

Subject: Collection Development

Title: Electronic Resources Collection Development Policy Operational Policy

Date Adopted by the Library Services Faculty: 12/7/06

I. Purpose:

The Electronic Resources Collection Development Policy for Joyner Library is intended to assist those persons responsible for building, maintaining, and evaluating collections of online resources that support the instruction and research of the students, staff, and faculty of East Carolina University, and authorized community users. The Electronic Resources Collection Development Policy follows from the over-arching Collection Development Policy for the Library, addressing issues related specifically to electronic resources. Electronic resources are defined as those available in digital format and which require computer access, and include ongoing subscriptions, one-time purchases, and freely-available Internet resources.

The Electronic Resources Collection Development Policy supports the missions of East Carolina University and Joyner Library. This document provides a method for communicating the Library's collection philosophy and principles to the University community and others. More specifically, this policy serves as a planning document to direct future collection development, and provides guidelines for selection, review, and deselection of electronic resources.

The Policy will be revised periodically to reflect changing academic needs and priorities.

II. Consortial Agreements and Resource Sharing :

Consortial agreements are particularly important to expand access to electronic resources, and resource sharing agreements are central in considering resources for the University. The Electronic Resources Collection Development policy affirms the commitment to consortial agreements and resource sharing in the Collection Development Policy for Academic Library Services. The associate director in charge of collections appoints the Library's representative(s) to negotiate consortial subscriptions to and purchases of electronic resources. Licenses for electronic resources may only be negotiated and signed by a librarian signatory approved by the library director.

III. Responsibilities:

Primary responsibility for the selection of all electronic materials for public use rests with the associate director charged with collections. For materials purchased from the appropriate budget line, the Electronic Resources Review Committee (ERRC) serves consultative and coordinating roles for the associate director (AD). Using the evaluation criteria described below, the ERRC will work with assigned subject selectors and other appropriate library units, including for instance Reference, the Music Library, or the Teaching Resources Center . The ERRC is responsible for organizing and evaluating all electronic resources and recommends potential purchases and subscriptions to the AD. Requests for electronic resources may originate from any member of the faculty or staff of the University or the library, or from any of the students of the University.

The Electronic Resources Review Committee works with the vendor to determine minimum software and hardware specifications and to arrange for trials of any product for which the library must pay one-time purchase, subscription, or licensing costs. The ERRC will invite input regarding trials from members of the library, relevant departments on campus, and other interested parties.

On the approval of library administration, the chair of Electronic Resources Review Committee will request all appropriate licenses and invoices for Acquisitions. An approved license signatory will check licensing requirements and is the only responsible party to negotiate any electronic resource licensing agreement.

Subject liaisons are responsible for promoting the resource to relevant faculty, students, and library staff. If staff training is needed, the subject liaisons will coordinate the training with the Electronic Resources Review Committee representative. The Collection Development Librarian is responsible for coordinating overall publicity for new electronic resources.

Evaluation is coordinated by the Electronic Resources Review Committee. Subject liaisons are responsible for reviewing ongoing products to reassess for relevance to the collections, currency, ease of use, and cost. Other means of evaluation, including usage statistics, will be part of the assessment of the electronic resources collections. When a product no longer has sufficient value as part of the collections, it should be reviewed by the selector for deselection. The ERRC and subject liaisons will invite input from authorized users regarding deselection decisions.

IV. Evaluation Criteria:

The following evaluation criteria are used for purposes of selection, evaluation, and deselection. These evaluation criteria include issues specific to electronic resources, and build on the selection criteria named in the Joyner Library Collection Development Policy. Evaluation criteria are arranged by four topics: usability, content, curriculum needs, and vendor. The committee will also seek out reviews of the databases to complement the members' own evaluations. The criteria currently in use by the committee include but are not limited to:

I. Content:

1. Uniqueness of content, including indexed titles
2. Overlap/fit with other databases
3. Is the resource a core database for its subject area?
4. Interdisciplinarity
5. Full text availability
 - a. File format (PDF, PostScript)
 - b. Full text value (includes core journals)
 - c. Embargo periods, if applicable
 - d. Fulltext coverage (eg., articles only, front matter, etc.)
 - e. Duplication of print titles held by Joyner or Laupus
6. Backfiles/Archive (including Full text issues above)
7. Competing electronic resources for consideration
8. Buffet versus big-deal buying; ie., can the library consider just part of a database, and will the part considered meet the library's needs?
9. Ownership of content versus access via an ongoing subscription

II. Curriculum Needs and Research Emphases:

1. Teaching faculty input
2. Growth of programs (recent and planned)
3. Distance Education needs of programs
4. Support for the University's areas of emphasis
5. Library Service Point input
 - a. Reference Department
 - b. Interlibrary Loan request history
 - c. Other relevant departments

III. Usability:

1. Ease of navigating interface

2. Search options (limits, combining results, truncation, proximity, sorting, browsing, SDI availability)
3. Linking ability (includes open-URL compliance)
4. Email options
5. Print options
6. Save options
7. Usage statistics (by month, database and year), including:
 - a. Number of logins (or sessions)
 - b. Number of turn-aways
 - c. Number of searches
 - d. Time periods for reporting: monthly, and length of access to statistics (prefer at least two calendar years at a time—all of previous and current year data available)
 - e. Availability of viewing and downloading statistics: via CSV, Excel file, available on password protected server
8. Depth of indexing
9. Data accuracy
10. Auto-logout availability
11. Email alerts
12. Special software required for data manipulation?
13. Ease of off-campus, remote use
14. Availability and ease of use for database "help" and FAQ documents

IV. Vendor Criteria:

1. Cost, including the following aspects:
 - a. recent years' increases
 - b. number of simultaneous users
 - c. competing vendors for same product
 - d. can subfiles be purchased as separate units
 - e. can payments be made over a multi-year period
 - f. are multi-year licenses available
2. ADA Compliancy
3. Provision of statistics (preferably COUNTER compliant; see www.projectcounter.org)
4. Training
5. Truth in advertising regarding content
6. Licensing issues:
 - a. Provision for off-campus, Distance Education, and walk-in users
 - b. Interlibrary Loan

- c. Coursepaks and electronic reserves
- d. Venue for dispute
- 7. Database response time
- 8. Stability of vendor; reputation
- 9. Timeliness of updates
- 10. MARC records availability, cost
- 11. Web-browser compatibility
- 12. Support, including:
 - a. Resolution of problems
 - b. Response time

V. Format and Material Types:

A. Included Electronic Resources : The following represents some of the types of electronic resources governed by this Collection Development policy:

1. Online bibliographic serial titles (indexes or A&I) converted from print to electronic subscription;
2. Subscribed fulltext databases, including but not limited to aggregators, journal and newspaper collections, primary works, biographical essays, encyclopedias or other reference works, music, and research reports;
3. One-time expenditures for fulltext electronic resources, usually archival in nature;
4. Freely-available databases produced by an authoritative body. These must be searchable and/or browseable and offer bibliographic access and/or fulltext content.

B. Material Types Excluded : The following list represents some of the types of resources not appropriate for this Collection Development Policy:

1. Individual electronic journals are more properly considered by the subject librarian, and governed by the collection development statements regarding serials and the subject area. The liaison librarian should notify the ERRC if the selected titles are part of a journal collection with special pricing. The ERRC will consider multiple title collections when the number of subscriptions makes the package a more cost-effective option.

2. Electronic books on a title-by-title selection, CD-ROMs, or other electronic resources eligible to be paid from subject funds or other library collections funds are governed by the collection development statements for that subject area or collection.
3. Freely-available World Wide Web pages that are "self-contained" or contain only links out to other pages are not within the scope of this policy, although departments or subject librarians may select these kinds of Web pages for instruction, quick reference, subject guides, or other purposes.

VI. Selection Tools:

In addition to other selection tools listed in Academic Library Services' Collection Development Policy, the following selection tools are particularly appropriate for electronic resources:

- Faculty requests
- Reviews in scholarly and professional journals, including the *Charleston Advisor*, *Choice*, *Booklist*, and other sources
- Publishers' and/or vendors' notifications
- Email lists and posting
- Relevant core lists
- Comparison with peer institutions

VII. Limitations:

A. Languages : Dependent on relevant subject area, although the main language of this collection is English

B. Geographical Guidelines : Dependent on relevant subject area

C. Chronological Guidelines : Access to current research will be given priority. Online archives and other retrospective coverage may be selected for any of several reasons:

1. To offer access to material of value not already owned;
2. To enhance research on already-owned content in other media, particularly for distance education or by offering additional access/manipulability; and/or

3. To maintain access to materials becoming fragile in other media, particularly print.

D. Duplication of Format : Is discouraged unless the duplication is justified for distance education programs, preservation needs, or other relevant reasons.

E. Cost : Five factors are weighed:

- 1 . The total budget and fiscal outlook for the year;
- 2 . The relative need for the resource compared with other resources being considered during the year
- 3 . Cost differences between vendors, if more than one offers the product, as part of the total evaluation of the requested resource.
- 4 . Expected price increase. In order to be recommended for purchase, the expected use/importance of the product should justify the extra cost. There are two types of price increases to consider:
 - a . Both the absolute increase from print to electronic access, and
 - b . The relative increase (ie., is the electronic resource twice the cost of the print, three times, quadrupled, etc.).
5. Hidden costs, including but not limited to time negotiating with the vendor/distributor, resource downtime, cataloging and other library processing time

VIII. Deselection:

Deselection, the removal of material from the collection, is essential for the maintenance of an active, useful library collection. Deselection is also made necessary by ongoing changes in the University's curricula and the limits imposed by the Library's available budget. Liaison librarians are responsible for conducting evaluation for deselection in their areas of collection responsibility; deselection activities will be coordinated by the Electronic Resources Review Committee. Faculty members are encouraged to give feedback

regarding the deselection of titles in their areas of teaching and research. Primary responsibility for the deselection of electronic resources rests with the AD. The general factors considered for deselection of electronic resources are:

- Cost, including the five factors listed above;
- Low-use item (with respect to the cost and size of department for subject areas served)
- Content and/or indexing of the electronic resource have been superseded by another, preferred, electronic resource;
- Technical requirements to maintain the electronic resource outweigh the need for the resource or are beyond the reasonable ability of the Library;
- Producer or distributor imposes unacceptable conditions on the Library in its administration of the electronic resource.