Purdue University
Purdue e-Pubs

Charleston Library Conference

Ebb and Flow: A Selection to Access Workflow for Consortia PDA

Denise Pan
University of Colorado at Denver and Health Sciences Center, Denise.Pan@UCDenver.edu

Yem Fong
University of Colorado at Boulder, Yem.Fong@Colorado.edu

Mary Beth Chambers
University of Colorado at Colorado Springs, mchamber@uccs.edu

Yumin Jiang
University of Colorado at Boulder, yumin.jiang@colorado.edu

Follow this and additional works at: http://docs.lib.purdue.edu/charleston

Part of the Library and Information Science Commons

An indexed, print copy of the Proceedings is also available for purchase at: http://www.thepress.purdue.edu/series/charleston.

You may also be interested in the new series, Charleston Insights in Library, Archival, and Information Sciences. Find out more at: http://www.thepress.purdue.edu/series/charleston-insights-library-archival-and-information-sciences.

Ebb and Flow: A Selection to Access Workflow for Consortia PDA

Denise Pan, Associate Director of Technical Services, University of Colorado Denver
Yem Fong, Faculty Director for Collection Development, University of Colorado Boulder Libraries
Mary Beth Chambers, Catalog Metadata Librarian, University of Colorado Colorado Springs
Yumin Jiang, Technical Services Librarian, University of Colorado Law School
Contributions from Gabrielle Wiersma and Wen-ying Lu, University of Colorado Boulder Libraries

Abstract

In the traditional workflow for delivering electronic resources to patrons, acquisitions have been the bridge between collection development and cataloging. However, new Patron Driven Acquisitions (PDA) purchasing models have reordered workflows and reemphasized communications. The sequence of activities differs since e-book discovery precedes purchasing activities. Workflow complexities are further exacerbated in a consortia environment. The University of Colorado (CU) system collaborated to implement a consortium PDA pilot with Ingram Academic on the MyiLibrary platform in December 2011. This presentation provides an overview of the pilot program and describes the workflow used for shared selection, cataloging, purchasing, and assessment of e-books among five separate libraries. The presenters provide details on the most salient issues encountered at each phase of the process, such as: selecting pilot subject areas; developing a consortium profile; establishing best-practices for MARC record editing and loading; troubleshooting duplicated e-book titles at individual libraries; resolving invoicing logistics; and designing assessment criteria. It also covers strategies for implementing a PDA program and describes some of the issues that may arise in a consortial PDA program.

Introduction

This presentation offers a different perspective on PDA or Demand Driven Acquisitions (DDA) by focusing on behind-the-scenes procedures and a consortial perspective. The traditional workflow for delivering electronic resources to patrons starts with selection by collection development, followed by acquisitions, cataloging, and assessment. In contrast, PDA purchasing is dependent on discovery. This change requires reevaluation of the selection-to-access process. In a consortia environment, workflow complexities are increased further. Specifically, implementing PDA can be complicated by factors such as e-book aggregator subscriptions, multiple monograph vendors, varying and incongruent local practices, and constraints on available staffing, cataloging expertise, budgets, and other details. The authors will provide an overview of the University of Colorado PDA pilot program, and highlight their implementation experiences during collection development/profiling, cataloging/discovery, acquisitions, and assessment.

Colorado Context

The University of Colorado system is often considered an institutional consortium by vendors and publishers. It is comprised of five separately administered libraries on four campuses for three institutions at Boulder, Denver, and Colorado Springs. The CU libraries have a long tradition of jointly licensing e-resources including journals, databases, e-book packages, and shared print resources. Moreover, the CU system was an early adopter of consortial PDA. In 1999, NetLibrary (formerly a division of OCLC and currently owned by EBSCO) and the Colorado Alliance of Research Libraries offered one of the first PDA programs, and one of the earliest for consortium. This experience led to the "banana book incident" at the Boulder campus when one class assignment in 2000 nearly tripled PDA e-book expenditures (from $13,000 to $37,000) in one month. More details are available from the paper "Patron-Driven E-book Solutions: Moving Beyond the Banana Books Incident" published in the *Charleston Conference Proceedings 2011.*

These initial experiences with PDA had a significant impact on participating libraries. Specifically at the Boulder campus, many collection development selectors were reluctant to try PDA again for several years. In 2009, Boulder launched a small controlled PDA pilot on the MyiLibrary e-book platform in a few subject areas with specifically allocated funds. The pilot was a success. The following year Boulder selected Ingram Academic as their primary monographic vendor and incorporated PDA into their firm and approval purchasing processes.

Building on the CU tradition of collaborative purchasing, Boulder negotiated with Ingram Academic to include the other CU libraries in their PDA program. In 2011, all five libraries began to plan their consortia implementation. In the first phase, from December 2011 to February 2012, patrons from the CU libraries were able to trigger purchases, and the participating libraries loaded discovery records based on Boulder's approval profiles. In March 2012, the CU libraries augmented Boulder's profiles in areas that Boulder does not typically collect, such as nursing, sports medicine, criminology, and law.

Collection Development/Profiling

The first step for libraries participating in a PDA project is to identify goals they hope to achieve. In general by allowing patrons to preview and eventually trigger purchases, libraries want to improve the use of their collections and meet patron demands. Libraries may want to adopt PDA to further strengthen core subject areas by expanding the selection list. Or, they may want to use PDA to gauge user demand in subject areas outside their core collection areas. On the practical side, PDA could be a strategy to conserve collection budgets by only paying for what patrons actually used. For the patrons, PDA means that they can view and trigger purchases of e-books at the time when they need them. Libraries can also use PDA to supplement publisher e-book packages as some publishers put different titles in their e-book packages and PDA lists.

Law Library Experience

The University of Colorado Law Library is administratively separate from the main University Library system in Boulder. Its collection is heavily focused on print materials. The Law Library hopes to increase exposure to e-books and to try the PDA model through this project. They also want to contribute to the shared collection development of e-books within the CU system. There were some initial concerns regarding this project, including faculty preference of print over electronic format, reduced control of the collection development process, and limitations on interlibrary loan. Librarians at the Law Library viewed this project as an opportunity to encourage use of e-books and planned to set up their profile carefully to manage risks commonly associated with PDA. They also acknowledge that while the current interlibrary loan clause is not ideal, it is important for librarians to continue working with vendors to address the issue of resource sharing.

The next step is to create a profile with the e-book vendor to generate a title list appropriate for the library. The Law Library started a very broad profile using the Library of Congress classification number *K* and then refined the profile with a variety of non-subject criteria. Criteria used include publication date, maximum price, language, book type, readership level, and publisher. The publisher factor is important, as the CU system already subscribes to some publisher e-book packages and thus needs to exclude them from the PDA project. Using the back title list provided by the vendor in a spreadsheet, the law librarians tested and refined the profile. They searched all back titles fitting the final profile against the Law Library catalog, and found that more than half of those titles were already in the collection. This confirmed that the profile aligned well with their regular selection criteria, while also allowing more choices in subjects outside their usual core areas.

The Law Library is satisfied with their experiences and exposure to e-book PDA. However, there are

some philosophical and practical issues and questions worth further consideration. First of all, some patrons still prefer print books. How can the library promote electronic books? Second, are the electronic books in fact better and easier to use than the print books? Are e-books appropriate for law titles? Long-term preservation and accessibility is also a concern. In terms of monograph selection workflow, how does a library choose the format? How does it decide whether to firm order a title or let it go through PDA? If a library uses multiple vendors for print and e-books, the workflow for ordering can become complex, and duplication detection is essential. Lastly, libraries need to consider weeding plans for the PDA discovery records they load into their catalogs.

Cataloging/Discovery

Recognizing the importance of the CU system libraries' local catalogs in the PDA e-book discovery and purchase process, in February 2012, the CU Libraries Electronic Resources Team (CLERT) invited catalogers from each CU library to attend a meeting to discuss the MyiLibrary project. At that meeting library administrators and acquisitions, electronic resources, collection development, and catalog librarians came together to share information concerning the project's progress and to discuss ways to streamline overall workflows. This included a discussion of cataloging procedures that would complement acquisitions and collection development activities and enhance discoverability of titles in the libraries' local systems. Afterwards, the catalogers met separately and continued to communicate via the Basecamp online project management system to formulate detailed procedures for facilitating MARC record loading at each institution for both PDA "discovery" titles (titles available for purchase) and for purchased titles.

Boulder agreed to serve as the MyiLibrary cataloging agent for the entire CU system. As such, Boulder procures and edits MARC records for all MyiLibrary e-books in the CU system plan and distributes them, via Basecamp, to the other CU libraries. When the other libraries receive the records from Boulder, they require no additional

editing except what is needed to accommodate local practices. Boulder's catalogers worked with Ingram Academic, their own cataloging staff, and the other CU libraries to establish metadata standards to assure that high quality MyiLibrary e-book records are available to all CU libraries. All CU libraries use ILS systems provided by Innovative Interfaces, Inc. (III).

The general cataloging workflow for the project is summarized as follows:

- Boulder loads, edits, and distributes all discovery records for PDA titles via Basecamp.

- Boulder replaces discovery records for purchased books with OCLC records.

- CU system libraries load records supplied by Boulder and set institutional holdings on OCLC WorldCat records.

- All CU libraries display holdings in regional catalog for purchased titles.

As of October 15th 2012, 6,567 records for MyiLibrary PDA titles have been entered in the catalogs for discovery. Among these, 484 titles have been purchased.

Metadata elements that support acquisitions, collection development, and access to MyiLibrary e-books are key components of CU's MyiLibrary e-book records. To that end, three MARC fields added to the records are particularly noteworthy:

- Access: URL landing page (MARC field 856)
  o Ingram Academic provides a URL for each PDA e-book discovery record that leads to a landing page on the MyiLibrary platform. The landing page offers information about the book that library patrons can review to help them decide if they want to access the book or not. Linking to the landing page alone does not count as a purchase trigger for the book. The portion of the URL that directs users to the landing page is removed from records for purchased titles to allow direct access to the e-books.
- Collection Development/Subject profiles: Fund code (local MARC field 950)

o Ingram Academic places the appropriate CU system libraries' profile fund code in this field in each PDA e-book record. This is a local processing information field and useful for collection development. This MARC 950 field is carried over to the updated records for PDA purchased e-books.

o Fund codes can be used to evaluate the MyiLibrary PDA e-book selection profiles' effectiveness. The libraries can make future adjustments to the profiles if or where necessary.

o Two specialized libraries in the CU system, Law and Health Sciences, have chosen to load only those records for e-book tiles related to law and health sciences respectively. Catalogers at these libraries can easily identify the records they need based on the fund codes and the Library of Congress classification ranges in the MARC 050 fields provided in the records.

• Acquisitions: Record type description (local MARC field 956)

o Ingram Academic adds the note, "MyiLibrary PDA," to each discovery record in a MARC 956 field, another local processing information field. This easily identifies records as PDA titles that are not-yet purchased. When Boulder replaces discovery records with OCLC WorldCat records for purchased titles, the MARC 956 field is updated to read, "MyiLibrary PDA purchased."

o Having this information in the records provides a means for the CU libraries to create lists of cataloged discovery titles or purchased titles when needed.

Boulder prepares a quarterly spreadsheet of all MyiLibrary titles found in Boulder's catalog and distributes it to the local libraries via Basecamp. Local libraries can create spreadsheets of the MyiLibrary titles in their own local catalogs and compare them with Boulder's to identify any missing records or records with inconsistent MARC 956, acquisitions status data.

A number of benefits resulted from the CU catalogers' shared involvement in the MyiLibrary cataloging process. For example, having multiple

CU libraries loading these records places multiple critical eyes on them. This has helped with detection of duplicate records and cataloging errors. In addition, the catalogers were able to pool their knowledge and expertise related to batch processing and those tools available in MarcEdit, OCLC, and their III ILS systems that facilitate it. The CU catalogers also worked together to assure that the MyiLibrary MARC records would display properly in the Prospector system, the regional unified catalog and circulation system sponsored by the Colorado Alliance of Research Libraries in which all CU system libraries participate.

Acquisition and Assessment

When establishing acquisitions and assessment for a multi-institutional PDA program, what are the best practices and workflow for the collective consortia and an individual library? To begin, identify the preferred payment method and account management that will streamline the procurement process. For example, instead of allowing for open-ended invoicing, each CU library contributed a capped amount, and the CU system consortium established maximum spending limits with a deposit account. A single account centrally managed by Boulder simplifies administration and invoicing for the e-book vendor, and allows for shared costs amongst the four other CU libraries.

Implementing a new PDA pilot creates new workflows in itself. Moreover, this new acquisition model can potentially impact existing processes at an individual library. Specifically, at the downtown Denver campus, preexisting monographic acquisitions strategies and established collection development policies were challenged by PDA. Ultimately these issues prompted the creation of new e-book purchasing procedures.

To implement PDA assessment, the CU system follows a basic 5-step process which includes identifying goals, developing assessment criteria based on project goals, gathering available data, analyzing that data, and reporting results back to stakeholders. The goals for the pilot were to expand e-book holdings, enable each campus to experiment with PDA, and share collection development activities and costs. Therefore, the

participants pursued quantitative evidence of increased e-book holdings, shared resources and costs, and a common collection of e-book. The CU librarians identified statistics on the number and cost of purchased e-books, number and value of discovery records loaded, and usage of e-books by campuses.

In order to gather statistics, the CU libraries identified available data sources and elements. For example, the e-book platform administration module provides usage statistics, vendor ordering system offers reports, and the Integrated Library Management System (ILMS) can be used to create lists. However, to make PDA e-books more identifiable, the CU libraries used the MARC 956 field to differentiate between PDA discovery and purchased records and the MARC 950 field to identify subject profile code. These fields in PDA records helped simplify list creation and data analysis.

While vendors and library management systems offer quantitative information, only library patrons and staff can provide qualitative data. With nearly one year of experience with PDA, the CU libraries are planning to assess patron needs and satisfaction with e-books through formal and informal feedback from both internal and external users. They envision utilizing traditional methods such as surveys, focus groups, and usability studies.

Conclusion

Overall, the CU system consortia PDA pilot has been a success for participating libraries. The benefits gained from shared e-book collection and costs far outweigh implementation challenges and local considerations. Moreover, coordinating and collaborating workflows has been a valuable opportunity to share knowledge and expertise with colleagues at other campuses. With no end date in mind, the authors anticipate transitioning the PDA from a pilot program into a standard acquisitions model for the CU system.