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Executive Summary

The E-Books Reserve Task Force was formed in June 2011. Its membership was comprised of librarians representing a cross-section of relevant functional areas and library. The Task Force was asked to investigate avenues for maximizing the benefits of an enhanced e-reserve collection, focusing on strategies for the inclusion of more e-books in e-reserves and exploring the possibility of providing an e-only reserve collection.

What we found was that there is no agreement among publishers as to format, features such as the ability to annotate or print, licensing or pricing. This makes it difficult to make decisions for the future of e-books in regards to reserve use. We recommend a phased approach to adding e-resources to the reserve mix. Once the inclusion of e-resources into the work flow is accomplished, we anticipate that this process will become easier and more “natural” for both acquisitions and reserve staff.

Recommendations:

- **Phase in the use of e-reserves**
  - In Fall 2012, begin a pilot project to manage reserve requests for new titles not previously acquired for reserve
  - For the Spring 2013 semester, begin a project to identify perennial, high-circulation Engineering and Physical Sciences reserve materials in print and transition them to e-versions, expanding to other units

- **Provide e-reserve training/education for CUL staff as well as users**
  - We need to refine the work flow and timing between reserves staff and acquisitions staff from the time of the purchase request to the time of acquisition and use
  - We also need to be sure that reserves staff understand the process and are able to fully integrate it into their work flow
  - CUL selectors should have a basic knowledge of the process

- **Participate in collaborative efforts**
  - We would seek out and welcome opportunities to work with Cornell and other institutions facing similar challenges

- **Create an E-Reserve Implementation Committee**
  - The Task Force recommends that CUL establish an implementation committee charged with implementing the recommendation as well being responsible for the ongoing assessment of current CU efforts
I. Introduction

Sponsored by the AUL for Scholarly Resources and Special Collections; the AUL for Teaching, Research, Outreach, and Learning Services; and the AUL for Central Library Operations, the CUL E-Books Reserve Task Force was formed in June 2011. Its membership was comprised of librarians representing a cross-section of relevant functional areas (e.g., acquisitions, access services, e-resources management, collection development) and library units (ILR, Engineering, Mann, Olin/Uris). The Task Force was asked to investigate avenues for maximizing the benefits of an enhanced e-reserve collection, focusing on strategies for the inclusion of more e-books in e-reserves and exploring the possibility of providing an e-only reserve collection. Our investigation was guided by three questions:

- What are the opportunities to transition to a full electronic reserves operation?
- What is the life cycle of e-books on reserve, from selection to access?
- What workflows need to be established to support such a transition?

The group met regularly to look at these questions from a range of perspectives, practical to theoretical, consulting with others outside the Task Force when additional information or expertise was needed. We reviewed recent e-book usage statistics and to our surprise found a pattern suggesting a reserve-like use (i.e., high use clustered at certain points of time during the semester) for items not designated by the library as reserve materials. In addition, we found that since publishers recognize no “reserve norms” for licensing, formats, or user preference, it is extremely difficult to address the multitude of reserve-specific issues or recommend an overarching policy without a much deeper and localized investigation into our users’ needs and expectations.

There are currently only a few e-books officially placed on reserve in CUL and we asked ourselves why this is the case. What we learned in our pursuit of an answer leads us to believe that many publishers do not make course textbooks available for libraries. They sell copies of e-versions to individuals but not to institutions because they are concerned with losing money. Those that do offer institutional licenses either do so at a markup of 0-100% or more of the original cost (depending on the specific provisions in the multi-user license purchased), or else they restrict the number of simultaneous users. As more e-reserves are added, more library funds will be required.

From our analysis of current workflows and practices – in the contexts of a move towards an e-preferred reserve approach and the challenging complexity of acquisition and licensing issues – we believe it would be difficult to ask reserve staff to adopt an additional skill set similar to that expected of e-resources staff. Coming to grips with a workflow that would serve everyone from selectors to patrons is a complex and time-consuming task, but we imagine that the included workflow (see Appendix) could be implemented in particular unit libraries in preparation for gradually expanding it across all CUL reserve operations.

What does this mean for the future of e-reserves in CUL? We recommend a phased approach to adding e-resources to the reserve mix. Once the inclusion of e-resources into the work flow is accomplished, we anticipate that this process will become easier and more “natural” for both acquisitions and reserve staff.
We also looked to other innovative ways to use our digital resources for reserve, particularly those leveraging the benefits of collaboration. For example, Deb Lamb-Deans and Michael Cook are working with the Academic Technology Center to help assess their E-Texts pilot project using McGraw-Hill material and a platform-agnostic software, Courseeload (see http://www.courseload.com/), that can be used to both read and annotate e-textbooks. Another example is the pilot program that Cornell Weill Medical School began last fall to provide first- and second-year students with iPads that they can use to download course material, watch multi-media lectures and demonstrations, access their grades, and collaborate with other students. We might also investigate ways in which we can use the resources we already have access to, similar to the project at Temple University where faculty are offered stipends to work with the library in identifying e-material that may be repurposed as a virtual “textbook.”

Such innovative programs would require collaboration outside the Library, as ultimately this is a campus-wide challenge. The recommended standing committee on e-reserves would be able to continue investigation into these areas and begin to chart a course that would move us into a more blended landscape.

II. Considerations

A. E-book reality

Uncertainty prevails in the market for e-books, especially with regard to institutional customers. The state of e-book sales and licensing echoes that of e-journals a decade earlier, and even now that market continues to offer a wide array of pricing models. There are hundreds of publishers and their confidence and acceptance of the new e-market for books varies considerably. They have concerns about losing print sales and worry that e-sales to institutions might reduce the potential individual market for their books. Although monographs are born digital and e-versions are increasingly available, most textbooks and many trade publications, as well as current fiction and many business and marketing books, are products for which sales to individuals, including students, remain critically important to publishers. We should expect that this state of uncertainty in a new, unsettled market environment will continue for some time. In general, with the exception of textbooks, the larger science, technology, engineering, and mathematics (STEM) publishers have moved forward more quickly and have somewhat better accommodated changes in the marketplace. But many publishers exclude items from institutional purchase, and these exclusions are not easily predictable. New pricing models are being tried to limit exclusions, but some of these come with a cost higher than desired and with further complications to acquiring and maintaining ongoing access.

In general, for unit ordering of e-books from MyiLibrary and ebrary – two established vendor accounts for CUL – the basic price of an e-book with single simultaneous use (which is usually not sufficient for potential reserve usage at peak times) is equal to or 10-20% greater than the cost of a cloth edition of the book. For multiple simultaneous use, when available, the cost is often 150-200% the cost of a cloth edition. In cases when no multiuser pricing is available, multiple copies of the single e-book need to be purchased. E-book pricing per title is often less expensive when collections or packages are purchased,
with discounts ranging from 10-50%, but each collection needs to be evaluated for its overall value since it is likely that some portion of the titles encompassed by a given collection would have little or no local use. CUL has not initiated any per-use (short term loan) access to e-books. Although this option might be suitable for rarely used materials, for reserves, and especially for larger classes, it would not be a cost-effective alternative unless there was some mechanism to automatically purchase and upgrade access (e.g., to multiple simultaneous use) without turning away students.

Although LTS has been able to streamline some e-book purchasing, standard rules and guidelines for acquiring and providing access to e-books continue to change as the market evolves and new possibilities become available. Current unit order e-book purchasing demands the consideration of numerous factors, including – in cases where an e-book is available for institutional purchase – whether multi-simultaneous use is available or whether multiple copies of an individual e-book must be purchased to support classes of varying sizes. For many items there remain licensing and purchasing factors that are part of the acquisition process. Also, there are e-book “circulation” based models that CUL has not embraced as part of the mix of building its e-book collections and that would come with other service and access implications. There remain pricing advantages to purchase collections that are usually, but not always, publisher-based, and some items are only available as part of a larger purchase. E-books also generally cost more than their print equivalents, particularly for multiuser options.

Unit ordering for e-books, even using tools such as POOF and establishing licensing to cover more purchasing in a semi-streamlined way, remains a highly staff-intensive process. This will continue into the foreseeable future. Accommodating an ever-increasing number of monographs to be routinely reviewed for e-book options would require a corresponding increase in communications with faculty and ongoing revision of reserve policies and procedures, all of which would have staff resource and training implications within LTS.

B. Current CUL use of e-book packages

In answering the question of whether or not we can completely switch our print reserves titles into e-book formats, staff in LTS took a sample of the monographs put on reserve through ARES for the Fall 2010 and Spring 2011 semesters. Staff in LTS Acquisitions took a sample of 497 monographs placed reserve during this period. The results of their sample matched a similar sample taken in the Spring of 2011, but that earlier sample was restricted to monograph reserves for the JGSM, ILR and Hotel Libraries. The more recent sampling was for monographs placed reserve throughout CUL. They have found that only 11% of the 497 were quickly identified as having an e-book available for purchase by institutions through two established accounts (with MyiLibrary and ebrary) and an additional 6% showed the existence of an e-version, but each of these titles would need further investigation to verify if CUL could purchase a copy and whether their licensing and/or access met CUL policy and processing requirements. Even if we assume that we can cover for the whole 17% of available e-books, the situation is far from ideal, therefore we have concluded that we should aim to increase e-reserves for monographs as much as we can, but cannot count on a complete transition into e-reserves at this point.
A second, far less systematic, but interesting sample looked at current e-book use. For several COUNTER-compliant e-book collections, the usage patterns for a subset of titles clearly showed spiking of use, where an item would have relatively little or stable use for much of the year and then spike to heavy usage in a month falling within either the fall or spring semesters. Titles with such spikes were sampled less systematically since we defined the spiking somewhat imprecisely\(^1\). More than 900 spikes were checked, with spiking roughly defined as more than 40 COUNTER recorded uses, with 80\% or more of uses recorded in one month during the semester. However, for smaller seminars, even a lower count of spikes in use might indicate an assignment or optional reading for the class. Titles showing some level of spiking, consistent with reserve use, were then checked against ARES for the same time period as the sample above, the Fall 2010 and Spring 2011 reserves. Approximately 9\% of the titles showing some usage spiking had their print equivalents on reserve during this time period. Even without the print materials on reserve, items are being found and used, supporting class assignments. This fact indicates that there are many titles not on e-reserve that show the same patterns we would expect of physical reserves, i.e. they show a considerable amount of use at a certain moment in the semester.

Even though we would recommend further study into this phenomena and a much more precise definition of a spike (according to number of student and level of the class) we can already assume that there exists a “reserve-like” use pattern for titles that faculty had not initially identified to us as reserve material. We would like to recommend a further analysis of this fact since it has significant repercussions on our decisions to purchase single or multi-use licenses for our e-collections.

We know that some e-book titles not purchased for reserve are also being assigned to courses. LIBIT-l investigates access issues and there could be a short flurry of frustrated students not able to get into an e-book for an assignment due the next day. Fortunately, only a subset of our e-book collections, as low as 1\% (but a bit higher for more recent imprints), have limited simultaneous use. (As more e-books are unit ordered, this relatively low percentage might gradually increase.) Several times each semester, we learn of an e-book that has been assigned to a class, usually too late. In recent discussions we’ve considered the possibility with one of our major unit order e-book suppliers to automatically upgrade our access and not turn users away, but this kind of automatic change needs to be seamlessly managed on their platforms and will come with a cost to upgrade titles. Our task force would recommend we pursue this approach further with vendors in order to accommodate this surprising behavior for items that are not clearly reserve titles and to review our library policies in regard to purchasing single use titles.

C. Staffing

\(^1\) Classes vary considerably in size. COUNTER statistics records the use of discrete sections of books, for example, usually a chapter: A book might have 15 chapters, and the statistics indicate that the e-book has been used, but a spike of 75 in October, comprising 98\% of the use over a full year, does not indicate whether the same book was used in its entirety by a few users for whether one or two chapters recorded all or most of the use by a larger population of users.
In our current situation, reserve staff is still required to process reserve materials, whether they are physical items or e-items. This processing includes working with faculty and Library Technical Services staff to ensure that reserve requests are processed in a timely manner. Faculty do not always submit their reserve lists in a timely manner that allows reserve staff to process material in time for the first day of classes, and there is usually a rush during the two weeks before and after classes begin to make all reserve requests available to students. Existing e-items (not print items requiring scanning) do not have to be processed physically or shelved, but there is still staff effort involved. Reserve staff is often called upon to provide assistance to faculty in using Blackboard, and the Ares system interface can be problematic, causing staff to spend additional time troubleshooting. The window of opportunity for reserve processing, especially for spring semester, is very short, allowing only three to four weeks for all the work to be done.

D. Influencing e-book vendors and publishers

Since the library market as a share of publishing output has not increased and for many publishers sales to individuals remain a larger and growing share of their customer base, it is difficult to influence their licensing practices for institutions. Still, libraries may be able to affect vendors’ e-book policies and practices in a favorable way by working with them early on as they explore the institutional market for e-books. For example, several Cornell librarians have joined with their 2CUL colleagues at Columbia to open an ongoing dialogue with JSTOR and Project Muse about their new e-book collections. Selectors who have connections with academic societies and publishers of interest can also play a part by seeking out and taking advantage of opportunities to discuss the situation of libraries vis-à-vis e-books. Most of the smaller publishers rely on established platforms for their e-book sales (ebrary, EBL, MyiLibrary), so it’s important that we maintain an open dialogue to assist them in developing new procedures and policies that minimize exclusions, increase option, and not further complicate acquisitions processing.

E. Legal aspects and faculty role in e-reserves

Beginning in the fall of 2006, CU faculty were given the responsibility for ensuring that their electronic reserve materials are compliant with copyright laws. The library created a fair use checklist to assist them in this process. This transfer of accountability leads to the question of whether or not CUL should support course reserve operations at all, leaving it to faculty to post links to reserve material for their courses. We asked Peter Hirtle, CUL’s Intellectual Property Officer, for his perspective on the issue. In his opinion, the section that addresses multiple copies for classroom use in the U.S. Copyright Office publication *Reproduction of Copyrighted Works by Educators and Librarians* (see [http://www.copyright.gov/circs/circ21.pdf](http://www.copyright.gov/circs/circ21.pdf), pages 5-7) would lend support to the argument that faculty are in a stronger legal position than are libraries in this regard.

The academic library world is waiting for the results of the Georgia State e-reserve case, which will provide more guidance. It is worth noting that ARL recently came out with *Code of Best Practices in Fair Use for Academic and Research Libraries*, which is characterizes as “a clear and easy-to-use statement of fair and reasonable approaches to fair use developed by and for librarians who support
academic inquiry and higher education” (see: http://www.arl.org/pp/ppcopyright/codefairuse/index.shtml).

The Campus Store offers a custom course pack service to faculty and will handle all copyright permission requests. As one would expect, the cost of copyright clearance is folded into the price of the course pack. The Campus Store also utilizes the CUL licenses in the preparation of custom course packs. This service offers faculty an alternative to asking CUL to put material on reserve.

The developments noted above notwithstanding, ceasing to provide course reserve service would constitute a policy change of some magnitude and would need to be vetted by many groups, beginning with LEG and PSEC as well as external groups such as the Library Advisory Council, the Faculty Advisory Board, and the Student Library Advisory Council. At this time we cannot recommend the elimination of our current service.

F. Using e-readers for reserve

Though some patrons will want to download reserve readers onto their personal e-book readers and borrow e-book readers from the circulation desk, we recommend against the use of e-readers as a way to handle reserve readings at this time. Reserve use is different from casual reading and requires the ability to highlight, annotate, print and retain material beyond a given date – features often not available on a given device. Despite the technology involved, e-readers do not get us past the “single copy=single user” paradigm of print reserves. Many e-books allow only PDF chapter downloading onto e-book readers.

The use of e-readers also raises concerns about service to visually-impaired patrons. In 2009 six universities (Pace, Arizona State University, Case Western Reserve University, Princeton University, Reed College and the Darden School of Business at the University of Virginia) agreed to a pilot project using the Kindle DX for reserve reading purposes in a few classes. The National Federation for the Blind and the American Council of the Blind pursued legal action, arguing that use of the Kindle DX was in violation of the federal law that entitled vision impaired students to full and equal access. While there is a function on the Kindle DX that turns text into audio, it is not on the keyboard. Case Western Reserve reached an agreement with the Department of Justice to refrain from adoption of the electronic readers until such a time when it can be made more user-friendly for the blind (see http://www.ada.gov/case_western_univ.htm). A similar lawsuit against the University of Arizona was settled out of court. Such litigation suggests that libraries must be careful about using e-readers when striving to ensure accessibility for all students.

While some institutions have purchased e-readers and loan them to patrons, we feel there are too many problematic issues concerning technology and maintenance that hinder our ability to offer this service in a reliable, efficient, and cost-effective way. There are too many brands of hardware (Kindle, Nook, Sony, etc.) and proprietary software packages that staff would need to learn about. Some e-books aren’t available on any of these devices, or are available on some but not on others. Some publishers have licensing issues that restrict the e-book to single-use only, on one reader only, making it no more useful for a reserve class than a single print copy. There are concerns about books being
deleted and new books being added without the library’s knowledge. It is difficult to keep up with the market, given that e-readers change, new models are frequently introduced, and software is always being upgraded. That said, public services staff should be familiar with the Library’s e-book collections (e.g., ebrary, NetLibrary, HathiTrust) as well as be able to refer users to publisher’s help pages in response to queries about personal e-book readers.

IV. Recommendations

A. Phase in the use of e-reserves

Since the Physical Sciences Library relocated its reserve operations to other libraries in December 2009 and the Engineering Library followed suit in July 2011, patrons who relied on those physical reserve desks have been inconvenienced by the lack of proximity to physical collections in their subject areas. They would of course derive immediate benefits from having more of their reserve materials accessible online and available 24/7; however, preliminary studies indicate that only a small percentage (perhaps 12%) of books recently placed on reserve for Engineering and Physical Sciences courses is available online to institutions. The percentage of e-versions for titles on reserve at ILR, JGSM, and Hotel classes is slightly higher, but regardless of the relative availability of e-books among the disciplines the pressure to provide e-reserves will become more acute as more Cornell libraries close their reserve desks.

Given the complexities and challenges noted throughout this report, some of which are presently beyond the Library’s control, we believe that an incremental approach to implementing an e-reserve service would be the most practical course to follow. CUL’s transition from a mostly print-based to an e-reserve operation might begin in two phases:

1) Library Technical Services is developing a process to more efficiently manage the acquisition of e-books under multi-use licensing whenever possible for campus libraries wishing to purchase electronic editions. Beginning with the Fall 2012 semester, a pilot project to manage reserve requests for new titles not previously acquired for reserve could be initiated to test this process, with a group established to monitor and assess the workflow, timing, staffing, and costs involved.

2) For the Spring 2013 semester, we should begin a project to identify perennial, high-circulation Engineering and Physical Sciences reserve materials in print and transition them to e-versions if they are available to libraries, expanding to other units. We have purchased large e-book collections and are publicizing these to instructors. Like the circulation of library materials in general, reserve usage follows a “long tail” pattern of distribution, so concentrating on the most requested items would have wider positive effects.

While it is clear that the proportion of e-reserve materials offered by CUL is increasing and will continue to grow rapidly, many items currently placed on physical reserve (such as course packs, print journals, sheet music, DVDs) are not yet available to libraries in e-versions and may not be for some
time. As a consequence, the Library’s reserve service is likely to remain in a blended, multi-format state for the foreseeable future.

B. **Provide e-reserve training/education for CUL staff as well as users**

The implementation of any new service requires both staff training and user education. While we need to refine the work flow and timing between reserves staff and acquisitions staff from the time of the purchase request to the time of acquisition and use, we also need to be sure that reserves staff understand the process and are able to fully integrate it into their work flow. This will require a training session of some sort, perhaps an Access Services Forum dedicated to the topic, or training on an individual basis. Part of that training should include the use of the POOF form for ordering e-items.

Though CUL selectors have varying degrees of involvement in the ordering of e-reserves, all should have a basic knowledge of the process. System wide training and discussion venues such as those sponsored by the Selectors Continuing Education Committee and the Current Issues in Collection Development discussion group could offer programs on the subject of e-reserves.

Instructors and faculty also need to be aware of the availability of the library’s large and growing e-book collection, in the hopes that more existing online books may be chosen as reserve books. When notification emails go out each semester to instructors, we should consider adding language pointing to the appropriate CUL collections. Reserve staff can work with selectors to compose these emails. Many instructors are unaware of our digital book collections and in some cases would prefer to find online books over print one. Below is a sample communication to Engineering instructors:

**E-Books** - If you are interested in choosing electronic books for course reserve, here is a link to some packages and publishers we have: [http://engineering.library.cornell.edu/find/Electronic-Books](http://engineering.library.cornell.edu/find/Electronic-Books)

These include books by McGraw-Hill, CRC, Taylor & Francis, Knovel, Morgan & Claypool, Springer, Books24x7, and others. Individual titles should be cataloged in the library catalog, but sometimes there is a lag before the records are loaded. Email engref@cornell.edu with questions.

User preferences should be acknowledged and, where possible and practical, accommodated. If faculty and students dislike the e-version of a given resource, the library should not force that format as the only option.

A phased project as outlined above would allow acquisitions and reserve staff time to acquire the new (and demanding) skills they’ll need – refining procedures as they gain experience – and involve faculty and library selectors in the reserve processing cycle. This approach would also give us the opportunity to measure staff workload and develop a methodology for assessment.

C. **Participate in collaborative efforts**

Since the provision of e-reserves is an interest common to all academic libraries, we would seek out and welcome opportunities to work with other institutions facing similar challenges. Michael Cook and Deb Lamb-Deans have been invited to meet with the ETextbook Pilot group, which oversees an
initiative sponsored by Cornell Academic Technologies (see: http://blogs.cornell.edu/etexts/) for assessment purposes. We should also ensure that the Library is represented in other related campus efforts; for example, Oya Rieger is CUL’s representative on Cornell’s Learning Technologies Advisory Committee. Since the campus store is the enterprise unit that handles faculty packets and currently uses CUL licenses, we need to explore ways in which we might work together with them. Looking off-campus, Cornell’s ever-strengthening relationship with Columbia University through 2CUL might lay the groundwork for shared processing of e-books, a subject already being discussed by the 2CUL E-Books Task Force.

D. Create an E-Reserve Implementation Committee

The Task Force recommends that CUL establish an implementation committee charged with the following:

- implementing the pilot project
- implementing the second phase, working with appropriate collection development and access services staff in identified libraries, beginning with Eng/Phy Sci
- creating an incentive program to encourage faculty to use materials where the library currently has access rights (see http://tinyurl.com/6rswaw5)
- partnering with other agencies on campus to find a campus wide solution to this shared problem
- ongoing assessment and recommending course changes as needed

The membership should include staff from all functional areas concerned: technical services, access services, and collection development. Collection development members could be chosen by implementation phase and could rotate off when their unit/responsibility has gone through the process. In 2 years this committee will re-assess the situation and recommend further actions, if necessary.
Appendix A: Reserve Workflow
Appendix B : E-Book Workflow

E-book workflow  
2/27/2012

INITIAL ORDER [POOF, E-mail, Paper, etc.]

Search Voyager. Do we have a copy [in print or E]? \[YES\]

Ask Selector for info/advice, or check for default preferences.

NO

Single/Multi-user specified?  
(Reserves=multi-user)

NO

Yes

Single-User

Multi-User

YES

Check main vendor sites (GOBI/OASIS). Is it available at a good price?

Unlimited, or limited simultaneous use?

NO

Tips to remember:
- Request as much info from selectors as is necessary BEFORE ordering.
- Keep an accurate tracking file of your orders.
- Keep all Voyager records accurate and updated, including appropriate links and fields in the bib, and correct invoice status.
- If you have any questions, consult with Jim Speer, or an appropriate E-resources specialist.

*Cambridge UP, Elsevier (Science Direct), Gale, Oxford, Sage, and Wiley may have multiple user platforms for reasonable prices, even if order called for single-user.

Check OCLC for Bib that has a link to a provider. Is there one, OR did Selector suggest one?

Available From Ebrary, or a usable pub. platform? (Note rules on some publishers*)

YES GOBI

YES OASIS

YES BOTH

Order from best vendor/platform, noting price, access, and Selector preferences. Add/modify Voyager records appropriately.

NO

Check with E-Resources specialist on how best to proceed.

Contact EbscoHost to check availability, hosting fees, etc. Consult w/selector if necessary. Proceed with order if applicable. Add or modify Voyager records as appropriate.

NOT ONLY FROM EbscoHost/NetLib.
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Cornell Store Course Packet Information