



## Serials Spoken Here: Reports of Conferences, Institutes, and Seminars

Susan J. Martin, Elizabeth McCormick, LeAnne Rumler & Kurt Blythe

To cite this article: Susan J. Martin, Elizabeth McCormick, LeAnne Rumler & Kurt Blythe (2016): Serials Spoken Here: Reports of Conferences, Institutes, and Seminars, Serials Review, DOI: [10.1080/00987913.2015.1137673](https://doi.org/10.1080/00987913.2015.1137673)

To link to this article: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/00987913.2015.1137673>



Accepted author version posted online: 09 Feb 2016.



[Submit your article to this journal](#)



[View related articles](#)



[View Crossmark data](#)

# ACCEPTED MANUSCRIPT

Serials Spoken Here: Reports of Conferences, Institutes, and Seminars

Susan J. Martin<sup>2</sup>, Elizabeth McCormick<sup>3</sup>, and LeAnne Rumler<sup>4</sup>, Kurt Blythe, Column Editor<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Serials Access Librarian, Davis Library, University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, Chapel Hill, NC 27514, USA

<sup>2</sup>Acquisitions Librarian, Texas Woman's University, Denton, TX 76204, USA;

smartin28@mail.twu.edu

<sup>3</sup>Monographics Librarian, Radford University, Radford, VA 24142, USA; email:

emccormick@radford.edu

<sup>4</sup>Technical Services Librarian, Mossey Library, Hillsdale College, Hillsdale, MI 49242, USA;

email: lrumler@hillsdale.edu

Corresponding author Email: kcblythe@email.unc.edu

## **Abstract**

This quarter's column offers coverage of several sessions from the 35th Annual Charleston Conference, held November 4-7, 2015, in Charleston, South Carolina. The sessions detailed herein largely concern the optimal management of eresources workflows and the evidence-based acquisitions models for eresources.

## Cost Per User: Analyzing EZProxy Logs for Collection Development

In her innovative session at the 2015 Charleston Library Conference, Tiffany LeMaistre discussed how Nevada State College is using data obtained from EZProxy logs and matching it with institutional data to run analyses. The results have yielded information on cost per user as well as who is using the resources by department or major and gender.

Nevada State College was founded in 2002 and is a four-year undergraduate institution with a culturally diverse student body of approximately 3,000 students, 51% of whom are first-generation college students. The Marydean Martin Library is the first cloud-based library in Nevada and has access to more than one million ebooks. The library has four librarians and two library assistants.

LeMaistre began her discussion with a quick overview of EZProxy, OCLC's access and authentication system. Nevada State College uses EZProxy to mediate all its electronic databases and services, on and off campus. EZProxy logs are an optional service, but can be set up to store user data. Nevada State College is using these logs, which include a user's ID and username, to link to institutional data. To set up these analyses, the library worked with the campus Information & Technology Department and Institutional Research (IR).

Why would a library want to calculate cost per user? Most libraries routinely calculate cost per use -- or cost per article download or search. Cost per user, LeMaistre explained, is a true comparison between products. It is available for every resource, and there aren't any concerns about missing data or unclear standards. Using EZProxy logs are a different metric than using COUNTER (Counting Online Usage of Networked Electronic Resources) data. It provides

another way of looking at statistics. For example, using proxy logs, a library could find out new versus repeat users on a given database.

The Marydean Martin Library has been able to create analyses in Tableau that informs them on who is using the library -- by year (sophomore, senior, etc.), by gender, by ethnicity, by major, and by GPA. LeMaistre noted that in spring 2015, the library discovered a positive correlation between library use and GPA. EZProxy logs and institutional data allow one to compare users and non-users and their GPA levels.

LeMaistre provided live demonstrations to show these example analyses in Tableau, which is the data visualization software Nevada State College is using.

The presentation concluded with a slide that contained the names of other institutions that have been doing similar work with cost per user information: the University of Minnesota, University of Wollongong, the University of Huddersfield, and JISC.

The session concluded with a brief question period. The first question dealt with privacy concerns. LeMaistre stressed that it is important for libraries to partner with their campus Information Technology and Institutional Research departments. At Nevada State College, all the analyzed data are stored in a high level database that operates under Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act (FERPA) regulations. The library only has access to anonymized data. Another question asked about the clean-up of data and if it was a problem. The library did not have to do the clean-up, but the IR department did do some to create the match points. Other questions include: how difficult is Tableau to learn? LeMaistre commented it was very easy to learn and use. What constitutes a session on EZProxy? LeMaistre explained that any time a user

logs in it creates a cookie, and the session ends when the cookie expires. EZProxy allows libraries to set the time length of each cookie. Nevada State College has a two-hour cookie.

## Do-It-Yourself Title Overlap Comparisons

In her concurrent session at the 2015 Charleston Library Conference, Melissa Belvadi provided a practical, step-by-step how-to for librarians wanting to do their own title overlap analysis of their abstract and index (A&I) databases, using Google Sheets and Excel. Belvadi provided the methodology and spreadsheet formulas needed to accomplish this task. She focused on EBSCO Discovery Service (EDS), which her library uses, but stressed that this would work with any discovery layer or A&I database.

The University of Prince Edward Island (UPEI) is a public liberal arts university located in Charlottetown, Prince Edward Island, Canada. The university serves over 4,000 undergraduate and graduate students. The Roberston Library has over 314,000 print volumes, 900 print subscriptions, access to 10,000 electronic titles, and 20,000 ebooks. The library has six librarians and uses the open source Evergreen system for its integrated library system (ILS).

Belvadi opened up with a discussion on why libraries should do a title overlap comparison and why make it a do-it-yourself project. The reasons to do a comparison are simple and straightforward; libraries may be faced with database cancellations and need to know where their journals are indexed, or perhaps they are looking at picking up a new subscription and wish to know if it is covered by a particular database. In addition, new products are being developed, and these products may be a better economic alternative if the coverage is there. Lastly, title overlap analysis would help librarians plan and budget for new program proposals.

Why do-it-yourself? Libraries will be able to customize the content of their comparisons and take into account the use and coverage of Google Scholar with their own holdings. Belvadi cautioned that while useful, a title overlap analysis does have its limitations; for example, it ignores the quality of metadata. Sample topic search comparisons would be ideal, but such an undertaking for most libraries is not practical due to resource limits. Title overlap analysis excels with the negative result cases -- where there is insufficient overlap with the product being considered.

The remainder of the session detailed the particulars of creating an overlap analysis. Belvadi uses Google sheets for her comparisons as it is a good collaborative tool and allows for multiple people to work on the project, but Excel would also work. The data entry is done by student assistants, and it is an excellent task for public service points. Since work is done cell-by-cell, students can easily pick up where they left off if they need to assist a patron. Depending on the size of the title list, a title overlap analysis could take about one month to complete.

The entire analysis is done in one workbook using multiple sheets with the first sheet as your title list and with each succeeding sheet the database on which you are running a comparison. The first item needed is a title list. This title list will be unique to each library and the desired comparison. You may want to use the index title list, published lists of major titles by discipline, or create your own list of titles of interest based on local programs and need. Once you settle on your list of titles, you'll need ISSNs, coverage dates, index hits (record count), and index priority (e.g., is it core, peer reviewed?). Belvadi stressed the importance of normalizing the ISSNs as that is the match point. She provided detailed formulas for accomplishing all the tasks.

Belvadi illustrated this technique's usefulness with two examples. UPEI did an overlap analysis for ProQuest's PAIS database. This index was intended primarily for undergraduate political

science majors. They started with a list of 995 titles, but focused on 196 core titles. PAIS had almost no indexing for 95 of them, and almost all 196 were well covered by Google Scholar and EBSCO's EDS. The library concluded that it was okay to cancel PAIS and rely on Google Scholar and EDS.

The second example was an analysis of Historical Abstracts, which has special metadata, an aspect that should be taken into consideration when analyzing the results. The title list had 1,362 priority titles, of which 391 were unique to Historical Abstracts. The library opted to keep this service.

At the end of the session Belvadi provided direct URLs to her slideshow, as well as a tips and tricks sheet with all of the spreadsheet formulas used: <https://goo.gl/iC61tz> and <https://goo.gl/hgJaJi>, respectively.

## Optimizing E-Resources Management

Athena Hoepfner (electronic resources librarian, University of Central Florida); Roen Janyk (web services librarian, Okanagan College); and Oliver Pesch (chief product strategist, EBSCO Information Services) presented "Optimizing E-Resources Management." Each discussed how e-resources management workflows can be improved through the use of different strategies and management products.

Hoepfner compared the results of a well-managed e-resources system (links are present and working, authentication works, network is functioning, user can find and access data) to those in a flawed management system (patrons cannot find content or they cannot access it once they find it). She stated that there are many systems that must interoperate to provide access to e-resources and mentioned Todd Carpenter's presentation "The Three S's of electronic resource

management” and the Digital Library Federation’s report on electronic resource management system (ERMS) standards as a starting points for evaluating an ERMS.

Janyk explained how most users do not look past the second page of search results and that librarians have roughly three minutes in which to ensure that users have found the relevant resources. Librarians should make their goal to be relevant information found quickly and easily but the question is how to get there? The answer is to have flexible systems that work with each other. Despite decades of development, the library world still does not have an integrated library system that offers interoperability with all other systems used for e-resource management. This requires customization by librarians so as to maintain accurate holdings and clean metadata for those holdings. However, a single knowledgebase, maintained by the librarian, would be the basis from which all these systems work and by which the librarian could determine changes to the knowledge base that need to be made as well as whether patrons are successfully accessing the library’s products and with which methods.

Pesch described the challenge of getting data to the librarians, who can then use it to make decisions about purchasing. He pointed out that where data are stored is often completely separate from where and how people perform their work. His own company, EBSCO, has created application programming interfaces (APIs) which allow data to be retrieved and loaded into the library’s electronic resource management system (ERMS). Another method is to extend the Knowledge Base and Related Tools (KBART) practice to cover the exchange of library holdings and then create an API for automated harvesting of that extra data via the Standardized Usage Harvesting Initiative (SUSHI)-Lite report’s recommendations.

The Unknown Path: Evaluating E-Resources for Access-Based Collection Development



Laurel Crawford (coordinator of collection development, University of North Texas Libraries) and Erin Miller (electronic resources librarian, University of North Texas Libraries) with help from Mark Henley (former contracts assessment librarian, University of North Texas Libraries), explained how the move to an access-based collection development plan required the development of an evaluation rubric to be used when deciding to purchase a new electronic resource. Selection at the University of North Texas (UNT) Libraries was done primarily by subject librarians while the purchasing was done by the librarians in their technical services department. While this worked well for print materials, it worked less well for e-resources. Further, the shift from purchasing to ownership to an access-oriented collection policy required less of the piecemeal, rubber-stamp process and more of a team approach toward collection “sculpting” through evaluation of the materials under consideration. As a result, an evaluation rubric was created that would be used on each product and would require feedback from all stakeholders. The result would be a strong position from which to negotiate with vendors and a documentation of the decision-making process.

Two of the first steps in the evaluation process were to obtain feedback, in the form of reviews by the subject librarians, and to set up a trial for the product so that faculty, students, and subject librarian reviews would be generated. These reviews would be generated through direct emails, a Qualtrics survey, promotion of the product on the libraries' website, instructions provided in a LibGuide, the libraries' newsletter, and monthly liaison meetings. High use of the product on trial combined with numerous positive reviews caused a higher ranking in the rubric.

Accessibility was evaluated by UNT librarians using the Voluntary Product Accessibility Template (VPAT) supplied by vendors. If a VPAT was available through the VPAT Repository,

then accessibility was considered fulfilled. The vendor would be contacted for a VPAT document if one was not in the Repository. Evaluation of the product's content and scope would be done via overlap analysis and comparing what it offers to the overall collection: does it fill any gaps in the collection? Library-specific concerns such as the availability of an access-based model and vendor communicativeness -- are customer service representatives available and responsive -- also appear in the rubric.

Licensing is a large part of the rubric and has its own checklist, which developed in consultation with university procurement staff. There are state requirements that must be contained in or met by the license agreement such as availability of usage statistics; existence of an indemnification clause that would need to be taken out; under whose governing law would the license fall; term limit to the license; limitation of claims; and a confidentiality clause. Other library-related licensing concerns would be identifying authorized users; interlibrary loan limits; use within course packs and reserves; the ability and permission to mine data; and the type and quality of perpetual access. The licensing checklist was developed to allow more than one person to review the agreement; it also supplies a pause in the process so the library can negotiate with the vendor. Another large part of the evaluation is usability. This is done mainly through students, who have been trained to perform the evaluations with a usability rubric. They are given specific, defined terms and questions on which to search and are trained to use the Chrome Mobile Emulator so that usability on a mobile device can be evaluated on a desktop computer. The main criteria include task success, task completion time, and overall usability. Overall usability can be determined through several metrics such as presence of an abstract; availability of full-text and multiple formats; do references display with the full-text and can they be exported to RefWorks;

presence of online help and tutorials; and ease of downloading, printing, or emailing the retrieved item. In concluding their session, Crawford and Miller mentioned the importance of creating a file structure for saving documentation that would still function despite the changes in staffing that are bound to occur.

## Playing “Moneyball” in Librarianship: The Winning Strategy of Gap Analysis

The term “Moneyball” (Lewis, 2004), describes the application of sabermetrics, used by Billy Beane (manager of the 2002 Oakland A’s baseball franchise) to build his team, based on research and data rather than the standard baseball statistics traditionally used for player selection. An overview was provided by a representative from Elsevier, and librarians from Columbia University, Rutgers University, and Syracuse University presented examples of ways in which librarians can use sabermetrics to analyze data for acquisitions and budget development in order to achieve a better return on investment (ROI).

Tommy Doyle (moderator), senior vice president, Strategy, Business Development & Continuity Publishing, Elsevier, was first up with introductions of each of the panel members and a summarization of the “Moneyball” strategy used by Billy Beane as the manager of the Oakland A’s. Using the same data-driven strategies, he suggested libraries should develop an investment thesis to guide purchasing decisions with long-term and short-term investment strategies.

Collection development investment strategies should develop both short-term investments for journals and similar materials, which are recycled frequently, and long-term investments for books, which may be on the shelves for 20 years or longer. The key to developing effective strategies is a gap analysis based on four questions: What is the research strategy (of the institution)? What is the user behavior? What types of questions are asked (organized by subject

and material type)? What percentage of answers are discovered within the available content (organized by subject and material type)?

The answers to these gap analysis questions help to identify gaps between what the users are searching for and what answers are discoverable within the library collection. The resulting data can be used to close the gaps and establish a better allocation of capital and resources.

Developing investment strategies using gap analysis has the added benefit of increasing collaboration and transparency between vendors, the library, and stakeholders.

Second up was Melissa Goertzen, ebook program development librarian, Columbia University, who spoke on how Columbia University started using the “Moneyball” strategies. Columbia University librarians asked the questions, “what are the current issues and challenges?” and “where are we going?” in order to create a collection development strategy. They studied previously collected data, content delivery, and business models. To better understand current issues and challenges they pulled usage statistics and matched them against search items. They then evaluated the correlation between searches and title retrieval and what retrieved content was used for: reference, citations, or quick fact checks. The results indicated strengths and weakness in the current collection which needed to be addressed. To better understand potential user needs, i.e., where they were going, trends in turn-aways and subject areas with heavy use were tracked. Results indicated new areas of interest and research which would guide future collection development.

Gracemary Smulewitz, head, Distributed Technical Services, Rutgers University Libraries, was up next to discuss how they used sabermetrics. She described how Rutgers used the application of statistical analysis to evaluate several varied areas within their libraries. The first example was

the combining of two separate research library collections. They used data and statistical analysis to evaluate usage, find duplicates, and identify unique items. Rutgers also analyzed database and journal use. Fund codes were assigned to each journal and database, then compared, by discipline, with cost and usage. Journal use was further analyzed based on material retrieval sources, tracking total use from A to Z journals, the discovery tool used at Rutgers, and ILL requests. Monographs were evaluated based on Library of Congress (LC) classification, and circulation and usage data were compared to enrollment, degree programs, and faculty publishing. All the statistical information gathered was analyzed using the sabermetrics model and then pooled together to create a big picture portfolio, i.e., collection development strategy, where all the collected and analyzed data enabled evidence-based acquisitions.

Scott Warren, associate dean, Research and Scholarship, Syracuse University Libraries, spoke next. He described how Syracuse University Libraries used “Moneyball” strategies to evaluate the big picture using aggregated data. Taking statistics from turn-aways, user demographics, and usage they were able to justify the purchase of three major packages, which would better support the needs of their users. Warren finished by stressing that to “live in the data” librarians must know the following: where the data come from, what data are not available, and how the data will drive decision making. It is also important to know which decisions will be made based on the data and who will make those decisions. Warren went on to say that data have limits and an evaluation to determine the success of data driven decisions needs to be part of the game plan. Warren cautioned that the data may lead to results that are not supported by all, saying, “... it is not about being fair, it is about being effective and getting the best bang for the buck for the university.” He also talked about the negative effects of looking for perfect data. Searching for

perfect data can lead to “paralysis by analysis”; he suggested using the data that is good enough for making the decision at hand.

A free copy of the white paper on Playing “Moneyball”, made available by Elsevier, can be downloaded here: <http://www.elsevier.com/books/moneyball/>

## Outsourced and Overwhelmed: Gaining a Grasp on Managing Electronic Resources

In order to better manage the ever changing landscape of ejournal and ebook packages, Matthew Harrington, library technician, North Carolina State University Libraries (mdharrin@ncsu.edu), using Microsoft Access, created a database which helps monitor the changes inherent to large electronic resource packages. The database links multiple tables using data from orders, vendor listings, publishers, the OPAC, and a discovery service to evaluate package content and holdings then compare and analyze the title lists for discrepancies and anomalies to be investigated and corrected.

Data are messy and e-resources are very messy. This messiness is the reality that inspired the creation of Matthew Harrington’s database, IMPART (Integrated Multi-Package Reconciliation Tool). The database enables the cross reference of multiple sources of data, relating to large e-resource packages, in order to evaluate the data for variances.

Large packaging models are common and have many benefits, but the size, quantity of data, and the frequency of changes make it an overwhelming challenge to organize holdings and content. The data connected to the content, in any large package, frequently comes from more than one source and in varying formats. This often leads to redundant data being stored in multiple systems that can corrupt the accuracy of the ILS, misleading users. Correspondingly, selectors

and librarians may not get accurate data for decision making, leading to poor acquisition decisions.

While subscription agents and electronic resource management (ERM) products attempt to help organize e-resource data, both work on the assumption that the available data are correct and have no mechanism to flag errors. IMPART uses data from multiple sources to check and cross check title information, analyzing common elements, to search for inaccuracies. It enables day-to-day comparison of title lists from various input sources and flags variances and anomalies.

The creation of the database required that relationships be established between the various types of information associated with each individual title (price, publisher, vendor, holdings, etc.). This further required that each piece of information be coded. Existing codes were used when available such as ISSN-L, TRANSFER codes, and fields from MARC records. Where coding did not exist, it was manually assigned. Title data from multiple sources -- the OPAC, orders, vendor listings, publisher title lists, EBSCOhost, and OCLC -- were then used to create tables within the database. Once the data are loaded into the tables they can be linked, searched, and used to create comparative title listings. Ideally all lists would match; realistically, anomalies often exist. Any anomalies found, such as a title found in the OPAC with no corresponding order number, are kicked out in checklists. Each checklist is then assigned to a staff member for investigation and reconciliation.

After a thorough explanation of the data types and format needed to make the database work, Harrington went through several slides showing examples of the output created by various queries.

# ACCEPTED MANUSCRIPT

The IMPART database was specifically designed by Harrington to work with the data sources used by North Carolina State University -- SirsiDynix, Serials Solution, and EBSCO -- but he believes the parameters can be applied to any library. He cautions that the initial workload for setting up the database is intense, but he is willing to share his models with other interested libraries.



# ACCEPTED MANUSCRIPT

## References

Lewis, M. (2004). *Moneyball: The Art of Winning an Unfair Game*. New York, New York: W.W. Norton & Company.