

Fanshawe College

FIRST: Fanshawe Innovation, Research, Scholarship, Teaching

Presentations

Conference Presentations and Posters

5-25-2017

Increasing Objectivity in eResource Selection

Megan L. Anderson

Fanshawe College of Applied Arts and Technology, manderson@fanshawec.ca

Follow this and additional works at: http://first.fanshawec.ca/lms_conferencepresentations

Recommended Citation

Anderson, Megan L., "Increasing Objectivity in eResource Selection" (2017). *Presentations*. 1.
http://first.fanshawec.ca/lms_conferencepresentations/1

This Conference Proceeding is brought to you for free and open access by the Conference Presentations and Posters at FIRST: Fanshawe Innovation, Research, Scholarship, Teaching. It has been accepted for inclusion in Presentations by an authorized administrator of FIRST: Fanshawe Innovation, Research, Scholarship, Teaching. For more information, please contact first@fanshawec.ca.



INCREASING OBJECTIVITY IN E-RESOURCE SELECTION

May 25 2017

Welcome and Overview

- Background and Context
- What was the problem?
- How did we solve it?
- Where are we now?
- Questions

About Us

- Fanshawe College
- London, ON
- 14,030 FTE
- 3 librarians
- Original campus – only campus with a library
- Several satellite campuses
- 101 databases, 34 paid



Megan Anderson:

- Former Assessment, Media, and Access Services Librarian
- Research and Curriculum Librarian for Schools of Aviation Technology; Building Technology; Contemporary Media; Design; Language and Liberal Studies; Public Safety; Tourism & Hospitality; and Transportation Technology



Linda Crosby:

- Former Systems and Technical Services Librarian
- Research and Curriculum Librarian for Schools of Nursing; Health Sciences; Information Technology; and Applied Science and Technology



Wendy Tippin
Library Technician – Periodicals & eResources



Laura Holton
Library Technician – Technical & Media Services

Background

- Poor Canadian dollar
- Budget cuts
- Want to keep everything – and add more!
- What can we do?

First Steps

- Environmental Scan
- Literature Review
- Formulate a Solution
- Plan of attack

Criteria

- Content
- Required Resource
- Cost Sharing
- Cost
- # of Applicable Programs
- Cost per Expected User
- Actual Cost per Use
- Currency of Content
- Licensing & Authentication
- Ease of Use
- Overlap of Content
- Depth of Coverage
- Opportunity Cost
- Vendor Support
- Perpetual Access
- Brand Recognition
- % of Budget Assigned to Applicable School(s)
- Frequency of course offering

Criteria Description Tab

Priority				
<i>Purchase/renew resource based on priority rating</i>				
1	2	3	4	
329-412	244-328	159-243	73-158	
<i>high priority purchase/renewal; robustly meets all requirements</i>	<i>general meets all requirements; purchase/renew if funds available</i>	<i>meets minimal requirements; purchase/renew with caution</i>	<i>does not meet basic requirements; do not purchase or renew</i>	
Content (x10)				
<i>Consider scope, authority, etc. as applicable</i>				
4	3	2	1	
Good	Acceptable	Problematic	Unacceptable	
<i>broad scope, all reputable publishers, reliable submission review process</i>	<i>reasonable scope, over 75% reliable publishers, reasonable submission review process</i>	<i>marginable scope, 1-74% reputable publishers, questionable submission review process</i>	<i>limited scope, no reputable publishers, no apparent submission review process</i>	
Required Resource (x10)				
<i>Is this a resource required for accreditation or is otherwise essential to the program?</i>				
4	3	2	1	
Essential / Must Have	Important / Should Have	Useful / Could Have	Marginal	
<i>a core resource integral to supporting a program and so necessary that the library needs to fund it if at all possible</i>	<i>a major resource for a program; recommended by faculty</i>	<i>a significant resource for a program</i>	<i>directly relevant to supporting a field within a program</i>	
Cost Sharing (x10)				
<i>Is the cost of this resource shared with other program(s)?</i>				
4	3	2	1	0
Full	Primarily Other	Equal Split	Primarily Library	None
<i>whole cost is paid by other</i>	<i>cost is split between other & library; other pays more than 50%</i>	<i>library and other split cost 50/50</i>	<i>cost is split between other & library; library pays more than 50%</i>	<i>whole cost is paid by library</i>

Criteria Weighting

- Content (x10)
- Required Resource (x10)
- Cost Sharing (x10)
- Cost (x8)
- # of Applicable Programs (x8)
- Cost per Expected User (x8)
- Actual Cost per Use (x8)
- Currency of Content (x8)
- Licensing & Authentication (x6)
- Ease of Use (x6)
- Overlap of Content (x6)
- Depth of Coverage (x6)
- Opportunity Cost (x4)
- Vendor Support (x2)
- Perpetual Access (x1)
- Brand Recognition (x1)
- % of Budget Assigned to Applicable School(s) (x1)
- Unweighted: Frequency of course offering

Criteria Weighting Rationale Tab

Criteria	Rationale
Priority	The Priority number calculated for a particular resource is calculated after the resource has been put through the matrix.
Content (x10)	Content of a particular resource is one of, if not the, most important factors in determining a resources value. Our beliefs on this particular criteria were reinforced by Mangrum and Pozzebon's 2012 study[1], and Walters' 2016 article[2]. As such, this criteria was assigned the top possible value score of 10.
Required Resource (x10)	Resources required for programs to maintain accreditation are, naturally, more important than others and therefore this criteria was assigned a value score of 10.
Cost Sharing (x10)	Given the current economic climate, the amount of money a program or school is able to contribute to a resource heavily influences our ability to make a purchase, resulting in this criteria begin assigned a value score of 10.
Cost (x8)	Cost is one of the most important considerations when reviewing potential purchases, however it is not one of the top considerations and so was assigned a value score of 8.
# of Applicable Programs (x8)	The number of programs that may find a particular resource useful speaks directly to value for money. Something may have a low initial cost, but may not be useful – thereby having low value for money. This is equally as important as the initial cost, so was also assigned a value score of 8.
Cost per Expected User (x8)	As important as the overall cost, the cost per expected user of a particular resource is equally important and speaks to value for money. Some resources are specialized, and it is not reasonable to compare their usage statistics to those of resources intended for a more general audience. This criteria should create a more equitable playing field. This criteria has been assigned a value of 8.
Actual Cost per Use (x8)	The number of uses any particular resource has requires further context. For example, a resource may have 1000 uses that are only \$0.02/use or they may have 100 uses that are \$3.50/use. This further contextualization allows accurate assessment of value for money and return on investment. This criteria has been assigned a value of 8, in line with the weight of other cost criteria.
Currency of Content (x8)	Currency of content is almost as important as overall content. While a database may have lots of title holdings, it is important to consider how current the content is – for example, heavily embargoed resources are not particularly useful and reduce the value of the resource. A value of 8 has been assigned to this criteria.























Database Data

- Name
- Cost
- Expected Users
- Cost per Expected User
- Actual Use
- Actual Cost per Use
- Cost Sharing
- Vendor Support
- % of Budget
- Perpetual Access
- Depth of Coverage
- Comments


Database Data

Name	Cost	Expected Users	Cost per Expected User	Actual Use	Actual Cost per Use	Cost Sharing	Vendor Support	% of Budget
MasterFILE Elite	\$0	15305	\$0.00		#DIV/0!	0		0%
ODESI	\$1,500	15305	\$0.10	90	\$16.67	0		
Ontario Real Estate Law Guide		1010	\$0.00		#DIV/0!	0		
Oxford Music Online	\$2,719	1205	\$2.26	80	\$33.99	0		1.00%
Proquest Nursing & Allied Health	\$5,104	4515	\$1.13	26074	\$0.20	0		11.80%
Proquest Research Library	\$36,300	15305	\$2.37	32328	\$1.12	3		
PsycArticles	\$13,987	4515	\$3.10	11756	\$1.19	0		
Quicklaw Plus	\$12,264	1010	\$12.14	9208		2		11.70%
RxTx	\$7,968	4515	\$1.76	25748	\$0.31	0		11.80%
ScienceDirect Health & Life	\$4,872	6239	\$0.78	7585	\$0.64	0		11.80%
ScienceDirect Phys. Science & Engin.	\$3,512	2053	\$1.71			0		6.80%
ScienceDirect - Social Sciences	\$4,872	6859	\$0.71	4650	\$1.05	0		1.40%
SimplyMap + PRIZM5	\$15,413	2636	\$5.85			1		
SocINDEX	\$7,896	4515	\$1.75	7461	\$1.06	0		
Statista	\$10,000	15305	\$0.65	2642	\$3.79	0		
WestlawNext (Law Source)	\$20,328	1010	\$20.13	23226	\$0.88	2		11.70%
WGSN (Worth Global Style Net.)	\$7,600	1169	\$6.50	184385	\$0.04	1		6.40%

Results Tab

	Name	Priority
1		
2	ABI/INFORM Global	 2
3	Academic Search Complete	 1
4	ACM Digital Library	 1
5	AOAC Official Methods ...	 4
6	Applied Science & Technology	 2
7	Art Full Text	 2
8	ARTstor	 1
9	Business Source Complete	 2
10	Cdn. Points of View	 2
11	CBCA Complete +	 2
12	CINAHL Plus Full Text	 1
13	Cochrane Database of System...	 2
14	CPI.Q / Academic OneFile / Info.	 2
15	Criminal Source	 2
16	DLI (Data Liberation Initiatives)	 4
17	DMTI	 4
18	eFunda	 4
19	LabourSource	 2
20	MasterFILE Elite	 4
21	ODESI	 4
22	Ontario Real Estate Law Guide	 4
23	Oxford Music Online	 3

Charts Tab



Implementation

- Individual evaluation
- Multidisciplinary resources
- Group evaluation
- School assignments to determine workload

What now?

- Implement identified revisions
- Create a second matrix for new purchases
- Confirm the schedule and responsibilities
- Use the matrix for other resources?
- Expand data visualization
- Discuss adding accessibility as criteria

Lessons Learned

- We aren't emotionless robots – even when we try to be
- We need to be tougher
- Collections decisions are complex
- Instinct is important



QUESTIONS?



THANK YOU!