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Overview

This study focuses on the current practices, procedures, and tools used in the management of electronic resources among members of the Council of Atlantic University Libraries. This report aims to make recommendations on how to improve workflows and create efficient processes to provide timely and accurate access to electronic resources, manage administrative data, insure succession planning, improve internal communication, manage usage statistics, and organize and provide access to licensing details. The study was comprised of two elements, a survey (Appendix A) conducted in the fall of 2013 and then follow up interviews and site visits in the spring of 2014.

Fifteen institutional members of the Council of Atlantic University Libraries (CAUL-CBUA) participated in the survey and site visits. Invitations to participate in the survey were distributed to libraries by email from the principle investigator and the Manager of CAUL-CBUA. The research project was approved by the Acadia University Ethics Board and was funded by a CAUL-CBUA Research and Innovation Grant and the Acadia University Research Fund. Respondents were: Mount St. Vincent University, St. Mary’s University, Dalhousie University, Memorial University of Newfoundland, Université Sainte-Anne, Université de Moncton, University of New Brunswick, University of Prince Edward Island, Nova Scotia Community College, Acadia University, Cape Breton University, St. Francis Xavier University, Atlantic School of Theology, University of King’s College and Mount Allison University. A summation of survey results is located in Appendix B.

Though the survey covered staffing, licensing, list management and statistics, the main focus of the research was the perceived lack of electronic resource management systems (ERMS) in the region. The value of an ERMS lies in:

- Improved internal communication and efficient workflows. All of the information regarding electronic resources is searchable and available to all staff members in one place.
- Succession planning: when electronic resource staff retire, go on leave, or even on vacation, all the information is accessible and organized.
- Centralized control: all information including contracts, statistical reports, administrative information such as contacts, username and passwords, URLs and descriptions are attached to the resource. Centralized control results in fewer errors and access issues and more consistent and timely information made available to the public.
- Reduced liability: the ability for all contracts to be organized, accessible and easily comparable to public descriptions.

There are a number of ERMS available in the market place. Commercial options include: Serials Solutions 360 Resource Manager, ExLibris Verde, OCLC WMS, EBSCO ERM Essentials. In addition, there are a number open source options, most notably ReSearch/CUFTS. All ERMS are separate products and have their own subscription costs.

Researcher/CUFTS is NOT equivalent to the SFX Resolver, but rather CUFTS has additional functionality beyond a simple resolver in four distinct areas:

1. **ERMS** – this product allows libraries to manage all aspects of their electronic resources:
   - Administrative data such as username, passwords, urls, contact information
   - Dates/Cost/invoicing and renewal information
   - Subject headings and ranking order for display on public websites
2. **A-Z List of Resources** – libraries do not need to maintain A-Z List of Resources or A-Z list of Resources by Subject as these pages can be generated directly from CUFTS (Appendix D). These subject pages can be directly embedded into libguides (Appendix E). This allows the library to present consistent, current, and accurate details about electronic resources everywhere on their library site.

3. **Statistics and Reports**: CUFTS supports SUSHI and Counter Compliance statistics. Further investigation of the functionality of the stats reporting is required. CUFTS does provide a resource comparator program to compare coverage of databases and ecollections, and generates reports on the highest usage of fulltext and not fulltext titles requested through the resolver weekly, monthly and yearly. This tool is valuable for collection development purposes.

4. **Display Licensing Information**: Licensing information/interpretation can be displayed at the database level and at the journal title level (Appendix C)

As a side note: As a member of the CRKN Subcommittee on Serials Management I can attest that, at least for CRKN title lists, CUFTS is the most current, and therefore accurate, of all of the resolver products. This is largely due to their responsiveness and that they do not wait and batch load their updates monthly or bimonthly. Acadia University has experienced a marked decrease in title access problems since implementing the CUFTS resolver. Acadia will continue to use the ReSearcher/CUFTS system for the foreseeable future, likely until a Unified Resource Management System (URMS), such as ALMA (ExLibris) is available to the region.

**Recommendations**

Based on the information gathered from the surveys, a review of the literature, and discussions during the site visits, the recommendations are as follows:

**Staffing**: It is difficult to make specific recommendations regarding staffing. In general, each library has migrated staff from existing/traditional areas to manage electronic resources. Given this, libraries should still evaluate their staffing structures, recognizing that a major shift in collections has occurred over the last ten to fifteen years and the workflows and tools that successfully managed printed materials for many years (catalogue, paper files, email communication and excel files) do not necessarily work for the management of electronic resources going forward.

**Licensing**: That CAUL-CBUA develop a licensing checklist to be used as a guideline by the CAUL-CBUA Manager when negotiating or renegotiating consortial resources.

That the checklist, along with other resources, such as the CRKN model license (with permission), be posted in a section of the CAUL-CBUA website to assist electronic resources librarians/staff in the region.

That public access to licensing information is important because it reduces liability, libraries should embed this information at the resource and/or title level. Please note: that libraries who currently subscribed to Mondo can cancel in lieu of CUFTS.

---

1 Please note: in order to display licensing information at the journal title level, a library must use the CUFTS resolver.
**Electronic Resource Management System:** Based on a literature review, Acadia’s experience, and the current lack of ERMS in the region it is recommended that CAUL-CBUA Directors consult with their librarians and staff who participated in this study to determine whether implementing CUFTS is appropriate at this time.

If any libraries want to proceed with CUFTS, the CAUL-CBUA Manager/CAUL-CBUA Board Chair contact Kevin Stranack at Simon Fraser University to negotiate a potential offer.

For those that implement CUFTS, a partially pre-populated installation be made available. The pre-populated database would be modeled on Acadia’s installation and would contain licensing information and descriptions for CRKN and CAUL products. This would be done by Acadia in an effort to reduce duplication and shorten the implementation period for new libraries.

It is also recommended that the CAUL-CBUA Manager have an installation of CUFTS to manage the CAUL-CBUA subscriptions. The manager could then push trials, descriptions, licensing interpretation, and renewal offers of products to participating CAUL-CBUA libraries.

For those libraries who are interested in implementing CUFTS, that they carefully compare and evaluate resolver products, particularly if displaying embedded licensing information is an important criteria (Appendix E).

**Title List/List Management:** the management of title lists has improved over time, but libraries continue to report problems and issues with these lists and a lack of communication and coordination in fixing, reporting, and updating custom lists (specific to CAUL) or in the identification of the correct lists from resolvers. Where many of the libraries share common resources, CAUL-CBUA should create a communication mechanism to facilitate discussion on problem lists and determine how to share responsibility for updating within the region – this could be in the form of a committee, email list or web-based solution.

**Statistics:** still tends to be a difficult area. CRKN is currently working on some analytics for CRKN packages and we should stay abreast of these developments. CUFTS does have options for the management of COUNTER and SUSHI statistics, but further work is needed in this area. One product of notable interest is JISC Usage Statistics Portal (JUSP) from the UK. It may be worthy of more investigation, however the cost of subscription may be prohibitive.

**CAUL-CBUA Support:** There seems to be substantial work for a CAUL-CBUA Collections/Eresources Committee. The formation of a CAUL-CBUA Collection/Eresources Committee could support the CAUL-CBUA Manager in her new role as contract negotiator, assist in the creation of the licensing checklist, assist libraries who chose CUFTS in the implementation phase, work with the new Novanet Collections Committee or perhaps form a joint committee (as many of the members would be the same), oversee the Last Copy project, and develop processes regarding the collection of statistics.

**Conclusion**

I would like to thank the University Librarians, the former CAUL-CBUA Manager, and the current CAUL-CBUA Manager for their support and assistance throughout this research project. I would like to recognize and thank CAUL-CBUA and Acadia University for funding this project and I would also like to express my appreciation to all of the librarians and staff members who took the time to meet with me. The insights gleaned from in person conversations are worth a great deal and put important context around the survey results. Portions of this report will be reworked into an upcoming article for either the Partnership Journal or the APLA Bulletin and/or an APLA conference presentation.
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Appendix A: Survey

A Study of Electronic Resources Management at Council of Atlantic University Libraries

Description and Consent

Dear University Librarians and Electronic Resources/Collection Librarians

My name is Jennifer Richard. I am an academic librarian responsible for the management of electronic resources at Acadia University. I am writing to you to invite you to participate in this research project on the Electronic Resources Management Practices among academic libraries in Atlantic Canada. The project, which is part of my yearlong (July 2013 until June 2014) sabbatical leave includes a survey (link below) and a follow up site visit interviews to your institution. Participants will be asked to fill out the linked survey which should take 10 to 15 minutes and then be willing to meet with me at your institution for 1 to 2 hours to further elaborate on issues identified through the survey. The librarian and staff that work most closely with Electronic Resources would be the best choices for the appropriate people to fill out the survey.

The result of the survey and interviews will be a description of the current practices, a SWOT analysis, and recommendations as to how we could work together to manage our resources more effectively and efficiently and provide better access and service to our academic communities. The results will be distributed to all members of CAUL-CBUA and results will only be identified at the institution level. No personal information (other than name and contact information) will be collected and no personal information will be included in the report. Personal names will be replaced with code numbers to insure confidentiality. All information gathered from the survey and interviews will hosted on secure Acadia University computers and servers and will be destroyed when the research is completed. Participation is strictly voluntary, participants can withdraw from the study at any time, and participants can withdraw their responses up to 30 days after the interviews have been completed. There are no risks or benefits to participants.

Please note that consenting to participate in this study does not waive any rights to have legal recourse in the event of research-related harm and Canadian employment law may give your employer the right to any information sent using employer-owned equipment. For further information regarding Acadia’s Research Ethics Board approval process, you can contact:
Dr. Stephen Maitzen
Chair, Research Ethics Board
214 Horton Hall
Acadia University
Wolfville, Nova Scotia
Canada B4P 2R6
Email: smaitzen@acadiau.ca

Telephone: 902.585.1407
Facsimile: 902.585.1096

The project has been supported through the CAUL-CBUA Research and Innovation Grant.

☐ I consent to participate in this study as described.
I ask that you complete the survey by Friday, November 15, 2013. For further information, please contact me directly:

Jennifer Richard  
Academic Librarian  
Acadia University Library  
Wolfville, NS, B4P 2R6  
Email: jennifer.richard@acadiau.ca

Tel: 902-542-1895/Cell: 902-670-0294

Name of Institution:  
Contact for follow up interview:  
Email address:  

For the purposes of this survey I am defining Management of Electronic Resources to include the following activities: negotiating terms of electronic resources, interpreting license agreements, management of an electronic resource management system, title list management, proxy and resolver issues, installation and troubleshooting of databases, generation and analysis of usage statistics generated from electronic resources. Liaison work and teaching should not be considered electronic resource management for the purposes of this study.

**Staffing**

1. Using the above description of Management of Electronic Resources, how many professional librarians manage electronic resources at your library?

   - [ ] <1  
   - [ ] 1  
   - [ ] 2  
   - [ ] 3  
   - [ ] 4-7  
   - [ ] 8 or more

2. Using the above description how many staff members work directly with the management of electronic resources?

   - [ ] <1  
   - [ ] 1  
   - [ ] 2  
   - [ ] 3
Has your library restructured or adjusted staffing levels to address the increased activity related to the management of electronic resources?

- [ ] Yes
- [ ] No

If yes, please describe the new structure.

If no, please describe how work has been distributed to current staff.

---

**Licensing**

All CAUL-CBUA members participate to some extent in licensing electronic materials through CRKN and CAUL-CBUA. The next few questions pertain to attitudes regarding licensing issues.

4. CRKN use a model license when negotiating with publishers. Does your library use a model license or certain criteria when negotiating the terms of a new eresource?

- [ ] Yes
- [ ] No

Comment:

5. CAUL-CBUA does not currently use a model license when negotiating new deals, would you prefer if CAUL-CBUA did use a model license?

- [ ] Yes
- [ ] No

Comment:
6. Would you like to see more deals to be negotiated by consortia?

- Yes, I would all deals to be handled through consortia.
- Yes, I would like most details to be handled through consortia, but I need flexibility for specialized resources.
- No, I would like to negotiate more deals on an individual basis.

7. Would you like to see CAUL-CBUA investigate more truly consortial deals (like the Novanet Ebook Project) – where participation by all libraries is mandatory. (No opt out option)?

- Yes
- Yes, but only for broad multidisciplinary packages
- No

Comment:

8. Who do you seek advice in the interpretation of licensing terms (check as many as apply):

- Colleagues at other institutions
- Colleagues at your own institution
- Consortia such as CAUL-CBUA or CRKN
- Publishers/Vendors
- Other

Please specify:

9. Does your library provide detailed licensing information to the public?

- Yes
- No

If yes, what product or service do you use? (Mondo would be an example)

Electronic Resource Management Systems

10. Do you currently use an ERM system to manage electronic resources at your library?
If yes, which one of the following do you use?

- CUFTS ERM
- EBSCO’s ERM Essentials
- Ex-Libris’ Verde
- Innovative ERM
- Serials Solutions 360 Resource Manager
- Swets Wise eSource Manager
- TDNet Open ERAM
- Other:  

11. Does your library have access to an ERM system, but do not use it?

- Yes
- No

If, yes, why don’t you use it? (check all that apply)

- Too complicated
- Limited Staff time
- Not a priority
- Doesn’t suit our needs

Other/Further explanation:  

If your library does not have/use an electronic resource management system, how does your library manage electronic resources? (check all that apply):

- Excel spreadsheets
- Email archives
- Access database
- Paper files

Other/Further explanation:  

12. Would your library be interested in participating in the investigation of an ERM system? (check all that apply)
13. What is the highest price range that your library would consider for an ERM system?

- $0
- Under $2000
- $2001-$5000
- $5000-$10,000
- Over $10,000
- Don't know/Unsure

Title Lists

14. Does your library review/check electronic journal title lists?

- Yes, we check every list before put them in resolver
- Yes, but only when notified about changes/transfers/ceased titles
- Yes, but only when an issue to brought to our attention
- No, we rely solely on the accuracy of the list as provided by our resolver

15. Is your library concerned with the accuracy of title lists, transfer and ceased titles, etc.

- Yes, we spend a great deal of time on these issues
- Yes we think these issues are important, but haven’t developed a strategy for dealing with them
- No, we don’t worry about it

16. How do you provide access to individual subscriptions?

- Through our catalogue
- Creation of custom lists in our resolver

Other: please explain:

17. Are you aware CRKN works with publishers and link resolver vendors to improve the accuracy of title lists?
Usage Statistics

18. Does your library collect and analyze statistics on electronic resource use?

☐ Yes
☐ No

If yes, How often are the statistics collected?

☐ Annually
☐ Quarterly
☐ Monthly
☐ Infrequently
☐ Situational (when required for a special assessment, or budget review)

19. Would your library be interested in participating in the investigation of a product or service that would collect and organize statistics and generate reports?

☐ Yes
☐ No
☐ Don't know

20. If a product or service was available that met your anticipated needs for statistical collection, how much would your library be willing to spend on this type of service/product?

☐ $0
☐ Under $2000
☐ $2001-$5000
☐ $5000-$10,000
☐ Over $10,000
☐ Don't know/Unsure

Support
21. Do you think CAUL-CBUA needs a committee or working group to address Electronic Resource Management issues?

- Yes
- No

22. What areas/services pertaining to Electronic Resource Management would you like to see CAUL-CBUA further explore or investigate?

23. General Comments
Appendix B: Summation of Survey Results

Staffing

The first section of the survey focused on staffing. The first two questions of the survey asked about the number of librarians and the number of staff involved in the management of electronic resources. Not surprisingly, the results were mixed, and interestingly, not proportional to size of the library. Larger libraries did not necessarily have more librarians or more staff working in this area. Three libraries stated they have less than one librarian, which indicates that the librarian has more responsibilities than just electronic resources and only spends a portion of their time on e-resources. Four libraries indicated they have one librarian, three libraries have two librarians, two other libraries have three librarians, and finally three libraries have between four and seven librarians working in electronic resource management. Libraries that have three or more librarians may have more decentralized processes. In the case of staff members, three libraries had less than one staff member assigned to this work, one library had one, four libraries had two staff members, one library had three, four libraries had between four and seven staff and one library had more than eight.

When asked if staffing had been restructured to deal with the proliferation of electronic resources, the libraries were split, seven had not been restructured and eight had. Those libraries that have restructured were asked to describe what has been implemented.

- St. Mary’s University notes that position descriptions have been modified to reflect new workflows in acquisitions, cataloguing and metadata. Specifically, a senior cataloguer was reassigned to work on aggregate databases and publisher collections for half of their time. One serials clerk expanded responsibility includes individual electronic journal subscriptions. The head of acquisitions does the overall management of electronic resources without an ERMS and one library assistant is responsible for copyright information and the management of Mondo.

- Mount Allison University is in the process of restructuring. They are using three staff to update and manage coverage of their resources through the knowledge base.

- Acadia has reassigned the head of cataloguing to the role of coordinator of electronic resources, along with her responsibilities as head of acquisitions.

- In 2006, Mount St. Vincent hired a systems librarian and then hired an electronic resources assistant who reports to the systems librarian in 2007.

- At Memorial University, the responsibilities have fallen to the systems department with staff increasing over the last 10 years from two to eight and serials and acquisitions departments decreasing in size.

- UNB’s structure and staffing has evolved over time. Over the last ten year, an electronic resources librarian position was created with three support positions and a new cataloguing librarian took on coordination of metadata. Positions have been redefined as vacancies arose, but overall staffing complement has been reduced.

- Dalhousie University is in the process of reorganizing their technical services staff. They are migrating from a decentralized model where staff focus on individual libraries to a more centralized model organized by task. As at St. Mary’s, job descriptions are being re-worked to formalize new roles and the scope of their work in technical services is incorporating the management of electronic resources. In addition, a portion of the time of a limited term librarian is dedicated to the analysis of electronic usage patterns.

Comments were also received from those libraries that have not restructured.
Two of the smallest libraries, Ste Anne’s and the Atlantic School of Theology noted that the university librarian is responsible for most of electronic resource management. Though Ste. Anne’s did explain the task of list/title management is done by a library assistant.

At St.FX, electronic resource management has been absorbed by a serials position, but they would like to have a new staff position to focus on electronic resources.

UPEI stated that a circulation/serials position has been moved from print subscriptions to focus on online subscriptions, ERMS work, and usage data collection.

Université de Moncton’s work has been absorbed by current staff with a change in job description for one staff member.

CBU provided details on each of the roles of three librarians, one responsible for the systems and access, one for the interpretation of licenses, and one for list management and resolver issues.

Finally at NSCC, the electronic services librarian takes care of the management of e-resources in terms of maintenance, administration, training, support, the public services librarian negotiates licenses and then passes the file over to the electronic services librarian and a copyright officer interprets the licenses to ensure there are no issues from a copyright perspective.

As is reflected in the literature, it appears that not one single staffing area has migrated to electronic resources management, rather re-purposing of staff from technical services, circulation, serials, acquisitions, and systems has occurred. Changes in current job descriptions and the incorporation of the management of electronic resources into new job descriptions is happening as well, though overall staffing levels do not appear to be increasing at academic libraries.

**Licensing**

All CAUL-CBUA members participate, to some, extent in licensing electronic materials through CRKN and CAUL-CBUA. This section of the survey asked questions which pertain to licensing issues. The first question asked whether individual libraries have their own model license. Only Dalhousie University uses a model license when negotiating individual deals. The next question asked whether libraries would like CAUL-CBUA to develop a model license that the office would use when negotiating consortial deals for its members. When asked if they would like CAUL-CBUA to develop and use a model license, nine out of thirteen indicated they would, and four (CBU, Mt. Allison, UNB and Université Sainte-Anne) stated they would not. In regards to comments about the adoption of a model license, some could see the benefits, particularly in consistency of language around permissions and copyright, but others were uncertain of the benefit. It was noted that the former CAUL-CBUA Manager was interested in exploring the concept of a model license. One library suggested that CAUL-CBUA adopt CRKN’s license and others suggested that perhaps a formal model isn’t necessary and would not be flexible enough to suit the needs of the libraries, but rather, a checklist of criteria or desired features would be a better alternative.

On the question of whether they would like to see more deals negotiated at a consortial level. Twelve libraries would like most deals to be handled through consortia, but need flexibility for specialized resources. Mt. Allison said they would like all deals to be negotiated through consortia and two libraries, UNB and CBU indicated that they would like to see more individual negotiation. The next question went a step further, inquiring about deals that required mandatory participation. Most libraries (ten) were not in favor of this idea. The main advantage to an “all-in” model would be that all patrons would have access to the same suite of products or materials, like the Novanet’s ebook project. This is more important for libraries that share an interface such as an ILS and/or a discovery service. However, concerns regarding variation in programs, including French language and college
level materials, size and number of our libraries, desire for flexibility and most importantly, budget trumped the advantages to mandatory packages. St. Mary’s did note that they would like to see the ability of libraries to choose the products, but have CAUL-CBUA, presumably the manager, conduct the negotiation on behalf of those libraries that wish to participate.

When asked where librarians/staff seek advice on interpreting licensing the answers were all over the map with most seeking help from at least three or four sources including colleagues at their own institutions and other institutions, consortia and publishers/vendors. These responses seem to indicate that it would depend on who negotiated the deal, so librarians would rely on interpretation from CRKN staff for CRKN deals and likewise with CAUL, but do reach out to colleagues at their own institutions and others, as well as eight libraries contacting publishers or vendors directly.

The final question was regarding whether libraries displayed their licensing information (permissions regarding printing, downloading, CMS, walk-ins, etc.) to their patrons. The results were that eight libraries do display their licensing information to the public, while seven do not. Of the eight that do, Acadia and UPEI use CUFTS and the rest use Mondo.

**Electronic Resource Management Systems**

This section of the survey dealt with electronic resource management systems (ERMS) in an effort to determine which libraries in the region had access and were using ERMS to assist in the coordination/management of their resources. The first question asked whether the library was currently using an ERMS. Thirteen out of the fifteen are not. Only Acadia and UPEI have systems in place and both are using reSearcher/CUFTS.

The follow up question: “Do you currently have access to an ERM system, but do not use it?” was asked. The question was not relevant to Acadia and UPEI as they are using their system. Out of the remaining thirteen respondents, eleven libraries do not have access to an ERMS. Two libraries have access to a system, but are not currently using it. Mt. Allison indicated they may have access to an OCLC WMS (WorldShare Management System) but have not fully implemented it, using only the link resolver application. Mt. A gave two reasons for not using/implementing the system; too complicated and limited staff time. UNB has recently purchased OCLC’s ERMS (WMS) and are in the planning stages of implementation. Ste. Anne’s indicated that limited staff time is a concern regarding adopting an ERMS and would like further explanation of the benefits of a system. NSCC indicated that an ERMS is not a priority for them right now.

Most libraries in region are using a combination of excel spreadsheets, email archives and paper files. Specifically eleven libraries use excel spreadsheets, six still rely on paper files and one solely on paper files, one library uses an access database and eight still access email archives.

The majority of libraries surveyed are interested in participating in the investigation of an ERMS. Four libraries were not. UPEI is already using one, Kings was not interested, though they did note that most of the management of electronic resources is done through Dalhousie University. UNB are currently implementing OCLC’s WMS and NSCC noted that it is not a priority for them at this time. The other eleven institutions were interested in either an individual or consortial system, with most being interested in consortial. In fact all eleven expressed interest in a consortial system.

Answers to survey questions about cost/funding are always nebulous at best, often due to the fact that decision making happens differently at each institution in addition to the varying sizes of libraries and library budgets. Given this, four libraries were unsure, two libraries chose under two thousand dollars, three library chose between two thousand and five thousand, one chose between five and ten thousand and one chose over ten thousand. The results indicate that while there is definite interest and an acceptance that it will require some additional funding, it would be wise to keep the options at a reasonable to low cost for CAUL-CBUA libraries to proceed.
List/Title Management

In this section of the survey, participants were asked about the management of lists/titles in their electronic journal packages. Though libraries purchase many of these titles through national or regional consortia, often a great deal of time and staff effort goes into insuring that title lists are accurate. The Canadian Research Knowledge Network (CRKN) has a subcommittee that reviews and corrects lists and then provides them back to publishers and Resolver companies. Most of the survey respondents (13 out of 15) were aware that CRKN does this work on their behalf.

When asked if the library checks the title lists, the results were as follows. Two libraries out of fifteen rely solely on the title lists provided by publishers, and two libraries check every list themselves, three check the lists when problems are brought to their attention and the rest (six) check when they receive updates regarding title changes, cessations, or transfers.

The next question dealt with how libraries felt they were coping with workload around title management. Only one library indicated that title management was not something they worry about, the rest were split. Six libraries indicated that they think the issues are important but haven’t developed a strategy to deal with workload and eight indicated, yes they spend a great deal of time on these issues. Though the majority of electronic journal collections come through larger packages there are still many titles that are individual subscriptions. These are often more time consuming because of the amount of work for one title. For example, all 1600 titles of a major publisher like Elsevier purchased through CRKN would have the same administrative information for statistics and contacts and the same licensing details, however each individual subscription of an electronic journal now carries its own administrative and licensing information. Older library catalogues were not designed to manage the amount of information attached to electronic subscriptions. Duplication in housing the information in two places becomes an issue. Currently, two libraries still house individual subscriptions in only the catalogue, while five house the information in both the catalogue and their link resolver and seven are using only link resolvers now.

Statistics

The collection of usage statistics continues to provide much grief to librarians with updates and changes to COUNTER standards, difficulties with SUSHI feeds, along with variations in what kinds of statistics are collected and how they are collected continue to cause problems. These issues make it difficult to compare apples to apples and to use statistics in conjunction with other qualitative information to effectively assist in collection development.

The first question posed in this section was simply “Does your library collect and analyse statistics on electronic resource use?” One hundred percent (all fifteen) of respondents indicated that their libraries do collect usage statistics. The follow up question “how often statistics are collected” was asked and respondents could pick more than one answer. Of the thirteen who answered the follow-up, ten selected situational as part of their answer. Other responses included: seven noting that they collect stats annually, one infrequently, two quarterly, and two monthly.

The majority of libraries (nine of thirteen in this case) were interested in participating in the investigation of a product or service that would collect and organize statistics and generate reports. Two libraries were not sure, and two were not interested. When asked about the cost of a service or product for statistics, seven stated they would prefer to keep costs under $2000, three libraries chose between $2001-5000 and four were not sure.

Though COUNTER, NISO KBART, and SUSHI standards are improving and there is a strong interest in collaborating and cooperating, the area of statistics still seems to be in constant flux. New products
and initiatives such as JUSP from the JISC in the UK and CRKN’s latest work proves these tools are needed by libraries and are worth pursuing.

**CAUL-CBUA’s Role and General Comments**

When asked if CAUL-CBUA needs a committee or working group to address Electronic Resource Management issues. There were thirteen responses to this question with the results being somewhat mixed with eight stating yes, and five stating no, a committee was not needed.

Respondents offered a variety of suggestions regarding how CAUL-CBUA could further support the libraries. Themes that came up many times were the concepts of improved communication, cooperation (sharing workload, working with Novanet to avoid duplication), and collaboration. One respondent also noted consistency as being an advantage of working from a consortial ERMS. A number of participants reiterated that a consortial ERMS is a good idea and long overdue. In addition to support of an ERMS, other suggestions regarding support from CAUL-CBUA were in areas of statistics, title management, and license interpretation and negotiation, specifically copyright permission and archived access.
**Electronic Resources**

**Academic Search Premier**

This multi-disciplinary database provides full text for more than 4,600 journals, at least 3,900 of which are peer-reviewed. Full text back files to 1975 and earlier are available for more than one hundred journals, and searchable cited references are provided for more than 1,000 titles.

- **Coursepacks**: no
- **Allows downloads**: yes
- **Allows emails**: yes
- **Allows reserves**: no
- **Ereserves notes**: You may not include material from this resource in e-reserves, which are electronic copies of articles stored on a secure network for use by students in connection with a specific class. The licensee and authorized users may not incorporate parts of the licensed materials in course management systems like ACORN (Moodle). Linking: You can create a persistent electronic link to an individual article or ebooks.
- **Allows ill**: yes
- **Ill notes**: Interlibrary loan is a service whereby users from one library may borrow material from another library via post, fax or secure transmission (whereby the electronic file is deleted immediately after printing), for the purposes of research or private study, and not for commercial use.
- **Coverage**: 1987 -
- **Resource type**: Full text Database
- **Simultaneous users**: Unlimited
- **URL**: Connect
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**At the Journal Title Level**

**Acadia's Journals**

**Nature**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Availability</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Environment Complete</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Link</strong>:</td>
<td><a href="#">Click here to access journal</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ERMS License</strong>:</td>
<td>ERMSO databases</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Allows electronic reserves</strong>:</td>
<td>no</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Electronic reserves notes</strong>:</td>
<td>You may not include material from this resource in e-reserves, which are electronic copies of articles stored on a secure network for use by students in connection with a specific class. The licensee and authorized users may not incorporate parts of the licensed materials in course management systems like ACORN (Moodle). Linking: You can create a persistent electronic link to an individual article or ebooks.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Allows coursepacks</strong>:</td>
<td>no</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Coursepack notes</strong>:</td>
<td>You may not include material from this resource in course packs, which are compilations of articles for use by students in a class.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Allows interlibrary loan</strong>:</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Interlibrary loan notes</strong>:</td>
<td>Interlibrary loan is a service whereby users from one library may borrow material from another library via post, fax or secure transmission (whereby the electronic file is deleted immediately after printing), for the purposes of research or private study, and not for commercial use.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Nature Publishing Group Journals</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Fulltext Coverage</strong>:</td>
<td>2008b-01-07 (v454, 7174) to current</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Link</strong>:</td>
<td><a href="#">Click here to access journal</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ERMS License</strong>:</td>
<td>Nature Publishing Group</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Allows electronic reserves</strong>:</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Electronic reserves notes</strong>:</td>
<td>You may include material from this resource in course management systems like ACORN (Moodle).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Allows coursepacks</strong>:</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Coursepack notes</strong>:</td>
<td>You may include material from this resource in course packs, which are compilations of articles for use by students in a class.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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