

Status Report

Demand Driven Acquisitions Pilot Implementation Team (DDAPIT)

September 28, 2011 (Revised on October 19, 2011)

Emily McElroy (Chair), Oregon Health & Science University

Xan Arch, Reed College

Jim Bunnelle, Lewis & Clark College

Linda Di Biase, University of Washington

Greg Doyle, Orbis Cascade Alliance

Susan Hinken, University of Portland

Mary Ellen Kenreich, Portland State University

Joe Kiegel, University of Washington

Other Participants:

Alison Bobal, EBL formerly of Oregon State University

Robin Champieux, EBL

Tom Larsen, Portland State University

Joan Thompson, YBP

General Update on Activities

Evaluation

1. Weekly usage and expenditure statistics are sent to the DDA liaisons list and posted on DDAPIT site (<http://www.orbiscascade.org/index/demand-driven-acquisitions-pilot#stats>).
2. Mid-term evaluation is due at the end of October. The following documents are planned for publication on the Alliance website prior to the November Council meeting.
 - a. Survey results on the effectiveness of DDA training and communication for member libraries.
 - b. Profiles of the usage and spending at each library.
 - i. Data will include
 1. When a library loaded records
 2. When classes started
 3. Use
 4. Total list price of content used
 5. Financial contribution
 6. The percentage of list price a library has paid to facilitate access at its campus
 - c. Method for library self-assessment, so libraries can update their case studies on their own.
3. Final evaluation is expected in early January.

Technical Services Workflow

Record loads are occurring on a monthly basis. There has been a significant drop-off in questions from libraries. For our evaluation, DDAPIT documented when libraries completed their first local load of DDA records. We assume libraries are maintaining the regular monthly schedule if they are loading records at the local level. Two libraries have either not loaded records or have decided to load only purchased titles. These libraries are unlikely to realize the full benefit of the pilot project.

Current Issues

Ownership and Usage as of September 16

Background

When the DDA Implementation Team started its work last January, our first hurdle was deciding whether or not our goal was to own or just access content. **We agreed that our goal was an ownership model**; otherwise the previous task force would have recommended a subscription model for ebooks. Early on, EBL presented the team with different options for determining the number of short-term loans. For an ownership model, they recommended a lower number of short-term loans because we would purchase content earlier and for less money. For an access model, they recommended a higher number of short-term loans. At our February meeting, we weighed the consequences of a high or low short-term loan number. The team decided to take a conservative approach in setting the purchase trigger after 10 short term loans because we were concerned that our funds would be depleted before most schools were back in session, or even at the mid-point of the project. This concern outweighed spending a higher amount on a per-title basis. We also restricted the number of included titles to a 2011 imprint year. Our team felt comfortable knowing that we could make adjustments during the pilot project based on actual usage by either increasing or decreasing the number of short-term loans or adding additional content. As we stated in our March Progress Report, "This is a pilot project. We are aiming for viability and not perfection. There has never been a shared, demand driven project done at this scale before. As we work with YBP and EBL, we need to remind ourselves to be flexible and patient. There is no doubt that this is a learning experience for all parties."

DDAPIT examined current usage and expenditures at a September 27th meeting and is making changes to the program's structure. We decided to lower the number of short-term loans from ten to five and to add additional years of content.

Issues

- It was the Alliance's expressed goal to purchase content for shared perpetual ownership. **After three months the Alliance had not yet purchased any content** and there were a marginal number of titles in the pipeline to be purchased. Lowering the short-term loan (STL) number would ensure that more content was purchased while still building a strong pattern of usage.

- Lowering the STL trigger from ten to five also reduces the overall cost of titles. For each short-term loan, the Alliance is charged a percentage of the list price. As an example, A Global History of Architecture would have cost the Alliance \$665 if we had stayed with 10 STLs. Instead, it only costs us \$593.75 with the move to five. Last February, the team struggled with the higher cost-per-unit cost if we went with ten short-term loans but felt it was a better alternative to running out of funds too early.
- The initial STL number was arrived at on speculation. We predicted that per title usage/transactions would be much higher in a large consortial environment than within a single institution. We set the number artificially high because we were more concerned with spending all of our funds before most schools were back in session. It was a balancing act between higher costs for an individual title and funds to continue providing any access. This has not been the case, however. The average number of STL's per title for the Alliance is 1.65. The average number across a single institution is 1.5. This data comes from EBL's experience with individual libraries. At this average, little to no titles would ever reach the point of purchase after the 10th STL.
- A sustainable program requires content. The program's trends for the first three months were dramatically below the expectations the Alliance set for the program and defined for the publishers, YBP and EBL. While all of the participants understood that the six-month timeline was an estimate, **the three-month trend showed that the Alliance would own very little content.** The trends also indicated that initial funds would not be spent for over two years, even when factoring for a very aggressive increase in usage for the fall. One concern expressed by EBL and YBP was that publisher participation was based on a much different pilot length and budget, which we defined. It is likely that publishers would have or will cease participation after six months if this trend continued. **EBL also stated that they were concerned with lack of any owned content beyond the pilot.** This change was not recommended to increase publisher revenue or spend out the pilot budget. Rather it was recommended to bring the program in line with our stated goals and budget and, accordingly, publisher expectations; subsequently, creating a more positive environment for continued and growing publisher participation.
- If the change proves unsuccessful, we have the flexibility to adjust it further. However, it seems that right now it is working. For October, we targeted a budget of just over \$53,000 or \$1,710/day. Thus far, we've only spent \$8,182.25 or \$629.40/day. So, as we planned there is still room to grow our collection significantly, purchase more content, and not bust our budget. And finally, the titles we purchased show a strong and diverse pattern of usage.

Marketing

We continue to receive questions on marketing the pilot project to users. DDAPIT still recommends that we provide minimal marketing to users. We want to limit the number of variables for the project's evaluation. As noted earlier, the library's commitment to making the pilot content available through its catalog or principle discovery tool is critical to patron access and use.

Link Resolver

As the pilot project went live, CTST identified issues with how the project's ebooks interact with the link resolver button (Find it @ Your Library) in Summit.

1. Issues
 - a. The link resolver button is misleading since it does not take a user to the actual ebook.
 - b. A smaller link below the link resolver button actually takes the user to the ebook.
 - c. For an Alliance pilot, the Alliance discovery tool should not be obviously broken.
2. Communication with SPOT
 - a. At the Alliance Summer Meeting, Joe Kiegel met with SPOT to raise concerns with how the link resolver is misleading for users accessing the pilot's ebooks. Joe proposed a solution for how the link resolver button would not appear for ebooks. His solution was to turn off the link resolver for "all other electronic content." SPOT said they would investigate how other libraries use "all other electronic content."
 - b. DDAPIT is concerned that we are halfway through the pilot project and this issue is still unresolved. We are concerned that this will become a public services issue as we increase content. We are unsure if SPOT is actively looking into this issue.
 - c. DDAPIT recommends that SPOT implement Joe's recommended fix and sees what happens for any content other than ebooks.
3. Next Steps
 - a. Greg followed up with Nancy Nathanson and SPOT. SPOT did an informal survey of members in the summer about the resolver button, but the response was not conclusive and there were concerns about the impact on other types of e-resources. SPOT is concerned that without understanding the full impact it is not appropriate to make such a decision for a Pilot Project. SPOT is intending to do a fuller survey of members to how members are using the link resolver button.

OCLC's KnowledgeBase (KB)

EBL and YBP have expressed concerns with how the KB is central to the project's workflow. DDAPIT shares many of the same concerns.

1. Issues
 - a. OCLC only updates the KB on a monthly basis while content is added on a weekly basis from YBP and EBL. The KB is always a month behind what is actually available in the pilot. As we move closer to the end of the month, the delay between the KB and available content grows longer. By the end of each month, the KB is two months behind the pilot's available content.
 - b. There are record integrity issues because the KB is not a real-time file. Titles move in and out of our project so records don't match with what is updated.
 - c. Currently, EBL has to perform a manual, time-intensive workflow specifically for this pilot project. While EBL finds this acceptable for the pilot project, they cannot sustain this workflow after the pilot project ends.

- d. OCLC is also inconsistent with when they update the KB. EBL often has to follow up with OCLC. We struggle with OCLC's unresponsiveness.
 - e. DDAPIT, EBL and YBP acknowledge that the KB is based on a serials workflow and OCLC plans on changing its update schedule from once a month. Yet, our workflow cannot be built on their growing pains as we wait for product development.
2. DDAPIT Decisions and Recommendations
- a. Starting in October, EBL will adjust its workflow so records will appear before links are made available through the KB.
 - i. 31 libraries are using Innovative for discoverability so they will not experience any problems.
 - ii. Five libraries rely on the KB for discovery in their WorldCat Local instance or in Summit. Their access will be temporarily broken while the KB is behind schedule. CTST will create a document on possible workflow suggestions for those libraries.
 - iii. Records will now be available on a weekly basis for libraries who want to load records more frequently.
 - b. Our goal is to create a consistent and sustainable workflow. At this point, DDAPIT feels it is time for the Alliance to engage in discussions with OCLC management on the issues surrounding the KB. The team agrees that we can create an issues document and participate in any required phone calls or meetings. Emily and Greg will follow up with John Helmer.

Funding

1. Issues
- a. DDAPIT projects that we will deplete funds in January 2012.
 - b. Without any funding to maintain the program, we will need to plan for how to handle records in local catalogs. We will also need to begin communicating any suspension of the program with publishers, EBL and YBP as soon as possible. Without additional data, we are not in a position to recommend a new funding model until January or February.
2. Recommendations
- a. As we have reported earlier, we hope to receive funds for the period from January to July 2012. During this period, we hope to receive the same level of funding as the initial funding for the pilot project. We do not recommend adjusting the funding model for this bridge period. We also do not recommend suspending the program until July based on potential cuts due to records management. Our preference is to move with more confidence from a pilot project to an ongoing program for continued publisher participation, partnership with EBL and YBP, and the example we are setting for other consortia.
 - b. DDAPIT will develop a funding model for the next fiscal year. This model, which we anticipate will take into account FTE, acquisitions budget, and demonstrated DDA use, will be ready for the March 2012 Council meeting.

Recommendation for Action

DDAPIT recommends that we agree to extend the ebook Project to June 30, 2012 with the understanding that additional funds may be required. The amount billed to extend the project will not exceed the [amount billed to each member for the initial phase](#). We request to commit funding sufficient to assure a six-month extension of the project, with the expectation that a revised funding model for FY13 will be presented for Council decision in March 2012.