

## **Meeting Minutes/Summary** **October 2008 Members Council Meeting**

### **Group Name: OCLC Research Service Group**

**Prepared and submitted by: Timothy J. Dickey**

Have the minutes been reviewed by the group chair? Yes  No

#### **Attending:**

Chew Leng Beh, Bob Bolander, Graham Jefcoate, Lorcan Dempsey, Timothy Dickey, Berndt Dugall, Nancy Elkington, Vic Elliott, Robin Green, Jan Ison, Alan Knox, Jim Michalko, Anne Prestamo, Lynne Siemers, Gregg Silvis, Pamela Snelson, Jerry Stephens, Gwen Thomas, Anne Van Camp, Mark Watson, Michael York

#### **Meeting Minutes/Summary:**

The group was called to order promptly at 8:30am by the chair. The chair informed the group that one significant issue to discuss later would be the future of the service group, and then introduced Ed O'Neill of OCLC Research. Dr. O'Neill presented his current research project: data mining in the circulation data from the OhioLINK consortium, which includes most academic libraries in the state of Ohio (<http://www.oclc.org/memberscouncil/meetings/2009/october/researchsg-oneill.ppt>). These data offer some challenges: it is difficult both to distinguish older circulations from newer, and to synchronize local catalog records with OCLC WorldCat numbers. In addition, as emerged in group discussion, there is no mechanism in place currently to track in-house usage across the consortium, and sometimes the circulation data are reset when items are taken off of reserve. Highlights of Dr. O'Neill's findings:

- Less than half of all materials in the statewide consortium had *ever* circulated
- Works in Chinese had the highest per-item circulation rates
- Only 12.86% of the collection accounted for 80% of the circulation use (a disagreement broke out in the group as to whether the "80/20" rule had been found valid for e-journals or not)
- The rate of duplication within the consortium actually remained relatively flat since 1975, standing at roughly 4.5 system-wide copies per work (the field of law had the highest rate of duplication)

The lively feedback session included discussion of

- whether 4.5 copies per item was actually an adequate for system-wide needs;
- how to incorporate data on out-of-state ILL circulation;
- whether there are grounds for a policy for satisfying materials needs within Ohio;
- whether the data indicate a need for a coordinated collection strategy (answer: yes);
- whether researchers had experienced any sensitivity on the part of library staff to the providing of data (some, but not significant);
- how to remove non-circulating items from the dataset;
- how to compare NetLibrary usage in the same consortium to these data; and
- how to compare these data to circulation patterns in other consortia.

The chair raised the question of the future of the service group, whether in the future global council, regional councils or both. Consensus was strong that the group is a valuable forum for input into the OCLC Research agenda. There does not appear to be a mechanism yet for cross-regional conversation, though since the service group is "pre-product," all of its concerns may not be region-specific. The majority of the group expressed interest in the possibility of continuing operations in both levels of the new governance structure. The meeting concluded at 10:02am.