In November 2007, a selected member of the Council of Chief Librarians, Electronic Access to Resources Committee (CCL-EAR) undertook a "hands-on" study of LexisNexis Academic (LNA) due to its major interface changes that were in effect since July, 2007. This review mainly takes a look at the changes to the product. Please also refer to the original September 2006 review at http://www.cclibraries.org/reviews/Documents/LexisNexis%20review.pdf

The reviewer independently, or in concert with other qualified professionals on their campus library staff, reviewed and evaluated LNA. Though other faculty and/or staff may have helped in the review process, completion of the form was by the CCL-EAR committee member only and not transferred to another. Ratings were based upon the potential value of the service to the California Community Colleges as a whole and not solely on the needs of any specific campus.

Following are the results of the CCL-EAR Committee's review. Unless otherwise indicated, all comments are for LexisNexis only.

RANKINGS

#1 --- No Support
#2 --- No Support at this time. Future support conditional, based on enhancements noted below in Comments Section.
#3 --- Support and Recommend proposal be forwarded to California Community College campuses for their acceptance or rejection. Would like to see enhancements in product noted below.
#4 --- Outstanding offer and opportunity. Recommend proposal be forwarded to California Community College campuses for their acceptance or rejection.

The following attributes were examined:

INFORMATION DATABASE
Consider functionality, appropriateness of format, database content, adequacy of coverage (retrospective, current), and value to the California Community Colleges as a whole.
SEARCH INTERFACE
Consider the functionality and ease of use of the interface. Is it intuitive or is an excessive amount of training required? Are any crucial features missing from the search interface?

USER SUPPORT SERVICES
What types of customer and technical support are available for end users and library administrators?

COST
If cost is available, does it seem reasonable in terms of comparable products?

AVAILABILITY/ACCESSIBILITY OF SERVICE
Is access/connection to product reliable and stable? Is response time adequate? Is product accessible to users with disabilities?

OTHER REVIEWS OF THIS PRODUCT

OVERALL ASSESSMENT  2.9
Is the product suitable for community college students?

The new LexisNexis interface has some definite improvements: gone are the confusing search screen elements such as required steps, multiple drop-down menus, and error messages if results lead to over a 1,000 hits. The Business interface has definitely improved. The Business Dossier search provides an excellent gateway to information on companies, and there are more useful options to discover and compare companies.

The database also still contains a lot of unique content, including legal resources, accounting reference sources, and is a huge database when it comes to newspapers, newswires, and transcripts. Colleges with paralegal programs should subscribe, and many other colleges would be interested in the large amount of news and company information content.

At the same time, the new interface still does not really best meet the skill levels of community college students who are new to research. The default search box looks like one of the big form boxes where users can type in text endlessly, and the Sources navigation interface seems convoluted and daunting on its own. The subject index limiters on the News search form does not address the fact that one of the main uses of LexisNexis news is for news. Instead, the News search index limiters assume the academic user base is business and law students. Librarians are best advised to provide multiple links from LexisNexis to
certain search forms and types of resources for certain student search needs that students, themselves, are not going to easily find. The Print and Email buttons need to be more distinguished, with messages given clearly that students cannot use the browser menus or buttons to print, save or transmit content.

Given this assessment of the new interface and our in-depth review last year, CCL-EAR would strongly recommend the following:

1. LexisNexis needs to continue to improve its interface to be more user friendly to best meet the needs of community college students. While the revised interface removes the “likelihood of failure” outcome with respect to search results (error messages), there still needs to be a better approach to the concept of searching itself. LexisNexis tried to go the direction of providing “natural language searching” options, but big search boxes encourage students, who are accustomed to entering long queries in blogs and social networks, to enter lengthy, imprecise questions that will have the unintended effect of limiting search results. The search form needs to LOOK like a search form. Most database products offer a Basic search form and a “Guided Style” search form, which individual libraries can choose as the default option.

2. LexisNexis still needs to adapt to users who are new at research. The organization of Sources seems quite daunting. Previously, users searched several levels and drop down menus. Now, students experience this process when finding types of resources or having specialized search needs. In fact, the whole organization and process would likely discourage more than encourage students who want to only search particular resources and publications. The burden is then put on the librarian, library staff members, and instructors to create API (Application Programming Interface) links for particular courses, and in most cases, mainly due to staffing issues and web know-how, such important links are not going to come to fruition on library web pages or course syllabi.

3. LexisNexis needs more feedback from community college librarians and other staff members, faculty, and students. The emphasis seems to be on students learning the product instead of on adapting the product to students’ needs. While LexisNexis has posted numerous tutorials on the welcome page, they are far from clear and it would be better to have a simpler search structure at the outset. CCL-EAR is wondering: does LexisNexis have community college librarians on its advisory boards? EBSCO, ProQuest, and Gale do.

4. LexisNexis needs to create an administrative feature so that librarians can create and adapt search forms. For example, California community colleges would love to have a California News search option pronounced clearly in the default interface and news interfaces. A college that has certain types of majors or assignments could put up files that match common subjects and assignments as options in the drop-down menus or options listed below the search form. The default time range could be adjusted. A college that does not want to include
certain materials, such as blogs, could turn them off in an “All News” search. Users who prefer a guided style Boolean search screen could make it the default. Search results could list subject headings as a narrowing option instead of by type of publication. When a user does legal research, the default screen could be by court cases, instead of law reviews. These are just a few examples.

5. LexisNexis needs to provide a heading that displays the persistent link on the article result page, itself. A persistent link must be able to include portions of a Library’s address such as proxy server components. Students and faculty are not going to create API (Application Programming Interface) links, and not every Library can afford an article linker service.

6. Index limiters need to include more News search needs, and less business subject needs. Most students who would be searching for news would be searching for current events, controversial subjects, and information from all subjects and perspectives, not just from a business perspective. Other options would be to customize the index limiters through an administrative interface or allow a library to choose to have the index turned off.

7. Options for different search screens in categories should be listed on the left side, instead of the right. Traditionally, the left side of most pages are reserved for the important navigational elements of a web page. Right side options are seen as extra/miscellaneous, according to web user research.

But overall, the goal for LexisNexis should be to create a database that would be simple enough for the novice searcher, such as a community college student, to search and navigate. Important, “hidden” information should be fairly easy to discover. These were issues that came up with the old interface. These issues continue to come up with the new one. As long as LexisNexis continues to feel that students must learn and adapt to an interface used in the corporate/legal world rather than providing more of a bridge for new students in an academic world, there will always be a disconnect. Libraries will always offer one-shot instruction sessions and work with instructors on how to use database products, in general, as well as how to search Google. But a more complex interface impedes students from using its product, especially when competing products offer more inviting or intuitive interfaces.

At community colleges, LexisNexis is prized mostly for news content. How can LexisNexis draw students away from the more imperfect Google news search? That should be the question LexisNexis should ask itself when adapting to an improved interface for the academic world.
INFORMATION DATABASE  3

Consider functionality, appropriateness of format, database content, adequacy of coverage (retrospective, current), and value to the California Community Colleges as a whole.

Since the September, 2006 review the content of LNA has remained about the same. More publications continue to be added than dropped. In the new interface, LexisNexis has created what they call “linking CSI”s—a number identifier attached to an individual source (such as the New York Times) or a certain type of source (such as book reviews or California newspapers). These CSI’s can be obtained from an Excel file or by right clicking on the link to the source or type of source itself.

One new noteworthy addition to LNA’s content are blogs. Coming from the Newstex company, LNA now has selections from hundreds of blogs, enhancing the editorial and opinion-oriented content in the product. Neither LNA or Newstex have provided a clear selection criteria of the blogs or the selected blog posts, however. And most of the blogs are not well known, while some well-known blogs such as The Huffington Report, Daily Kos, and Red State are not even included.

LNA continues to be a large database. As of November, 2007, Serials Solutions lists LNA as having 3,673 full-text titles (those that do not have “selections” only) and LNA claims to have 3,347 additional “select text” titles—though both these counts also include one-time publications such as the 9/11 Commission Report and government publications and codes that are simply updated such as state constitutions.

LNA still has a rolling archive of the last six months of Tribune newspapers such as the Los Angeles Times.

SEARCH INTERFACE  2

Consider the functionality and ease of use of the interface. Is it intuitive or is an excessive amount of training required? Are any crucial features missing from the search interface?

NOTE: As this review is being written, LexisNexis has done some tinkering with the interface. Some default options on particular search forms may have changed since the writing and publication of this review.

In the September 2006 review, the CCL-EAR review team had this to say in its first sentence discussing the interface: “Searching Lexis/Nexis is not intuitive and
requires some training for students.” Unfortunately, the same can be said for the new interface. Take a look at the figure, below.

The first three rows of the interface provide the main categories of the organization of the database product. The top folder tabs show that you are either at a Search form, or looking for particular Sources. The second row indicates the type of information the user is seeking, which is now divided into “General,” “News,” “Legal,” “Business” and “People.”

The third row, which only exists in the General Search category, is yet another series of folder tabs which in the screen above are “Easy Search” and “Power Search.” Already, one ambiguity in the interface is the “General Search” stated on the right, which is not a folder tab, but stating what type of search form the user is at. A novice user could read “General Search” as an inactive option rather than a category.

While the default search screen is titled “Easy Search,” the student is given a large box to fill in text. Students who are accustomed to seeing boxes this big in forms and online social networks can be inclined to enter a lot of text. While the good news is that the default allows “natural language searching” and search results will take in certain keywords and ignore likely stop words, students who enter any phrase in quotation marks are actually asking the database to literally read the phrase. In other words, the “Easy Search” screen has the potential to lead students to a zero results search.

The rest of the search form is better than the previous default Quick News Search. The “Search Within” list allows students to make selections. The “Specify Date” drop box allows students a better default option of two years than the previous “Quick News Search” default which allowed only the last six months. In this case, the user has more options including All Dates, though the student would have to see from other options that specific dates can be entered to narrow down a search. The right side of the search form is unfortunate, as the
“Related Links” category can be interpreted to imply that ALL search screens would have extraneous links to related and help screens—when in fact, other search forms’ right links actually lead to other specific search forms students may need to use. And since they can only get to these search forms by this method, these links are certainly NOT extraneous.

The Power Search form is even less clear. Look below:

Once again, the student is welcomed with a large text box. The choices are “Terms and Connectors” (meaning a student would enter a Boolean search) or “Natural Language” (entering text as if asking a question or making a long search statement). The options below allow students to view connectors, add keywords (index terms) to a search, and select what LexisNexis believes are the most common group of sources searchers would use.

If a student clicks on any of the links listed, the immediate reaction will usually be one of confusion. “View Connectors” leads to a Help screen of all the types of connectors available in Lexis and how they are used. Oddly enough, there’s not an option to simply click on the Connector and have it appear on the search screen. The “Add Keywords” search leads the student to a search form where he or she can enter terms and then be led to types of publications, publication titles, and subject headings. Selecting any of them and then clicking an “Ok Add to Search” button on the bottom would add them, but this process seems more advanced and less clear to the novice user. The “Search within Document Sections” may be a nifty option for expert researchers to specify a certain section of a newspaper or a report, but from the student’s point of view that option is all the more confusing. “Show” leads to a section with pull-down menu options that include “Body,” “Section,” and “Subject.”
“Select Sources” option is troublesome. While many options are listed, common search options students may need will not always be listed there. When this happens, the option is to then click “Find More Sources” and then the user is led to the Sources navigation page, which as stated below can be rather disorienting for the novice user.

The News search form goes to a somewhat familiar Guided Style search form, but once again the boxes are huge and the user is once again invited to enter text endlessly rather than enter one term at a time.

This search form is somewhat reminiscent to the older Lexis guided style forms, as there are options to search in Headline, Headline and Lead Paragraph, and Byline. The default option is “All News” that is in English (or the user can select a more narrowed down option from the pull-down menu and select different types of news). **NOTE: As this article was being written LexisNexis changed the default to U.S. Newspapers and wires.** Specify Date is limited to just the past three months, however, so for some search needs, students should be encouraged to use that pull-down menu before clicking on the Search button. Options under “Select Sources” list to all different types of news sources, but NOT by region of the United States as was available by the Guided News search form of the previous version. Instead, there are options by news type (such as newspapers, magazines, transcripts, or news wires, World News, all U.S. News, and language and key individual titles such as the New York Times).
In the “Add Index Terms” option, the user is led to three boxes where the user can narrow down his or her search. They are “Industry,” “Subject,” and “Region.”

The Industry option is mainly going to be useful if one’s search topic is related to a certain industry. This option can be confusing if the search is not business oriented at all. The Subject search has subject categories such as “Alliances & Partnerships,” “Best Practices,” “Contracts and Bids” and “New Products.” Such subject terms are used more often rather than common news subject terms such as “War and Conflict,” “Statistics,” and “Editorials and Opinions” which a student likely would not pursue finding as most of the Subject terms seem related to business or law issues. The Region category leads only to particular countries, (not states or provinces) and a student would have to scroll all the way down alphabetically to select “United States.” Given how it is set up, the Index Terms seems to be geared toward the legal and corporate worlds and not to students in academic institutions. One could almost see students selecting the “Exclude from Search” option instead, which would likely lead them away from relevant articles to their search.

Legal Search Forms

In the News Search form, on the right side, there was actually a selection to another search form to search the Roper Poll surveys. In the Legal Search forms, this right side of important links becomes all the more important, but users can easily miss it. The legal search form, for example, defaults to the Law Reviews search form, even though at community colleges, students are more often searching for court cases, constitutions, or codes.
Such a search screen as this reveals likely confusion for the student. The student has to remember to click one of the options on the right, if not searching in law reviews, and also needs to be aware when seeing search boxes such as the ones listed below, that they are optional and not required. Likewise, the user needs to know this when selecting Federal and State cases as listed below. The student may feel that he or she needs to know the case name, the citation number, the judge’s last name, and the counsel’s name before continuing, when in fact, all a user needs to do is enter text in at least ONE of these boxes.
Business Search

In the Business Search option, students are led to the new Business Dossier search. This new search allows a gateway to information, including a company profile, links to news stories, and links to other key information. The default option does not allow any text or subject searching. Students must know a company name, ticker, DUNS number, company type, city, a state/province or country/region. If students want to look up industry and business news, apparently they need to go to the News Search feature, or to find profiles with general text go to the Company Profiles option instead. The reviewer wishes the Company Dossier option would include a full-text and/or subject option as well, especially if a student does not have an individual company but wants to further narrow down by company type.

As in Legal Search, important categories that used to be in drop-down menus are now listed on the right side. But the way the interface is set up they appear extraneous, rather than essential search forms students need. A lot of interface research has stated that users gravitate to options listed above the main part of the screen or the left side for key navigation links. The right side options are likely to be overlooked.

After a user clicks on a company name in the Dossier search options, the user is led to a list of addresses, phone numbers, ticker symbols, Internet address, and number of employees. Listed below is a company description, yearly financials (which lead to downloadable tables), list of competitors, a list of Executives, Brand Names (with lookup trademark links available next to them), and a list of Current News with a “More Stories option listed below. On the left side, users can select choices to narrow “In the News” by Top Publication (Major Newspapers, Magazines, Transcripts, Legal Publications), Topic (Business
Activity, Corporate Structure, Financial, Legal, Marketing and Product), and Region (United States; Canada, Central America, and South America; European; Asian and Pacific Rim; and Middle East and Africa), Corporate Hierarchy, Financial Information, Legal Information, Intellectual Property Information, References and Custom Report.

If users select Company Profiles, they have more flexibility to enter general search terms than in the Company Dossier search. They can also select individual sources and specify a more specific date.
In the September 2006 review, the review team found options to compare companies mainly by region and population to be limiting. The review team wished that options to search by industry, SIC and NAICS codes, or by names of companies were available. The new interface now provides two options that can lead to more relevant and fruitful research needs. “Create a Company List” allows options to list company names, sales/revenue, number of employees, SIC Code, NAICS code, Terms (a keyword search), and Search Within (which has options to Business Description, Executives, Subsidiary, Brands/Products, Competitors, Auditors, Legal Counsel).

A Compare Companies option is also available, but in this option users need to know exactly the company name or ticker symbol. As these feature SEC filings, only publicly traded companies will be listed. If a student wants to get any comparison with any privately owned company, the best he or he can do is create a company list and then look at each selection.
Other options for Company search include a link to Accounting (a very unique search feature) and to content in LexisNexis), as well as to SEC filings, and Country profiles (an odd place to position this since users may want country profiles for more than business reasons).

No More Reference—Except for People

While Reference resources are still available in LexisNexis, the company has chosen to eliminate this category and instead provide a search interface only for People. Articles on people can be found by last name, first name, or additional terms. The other reference works are now only available in Sources, such as the World Almanac, or listed on the right side of other categories (Roper Polls as a selection under the News category and Country Profiles listed as a selection under the Business category). The People search actually is quite fruitful and an improvement over the previous interface.
Search Results

If a user enters a broad enough search, whether by subject or date range, the user will be led to a screen if the results are more than 3,000 results with suggestions. However the user can click on “Retrieve Results” if they wish, and be led to the 1,000 most relevant results, instead.

The results screen contains 25 articles per page, (default sort is by relevance), and the user can then manipulate the search with the View, Sort, and Next Stages, pull-down menus listed in the first two rows, below the Results tab. Also included is a Narrow Search box where users can type in more search terms and then click “Go.” The View options are the same as the previous interface, List, Extended List, Full Document, Full with Indexing, Custom and KWIC (Key word
in Context). The extended list and Full with Indexing include predominant subject headings with percentage of relevancy given with respect to the article.

The Sort option is by Relevance or Publication Date (which would be descending)

and the Next Steps allows the user to go back to the search form and edit the search or do a New Search.

On the left, there’s a pull-down menu for “Result Groups” with the default being types of publications. The Result Groups option can be quite fruitful for students who reach a great number of results. Options include Publication Name, Subject, Industry, Company, Geography, Language and People.
The Subject Category can actually be quite fruitful. While the subject listings are complete and can seem like an endless column of subjects, a student could utilize these options to conduct more focused searches.

The reviewer wishes LNA would list options for publication types on the top of the interface as ProQuest, Gale, and EBSCO have done for theirs (usually in the forms of folder tabs, buttons, or clear link categories), and that by default the
Result Group on the left would be the list of Subject headings. That way the novice user can utilize subject headings to narrow down topics or get to a more precise list of results. This interface practice has been utilized already in the Gale Powersearch and EBSCOhost interfaces.

In addition to finding subject headings on the left, users can also trace subject headings on the bottom of the screen. What is especially nice is that these subject headings have check box features on the left, meaning a user can select more than one subject heading to get more results—allowing a precise search using actual indexing terms in the product. Checking in the boxes will “OR” each term by default. The user will be led back to a search form where below, under “Edit Search with Document Terms.”

Like in the previous interface, in full text articles, search terms are in bold within the text.

**Print/Email/Save/Export**

The Print, Email, Save, and Export options appear on the top right of the Search Results screen as well as the top right of the actual full-text article, itself. With the new interface, any user who tries to perform any of these functions outside of these buttons will end up printing or transmitting blank pages. With the icons appearing so tiny and so much in the background, a novice user could miss these important options. The user gets textual meaning of the icons when the user moves the mouse over each of them. Each option leads to a screen where a user makes choices on how they want to send information. The default setting for printing lists is to full-text documents and to all, meaning if the user makes no other choice, the text of ALL the articles will be printed.

In addition in the search results, users can mark entries and then later see them with a “View Tagged” button, however those saved entries will disappear if a user conducts a new search. It is unfortunate that users cannot save marked entries from multiple searches or view a search history. The user actually has to go one by one and remember searches they have conducted or write them down on a
piece of paper as they are searching, if they need to re-perform. Alerts are also not available.

**Sources**

If the user cannot find a particular type of resource, he or she needs to go to the Sources option. The Sources option screen asks users to select from three steps: 1) Whether they want to find their particular resource or group of resources by Publication Type, News and Business Topics, Industry, or Area of Law, 2) Filtered by Country and Topics, and then when both are selected 3) A Category to view sources. On the top right, users can also perform keyword searches to find a Source. When certain options are selected more pull-down menus and options may appear (such as when a country is selected, a pull-down menu for states, regions, provinces, etc. may appear).
In the example listed below, the search is by Publication Type, then United States is selected, a new pull-down menu is available for regions, and if the user was pursuing California information, after California is selected, several categories are available. By selecting News, the user can select different regional options, including one just for Northern California or Southern California. If the user wants to find a list of Newspapers, the newspapers option needs to be selected.

Once a category is selected through Sources, the user is then led to the Power Search screen with the individual source(s) that have been checked in the checkboxes to appear in the Select Sources text box screen on the right:
This portal like process (a bit reminiscent of Yahoo!) is a bit convoluted. More likely, if students use Sources at all they will type in keywords in the top right. The alphabetical list has been eliminated, which is unfortunate, if students get the spelling of the title wrong (especially for non-U.S. English publications that would have variant spellings of familiar words). The reviewer wishes there was a better gateway to information, especially since some categories in the previous LexisNexis such as Medical, Quotations, and the World Almanac, are now buried in the interface.
The author of this review has found that students at his institution find the multi-step process daunting and has begun providing direct links to particular sources to students for particular classes.

**Linking to Search Screens, Sources, Publications, and Articles**

The new LexisNexis has now provided linking to particular search screens, Sources, Publications, and Articles. Unlike the previous interface, where some links to publications and certain categories were possible but convoluted, the new LexisNexis has created a failsafe predictable URL protocol to get to the desired screen, source, or individual article. This process is called API (Application Programming Interface). The document on how to do this is at: [http://www.lexisnexis.com/documents/academic/academic_migration/LexisNexis%20Academic%20URL%20API%20Specification%202007_07_01-1.pdf](http://www.lexisnexis.com/documents/academic/academic_migration/LexisNexis%20Academic%20URL%20API%20Specification%202007_07_01-1.pdf) or at: [http://tinyurl.com/ysb8gq](http://tinyurl.com/ysb8gq)

What does the process entail? Well, to directly link to the Power Search form so that students are only searching California News sources the URL looks like this:

```
http://www.lexisnexis.com/us/lnacademic/api/version1/sf?shr=t&sfi=AC00NBGenSrch&csi=149356
```

and that long URL would also need any proxy server or referring URL components your institution uses. Imagine trying to teach these linking options to students, faculty, or only somewhat technologically adept librarians.

However, as convoluted as it seems, all URL’s at least have the same beginning, and a predictable structure.

Here is a guideline


The guide also gives Base URL’s for different types of publications. Below are the following:


The reviewer is glad that such options are available as there continue to be good sources and search needs that can occur but are still hidden (in some ways more so) in the new interface. But considering that API requires libraries to have the staff and know-how to provide such links, this neat option will rarely be used. The API’s to sources and to specific articles will at least be used for institutions that have journal and article link resolvers. Serials Solutions, Ebsco A to Z and other products have already incorporated these new links.

Persistent links do not appear in a LexisNexis record. The reviewer strongly recommends that like other vendors such as EBSCO, ProQuest, and Gale, that LexisNexis list a persistent link in the article’s record, itself, which can also include individual institution’s authentication (such as a proxy server prompt).

Other Issues

Publications that have full-text articles in PDF format are still listed as having Abstracts-Summaries-Briefs. The reviewer wishes LexisNexis would identify when PDF is clearly available (it is stated at document level with a link that states “Get the Full Text PDF Version (Web Users Only)” but the user would not know it is available unless at document level.

Also, LexisNexis still does not provide the option to browse issues in any of its publications, which the reviewer believes limits potential of finding and discovering articles.

USER SUPPORT SERVICES 3

Compared to the old interface, LexisNexis has improved customer support for users. Unlike the previous interface, Help links are clearly marked and are context sensitive. Three handouts are currently available as well as four tutorials. They are available at: http://www.lexisnexis.com/academicmigration/viewpage.asp?p=1

Their handouts are for the most part very text heavy with few sample screens. Considering that community college students are at various levels and have multiple learning styles, the reviewer wished LexisNexis would create more handouts to appeal to the visual learner (though the online tutorials do). The handouts and the tutorials seem to have a somewhat promotional edge. It would be nice if LexisNexis could especially create tutorials and handouts that were targeted more toward the novice user such as the community college student.

The customer support link is still buried within the help pages, and, if selected, still asks the user to contact the reference librarian, but provides no link or number or method for the user to easily achieve this.
Technical support for librarians is still a bit convoluted. At present time, Lexis-Nexis still asks for a Customer Number, however if the institution does not know its number, LexisNexis will ask for other information to verify the institution (name, institution, etc.) Considering that fewer vendors now ask for account numbers, the reviewer wishes that LexisNexis would drop the protocol, or at least have names of contacts for individual institutions in their files.

**Cost 3**

LexisNexis continues to offer an affordable price for its product, especially considering the large bulk of newspapers, law reviews, business information, and other key resources and documents. Their per FTE rate is more affordable to smaller community colleges than larger ones, however. In fact, for very large community colleges, Lexis may only be somewhat competitive, at best. But for most community colleges, LexisNexis definitely has a competitive edge over most newspaper and business products, and is still the only Consortium choice for community colleges with paralegal programs. With respect to the content, the cost is a good bargain.

**AVAILABILITY/ACCESSIBILITY OF THE PRODUCT 3**

LexisNexis claims to meet Section 508 requirements. At the time this re-review is being written, we are unable to get a usability test but will update this review with one soon.

The connection requirements to use the new LexisNexis are the following:

- 128 MB of RAM (256 and above recommended)
- PC Pentium (233 Mhz and above) Macintosh (Power PC G3 and above)
- Modem speed (56K and above)

The browsers it works with are Internet Explorer 6 and above, and FireFox 1.5 and above (but with Windows Vista only Internet Explorer 7 and Firefox 2 at the time of publication of this review). It works with Safari 2 and above and Firefox 1.5 and above in Macs.

**Summary**

While the updated interface has some enhancements and improvements, CCL-EAR wishes that LexisNexis would strive harder for a user interface that meets the research needs of community college students. An administrative option would definitely benefit individual institutions, and more interfaces that use Basic
and Guided search screens (without large text boxes) and search results screens that provide clear visible options for students to narrow searches by subject would definitely be a plus. The reviewer strongly recommends that LexisNexis study how major vendors such as EBSCO, Gale, and ProQuest have achieved such results.

Other Reviews/Articles
