To begin, please let me thank ERMN for this opportunity to share our work. We are a team from Minnesota State University, Mankato, a regional public access university with about 14,000 full-year-equivalent students.

We recognize that it’s not always possible to follow along with a presentation, so we’ve also linked a version of this presentation here, and you’ll see the URL at the footer of this slide and the next few slides.
Local Dakota Land Map — downloadable visual and audio Dakota land maps of Minneapolis, St. Paul, and surrounding areas by local artist Marlena Myles

Why Treaties Matter — a comprehensive and thoughtful exploration of treaties and land theft in Minnesota. For our area, we recommend you begin by reading about the 1837 land cession treaties with the Ojibwe and Dakota, and the 1851 Dakota land cession treaties

Credit: https://ias.umn.edu/about/ias-land-acknowledgement

Please let me also take this opportunity to recognize that we live, work, and learn in the homeland of the Dakota people, and whose language frames our name—Minnesota State University, Mankato.
We’ll be talking today about our iterative and ongoing project to implement Alma licensing. Our presentation takes a panel approach,
so we’ll each provide different windows into various aspects of our projects. I’ll start by providing a brief background for our projects. Lisa Baures will demonstrate a tool she developed for training purposes, which has helped us to standardize our approach to journals licensing specifically. Pat Lienemann will provide an overview of our Alma licensing processes and procedures. Joe Holtermann will highlight several types of licensing documents. Finally, I’ll return to discuss the benefits of Alma licensing.
Our library migrated from the Aleph Integrated Library System (ILS) to Alma primarily in the academic years from 2019 to 2020. We did not use a dedicated license management system prior to the migration. We did use Serials Solutions to display selected public terms via link resolver menus, but we did not manage our licenses in Serials Solutions, so license management was not an early focus for us *in* Alma.
Outside of Alma, licensing has been an ongoing priority for the library for many years. We are in the Minnesota State system of universities and colleges. We must follow Minnesota law, Minnesota State system board policies, and university policies and practices as we pursue collection management. Speaking generally, we are required to pursue licensing steps with every vendor who supplies electronic resources, as well as other kinds of services. In addition, we are required to replace subscription licenses after their fifth year.
Lisa and I worked together in AY20 to conduct a comprehensive review of journals licenses. Lisa had not previously work on licensing, so our project involved several aspects, including training and documentation.

For the purposes of the review, I developed a list of all journals subscriptions and publishers for us to check for licensing, which you can see here – or maybe not – don’t forget that you can access a copy of this presentation at the link provided. Working together, Lisa and I developed workflows, decision-trees, vendor letter templates, and shared license term expectations.

Lisa and I worked together in AY20 to conduct a comprehensive review of journals licenses. Lisa had not previously work on licensing, so our project involved several aspects, including training and documentation.

For the purposes of the review, I developed a list of all journals subscriptions and publishers for us to check for licensing, which you can see here – or maybe not – don’t forget that you can access a copy of this presentation at the link provided. Working together, Lisa and I developed workflows, decision-trees, vendor letter templates, and shared license term expectations.
We were able to complete our AY20 journals license review successfully, but I had several concerns. I’ll focus on the three leaders. (1) I wanted to develop the capacity to track which licenses would need to be replaced in any given year at “the push of a button,” so to speak, so that I could work on license replacement without needing to do extra work either to look up license dates or to generate lists. (2) I wanted to be able to see all relevant license terms across all of the journals licenses. Not only would this allow me to pursue consistency across the journals licenses, but it would help me see specifically how to improve the licenses, because I could use the overview to identify preferred terms to pursue as benchmarks. I’ll talk more about the benefits provided by such an overview in the conclusion of this presentation. (3) We as a library needed to review our publicly displayed terms. These public terms are used internally, for example, for interlibrary loan purposes, but we are also contractually obligated to display certain terms. We hadn’t reviewed the list of public terms for at least several years.

The path forward was to pursue Alma licensing in a wider group.
Pat had entered numerous licenses into Alma immediately following the migration, but his focus was on the public terms as we had handled them in the old environment. Still in AY20, Lisa and I started meeting with Pat to talk about how to implement Alma licensing for license management and to re-visit our implementation of public terms. It quickly became apparent that we should also meet with Joe. Joe is responsible for licensing all resource types other than journals for our library, and we knew our implementation would need to account for a wider range of needs than just journals licensing ... so our group grew to four. This group met in the spring of AY20, then very often through AY21, leading into this year and this report on our progress.
The licensing group has discussed a wide range of licensing issues and questions, but a focus all along has been on the Alma implementation. We needed to agree on several basics, such as (1) license name and code conventions, (2) which license terms to track and which of these to display publicly, and (3) how to track these terms, with what variables.
We developed a first draft of Alma licensing guidance, borrowing a little bit from the University of Minnesota especially for license codes, and Pat entered dozens of licenses into Alma. This iteration of our project allowed us to test purchase order linking to licenses, to develop a draft overview report, and to see areas for improvement.
We developed a second draft of Alma licensing guidance in the spring of 2021 and this fall as I completed entering all active journals licenses into Alma. This guidance will continue to be refined and improved as we move on to pursue Alma licensing for resource types other than journals, as well as retrospective Alma licensing for all resource types. Pat will provide a glimpse of this guidance in his section. Now, though, please let me introduce Lisa Baures...
As previously noted, a decision was made to conduct a review of journal licenses and I volunteered to work on the project. New to the realm of journal licensing, my first instinct was to draw on the experience I acquired while working on the retrospective conversion of metadata from card catalog records to machine readable records. That experience deeply ingrained in me the benefits to be derived from applying the principles of standardization.
From a broad overview, standardization as a process for developing and implementing guidelines serves to promote compatibility, interoperability, and consistency. And a modular construct lends itself to the emergence of efficient workflows. Such an approach enhances the ability to change how various components of the standardization process are linked while the individual components remain unaltered. This flexibility accommodates opportunities to pursue any number of possibilities to improve on existing practices or inform the adoption of new technologies.
The benefits to be achieved from the standardization process cannot be realized unless procedures are established to document and share knowledge, otherwise known as codification. Without the systematic organization of methods, rules, etc. and an agreed upon nomenclature, it is not possible to fully benefit from standardization efforts.
The first step taken to move towards standardization of the journal licensing process was the creation of an Excel spreadsheet by the Collections Librarian. This spreadsheet included such information as:

(a) journal title;
(b) ISSN;
(c) journal publisher;
(d) name, email address, and telephone number of a contact person;
(e) contact dates;
(f) case number;
(g) availability of a license;
(h) date a license was received as well as the URL link for the license;
(i) date the license was forwarded to the Contracts Coordinator after review by the library; and
(j) a category for other information.
Although the Excel spreadsheet served as a tool to easily compile and provide access to information necessary to track the progress of a journal license, it did not provide a sense of how to navigate the licensing process. Identifying a means by which to provide documentation for training while accommodating the reiterative nature of the process presented a challenge. Integrating the functionalities of a content management system designed to curate, share, and publish informational content with those of flowcharts offered an option for addressing the challenge. Using the Springshare LibGuides application creates a container for documentation and flowcharts accommodate the reiterative nature of the licensing process while allowing the user to select from either sequential or nonsequential navigational paths.
When attempting to determine the parameters for authorized use of journal content—accessing, sharing, distributing, and storing—five possible options exist:

(1) a license is available,
(2) acceptable terms and conditions are available,
(3) terms and conditions are available but are unacceptable,
(4) Shared E-Resource Understanding (SERU) is used to license content, or
(5) neither a license nor terms and conditions can be found.
Determining the availability of a license, or in the absence of a license, an agreement delineating terms and conditions, governs the subsequent course of action in the licensing process. Consequently, a decision tree of sorts is required to determine how the library should proceed to complete licensing for a journal title. A rudimentary decision tree evolved and served as an embryonic outline for developing workflows for the licensing process.
Inflection Points

• Is a license available?
  Yes
  No, but an agreement delineating terms and conditions are available
    *Terms & conditions are acceptable
    *Terms & conditions are not acceptable
  No, neither a license nor an agreement is available
• If no license/agreement is available, was a response received to the request for a journal license?
• Based on the response received or lack thereof, how is the licensing process to proceed?

Inflection points in the decision tree for the licensing process were identified and a flowchart for each was developed delineating the appropriate sequential steps.
Within the flowcharts, links are provided to email templates. The various email templates serve as examples and identify key elements to be included in each type of correspondence. To anchor the process, within the various flowcharts is a link to benchmarks for reviewing journal licenses. These workflow charts are internal documents and are very much works in progress. If you would like to learn more about the workflow charts, please feel free to contact me.
Journal Licensing Review Process

Accessibility

- **Benchmark**
  - Are ADA issues and concerns addressed in the license?

- **Rationale**
  - By law the library is required to address ADA issues and concerns.

- **Desired Language**
  - The Subscriber may transcribe any portion of the Licensed Material into braille or enlarged type for Authorized Users who are visually impaired.

- **Accompanying Desired Explanation**
  - University and Library policies support the provision of accommodations to address the special needs of students with disabilities.

Since little has been said regarding the review of journal licenses, I would like to briefly outline the strategies adopted for determining if the terms and conditions as written in a license are acceptable. To facilitate the review of journal licenses, benchmarks are identified and phrased in the form of a question or questions. For each benchmark a rationale, suggestions for desired contract language, and an explanation for the requested desired contract language are provided. This information adds context, clarity, and norms to assist in achieving a certain level of consistency in the review of journal licenses. Originally conceived as a checklist, the notion of identifying guidelines for the review of journal licenses was expanded to encompass a perspective reflecting the nuances commonly associated with the application of legal definitions and clauses.
To conclude my section of the presentation and segue way into the next, the development of journal licensing documentation and workflows established a foundation from which the library could proceed to the next phase—the implementation of Alma for the management of journal licenses. I will now turn the presentation over to Pat Lienemann to discuss the issues and questions related to this phase of the journal licensing project.
For us, there were three phases of Alma licensing, illustrated by the complexity of the three types of license codes you see above:

- Phase 1) was the, “OH NO! This should have happened weeks ago!”
- Phase 2) was the, “Our license area looks like a disorganized mess – can it be a more organized mess?
- Phase 3) was “How can the licensing module actually be useful and worth investing our time in?”

Thank you Lisa.
Phase One)  Docuseek2  48504

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Provider Name</th>
<th>Local License URL</th>
<th>Authorized Users</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Provider Code</td>
<td>Physical Location</td>
<td>Authorized Users Note</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Database Name</td>
<td>Status</td>
<td>Concurrent Users</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Database Code</td>
<td>Reviewer</td>
<td>Concurrent Users Note</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Database Status</td>
<td>Reviewer Note</td>
<td>ILL General</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Title Name</td>
<td>License Replaced By</td>
<td>ILL Secure Electronic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Title Id</td>
<td>License Replaces</td>
<td>ILL Electronic (email)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Title Status</td>
<td>Execution Date</td>
<td>ILL Record Keeping</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prevailing</td>
<td>Start Date</td>
<td>ILL Record Keeping Note</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>License Name</td>
<td>End Date</td>
<td>Perpetual Access Right</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Origin</td>
<td>Advance Notice in Days</td>
<td>Perpetual Access Note</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>License Id</td>
<td>License Note</td>
<td>Perpetual Access Holdings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type</td>
<td>Date Created</td>
<td>Archiving Right</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vendor License URL</td>
<td>Last Updated</td>
<td>Archiving Format</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vendor License URL Date Accessed</td>
<td>Template Note</td>
<td>Archiving Note</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Phase 1) Alma Licensing started for us over a short period around the time we went ‘go-live’ during the Alma migration all Minnesota State libraries did several years ago. It came to my attention something was off when our ILL department asked where they can find the ILL terms in the new ILS.

It was my first year as a librarian on campus, and although I knew licensing was in my job description, it was essentially an ‘out of sight/out of mind’ type of deal. I hadn’t known that Serials Solutions was utilized by ILL for identifying sharable materials and that I should have checked to see if the data had migrated to Alma. But we were migrating after one semester into my first academic year, and I was focusing on learning Alma and tried to learn as little about Serials Solutions as possible. I downloaded all the ERM data as a backup and we still had continued access to Serials Solutions – it just needed to be ported into Alma.

I chose the simplest (but not necessarily the most uncomplicated) solution and manually copied whatever active license data was from Serials Solutions into Alma. The above table shows most of the data fields that were available – not all of them were necessarily populated within Serials Solutions when past license data was entered into the ERM. So the first phase specifically focused on the yellow highlighted terms (authorized users, concurrent users, ILL options). It was the bare minimum, but it was ‘good enough’ for ILL purposes and that was the conclusion of that phase.
Phase 2 was initiated after a visit to Wilson Library that spring – the University of Minnesota had already transitioned to Alma before us and was willing to share what they learned – which was really cool & helpful. My major take-away was their use of license codes and naming conventions to provide a clear data architecture (especially when you are looking at data directly in Alma and not pulling reports/exporting into excel).

In the above screenshot you’ll see many of those elements: the use the full name of the product, placing the university code within the license code, year of license, year of amendment, the way the amendments follow the licenses...

After adapting this data structure, I completed another phase of the project: inputting most of our licenses and terms into Alma, both active & historical (with special emphasis on getting the licenses and amendments correctly related).
And then finally phase three started when this licensing group decided we were going to schedule a couple hour-long working meetings to finalize which terms we needed to track and optimize the setup for all our different purposes...

After spending the first couple weeks discussing only a handful of terms, we realized it was going to be a more comprehensive process. We ended up holding weekly sessions for an entire semester to develop this tailored approach for us to utilize Alma licensing.

This screenshot is just an example of some of the terms we do track, including what type of input each field allows (one of the best things we did right away was create controlled vocabularies for our own use). This screenshot also shows some of the definitions and guidance on how to input different cases – which is really what we were developing over the course of the semester.
One of the simplest yet most impactful changes we made during Phase Three was tweaking Minnesota’s naming convention. Whereas they needed to label licenses based on campus or library, we only license for our one university. However, we do differentiate our materials based on the committee – either our Journals Review Committee, the JRC, that Nat leads or our Collection Development Committee, the CDC, that Joe leads.

So now we start the code with the committee’s initials and it just takes a simple search to pull up each committee’s licenses.
Once our discussions stabilized (we know this is going to continue to be an evolving process), we were able to restart adding licenses to Alma and cleaning up already inputted licenses.

Switch to Alma instance: Example CD_Sage

I just wanted to briefly walk you through our input process:

• Summary Tab [skipping some non-mandatory fields at this time]
• Uploading an OCR scanned copy of the license.
• As much as possible we like to copy and paste directly from the pdf copy of the license – especially for contractual obligations or just make those public viewable terms really clear for our colleagues.
• Additionally, we like to reference section letters/numbers for those specific details we’d want to read directly from the license (Another nice aspect of the Alma license module, is that we can attach the pdf directly within Alma – making this referencing very convenient).
• PO Lines
• Inventory

Amendments
Using the amendment function: terms follow form base agreement but easily customizable if the amendment is different.

As I mentioned a minute ago, we are utilizing Alma licensing for all our electronic resources. Joe Holtermann is going to be speaking next on how we manage some of the complexities involved in the non-journal materials we license.
Agreements, amendments, exhibits, etc.

In addition to—
• workflows for current licensing,
• managing projects related to our new and ongoing license agreements, and
• entering licenses and their terms into Alma,

our implementation of licensing in Alma includes a variety of resources and a variety of licensing documents.

In this portion of our panel discussion, I would like to highlight several ways that we work with a variety of resources and a variety of licensing documents.
Types of resources

- Abstracts and indexes
- Reference sources (such as encyclopedias, handbooks, etc.)
- Ebooks (individual titles and collections)
- Digital archival collections
- Streaming video (individual titles and collections)
- Databases of various kinds
- Aggregators (A & I, with selected full-text)
- Access fees (for services, as well as information resources)

Like many libraries, our collections include an increasing number of electronic resources that require licensing – including traditional A & I resources, ebooks, digital archives, and other types of databases.
Purchasing models
- Subscriptions
- One-time purchases
- Hosting fees
- Collections
- Individual orders, or a la carte selections

Access periods
- Annual
- Perpetual access rights
- Limited terms (i.e. 3-year streaming access)

We acquire access this variety of resources through several different purchasing models.

And we acquire access for different periods of time — annual, in perpetuity, or for defined periods, such as 3-year streaming access.
Common licensing documents
- License agreements (for individual resources)
- Master license agreements (for multiple resources and/or resource types)
- Amendments (or addenda)
- Exhibits or schedules (within agreements or amendments)
- [Purchase order letters] (that refer to license agreements)

As we work with this variety of resources, purchasing models, and access periods, we encounter several common types of licensing documents. These include license agreements for individual resources, master agreements, amendments, and exhibits or schedules that could be part of either a license agreement or an amendment.

Ordinarily, we receive draft license agreements from vendors and begin our review and negotiation from those documents.

We also follow the recommendations of our Contracts Coordinator. For example, we maintain title lists for some resources in license exhibits, when appropriate.
**Licensing documents & order records (POLs)**
- License agreement – for a subscription
- License agreement – for multiple subscriptions
- License agreement – for a one-time purchase
- License agreement – for a one-time purchase + a hosting fee
- License agreement with an exhibit – for individual titles
- Amendment with a revised exhibit – for additional titles
- Amendment – for related resources, with additional terms and conditions
- Master agreement – for a combination of resources
- [Purchase order letters] – that refer to a license agreement

Together, a list of common licensing documents and associated order records ("purchase order lines" or POLs) that we need to implement in Alma might look something like this—

In addition to agreements for subscriptions, we also work with agreements for one-time purchases, for hosting fees, for individual title purchases, and for some library services.
In most cases, POLs can be linked directly to the appropriate license agreement in Alma when creating or editing a POL.

More than one POL can be linked to a particular license, when appropriate.

Different types of POLs can also be linked to a particular license. For example, a POL for a one-time purchase and a POL for an annual hosting fee can be linked to the same license agreement.
Alma’s functionality for amendments also allows us to create a second (or third) licensing document based upon an initial license agreement.

In our library, one of the common reasons for an amendment is to acquire additional content. For example, we may acquire more than one digital archival collection from a single vendor.

In this hypothetical example, the order records for Digital Archival Collection A are linked to the initial license agreement. The order records for Digital Archival Collection B are linked to the amendment. Although they were purchased at different times, the collections share the same terms and conditions.
Viewing a similar example in Alma, the initial license for the archival collection African-American Communities (from the provider Adam Matthew) has been amended to acquire a second collection, American Indian Newspapers.
The Alma functionality for amendments can be implemented in a couple of steps.

Once an initial license agreement has been established in Alma, the “Create amendment” function duplicates a selected license.

Overwriting the information on the “Summary” tab allows us to assign the correct signature date and other new information. Then saving creates a unique amendment.

The amendment contains the same terms and conditions as the initial license. Or if there are new or different terms, they could also be updated prior to saving.

When saving, we try to follow a consistent naming convention for amendments.
We also acquire individual (or *a la carte*) titles from some vendors. For example, we can acquire major reference works this way. The electronic portfolios are localized in Alma and in some cases the individual titles are identified in a license exhibit.

When our library acquires additional titles at various times, an amendment can update the title list through a new or revised exhibit. In this hypothetical example, an initial license identifies three titles and the subsequent amendment provides for two additional titles.

A series of amendments can maintain an ongoing entitlement list with our library’s holdings.

Note – When managing title lists, our needs vary depending on the types of resources. For many collections & databases, we don’t need to track the titles in a licensing document. Many collections of titles are pre-defined by a vendor and described in detail in the Alma community zone.
Additional a la carte titles

Amendment [2018]  
with Exhibit A-2  
Newly purchased titles (Start date - 10/15/2020 / End date - 10/14/2023)  
• Title 4 (POL 535)  
• Title 5 (POL 536)  

Previously purchased titles (Start date - 2/1/2018 / End date - 1/31/2021)  
• Title 1 (POL 421)  
• Title 2 (POL 422)  
• Title 3 (POL 423)

For some resources, a series of licensing documents allows us to review and reconcile our title lists over time. This method can be especially helpful when we acquire access for limited access periods, such as 3-year access for streaming videos, that are specified in the purchasing process.

In this case, the access periods can be identified with the title list in an amendment.

In Alma, the order records can be linked to each amendment as they occur.

Note – Of course, there are limitation to this method too. It could be challenging to keep up with amendments and exhibits for frequent purchases from a single vendor. Even a relatively simple amendment requires review and preparation. Also, some vendors do not work with amendments, exhibits, and title lists in this way.
When acquiring content with a purchase order letter, we refer to our current license agreement.
In this case, POLs can be linked directly to the license agreement in Alma. And the purchase order letter can be attached to the POL, as a record of the purchase and a reference to the license agreement.

Attachments – whether to order records or to invoices, are a useful function in our implementation of Alma.
A couple of challenges
• Migrated POLs – Physical inventory
• Updating / replacing licenses

In summary, our implementation of the Alma functionality for licensing allows us to handle a variety of circumstances and the related licensing documents.

We are not recommending one method or another for licensing specific resources. We review and negotiate the draft documents provided by vendors in cooperation with our campus Contracts Coordinator.

We do anticipate a couple of challenges ahead—

Some of our migrated POLs that originated in Aleph contain a PO Line Type for physical inventory. We haven't found a way to include these POLs in Alma licensing functions.

We also anticipate replacing our current licenses with new and updated agreements. This will be a future project to consider.
I’ll conclude our presentation by talking about some of the benefits provided by our projects. And yes, this slide is for the cute factor, but maybe there’s something to do here about the value of our industry.
In the first place, we’ve improved our public display of license terms, which is often a contractual obligation – and we’ve identified follow-up steps to ensure that our ILL office is complying with our license requirements.
In the second place, it seems that we can use Alma licensing to some extent for license workflow management, to the extent we can enter drafts and refer to those drafts during the license negotiation process.
However, I can’t search by license status or review status in Alma, so I continue to fall back on simpler approaches, like this table, to see what licenses are currently under negotiation and where they are in process. Honestly, though, when I get questions either from the university contract coordinator or the vendor, I still tend to go straight to the license, rather than the license record in Alma, although my behaviors might evolve.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>License</th>
<th>Sent to Diane/ Other</th>
<th>Complete</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ACM</td>
<td>12/11/2020</td>
<td></td>
<td>Vendor said they will sign once I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AIP</td>
<td>10/7/2021</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual Reviews</td>
<td>SERU</td>
<td>10/13/2021</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APS Quote</td>
<td>11/19/2021</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cambridge</td>
<td>10/1/2021</td>
<td></td>
<td>Ready to execute 12/8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comparative Politics</td>
<td>No License</td>
<td>10/25/2021</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emerald</td>
<td>10/13/2021</td>
<td>11/9/2021</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human Kinetics</td>
<td>Sent by Lisa Feb, 2020</td>
<td></td>
<td>Sent reminder, 9/9/21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JAMA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>GET NEW in March or April</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minneapolis St. Paul Business Journal</td>
<td>No License</td>
<td>10/1/2021</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minitex Library Consent Agreement for Elsevier</td>
<td>12/9/2021</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ovid: Circulation</td>
<td>7/20/2021</td>
<td>9/9/2021</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ovid Itemized Journals</td>
<td>10/20/2021</td>
<td>10/29/2021</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oxford</td>
<td>10/20/2021</td>
<td></td>
<td>Diane sent final to Susan 12/13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SBJ</td>
<td>10/13/2021</td>
<td></td>
<td>Revisions accepted 11/12; inquir</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
I am most impressed by the capacities we’ve gained for license management.

As I mentioned in the Introduction, my personal goals for this project were to gain the capacity to track which licenses would need to be replaced in any given year at “the push of a button,” and I wanted to gain an overview of all relevant license terms across all of the journals licenses.

I can now accomplish both of these goals by running reports from Alma Analytics, although I do prefer to work with the outputs in Excel, which is more useful for combining results and easier to use for practical follow-up.
My basic approach right now is to run two Analytics reports. The first is a list of all active journals-related purchase orders, which includes the license, if it’s been linked. There can be multiple reasons why I don’t have one linked, but this first report could be used to get a sense if any basic license maintenance work is needed. I apologize if the table is too small to make much sense of – please remember that this presentation is available via the link at the bottom of this slide.
The second basic Analytics report I run is just a list of all of the licenses, their terms, and the term values. This version is inconvenient because the term values are listed vertically. It is possible to construct the Analytics report so that the terms are listed horizontally, so that there would be just one row per license, but the process to create the report would be tedious, and I think it’s just easier in Excel, where it takes about a minute or two to produce the same result, and by moving the list to Excel, I gain Excel’s flexibility and power for further analysis.
See Action Demo

Very quickly, please let me just point out that I can combine the two basic analytics reports. Here we see license terms at the purchase order level. You can see there are a very large number of terms. Basically, I’m just using a Boolean Filter formula to look up the values.

Or we can view license terms at the license level. One use of this report is to monitor which licenses will need to be replaced. Under Minnesota State Board Policies, we can’t have a subscription license for longer than five years, so it’s very handy to use this report to see which licenses are expiring and to get an overview of the terms which might require attention. You can also get a sense here how we can use this report to focus negotiation efforts. For example, I started eliminating confidentiality or non-disclosure clauses about two years ago, and you can see here exactly how much progress I’ve made. I can also use this information for future negotiations, to let other vendors know that their peers have complied with this request.
Next Steps

Immediate Next Steps:

1. Ensure we have agreement about reasonable time-period for license entry in Alma licensing workflow
2. Ensure we have agreement about how to use License End-date
   a. Ensure we have agreement about end-dates for ‘No-license’ license records
   b. (Longer term: Develop process for reviewing No-licenses)
3. Review Statuses of all entered licenses
   a. Ensure we have agreement about schedule to update Statuses annually
4. Is retrospective licensing complete? If no, what steps are necessary?
   a. What are the follow-ups for license storage (hard copies, personal copies, etc.)?

Future Agenda:

1. POL & E-Inventory License Linking Review
2. License term review projects
   a. Review any granted PCA rights that are impractical and change accounting accordingly
   b. Review all licenses for any restrictions beyond typical Commercial Use limitations
   c. Review all licenses for user definitions
      i. Expand user access (see Lisa’s question about COB seminars)
      ii. Expand user access for 24/7 reference librarians
   d. Review all licenses for preferred terms
      i. ADA/ Accessibility compliance
      ii. Data mining rights

We have discussed numerous next steps as a group, and there are too many to present here. In the big picture, an early priority is to use the reports to understand the variety of terms across our licenses, both to improve the consistency of our licenses and to identify preferred terms to seek across all licenses.
Let me provide a brief example of how this can work. I attended a webinar on data privacy recently. During the webinar, I was able to look across all of the data privacy terms included in the journals licenses and I was able to find the best term among the set. I contributed that term to the live webinar conversation about data privacy terms. As a further follow-up, I have since started asking for this preferred term for any new licenses, even if there is a reference in the contract to the MN Data Practices Act, because I don’t think the reference to the Minn DPA is explicit enough to provide guidance or assurance either for our vendors or the library. As I run these reports over time, I should see my preferred data privacy term showing up across more and more licenses.
Thank you!

• Nat Gustafson-Sundell, gustan2@mnsu.edu
• Lisa Baures, Lisa.Baures@mnsu.edu
• Pat Lienemann, Pat.Lienemann@mnsu.edu
• Joe Holtermann, Joe.Holtermann@mnsu.edu

Put briefly, we have gained more power to manage our licensing effectively and more efficiently. We can also monitor and pursue preferred terms confidently as our needs continue to evolve, so we can now track and negotiate more terms more effectively. We look forward to the next steps in our project as we continue to improve our licensing practices and our policy compliance.