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Definitions

- **Patron-Driven Acquisition (PDA)**
  - Faculty Requests/Input
  - Use Data

- **Demand-Driven Acquisition (DDA)**
  - Meets immediate need
Why DDA?
Annual Book Production

DU Purchases
North American Scholarly (YBP)
United States (Publishers)
United States (Self Published)
World (UNESCO)
# DDA Opportunity for Publishers & Libraries

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Publisher</th>
<th>New Print Titles</th>
<th>Slip Notifications Sent</th>
<th>Notifications % Ordered</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Springer</td>
<td>3,261</td>
<td>1,177,454</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wiley</td>
<td>2,881</td>
<td>1,219,333</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oxford</td>
<td>2,146</td>
<td>921,359</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Routledge</td>
<td>2,200</td>
<td>1,099,110</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cambridge</td>
<td>1,551</td>
<td>736,043</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Palgrave Macmillan</td>
<td>1,310</td>
<td>1,006,981</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McGraw-Hill</td>
<td>637</td>
<td>218,244</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HarperCollins</td>
<td>410</td>
<td>144,881</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ABC-CLIO</td>
<td>409</td>
<td>214,167</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continuum</td>
<td>518</td>
<td>243,636</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brill (&amp; Nijhoff)</td>
<td>573</td>
<td>197,895</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Penguin Putnam</td>
<td>447</td>
<td>169,820</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Data from Michael Zeoli, YBP Library Services
Books Cataloged 2000-2004 (126,953 Titles)*

- 0 uses; 39.6%
- 1 use; 20.6%
- 2 uses; 12.8%
- 3 uses; 8.2%
- 4+ uses; 18.8%

*University of Denver. Data from June 30, 2010
Books Cataloged 2000-2004 (126,953 Titles)*

*University of Denver. Data from June 30, 2010.
Demand-Driven Acquisition Goals

- Broaden the collection
  - More titles
  - More publishers
  - More subjects

- Match acquisitions to immediate demand
  - Pay at point of need
  - Pay for amount of need
  - Short-term loans
  - Purchase-on-demand
Redefining the Collection

- Everything we can provide in a timely manner
- Ultimately, bounded only by budget
What We’ve Done at the University of Denver (DU)
netLibrary

- Colorado Alliance of Research Libraries
- 1999-2005
- First use free
- Purchase on second use
- Shared access
NetLibrary Model Weaknesses

- 2 clicks of any length = a purchase
  - We bought books we didn’t need
  - Bananas!

- Careless initial profiling
  - We bought single volumes of multi-volume series
  - We bought stuff we didn’t want
Purchase ILL Requests

- Price
- Publisher
- Publication Date

- Limited utility
eBook Library (EBL)

- Began May 2010
- Loaded 42,000 records into catalog (now 90,000 – Aug 31, 2012)
- No budget for FY 2010
- Budgeted $150,000 for FY 2011, 2012
  - 2011: spent $72,924 (14 months)
  - 2012: spent $61,418 (12 months)
EBL – Initial Criteria

- Books published after January 1, 2007
- Subject limits only in Medicine and Law
- Some publishers excluded
- Books under $250.00
The EBL Model

- First five minutes free
- STL for three uses (customizable)
  - One day or one week
  - 10-20% list price
- Purchase on fourth use (we have just changed to the fifth use)
  - List price
A Recent Chronology of DDA at DU

- May 2010 – 42,000 titles from EBL
- February 2012 – EBL integrated into approval plan (YBP)
- May-August 2012 – Consortial DDA
  - Pilot with small list of publishers
  - EBL (May)
  - Ebrary (August)
A Recent Chronology of DDA at DU

- August 2012 – ebrary added into YBP approval plan
- September 2012
  - Added 12,000 older titles via EBL
  - Increased STLs to 4
- September 2012
  - Pilot with large humanities/social sciences publisher
    - Committed same $ as spent on print last year
    - All titles available
    - Ultimate purchase based on use
## DU EBL Data (5/1/2010-6/30/2012)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Actual</th>
<th>List</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>619 titles purchased</td>
<td>$49,003</td>
<td>$49,003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5,031 titles with at least one STL</td>
<td>$85,338</td>
<td>$398,278</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4,154 titles with at least one browse</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$328,872</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total (9,804 titles)</strong></td>
<td><strong>$134,341</strong></td>
<td><strong>$776,153</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Savings</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>$641,812</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Cost Per Transaction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Purchase Type</th>
<th>Total Cost</th>
<th>Cost per Transaction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>STL</td>
<td>$85,338</td>
<td>$9.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Autopurchase</td>
<td>$49,003</td>
<td>$79.17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Cost Projections - GVSU

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th># of Ebooks Purchased</th>
<th>Total $ of Ebooks not Purchased</th>
<th>Additional STL Costs</th>
<th>Total Savings over Existing Plan</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Purchase on 4th Loan</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>$17,382.31</td>
<td>$3,327.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purchase on 5th Loan</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>$24,512.55</td>
<td>$4,621.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purchase on 6th Loan</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>$25,722.11</td>
<td>$5,041.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purchase on 7th Loan</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>$26,899.83</td>
<td>$5,324.84</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

What We Want to Do at the University of Denver
A Multi-Format Model

- E-Books from multiple vendors/publishers
- Print books
  - When electronic not available
  - When electronic not desired
  - Slip notifications
- Managed by YBP
- Primary means of monographic acquisition
E/P are NOT Simultaneous (but getting better)

- YBP Library Services data
  - Simultaneous publication = within 8 weeks

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fiscal Year</th>
<th>Percentage of titles released as ebooks simultaneously with print</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FY 2013 (Aug 31, 2012)</td>
<td>42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 2012</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 2011</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Why is DDA Perfect for E-Books?

- Seamless
- Instant Access
Why is DDA for Print So Difficult?

- Needs to be automated
- Must link to a request form from catalog record
  - Must pass through bibliographic information, patron information to acquisitions
- Should feed into a queue for acquisitions staff
Why is DDA for Print So Difficult?

- Users need to understand the process
  - (Unlike for e-books, for which the process can/should be seamless)
- Clear explanation that this is not immediate
- Clear explanation that e-book version may be available
Why is DDA for Print So Difficult?

- Can we rely on a book supply network set up for traditional distribution (at point of publication)?
- Must rely on availability of title months/years after loading record
- Will move from bulk shipments to title-by-title
- Will rely on rush ordering
Why Print May Not Be So Hard

- Commercial Print On Demand
  - Lightning Source
  - Nothing will go out of print
- Increasing availability of e-books
- User comfort with requesting books
  - From other libraries
  - From remote storage
The Future

- E-Books on demand
- Local print-on-demand option
- Make accessible all that we can afford
Budget Goals

- Commit most of the monographs budget
- Spend the same to access more titles
Long-Term Management of the Consideration Pool
Another Definition

- Consideration Pool
  - All of the books available for access through the DDA program
  - Potentially much larger than a traditional collection
  - Can be tightly controlled or not – library preference
Filling the Pool

- Approval process
- Broader criteria
- Inclusion rather than exclusion
Adding/Removing Records

- Discovery is key
- Must be automatic
- Approval vendor
- MARC record service
Pool Maintenance

- Rules for
  - Length of time in pool
  - Removal
  - Replacement
Removal of Titles

- Removal because of content, quality
- Removal because of financial risk
- Rules for temporary removal
- Rules for permanent removal
Removal?

- May not be necessary at all
- Large enough budget and small enough user base may allow permanent access to unlimited titles
Use Shapes the Pool

- Titles that are used remain available a bit longer
- Removing titles = unhappy users
A Permanent Collection

- Some titles are core
- Establish criteria for permanent/longer-term availability
  - Title-by-title
  - Series
  - Publisher
  - Subject
Role for Vendors

- Fill the pool (profiling)
- Provide discovery tools
- Remove/replace content (profiling)
- Comprehensive reporting
What About Consortial DDA?

• Tension between?
  • Goal of consortial purchasing: shared access for discounted group price
  • Goal of DDA – pay for only what is needed (locally)
Does DDA Change the Role of the Library?

- Long-term stewardship vs provision of robust collection for current research and teaching
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