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1. Purpose of Policy
Recognizing that electronic resources have different selection considerations (mode of access, multiple pricing options, hardware/software, etc.) compared to traditional library materials, this policy provides guidelines to the Library’s Electronic Resources Committee (LERC) for development of procedures to identify, evaluate, select, manage, and maintain electronic resources that match the academic profile of the University of Tennessee at Chattanooga and meet the educational, scholarly, and research needs of students, faculty, and staff.

The policy supplements the Library’s general Collection Development Policy and adheres to the basic principles therein.

2. Scope: Types of Electronic Resources
In general, electronic resources and services, as identified below and defined in Appendix I, will fall within the subject scope as described in the Library’s general Collection Development Policy. Both free and fee-based electronic resources, regardless of format, are included. For clarification purposes, a list of items not covered by this policy, and therefore not under the purview of LERC, is also provided.

Resources covered by this policy include:
2.1. Subscription Databases
2.2. Electronic Serials (includes journals and standing orders)
2.3. Electronic Books
2.4. Other Digital Media
2.5. Freely Accessible Web Resources
2.6. Subscription-based Electronic Services

See Appendix I for Definitions and Examples

Resources that will not be covered by this policy include:
2.7. Software accompanying traditional library materials
2.8. Multimedia (non-book) formats of traditional library materials (films in DVD or VHS format, books on tape, musical recordings, etc.).
3. **Responsibilities**

3.1. Ultimate responsibility for development and maintenance of collections at Lupton Library resides with the Library Dean, in cooperation with the Library’s Head of Acquisitions and Collection Development, Subject Liaisons, discipline faculty, and the Library Electronic Resources Committee.

3.2. Responsibility for development and approval of electronic resources is delegated by the Dean to the Library’s Electronic Resources Committee, which comprises members of Information Technology, Acquisitions, Reference/Instruction, and/or other Library departments, at the discretion of the Dean or the Committee.

3.3. Both LERC and Subject Liaisons are responsible for maintaining current awareness of university academic program changes, as well as new or revised product offerings from library vendors, by regular review of relevant publications (subject or library journals, meeting minutes) and discussion lists; attendance at university, library, and other meetings and conferences outside of UTC; other collection development-related activities.

3.4. The Library Information Technology Department, specifically the Electronic Resources Librarian, is responsible for coordinating trials; preparing and disseminating information regarding trials, new acquisitions, or important changes regarding electronic resources, as appropriate, to the Library and general campus; maintaining access to electronic resources; preparing and disseminating usage statistics. The Electronic Resources Librarian serves as the primary technical contact for vendor communications.

3.5. The Head of Acquisitions and Collection Development is responsible for coordinating the budgeting, ordering, and licensing activities related to electronic resources. The Head of Acquisitions and Collection Development serves as the primary business contact for vendor communications.

3.6. Subject Liaisons, as the Library’s subject experts, are responsible for:

3.6.1. assisting in the recommendation and selection of electronic resources, (fee and free),

3.6.2. participating and providing feedback on all trials related to their subject areas, involving assigned departments as decided by LERC (see Section 6),

3.6.3. leading Library staff in product training,

3.6.4. teaching users how to access and use electronic resources,

3.6.5. communicating the availability and promoting the use of electronic resources to their assigned departments.

3.7. Library Instruction faculty are responsible for working with individual departments regarding the specific needs of their students in accessing and using resources.

3.8. The Reference/Instruction Department representative to LERC is responsible for soliciting feedback from department members and reporting the results to LERC.

3.9. The LERC chairperson is ultimately responsible for ensuring that personnel are available to record, transcribe, and distribute the minutes for each meeting, since these minutes are a primary form of communication to Library faculty and staff.

These responsibilities may change from time to time, as necessary, to more effectively conduct business related to electronic resources.
4. **Product Assessment and Identification**

4.1. **Assessment for continuation or withdrawal**

4.1.1. LERC will review continuation of all resources annually, preferably a minimum of 2-3 months before the subscription’s expiration date, to determine if the product complies with factors listed in “Criteria for Product Selection and Review.”

4.2. **Identification of new resources**

4.2.1. All Library staff members, as well as UTC faculty, students, or staff, may suggest that certain electronic resources be acquired, withdrawn, or replaced by contacting any member of the Library’s Electronic Resources Committee or the Library Dean. It is recommended that these proposals be in written format and include justification for the request. Such requests will be forwarded to the chairperson of LERC for Committee review.

4.2.2. LERC members, through annual review of existing resources and from activities described in Section 3 (Responsibilities), will identify potential new or alternative resources and bring them to the attention of the chairperson. LERC may call upon Subject Liaisons to assist in this process.

4.2.3. LERC will maintain a “wish list” of potential resources for the collection, to be consulted when funding becomes available.

5. **Criteria for Product Selection and Review**

Primary criteria used to determine content relevance of electronic resources, including freely accessible web resources, will not differ substantially from those used for book or other formats, as defined in the general Collection Development Policy. A list of criteria to consider when selecting new or reviewing existing resources, although not all-inclusive, appears below. Additional criteria for freely available web resources appear in Appendix II: Selection Criteria – Freely Accessible Web Resources.

5.1. **Content Factors**

In general, decisions are based upon student and faculty needs.

5.1.1. Preferred content factors

5.1.1.1. Resource is of an authoritative quality,

5.1.1.2. Fills gaps in resources in order to meet the research needs of a substantive portion of students and faculty,

5.1.1.3. Provides full text access.

5.1.2. Coverage and currency are relevant to the subject matter.

5.1.3. Frequency of update should meet or exceed generally accepted standards.

5.1.4. Interface should be user-friendly.

5.1.5. Replacement of existing resources

5.1.5.1. When reviewing replacement of an existing electronic resource, all applicable factors shown under “Evaluation Process” should be considered.

5.1.5.2. When reviewing replacement of print materials, the electronic version should at least be equivalent in content (to include graphics, pictures, charts, etc.) and should offer a value-added enhancement that makes it preferable to its print equivalent, e.g., availability independent of time or location, greater functionality or ease of use, more up-to-date content, lower or no additional cost, etc.

5.1.6. Duplication of print resources

5.1.6.1. Duplicate formats are discouraged, but will be considered by LERC on a case by case basis.
Technical Factors

5.1.7. Preferred technical factors

  5.1.7.1. provides greater access over other formats,
  5.1.7.2. interface is user-friendly,
  5.1.7.3. meets technical standards of the industry (e.g., OpenURL),
  5.1.7.4. provides aggregated statistics, preferably Counter-compliant,
  5.1.7.5. access is IP-controlled,
  5.1.7.6. allows for an appropriate number of simultaneous users,
  5.1.7.7. compatible with existing hardware/software (Library and users) and is platform-independent,
  5.1.7.8. requires no additional hardware/software costs for majority of relevant users or the Library.

5.2. Pricing Factors

In general, pricing from vendors should be reasonable and competitive, when weighed against alternatives, value-added features, etc. LERC should pursue consortial or other cooperative collection development arrangements that offer reduced pricing without adversely affecting access or service.

Where free online resources are available equivalent to the print version, selection process criteria should be applied to determine if the free online resource should replace or duplicate the print version.

  5.2.1. Preferred pricing factors

    5.2.1.1. provides greater access over other pricing models or alternative products,
    5.2.1.2. minimal or no setup costs,
    5.2.1.3. minimal or no maintenance fees.

5.3. Licensing Factors

  5.3.1. Preferred licensing factors

    5.3.1.1. allows for ease of approval by all parties without compromising generally accepted business practices,
    5.3.1.2. places no restrictions that will prohibit the Library from meeting its interlibrary loan agreements,
    5.3.1.3. places no restrictions that will prohibit the Library from providing electronic reserve services,
    5.3.1.4. allows for termination rights appropriate for each party to the contract,
    5.3.1.5. provides for the protection of patron privacy and confidentiality.

5.4. Vendor Factors

Vendor exhibits the following characteristics:

  5.4.1. reputable, responsive, financially stable, innovative, competitively priced, as determined from practical experience, discussion list forums comprised of similar users, etc.,
  5.4.2. accessible, proactive, responsive, flexible customer service/sales and technical support,
  5.4.3. provides technical support and training at no additional cost for reasonable and generally acceptable types of requests.

5.5. Evaluation process

  5.5.1. It is LERC’s responsibility to use the above-referenced factors when considering new subscriptions, product renewals, or print-to-digital conversions.
  5.5.2. When available, resource usage data on existing electronic products should be used to help determine if keeping and maintaining access is justified.
  5.5.3. Informal or formal feedback regarding potential purchases, renewals, or print-to-digital conversions may be solicited, at LERC’s discretion.
6. **Product Trials and User Feedback**

The decision regarding whether to entertain a trial is the responsibility of LERC. Trial access to products is managed by the Electronic Resources Librarian (ERL). Short-term trials of solicited (new vendors for existing databases or new databases) and unsolicited (e.g., OVID site of the month) are covered herein, as well as longer term trials (e.g., Philosopher’s Index, 2005-06) where a subscription has been secured for a year or more to allow for more thorough review of the product.

Solicited trials, whether short term or longer term, should first meet selection process criteria defined in this policy. Unsolicited trials are approved by LERC on a case-by-case basis. These may not necessarily meet selection process criteria and may require additional information if presented to campus (such as feasibility of acquiring).

The scope of participation (campus-wide, specific departments, Library only) for any trial, whether short term or longer term, shall be made by LERC on a case-by-case basis.

6.1. **Trial notifications**

6.1.1. For campus-wide trials, ERL sends general notices to Library and campus, and posts information on the Library’s web page, as appropriate. For department-specific trials, ERL sends general notices to Library; Subject Liaisons are responsible for notifying appropriate academic departments of trials, as decided by LERC, and soliciting and encouraging department participation.

6.2. **Trial participation**

6.2.1. For campus-wide or department-specific trials, participation of faculty and students should be encouraged by directly contacting student groups and academic departments.

6.2.2. Library Subject Liaisons are required to participate and provide feedback on all trials related to their subject assignments.

6.2.3. Library faculty and staff are strongly encouraged to participate and provide feedback for trials.

6.3. **Feedback process**

6.3.1. Formal evaluation forms are the preferred method for obtaining feedback on solicited and longer-term trials and are at LERC’s discretion for unsolicited trials.

6.3.2. Feedback should be solicited on the content, coverage, ease of use, and other criteria deemed important for the resource (see Appendix III and IV).

6.3.3. In most cases, Library faculty will be required to provide more detailed evaluations than other campus groups.

7. **Product Approvals, Cancellations, Cessations, Changes, and related Notifications**

7.1. **Approval process**

7.1.1. LERC approves or disapproves new or existing products after review of compliance to content, technical, pricing, and licensing factors, as well as feedback from campus users or Library faculty.

7.1.2. If LERC does not reach a consensus during the review process, the Library Dean will decide the next course of action.

7.2. **Notifications**

Note: A workflow diagram is to be developed in 2007-08 to assist with the notification process internal and external to the Library.

7.2.1. In general, LERC meeting minutes will serve as the initial notification to Library faculty and staff regarding the status of new or existing products.
7.2.2. The Head of Acquisitions and Collection Development is responsible for notifying the Electronic Resources Librarian of information from the vendor regarding product availability. Electronic Resources Librarian is responsible for activating or de-activating access.

7.2.3. When a new resource is fully accessible on the Library’s website, the Electronic Resources Librarian will send formal announcements, as necessary, to Library and campus. Subject Liaisons are responsible for notification to their assigned departments (see Section 3.6). Where possible, resources should be implemented during time periods that will not adversely affect research needs of students.

7.2.4. If a product is not approved:
   7.2.4.1. Vendors whose products are not selected for acquisition or renewal should be notified of the decision on a timely basis. Where requested, a summary of feedback should be provided as a courtesy.
   7.2.4.2. Subject Liaisons (or other parties, if applicable) should notify departments or other participants who were specifically asked to provide feedback.

7.2.5. If a product is cancelled, ceases publication, or changes substantially:
   7.2.5.1. LERC will determine notification on a case-by-case basis to those external to the Library. Current internal notifications will be clarified with the development of workflow diagram noted earlier in this section.

8. **Budgeting and Allocation of Funds**
   LERC will review material expenditures v. available funds at least annually and at time of individual product renewals and conversions.

   8.1. **Sources of Funds**
      8.1.1. Base budget
      8.1.2. Other University funds
         8.1.2.1. Replacement of print resources (books, serials, reference materials) with electronic formats, whether free or fee-based, will generally result in the reallocation of funds into electronic resources budget lines.

9. **Cataloging of Electronic Resources**
   In general, the OPAC will include only those items paid for by UTC, such as individual e-journal titles, publisher or aggregator search page URLs (e.g., ACS journal package, Expanded Academic ASAP), electronic standing orders (CQ Weekly).

   More specific information is in Appendix I: *Types of Electronic Resources: Definition and Examples*.
   Also see Section 3: Responsibilities for information regarding teaching and promoting electronic resources.

10. **Policy Review and Revision**
    This policy will be reviewed and revised by LERC on at least an annual basis or as needed, to reflect changes in the emerging and constantly changing electronic information environment and in conjunction with revisions to the Committee charge or the general Collection Development Policy.
Appendix I: Types of Electronic Resources: Definitions and Examples

2.1. Subscription Databases

2.1.1. This category includes aggregated, bibliographic resources (e.g., citation indexes, such as Arts & Humanities Search and full-text databases, such as Project Muse, Wilson OmniFile) or non-bibliographic resources (e.g., image databases, subscription music services), regardless of format (CD-ROM, networked (LAN), Internet).

Approval: LERC approves all items in this category.

Notification (internal): Following approval and implementation, Electronic Resources Librarian is responsible for general notification of availability of new subscription databases to Library Faculty and for notification to Cataloging of title and URL to be included in the OPAC. External notifications are under Responsibilities (Section 3).

Cataloging: In general, all items in this category will be included in the OPAC.

Website Location: Electronic Resources Librarian will consult with Head of Reference/Instruction and Subject Liaisons regarding the placement of databases.

2.2. Electronic Serials

2.2.1. Individual e-journal titles (e.g., Israel Journal of Plant Sciences) and standing order subscriptions (e.g., CQ Weekly).

2.2.2. Publisher journal subscription packages (replacing print, print plus online, online only, etc.) (e.g., SAGE, ACS).

2.2.3. Publisher journal subscription packages PLUS free full text of additional titles (e.g., Emerald, Wiley).

2.2.4. Freely accessible journals: only if substantially all of the print version of the journal is available, ideally with an identifiable start date of coverage; may require some form of free registration before content can be accessed (free to all via Internet, e.g., Highwire Press, Cell Press, DOAJ).

Approval: In general, LERC will approve all electronic serials’ subscriptions.

Notification (internal): Acquisitions Department is responsible for notifying Electronic Resources Librarian and Cataloging on a timely basis regarding new online titles to be ordered from the subscription agent and changes to access terms for existing titles, including deletions. Electronic Resources Librarian is responsible for maintaining holdings records for online titles with the contracted link resolver vendor (e.g., Serials Solutions), for notifying Cataloging of access URLs, and for notifying Library Faculty of new e-serial titles. External notifications are under Responsibilities (Section 3).

Cataloging: In general, only subscribed journal titles will appear in the OPAC; however, additional full text titles that are made available as a package deal based upon one or more individual subscriptions (2.3.3, e.g., Emerald, Wiley) will be discussed on a case by case basis. Inclusion of a “search engine” URL for journal packages (Emerald, OUP) will be determined on a case by case basis. Subscription standing orders will appear in the OPAC.

Link Resolver (UTC’s TextLinker): The Library’s link resolver, TextLinker (Article Linker from Serials Solutions), is the primary access point for all journal subscriptions, whether electronic, print, or microform. Subject categories are assigned to each journal by the link resolver vendor and are available for use by Subject Liaisons in communicating journal availability to departments.

Website Location: TBD.
2.3. **Electronic Books**
The following electronic book types are in this category:

2.3.1. **E-books** include:

2.3.1.1. databases/packages (Netlibrary), where the majority of books, if ordered in print, would normally be housed in a circulating collection (e.g., Netlibrary).

2.3.1.2. individual title subscriptions (e.g., Patrologia Latina), which would normally be housed in a circulating collection.

2.3.2. **E-textbooks** include:

2.3.2.1. textbooks considered to be supplemental materials, i.e., not in current use, as determined to the best of our ability (e.g., STAT!Ref Nursing Textbooks).

2.3.3. **E-reference books** include:

2.3.3.1. the majority of items in an e-reference book resource, if ordered in print, which would normally be housed in a reference collection (dictionaries, bibliographic indexes, encyclopedias, etc.). Examples include subscription resources, such as Philosopher’s Index, Britannica Online, OED, Credo, Oxford Reference Online, Gale Virtual Library and free resources, such as Statistical Abstracts, Department of State Background Notes, Occupational Outlook Handbook. One-time digital purchases of e-reference books, such as Encyclopedia of Philosophy, will be considered by LERC on a case by case basis.

2.3.4. **Other digital reference tools** (e.g., RIA Tax Research)

**Approval**: In general, LERC will approve all electronic book subscriptions.

**Notification (internal)**: Acquisitions Department is responsible for notifying Electronic Resources Librarian of new or deleted titles a minimum of once per year, at time of individual or package subscription renewal, and when status changes. Electronic Resources Librarian is responsible for activating titles with the contracted link resolver vendor (e.g., Serials Solutions), when this feature becomes available for books, and for notifying Cataloging of titles and their URLs to be included in the OPAC. External notifications are under Responsibilities (Section 3).

**Cataloging**: In general, titles of individually subscribed e-books (2.4.1.2), subscription e-reference database names (Credo), and digital references tool names (RIA Tax Research) will appear in the OPAC; however, additional full text titles that are made available as a package deal based (e.g., individual titles in Xrefer, STAT!Ref Nursing textbooks, Netlibrary) will be discussed on a case by case basis.

**Website Location**: TBD.

2.4. **Other Digital Media**
The following items are in this category:

2.4.1. CDs and DVDs with an interactive component.

**Approval**: In general, LERC will approve items in this category on a case by case basis. Examples include Interactive Neuroanatomy (2005).

**Notification (internal)**: As applicable, Acquisitions Department is responsible for providing the purchased media to the Electronic Resources Librarian. Electronic Resources Librarian is responsible for overseeing the upload of the media, if appropriate. External notifications are under Responsibilities (Section 3).

**Cataloging**: In general, all items in this category will be included in the OPAC.

**Website Location**: TBD.
2.5. **Freely Accessible Web Resources**

LERC is responsible for content guidelines for the following types of freely accessible web resources. Guidelines appear in Appendix II: Selection Criteria: Freely Accessible Web Resources.

2.5.1. Online free bibliographic databases/indexes (Agricola, ERIC, PubMed, Alcohol/Problems (ETOH), HSTAT, Biomedicine Bibliography, Journalism & Mass Communication Abstracts, IMDB)

2.5.2. Online free image databases (e.g., NYPL Digital Library)

2.5.3. Online multimedia (streaming video, music) databases (e.g., Vanderbilt Television News Archive)

2.5.4. Other free, unique, non-bibliographic web resources (UN Official Document System (http://documents.un.org/), Terrorist Knowledge Base (http://www.tkb.org/Home.jsp), Census Data)

2.5.5. Other free, non-bibliographic web resources duplicating or replacing print at UTC (Statistical Abstracts, Occupational Outlook Handbook)

**Approval**: Subject Liaisons are responsible for selecting web resources that meet content guidelines approved by LERC (see Section 3: Responsibilities).

**Notification**: Notifications, internal and external, are under Responsibilities (Section 3).

**Cataloging**: In general, freely accessible web resources will not be included in the OPAC. Exceptions may include “Publisher Plus” websites that duplicate what we order in print; free government websites that replace print materials.

**Website Location**: TBD.

2.6. **Subscription-based Electronic Services**

As appropriate, LERC will work with other library committees (e.g., Web Committee, IT Council) to assist in identification, evaluation, and selection of system-wide finding aids or services such as the following:

2.6.1. Federated search systems (e.g., Central Search, Metalib)

2.6.2. Content sensitive linking systems (OpenURL) (e.g., SFX, Article Linker)

2.6.3. Responsibilities for identifying, evaluating, and selecting non-bibliographic services, such as Chat, 24/7 reference, document delivery, online catalog/integrated library systems, etc. will be determined on a case by case basis at the discretion of the Library Dean or IT Council, as appropriate.
Appendix II: Selection Criteria – Freely Accessible Web Resources

Selection Criteria
The selection of freely available websites for the UTC Library should follow applicable guidelines under “Criteria for Product Selection and Review” and as set forth in the general Collection Development Policy for books, videos, periodicals, reference tools, or other formats for the library’s collection. In addition, Subject Liaisons should also consider the following criteria when reviewing freely available web resources:

- The primary consideration for selecting freely accessible websites is the appropriateness of the resource for the academic curricula of the university.
- Content of the website should be authoritative in the subject area, as would be expected of books, reference resources, etc.
- Content should be attributable to an author, editor, editorial board, or publisher with credibility in the subject area presented. Anonymous or non-attributable information should not be considered.
- The website should reflect accurate and updated content to the extent necessary for the subject area. For example, health or technology-related sites should reflect frequent updates of new information because of the nature of their content, while websites about historical facts may not need to be updated as frequently.
- The primary language of search interfaces (and help screens, navigational information) should be English.
- The website should reflect some stability in availability, preferably with persistent URLs.
- Access to bibliographic information should be free. Ideally, there will be no advertisements, pop-ups, or registrations that will result in unsolicited or unsubscribed email.
- Information should be accessible with common or generally available software and equipment, e.g., for Macs or PCs, using PDF readers, such as Adobe, etc.
Appendix III: Feedback Form (Campus)

To be revised 2007-08.
Appendix IV: Feedback Form (Library Faculty)
To be revised 2007-08.
Appendix VI
Subject Liaison Guidelines for Core Resource Review

Purpose
The primary purpose of these guidelines is to provide Subject Liaisons with an outline for understanding and managing content and coverage in their assigned areas.

General Guidelines
Curriculum Requirements
Subject Liaisons are responsible for understanding the current curriculum requirements in their assigned subject areas. This is necessary in order to make a knowledgeable assessment of the existing collection and recommendations for changing or enhancing the collection to meet curricular needs. Resources that can assist in determining curricular needs include, but are not limited to:

- Review of catalog course descriptions.
- Review of departmental and individual course goals/objectives (meetings with faculty; reviews of syllabi, assignments, library instruction coursework, etc.).
- Review of accreditation agency requirements and reviews, if applicable.

Resource Review
Subject Liaisons are responsible for reviewing the existing library resources, regardless of format, to determine if primary finding tools (core resources) are being provided to meet curriculum requirements. Primary finding tools can be fee or free, print or online, and include A&I (abstracting and indexing) resources, individual journal titles or journal packages, aggregated databases, subject reference tools (e.g., encyclopedias and dictionaries), etc.

Recommended Sources for Subject-Specific Resources
Recommended sources of information for determining subject-specific resources include, but are not limited to:

- Library websites of universities with similar academic programs.
  - Contact academic departments for recommendations of well-respected programs.
  - If applicable, review accreditation agency websites for potential university names.
- Product information from websites, conference booths, discussion lists, etc. of the following:
  - Journal publishers (listings of packages).
  - Aggregators (database product listings).
  - Book publishers (e-book offerings).
- Reviews of electronic resources published in:
  - CHOICE.
  - Reference Reviews.
  - Other general library review resources.
- Subject-related and general discussion lists.
Electronic Resource Recommendations
Selection Criteria for Electronic Resources
In general, when selecting and recommending subject-specific electronic resources to LERC, Subject Liaisons should follow guidelines for “Content Factors” under “Criteria for Product Selection and Review” in the most current version of the Electronic Collection Development Policy, as well as general guidelines as set forth in the general Collection Development Policy for books, videos, periodicals, reference tools, or other formats for the library’s collection.

Product trials may assist with content evaluation. Contact the LERC chairperson to request a trial. Note that Subject Liaisons are required to provide feedback in trials affecting their departments, whether they specifically requested the trial or not. For more information, see Section 3: Responsibilities and Section 6: Product Trials and User Feedback.

Comparing title list may assist with content evaluation. Contact the Electronic Resources Librarian and ask if title analyses are available.

Procedure for Recommending Electronic Resources to LERC
Positive and negative recommendations should be submitted to the Chairperson of LERC in writing and include information that will assist LERC in determining priorities among all requests. Recommendations can be made at any time during the year.

- For comprehensive reviews, submit information per the sample spreadsheet shown at the end of this section, to include the following:
- Product name and name of vendor/publisher offering the product.
- Content type (full text, abstract, index, reference tools, free, other).
- How you learned about the resource (name of university website, name of faculty member who recommended, conference demo or brochure, unsolicited vendor contact, etc.)
- Justification for recommending or not recommending the resource. Refer to the Content Factors section of this policy for considerations that will help you make your case for why this resource should or should not be considered for subscription.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Product Name</th>
<th>Vendor Name[s]</th>
<th>Full Text</th>
<th>Index Only</th>
<th>Abstracts Only</th>
<th>Reference Tool</th>
<th>Free Resource</th>
<th>How you learned about the resource</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ethnic Newswatch</td>
<td>ProQuest</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Requested by Department</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>See attached recommendation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication &amp; Mass Media Complete</td>
<td>EBSCO</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Vanderbilt website</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>See attached recommendation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Communication with Vendors
In cases where vendors contact Subject Liaisons directly, whether at a conference booth or via unsolicited email, it is the Subject Liaison’s responsibility to advise the vendor of our resource review process, which is:

- Subject Liaisons review products for content applicability to our needs and should feel free to ask vendors about content information that will help them evaluate their products;
- Subject Liaisons recommend to LERC whether to trial or subscribe to the product;
• LERC reviews all recommendations for trials and subscriptions and will respond to the Subject Liaison questions or decisions. In most cases, LERC will assume vendor contact at this point.

Important Notes
• As a professional courtesy to colleagues, please do not forward unsolicited print product information from vendors to LERC members unless it accompanies your review and recommendation of the product.
• As a professional courtesy to colleagues, please do not give vendors the contact information for LERC members (or fellow Subject Liaisons) without first consulting with the LERC member or Subject Liaison.
• Please do not solicit quotes from vendors unless asked to do so by a LERC member. In most cases, the process will be more efficient if LERC requests quotes from its network of contacts (consortia, vendor reps, etc.) and its bank of information typically required to prepare a quote.
  o Unsolicited quotes should be treated as unsolicited product reviews: the Subject Liaison should review the product and forward the recommendation (for or against), along with the original quote, to LERC Chairperson.
Submit recommendations for electronic resources using this format in Excel spreadsheet.
To create your own worksheet for submitting recommendations, open a blank worksheet in Excel. Come back to this form and double-click on the table below. It should look like an Excel spreadsheet. Select the first row and right-click to copy. On the new, blank worksheet, right-click to Paste Special and select XML spreadsheet. You are now ready to edit/save.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Product Name</th>
<th>Vendor Name (s)</th>
<th>Full Text</th>
<th>Index Only</th>
<th>Abstracts Only</th>
<th>Reference Tool</th>
<th>Free Resource</th>
<th>How you learned about the resource</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
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**Examples**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Product Name</th>
<th>Vendor Name (s)</th>
<th>Full Text</th>
<th>Index Only</th>
<th>Abstracts Only</th>
<th>Reference Tool</th>
<th>Free Resource</th>
<th>How you learned about the resource</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ethnic Newswatch</td>
<td>ProQuest</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Department request. See attached recommendation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication &amp; Mass Media Complete</td>
<td>EBSCO</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Vanderbilt website. See attached recommendation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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