Appendix

Note: this document constitutes the appendix to the report:

OhioLINK Collection Building Task Force, Julia Gammon and Edward T. O'Neill. 2011. *OhioLINK OCLC Collection and Circulation Analysis Project. 2011*. Dublin, Ohio: OCLC Research and OhioLINK. http://www.oclc.org/research/publications/library/2011/2011-06r.htm.

Please cite the full report, not just the appendix.

Contents

Questions that Started the Study Discussion

Collection Analysis Questions by Categories (August 2005)

Upfront Decision to be made by CBTF

(Average numerical rankings of importance by CBTF members are in bold before question)

2.8 What circulation use date do we want to collect? (P-Circ? ILL? Local circ?)

2.4 What formats are we interested in tracking? monographs? scores? gov docs? books? languages? manuscripts? thesis/dissertations? electronic? Musical recordings? videos/DVD?

2.4 How do we want the data collected to be mapped when we get it? (e.g., Conspectus – broad; North American Title Count—detailed)

2.7 How do we identify materials that do not circulate so they won't affect circulation counts? Do we need to adjust? Should we consider only circulating titles? Reference? Special collections?

Book Trade Information Needed

1.9 What is the yearly publishing output in specific subject areas?

1.8 What is the average cost per book by subject?

1.4 Who are the core publishers in specific fields?

Literature Review Needed

2.0 Is there much published in the area of data collection in collection development?

Usage of Collection Needed

What is Used?

<u>2.3</u> What subjects *are* being used?

<u>2.4</u> What subjects *are not* being used?

<u>0.5</u> Who is using them?

<u>2.0</u> What subject areas have the lowest usage? The highest?

<u>2.3</u> What materials have never been used? Used the least?

<u>2.6</u> What materials are used the most?

<u>2.1</u> How many "extra" (excessive duplicate) copies remain on the shelf during a use?

<u>2.9</u> What areas don't we have enough copies?

<u>2.3</u> What percentage of items circulate in a given subject collection?

<u>1.8</u> Do the circulation figures by subject hold up against time in (X) year study?

<u>1.3</u> What publishers had the highest circulation? Lowest?

<u>1.2</u> Does a high percentage of circulation relate to size of collection or number of transactions per item? (Does size of overall collection correlate to number of items circulated?)

<u>2.5</u> What is the average number of circulations per book? By subject?

<u>2.8</u> What is the optimum range of copies for OhioLINK by subject area?

<u>2.5</u> What is the percentage of the total collection in subject areas that circulated in the time period of the study?

How is it used?

<u>2.1</u> How many circulation transactions (initial circ and renewals) were completed for each circulated item?

<u>1.7</u> What is the ratio of uses (in-house) & external by holdings per subject area?

2.4 What patterns of usage can be tracked between institutions? By subject? By type of library?

1.6 How many of the circulations were for books located in depositories? What subject areas/ranges of years could be weeded?

Collection Analysis Information Needed

2.7 Is our OhioLINK collection getting more diverse?

2.8 Is duplication of titles increasing or decreasing?

2.6 What does the complete overall OhioLINK collection look like?

2.5 What books didn't we purchase? (Not Bought in Ohio or ILL stats?)

1.4 Does the 80/20 rule (80% of users' needs are satisfied by 20% of the collection) apply?

1.8 Are we spending our money (acquisitions budgets) on speculative materials or on materials in demand?

1.4 What is the average age of the books circulated by subject? What is the half-life of books in a given subject area?

1.6 Did the usage transactions correlate with the strengths/specialties/programs of the specific institutions?

1.3 Are the perceived traditionally journal-focused subject areas (sciences, math, computer science) really not using books?

Calls for Data Collection

Call for Phase 1 Data

Message Posted to Listserv

From: cirm-bounces@ohiolink.edu [mailto:cirm-bounces@ohiolink.edu] **On Behalf Of** Anne Gilliland
Sent: Monday, March 26, 2007 1:09 PM
To: 'The Lead Implementors List'
Cc: 'Collection Building Task Force'; 'Library Advisory Council plus Medical and Law Library Directors'; 'O'Neill, Ed'; 'Cooperative Information Resources Management'
Subject: [Cirm] More information on the Collection Building Task Force/OCLCCollection Analysis Project

A couple of weeks ago, I announced that we would be asking lead implementors to start data collection for the Collection Building Task Force/OCLC Collection Analysis Project on April 9th. The full text of the announcement I sent at that time is below.

Now I'm sending you the instructions for the data collection process, so that you can see what data collection will involve in greater detail. There are two documents. One gives detailed instructions on how to construct the lists, what fields should be present in the records you export, where to send the records, and what additional information OCLC will need. The second document, the checklist, lists the data collection steps in a shorter form.

Please do not start making lists and exporting records yet. Please wait until April 9.

We hope that everyone will be able to complete data collection and send OCLC their records within the time period of April 9 to May 7. This will allow us to collect the most accurate snapshot of OhioLINK holdings. For future reference, if we collection data a second time, we will try to do it within this same time period. So, for example, if you write records out of your system during the third week of April this year, it would be optimal, if we do this again, to write them out during that same week next year.

Again, CBTF, the OCLC Research Office staff, and I all thank you for your participation. If you have questions or problems now or once you get started, please don't hesitate to contact me.

--Anne Gilliland
OhioLINK

March 13 Announcement:

Part of the charge of the Collection Building Task Force (CBTF) is to investigate and foster ways to reduce the unnecessary duplication in current purchases and so free funds to be reallocated to increase the depth and breadth of OhioLINK libraries' collections. As part of that investigation, CBTF is working with OCLC's Research Office on a large-scale project to analyze use in our environment. The goal of the project is to learn more about how we are collecting material and circulating it in a cooperative environment of patron-initiated borrowing with the ultimate aim of furthering the task force's goals.

We will ask lead implementors to create lists and write out records from their systems. The data we will need is for monographs only, both circulating and non-circulating, and will include the total circulation information, location code, author, title, and standard numbers. OCLC will match this information from each system with fuller bibliographic information from WorldCat and generate reports. OCLC will create a repository of data about the circulation of monographs in Ohio, and they will correlate the data with subject, age of the material, holding library, publisher, and FRBR information on works and versions we hold. We are not able to get all these pieces of data at this level of detail from our Innopac reports alone. Outside of WorldCat itself, we will be providing the largest pool of data that the OCLC Research Office has ever used for a project.

We will ask you to start creating lists and writing out records on April 9. You will have a month to finish the project. We are asking for a relatively short turnaround period so that there will not be large discrepancies in when the data was gathered. We plan to ask you to go through this process for a second time next spring, so that we can get a sense of how circulation is changing.

In order to get as full a picture as possible, we would like for all OhioLINK libraries to participate. We have spoken to the LAC about this project, and many library directors have expressed their enthusiasm and support for what we are doing. In addition, OCLC will provide individual libraries with files and reports so that you may assess your own circulation data and collection patterns.

The procedure will be a straightforward one of making a list or lists and writing out records from your system.   I will be sending out detailed instructions and a checklist, but essentially you will need to create lists, export records, and send in information about how many files you sent, what you named the file or files, and information about circulating and non-circulating location codes. It will be a time-consuming process for larger systems, but you will not need to be running Millennium or have any special software in order to complete the procedures. Some members of the Collection Building Task Force and I will be available for consultation, and some have volunteered to visit you on-site if you would like extra help and encouragement in completing the project.

Members of the Collection Building Task Force and staff at the OCLC Research Office are excited about this project, and we look forward to your participation.

--Anne Gilliland
OhioLINK

First Attachment (of Two)

CBTF/OCLC Circulation Statistics Project
April 9-May 7, 2007

#1: Search Criteria
Note: Use at least a 60,000 count list, or your largest list, if it is available.
Do: Include records for all monographs, where they circulating or non-circulating.
Don't: linclude records for collection that are loaded into your catalog, but are not part of your institution and do not circulate via OhioLINK.

Store Record Type: ITEM (i), NOT BIB (b); Use a range of <u>ITEM</u> numbers to construct your search.

Range Start   i10000008   Stop   i########   {where ######## is system supplied}

Term	Operator		Type	Field	Condition	Value A	Value B
1			BIBLIOGRA...	BIB LVL	equal to	m	

Note: Adjust the item record range for subsequent lists.
Example: the previous list ended with item record i10659031
    Use previous list end-point.   i10659031
    Remove the last digit.   i1065903
    Add one to the item record.   i1065904
    Append an "a".   i1065904a

#2: Export Fields
Export ITEM Information

Line	Type	Field	Field Code (Caution—field numbers may differ from system to system)
1	ITEM	RECORD #	81
2	BIBLIOGRAPHIC	OCLC #	o
3	BIBLIOGRAPHIC	TITLE	Use the MARC 245 field with no indicators for output (! Command)
4	BIBLIOGRAPHIC	LCCN	l
5	ITEM	LOCATION	79
6	ITEM	STATUS	88
7	ITEM	TOT CHKOUT	76
8	ITEM	TOT RENEW	77
9	ITEM	CREATED	83
10	ITEM	LCHKIN	68
11	BIBLIOGRAPHIC	ISN/STD #	i

Field delimiter = carat (^)   (set the delimiter to a carat instead of a comma)
Text qualifier = No text qualifier needed
Repeated field delimiter = | (vertical bar)
Maximum field length (0-1000) = <none>

If you are not using Millennium, you will use the U>Output User-Selected Format Option to export the records.

#3 Send the Data to OCLC

Name your files with your OhioLINK 5-character code and a sequential number. If you do not know your 5-character code, check here: http://silver.ohiolink.edu/dms/5char.html.

FTP your files to ftp.oclc.org
      User name: olinkcir
      Password: olnk2007

After you FTP your files, send an email to Ed O'Neill, oneill@oclc.org and Anne Gilliland, anne@ohiolink.edu. The email should include the following:
- The number of files, number of records in each, and the file names
- Information about your location codes—what location codes do and don't circulate. (Use status if that is a more accurate value in your library system)
- What location code(s) denote locations that you would like to break out for statistical purposes, such as law libraries, medical libraries, and regional campuses
- Whether you have you included records for collections that are represented in your system but are not really part of OhioLINK, such as art museums or other institutions. If so, are what location codes should OCLC use to exclude those records?
- REMEMBER THAT YOUR OUTPUT <u>SHOULD</u> INCLUDE RECORDS FOR BOOKS THAT ARE PART OF YOUR COLLECTION BUT DO NOT CIRCULATE TO OHIOLINK

If you do not have Innopac's FTS product, you may either export records to a disk and mail them to Ed O'Neill (contact Anne for the address) or you may export them to your computer and send them via another FTP program.

Sample email:

From: John Doe [mailto:jdoe@sample.edu]
Sent: Tuesday, March 20, 2007 5:39 PM
To: 'Anne Gilliland'
Subject: Files from Sample Ohio University

I have just put 5 files from Sample Ohio University on OCLC's FTP for the collection analysis project. They are:

Sa2ug-1 (60,000 records)

SA2ug-2 (60,000 records)
SA2ug-3 (60,000 records)
SA2ug-4 (60,000 records)
SA2ug-5 (15,987 records)

Books in all our locations circulate except Ref and Rare.

Locations we'll want to break out for analysis purposes are all those for our law library (LAW, LAWREF, LAWRARE) and those for our two-year regional campus library (2YR, 2YREF, 2YRARE).

Our system includes records for our city's art museum library, but that library really isn't an OhioLINK member, so I didn't include them in the lists I created.

--John Doe

#4 Questions
If you have questions about what records to include in the lists, how to construct the lists, how to FTP the files, or anything else about this project, contact Anne Gilliland (anne@ohiolink.edu or 614.728.3600, ext.324).

Second Attachment

OCLC Research Project
Checklist
April 9-May 7, 2007

- **Finish** your list(s).

- **Name** your files with your 5-character OhioLINK code and a sequential number.
    - If you are not sure of your 5-character code, see http://platinum.ohiolink.edu/dms/5char.html.

- **Export** files to ftp.oclc.org. User Name—olinkcir; Password—olnk2007

- **Send** email to Ed O'Neill (oneill@oclc.org) and Anne Gilliland (anne@ohiolink.edu) This email should include information on:
    - The number of files you sent, number of records in each, and the file names
    - Information about your location codes—what location codes do and don't circulate. (Use status if that is a more accurate value in your library system)
    - What location code(s) denote locations that you would like to break out for statistical purposes, such as law libraries, medical libraries, and regional campuses

- o Whether you have you included records for collections that are represented in your system but are not really part of OhioLINK, such as art museums or other institutions. If so, what location codes should OCLC use to exclude those records? (But, if possible, exclude these records when you output records from your system.)
- o REMEMBER THAT YOUR OUTPUT <u>SHOULD</u> INCLUDE RECORDS FOR BOOKS THAT ARE PART OF YOUR COLLECTION BUT DO NOT CIRCULATE TO OHIOLINK

We all thank you for participating in this project!

- ❖ Anne Gilliland, OhioLINK
- ❖ OhioLINK Collection Building Task Force
- ❖ OCLC Research Office

Call for Phase 2 Data

Message Posted to Listserv

From: cirm-bounces@ohiolink.edu [mailto:cirm-bounces@ohiolink.edu] **On Behalf Of** Anne Gilliland
Sent: Monday, April 07, 2008 3:53 PM
To: 'The Lead Implementors List'
Cc: ohiolink@ohiolink.edu; 'Cooperative Information Resources Management'
Subject: [Cirm] 2008 Data Gathering Begins for the Collection Building Task Force/OCLC Office of Research Circulation Statistics Project

Recently, I wrote to you to tell you that we intend to do a second pass of data gathering for the Collection Building Task Force/OCLC Office of Research Circulation Statistics Project from April 7-May 5 of this year. Today is April 7, so you may begin.

The vast majority of OhioLINK libraries participated last year, and we hope all those libraries do so again. Those of you who were able to attend either the presentation we've done at OHIONET or at OCLC are aware that this data will get more interesting and valuable when we're able to collect a second year of information and learn more about how circulation is changing. If you didn't have a chance to attend one of those sessions, you can view PowerPoints from those meetings at http://platinum.ohiolink.edu/cbtf/oclcres/index.html. Later this week, I will post the latest version of statistics from last year's data collection.

I am attaching two documents. One gives detailed instructions on how to construct the lists, what fields should be present in the records you export, where to send the records and what additional information OCLC will need. The second document, the checklist, lists the data collection steps in a shorter form. There is only one change in the documents from last year; we're asking you to output the itype for the records along with their other fields.

Please send your data to OCLC by May 5.

We hope that everyone will be able to complete data collection and send OCLC their records within the time period of April 7 to May 5. This will allow us to collect the most accurate snapshot of OhioLINK holdings.

If you have questions or problems, please don't hesitate to contact me. After I leave OhioLINK on April 11, please contact Anita (anita@ohiolink.edu) with questions. Here is a short FAQ:

How often do I run this list?
Run the list in as many increments as you need to collect information on your entire range of item records one time only. What you collect is intended to be a one-time snapshot for this year. We are giving people a month so that they have time to schedule the process. If you are a lead implementor at a smaller library, you will probably create and run the list within one day or two. Data collection for larger sites will take much longer than that.

What if I don't have Millennium? Do I run the report from my circulation statistics or from create lists?
Use the "create lists" functionality. The search criteria listed have equivalents in the telnet system. Remember to start with a range of item numbers. Contact me if you have questions. A Collection Building Task Force member or I will be glad to walk you through the process.

Do I include monographs that do not circulate or don't circulate to OhioLINK?
Yes, please include them.

Should I exclude branch or regional campus records and records from law and medical libraries?
You should include these records unless someone who manages that part of the system is going to write those records out separately. For example, if you are the main campus lead implementor, you should include records from your institution's law library unless you have made arrangements for the law library lead implementor to write out those records.

Again, Collection Building Task Force, the OCLC Research Office staff, and I all thank you for your participation.

--Anne Gilliland
OhioLINK

Project Description

Part of the charge of the Collection Building Task Force (CBTF) is to investigate and foster ways to reduce the unnecessary duplication in current purchases and so free funds to be reallocated to increase the depth and breadth of OhioLINK libraries' collections. As part of that investigation, CBTF is working with OCLC's Research Office on a large-scale project to analyze use in our environment. The goal of the project is to learn more about how we are

collecting material and circulating it in a cooperative environment of patron-initiated borrowing with the ultimate aim of furthering the task force's goals.

We will ask lead implementors to create lists and write out records from their systems. The data we will need is for monographs only, both circulating and non-circulating, and will include the total circulation information, location code, author, title, and standard numbers. OCLC will match this information from each system with fuller bibliographic information from WorldCat and generate reports. OCLC will create a repository of data about the circulation of monographs in Ohio, and they will correlate the data with subject, age of the material, holding library, publisher, and FRBR information on works and versions we hold. We are not able to get all these pieces of data at this level of detail from our Innopac reports alone. Outside of WorldCat itself, we will be providing the largest pool of data that the OCLC Research Office has ever used for a project.

We will ask you to start creating lists and writing out records on April 7. You will have a month to finish the project. We are asking for a relatively short turnaround period so that there will not be large discrepancies in when the data was gathered. We plan to ask you to go through this process for a second time next spring, so that we can get a sense of how circulation is changing.

In order to get as full a picture as possible, we would like for all OhioLINK libraries to participate. We have spoken to the LAC about this project, and many library directors have expressed their enthusiasm and support for what we are doing. In addition, OCLC will provide individual libraries with files and reports so that you may assess your own circulation data and collection patterns.

The procedure will be a straightforward one of making a list or lists and writing out records from your system. I will be sending out detailed instructions and a checklist, but essentially you will need to create lists, export records, and send in information about how many files you sent, what you named the file or files, and information about circulating and non-circulating location codes. It will be a time-consuming process for larger systems, but you will not need to be running Millennium or have any special software in order to complete the procedures. Some members of the Collection Building Task Force and I will be available for consultation, and some have volunteered to visit you on-site if you would like extra help and encouragement in completing the project.

Members of the Collection Building Task Force and staff at the OCLC Research Office are excited about this project, and we look forward to your participation.

First Attachment (of Two)

CBTF/OCLC Circulation Statistics Project
April 7-May 5, 2008

#1: Search Criteria
Note: Use at least a 60,000 count list, or your largest list, if it is available.
Do: Include records for all monographs, where they circulating or non-circulating.
Don't: Include records for collection that are loaded into your catalog, but are not part of your institution and do not circulate via OhioLINK.
Store Record Type: ITEM (i), NOT BIB (b); Use a range of <u>ITEM</u> numbers to construct your search.

Range Start   i10000008   Stop   i########   {where ######## is system supplied}

Term	Operator		Type	Field	Condition	Value A	Value B
1			BIBLIOGRA…	BIB LVL	equal to	m	

Note: Adjust the item record range for subsequent lists.
Example: the previous list ended with item record i10659031
    Use previous list end-point.   i10659031
    Remove the last digit.   i1065903
    Add one to the item record.   i1065904
    Append an "a".   i1065904a

#2: Export Fields
Export ITEM Information

Line	Type	Field	Field Code (Caution—field numbers may differ from system to system)
1	ITEM	RECORD #	81
2	BIBLIOGRAPHIC	OCLC #	o
3	BIBLIOGRAPHIC	TITLE	Use the MARC 245 field with no indicators for output (! Command)
4	BIBLIOGRAPHIC	LCCN	l
5	ITEM	LOCATION	79
6	ITEM	STATUS	88
7	ITEM	ITYPE	
8	ITEM	TOT CHKOUT	76
9	ITEM	TOT RENEW	77
10	ITEM	CREATED	83
11	ITEM	LCHKIN	68
12	BIBLIOGRAPHIC	ISN/STD #	i

Field delimiter = carat (^)   (set the delimiter to a carat instead of a comma)
Text qualifier = No text qualifier needed
Repeated field delimiter = | (vertical bar)
Maximum field length (0-1000) = <none>

If you are not using Millennium, you will use the U>Output User-Selected Format Option to export the records.

#3 Send the Data to OCLC

Name your files with your OhioLINK 5-character code and a sequential number. If you do not know your 5-character code, check here: http://silver.ohiolink.edu/dms/5char.html.

FTP your files to ftp.oclc.org
        User name: olinkcir
        Password: olnk2007

After you FTP your files, send an email to Ed O'Neill, oneill@oclc.org and Anita Cook, anita@ohiolink.edu. The email should include the following:
- The number of files, number of records in each, and the file names
- Information about your location codes—what location codes do and don't circulate. (Use status or itype if one of those values is more accurate in your library system)
- What location code(s) denote locations that you would like to break out for statistical purposes, such as law libraries, medical libraries, and regional campuses
- Whether you have you included records for collections that are represented in your system but are not really part of OhioLINK, such as art museums or other institutions. If so, are what location codes should OCLC use to exclude those records?
- REMEMBER THAT YOUR OUTPUT <u>SHOULD</u> INCLUDE RECORDS FOR BOOKS THAT ARE PART OF YOUR COLLECTION BUT DO NOT CIRCULATE TO OHIOLINK

If you do not have Innopac's FTS product, you may either export records to a disk and mail them to Ed O'Neill (contact Anita for the address) or you may export them to your computer and send them via another FTP program.

Sample email:

From: John Doe [mailto:jdoe@sample.edu]
Sent: Tuesday, March 20, 2007 5:39 PM
To: Anita Cook
Subject: Files from Sample Ohio University

I have just put 5 files from Sample Ohio University on OCLC's FTP for the collection analysis project. They are:

Sa2ug-1 (60,000 records)
SA2ug-2 (60,000 records)
SA2ug-3 (60,000 records)

SA2ug-4 (60,000 records)
SA2ug-5 (15,987 records)

Books in all our locations circulate except Ref and Rare.

Locations we'll want to break out for analysis purposes are all those for our law library (LAW, LAWREF, LAWRARE) and those for our two-year regional campus library (2YR, 2YREF, 2YRARE).

Our system includes records for our city's art museum library, but that library really isn't an OhioLINK member, so I didn't include them in the lists I created.

--John Doe

#4 Questions
If you have questions about what records to include in the lists, how to construct the lists, how to FTP the files, or anything else about this project, contact Anita Cook (anita@ohiolink.edu or 614.728.3600, ext.325).

Second Attachment

OCLC Research Project
Checklist
April 7-May 5, 2008

- **Finish** your list(s).

- **Name** your files with your 5-character OhioLINK code and a sequential number.
    - o If you are not sure of your 5-character code, see http://platinum.ohiolink.edu/dms/5char.html.

- **Export** files to ftp.oclc.org. User Name—olinkcir; Password—olnk2007

- **Send** email to Ed O'Neill (oneill@oclc.org) and Anita Cook (anita@ohiolink.edu) This email should include information on:
    - o The number of files you sent, number of records in each, and the file names
    - o Information about your location codes—what location codes do and don't circulate. (Use status or itype if those are more accurate values in your library system)
    - o What location code(s) denote locations that you would like to break out for statistical purposes, such as law libraries, medical libraries, and regional campuses
    - o Whether you have you included records for collections that are represented in your system but are not really part of OhioLINK, such as art museums or other institutions. If so, what location codes should OCLC use to exclude those

records? (But, if possible, exclude these records when you output records from your system.)
- o REMEMBER THAT YOUR OUTPUT <u>SHOULD</u> INCLUDE RECORDS FOR BOOKS THAT ARE PART OF YOUR COLLECTION BUT DO NOT CIRCULATE TO OHIOLINK

We all thank you for participating in this project!

- ❖ Anne Gilliland, OhioLINK
- ❖ Anita Cook, OhioLINK
- ❖ OhioLINK Collection Building Task Force
- ❖ OCLC Research Office

Breakout Session Reports

OhioLINK—OCLC Research Project
February 7, 2008 Program at OCLC

Public Universities: Group #1
Convener & Recorder: Jerry Newman, UC & Phil Flynn, WSU

1. Surprises
   a. Language analysis is surprising—thought that there would be a LOT more non-English materials
   b. Level of detail—wanted more analysis of collection at loc code level
   c. Found some loc codes that aren't supposed to have circulating items in them; but circ counts are indicated; is there an error in the loc code attribution?
   d. Opportunity to check abnormal entries; this could develop into a local data fixing project
   e. Question: To whom do we send data problems?
   f. Analyzed serials tagged "M" look like monographs but aren't
   g. Literature collections are huge, but then we all have literature curricula
2. Question: Should we share the data?
   a. Within OhioLINK; most definitely yes
   b. Beyond OhioLINK; most likely, but with restrictions, and probably only higher level, summary information
3. Excites
   a. Books in science still circulate
   b. Have stats to share with non-library people (administrators)
   c. Have independently verified data for the first time
4. Need to compile a list of when different data was collected by each institution [i.e. institution name—date on III—first date of circ data (retro or III date)]
5. will now be able to adjust bands in the monographic budget from subject use (high duplication to use: and adjust money to match need)
6. Compare this study to older studies

7. Need more information on figures; specifically unique items; and want a table describing the calculations of each column
8. Need an analysis based upon curriculum uniqueness verses subject uniqueness
9. Useful to talk with faculty about duplication issues at the point of order; especially where faculty do most of the purchasing
10. Create a document that articulates the library perspective of a subject area to help assist cooperative collection efforts
11. Soft caps have been more successful than we thought; more happening by what people do than by stated policy
12. Keep in mind that a lot of the uniqueness will be dissertations and thesis—will skew uniqueness value in the area the material is housed.
13. Want more data: specifically on materials that moved by virtue of PCIRC rather than local circulation; and want a count on how many things with the high circulation were textbooks.
14. What to do with:
    a. Locally want a table of: size X circulation by subject X institutional allocation
        i. Have to think statewide
        ii. Enable joint institutional budget planning
    b. Map curriculum programs to subject areas and then collecting institutions; line up the funding accordingly
    c. Hot topics: do more with it; particularly a breakdown by LC sub classes
    d. Make e-book decisions based upon figures of circulation of print material
    e. Some administrators may decide regional branches are not necessary
    f. Use data to "kick-start" subject groups
15. Limiting copies—must co-think:
    a. Extended loan periods
    b. Improved delivery speed
    c. Special reserve loans (especially for text books)
16. Shelve anywhere—move when needed verses where owned
17. Want an editable e-copy of the print outs offered
18. Need caution with the distribution, and careful explanation, especially in relation to campus administrators
19. Match of LC data will be problematic
    a. Libraries with Dewey collection won't find the LC description of their collection helpful; or NLM collections either
    b. Want much more specific breakdown within LC class
20. Give our individual systems people a HUGE thanks—had no idea this is what they were working on—for institution it was a huge job

21. Reinvigorate the subject groups of subject based projects
22. Start a central purchasing pilot project (example: nursing)

Public Universities: Group #2
Convener & Recorder: Anne Gilliland, OhioLINK & Bruce Leach, OSU

Can we share this data? How broadly? At what level of detail?

The group generally agreed that we want to share the data, but we need to define what we mean by "share." We do not want to do any sharing until we have collected the 2008 data and made corrections to the 2007 data. One member of the group suggested that Ed set a deadline for corrections to be sent [it is March 15th].

What surprises you about this data?

Foreign language materials make up a relatively small part of the statewide collection. The percentage of circulation since 2000 seems small.

Use of books in the sciences is greater than expected [this is not surprising to science librarians].

The level of uniqueness in individual collections is surprisingly low. Is this related to the use of approval plans? Perhaps the time required to select materials that are unique in the state has been too great.

What is lacking from the study? What is not relevant?

Commentary. We need more discussion of methodology [Anne has material that will help with that]

The study includes only monographs.

So far, the study results don't support our effort to move from thinking about local collections to thinking about the statewide collection.

The study doesn't point toward a target number of copies for each discipline. Do we need to included theses and dissertations?

What additional information do you need that wasn't provided?

Data on the circulation of reserve materials. Some locations have included reserve circulations in their data, some have not.

Need more subject breakdowns.

How do you envision using this information at your library, across institutions, and across OhioLINK?

That depends upon how well we are able to clean up the data and exclude problem categories of material.

Once the data is distributed, how might further conversations be facilitated?

Subject specialist groups? Regional groups? Groups of similar institution type?

Sharing the data with the ICPSR data set archive [Interuniversity Consortium for Political and Social Research?].

Conducting more detailed subject analysis for <u>some</u> subject areas (this may be like peeling an onion).

What cooperative projects can you see coming out of this project?

We need to address retention of copies and promote collecting with an eye toward the statewide collection. That is, buy what nobody else has.

One member of the group related a situation where a library lacking the space to add unique gift materials needed to refer the material to another location, but lacked the staff to do that work.

We need to reexamine approval plans.

Independent Colleges: Group #3
Convener & Recorder: Julie Gammon, UA & Andrew Whitis, Muskingum

1. What surprised you?

- Science books circulate.
- 40% circulation rate since 2000 (expected a lower number).
- Disappointed that 60% did not circulate.
- Science not being used.
- Old is not always bad, an older book could be a standard in a field.

2. What excites you?

- Look at foreign language circulation and maybe use the data to promote collection to departments.
- After heavy "Excel time" would like to work on an article for publication.

3. What is lacking?

- Aggregated OhioLINK data for comparison.
- Was the checked-out or checked-in date used?
- Not knowing what is being requested through PCIRC. [Note: I encouraged this individual to explore the INN-Reach Circulation report available through Millennium reports. This person is from an OPAL library. ARW]
- Not including in-house use counts. Some libraries scan books found on tables or carts before reshelving and consider that a use comparable to a circulation use.
- Knowing institutional FTE data to determine true peers vs. going purely on collection size.
- Additional reports by peers, collection size, FTE, and existing consortia (CONSORT, OPAL).
- "So what?" factor.
- "Non circs" get rid of.
- Call number detail and circulation by status codes.

3. What is not relevant?

- Audience level—interesting concept, but not sure how useful.
- Juvenile collection affects overall audience level.

5. How important is the data?

- Combine with other data during budget analysis and planning for administration.
- Use to justify increasing monograph collection budget.
- May purchase electronic books for areas with low print usage.
- Drive information literacy with some departments.
- Correlate e-usage to print usage?
- Use as a discussion point with faculty. Buying X subject does not make sense any more, it is not being used.

6. Will others from your institution benefit from data?

- Yes. Plan to share with all library staff.

7. How would you envision use of data across OhioLINK?

- Regions of the state could compare their collections and identify strengths and weaknesses.
- Consider changing the INN-Reach settings (if possible) to allow cooperating libraries to have priority access to each other's collections.
- Lobby for quicker delivery.
- Find peers based on collections.
- Weeding—OCLC has aggregated the data needed to see who has an item and its circulation status. Labor-intensive process using Central Catalog.
- Not Bought in Ohio Reports not always useful. Cannot buy if it does not support my curriculum.
- Is access impacted by cataloging issues? TOC data in OPAC only available for newer materials. Would circulation increase if TOC data were available for older items?
- Reviewing "local use only" policies.
- Reviewing the policy of not allowing OhioLINK items to be put on reserve.
- We now have a tool to identify multiple bib records in central catalog with only a couple holdings and consolidate by encouraging owning library to cleanup of those records.
- FRBRize the Central Catalog.

8. How can future conversations be facilitated?

- Collect and post how people are using the data on the OhioLINK web site.
- Have another meeting after the second round of data has been collected.
- Concern that we just created a shopping list of rare materials. How do we protect our rare items? We do not always realize what we own until it is requested through ILL. Another member shared that OCLC can create a report that will tell you what you have that is of value, but for a price.

Can your data be shared?

- If cleaned up, then okay.
- Not sure if campus administration would approve.

Future Plans

- Mandate participation in subject groups based on strength of local collection.
- Find likely partner for CCD by identifying similar collections.
- Video conferencing would increase participation in these types of meetings.
- Exchange non-used collections with an institution that could use it.
- Discards list on steroids.
- Need to focus on current collections and what we are buying and not worry about managing existing collections.
- Second data collection should help refine soft caps already in use.

What can YBP to do help?

- Create a list of programs of study at each institution and then find peers.
- A third of the room purchases through firm orders, no approval plans of any kind.

Final Comments

- Need time to digest the data and think about it.
- It was suggested that we send out the set of questions asked to everyone who participated and ask for consideration and response. We might get additional comments, because people did not want to speak out in the group or would have had sometime to think about the data and the question being asked.

Independent Colleges: Group #4
Convener & Recorder: Margo Warner Curl, Wooster & Jessica Grim, Oberlin

What surprises/excites about data?

- Audience level rubric—very interesting—most of us hadn't thought about our collections quite like that before
- Duplication rate—4.5 surprisingly low—this seems a positive finding

What's lacking, or not relevant?

- Incorporate explanation of data in more detail—creation of a "data guide" would be very useful for in-house use

- Libraries need access to raw numbers in order to make sense of, and be able to use, the circulation figures
- Need clearer understanding of the project definition of circ/non-circ; it seems clear that different institutions were using different understandings

Possible uses for data?

- Communication with faculty on a number of fronts; also with administration; could be used to support various collection development/management projects, but must be vetted carefully first by library staff

Data sensitivity?

- Sharing within OhioLINK and our peer groups is fine & useful—particularly within peer groups the information becomes potentially much more useful through sharing
- The broader the audience is (administrators, faculty, wider community) the more aggregated the information/numbers should be

Future

- Directors need to make projects coming out of this data a priority
- Soft caps—lots of local issues, need to garner faculty support/buy-in; can be hard for smaller institutions

What CBTF/OL can do

- Statewide depository projects need to move/develop more quickly as the existence of depositories will be crucially important in supporting projects coming out of this data
- CBTF could facilitate/coordinate pilot projects
- CBTF could poll institutions about areas they'd be interested in working on
- Will "round 2" data be available more quickly (say summer or fall?)
- CBTF could set up a wiki for statewide info sharing about what institutions are doing, or thinking about doing, with the data
- Longer term data collection—consider collecting every 5 (or so) years?

Two-Year College: Group # 5
Convener & Recorder: Rob Kairis, KSU-Starke & Joyce Baker, Belmont Tech

1. What surprised you?

- Circulation stats were higher than expected in several cases
- Unique titles were higher than expected in several cases

2. What excites you?

- Would like to see how community colleges compare with one another
- Would like to see how community colleges as a group compare to the whole collection
- Would like to see how Ohio community college collection compares to other similar groups in other states
- Anxious to drill down to more specific subject and titles levels

3. What is lacking?

- Need more information about how to interpret the results
- What are the formulas that were used for the calculations?
- Circulation and non-circulating collections need to be considered when interpreting the data
- Would be interesting to calculate cost/use

4. What is not relevant?

- Not sure how we will use this
- Statistics will be skewed by non-circulating materials that were included

5. How important is the data?

- This is similar to the individual iii stats that each library can generate; real importance is if we can see results from others
- This would be very useful to use for weeding collections
- Need a more global policy and procedures for last copy in OL
- Will be more important after follow-up study is done

6. Will others from your institution benefit from data?

- Plan to share with staff within the library and with administration if it is beneficial to do so

7. How would you envision use of data across OhioLINK?

- It is important to see what is not circulating and why. The 2yrs have an especial need for reference materials that do not circulate in OhioLINK. This is usually what the 2yrs cannot afford to buy.
- It would be interesting to see what logical collaborations might present themselves: geographic, course of study, niche publishers, special needs such as reference, etc.

8. How can future conversations be facilitated?

- This group does not meet regularly. There is a 2yr library directors group but that does not necessarily include the selectors and collection development staff. It would be beneficial to have further conversations. Interesting ideas such as sharing reference materials by using Odyssey and circulating a reference collection need to be explored further.
- Need guidelines for doing pilot projects
- Develop a means for sharing information about projects; perhaps at a conference
- How can this be used in cooperation with the development of the Univ. Sys.of Ohio?

Can your data be shared?

- Yes, in most cases as long as it is kept within OhioLINK community
- Group felt that the information needed to be shared and accessible on-line (ostaff) if it was to be useful

Future Plans

- Need more time to digest the information
- Seems that there may be lots of possibilities

What can YBP to do help?

- 2yrs need more training in how to use slips and other gobi features
- How can approval plans be synchronized?

Final Comments

- Many of the colleges represented already participated in a soft caps policy. Many used "10" as the magic number.

Additional Notes

The group agreed that the data was too new to them and they did not understand it well enough to form good answers to the questions we were posing.

It was discussed that the data would be helpful from an operational point of view for an individual library for the purposes of such things as weeding.

The group commented that OhioLINK libraries were already doing cooperative things When the mention of soft caps came up, although most did not know what the term meant, once it was defined just about everyone in the room stated they were already doing it to some extent. Most were not using a specific number, but were checking the OhioLINK Central Catalog for holdings prior to ordering.

There was little discussion of approval plans, because most did not use them. The ones that did, had just recently begun using them.

There was a discussion about the potential of lending non-monograph types of materials. Although videos are already being loaned, many libraries do not lend them. Then there was a discussion about the possibility of lending reference books. If 2 institutions wanted to begin a partnership for reference titles, they wondered if a system could be set up where their materials could be borrowed just between those 2 libraries. Another alternative presented was to use scanning technology (Ariel/Odysseus) to scan parts of reference works and send them to partner libraries.

The discussed ended by asking how 2-year institutions could begin the process of planning the use of the data to more formally discuss implementing cooperative projects. Most did not know (there were few if any directors in the room). One person mentioned that the new University System of Ohio might require more cooperation between specific institutions (particularly ones located in the same geographic area—perhaps different types of libraries).

Breakout Session Reports

OhioLINK—OCLC Research Project Meeting
April 13, 2009

Group #1 Comments   Joyce Baker and Phil Flynn

What we will be able to learn from the data:

- If the figures support generally held beliefs about circulation; meaning of 80/6.5
- How many copies of core titles and unique holdings are needed for circulation
- Life cycles of specific collections such as computer science, humanities, etc.
- Where and in what subject areas we have unique holdings statewide
- Correlation between number of holdings in a subject area and circulation

What we will be able to do with this information:

- Use as a starting point for de-duping monograph collections
- Examine collection budgets: how much money is spent in areas such as middle range materials; on titles that circulate and those that don't
- Assess the effectiveness of the selection process at our individual institutions and our use of faculty and library subject specialists as selectors

Where we need to go:

We need to:

- *Stop purchasing superfluous duplicate copies*
- Set specific caps for general purchases and separate caps for specific subject areas
- Share information about collection changes, new missions, new directions at our institutions
- Share successful procedures that eliminate duplication

- Define ways in which the data can be used to change collection purchasing behaviors
- Examine types of collections for cooperative opportunities: reference serials, e-books
- Examine e-book purchasing locally and statewide; develop a cooperative approach; eliminate duplication and use funds for e-book deals and local unique titles; examine duplication and obsolescence of e-books
- Examine results for similar institutions such as community colleges, ARL's etc.
- Examine results for institutions that share subject specialties and programs
- Improve the selection process; selectors may need more guidance; methods for selecting alternative purchases need to be explored

Considerations:

- View OL as **THE** statewide comprehensive collection
- Think of our individual collections as the portion of the statewide collection, housed at our location
- How does collection management affect circulation?
- What impact does e-book collection have on the 80/6.5 effect?
- How close are collection selectors to the users? How do they assess user needs? Are faculty asking for less; are students asking for less; what areas are they requesting; what is requested on ILL?
- How effective is Patron-based purchasing (currently there are pilot projects at several colleges)?
- We need to be diligent about pcirc efficiency
- We need to consider how our collection and its use will be affected by state directives and future trends in education and incorporate this into collection decisions
- Does the old way of doing things match the direction that education is going?
- Does it match the needs of library users?
- Should we be spending print book money on other areas?

Information needs:

- Documentation about the details of the project: subject lists used; how reserves are treated, etc.
- Specific definitions/glossary and column formulas
- What comparisons can be made with last year?
- Specific guidelines and directions for comparisons: what comparisons are possible; how can data be massaged?

- SAS or statistical analysis tool
- We need to know if users needs are being met with the current collection and number of copies
- Circulation is not the only measure of use; how can we assess use of materials not circulated?
- How can data help us with "future looking"
- What trends can be seen?

Group #2 Comments: Margo Warner Curl and Danny Dotson

- use data as performance measure of library—comparison to similar institutions
- %age of coverage in OhioLINK—identify strong collections
- SWORCS project as model
- Less use of non-English. Problematic? What is driving that? Why Italian & Chinese?
- Budget—adjust profile w/YPB
- 4.5 copies per title—why has it stayed the same?
- Book ordering down at Wooster—same thing observed at Wittenberg
- What data will we ultimately get? How fine a level of data can we get? Could help with making weeding decisions. Suggest one institution do a very sophisticated analysis that could be used as model for others
- If we have fewer copies—with more in depositories—will be a cost to this as the cherry picker system in some of the depositories has limits … may require some more infrastructure spending as retrieval systems will need updating
- Future of OhioLINK central catalog (CatArch). hope will provide more robust pcirc data
- Rethink funding allocations?
- Undergraduates use books more than grad students or faculty—purchasing fewer books does not serve undergrads
- Get subject areas together. Do some standard analyses in specific subject areas to light a fire under subject groups

Group #3 Comments: Andrew Whittis and Carol Zsulya

What does this data mean for OL collection

- Raises questions about circ vs. preservation of intellectual record. Focused on use, which is important to collection development, but shouldn't be the only factor.
- Tying this data with Depository guidelines for preserving for access.

- Private collages can do more deselection knowing that depositories will retain what they have. While, private colleges may not ever make a deposit, it will influence local level collection management in the long term.
- Last copy in OhioLINK cries out for digitization if possible.
- Digitize high use items.
- Some rare books now showing up in Google books.

1. **What does budget look like and does this data help**

- It is now more important to see who is buying what to make sure that scarce dollars are spent to the most benefit. This is difficult since everyone is not using YBP and even those that do, don't purchase everything through YBP.
- Most everybody in the group uses soft caps currently.
- Shelves are full, budget flat. This data can help make decisions as to what to keep and where to prioritize spending.

2. **Can you use this data for coop purchase? How?**

- Kenyon-Denison joint approval plans implemented 4 yrs ago, works perfect according to Scottie.
- KSU joint nursing approval plan between Kent main and branch campuses starting in July 2009. All money into one fund code. Campus identified specialties, broke up LC ranges for selection and to share workload, Campuses wanted randomization. YBP is implementing. Auditor ownership issues not a problem, since main campus gives dollars to regionals to build collections.
- OPAL starting a group to identify project(s). Most involved to date do soft cap. Looking at developing a model to do cooperative collection management. First face to face meeting in May.
- Joint approval plans a tough nut to crack.
- Did away with approval plans, went to slip plan more work on selector, but allows for soft caps to be applied.
- A big challenge is that some colleges order pre-pub, which sometime beat YBP profiling. Problem is that the current way is not systematically planned within the state. Whoever gets to place order first gets the book.

3. **New approaches to coop purchasing**

- Fund management at local level is problem.
- The big idea of centralized acquisitions with random localized housing is good in theory, but hard to implement.

- Kenyon-Denison currently doing floating collections. Works because they are similar. Would be an issue because of all the non-LC Dewey schools.
- User doesn't care who owns the book.
- 80/6.5 metric may not be the best to focus our thoughts.
- OSU is rethinking how they accept gifts. Example, some countries provide free copies of items. This may not be the best collection to build, because it would not have wide appeal.
- We each have very different constituencies and there isn't a one size fits all approach.

5. How can we improve coop buying?

- Unlikely that we will have 65 local systems in the future.
- It was a big step backward when the new practice of suppressing brief order records from the Central catalog was implemented. Now we don't know what people are buying.
- There is a state mandate for cooperation among all library types. Take to logical conclusion. We will have one catalog for all of Ohio libraries. Be able to see how many copies are in the state. Google model applied in catalog.
- Since we are all moving to caps, it would make better use of time and money if there was an overriding statewide plan. Maybe pooling percentage of money for monographs is way to go.
- CSU conducting faculty focus groups. Most (not all) of their faculty doesn't care where monographs come from, as long as they have access to it.
- Faculty resist the use of the cap because it's a major that we offer. Use own judgment if it's the 6th copy. This is where the hard cap is not realistic. School that has PhD program feels that they need to have it and would override the hard cap. They need it because they talk about how they teach their students.
- Browse is a lie.
- OSU doesn't have a very deep history collection, expect others to pick up. No one is so big or small that we can't rely on each other.
- Ed O'Neil's comment: Soft caps don't seem uniform. Some things are justified. Each campus would have core collection. Then another tier. Need access statewide, but not local campus. Foreign language items have a smaller soft cap than other subjects.
- Unique programs drive collections and make it easier for some.
- Core funding would be a hard sell for some schools for books, even though we are doing it now for e-journals and e-books. No one suggesting that local needs wouldn't be addressed….need to do central monographs collection.

- Capital budget vs. operating budget. Could we get support from the Ohio independent college association to get an accountant to help sell this concept to our local CFOs?

6. Other questions about the data?

- Study is great, but just monographs. What about other format types...a/v items. Ed said that a/v is a challenge since many libraries don't allow a/v to circulate. No equiv circ data to measure use.
- Do people still buy books on tape and videotapes? People buying CDs and DVDs. Directing faculty to use Digital Video Collection and only buy AV if specifically requested.
- Kent State has called and received permission to transfer VHS content to DVD content. Just takes a call sometimes. Others are surprised that VHS tapes are still being used.
- Scottie dreaming...what about digital on demand...get out congressional delegation to Washington to get a revision of DMCA. It's been ten years and it's not working. Something needs to be done to allow for us to digitize on demand. We're being cooperative, efficient, effective, but we're tying own hands not doing digitization on demand. If OH delegation would work together, we could be the leaders in the US. Look what Ohio is doing about this Federal law tying our hands.
- Perhaps, if meet a certain criteria, we can digitize, and make available. If need to pay a copyright holder than we could do that as well. Graham said that Google would like nothing more than to digitize on demand and has a bunch of lawyers trying to figure it out.
- Somebody with deep pockets would have to be interested to get DMCA changed. Big music, Disney, and publishers like to keep it the way it is. Once Google can figure it out, the change will happen. There is far too much money involved.
- Libraries need to be at the table to make sure the Google solution is not worse than what we have now. Scottie thinks that OH has the best chance. She is not anti-paying, but libraries need to be at the table and have collective power.

Other comments

- How can YBP help us with the data? Would it help if every OL library had a baseline YBP profile to help address some of these issues?
- Wilmington uses Amazon for user generated orders. If books a patron wants is not available in OhioLINK, they order a copy from Amazon and process it and then get it to the patron.

Group #4 Comments: Rob Kairis and Jessica Grim

- Doing this repeatedly (every couple yrs?) might be very useful, esp. in terms of how the 6.5% figure might move
- Collaboration btwn schools—surprised at how little happens.
- Until now a barrier has been not having the info about how our—and the states'—collections are being used.
- The culture change is really big—how we view our individual institutions in relation to OhioLINK and vice versa. Institutions appear to me much more willing to see themselves as "part of the whole".
- How the economy fits into all this -- looking back once the crunch is over will administrations look back and say "we need ours back"? -- though this may not become a real problem.
- Are we ready to start thinking about OL as "our" catalog? CatArch group doing a lot of work (1 system as opposed to 87 system); some institutions have OL central cat even now as their "main" catalog.
- The data will help determine whether we've been successful in areas where we set collecting strengths in the past (not sure how formal this was)—but moving ahead too, to see where the current collecting strengths ARE.
- Soft caps—need to vary by subject, etc.
- Coordinating approval plans—lots of work—shifting of culture on the part of faculty, but also on the part of librarians.
- Need to be careful about using the data for the future—the 6.5% figure itself is interesting but not necessarily the basis of collecting plans moving forward.
- Obsolescence data very useful—can help us form CD behaviors moving forward (using $ to "rent" e-books in given subject areas where obsolescence is high, instead of purchasing books (or e-books)- like in education—for example).
- What are the stats that we should be collecting moving forward—what's important to us to measure?
- What does a collaborative weeding project look like?
- If we were able to work more on a regional level there's possible benefit in terms of various projects—but software needs to be there to support it.
- Reference book project for collective CD as a possibility, given that these are high-cost materials.

Group #5 Comments Kevin Messner and Celeste Feather

- Many of us are thinking in terms of "a" statewide collection, both in terms of repositories and for future purchasing
- Fair consensus in the room that this is necessary, "the reality we're in"

- Some libraries have formal no added copies policies, though this varies
- But, faculty at some institutions not on board with this notion
- Marketing the notions of statewide deduplication and/or collective purchasing is a huge problem with faculty audiences how to show benefits, is there an attractive/compelling choice to present to faculty?
- Slowness of delivery an issue for some faculty what are the levels of satisfaction with current pcirc
- Will loss of ownership of repository material negatively affect strong institutions (they have more to "lose") how to justify?
- Cooperative book purchasing can we create statewide approval plans?
- Is the 6.5% highly used portion of the collection predictable?
- If so, should we have shared bibliographic expertise? (e.g., an organic chem expert for OhioLINK) Are libraries currently losing bibliographic expertise as priorities change?
- Physical location of materials—Do we establish regional or state special libraries for particular subjects, or spread material widely so that a given library's users can expect to find "something" on their topic of interest?
- If we have a statewide print journal center, should there be coordination of print subscription responsibilities amongst OL members? No consensus that this necessarily followed.