

**Canadian National Site Licensing Project
Projet canadien de licences de site nationales**

**Survey of CNSLP Library Directors, 2002
Summary Report**

**Prepared by Ellen Hoffmann
Chair, CNSLP Evaluation Task Group**

**Submitted to CNSLP Participating Libraries
June 14, 2002**

1. CNSLP Goals

The Canadian National Site Licensing Project (CNSLP) is a collaborative initiative of sixty-four universities in Canada, designed to test the concept of licensing electronic scholarly publications on a national basis. CNSLP is funded as a three-year pilot project totaling \$50M, with \$20M awarded by the Canada Foundation for Innovation (CFI) and \$30M contributed by participating universities, provincial governments, and the Atlantic Canada Opportunities Agency (ACOA).

The project's goals are:

- to increase the quantity, breadth and depth of research literature available to the academic community, thereby building capacity of the research enterprise;
- to maximize the use and utility of content for researchers, by speeding transition to and encouraging large-scale adoption of electronic publication formats;
- to leverage Canadian universities' buying power and influence in the information marketplace, and foster development of new access/business models.

As a pilot project, CNSLP is deliberately focused in its initial scope so as to develop the expertise and means to extend it to a larger project over time. This initial focus is on licensing a limited but high-impact portfolio of fulltext electronic journals and research databases, primarily in science, technology and health disciplines, and on achieving superior terms of usage and pricing for all participants compared with what could be achieved on a site-by-site basis.

2. CNSLP Evaluation Task Group

The CNSLP Evaluation Task Group (ETG) is charged with gathering and assessing both quantitative and qualitative information to assist in evaluating CNSLP through its pilot stage, and to position it for growth. Members of the ETG are:

Sylvie Belzile	Université de Sherbrooke
Jonathan Blay	Dalhousie University
Helen Clark	University of Calgary
Ellen Hoffmann (chair)	York University
Susan Miller	University of Manitoba

CNSLP staff members Deb deBruijn (Executive Director), Leacy O'Callaghan-O'Brien (Communications Director), and Ben Schmidt (Technical Director) assist the ETG as resource personnel.

3. Survey of CNSLP Library Directors

3.1 Objectives

A survey of the library directors from the 64 participant universities was devised as one of the qualitative components of CNSLP's overall evaluation efforts. The objectives of the survey were:

- to help CNSLP "take the pulse" of the project from the viewpoint of key library stakeholders;
- to gather frank, internal information from library participants to inform CNSLP's understanding and frame the issues;
- to help CNSLP plan further evaluation activities.

3.2 Methodology

Draft survey questions were prepared by members of the ETG, and pre-tested during Fall 2001 through telephone interviews with a small number of library directors in each of the four regions. The survey questions were then refined based on feedback from the pre-testing, as well as on advice provided by the director of the survey institute at York University.

The survey questions and a cover letter from Deb deBruijn were distributed by email to all library directors on February 20, 2002. A French-language version of the questions and letter was provided to Quebec libraries during the first week of March 2002. A copy of the survey questions and covering letter is included in Appendix I.

ETG members Ellen Hoffmann and Sylvie Belzile contacted library directors to schedule 30-minute telephone interviews. Telephone interviews were conducted by region during the following months. Ellen Hoffmann conducted interviews in English with library directors in Ontario, the Atlantic and Western regions. Sylvie Belzile conducted interviews in French with library directors in Quebec.

As of June 2002, interviews were completed with library directors at 60 of the 64 participating libraries. Many directors consulted with librarians and others at their institution in preparation for the interviews. Scheduling difficulties prevented interviews from being completed at the following institutions:

Atlantic region

Nova Scotia Agricultural College

Quebec

Institut national de la recherche scientifique
École Nationale d'Administration Publique

Western region

University of Northern British Columbia

3.3 Summary results

Data from the survey results was assessed according to their relationship with CNSLP goals (i.e. *increase the quantity, breadth and depth of research literature; maximize the use and utility of content for researchers; influence the marketplace*) and with goals of the survey itself (i.e. *inform CNSLP's understanding; plan future evaluation activities.*) In all these areas, the ETG sees in the interview results, a strong "pulse" for CNSLP and the potential for a healthy future.

3.3.1 Increase the quantity, breadth and depth of research literature

“ . . . cheaper than photocopy, faster than stacks . . . ”

“ . . . high anticipation for new titles. . . ”

Library directors see CNSLP as successful in building capacity and “metaphorically” doubling content to assure a critical mass of electronic resources. The project has been positively received on almost all campuses. Directors report positive feedback from researchers and appreciation for all aspects of

improved access, including new or restored titles, ubiquity (access anytime from anywhere), and convenience. In the view of library directors, the existence of CNSLP and the success of negotiations have resulted in an increased profile for libraries on the national agenda and a permanent seat at the research table.

The ISI *Web of Science* product appears to have been the most visible success on a number of campuses, with sometimes surprising popularity among social science, humanities and legal researchers. On most campuses, directors report that researchers do not distinguish between CNSLP titles and other electronic resources. CNSLP is seen to be especially important at universities that are expanding into new program areas.

Directors also report unreserved enthusiasm from undergraduate students for all electronic resources, and that undergraduates also take the availability of online fulltext information for granted. Those libraries monitoring statistics report high use across a range of titles. Directors at several institutions report that CNSLP has been a boon for distance education students.

The effect of CNSLP appears to have been least visible at very large institutions where most resources were already available and at very small institutions where there may be limited demand for these titles.

3.3.2 Maximize use and utility

“ . . . helped people to think about new possibilities. . . “

“ . . . behaviour has changed. . . “

Library directors consider CNSLP successful in fostering the transition from print to electronic collections. In some libraries, CNSLP jump-started the move to e-journals and in others, it accelerated an existing trend. CNSLP is credited with changing a negative environment about the library on some campuses. The project allowed faculty members to think about a bigger picture for the longer term rather than protecting one journal from cancellation for one more year. Several institutions reported that CNSLP helped prompt or justify new investments in network capacity, desktop computers, and printers. Occasional technical difficulties occur, but all libraries consider that the technical infrastructure is satisfactory.

Libraries are at different stages in canceling print copies of CNSLP titles—from cancellation in anticipation to no cancellation. At libraries where substantial cancellations have occurred, unrest or unease has dissipated (with the possible exception of among some senior chemistry professors). Some directors expressed the need for national strategies regarding retention of at least one print copy and development of electronic archives.

Faculty councils, deans meetings, library advisory committees and university senates were among the groups where presentations on CNSLP were made. Campus visits by the CNSLP Executive Director were also reported. Many directors commented on the importance of one-to-one communication between librarians and faculty or administrators. One library reported preparation of “cheat sheets” and Frequently Asked Questions (FAQs) for librarians to encourage a consistent message. Liaison librarians are an important channel and used a variety of venues. One library reported watching the statistics log and then targeting departments where title usage is low.

CNSLP has affected the environment in which librarians work. Librarians reported welcoming the opportunity to offer better service and better collections with less frustration. Especially at undergraduate libraries, CNSLP has allowed librarians to feel enabled; they sense a better climate and changed relations with faculty. Directors report that staff members have generally responded well to organizational realignment in response to CNSLP requirements. Timely and accurate notice of changes in publisher products remains an unmet need.

On many campuses, CNSLP is one of several concurrent initiatives prompting faculty members to incorporate readings from e-journals in web sites, online course components and/or distance education courses. A critical mass such as CNSLP is important, but e-journals are generally considered an enabler rather than a cause of curricular change.

Library directors generally agree that CNSLP has highlighted the evolution in collection development. Some librarians express concern about the loss of control and autonomy with the move from title-by-title selection and worry that money is wasted on titles that would not have been selected or that too much money is committed to aggregators. They regret the loss of relationships with department and programs and see the demise of the “art” of collection development. Other librarians welcome the multidisciplinary approach and the availability of “surplus” information. They see collection development integrated with access and service and not as a stand-alone activity.

A few libraries report seeing a decline in interlibrary loan and document delivery statistics, but are unsure at this time whether CNSLP is a causal factor. Several libraries have calculated the savings in stack space that CNSLP makes possible.

3.3.3 Influence the marketplace

“ . . . role is to influence megavendors . . . “

“... perceived by vendors as well as librarians as a fair process...”

Most directors believe that CNSLP has been successful in modifying the marketplace and establishing a new relationship with vendors. They consistently expressed admiration for the negotiating process and the model license. They are proud of the principles, the process, and the outcome. The negotiating strategy was praised as clever, ethical, and well-executed. It resulted in high-quality titles with real savings. All aspects of the licenses – price, cap on increases, access rights that would survive license termination, decoupling of print and electronic, Canadian dollar terms, statistics, interlibrary loan and alignment with Canadian copyright – were received positively. Two directors suggested that CNSLP affected positively the offers made to Canadian consortia after their CNSLP bid was not accepted. In retrospect, many acknowledge the benefit of taking time at the beginning to get it right although it was frustrating during the wait. The formal and business-like approach was a beneficial learning experience. Most librarians welcome the opportunity to “outsource” license negotiations and believe that the terms of the CNSLP agreements are superior to what could have been achieved locally.

Approximately half the directors in the Atlantic region and Ontario believe that CNSLP strengthened regional library cooperation by providing a model and giving confidence and credibility to cooperative activity. The other directors either had no opinion or attributed change to other causes. Most directors in

Quebec and the Western region did not see much affect on regional cooperation because a great deal was already in place. The participation of regional representatives in negotiations aided understanding and developed skills that are being used elsewhere. Most consider that the consultation process in preparation for negotiations was good and worth emulating.

About 10% of library directors regret the inability to address fundamental structural and economic issues of scholarly publishing. Several hope for more attention to non-commercial and innovative responses; the Open Archives Initiative was suggested.

Libraries are at different stages in their budget planning to sustain CNSLP. A large majority of Ph.D. granting institutions plan to create the funds from several existing sources (e.g. cancellations, reallocation, endowments) and a number are hopeful that funds for the indirect cost of research will be an additional source. Planning is less advanced at smaller institutions where there is less internal budget flexibility and more dependence on university decisions.

3.3.4 Inform CNSLP's understanding

There was widespread praise for the leadership, energy and communication skills of the Executive Director. Her importance to the success of the project is recognized and admired.

Directors want CNSLP to continue and to include more disciplines, and there is intense interest in how to make this possible. A minority expressed concerns about a seeming loss of momentum and a need to capitalize on the expertise that has been built. Uncertainty about next steps at the time the interviews were conducted undoubtedly intensified concerns about timely and meaningful communication. Unhappiness about communication was more common in large than small institutions. There is regret about the delay in hiring additional staff. Several directors expressed the need to consider more flexible economic models in the next phases. Other areas suggested for improvement are: cataloguing records and URL maintenance support, better statistics and analysis of use data; faster turnaround and a willingness to move more quickly and tolerate some imperfection.

3.3.5 Plan future evaluation activities

Meaningful use data is a high priority for library directors. Analysis of use data will contribute to the cost-benefit analysis, and will also help in understanding changes in collection development. The survey also identified areas for further exploration in terms of the cost-benefit analysis, such as cost-avoidance, space gains, staff savings, etc.

Telephone interviews with questions distributed in advance were an effective way to obtain systematic information from library directors as key stakeholders. The ETG would have benefited from advice about better ways to analyze and disseminate this information. The need to obtain information directly from researchers remains, and will be addressed by the ETG in conjunction with program evaluation consultants engaged by CNSLP.

Several directors noted the international recognition the project has earned and the potential for comparative studies.

Appendix I

Covering Letter and Survey Questions – English version

TO: CNSLP library directors
FROM: CNSLP Evaluation Task Group

As you know, the CNSLP Evaluation Task Group (ETG) is charged with gathering and assessing both quantitative and qualitative information to assist in evaluating the success of the project through its pilot stage

As one component of this evaluation, a survey of CNSLP library directors has been designed by the ETG, and will be carried out by way of 30-minute phone interviews with library directors over the next two months.

The purpose of the survey is to:

- help CNSLP "take the pulse" of the project from the viewpoint of key library stakeholders;
- gather frank, internal information from library participants to inform CNSLP's understanding, frame the issues, and help CNSLP plan further evaluation activities.

You will be contacted shortly by a member of the ETG to schedule a phone interview. The survey questions that will be dealt with during the phone interview are attached for your convenience and advance review.

Thank you in advance for your time and willingness to share your views and frank information with the ETG. Please be assured that all responses will be treated as internal to CNSLP, and not for public release without the express approval of the CNSLP Steering Committee and survey respondents.

Best regards,

Deb deBruijn
on behalf of the Evaluation Task Group:
Ellen Hoffmann (chair)
Sylvie Belzile
Jonathan Blay
Helen Clarke
Susan Miller

Canadian National Site Licensing Project

Survey of Library Directors February 2002

Reception on Campus

1. Do you have information about faculty and graduate student satisfaction with online access to CNSLP titles that the library used to have in print only? Please describe.
2. Do you have information about faculty and graduate student satisfaction with online access to CNSLP titles that the library did not have in the past? Please describe.

3. Do you have information about faculty and graduate student concerns regarding cancellation of print journals now available through CNSLP? Please describe.
4. Do you have information about undergraduate student satisfaction with online access to CNSLP titles? Please describe.
5. Do you have information about curricular or other innovation as a result of CNSLP? Please describe.
6. Libraries have promoted CNSLP in a variety of ways.
 - 6a. Have you placed information in campus publications? Please describe.
 - 6b. Have you placed information in library publications? Please describe.
 - 6c. Have you placed information on the library web site? Please describe.
 - 6d. Have you linked all titles in your online catalogue? Please describe.
 - 6e. Have you linked all titles in a database or list of electronic journals available through the library? Please describe.
 - 6f. Have you held workshops? Please describe.
 - 6g. Other?
7. Has CNSLP ever come up in your conversations with senior university administrators? If so, what are their comments/opinions?

Financial issues

8. We understand your contribution to CNSLP is \$xxx,000 [from information on Schedule B of the Inter-University Agreement, January 2000 – attached. How did you find the money for your contribution?
9. At this time, what is your financial exit strategy (i.e. when CFI and any other provincial or regional contributions terminate?)

Reaction in library

10. Do you have information about what library staff view as CNSLP benefits? Please describe.
11. Do you have information about what library staff as CNSLP difficulties? Please describe.

Other impacts

12. We understand that in some regions, CNSLP has had an impact beyond the individual university and its researchers.
 - 12a. Have you seen an impact on cooperation among libraries in your region? Please describe.
 - 12b. Have you seen an impact on relations with businesses and government in your area? Please describe.
 - 12c. Have you seen an impact on relations with public or special libraries? Please describe.

Concluding questions

13. What has CNSLP done well?
14. What could CNSLP improve?
15. Are there other comments you would like to make?

Covering Letter and Survey Questions – French version

Comme vous le savez sans doute, le Groupe de travail sur l'évaluation (GTE) du PCLSN a pour mandat de recueillir et d'évaluer les données tant quantitatives que qualitatives permettant de mesurer le succès du projet durant sa phase initiale (projet-pilote).

Le sondage auprès des directeurs des bibliothèques adhérant au PCLSN préparé par le GTE constitue un volet de cette évaluation, et prendra la forme d'interviews téléphoniques d'une demi-heure avec ces derniers au cours des deux prochains mois.

Le sondage a pour but:

- d'aider le PCLSN à "prendre le pouls" du projet selon la perspective de partenaires majeurs provenant du milieu des bibliothèques;
- de recueillir auprès des bibliothèques participantes, et ce sans détour, des informations provenant de l'intérieur de l'établissement afin de permettre au PCLSN de comprendre les situations, de définir les problèmes, et de l'aider à planifier les évaluations futures.

Un membre du GTE se mettra sous peu en communication avec vous pour fixer la date et l'heure de l'interview. Vous trouverez ci-joint, aux fins d'une meilleure préparation, les questions du sondage qui sera mené lors de l'interview téléphonique.

Nous vous remercions à l'avance de bien vouloir prendre le temps de partager franchement vos opinions avec le GTE. Toutes les réponses seront traitées de façon confidentielle par le PCLSN, et ne seront rendues publiques qu'avec l'accord explicite du Comité directeur du PCLSN ainsi que des participants au sondage.

Sincères remerciements.

Deb deBruijn
au nom du Groupe de travail d'évaluation:
Ellen Hoffmann (présidente)
Sylvie Belzile
Jonathan Blay
Helen Clarke
Susan Miller

Projet canadien de licences de site nationales

Sondage auprès des directeurs de bibliothèques février 2002

Réactions sur le campus

1. Possédez-vous des informations vous permettant d'évaluer le degré de satisfaction des membres du corps professoral et des étudiants relativement aux titres, maintenant accessibles en version électronique dans le cadre du PCLSN, que votre bibliothèque n'avait antérieurement qu'en version imprimée? Veuillez expliquer.
2. Possédez-vous des informations sur les préoccupations exprimées par les membres du corps professoral et les étudiants au sujet de l'annulation de la version imprimée de titres disponibles dans le cadre du PCLSN? Veuillez expliquer.

3. Possédez-vous des informations sur des modifications aux programmes ou d'autres innovations attribuables au PCLSN? Veuillez expliquer.
4. Les bibliothèques ont utilisé tout un éventail de moyens pour promouvoir le PCLSN.
 - a. Avez-vous fait de la publicité dans les publications du campus? Veuillez expliquer.
 - b. Avez-vous fait de la publicité dans les publications de la bibliothèque? Veuillez expliquer.
 - c. Avez-vous fait de la publicité sur le site web de la bibliothèque? Veuillez expliquer.
 - d. Avez-vous fait l'intégration de tous les titres au catalogue automatisé? Veuillez expliquer.
 - e. Avez-vous fait l'intégration de tous les titres dans une base de données ou une liste de périodiques électroniques disponible à la bibliothèque? Veuillez expliquer.
 - f. Avez-vous offert des ateliers? Veuillez expliquer.
 - g. Autres activités?
5. Le PCLSN a-t-il été abordé lors de vos conversations avec des membres de la haute direction de l'Université? Si oui, quels furent leurs commentaires ou leurs opinions?

Aspects financiers

6. Selon nos informations, vous contribuez xxx,000\$ au PCLSN <d'après les données de l'Annexe B de l'Entente inter-universitaire, janvier 2000, texte ci-joint>. Quelles sont les sources de ces fonds?
7. Quelles sont actuellement les mesures que vous entendez prendre au plan financier à la fin du projet-pilote (soit lorsque prendront fin les contributions de la FCI et de toute autre source de financement à l'échelle provinciale ou régionale)?

Réactions à l'intérieur de la bibliothèque

8. Possédez-vous des informations sur la vision qu'ont les membres du personnel de la bibliothèque des avantages du PCLSN? Veuillez expliquer.
9. Possédez-vous des informations sur la vision qu'ont les membres du personnel de la bibliothèque des inconvénients du PCLSN? Veuillez expliquer.

Autres répercussions

10. Nous croyons savoir que le PCLSN a eu dans certaines régions des répercussions en dehors des murs de l'Université et par delà le groupe de ses chercheurs.
 - a. Avez-vous constaté des répercussions sur la coopération entre les bibliothèques de votre région? Veuillez expliquer.
 - b. Avez-vous constaté des répercussions sur les relations avec les milieux d'affaires et les gouvernements dans votre région? Veuillez expliquer.
 - c. Avez-vous constaté des répercussions sur les relations avec le public ou avec les bibliothèques spécialisées? Veuillez expliquer.

Dernières questions

11. Le PCLSN s'avère-t-il un succès?
12. Comment pourrions-nous améliorer le PCLSN?
13. Aimerez-vous faire d'autres commentaires?