**Evidence for Scholarship**

My scholarship has related closely to my library responsibilities and the concerns and experiences of our users. First, how can we make the links from user to full text articles work better? Second, how likely are you to find an open access, post-peer review version of the article you want? How do our researcher-authors make their articles open access? Third, how do users experience ebooks, in particular, EBSCO ebooks? And how can we encourage quick, focused analyses of ebook quality?

**Indicator #1 --** Link resolvers

With my colleagues Megan Johnson and Andie Leonard, I co-authored the peer-reviewed, scholarly article, “Deciding to Change OpenURL Link Resolvers,” published in the Journal of Electronic Resources Librarianship. The processes described in the article have been important in giving our users the most direct access possible to full text journal articles. The barriers between (1) search and identifying articles that might meet the searchers’ needs and (2) then getting the full text of the articles, are challenging. The paywall barriers are intentional, and they also fail in a variety of ways. Having an effective link resolver system is essential. This is especially true for off-campus users and for secondary sources of full text. Secondly, one takeaway of the article is that users just want full text, and you help them by simplifying success and failure in that one task. Complex pages of alternative options, including librarian help, are not welcome.

This case study was important for my library practice. We became much more knowledgeable about the technologies and obstacles involved in delivering content and much less accepting of failure. This was also a taste of usability testing and getting closer looks at the user experience.

I was fortunate to work with my colleagues Johnson and Leonard, with whom I had served on the early WebBridge working group and later as part of WebBridge vs. LinkSource decision-making.

**Indicator #2 –** Open access and delay

I presented “Delays in Availability of Faculty Journal Articles : Local Effects of Open Access Policies,” a refereed research poster at the Medical Library Association Annual Meeting 2016, Toronto. This was an international joint meeting with the Canada Health Libraries Association and the International Clinical Librarians Conference. I also presented on a related topic at the regional Medical Library Association meeting, and it won third place among research posters. I gave a talk on a related methodological problem and sampling techniques at a regional conference at North Carolina A&T University.

There are problems both for authors and readers. Readers need access to the full text of articles that appear might be relevant for their needs. Many readers have little access behind subscription paywalls. Other readers have access to immense journal content, but not for the one that they are ready to read right now. The quintessential case is the author who cannot read their own article. At the same time, many authors want to make their work available to a wider range of readers, including readers who should have immediate access, if only this interface linked smoothly to the next interface.

I was inspired by the 2013-2014 reports for the European Commission that estimated that about 50% of recently published journal articles were (by some definition) open access, through a variety of processes. I found this surprisingly high. My projects measured open access availability and delay among published articles at Appalachian and two peer institutions. My small-scale estimates suggested that the global estimates were plausible. The survey also showed that variation in open access could be found across seemingly similar institutions and that it was supported by a variety of venues, led by ResearchGate and clearly not by institutional repositories. (ResearchGate has since had to remove many full text articles, in response to litigation. The proportion of articles that are open access appears to have fallen, but it is not clear how much of this effect is due to ResearchGate alone.)

These insights have been valuable for me as consultant for students, for my role as liaison and consultant for authors, and for my work in collection management. A range of big data studies have been presented and published since my estimates of 2015-2016, and now you can get good, though still not perfect, estimates using the Web of Science, Dimensions, and similar databases. For our Appalachian State users, one outcome is the extent they can efficiently access subscription content plus high quality open access. How can we optimally create the rich environments that contribute to library-relevant student learning outcomes and to transformational research and capstone experiences, while responsibly spending limited funds?

On the other hand, how do our authors make their research more available? How could they? What barriers are there and how can we help with those? How might we stabilize and reduce our expenditures on scholarly publishing, while still paying our fair share to support stability and creativity. I intend to continue to work in these areas, including measuring open access and small-scale methods for doing that.

**Indicator #3 --** Ebooks and User Experience (UX). Charlotte Initiative.

I presented “Comparing use and usability of ebooks to near-at-hand pbooks,” a refereed talk at the Electronic Resources & Libraries Conference, a national conference. I gave a related methodological talk at the Charlotte Initiative Open Conference, a national conference.

Our study demonstrated that one type of electronic book we license was unnecessarily challenging to use, especially in terms of page navigation and search. Although we continue to license over a hundred thousand ebooks of this type, which has been improved partially, we generally do not buy them and they make up a decreasing proportion of our ebooks. There was almost unanimous agreement among our study subjects that we should continue to offer ebooks, and only a few of our subjects turned from the ebook (on a laptop) to the physical book beside it. (Our study was too small to yield estimates on these two points, but the overall responses were extreme.)

Our Charlotte Initiative research group addressed the problem that previous analyses of electronic book usability, use, and acceptability were almost always failing to distinguish among the wide and growing variety of ebook interfaces and features and among the variety of ways people use books. My talk at the Charlotte Initiative Open Conference described how we had done our small study, as part of an effort to encourage many librarians to do small user experience studies on their specific ebooks. Then librarians could buy and demand better ebooks.