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Value

- Private goods and services
  - University students pay tuition
  - University faculty get grants
  - Value proposition – value to an individual or institution determines whether payment is made for the service

- Public goods and services
  - Academic libraries provide services and resources to all patrons
  - Value proposition - Collective value to all users must be estimated.

- What is value of electronic resources to the individual?
- What is the value of electronic resources to the institution? (Kingma 2012)
Value v. Use

- **Cost / Use**
  - COUNTER Data
  - Subscription costs (including consortial)

- **Cost / Use is not value**
How to Evaluate Value

- Purchase or exchange value (surveys)
  - Time saved
  - Willingness to pay
    * What if there were no online access?
    * What if there were no shared access to journals?

- Use value: favorable consequences (surveys)
  - Successful scholars read a lot
  - Relating citations to grants (causation issues?)

- Supporting success (surveys)
  - Successful scholars use library resources more (Tenopir 2012)
Value landscape

- ARL statistics
- COUNTER (Shepherd)
- Data Farm (Zucca)
- Web site – Transactional Log Analysis
  - MESUR – MEtrics from Scholarly Usage of Resources
  - Deep Log Analysis – relating server logs to users
- ROI – Return on Investment
  - Students do better
  - 1:4
  - LIBValue (Tenopir, Kingma, & Kaufman)
- MINES (ARL)
MINES for Libraries®

What is MINES for Libraries®?
Measuring the Impact of Networked Electronic Services (MINES for Libraries®) is an online transaction-based survey that collects data on the purpose of use of electronic resources and the demographics of users. As libraries implement access to electronic resources through portals, collaborations, and consortium arrangements, the MINES for Libraries® protocol offers a convenient way to collect information from users.

How is the MINES for Libraries® survey conducted?
MINES for Libraries® is a Web-based international survey that is presented to the user as the first digital resource is accessed. It is called a "digital audit audit." Why Participate?
Why Participate?
Library staff can collect useful data about their users, which can help inform and improve their electronic resource usage models.

Origins of MINES for Libraries®
MINES for Libraries® was developed by Sonya Frankels and Terri Pollard as an online transaction-based survey to implement a library usage audit.

MINES for Libraries® aims to:
- Measure the value and impact of digital content
- Determine how specific user populations apply digital content to their work, based on demographic and purpose of use analyses
- Identify where library use originates in the networked environment and other services

PUBLICATIONS
- Measuring Use of License Electronic Resources: A Second Iteration of the MINES for Libraries® Survey on Scholarly Portal and Other Resources for the Indiana University Libraries

EVENTS
- 2014 MINES: Webinar Series
- 2014 MINES: Webinar Series
- 2014 MINES: Webinar Series

NEWS
- 2014 Call for Proposals: Library Assessment Conference 2012
- 2014 Call for Proposals: Library Assessment Conference 2012
- 2014 Call for Proposals: Library Assessment Conference 2012
What is MINES for Libraries®

- Action research
  - Historically rooted in indirect cost studies
  - Set of recommendations for research design
  - Set of recommendations for web survey presentation
  - Set of recommendations for information architecture in libraries
  - Plan for continual assessment of networked electronic resources
  - An opportunity to benchmark across libraries
Library User Survey

UConn Library Electronic Services Web Survey

This survey is being conducted during a two-hour time period by the University of Connecticut to assess the usage of the Library’s electronic services. All responses are anonymous. The data is critical for obtaining continued funding.

After completing the survey, you will be connected to the service you selected.

Thank you for your help.

Patron Status: Select Patron Status
Affiliation: Select Affiliation
Location: Select Location
Purpose for Using this Electronic Resource:
- Sponsored (Funded) Research [Definition]
- Instruction/Education/Departmental (Non-Funded) Research [Definition]
- Other Activities [Definition]

Submit Survey
Library User Survey
Patron Status

UConn Library Electronic Services Web Survey

This survey is being conducted during a two-hour time period by the University of Connecticut to assess the usage of the Library's electronic services. All responses are anonymous. The data is critical for obtaining continued funding.

After completing the survey, you will be connected to the service you selected.

Thank you for your help.

Patron Status

Affiliation

Location

Purpose for Using this Electronic Resource:

Select Patron Status

- UConn Undergraduate Student
- UConn Faculty
- UConn Graduate Student
- UConn Staff
- UConn Post-Doc Fellow, Research Associate, Lecturer, or Visiting Professor
- Non-UConn

Other Activities

Submit Survey
Library User Survey
Affiliation

UConn Library Electronic Services Web Survey

This survey is being conducted during a two-hour time period by the University of Connecticut to assess the usage of the Library's electronic services. All responses are anonymous. The data is critical for obtaining continued funding.

After completing the survey, you will be connected to the service you selected.

Thank you for your help.

Patron Status

Affiliation
Location
Purpose for Using this Electronic Resource

Select Patron Status

- Select Affiliation
- Agriculture & Natural Resources
- Allied Health
- Business Administration
- Continuing Studies/B.G.S.
- Education
- Engineering
- Family Studies
- Fine Arts
- Liberal Arts & Sciences
- Nursing
- Pharmacy
- Social Work
- Other UConn
- Non-UConn
Library User Survey Location

UConn Library Electronic Services Web Survey

This survey is being conducted during a two-hour time period by the University of Connecticut to assess the usage of the Library's electronic services. All responses are anonymous. The data is critical for obtaining continued funding.

After completing the survey, you will be connected to the service you selected.

Thank you for your help.

Patron Status: Select Patron Status
Affiliation: Select Affiliation
Location: Select Location
Purpose for Using this Electronic Resource:

In the Library
On Campus - Storrs
On Campus - Regional Campus
Off Campus

[Submit Survey]
Library User Survey
Purpose

UConn Library Electronic Services Web Survey

This survey is being conducted during a **two-hour** time period by the University of Connecticut to assess the usage of the Library's electronic services. **All responses are anonymous.** The data is critical for obtaining continued funding.

After completing the survey, you will be connected to the service you selected.

Thank you for your help.

**Patron Status**: Select Patron Status

**Affiliation**: Select Affiliation

**Location**: Select Location

**Purpose for Using this Electronic Resource:**
- Sponsored (Funded) Research
- Instruction/Education/Departmental (Non-Funded) Research
- Other Activities

**Definition**

**Sponsored (Funded) Research Projects**

This includes:
- Research funded by grants or contracts from federal, state, or local governments
- Research funded for grants, contracts or gifts from a foundation or other outside party
- University funded research (Research Foundation Awards)
- Research training

**Note**: This category includes only specially funded research projects, which are separately budgeted and accounted for as organized research projects by the institution.
MINES for Libraries® Survey on Scholars Portal and Other Resources for the Ontario Council of University Libraries

- The Team
  - Dana Thomas
    Evaluation and Assessment Librarian, Scholars Portal
dana.thomas@utoronto.ca
  - Catherine Davidson
    Associate University Librarian, Collections, York University
    cdavids@yorku.ca
  - Alan Darnell
    Project Director, Scholars Portal alan.darnell@utoronto.ca
  - Martha Kyrillidou
    Senior Director, Statistics and Service Quality Programs, Association of Research Libraries
    martha@arl.org
  - Terry Plum, Assistant Dean, Simmons Graduate School of Library and Information Science
    terry.plum@simmons.edu
MINES for Libraries® Survey on Scholars Portal and Other Resources for the Ontario Council of University Libraries

- Publications and Presentations (This presentation is taken primarily taken from these three publications)
Ontario Council of University Libraries

420,000 FTE

Thomas 2011
Scholars Portal

JSTOR collections now available in Journals
Approximately 2000 titles from the JSTOR archives collections have been loaded onto Scholars Portal Journals. This collection includes the Arts & Humanities Collection, the Business Collection, and the Life Sciences Collection. Users can search...

OCUL Releases Scholars Geo Portal
March 1, 2010. OCUL is pleased to announce the release of Scholars Geo Portal. Scholars GeoPortal is a new web-based gateway to data discovery tool allowing Ontario university students and researchers to enrich their teaching and research by engaging with OCUL's growing...

Scholars GeoPortal Recognized by the OLA
Scholars GeoPortal has been awarded the OLA Award for Technical Innovation. Read the OLA award announcement here:
Goals for MINES for Libraries at OCUL 2010-11

- Demonstrate the value of the library
- Secure resources as needed
- Understand use of resources within the library, on campus outside the library, and off campus
- Understand use of resources across disciplines and user groups
- Understand why people are using electronic resources
- Track the trajectory of the use of the resources since 2004-05
OCUL MINES 2004 vs 2010

- **OCUL I : 2004**
  - Randomly selected 2 hour periods each month for a year
  - Mandatory
  - Scholars Portal

- **OCUL II: 2010**
  - SFX as delivery mechanism
  - Systematic sampling (every nth)
  - Mandatory and optional versions
  - Additional question: recommender
# Content Types Being Measured

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2004/05</th>
<th>2010/11</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>ejournals ONLY</strong> locally loaded on Scholars Portal</td>
<td><strong>ejournals PLUS</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Press</td>
<td>abstracts and indexes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Psychological Association</td>
<td>e-books</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Chemical Society</td>
<td>dissertations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Berkeley Electronic Press</td>
<td>library catalogues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blackwell Publishing</td>
<td>reference materials</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cambridge University Press</td>
<td>institutional repositories</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emerald Publishing</td>
<td>other services (e.g. interlibrary loan, Ulrichs, JCR – Journal Citation Reports, Refworks)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elsevier Science (Elsevier Science, Harcourt Health Sciences)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IEEE Publication</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kluwer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oxford University Press</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project MUSE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sage Publications</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Springer-Verlag</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taylor and Francis</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Wiley &amp; Sons</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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MINES: Optional and Mandatory

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Partner Institutions</th>
<th>FTE, July 2010</th>
<th>OCUL 1 - 2004/05</th>
<th>OCUL 2 - 2010/11</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Algoma</td>
<td>870</td>
<td>Not part of OCUL</td>
<td>Optional</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brock</td>
<td>14,557</td>
<td>Mandatory</td>
<td>Optional</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carleton</td>
<td>20,743</td>
<td>Mandatory</td>
<td>Optional &amp; Mandatory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guelph</td>
<td>21,452</td>
<td>Mandatory</td>
<td>Optional</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lakehead</td>
<td>7,583</td>
<td>Mandatory</td>
<td>Optional</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laurentian</td>
<td>7,630</td>
<td>Mandatory</td>
<td>Optional</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McMaster</td>
<td>24,944</td>
<td>Mandatory</td>
<td>Optional</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nipissing</td>
<td>5,535</td>
<td>Mandatory</td>
<td>Optional &amp; Mandatory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OCAD</td>
<td>3,019</td>
<td>Mandatory</td>
<td>Optional</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UOIT</td>
<td>5,147</td>
<td>Mandatory</td>
<td>Optional &amp; Mandatory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ottawa</td>
<td>32,230</td>
<td>Mandatory</td>
<td>Optional</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Queen’s</td>
<td>20,751</td>
<td>Mandatory</td>
<td>Optional</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Royal Military College</td>
<td>1,792</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>Optional &amp; Mandatory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ryerson</td>
<td>28,841</td>
<td>Mandatory</td>
<td>Optional &amp; Mandatory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Toronto</td>
<td>68,334</td>
<td>Mandatory</td>
<td>Optional</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trent</td>
<td>7,030</td>
<td>Mandatory</td>
<td>Optional</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waterloo</td>
<td>27,674</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>Optional</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Western Ontario</td>
<td>33,119</td>
<td>Mandatory</td>
<td>Optional &amp; Mandatory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilfrid Laurier</td>
<td>14,054</td>
<td>Mandatory</td>
<td>Optional</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Windsor</td>
<td>14,419</td>
<td>Mandatory</td>
<td>Optional</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>York</td>
<td>45,235</td>
<td>Mandatory</td>
<td>Optional</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>402,950</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Limitation: Variations in SFX as delivery mechanism

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Uses az list?</th>
<th>SFX from OPAC?</th>
<th>Google Scholar?</th>
<th>Citation linker?</th>
<th>bx?</th>
<th>PRIMO?/Discovery layer?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ALGOMA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BROCK</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CARLETON</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DURHAM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GUELPH</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LAKEHEAD</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LAURENTIAN</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LAURIER</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MCMASTER</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NIPISSING</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OCAD</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OTTAWA</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QUEENS</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RMC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RYERSON</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TORONTO</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRENT</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UOIT</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WATERLOO</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WESTERN</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WINDSOR</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YORK</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Introduction to OCUL Report and Institutional Reports

- 34,776 complete responses across all OCUL institutions
- 4,255 surveys from mandatory and 30,521 from optional implementations
- Summarized as:
  - PDF reports
  - Excel files
  - SPSS dataset(s)
  - SPSS syntax file(s)
Distribution of OCUL Partner Institutions' Enrollments as of July 2010, Responses to MINES for Libraries(R), and SFX Statistics (Clicks) from 2/16/2010 to 2/17/2011
Findings: Frequency of Use of Electronic Resources by User Status
Findings: Frequency of Use of Electronic Resources by Purpose of Use

[Diagram showing frequency by primary purpose of use with categories: Sponsored (funded) research (for Faculty, Graduate Students, staff), Patient Care, Teaching, Other (non-funded) research (for Faculty, Graduate Students, staff), Other Activities including General Interest, Coursework/Assignment.]
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Findings: Frequency of Use of Electronic Resources by Location

- Off Campus use up 23.5%
- On Campus not in library down 15.9%
- Library use down 7.7%

Thomas 2011
Findings: Frequency of Use of Electronic Resources by Affiliation

Thomas 2011
Mandatory v. Optional – Five Universities
Purpose of Use
Carleton, Ryerson, Nipissing, UOIT, Western

*n=6962*  
*mandatory* = 4255  
*optional* = 2707

**Mandatory by Purpose**

- **Coursework**, 61.36%
- **Sponsored**, 14.76%
- **Other Research**, 12.48%
- **Patient Care**, 2.59%
- **Other Activities**, 4.44%

**Optional by Purpose**

- **Coursework**, 61.21%
- **Sponsored**, 14.41%
- **Other Research**, 13.26%
- **Patient Care**, 2.73%
- **Teaching**, 4.37%
- **Other Activities**, 3.95%
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Mandatory v. Optional – Five Universities

Status

Carleton, Ryerson, Nipissing, UOIT, Western

\[ n = 6962 \quad \text{mandatory}=4255 \quad \text{optional}=2707 \]

Mandatory by Status

- Undergraduate: 57.41%
- Graduate/Pro: 28.93%
- Staff: 7.24%
- Faculty: 2.84%
- Library: 1.01%
- Other: 2.56%

Optional by Status

- Undergraduate: 56.89%
- Graduate/Pro: 30.14%
- Staff: 1.96%
- Faculty: 1.96%
- Library: 1.33%
- Other: 2.07%
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MINES Results – SFX and Target URLs

- We will be able to investigate numerous questions of interest including:
  - Purpose of use by database
  - Purpose of use by resource type (book, journal…)
  - Uses of resource types relative to size of those collections
  - Frequency of use relative to the size of a vendor/publisher collection
  - Uses by title for heavily-used titles (Nature, Science, etc.)
  - Uses of resources by patron type and discipline

Thomas 2011
SFX – Target URLs

- SFX provided information to add six additional variables for each survey response:
  - ISSN / ISBN
  - Normalized Publisher or Vendor Name
  - Database Name
  - Resource Type: EJournal, ebook. Database
  - Subscription Type: Consortial, Local, or Free/ Open Access
  - Consortia: OCUL, CRKN, Knowledge Ontario
Consortial – Local - OA

Open Access/Free

517

Local
11,503

Consortial
25,207
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Uses in MINES: Subscription Type
Large School

Free/Open Access: 0%
Local: 30%
N/A: 3%

Consortial: 67%
OCUL: 46%
CRKN: 20%
Knowledge Ontario: 5%

Uses in MINES: Subscription Type
Small School

Free/Open Access: 0%
Local: 26%
N/A: 3%

Consortial: 71%
OCUL: 47%
CRKN: 20%
Knowledge Ontario: 4%

Titles available in SFX: Subscription Type
Large School

OCUL: 14%
CRKN: 13%
Knowledge Ontario: 5%

Free: 22%
Local: 46%

Titles available in SFX: Subscription Type
Small School

OCUL: 34%
KO: 28%
CRKN: 10%

Local: 9%
Free: 19%
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Within each publisher what is the breakdown by affiliation?

Affiliation by Publisher

- Applied Science and Engineering
- Business
- Education
- Environmental Studies
- Fine Arts
- Humanities
- Law
- Medical/Health Sciences
- Sciences
- Social Sciences
- Other
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Within each affiliation what is the breakdown by publisher?

Affiliation by Publisher (% Share of Category)

- Applied Science and Engineering
- Business
- Education
- Environmental Studies
- Fine Arts
- Humanities
- Law
- Medical/Health Sciences
- Sciences
- Social Sciences
- Other

IUPUI University Library and SILS Joint Research Conference
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Within each publisher what is the breakdown by purpose of use?

Purpose of Use by Publisher

![Graph showing the breakdown of purposes by publisher]

- **Elsevier**
- **Wiley**
- **ProQuest**
- **Ebsco**

- Funded Research
- Non-Funded Research
- Teaching
- Coursework/Assignment
- Patient Care
- Other Activities
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Within specific purpose of use what is the breakdown by publisher?

Purpose of use by Publisher (% Share of Category)

- Elsevier
- Wiley
- ProQuest
- Ebsco

Categories:
- Funded Research
- Non-Funded Research
- Teaching
- Coursework/Assignment
- Patient Care
- Other Activities
Findings: Comment Code comparison (SAFI)

- **04/05:**
  - Annoyance with the survey accounts for 20.5% of the total comments and 76.1% of negative comments
  - $n=748$

- **10/11:**
  - Annoyance is 12.8% of the total comments and 41.9% of the negative comments
  - $n=1521$
Practical Implications/Value

- What are the implications of running the survey in session mode vs link-resolver?
- How does the use of consortial products compare to that individually-licensed content?
- What conclusions can be drawn about the efficacy of surveying users via an open-URL resolver?
- How will MINES fit into the overall assessment program for OCUL?
- How useful is the contextual information from MINES in understanding user workflows?
- And what about open access?
Value of Digital Content

- Value of digital content will be in the services that surround it.

- Scholars Portal may be the future
  - Surrounding content with services in a controlled environment
    - Infrastructure of assessment to quantify value
    - Saving time for the patron
    - Connecting people to information in value added ways