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Overview

• Colorado Context
• Defining Assessment Questions
• Analysis
• Conclusions
• Where do we go from here?
About the University of Colorado (CU)

• 5 Libraries, 4 campuses, 3 cities: Boulder, Denver, Colorado Springs
• Materials Budgets from $1.3M to $10.8M
• FTE from 8,675 to 33,885
Patron-Driven Acquisition at CU

1999-2005  PDA with Colorado Alliance of Research Libraries and netLibrary
  ◦ The “banana book incident”

2009-2010  PDA Pilot with MyiLibrary platform

2010-present  PDA integrated into approval plan with Coutts and MyiLibrary
  ◦ Share pool of discovery records with all CU libraries
  ◦ Any library can trigger a purchase
  ◦ Shared access to all purchased content
How has PDA impacted collection building at each library in the CU System?

• Which subjects are loading the most records and triggering the most purchases?
  • Which library is triggering those purchases?
• How does the PDA eBook program impact the print book collection?
  • Collection size, growth, and usage
• Are we building collections that support the teaching and research needs of our campuses given existing resources?
MyiLibrary PDA Summary Data: 
# of Purchased eBooks FY12-15
Which subjects have the most records?

- Education: 1735 eBooks
- Political Science: 1631 eBooks
- Business: 1534 eBooks
- Psychology: 1351 eBooks
- Biology: 1317 eBooks
- Religious Studies: 1203 eBooks
- Engineering: 900 eBooks
- Anthropology: 816 eBooks
- Law: 719 eBooks
- Sociology: 700 eBooks
MyiLibrary PDA Summary Data: Expenditures FY12-15

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fiscal Year</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FY12</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY13</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY14</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY15</td>
<td>$150,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Which subjects have triggered the most purchases?

- Education: 302
- Psychology: 227
- Business: 165
- Political Science: 158
- Religious Studies: 132
- Anthropology: 130
- Engineering: 125
- Biology: 114
- Criminal Justice: 95
- Sociology: 93

# of Purchased eBooks
Are all subjects purchasing PDA at the same rate?
Top 10 Subjects with Highest PDA Purchase Rate

- Computer Science
- Criminal Justice
- Earth Sciences
- Education
- Ethnic Studies
- Journalism & Comm
- Math
- Physics
- Psychology
- Sports Medicine
Bottom 10 Subjects with Lowest PDA Purchase Rate

- Business
- Comp Lit
- Economics
- Film Studies
- Interdisciplinary Sciences
- Law
- Nursing
- Political Science
- Reference
- Religious Studies

PDA Records vs. PDA Purchased
Which subjects get the most usage?
Zero usage?

Titles by LC - All Libraries

Number of zero use titles and number of titles used.
Which libraries have triggered the most purchases?

- **Auraria**: 25%
- **Boulder**: 62%
- **HSL**: 11%
- **UCCS**: 2%
Which libraries have triggered the most purchases?

**Political Science HX, J**
- Auraria: 27%
- Boulder: 64%
- UCCS: 9%

**Philosophy B-BD, BH-BJ**
- Auraria: 12%
- Boulder: 78%
- UCCS: 10%

**Chemistry QD**
- Boulder: 88%
- UCCS: 4%
- Auraria: 4%
- HSL: 4%
How does a library analyze the impact of a PDA program on the print book collection?

- Are we buying roughly the same number of books in each subject area as we were before PDA?
- If we are buying more eBooks, does that mean we are purchasing fewer print books?
- If we are buying fewer print books are we buying more eBooks?
- Or has the overall number of books/rate of growth remained the same despite the introduction of eBooks as a format?
Print Purchasing Trends: Chemistry, Philosophy, and Political Science

Auraria

Boulder

UCCS

- Chemistry
- Philosophy
- Political Science
What is the ratio of print to MyiLibrary eBooks being purchased in Chemistry?

- Auraria
- Boulder
- UCCS

- Chemistry Print Books
- Chemistry eBooks
What is the ratio of print to MyiLibrary eBooks being purchased in Philosophy?

- **Auraria**: 80%
- **Boulder**: 100%
- **UCCS**: 100%
What is the ratio of print to MyiLibrary eBooks being purchased in Political Science?
Print Circulation Trends

Auraria

Boulder

UCCS

- Chemistry
- Philosophy
- Political Science
How are the Print Books Used?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Print Turnover Rate</th>
<th>Chemistry</th>
<th>Philosophy</th>
<th>Political Science</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Auraria</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boulder</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UCCS</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Turnover Rate = Number of circulations divided by the number of titles available
How Does eBook Usage Compare to Print?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Print</th>
<th>Chemistry</th>
<th>Philosophy</th>
<th>Political Science</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Auraria</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boulder</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UCCS</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>eBooks</th>
<th>Chemistry</th>
<th>Philosophy</th>
<th>Political Science</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Auraria</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>.38</td>
<td>.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boulder</td>
<td>3.48</td>
<td>.93</td>
<td>.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UCCS</td>
<td>.34</td>
<td>.28</td>
<td>.14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Are we building collections that support the teaching and research needs our campuses?
Are we building collections that support the Chemistry teaching and research needs on our campuses?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th># Print Books per FTE</th>
<th># eBooks per FTE</th>
<th>Total # of Books per FTE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Undergrad</td>
<td>Grad</td>
<td>Faculty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auraria</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boulder</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>12.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UCCS</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>58.0</td>
<td>18.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Are we building collections that support the **Philosophy** teaching and research needs on our campuses?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th># Print Books per FTE</th>
<th># eBooks per FTE</th>
<th>Total # of Books per FTE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Undergrad</td>
<td>Grad</td>
<td>Faculty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auraria</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>16.0</td>
<td>26.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boulder</td>
<td>8.2</td>
<td>193.8</td>
<td>193.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UCCS</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>53.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Are we building collections that support the **Political Science** teaching and research needs on our campuses?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th># Print Books per FTE</th>
<th># eBooks per FTE</th>
<th>Total # of Books per FTE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Undergrad</td>
<td>Grad</td>
<td>Faculty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auraria</td>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>22.1</td>
<td>40.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boulder</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>120.5</td>
<td>176.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UCCS</td>
<td>13.3</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>217.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Conclusions

- Benefits and challenges of building a shared collection
- Cost Sharing
- Give up institutional control over what we acquire
Where do we go from here?

• Exploring potential causation and correlation
  • User demand for monographs and format preference by discipline
  • Identifying gaps in PDA profiles and ILL requests

• Developing additional analysis on how the budget is spent on the PDA program
  • Percentage of money spent by subject area
  • Inadvertent budget implications

• Creating methodologies that allow for comparison across institutions, disciplines, and formats
Questions? Thank You!
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