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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
- Political Science: 1631
- Business: 1534
- Psychology: 1354
- Biology: 1317
- Religious Studies: 1203
- Engineering: 900
- Anthropology: 816
- Law: 719
- Sociology: 700

# Available eBooks
MyiLibrary PDA Summary Data: Expenditures FY12-15
Which subjects have triggered the most purchases?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject</th>
<th># of Purchased eBooks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>302</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychology</td>
<td>227</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business</td>
<td>165</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political Science</td>
<td>158</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religious Studies</td>
<td>132</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anthropology</td>
<td>130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering</td>
<td>125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biology</td>
<td>114</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criminal Justice</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sociology</td>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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
Which subjects get the most usage? Zero usage?

Titles by LC - All Libraries

# Zero Use Titles  # titles used
Which libraries have triggered the most purchases?

- **Boulder**: 62%
- **Auraria**: 25%
- **UCCS**: 11%
- **HSL**: 2%

Legend:
- Orange: Auraria
- Brown: Boulder
- Gray: HSL
- Beige: UCCS
Which libraries have triggered the most purchases?

**Political Science HX, J**
- Boulder: 64%
- Auraria: 27%
- UCCS: 9%
- 0%

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

**Chemistry QD**
- Boulder: 88%
- 4% Auraria
- 4% UCCS
- 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

FY09 FY10 FY11 FY12 FY13 FY14
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?

![Bar chart showing the ratio of print to eBooks in Philosophy for Auraria, Boulder, and UCCS.]
What is the ratio of print to MyiLibrary eBooks being purchased in Political Science?

- **Auraria:**
  - Political Science Print Books: 60%
  - Political Science eBooks: 40%

- **Boulder:**
  - Political Science Print Books: 90%
  - Political Science eBooks: 10%

- **UCCS:**
  - Political Science Print Books: 50%
  - Political Science eBooks: 50%
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></th>
<th>Chemistry</th>
<th>Philosophy</th>
<th>Political Science</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Print</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<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></th>
<th>Chemistry</th>
<th>Philosophy</th>
<th>Political Science</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>eBooks</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<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 of our campuses?
Are we building collections that support the Chemistry teaching and research needs 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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