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- Private, Catholic University
  - 4,871 undergraduates (88% full time)
  - 3,293 graduates (33% full time)
  - ~800 faculty & staff

- Other Walsh Library users
  - SHU Alumni; others via ReBL, VALE, PALCI, ILL
  - Extended library hours attract local students

- Our print book collection.
  - 500,000+ books (excluding journals, archives and special collections)
  - Concerns re space, maintenance, loss or theft, lack of use/declining circulation.
1. SHU books by subject area.
Based on OCLC data July 2011, n = 402,112 excluding government documents & “other”
2. Number of books in subject area by publication date range.
3. Proportion of books in major subject areas published since 2000

(n = 74,945)

- Humanities: 21.0%
- Social Science: 16.4%
- Business & Economics: 16.3%
- Science: 11.1%
- Health & Medical Sciences: 10.9%
## 4. Circulation of SHU books

based on OCLC circulation data 2005-9

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject area</th>
<th>% books in subject published in 2000's</th>
<th>% books in subject circulated between 2005 and 2009</th>
<th>Average checkouts 2005-9</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Arts</td>
<td>34.4%</td>
<td>28.6%</td>
<td>1.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sociology</td>
<td>18.4%</td>
<td>27.9%</td>
<td>2.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>History</td>
<td>22.0%</td>
<td>25.0%</td>
<td>1.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health &amp; Medical Sciences</td>
<td>16.4%</td>
<td>23.9%</td>
<td>2.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political Science</td>
<td>14.8%</td>
<td>23.7%</td>
<td>2.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>17.1%</td>
<td>23.4%</td>
<td>1.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anthropology</td>
<td>30.0%</td>
<td>23.0%</td>
<td>1.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychology</td>
<td>12.0%</td>
<td>22.7%</td>
<td>1.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Law</td>
<td>14.6%</td>
<td>21.5%</td>
<td>1.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>19.8%</td>
<td>21.1%</td>
<td>1.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philosophy &amp; Religion</td>
<td>16.0%</td>
<td>20.9%</td>
<td>1.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business &amp; Economics</td>
<td>11.1%</td>
<td>18.1%</td>
<td>1.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science</td>
<td>10.9%</td>
<td>12.2%</td>
<td>1.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Literature</td>
<td>11.7%</td>
<td>9.2%</td>
<td>1.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Average</strong></td>
<td><strong>17.8%</strong></td>
<td><strong>21.5%</strong></td>
<td><strong>1.88</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5. Currency vs. circulation

(r = 0.614, df =12, p < 0.05)
6. total checkouts by year and subject 2005-9
(n = 19,208 checkouts)
7. Checkouts by patron type, from Voyager data July 2010-11 (n = 38,395 checkouts)

- Undergraduate: 46.4%
- Grad student: 22.4%
- Faculty: 13.6%
- Adjunct: 11.1%
- Admin/Clerical/Other SHU: 7.6%
- Alumni: 0.9%
- REBL/visitor: 5.2%
- EZ borrow/ILL: 2.8%
8. Science books, OCLC vs. Voyager by date
(OCLC = 28,192; Voyager = 28,939 as at July 2011)
9. Science books by date and location
(Voyager data, n = 28,939)
10. Main science collection: circulation vs. publication date
(from Voyager data, n = 26,190, average circulated 12%)
11. Average times science Books circulated 2005-10 by location

- Main (average 1.8)
- Curriculum (average 3.5)
- Other (average 1.3)
12. % of science collection vs. % of science books circulations 2010-11 by subject
(from Voyager data, n = 1246 science book checkouts)
CONCLUSIONS

- 21.5% of our books were checked out at least once (average twice) in the five years 2005-9.
- There is variation by subject area, but generally more recent books are more likely to circulate.
- Our book collection is stronger and more current in the humanities than in other subject areas.
- Our science book collection is small & outdated: 6.4% of total books, almost 90% >10 years old.
- Over 36% of “recent” science books circulated & circulation has not declined in past 5 years.
- There is not a good fit between subject collections and subject circulation.
RECOMMENDATIONS

- Judicious weeding is clearly needed
  - some older books are still in demand (or do students disregard publication dates?).
- We need a better match between our academic programs and collections, especially in the underfunded non-humanities subjects.
  - We need more consultation with faculty, book store, students.
- Begin a pilot PDA program for e-books with ebrary.
  - 48% of hand-picked e-books were used at least once in the first year. PDA should allow better fit at less cost.
- Budget, budget, budget!
  - Less money = fewer resources. There is no magic wand.
PROGRESS

- Inventory and weeding is well underway
  - Better World Books a market/recycler for many unwanted books. We have sent 50+ boxes already.

- Efforts to reach users ongoing
  - And we are consulting with bookstore re textbooks

- Pilot PDA has begun with ebrary.
  - We are being conservative (selection not broad profile) but have added 750 books so far.

- Budget, budget, budget!
  - Driving us to “just in time” vs. “Just in case” ... good, bad, indifferent?
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