

## **Appendix 14: Feasibility Analysis Key**

## Feasibility Analysis Key

A rating system has been developed in order to determine the feasibility of various resource sharing models in Part 2 of the report. The resource sharing models were measured against four major areas of consideration: legal, political/social, fiscal, and the solution's ability to meet success criteria. While analysis using traditional cost benefit analysis is often strictly quantitative, the outcomes related to improved service to patrons are difficult to monetize. Therefore, a qualitative rating scale was developed, using the factors and criteria outlined below.

Potential Feasibility Scores range from 0 to 16. Score ranges have been divided into Highly Feasible, Feasible, Somewhat Feasible, and Not Feasible.

14-16	Highly Feasible – requires scores of 3 or 4 for each criteria
11-13	Feasible – requires scores of at least 3 for each criteria
8-10	Possibly Feasible – indicates scores of 2 for most criteria
1-7	Not Feasible – indicates scores of 1 for many criteria

### Legal

#### Factors Considered

Need for statutory or regulatory change; requirements and allowable use of LSTA grant monies; need for local policy change.

#### Rating Criteria

4—This program/service does not require statutory or regulatory change, meets LSTA requirements and allowable use, and requires no local policy change.

3— The program/service requires change in 1 of 3 of legal areas.

2— The program/service requires change in 2 of 3 of legal areas.

1—The program/service does not conform to state statutes, LSTA priorities, nor local policies.

### Political/Social

#### Factors Considered

Effect on patron community; impact on staff within libraries affected by the examined change; effect on the resource sharing community within the state of Texas as a whole; development of ILL as a core service; increased value of training and continuing education.

#### Rating Criteria

4—This program/service meets the needs of (a) the Texas library patron community, (b) the local library staff and administration charged with delivering the service, and (c) the resource sharing community as a whole.

3—The program/service meets the needs of 2 of 3 of the named communities well, but not the third.

2—The program/service meets the needs of 1 of 3 of the named communities well, but fares poorly with the other two.

1—The program/service does not meet the needs of the 3 communities.

## **Fiscal**

### Factors Considered

Statutory funding cycles; fiscal climate; overall costs for start-up and maintenance; shared funding at local, state, and federal levels.

### Rating Criteria

4—The program/service addresses (a) the overall costs, (b) the statewide fiscal climate including funding source (i.e. local, state, and federal), and (c) the sustainability of the program/service.

3—The program/service addresses 2 of 3 of the fiscal issues, but not the third.

2—The program/service addresses 1 of 3 of the fiscal issues, but not the remaining two.

1—The program/service does not address the 3 fiscal issues.

## **Success Measures**

### Factors Considered

Maximized use of technology; enhanced reciprocity; increased visibility of holdings; flexibility for on-going change; sustainability of the program (for further discussion of these measures see Part 3: Recommendations—Goals for a Statewide Resource Sharing Service).

### Rating Criteria

4—The program/service (a) meets the diversity of needs at all levels from the patron to the statewide resource sharing environment, (b) promotes recognized best practice criteria, and (c) leverages resources in cost efficient ways.

3—The program/service achieves 2 but not all 3 of these criteria.

2—The program/service achieves only 1 of these criteria.

1—The program/service does not achieve these criteria.

### **Comment on the Texas Interlibrary Loan and Resource Sharing Study - Final Report**

Go to <http://www.texshare.edu/apps/illstudy2008/index.php> and write your comments in the comments section.