Please complete the following questions as thoroughly as possible. We especially encourage you to solicit opinions from staff who will be unable to attend the Planning Meeting on March 11-12. We assume that the survey response will represent the consensus view from your campus, so if there are differences of opinion within your campus, please note accordingly.

Submit the survey via return e-mail (stefw@ucr.edu) or fax (909/787-3720) to Stefanie Wittenbach, Chair, Program Planning Committee no later than Wednesday, March 3rd. Survey data will be compiled and distributed for discussion at the Planning Meeting on March 11th. Thank you!

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).

Cataloging: Electronic Resources Librarian who catalogs electronic resources and participates in the Digital Initiatives Program and Library Assistant III/Copy Cataloger, both reporting to Head of Monographs Department. Most MARC Web cataloging has gone over to Serials as a result of the revision of Chapter 12 of AACR2 and most current cataloging in Monographs relates to CDROMs, with the occasional web “monograph” (report, proceedings, literary text).

In Serials Dept:
Head, Serials Acquisitions Unit – CDL Acquisitions Liaison
Electronic Resources Serials Librarian (cataloging)
Serials Maintenance Assistant (cataloging)
Project Manager/Database Maintenance (cataloging)
Serials Inventory Assistant
Maintenance Processing/Administrative Assistant (cataloging)
Student Assistants (cataloging)

Collection Development Coordinators and Selectors are actively involved in assessing whether electronic resources should be pursued and participate in negotiations for resources.

Digital Initiatives Librarian reports to the AUL for Technical Services and Technology, develops digital collections, finding aids, and chairs the Digital Library Collections Task Force.

Licensing Coordinator (Librarian) in Systems Department (~50% of time)

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.)
Excel spreadsheets from CDL Acquisitions Unit at UCSD
Excel spreadsheets created locally
CDL website for current data

The ILS is used to record the order process including some notes relating the license process. OCLC Cat ME is used to prepare cataloging for resources incorporated into the OPAC for titles that are not from the UC Shared Cataloging stream. Shared Cataloging records are loaded automatically with attached holdings into a holding area used to create, overlay, or modify catalog records. The catalog is used to generate a report which forms the input to a cold fusion (becoming mysql/php) database that can be searched by title word. Selected electronic database resources are accessed through another cold fusion database which produces dynamic subject guides with annotations by librarians. A URL checker run on the catalog produces candidate URLs for creation of a proxy.pac needed for remote access.

SFX has been used to generate lists of titles from individual publishers that are checked against the catalog to identify which titles may be available for acquisition/activation.

For UCD’s Digital Initiatives Program, the Electronic Resources Librarian in Monographs has developed an EAD template and various metadata schemas (Dublin Core, METS) are used.

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?

Spreadsheets from CDL Acquisitions Unit are very helpful
Shared Cataloging Records have saved lots of time – especially the PIDs and the updated holdings information

The A-Z list works quite satisfactorily and is appreciated by faculty. The URL checker alerts cataloging staff to the need for maintenance and initiates a search for current information. The automatic generation of the proxy information works well with the proviso that secondary or masked hosts may need to be added to a supplemental input file and another auxiliary input file is required to remove unlicensed resources that are also contained in the catalog.

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?

Keeping up with titles that are DDP-eligible and vendor changes
Redundancy of data between ILS and SFX KnowledgeBase database environments with procedures for coordination not completely established.

Maintenance of URLs is difficult to keep up to date with existing staffing.

Often some of the licensing issues are not dealt with until we get the material to catalog. This is often the case with CDROMs (particularly those that accompany printed volumes) that may only allow for the installation of software on a single machine.
At an early stage of the history of electronic resources, there was a local MS Access database of titles that recorded information relating to the licensing, but it duplicated much of the information that the catalog and the serials acquisition system recorded with no good means of combining its information with the price and publication history of the titles controlled. Sharing the information with selectors was not efficient.

Budgeting remains difficult when pricing can change significantly during the period the available window for cancellation.

At one time an administrative assistant was available and the occupant of that position was able to gather and analyze online usage statistics. The ability to identify marginal titles based on cost per use would be beneficial in achieving budget reduction targets.

5. What are your campus’ greatest needs in terms of electronic resources management and related systems?

More current tracking of individual titles in response to movement among publishers, inclusion or exclusion from packages. Better knowledge for selectors of where things are in the process of acquisition and licensing. Ability to identify and target marginal resources.

We need a single source of many types of data: DDP adds/deletes, package contents, cost information, licensing terms, electronic coverage, campus participation, campus print holdings. Ideally, we would like one comprehensive source for this data, even if it is external to our local system.

6. What are your immediate, mid-and long range top priorities for electronic resources management and related systems?

Identifying where savings can be achieved by switching from print to online and coping with budget shortfalls.

Continue to expand opportunities for sharing the effort of negotiating to UC standards. Reduce the effort required to control resources and improve currency and accuracy.

Need for cooperative collection development tool for the UC Libraries.

7. What are your campus’ current plans for addressing your campus’ top priorities and needs?

Continue to examine functionality available in ILS for ways to improve work flows and management information.

8. Are you considering purchasing systems or products for electronic resources management?

The Digital Initiatives Program is planning on doing two pilot projects using the Greenstone and Fedora packages for locally created digital content.
More likely than new purchases are further investigation of how existing facilities (ILS/SFX) can be cost-effectively adapted to answer needs without excessive ongoing maintenance costs.

9. What are your campus’ greatest needs with regard to shared/system-wide electronic resources management?

Publishers are able to employ a divide and conquer technique that enables and perpetuates business models that are threatening in a period of general budget contraction. Particularly where online is provided “free” with print, there is no ability to continue online access to previously acquired content should it be necessary to cancel the title, and access is not guaranteed to backfiles as they accumulate. The situation (and loss) is worse when a premium is extracted for current online access based on some size measure for titles that were formerly available at a much lower fixed cost. License conditions can be imposed that are not up to CDL standards with regard to authorized usage (ILL, RBR, etc.) or legal conditions. “Consortial” acquisition has been extremely successful in extending access to a greater range of resources and is beginning to be used to achieve spending reductions. The Tier II process has been a great help and deserves every encouragement as a means of extending the success of consortial negotiations where interest and need are not universal and as a means of fighting off threatening business models.

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

The diversity of data structures/routines associated with differing sources of the data. Also, the diversity of data & routines of local ILS systems.

The issue of how to bring locally created digital content together with our licensed resources. Metadata requirements (descriptive, technical, and administrative) will require a great deal of coordination between the campuses.

11. Anything else you’d like to share?