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My Approach:

1. To be exploratory
2. To be provocative
3. This is a preliminary view, but one that I believe could (or should) lead to a reconsideration of library practice

Based on presentation first given at the Coalition for Networked Information, Fall Meeting, Portland, OR, December 7, 2004
Underlying Assumptions:

- **Collections drive library practice** because most library resources go into purchasing, organizing, and managing them. In addition, libraries base much of their identity on their collections.

- **Unless current collection practices are changed, libraries cannot change**, except on the margins.
Underlying Assumptions:

• Libraries must change.

• Therefore collection practices and strategies must change.

Underlying Assumptions:

- This change will be very hard

- We need to develop arguments and a vocabulary so we talk about this issue clearly

- To do this we need to have a clear conceptual understanding of what we hope to accomplish
My Fear:

I will be the Daniel Gore of the early 21st century.

Agenda for Today:

• Supply versus Demand driven collection strategies
• Present a model of demand for library collections over the next 25 years
• Explore implications of the model
• Propose alternative approach to collection practice based on the model

• Discussion
Supply Driven Strategy

• Historically this is the way libraries have approached collections

• Collect it and they will check it out

• Responds to expressed needs of high-end users — the faculty — and uses them as allies to get more dollars so we can build larger collections
Supply Driven Strategy

• In a print world this was not a bad strategy. Demand for materials was, and is, unpredictable and to serve a local community well print materials need to be in that community. So building large “just in case” collections made sense.

• Except…
Supply Driven Strategy

• Lead to **judging quality by size** (as in the ARL rankings) and libraries were then held captive to this standard

• Lead to **inelastic demand for journals** and the exploitation of this fact by commercial publishers
Demand Driven Strategy

• Look at how collections are actually used, not at expressed need

• Modify collecting based on changes in the actual use

• “Follow the User”
My Model
Really a Thought Experiment

• Makes assumptions about the use of various types of information sources

• Projects these assumptions over 25 years — 2005 to 2029
Variables in the Model

1. Use of the free web versus scholarly/library materials

2. Use of purchased library materials versus the use of open access materials

3. Database use versus the use of other purchased materials
Variables in the Model

4. Use of paper books versus electronic books

5. Use of paper journals versus electronic journals

6. Use of books versus journals
Problems:

1. **Continuity** over this time frame is unlikely

2. **Categories are fuzzy**
   - Is ebrary electronic books or a database?
   - What is ArtSTOR?

3. There is little or **no good data** of the sort need to drive the model
My Solution

• Charge ahead

• Make up numbers that seem reasonable

• Look at the big picture and not worry too much about the details
Open Web versus “Scholarly” Materials

• **Current Use:** “Scholarly” Materials 75%

• **Change:**
  2005 to 2009 — Library Materials decline 3.0% per year
  2010 to 2014 — Library Materials decline 2.5% per year
  2015 to 2019 — Library Materials decline 2.0% per year
  2020 to 2024 — Library Materials decline 1.5% per year
  2025 to 2029 — Library Materials decline 1.0% per year
Open Web versus “Scholarly” Materials

![Graph showing the percentage of Library Resources and Free Web materials from 2006 to 2029. The graph indicates a decreasing trend in free web materials over the years, with a steady increase in library resources.](image-url)
Purchased versus Open Access

• **Current Use:** Open Access 10%

• **Change:**
  2005 to 2009 — Open Access increases 15% per year
  2010 to 2014 — Open Access increases 10% per year
  2015 to 2019 — Open Access increases 7.5% per year
  2020 to 2024 — Open Access increases 5% per year
  2025 to 2029 — Open Access increases 2% per year
Purchased versus Open Access
Databases versus Other Purchased

• **Current Use:** Database Use 25%

• **Change:**
  2005 to 2009 — Database use increases 1% per year
  2010 to 2014 — Database use increases 1% per year
  2015 to 2019 — Database use increases 1% per year
  2020 to 2024 — Database use increases 1% per year
  2025 to 2030 — Database use increases 1% per year
Databases versus Other Purchased

The chart illustrates the percentage of purchases attributed to databases versus other materials over a span of years from 2005 to 2029. Over this period, the proportion of purchases made for databases remains consistently high, indicating a significant reliance on databases for purchases.
Paper versus Electronic Books

- **Current Use:** Electronic Books 5% of use

- **Change:**
  2005 to 2009 — E-Book use increases 15% per year
  2010 to 2014 — E-Book use increases 15% per year
  2015 to 2019 — E-Book use increases 15% per year
  2020 to 2024 — E-Book use increases 10% per year
  2025 to 2030 — E-Book use increases 5% per year
Paper versus Electronic Books
E-Book Use at Duke

“Based on this method of evaluation, e-books received 11 percent more use than comparable print books. Given their recent introduction to patrons at Duke, this suggests rapid growth in the adoption of e-books.”

p. 260.

Paper versus Electronic Journals

• **Current Use:** 20% Paper — 80% Electronic

• **Change:**
  
  2005 to 2009 — Electronic Journal use increases 2% per year
  2010 to 2014 — Electronic Journal use increases 1% per year
  2015 to 2019 — Electronic Journal use increases 1% per year
  2020 to 2024 — Electronic Journal use increases 0.5% per year
  2025 to 2030 — no change
Paper versus Electronic Journals
Books versus Journals

- **Current Use:** 40% Books - 60% Journals
- **Change:** None
Results

The graph shows the percentage of resources available in the years from 2005 to 2029. The y-axis represents the percentage, ranging from 0% to 100%. The x-axis lists the years from 2005 to 2029. The graph categorizes the resources into three types: Purchased, Open Access, and Free Web. The colors used are blue for Purchased, maroon for Open Access, and yellow for Free Web. The data indicates a gradual decrease in the purchased category over the years, while the open access and free web categories show an increase.
## Results — Use of Purchased versus Free Material

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2005</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2025</th>
<th>2029</th>
<th>Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Purchased</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>-70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open Access</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>254%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Free Web</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>113%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2005</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2025</th>
<th>2029</th>
<th>Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Paper Books</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>-92%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electronic Books</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>293%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paper Journals</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>-94%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electronic Journals</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>-68%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Databases</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>-62%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open Access Monographs</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>254%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open Access Journals</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>254%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Free Web</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>113%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

100% 100% 100% 100% 100% 100%
Conclusions

• Use of purchased library collections will decline **significantly!!!**
• Continued increases in **collection budgets** at the rates of the past several decades will **not be justifiable**
• Performance oversupply
• **Open Access** will need to be **successful** and libraries will have to help make this happen — **It will be**
Implications: Collection Strategies

Model a hypothetical library under two scenarios

1. Continue current collecting practice

2. Base collecting on the patterns of use or demand — “Follow the User” model
## Hypothetical Library — Budget

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Budget</th>
<th>Cost per Unit</th>
<th>Units Purchased</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Paper Books</td>
<td>$600,000</td>
<td>$50.00</td>
<td>12,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electronic Books</td>
<td>$60,000</td>
<td>$75.00</td>
<td>800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Databases</td>
<td>$500,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paper Journals</td>
<td>$800,000</td>
<td>$500.00</td>
<td>1,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electronic Journals</td>
<td>$800,000</td>
<td>$500.00</td>
<td>1,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Binding</td>
<td>$28,000</td>
<td>$10.00</td>
<td>2,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$2,788,000</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# Hypothetical Library — Processing Costs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service</th>
<th>Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Paper Books</td>
<td>$40.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E-Books</td>
<td>$5.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paper Journals</td>
<td>$75.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electronic Journals</td>
<td>$30.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Binding</td>
<td>$10.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Hypothetical Library — Inflation Rates

Books 2%
Journals 8%
Databases 5%
Processing 2%
Binding 2%
Hypothetical Library — Changes in Practice

1. Migrate from 50/50 split between paper and electronic journals to a 20/80 split by 2015

2. Migrate from 94/6 split between paper books and e-books to a 40/60 split by 2020
Results - Current Practice Costs

- Paper Books
- Electronic Books
- Databases
- Paper Journals
- Electronic Journals
- Binding

Costs:
- $0
- $2,000,000
- $4,000,000
- $6,000,000
- $8,000,000
- $10,000,000
- $12,000,000
- $14,000,000

Years:
- 2005
- 2006
- 2007
- 2008
- 2009
- 2010
- 2011
- 2012
- 2013
- 2014
- 2015
- 2016
- 2017
- 2018
- 2019
- 2020
- 2021
- 2022
- 2023
- 2024
- 2025
- 2026
- 2027
- 2028
- 2029
## Results - Current Practice Costs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2005</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2025</th>
<th>2029</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Books</td>
<td>$660,000</td>
<td>$631,710</td>
<td>$944,964</td>
<td>$1,119,762</td>
<td>$1,236,308</td>
<td>$1,338,220</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Databases</td>
<td>$500,000</td>
<td>$638,141</td>
<td>$814,447</td>
<td>$1,039,464</td>
<td>$1,326,649</td>
<td>$1,612,550</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Journals</td>
<td>$1,600,000</td>
<td>$2,350,925</td>
<td>$3,454,280</td>
<td>$5,075,471</td>
<td>$7,457,531</td>
<td>$10,145,889</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Binding</td>
<td>$28,000</td>
<td>$23,071</td>
<td>$16,812</td>
<td>$15,504</td>
<td>$17,118</td>
<td>$18,529</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Processing</td>
<td>$680,000</td>
<td>$630,050</td>
<td>$562,337</td>
<td>$510,784</td>
<td>$563,947</td>
<td>$610,434</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>$3,468,000</td>
<td>$4,273,896</td>
<td>$5,792,841</td>
<td>$7,760,985</td>
<td>$10,601,553</td>
<td>$13,725,622</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Annual Rate of Increase Total | 5.2% | 5.7% | 6.2% | 6.5% | 6.7% |
| Annual Rate of Increase Materials | 6.5% | 6.6% | 6.8% | 6.8% | 7.0% |
## Results - Price Increases Current Practice Projection

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2005</th>
<th>2029</th>
<th>Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Books</td>
<td>$50</td>
<td>$80</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Journals</td>
<td>$500</td>
<td>$3,170</td>
<td>534%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Price Increases 1975 to 2000

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1975</th>
<th>2000</th>
<th>Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Books - U.S. Hardcover</td>
<td>$16.19</td>
<td>$60.80</td>
<td>275.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S. Periodicals</td>
<td>$19.94</td>
<td>$261.56</td>
<td>1,211.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Current Practice Projection versus ARL Mean 1980 to 2003 — Material Budget Percentage Increase

![Graph showing material budget percentage increase from 1980 to 2003 comparing current practice with ARL mean. The graph includes a line for ARL materials expenditures and another for current practice.](image-url)
Current Practice Projection versus ARL Mean 1980 to 2003 — Material Budget Expenditures

In year 5 A is $133,001.8% less than Current Practice Projection. That is $8 or 8.6% more than the mean 25 year period.
Current Practice - Summary

• Even though this seems like an **impossible** scenario, **we have just lived through it**

• **But, it will not happen again!!!**
“Follow the User” Collection Strategy

• Begin with current collecting patterns

• Change the number of items purchased in a category based on the changes in use — if book use drops by 5%, buy 5% fewer books

• Same processing and inflation assumptions also same shift from paper to electronic books and journals
“Follow the User” — Guess What Happens to Costs?
Results — “Follow the User”
Collection Strategy

![Graph showing the collection strategy over the years]

- Paper Books
- Electronic Books
- Databases
- Paper Journals
- Electronic Journals
- Binding
Results — “Follow the User”
Collection Strategy

[Diagram showing annual collection costs from 2005 to 2029, with categories for Processing, Books, Databases, Journals, and Binding.]

- Processing
- Books
- Databases
- Journals
- Binding

Costs are displayed in increments of $500,000 from $0 to $4,500,000 for each year from 2005 to 2029.
## Results — “Follow the User” Collection Strategy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2005</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2025</th>
<th>2029</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Books</td>
<td>$660,000</td>
<td>$499,228</td>
<td>$540,066</td>
<td>$470,516</td>
<td>$390,136</td>
<td>$361,916</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Databases</td>
<td>$500,000</td>
<td>$519,486</td>
<td>$532,751</td>
<td>$535,833</td>
<td>$551,288</td>
<td>$608,447</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Journals</td>
<td>$1,600,000</td>
<td>$1,789,951</td>
<td>$1,974,192</td>
<td>$2,132,674</td>
<td>$2,353,336</td>
<td>$2,743,911</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Binding</td>
<td>$28,000</td>
<td>$17,566</td>
<td>$9,609</td>
<td>$6,515</td>
<td>$5,402</td>
<td>$5,011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Processing</td>
<td>$680,000</td>
<td>$479,709</td>
<td>$321,387</td>
<td>$214,628</td>
<td>$177,962</td>
<td>$165,089</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$3,468,000</strong></td>
<td><strong>$3,305,939</strong></td>
<td><strong>$3,378,005</strong></td>
<td><strong>$3,360,165</strong></td>
<td><strong>$3,478,123</strong></td>
<td><strong>$3,884,373</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual Rate of Increase Total</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
<td>2.7%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual Rate of Increase Materials</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
<td>3.2%</td>
<td>2.9%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Cost Comparison

- Current Practice
- Follow the User
Results — “Follow the User”
Collection Strategy

Books

Journals
## Results — “Follow the User” Collection Strategy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2005</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2025</th>
<th>2029</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Paper Books</td>
<td>12,000</td>
<td>7,382</td>
<td>4,225</td>
<td>2,151</td>
<td>1,616</td>
<td>1,385</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electronic Books</td>
<td>800</td>
<td>2,363</td>
<td>3,091</td>
<td>3,227</td>
<td>2,424</td>
<td>2,077</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Books</td>
<td>12,800</td>
<td>9,746</td>
<td>7,315</td>
<td>5,378</td>
<td>4,039</td>
<td>3,462</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of 2005</td>
<td>76.1%</td>
<td>57.2%</td>
<td>42.0%</td>
<td>31.6%</td>
<td>27.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paper Journals</td>
<td>1,600</td>
<td>853</td>
<td>366</td>
<td>269</td>
<td>202</td>
<td>173</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electronic Journals</td>
<td>1,600</td>
<td>1,584</td>
<td>1,463</td>
<td>1,076</td>
<td>808</td>
<td>692</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Journals</td>
<td>3,200</td>
<td>2,436</td>
<td>1,829</td>
<td>1,345</td>
<td>1,010</td>
<td>865</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of 2005</td>
<td>76.1%</td>
<td>57.2%</td>
<td>42.0%</td>
<td>31.6%</td>
<td>27.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
“Follow the User” Collection Strategy Comments

1. This version of a “follow the user” strategy may be too aggressive, but the general approach makes sense

2. Decreasing purchased collections is only one part of what is required

3. Other part is need for libraries to support open access
With Repository

$500,000 to start with 5% increase per year
## With Repository

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2005</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2025</th>
<th>2029</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Materials Budget</strong></td>
<td>$2,788,000</td>
<td>$2,930,236</td>
<td>$3,056,618</td>
<td>$3,145,537</td>
<td>$3,300,161</td>
<td>$3,719,284</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Processing</strong></td>
<td>$680,000</td>
<td>$479,709</td>
<td>$321,387</td>
<td>$214,628</td>
<td>$177,962</td>
<td>$165,089</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Repository</strong></td>
<td>$500,000</td>
<td>$638,141</td>
<td>$775,664</td>
<td>$989,966</td>
<td>$1,263,475</td>
<td>$1,535,762</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>$3,968,000</td>
<td>$4,048,086</td>
<td>$4,153,669</td>
<td>$4,350,130</td>
<td>$4,741,598</td>
<td>$5,420,135</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Annual Rate of Increase Total</strong></td>
<td>1.0%</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
<td>3.5%</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Cost Comparison with Repository
What this Means to Me

1. Assuming open access develops as it should, libraries can develop their collections in an appropriate way at a reasonable cost

2. To do so requires that we change our collection building strategies — near term

3. To do so requires developing a new way of thinking about the role of the library — long term
New Collection Strategies — Near Term

• Really really good document delivery — maximize the use of paper collections
• Leverage the attributes of electronic formats
  – Aggregated journal collections purchased on an FTE basis
  – “selected” collection versus user-drive purchasing (or Patron Driven Access - PDA) especially for e-books
New Model — Long Term and More Important

Libraries have two roles:

1. To make purchased collections available to the members of the library’s community
2. To make special or unique collections held/managed by the library available to the world
New Model

In most libraries today
  90% of the money for purchased collections
  10% into special collections

Over the next 25 years this should change to at least a 50/50 split
New Model

- Libraries should **claim responsibility for institutional repository**

- This role should be **defined broadly** to include digital libraries and digital publishing
New Model

• Put infrastructure in place — technology and people
• Some metadata is library responsibility
• Developing repository collections is part of librarian’s liaison work
• Pay some authors fees for open access journals
• Fund national initiatives, for example Open Content Alliance and LOCKSS
New Model

• Library Assets
  – Institutional commitment to access and preservation for the long haul
  – Knowledge of how to do this (at least we know more than anyone else — for now)
  – Significant resources (if we can repurpose them)
Internal Political Dynamic

• Current materials purchasing is (or is generally viewed as being) balanced across the university

• Repository/Digital Libraries must also be seem as a university-wide service which serves all segments of the campus
“Free Rider” in the Commons

• Repository effort is self-serving because open access serves the institution and faculty by making their works easily available thus enhancing institutional and individual prestige
The Practical Question

• What annual percentage increase does the library need to manage its legacy print collections and to establish itself in the electronic/web environment?

• Answer — 2.5% to 3.0% a year
The Practical Question
The Practical Question — IUPUI

- 15 year model of IUPUI University Library materials budget
  - 2.5% annual increase
  - Hold book/serials dollar split constant for all schools
  - 8% serials inflation and 2% book inflation
  - 50% annual increase in document delivery for five years and 10% per year after that
  - Add 0.5% of total materials budget to digitization fund each year (year one 0.5%, year two 1%, etc.)
  - Standard school allocation model
The Practical Question — IUPUI
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## The Practical Question — IUPUI

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2006/07</th>
<th>2011/12</th>
<th>2016/17</th>
<th>2021/22</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Budget Reserve</strong></td>
<td>$50,000</td>
<td>$57,596</td>
<td>$66,794</td>
<td>$73,728</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Document Delivery</strong></td>
<td>$26,500</td>
<td>$98,381</td>
<td>$174,288</td>
<td>$255,176</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Reference &amp; General</strong></td>
<td>$163,000</td>
<td>$163,000</td>
<td>$163,000</td>
<td>$163,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Electronic Resources &amp;</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E-Book Projects</td>
<td>$615,000</td>
<td>$719,463</td>
<td>$910,350</td>
<td>$1,064,981</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Other</strong></td>
<td>$139,700</td>
<td>$134,419</td>
<td>$125,318</td>
<td>$119,836</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Digital Conversion</strong></td>
<td>$17,500</td>
<td>$91,530</td>
<td>$217,232</td>
<td>$311,997</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Schools Books</strong></td>
<td>$643,529</td>
<td>$645,121</td>
<td>$700,378</td>
<td>$733,077</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Schools Serials</strong></td>
<td>$1,823,371</td>
<td>$1,930,213</td>
<td>$2,095,542</td>
<td>$2,193,377</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>$3,478,600</td>
<td>$3,839,724</td>
<td>$4,452,902</td>
<td>$4,915,171</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2006/07</th>
<th>2011/12</th>
<th>2016/17</th>
<th>2021/22</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Budget Reserve</strong></td>
<td>1.44%</td>
<td>1.50%</td>
<td>1.50%</td>
<td>1.50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Document Delivery</strong></td>
<td>0.76%</td>
<td>2.56%</td>
<td>3.91%</td>
<td>5.19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Reference &amp; General</strong></td>
<td>4.69%</td>
<td>4.25%</td>
<td>3.66%</td>
<td>3.32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Electronic Resources &amp;</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E-Book Projects</td>
<td>17.68%</td>
<td>18.74%</td>
<td>20.44%</td>
<td>21.67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Other</strong></td>
<td>4.02%</td>
<td>3.50%</td>
<td>2.81%</td>
<td>2.44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Digital Conversion</strong></td>
<td>0.50%</td>
<td>2.38%</td>
<td>4.88%</td>
<td>6.35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Schools Books</strong></td>
<td>18.50%</td>
<td>16.80%</td>
<td>15.73%</td>
<td>14.91%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Schools Serials</strong></td>
<td>52.42%</td>
<td>50.27%</td>
<td>47.06%</td>
<td>44.62%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Books from 13,165 to 11,290 decline of 14.2%
Serials from 2,635 to 1,333 decline of 49.4%
New Model — Conclusion

• By selling the repository role and open access
• And by documenting actual use of resources

• You can then make the case for constraining expenditures on purchased resources
• And then you can create the new model
Questions??
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