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University of North Texas

• State-funded public university

• Enrollment of 36,168
  – 29,481 undergraduate students
  – 6,687 graduate students
UNT Libraries budget

- Almost exclusively provided by student use fee
- Covers all library expenses
- Limits of fee-based budget
  - Only charged to undergraduates
  - Per-credit hour fee capped at 12 hours
  - Budget rises and falls with enrollment
  - Flat enrollment = flat budget = cuts
2011: Round 1 of Cuts

- Target: $750,000
- Deactivation of all YBP approval plans
- 71% reduction of departmental firm money allocations
- Massive E-conversion project
Round 1 Pros & Cons

• PROS
  – Simple to implement

• CONS
  – Stop-gap measure
2012: Round 2 of Cuts

• Target: $1 million

• Criteria for consideration
  1. Duplication between print and electronic formats
  2. Duplication in another source
  3. Restricted access
  4. Low internal usage/lack of usage
  5. High cost/use
  6. Embargo of less than one year
  7. Embargo of one year with cost greater than $2000
Round 2 cont.

• Gathering data

• Liaisons meetings
  – Met individually
  – Provided spreadsheets
  – Asked them to rank each title as 1 – Must Have; 2 – Nice to Have; or 3 – Can Go
  – Allowed one month to consult with faculty
Round 2 cont.

- Compiled $1 million cut
- Revised Target: $1.25 million
- Provided master cut list to liaisons for review
- Cut list finalized June 22, 2012
Round 2 Pros & Cons

• Pros
  – Value of data
  – Allowed for liaison/faculty feedback

• Cons
  – Liaisons overwhelmed with info
  – Ranking issues
  – Not enough time/data for in-depth analysis
2013: Reprieve

• One time lump sum of money to cover inflation

• Time to plan for 2014 cuts
  – Implement ERM
  – Implement EBSCO Usage Consolidation
2014: Round 3 of Cuts

- Target: $1.25 million
- Focusing on subscriptions > $1,000
- Looking at Big Deals
- **Using a Decision Grid Process to Build Consensus in Electronic Resources Cancellation Decisions**
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Lifting the Veil

THE UNCOVERING
Kinds of Data to Collect

Usual Suspects

- Cost
- Uses
  - Highest & Best Use Measure
  - Average of last 3 years
- Cost per Use

Widening the Net

- Overlap with other resources
- Sustainability or Inflation Factor
- Librarians’ perceptions of value
- Relevant to the type of resource
Measures Common to Many Resources

Overlap

Usage

Inflation Factor

Librarian’s Input
Overlap

Ejournals
- Serials Solutions Overlap Analysis

A&I Databases
- JISC
- Cufts
- Manual comparisons

Full-Text Aggregators
- JISC
- Cufts
- Serials Solutions
Usage

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Closest to the user</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cost-per-use calculated based on Highest &amp; Best Use measure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Usage measure included in final analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average of the last 3 years</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Highest & Best Use Measure

- **Sessions**
  - Reference sources (Non-COUNTER)

- **Searches**
  - A&I Databases (COUNTER 3)

- **Record Views**
  - A&I Databases (COUNTER 4)
  - Some reference sources

- **Full-text**
  - Ejournals
  - Full-text Databases
  - Some reference sources
Inflation Factor

Expenditures from ILS

From last 5 years

Average change per year

Relative to resource type
Distribution of Inflation Factors by Resource Type

- Each column is a Resource Type
- Range
  - 10\textsuperscript{th} percentile in green
  - 50\textsuperscript{th} percentile in yellow
  - 90\textsuperscript{th} percentile in red
## Average Percentage Change Over 5 Years

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Min</th>
<th>10th</th>
<th>25th</th>
<th>33rd</th>
<th>Median</th>
<th>66th</th>
<th>75th</th>
<th>90th</th>
<th>Max</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Databases</td>
<td>-19</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jnl Package</td>
<td>-22</td>
<td>-1.5</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reference</td>
<td>-14</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual Jnls</td>
<td>-12</td>
<td>-0.9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Print</td>
<td>-24</td>
<td>-20</td>
<td>-3</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Librarian’s Input

3x3 Rubric

- 3 Criteria
  - Ease of Use
  - Breadth
  - Uniqueness to Curriculum
- 3 Level Scale
  - 1 Best
  - 2 Medium
  - 3 Worst

Resources evaluated

- Specific to discipline
- Relevant Interdisciplinary

Notes for qualitative input
Evaluating Specific Types of Resources

Big Deals

Databases & Reference
Assessing Big Deals

Usual Suspects

- Cost
- # of Titles
- Cost/Title
- Uses
- Uses/Title
- Cost/Use

Widening the Net

- Overlap
- Usage Scope
- List price
- Alternatives
Serials Solutions Overlap Analysis

Overlap status for each title:
- Unique
- Partial Overlap
- Full Overlap

Total Holding Overlap:
- Source & years covered for each overlapped title
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Overlap Source</th>
<th># Titles Overlapped</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ABI/INFORM Global</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Search Complete</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Insights: Global</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Source Complete</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environment Complete</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health Reference Center Academic</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health Source: Nursing/Academic Edition</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JSTOR Arts &amp; Sciences I Archive Collection</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JSTOR Biological Sciences Archive Collection</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JSTOR Ecology &amp; Botany Archive Collection</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NASA Astrophysics Data System Journals</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ProQuest Research Library</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychology &amp; Behavioral Sciences Collection</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science and Technology</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SocINDEX with Full Text</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Total</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Distribution of Usage

How useful is the package to our users?

80% of uses served by ?% of titles*

- Sort titles by usage from highest to lowest.
- Calculate cumulative % of uses and cumulative % of titles for each title.

Higher ~ wider spread of usage

Lower ~ greater concentration of usage

Conditional Formatting in Excel highlights cells based on values from the 10th to the 90th percentile.

Pareto Distribution: ~80 of uses served by ~45 of titles.
Alternative Models

What would we do if we canceled the package?

List price of each title

Cost-per-use based on the list price (LP CPU)

Compared with the package CPU
Alternative Models

Big Deals

PPV or Get it Now

Multiyear Commitment

Flexible

High CPU for some titles

Seamless to User

Lower CPU
## Alternative Model Scenarios

**What would we do if we canceled this package?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Individual Subs</th>
<th>Alternative sources</th>
<th>Interlibrary Loan</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Highly used titles</td>
<td>• moderately-used titles</td>
<td>• All the rest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Low List Price CPU</td>
<td>• too expensive to subscribe</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• titles with short embargo period</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Databases & Reference Sources

Usual Suspects

Cost
Use
Cost per use

Widening the Net

Overlap
Serials Solutions
Linking
  • Links-in
  • Links-out
Overlap

Data Sources
- JISC ADAT
- CUFTS
- Serials Solutions Overlap Analysis
- Journal coverage lists

Calculated
- Overlap Rate

Noted
- Highest overlap rate
- Comparable database
PULLING IT ALL TOGETHER
Comparing the Apples with Oranges
Criteria for Evaluation

Cost-per-Use

If no usage data, 0

Liaison Ratings

Weighted sum
- Ease of use * 1
- Breadth * 2
- Uniqueness * 3

Inflation Factor
Scale of Scores

Scale: Percentiles

Relative to Resource Type

Composite Score:
• Average of percentiles of criteria
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ORDER</th>
<th>TITLE</th>
<th>ORD TRACKG</th>
<th>Liaison Ratings Composite Percentile Rank Reverse</th>
<th>Inflation Score Percentile Rank Reversed</th>
<th>CPU Percentile Rank Reversed</th>
<th>Composite Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>o3518024</td>
<td>Communication sciences and disorders doi</td>
<td>Database</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.71</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>0.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o2867114</td>
<td>International journal of audiology</td>
<td>E-Journal</td>
<td>0.113</td>
<td>0.633</td>
<td>0.731</td>
<td>0.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o2761361</td>
<td>ABI/INFORM</td>
<td>Database</td>
<td>0.521</td>
<td>0.556</td>
<td>0.809</td>
<td>0.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o4841050</td>
<td>Business Insights: Global</td>
<td>Reference</td>
<td>0.323</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>0.317</td>
<td>0.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o3214771</td>
<td>European journal of information systems</td>
<td>E-Journal</td>
<td>0.902</td>
<td>0.019</td>
<td>0.896</td>
<td>0.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o324989x</td>
<td>Hoover's online</td>
<td>Reference</td>
<td>0.323</td>
<td>0.463</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o468039x</td>
<td>International Journal of Revenue Managen</td>
<td>E-Journal</td>
<td>0.626</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>0.079</td>
<td>0.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o2189872</td>
<td>Journal of information technology</td>
<td>E-Journal</td>
<td>0.902</td>
<td>0.67</td>
<td>0.592</td>
<td>0.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o4405213</td>
<td>Million dollar database</td>
<td>Reference</td>
<td>0.323</td>
<td>0.657</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o4632369</td>
<td>Morningstar investment research center</td>
<td>Reference</td>
<td>0.619</td>
<td>0.538</td>
<td>0.917</td>
<td>0.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o3023643</td>
<td>RIA checkpoint</td>
<td>Reference</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.36</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o4864529</td>
<td>Sourcing Journal</td>
<td>E-Journal</td>
<td>0.626</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o2963243</td>
<td>Thomson ONE banker</td>
<td>Reference</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.63</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>0.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o4656040</td>
<td>Transportation Research Record</td>
<td>E-Journal</td>
<td>0.902</td>
<td>0.614</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>0.55</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Final Analysis

Master List
• Overall evaluation of each resource
• Sort by percentile rank for each criteria

Actions by Fund
• Ensure appropriate distribution of pain

Notes from Librarians
• Provide insight into utility or user needs
Labeled the action for each resource:

- Cancel
- Modify
- Keep
- On Table

Distribution of Actions by Fund

Pain is spread fairly
### Actions by Fund

No fund should have all or none dropped

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fund</th>
<th>Modify</th>
<th>On Tab</th>
<th>Safe</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>abizp4</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>achzp4</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>acstp4</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>addzp4</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>aeczp4</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>aenzp4</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>agezp4</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ahizp4</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ajozp4</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>altzp4</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>amazp4</td>
<td>82%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Semi-Final Results

137 Resources Retained

167 Resources Canceled or Modified

$1.6 million in cost-savings
Round 3– Next Steps

• Provide master list to liaisons
• Allow time for faculty feedback
• Incorporate suggested swap-outs
Round 3 Pros & Cons

• Pros
  – Combined objective and subjective data
  – Composite score facilitates sorting and ranking
  – Compared resources by type
  – Feedback from multiple sources

• Cons
  – Time and labor intensive
  – Still gathering usage data
  – Complex
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