September 2007

ATG Annual Survey Report

Leah Hinds

Charleston Conference, leah@charlestonlibraryconference.com

Follow this and additional works at: <https://docs.lib.purdue.edu/atg>

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

Recommended Citation

Hinds, Leah (2007) "ATG Annual Survey Report," *Against the Grain*: Vol. 19: Iss. 4, Article 10.

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.7771/2380-176X.5100>

This document has been made available through Purdue e-Pubs, a service of the Purdue University Libraries. Please contact epubs@purdue.edu for additional information.

ATG Annual Survey Report

by **Leah Hinds** (Assistant Director, Charleston Conference; Phone: 864-353-1181)
<leah@katina.info> <leah_hinds@hotmail.com>

Endnotes

1. 17 U.S.C. § 107 and 17 U.S.C. § 108.
2. For more on Fair Use balancing and its First Amendment implications, see, **Bryan M. Carson**, Chapter 4 "Fair Use and Intellectual Property Rights," *The Law of Libraries and Archives*. Lanham, MD: Scarecrow Press, 2007.
3. House Report No. 94-1476, U.S. House of Representatives (1976), available at <http://www.rbs2.com/copyr2.htm>.
4. For more information on the brevity requirement, see Chapter 4 of *The Law of Libraries and Archives*.
5. Association of American Publishers, *Frequently Asked Questions about E-Reserves* (May 17, 2004). Available at: <http://www.publishers.org/about/pdf/E-ReserveFAQ.doc>.
6. **Basic Books, Inc. v. Kinko's Graphics Corp.**, 758 F. Supp. 1522, 1991 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 3804, Copy. L. Rep. (CCH) at 26709, 18 U.S.P.Q.2d (BNA) 1437 (S.D.N.Y. 1991).
7. Princeton University Press et al. v. Michigan Document Services, Inc., 99 F.3d 1381; 1996 U.S. App. LEXIS 29132; 1996 F.E.D. App. 0357P (6th Cir.); 40 U.S.P.Q.2D (BNA) 1641; Copy. L. Rep. (CCH) at 27,579 (6th Cir. 1996).
8. National Information Infrastructure Task Force Working Group on Intellectual Property Rights, *Conference on Fair Use Final Report*. Available at: <http://www.utsystem.edu/ogc/intellectualproperty/confu.htm>.
9. **Georgia Harper**, "Fair-Use Guidelines For Electronic Reserve Systems," *Copyright Crash Course* (March 5, 1996). Available at: <http://www.utsystem.edu/ogc/intellectualproperty/rsrvguid.htm>.
10. *Id.*
11. **Kenneth D. Crews**, "Electronic Reserves and Fair Use: The Outer Limits of CONFU," *Journal of the American Society for Information Science* 50 (December 1999): 1343, 1344.
12. *Id.*
13. **Georgia Harper**, "CONFU: The Conference on Fair Use," *Copyright Crash Course* (March 5, 1996). Available at: <http://www.utsystem.edu/ogc/intellectualproperty/confu.htm>.
14. The **International Coalition of Library Consortia (ICOLC)**, *Statement of Current Perspective and Preferred Practices for the Selection and Purchase of Electronic Information* (March 25, 1998). Available at: <http://www.library.yale.edu/consortia/statement.html>.

Bet you thought we'd forgotten the survey results this year! Delayed, but not forgotten, here are your 2007 Annual Survey results.

Against the Grain's Annual Survey is designed to provide readers with library information that is unavailable anywhere else. The survey is an opportunity for readers to give opinions and statistics concerning librarians and libraries around the world. Participants submitted their surveys either online, through the **ATG** Website, or by sending a hardcopy through snail mail or fax. The results were compiled from data submitted by 46 librarians, a number comparable to past years' participation (48 in 2006, 49 in 2005).

Budgets, pricing increases and salary decreases topped the list of **five things you are most concerned about in the industry in the 21st century**. 28.3% of respondents listed budget/pricing/salaries as their number one concern, followed by archiving (8.7%), access to online non-textual content collections, to tangible resources, or loss of (8.7%), the future role of libraries and/or librarians (6.5%), user's ability to find information, focus on user as researcher (6.5%), e-resource management (4.3%) and technology/staying current (4.3%). Six respondents did not answer this question (13%). The remaining 19.8% had varying answers, such as consistency in services provided, open access, and mergers/acquisitions in vendors and publishers.

The number two concern was again topped by budgets/funding issues (19.6%), followed by e-resource management (8.7%), over-reliance on eBooks/e-resources (6.5%), users ability to serve needs, patron avoidance, staying customer focused (6.5%), and open access (4.3%). 19.6% of respondents did not answer this question. The remaining 35.2% had varying answers such as licensing, dark archives, and the decreasing supply of librarians.

Concern numbers three through five were much more spread across the board, with fewer duplicate answers. Again, topping these lists, were budgets/funding/pricing issues, followed by staff training/library education, library relevance, information literacy and mergers/acquisitions in publishers and vendors.

Last year, concerns were topped by 1) budget and pricing issues, followed by 2) digital preservation, 3) search technology competition, 4) loss of experienced personnel and 5) the future role of the library.

Has your library bought eBooks? 67.4% of you have, 6.5% haven't, and 23.9% didn't answer. For those who do purchase eBooks, the average budget allocation is \$58,800. 45.5% of eBook purchasers said that their budget varies, so they couldn't

respond with a set dollar amount, and 54.5% didn't answer the question. Compared to the previous year's results, there is a marked decrease since 85% reported purchasing eBooks. Interestingly, even though fewer people reported buying, the budget allocation has gone way up. The dollar amount was an average of just over \$14,000 last year!

What functions has your library been outsourcing? 30.4% outsource your catalogs, approval plans are outsourced by 32.6%, and 26.1% outsource other items (such as binding, physical processing, and ERMS). No one answered that they outsource their acquisitions, and 15.4% didn't answer the question. These results are comparable to last year's, with approval plans at 38%, cataloging at 27%, and acquisitions at 4%.

Has your technical services operation been downsized in the past two years? 32.6% said yes, 34.8% no, and 32.6% had no answer. Of those who have been downsized, 15.2% have experienced a professional staff decrease, 17.4% have seen a decrease in para-professional staff, 4.3% have seen teams implementation, 6.5% have been merged with cataloging, and none have seen a merge with ILL. The remaining 8.7% answered "Other" with responses ranging from a decrease in student worker hours to the dissolution of a department head position. There was a significant change from previous years' results here: in 2006 56% were not downsized, and in 2005 that category included 60% of respondents. The effects of the downsizing, however, remain similar. Last year, 17% reported a professional staff decrease, 25% saw a para-professional staff decrease, 2% used teams implementation, and 15% reported merges with cataloging.

The **effects of being downsized** were split fairly evenly. 43.8% believe the effects have been positive, with comments such as "Greatly increased turnaround time from order to shelf. Higher profile for acq staff." and "While we have not been downsized, we have conducted extensive cross-training with improvements in efficiency and consistent acquisition practices." 56.3% say they've seen negative effects, with comments like "Increased backlog" and "Many things have been falling through the cracks."

Now for the budget section! Since they have consistently been first and foremost on the list of concerns, we have a substantial section of the survey devoted to budget issues.

In the past year, has your total materials budget increased or decreased? 50% of respondents reported an increase, 10.9% reported a decrease, and 39.1% did not answer. The average percentage of increase was 8.2, and average decrease was 5.75% overall.

In the past year, has your materials budget for books increased or decreased? 30.4% saw an increase, 28.3% saw a decrease, and 41.3% did not

continued on page 36

answer. The average approximate budget increase was 11.4% overall, and the average approximate decrease was 10.5%.

In the past year, has your materials budget for journals increased or decreased? 41.3% reported an increase, with an average approximate budget increase of 6.3%. 13% reported a decrease, with the average being 5.1%. 45.7% did not answer.

In the past year, has your materials budget for electronic resources increased or decreased? 52.2% of respondents indicated an increase, with the average percentage being 11.5%. 4.3% saw a decrease, with the average percentage being 5.5%. 43.3% did not answer this question.

What percentage of your total materials budget this year (2005/2006) is going to the following categories? (Please note: Since I'm reporting the average for the responses in each category, the total will not be 100%.)

Books – 22.8%
E-serials – 31.6%
CD-ROM's – 2.5%
Journals – 25.6%
Online resources – 21.9%
Other – 18.9%

In the "other" category, respondents specified microforms, copyright licensing, videos, binding, and education/curriculum DVD's. That brings us to the end of the budget section!

Do you have a homepage (work, personal, etc?) 21.7% answered yes, 37% answered no, and 41.3% didn't answer at all. This is a drastic change from previous results: in 2006, 88% reported having a homepage, 87% in 2005 and 81% in 2004. I believe the change comes from the wording of the question. This year, we added the word "personal," where before the question was interpreted to ask whether your library has a homepage.

Does your library use commercial document delivery or pay-per-view? 26.1% of respondents indicated that they do, and 30.4% said they do not. 43.4% did not reply. When asked to rate their library's document delivery system, 79% of this question's respondents rated it "Very Effective," while 21% deemed it "Not Very Effective." When posed the same question for their pay-per-view system, 14% rated it "Very Effective" while 86% answered "Other." Comments from those who answered "other" indicated they do not use pay-per-view.

Do you use ILL's or PPV as a concrete factor in purchasing decisions, i.e., do you purchase books and journals based on ILL statistics? 37% of respondents said yes, 17.4% said no and 45.7% did not answer.

Do you keep use statistics on electronic resources? 52.2% said yes, 4.3% said no, and 43.5% did not answer.

Does your library provide training for Library Technical Assistants (LTA's)? 54.3% of respondents indicated yes, 4.3% said no, and

41.3% did not reply. Some of the comments received were, "Varies by dept," "Formal for two weeks, informal over three months" and "Combination." LTA training has decreased from 88% last year, and 96% in 2006!

What type of training is provided? In-house classes by existing staff are utilized by 52.2% of respondents. Continued education courses in-house (with experts from outside the library) are provided by 23.9% of respondents' libraries. Satellite transmissions are used by 19.6%, while 30.4% fund travel to conferences, workshops, etc. and 10.9% fund credit courses. 4.3% of respondents indicated "other" and comments included "distance ed via Internet" and "state paraprofessional association conference."

When asked **"How are you dealing with more resources and more demands?"** the majority (56.5%) of respondents are absorbing the work into their current workflow. 2.2% say they provide essential services only, 15.2% teach the end user to do research on his/her own, and 6.5% send the user to another library. 8.7% indicated "other" and comments ranged from "Creating new workflows" to "Some things just don't get done." (Note: some participants indicated more than one response, so there isn't a total of 100% in the results.) Last year, the results were: 90% absorbed into current work flow, 2% reduced to essential services only, 29% taught end user to research on his/her own, 4% sent users to another library, and 31% responded "other."

Have you implemented paperback only approval plans, i.e., do you get paperbacks on approval instead of hardcover? 17.4% of respondents answered yes, 28.3% said no, 10.9% indicated they don't have approval plans, and 43.5% had no answer. In 2006, 12% had implemented paperback only approval plans, 52% said they had not and 33% did not have an approval plan.

Have you implemented paperback only for firm orders? 4.3% said yes, 17.4% said no, and 41.3% did not answer. This is a change from last year, when 25% said they had implemented paperback only for firm orders, 65% had not, and 10% did not answer.

Have you cancelled paper subscriptions in favor of electronic subscription to journals? 43.5% said yes, with an approximate dollar amount average of \$500,000. 13% said no, and 43.5% did not answer. Those who answered yes were asked **"How are you dealing with the issue of archiving the information?"** 19.4% answered that some other library will worry about this, 25.8% will keep electronic information in whatever format they acquire it, 19.4% are keeping paper for the present, and 35.5% answered "other." Comments in the "other" section were dominated by **Portico**, **LOCKSS**, and **JSTOR**. Other comments ranged from "Can't afford to consider this issue." to "A little of each of these."

Does your institution offer distance education? 41.3% of respondents answered yes, 15.2% answered no, and 43.5% didn't answer. Of those who answered yes, the location of the programs varied from "five sites in the state" to "worldwide." When asked **how their library**

supported distance education programs, there was a wide range of answers. Most were online resources, but other comments included "Not very well; this is something we're working on, but have been very short staffed due to vacant positions," all the way to "part-time librarian, email, remote access to resources, Websites." Last year, 65% said they offered distance ed, with the locations and support varying just as widely.

Is your library merged with your computer center? 6.5% said yes, 50% said no, and 43.5% did not answer. Most comments said that they have computer labs in their library, and others included "No – thank goodness!", "Some parts have merged, not all." 10% reported being merged in 2006.

When asked **"What type of librarian are you?"** we received the following answers:

Academic – 43.5%
Reference – 2.2%
Technical Services = 6.5%
Other – 4.3%
No Answer – 43.5%

Comments for the "other" section were "Health Services" and "No MLS, professional acquisitions staff." Last year, the percentages were 84% Academic, 2% Special, 10% Tech Services, 2% Government and 2% Other.

What library publications do you read? A whopping 100% of respondents read *Against the Grain*, 28.3% of you read *Choice*, 39.1% read *C&RL*, 10.9% read *Wired*, 43.5% read *Library Journal*, 6.5% keep up with *InfoTech in Libraries*, 13% read *Publisher's Weekly*, and 28.3% indicated "Other." There were zero responses for both *Internet World* and *LACTS*. In the "other" category, journals mentioned were *Educause*, *Chronical of Higher Ed*, *Information Outlook*, *JMLA*, *D-LIB*, *The Acquisitions Librarian* and various library blogs.

How many years have you been a librarian? Answers were pretty evenly spread across the field. 8.7% answered in the 0 – 5 years category, 13% were 6 – 10 yrs, 17.4% answered 11 – 15 yrs, 4.3% indicated 16 – 20 yrs, and 15.2% have been in the profession over 21 years. 41.3% did not answer.

Each year, we draw the name of a survey participant to win free registration to the **Charleston Conference**. Congratulations to this year's winner: **Peggy Sleeth**, Associate Director/Information Resources at **Dartmouth College Biomedical Libraries**. Good luck to next year's participants as we will continue this tradition for 2008!

And speaking of next year, **do you have questions for next year's survey? What information would be useful and interesting to you?** Let us know!!! Email questions or comments to me at <leah_hinds@hotmail.com> or call me at 864-353-1181. I'd love to hear from you!

In conclusion, a big "thank you" to all who participated! We really appreciate your input and hope the summary of the survey is helpful to you. For those of you who didn't complete a survey, please do so next year! *Against the Grain* readers want to know....