

UC Electronic Resources Management Planning Meeting
Campus/CDL Survey
Electronic Resources Management at the California Digital Library (CDL)

1. Who is involved in an official capacity with electronic resources? Please list job titles and reporting structure for the position (e.g., electronic resources librarian in the Cataloging Department).

Decision-Making and Acquisitions report to Bev French, Director, Shared Content

- Maria Figueroa, CDL Acquisitions Specialist
- Tony Harvell, Head, Acquisitions
- Wendy Parfrey, Shared Content Analyst
- Terry Vrable, CDL Acquisitions Coordinator
- Jackie Wilson, Senior Associate for Shared Content

Licensing reports to Cate Hutton, Director, Business Development and Business Services

- Curtis Lavery, Licensing Coordinator

Cataloging reports to Bev French and Adolfo Tarango, Head, Serials Cataloging (UCSD)

- Renee Chin, Electronic Resources Cataloger
- Becky Culbertson, Integrating Resource Cataloging Librarian and Manager, Shared Cataloging Program
- Hanley Cocks, California Document Cataloger

Management and Tracking reports to Laine Farley, Director, Digital Library Services

- Heather Christenson, Resource Liaison Coordinator
- Pam Daniels, Bibliographic Analyst
- Jayne Dickson, Digital Library Services Analyst
- Lena Shelton, Bibliographic Analyst
- Steve Toub, Web Design Manager
- Sherry Willhite, Information Resources Analyst

Access Systems reports to Mary Heath, Access Services Manager, Digital Library Technologies

- Margery Tibbetts, Senior Development Programmer

Systems (redistribution of SCP records) reports to Shirley Higgens, Assistant Head of Cataloging, UCSD

- Ryan Finnerty, Head, Database Management
- Karen Peters, Innopac Coordinator

Scholarly Communication Outreach. John Ober, Director, Education and Strategic Innovation

Preservation. Trisha Cruse, Director, Digital Preservation

- Suzanne Samuel, eScholarship Program Coordinator

2. What tools, software or systems are you currently using to manage electronic resources decision-making, acquisitions, licensing, cataloging, maintenance, and access issues? (e.g., keeping track of license details, print subs. associated with the package, statistics, providing patrons with an e-journals directory, etc.)

Decision-Making and Acquisitions

- Innovative ILS (UCSD)
- Ulrich's Periodicals Directory, EBSCOnet, Data Swets
- Microsoft Excel spreadsheets
- LISTSERV, Microsoft Word, and other ad hoc tools

Licensing

- Web pages, LISTSERV and other ad hoc tools

Cataloging

- Innovative Pactech (UCSD)
- MarcEdit
- OCLC PURL (PID server)
- Custom scripts that substitute PIDs/URLs
- LISTSERV, HTML pages and other ad hoc tools

Management and Tracking

- "New Resource Forms" are Microsoft Word documents
- The "MIS" database, which manages and tracks for package level metadata, is a Microsoft Access database
- The Directory of CDL-Licensed Content, which provides item-level metadata, has a Sybase back end and uses C scripts to load data and provide a Web CGI interface
- The CDL Helpline, which manages and tracks problems with resources, uses a Unipress Footprints database
- LISTSERV, Microsoft Excel, and other ad hoc tools

Access Systems

- UC-eLinks is an Ex Libris SFX link resolver
- OCLC PURL (PID server)
- Directory of CDL-Licensed Content
- Inside CDL web site

3. What aspects of any tools, software, or systems that you currently use to manage electronic resources work well or sufficiently? What if anything would you recommend to others?

- The SFX consortial architecture makes it easy to maintain shared/local knowledge bases
- Innovative ILS system is good at manipulating data
- E-Resources Tracking web page

- Internal processes (new resource form, "checked flag") have been improved
- ROGER provides authoritative metadata in real-time

4. What isn't working? What parts of electronic resources management are not well covered by your current system? Where are your greatest points of pain?

- Existing tools do not support existing and anticipated needs.
 - Inability to easily generate reports to facilitate decision-making
 - Inability to easily share data across systems; no single source of information
 - Many key reports are not updated in real-time and easily shared.
 - Tracking status within ERM workflows can be difficult since it tends to be ad hoc (no shared, real-time electronic system)
 - Difficult to know if a title is licensed or not
 - Takes too much time for campuses to pick up and load SCP records
- Too much staff time spent on ERM tasks
 - Redundant data entry in multiple systems
 - Time spent on menial tasks (e.g., identifying and verifying coverage)

5. What are your campus' greatest needs in terms of electronic resources management and related systems?
6. What are your immediate, mid-and long range top priorities for electronic resources management and related systems?
7. What are your campus' current plans for addressing your campus' top priorities and needs?
8. Are you considering purchasing systems or products for electronic resources management?
9. What are your campus' greatest needs with regard to shared/system-wide electronic resources management?

The following table attempts to provide a synthesis of our responses to questions 5 through 9. The "CDL needs" correspond roughly to the items from the draft ERM requirements document that CDL shared with SOPAG in January.

CDL's needs and plans are largely enumerated in the "Systemwide/Shared" column since that is the CDL's chief area of operations. However, many of our needs, priorities and systems can and will affect locally licensed resources, so we have made some comments in that column as well there as well. The column for issues related to "2-9 campuses" is currently black; these needs usually overlap with systemwide needs and local needs, but these so-called Tier 2 resources requires further discussion.

CDL needs	Systemwide/Shared	2-9 campuses	Locally licensed
1. Collection development decision-making: supporting selection and evaluation (shared digital, including digital preservation, and shared print)	<p>Short-term: Pilot implementation to support selection and evaluation for two shared digital 2005 renewals (Blackwell, Kluwer/Springer).</p> <p>The need for this project is immediate. The data and tools need to be in production in the next 2-3 months.</p> <p>For Blackwell and Kluwer/Springer, the goal is to be able to replicate the process of the "Elsevier spreadsheets" but with less pain.</p> <p>In moving forward, the highest priorities are to determine the required data elements and to select the data providers for each of the required data elements. Tool development is less of a priority (real-time voting, etc. may be deferred to a later date), but this is a good opportunity to test drive existing tools.</p> <p>Possible data providers:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Colorado Alliance's Goldrush • EBSCO? 		If pilot (systemwide packages only) is successful, would endorse rolling out a system to incorporate locally licensed packages. Because of the time constraints of the immediate need, CDL cannot afford to wait to incorporate local needs into the pilot system.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ex Libris SFX (or possibly TDNet or Serials Solutions) • ISI Journal Citation Reports (for impact factors) • UC Shared Cataloging Program • Ulrich's Serials Analysis System <p>Possible tools:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Colorado Alliance's Goldrush • Custom (Crystal Reports on mySQL?) • Innovative's ERM module • Microsoft Excel • UCLA's ERDB • Ulrich's Serials Analysis System <p>Longer term: The Elsevier contract needs annual management. As our needs mature, we want to do deploy a stable platform.</p> <p>A pilot system may constrain choices for the longer-term system. We need to better understand these dependences and variables. Having the pilot invest lightly in tool development will minimize the risk of transitioning to an alternative tool for the longer term.</p>		
<p>2. Ongoing management and tracking of e-resource packages, including workflow</p>	<p>Short-term:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provide UC librarians with better access to licensing terms and conditions. • Clean up data in the existing MIS database. • Investigate incremental improvements to title-level access of this type of information. <p>Longer-term: Willing to wait until ERM product category matures.</p> <p>Possible tools:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Colorado Alliance's Goldrush • Innovative's ERM module. • UCLA's ERDB • Other vendors who are planning products: Dynix, Endeavor, OCLC, Swets, VTLS and Ex Libris. [Ex Libris has offered UC/CDL a seat on an 		<p>CDL sees the need for campuses have a single system for ERM for systemwide resources and locally-licensed resources. Willing to wait until a product exists that meets consortial needs in this way.</p>

	Ex Libris "focus group" for their ERM product development to provide input on that product's consortial aspects.]		
2.1 Ability to batch overlay records across multiple silos (identifiers, descriptive standards, single vs. separate, etc.)	Strategy: Willing to wait 12 months until UC-wide solution emerges.		CDL encourages UC Libraries to address these issues, which in many ways are fundamental to achieving interoperability across tools and systems. CDL is willing to participate in such an effort.
3. End-user discovery and access	<p>Strategy: Prepare a transition plan for the "Directory of CDL-Licensed Content.</p> <p>Possible data providers:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SFX • now, piggy-back on to of efforts in 1 and 4.1 or could wait until 2 and 2.1 are complete until we transition. <p>Possible tools:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Same as 1 (or 2) 		CDL encourages campuses to consider whether or not shared software should be used to power campus e-resource directories. CDL is willing to participate in such an effort.
4.1 Educate faculty and other key stakeholders about a particular title (impact factor, price, editorial board members from	<p>Short-term strategy:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provide end-user navigation to a database, either piggy-backing on top of 1. or SFX. This could be the next-generation "Directory of CDL-Licensed Content"? • Also provide a new UC-eLinks services that provides information about titles. <p>The need is immediate. Need to implement in the next few months with</p>		CDL needs campus input to determine to what extent locally licensed titles should be included in this database/service.

<p>UC, open access alternatives, etc.)</p>	<p>limited data for a subset of shared digital resources; the scope will expand over time.</p> <p>Possible data providers:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Same as 1 <p>Possible tools:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Same as 1 <p>Long-term strategy:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Add additional data elements to this database as they become available. • Add additional functionality or change tools as they become available. 		
<p>5. Provide functionality related to the full life cycle of the management of licensed serials in CDL's digital preservation repository.</p>	<p>Short-term strategy:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The CDL is in conversation with several journal publishers about working together on preservation efforts, discussions with Wiley being the most advanced thus far. • Strategy to be determined; many data elements are shared with other systems but some data elements are unique to preservation. • The need is immediate. Need data and tools to be in production in the next several months. <p>Long-term strategy:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To be determined 		<p>To be determined</p>
<p>6. Provide functionality related to the full life cycle of the management of items in the UC Libraries shared print repository.</p>	<p>Short-term strategy:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In the current pilot project, UCLA is processing Elsevier serials and UCSD is processing ACM serials and monographs using existing ILS tools, though some custom development may be necessary. • At this stage, needs are still largely undetermined. <p>Long-term strategy:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To be determined 		<p>To be determined</p>

10. In your opinion, what are the greatest barriers to implementing a UC-wide ERM system?

- Lack of data standards that facilitate seamless functional integration
- Inherent complexity of the problem space (ERM in itself is complex, consortial environment add complexity, migration path will not be straightforward, multiplicity of systems etc.)

- Lack of existing ERM systems that support UC-wide needs
- Inherent inefficiencies of collective decision-making
- Lack of objective measures of existing ERM processes (time or money spent); lack of objective measures of possible return on investment of alternatives (e.g., cost savings by moving to separate records for serials)
- Unclear priorities at this stage, which may make it hard to balance short-term and long-term solutions
- Fear of change; fear of lack of local control

11. Anything else you'd like to share?

- This event is a great idea; CDL is looking forward to it!