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Premise

- In a library with a well-selected collection, ILL requests should seem as though they are randomly drawn from the subjects in the collection.
Premise

- In a library with a well-selected collection, ILL requests should seem as though they are randomly drawn from the subjects in the collection.
- The percentage of requests for items on subject x should be the same as the percentage of materials in your collection on subject x.
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- **Time:** serve college students—they are usually seeking material because they have a looming deadline and can’t afford to wait for us to order and catalog something
- **Expense:** Purchase-on-demand plans that integrate with ILL and have dedicated money set aside often expensive and difficult to implement
- **Goals:** Want all our purchases, even PDA, to reflect our collection development plan
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- Tech Services staff of 4: Manager, electronic resources librarian, copy cataloger, and ILL specialist.
- Belongs to MCLS’s (Midwest Collaborative for Library Services') MeLCat, Michigan’s largest resource-sharing consortium. Accounts for most of our ILL.
- Also uses OCLC’s WorldShare service, mostly for article borrowing.
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- LMS/ILS is Innovative Interfaces’ Sierra
- Get our bibliographic records from Innovative’s SkyRiver
- No sophisticated software for tracking our resource-sharing activity—recorded volume of activity in Microsoft Access database but were not recording content of MeLCat/ILL borrowing before I arrived
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- Population of repeat ILL users is fairly small. MeLCat/ILL service is fairly well-advertised but students still face barrier of having to find/use it on their own.

- Pool of requests supplemented by students who want a single item, find out we don’t have it, and go to a reference librarian who helps them place the ILL request.
Data

- I recorded title, author/editor, and edition of most* items received from September 2014-April 2015 (most of Fall and Spring Semesters) in an Excel spreadsheet
Data

- I recorded title, author/editor, and edition of most* items received from September 2014-April 2015 (most of Fall and Spring Semesters) in an Excel spreadsheet
- For each item, I checked to see whether the college owned any copies and what their status was and recorded LC call number
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Author/ editor</th>
<th>Owned by LCC?</th>
<th>Owned by LC numeric</th>
<th>Ownership notes</th>
<th>Call # (per SkyRiver)</th>
<th>Call# (Subclass only)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Creativity in fashion design: an inspiration workbook</td>
<td>Jennings</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>West campus collection--uncataloged until winter 2015</td>
<td>TT507 .J46 2011</td>
<td>TT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The celluloid closet: homosexuality in the movies</td>
<td>Russo</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1 circulating copy</td>
<td>PN 1995.9 .H55 R8 1987</td>
<td>PN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michigan: a history of the wolverine state</td>
<td>Dunbar and May</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1 reserve copy</td>
<td>F566.D84 1980</td>
<td>F5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michigan: a history of the wolverine state</td>
<td>Dunbar and May</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1 reserve copy</td>
<td>F566.D84 1980</td>
<td>F5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dancing skeletons</td>
<td>Dettwyler</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>GN655.M22 .D48 2014</td>
<td>GN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dialogues: An argument rhetoric and reader</td>
<td>Goshgarian and Krueger</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4 res copies</td>
<td>PE1431 .D53 2011</td>
<td>PE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Generation T: beyond fashion</td>
<td>Nicolay</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>TT550.N5423 2009</td>
<td>TT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The corporate athlete</td>
<td>Groppel</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>HF5386.G778 2000</td>
<td>HF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>She's a rebel: The history of women in rock &amp; roll 2nd ed.</td>
<td>Gaar</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1st ed: 1 circ copy</td>
<td>ML394 .G28 2002</td>
<td>ML</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religions of the West today 2nd ed.</td>
<td>Esposito et al</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>BL689.E87 2012</td>
<td>BL</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Prep for Analysis

- Simple Excel formulas allow you to convert text into numeric data in order to find percentage information:

```
=IF(C2="Yes",1,0)
```

Numerically-coded data allows easy calculation of averages/percentages
Prep for Analysis

- A truncating formula in Excel converts the copied-and-pasted call number into just the LC subclass.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>J</th>
<th>K</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Call #</td>
<td>Call#</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(per SkyRiver)</td>
<td>(Subclass only)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TT507.J46.2011</td>
<td>TT</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The second column is generated by the Excel formula:

=LEFT(J2,2)
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Results: LCC-owned items

- 22% of all items requested can be found in our college’s own library catalog.
- However, only 7% of requests were for items actually available to circulate from the library (excludes missing items, use-in-library only items, etc.).
- An additional 7% of requests were for items in the Reserves collection (i.e. currently required texts for a course), which have limited circulation.
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- 7% of requests are for items that we already have in our circulating collection—in a perfect world this would be 0%.
- Maybe we should rethink our practice of buying only a single copy of titles? Talk to professors about what will be in high demand?
- Shelf-read more for missing items?
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Implications: LCC-owned items

- 7% of items requested are in LCC’s reserve collection but reserves only account for 1.7% of our complete holdings. Suggests that demand for reserve items could be met better.
- Could buy additional copies of reserve items or switch to longer checkout period
- Maybe we should advertise MeLCat services at point of checkout for reserve items?
## Results: LC subclasses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LC range</th>
<th>Existing collection fraction</th>
<th>Request fraction</th>
<th>Rate of requests/existing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HD4801 - HD8999</td>
<td>0.0110</td>
<td>0.0081</td>
<td>0.7371</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HF5001 - HF5600</td>
<td>0.0226</td>
<td>0.0163</td>
<td>0.7200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KF</td>
<td>0.0251</td>
<td>0.0163</td>
<td>0.6481</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D - DZ</td>
<td>0.0414</td>
<td>0.0244</td>
<td>0.5889</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ML</td>
<td>0.0143</td>
<td>0.0081</td>
<td>0.5680</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TR</td>
<td>0.0152</td>
<td>0.0081</td>
<td>0.5349</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HD - HD100</td>
<td>0.0172</td>
<td>0.0081</td>
<td>0.4720</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HV6001 -</td>
<td>0.0306</td>
<td>0.0081</td>
<td>0.2657</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Results: LC subclasses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LC range</th>
<th>Existing collection fraction</th>
<th>Request fraction</th>
<th>Rate of requests/existing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>S - SA</td>
<td>0.0010</td>
<td>0.0325</td>
<td>34.050</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>0.0007</td>
<td>0.0163</td>
<td>24.070</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HN</td>
<td>0.0040</td>
<td>0.0325</td>
<td>8.0930</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BV - BW</td>
<td>0.0021</td>
<td>0.0163</td>
<td>7.7992</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RJ</td>
<td>0.0059</td>
<td>0.0407</td>
<td>6.8434</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BS</td>
<td>0.0029</td>
<td>0.0163</td>
<td>5.6982</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F - F1000</td>
<td>0.0059</td>
<td>0.0325</td>
<td>5.4855</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TT</td>
<td>0.0064</td>
<td>0.0325</td>
<td>5.0951</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Results: LC subclasses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LC range</th>
<th>Existing collection fraction</th>
<th>Request fraction</th>
<th>Rate of requests/existing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reserves collection</td>
<td>0.0200</td>
<td>0.0700</td>
<td>3.5000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Thank you for listening!

- Questions?
- Want the data/more information/to give me tips on being a better presenter? Email olmstee1@lcc.edu