



## The Electronic Library

Survey of selected US academic library consortia: a descriptive study

Saleh A. Al-Baridi

### Article information:

To cite this document:

Saleh A. Al-Baridi , (2016), "Survey of selected US academic library consortia: a descriptive study", The Electronic Library, Vol. 34 Iss 1 pp. 24 - 41

Permanent link to this document:

<http://dx.doi.org/10.1108/EL-09-2014-0153>

Downloaded on: 01 November 2016, At: 23:22 (PT)

References: this document contains references to 15 other documents.

To copy this document: [permissions@emeraldinsight.com](mailto:permissions@emeraldinsight.com)

The fulltext of this document has been downloaded 429 times since 2016\*

### Users who downloaded this article also downloaded:

(2016), "Conceptualization of science using collaboration and competences", The Electronic Library, Vol. 34 Iss 1 pp. 2-23 <http://dx.doi.org/10.1108/EL-01-2014-0015>

(2016), "Integrating ISSM into TAM to enhance digital library services: A case study of the Taiwan Digital Meta-Library", The Electronic Library, Vol. 34 Iss 1 pp. 58-73 <http://dx.doi.org/10.1108/EL-01-2014-0016>

Access to this document was granted through an Emerald subscription provided by emerald-srm:563821 []

### For Authors

If you would like to write for this, or any other Emerald publication, then please use our Emerald for Authors service information about how to choose which publication to write for and submission guidelines are available for all. Please visit [www.emeraldinsight.com/authors](http://www.emeraldinsight.com/authors) for more information.

### About Emerald [www.emeraldinsight.com](http://www.emeraldinsight.com)

Emerald is a global publisher linking research and practice to the benefit of society. The company manages a portfolio of more than 290 journals and over 2,350 books and book series volumes, as well as providing an extensive range of online products and additional customer resources and services.

Emerald is both COUNTER 4 and TRANSFER compliant. The organization is a partner of the Committee on Publication Ethics (COPE) and also works with Portico and the LOCKSS initiative for digital archive preservation.

\*Related content and download information correct at time of download.

# Survey of selected US academic library consortia: a descriptive study

Saleh A. Al-Baridi

*King Fahd University of Petroleum and Minerals, Dhahran, Saudi Arabia*

Received 4 September 2014  
Revised 9 November 2014  
Accepted 12 December 2014

## Abstract

**Purpose** – The purpose of this paper is to develop and present a working model for consortia of academic libraries in Saudi Arabia. It is based on the American model of consortia operating at all levels, including local, state and region. The American consortia are highly developed, functional and have a large membership of small-, medium- and large-size libraries and are good models to be followed by other countries.

**Design/methodology/approach** – An email survey questionnaire (with seven closed-ended and four open-ended questions) was distributed to ten selected US academic library consortia to obtain relevant information on various operational facets and policies they have adopted.

**Findings** – The survey results will provide useful information to help develop a workable consortia model for Saudi Arabia. If implemented successfully, the Saudi model is expected to motivate other library groups at provincial and national levels in Saudi Arabia and regional level in the Arabian Gulf Region.

**Research limitations/implications** – The survey is aimed at gathering relevant information about the experiences of ten selected US academic libraries as members of various consortia.

**Originality/value** – While the project will start with academic libraries only, it may open membership for other libraries not only in Saudi Arabia but also for libraries of the Gulf Cooperation Council countries. The other scenario could be that instead of joining Saudi consortia, the libraries may decide to develop their own consortia.

**Keywords** Academic libraries, Consortia, Saudi Arabia, Development, Arabian Gulf region

**Paper type** Research paper

## Introduction

Libraries are facing a continuous increase in subscription costs and unprecedented budget cuts, making it difficult for them to acquire sufficient resources to fulfill the information needs of their clients. One austerity measure is to develop and join networks of other libraries to share the costs of information provision and to provide access to materials they otherwise could not afford. There is an even greater need for libraries in developing countries to develop library collaboratives to meet the needs of their users (Lugya, 2010).

Library consortia in the USA originated from the need to share resources to avoid duplication and expand their collections when funds became scarce. Library consortia are an important part of the library and information field. According to Bostic (2001, p. 7), “[...] library consortia have existed there for over a century and have gone through several phases of development”. With the creation of the International Coalition of Library Consortia (ICOLC), several smaller library consortia merged into a larger



network, with the agendas nicely worked out among themselves (Allen and Hirshon, 1998). Presently, library consortia continue to grow and face many new challenges.

University libraries in Saudi Arabia are eager to develop their e-resources, but they are mostly doing it individually. This has resulted in duplication of expensive resources. Recognizing the lack of resource sharing among Saudi Arabian university libraries, the libraries of King Saud University and King Fahd University of Petroleum and Minerals initiated a partnership program by forming a loosely knit consortium in 2004-2005. However, in 2005, the National Centre for e-Learning and Distance Education (NCEL) was established under the umbrella of the Saudi Ministry of Higher Education (MHE) with the main goal of enhancing the education process in the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia. The NCEL launched the Saudi Digital Library (SDL) in 2010 (Al-Meghren, 2011). The SDL holds more than 310,000 eBooks and reference works (available in both full text and multimedia) spanning various academic disciplines. The SDL also covers titles from over 300 prominent and specialized publishing houses around the world. The SDL works continuously to update this content to accumulate a huge store of knowledge for the long term. According to the SDL portal ([http://portal.sdl.edu.sa/english/?page\\_id=1487](http://portal.sdl.edu.sa/english/?page_id=1487)):

SDL's primary aim is to avoid duplication of resources by subscribing to e-resources through a single license for use by all member libraries. It is a good beginning, but lacks proper planning, and policies, which guide the western consortia towards achieving their ultimate goal of sharing resources with member libraries. Presently, there are 24 Saudi universities listed as members of the SDL consortia.

### *Purpose of the study*

The purpose of this study is to compare the administrative structure, membership policies, funding sources, payment model, training and other elements of US academic library consortia with those of the SDL using a questionnaire. The information and data collected through the questionnaire will be carefully reviewed to see how Saudi libraries can benefit from the experiences of American consortia in expanding the role of SDL in the region. The author hopes that, when his recommendations are implemented, SDL operations will expand to the regional level and will act as an efficient and effective working consortia model, not only for Saudi Arabia but also for the Arabian Gulf region as a whole. The author wishes to present the recommendations of this study to SDL authorities directly and at the meetings of the Deans of Saudi university libraries and the MHE. The study is limited to Saudi Arabian university libraries and the survey is limited to ten selected US academic libraries consortia.

### *Saudi digital library*

SDL is one of the pioneer projects of the NCEL, an organ of the MHE. The NCEL was established with the main goal of enhancing the education process in the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia and the objective of supporting education and learning in general and e-learning and distance learning in particular. It also makes an effort to fulfill the requirements of scientific research, empowering competencies and building a knowledge-based society. SDL (2014) lists the following objectives:

- Supporting university education system and servicing employees of Saudi universities through providing information resources and services on the digital library portal.

- Developing a digital environment that copes with technical developments in the electronic publishing industry, which, in turn, will increase the speed of communication between researchers in the field of production and scientific publishing.
- Acquiring digital books produced by the prestigious world universities, as well as books produced by global commercial publishers in various specializations.
- Saving the time and efforts of faculty staff, researchers and others spent on searching for information and accessing it in the digital environment.
- Sharing electronic information resources among digital library members.
- Converting paper-based information resources produced by the Saudi universities (books by faculty staff, Master's and PhD theses, scientific magazines, research and conferences papers and other publications) into digital format.
- Enriching Arabic digital content through electronic publishing of value-added books and research documents.
- Finding a party that negotiates with publishers and gets the best quotations.

The SDL is the largest academic gathering of information sources in the Arab world, with more than 310,000 eBooks and over 100 databases covering all academic disciplines. It has also subscription contracts with more than 300 global publishers as well. It is worth mentioning that, in 2010, the SDL was awarded the Arab Federation for Libraries and Information outstanding project award for libraries and information centers in the Arab world. The SDL has framed a policy for using and accessing services through its portal, but lacks proper guidelines and policies relating to its functioning and structural framework.

#### *Issues and challenges*

Initially, [SDL \(2014\)](#) had to face the following three main challenges:

- (1) "Convincing Saudi higher education institutions to contribute and make use of this project, while providing each of them with a digital library that covers their various requirements.
- (2) Attracting major publishers and bargaining with them to get the best deals for the best e-book collections (a daunting task).
- (3) Establishing the SDL technical platform and designing an inviting portal. In addition, they had to provide each university and higher education institution in Saudi Arabia with their own access point customized to their Web site and specific needs".

Apart from the aforementioned challenges during the formative years, the SDL management has been discussing and addressing the issues of its member libraries at the annual meetings of the Deans of Saudi university libraries and at the meetings held by the MIHE. Some of the important issues raised during these meetings by the member libraries are listed below:

- subscriptions to appropriate scholarly sources;
- customization and authentication problems;

- statistical reporting mechanism; and
- strong communications and customer support from vendors.

It is now several years since the launch of SDL in November 2010. Although SDL issues are regularly discussed, there is a lack of progress in resolving them due to the absence of proper guidelines and policies. To build a strong partnership between the consortium and its members, focus on customer service, new areas of growth and revenue-widening ventures are necessary. According to [Guzzy \(2010\)](#):

Consortia participants must recognize that their organizations will inevitably change and that a continual review of practices and relationships is an essential exercise. They should also make sure that the services they continue to offer are relevant to all the participating libraries.

Therefore, SDL authorities need to seriously consider the recommendations of this study to overcome many challenges facing today.

### Literature review

A good amount of published literature is available on e-resource sharing from both the theoretical and practical points of view. However, there are few publications on the issue of e-resource sharing in Saudi Arabia and the Arabian Gulf Region.

Interlibrary loan services in Saudi Arabia have experienced a significant increase, although the majority of these activities have been pursued informally and remain dependent on the whims, motivation and goodwill of individual libraries and librarians ([Arif \*et al.\*, 1998](#)). [Sheshadri \*et al.\* \(2011\)](#) discussed five library consortia in the UAE. These are the UAE Health Libraries Consortium, UAE Higher Education Library Consortium, Library Information Web Access, Information Literary Network and Dubai Public Library Online. These consortia are still evolving and consider as such that there is no specific consortia model which addresses the needs of institutions of higher learning.

Recognizing the lack of resource sharing among Saudi Arabian university libraries, the libraries of King Saud University and King Fahd University of Petroleum and Minerals initiated a partnership program by forming a loosely knit consortium in 2004/2005. According to [Al-Meghren \(2011\)](#):

In November 2010, the Saudi Digital Library (SDL) was established with the main purpose of supporting university education system and servicing employees of Saudi universities through providing information resources and services on their digital library portal.

However, no significant publication related to the SDL or its workings is found in the literature, except the information that is available on their Web site. Therefore, the present study will be of value for libraries in Saudi Arabia and Arabian Gulf region in particular.

### Methodology

The study used the survey method. The survey questionnaire ([Appendix 1](#)) is divided into 11 parts. The first seven parts contain “close-ended” questions and the other four parts provide “open-ended” questions. The survey was conducted via e-mail. The questionnaire consists of multiple-choice questions requiring one or more answers. The questionnaire was sent to about ten selected academic libraries consortia in the USA. Seven valid responses (70 per cent) were received via e-mail. The selected consortia were

EL  
34,1

28

randomly picked from the list of academic consortia (Appendix 2) examined by Chadwell (2011). In the survey questionnaire, the author incorporated dichotomous-type questions, in which “Yes” corresponds to value “1” and “No” corresponds to value “0”. The percentages mentioned in the results section have been calculated based on the ratio of the total number “Yes” answers divided by 7 (the number of consortia that responded) and the total number of “No” answers divided by 7 (the number of consortia that responded).

## Results and discussion

### *Consortium profile*

As previously mentioned, the questionnaire was organized into different parts. The first part is about the “Consortium Profile” with five questions to get consortium details and contact information. Of these, the most important questions were about the number of members and the current annual budget. Membership is an important component of a consortia organization, and the number of members varies from consortia to consortia. The role of staff, their participation and the amount of time committed are essential for the success of the consortia (Bostic, 2001). The profile of the consortia is presented in Table I.

The LYRISIS (2014) Web site mentioned that “it has a maximum number of members (1400) with an 80M budget allocation”. This was due to the merger of SOLINET and PALINET, two of the most successful library networks in the USA. Later “NELINET (New England Library Network) and Bibliographical Center for Research (BCR) also were merged with LYRISIS in 2009”. Although OHIOLINK has fewer members (90), it has a total current annual budget of 40 million, which implies that they spend much of their budget for providing efficient services to the benefit of its members. CRR, one of the earliest consortiums which was established in 1949, has 260 members with an annual budget of 6.2 million. The members are from colleges, universities and independent research libraries in the USA, Canada and Hong Kong. The Washington Research Library Consortium (WRL), established in 1993, is the smallest of all surveyed consortia with just nine members and an annual budget of 4 million. Unlike the US consortia surveyed, the SDL has a very limited membership. They should allow participation of all types and sizes of academic and research institutions to present itself as a truly national program.

Consortium name	Year established	No. of members	Annual budget
CAR	1979	143	6,000,000
CRL	1949	260	6,200,000
LYRISIS	2009	1,400	80,000,000
OHIOLINK	1992	90	42,000,000
SCELC	1986	108	1,000,000
SUNY	2000	60	–
WRL	1993	9	4,000,000

**Table I.**  
Consortium profile

*Consortium funding sources*

All of the surveyed consortia receive funding through their membership subscriptions, while 43 per cent also received funding from their state governments (Table II). No consortia receive funding from the federal government or any sources.

The majority of American consortia receive their funding from several sources, including state funding, consortia membership fees, participation in a service fees and federal funding (Horton, 2013). The current funding issues, according to Bostic (2001), are resource allocation and equitable spending, especially when licensing large, expensive databases to a number of libraries. Funding for the SDL is entirely received from the Saudi Government through the MHE, as only public universities are members. However, to sustain the high cost of subscriptions and to provide additional services, the SDL needs to implement a rational formula to receive funding from private and other institutions.

*Benefits offered by the consortium*

The benefits the consortium provides will depend upon the specific programs and services that it chooses to offer (Table III). EIFL (2014) lists the following typical benefits:

- “reductions in costs through group purchasing (for example, purchasing electronic resources);
- increasing the ability through collaboration to advocate for the needs of libraries;
- improving the capacity and expertise of the members by providing professional development programs for library staff;
- encouraging the sharing of resources among members (including content, technology, expertise and funding);
- creating opportunities for joint advocacy, marketing and fundraising for libraries; and
- undertaking special initiatives of importance to the group, such as digitization, technology implementation, information sharing or creation of a union catalog”.

Moghaddam and Talwar (2009, p. 102) find other reasons for libraries to “turn to consortia as a way of brokering better prices and rendering rapid and efficient services to information seekers”. The two main factors that influence the decision to join a

Consortium name	Participating libraries	State government	National government	Others
CAR	1	1	0	0
CRL	1	0	0	0
LYRASIS	1	0	0	0
OHIOLINK	1	1	0	0
SCELC	1	0	0	0
SUNY	1	1	0	0
WRL	1	0	0	0
YES	7	3	0	0
NO	0	4	7	7
Percentage (YES/7)	100	43	0	0

**Table II.**  
Consortium funding  
sources



**Table III.**  
Benefits offered by  
the consortium

Consortium name	Discounted/subs e-resources	Value of networking	ILL facilities	Cooperative collection management	Cost/benefit effectiveness	Training and CE	Others
CAR	1	1	1	1	1	1	0
CRL	1	1	1	1	1	0	0
LYRASIS	1	1	0	0	1	1	1
OHIOLINK	1	1	1	1	1	0	0
SCFELC	1	1	1	1	1	0	0
SUNY	1	1	1	1	1	1	0
WRL	0	1	1	1	1	1	0
YES	6	7	6	6	7	4	1
NO	1	0	1	0	0	3	6
Percentage (YES/7)	86	100	86	86	100	57	14



specific consortium by the surveyed libraries (100 per cent) are the “cost/benefit” effectiveness and “value of networking”. However, discounted/subsidized e-resource subscriptions, ILL facilities and cooperative collection management as other benefits, which the libraries (86 per cent) consider are equally important. Only around 57 per cent of surveyed consortia offer regular training to their members. As SDL is still evolving, it needs to offer maximum benefits and attract libraries to join the consortium to take advantage of its offers.

#### *Payment model*

Payment formula is the most important part of the negotiations libraries have with the consortium administration (Table IV). In total, 86 per cent of the consortia receive payment (subscriptions and related costs) from the participating libraries based on a rational formula, and only 14 per cent prefer payment based on the usage of e-resources. Around 71 per cent of consortia follow the same payment formula for both public and private universities. Only 14 per cent prefer other methods of payment.

The payment model is not an issue for the SDL, as the MHE takes care of payments on behalf of all its members (public university libraries). The MHE deducts a specific amount from each university’s budget on an *ad hoc* basis. At present, there exists no rational formula, even for private universities. As the survey results indicate, there needs to be a rational formula and that the payment formula has to be same for both public and private universities; hence, the SDL should consider developing a more rational formula.

#### *Promotion of e-resources*

All of the surveyed consortia promote their e-resources through e-mails and Internet mailing lists (Table V). A majority (86 per cent) promote their e-resources through their consortium Web site, guides and tutorials and posters. Only 14 per cent note that they do not utilize the aforementioned sources except through their consortium Web sites and other channels of communication, such as field staff, who directly contact their respective members. SDL’s promotional channels are not adequate; therefore, it needs to use all the aforementioned channels to promote its resources and activities.

Consortium name	Based on rational formula	Based on usage of e-resources	Payment formula same for public and private universities	Others
CAR	1	0	1	0
CRL	1	0	1	0
LYRISIS	0	0	1	1
OHIOLINK	1	1	1	0
SCELC	1	0	0	0
SUNY	1	0	0	0
WRL	1	0	1	0
YES	6	1	5	1
NO	1	6	2	6
Percentage (YES/7)	86	14	71	14

**Table IV.**  
Payment model

EL  
34,1

32

**Table V.**  
Promotion of  
e-resources

Consortium name	Providing access through consortium Web site	Through e-mails and Internet e-mailing lists	Guides and tutorials (printed/electronic)	Posters	Any other
CAR	0	1	0	0	0
CRL	1	1	1	0	0
LYRASIS	1	1	1	0	0
OHIOLINK	1	1	1	0	0
SCELC	1	1	1	0	0
SUNY	1	1	1	0	0
WRL	1	1	1	1	1
YES	6	7	6	6	1
NO	1	0	1	1	6
Percentage (YES/7)	86	100	86	86	14

*Managing consortium e-resource subscriptions*

All of the surveyed consortia manage their e-resource subscriptions based on recommendations from review committees formed locally by each of the consortia administrators and suggestions from consortium members. Only 57 per cent of respondents consider using statistics as an important tool for managing their e-resource subscriptions. As review committees play an important role in managing e-resources, it is necessary for SDL to strengthen the review committee's structure and regularly solicit suggestions from members so that healthy and effective decisions are made in this regard (Table VI).

*Consortium training*

In total, 71 per cent of the surveyed consortia report that they provide training on an ongoing basis. Further, 43 per cent conduct initial training and 57 per cent conduct orientation/tutorials for members on a regular basis. Only 14 per cent use other methods, such as providing training on specific topics related to their services throughout the year (Table VII).

Training provided by consortia play an important role in the effective utilization of e-resources. Survey results suggest that regular and ongoing training are an important

**Table VI.**  
Managing  
consortium  
e-resource  
subscriptions

Consortium name	Based on usage statistics	Recommendations of the review committee	Suggestions from consortium members	Others
CAR	1	1	1	0
CRL	0	1	1	0
LYRASIS	0	1	1	0
OHIOLINK	1	1	1	0
SCELC	0	1	1	0
SUNY	1	1	1	0
WRL	1	1	1	0
YES	4	7	7	0
NO	3	0	0	7
Percentage (YES/7)	57	100	100	0

Consortium name	Conduct initial training for members	Conduct orientation/tutorials for members regularly	Provide training on an on-going basis	Others
CAR	1	1	1	0
CRL	0	1	0	0
LYRISIS	0	0	1	0
OHIOLINK	1	1	1	0
SCELC	0	0	0	0
SUNY	1	0	1	1
WRL	0	1	1	0
YES	3	4	5	1
NO	4	3	2	6
Percentage (YES/7)	43	57	71	14

**Table VII.**  
Consortium training

activity of a consortium. At present, SDL lacks a proper training policy; thus, it needs to evolve a robust policy and also introduce and explore new training methods apart from those mentioned earlier.

#### *Consortium problems*

As question numbers 8, 9, 10 and 11 are open-ended questions ([Appendix 1](#)) and because the sample considered is small, categorization is deliberately avoided and the views/comments of the consortium members are presented verbatim as received from the surveyed consortia in the following sections. The consortia-related problems are listed as received from surveyed consortia, which varies according to the nature of each consortium.

- *CARLI*: Publishers all have different policies regarding access for universities that have branches in other state or countries. Because CARLI uses funding from the State of Illinois, it is hard to justify spending state money on some of these branches. It becomes very confusing for the publishers, for the member libraries and for us.
- *CRL*: We have a diverse membership, and all members are not interested in the same e-resources. Our members have vastly different budgets and abilities to afford e-resources. Many national and regional consortia have overlapping memberships. This sometimes creates confusion about which consortium is offering a particular e-resource.
- *LYRISIS*: This is complicated answer. Many issues relate to the specific nature of LYRISIS and our relationships with libraries and other consortia in the USA. We share the same concerns of price increases and sustainability expressed globally. This would require more discussion with you.
- *OHIOLINK*: The rising cost and inflation of electronic resources are challenging the libraries and the state to keep all resources. Choices have to be made as to what are core services and what can no longer be supported. We are going through that exercise this fiscal year.
- *SCELC*: No major problems. IP-authenticated access works well.
- *SUNY*: Lack of funds; attempting to establish fees for library content.
- *WRL*: We neither provide nor negotiate contracts for vendor-supplied databases.

Consortia problems vary from consortium to consortium depending on the programs and services offered by them. However, some of the common problems mentioned are lack of funds, management of e-resource subscriptions and overlapping memberships (national versus regional). In the case of SDL, funding is not an issue because, as mentioned earlier, the MHE provides the entire funding for public universities from a federal allocation. However, managing e-resource subscriptions is an important issue and presently there is no reasonable policy in this regard. Therefore, the review committees need to develop a workable policy. The question of overlapping of membership does not arise as there are no other options currently available for Saudi Arabian libraries.

#### *Consortium marketing*

The following marketing strategies were used by the surveyed consortia are listed as received:

- *CARLI*: Almost all academic libraries in Illinois are already members of CARLI. We find it very effective to meet with new library directors as they begin their jobs to be sure they are aware of ALL of the services we offer.
- *CRL*: Listserves, webinars and e-mails.
- *LYRASIS*: As a self-supporting consortium, we have an ongoing program. This would require more discussion with you.
- *OHIOLINK*: Marketing to the end-users is accomplished by the member institutions for the most part. The consortium itself does some marketing through newsletters and training sessions that “train the trainer”.
- *SCELC*: SCELC offers a Vendor Day, Research Day and Colloquium once a year (See our Web site.) We also e-mail announcements and have four advisory committees engaged with work on behalf of the consortium.
- *WRL*: Online newsletter, annual meeting for all member staff and regular committee meetings.

Marketing techniques used vary from consortium to consortium. Some of the tools and techniques used by surveyed consortia are mentioned above. The SDL does use some of the aforementioned tools, but needs to develop and implement additional tools and techniques to market its programs and services efficiently.

#### *Consortium assessment*

The following consortia assessment views expressed by each of the consortium members are listed as received:

- *CARLI*: I think it varies from culture to culture. I think the smartest is to assess a portion of the fee (maybe 30 per cent) equally and let the remainder of the fee (70 per cent) be based on size/budget.
- *LYRASIS*: Significant energy has been applied to this question across the consortia community and is an ongoing topic at ICOLC meetings. We all approach this question with similar measures but evaluate and apply these as needed within each of our consortia environments. There are several consortia directors in the ICOLC family who are good resources for this question.

- *OHIOLINK*: Effectiveness in reducing the cost for content so that it is far more economical to subscribe to resources through the consortium than it is to subscribe individually by institution. OHIOLINK saves the state millions of dollars each year by negotiating group prices for resources. Also, the effectiveness of the inter-institutional cooperation in sharing resources and managing collections.
- *SCELC*: Cost savings and perceived customer satisfaction. Constant communication with vendors and librarians to assure things are going well. Nothing fancy – just solid relationship building.
- *WRL*: It varies from one consortium to another. Each has a unique set of services that they provide so it would be complicated to impossible to have a standard measure of consortia effectiveness.

Assessment is an important exercise to measure the consortia effectiveness. However, the tools and methods used vary from one consortium to another. The assessment also depends on the services provided by each of the consortium. Because SDL is still evolving and now it is more than three years since its launch in 2010, it should make it a policy to conduct regular assessment exercises to derive benefit from its outcomes.

### Recommendations

SDL, in spite of its limitations, is evolving as a national consortia model, which need to be further expanded and strengthened to improve its functioning and by developing and implementing relevant and effective policies. The following recommendations are made in this direction:

- There is a need to expand the SDL membership-base to include all academic, medical and technical institutions belonging to both public and private sectors at the national level.
- Apart from federal government funding, consider membership subscriptions from private universities and other institutions as a regular source of income.
- As the survey reveals that cost-benefit effectiveness and value of networking are important; therefore, SDL needs to thoroughly evaluate its infrastructure and develop effective policies to negotiate with vendors and pass the benefits to its members.
- An objective payment model needs to be developed which follows a uniform formula for both public and private institutions.
- For promotion purposes, the SDL should extensively make use of e-mails, mailing lists and also needs to improve its Web site to include Web 2.0/3.0 technologies, such as RSS/XML, blogs, social media (Facebook and Twitter for example) and other technologies.
- A number of review committees should be formed to receive suggestions from members and discuss their requests, ideas and grievances.
- Training for members of the consortia needs to be offered on an ongoing basis, apart from conducting the initial training/orientation. New training methods may be developed to promote effective utilization of e-resources offered by the consortia.

- Consortium problems, such as budget allocations, membership issues, subscription increases and similar, need to be addressed and discussed regularly among members.
- Consortium marketing strategies, such as e-mails, webinars and new innovative methods need to be used for effective and efficient utilization of its services.
- Consortium assessment should be exercised periodically and issues raised by its members should be addressed positively.

### Conclusion

As library budgets shrink, it has become economically untenable for libraries to follow the old practice of owning journal subscriptions. The role of consortia has become more important than ever (Burke, 2010). As members, libraries can benefit from the special rates vendors offer as consortium subscriptions. The survey results presented in the paper provide useful information on consortia funding sources, benefits offered, payment models, promotion of e-resources, managing e-resource subscriptions, training, problems, marketing and assessment. SDL's present state lacks adequate policies, services and a technical support mechanism. Hopefully, with the implementation of the recommendations listed in the paper, SDL's working and services will improve and SDL will become an efficient, effective and viable consortia model for Saudi Arabian libraries in particular and for the Arabian Gulf region libraries in general.

### References

- Allen, B.M. and Hirshon, A. (1998), "Hanging together to avoid hanging separately: opportunities for academic libraries and consortia", *Information Technology and Libraries*, Vol. 17 No. 1, pp. 36-44.
- Al-Meghren, A. (2011), "Arabian prints: the Saudi Digital Library", available at: [www.online-educu.com/OEB\\_Newsportal/arabian-prints-the-saudi-digital-library/](http://www.online-educu.com/OEB_Newsportal/arabian-prints-the-saudi-digital-library/) (accessed 30 June 2014).
- Arif, M.J., Sibai, M.M. and Sulaiman, M.S. (1998), "Inter-library loan service in the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia: a case study of medical listing", *International Information & Library Review*, Vol. 30 No. 4, pp. 341-365.
- Bostic, S.L. (2001), "Academic library consortia in the United States: an introduction", *Liber Quarterly*, Vol. 11 No. 1, pp. 6-13.
- Burke, R. (2010), "Library consortia and the future of academic libraries", available at: [www.neal-schuman.com/nealschuman/companionwebsite/academic/Burke2010.pdf](http://www.neal-schuman.com/nealschuman/companionwebsite/academic/Burke2010.pdf) (accessed 30 June 2014).
- Chadwell, F.A. (2011), "Assessing the value of academic library", *Journal of Library Administration*, Vol. 51 Nos 7/8, pp. 645-661.
- EIFL (2014), *Frequently Asked Questions – Consortium Management*, available at: [www.eifl.net/faq/consortium-management](http://www.eifl.net/faq/consortium-management) (accessed 10 July 2014).
- Guzzy, J.E. (2010), "US Academic library consortia: a review", *Community & Junior College Libraries*, Vol. 16 No. 3, pp. 162-184.
- Horton, V. (2013), *Library Consortia Overview*, available at: [www.minitex.umn.edu/Communications/Director/ConsortiaOverview.pdf](http://www.minitex.umn.edu/Communications/Director/ConsortiaOverview.pdf) (accessed 30 June 2014).
- Lugya, F.K. (2010), "Successful resource sharing in academic and research libraries in Illinois: lessons for developing countries", Thesis, University of Illinois.

---

Saudi Digital Library (SDL) (2014), available at: <http://portal.sdl.edu.sa/english/> (accessed 30 June 2014).

Sheshadri, K.N., Shivalingaiah, D. and Manjunatha, K. (2011), "Library consortia in United Arab Emirates: an opinion survey", available at: [http://eprints.uitm.edu.my/3961/1/SP\\_LCI11\\_39.pdf](http://eprints.uitm.edu.my/3961/1/SP_LCI11_39.pdf) (accessed 30 June 2014).

**Further reading**

Ahmed, M.H. and Suleiman, R.J. (2013), "Academic library consortia in Jordan: an evaluation study", *The Journal of Academic Librarianship*, Vol. 39 No. 2, pp. 138-143.

OCLC (2012), "US library consortia: a snapshot of priorities & perspectives", available at: [www.oclc.org/reports/us-consortia.en.html](http://www.oclc.org/reports/us-consortia.en.html) (accessed 30 June 2014).

Urbana-Champaign, IL., Moghaddam, G.G. and Talwar, V.G. (2009), "Library consortia in developing countries: an overview", *Program: Electronic Library and Information Systems*, Vol. 43 No. 1, pp. 94-104.



**Appendix 1. Survey of US academic libraries consortia: questionnaire**

**I. Consortium Profile**

Consortium Name:

Year Established:

Number of Members:

Current Annual Budget:

Contact details:

- Contact Person's Name:
- Mail address:
- E-mail:
- Telephone No.:

**II. Consortium Funding Sources**

From where does the Consortium receive funds?

- |                                |     |    |
|--------------------------------|-----|----|
| - Participating Libraries      | Yes | No |
| - State Government             | Yes | No |
| - National Government          | Yes | No |
| - Others (Please specify)----- |     |    |

**III. Benefits Offered By Consortium**

What influences the libraries to be part of the Consortium?

- |   |     |    |
|---|-----|----|
| - Discounted/Subsidized electronic resources              | Yes | No |
| - Value of networking with other members of the Consortia | Yes | No |
| - Inter Library Loan Facilities                           | Yes | No |
| - Cooperative collection management                       | Yes | No |
| - Cost Benefits/effectiveness                             | Yes | No |
| - Training and continuing education                       | Yes | No |
| - Others (please specify) .....                           |     |    |

*(continued)*

**IV. Payment Model**

On what basis does the Consortium manages its fund resources?

- Based on a rational Formula? Yes No
- Based on usage of e-resources? Yes No
- Payment formula same for Public and Private Universities? Yes No
- If no to above, please provide details of the method used.....

**V. Promotion of E-Resources**

What measures are taken to promote e-resources?

- Providing access through Consortium Website Yes No
- Through e-mails and Internet mailing lists Yes No
- Guides and Tutorials (printed/electronic) Yes No
- Posters Yes No
- Any other (please specify).....

**VI. Managing Consortium E-Resource Subscriptions**

How the Consortium manages its subscriptions to e-resources?

- Based on Usage statistics Yes No
- Recommendations of the review committee Yes No
- Suggestions from Consortium members Yes No
- Others (please specify) .....

**VII. Consortium Training**

How does the Consortium provide training to its members?

- Conduct initial training for members Yes No
- Conduct orientation/Tutorials for members regularly Yes No
- Provide training on an on-going basis Yes No
- Others (please specify) .....

*(continued)*

**VIII. Consortium Problems**

What are the main problems relating to providing access to e-resources and concrete measures taken to address them effectively?

**IX. Consortium Marketing**

What steps are being employed to market consortium services?

**X. Consortium Assessment**

What do you think are the rational criteria for assessing a consortium?

**XI. Any Other Comments**

Contact person's signature:

Designation:

Date:

---

**Appendix 2**

 US academic  
 library  
 consortia

---

California Digital Library	<a href="http://www.cdlib.org">www.cdlib.org</a>
Center for Research Libraries Global Resource Network	<a href="http://www.crl.edu">www.crl.edu</a>
Consortium of Academic and Research Libraries in Illinois (CARLI)	<a href="http://www.carli.illinois.edu/">www.carli.illinois.edu/</a>
Council of University of Wisconsin Libraries	<a href="http://uwlib.uwsa.edu/">uwlib.uwsa.edu/</a>
LYRISIS	<a href="http://www.lyrasis.org/">www.lyrasis.org/</a>
New York State Higher Education Initiative	<a href="http://www.nyshei.org/">www.nyshei.org/</a>
Ohio Library and Information Network (OhioLINK)	<a href="http://www.ohiolink.edu">www.ohiolink.edu</a>
Statewide California Electronic Library Consortium (SCELC)	<a href="http://scelc.org/">http://scelc.org/</a>
SUNY <i>Connect</i>	<a href="http://www.sunyconnect.suny.edu/default.htm">www.sunyconnect.suny.edu/</a> <a href="http://www.sunyconnect.suny.edu/default.htm">default.htm</a>
Washington Research Library Consortium	<a href="http://www.wrlc.org">www.wrlc.org</a>

---



---

**41**
**Table AI.**  
 List of selected US  
 academic libraries  
 consortia

**Corresponding author**

 Saleh A. Al-Baridi can be contacted at: [albaridi@kfupm.edu.sa](mailto:albaridi@kfupm.edu.sa)


---

 For instructions on how to order reprints of this article, please visit our website:

[www.emeraldgroupublishing.com/licensing/reprints.htm](http://www.emeraldgroupublishing.com/licensing/reprints.htm)

 Or contact us for further details: [permissions@emeraldinsight.com](mailto:permissions@emeraldinsight.com)