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• The presenter is happy to provide data slides upon request. The full data is expected to be published soon.
Outline

- Why do an assessment and what to examine
- What to look at within the study
- What we found out
- What we might do with that
- What we did do with it
- What we didn’t do
- Ongoing challenges
Illinois

- 56,400 square miles = 146,075 square kilometers (24th largest state in size)
- Population: 12,852,548 – (5th largest state)
- 87.8% population in urban areas
- 93% rural
- Cities: Chicago, Peoria, Rockford, Springfield
Illinois is known for......
Illinois Library Cooperation

- Shared Integrated Library System (ExLibris Voyager)
  - 150 members CARLI with 76 libraries in I-Share
  - 28.2M bibliographic records over 37M items
  - Users have seamless access to all circ titles (public too)
  - 8 million unique titles (UIllinois 52% of those)
  - 385,000+ “resource sharing” loans in FY2009
  - CARLI serves 98% Illinois Higher Ed population
University of Illinois Urbana Champaign

- **42,000** Total students: 31,000 undergraduate and 11,000 graduate and professional students
- **3,078** Faculty 21 Nobel Prize faculty and over **8,500** staff
- And a really big library OCLC symbol = UIU
CARLI: Access and Analysis Award to study the shared collection of books

- Began work two years ago to analyze recent imprints in our shared collection: MONOGRAPHS only
  - At that time over 35 Million items and 25.7 Million Bibliographic records

- The authors collected data for the last 5 years of domestic monograph purchases for CARLI members, including
  - Data allowed for Categorization of Subject by LC, publishers, and use of all
  - Identified the multiple copies group shared and use
  - And allowed for gap analysis with additional help from book vendor YBP
Questions....

• What was bought by libraries?
• What was used?
• Where there gaps in the collection?
• What degree of overlap existed and for what and what was the use
• How do we balance access and ownership collectively –especially now that budgets are low
• Can we move towards a collective collection when it comes to collection development?
• How can we purchase titles jointly based on demand
Actual Analysis

• Began with 76 members, five years monograph purchase data
• Eliminated 19 due to 5 year requirement, leaving 57 libraries in the final study
• Acquisition dates cover 2004 through 2008
• Copyright 2003 and later only, other data were discarded or held for future use (i.e. older items purchased retrospectively)
• Only looked English language material for Phase 1
• Incomplete bibs discarded (that’s where those local reserve records are!)
Results: What books did we buy and what did the users request five years?

- LOTS of Number crunching
- What are the HIGH volume subject areas...the Low? And the use of each?
- What publishers are we buying from and do our users’ selections match our purchase selections?
- Where do we overlap in the collective collection? How many copies are enough?
- Gap: users can not ask for what is not there (have to go to for example OCLC)
Circulation of the final data set:
1,342,283 records for 866,255 titles:
Total use 1,675,471

Local Borrowing of Local titles: 1,220,385, 73%
UB Borrowing of nonlocal titles: 455,086, 27%
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LC Class</th>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>Total records</th>
<th>USE</th>
<th>USE /Record</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RD</td>
<td>Surgery</td>
<td>1270</td>
<td>7834</td>
<td>6.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RG</td>
<td>Gynecology</td>
<td>1212</td>
<td>6205</td>
<td>5.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QR</td>
<td>Microbiology</td>
<td>1091</td>
<td>5431</td>
<td>4.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QD</td>
<td>Chemistry</td>
<td>2129</td>
<td>10594</td>
<td>4.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RM</td>
<td>Therapeutics</td>
<td>2051</td>
<td>9403</td>
<td>4.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QP</td>
<td>Physiology</td>
<td>3633</td>
<td>15635</td>
<td>4.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RT</td>
<td>Nursing</td>
<td>3927</td>
<td>15202</td>
<td>3.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PE</td>
<td>English Language</td>
<td>4143</td>
<td>15373</td>
<td>3.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RC</td>
<td>Internal Medicine</td>
<td>15326</td>
<td>56675</td>
<td>3.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>Social Sciences</td>
<td>1506</td>
<td>5482</td>
<td>3.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RJ</td>
<td>Pediatrics</td>
<td>3930</td>
<td>13649</td>
<td>3.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R</td>
<td>Medicine</td>
<td>4065</td>
<td>12661</td>
<td>3.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LC Class</td>
<td>Subject</td>
<td>Total records</td>
<td>USE</td>
<td>USE /Record</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UG</td>
<td>Military engineering</td>
<td>1135</td>
<td>369</td>
<td>0.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GB</td>
<td>Physical geography</td>
<td>1913</td>
<td>635</td>
<td>0.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD</td>
<td>Forestry</td>
<td>1313</td>
<td>510</td>
<td>0.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KF</td>
<td>US Law</td>
<td>81165</td>
<td>40803</td>
<td>0.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HJ</td>
<td>Public Finance</td>
<td>1419</td>
<td>875</td>
<td>0.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UA</td>
<td>Armies</td>
<td>2002</td>
<td>1432</td>
<td>0.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Environmental Technology</td>
<td>2524</td>
<td>2180</td>
<td>0.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TD</td>
<td>Technology</td>
<td>2524</td>
<td>2180</td>
<td>0.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UB</td>
<td>Military admin</td>
<td>1047</td>
<td>1106</td>
<td>1.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NB</td>
<td>Sculpture</td>
<td>1015</td>
<td>1088</td>
<td>1.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QE</td>
<td>Geology</td>
<td>2906</td>
<td>3169</td>
<td>1.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U</td>
<td>Military Science</td>
<td>1853</td>
<td>2050</td>
<td>1.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HE</td>
<td>Transportation</td>
<td>2240</td>
<td>2509</td>
<td>1.12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Publishers

- Who does I-Share buy from?
- Are they Trade or University?
- What is the use by publisher?
- Can we eliminate some?
- Buy ebooks from others?
Overlap in Copies?
We have three overlap groups:

- **High**: lots of copies for high demand books and reference titles
- **Middle core**: the group we must examine for better collaboration
- **Low**: the research corpus or Comet tail

- Needed average costs for copies..... to figure overlap costs
Sampling of Overlap for the Middle Core
Collection Gap

• What didn’t we get from domestic from 03-08?

• YBP supplied the ISBNs that corresponded to their database offerings for those years - 286,495

• YBP actually had quite a few from foreign publishers included so eliminated 45K non-English language ISBNs to match Phase 1
Gap contd

• That left almost ¼ million 240704
• ISBNs =TRICKY (10-13 format, hard-back, paper, ebook editions, reissues, etc)
• Of the 240K, compared them to collective 1.3 million CARLI record set and identified non matches
• Took those and matched to OCLC pulled back alternates and matched again 52, 996 left
What we Found from the analysis

• Hard to do this!
• Overall pleased at use average (note 17% no circ)
• High correlation of purchases to use
• Isolated distinct high subject areas as well as low
• Isolated high use Publishers and low
• Found very little Gap on domestic side
• COPY Overlap too high in mid range-too expensive
What to do about findings

• Share vendor to buy books (YBP contract)
  – Update profiles to remove low use titles
• Reduce copies
• Purchase on demand instead of anticipating use
• Ebook packages
• Build subject excellence centers
  (breadth and depth)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Library</th>
<th>Approval Plans</th>
<th>Orders</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS LIBRARY</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INDIANA UNIVERSITY LIBRARY</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MICHIGAN STATE UNIVERSITY</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NORTHWESTERN UNIVERSITY</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OHIO STATE UNIV LIBRARIES</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PENNSYLVANIA STATE UNIVERSITY</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PURDUE UNIVERSITY LIBRARIES</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNIV OF ILLINOIS/CHICAGO</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNIV OF MINNESOTA/MINNEAPOLIS</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
What to do about findings

• Share vendor to buy books (YBP contract)
  – Update profiles to remove low use titles
• Reduce copies
• Purchase on demand instead of anticipating use
• Ebook packages
• Build subject excellence centers (breadth and depth)
Users from all most all institutions

- 58 of 76 libraries users had a request filled
- ALL User groups rep (undergrad, grad, staff faculty)
- All items bought were used and some within 2 months were used multiple times
What to do about findings

• Share vendor to buy books (YBP contract)
  – Update profiles to remove low use titles
• Reduce copies
• Purchase on demand instead of anticipating use
• Ebook packages
• Build subject excellence centers (breadth and depth)
Ebooks

- Springer Ebooks offered CARLI wide but too $$ for all as package based
- Wiley Elsevier maybe
- Most ebook Title by title not available yet or too expensive consortially (quoted high cost per consortial use by one third part broker)
What did NOT do

• Plan for cooperative buying based on subjects: no excellence centers as yet!
  – Hard to change culture to think collective versus local needs
• Ebook title by title: no model yet
• Ongoing PDA Pilot not sure as yet but planning to offer some ongoing model though would rather do ebooks!
Next up

• Work Carli Collection Working Group
• White paper being written
• Test ILL sharing ebooks (have rights but HOW?)
• Title by title ebooks
• More PDA but culture again a problem

• Lack of funds most likely will push change
• CARLI Staff
• CARLI Collection Working Group Committee
• U Illinois Staff
• YBP
• Mary Hollerich for referring my talk to Poul and on to Pentti

• See you in Illinois!