

Welcome
to the
Portico Participants' Meeting

ALA Annual Conference
Anaheim, CA
June 28, 2008

8:00 – 8:30 a.m. Breakfast

8:30 – 10:00 a.m. Program



Today's Program

- I. Welcome
- II. Results from the Portico/Ithaka 2008 E-Journal Survey
- III. New Preservation Activities
 1. Extension of Portico preservation activities to e-books and d-newspapers.
 2. Service to enable libraries to preserve locally created / digitized electronic scholarly materials
- IV. Portico Holdings Comparison
- V. Closing



Meeting Handouts

- Facts & Figures
- Participating Libraries
- Participating Publishers
- Holdings Comparison
- Results of E-Book Study
- Feedback Form



Results from the Portico/Ithaka 2008 E-Journal Survey

Nancy Maron
Senior Research Associate
Ithaka Strategic Services
nancy.maron@ithaka.org

Portico Participants' Meeting
June 28, 2008



“[In] a scholarly environment that is increasingly dependent on information in digital form, preservation of electronic journals is necessary and urgent.”

Urgent Action Statement
October 15, 2005



Background

- Portico and Ithaka designed a survey of U.S. Library Directors at four-year institutions with two goals in mind:
 - Understand the community's current attitudes and priorities around e-journal preservation, in order to guide Portico in fulfilling its mission as a not-for-profit archive of scholarly resources
 - Provide the community with concrete data that could assist library directors, funders, and administrators as they allocate limited resources for library priorities
- Web-based survey conducted in January 2008
- Summary report is available at **www.portico.org**




Methodology

- In January 2008, sent survey email link to 1,371 library directors at four-year academic institutions in the U.S.
- Received 186 full submissions, a response rate of 13.6%
- Responses showed a greater share of Portico participants than in the target population. To correct for potential bias, we removed responses from Portico participants at random from the sample until the proportion of Portico participants in the sample matched that of the larger population. New sample size: 168.
- No evidence of response bias by size of library budget or staff (proportions mirrored that of the larger population)




Most librarians find the idea of losing access to some of their e-journals unacceptable

"It would be acceptable if access to some of our e-journals was permanently lost at some point in the future."




Wide agreement that it is important to support community preservation initiatives

“Libraries need to support community preservation initiatives because it’s the right thing to do, even in the absence of tangible, near-term benefits to a particular library.”



Over 70% believe that their library has a role to play in e-journal preservation

"Our library should ensure that e-journals are preserved somewhere."




...but not every library is taking action



Many libraries claim that e-journal preservation is important; only some act on it

The gap between stated priorities and taking action




What might explain this gap?




Competing priorities: budget concerns make non-participants risk averse regarding “new” products

“Because our budget is constrained we cannot afford to adopt new products or approaches until we see they are broadly adopted by the library community.”




But of the budget-constrained group, about 44% claim they can still make room for priorities

"Because our budget is constrained we cannot afford to adopt new products or approaches until we see they are broadly adopted by the library community."



"When our library identifies a top priority, we can make room in the budget for it."




So, what else might explain why they don't act?




Many competing priorities: preservation doesn't always have a standard place in the budget so might be in competition with collections for budget resources

If your library were to expend financial resources on e-journal preservation, from which budget area would the monies most likely be drawn?



Non-participants see e-journal preservation landscape as extremely complicated

"The e-preservation landscape is extremely complicated; our library doesn't really understand our options in this area."



Respondents acknowledged the difficulty of having to preserve different content types in different ways

- “Develop more options or approaches for diverse content and materials used in research and teaching. Journals are important but not the only important content or format used for research and teaching.”
- “Work toward a solution that all publishers would buy into, so that libraries didn't have to learn about, and manage, a variety of different solutions incorporating different titles.”
- “Get more content”



As a result, of those who have not yet chosen to participate in Portico, many have adopted a stance of “wait and see”


Over 40% of those not participating in Portico cited reasons that stated or implied waiting to take action, including:

- waiting to see what other libraries like ours decide to do
- waiting to see what our consortium of system decides to do
- considering participation but deferring a decision until Portico is more proven or mature
- considering participation, but we do not have sufficient information to make a decision



At non-participating libraries, faculty are less likely to have approached librarians about the topic of e-journal preservation

Have faculty members ever approached you about e-journal preservation?



Conclusions... and the questions they raise

- E-journal preservation is a complex issue without one clear answer, which leads some libraries to take a “wait and see” approach.
 - Exactly what indications are libraries waiting for that would convince them to support e-journal preservation?
 - How can preservation initiatives like Portico help to simplify a complicated process?
 - What risks do libraries run by waiting to support preservation initiatives?



Conclusions, continued.

- While budgets may always be tight, many libraries still have enough autonomy to act on their priorities, though they do not always place e-journal preservation at the top of the list.
 - To what extent does e-journal preservation still need to be acknowledged as a separate budget line, with funds allocated for these activities?
 - If funding is not set aside, how do we address the “competition” with collections priorities?



Conclusions, continued.

- The library community has an opportunity to take the lead on campuses, to raise awareness of the issue with key stakeholders.
 - In what ways can the core community of librarians spur on the discussion on campus, to garner further support for this critical issue?
 - Do smaller teaching-focused libraries have a role to play in addressing the community's digital preservation needs?
 - In what ways can preservation initiatives help institutions to bring the importance of e-journal preservation to a wider audience, beyond the library?



Questions

To read the summary report, visit:

www.portico.org



New Digital Preservation Activities:

E-Books, Digitized-Newspapers
and Local Library Content

Eileen Fenton
Executive Director, Portico
eileen.fenton@portico.org

Portico Participants' Meeting
June 28, 2008



Portico's New Preservation Activities

1. Why new digital preservation activities?
2. What are the new preservation activities?
3. Who is involved?
4. Timeline?



1. Why New Preservation Activities?


Portico's Mission

To preserve scholarly literature published in electronic form
and to ensure that these materials remain available
to future generations of scholars, researchers, and students.



1. Why New Preservation Activities?

Growing Expenditures on E-resources



- The shift to reliance upon e-resources is accelerating.
- E-resources consume a growing portion of total library materials expenditures.
- Libraries typically license access to rather than own outright e-resources.



1. Why New Preservation Activities?

New Needs Expressed by Libraries and Publishers

- 2007-08 E-book preservation study engaged 11 libraries, 1 consortium and 9 publishers and aggregators
- Finding: E-books uptake growing rapidly; post-cancellation access mechanisms are uncertain; some loss already experienced
- Recent acquisitions have raised concerns about long-term preservation and access of large d-newspaper collections.
- Libraries' own digital collections are growing and require preservation within a robust preservation repository.



2. What New Preservation Activities?

E-books, D-newspapers, Local Library Content

E-books and D-newspapers

- Same model as with journals
 - Legal agreements with publishers specify trigger events
 - Publishers may name Portico for post-cancellation access
 - Deposit of source files; migration preservation strategy
- First signed publisher participant: Elsevier
 - Portico named as post-cancellation access mechanism.
 - Back list and forthcoming e-books committed.



2. What New Preservation Activities?

E-books, D-newspapers, Local Library Content

E-books and D-newspapers (con't.)

- Discussions with d-newspaper publishers are continuing; Portico is exploring what role, if any, e-book aggregators may play in long-term preservation arrangements.
- Publishers sign a formal agreement and pay a new one-time setup fee and additional annual fee to help to defray new preservation costs.
- E-book and d-newspaper content is covered under existing Portico agreements with library participants.



2. What New Preservation Activities?

E-books, D-newspapers, Local Library Content

Local Library Content

- Libraries have growing collections of locally created / digitized electronic scholarly content. Typically organized within DSpace, CONTENTdm, Fedora or similar platforms.
- Portico will begin to preserve this locally generated content.
- Introductory phase of this service is limited to select libraries.



2. What New Preservation Activities?

E-books, D-newspapers, Local Library Content

Local Library Content (con't.)

- During the introductory phase content transfer protocols and service agreements will be developed and refined. Costs will be evaluated and fee levels established.
- Portico expects to open this service to interested libraries in Summer 2009.
- Interested libraries can receive progress updates.



3. Who is involved?

E-books and D-newspapers - as noted

Local Library Content

American University	Middlebury College
Baylor University	Northwestern University
Binghamton University	Trinity College, Dublin
Brigham Young University	University of British Columbia
California State Polytechnic University, Pomona	University of Notre Dame
City University of New York	University of Queensland
Colorado State University	Vassar College
McMaster University	



4. Timeline

E-books and D-newspapers

- Work to begin later this year.

Local Library Content

- Introductory phase launches Summer 2008.



Questions?



Portico Holdings Comparison

Ken DiFiore, MLS
Assoc. Director, Library Relations
ken.difiore@portico.org

Portico Participants' Meeting
June 28, 2008



Holdings Comparison

- Enables librarians to compare their journal holdings – both print and electronic – to what is being preserved in Portico.
- Assists librarians in making decisions about maintaining print holdings of e-journal content being preserved by Portico.
- Free service available to both participating and non-participating libraries.



Benefits of Holdings Comparison

- Can be used with faculty and administrators to cost-justify preservation decisions.
- Facilitate collection management decisions:
 - Discontinue receipt of print journals.
 - Move print journals offsite.



Holdings Comparison Use Cases

- An ARL library undergoing a rolling renovation to provide for more group-study areas used Holdings Comparison to inform their decision about moving print to offsite storage.
- Small liberal arts college library used Holdings Comparison to verify the preservation of its core journal titles.
- Medium-sized publicly funded college library responded to mandated 5% budget cut used Holdings Comparison to help decide print cancellations.
- Medical school library seeking to install new computer workstations in an area used for current issue display used Holdings Comparison to evaluate the cancellation of current print versions.
- Medium private institution seeking to used Holdings Comparison to reduce microfilm holdings.



How it Works

- Library sends Portico a list of ISSNs in an Excel spreadsheet.
- Portico returns spreadsheet with status of each ISSN:
 - Not-committed
 - Committed
 - Archived
 - And indication of whether the publisher of the ISSN has designated Portico as a post-cancellation access mechanism

Microsoft Excel - sample2.xls

	A	B	C	D
	ISSN	Title	Publisher	
2	1616-301X	Advanced functional materials	John Wiley & Sons	
3	0935-9648	Advanced materials (Deerfield Beach, Fla.) [VCH]	John Wiley & Sons	
4	0001-1541	American Institute of Chemical Engineers. AIChE journal	John Wiley & Sons	
5	0570-0833	Angewandte chemie international edition	John Wiley & Sons	
6	0003-3804	Annalen der physik	John Wiley & Sons	
7	0364-5134	Annals of neurology	John Wiley & Sons	
8	0888-4080	Applied cognitive psychology	John Wiley & Sons	
9	0268-2605	Applied organometallic chemistry	John Wiley & Sons	
10	0003-8504	Architectural design	John Wiley & Sons	
11	0004-3591	Arthritis and rheumatism	John Wiley & Sons	
12	0893-7524	Arthritis care and research	John Wiley & Sons	
13	0932-8351	Bautechnik	John Wiley & Sons	
14	1069-7089	Bell Labs technical journal	John Wiley & Sons	
15	0005-9900	Beton- und Stahlbetonbau	John Wiley & Sons	
16	0265-9247	BioEssays	John Wiley & Sons	
17	0006-3525	Biopolymers	John Wiley & Sons	
18	0006-3592	Biotechnology and bioengineering	John Wiley & Sons	
19	0964-4733	Business strategy and the environment	John Wiley & Sons	
20	0008-543X	Cancer : a journal of the American Cancer Society	John Wiley & Sons	
21	0930-7516	Chemical engineering and technology	John Wiley & Sons	
22	0948-1907	Chemical vapor deposition	John Wiley & Sons	
23	0009-286X	Chemie - Ingenieur - Technik [CIT]	John Wiley & Sons	
24	0947-6539	Chemistry : a European journal	John Wiley & Sons	
25	1612-1872	Chemistry & biodiversity	John Wiley & Sons	
26	0010-3640	Communications on pure and applied mathematics	John Wiley & Sons	
27	1076-2787	Complexity	John Wiley & Sons	
28	0196-4763	Cytometry [includes Communications in clinical cytometry, w]	John Wiley & Sons	

For more information about Holdings Comparison:
www.portico.org/news/HoldingsCompService.html

To initiate Holdings Comparison:
participation@portico.org



Thank you for your attention.

Always feel free to contact us.

participation@portico.org
www.portico.org

Portico Participants' Meeting

ALA Annual Conference
Anaheim, CA
June 28, 2008

