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Background: Georgia Southern University Libraries

- Georgia Southern University
  - Public R2 in southeast Georgia
  - 26,000 students (+/-)
  - 141 degree programs
  - 3 campuses

- University Libraries
  - 2 libraries (Savannah & Statesboro)
  - 70 FT & PT personnel
  - 25 faculty librarians
  - 860,000 volumes
  - 95,000 journals
  - 296 databases
  - Member of GALILEO
Background: Discover @ Georgia Southern

- **Discover @ Georgia Southern**
  - Adopted 2012, no prior discovery
  - Alma / Primo catalog
  - Digital Commons IR
  - Alma Link Resolver (ALR)
  - ILLiad via ALR & custom link
  - AiLC limiter enabled by default
  - Auth: IP / Guest / OpenAthens
  - Express links disabled

- **Content**
  - EDS databases enabled: 232
  - Full text results: 450 million
  - Total results: 1.45 billion
Background: Metadata Mayhem

- First Try: New content automatically enabled
- Second Try: Enable all Open Access content
- Third Try: Intentionally curate, OA or not
  - Overall Metadata Quality
  - Likelihood of ILL Fulfillment
  - Value to the Collection

“Water! Water! Everywhere; and not a drop to drink”; anon., 1849. Credit: Wellcome Collection  CC BY
Background: Metadata Mayhem

- **Overall Metadata Quality**
  - Are the records well described, indexed, & maintained?
  - Do the access points work?

- **Likelihood of ILL Fulfillment**
  - Does the metadata populate to ILLiad?
  - Is the metadata adequate to locate the resource?
  - Is the resource likely to be filled?

- **Value to the Collection**
  - Is the content of appropriate quality?
  - Does the content align with reference & instruction?
  - Does the content rank appropriately?

"Water! Water! Everywhere; and not a drop to drink"; anon., 1849. Credit: Wellcome Collection CC BY
Curation Workflow: Enable Trial Databases

- Accumulate EBSCO’s *Content Update Newsletters* until 5-10 new databases become available.
- Activate all new databases in the live EDS profile.
- Configure custom links for OA databases only.
- After the profile updates, schedule a meeting of technical services & ILL personnel to review the results.
Curation Workflow: Metadata & ILL Review

- Search “FT Y OR FT N” & filter results for each trial database.
- Review quality/completeness of metadata & indexing for language, AiLC limiter filtering, etc.
- Test population of ILLiad form via link resolver & custom link.
- Discuss likelihood of fulfillment:
  - Unsubscribed content
  - OA results
Prepare a survey for the liaisons to review each trial database for quality, alignment, & relevance ranking.

Ask whether each database should remain enabled or be disabled.

In the survey, include:
- Description of the database
- Description of the results
- Visibility of OA/FT resources
- Likelihood of ILL fulfillment
Curation Workflow: Liaison Review

- Give the liaison librarians 2-3 weeks to complete the survey.

- Include a mechanism for liaisons who claim unique subject area overlap to weight their score.

- Provide instructions for how to conduct the search & filter results to each database.
Curation Workflow: Liaison Review

- When the survey closes, analyze the liaisons’ feedback.
- In this example:
  - Technical services and ILL personnel recommend the database be disabled due to poor metadata quality & low likelihood of fulfillment.
  - 83.3% of all liaisons (n=6) recommend the database be disabled.
  - Liaisons claiming unique subject area overlap (n=2) are evenly divided.
Metadata Curation: Deactivate & Monitor

- After analyzing the liaisons’ feedback in context of technical services & ILL’s recommendations, prepare a final set of recommendations for approval by the library faculty.

- Based on the faculty’s final approval, disable any ‘rejected’ databases.

- All library personnel monitor & report any access issues through established troubleshooting channels.
Outcomes: Lessons Learned

- Since Late 2015:
  - 17 database reviews completed
  - 156 unsubscribed & OA databases reviewed
  - 65 databases permanently enabled
  - 92 databases disabled

- Most liaisons follow technical services & ILL’s recommendations; however, they diverge enough to make the effort worthwhile.

- No permanently enabled unsubscribed or OA databases disabled since review!
How often (and to what extent) should we review **ALL** of our enabled databases & custom links?

- Metadata quality & indexing
- OA status
- Custom links
- Relevance to reference & instruction changes
Thank You!
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