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Results of Serials Solutions
November 2006 Survey of Customers
Market Research Study

- Parker LePla – Seattle-based integrated-brand research firm
- Looked at library environment
- Provided Serials Solutions with a survey results and a “score card”
Interviews

• 38 customers
  – 10 ARLs
  – 10 4-year academics
  – 10 corporate, hospital and government
  – 8 public libraries

• 2 consultants

• 20 employees
What are librarians worried about?

• Keeping up with all of their duties
  Too much to do and not enough time, people, or budget

• Making the transition to a user-friendly (Web 2.0) library
  This was the most frequent answer to many of the question on the survey
What they want ---

• A way to manage resources that provides seamless integration and access to all content repositories both internal and external
  – Including journals, reference works, e-books, audio, video, datasets, institutional repositories, etc.
  – It’s impossible to maintain multiple knowledgebases
• Integration of all solutions into one product
• Interoperability
And they want more functionality

• Functionality and features were noted to be top buying criteria
  – Will select whichever vendor can meet their current and perceived future needs now
  – Especially if the price is right
Nature of collections has changed

The physical model no longer dominates library operations

– It is not unusual for libraries to spend 50% or more of their materials budgets on e-resources
And library users are forcing a paradigm shift

33 librarians (87%) believe that the paradigm has shifted from library management to user-centric

– They cite the “Googlization” of information access as a primary reason
It’s all about the Users

The Web has changed how we distribute and consume information

• The shift from physical to digital delivery of information has created new requirements and opportunities for delivering effective library experiences

The Web has transformed the nature of library collections

• The majority of new acquisitions are web-based
• Collections have increased dramatically and content is available anytime, anywhere
• Web search engines compete with libraries
The library as the source for value-added research is being threatened

The Internet and Google have allowed researchers to partially or completely replace the library
   Where researchers still use the library--it is often remotely
   This negates the research librarian’s traditional value-added role in the research processes

Electronic content in libraries is underutilized
   Resources get “lost” and are underused
   Patrons don’t know which resources exist
   Patrons can’t find items that are known to be in the collection

Multiple authentication systems and user interfaces create user confusion and frustration
   Usability requires integration of data, access, and management tools in a cohesive system

Available technology is not being used to its potential
How the Respondents Define Success

• Users find what they need quickly
  – Simple
  – Wherever they are
  – So they don’t have to wait or go somewhere else

• Measurement
  – What’s being used and how often
  – The meaning behind the statistics
  – Some way to measure return on investment

• Features that provide libraries a competitive advantage over the “free” services of the Internet
  – Honing in on the value libraries add to the research experience
To succeed they need:

Help in making their case to university/funding authorities.

This needs to be a component of how vendors communicate their services to libraries.
DLF ERMI Workflow Diagram

Overview Flowchart for Physical Resource Acquisition and Management

1. Notification of new product
2. Product consideration
3. Acquisition process
4. Receipt and physical processing
5. Retention, circulation, preservation

Overview Flowchart for Electronic Product Acquisition and Management

1. Notification of new product
2. Product consideration and trial process
3. Licensing negotiation
4. Technical evaluation
5. Business negotiation
6. Implementation processes
7. Maintenance and review
UCLA’s Digital Acquisition Process

Acquire
- Trial use
- Assess need/budget

Evaluate Monitor
- User feedback
- Usage stats
- Downtime analysis
- Review problems
- Problem log
- Hardware needs
- Software needs
- Contact info
- Troubleshoot/triage

Provide Access
- License terms
- Price
- Evaluate
- Register
- IP Addresses
- Portals/Access lists
- Proxy servers
- Campus authentication
- URL maintenance

Provide Support
- User IDs
- Preferences (store)
- Holdings lists
- Access restrictions
- View rights for use

Administer
- Usage stats
- Downtime analysis
- Review problems
- User feedback
- Hardware needs
- Software needs
- Contact info
- Troubleshoot/triage
In February, 2007, an invitation to an informal survey of "Nine Questions on Technology Innovation in Academic Libraries" was posted to the WEB4LIB, NGC4LIB, LITA-L, COLLIB-L, ACRL-NJ and New Jersey academic library listservs, and it was mentioned in the national ACRLog blog.

*The driving force behind tech. innovation is student needs, followed by an Information Tech. Chief or Dean with vision, and the initiative of individuals.

*The biggest obstacle to tech. innovation in libraries is lack of money, staff, and time, with an unsupportive administration cited as one of the top four obstacles.

*The Library's approach and the Library staff's approach to technology innovation were both overwhelmingly described as "cautious but willing," though the staff were more often described as "resistant and blocking" than the Library itself.
“Libraries have been slow to reallocate staff resources toward processing of electronic materials from processing of print materials in proportion to the reallocation of print to electronic acquisitions dollars. Often they have to wait for positions to open up because current staff do not have skills transferable to the new scene; unions and tenure make this kind of job re-deployment difficult. We booklovers are sad to see the decline of book purchases, but the library users are clear that they want it full-text, online.”

Helen H. Spalding, University Librarian, Portland State University (private email correspondence)
Libraries need ERAMS

E-Resource Access and Managements Services

A new way of thinking about how we manage library collections and make them accessible
  – Technologies used for physical collections are not suited for the challenges of electronic resources
  – ERAMS augment the physical library and the ILS

A planning and budgeting category
  – ERAMS help ensure the capabilities and relevance of libraries moving forward

A collection of tools and services that help libraries optimize access, usage, collections and workflows
  – Collect -- a comprehensive e-resource knowledgebase
  – Correct -- the knowledgebase to maintain accuracy
  – Connect -- people with answers using the best method
  – Control -- budgets, collections, and workflows to optimize value
Establishing ERAMS as a product category:

– Clearly separates the issues of e-collections
– Provides foundation for organizational and budget decisions
– Justifies spending for needed tools and services
– Provides framework for defining enhancements from vendors.
Individual Products Within the ERAMS Category

– A–to–Z Title lists
– Link resolvers
– Federated search engines
– MARC updating services
– ERM applications

In the future, ERAMS will expand functionality to provide for continued enhancement of libraries. As new services are introduced, they must work together as a cohesive and effective solution.
Intelligent, forward-facing e-resource access and management (ERAMS) is the essential ingredient for libraries to remain relevant for research in the digital era.