SCONUL ERM Project:
Electronic Resource Licensing & Management – Use Case Workshops

University of East London

Case Study: Usage data

3rd February 2011

People
Library
Gurdish Sandhu, Associate Director
Nick Jarrett, Systems Manager.
Libby Homer, Collections Development Manager
Rachel Todd, Technical Service Coordinator (works between e-resources and subject librarian and deals with cataloguing and acquisitions -LMS
Yvonne Klein, E-resources Manger (managing SFX and MetaLib)

ERM Project team
Ken Chad, Director Ken Chad Consulting Ltd
Angela Walker, Digital Library and Systems Manager Salford University

CONTENTS

Use Case developed by University of East London

Usage data (16)

The library wishes to carry out an annual review of all their electronic subscriptions. They wish to get reports offering 'per use' or 'per download' costs for each resource, and to compare their usage with average use across similar institutions.

What happens?

- Using SWETS for most subscriptions and usage data
- Looking a low used stuff on SFX, Athens
- Download COUNTER stats
- bX and BibTip recommendations services will be implemented in the near future Will get Usage data from user driven purchasing—when it prompts student puts in school data
- Work flows are evolving
- Benchmarking using SCONUL

Activity

Divide subscription cost (from SWETS of databases) by usage from supplier and *some counter compliant . Then the data is populated in spreadsheet.

Volumes

900+ print & e-subscriptions on SWETS, 36 databases, 37K e-journal titles

Actors

Rachel Todd and Yvonne Klein with others

Data involved

COUNTER data, or equivalent where no counter data--but how do you count stuff like on a fashion database like images ideas trends. There is no full text and no download,

Workflows

Rachel coordinated data into spreadsheets--simplified version to SCONUL stats—to Libby and Gurdish and for collectin development workshop and decision making.

Current Examples

Motivation – What are the pain points?

Current problems

Not everyone COUNTER complaint
Trust—do we really believe data, how is access download etc defined? It is very time consuming and complicated.

Efficiency assessment

Potential to greatly streamline workflows if there is just one source of aggregated data. It's not just COUNTER though—lots of locally held data –via authentication services etc

Economy assessment

Value of usage data will only increase and demand are made of library from various places to justify resources.

Effectiveness assessment

Beginning to make people more aware—still at an early stage. We're becoming more sensitive to the costs and a measure of ROI. Creates pressure on subject libn to promote resources

Intended Benefits – What is the business case?

Library Service

Need better data to judge the ROI--and this becomes more critical as library links resources to the University's current course/programme portfolio. It is not just about ROI, but also making our resources more relevant to the current teaching, learning and research information needs.

Users

Their use is being measured so they become an influence in what resources are sustained

Suppliers

They will be concerned about low use and (we hope) seek to make improvements to their offering (e.g. access/ease of use or other factors to drive usage)

Consequences of doing it (risk assessment) 'above campus'

What will happen?

A platform to gather usage data for all (or at least nearly all) licensed resources. Such a platform will be more useful if it not only provides data on institutional usage but enable cross institution benchmarking as well.

Potential Risks

Risk of missing some data and giving false impression
Unable to manipulate /drill down data according to our needs.
If data is not COUNTER compliant or lacks standards, there is risk of subjective decisions on which data should be counted and this risk is compounded if different people compile the statistics every year. This makes difficult to benchmark across years.

Potential Opportunities

Good opportunity to simplify a morass of data feeds and to enable benchmarking across institutions.

Consequences of not doing it

The problem will not diminish and if there is nothing available as a shared service there will continue to be massive duplications of effort

Implementation Pointers – Things to take in to account

Mechanism

Could this be an extended version of the existing JIS service (JUSP)?

Inputs & Outputs

Publisher COUNTER stats and local data from various systems.

Standards & Protocols

COUNTER SUSHI. What standards for authentication systems?

Existing systems

Knowledge base (SFX) is key (and is basis for ExLibris bX shared service for example). Authentication systems. Primo and supplier systems.

Staffing

The opportunity may not cut staff but will enable better measurement of resources within existing staff costs

Challenges & Costs – Direct and indirect

Set up and Transition

Need to sort out what systems will contribute and how it will interoperate—some complexities there. Issues of comprehensiveness and trust will be a factor in take-up –people may still prefer their 'trusted' local approach

Ongoing

Need to be competitive with local alternative on simplicity, effectiveness, reliability and trust