

## University at Albany, State University of New York Scholars Archive

---

University Libraries Faculty Scholarship

University Libraries

---

2015

# Go Team! Using Teams to Manage Electronic Resources

Rebecca A. Nous

*University at Albany, State University of New York*, [rnous@albany.edu](mailto:rnous@albany.edu)

Wendy L. West

*University at Albany, State University of New York*, [wwest@albany.edu](mailto:wwest@albany.edu)

Follow this and additional works at: [http://scholarsarchive.library.albany.edu/ulib\\_fac\\_scholar](http://scholarsarchive.library.albany.edu/ulib_fac_scholar)

 Part of the [Library and Information Science Commons](#)

---

### Recommended Citation

Nous, R. A., & West, W. L. (2015). Go, Team! Using Teams to Manage Electronic Resources. *Serials Review*, 41(4), 234-241.  
doi:10.1080/00987913.2015.1094365

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by the University Libraries at Scholars Archive. It has been accepted for inclusion in University Libraries Faculty Scholarship by an authorized administrator of Scholars Archive. For more information, please contact [scholarsarchive@albany.edu](mailto:scholarsarchive@albany.edu).

Title: Go Team! Using Teams to Manage Electronic Resources

Rebecca A. Nous<sup>a,\*</sup>

Wendy L. West<sup>b</sup>

<sup>a</sup> Catalog Management Librarian, University Libraries, University at Albany, Albany, NY 12222, USA

<sup>b</sup> Head of Catalog Management Services, University Libraries, University at Albany, Albany, NY 12222, USA

\*Corresponding author.

E-mail addresses: [rnous@albany.edu](mailto:rnous@albany.edu) (R. Nous), [wwest@albany.edu](mailto:wwest@albany.edu) (W. West).

### Abstract

The increasing prevalence of e-journals in library collections has impacted many aspects of library operations. Libraries have had to rethink workflows, processes, staffing needs, and other factors to account for the differences between print and online journals. The management of e-journals can often cross departmental boundaries and bring into question current workflow. To address the changing landscape of journal management, the University at Albany University Libraries developed two teams: one to implement batchloading e-journal records and a second to address ongoing management and related policies. As a result of using a team approach for these responsibilities, the University Libraries was able to streamline processes, reduce duplication of effort across departments, coordinate policies and procedures, improve communication, and develop best practices.

Keywords: Teams; Batchloading; Electronic resources; E-journals; Academic libraries

## **1. Introduction**

Workflows for print and online resources differ greatly, and have different management and maintenance requirements. The proliferation of electronic resources prompted the University at Albany University Libraries to evaluate our e-journal access and ongoing electronic resource management processes. This evaluation resulted in the creation of teams to address our work with electronic resources.

### *1.1 Background*

The University at Albany is a research university within the State University of New York (SUNY) System. As a research university, we operate more independently than the SUNY colleges and community colleges. The University Libraries is composed of three divisions: Public Services, Collections, and Technical Services and Library Systems. The Technical Services and Library Systems Division consists of four departments: Acquisitions Services, Cataloging Services, Catalog Management Services, and Library Systems. Acquisitions Services is responsible for ordering, receiving, and paying for all items added to the University Libraries' collections, as well as licensing for electronic resources. Cataloging Services catalogs library materials in all formats. Catalog Management Services maintains records in the online catalog, manages access to e-journal collections, maintains the Libraries' storage facility inventory, and carries out physical processing and bindery. Library Systems manages the Libraries' web pages, database applications, Integrated Library System functionality, and servers. The University Libraries are responsible for maintaining our own catalog and access to our e-journals independently.

### *1.2. Past Practices for Electronic Journal Management*

The University Libraries used the single record approach when we began adding e-journal access to the online catalog. The decision to use the single record approach resulted in the need to manually process and maintain our electronic journal holdings. At that time, our Electronic Resources Librarian focused solely on adding and removing titles from the catalog, but not changes in coverage or URLs due to time constraints.

Several years later, the Electronic Resources Librarian resigned, and we were compelled to consider our electronic journal management strategy. Library administration did not fill that vacancy, and decided that the responsibility for managing e-journals be divided between two departments, Cataloging Services and Catalog Management Services. At that time, both departments decided to begin addressing changes in coverage and URLs as well. Members from both departments routinely had to meet to address and resolve problems related to e-journal access. Policies and procedures were developed by staff members of these two departments on an ad hoc basis, and were not always documented. Other decisions, such as display preferences and notes were made by other committees and individual faculty members as issues arose. These

decisions were not made in accordance with a strategic plan for electronic resource management, or in consultation with electronic resource management staff.

Though initially the process of manually maintaining access to electronic journal titles provided in aggregated databases seemed plausible, as the number of collections and titles contained in those collections grew, this manual maintenance became impractical, if not impossible. The sheer volume of titles resulted in having to choose what databases we could analyze, and which ones we simply did not have the staff to handle.

Manual processing became a full time job for the staff involved and required regular requests for assistance from staff in other departments. Their assistance was voluntary and dependent on their availability and workload. In addition, training and developing the skill set needed to work with these titles was time-intensive. Beyond initial training, additional refresher sessions were often needed for staff in other departments who were not regularly working on them. Student assistants were regularly available, but could not be expected to recognize problems, let alone solve them, which meant we were limited in what we could ask them to work on.

### *1.3. Consequences*

While taxing to Catalog Management Services' resources, the biggest issue with manually maintaining access to these e-journal collections was the resulting poor user experience when trying to access library resources because the catalog often contained inaccurate access information.

Choosing to include titles from some databases and not others in the catalog also resulted in a cumbersome and confusing search process. Some e-journals were available in the online catalog, but not all. For those that were not, researchers would need to use our A to Z list, meaning richer search options were not available for a large portion of our e-journal titles. The disparity between the two was also not readily transparent. A researcher may think the catalog contained all of our e-journal holdings, and not know to check the A to Z list for a specific title. This was not only confusing for students and University faculty, but also other departments within the library, such as Reference and Interlibrary Loan.

### *1.4 New Directions*

The University Libraries hired a new Head of Cataloging Services, who decided to transition from the single record to separate record approach. In light of this shift in cataloging practice, and faced with the challenges described, our new Associate Director for Technical Services and Library Systems decided to explore batchloading bibliographic records for our e-journal collection, and future e-journal management strategies. She had successfully used a team approach to work in her previous positions, and decided to use teams at our library as well.

## 2. Literature Review

### 2.1. Team approach to work

Teams are prevalent in the technical service divisions of academic libraries. Zhu (2011) conducted a study of teams in academic libraries that revealed approximately 67% of technical service divisions report having permanent teams, project-based teams, or both to facilitate their operations (p. 77). The same study found that about 74% of respondents found that teams had a positive impact on their effectiveness and their work (p. 80). But what constitutes a team? A team is more than just a group of people working on the same project. Katzenbach and Smith (1993) define a team as “a small number of people with complementary skills who are committed to a common purpose, performance goals, and approach for which they hold themselves mutually accountable” (p. 45). Teamwork, then, is the “means by which individual task expertise is translated, magnified, and synergistically combined to yield superior performance outcomes, the wisdom of the collectives” (Salas, Rosen, Burke, & Goodwin, 2009, p. 41). Kanaga and Kossler (2001) identified the following five characteristics of a team: (1) members are dependent on each other to complete a complex task; (2) members possess different, but complementary, skill sets; (3) they manage their own work autonomously; (4) they manage their own communication, conflict resolution, problem solving, decision making, and goal setting; and (5) membership is stable over time (p. 7-8). Though these criteria are necessary, they are not sufficient to create an effective team in and of themselves. To build an effective team, these criteria must also be met: (1) a common purpose must be defined; (2) organizational support should be secured; (3) team members must feel empowered; (4) key relationships between individuals, and with other teams, should be identified; and (5) external factors that will impact the team’s progress should be identified and monitored (Kanaga & Kossler, p. 9).

Teams may have short-term, project driven goals or have a long-term, ongoing purpose. Joshi and Roh (2009) hold that short-term teams tend to address more urgent issues, and require a shorter-term commitment from team members. Project-driven teams often focus on unique, non-routine projects that facilitate work between multiple departments (Pinto, Pinto, & Prescott, 1993). The result of the work of project-driven teams is typically a single outcome, which requires the specific skills and expertise of team members to produce (Cohen & Bailey, 1997). Ongoing teams, on the other hand, are more permanent and expected to exist for an indefinite period of time (Joshi & Roh, 2009). In an ongoing team, roles and member responsibilities are typically well-defined (Joshi & Roh, 2009). Longer-term teams are generally focused on innovation and have greater autonomy than a project-driven team (Sundstrom, De Meuse, & Futrell, 1990).

Liu, Tseng, and Huang (2005) stated that teams help to overcome staff and time limitations by encouraging and enabling wider participation in initiatives and projects (p. 140). Norman (2006) noted that by involving a greater number of employees in planning and carrying out projects and daily work, teams maximize the skills of all employees (p. 24). According to Black and Granskog (1997), teams are best able to take advantage of employees' abilities when members create the plan of work and when the responsibilities of the team are well-defined and articulated (p. 31).

Teams are an effective way of ensuring that the work of different departments or those with varying responsibilities in the workflow will be taken into account. Thompson (2004) stated that members of the team may have similar questions, but they will relate to different aspects of the work and represent a unique perspective (p. 92). This aspect of working in teams also serves as an educational experience. Withers, Garber, & Brewer (1999) noted that to function effectively, it is essential that each member of the team understand how his or her work impacts the work of others on the team (p. 60). According to McLaren (2001), though it may take a significant amount of time, this aspect of teamwork is necessary to guarantee that all workflows, priorities, and functions would be represented or accounted for in the work of the team (p. 363). Gaining this understanding and expertise by working closely together improves the work of the department, division, and library. Planning and articulating the work of the team and individual responsibilities within that team, results in a dynamic, flexible team that can adapt to a changing environment (Withers et al., 1999).

## *2.2. Team Approach to Managing Electronic Resources*

The non-linear, volatile, complex nature of electronic resources requires a different workflow and management from that of print resources (Collins, 2008). Geller (2006) suggests that the best method for managing electronic resources in a distributive environment is to form a team or group that can facilitate communication. An electronic resource workflow analysis at Virginia Commonwealth University revealed that teams are essential for effective electronic journal management (Branch, 2012). Schmidt and Dulaney (2014) note that building collaborative relationships with multiple library departments to identify unique characteristics of electronic resources enhances their discovery and access.

Batchloading bibliographic records is a common practice in academic libraries, and may involve collaborative efforts. Panchyshyn (2013) noted that, at Kent State University Library, intradepartmental collaboration increased with the implementation of an electronic resources batchloading checklist. They identified an increase in exchanges and collaborations between acquisitions, cataloging, systems and public services. The checklist also identified local practices that did not work well with electronic resources management.

As Mugridge and Edmunds (2009) note, the workflow for batchloading record sets often develops a natural collaboration between several departments and staff. A survey given by Mudgridge and Edmunds (2012) found that the management of electronic resources was identified as being a shared process. While cataloging departments were the primary manager, others identified as participating in electronic resource management such as information technology, acquisitions, collection development and public services.

The successful resolution of problems related to access can be addressed using a diverse team approach. Communication needs to happen across a range of individuals including, but not limited to, catalogers, IT staff, end users, vendors and interlibrary loan staff (Fischer & Barton, 2005). Technical services staff collaborating with others can help bring around quick resolution for end users' access issues. This is particularly important in light of the few staff that libraries have to focus on electronic resource management (Chen & Wynn, 2009).

### **3. The Team Approach**

#### *3.1.360 MARC Implementation Team*

The Libraries were already a customer of Serials Solutions (now ProQuest), and subscribed to their 360 Core and 360 Link services. We decided to implement their complementary MARC records service, 360 MARC Updates. To carry out this project, the Associate Director for Technical Services and Library Systems formed the 360 MARC Implementation Team. This team was charged with creating a record profile with our vendor, developing an implementation timeline, and testing the process (Appendix A). Members of the team included staff from Cataloging Services, Catalog Management Services, and Library Systems. These three departments were represented on the team because they are responsible for providing and maintaining access to the University Libraries' e-journals in the catalog. Acquisitions Services was not included on the team because their primary responsibility with e-journals is ordering, payment, and licensing, but not access in the catalog.

While the 360 MARC Implementation Team prepared for batchloading, we also introduced the project to several library-wide stakeholder groups such as the Library Policy Group, Online Public Interface Committee, Technical Services Department Heads group and the Library Management Group. This outreach effort increased the visibility of this project, spurred interest in staff from other departments in becoming more involved going forward, and raised the profile of the Technical Services and Library Systems Division.

After providing several live demos for all library faculty and staff, the 360 MARC Implementation Team used the feedback we received as we moved forward with the implementation process. This load consisted of approximately 65,000 records from 74 aggregated databases and 1 local holdings collection for our individual subscriptions. Though

the Team originally chose to fully extract and reload the e-journal records every month, we experienced very long indexing times, and had to revisit that decision. After successfully implementing the batchloading process, the work of this team was concluded, and the team was dissolved.

### *3.1.1. Post-360 MARC Implementation Clean-up Project*

After the 360 MARC Implementation Team was disbanded, Catalog Management Services began analyzing the impact of the batchloading process on our electronic journal access. Though we receive the vast majority of our electronic journals through aggregated database subscriptions, there are a group of titles we subscribe to individually. Prior to implementing the batchloading process, the holdings for these individual subscriptions were maintained in our catalog. That data was then extracted and loaded into a local holdings collection in our knowledge base, so that those holdings would be available through our A to Z list. The responsibility for providing access to these individual subscriptions was divided between Acquisitions Services, who would provide the holdings information regarding those subscriptions, and Cataloging Services, who would add that data to the catalog. Deciding to batchload our electronic journal records highlighted several issues with our past practice, and required a fairly extensive clean-up process of our individual electronic journal subscription holdings data.

The most obvious issue was that there was a breakdown in the holdings extraction process. A number of titles had nonsense holdings statements, or no holdings statement at all. As we looked into the holdings information further, we discovered that some titles were missing entirely, and must have been missed by the extraction process. In addition, we discovered that some titles we no longer subscribed to were still included in this collection. It quickly became clear that cleaning up this collection in the knowledge base would require Acquisitions Services, Cataloging Services, and Catalog Management Services to work together to verify and update our holdings.

We also discovered a breakdown in our existing process for communicating current holdings data and access points for individual subscriptions. There were inaccuracies in our holdings statements, URLs, and titles included in the local holdings collection in the knowledge base that could not be attributed to a problem with our automated extraction process. Re-evaluating the workflow for storing, communicating, and updating this information is an ongoing process, and has resulted in the creation of an Electronic Resources Management Team.

### *3.2. Electronic Resources Management Team*

Electronic resources at University at Albany have been managed in smaller, more specialized groups with some membership crossover. For example, e-books and electronic journals have traditionally been managed by distinct groups, each deciding policies and procedures independently of each other. The Associate Director of Technical Services and Library Systems



felt the University Libraries would benefit from managing all electronic resources under one umbrella. She formed the Electronic Resources Management Team so that policies, practices and decisions would be made in a more consistent manner.

The Associate Director appointed co-chairs for the Team, and with their input, began considering membership. Key considerations for determining the membership of the Electronic Resources Management Team included:

- How do we determine the right configuration of the team?
- What workflows should be represented?
- What are the current challenges for managing electronic resources?

With these questions in mind, the Associate Director invited representatives from Catalog Management Services, Cataloging Services, Acquisitions Services, Library Systems, Access Services, Reference Services, and Collections to serve on the Electronic Resources Management Team. This ensured that the Team included staff who are involved in providing access to electronic resources, and also those who represent a variety of user perspectives. Before agreeing to serve on the Electronic Resources Management Team, all potential members were made aware of the responsibilities of membership, and were given the opportunity to decline if they could not commit to them. Those serving on the Team agreed to attend all meetings, dedicate time between scheduled meetings to the work of the group, and serve on subgroups as needed. This awareness has resulted in members committing the time and energy required to meet the Team's goals.

The Electronic Resources Management Team is charged with coordinating the management of electronic resources, documenting and assessing workflows, and making recommendations for improving electronic resource management (Appendix B). The Team is empowered to create subgroups and to assign other staff to those subgroups to do project-based work. Unlike project-based teams, the Electronic Resources Management Team has no specified end date. Membership on the Team is evaluated annually by the Associate Director, and at the next appointment date, job descriptions outlining members' responsibilities will be distributed (Appendix C).

## **4. Discussion**

### *4.1. Differences Between the Teams*

The 360 MARC Implementation Team was a short-term project-based team. The work of this team was finite and had a defined conclusion – successfully batchloading bibliographic records for the University Libraries' electronic journals. Membership in this team was limited to those with direct responsibility for implementing the project. The nature of the work of this team lent

itself to easily defining tasks that must be completed, creating a timeline for those tasks, benchmarking our progress, and knowing when the work of the team was concluded.

In contrast, the Electronic Resources Management Team, was created as a long-term, ongoing team to address issues related to all aspects of electronic resource management now and in the future. This team has a broader charge, which lead to a more diverse composition from its inception. While there are specific tasks to be completed as part of the team charge, the goals and work of this team are continuous, evolving, and dependent on issues and problems we are experiencing or enhancements we would like to pursue. This team is addressing multiple facets of electronic resource management simultaneously, rather than having one concrete, finite goal.

#### *4.2. Benefits of the Team Approach*

Using a team approach to batchloading records, conducting our clean-up project, and maintaining our electronic journals has resulted in numerous benefits for library users. Our holdings information and access points for titles available in our databases are more accurate as they are updated automatically. The automated process has also allowed the library to provide access to all titles from all sources through the online catalog, rather than having to choose only those that are stable enough or small enough for our staff to manage manually. The resulting parity between our online catalog and A to Z list is a boon to patrons and staff, since they can check in one place and be sure they are seeing all of our e-journal holdings.

By using the 360 MARC Implementation Team, rather than placing the responsibility with one individual, we were able to create a smooth transition from manually managing our e-journals to batchloading them. The team approach allowed us to leverage the expertise and experience of each of the represented groups. Cataloging Services members were critical in evaluating the records, determining source and encoding level preferences, and choosing customizations. Library Systems members' expertise was essential for navigating the technical aspects of actually loading and removing the records, as well as creating a process for switching to loading only updates in the future. Catalog Management Services members' experience with navigating the knowledge base, managing collections in the knowledge base, and troubleshooting issues with our electronic journals was very valuable.

The success of the 360 MARC Implementation Team resulted in creating the Electronic Resources Management Team, which offered many of the same benefits that using an implementation team did. Acquisitions Services, Catalog Management Services, Cataloging Services, Collections, Access Services, Reference Services, and Library Systems representatives bring their respective expertise to the management process. Meeting regularly has led to better communication, and has fostered a better understanding of the role that each department plays in providing reliable access to our electronic resources. This also raises awareness of the work of Technical Services and Library Systems outside of the division.

The Electronic Resources Management Team has already been tasked with several projects, such as creating new local holdings resources in the knowledge base, evaluating our electronic resource workflows, and exploring electronic resource management systems. The Team has already addressed the process for ordering new electronic resources, and has implemented the transition from paper order forms to a shared electronic document resulting from collaboration between staff from acquisitions, cataloging, and collections. Having this team in place with representatives from a variety of departments has proven beneficial in these initiatives and will be for those to come.

Because the Electronic Resources Management Team has the authority to set goals and deadlines, we are able to keep projects moving forward. Meeting regularly and requesting project updates has helped to improve accountability and resulted in completing projects in a timely manner.

#### *4.3.Challenges Encountered in Team Approach*

While there were many benefits to the 360 MARC Implementation Team and the Electronic Resources Management Team, we did face some challenges as well. Because the Teams consisted of members from multiple departments, we faced a fairly substantial learning curve. For example, with the 360 MARC Implementation Team, we had representatives from three different departments attempting to learn the work of each of the other departments. Members came with various levels of initial knowledge and experience with developing a batchloading process and policies. We encountered a similar situation with the Electronic Resources Management Team. These learning opportunities became a very valuable exercise, and have resulted in a stronger understanding of our workflows, but it did take some time initially.

The team approach is also a more deliberative, slower process. In some cases, reaching a consensus was very easy, with little need for prolonged discussion. Other aspects of implementation and management, such as evaluating and revising workflows, required more consideration and discussion. This is not inherently a negative aspect of our group approach, but it was challenging depending on the project and deadlines.

Depending on the size of the team, we experienced difficulty in scheduling meetings. Finding meeting times for the 360 MARC Implementation Team was easier than for the Electronic Resources Management Team because of the size and diversity of membership.

We found that working closely with a team highlighted the need for especially good communication between members to minimize confusion about the focus of the team or members' responsibilities. The 360 MARC Implementation Team experienced some miscommunications and confusion about responsibilities and action items as we went through the implementation process. We did not use any project management tool for this project, and

these issues highlighted a need to investigate and implement one for the next big project-based team in order to keep track of our progress and stay on track.

#### *4.4. Lessons Learned*

After our experience with both of these teams, we found that determining team composition is one of the most critical factors in a team's success. For example, the 360 MARC Implementation Team was missing a critical component that made the work of the Team more protracted and complicated than necessary. Including Acquisitions Services staff would have not only given us more immediate access to subscription information, but it would have assisted with the clean-up work by identifying the holdings data issues and complexity of the individual subscription electronic journals much earlier in the project. In turn, Acquisitions Services would have been more aware of the process' impact on their department and would have had a clearer understanding of what the Team needed from them. After this experience, the Associate Director for Technical Services and Library Systems, as well as 360 MARC Implementation Team members, realized that it was essential that Acquisitions Services be represented on the Electronic Resources Management Team.

From the batchloading project, members of the 360 MARC Implementation Team and the Associate Director became aware that centralized data management is a key component to providing access to the University Libraries' electronic resources. Resolving electronic resource problems is dependent on having quick and ready access to the details of our subscriptions. This highlighted the importance of sharing information and maintaining open communication in managing our electronic resources, which we are achieving through the work of the Electronic Resources Management Team.

Legacy data is complex and time-consuming to manage and clean-up. The clean-up process after implementing batchloading highlighted the importance of addressing those issues rather than allowing them to collect over time. As a result, the Electronic Resources Management Team is and will continue to think more critically about the long-term impact of the decisions we make today. Continuing to manage our electronic resources using this diverse team will ensure that the work of multiple departments will be considered when making decisions.

### **5. Conclusion**

Libraries are faced with the daily challenges of managing electronic resources. Electronic resources of any type provide their own set of unique challenges and management needs. Beyond the day to day maintenance, there is also a need to develop policies to coordinate the work being done on all electronic resources. Librarians are faced with the challenge of trying to match their staffing to the management of their electronic resources.

Recognizing the problems we had long been experiencing with manually maintaining access to the University Libraries' e-journal collection, the new Associate Director for Technical Services and Library Systems decided to appoint the 360 MARC Implementation Team to coordinate batchloading e-journal records. After the success of that team, the Associate Director determined that there was a need to develop consistent policies and procedures for all types of electronic resources, and created the Electronic Resources Management Team. The Electronic Resources Management Team has brought a variety of groups together to coordinate efforts and develop transparency for the processes related to electronic resource management, and has resulted in a more inclusive and robust approach to managing electronic resources.

Creating diverse, representative teams for the implementation of batchloading electronic journals and the ongoing management of a broader array of electronic resources has had many benefits. Though the Teams did encounter some challenges, the advantages more than offset them. In fact, despite some issues with the 360 MARC Implementation Team, both the Associate Director for Technical Services and members of that team agreed that a team approach would be best for the ongoing management of electronic resources. The charge of the Electronic Resources Management Team requires the expertise and input of various departments, and the team approach has proven to be an effective way to bring all stakeholders to the table with a common purpose.

## References

Cohen, S. G. & Bailey, D. E. (1997). What makes teams work: Group effectiveness research from the shop floor to the executive suite. *Journal of Management*, 23, 239-290.

Black, L., & Granskog, K. (1997). Teamwork in technical services: Thesis processing project at the Michigan State University Libraries. *Technical Services Quarterly*, 14(3), 25-32.

Branch, D. (2012). Electronic workflows: Taking it to the cloud. *The Serials Librarian*, 63, 315-332.

Chen, X. & Wynn, S. (2009). E-journal cataloging in an age of alternatives: A survey of academic libraries. *The Serials Librarian*, 57, 96-110.

Collins, M. D. (2008). Staffing trends and issues in e-resource management. In M. D. Collins & P. L. Carr (Eds.), *Managing the transition from print to electronic journals and resources*. New York: Routledge.

Fischer, K. S., & Barton, H. (2005). The landscape of e-journal management. *Journal of Electronic Resources in Medical Libraries*, 2(3), 57-63.

Geller, M. (2006). Managing Electronic Resources. *Library Technology Reports*, 42(2), 6-13.

- Joshi, A. & Roh, H. (2009). The role of context in work team diversity research: A meta-analytic review. *Academy of Management Journal*, 52, 599-627.
- Kanaga, K. & Kossler, M. E. (2001). *How to form a team: five keys to high performance*. Greensboro, NC: Center for Creative Leadership.
- Katzenbach, J. R. & Smith, D. K. (1993). *The wisdom of teams: creating the high-performance organization*. Boston: Harvard Business School Press.
- Liu, J., Tseng, M., & Huang, T. (2005). Building digital heritage with teamwork empowerment. *Information Technology and Libraries*, 24 (3), 130-140.
- McLaren, M. (2001). Team structure: Establishment and evolution within technical services at the University of Kentucky Libraries. *Library Collections, Acquisitions, & Technical Services*, 25(4), 357-369.
- Mugridge, R. L., & Edmunds, J. (2009). Using batchloading to improve access to electronic and microform collections. *Library Resources & Technical Services*, 53(1), 53-61.
- Mugridge, R. L., & Edmunds, J. (2012). Batchloading MARC bibliographic records. *Library Resources & Technical Services*, 56(3), 155-170.
- Norman, M. (2006). When is a team really a team? Examples of team-based management concepts in academic libraries. In R. Bazirjian and R. Mugridge (Eds.), *Teams in Library Technical Services* (pp. 23-44). Lanham, MD: The Scarecrow Press.
- Panchyshyn, R. S. (2013). Asking the right questions: An e-resource checklist for documenting cataloging decisions for batch cataloging projects. *Technical Services Quarterly*, 30(1), 15-37.
- Pinto, M. B., Pinto, J. K., & Prescott, J. E. (1993). Antecedents and consequences of project team cross-functional cooperation. *Management Science*, 39, 1281-1297.
- Salas, E., Rosen, M. A., Burke, C. S., & Goodwin, G. F. (2009). The wisdom of collectives in organizations: An update of the teamwork competencies. In *Team effectiveness in complex organizations: Cross-disciplinary perspectives and approaches* (pp. 39-79). New York: Routledge.
- Schmidt, K. & Dulaney, C. K. (2014). From print to online: Revamping technical services with centralized and distributed workflow models. *The Serials Librarian*, 66, 65-75.
- Sundstrom, E., De Meuse, K. P., & Futrell, D. (1990). Work teams: Applications and effectiveness. *American Psychologist*, 45, 120-133.
- Thompson, L. L. (2004). Analyzing electronic license agreements: Strategies for success. *Journal of Electronic Resources in Medical Libraries*, 1(1), 91-102.

Withers, R., Garber, L., & Brewer, R. (1999). How to create a technical services team. *College and Undergraduate Libraries*, 6(1), 53-63.

Zhu, L. (2011). Use of teams in technical services in academic libraries. *Library Collections, Acquisitions, & Technical Services*, 35(2), 69-82.

## Appendix A

### 360 MARC Records Implementation Team

#### Charge:

To implement the 360 MARC Records Service offered by Serials Solutions. The Group reports to the AD for Technical Services and Library Systems. Tasks will include:

- Review Serials Solutions 360 MARC record service documentation
- Make recommendations regarding direct or hosted links (consult with OPIC and others as appropriate)
- Make recommendations regarding frequency of batchloading and whether we delete and reload the whole file monthly, or whether we only load adds, changes, deletes
- Design a workflow that minimizes record manipulation and maintenance
- Test suppression of e-journal holdings in ALEPH
- Set up and test ALEPH configuration for batchloading 360 MARC records on Test ALEPH
- Set up ALEPH configuration for batchloading on PROD ALEPH
- Confirm successful load in Production ALEPH
- Document local configuration and policy decisions
- Document monthly procedures for handling errors
- Consult with other groups and individuals as appropriate
- Provide weekly reports on progress

#### Members

- Head, Catalog Management Services
- Senior Programmer Analyst
- Catalog Management Librarian
- Head, Cataloging Services
- Serials Cataloger
- Head, Library Systems



## **Appendix B**

Electronic Resources Management Team

Appointment date: September 10, 2014

Charge:

The purpose of the new Electronic Resources Management Team (ERMT) is to bring together individuals who work with the management of licensed, purchased, and free electronic resources (serial and monographic) at the University at Albany Libraries. The focus will be to identify and implement ways to continually improve and enhance user access to all our e-resources. The team is charged with examining the different pieces of electronic resources management and then to work collaboratively to provide a comprehensive plan for dealing with the "back-end" work regarding e-resources, including the acquisition, licensing, cataloging, creating and maintaining the systems and databases to manage the data and knowledge bases concerned with these technical activities, and the intersection of electronic resource management and the dissemination of e-content through various search mechanisms.

The Team reports to the AD for Technical Services and Library Systems. Its work is carried out in consultation with other library groups as appropriate. Membership will be reviewed annually.

Tasks will include:

- To plan and coordinate the management of electronic resources at UAlbany Libraries.
- To provide oversight of 360 Link Resolver and MARC Records Services offered by ProQuest (formerly Serials Solutions).
- Assess current workflows for individual e-journal and e-book subscriptions, including the acquisitions, cataloging, and ongoing maintenance.
- Investigate and make recommendations regarding the use of an electronic resource management system (ERM).
- Make recommendations for workflows that minimize record manipulation and maintenance.
- Monitor Footprints tickets for electronic resources; document process for resolving problems.
- Document local workflows, Aleph configurations, and policy decisions.
- Document monthly procedures for handling errors.
- Consult with other groups and individuals as appropriate.
- Maintain meeting summaries and share with Associate Director for Technical Services and Library Systems.

Members:

- Head, Catalog Management Services
- Catalog Management Librarian
- Head, Reference Services

- Electronic Resources Coordinator
- Coordinator of Interlibrary Loan
- Senior Programmer Analyst
- Subject Librarian for Business & Economics
- Head, Cataloging Services
- Monographs Coordinator

## Appendix C

### Electronic Resources Management Team

#### Chair

#### Job Description

(Total average time commitment: 2-4 hours per week)

1. Actively follow trends and developments in electronic resource management in academic libraries.
2. Using the Team charge and tasks as a guide, set goals and target dates for the Team.
3. Appoint and monitor the progress of sub-groups as necessary to complete the work of the Team.
4. Communicate with and seek input from others throughout the Libraries as necessary or appropriate.
5. Work with Team members to achieve consensus regarding the management of electronic resources.
6. Draft agendas and lead Team meetings.
7. Ensure that decisions and actions taken by the Team are documented in the minutes.
8. Distribute minutes to the Team and post on libstaff.
9. Manage the Team's web page (this responsibility may be shared with other Team members as feasible).
10. Review Team membership annually.

### Electronic Resources Management Team

#### Member

#### Job Description

(Total average time commitment: one hour per week)

1. Actively follow trends and developments in electronic resource management in academic libraries.
2. Using the Team charge and tasks as a guide, work with other Team members to carry out goals.
3. Represent your unit's interests and concerns in Team discussions and plans.
4. Seek feedback from your unit on any issues that might affect their work.
5. Make recommendations regarding the management of electronic resources.
6. Attend regularly-scheduled Team meetings.
7. Assist with taking minutes on a rotating basis.
8. Serve on sub-groups as assigned.