members.

One early outcome of the FRAME grant has been a unified search of three accessible text providers. Our metadata is harvested into the search, as well as metadata representing Bookshare and Internet Archive materials. Other collections may be included in the near future. Building a shared search of materials that disability services staff can download for their eligible patrons will hopefully minimize the time spent searching for materials.

**Opportunities for Collective Action**

Many of the challenges I described above are common to other libraries and organizations and can only be solved through collective action. HathiTrust itself grew out of a shared need to preserve the millions of books being scanned through mass digitization efforts, and more recently, the FRAME grant coalesced to solve known needs in disability services offices.
Some of the feedback we've heard from contacts in our member libraries and disability services offices are systemic problems. For example, we've heard that often, faculty and staff are not served by the student disability services office on their campus, and that they can only access services through a human resources accommodations office. These accommodations offices typically do not provide the kind of access to information resources that student disability offices excel in. Disabled faculty and staff have reached out to us directly to request downloads of copyrighted material, but unfortunately, because we do not have the expertise to verify eligibility for accommodations, we have not been able to serve these needs. These individuals can be left behind.

In another example, proving eligibility for accommodations can be a difficult obstacle for many students. Eligibility for accommodations is typically governed by the Americans with Disabilities Acts or other federal or state statutes, and to prove one's eligibility can take a long time, require a lot of effort and motivation, and it can also be expensive for individuals with disabilities. Our ATRS policy is silent on how campuses should determine whether a patron is eligible for this service. In a better, more just world, we and our campus partners would be able to distribute content to all who have a disability, not just those that are “disabled enough”—or motivated enough—to be eligible for accommodations.

Solving the usability and accessibility problems I've described above is a daunting task for seventeen million texts. There may be large-scale solutions to quality problems that we can explore, but some things can only be fixed with manual interventions, such as tagging headings or images appropriately. Our User Support team serves as a possible model for quality corrections. Librarians and staff members from HathiTrust partner institutions dedicate several hours a week to handling requests from patrons, and the two quality corrections subgroups (one focused on content quality and the other on catalog record quality) have built substantial expertise in diagnosing problems and collaborating with digitization partners and contributing libraries. Are there ways that we can scale up these
teams to fix problems directly? However, answering that question requires more staff hours, and in a landscape of pandemic-fatigued libraries, recruitment for working groups and collaborative teams is getting harder and harder.

Some of these challenges may be addressed by changing the relationship that HathiTrust member libraries have to the HathiTrust collection. Some contributing libraries are dedicated stewards of their content and work closely with us to manage problems; other contributing libraries are very hands-off once they have deposited the content, due to the aforementioned lack of resources; many non-contributing members see the collection as another vendor resource that they have little ownership over, or they are unable to contribute resources to the few opportunities that we currently support for engagement. But to solve some of the large-scale usability and accessibility issues in our collection, we at HathiTrust must work more closely with our members to generate innovative, exciting new ideas for managing this collective collection and to implement them. Only through collaboration can our mammoth collection evolve to meet current and future needs.
Appendix

Figure 1. How can blind or print-disabled users acquire academic texts?

- They can purchase a text. Common resources include:
  - Kindle and other e-book providers
    - Audible
    - Local, online, or university bookstores
- They can sign up for disability library services, such as:
  - National Library Service for the Blind and Print Disabled, managed by the Library of Congress
    - Bookshare
    - Learning Ally
- They can contact their campus disability services office to request a text. Staff at those offices use a variety of resources
and strategies to provide requested texts, including:

○ HathiTrust’s Accessible Text Request Service
  ○ Contact the publishers for e-copy
  ○ Convert print books acquired through various means
  ○ BiblioVault
  ○ AccessText Network
  ○ FRAME unified search
  ○ Bookshare

• They can borrow a text from various services, such as:

○ Their local or university library
  ○ Various library databases
  ○ Overdrive, Hoopla, or other e-book services
  ○ Interlibrary loan
  ○ Internet Archive’s Lending Library or Books for People with Print Disabilities

• They can find a copy on free and/or open-access websites, including:

○ HathiTrust
  ○ Internet Archive
  ○ Gutenberg
  ○ LibriVox
  ○ Piracy sites
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