SEECEing a Solution

A recipe for the selection and evaluation of electronic content
Collection Management

How do we allocate our budget?

- Texts
- Print Collections
- Electronic Book
- Databases
- Journals
Some Fun Facts

Format Spend Ratio
- Electronic: 96%
- Print: 4%

Content Spend Ratio
- Databases & Subscriptions: 94%
- Monographs
- Video Streaming
- Textbooks: 6%
More Fun Facts

Student FTE by Discipline

- Business: 14%
- Engineering & Sciences: 23%
- Health & Community: 24%
- Education: 16%
- Arts: 9%
- Pathways Programs: 10%
- Law & Justice: 4%

Students by Level of Study

- Undergraduate: 81%
- Postgraduate: 19%
How do we make decisions?

Accessibility
Duplication
Format
Reporting
Cost
Analytics
Research priorities
Currency
Accreditation
Need
Coursework
Technical Support
And so much more...
Our SEEC recipe

Ingredients

- Content Coverage
- Cost
- Support/Reporting
- Delivery
- Content importance to success
- Consultation
- Accessibility/Functionality
Content coverage

Does the content fill a unique research need and is it necessary for our education goals?

- Uniqueness
- Completeness
- Duplication
- Accuracy
- Quality
- Currency
Is the cost worth the benefit and/or potential outcomes?

- Overall cost
- Cost per use
- Open Access availability
- Inter-Library loan options
- Individual commercial purchase options
Can I gain feedback about performance and support if required?

- Usage data available
- Technical support and system notification processes
- Availability of bib records
- Coverage in Primo Index
Content Delivery

Are the means of delivery suitable and effective?

- IP Access
- SSO Compliant
- Acceptable number of concurrent users
- Perpetual access
- Embargo period
How does this resource contribute to the success of the organisation?

- Student success
- Researcher success
- Teaching and learning
- Institutional reputation
Consultation

How do stakeholders value this resource?

- Liaison Librarians
- Research Librarians
- Academic staff
- Other stakeholders
Does it allow me to achieve my intended goals?

- Appearance
- Navigation
- Range of Formats
- Ability to change formats
- Support Information
Method

1. Assemble ingredients
2. Consult
3. Weigh options
4. Assess and evaluate in institutional oven until done
Result

Evidence based collection decisions
- Reproducible
- Consistent
- Transparent
- Communicable
- Defensible
## An Example

### Content Importance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Database</th>
<th>Student Success</th>
<th>Researcher Success</th>
<th>Teaching &amp; Learning</th>
<th>Institutional Reputation</th>
<th>Uniqueness</th>
<th>Currency</th>
<th>Accuracy</th>
<th>Completeness</th>
<th>Duplication</th>
<th>Overall Rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Insert Name Here</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weighting (1 - Low, 2 - Medium, 3 - High)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Score

<p>| | | | | | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Definitions

- **Student Success**: Access required for UG student study
- **Researcher Success**: Access required for Researcher/PG study
- **Teaching & Learning**: Access required for coursework
- **Institutional Reputation**: Access as deemed important by external parties
- **Uniqueness**: Is similar content available via alternate resources
- **Currency**: Is content up to date
- **Accuracy**: Is the content correct, is it peer reviewed
- **Completeness**: Is there additional cost for historical content
- **Duplication**: Is this content accessible in other USQ subscriptions

### Column K

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Overall Rating</th>
<th>Rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>20 - 30</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31 - 49</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50 - 60</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Column F - I

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Quality</th>
<th>Rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vehemently Agree</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Column J

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Duplication</th>
<th>Rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lots of Duplications</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some Duplication</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Duplication</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Review Parameter</td>
<td>Review Parameter Weighting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost per Usage</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ILL Supply Cost Difference</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Content Importance</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Functionality and Accessibility</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delivery Model</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reporting</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vendor Supply / Support</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Licence Terms</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Overall Score</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Outcome**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Recommend for Renewal / Purchase</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50 - 72</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Liaise with stakeholders regarding Renewal / Purchase</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>25 - 49</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Recommend not to Renew/Purchase</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0 - 24</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Why is this useful?

- Framework for evaluation
- Allows us to weigh up options and consider variables
- Provides evidence for:
  - Comparison
  - Reporting
  - Decision making
  - Storytelling
Evidence-based approach

(Koufogiannakis & Brettle, 2016)
Articulate (What are we trying to achieve overall?)

How do I improve the USQ Library evaluation process for the purchase or renewal of our databases to ensure a transparent, reproducible, consistent, communicable and defensible decision?
Assemble (what evidence do we need)

Use the SEEC Tool as a framework to gather data
- Local evidence
- Research evidence
- Professional knowledge

Create a databank of evaluations
Assess and Agree (Do we like this and will we use it again?)

- Evaluate the outcomes of the tool compared to previous decision making methods
- Agreement about continued use and proposed improvements
Adapt (Tweak the process)

Refining the tool:
• Updating elements
• Adjusting weighting
• Defining terms
• Defining parameters
Articulate (Share the outcome)

Share information with:
• Library staff
• Academic staff
• Organisational leadership

Next steps:
• Define the next question
Top Tips

1. There is no perfect solution
2. Give yourself time
3. Be flexible and adaptable
4. Empower staff to use, understand and improve the tool
References


