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### Main Survey Results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1. Name</th>
<th>Response Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>answered question</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>skipped question</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2. Institution Name</th>
<th>Response Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>answered question</td>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>skipped question</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>3. Email address</th>
<th>Response Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>answered question</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>skipped question</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>4. What have you identified as areas of risk associated with any particular DDA access model (whether you offer it or not)?</th>
<th>Response Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>answered question</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>skipped question</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Comments:

Patrons may not realize that they have triggered a purchase.

We are doing a demonstration project involving 16 rural public libraries statewide, where we are using purchase/direct delivery to patrons (using Amazon and Amazon Prime) in place of traditional interlibrary loan. Risk is creation of artificial demand for what is meant as an alternative to traditional interlibrary loan practices. 

Active faculty making more requests for books etc., creates imbalance of collection and spends more budget.

Cannot meet demand at point of need acquisition. So far this not an issue.

Duplication and overlapping of purchases by various vendors. Methods of tagging and removal of unused titles may involve additional employee hours

Ordering material not in sync with mission of college

The ability to reconcile linking data in our discovery workflow as a document changes in status from available to purchased.

Short-term loans essentially drive up the purchase price of each title.

Using up the 'book' budget very quickly - limits reached early in financial period. No financial input or consideration on decision on access method - traditional interlibrary loan may be cheaper than online loan/rental; print book may be cheaper than electronic book.

user's usage is not the real demand

We are not deeply involved with DDA but risks that come to mind are: Patron communication - particularly when a title is not added after evaluation Budget constraints, how is demand met without breaking the budget?

Budgetary - how to control the use of funds in acquisition of titles (a la the "banana story") with unmediated acquisition

All DDA models currently have a lot of manual work in technical services. Libraries have to create the selection pool, load records (often with manual changes), set up the discovery resource list, etc. This is causing some libraries not to embrace what is clearly a service that patrons like. The risk of overspending that was present when there was only one model seems to have been mitigated with the multiple models now available.

Buying material that doesn't circulate, with a small budget, could be critical to our operation

DDA models seem to suit Academic Libraries and/or larger libraries more so than ours (we serve 103,988). Auto-Purchase still brings into question how many copies, etc. Short term loan is more like leasing so you don't have an on-hand collection. Evidence-based is the best and in theory what we already do. We have recently acquired Collection HQ as well but have not used it to its potential yet. $$ is a risk with auto purchase, shorter term loan, and free browse.

Many Short-term loans may result in 0 books when the DDA project is over. You have spent your money but have nothing instead.

Auto-purchase does not permit us to control spending; need may be temporary and not fit scope of collection

Simultaneous publication across formats continues to be a significant area of risk. It is not an industry standard though it is being adopted increasingly. Publishers who continue to embargo the e-format in favor of print for short or lengthy periods of time put libraries in a difficult position. Related to this is the concept of content completeness or limitations in the electronic version. There are instances where the e-book version of a title is sold without graphic images that are included in the print version. Publishers/vendors should be required to disclose content omissions for whatever reason (i.e. copyright).

Escalating costs make budget prediction difficult. Exclusion of and/or limited sim user access for textbooks.

A high short term loan per title limit risks expenditure without perpetual purchase (expenditure equal to or greater than purchase). Auto Purchase risks expenditure above budgeted total. Evidence based risks hampering efforts in providing just in time delivery.

Many Short-term loans may result in 0 books when the DDA project is over. You have spent your money but have nothing instead.

Financial/Budgeting seems to be the greatest area of risk right now. It is difficult to know how to project what level of usage--and therefore cost--we will see in the coming months. In the first year of our DDA program, we
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over-projected and spent much less than we anticipated. In the second year, users seemed to suddenly catch on, and we spent much more than we had anticipated.

Purchase of a title that would not normally be added permanently to the collection Cost control - not in control of spending, and e-books cost more than print

Loss of access to purchased titles (usually when publisher withdraws content); Security of access being restricted to licenced, authorised patrons; Duplication or overlap of content between different vendors

Usage may become so high that we cannot afford the monthly cost and need to scale back our collection, confusing and frustrating our community.

risks--uncertain exact costs, duplicate titles (paying for what you already own), non-academic use, MARC-record quality

1. Difficult to develop profiles for higher level research programs. These are areas where traditional selection and curation makes sense (even for e-content). 2. Destabilization of the information ecosystem by changing revenue models for publishers and vendors; while potentially a boost to long-term, "long-tail" sales, it is unclear what widespread adoption of DDA will mean in the short term for content providers. 3. Long-term preservation of e-books sold as "permanent access" remains very uncertain. Hosted by third-party commercial entities for the most part, both the platform and content remain vulnerable even when sold as "permanent access." 4. Privacy concerns remain largely unaddressed in the access and use of e-books. While data is usually anonymous, it is probable that granular and personally-identifiable information can be extracted from the platform logs. 5. Proprietary formats still prevent interoperability in some cases. 6. DRM can be very restrictive in terms of how and how long a book can be used. 7. Auto-purchase models can consume an allotted budget very quickly. 8. Short-term loans cut both ways: in aggregate, they potentially erode revenue for publishers, while for individual libraries such loans will actually increase the cost of popular, purchased titles. 9. Some subjects (e.g., art) aren't especially well represented in the corpus of existing e-books and cannot, therefore, be well served by a DDA program.

I would recommend a price limit associated with a library's profile. Publishers may be tempted to increase the price of the electronic version. I have seen one example for a $200 priced print book that was priced above $600 for the electronic. Fortunately we did not have to pay for it because there was supposed to be a price limit on our account. Another problem is missing images in the electronic version.

It is difficult to prevent duplicate orders across DDA programs (we have several and we are involved in a consortial effort as well) and with our traditional Library Liaison selection efforts. In addition, expenditures for these programs escalate quickly once they take hold in the user community. We are looking at ways to contain costs without cutting back access but that is still an effort in progress. Obtaining, loading, updating and deleting the catalog/discovery records for these items is challenging - not sure this is a risk but it is definitely a factor when implementing a DDA program.

We are a small library whose collection tightly targeted to our university's graduate programs. A "pure" version of any of these models would not work for us, because we need to control what our limited collection-development budget is spent on. We don't want student requests or outside reviews to "automatically" trigger a purchase or paid access.

With the auto purchase option the biggest risk is that a title is used multiple times by the same user, triggering a purchase, and then is never used again. With the first three models there is a risk of content duplication because many titles are loaded prior to purchase and our experience is that it can be challenging to ensure there is no duplication of content - even if only one vendor is used. Finally, there is a risk that content required which isn't required immediately but may be necessary in several years will no longer be available. It diminishes the development of comprehensive, legacy collections.

Evidence-based would defeat the purpose of streamlining the ebook acquisitions process; making a decision to purchase based on use after the fact is too time consuming. The single user limit does undermine online access for users when more than one wants to look at the title at the same time.

Auto Purchase – accountability [not sure if criteria are really applied on the vendor side] and of course too many error activations • Short-term loan – too many stls can be pricier • Free browse before a short-term loan or purchase is triggered - less risky in terms of error rates but the same problem with price. • Evidence-based – titles are made available and are added to the collection based on evaluation of use. not sure why this is considered as DDA? looks like everything we do anyway.

Unexpected excessive use that would drive up our costs; Multiple uses by one user means we buy the book even if only one user wants it (which may be OK); some publishers have unreasonable STL percentages and it is hard
to know that in advance; high list price of books used for DDA; books may vanish. Dependence on vendor/platform.

Since not all publishers participate in DDA, use of DDA skews use of publications available - not always the best choice.

duplication of titles / overlap with packages

double purchase print-online due to insecure isbn-matching (single isbn for the same books with each aggregator) hard DRM - our patrons do not like the restriction at all

Less budget control. One single user could influence the collection in a certain direction.

It is impossible to budget for. It is a "sometimes" service. On when there is money, and off when the money runs out. This is not a good service model.

- duplicate orders - the quality of the books if you don’t make pre-selection

1. Cost overrun  2. Unsuitable titles slipping past selection profile  Apply to all but Evidence Based model

We participate in two programs, one local and one in alliance. The problem we have run into is that when a title in the DDA catalog is ordered to be added to our collection. Do we just purchase a copy? Do we actuate the number of uses that makes the DDA title purchased? Do we just hope that enough students use it to purchase the title? Do we just sit and wait since it is available to see if there ever is enough use to purchase?

Duplication with regular purchases. Duplicate records in the catalog.

STL to purchase model: if STL trigger is too low, the book may have been purchased prematurely and may not see subsequent use; if too high, may pay too much for title overall. Evidence based model seems to me to be another version of the "Big Deal" but in ebook dress. High cost upfront, may not be sustainable for library in long term.

Rate of unmediated purchases too large or too small; time spent by systems and/or cataloging staff loading and suppressing titles too great.

a) purchases may be triggered "by accident" or with low use/review thresholds  b) purchases will only be used once and may not be worth the extra cost  c) risk of duplication

using up the money fast, if all students and faculty have ability to order  workload for cataloging  workload for access and setup and budget management  how this will work with our discovery service

Short-term-loan moving to autopurchase after specified number of loans: We've automatically purchased several "copies" of a title, as well as paying for the additional short-term loans on each copy. The risk is multiplied overpayment on heavily used titles. We don't yet have a way of eliminating new short-term loans toward an additional copy (i.e., moving straight to purchase on subsequent copies that we know will be used). The second risk is the balance point of having a price cap in place; the model does allow for mediating usage at a library-defined cap, but if the point is to make access as seamless as possible...

That funds are used to purchase public library type materials that are better requested/owned by a public library.

There is a small risk in allowing too many short-term loans before buying a book which would increase the cost of the book. We try to set up a model that balances short-term loans with purchases.

1. not having enough funds available to meet (unknown) demands  2. creating unbalanced collections - grad students specific collection needs for dissertations, resulting in purchases of materials that no other grad student will use

The first three methods have the risk of potentially high cost. We have already experienced that in our own program. When the trigger is unmediated and you offer a large number of titles, the cost is potentially very high. It also requires more intensive catalog management so it is time consuming for our cataloging department. It pulls from our staff time to manage the program even if we aren’t making the individual selection and purchase.

Auto Purchase -- that the use will be a one-time event and that a title that we would not ordinarily purchase gets triggered by either a one-time user or, even, an outside user. Short-term Loan -- that for titles that we would almost certainly purchase, we’ll end up paying more, waiting for the various loans to take place before actual purchase. Not seeing risks associated with the other two items listed above.

Concern over uneven collections and undergrads not being able to access information in a timely manner.
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With the auto purchase and short-term loan the risk is loosing control over your budget. With Evidence-based you could have low usage and end up buying books that are not so popular.

Auto purchase and evidence-based seem the most problematic. While we offer both auto purchase and short-term loan, the usage statistics seem to show that the short term loan model is more successful. Several of our auto purchase titles are used infrequently enough beyond the initial trigger to make me wish they were short term loan and we'd only pay 10%. Evidence-based, which we do not participate in, also seems problematic depending on the parameters.

Publishers pulling titles out of DDA (either making them unavailable for DDA or removing from an aggregator's platform); DDA ultimately proving unsustainable for publishers.

1. On campus, access is open to DDA books so non-student users could potentially trigger purchases. 2. From off campus, students/faculty must login to the remote access server to access DDA purchases. Hackers could potentially hack in and trigger purchases. 3. The potential is there for the vendors to abandon the model and leave us without ebook access.

inappropriate titles selected- (auto purchase) in an academic library. Paying a very high price for a title that has been clicked on the appropriate # of times and then purchased. (STL)

That titles will be used a small amount of times triggering a purchase and never be used again.

Managing the marc records has been challenging, especially when titles move out of DDA offerings. Because of time lags and poor notification from some vendors, this could potentially lead to users trying to access titles they have found in the library catalogue, only to discover they are not available. There is a small risk of inappropriate material being triggered if not enough effort is put into profiling your DDA range of titles.

That the collection is potentially being built by students who have no expertise in building collections that match institutional needs or overall system strategic directions. I would like to think having collections built by librarians contributing their subject expertise provides a measure of quality and we would want to make sure our constituents know this. It is almost like it is hard to give over control for something this critical; especially if the work of librarians becomes further jeopardized or their value to their institutional parents become questionable. I see DDA as a way to augment access to information not to build collections just like interlibrary loan or document delivery.

No real areas of risk, per se. Wholly unfamiliar with “evidence-based” DDA, though. Only point of “awareness” is that it is possible to run through money quickly in areas where the perpetual access collection is weak.

Ability to control costs

Missing items that are likely to have long-term scholarly import; imbalances in the collection driven by high use by small groups of users; risk of purchasing e-book when print copy already held (may not always be considered a problem).

Purchasing items that will have limited interest for other patrons. Spending up to 50% of the purchase price for "renting" items that should have been purchased out-right. Spending funds on rentals of many items that fill a temporary need.

The most common area of concern I have heard as we have started to consider DDA is control. I think there is still lingering fear that we may give up too much control over the selection of materials.

The largest risk and impact in implementing an ebook DDA model has been by far alienating the user and the poor user experience that comes with the digital rights management embedded into the ebook products, such as EBL’s use of Adobe Digital Editions. This has been one of the major complaints with moving to this model. Because we are a STEM library in a research-intensive institution, many of the ebook aggregators just do not provide the appropriate level of scholarly materials in the subject areas relevant to our institution, leaving very little viable vendor options that offer the types of business model (we had no interest in a single user model). Ebooks are not always the preferred format for many of our users. Other risks to a lesser degree of impact, potentially paying twice for the same content.

None

Blowing the budget in a very short time (hasn't happened to us)

Some risks associated with unmediated purchase and short-term loan: 1. Budgeting and managing an equitable distribution of funding allocation per academic department within the college/university is time-consuming and fraught with potential controversy. 2. If monitoring of expenditures is not timely and rigorous, it may result in turn-aways (and consequent faculty frustration) due to having expended all funds. 3. Creating false expectations
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that that the library has unlimited resources for making everything available to everyone 4. Disrupting the balance of content within the resources thru individual selection that is for individual only purposes and beyond the scope of the curriculum or community need 5. Turn-away (and consequent faculty/student frustration) with only 1 concurrent user 6. Escalating purchase prices and restrictive DRAM will make the resource unsustainable 7. Bundling high priority titles into big deal collections, forcing smaller libraries to go without.

Auto purchase risk - uncontrollable cost for resources desired/used by few

Too many things that we would not select or choose to retain would be included and purchased by users - usually meaning general audience materials, materials of temporary interest, self-help or health materials of dubious quality, etc.

Many publishers don’t participate. Also, despite our best efforts to avoid duplication, we know there is some overlap between our DDA program and other ways that we acquire e-books. Also, aggregator platforms often don’t offer as many features as publisher platforms, yet we don’t want to get locked into too many publisher packages when we know that our patrons won’t use all the content. Printing and downloading limits in DDA programs can be difficult to explain to users.

We may buy an item needed by one person immediately as an auto purchase, but it will have no long-term value to the collection. No one else will use it.

Before we started there were a lot of fears about blowing through our money. We wanted to make sure we could “turn the spigot off” if we needed to. After hearing a lot of presentations, I knew this would not be a huge problem and it hasn’t been. Communication is key. We have some communication issues with one of our vendors and ended up with a retro load (that we wanted) with titles from all subject areas, not only the ones doing the pilot. Because the retros did not come in with fund codes attached, they were put in a big miscellaneous fund and the error wasn’t noticed until a year later.

STL causes a payment premium. At the point that you purchase, you can exceed your budget because of the premium paid for STLs. When part of a consortia DDA program, this problem is magnified. There are also inconsistencies in what publishers actually charge for STLs, which makes budgeting difficult.

Auto purchase and short-term loans are risking. Auto purchase is likely to cause purchase of titles that will never be used again. Short-term loan may cause the library to pay more for the rental terms than the actual cost of the book.

Auto Purchase & Short-term without a period of free browsing first, could lead to the purchase of extraneous books whose titles look enticing, but are not useful or relevant to library users. We would not purchase any collection that did not provide a certain period of free browsing prior to triggering a purchase of some kind either short-term loan or full purchase

unanticipated level of use = unexpected cost; cluttered catalog, getting unused; unwanted records out of the system; duplication of titles, i.e. a DDA purchase of something we already own.

Exceeding budget is the primary risk; Risk of potential abuse

Faculty believing we own titles in our catalog when in fact they are only discovery record. Spending all our budgeted money for DDA too quickly and having to temporarily stop programs. Patrons purchasing books that would not fall within the scope of our collection and/or mission (this can be controlled to some extent by a good profile, but some books do slip through) Purchasing titles twice (this can be controlled to some extent, but we have seen discovery records appear for which we have access to through a subscription or outright purchase) Loss of ILL capabilities as more libraries move to e-books and no process has been established

Auto Purchase: duplicate records for print and e-version. Sometimes while a print request is being processed; the e-purchase is triggered. Short-term loan: here today, gone tomorrow.

Platforms for EBL and ebrary ebooks is not accessible per disabilities standards. The risk of offering DDA books that are not accessible via standard screen readers and Braille readers is the institution could be considered liable for not meeting accessibility standards/principles highlighted in the "Dear Colleague Letter" from the Department of Education and Department of Justice to College Presidents. (http://www2.ed.gov/about/offices/list/ocr/letters/colleague-20100629.html)

In the beginning we had someone select materials that we would not have chosen to select based on their more public library type of content.
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Library instructors not knowing how to use all the available e-book platforms; would prefer a longer short-term loan before purchase is triggered.

Purchase options could unbalance the collection - people who cotton on to the system could potentially download all of their titles of interest and use up the list allocation.

One risk is that I will purchase or access a document that is not useful to me and thus waste money and time. Evidence has lead me to many documents that turned out to be totally useless for my purposes.

management of DDA

Too many requests leading to too much expenditure  People gaming the system leading to the purchase of limited appeal books

The risk is that the DDA model is tested during a specific timeframe thus limiting usage. There might be instances that other titles could get used but they didn't get used during the trial period.

the STL model threatens the viability of a publishing program if we might not ever sell a book for it's full list price. Given what we know about book usage generally, the challenge of "use" as the driver for purchase is magnified when STL comes into play.

Auto Purchase - if professors don't alert us to use of a specific DDA title for a class, we may pay for the set number of short-term loans before an auto purchase is generated. In addition, if someone wanted to "mess with" the library they could trigger auto purchases at a high expense. Another risk for AP is an auto purchase may be generated for a title that is then never used again--this obviously happens with print texts, but it is also possible with DDA. Short-term loans--If auto purchase is not set, you may pay more for multiple short-term loans of a title than you would had you just purchased the title.

short term loan - don't own anything

auto-purchase - wouldn't do, human error risk too high. STL - possible to spend more for titles than would have if had just purchased it free browse - I think most of the risks have been dealt with here(?!) by not counting inactive screen time, etc. evidence based - risk is that pick a bad pub year to go evidence based with a publisher, maybe output isn't high or output is of low interest and users don't use as much as anticipated so pay for titles don't want, risk that pubs will keep back titles you want from ebs selection lists/packages

Free browse and auto purchase. I don't think patrons understand that the library is buying the book. Many perceive eBook usage as the same as article downloading and printing -- already paid for with tuition dollars. Should reading a book for 10 minutes trigger purchase? I am not sure that this is fair.

unbalanced selection or stronger coverage in one subject area

With auto-purchase, the concern lays with the actual relevance of the item requested for purchase to the patron, when the patron is only browsing through titles. The lack of request limits before triggering a permanent purchase. Length of the short-term loan may not be sufficient for the patron. Number of pages or percentage of book available via free browse may not be sufficient to provide the patron with enough data to evaluate the relevance of the book to the patron before triggering the short-term loan or auto purchase. Who and how is the evaluation conducted for the evidence-based method. Is it inclusive or discipline driven?

Purchases of material used once by a single user.

Undermining of long-term, big-picture collection development

Patrons requesting expensive titles. Hitting our budget ceiling for PDA.

How are the available materials used? Are people only browsing a title or using the content?

Unintentional duplication across different vendors resulting in multiple purchases triggered. Unequal participation of publishers - especially those that suddenly pull out of an aggregator DDA program.

Possible duplication of materials already owned due to bad data (ie. ISBNs) in the system. Lack of security in perpetual access/conflicts in ownership of material.

Quick exhaustion of allocated budget and need to withdraw services or spend more than we are comfortable

Fiscal risk (unable to predict amount of spending in a given year).

Purchasing material that may only be used once or twice.
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A patron triggers a purchase by trying to download more than the allotted amount. We had one patron trigger purchases for over 20 books in one week. You just have to be aware that these types of triggers are weighted more for the publishers than for the libraries/patrons.

for consortial models we don’t like the multiplier. It doesn’t make sense for books on the long tail.

Unpredictable expenditures (auto purchase)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>5. What have you identified as areas of reward associated with any particular DDA access model (whether you offer it or not)?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Response Count</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>answered question</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>skipped question</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments:

We can offer access to a wider variety of titles to our ebook users and not necessarily have to purchases them all.

getting what the patron wants in a timely manner. Usage stats. (all models)

Freeing up staff time that would have used on selection, checking and placing or orders

Able to supplement specific subject areas of the collection, especially those that are "thin” or in high demand/growth.

To have broader access to resources not normally identified or seen as associated with an institution's mission!

For all of the first three, the reward is literally tripling our "collection” overnight through DDA.

Improved access

Meeting actual need in real time; possible reduction of costs associated with ILL or standard mediated acquisition processes; increased use of materials.

A collection that meets our patron’s needs, however temporary that is. Spending funds on resources that have at least a minimal amount of usage. Being able to learn more about our patron’s needs by what they actually use.

Clearly from my perspective this is a great opportunity to allow our users immediate access to the resources they have identified that they need in a very efficient manner.

We can now provide customers with more access to content outside of our subscribed ebook packages. Most of this newly available content is in emerging research

Can provide just in time v just in case acquisitions. That is, we can make a large number of titles available to our users but only pay for those actually used.

Frees up staff time to concentrate on areas other than collection development Provides just-in-time access to resources that patrons need

1. E-books offer convenient and effective resource support for campus and online learning  2. If the e-book is purchased with perpetual access rights, it allows for more efficient use of shelving and space for print and media collections  3.

Incredibly rewarding user experience

There are several subject areas that have both large numbers of very specialized titles available and very unpredictable user interests - ie, advanced practice dentistry, pharma research, etc. DDA would allow users to find anything they are interested in, no matter how surprising, and choose to use it immediately - it wouldn’t depend on a librarian predicting their interest or require them to figure out how to request it.
Demand Driven Acquisition of Monographs Survey Results

Being able to offer (literally) millions of dollars worth of content, yet only pay for what patrons actually use.

Using DDA we know the item will be used.

the cost benefit is wonderful. and, it has allowed us to increase our ebook offerings without impacting what would normally be purchased.

Free browse allows patrons to better evaluate effectiveness before committing to a title and (unknowingly in our case) triggering a purchase. An overall reward is that we only pay for actual use, and some use remains free depending on the model.

A limited number of free accesses before purchase works pretty well for us. We seem to be purchasing books in subject areas that are strong in our curricula. I like evidence that titles have had some use before actual purchase.

The DDA collections we have purchased have a period of free browsing prior to the trigger of purchase. This is definitely a reward, in that it allows us, in theory, to purchase only those titles that were found relevant enough to use for a period of time. It also allows, brief access to titles without having to pay for them. Depending on how the evaluation of use is implemented, evidence-based purchasing seems to also support purchasing only those titles that are actually relevant to users.

the ability to offer a wide range of obscure titles without financial commitment; the opportunity to test out our customer's willingness to use e-books.

Ability to experiment with different subject areas and coverage; opportunities to learn more about patron needs

Only purchasing monographs that are "used" (whatever that means) Preview of many more titles than we could actually purchase. Increased spending power by pushing the full price of a title to subsequent fiscal years (with short-term loan, in particular) Instant gratification by our users

Auto Purchase: nice to pay for an item only when someone actually uses it

Our DDA model from EBL (with Orbis Cascade Alliance) facilitates collection development that addresses student needs for resources at the point of need. Ability to print or use chapters of EBL books as electronic course reserves is also a rewarding feature.

We are pleased to see users select items that they will use.

Reduced need for shelf space in an environment where library real estate is very pricey; cost saving as we are buying just in time rather than just in case; limited human resources in tech services due to budget cuts; timeliness

Money is not wasted on material that no one wants to read unanticipated useful information.

Offer more titles to patrons

Meeting the needs of our patrons

Typically you can quickly identify which titles are getting the most use and are therefore the most successful.

There aren't many rewards for publishers other than making it possible for some libraries to participate in purchasing our content when they might not have done so otherwise.

Short-term loan: We can see exactly which titles are being used and see borrowing patterns. Also, the collection does not become "stale", the community has access to exactly what they want--not what we think they might use.

free browse & autopurchase: buys what our users need

Budget pressure relief (savings redirected to other one time purchases); greater understanding of user behavior/interest - both in terms of what is exposed to them to select for DDA and what they choose along with what they ask us to purchase that is separate from our DDA program (helps to know what to add to the DDA suite of selection options - a good needs assessment tool for the approval plan)

Ready access to information that is organized and typically found only in book format.

quick delivery to users, front list titles readily available

9
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In some discipline areas, auto-purchase and evidence-based DDA provides librarians with anecdotal evidence of research trends, which could influence library driven acquisitions.

Collection reflects current trends and reader interest, Patrons feel confident that we are there to serve them.
Generally speaking what is bought will get use
Immediate use by the patron, convenience for the patron, knowing that titles requested by patrons this way are usually quite popular.
An institution’s community is selecting material; usage of material is high.
Ability to make higher volume of titles "available" to our patrons and purchasing only those that are actually used.
no DRM, multi-user license
Guaranteed use.
Availability of wide range of titles to library users, while paying only for what is used - a nice resolution of the just-in-case vs. just-in-time paradigms, at least for electronic resources
Ability to provide discovery of more materials through library catalog. Spending money only on used titles.
Purchasing materials that have been accessed.
fairly instant usage
expenditure at point of use, instead of purchasing then maybe being used. Collections have not seemed to be a good way to go for us, for a cost per use evaluation, DDA is much better.
Buy only what is needed by customers
customer satisfaction

6. Is there anything you would like to change about the access models that are currently available? Please describe.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Answered question | 79 |
| Skipped question  | 20 |

Comments:
No
Not that I can think of.
A real time mechanism is needed to indicate what is available and what is owned.
The costs of short-term loans should be applied toward the purchase price.
Publishers/vendors to make prices clear at point of access/purchase/loan (we don’t see this on a particular platform we are using for ebooks)
Evidence-based Model - the added titles should be included in the collection at first
Disambiguate from DRM - we don’t purchase e-books that use DRM; so far, no DDA platforms have been available to us
Models are evolving rapidly because the ebook providers are listening to customers.
Demand Driven Acquisition of Monographs Survey Results

not sure, don’t know enough

Books be made available on demand in e-format

I would like anonymity to be restored to the user by not calling for registration at a vendor or publisher site to have functionality such as downloading. I would like to see the embrace of interlibrary lending for academic content that has long been available for commercial content.

Range of charges being applied by publishers for STL’s. Would like to standardise at maximum 5% of purchase price.

The free browse times are similar across platforms at approx 10 minutes, or a number of pages. A higher browse time, plus intelligent browse evaluation such as only counting consecutive pages as part of a browse, would be more predictive of actual use by readers.

No.

I think the short term loan amounts are a little high. We have a print DDA service that has issues with the items not being in stock at our book suppliers—then we have to go out to someone like Amazon to make the purchase.

This is more of a vendor-control/configuration problem, but in our current access model, we are allowed to set user limits based on the cost of the short-term loan (e.g., loans over $XXX.XX must be approved by a librarian), but not based on the overall cost of the book. That is a problem because publishers are not consistent in their pricing models. For example, if a very expensive book is priced such that the short-term loans are a low percentage of the list price, then we don’t get a chance to approve or reject the purchase of the (expensive) book because the limits are based on the (low-percentage) short-term loan cost. And personally, I really disapprove of the one-book-one-user model because it defeats most of the potential of e-books. I really like EBL’s model of basing the price of the e-book on the number of “uses” rather than the number of simultaneous “users”.

They suit our needs. It’s the pricing models that are more problematic.

Easier downloading and printing; less variation between conditions of use between different vendors as these are hard to manage and patrons have difficulty remembering the different criteria.

EBL’s model works very well for us. We would prefer that all publishers sign on to the more expansive user limits, but that is a publisher limit, not one of the model itself.

changes—1. Greater number short terms loans option, 2. Vendor should have EDI invoices, 3. Which publishers are available changes too much and seems random, need more openness and transparency, 4. Vendor should allow greater MARC-record customization, 5. Duplicate checking is a nightmare

Models that restrict simultaneous use really detract from one of the main advantages of using an e-resource in the first place. Also, e-books need to be generally compatible with several device and platform offerings so that users can access e-content on their own terms. The current need for specific devices and apps (in many cases) complicates access and is too convoluted for many potential e-book users to bother with. Finally, it would be a great help in profiling and securing buy-in for DDA plans if more academic content was published in e-book format in the first place. Inconsistency in e-book availability poses a challenge when making a case to those users who don’t always have an option for e-books.

Titles with missing images should not be included in dda.

All DDA programs for libraries should support unlimited use, copying and printing. For consortia programs the multiplier to establish cost must be lower or else the traditional trigger model needs to be modified.

I think it can be challenging to identify the appropriate amount of use to trigger a purchase. We have a plan which triggers purchase on the second use, and I sometimes wonder if this is too low. It would also be nice if publishers commit to the model and then stick with that commitment. We’ve had to pull books out of the DDA collection because publishers have changed the access option and no longer allow titles to be offered on DDA.

I would like for publishers to offer more multi-user titles.

more flexibility and automation in shifting from one model to another. a well conceived holistic approach to dda’s long tail records.

Consistent STL pricing; pricing based on typical purchase price (rather than on high cloth prices).

Selection/profiling is still very clunky. Some models have much more flexibility of setting purchased triggers.

flat-rate for short-term loans
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Not today.
I can’t think of any better solutions.
- duplicate order problem
Finer adjustment of profile that selects books available on DDA

Moving a title from the DDA collection to the owned collection can be time consuming and choosing the means could be made easier, possibly through the contract, i.e. a clause that states that if the library wishes to purchase a title that is part of the DDA collection due to faculty request, that there would be an automatic trigger to move it to purchase without the x number of viewings. The definition of viewing varies from publisher to publisher. There needs to be a uniform definition of viewing. Does reading the table of contents constitute a viewing? Does skimming a chapter constitute a viewing? Does reading the book for 6 minutes equal a viewing, but 5 does not? What about 5.25 minutes?

Multipliers are too high. Need a (or a better) ILL Model. Perpetual access to titles purchased is not well defined.

Single user (SUPO) is problematic; there needs to be turnaway options for all titles involving STLs or rentals (rather than just buying an additional copy). Access models need to accommodate course reserve situation better than at present (though I don’t have a good idea how to do that.)

Price point; licensing (ability to share; place on reserve and more)

a) the pool of books is too limited  b) some staff think it would be nice to be charged only for how many users access/use the item rather than setting a default "MUPO/SUPO" designation  c) there is often a lot of overhead related to setting up these plans / print DDA was too time consuming for our staff

Have not used enough to answer this...this year is our first try

We think we’re doing pretty well. We’ve managed to create a few modifications that let us do more selecting of the records we receive--currently getting them via profile from a jobber--but that’s arguably external to the ebooks themselves.

Have a weighting/selection process that understands/appreciates/rewards the need and demand for specialty books in areas in which only a few institutions collect, e.g. veterinary medicine which is taught in only 27 U.S. universities. Else books in subject areas such as English and history which are taught in all institutions receive the most uses/purchases.

No, we are happy with our existing model.

short term loans are nothing more than money down the drain.

The trigger for a “copy” in particular seems harsh. I realize that potentially a student is going to use that content, but the most they are taking with one copy is one page of content. STL cost currently counts in addition to purchase cost. It’d be nice if that wasn't the case.

No

Sometime the actual workings of the different models are so easy as it might seem. More flexibility in combining the different elements of DDA.

Unfortunately, I don’t have concrete solutions but here’s what I would like to change and I think it falls under "access models" but maybe not: Come to some kind of one-size fits all arrangement when it comes to simultaneous users. Or, simplify the options for libraries. Right now, there are single, multi-, 3 user, etc. It’s difficult to gauge how many users might want to use the book at the same time up front. We do single user only because of this and it hasn’t been a problem. Yes, you can sometimes “upgrade” to multi-user later but that’s annoying. And while I understand why many publishers limit certain titles to single user only, there must be a better option to offer those titles for more than one user if necessary and keep publishers and librarians happy.

More flexibility with rentals/short term loans (i.e., having the option to implement a greater number of loans before a purchase is triggered; for single-user titles, having the option to rent simultaneously so concurrent users are never locked out of a title)

Ebook prices in general tend to be much higher than paper book prices. The publisher/vendor we use (Ebsco) has very poor administrative capabilities for tracking, purchasing, removing titles from the pool, etc. I know this is new territory for them, but it’s been around a few years and they need to make improvements in this area. They also need to make it easier for users to download books to their reading devices (tablets, phones, etc.) Our students are used to this being a one-click operation for purchases, so they don’t understand why it has to be so
complex for library ebooks. I don’t understand that either. Also, in their model, users can’t check books back in when they are finished with them. This is particularly annoying when a user has used a book on their desktop computer and would like to download it to a reading device. They can’t check it back in on the desktop and check it out on a tablet immediately. They have to wait until the book checks itself in automatically. (I know some access models allow immediate check-in, but apparently Ebsco does not.) Also, it would be nice if the library had better control over check-out times and the ability to check-in a book for a user who wants to return it. Users don’t understand why we can’t help them when they run into this problem but we have absolutely no control over that.

I have unlimited users for all models; sell e-books at a discount (add models)

I would prefer if the threshold used to trigger a purchase was higher.

There is a lot of variation in licensing models and platforms, library staff find it confusing and god help the end users!

Not so much. My issues lie more with the long term impact of this type of endeavor or with the quality of a collection to be best meet institutional missions. I would like to see some print copies still be purchased of heavy use items too. I think that current digital rights protection by vendors also threatens the sustainability of DDA, as we all should be building collections that are different and then having the ability to loan or borrow would not be threatened either. The way interlibrary loan operates now, might not be around in the future and libraries are built on this concept.

The access models are surprisingly anticipatory of most concerns. Again, no idea about evidence-based. Not even sure what that is after reading the description.

Uniform ILL/reserve standards industry-wide

There are a number of problems with DDA and our print workflow models that need to be better reconciled. Ways of eliminating format duplication, for example, and making sure payments and invoicing are handled properly are two such areas.

The rental fees should be applied to purchase price (loan-to-own). The rental fees should be more proportionate to length of actual usage.

At present, I need to make decisions that a particular profile will be some combination fo auto pruchase or short-term loan. I have to think that in the aggregate we have enough information (i.e. approval vendor profiles, ILL transactional data, print book usage, other eBook usage, available to help us formulate that mix of models in a more effective way and at a much more granular level.

Remove the DRM from the ebooks. Do not expect users to download a third party application to download your ebooks. Make it easier, not harder to use.

No

Allow for greater tiered pricing, regardless of Carnegie classification - e.g., buy 1 get 1 discounted; allowance for cherry picking titles out of collections Adoption of uniform licensing agreements and pricing structures by publishers

No

The model with the most attractive interface also only allows libraries to purchase certain numbers of accesses - once the DDA trigger is pulled, a volume is purchased. However, that volume only includes 365 uses annually; if this number is exceeded the library must purchase an additional volume, or wait for the end of the year to 'restock.' This is not likely to be a problem with most titles, but I’d prefer a more typical perpetual access model.

Pricing, we get a discount off of the up-charged cost so we are doing pretty well, but it is still more expensive than purchasing the books. I suppose we may make up the difference in lack of processing costs. I have not evaluated the overall costs however.

Availability of lower-cost STLs. Improve consistency for STL charges.

Longer browse period before a purchase is triggered

greater uniformity among (between?) publishers.

Platform complexity for e-access; Clearer ability to use multiple publishers and vendors.

I love the idea of triggers based on "use", or actual eyeballs looking at the content. Typically, downloading part of a book is considered a trigger and I understand why. I am leery of evidence-based usage statistics if they only
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way to access the content is by downloading the content (e.g. a chapter of a book is only viewable by
downloading the actual chapter). I feel strongly that patron behaviors that trigger a purchase (e.g. page views,
time, etc.) more accurately reflect the actual usage or VALUE of the resource. The download of a chapter, sight
unseen, means much less to me. A fabulous sounding title and abstract do not equate a highly usable chapter. So
when download is the only trigger point or metric of "usage" I am less likely to want to participate.

Auto Purchase and Evidence-based seem the same: if one person wants to use it, that's evidence enough for me
(as opposed to the zero uses most of our print collection has)

Accessibility issues with platform.
The reader display is tedious to use when reading ebooks on PCs. Library staff won't use ebooks here unless
there is no other alternative. We don't even like them.

Would like to see more MUPO titles.

In these access models the entire responsibility for finding useful information is placed on the client. A
successful librarian participates with the client in finding useful information.

Tailored genre-oriented plans

Instead of offering a short-term loan, probably offering a purchase model

Free browse is a potential problem - users might get everything they need in the 10 minutes of accessing the
title - and then they never need to come back to the title again so that a trigger is never purchased.

We are fairly content with the models currently available. If I had to change one thing, I would like to see the
short-term loan option automatically calculate the cost of short-term loans of a title and when the purchase
value of the title is met automatically add it as a purchased title to the purchased title collection. I doubt the
vendors would support this type of move though, as they might/probably would not make as much money on
DDA if this were the model.

need the capability to index crawl across platforms to enhance discoverability. Need ease of downloading of
books & chapters to ereaders. Need ability to trigger purchase on any ebook regardless of publisher. YBP only
works with ebrary & EBL.

this may already exist - chapter level short term loans, sometimes people just need a chapter or two from a book,
some reduced fee for chapter level loans/purchases - leading to often requested chapters being purchased
maybe or, if X number of chapters in a book are requested the book is purchased at a reduced rate because of all
the STL fees already paid

Placing a limit on the number of books that can be purchased so the library can be prepared to add additional $
to the budget.

Standardization of trigger levels would be helpful.

I think one of the big problems with DDA options today is the confusion that is created by the multitude of
different options. Each aggregator tries to outshine the others with more and more access at a lower cost, and
librarians have a difficult time determining the best platform and model for their collection. The fact that you've
identified 4 "flavors" of DDA above illustrates the complexity. Add into this the various purchase models
available once patrons have accessed a title enough times to trigger a purchase (single-user, 3X user, unlimited,
access credits, etc.) and a whole new level of questions arise. DDA needs to be simple for both libraries and
publishers. Kudos to this group for attempting to create a standard for "best practices." I think we really need
this!

Need to use the EBook sampling feature - not available yet

A profile must be in place that allows the streaming of titles that are appropriate for the institution,
Pricing - at least with print there was often discounts. Trigger points seem too involved and hard to convey to
users.

would like direct linking to the TOC or chapter level through our discovery service

Perpetual access, local loading, multiple users, fewer platform options to simplify the acquisition process.

the logins are cumbersome. Ebsco requires you to create a user name and password; this is in addition to the
user name and password you used to get access to the book from the catalog. Also, the different vendors use
different platforms and software for access and they can be cumbersome to download.
We are working with EBL on a model that doesn’t have a multiplier for our consortium and we are eager to see how it works out.

Clear public record metadata on license terms (single/multi user, download options, etc)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>7. Are there access models you can envision that are not currently available? Please describe.</th>
<th>Response Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

 answered question 56

 skipped question 43

Comments:
I think the access model we’re using as described above differs from the ones listed.

Not known to me

A target for my DDA universe for my SFX link resolver including rich metadata such as author and subject information, along with a reporting mechanism to let us know when a title has been purchased. Vendor MARC record collections would need to be provided for all purchased titles.

Yes! DDA should be enabled for book chapters and serial articles (or even at the level of serial issues or volumes), as well as audiovisual items.

if there is a Model combining the present four Models, it will be perfect

We are considering a model that would allow for purchase requests from a collection of pre-selected popular titles that our libraries might not otherwise purchase. We are a consortium of primarily public libraries, so access to scholarly / research titles are out of our scope.

no

I would like to see a fully-functional consortial access model with ILL. In addition, I would like to see more boutique or niche access models around publisher type (e.g. University Presses) or area studies, particularly foreign language material. Again, with a strong facilitation of ILL.

Free short-term loans.

Lifting of DRM limitations even if cost increases.

Sorry, I’m not coming up with anything good right now.

Would like to select packages/collections for DDA - make the package available for discovery but only purchase titles showing use.

Making textbooks available in ebook format perhaps on a cost per FTE basis.

1. streaming films should be available patron-driven 2. Should have more choices besides loan one day or lone one week, how about one month, six months, one year, etc. 3. Should have new model for those considered "textbooks"

no

There needs to be a trigger model just for consortial programs that takes into account a higher cost per title for based on a larger FTE user base. The BLC has been involved in a pilot DDA program for about 1.5 years and we now have enough data that we can begin to analyze the results of our joint effort.
For the past two years, we have used a hybrid patron-driven acquisition program that we developed ourselves. Inter-library loan requests are evaluated for purchase based on their call numbers -- if (a) their subject falls into an area we have identified as one in which we need to purchase more items, and (b) we have enough money in that month’s collection-development budget, we purchase it rather than request it from another library. If neither (a) nor (b) is applicable, we process it as a “regular” I.L.L.

My ideal access model would allow the DDA program to be set up through a monograph vendor but allow access to the DDA titles on the publishers’ e-book platform (both before and after purchase).

No.

Vendor platforms need to allow direct linkage between use stats and purchasing for all electronic materials. Models that would allow you to "ILL" for some $ amount.

Not today.

Yes. One where the short-term loan cost applies towards the purchase price of the book.

Our DDA provides for a set number of loans before automatic purchase. If the first short term loan of books conforming to certain criteria (e.g. expensive or published before a set date) could trigger a notice to a librarian for review to enable/ disable purchase on subsequent use, we may consider adding titles to our profile that are currently excluded.

I am not certain. What I would like to see is a DDA program that has an acquisition link to allow the acquisitions department to purchase a title from the program when the need arises, rather than purchasing an additional copy that after 1 semester of use may never be needed again due to outdated material.

More consortially available titles

   a) service providers could charge based on amount of use and number of users accessing the content - individually or simultaneously (pay per use model may not be good though...) b) Perhaps we would never purchase e-books as we purchase tangible books

   not at this time

A weighting system described as above.

Not at this time.

Please see my description of Evidence-based Purchasing, above -- if that’s not what your use of the term means, then this is what I can envision as a good option to have available to libraries.

No.

Perhaps a model where when the amount paid for short-term loans reached the purchase price the book would be automatically purchased for you.

There must be something better than what we have now but someone more innovative than me needs to come up with it.

I particularly like EBL’s non-linear lending model, which I know isn’t currently very popular with publishers. But I do think that is the direction we should be moving in, exploring its possibilities & permutations, rather than being stuck in this tea leaf-reading world of awful single-/multi-user choices.

1. A reasonably priced model  2. One-click download for users  3. Ability for users to check in books instantly  4. Ability for librarians to check in any book title at any time  5. Ability to easily add and remove titles from the DDA pool at any time  6. Easy availability of usage statistics including date added to pool, date purchased, date used, purchase trigger (printing, copying, time spent browsing, etc.), price, bibliographic information  7. Vendor provides full OCLC marc records and adds library holdings to OCLC upon purchase trigger

offer a model with unlimited users for each book purchased. Reduce price per book on each click before purchasing.

I guess not other than the hybrid print issue or the ability to perform interlibrary loan to ensure long term preservation.

I wish there were more "reference" type PDA programs - Credo, Gale, etc. They seem to feel their titles do not lend themselves to PDA, though.

No
Loan-to-own

Again, I would like to see a model that could bring together statistical data from across the library to help better inform decisions about how we bring DDA titles into our program.

Access to resources at a chapter or article level rather than a whole book.

No

Some easy way for vendors to match our holdings (print and electronic) against our DDA profile on a fairly regular basis so that titles we’ve acquired elsewhere will drop silently out of our DDA plan. Right now we can do this through our regular book vendor, but it’s slow, cumbersome, time-consuming, non-automated as to frequency, and costs us money if we do it more often than 3 times a year.

Pay-per-page.

Not at this time

Not at the moment

Unlimited usage; Fewer restrictions on use; More publishers providing a model for DDA

moving this model to journal articles (actually "own" an article requested)

N/A

The reading of an ebook should be more fluid.

There is some context associated with a request that can be used to enhance the quality of the response. How do we get at that context? If we can get the context, how can we use it?

I think this covers it all

Want options like overdrive offers, only for medical books

Having metadata in public library catalogs of eBooks we don't own on Adobe Content Server.

Somehow more effectively merging short tem loan and purchase triggers.

ebooks priced more like print

rent to own would be a good model, whereby the lease costs can be applied to the purchase price after a certain number of leases.

no

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>8. Does your organization participate in a DDA program?</th>
<th>Response Percent</th>
<th>Response Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>81.6%</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>18.2%</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>answered question</td>
<td></td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>skipped question</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 9. Why have you chosen not to participate in a DDA program?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>answered question</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>skipped question</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Comments:**

We have a very small budget and limited staff time. I think we need to consider it in a limited form, but we haven't taken the time to work out any details.

We are testing this model in public libraries; we may adopt some aspects of it for the state library.

University is too new. As institution we are still growing and things are taking shape. May be we will do at a later stage

Not sure

Management has not made a decision to do so. I believe there is a fundamental lack of understanding in re these products in the Legal field.

still discussing the cost and overall and multiple users and right of resale...

The management of DDA programs are not robust enough. There is limited quality assurance in today's programs related to what is available and what is owned.

We plan to participate after we hire a new Discovery & Systems Librarian. My previous library participated as well.

Limited book budget that we have to 'police' and direct ourselves rather than let clients spend. Already purchase or give access to items 'on demand' to some extent. Take up and use of ebooks is very low.

to reduce the risk of wasting the budget

As a public library consortium, we have the perception that we are largely on our own. We have other projects in the pipeline and DDA has taken a backseat.

The DRM issue identified in question 7

We are not a library. We do offer PDA programs from both eBrary and EBL.

haven't seen one that would work for us

I feel like all selectors do their own evidenced based in however they are selecting materials. We've recently acquired CollectionHQ but have not used it to its capability yet. I would hope this tool further enables us to use the available data in our collection development.

We had a pilot for 6 months. The answer to this question is : lack of money.

Prefer to order or borrow for customers on demand - better able to control cost and veto purchases not in scope or requiring interlibrary loan instead

cost

budget

N/A
Comments:

Generally, they have been effective because it gives both users and librarian selectors options. It gives users more immediate access to current materials. It also gives selectors the opportunity to focus their attention on advanced or specialized collection development. In addition, it allows selectors to put titles in the discovery pool for possible trigger that they would have bought in the past with a "just in case" philosophy.

Yes, we have been able to increase our eBook content available by volumes over what we would have been able to do via outright purchase. Our eBook usage has multiplied by over 6 times in three years and PDA content has been a significant contributor.

Our DDA program has been effective in part because of wise consideration pool management, realistic budgeting, simple billing, and excellent reporting capabilities of the platform.

We have found that approximately 5% of titles loaded have been purchased. Approximately 60% can be considered scholarly. We are no longer purchasing as many e-books or print in some areas and rely on DDA to meet user demand. This has been especially true for our medical center library.

Our goals have been fairly well met. For e-books the process effectively gets the materials in the patron’s hand right away. Print DDA is a bit more challenging. But much of that may have been how we set it up – making it a rush order is entirely too easy.

DDA has been very effective for us. As mentioned in a previous answer, our usage really took off during the past year; usage in the 2012-13 academic year was more than double that of the 2011-12 year. We do feel that the increased collection of available, current, scholarly titles has benefited our university community. DDA allows us to provide access to many more titles than we would otherwise be able to provide, and our users are using them.

Very successful, have controlled costs through careful profiling and have been able to show user interest in e-books.

So far ebooks are well-received by patrons in general. Problems of duplication and overlap are still problematic. On the whole ebooks (especially multiple sim-user models) are better than print in terms of access, processing and speed of acquisition. Also auto-purchased content is based on usage and support just-in-time as opposed to just-in-case collection building.

EBL’s program has been great. They allow us ample room to create a profile based on our needs, and to automatically receive bib records weekly based on that profile. The administrative experience with EBL is pretty efficient and our patrons use the ebooks a lot. Ebrary’s product is less effective for us, as titles have to be selected for inclusion individually, which we don’t have time for. Ebrary is a good back-up vendor if EBL lacks a title. We looked at the Ebsco product and thought the admin site was such a mess that we didn’t pursue it any further.

In general we love and recommend DDA, but it has been a challenge. Our goal to provide greater access to patrons has been met, but at a cost of librarian time including duplicate checking, invoicing, MARC-record customization, etc.

We have conducted a pilot program and are now in the process of implementing an ongoing program.
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The programs have been hugely successful as evidenced by our increasing use/cost for the programs over time. They have reduced selection time for staff which some think is good and others bad, and it may be possible that our DD/ILL costs have decreased because of the DDA programs but that has yet to be proven. Our DD/ILL costs have decreased - maybe because of DDA but there could be other causes as well, we need to investigate this further before a firm cause and effect statement can be made.

Our program has been successful by many measures. Students and faculty get the materials they need, loaned on our terms rather than another (ILL) library’s; we acquire new, up-to-date materials in the academic areas we most need them.

We are very happy with the DDA program in place at the moment. The challenges we face have less to do with the program than with the fact that the vendor’s platform is not always ideal. The vendor’s platform needs to be easier to use, especially on mobile devices. As stated in the previous answer, ideally access would be from the publishers e-book platform.

Very successful. We have not gone over budget. Users are getting access to titles they need that we would not have purchased. It is easy to track use by individual titles in provider reports. Social science use is primary. We have large publisher packages in the sciences by not in the social sciences where output is great.

yes. major savings and better service for patrons (full records coming in at the point of discovery).

We've added titles that meet some criteria. We used ebrary through Yankee. We've had use of titles that we didn't have to buy. I think it is overall a good thing. Some of our librarians say they have trouble finding books to buy because books are already in the catalog as DDA.

In general I find them very successful. There is still a long way to go in the tools to manage the programs, particularly in the selection of the pool of titles, the quality of the records, and the ability to troubleshoot problems. There are still many many titles not available in DDA.

setting up an approval plan profile is essential. meticulous choice of publishers is important to avoid garbage

Effective so far as recently published titles are added quickly and without restrictions, we would welcome front-lists for pda, many of our patrons are disappointed by hard DRM (too little printing and copy-and-paste)

We have good experience from working directly with two publishers in evidence based models. They provide us with qualitative marc records, user stats analysis, and economic reports. In our experience these publishers have helped us meet our goals, e.g. increase the access and usage of e-books.

Patrons love having the large pool of titles to browse through. This part has been very effective and we have seen faculty and students use e-books who we thought never would. The down side is that we have always run out of money before the end of the year and have had to turn off the service. I see this as a real service problem.

problems with duplicate orders and marc records management -e-book collection has increased and the books our customers really use are purchased

General experience has been good though DRM confuses and adversely impacts some users. Controlling cost demands vigilance.

The programs we have work somewhat, but have problems. I think that as we move to a larger online collection the programs will be less cumbersome and more defined. This will aid the general acquisition of materials.

Ours is a pilot model with our consortia. So far the experience has been positive. Duplication of titles purchased outside the DDA model is a problem.

Yes, they are generally effective. Lots of concern on part of our selectors when piloted in 2010, but now no one feels threatened. Presence of title in our local and/or consortial DDA programs needs to be more apparent in YBP database (GOBI) to alert our selectors as they consider buying a print title. (Duplication in print is permitted at our library.)

Effective in meeting users needs to large content areas we would otherwise be unable to afford; but difficult and time consuming in terms of creation of content pools, loading and suppressing of titles (title changes, access changes); monitoring of expenditures

Yes, they have met our goals but admittedly we were approaching DDA projects as experiments to learn more about our patron interests in certain areas of our collections

We are just in the implementation phase so I am sure I will have thoughts and comments after a month or so
Our program has been effective. We've made available some 40,000 titles now, with all the use of their metadata in our catalog and availability of quick-browse, for the total cost of purchasing about 150 of them. We've also been able to lend far more than 150, as much of our usage is in short-term loans rather than eventual (or preemptive) purchases.

I think that work fairly well in the humanities, social sciences, and maybe the general sciences for general reading, but not necessarily so for advanced graduate and professional disciplines.

Our DDA program with EBL works seamlessly with Worldshare Management Services (WMS). Our patrons have access to 140,000 e-book titles. The vendors keep track of the activity. We can monitor activity by running reports. Mostly we just pay the monthly invoice for usage. In spite of a reduction in funding, we were able to offer access to current academic titles, which met our goals.

Overall, the experience with the program has been positive. The majority of our funds for electronic purchasing are spent on the PDA program with ebrary. The program is valuable for meeting the needs of our online students in particular. They cannot easily access the print collection, so being able to offer a wide variety of titles online and only purchasing the ones which receive use is helpful. The program has resulted in many purchases, so we consider it successful. Most titles only receive the 1 use but at least we know there was 1 use for the purchase. We consider that an improvement over the many print purchases we make that receive 0 circulations. It is, however, hard to predict the cost of the program. We are going to experiment with STLs this year partly because of the potential to reduce costs.

We have a DDA program in our library; we also participate in a consortial DDA pilot. The former has been extremely successful -- we see the users as picking fairly wisely (they are not purchasing much that we would not want to purchase), and we are seeing demonstrated use with each purchase. Our consortial DDA participation has been less successful -- in large part, probably, because of the fact that we have a good DDA already working "in-house" with all of the essential publishers included. The cost of the consortial purchases is extremely high when you take into account the multipliers we're seeing -- 3, 3.5 and 4. The publishers included in the consortial project either overlap with our in-house ones, or are those of less interest.

Yes, we have met our goals.

The program has been effective. We have been able to give access to books that can be browsed for free for five minutes and the ones that people are more interested in gets loaned or purchased. We have kept our budget so far.

In general, I'm pleased with DDA - especially short term loans. It's been fairly cost-effective and I'm pleased with the usage of content I'm seeing. However, we still have a long way to go before we see how sustainable this is in practical terms. While DDA is still a supplementary collection activity, so to speak, for our library, I'm adding more content from our e-preferred approval plan into DDA and am intrigued to see if this is successful.

I have personal experience at my previous institution with a large-scale DDA profile designed to replace, wherever possible, our print approval plans. It worked fantastically well. The only limitations were publishers withholding titles, either from e-format or from DDA, and our book jobber's struggle with moving its approval plan activities (profiling, record provision, etc.) from shipping print to providing ebook DDA records. I am now in the process of setting up a similar plan at my current institution, but with a different ebook aggregator. I am a bit frustrated by the limitations with this aggregator (less flexibility for STLs, SUPO licenses), but still believe it will largely meet our goals of providing greater access to ebooks while remaining with in our (increasingly restricted) budget.

The administrative side is much more difficult than I had anticipated as the administrative tools that our vendor has available are extremely limited. Removing titles from the pool is problematic at best. I literally have to call the vendor for each title since the sorting function on the list of titles is not working at this time. Even when it was working, you still had to browse for the title you wanted to remove. The search capability has never functioned to allow a title to be removed from a DDA list. The is no ability to see when a title was purchased in the administrative module or how the purchase was triggered. It's just horrible. We keep getting promises about improvements but that's been for several years now and nothing has improved. From the user side, there are difficulties with checking in titles that the user wants to check in but can't. Downloading is a difficult process. Simply reading can be a challenge on a smaller screen since many of the titles are in PDA format. Our goal was mainly to provide a wider variety of titles to our users at a lower cost to us so that goal has been met. But the aggravation factor is still an issue.

Some complaints from patrons who do not like e-books. Yes, the DDA has been effective.

They have been both effective in identifying and purchasing relevant material quickly without staff intervention and they are very popular with users. The main issues we have had are related to records management and
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administration. It has taken to streamline the import of order and bibliographic records and to ensure there are no duplicate orders.

Very positive. Met legitimate demand in several subject areas. STLs good value.

We started this spring, so our experience has been limited. However, we have noticed users getting at resources that would not normally be part of our collection and the speed with which they can access these resources has increased. Oppositely, we have noticed a few users complaining that they wanted print copies or that they disliked all the extra software required to download DDA books onto their portable devices.

These have been very good, helped us meet our goals and we hope to continue for some time to come. It expands our collection, and provides access to many titles we would never be able to buy outright, solely on a bet hedge of "may get used."

Generally yes, though we would like more content available

The programs have to date been more problematic than we would have liked. A limited number of materials available for purchase, lag time between e- and print versions, less than clear reports about activities, and idiosyncratic workflows have overridden the benefits for us at this point.

Generally positive. We monitor our programs carefully and we have seen that the distribution of our DDA collection by subject is similar to how our print collection is distributed. We have expanded our program to include a total of 4 vendors, dividing funding and subjects by vendor. Our initial program was auto-purchase, but we went through our funding about 4 months earlier than expected. So we switched to short-term loans. We decided on a 2-loan model, purchasing the title on the third triggered use based on scenario analysis of our first year's experience.

We are only at the beginning. From a management perspective it has been somewhat of a headache to get started. We are working to expose our ebrary titles in our instance of Summon. This should be an easier process.

Overall it has been effective in stretching our buying power, gaining access to more content electronically, saving time and guesswork out of the selection process. However the downside, is our implementation of DDA is not format agnostic so if the patron does not want an e-book format but a print copy, they are out of luck as we do not provide it.

Yes - the resources selected have met the selection criteria for the relevant subject areas

We use DDA program for ebooks with x number of usages triggering an alert to me about the usage. Effectiveness has yet to be determined. The patrons are delighted. However, we have seen books purchased that have had 0 subsequent usages: the ebook was used for a project

happy with the experience for the most part. using an aggregator platform in conjunction with our approval plan has been a hassle, with most of the blame on the approval plan vendor.

Thus far, we are still setting our program up. So far, we've had an easy time getting the parameters we'd like set up, but we haven't had a chance to test them out yet. I'm currently optimistic about it working well.

We love it! Ours has been in place about 2.5 years. I’ve been surprised that our greatest costs have been for STLs; relatively few titles have seen enough use to go to the purchase point. Still, this is the the beauty of DDA -- if our patrons only use a title once or twice, we can provide instant access yet avoid actual purchase.

Yes, our program with MyiLibrary has been effective and met goals. Students are getting access to titles we may not have purchased otherwise and are not even aware of the process. I wish they used the service more. We seldom purchase more than 6 items a month.

in general, yes, overall it has been a positive experience.

Our experience has been positive - we’ve met (exceeded) our goal of saving money. However, usage is low, which is a concern if we want relevant, accessible content for users.

It’s working well for us. We’ve recently revised most of our approval plans to e-preferred with a feed of PDA records for these titles, so subject librarians will be spending less time selecting individual titles. Purchasing started out slowly. We set aside a large sum of acquisitions funds and it took us a bit over two years to use it all.

Currently we subscribe to a DDA account via ebrary and have been very happy with the selection of titles and publishers offered. Although our institution is small the breadth of research topics is large, so purchasing subscription based subject collections of eBooks is prohibitively expensive for us. DDA provides us with the
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ability to craft our own subject collections and then purchase only those that are used, which is the only way that our institution can afford to provide access to books electronically.

We are in the third year of our DDA program. Patron us has been extremely low; less than <$5,000 in three years. We are in the process of updating our profile.

I want to clarify that we do not CURRENTLY have a DDA program, but we just finished up a year long trial of a PDA program and I wanted to contribute my thoughts on DDA/PDA at our institution. We initially invested $10,000 towards the DDA program, which included a very tight profile to see if we could stay within our budget. Long story short: We went over a bit, but did very well. Without more funding though we couldn’t continue. After ending, we compared usage of patron-selected materials against selector-selected materials. This made us believe that we should divert some of our print monographic budget to DDA. Potentially we will do that in FY15. More information can be found at http://z.umn.edu/umdpda

The way we set it up has penalized selectors willing to experiment (not all the funds went DDA). I’ve ended up buying several items off of firm order monies that would have come in on approval.

Overall, with the exceptions already mentioned earlier, the experience has been pretty good.

Our library has decided to go primarily with ebook purchases so it has been effective in that sense.

All in all, I have been very pleased with the DDA program we have through YBP. I would like to see other e-book vendors follow their model.

So far yes. We have only implemented it a few months ago and should probably do more marketing but so far it has gone well and being used.

Usually, what I find is useless or inappropriate.

Hard to measure because vendor reporting is horribly incomplete

They have met our goals fine. Our requests come through a consortium and we are able to buy most everything requested.

We are still in testing stages and so far have not been able to evaluate the success

We have created an evidence based program for use on our own platform. Libraries have been very receptive and the results have exceeded our goals so far.

We have only been doing DDA since March 2013. We are in the evaluation period (6-12 months evaluation). Our goals were to see if our patrons would like DDA and use it—and they do. So, we are successful in that goal. We are currently just doing short-term loan while we evaluate our patron’s borrowing patterns to determine how/if we want to set up auto purchase.

effective where we can do it, but so many publishers we want still insist on only selling or renting packages with their whole catalog.

We are just starting the DDA program through YBP

our primary goals with DDA have been to: get patrons the items they need at the point of need and relieve pressure on our vastly reduced collection budget. Yes, to date, it is helping in both areas.

Our program began 1 week ago and we don’t have enough experience to answer.

very positive, the content is timely, we have stayed within budget

Actual implementation of DDA has proven to be disappointing. Our patrons are not availing themselves to the option.

I work for an aggregator, rather than a library, but I would say the programs are very effective. Purchases are made at the point of need, so libraries are not spending money on titles that are likely to not see any usage.

We are pleased with the DDA program we have in place.

the program meets our goals of reducing firm order and approval shipments, and introducing more ebooks

Very effective, we’ve moved to replace most firm ordering of to DDA, where available (i.e. only when available electronically).

We have just begun a limited pilot program in two disciplines. It’s too early to evaluate them.
We are generally pleased with this program. One area of complaint is inability to seamlessly integrate our DDA holdings in Serials Solutions and in OCLC.

We were pretty conservative with publishers and dates coverage in the beginning so that our funds wouldn’t run out, but have been pleasantly surprised that, while there are purchases practically every week, our patrons haven’t run amok. We also didn’t advertise the fact that we don’t own the ebooks in the catalog and patrons may just discover at will.

We have a couple different ones and they are successful, but each has limitations. One doesn’t offer good triggers, one does offer good usage statistics, etc. various experiences with each, but all are still better than purchasing collections of ebooks.

Effective, but variety of DRM and license terms confusing for customers and librarians

11. What access models are you currently using in your DDA program? [Select all that apply]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Response Percent</th>
<th>Response Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Auto Purchase</td>
<td>60.5%</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Short term loan (STL)</td>
<td>53.1%</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Free browse before a short-term loan or purchase is triggered</td>
<td>77.8%</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evidence-based</td>
<td>25.9%</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Other (please specify) 11

Comments:

We also have a PDA model for online video which includes 4 free views.

I know you explained evidence-based in the first screen, but I don’t recall what that means. It’s not an official part of our program with vendors, at least by that name.

We have just begun to explore evidenced-based selection and hope to have something in place before the beginning of the Fall semester.

See above. I think “evidence-based“ is closest to our model, but there are many differences.

The free browse is limited to certain parts of the book.

(not sure if by Auto Purchase you mean Auto Purchase after a certain number of STL, or purchase after a single use.

Short term loan that trigger an auto purchase after a specific number of short term loans.

Our DDA provides for a set number of loans before automatic purchase

We have a consortial DDA with auto-purchase wherein download is the only trigger for purchase; online reading, searching and browsing are free. This consortial DDA program also allows libraries to choose which titles to purchase at the end of the contract (1 year) out of a list of titles used but not downloaded during the year (so evidence-based).
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we have multiple, though limited, free browses before a purchase if triggered.
We are also doing a very limited trial of DDA for ILL requests for which the item cannot be filled quickly or cheaply.

12. Tell us what actions or events cause a financial transaction to occur in your DDA program. [Select all that apply]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Event Description</th>
<th>Response Percent</th>
<th>Response Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Exceeding a time limitation/free browse period</td>
<td>88.2%</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Content quantity (more than a certain number of pages looked at)</td>
<td>63.2%</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Content quality (TOC, Index, etc)</td>
<td>15.8%</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Copy/Paste</td>
<td>51.3%</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Downloading</td>
<td>81.6%</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Printing</td>
<td>67.1%</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (please explain)</td>
<td></td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

answered question 76
skipped question 23

Comments:
More than a certain number of uses
In each case, before a transaction occurs, the user is asked if they wish to continue/"create a loan". There is no indication to the (average) user that a cost is associated.
Inter-library loan requests (see above).
On the second access of the content of the book a purchase is triggered. Or on the first copy/paste, download, print.
we have 2 PDA/DDA providers both use different triggers
multiple request of the same title as a short term loan - we rather buy the full text after 2 stls
After 3 clicks on the book, it is automatically purchased
Standard 10-10-1 model.
After a certain number of STLs, the AUTOPURCHASE is triggered and we buy the ebook.
3 downloads and then I am notified of the usage. I then decide to purchase or not.
Amount of STL per Alliance participants (e.g. 5 STLs total for a books = automatic purchase)
All of these things listed contribute to a financial transaction occurring because each takes time to do. If the reader is doing any of these tasks for 10 minutes or more, the purchase is triggered.
one, we evaluate titles access
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User request for books not available through the options above, e.g. print
Patron clicks on "Request Item"
None of these. Overdrive offers a DDA program that is moderated by a collection development librarian
The number of times a book is opened.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>13. Are these trigger models working well for your DDA program?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If no, please comment

| answered question | 76 |
| skipped question | 23 |

Comments:
We’re considering lowering the number of STLs that trigger a purchase, but don’t have the data yet to help with that decision
It often takes the patron longer than the time limit to figure out if this book is relevant. Also, the TOC’s are often so poorly designed that it is unclear to the patron whether this book is relevant. Many times it is not the book that has a bad table of contents but the way it was scanned into the system.
I think a more accurate response would be I am not sure - there are so many variables at play that more time needs to invested in data analysis before an appropriate response can be offered.
not known at this time
Maybe
We are comfortable with the rate of triggering.
somewhat restrictive
I don’t know since we don’t get any information on how a purchase was triggered.
I would prefer the trigger threshold to be higher. It is currently two uses (each consisting of a 24hr period)
Well, I wish you had an option for “I don’t know”. I’d like to find out how the trigger is associated with usage - do those titles triggered by the download/copy/print get used more or less than titles triggered by time or pages viewed.
We are in the initial stages and have little data to respond either way.
We have no experience yet, we are just in the implementation stage
Unable to comment at this time.
The answer is more somewhat. For the longer tail books we would like the rent to own and for the newer books we would like a little more time in the book before it is triggered.
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14. Have you identified any risks associated with any particular trigger model (whether you offer it or not)?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Response Percent</th>
<th>Response Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>47.9%</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>52.1%</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If yes, please comment. 40

answered question 71
skipped question 28

Comments:
We have been reticent to try the STL model even though some consider it as a means of cost savings. However, when the population is 50K+ it seems highly inflationary.

You can end up spending a lot on STLs but not end up owning anything. If you don't set the trigger at the correct level you may buy too early and find books purchased are not re-used, or too late and find that the cost of the purchase combined with the cost of STL is higher than it could have been.

We have set 3 STLs before Autopurchase on 4th trigger. This appears to be a good mixture of loans to purchase for our institution. I am aware of institutions that are strictly auto purchase, and others that are strictly STLs. I have outlined risks of an unbalanced scheme earlier in this survey.

I don't like triggers based on content quantity, because they don't allow much flexibility for a user to evaluate the e-book before knowing if they want to continue. Basing a trigger on functions like copy/download/print carries some risk for user error. For example, a user may click on "Download," but after they have (unknowingly) triggered a purchase or short-term loan, they realize that the button labeled "Download" didn't do what they expected/wanted it to do. Or they might trigger a loan by clicking "Copy" but then be unable to figure out how to make the DRM-crippled Copy function work, so the library ends up paying for a frustrated user to not get what they need. (OK, maybe that's more a problem with poorly-designed, DRM-crippled interfaces than it is with the trigger model.) An even bigger risk, IMO, would be in providing DDA e-books from multiple providers and thus having different triggers for different books. Difficult to manage/maintain, very difficult to explain to users (who won't care, they just want access to the content).

Sometimes we auto-purchase books for which we already hold a later edition and we would not normally buy the earlier auto-purchased edition.

Short-term loans have a risk of paying more than if you had bought the book outright. Would be nice if you only had to pay the difference in price between the loans and the purchase price of the book.

If a user automatically downloads a book, a purchase is triggered even if the user doesn't ever really need/use the book. The only way to prevent this would be a five-minute wait on downloading, and there are good reasons for not imposing this kind of delay.

The current models allow for one a user to trigger a purchase for a high cost title with very little effort on their part, e.g. printing one page. The STL model helps to mitigate that risk but it is not a perfect solution by any means.

We needed to make sure that our inter-library loan statistics did not appear to be artificially lower than they were, so we devised a "dummy library" that fulfills any I.L.L. requests that are converted to purchases.

The time limit could prove risky as users frequently open a screen and then move away from it and forget it’s open.

Although we have a short term loan program, some publishers only allow purchase on first use.
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time limit feels like big brother - downloading and copying limits are not natural and hard to explain to patrons. I'm not sure but there could be a problem with a time limit because user might just leave the book open. The 5-minute maximum of viewing time is not long enough. EBL is "trigger happy."

If a patron is not certain they need the title until they spend a significant amount of time, it has already been triggered to purchase.

Titles were being triggered and a large percentage were only being viewed once. We went with the 3 STL model before purchase to try to stretch our dollars.

Vendor-determined triggers (with no ability for library to adjust) make budget management more difficult. The trigger # as an ultimate predictor of subsequent or post-purchase use

trigger levels should be carefully considered. Avoid low threshold triggers

not known at this time

I understand the copy/paste trigger, but I don’t really like it. Given the copy/paste limitations already in place, it seems harsh. It’s also inexpensive, so it’s not on our squawk sheet. The way it works, however, makes it easier to back out and find another source than to continue on with something that really does look promising. That’s a functionality issue, though, not a problem with the trigger itself. Our browse-time trigger functions the same way, and I think it has the same effect. Again, functionality rather than the trigger itself.

Public library/general material is purchased at the expense of more scholarly materials best suited for the academic environment.

Specifying too many short term loans before a purchase is triggered can increase the cost of a book when it is finally purchased. It’s best to find a balance.

One of the risks is that the title was triggered but still determined not to be worth using by the user. The fact that the ebook was triggered hopefully indicates it was a useful ebook, but we don’t know for sure. But the same is true of books that are checked out – we don’t know if the book ended up being useful. When the title is triggered because of a print or download in particular, the purchase may have been made before the user has determined if the book will be useful.

The time limitation has the potential for accidental triggers if an ebook is simply left open in users browser while they’re doing something else; although I haven’t seen any patterns to indicate that this is a problem.

May pay a very high price for expensive books after the no. of clicks has been passed. I worry that books we need in the future will not be selected by the click method

I think the threshold limit is a risk as it’s hard to know if the book is really in high demand after only two uses. You must get the profiling right too or material you don’t want will be added to your catalogue and purchased.

Just that we are not sure we have the trigger model low enough (might have set it too high) as we are renting the content (have not reached the auto purchase threshold limit as of yet). We are not building a collection as a result.

The only real "risk" is triggering a purchase because someone requests a few pages from a DDA book title. In those instances, sometimes our staff inadvertently purchases books through DDA even though we are really only copying a few pages for another library’s ILL request.

Well, not yet...but I need to look at it more carefully.

The immediate trigger-to-purchase model has too high a cost/benefit ratio and is overly subject to individual mis-use of the system.

Some models will purchase a book based upon simple examinations of table of contents, or if a user glances through a few pages even if they then reject the book. I know from others' sad experiences that this can completely decimate any budgeted funds for a DDA project - and more.

Content quality can be problematic. The quality of TOCs can be such that it's difficult for a patron to determine whether a title is a fit for their needs, so that the patron has to visit the text of the book, thereby triggering a financial transaction. If the title wasn't what they needed, the library has just spent money they didn't need to spend.
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as previously stated, without a browse period auto-purchase would acquire books of questionable value for our collection

have received duplicates: print and e

If a title is being used for a class assignment and many students are using the book at one time, it's possible the book could be purchased multiple times. Although this hasn't been a problem for us to date - we've been doing DDA since July 2012.

The time and page limit triggers could be a bit low - ie within scope of browsing and rejecting but by then the purchase has been triggered.

a good sales pitch for a useless document.

there are always risks, depending on which model you choose

We have ended up spending more on multiple short-term loans of a title than it would cost to purchase the title. We knew this would be a risk (and it has not happened often in the 6 months we have been doing DDA).

There are always monetary risks when a library cannot control, or does not know, the annual dollar spend.

Paying for a short-term loan when very little of the book is actually used.

For the time in book, there needs to be a clear understanding that activity must occur during the time. If someone opens a book and then walks away from the terminal and there is no activity, there should not be a trigger.

15. Have you identified any rewards associated with any particular trigger model (whether you offer it or not)?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Response Percent</th>
<th>Response Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>57.1%</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>42.9%</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If yes, please comment. 40

answered question 70

skipped question 29

Comments:

A PDA model which offers several free views is a more cost-effective option than librarian selected annual subscription licenses. The EBS model means you don't need to pay STLs. It would be great if the aggregators offered this model - all content available, you only buy what you use and you get to decide which titles end up being purchased based on their usage.

STL provides just in time delivery of content. This appears to be appreciated by users.

Short-term loan allows a user to use for limited time. Single short-term loans are prevalent and limit the overall cost of the program. In other words, a single use (10% - 15% of list) is the cost for use of that title.

Low cost for low use

Some users have taken advantage of the free browse period to assess whether or not they want to check out (or perhaps even purchase) a print copy of the book. From a teaching perspective, the free browsing period sometimes also allows me to quickly check a student's work without incurring additional cost for the library.

We are new to short-term loans (had auto-purchase exclusively) and it is saving money.
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Usage of a title is already proven and we can demonstrate a return on investment.
Titles have to be used in order for us to spend money on them. That was our original goal and it’s still important.
If patrons knew it, they would quickly scan the TOCs to determine relevancy.

A free browse period is critical. Ideally, the contents and index should be exempt from a time or page trigger, so that the users can determine if the content actually meets their needs.
The trigger model based on number of uses allows a user to use a book as much as they like with no purchase the first time.
We prefer the three uses and then purchase model.
If only 1 STL then use is accomplished with a fraction of the cost

Having a free browse period and/or free use of a certain number of pages helps stop purchase triggering of a title of limited interest.

it is the only immediate control you can exercise - you see what the money is spent for

By reading the table of contents and possibly the bibliography a patron might be able to tell whether or not they need the title before the trigger time.

Being able to adjust the trigger up or down assists with budget management.

Similarly, the trigger as a rational predictor of long term or repeated use to constituents

Ebrary offers a preview model where some browsing/use is allowed before a purchase is triggered.

not known at this time

The likelihood that books purchased and/or accessible are actually used.

We at least know that it is more likely that the ebook was useful for research if it was triggered, even if it’s not guaranteed. The STL model is also potentially rewarding in that many ebooks are only used once or twice. We can pay for just a rental fee a couple of times rather than purchase the ebook. Many ebooks will never be purchased but just rented a couple times.

immediate access to e-books

Free browse periods and STLs are extremely cost-effective. Without free-browse, most libraries would double their spending on DDA, on items that aren’t being used in any significant or beneficial way (beyond being reviewed to determine they are NOT needed!). STLs can reduce spending considerable, as well (my modeling suggests that the more STLs before purchase the better--until the STLs have equaled the price of the purchase).
The reward is not saving money. The reward is allowing libraries to expand their DDA programs with the confidence that their budgets will only be spent on what it is needed, to the extent that it is needed.

Fast and seamless ordering

Having autopurchase set at 2 STLs is working well. Librarians can trigger auto-purchase by browsing STL activity.

I guess if we don’t have high individual uses, our budget deposit account goes that much further.
The rewards are having several academic titles readily available without having to pay for them unless accessed.

Reports have shown that a number of titles were browsed, but not triggered for purchase. This is a good way of balancing reader curiosity with real need and limited budgets.

Not yet. We do hope that our users are happy with the seamless access.

Helps identify high-use content we should purchase so users can use it without the hassle of the DRM.

Short-term loan allows users to determine usefulness of resources before obligating purchase.

If the trigger model is well designed to focus on actual reading or downloading of significant book content, the library acquires books that users are actually interested in. Even if only one or two people use it before the trigger, this bodes well for additional users finding and appreciating the book.

i think it is reasonable overall.

Free browse time allows for better evaluation of content.
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As previously stated, the browse option allows more relevant and higher quality content to be purchased don’t pay until someone uses
Yes, we don’t have a financial transaction is someone is using a book for 9 minutes or less.
rewarding institutions for purchasing only what they're using
We feel we are not purchasing materials that people will only use once or twice and then the title just “sits” there.
STLs help manage the one-off views of a title that could be costly.
ability to look at the book and determine if you really want to use it. Time out period so if people are not actively engaged then it does not produce a trigger event
Ensures that the patron is intending to engage in the chosen title for serious study, and not just browsing in initial research stages.

16. Is there anything you would like to change about the trigger models you are using? Please describe.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response Count</th>
<th>48</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>answered question</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>skipped question</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments:

It has become fairly easy to include titles in a discovery pool. It would be helpful to see 1-click options to remove no longer wanted titles individual or in groups from the aggregator platform as needed.

It would be nice if they adjusted themselves based on your usage to achieve the best value for money.

There is only one trigger scheme per platform. I could see the potential for multiple trigger schemes to be set depending on type of content or subject area (e.g., literature vs engineering texts vs STM).

No

Some of the STL amounts are a little high—that’s why we’re considering lowering the # of STLs to trigger a purchase

We've seen some cases in which a user apparently has reached the end of the free browse period and clicked on the button to create a loan, but then immediately exits the e-book. I think that if a user initiates a short-term loan or auto-purchase by exceeding the free browse time, but then does not continue to read the e-book, the vendor should not charge. It would also be nice if the library had the ability to “forgive” a limited number of transactions that were triggered in error; for example, if a librarian is aware of a user having clicked on something but then found that it didn’t do what they wanted it to.

Publishers are inconsistent in pricing for short-term loans, so a purchase could end up being very expensive in some cases. Would like an agreed-on percentage that we can predict.

Only to be able to identify older editions of titles for which we already own a latter or current edition - and to prevent auto-purchase of titles that we have in other collections. We already suppress these manually from view if we become aware of title duplication between vendors.

No

Copying and pasting shouldn't be an automatic trigger, especially if it was only a word or two.
I would like options for mediating download, though I am not sure that I would actually want to implement such mediation. Also, one should be able to make a detailed review of the contents and the index to determine the suitability of the text without automatically triggering a purchase.

Institutions and consortia need to be able to customize trigger models based on established use patterns by a particular user population, e.g. engineering user community use of content from IEEE. Some of us have had DDA programs in place for a while now and use patterns are emerging. We need to link that information to our upcoming renewal offers from our DDA partners.

As already mentioned, I sometimes wonder if a purchase triggered by the second use is reasonable. We have not tested this.

Although we have a short term loan program, some publishers only allow purchase on first use.

Flexibility in triggers models are a must - different libraries have different missions and expectations according to their status and user’s expectations. I want to be able to choose different triggers for certain call number ranges.

We participate in 2 programs (1 individual and 1 with a consortia). One program allows us to adjust the number of short term loans that trigger a title purchase. This is very helpful in balancing access v. collection building. A problem with 1 model we have is that not all publishers allow short term loans and only offer autopurchase. We can’t easily separate these out in our profile and would like to. We would be more restrictive in the profile of those titles where only 1 use triggers purchase.

We have limited the trigger to a certain price - if the price exceeds the limit, a colleague sees to the request. We would like to set different price limits for our different subjects: a book on engineering of 30 USD is cheap - one on language is not.

The only idea I have is to create trigger models that are as conservative as possible. Increase time limits and number of pages browsed prior to trigger.

Define the triggers more thoroughly. The patrons in our library do not know that the title is not already owned, they just know it is available.

Would like to have the ability to set different triggers based on the subject matter of the ebook -- e.g., to privilege access over ownership for subjects that are soon outdated.

The weighting towards scholarly materials, as well as in specialty fields

Not at this time.

The trigger for copy seems harsh. They can’t get that much of the content with a copy.

I’d like more information on what triggered a particular title to be purchased.

I would like to be able to customize the messages the user gets after setting of a trigger which caused us to have one short-term loan before a purchase. Otherwise we might have considered more loans.

I’m ok with the triggers.

I’d like to increase the number of STLs before purchase. Our current vendor has a maximum of three (with STLs running 15-20% of the purchase price, 5 STLs before purchase would probably be ideal).

I’d like more information on what triggered a particular title to be purchased.

Unlimited users and lessen the cost of STLs

Higher threshold

We will have to use more data to make informed decisions about changing this to a higher or lower trigger point. An annual evaluation will take place next spring.

n/a

Patrons may not understand what triggers purchases
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No

I would like the triggers to be more evidence-based - titles used 10 minutes may have much fewer repeat uses
than titles triggered after 15.

If we autopurchase the ebook, the DRM should get disabled to improve the user experience.

A little longer "trial period" per book

Not yet - no actual experience.

Seems to be working well.

No, I think it is fair.

No

Raise the browse period from 10 minutes to 15 minutes.

I think there needs to be a specific model for textbooks. I believe more professors are going to be requesting e-
textbooks in the next few years than there are now.

As above - maybe allow people a little browsing before the trigger kicks in.

not at this time

we haven’t triggered a ton of purchases in our programs (one pilot with ebl, publisher based in spring of 2012)
moved entire profile to DDA in Feb 2013.

Allowing patrons to review more chapters than are now allowed before triggering a purchase.

longer time in book and more downloading before trigger

17. Are there trigger models you can envision that are not currently available? Please describe.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>answered question</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>skipped question</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments:

It would be nice to have more interoperability within discovery systems particularly with citations or ILL
requests.

A PDA model which offers several free loans. For instance, this could be used for older content.

Allowing multiple trigger schemes per platform.

No

Not at the moment.

Not yet, but I’ll offer a criticism of 'less than unlimited simultaneous users' models where purchase is triggered
by a predetermined number of 'holds' on an ebook. The need is often only for a couple of weeks when
assignments or exams are due, so demand is somewhat artificial as is it short-term.

I envision an overall "use" stat used in a formula to determine cost, and not some title-by-title calculation.
Example, you pledge of spend a minimum of $5k, but your use with determine the cost from $5k-$15k,
something like that.
See above - my vision calls for some serious staff time for data analysis but I believe the outcome would be well worth the effort.

See above.

NO

No.

Yes, but they are intrusive to the patron and would not fit the service model of most libraries. For example, "Who are you?" "Why are you interested in this book?" "Will you really use it in your bibliography?" "Did you really look at it hard or just skim?" That sort of thing would be nice to incorporate into a trigger. No real interest = no trigger.

n/a

not at this time

See #15

Not at this time.

No

No.

Not at this point

n/a

No

Perhaps a way to "return" or "deselect" purchased titles for a percentage of the purchase price (e.g. 50 cents on the dollar) applied to other purchases (e.g. "store credit"). Limits would apply, such as age (no older than 10 years), etc.

Let’s say we decide that a particular profile is going to trigger purchases after the first patron has used a substantial portion of the title. If over the course of the next six months the title was not used again we could opt to undo the purchase and convert it to a short-term loan. The lure of DDA is that you only pay for what users want. In some cases we are going down a road that causes us to pay more for a title than we might want. Probably not a model many vendors would want to embrace.

no

No.

No

gifts

not at this time

I would like to see trigger models where if you have spent the value of the purchase title on short-term loans, you automatically own the title.

see above
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18. Which simultaneous user models are you using for your DDA program?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Response Percent</th>
<th>Response Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>One user at a time</td>
<td>53.2%</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiple (but not unlimited) simultaneous users</td>
<td>36.7%</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unlimited simultaneous users</td>
<td>39.2%</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A set number of uses per year (Sometimes referred to as Non-linear lending or NLL)</td>
<td>35.4%</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (please explain)</td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments:

These are driven by publishers, so all are in place.

However, we have automatic turnaway prevention which "upgrades" one user at a time to a higher category based on use!

Our DDA plan is with EBL, which offers unlimited simultaneous use within an absolute limit on the number of uses per year through their "non-linear" lending model.

None of these apply to us.

The default is multiple but this is not always available.

We started with multiple-user only but have moved to single-user only. It's cheaper and we haven't seem any turnaways, even for texts that are clearly used as course readings based on the amount of page views.

For most programs, the default purchase is either single-user or 3-multiple users. We've only just started with the NLL model from one vendor - we're not sure how well this will work.

Our local DDA is based on an NLL model; our consortial DDA is based on 2 concurrent users.

Each of our programs has a different simultaneous user model.
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19. Are the simultaneous usage models you are using working for your DDA program?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>83.6%</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>16.4%</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If no, please describe.

answered question 73
skipped question 26

Comments:

Yes for Unlimited and Non-linear. NO for Multiple (not unlimited) users. It is very confusing for our users when most of our e-books allow (for practical purposes) unlimited users, but then the come across one that can only be used by 3. In EBL’s 3-at-a-time model, it’s actually three within a 24-hour period; i.e., if one user logs in at 8:00am but only uses the book for 10 minutes, and then two more users log in, the book is frozen until 8:00am the next day, 24 hours after the first user’s session began. It might not be so bad if the "seat" were freed up after the first user's session ends, but because of the way EBL structures their loans (each loan is good for 24 hours), the seat is taken for a full day. Not sure how that works with ebrary or EBSCO e-books.

However, it is a headache with the billing, invoicing, MARC records.

The only model that works and that should be deemed acceptable by libraries is the unlimited simultaneous users model.

We can upgrade to 3 users but this is not sufficient when a text is required for a class. Our vendor has just recently started offering the option of a set number of uses per calendar year and is negotiating with publishers to offer this option.

Too many titles available as 1-user only; price point for some vendor is hardcover list for one simultaneous user - which is too high

too early to tell

I'm not sure the multiple user model is worth it for most titles.

Currently, we have a lot of SUPO titles, and we get turnaways. I consider this 'not working'. We are working with our vendor to implement post-purchase rentals to prevent turnaways.

Right now we aren't using simultaneous users.

It is difficult to determine which titles should have which model, and different vendors provide different models. It is quite confusing and takes more staff time to manage them.

But we have limited experience and a relatively small FTE.

n/a

The NLL model is working well for us, especially for titles that we know will get a lot of use during the academic year

None of these for DDA

Well, ideally we would want unlimited, but cannot afford even MUPO.

I would like to see more options for unlimited simultaneous users - especially if we go to e-textbooks

We have marketed the one use at a time concept so that people understand what is happening if they get a turnaway. I'm not aware of any turnaways yet.
they could be working better. I don't think we get turnaway statistics. Also a lot of the books we want site licensed aren’t sold that way.

**20. Is there anything you would like to change about the simultaneous usage models you are using? Please describe.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>answered question</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>skipped question</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Comments:**

Consistency from publishers. Single, multiple, and unlimited usage should be an option for every DDA title. Publishers continue to send mixed messages with restrictions around categories. Titles which are considered textbooks are particularly inconsistent in usage models and pricing.

Remove the sim user limit on textbooks

We use EBL (non-linear) for DDA that limits use to 325 per year. This has worked well since only two titles exceeded the limit. However, I would expect the model to change given the merger of EBL with ebrary.

It would be nice if all books were offered with all the options--we would select partially based on price and partially on perceived needs of the campus community.

Just the 3-a-day model I described in #18 (what EBL calls the "textbook" model).

Not at this time.

Not at this stage - unlimited sim users is our preferred option.

We would like every single e-book to have unlimited simultaneous usage, or at least the NLL model, which is unlikely to be exceeded in our institution. Anything more restrictive is a disservice -- and potentially confusing and frustrating -- to our users.

Yes--EDI invoicing, better MARC customization, better duplicate checking (even within the same vendor)

I think that EBL’s "non-linear" model is a good compromise, allowing multiple users to access a text while offering the publishers protection by restricting the use over time. The EBL usage limit is adequate in almost all cases.

See above

We have experience with multiple users, unlimited users, single users and a set number of uses per year. Out of all these models the one that has worked the best for us and is the most cost-effective is the set number of uses per year. We find we rarely run out of uses, it suits the needs of classroom use, and the cost is only marginally higher than the single user option.

We would like all titles to be multiple user.

should be an automatic upgrade to multi as users need

I think some of our librarians would like to be able to set some titles to multiple simultaneous usage. But if we expect multiple simultaneous usage then we probably should just purchase the book outright

No.

No

We have DDA-books in three-user -model. If the book is a textbook, three simultaneous users maybe be too little

n/a

Consistency among publishers as to annual limit of uses is desirable.
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Cost and number of titles available

dual access: get access to the book via the publisher’s site as well
too early to tell

Not at this time.

It’s okay that we get 1 user access models, but I would like a multi-user option for all of the titles. It’s only available for some. It would save me hassle if I could get multi-user for anything I wanted to. Single user access works for the vast majority of the titles. Then some others are more popular. I would also prefer that the ebook price be the same as the book price – at least the hardcover. But often it’s more than that.

Single user models make sense in the triggering phase. It would be ideal, however, if that initial trigger could be converted to a multiple user model upon sufficient usage -- maybe along the lines of a NLL model -- however, without the requirement to purchase a second copy mid-year (maybe there would be percentage cost added on when the "bump-up" to multiple users takes place.

The price for unlimited users is often too high. The process for upgrading from a single user to multiple users is cumbersome.

Some of the books in our DDA selection had their user model changed without us knowing it from unlimited simultaneous with a set number of uses the three users at a time combined with a set number of uses. I think these changes happened to several platforms and will probably continue to change. It makes it even harder to predict cost, usage etc.

Yes! There are too many options. I say single user or unlimited and get away from this 3/multi middle ground.

Nonlinear lending is, in my experience, the simplest and most elegant option--at least from a librarian’s perspective. There's too much guess work in SUPO/MUPO, and these 'turnaway protection', post-purchase rental options, needlessly complex.

Don't charge extra for them

Not all publishers on the platform we use (myiLibrary) allow it.

Too many models and every vendor has their own terminology for the same thing. Some standardization would be desirable but probably unrealistic.

We don’t have any data yet. I am worried about resources getting adopted as a course reserve? So again, monitoring of the vendor supplied reports will be required.

Would like unlimited users at an affordable cost

We would like the option of moving from 1 user to multiple (but not unlimited) users based on turnaway data, if it were available.

Consistency, please! Consistency in models offered, terminology, definitions.

unlimited would always be nice and, our EBL books are that way.

The consortial DDA program is just starting, so not sure yet if the 2 SU limit will work across multiple institutions. The NLL works great, nothing to change there. We had a previous DDA program (now discontinued) that was based on single- or multi-user model, and this was problematic because of the lock-outs that occur. We decided that DDA program didn’t work largely because of the SU models available to us.
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No
not at this time
would like site license as an option for any book. also would like Release this title button back in ebrary. And ebrary keeps putting up a download option for our SUPO titles, which makes no sense.
wish they could all be consistent, the usage models vary by publisher and platform

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>21. Are there simultaneous usage models you can envision that are not currently available? Please describe.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Response Count</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>answered question</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>skipped question</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments:
It would be interesting to see usage models for long-term loan, especially in answer to editions, updates, etc.
No.
I just want the publishers to come to their senses and realize that this is the way of the future.
Yes, a textbook category that would allow "semester" use
Unlimited simultaneous users based on a defined user community.
NO
we begun from unlimited and got downgraded to multiple - get back to unlimited.
No.
No.
No.
n/a
at this time
too early to tell
Not at this time.
Perhaps the ability to rent unlimited access for a time, like the STLs. Especially if publishers won’t allow an unlimited users license. Perhaps the option to put electronic items "on reserve" like print items.
No
I addressed this in a previous questions about access models (sorry).
No.
no
Cannot comment
n/a
A "shared usage" model, allowing for interlibrary loans or consortium lending.
no
More flexibility and options for reserves; models that take ILL into account.
No
not at this time

how about the option to buy or loan a 2nd copy if the first one is in use?

A better way to handle DDA titles that are put in e-reserves would be helpful.

### 22. For which type of materials does your organization offer a DDA program?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>E-books only</th>
<th>70.0%</th>
<th>56</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Print books only</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E-books and print books</td>
<td>28.6%</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

answered question  80
skipped question   19

### 23. Do you have any desire to include print in your DDA program?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>14.5%</th>
<th>8</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>47.3%</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maybe</td>
<td>38.2%</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Why or why not?  41

answered question  55
skipped question  44

**Comments:**

There is a curiosity, but simultaneous format publishing must be a standard first. In addition, long-established discounted pricing must carry over into this acquisitions model.

Patron demand has been proven with eBooks to be the best method of selection. The problem is the delay with getting the print.

We endeavor to purchase new content in e-book format when practical and available. When e- is not available, it would be good to be able to provide similar service for print books. These services are available but we do not use them currently.

Well, our Interlibrary Loan dept will sometimes order a print book when that would be cheaper &/or faster than placing the ILL request. But other than that, I don't think it has ever really been discussed here.

Have discussed it, but requires programming on the user interface and we are still troubleshooting a new system

It is difficult because of the time lag for acquiring and cataloging print materials in our organization.
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The delay in providing print makes a DDA program for print materials very different than it is for e-books. Discovery is usually limited to metadata, shipping and processing delay access, and the user must go to a service point when the books is eventually ready. Our library already obtains requested materials, submitted through acquisitions and/or ILL, so DDA for print is already happening to a degree. The main difference is that large quantities of records are not being added by the library for discovery within library systems, as is done for DDA for e-books.

We have talked about this option and there is interest but we've taken no action to implement it.

We could purchase instead of ILL, with certain criteria. We just haven’t done the organizational work.

We are de-emphasizing print books. We have a print request method, don’t see a need to expand on it.

supply of available titles for fast delivery is limited

We have a ‘e first’ and ‘e only’ acquisition policy.

There is too much of a time lag between when the patron expresses need and when the book can be provided to them. It’s not a good service model.

Moving away from building print collection

We are moving away from a largely print library to a largely online library. The materials are more timely in most areas of study. There will always be a print collection but over time it will become more historical or arts related.

Haven’t thought much about it - we are generally moving to e-only when available.

Would be problematic would a shared consortial catalog as we have. Many titles potentially would have to be non-loanable (because they are really owned by the library that “holds” it, and it would be frustrating for users.

Users have a hard enough time accepting that they can’t access e-books that belong to another library.

Would be nice but our investigations into print DDA resulted in our not pursuing it further. It was too much work for our acquisitions team to manage the records in our catalog.

We’re not sure how well it would work with our population and in our space. We’re under a lot of pressure to focus on shifting from print to electronic--in part to support planned expansion in online-degree programs--and we’ve already reduced our print monograph spending so far that shifting models there wouldn’t have much effect. Print isn’t dead here, but at the moment we’re on the wrong foot to step in that direction.

Not really. Ebooks are easier to share among consortia.

Purchasing print books will be more complicated than purchasing e-books. Print books require receiving, cataloging, and processing as well as shelf room. E-books are very simple and immediate. We already purchase requests from faculty, so a print DDA program would not be advantageous in any way.

you are talking about the "approval" method of acquiring books from vendors, or ILL from libraries -- both are very problematic

We are considering this option right now. The DDA for e-books has been very successful leading us to consider trying it for print.

When the bulk of the books were purchases are e-books, I think a print DDA program would be welcome. But, while there is still a large amount of print purchases, those individuals who wish to have the print version of an e-book can get it from another library. As other libraries move to more e-books that will become problematic and print DDA would be more attractive.

If the printed book could be supplied quickly and at a reasonable price, I would love to include print in a DDA model. But I can’t envision how that would work. To me, the point of DDA is that it is transparent to user. I don’t see how print DDA would ever be transparent.

Sounds messy and users would prefer immediate access which they can get with ebooks

I have not investigated print DDA, and am a little unsure how it would work. As well, the appeal is significantly less due to space, potential shipping concerns, etc.

We would like to include print, but feel that users may expect a faster turnaround time than we could deliver.

While we are increasing our emphasis on developing an electronic collection and decreasing our purchase of print books, we understand the need to continue to purchase print for different subjects and uses. It would be
worthwhile, then, to provide a DDA program for our print that would provide similar benefits as the ebook DDA - a collection that reflects our users' needs.

We need to work through our pilot program first before management would buy into this idea.

Our goal with DDA is to provide a seamless experience. A print DDA program doesn't allow for this.

We are moving to an e-preferred model to expand the publishers we can offer via DDA; some are not available on e-DDA.

I think that this would just cause massive irritation amongst users and librarians - with an e-book DDA program, they can immediately use the book; with a print DDA program, they'd still have to wait and go to the library to get it. Based upon my past experience with paper interlibrary loan materials, I think that many would not show up to get it, and then the library would have a random book that wasn't wanted by the library and wasn't used by any person. Not good.

We perform firm orders for those now using requests from faculty and librarians. This system is working fine for now. We also firm order ebooks.

We'd like to consider print in a DDA program, but processing a print title request is too slow. We sort of do DDA for print now – someone orders it, wants it now, so we rush it. But a formal print DDA program is hard to fathom.

Waiting to see how our eBook PDA pans out.

We are not sure how this would work in our environment.

This would have to be carefully thought through. One advantage of e-books is that students in our current model do get free browsing that helps them determine whether or not a particular book meets their information needs. Not sure how this would work with print and also they would have to wait for print titles to be ordered, processed and cataloged and most of our students prefer instantaneous access to information.

We already respond well to user requests so in a way that's a form of informal DDA. Collection management is about far more than just user demand - it's about pre-empting needs too. So the DDA on eBooks balances our collection selection overall. Print DDA would also be difficult to allow the "try before you buy" concept so the requesting would need to be for books unseen. I think. We need to think about that question in the future.

We are moving away from purchasing print, so we might consider DDA in relation to ILL, but in general I don't see us wanting to do print DDA.

want to minimize print purchases. We do offer purchase on demand through Interlibrary loan, but it's not the same model as the ebook DDA.

If we have to pay for rush delivery to meet user expectations is the added cost justifiable? And is the coverage good if you include only rush available titles? These would be my considerations for doing this.

| 24. Do you have any desire to include e-books in your DDA program? |
|------------------------|------------------|------------------|
|                       | Response Percent | Response Count   |
| Yes                   | 0.0%             | 0                |
| No                    | 100.0%           | 1                |
| Maybe                 | 0.0%             | 0                |

Why or why not? 1

answered question 1

skipped question 98
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Comments:
So far, as we look at the models for purchasing and loaning e-books “on demand,” none of them work for our library and our students. We do participate in several consortium programs that purchase e-books at a discount, and we have many e-books available to our users through EBSCO.

25. Please identify your role

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role</th>
<th>Response Percent</th>
<th>Response Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Academic library/collection development</td>
<td>43.0%</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic library/acquisitions</td>
<td>34.2%</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic library/cataloging</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic library/other</td>
<td>12.7%</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public library/collection development</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public library/acquisitions</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public library/cataloging</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public library/other</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Publisher</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E-book aggregator</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library service vendor</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Library/Other (non-publisher, aggregator or vendor) Please specify: 12

Comments:
We’re a small institution. I am academic library/acquisitions AND cataloging. And other roles too. Please allow multiple answers.

Acquisitions
Medical library/all
I’m responding to this survey on behalf of Cataloging, Acquisitions, Collection Development, and Administration Head, Technical Services/Academic Library
Government Research Library/administration
branch head
head of technical services
Hospital Librarian including collection development
software vendor
Demand Driven Acquisition of Monographs Survey Results

Director, Virtual Services (which includes all things tech related, acquisitions, cataloging and collection development)

health sciences library/other

Strategic Budgeting and Licensing

| 26. What is the goal of your DDA program? Please rank. |
|------------------------------------------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|
|                                           | 1         | 2         | 3         | 4         | 5         | Rating    | Rating    |
| Providing better access to patrons       | 76.3%     | 17.6%     | 10.8%     | 1.4%      | 0.0%      | 1.43      | 74        |
| (expanding the content they can see)     | (52)      | (13)      | (8)       | (1)       | (0)       |           |           |
| Cutting costs in the materials budget    | 6.8%      | 16.2%     | 14.9%     | 32.4%     | 28.7%     | 3.62      | 74        |
|                                           | (5)       | (12)      | (11)      | (24)      | (22)      |           |           |
| Freeing up staff time                    | 0.0%      | 6.3%      | 17.6%     | 23.0%     | 52.7%     | 4.22      | 74        |
|                                           | (0)       | (5)       | (13)      | (17)      | (39)      |           |           |
| Making sure that the collections         | 16.2%     | 27.0%     | 32.4%     | 18.9%     | 5.4%      | 2.70      | 74        |
| budget is spent appropriately            | (12)      | (20)      | (24)      | (14)      | (4)       |           |           |
| Building a better collection             | 6.8%      | 32.4%     | 24.3%     | 24.3%     | 12.2%     | 3.03      | 74        |
|                                           | (5)       | (24)      | (18)      | (18)      | (9)       |           |           |

answered question 74

skipped question 25

27. Do you have another goal not listed above? Please describe. Where would it rank?

Response Count

25

answered question 25

skipped question 74

Comments:

Getting the right materials into the hands of our patrons as quickly and seamlessly as possible.

Evaluating user satisfaction with e-books in relation to print.

Allowing patrons to determine what content is relevant to their course of study or research. I’d rank this #2

Freeing up staff time wasn’t really the goal -- collection development wasn’t getting done to a sufficient degree in the pre-DDA days. We needed a model that reduced the need for staff time.

Increase speed at which newer materials are accessible #2

I would not include 4 or 5 as goals of our program but I could not eliminate them from the drop down menu. I don’t believe that DDA will cut costs and DDA is about better access not collection building.
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Look at usage to determine whether certain areas of our approval plan need to be changed. Determine whether we should offer e-preferred over print in certain approval subjects.
support scholarly communication by allowing broader discovery of items
Making sure titles purchased are actually used.
No.
No
n/a
Providing information at point of need, 24/7. I’d rank that #1.
Demonstrating the library’s commitment to sharing campus strategic goals. Proving that the collections budget is being spent wisely (beyond just making sure of it).
No
Tying costs to use to determine value. We are moving to this for all of resources: print, journals, databases. (And I think we should be doing it for our services as well.)
no
Building e-content generally.
Supporting distance learners / online learners Increasing access during the times the building is closed.
Improve user experience by removing DRM. It would definitely make our users more satisfied with ebooks.
Providing a broader range of publications for consideration by faculty and students.
Spending at least part of our budget on titles that patrons actually use, rather than on titles that we think they might use.
2 - Freeing up shelf/physical space (then providing better access to patrons as 3, and so on)
Increasing usage of our collection (which ties into Making sure the collections budget is spent appropriately).
From the data we evaluated (poster located at http://z.umn.edu/umdpda) we discovered that usage or newly published, newly purchased books was higher for DDA books than selector purchased books. For our level of institution (primarily undergraduate) is it really appropriate to purchase a book that never gets used (this is hotly debated amongst my colleagues and other libraries, I’m sure), especially in these financially difficult times?
"better" is a loaded term. Here, I’m using it as "get what current researchers want" and not "most comprehensive."

Convenience to the patron
space savings by decreasing print collections. Rank 4
expand consortial access to more materials for students enrolled in courses on multiple campuses
28. Through which type of vendor do you offer your DDA program? Select all that apply.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Vendor Type</th>
<th>Response Percent</th>
<th>Response Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Directly from the publisher</td>
<td>14.9%</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Directly from an e-book aggregator</td>
<td>55.4%</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Via a library service vendor</td>
<td>64.9%</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other - please describe:</td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments:
Currently it is from an e-book aggregator, via a library service vendor. Not sure if that’s what you meant above.
We identify the books we need and place orders as usual. (We use Amazon and pay the yearly fee for “free” two-day delivery, so our purchased books often arrive before an I.L.L. would.)
Proquest, ebrary DDA/PDA program
It’s from a library service vendor, but we are working very closely with a specific e-book aggregator - it’s more of a project between three entities than one between just us and one vendor.
Coordination is a valuable service - that’s why we use a vendor
We used YBP for our ebrary DDA program.
We want to work directly with publishers in the near future

29. Are you using a short-term loan (STL) model?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Use STL</th>
<th>Response Percent</th>
<th>Response Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>65.3%</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>34.7%</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

answered question: 75
skipped question: 24
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#### 30. How do you offer/participate in a DDA program?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option</th>
<th>Response Percent</th>
<th>Response Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Direct on our own platform</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Through aggregator</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Through vendor</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If "other," please specify 0

- answered question: 2
- skipped question: 97

#### 31. Do you offer any of these models on your own platform?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option</th>
<th>Response Percent</th>
<th>Response Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Auto purchase</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STL</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Free browse</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evidence based</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Other (please specify) 0

- answered question: 3
- skipped question: 96
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### 32. What is the preferred time length for STLs in your DDA program?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time Length</th>
<th>Response Count</th>
<th>Response Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 day</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>48.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 days</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>44.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 days</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 days</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Other (please specify) 6

**Comments:**
- User specified, default of one day, up to 7 days.
- We offer the choice of 1 or 7 days.
- Don’t know
- It varies
- 3
- 1 or 7 days options

### 33. Why have you chosen the STL length you have in place?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason</th>
<th>Response Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>answered question</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>skipped question</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Comments:**
- We felt that any less would trigger too many STLs and any longer would use too many non-linear lending days. It seemed a reasonable compromise.
- Limit cost
- 1 day is too short, but we also want to make the material available to the largest number of patrons as possible.
- Cheaper than 7-day, and as I mentioned above, about 70% of our e-book usage is one-time only.
- Cost.
- After discussion between librarians when the model was set up we decided to start with the minimum offered and monitor demand and usage.
- We like to offer our patrons choice (1 or 7 days).
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We used statistical analysis
To allow other users access.
Actually depends on the DDA program-
We don’t want books to be unavailable to other users and haven’t found multiple uses of the same time by one individual.
I’m not sure we have a time length
It’s a compromise between the amount of time available to the user and the cost.
we have tested different time lengths, 7 days had the best results
It was chosen in the collection development office.
To better control annual uses -- i.e., a 7-day STL period eats up 7 loans and the patron may not actually use the item 7 days.
Cost
It was the result of a compromise. Characteristically, few librarians were happy with it, but we haven’t found a need to change it.
That is meeting the needs at this time.
We plan on serving mainly online students with the books. Their classes last 8 weeks so they are moving at a fast pace. Our thought is that a 1 day rental makes the most sense for how these students work.
We felt that this made the most sense for books that were likely to be used just once -- and the pricing was best.
It seems to offer students the time they need
It was the shortest length we could choose. We would have chosen a shorter time if we could, 1-3 days which is the length we use for downloads of already purchased books.
I think it makes more sense than the other lengths of time offered.
It’s much more cost-effective. Without it, our DDA profile/program would have to be much smaller--probably by two-thirds.
just seemed reasonable- also conforms with reserve check out
yes
We feel that this is an appropriate time for loans and is not too short or too long. We can monitor and adjust if we find out differently.
It is relatively new for us, and it is still under review to see how it goes. However, our sense is most people using ebooks at this time do not want to hold onto them to read through as one might a novel or other narrative text. Most people seem to be able to extract what they need in 7 days or less.
Negotiated between consortium and vendor
It was the only period available for the vendor of our original STL program. However, I would like to investigate this more carefully. FYI - for one vendor, the STL period is fixed. For another vendor, the STL period is flexible. The responses below are for the second vendor.
I believe it is the only option.
One day is not long enough for most users and fourteen days gets costlier. Seven days is a happy medium.
That may be all that is required
Assigned.
This was someone else’s choice, not mine.
We picked this during the pilot phase. It seems to be working well, we we never changed it.
It’s the least expensive option
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With our program, users can select either 1 day or 7 days.
It is similar to the original checkout time patrons have with print books
seemed to be a good medium

### 34. Is the library able to change the length of STLs?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>78.7%</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>21.3%</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Answered question: 47
Skipped question: 52

### 35. Do you allow your patrons to select the length of an STL?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>14.9%</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>85.1%</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Answered question: 47
Skipped question: 52

### 36. Is there any limitation on the number of STLs per day, either for an individual user or the institution as a whole?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>17.0%</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>83.0%</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Answered question: 47
Skipped question: 52
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### 37. Is the library able to set a limit on the number of STLs per day?

| Yes | 30.4% | 14 |
| No | 69.6% | 32 |

- answered question 46
- skipped question 53

### 38. Does your DDA program use any form of mediation (request made by patron and purchase mediated by librarian)?

| No | 71.6% | 53 |
| Yes, a “wish list” model | 4.1% | 3 |
| Yes, an evidence-based model | 4.1% | 3 |
| Yes, a librarian approval transaction model | 20.3% | 15 |

- answered question 74
- skipped question 25

### 39. Do you mediate for a specific user group?

| Yes | 19.0% | 4 |
| No | 81.0% | 17 |

- If yes, how is that group defined? 3

- answered question 21
- skipped question 78

Comments:
The purchases are sent out to the selectors, the appropriate selector according to subject will let me know if they think a purchase is not appropriate for our collection.

Faculty members' requests for materials they need to use in class are put at the top of our list. If we have the budget, we purchase them.

departmental/college affiliation

| 40. What are the current parameters of your DDA profile(s)? Select all that apply. |
|---------------------------------|-----------------|-----------------|
|                                 | Response Percent | Response Count  |
| Price                           | 86.5%            | 63              |
| Date of publication             | 78.1%            | 57              |
| Subject                         | 72.6%            | 53              |
| Publisher                       | 66.5%            | 50              |
| Licensing model                 | 34.2%            | 25              |
| Country of origin               | 12.3%            | 9               |
| Inclusion when electronic version is available any time after print publication | 16.4% | 12 |
| Inclusion only when electronic and print are published simultaneously (based on the vendor's definition of simultaneous) | 11.0% | 8 |
| Language                        | 56.2%            | 41              |
| Other (please specify)          |                  | 19              |

Comments:
Exclusion of owned content. Reading level.
Target audience (academic vs. juvenile vs. popular)
Academic level - no Popular
I.L.L. requests
Vendor assessment (we only add books that our vendor has profiled & assigned certain designators to)
We currently use Language as a limiter only because we had a problem with inappropriately downloaded titles in foreign languages.
We have access to all e-book content directly from three different publishers.
textbooks
I am not aware of all the criteria, this is handled in the Collection Development Office. NSPs as applied to our [remaining] print-approval profiles and our notification slips. Fits our DDA approval profile
readership level
Non duplication of titles between e-book DDA vendors
I choose.
Also, content level as defined by our library service vendor - we don’t want any lower-level resources included here, though we buy them when requested or when selected by librarians
We define simultaneously as 8 weeks - if the e-book is available within 8 weeks of the release of the print, then we get the e-book record for DDA; anytime after 8 weeks, we get slipped or shipped the print book according to the profile.
Mix of title by title selection and call number range
for eDDA: from ebrary
We have an open profile, we offer our patrons every title in the EBL collection.
we moved our YBP profile over to DDA so subject, price, publisher - all of our approval parameters apply none of the above. There are no restrictions as to the list of available titles through our library consortium.
Select types of materials (cookbooks, etc.) were excluded.

### 41. Does your DDA profile differ from your approval plan profile?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Response Percent</th>
<th>Response Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>56.2%</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>43.8%</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If yes, how do they differ? 40

answered question 73

skipped question 28

**Comments:**
The virtual approval plan includes both print and electronic formats and less exclusions around price, language, subject, etc.

Approval plan is based on specific subject areas of interest

We have several approval plans. They all differ from each other, and from the DDA selection plan.

We have 4 DDA 'categories'. 1. was a subset of our purchase plan profile with a limited number of publishers (e-book) 2. replaced our purchase plan and was expanded to include our slip plan (with price limitations) (e-book) 3. replaced our purchase plan with discovery records (print books) 4. a consortial plan that includes only a handful of publishers

DDA profile is much broader

Only our slips go to DDA, not auto-ship approval titles.

We don’t have approval plans. We do have DDA. That’s the difference.

DDA--wider LC call #s, more "textbooks"
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Our US approval plan has been restricted so that all titles selected for the plan are processed by the vendor and automatically accepted by the library. The DDA profile is broader in order to maximize user access and choice; there is no intention of buying everything made available through DDA, just those e-books that are used.

We no longer have a approval plan in place, titles need to actively be selected in order for a purchase to occur.

not much but differences in price caps and licensing involved.

We started with our approval plan profile but then expanded it to include all books that the vendor has profiled and assigned certain designators to; & that fit the rest of our criteria

It replaced our print approval plan, and is slightly more narrow.

The DDA profile is much broader than the acquisitions profile.

approval plans exist only for special collections in print

Print approval plan is limited to Australian publications

Our approval plan exists independently of our ebook DDA profile

DDA is much more narrow and does not include books on approval

The DDA profile is broader than our print approval plan profile.

We have been very liberal with what we include in the PDA program. We pull lists of available titles from ebrary based on LC Class and then filter from there. We assess publishers, removing those which do not appear to be academic or scholarly. We limit by publication date and include only titles published within the past 5 years. Lately we have added in some formulas for predicting which titles will be more likely to be used.

The DDA is limited to $200/title or less.

We don’t have an approval plan profile.

Initially, our DDA profile mirrored our notification plan exactly, except we excluded popular material. Now, we’ve changed that because of the percentage of titles actually purchased vs. triggered is pretty large. We’ve removed some LC call number ranges that aren’t of interest to our patrons and scaled back some other subject parameters. We are also feeding our e-preferred approval plan into our DDA plan.

Our current DDA profile a consortial one, and much smaller than our approval plan--in part because it is still a pilot project and because their are currently few publishers willing to participate in consortial DDA. We do intend to move our approval plan to e-preferred, DDA by the end of the calendar year.

tend to focus on specific subject areas for DDA

It is more focused to the heavily used print collection subjects. We also may have to change this.

The DDA is a bit narrower.

The DDA profiles cover more subject areas than print, given our decrease in print acquisitions.

Both were developed independently. Because of time constraints we did not compare them.

We use our approval plan for our institutional DDA, but a different profile for our consortial DDA

There are fewer DDA qualifiers.

Many things are included as slip notifications in our approval plan but not in the DDA; this is largely because we are attempting to limit user choices to things that we would find acceptable to include in the library without much consideration other than whether users would read them.

it is our slips

We removed foreign language materials from the DDA profile, as well as guidebooks and textbooks

We do not have an approval plan. All of our print titles are individual selected by our librarians or via patron requests.

narrower subject range

We don’t have an approval plan profile

we don't have an approval plan
Different collection areas
We don’t do approval plans anymore.
We do not have an approval plan.
We have many approval profiles. The profile with DDA is a general profile. Other approval profiles are more specific.
With DDA, we want everything except for a few types (cookbooks, etc.) and anything over $500.

42. Do you have multiple profiles?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Percent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>41.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>58.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If yes, with one vendor or with multiple vendors? 25

Comments:
one vendor. This refers to print profiles not DDA
We have one DDA plan at this time.
Assuming you mean multiple *DDA* profiles.
One vendor forced us to, due to some internal limit of theirs, based on number of publishers, I think.
one vendor
With one vendor.
One vendor
multiple
One vendor, multiple subject areas
with one vendor
multiple vendors
1 local, 1 consortial profile with same vendor
Multiple
With YBP-GOBI and Proquest ebrary
Multiple
one vendor but we will be starting multi-vendor DDA soon. The profiles won’t be different.
multiple vendors
Multiple vendors
multiple vendors
one
With one vendor - we have different libraries with different subject interests
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Yes in that we have a profile for our local DDA program and a different profile for our consortial DDA, which is all Chinese-lang material

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>43. Do you have different DDA profiles for different subjects?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Yes</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>No</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>44. Have you evaluated your profile based on usage and purchase patterns?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Yes</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>No</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>45. Did you make changes to your profile based on this evaluation?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Yes</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>No</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If yes, please describe.
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Comments:

We have price exceptions for some subject disciplines and exclude additional publishers we acquire through other sources.

We limited the publication date to 2006 onwards based on low usage of older content.

Each year, the profiles are adjusted. This includes evaluation of use, but that is only one factor.

Made the profile broader (removed price cap but added librarian mediation over certain price) based on first year’s usage.

We make titles published in the current two year available in our catalogue and suppress earlier content.

We removed unused books after several years, we removed children’s ebooks, we frequently find dupes despite hours and hours of dupe checking.

Not yet. As we profile for an ongoing plan, we will look at what patterns we can find from our pilot plan.

Added STL to one program.

We are still in the early stages of this evaluation. As we fill in the "holes" in our collection, we will see what other areas might be more suitable for inclusion in PDA.

For some subject areas we broadened the scope of the profile to bring in more e-books for the DDA program.

No backwards limit in publication date, some publishers were excluded.

Reduced maximum price cap.

Went with short term loans (3) before purchase is triggered.

We plan to make changes to scope and/or call number ranges.

Yes, as described in #35.

Certain LC ranges we were receiving a lot of discovery records and but they weren’t being touched.

Mostly broadened it, actually, except for a few "hobby" areas that are not much supported by our curricular goals. However, even then, the titles provided by our profile are mostly academic in nature already.

Split different subjects for different vendors, changed from auto-purchase to STL, adjusted price limitations.

Eliminated publishers that were still appearing in our profile though the content was still outside the scope of our profile we set up. We are constantly having to revise our profile to eliminate irrelevant content.

We are in the process of making changes now.

We eliminated tech books from our DDA profile when we discovered so many discovery records duplicating our subscription to tech book leasing packages (e.g. Safari, ITPro).

Some content was not appropriate for our type of library. Dropped out some subject areas and publishers.

Not yet

we expanded our profile after our initial 6 months, we determined that we could expand our offerings and subjects and still stay within budget.
46. How often do you change your DDA profile?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Response Percent</th>
<th>Response Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Monthly</td>
<td>2.8%</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quarterly</td>
<td>25.0%</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annually</td>
<td>72.2%</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (please specify)</td>
<td></td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments:

- We haven’t changed for several years
- We make changes when needs are identified, not on a regular schedule.
- Changes made to approval profile by subject selectors
- No established pattern.
- Have not made any changes.
- We’ve edited the publishers-available list and the timespan of our content, but these were organic changes based on what the vendor could do and what we were seeing in our collection, not based on a time cycle
- Our ongoing plan is not yet established.
- We added subjects but that is the only change
- Actually, as needed since we are still building it
- As needed
- Semi-annual
- When necessary, e.g. with new scientists in the University
- Haven’t yet been applicable.
- We have not had it long enough to have decided this.
- We are in the beginning with DDA, not yet changed
- Only changed once to date
- I don’t know
- Have not changed them
- As needed
- To start with we plan on reviewing monthly
- Still accumulating usage data in order to assess it.
- Never
- We have made only a couple of changes -- primarily in format and treatment -- not doing this on a regular basis at this time.
- As needed
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We have only run it this year but I think we might change it twice per year.
We've changed it twice in two years but I'm not sure how often it needs to be adjusted.
We haven't had our profile in use long enough to evaluate it.
We just started our DDA. It is too early.
We have not yet looked at changing our DDA profiles
As needed
Not at all yet - it hasn’t gone live
Haven't changed it since we started, other than to drop put a few publishers when we got their e-book packages.
We adjusted it when we started it, last year.
As needed, as identified problems occur
We are in the process of changing our profile for the first time in three years
As needed, but likely annually
Only a couple of times in a year
Alliance changes DDA profile as needed, usually to moderate spending.
If needed.
haven't done this long enough to have a reply to this, suspect annually
Our program has been in place for only one week.
As needed
We have only done it once, to exclude a specific publisher.
haven't changed yet, our oldest DDA is not yet a year old

47. How often are new titles added to the discovery pool?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Response Percent</th>
<th>Response Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Daily</td>
<td>4.4%</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weekly</td>
<td>61.8%</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monthly</td>
<td>23.5%</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quarterly</td>
<td>10.3%</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annually</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments:
I don't know! I receive email alerts when new content is added.
Actually "at least weekly" -- requests may be added as often as 3x week. The vendor batch load appears weekly.
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(When implemented.)

For 1 plan - weekly, for the other plan - as desired
bi-weekly

Don't know

We are not yet at the point of considering this.

Weekly for our local DDA, monthly for our consortial DDA

Varies

unknown

### 48. Are titles removed from the discovery pool?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Response Percent</th>
<th>Response Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>70.8%</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>29.2%</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

answered question 72

skipped question 27

### 49. How often are titles removed from the discovery pool?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Response Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

answered question 50

skipped question 49

**Comments:**

Monthly

Irregularly. Some titles have been removed by the vendor, due to e.g., publishers pulling their titles from availability. Few titles have been removed by the Library, and this has usually been due to duplication of owned content.

Weekly, but these are removed because they are no longer available from the publisher (e-books). Plus adjustments where the discovery records did not match our criteria.

Weekly

Once a year.

When we do the annual review and when the aggregator informs us that content has been removed by the publisher.

Whenever the vendor tells us something is no longer available, or if we find something not suitable or if a DDA title overlaps with something we've already bought or subscribed to.

Once every three years
I'm not sure, maybe once a month.

monthly

There is not regular schedule for removal. They are removed when the publisher no longer makes them available for DDA or the collection librarian decides to purchase the print or the electronic outright.

as needed

I don't know, this happens automatically

For 1 plan - monthly. For the other plan - whenever we update the discovery poo.

bi-weekly
quarterly
Weekly
Monthly
Policy is to do, but not yet implemented

I am not certain.

Occasionally

Monthly but not en masse

as needed

not yet known

Biweekly, sometimes monthly.

Every 6 months?

Annually.

We only remove titles on demand.

monthly

various, depends on publishers withdrawing from aggregator

Only when they are removed by the ebook aggregator

Annually

Annually, if no recorded use (including browsing that did not trigger a purchase)

Monthly

ongoing

Monthly

Annually

Monthly

We don't know yet.

Only when directed to do so by vendor, usually because publisher has pulled content. So far, we haven't dropped anything on our own since we started.

quarterly?

as needed by publisher - we will do a weeding project in the future and let all of the liaisons look at the collection and decide which to keep as DDA, which to trigger and which to delete

As we are notified by our DDA provider (EBL) that titles need to removed. We also identify duplicates with package content at the time that we load new titles into the DDA pool, and remove any duplicates before they incur use.

As needed
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yearly
In first year of implementation we had some technical difficulties and needed to pull all titles and replace them manually
Only as they were removed from the provider
On weekly basis
Quarterly
Weekly
Unknown
As needed
Monthly
depends on what is removed from aggregator or publisher

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>50. What are the criteria for removing titles from the discovery pool?</th>
<th>Response Percent</th>
<th>Response Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Price exceeds preferences</td>
<td>45.8%</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Title no longer matches existing profile</td>
<td>79.2%</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (please specify)</td>
<td></td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments:
Publisher withdraws
Few titles have been removed by the Library, and this has usually been due to duplication of owned content.
Determined by aggregator (i.e., titles removed from availability for all customers)
Publication date
Publication date - current 2 years' worth in our catalogue. Also when the aggregator informs us that content has been removed by the publisher.
Whenever the vendor tells us something is no longer available, or if we find something not suitable or if a DDA title overlaps with something we've already bought or subscribed to.
Not used
Titles are only removed when they've been purchased outside of the DDA or when they are removed because the publisher no longer allows inclusion and the vendor notifies us.
This would be a vendor/publisher decision
Generally the publisher has withdrawn the rights for it's inclusion.
We manually remove earlier editions
Duplicate titles
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Publication date
Publisher pulls content
Titles were erroneously added to the pool (did not match profile)
Publisher withdrawals from aggregator.

Publication date, content out of scope of collection development policy. We also have decided to weed titles that are not used in after being included for 18 months.

We remove DDA titles where we have already purchased the paper book.

Publisher requests it to be withdrawn from PDA

Date of publishing
See above.

Over a year in pool without trigger

I remove

Whenever a librarian purchases one manually, or a new edition is released

When vendor requires it.

pulled by publisher, weeded

Publisher discontinues a title for DDA We already own a title through a package or other purchase and don’t want to duplicate

print edition of title purchased

publication date, time in catalog without use.

Title not available by provider

Publishers wish to remove titles and aged materials and lack of use.

No longer available

Titles are removed by EBL (removed from the collection)

unknown

Publishers opt out of DDA plans

We do not exclude titles. EBL makes titles unavailable for various reasons.

mostly it comes from publishers pulling titles from the program

---

### 51. Are you making any exceptions to titles that get included in the discovery pool?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Response Percent</th>
<th>Response Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>32.8%</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>67.2%</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please explain. 25

answered question 67

skipped question 32
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Comments:
I’m not sure I understand what you mean by exceptions that wasn’t covered in a previous question.
We are limiting to current and prior year to limit expenditure
Do not load titles for publishers we have e-book package agreements with.
If a patron asks for it, we’ll generally add it to the DDA pool. This includes requests and ILLs.
No serials (for the most part), no ebooks from certain BAD publishers, removing titles we already have access to,
foreign titles subject to greater scrutiny
Not sure what exceptions would be made?
Adding content not in the discovery pool.
If we have publisher package collections, we exclude (as we do approval books).
We have criteria for what is added. We don’t check when records are downloaded
May add a title with an earlier copyright if the title has been requested.
We remove earlier editions and, where we notice them, titles that duplicate in our subscribed packages.
Don’t understand question.
not as much fiction as they provide since we are academic institution fiction is lower priority than a public library
Unusable MARC records, duplicate titles, other technical problems.
We excluded a few subjects and a few publishers that we already purchase elsewhere. We accept all titles in the
discovery pool, though we reserve the right to delete titles if we want to.
Occasionally. We allow faculty and librarians to suggest additions. We will also use ebrary PDA to add a title that
is not readily available for students if the content is academic. Also, sometimes to provide access to a complete
series we include titles that are older than 5 years.
some we go ahead and purchase
We fill our DDA pool for some items requested through ILL or other means, such as if an instructor offers a new
course and we do not have any resources for the course.
When titles are requested by our liaison librarians, our acquisitions specialists first look to see if the title is
available from our DDA vendors. If so (and not already in our discovery pool), it is added to our discovery pool,
but not purchased.
NA
Our profile seems robust. Probably a few odd things are slipping in, but not enough to worry about.
Only for duplicates - if we already own or have access to a title through other means, then we don’t include it in
the DDA pool.
If patron requests title that is not included in the discovery pool, but can be added, we will do so.
Yes, when selectors wanted to include them in discovery.
Not sure.
just based on exceptions in our profile - block so
limited by subject profile, publishers, data
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52. Where do you make your discovery pool available to patrons?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Response Percent</th>
<th>Response Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Discovery layer only</td>
<td>9.6%</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Catalog and discovery layer</strong></td>
<td><strong>71.2%</strong></td>
<td><strong>52</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catalog only</td>
<td>15.1%</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Only via the vendor platform</td>
<td>4.1%</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (please specify)</td>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Comments:**

and the vendor platform.

We only have a discovery layer now.

Our catalog isn't linked on our website. If patrons can find the catalog, they'll find the DDA titles there.

Also via aggregator platform.

A brief catalog record (title and author only) is created when the item is ordered. We catalog the book the day it arrives from the publisher. The patron who requested it gets an e-mail telling him/her it’s on hold; other patrons can, if they search for it, see the title in the catalog.

I am not certain where.

Our catalog is not integrated with our discovery system. Although I expect the DDA ebooks from at least one vendor will be available through the discovery system soon.

"Catalog" for us means our local catalog and our consortial catalog, which is a WorldCat catalog

Catalog & vendor platform (not sure what you mean by "discovery layer")

We did not promote, or provide a link to ebrary on our databases page.

I think...

We would like to also make them available through our Serials Solutions online journal/book portal.

This may change when our discovery layer goes live with monograph holdings.
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#### 53. What is more important to you in determining the success of your DDA program as it relates to budget and expenditure?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason</th>
<th>Response Percent</th>
<th>Response Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>to make sure you only spend what you've committed to DDA</td>
<td>46.5%</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>to never interrupt your patrons' access to the discovery pool</td>
<td>53.5%</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- answered question 71
- skipped question 28

#### 54. How do you monitor your DDA expenditures?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Method</th>
<th>Response Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>answered question 71</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>skipped question 28</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Comments:

Weekly reports from profiling vendor that show number of titles triggered and debits against established deposit account.

Monthly reports

Accounting reports and platform (aggregator) reports.

Maintain a deposit account with YBP. Receive expenditure reports from YBP.

Monthly reports delivered at our monthly budget meetings

Mediation of short-term loan requests over certain amount. Periodic budget checks.

Reports from vendor, alerts if balance is low. Track also in our acquisitions system.

Review invoices and/or pre-allocate lump sums - which one depends on budget flexibility and remaining funds.

Like I said, we're a small shop. I see the invoices, I manage the collection budget.

Multiple ways: using the vendors profiles, using our own accounting

Via aggregator platform (using alerts and reports), and through the vendor (fund and invoice reports)

Reports from the vendor.

I monitor the email messages as they come in for some DDA programs, for others I monitor the data in the admin module provided by the vendor. Also, I review invoices from my book jobber as time permits.

They come out of our regular (small) collection-development budget.

We are invoiced weekly for titles purchased through DDA and the invoice totals are recorded on a spreadsheet.

A separate fund for DDA loans and purchases. A weekly report from aggregator; daily report of items.
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stats sent by vendor
For first year I tracked them pretty closely; not sure what we'll do for future. But we get invoices & the vendor uses a special subcode.
Via reports from the ebook provider
Spreadsheets updated weekly with expenditures.
monthly statistics
weekly invoices, price-limit for unmoderated short term loans
Through quarterly economic reports from the publishers.
Monthly system reports.
Vendor's reports
Regular report from vendor
This is done in the Collection Development Office.
Monthly budget reports
YBP reports
weekly
we set up weekly reports; we are notified by YBP if funds are low
auto reports on expenditures and alerts when reaching designated amount
Collection Development Librarian keeps neurotically close tabs on usage and invoice reports--roughly biweekly.
We run reports from the vendor site.
We maintain an Excel spreadsheet of expenditures over multiple fiscal years. The spreadsheet is updated weekly when the new invoices come in.
Regular review of costs.
reports and email notifications
Checking usage and spend on the provider’s platform.
in our ILS
We receive monthly statements from the vendor, but we can view real-time reports through the vendor’s admin website, too.
We place a cap on expenditures at the vendor admin site.
by keeping a spreadsheet for the invoices.
A set amount id allocated which the supplier has agreed not to exceed and to warn us when 90% of it is spent.
We get weekly spend reports from the supplier.
weekly reporting from aggregators
During the normal 9 month school year, we look at the expenditures each week and during the summer less so.
Vendor reports, e-mailed periodically and automatically
Monthly collection development and cost reports
Through the weekly reports received.
We track costs by downloading acquisitions data from the vendors platforms and importing them into an Access database, from which reports can be run.
Internal reporting within the vendor platform
review usage
Monthly
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Through 3rd party vendor
I have to approve any purchase
weekly reports
A designated contact will receive regular reports and monitor them to see if they exceed what we’ve planned for
monthly expenses
Monthly statements from book vendor. Also periodically look at DDA vendor stats.
Monthly updates from vendor.
I have a general fund and then subject funds that we “track” the funds with like we would serials.
Statistics from our ILS Reports out of our vendor’s database Reports out of the e-book provider’s database
Email notifications to bibliographers
monthly expenditure reports
Weekly report. Also have a low amount setting that will trigger an email should we fall below a certain dollar
amount.
notified when a purchase is triggered.
Through library service provider.
Review weekly e-mail from provider about triggers and expenses.
fund code
Reports from Orbis Cascade Alliance
When they get low we get an alert.
weekly
I receive weekly invoices from the vendor.
by subject area in approval plan
through reports available from vendor site, through local budget reporting
Receive weekly/monthly reports
Monthly review of reports from DDA vendor.
basic spreadsheet to determine spending, # of books purchased/STL, average price.
we check weekly for our purchases and account balance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>55. Do you have ready access to expenditure reporting?</th>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Response Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>86.7%</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>13.3%</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

answered question 75
skipped question 24
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### 56. How frequently do you access reports on expenditures?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Response Percent</th>
<th>Response Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Daily</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weekly</td>
<td>40.0%</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monthly</td>
<td>41.7%</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quarterly</td>
<td>13.3%</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annually</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (please specify)</td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Comments:**
- More frequently (weekly, maybe even daily) as the end of the budget year approaches.
- At least monthly. More often if we have questions or concerns.
- This is the responsibility of another librarian, so I'm not sure of the frequency.
- This still isn’t set.
- I don’t.
- Biweekly.
- And as needed for bibliographers to monitor their fund code expenditures.
- From alerts from the vendors.
- Too soon to say.

### 57. Do you have a DDA budget cap established with your provider?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Response Percent</th>
<th>Response Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>68.0%</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>32.0%</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Comments:**

- Answered question: 75
- Skipped question: 24
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58. Are you notified by your DDA provider when you are approaching your budget cap?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>90.0%</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>10.0%</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

answered question 50
skipped question 49

59. How do you ensure that you can maintain access to the content of the discovery pool within the confines of your budget? Select all that apply.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adjust profile</td>
<td>61.5%</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjust titles in the pool</td>
<td>61.5%</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjust triggers</td>
<td>38.5%</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Other (please specify) 27

answered question 52
skipped question 47

Comments:
We haven’t needed to adjust thus far. We made some lucky guesses.
Adjust budget (rob Peter to pay Paul, so to speak)
Turn off auto-purchase when allocation is spent.
Haven’t needed to do this in response to an immediate threat. We monitor and plan, so far so good.
we have no cap - yet...
No money left, no PDA.
This has not really been an issue for us as we’ve found that the expenditures for monographs has actually decreased.
Haven’t had to adjust; would probably remove titles
This hasn’t happened.
Not applicable.
We have not been successful at this.
I don’t know
we are running a pilot, once the funds are spent we will close the pilot
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Haven’t done this yet.

Transfer funds from other funds in the budget. We put high importance on keeping the titles available.

We do not regularly "weed" our DDA discovery pool, but we have done that once, so far, and expect to start doing this more regularly before long -- when Alma makes this easier than it is now.

never had to

We haven’t had to do it yet so I don’t know.

Haven’t had to yet.

So far we have just added more money and have not hit a point where more adjustment is needed.

NA

So far, budget has been generous and adequate. We could probably replenish it if we ran short near the end of the FY.

We are so underspent, though, we haven’t had to do anything like this yet.

Have not needed to do any of these. Our budget has been able to keep up with expenditures thus far (last 7 months)

we have spent so little it has not been an issue.

We only had a bit of time left when we reached our cap, so selectors pool remaining print budget funds to get us through the end of the academic year. Then we ended the program.

We add money to the DDA budget, so actually the DDA budget takes precedence over the print budget.

haven't done this long enough to have a definitive answer assume we will adjust triggers and adjust profile add more funds

at this point we haven't done anything except add money

### 60. How often are you reviewing your budget/expenditures?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Response Percent</th>
<th>Response Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Daily</td>
<td>2.8%</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weekly</td>
<td>31.0%</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monthly</td>
<td>40.8%</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quarterly</td>
<td>21.1%</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annually</td>
<td>4.2%</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Other (please specify)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**answered question** 71

**skipped question** 28

**Comments:**

More frequently as the end of the budget year approaches.

At least monthly. As I said, we're a small shop and I get the invoices and manage the collection budget.

but just on a quick look basis - not an in-depth analysis
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Biweekly
and as needed/requested by bibliographers for them to monitor their fund codes

61. How do you track expenditures? Please select all that apply.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Response Percent</th>
<th>Response Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Separate your DDA account funds from your other acquisitions funds</td>
<td>71.4%</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Separate STL funds from other DDA funds</td>
<td>14.3%</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have a deposit account with your DDA vendor</td>
<td>48.6%</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Invoiced as use occurs within your DDA program</td>
<td>48.6%</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within DDA program, have separate allocations for print and electronic</td>
<td>4.3%</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (please specify)</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Other (please specify)

answered question | 70 |
 skipped question | 29 |

Comments:
I have a spreadsheet. I also use our ILS’s reporting capabilities.
Use a University Credit Card for print DDA expenditures
We code our order records according to whether it is an STL or purchase record for tracking purposes
We pay an annual amount to the Orbis Cascade Alliance for our institution’s expenditure for a year. This amount is determined our institutional FTE, usage and budget.
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### 62. How important are the following metrics or statistical relationships in assessing the success of a DDA program?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Metric / Scenario</th>
<th>Unimportant</th>
<th>Of little importance</th>
<th>Moderately important</th>
<th>Important</th>
<th>Very Important</th>
<th>Rating Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Use of content already purchased through DDA</td>
<td>0.0% (0)</td>
<td>1.4% (1)</td>
<td>16.4% (12)</td>
<td>41.1% (30)</td>
<td>41.1% (30)</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Triggered financial transactions (STLs, purchases)</td>
<td>1.4% (1)</td>
<td>2.8% (2)</td>
<td>11.1% (8)</td>
<td>47.2% (34)</td>
<td>37.5% (27)</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Category of referring source</td>
<td>7.5% (5)</td>
<td>40.3% (27)</td>
<td>26.9% (18)</td>
<td>22.4% (15)</td>
<td>3.0% (2)</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type of user responsible for use/trigger event</td>
<td>18.1% (13)</td>
<td>31.9% (23)</td>
<td>22.2% (16)</td>
<td>19.4% (14)</td>
<td>8.3% (6)</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use of past usage and expenditure data to predict future spending (new)</td>
<td>1.4% (1)</td>
<td>4.3% (3)</td>
<td>31.4% (22)</td>
<td>42.9% (30)</td>
<td>20.0% (14)</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analysis of number of titles in the discovery pool to predict future spending</td>
<td>2.8% (2)</td>
<td>11.3% (8)</td>
<td>32.4% (23)</td>
<td>42.2% (30)</td>
<td>11.3% (8)</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Other important or very important criteria (please specify)**

- answered question: 73
- skipped question: 26

### Comments:

- Pricing inflation directly effects the number of titles we are able to acquire in this flat or reduced budget era.
- I’d love to hear what you all are thinking of in terms of predicting future spending. I’ve gotten a formula from EBL that accounts for a great number of criteria, but it doesn’t account for how many students we have on campus. I need a formula that accounts for this so I can plan for both fall/spring usage and summer usage.
- Which publishers were involved in financial transactions
- Immediate use of a title needed by a user.
- How much have we spent before DDA on similar profiles
- How much of the pool is duplicated among our subscription packages and print holdings.
- How users are using the titles (copy, download, etc.)
- Wish we could discern user types responsible for trigger events, but our authentication system can’t do it. That would be important.
- We have no way of knowing the status of a user — this would be interesting information, however, if we could get it.
- Type of user would be more important if we could get more vendors to provide that data. Of course, that would require our users to log in, so it’s a delicate balance.
- Ratio of STLs to purchases. Average costs. Use by broad subject/call number categories.
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The importance of the analysis of number of titles in the discovery pool to predict future spending should change over time as we have more and more items that can be discovered. We do not track user type, so "type of user responsible" is really an n/a for us.

| 63. How important are the following criteria in being able to predict spending? |
|-----------------------------|-------------------------------|-----------------|------------------|------------------------|---------------------|
|                             | Unimportant | Of little importance | Moderately important | Important | Very Important | Rating Count |
| Number of titles in the discovery pool | 2.9% (2) | 5.8% (4) | 27.5% (19) | 42.0% (29) | 21.7% (15) | 69 |
| Number of short term loans allowed | 16.7% (11) | 4.5% (3) | 19.7% (13) | 39.4% (26) | 19.7% (13) | 66 |
| Previous usage | 2.9% (2) | 5.8% (4) | 34.8% (24) | 26.1% (18) | 30.4% (21) | 69 |
| Previous spend | 6.0% (4) | 1.5% (1) | 31.3% (21) | 32.8% (22) | 28.4% (19) | 67 |
| Other important or very important criteria (please specify) | | | | | | 12 |

Comments:

Number of STLs triggered in each category and proportion that became purchases

Match between content and users needs.

Comparison to other institutions' usage/spending is also helpful. Individual publishers' rates for short-term loans (as a percentage of list price).

Number of unique titles is very important - as in not available though any other aggregator or vendor that we use.

I don't know! This is what I want to know. My answers are just guesses.

Amount budgeted for DDA-selected e-books

Any of these criteria are important if they accurately predict spending.

Average transaction cost.

We have not yet attempted to predict spending

Average cost of titles in the discovery pool is very important, as publishers seem to be raising their ebook prices relative to print. Also, knowing the average cost of STL as a percentage of the purchase price. These two factors greatly affect expenditures, and can be variable--without notice (unlike number of titles, which is usually very easy to determine, or number of STLs, which is usually set by the library and stable).

Subject categories, average purchase price, average STL percentage.

We don't know yet; I'm going to assume that they all will be of some importance.
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64. Please rate the importance of the following aspects of book usage of titles already purchased through DDA, in evaluating the effectiveness of a DDA program:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Unimportant</th>
<th>Of little importance</th>
<th>Moderately important</th>
<th>Important</th>
<th>Very Important</th>
<th>Rating Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of unique users</td>
<td>2.9% (2)</td>
<td>11.4% (8)</td>
<td>20.0% (14)</td>
<td>32.9% (23)</td>
<td>32.9% (23)</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of pages accessed</td>
<td>4.3% (3)</td>
<td>17.1% (12)</td>
<td>30.0% (21)</td>
<td>35.7% (25)</td>
<td>12.9% (9)</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of pages printed</td>
<td>7.2% (5)</td>
<td>24.6% (17)</td>
<td>33.3% (23)</td>
<td>27.5% (19)</td>
<td>7.2% (5)</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of times downloaded</td>
<td>2.9% (2)</td>
<td>8.7% (6)</td>
<td>23.2% (16)</td>
<td>47.8% (33)</td>
<td>17.4% (12)</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of loans</td>
<td>5.7% (4)</td>
<td>4.3% (3)</td>
<td>15.7% (11)</td>
<td>42.9% (30)</td>
<td>31.4% (22)</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total user time spent in book</td>
<td>5.7% (4)</td>
<td>5.7% (4)</td>
<td>32.9% (23)</td>
<td>34.3% (24)</td>
<td>21.4% (15)</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total book cost (short-term loan cost + purchase cost)</td>
<td>2.9% (2)</td>
<td>4.3% (3)</td>
<td>27.5% (19)</td>
<td>34.8% (24)</td>
<td>30.4% (21)</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of sessions per book</td>
<td>1.4% (1)</td>
<td>7.1% (5)</td>
<td>15.7% (11)</td>
<td>45.7% (32)</td>
<td>30.0% (21)</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Other important or very important aspects (please specify) 7

Comments:

No idea, we haven’t really dug into this yet in any depth.

Publishers and subject classifications accessed

How many more months of use.

Note: Total DDA expenditure is important, but ‘total book cost’ for a particular title isn’t.

This is based on assumption again.

We don’t really track number of unique users, so unimportant now, but this would change if we were to track

Total user time actively spent in book (is how I am interpreting the question above)
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#### 65. Please rate the importance of the following aspects of book usage of titles not yet purchased through DDA, in evaluating the effectiveness of a DDA program:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Aspect</th>
<th>Unimportant</th>
<th>Of little importance</th>
<th>Moderately important</th>
<th>Important</th>
<th>Very Important</th>
<th>Rating Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of unique users</td>
<td>6.1% (4)</td>
<td>13.6% (9)</td>
<td>16.7% (11)</td>
<td><strong>33.3% (22)</strong></td>
<td>30.3% (20)</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of pages accessed</td>
<td>4.5% (3)</td>
<td>12.1% (8)</td>
<td>22.7% (15)</td>
<td><strong>42.4% (28)</strong></td>
<td>18.2% (12)</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of pages printed</td>
<td>12.7% (8)</td>
<td>14.3% (9)</td>
<td>30.2% (19)</td>
<td><strong>34.9% (22)</strong></td>
<td>7.9% (5)</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of times downloaded</td>
<td>14.3% (9)</td>
<td>6.3% (4)</td>
<td>19.0% (12)</td>
<td><strong>44.4% (28)</strong></td>
<td>15.9% (10)</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of loans</td>
<td>6.2% (4)</td>
<td>3.1% (2)</td>
<td>13.8% (9)</td>
<td><strong>41.5% (27)</strong></td>
<td>35.4% (23)</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total user time spent in book</td>
<td>6.1% (4)</td>
<td>3.0% (2)</td>
<td><strong>34.8% (23)</strong></td>
<td>33.3% (22)</td>
<td>22.7% (15)</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Short-term loan cost</td>
<td>16.7% (11)</td>
<td>4.5% (3)</td>
<td>18.2% (12)</td>
<td><strong>33.3% (22)</strong></td>
<td>27.3% (18)</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of sessions per book</td>
<td>4.6% (3)</td>
<td>6.2% (4)</td>
<td>23.1% (15)</td>
<td><strong>36.9% (24)</strong></td>
<td>29.2% (19)</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Other important or very important aspects (please specify)  

- answered question 66  
- skipped question 33

#### Comments:

- We look at number of short term loans, primarily.  
- not applicable to us (no DDA e-books)  
- Publishers and subject classifications accessed  
- We are not yet reviewing this data  
- Note: Total expenditure on STLs is important, but not for individual titles.  
- We don’t really track number of unique users, so unimportant now, but this would change if we were to track since printing, downloading & loans trigger a purchase for us, these are really N/A answers for me

#### 66. Please provide examples of actual or potential use of metrics to refine or assess your DDA program

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- answered question 35  
- skipped question 64

#### Comments:

- 76
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Number of loans and re-use of purchases to determine where to set the trigger; number of loans per user and whether to set a limit.

We assessed overall usage, before and after auto purchase. We determined that if we had set STLs to Auto purchase at a lower transition number, we would have purchased many books that have only been used once or twice. If we had set a higher STL to Auto purchase, we would have overpaid on STLs, increasing the total expenditure for the content exposed to readers.

Subject areas -- titles loaded, STLs, and auto-purchases. Depending on subject area will refine approval plan to include or exclude titles from DDA profile but will receive as slip.

Uses post purchase

High numbers of loans of a book by mostly unique users indicates use in a course. Percent increase in sessions (COUNTER BR6) and numbers of loans (month-by-month increase, as well as comparing years) helps inform budget. We have used # of actual loans paired with loan cost data to calculate what our spend would have been at different purchase triggers (i.e. what we would have spent if we purchased after 2 short-term loans, 3 short-term loans, etc.).

Subject analysis could help identify weighting or gaps in the content that has been pre-selected.

call number ranges STLs and triggered purchases, publishers STLs and triggered purchases

1. Number of titles purchased and amount spent per subject. 2. Average cost of a DDA e-book. 3. Titles that should have been excluded by profile.

We have looked at the average time between a title being loaded in our catalogue and getting purchased. We've also gathered user information regarding preference for e-book vs print. We are gathering information regarding the number of DDA titles selected by a subject profile compared to the number of DDA titles purchased for that subject area. We are also comparing across subject areas to see how subjects compare with respect to the number of titles available for DDA and the number of titles purchased for DDA. We are also comparing the cost of the DDA titles purchased in each subject area (as identified by the profiles).

Look at subjects to see where usage lies

We haven’t done much. This brings up some interesting questions. For first year I'm preparing to look just at usage & at the subject.

nothing more to add

? For titles we have in p- and e-, comparison of ebook usage with print usage during same time period. Usage by LC class and pub date. Usage by publisher. All these can be used to modify library’s approval plan.

Since our DDA is publisher driven; the number of titles in the pool by a given publisher and rate of use of particular publisher.

used aggregator reports to see what subjects, e.g. medicine, and call numbers were triggered most, so we select books in those areas more

We'll want especially to examine patterns of LC class and material types being used. That’s where we might decide to adjust triggers, monitor usage differently, make pre-emptive purchases, etc.

We look at how many books are purchased to determine how many short term loans should be allowed. At first we only had 1 short term loan, but then we were purchasing lots of books. We then went to 4 short term loans, and now we are purchasing fewer books. We try to determine what level provides access for the lowest cost.

We have used the pages viewed data to determine the highly used LC Classes. We then used this data (in conjunction with COUNTER data) to predict how likely a new title was to be triggered. We add to the program using this formula. We also used the session, print, and download data to try to predict what the STL cost would be if we made that switch (which we plan to do very shortly).

We have not refined ("weeded") our DDA, as yet, except for a one-time deselection effort when we transitioned from one type of DDA to another.

overall cost, number of titles, and nature of the specific titles
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I think you missed to have the possibility to choose "Not applicable" in these questions. As an example we can’t download a book without it being purchased hence it is not applicable for us to rate the importance of those stats for unowned content.

- To determine most efficient number of STLs before purchase  - To allocate funds for STLs/purchases  - To determine if triggers should be adjusted, and which ones: Number of days for a STL (1, 7, 14?), number of days for a download, etc.

I wish we could get some decent metrics from our vendor.

Right now we monitor both the browses, STL’s, unique uses, and time spent to do the above.

Honestly, for us so far, we mostly look to see which subject areas are of primary interest. Even at that, it is pretty scattered. So far, knock on wood, we have not had to make major tweaks, and things seem to be humming along at a fairly steady rate.

Number of loans/purchases within our consortium

We would love to have user type identified (i.e., grad, undergrad, staff, faculty) as well as number of unique sessions. Current reporting can provide neither, but would be invaluable--and it’s the kind of information we can gather already about print titles through the ILS.

When we ran out of money for our auto-purchase program, we ran scenario analysis in Excel. Based on usage data of titles purchased, we determined the number of titles purchased and costs of programs for each of 5 STL models (1-5 rentals before purchase). This allowed us to select the STL model that would provide the right balance of rentals & purchases.

We look at the ratio of loans to purchases. We've been trying to find an easy way to group loans and purchases by broad subject categories.

We are in the process of developing our assessment tool now, so here are some wish-list items. Over several years, we'd like to see last date of access and time between accesses. We’d like to know the status (grad, undergrad, researchers/faculty), but we don’t have that in place at this time. The number of uses by publisher might be useful for us.

Use a cost per use and average cost of book triggered as metrics.

Evaluate days accessed to determine STL duration. Evaluate unique users to determine purchases vs STL.

we are still working this out for our campus - we are interested in assessing our existing approval plan - what did people use on DDA that would have automatically come in on approval plan and what did they use that would have been slivered on approval; what did people ask us for that was nowhere to be found on our DDA set-up. For us it is about relieving pressure on the budget, getting a better handle on what people are using (and in what divisions they are using titles) and how what they use and ask us to purchase outside of DDA, can be used to open up or add to the profile, rework our triggers for purchases and help us determine how we should be allocating our funds for monos.
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67. Where do you get your discovery records?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Publisher</td>
<td>11.1%</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library service vendor</td>
<td>58.3%</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direct from e-book aggregator</td>
<td>40.3%</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bibliographic utility such as OCLC or SkyRiver</td>
<td>18.1%</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (please specify)</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments:

See above for a description of our hybrid DDA program.

For our local DDA, we receive OCLC records (and our holdings are set for us in OCLC); for our consortial DDA, we receive vendor records.

EBL does weekly loads of records in to OCLC and OCLC "matches" bib records

68. Please describe your decision-making process for the method you chose for receiving discovery records.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Answered question</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skipped question</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments:

No cost and back-end integration with our discovery layer knowledge bank.

Quickest, most direct method. After the first STL is triggered a full record is provided by vendor, which provides improved discovery at an affordable cost.

We chose to receive records from our service vendor to match our current workflows.

Quality of records received from YBP in most cases superior to other publisher or vendor supplied records.

Wanted it simple, low (or no) cost. Wanted weekly delivery.

Streamlined workflows - get all records from the same source.

Available customization, integration with ordering and invoicing workflows

First preference via Discovery vendor; then from ebook aggregator/vendor directly (via FTP) Determined by Discovery vendor
We didn’t want a vendor like YBP getting in the way of working with the DDA vendor. We wanted to be nimble and quick, and not have to deal with multiple layers of vendors.

We decided we didn’t want to pay extra for discovery records at this time, though we don’t like the lack of customization ability.

Discovery records must be supplied in MARC format so that the DDA discovery titles can be mapped as a "collection" into the discovery service.

Communication and service is better through the service vendor. We are also able to dedup orders by using them as a pass-through. The selectors only have to learn to search one platform.

Depends on cost of records, staff time needed to access/load records, quality of records being provided - so method varies widely depending on the DDA program.

See above.

We have been working with the vendor for years and have always been happy with the records provided.

Like to have the DDA program centralized with flow coming from one place; library service vendor records very acceptable.

Full records are needed

We use ebrary. We already have ebrary academic complete so we already have a mechanism in place for downloading the records. There is no extra cost.

The vendor could provide marc records in a more timely manner than the ebook provider.

We examined sample records prior to initiation of the programs (involved in 2). In one program the records proved inadequate after we started using them and we migrated to YBP records.

it proved to be the quickest way to get the MARC records from the business partners

Process was already established for PromptCat, so it was an easy model to adopt.

Available technical capacity

n/a

Quality of MARC record and availability of OCLC number for each record.

Record quality

convenience; we conduct a lot of other business with YBP

cheaper

Examined sample records from aggregator, from other libraries working with that aggregator, and from library-service vendor. Many meetings and discussions with subject specialists, technical-services librarians, aggregator reps, and vendor reps.

EBL works with Worldshare Management Services. They have a file of the discovery records and a file of the purchased records in the Knowledge Base. The discovery records appear as held items in our WorldCat Local catalog.

We use only OCLC records in our local catalog so we chose delivery methods that will allow us to get the best possible OCLC record.

Reasonable cost and adequate record quality.

Already had a system in place for receiving and loading vendor records

The give them to us and they have good enough quality.

Easier in workflow.

For our consortial DDA program, the library service vendor was a integral part of the project from the beginning. Other factors include timeliness, records quality, visibility of inclusion in DDA to bibliographers when searching/ordering in service vendor’s database.

Marc records are free from the aggregator.
Demand Driven Acquisition of Monographs Survey Results

Based upon cost of record and completeness of record.
Ease of integration into existing workflows
most convenient
We balance quality with ease. We want the records to be accurate and to look the same to users.
We do not have such a huge volume, and it is easy enough for us to batch import and do minor record clean-up.
Consortium determines
Experience with similar processes; time and money saved by taking records from service provider.
The records come from the DDA provider. We have 4 DDA providers - 2 are aggregators, one is a library vendor, and the other is a publisher.
We utilize the free records made available from the aggregator although this sometimes means sacrificing quality. Many of the records we receive have "issues" that require cataloger time to fix
Our shared catalog policies dictate the use of OCLC records when possible.
Still in the early stages - will reassess at the end of the year
use free records whenever they are available AND of sufficient quality
Quality of records, then ease of use of and ease of access to records
When we set up the pilot, it seemed easiest to get the aggregator records. Some of them are less than stellar, and we have been thinking about upgrading to OCLC records.
Simplicity
Since our consortial catalog is a WorldCat catalog, it was important to us that our DDA pool be discoverable in WorldCat. Our current e-book provider for our local DDA program was able to provide us with OCLC records and set our holdings in OCLC, which had a lot to do with our decision to go with that provider. The consortial DDA program is a much smaller set of titles, and unfortunately the vendor is unable to provide OCLC records (they're a Chinese vendor), so we had to compromise and accept vendor records. When those titles get purchased they will get a fully cataloged OCLC record to replace the vendor record.
Already getting them for firm order e-books.
It’s what [our sister] campus was already doing, and they do our record loads. Procedure already set in place.
Discovery records are automatically loaded in to OCLC by EBL--this is the only "method" available in OCLC’s WCKB
we chose records that had enough information in them to make DDA records easy to find in searches patrons conduct
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69. How often do you load, update, and remove records as your DDA collection changes?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Response Percent</th>
<th>Response Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>One time only</td>
<td>2.9%</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weekly</td>
<td>58.0%</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biweekly</td>
<td>4.3%</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monthly</td>
<td>26.1%</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quarterly</td>
<td>7.2%</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yearly</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (please specify)</td>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

answered question: 69

skipped question: 30

**Comments:**

We also receive

New record loads are monthly, Record deletions are weekly

Weekly for loading, monthly for removing

At least weekly, sometimes more often, based on requests.

Our pilot project required only one load. The ongoing project will require ongoing updates.

We catalog them as we do other purchased materials.

Since migrating to Alma in June 2013, we have been unable to load new records or update record pool. I was unable to consult with Tech Services to answer these questions concerning our pre-Alma practice, so most questions below will not get answered.

deletion - annually (or when pilot is over)

we do not remove records

Others done when received on an irregular basis.

Load - weekly for our local DDA, monthly for our consortial DDA; remove - as the need arises due to duplication or vendor notification to pull a title

As new books are added. At some times this is weekly, others it may be monthly
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70. Please describe your decision-making process for the frequency at which you are loading, updating and removing records.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Response Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>answered question</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>skipped question</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments:

Staff workload and internal scheduling around recent IT transitions.

Workloads prohibit more frequent updates.

We do batch uploads weekly. Seemed a reasonable schedule. Our goal is to make newly published titles available quickly. Updating and removal is very rare and done manually, so far.

We load other records on a weekly basis, so process and timetable already in place.

Wanted as timely access as possible. Also want to remove records when the e-book is no longer available.

Originally both the loading of new records and the deletion of unavailable records occurred monthly. But we recently encountered some problems with books being unavailable on the aggregator site but still included in our catalog. So we changed our record deletion cycle to weekly.

Loading: as profile generates slips we receive the discovery records. Library service provider sends these weekly. Removing: based on aggregator file of deleted records

Determined by vendors.

Vendor files arrive weekly (adds and deletes). Patron requests arrive any time and we respond a.s.a.p.

We want to do it often enough to provide the newest materials to our patrons without an undue burden on our staff.

Decision-making for this process has not yet been finalized.

The records are provided once a week.

We ran trials of DDA programs and determined that loading less frequently creates a burden on staff as too many records are received at once. Weekly loads provides a manageable list of new DDA records weekly.

Vendor schedule

will need to become daily once DDA plans fully implemented

This is based on the vendor telling us that records are released this frequently

It is a fairly manual process. Any more frequently would be burdensome, any less frequently would inconvenience the patrons.

YBP provides a weekly upload of new records.

actuality new titles must be given - biweekly sufficient for processing as number of new titles is low connected to other weekly routines, staff restrictions

Not enough staff do it more often.

I feel that it lessens the workload if we do the loads and deletions more often.

Workload and staff capacity drives decision

Adding records is done as they are received, removal is done at the Department Head level.
We load records when they become available - weekly.
done by consortium members and that is how often it occurs
General consensus in the library to keep things as constantly up to date as possible.
Our vendor, EBL, loads the records weekly into the OCLC Knowledge Base for us.
We chose to check for new records weekly so that we could keep up with changes to the DDA program on a regular basis. If there are no changes that week, we just check again the following week. It helps us to make sure we capture any updates and don’t miss them.
YBP supplies the records on a weekly basis. We do not remove records.
We can’t get updates on a monthly basis which we would prefer so we have to make a new selection and upload the whole lot instead.
loading records weekly as they are available. no removal of records yet.
This is as frequent as we can get. I’d prefer daily loads, quite frankly.
We receive new records weekly.
compromise with workload
We go with what the vendor provides in order to keep the DDA program up to date.
Our ebook vendors send automatic reports. Probably we could change those times, but so far it works out fine.
Consortium determines
Our PDA project is fairly small and the number of new titles appearing isn’t large, so quarterly works well for us.
When there is the option, we wanted to provide our users with the most up-to-date information.
workflow driven
Titles to add to discovery pool are chosen weekly.
Time constraints
Frequency of updates will grow as # DDA purchases grows.
We load as often as records are made available
This is planned; we haven’t tested it out yet, but we want our records accurate
We get new titles weekly, and load them as they come in. Requests from the aggregator to remove titles come sporadically, and we handle these as needed.
vendor recommendation
For our local DDA: Our profile is based on an 8-week window. Titles are profiled and we wait 8 weeks from the print release date for an e-book to become available. If within 8 weeks an e-book is available, we get the record for our DDA pool. Since the window is short, we don’t want to wait and only load titles monthly. Loading them weekly ensures timely access to those titles that are available to our pool. The consortial DDA program is a bit different and the vendor is handling the profiling differently, so the monthly loading made sense. Each week, after we load local DDA titles, we check our ILS for duplication and remove any duplicates from the DDA pool.
Want the books to be discoverable as soon as they are added. While we run our profiles to add titles on a quarterly basis, we add patron requests as they arise. Because we are a small organization and add items manually to our DDA, we know when MARC records for the new items will be available.
It’s what [our sister] campus was already doing, and they do our record loads. Procedure already set in place.
As they come in.
Determined by vendor and OCLC.
records come from YBP weekly and are loaded weekly
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#### 71. What systems do you update for titles in your discovery pool?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>System</th>
<th>Response Percent</th>
<th>Response Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Discovery interface</td>
<td>48.8%</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local catalog</td>
<td>91.4%</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Link resolver</td>
<td>17.1%</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ERMS</td>
<td>4.3%</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resource sharing network</td>
<td>5.7%</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Other (please specify)**: 7

---

**Comments:**

Marc records are loaded into the local catalogue. The discovery interface gathers these records automatically on a schedule. Link resolution is included in the discovery service.

Next generation system has back end for management and discovery interface for users. Records are in the back end system and published to the discovery layer.

I am not sure what other methods are used.

OCLC Knowledge Base

Local Catalog for triggered titles only

Link resolver used for purchased titles only

Local catalog and our consortial catalog, which is a WorldCat catalog.

---

#### 72. Please tell us why it is necessary to update each of the systems that you do for titles in your discovery pool.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Response Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**answered question**: 45

**skipped question**: 54

---

**Comments:**

They are separate systems currently. In addition, we acknowledge that different users engage different discovery layers. Undergrads seem to prefer the discovery interface, while seasoned researchers prefer the local catalog.
They are separate systems, separate providers, separate knowledgebases.

We prefer not to silo these titles.

Actually, our local catalog is harvested nightly for our Discovery layer. We do not use our OpenURL link resolver for e-books. We do not send our discovery records to our union catalog.

We do not include e-books in our link resolver, and we do not list individual e-books (or e-journals for that matter) in our ERMS. Our Discovery interface pulls from the local catalog, so no additional updating is necessary there.

See explanation above.

Catalogue and discovery layer are separate systems and interfaces. Also Link resolver is update in line with Discovery interface updates.

Because patrons find our materials via our discovery layer. That’s the interface that we push, it’s front & center on our homepage and most of our research-help tools.

Patrons use both systems

Currently, discovery service will not accept records directly from the vendor. Library mediation is currently required even though we are just moving the records.

The catalog shows most holdings and is what the patron uses most often to find books.

We load the records into the catalogue which makes them available through the discovery layer within a short period of time. We do not update the ERMS until the records are purchased and then we run the purchased titles through ERMS to create the permanent link to content.

To make sure users can access items from any source;

We are just adding a discovery layer. Having the records in the catalog should make them visible to the discovery layer.

Optimum access for the patrons

Our patrons need to be able to find the titles. We have just initiated a discovery service and want the titles available both there and in the catalog. Our discovery system does not offer the option of directly loading the DDA titles without going through the catalog.

To get updated holdings in our catalogue.

Our DDA titles are offered through the OPAC as the primary means of discovery.

Customers can find the books easier.

Catalogue is essential core record and it drives content of our Discovery system (Summon)

Links need to work. Broken or changed links cause frustration, disuse and distrust of the catalog.

We participate in a local and a consortial DDA

currently our catalog is the primary way uses can find DDA books

Our public-services librarians do not believe patrons will seek out and use a native interface for general ebooks, so we rely on the catalog. Our discovery interface pulls records from the catalog.

Our vendor updates the files in the Knowledge Base. It reflects what titles are available and what titles are purchased.

Discovery interface, local catalog, and link resolver are for the user to "find" the content. ERM is for management and control of the DDA

We provide the records in the catalog as the main access point for the PDA titles. The catalog records are then added to our discovery service. These are the two main points that students use to search the library resources.

they are our main discover tools

We update the local catalog and then those updates are harvested by the discovery layer.

Well, our catalog is our ERMS and it also automatically updates our discovery interface.
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Having the titles in our catalog simplifies the acquisitions process for us, particularly pre-order searching, so patrons see consistent records and not get misinformation. Because users view material in both our catalogue and discovery interface and we want to ensure they have every opportunity to see the content, our main method of discovery needs to be accurate. We are in the midst of implementing an RDA, so we have to do it in each. This is likely to be done away with once implementation is completed and we will just go with the RDA.

Anything triggered and will be permanently retained warrants proper cataloging. Otherwise, it is simply too many records to justify pulling them in and getting them into our ILS. Plus, reporting wise, it makes it much easier to answer questions for auditors, administrators, etc. about collection size and so on if we include only triggered titles.

Link resolver used for purchased titles only.

The catalog is the database of record for the library. We must update it with titles for discovery that might be purchased. The discovery layer works from the catalog (automatic updates each night). Updating in the catalog also updates our discover layer, so we only update once.

To provide maximum discoverability, both include records.

Keep DL current for titles that we have access to.

We want our titles to be as discoverable as possible; however, workload issues led us to decide *not* to update our link resolver or ERMS until titles are purchased.

The catalog is our main discovery interface.

Our discovery interface is our local catalog, so it is the same system. Our catalog needs most recent discovery records loaded for patrons to access them.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>73. Do you receive point of purchase records for purchased titles?</th>
<th>Response Percent</th>
<th>Response Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>66.7%</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Answered question: 72

Skipped question: 27
Demand Driven Acquisition of Monographs Survey Results

74. Where do you get your point of purchase records?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option</th>
<th>Response Percent</th>
<th>Response Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Publisher</td>
<td>6.3%</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library service vendor</td>
<td>70.8%</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direct from e-book aggregator</td>
<td>22.9%</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bibliographic utility such as OCLC or SkyRiver</td>
<td>22.9%</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (please specify)</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments:
book jobber for local and ebook aggregator for consortia
EBL works with OCLC to add purchase records

75. What systems do you update for purchased titles?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>System</th>
<th>Response Percent</th>
<th>Response Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Discovery interface</td>
<td>43.5%</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local catalog</td>
<td>97.1%</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Link resolver</td>
<td>26.1%</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ERMS</td>
<td>8.7%</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resource sharing network</td>
<td>7.2%</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (please specify)</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments:
See previous answer.
If you're talking about bib records, I make a few edits if needed in our ILS. Discovery updates happen automatically, I don't need to do anything else.
Local catalog includes our consortial catalog as well
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#### 76. Are you notified about changes to the titles in your DDA collection (whether purchased or unpurchased)?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Response Percent</th>
<th>Response Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>82.6%</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>17.4%</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Comments:**

Invoices

Clarification: We receive e-mail notices whenever a title purchase is triggered. We do NOT receive notices when a title is deleted, so the only "notification" for those is the MARC record deletion/updates.

NA

#### 77. How are you notified about changes to titles in your DDA collection (whether purchased or unpurchased)?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Notification Method</th>
<th>Response Percent</th>
<th>Response Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MARC records</td>
<td>33.9%</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reports</td>
<td>39.3%</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email message</td>
<td>67.9%</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Other (please specify)**

3

**Comments:**

Invoices

Clarification: We receive e-mail notices whenever a title purchase is triggered. We do NOT receive notices when a title is deleted, so the only "notification" for those is the MARC record deletion/updates.

NA
78. What changes to the notification process would improve your workflow?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>answered question</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>skipped question</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments:

Vendor providing a record with embedded invoice for purchased titles
Automation of some sort, plus reports.

None at this time.

I think the notification process is fine the way it is. Even if we received notifications of title deletions, I doubt we’d do anything before the (automated) weekly record update.

Would like notification of deleted titles pushed out to us. We have to go pick them up. They come directly from aggregator and do not integrate with the library service provider sending us the new records.

EBL does just fine.

Electronic EDI invoicing.

Notifications are adequate for now.

Spreadsheets provided with the titles that require updating should include title and ISBN. This has not always been the case.

Works smoothly

notification before change - sadly, the notification mostly follows the change

No ideas.
Advance notice of changes
This works fine.
not yet known

Deletions come directly from the aggregator, so they’re not in the same format as the discovery records we get from our vendor. We’ve identified a common data element, but we’d love to have some primary key that’s easier to use in pulling the deletions bibs.

None at this time.

Notification that an e-book dda record is available to replace a print dda record and a match point for replacing in an automated fashion

Managing deletions is a big headache, but I’m not sure how to improve it.

none
I’d like the price to be included in notification emails
regular accurate automated delivery of notifications

Not sure. There are a lot of records to manage each month.
So far it works fine for us because if titles are simply adding and dropping in the main pool (non-triggered) it does not affect us so much.
If *all* vendors sent us add, update, and delete files.
Seems to be working okay.
The system for notifications is working well for us.
email when items are removed

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>79. What is your workflow for managing the records for previous and new editions?</th>
<th>Response Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>answered question</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>skipped question</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments:
We have not addressed this as yet.
Rely on aggregator to withdraw
We have no workflow for this yet. Our program is approximately one year old. We may consider a process for this in future.
Records retained in catalog for earlier editions unless asked to remove by subject selectors.
Notification from our vendor that a new edition is available, then manually remove the older edition
No systematic way yet of dealing with these. I think our aggregator has indicated that this may be an upcoming improvement. But for now, it’s only on an ad-hoc basis (a librarian sees two editions, so we remove the earlier one).
None right now.
Manual but only if notified by librarian or academic that an earlier edition has been auto-purchased when we already hold a later edition.
We instituted a 36 month rolling wall (pub date), so titles older than 36 months, which haven’t been used in 24 months, will automatically be removed. That seems sufficient.
Remove old editions, manually, from the pool if no financial transactions or hide from patrons if there are financial transactions.
No workflow established yet.
We take all editions
At this point we just put the new edition in, we haven’t been checking for previous editions.
We simply delete using the delete files, and load using the new files.
Ah, this is a very sticky area that needs improvement.
new edition is added
We manually export all new discovery records that have edition statements, review the list for editions higher than “first,” and search each title to see if we have an earlier edition.
Rely on provider sending new MARC record and deletion
Generally newer editions replace older.
Add new records for new additions.
separate records for each addition
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not yet known

Cataloging staff check manually for duplicates on every load, but generic titles and variations can’t always be caught without chasing down all possible ambiguities. Given the challenges, they do a very good job.

The vendor, EBL, manages the records for us.

We add new records for previous or new editions of any e-books that we already own. This is in keeping with AACR2 cataloging rules – a different edition requires its own record.

do not delete

We are running it for the first year so none yet.

Usually these are done through routine adds and deletes (if the new is replacing the previous).

We retain access to previous ebook editions. We often discard previous paper editions unless they have circulated recently and frequently.

new editions are added as new titles

Not sure.

We follow the same workflow as print. If it is superseded and someone uses it, we pull in the PDA. If we want the specific edition, we would buy it perpetually.

Preferably notified in the update file, if any. Otherwise, serendipitous discovery.

Keep both records separate.

Haven’t worried about this one yet.

If previous and new editions remain discreetly available, we have records for each in our catalog. If a new edition replaces the old, then the record gets updated to reflect the change.

| 80. Are there any changes that could be made to MARC records that would improve your workflow? |
|---|---|---|
| **Yes** | 31.6% | 18 |
| **No** | 68.4% | 39 |

If yes, please comment:

answered question 57

skipped question 42

Comments:

This could be a survey unto itself. We need standards and consistency from all parties. Many vendor records are hybrids or mash-ups of a print or foreign record used out of context.

Better quality subject headings, author, title and series headings

We have some customization done by the vendor, and then by our loader program. Only when the book has been purchased do we modify the MARC records (i.e., catalog the book fully)

The MARC records we receive for un-purchased titles are pretty bare, sometimes just author/title. But getting fuller records would cost more. Too bad, since better records would increase discoverability and therefore uses and therefore revenue for the aggregator and publishers.
I'm not sure this is a workflow thing, so much as an access/find-ability thing: make sure all records have subject headings, and a table of contents and/or summary note. I want lots of metadata so patrons can find these records and see what's relevant to their needs.

More customization.

many publishers' MARC records are mere skeletons of bibliographic description ... 

series records do not include volume numbers

not yet known

Vendor neutral ebook records from all vendors so that there would be just one record per ebook in OCLC. Also, it would be very helpful if all ebook records had full 776 fields referencing the print version of the item.

ISBN's are useless for matching and replacing print with e-book

No

needs unique identifier so they can be easily deleted, removed, updated

Follow standards, clean up machine-created 505 (table of contents), authority control on tracings.

For starters, do not use the year added to the ebook aggregator platform but the actual year of publication. My cataloger has a litany of complaints regarding the metadata quality of EBL records.

Include number of simultaneous users

Our consortial DDA vendor can't provide us with OCLC MARC records - it would be better if they could.

Vendor should pick better MARC records. Sometimes they us record for spanish or other language editions, when the edition added to collection is English. Seems like they just send the first record they found for the title, not necessary the most accurate record.

It would be better for us if each vendor had its own record with its own unique 856 field included. Now we have to delete fields of other vendors since our ILS only displays for the user the first one listed.

### 81. Do you allow duplication of e-book records from your DDA provider and from other e-book sources?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Response Percent</th>
<th>Response Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>44.6%</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>55.4%</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If yes, please comment. 24

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>answered question</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>skipped question</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments:

We will allow it, but we try out best to avoid it...especially outside of databases.

It occurs, but we are taking steps to reduce the occurrence. We prefer not to allow this.

We allow (do not try to identify them at the time of loading) but we do delete one or the other (usually the DDA version) when discovered.
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If we see duplicate records (i.e., the same e-book as a DDA/discovery record and also already purchased from another source, such as the Gale Virtual Reference Library), we delete the DDA record. But we don’t have a way to systematically filter those out of the DDA profile before loading the discovery records. Would love to, but can’t.

This is a problem as mentioned in previous questions - quite simply it is difficult to manage.

Our vendor will dedup for us periodically, based on a file of ISBNs we send.

But it is a horrible horrible pain.

We try to limit this as much as possible from the vendor side but it is not always successful.

sometimes we do - to investigate user’s preferences

Our vendor & ebrary are supposed to make sure we don’t have duplicates with ebrary, but there might be duplication with another e-book provider. (Like if we purchased the title from ebsco but then it showed up in DDA I don’t think we would catch it automatically.)

We filter where we can, but have had to accept some duplication where the effort to weed it out is not cost effective.

Do we have a choice?

Because the purchased copy will remain in or catalog it gets a separate record from one that may or may not go away.

DDA records cannot be merged at this time with records for purchased materials. If a DDA record is deleted we need to be able to delete the MARC record from the system using it’s unique ID.

We have contract restrictions on this.

We try to avoid duplication by excluding publishers, but there is a small amount of overlap.

We allow duplication of DDA records to simplify the eventual removal of unpurchased titles from the catalog. Titles that have been permanently purchased (if duplicated) are placed on a single record.

Technically, we don’t, but vendors manage to provide us with duplicate copies even when we ask not to.

Some books are requested in print for the reference collection. We also make them available in e through DDA

Sometimes we prefer our other sources and replace records, but they don’t always arrive at the same time

We try hard to avoid this, but it can happen.

If we have access to a title through a previous purchase or a package, then we don’t include that title in our DDA pool, if we can identify the duplication.

This is the only way we can handle the display of the 856 field in our ILS catalog.

NA

dups are in subscribed collections primarily (ebrary academic complete)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>82. How do you handle de-duplication of e-book records?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Response Count</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>answered question</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>skipped question</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments:
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Headings reports, manual notification when collections purchased

YBP de-dupes in most cases. We will not load records for e-book packages even though we may not receive all
titles in the package.

Vendor will dedup based on a file of ISBNs that we gather and send. Otherwise, we only de-dup if we happen to
run across dups. In-house deduping on a larger scale are too time-intensive.

Slowly, title by title. All attempts to automate this have failed with the top people in the business.

E-book duplication is controlled through the vendor.

We try to be proactive and make sure they are not loaded by tweaking the profile. If duplicates do get through
we will dedup them as we find them and change the profile if possible.

Our vendor is provided with our holdings on a weekly basis so we have very little duplication. Duplicate records
are merged.

Certain aggregators are handled by assigned staff... library service provider de-dups also.

deleting double titles
with a good deal of librarians' work - there are so many differences between the publishers and aggregators that
simply copying won’t do
-Checking the books beforehand -Removing the books if duplicates has been noticed
we wrote a script that checks ISBN, OCLC#, and title to alert us to duplicates
Proquest ebrary has a process that we run.

Manually. Laboriously. With great forbearance and patience.

Include dups
don’t have to because I use only 1 DDA vendor.

Generally, we perform a batch load using criteria that will reject ISBN matches. We then evaluate each rejected
record to see if we have that title in the catalog as a physical item or a print item. We allow duplication in terms
of an ebook that we already own in physical format. In those cases, we add the ebook record manually.

Manually.

Sending excel sheets with ISBN’s to the DDA ebook platform.

This isn’t really much an issue for us.

we just remove them

Send full database holdings to PDA supplier before uploads for de-duplication.

RDA is supposed to take care of this.

N/A

ISBN’s are useless. We use OCLC numbers, if available. We also use heading reports from the catalog.
If we have access to better publisher provided records we will choose those over the EBL provided records,
which have many problems.

Run in-house de-duping

By profile with e-book vendor management

Manually on an annual basis

Both publisher and aggregator records show in the DL if we have dups.

in the firm order acquisitions process

I’m in Acquisitions, E-Resources; I keep a spreadsheet of titles that need to be removed, sorted by publisher.
When a duplication is identified, I record the title, ISBN, author, EBL ID, OCLC# on the spreadsheet. I then batch
un-set our holdings in OCLC for all titles that I’m working on, and print the results of that action to a PDF that I
then file. I then remove the DDA records one-by-one from our ILS, and make the titles “not visible” in EBL’s
administrative platform (also done one-by-one - they don't have a batch function available). I then mark my spreadsheet that the EBL, catalog and OCLC tasks are completed.

After loading DDA records, we check for duplication and remove the DDA record if we have purchased the titles already or have access via a large rented ebook collection.

Dups are looked for when adding records to catalog, if found the title is removed from our DDA collection.

NA

83. What is your collection development policy on print / electronic duplication?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Allow</td>
<td>23.3%</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sometimes allow</td>
<td>67.1%</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't allow</td>
<td>9.6%</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

answered question 73

skipped question 26

84. In allowing duplication of print and electronic formats, how do you catalog or link all formats for a title?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Response Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>answered question</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>skipped question</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

 Comments:
We add the URL to the print bib record.
We don't
We do not link the formats.
Separate bibliographic records
We don't. E books and print books are cataloged separately. We just assure that the access points are the same
Basically relying on the relevancy ranking of the discovery system to bring both formats to the top. Doesn't always work. But we made a deliberate decision when we did our initial DDA load not to de-duplicate against print holdings.
Separate records for print and electronic.
We don't link records for the different formats together. We use separate bib records for each instance of a title. Separate records.
E- and p-books are cataloged separately.

Separately

One bibliographic record with one or more embedded URLs for electronic access. A separate bibliographic record for the print copy with one or more holding records.

Our current policy is to link the e-book to the print catalog record, but we may change that to reflect cataloging "best practices."

We have a single record approach so print and electronic records are merged.

separate records always

we don't - e and p are separate records

We don’t. We have separate catalog records for print & electronic. And separate catalog records for each electronic edition or vendor.

separately

Separate records

print and electronic formats have separate entries

by adding information to both bibliographic records

Separate marc records and holdings for print and electronic.

Separate marc records in our catalogue

We don’t.

We do not link these.

Separate record approach.

Multiple records by format

it depends; we link all formats in on record mostly but sometimes automated downloading creates separate records

indicated second copy, it is very rare that we do this

Single bib.

Print and electronic titles are on their own records. Links for the electronic titles are provided through the Knowledge Base.

Physical and electronic formats each have a separate record. Duplicates of electronic resources are all on the same record once a purchase has occurred to conform with vendor neutral cataloging practice. When we have a DDA title that is not yet triggered and we already own it from other electronic material vendors, we create a separate record for the DDA item until such time that it is triggered for purchase. Once triggered it is added on to the MARC record for the already owned electronic materials.

Catalog separately

Separate records that should be FRBRised by the discovery layer.

separate records

Our library system is Alma/Primo, which presents p & e as two versions of the same work.

A paper book that has an ebook duplicate gets a note and an 856 link. An ebook with a paper duplicate gets a note.

separate records

individually catalogued

Each is distinct.

One title record, multiple item ids on same record.

Separate records
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We use separate records for each format.
separate records for print and e
Separate bib records
Type of material
Separately
No attempt to link. Separate records for each format.
bib record per edition/format, generally
separate records for each format
Single record
We catalog separately.
Different bib records
We catalog print and electronic resources separately
separate records
Serial records are linked, we make no effort to link monographs (both formats show up in the search results).

85. How are you notified when a DDA title is purchased?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Notification Type</th>
<th>Response Percent</th>
<th>Response Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MARC records</td>
<td>23.2%</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reports</td>
<td>49.3%</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email message</td>
<td>63.8%</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Receipt of invoice</td>
<td>47.8%</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (please specify)</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments:
Currently working out a revised workflow with book vendor to provide MARC record with invoice embedded
Receipt of book
Check the vendor's website for purchased Records.
I trigger the purchase
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**86. Does your DDA provider offer an upgrade function to increase the number of users able to access a title after purchase?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Response Percent</th>
<th>Response Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>51.5%</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>48.5%</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

answered question 66
skipped question 33

**87. Would you be willing to share technical services workflow documentation?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Response Percent</th>
<th>Response Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>48.4%</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>51.6%</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

answered question 62
skipped question 37

**88. Do you participate in a consortial DDA program?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Response Percent</th>
<th>Response Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>31.1%</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>68.9%</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

answered question 74
skipped question 25
89. Do you also have a local DDA program?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>76.0%</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>24.0%</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

answered question 25
skipped question 74

90. How are your local and consortial DDA programs coordinated?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

answered question 17
skipped question 82

Comments:

Local -- Acquisitions Dept work with vendor. Consortial --- Collection building task force and consortium staff work with vendor and publishers.

Both are through the same vendor, so there is little duplication

Same service provider so publishers in the consortial program are blocked from our individual plan.

One major point of contact for both programs working in concert with staff at the local site.

manually

Our local DDA program excludes publishers contained in the consortial DDA program.

YBP profiles

Consortial program is an opt-in project; it is coordinated through the NY3Rs which is a state mandated multi-type group of regional library councils; as such we could not rely on one book vendor; the group selected to work directly with the ebook aggregator. Our local program was once aggregator based but we've moved to working with a book vendor so that we may receive content from two ebook vendors and have the book vendor/jobber dedup for us at outset

While we do not have a consortial DDA program in place yet, we are in the process of setting one up with several of the Borrow Direct libraries as a pilot for engineering books only. This is to begin in the Fall. There is a Borrow Direct working group that is coordinating the program.

We don't really coordinate the programs other than checking to see if we have titles from one already in the other. We don't add titles to both DDA programs.

In cases of duplication, the consortial record is the one that takes precedence -- and is the one that is triggered for purchase.

We use the same provider for both, who is able to nest the STLs/purchases (consortial before local). yes
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They cover separate subject areas.

They aren’t

They are through different vendors but the consortial one is limited to STEM. We don’t have a lot of STEM material in our local DDA.

Local is coordinated by a team consisting of Acquisitions, Cataloging, Collection Development, and Reference personnel. Consortial DDA is coordinated by a hybrid approach - licensing was done by our campus as we were the initiators of the program; admin functions such as invoice payments, IP addresses, checking access, etc are performed by our consortium (CDL); titles in the DDA pool are loaded by each participating campus into their own ILS; the consortium will catalog each purchased title and send to each campus to add to their ILS to replace the discovery record.

just getting online with consortial now

### 91. What is different about your local program when you participate in a consortial DDA program?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Answered question | 16 |

| Skipped question | 83 |

**Comments:**

We have excluded publishers targeted for the consortial DDA program.

Not much.

Only that we block the publishers included in the consortial plan.

Needed to change parameters of the local program to avoid duplication with the Consortial DDA program.

better terms locally and the inclusion of print PDA

You have to be careful in your profiling not to replicate titles from the consortia. You may end up with multiple platforms for your users.

Local is pretty much our approval profile, deduped against consortial profile. Different purchase triggers

We omit two publishers that are covered well in the consortial DDA

All our DDA plans are pilots so some overlap is acceptable

We are using different vendors for the programs so not much is different. We avoid duplication. The consortial DDA has a specific purchase with building up STEM-H content.

We have had to change our local profile to limit duplication with the consortial DDA.

Our local program contains a much larger pool, and allows us to add individual titles on demand.

Have to watch for duplication. We get statistics from just the consortia purchases separate from our local stats.

Nothing.

the triggers are different, there is a multiplier and, we don’t pay for the consortial

Nothing - they are not connected. The consortial DDA program is for Chinese-language material only.

consortial is publisher based, local is approval plan based
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92. What are some of the challenges of participating in a consortial DDA program?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>answered question</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>skipped question</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments:

Timing is sometimes an issue as the process is more extensive with multiple institutions being involved and control lying outside of local purview. Content priorities vary.

More short term loans. In our program, my institution accounts for 40% of the use, so we pay proportionately more

Agreeing on publisher lists, multipliers, and workflows (MARC records).

Getting buy-in from disparate institutions is not easy, especially when only some are committed to DDA as a viable access/collection strategy. Also, funds committed to the consortial program are removed from the local program and that is a challenging concept for consortial task force members to sell to their local institutions - have to overcome the "what’s in it for me" syndrome.

many

I’ve been on the consortia working group that coordinates our consortial DDA program. I could write an essay on this question. There are problems managing records, dealing with differing levels of technical expertise, challenges in developing an fair and acceptable financial contribution system, establishing and maintaining adequate communications among all the players.

Agreeing on which publishers to include - some libraries purchase access from publishers and would not want them included in the DDA program - others do not and would want them included.

The variety of access models are confusing to users and public services staff of my library. It’s even more confusing when you have ebooks from the same vendor with different download periods, for example. As chair of the consortial DDA implementation team, I can also say that meeting the needs of a diverse consortium and increasing content, all the while staying within budget, is quite challenging.

Managing loading and suppressing in terms of timing; de duping if at all and more

a) duplication  b)each library has its own priorities  c) some publishers are not willing to participate

I haven’t run into any challenges at this point that have been different from our own program. We are all managing our own catalogs so we handle the consortial DDA program the same way as our local one. I think that if we were using a consortial catalog, that would be a different story

Duplication of records is a big one; higher cost of consortial titles is also a challenge.

No significant challenges, really. But it is a pilot program, and trying to understand the role such a program will play in our acquisitions and how it will shape our collection development is difficult at this point. That is, will this be growing? Is it the way of the future? Or will stay fairly small scale?

Trying to keep from duplicating titles; sometimes difficult to figure out what will be gotten from the consortium and what we should order locally

Negotiating common standards

Pricing, tech services workflow.

For some participants, there is the potential for conflict with individual DDA programs.

organization and not always knowing where something is ‘coming from’
Coordinating the campus needs for technical requirements; getting to a shared understanding about what constitutes use, what triggers purchase, whether each campus would then own a purchased title, things like that.

Purchasing titles that are not relevant to community college needs.

Coordinating local plan with system plan

---

### 93. How is the consortial program funded?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fund Type</th>
<th>Response Percent</th>
<th>Response Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Shared fund</td>
<td>76.2%</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Each member pays</td>
<td>23.8%</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (please explain)</td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Comments:**

Each member is assessed a contribution based on FTE and acquisitions budget which then goes into a common pool.

(Each member library pays annually into a deposit account)

The consortial program is covered by state funding. We are a private institution so we contributed funds with other private schools.

[Our state] pays for it.

money given to the consortium from the state to do a pilot.

Each participating campus deposited their share of an overall pot of funds with the DDA provider

Each member pays an amount into this Shared fund based on FTE, previous usage and budget size.
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**94. How does ownership of purchased titles work?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ownership Model</th>
<th>Response Percent</th>
<th>Response Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Every participating library owns every purchased title individually</td>
<td>36.4%</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The libraries share ownership</td>
<td>27.3%</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The consortium owns the content</td>
<td>36.4%</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Each individual library owns only the books accessed by its users</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (please explain)</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Comments:**

We have a blended model that includes "Every participating library owns every purchased title individually"; "libraries share ownership" and "consortium owns the content" and the particular model that applies to titles is set by the publisher.

Each library that is a member of the consortium will have perpetual "ownership" of the titles purchased by the group. All of the consortially-purchased titles are labeled with the consortial OCLC code in WorldCat.

Our is actually mixed, depending on the publisher. For most, every library owns a copy. For some, though, the consortium is the owner.

The participating campuses share ownership as it's based on a limited SU model (2 users).

**95. Please describe the management of the process that allows libraries to share ownership of purchased titles.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer</th>
<th>Response Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>answered question</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>skipped question</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Comments:**

Negotiations included usage models for unlimited or specific number of simultaneous users along with pricing multipliers to accommodate consortial level usage.
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For this model; a better description would be that the libraries share access to the content that the consortium owns. The number of copies available for access is dependent upon the multiplier applied to the price which has been negotiated between the e-book aggregator and the publisher with input from the library participants. Do not understand the question.

Once we reach 10 loans (I think) we purchase a title. Then we are purchasing at a 4 or 5x multiplier. We get 325xmultiplier uses for the book for the year at that point.

Single OCLC record, work managed by the consortium office.

As with all of our consortial purchases, the campuses pay a share (based on co-invest models determined by size of campus, budgets, etc) and each campus can access the purchased title.

Each library buys

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>96. How does cataloging of purchased titles work?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Every participating library catalogs every purchased title individually</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The libraries share cataloging processes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The consortium catalogs the content</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Each individual library catalogs only the books accessed by its users</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (please explain)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| answered question | 18 |
| skipped question | 81 |

Comments:

As the lead institution, we catalog the purchases, then send the MARC records to the participants to load in their local catalogs.

Every library downloads titles in the DDA pool. Each library has the option of modifying records of purchased titles or obtaining better records, but they pay for that individually.

This is going to change once we are all migrated to Alma.

Individual libraries purchase their own MARC records after triggering through the discovery pool provided.

Cataloging records are provided by the vendor to all libraries.

Each library determines its process because of the capacity of ILS.

The consortium catalogs the content and sends a cataloged record to each participating campus to add to their ILS. Each of those records reflects that the title is shared among the campuses.

shared cataloging gets the records from the vendor, pushes them out to campuses to load
97. If libraries share cataloging processes, please describe the management of this process.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>answered question</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>skipped question</td>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments:

One library does the initial catalog or load into the union catalog and individual institutions have the option of loading into

See above

Complicated - certain libraries that are part of SUNY have SUNY Central manage their ILS. We do not use a shared union catalog for any DDA. Our institution and others decide how to load records locally. Smaller schools may not load into their local ILS (they use the vendor database alone); we load our own records as received by the vendor/aggregator

Different members of the consortium acquire their MARC records from different sources.

Records are loaded for all pool titles

This is still somewhat in the works, but we all agree to download the MARC records into our local systems and then manage the titles purchased by our institution.

98. Are triggers shared across the consortium or implemented only at the local institution?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Shared</td>
<td>95.5%</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local</td>
<td>4.5%</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

answered question 22

skip question 77
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**99. How do you manage differences between the consortial and local catalogs?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Response Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>answered question</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>skipped question</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Comments:**

Bib record coding

Discovery records are loaded by one library in its local catalog, and contributes those to the union catalog. Each library loads the discovery records in their local catalogs but do not contribute those to the union catalog.

We don't have a consortial catalog per se.

There is no consortial catalog.

no need to

Only 1 set of records are loaded into the consortial catalog. Each library loads their own set of records.

Do not understand the question.

in the Marc record for each

each DDA pilot has or will have its own note in the MARC record

N/A

Consortial purchases are labelled as such in the 940 field.

We only have local catalogs.

There is not consortial catalog.

Consortial records are standard for DDA.

There is no consortial catalog in this case.

We share a catalog.

no consortial catalog.

This is not a problem unique to consortial DDA - all consortial purchases and subscriptions have the risk of creating differences between consortial and local catalogs. In our case, our consortium catalogs each shared resource and sends records to each participating campus, so the differences are minimal and mostly pertain to locally added fields.

n/a
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>100. How do you grant discovery access to consortial DDA titles?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Response Count</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Comments:**

- IP recognition
- Local proxy servers.
- Same as our own, the records for these titles are in our system and made available through our discovery platform.
- Loaded same as local DDA titles
- Both through individual library catalogs and the consortial catalog.
- via proxy in the catalog
- Through library's local catalog and/or discovery platform.
- Local ILS, discovery layer and vendor database will be through our catalog like our local DDA pilots
- We have the records in the catalog. The catalog records are then included in the discovery service. These are added into our discovery system.
- I don't understand the question. Access is IP controlled through each library's proxy, and unmediated.
- Link resolver for purchased titles only
- Each institution's own OPAC.
- Through catalog and discovery layer
- use the KnowledgeBase to get MARC records
- Through our local catalog and in our consortial catalog. Each campus is loading discovery records to their own ILS, and the consortium is loading the discovery records to the consortial catalog.
- Via local catalog links and EZproxy authentication implemented consortially
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### 101. Could each library have a separate profile that generates a local discovery pool (as opposed to a consortial profile that results in a shared discovery pool)?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>18.2%</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>81.8%</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Answered question:** 22  
**Skipped question:** 77

### 102. Does each member of the consortium catalog the same discovery pool?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>77.3%</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>22.7%</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Answered question:** 22  
**Skipped question:** 77

### 103. Please rate the importance of the following metrics for consortial DDA programs:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Metric</th>
<th>Unimportant</th>
<th>Of little importance</th>
<th>Moderately important</th>
<th>Important</th>
<th>Very important</th>
<th>Rating Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of institutions contributing to pre-purchase usage</td>
<td>0.0% (0)</td>
<td>4.5% (1)</td>
<td>36.4% (8)</td>
<td>27.3% (6)</td>
<td>31.8% (7)</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of institutions involved in post-purchase usage</td>
<td>0.0% (0)</td>
<td>4.5% (1)</td>
<td>31.8% (7)</td>
<td>27.3% (6)</td>
<td>36.4% (8)</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage or instances of usage per institution across the consortium leading to purchase</td>
<td>0.0% (0)</td>
<td>4.5% (1)</td>
<td>13.6% (3)</td>
<td>36.4% (8)</td>
<td>45.5% (10)</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Answered question:** 22  
**Skipped question:** 77
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104. Thank you for taking the time to complete this survey. We will be continuing our research over the next few months and would like to be in contact with survey participants. Would you be willing to be interviewed and contribute to this NISO project?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Response Percent</th>
<th>Response Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>73.7%</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>26.3%</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please share any additional comments you have.

18

Comments:
We could harness the power of discovery services, tie it to the DDA model, and make the subscription model obsolete for serials. This would enable librarians to purchase only the parts that are actually being used, would provide instant and seamless access for patrons, and would also favor publishers by routing funds to them instead of relying so much on interlibrary loan. After all, the difference between a monograph and a serial is not easily defined. This is important work.

Clarifications: #34 Does your DDA program use any form of mediation? - I marked "Yes, a librarian approval transaction model," but we do not mediate *all* DDA transactions, only those for loans over a certain price threshold. #80 - Would you be willing to share workflow documentation? - We are willing to share, happy to talk to others, but our written documentation is not in a format conducive to sharing (it's online, in a password-protected environment). #81 - Do you participate in a consortial DDA program? - We are part of a consortium that has arranged for an across-the-board discount for purchases from our e-book aggregator, but not cooperative DDA. Excellent (and thorough) survey! I actually enjoyed the intellectual exercise of completing it. Good luck compiling and analyzing the results! (Lots of qualitative data)

Please think about small libraries doing DDA. A lot of this survey assumes a certain size institution, but we have an FTE of about 5,000 students and a library staff of under 20 and more than 80,000 DDA records in our catalog. We're hugely invested in DDA but it needs to be a model that isn't staff intensive (because we don't have the staff); that's why EBL's model works for us and why ebrary and Ebsco's doesn't.

This was a marathon survey - not sure you will get your best information from something so long especially given the complexity of the topic.

I look forward to seeing what other institutions are doing in this ever-changing field. Thanks for your research! Hopefully by the time I'm contacted we will have worked out our problems with loading new discovery records into Alma.

One of the main misconceptions I feel publishers have about these programs is that they save libraries money. That is not what is happening. I have the same pool of money to spend and I am going to spend it no matter what. PDA just helps us purchase based on usage rather than educated guessing. I think that could be communicated better to publishers.

Good luck!

We also use DDA for a small number of video streaming licenses from one video vendor.

The [our university] is embarking on a consortial e-book DDA pilot program this fall. The details are still being worked out. I am on this committee.

We are currently development partners with Serials Solutions on their Intota library management product.
This was far too long a survey!
Survey TOO LONG
Unfortunately my technical services librarian had left for the day, so I answered the questions to the best of my abilities
woosh, that was one long survey
This survey was way too long and the latter portion too complex. You lost me at #52.
The last question wouldn't let me passed without ticking a box. So I ticked an incorrect one.
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**Consortia Survey Results**

1. Name

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response Count</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>17 answered question</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0 skipped question</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. Institution Name

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response Count</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>14 answered question</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 skipped question</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. Consortium name (if different from Institution name)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response Count</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>13 answered question</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 skipped question</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. Email address

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response Count</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>17 answered question</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0 skipped question</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5. Does your consortium participate in a DDA program?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>76.5%</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>23.5%</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6. What are some of the challenges of participating in a consortial DDA program?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answered</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Skipped</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments:

What are some of the challenges of participating in a consortial DDA program? - Open-Ended Response

- Receiving Consortia Catalog Records from OCLC for EBSCO platform.
- The high cost of purchase with our multiplier. - Satisfying the interests of all consortial members in our diverse group. - Adding additional content from additional publishers that would interest our members since we are restricted by costs.
- Getting publishers to participate. Analyzing early data to see if it’s a cost effective program.
- Budget constraints on a member such that they may need to drop out. A member may become interested in another program and may opt out of the consortial arrangement. Both of these issues can affect the cost or even viability of the agreement for remaining members.
- Publishers are often reluctant to participate; it is difficult to convey the subtleties of DDA to a wide population; record management issues are amplified.
- Agreeing on the publishers that should be included, as some libraries are able to buy all of the ebook output of a publisher and others are not - Agreeing on fiscal models
- Finding publisher willing to work with a consortia. Varying levels within consortia of experience working with e-records. Coordinating record loading across multiple institutions
- We are a multi-type group (public library systems, school library systems, university centers, community colleges, private 2-year, public and private 4 year). Finding the right mix of publishers willing to participate has been a challenge. Also, we do not have a union catalog so the burden to load records is on each participating library.
- Deciding on the appropriate level of materials for multiple institutions. Working with a shared IT operation.
- As database manager I find the biggest challenge to be with records and access. We have two dda programs, one on our own and one with the BLC. Sometimes the materials overlap and it has been difficult to make sure the
records load correctly. We have not been able to get the "view now" buttons turned on for the BLC consortium records, and since WorldCat Local is our main portal I think that our patrons don’t see the books in the consortium dda project or know that they have access to them if they do see them.

conflicting needs - developing a cost-sharing model - developing a licensing model

### 7. How many libraries participate in your program?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>answered question</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>skipped question</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Comments:**

12
37
9
3
51
8
18
21
11
17
10

### 8. Do you use STLs?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Response Percent</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>81.8%</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>18.2%</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Comments:**

answered question 11
skipped question 6
### 9. How many STLs do you use prior to purchase?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Answered question: 9
- Skipped question: 8

### Comments:

- 15
- 6
- 25
- 3
- 3
- 7
- 3
- 4
- 5

### 10. In considering the planning and goals for your consortial DDA program, which is more important?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response Percent</th>
<th>Response Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Broader access (more STLs before purchase)</td>
<td>77.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ownership (fewer STLs before purchase)</td>
<td>22.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Answered question: 9
- Skipped question: 8
How is the consortial DDA program funded? - Other (please include a general explanation of your funding structure, as applicable):

A quarterly charge back to participants based on the consortia formula for charge back.

The contribution is determined with a formula applied to each library: 30% even split 35% FTE 35% materials budget

We’re only in the second year of this pilot project. At the beginning, each library put in a certain amount of money, and we drew on that. For the second year, as we had a slow start up, we didn’t need much additional money and several of the smaller libraries did not have to contribute additional funds.

Portion from central, state-provided funds for public institutions; portion as opt-in from private institutions.

Each member contributes to a pool of money that is then paid to the vendor who manages the payment to the ebook providers and facilitates the profiling process.

Each library contributes an amount according to our cost share model and the funds are pooled.

Both shared and member paid. Our central IT/Systems operation put up some $, and each member contributed as well.

We are currently in our DDA pilot. We took $100,000 for the pilot; each member paid their portion as per our established consortium funding formula.
### 12. How does ownership of purchased titles work?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ownership Model</th>
<th>Response Percent</th>
<th>Response Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Every participating library owns every purchased title individually</td>
<td>20.0%</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The libraries share ownership</td>
<td>10.0%</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The consortium owns the content</td>
<td>60.0%</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Each individual library owns only the books accessed by its users (and ownership is not shared)</td>
<td>10.0%</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Other (please also include a general explanation of how ownership works) 2

**Comments:**

Technically the consortium owns the content, but only the contributing members in the particular phase of the pilot (we’re in phase 2) can access the titles purchased during that phase. Depending on the publisher, we either pay a multiplier and own multiple "seats" on a title or each contributing member "owns" a copy of the title. I’m not sure what difference you mean between the 1st and 2nd option. Each library has permanent access to all purchased titles, whether or not they remain in the consortia.

### 13. Does your consortium use a multiplier to determine the cost of books purchased and shared across the consortium?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Response Percent</th>
<th>Response Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>70.0%</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>30.0%</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If yes, what is the multiplier? Is the multiplier model effective for your consortium? Would you change the model or the multiplier in any way? How did you come up with that number? 8

**Comments:**

3

Our multiplier is 5 times list price. We are examining alternative models that will allow us to add more records and keep the same budget. At the moment, the membership is still very interested in ownership and likes the
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idea of unlimited no-cost post-purchase use. We negotiated with publishers to reach the 5x number. They initially wanted something closer to 11, but we argued that most duplication across the consortia stops at 3 copies (using YBP purchasing history), and we compromised at 5.

2.5. We’re looking at trying to get a lower multiplier.

Multiplier of 6 for the pilot period. It does seem effective/fair. It was based in part on the Orbis Cascade Alliance multiplier and was graduated based on the number and FTE of private institutions that would come in to the program. It was developed in collaboration with the DDA vendor, EBL. (We maxed out the multiplier, so all institutions could now come in under the multiplier of 6.)

Some publishers have chosen this model. The multiplier differs from publisher to publisher and was initially based (sort of) on the average number of copies our participating members purchased from that publisher through our Approval vendor. (There were some publishers who demanded a multiplier we thought was too high and we didn’t include them in the Pilot.) We’ve negotiated some of these to lower numbers in the second phase of the project based on usage and purchasing statistics from the first phase.

3. We would like a model that more closely aligns # of copies with subsequent use - subsequent use triggers additional copies. The multiplier was negotiated with the publisher and is based on statistics about the number of copies of each title by particular publishers - provided by YBP and backed by union catalog.

We did in phase one and eliminated for a limited use model in phase 2.

3. I think the multiplier is fair. 11 institutions get access to one title at 3 times list.

| 14. Does your consortium use a model other than a multiplier to share purchased titles? |
|---------------------------------|-----------------|-----------------|
|                                  | Response Percent | Response Count  |
| Yes                             | 30.0%            | 3               |
| No                              | 70.0%            | 7               |

If yes, please explain

3

answered question 10

skipped question 7

Comments:

We also use what is being called the "buyers club" model, whereby we pay a discounted price for every site to get a single use copy of the ebook. They're really just two sides of the same coin.

Limited use

We successful argued that our consortium could be viewed as one large institution in that our tight integration means that a member very rarely buys a second copy of a book if one is already owned by another member in the consortium.
15. Please describe your ideal model for managing shared ownership of purchased titles across the consortium.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Comments:**

Centrally loaded titles that are immediately added to the library's holdings and made available in their discovery layer. We are hoping to achieve this with our adoption of a shared ILS and Discovery layer.

Unlimited, simultaneous users with true perpetual access. (EBL's model is limited uses that renew each year. Not bad, but not ideal.)

We really do prefer the multiplier model that results in some set of "seats" for each purchase. For instance, a multiplier of 3 that results in an ebook purchased with 3 simultaneous uses.

Too early to tell. We would like a model that both allows for consortial collection development and short term loans to stretch the dollar and the number of titles available. We would like a purchase model that aligns use with cost. We'd like a model that did not require negotiating with each publisher and that many publishers would find acceptable.

Would prefer to manage own platform to provide access to purchased titles in perpetuity. However, EBL currently hosts our content including our purchased titles. Ongoing concern.

purchased items owned by consortium regardless of which institution's patron triggered the buy.

16. How does cataloging of purchased titles work?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response Percent</th>
<th>Response Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Every participating library catalogs every purchased title individually</td>
<td>60.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The libraries share cataloging processes</td>
<td>20.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The consortium catalogs the content</td>
<td>20.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Each individual library catalogs only the books accessed by its users</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Other (please explain)** 7

**answered question** 5

**skipped question** 12
Comments:

We are beginning this and plan to have the consortia do weekly bulk imports of the titles based on rules provided by each participating library.

Two libraries each catalog their own titles. The 3rd uses the records available in (Ex Libris) SFX.

The DDA vendor sends new titles to OCLC, which adds them to central/shared WorldCat Knowledge Base collections - one for unpurchased books and one for purchased books. These collections are used to export records to the individual libraries, and libraries can customize those records using the Knowledge Base. When a book is purchased, it moves from the unpurchased to the purchased collection and the record update goes out to the libraries.

There are a couple of models. Some libraries get "discovery" records for their catalogs (either from the ebook platform provider or the Approval vendor) and then get full bibs to overlay when the item is purchased. Others (like my library) choose to upgrade their records on their own as the books are purchased. Consortial holdings are being set on OCLC as the books are purchased.

Discovery records are made available to each library, where they are loaded into the individual catalogs. Libraries modify those records as desired. Notification of purchase is disseminated and each library handles the records as they please (replace with fuller record, modify existing record, leave record alone). One library loads both discovery records and any modifications to the union catalog.

We do not have a union catalog.

We get records from the vendor, which the consortium loads. I wouldn't say the consortium "catalogs" the titles. Individual catalog depts often upgrade these records.

17. If libraries share cataloging processes, please describe the management of this process.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>answered question</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>skipped question</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments:

We have a DDA cataloging sub-committee of three catalogers who work with EBSCO, YBP, and OCLC to establish and test procedures, with a goal of automation of the process administered by the consortia. We are still testing.

YBP notifies EBL of what titles became available during the week. EBL notifies OCLC. OCLC makes the records available on an FTP server. Each library loads the records to their catalog weekly. Some libraries, those using WorldCat Local, use OCLC's knowledge base to manage their loads.

We may change this, but typically at the end of the academic year, a list of purchased titles is provided to each library along with basic MARC records so they can catalog them fully in the catalog. Other EBL title records are loaded into the discovery layer or catalog but are not fully cataloged. Updates and new additions are provided monthly.

We have a shared cataloged. Theoretically, there is one record per title, and each institution's holdings is added to the single record. It's conceivable that there would be a shared holding for a title, plus an individual library's holding (they purchased it earlier, it's part of a package, etc.)
**Demand Driven Acquisition of Monographs Survey Results**

**18. Are triggers counted across the consortium or counted only at the local institution?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Response Percent</th>
<th>Response Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Shared</td>
<td>90.9%</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local</td>
<td>9.1%</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Comments:**
I have customizations for each participating library on an Excel Spreadsheet.
We don’t have a consortial catalog at this time.
We do not have a consortial catalog.
Everyone is loading the records locally, then submitting them to the shared catalog where they are (hopefully) being deduped.
One institution only loads the PDA/DDA records into the union catalog. The rest of the institutions only load locally.
We do not have a consortial catalog.
Our local catalog is not the primary portal into our collection, the consortial catalog (OCLC World Cat Local) is.
One catalogue for the consortium. No local catalogues.

**19. How do you manage differences between the consortial and local catalogs?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Response Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>answered question</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>skipped question</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Comments:**

**20. How do you grant discovery access to consortial DDA titles?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Response Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>answered question</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>skipped question</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Comments:

EBSCO turns on the titles in EBSCO Discovery Service, one library in our group uses Summon and they will receive bib records from OCLC (again we are just beginning)

This is done at the local level with local record loads.

If you mean access through a discovery layer, this is done through the WorldCat Knowledge Base through collection selection or through record loads by institutions to other discovery products. If you mean a central access point, we have a specific URL that goes to the consortium's holdings on the EBL platform.

I'm not sure what you mean by this question. Any authenticated user (or walk-in user presumably) can access the titles via the bib in their local or consortial catalog or by going directly to the ebook platform providers site.

Through catalog records in both individual catalogs and the union catalog.

unlimited simultaneous access. Each library loads records into their own catalog or discovery layer.

DDA records are loaded directly to individual institutions' discovery index. Once titles are purchased, they are loaded to the shared catalog.

We try to get the "view now" buttons turned on in WorldCat local. Failing that, we ask the public service staff to tell people to check our internal catalog as well.

See above

21. Could each library have a separate profile that generates a local discovery pool (as opposed to a consortial profile that results in a shared discovery pool)?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Response Percent</th>
<th>Response Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>12.5%</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>87.5%</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If yes, please explain

answered question 8

skipped question 9

Comments:

We are looking at implementing this option.

I suppose it's possible, but it's not what we wanted. One goal is to reduce duplication among the consortium members, and a shared PDA program has the potential to do that.

I am not sure what you are asking.
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22. Does each member of the consortium catalog the same discovery pool?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Response Percent</th>
<th>Response Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>71.4%</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>28.6%</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments:
Yes and No. Eight libraries catalog the same pool. Two libraries opted to rely on EBSCO discovery service as the finding aid and do not catalog ebooks at all.
As mentioned above, cataloging is done through OCLC.
A file is made available weekly that all libraries download into their catalogs.
They load the same records but they are not fully cataloging un-owned titles.
Records are loaded to the shared catalog upon purchase and to individual discovery indexes as PDA records.
Batch loads done consortially.

23. Please rate the importance of the following metrics for consortial DDA programs:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>unimportant</th>
<th>of little importance</th>
<th>moderately important</th>
<th>Important</th>
<th>very important</th>
<th>Rating Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of institutions contributing to pre-purchase usage</td>
<td>10.0% (1)</td>
<td>10.0% (1)</td>
<td>20.0% (2)</td>
<td>50.0% (5)</td>
<td>10.0% (1)</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of institutions involved in post-purchase usage</td>
<td>10.0% (1)</td>
<td>10.0% (1)</td>
<td>40.0% (4)</td>
<td>30.0% (3)</td>
<td>10.0% (1)</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of instances of usage per institution across the consortium leading to purchase</td>
<td>0.0% (0)</td>
<td>0.0% (0)</td>
<td>30.0% (3)</td>
<td>40.0% (4)</td>
<td>30.0% (3)</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

answered question 10
skipped question 7
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24. Thank you for taking the time to complete this survey. We will be continuing our research over the next few months and would like to be in contact with survey participants. Would you be willing to be interviewed and contribute to this NISO project?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>92.3%</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>7.7%</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please share any additional comments you have.

Comments:

The success of this way of purchasing ebooks is essential to us. We are facing a period of increase in student services in the library and a decrease in back office staff.

The field for STLs before purchase would not let me add this there, but we just changed our trigger from 10 to 25 based on a usage and expenditure analysis.

I left #10 blank because both are important. We currently try to balance the $ amount between the two.

I prefer a written interview than via phone.

A DDA pilot is currently in the works, maybe for 2015.
## Public Library Survey Results

1. **Name**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response Count</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>answered question</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>skipped question</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. **Institution Name**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response Count</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>answered question</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>skipped question</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. **Email address**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response Count</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>answered question</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>skipped question</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Demand Driven Acquisition of Monographs Survey Results

#### 4. Does your library offer eBooks to the public?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Response Percent</th>
<th>Response Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Through a consortium</td>
<td>58.3%</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library purchases / licenses on its own</td>
<td>58.3%</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No, we don't offer eBooks</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (please specify)</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments:
We have a few misc. ebooks, and use Overdrive for our main ebook collection.
We offer eBooks through Freading which is DDA to our 14 small public libraries in the county. We also post several links to free eBooks.

#### 5. Are your eBooks available through (check all that apply):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Response Percent</th>
<th>Response Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Online catalog (API's)?</td>
<td>64.3%</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vendor interface?</td>
<td>92.9%</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mobile apps?</td>
<td>85.7%</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (please specify)</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments:
Going to be available through APIs soon.
### Demand Driven Acquisition of Monographs Survey Results

#### 6. Does your library offer a way for patrons to request eBooks for purchase (DDA: Demand-driven acquisition)? These are often called ‘Wish Lists’ or ‘Recommend to Library’ features.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option</th>
<th>Response Percent</th>
<th>Response Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>From a vendor</td>
<td>46.2%</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Online form on library’s or consortium’s website</td>
<td>53.8%</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No, we don’t solicit input from our patrons in this way</td>
<td>7.7%</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (please specify)</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments:

We participate in Overdrive’s WIN Affiliated Retailers program, and patrons may request titles for the library to purchase from the 3M and Overdrive platforms.

Paper request forms

We accept email, phone calls and in-person requests

we also offer the paper forms that we use for all other requests

#### 7. Is the wish list mediated or is the purchase automatic?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option</th>
<th>Response Percent</th>
<th>Response Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mediated</td>
<td>91.7%</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Automatic purchase</td>
<td>8.3%</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

answered question 12

skipped question 2
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8. Do you establish a separate budget for DDA?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Response Percent</th>
<th>Response Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>14.3%</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>85.7%</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

answered question 14
skipped question 0

9. What is the biggest advantage to offering DDA?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Response Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

answered question 12
skipped question 2

Comments:

Knowing that, with a limited budget, we are being responsive and able to provide what people really want.
We're buying what the patrons really want, not just what we think they want.
Allows patrons to select their own content
OverDrive's ebooks, until recently, have not all been mainstream titles. It helps to have an idea of what patrons actually WANT.
Streamlined selection process. Time savings.
Patrons get what they want - not what we want them to have.
Not having to second guess what might get used by patrons, and having a much larger selection to choose from without having to buy every title. Just the time saved in not having to select and acquire the titles is great for busy library staff.
Allows us to purchase what patrons want.
Latest, greatest form of information library PR coup
Patrons can request items that we haven't purchased.
Serving immediate patron needs.
ensures higher circulation
## Demand Driven Acquisition of Monographs Survey Results

### 10. What is the biggest disadvantage to offering DDA?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>answered question</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>skipped question</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Comments:**

Lack of ability to provide feedback directly to the patron. When we receive requests by other means we can follow up if we are not able to purchase something requested, but not with eBooks, since requests are all 'anonymous.' So a requestor may think we are just being unresponsive.

Cost - they may want more than we can afford to do at one time - take when they request an author of a series - it can be 20 to 30 titles and that's hard to purchase all at once. We purchase a few at a time.

Managing the budget

Some patrons want a LOT. We don’t want our entire collection to be suited to only that one patron.

Selection of items that fall outside the collection policy

Collection could be geared to certain segments of the population

If the price per download is too high that could become a huge cost-prohibitive disadvantage.

Sometimes it is only that one patron who wants that book, or they've made an error and didn't really want that particular title

Variety of devices to learn for staff

Some items we don’t want to purchase, such as abridged audio.

Requests for fringe materials and at high prices, especially from Random House

Higher cost for the library

### 11. What is your role in the library?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role</th>
<th>Response Percent</th>
<th>Response Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Collection Development</td>
<td>26.6%</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cataloging</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Service</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administration / Manager</td>
<td>71.4%</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Other (please specify)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>answered question</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>skipped question</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Comments:
Electronic Resources Librarian
we all do a little collection development - there is another librarian that does most of the e-book purchasing

12. Thank you for taking the time to complete this survey. We will be continuing our research over the next few months and would like to be in contact with survey participants. Would you be willing to be interviewed and contribute to this NISO project?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>84.6%</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>15.4%</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please share any additional comments you have.

2

Comments:
Actually, my library, the [name of state] Library does NOT offer eBooks directly, but I’m the manager of a consortium of 35+ libraries that offer an OverDrive collection to their patrons, and I’m answering the questions regarding DDA from the perspective of the consortium.

In our small area with small budgets, so far DDA has been our most attractive option to offer eBooks. OverDrive's costs are great. Reading is somewhat cumbersome for downloading for some devices. Easy downloading is what patrons want. I understand 3M stands out in this area.