

# User research Plan

## Background

ICOLC Needs assessment: [https://docs.google.com/document/d/1\\_XKIJAhd4pO6-Vt9qYg2ITZbSj4HyZpiJrtHBVBc8/edit?usp=sharing](https://docs.google.com/document/d/1_XKIJAhd4pO6-Vt9qYg2ITZbSj4HyZpiJrtHBVBc8/edit?usp=sharing)

## Plan

interviews with small groups representing 2-3 library/consortia. Ask them demographic and outcome-based questions and ask them to demo any tools used.

Purpose is to define

- User persona types
- Relationships between user/institution/consortia
- Which demographic characteristics are useful to have in the product

## Question Areas

### Background/Demographics

- Role/Institutional associations
  - Do you work for a consortia or a library?
    - If library, what type?
    - Size of collection
    - Size of user population
    - How many FTE
- Responsibilities
  - What is your title
  - What are your main responsibilities
  - How does your work involve usage statistics for licensed resources
- For consortial user:
  - What demographics about institutions are important to have in connections to usage data

### Statistics and Reports

- Reports we need to ingest
  - What is the minimal set of vendors we must be able to work with
  - Extent of non-COUNTER data or manually uploaded is needed
  - COUNTER 4 vs. 5 support
    - Do you even need COUNTER 4 support? If so, which? Must it be COUNTER 4, or would a view replicating it suffice

- Views we need to create
  - How much do users need to customize
- Faceting/filtering tools
- Sources of reports other than COUNTER/SUSHI
- Scheduling
- Alerting and other workflow tools
- Cross-consortial benchmarking or other sharing issues
- What types of stats, regardless of specific reports
  - What types of stats are you looking for (either general characteristic (usage, denials, etc.) or specific reports)
  - For what types of materials (journals, books, etc.)
  - At what level of granularity (title, article, download, etc.)
  - For which users (student, faculty, general, staff, etc.)
  - Walk through your typical workflow/tasks
  - How far back would you want to access data
- COUNTER 4 v. 5
  - What COUNTER 4 reports do you use
  - Are you familiar with/expecting to use any particular COUNTER 5 reports
  - Are there stats or views of stats that you would like to get out of COUNTER 4/5 but either aren't or have to aggregate manually
- Sources of stats
  - Reports from vendors (other than COUNTER)
  - Proxy log reports
  - Web analytics
  - Other APIs
  - Other spreadsheet data
- Frequency of need for stats
  - How often do you download stats
  - For what time period
- What are the primary vendors we need CCPLUS to support
- Are there automated messages or alerts that you would like to receive from the system?
  - How frequently would you expect to be notified?

### End use

- Export options
- Tool integrations
- Storing of data
- Do you want an export
  - Do you need the raw COUNTER report?
- Downstream uses/other tools
  - What do you do with statistics after you request them

- Do you combine them with other data
- Do you use other tools to look at or analyze them
- What kinds of data would you want to see about usage in other consortia?
- What kinds of data would you want/not want shared about the usage in your consortia?

### **Membership/Permissions**

- Relationships between user/institution/consortia
- Privacy and security issues for institutions within consortia
- Shared and comparison data needs
- Shared access -- what roles within your consortia/org do you imagine
  - Do others in your org use stats
  - How do you manage/hand off this work with them

### **Installation/Configuration**

- Model for hosted service
- Needs for local installation
- Desire for extensibility
- Local infrastructure/support
  - Hosted
    - Price
    - Packaging with other tools?
    - Service expectation
    - Security/privacy expectation
  - Local
    - Install/configure issues
    - maintenance/help issues
    - Local users
    - Do you anticipate wanting to customize the code? To what degree
    - What kind of support do you have for software installation and maintenance?
- Would you expect to run a product like CCPLUS as a standalone component (hosted or not) or would you expect it to be integrated into an existing tool you use?

## **Findings**

### **Institutional Make-up**

- Range in size from about a dozen to multiple hundreds
- Some contained smaller consortia within their consortia

- Others were all branches of a single administrative unit
- All had members who maintain other subscriptions outside of what is consortially licensed
- Many used different categorizations for comparisons of their stats
  - FTE of the institution
  - Consortia-defined type (e.g. “public, private, hospital, etc.)
  - Carnegie Classification

### **Nature of stats gathered**

- Journals, databases and ebooks most common
- Usage by download or full-text most commonly used
- Several mentioned importance of getting OA info as well
- Consortia report after move to R5 is obviously a big issue
- Other COUNTER stats are less frequently used, but also less commonly provided; generally more data is better as long as they can filter out what they need
- Databases are sometimes best characterized by searches instead of downloads
- Frequency of use varies from annually to monthly
- Some look at other types of stats, such as proxy logs or vendor-specific data. Expectations about using these in combination with COUNTER reports within an interface was mixed. In some cases the data is using a different metric for different reasons. In others would be good to be able to modify the format to match COUNTER and upload them
- Several mentioned comparing usage stats with other kinds of stats like ILL requests, reference data, etc. more of a qualitative comparison

### **Methods for harvesting stats**

- Both automated and manual methods are used for downloading reports
- Some rely on publishers to send to reports individually
- Spreadsheets, particularly tab-delimited or comma-separated, are the most commonly used final format
- Raw COUNTER reports in XML or spreadsheet are kept by some, but not all; New COUNTER reports in JSON will pose more problems for manual workflows
- 3-5 years was the most commonly used past time period, although several indicated a strong preference for wanting to have as much history as they could
- Many need to be able to send out reports to members in spreadsheet format
- Validation of reports is a manual and time-consuming process for many
- Biggest validation issue is the different way that different publishers refer to the same place
- Sometimes a tool like Tableau is used for its database functionality (to join tables) rather than just as a visualization
- Restated data is also a time-consuming workflow for those gathering statistics more frequently than semi-annually
- Keeping versioning metadata about when reports are downloaded or restated is important; keeping versions of the data is less important

### **Consortial needs/uses for stats**

- Consortia need to be able to separate out what they have licensed vs. what an institution has individually licensed (“Entitlements with GoKB would be the dream”); This is a problem for several institutions already in the reports they receive
- Visualizations are helpful to several members. All indicated an interest; but some imagined CCPLUS as more of a “storehouse” and still anticipated they would do their own analysis with other tools (tableau, excel, access, OpenRefine, google sheets, etc.)
- Customizable timeline for viewing reports is important. The license terms don’t necessarily line up with calendar and fiscal years differ
- Most important factor with usage statistics is ability to determine cost per use
- There were differing levels of interest in alerts about spikes in activity. For relatively low-use material, an increase of even 10 uses would be significant. Academic year fluctuation could also produce noise. If these kinds of features were incorporated, they would have to be highly customizable; Some preference expressed for this to be an indication in the interface and not an email or other notification
- Alerts about restated data would be useful to those who gather statistics more than semi-annually
- Some institutions do use non-Counter, vendor-supplied stats fairly heavily. As of this point, incorporating those into CCPLUS was not seen as a high priority since the reports may be providing very different metrics that are incompatible with COUNTER metrics
- Some institutions would use CCPLUS most for consortial use and others would see it as more of a service to their members; however, all imagined some self-service aspect to the service for their members

#### **Sharing access with libraries/members**

- Library/member usage of a CCPLUS dashboard was anticipated by all; however, the level of library interest and participation anticipated varied
- Some imagined that their libraries would be able to identify and add in their own SUSHI credentials while others imagined that all administrative functionality would reside within the consortia
- The question of whether a library would be able to add in their own subscriptions in addition to the consortia-managed ones came up in several meetings. Some felt their members would really like this feature, but were unsure how it would be managed.
- Most were comfortable with members within their consortia being able to see each others basic usage statistics for benchmarking purposes, although some less so. This becomes particularly fraught if libraries are adding other licensed resources, or if price information is shared
- Only one objected to sharing stats with other consortia if the data was sufficiently anonymized, but it wasn’t of high interest; would need to be highly in control of what is shared and be able to go on an institution-by-institution basis

#### **Consortia Manager possibilities**

- Interest in using CCPLUS through consortia manager was mixed. Not all are currently using consortia manager
- Levels of integration anticipated with the functions CM already provides were mixed. Some would be happy if they just had access to usage comparison statistics in a separate module.

Others wanted the usage integrated with the other data around cost and institution so that usage was more seamless

- Some worried that the software may eventually become dependent on CM and only available as a hosted service through it
- One mentioned that their use of CM is intended to increase the self-service of their membership and having usage stats there would primarily be to allow their members to see their own stats
- Keeping data in sync between CM and CCPLUS would also be important.

#### **Installation issues**

- Many were interested in the idea of a hosted service
- The factor most likely to persuade them would be cost; extensive support was not required – the main reason for hosting was simply to not have to have hosting services and routine maintenance and upgrades
- Privacy of data was not a huge concern – normal privacy expectations, particularly from vendors, was anticipated with the exception of EU institutions
- There wasn't a huge interest in customization or further development of code
- If local installation is pursued, community support and extensive documentation would be factors in the decision