Abstract

Purpose – The purpose of this paper is to discover the characteristics and quality of interlibrary loan (ILL) titles, and determine whether purchasing ILL titles is a useful collection development method.

Design/methodology/approach – The study analyzed document containing 18,322 monographic education and psychology monographs borrowed by Southern Illinois University Carbondale patrons through I-Share, Illinois’ statewide catalog, during the 2004 calendar year. Education and psychology books account for 574 of the 18,322 titles. The study located 132 reviews for 92 of the titles by searching PsycINFO and Education Abstracts. It recorded reviewer recommendation, publication date, publisher, source of review, and list price.

Findings – The paper finds that ILL titles are high quality, inexpensive, new, and easy to obtain. Average list price of education and psychology ILL titles is $48.82. A total of 60 percent of the titles were published in the last three years. Only 7 percent of the titles received negative reviews.

Practical implications – The paper recommends that Southern Illinois University Carbondale and, potentially, other academic libraries develop books-on-demand programs because most of the books in the present study are high-quality, inexpensive, new, and easy to obtain; ILL titles represent research needs of university community; multiple library patrons will benefit; equity will be added to the library’s collection; and ILL titles are likely to circulate again.

Originality/value – Previous studies report results of pilot books-on-demand programs. The current study provides background reasons for a books-on-demand program (reading book reviews of titles borrowed through ILL) and presents a new aspect of the relationship between collection development and ILL.
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Introduction

Sarah Whitehead, a graduate student at Southern Illinois University Carbondale (SIUC), needs a specific book for her thesis on writing across the curriculum. SIUC’s Morris Library does not own it, so she borrows it from another Illinois library using I-Share, the statewide catalog with user-initiated, non-mediated borrowing. Eight days later, she picks up Writing across the Curriculum: A Reader at Morris Library. Later that semester, the Education Reference librarian examines the list of items requested through I-Share during 2004. Of the 18,322 monographs borrowed by SIUC patrons, she notices several patterns related to books about education. For example, 16 of the titles are about teaching English as a second language. The librarian decides to study the list of interlibrary loan (ILL) titles and decipher education-related topics in the list, as well as form a list of recently published titles that can be purchased for Morris Library. The librarian’s overriding concern was “Why does Morris Library borrow thousands of books every year that might be good purchases for our collection?”.

Background

Morris Library is located on the campus of SIUC, a comprehensive research university with 21,387 students. Psychology and education are the two most popular degrees at undergraduate, graduate, and doctoral levels (Southern Illinois University Carbondale, 2006). The popularity of these programs, the author’s personal interest in them, and the semi-factual scenario above, form the basis of this article.

Between January and December 2004, the Morris Library borrowed 18,322 from Illinois libraries (via I-Share) and 9,219 additional items, including copies of periodical articles and items not available within Illinois, such as books, dissertations, theses, etc., through a manual, mediated ILL request system. SIUC is a part of I-Share, the shared catalog for 65 libraries in Illinois, which are all part of the Consortium of Academic and Research Libraries in Illinois (CARLI).

While Morris Library patrons have access to millions of materials held by CARLI libraries, collection development is still a core practice for the faculty liaisons (subject librarians) at SIUC. Liaisons include 15 library faculty members who have one or more subject specialties that match SIUC’s departments/programs.
The Education/Career Services Reference librarian ("Education librarian" and the author of this article) has long held a belief that ILL is a core library service that allows patrons to obtain access to virtually anything published, whether it is in the patron's home library or not. A library can use ILL to obtain an item that is:

- not owned by the library;
- currently checked out from that library;
- currently missing or lost from that library's collection;
- outside of the collection development guidelines; or
- too expensive for that library to purchase.

In essence, ILL serves as an access equalizer; library materials budgets may be declining, but a library can still get access to a needed item for a patron, without purchasing it. This is where ILL and collection development converge. While ILL is an unquestionably beneficial service for library patrons, the author feels that books requested from other libraries are often good candidates for a library's own collection. Analyzing lists of borrowed monographs may not always lead to a decision to buy particular titles, but rather to consider the subject as an indicator of collection gaps: "ILL data are generally used both qualitatively and quantitatively" (Livingston, 2004).

While even large research libraries cannot own every item its patrons need, ILL patterns should be examined for gaps in the collection. "This is not a plea for unrestrained collection building – we are all well aware that libraries cannot be self-sufficient or grow ad infinitum" (Roberts and Cameron, 1984). Ward (2003) notes that the 700-800 titles added through Purdue University's books-on-demand (BOD) program represent materials that are often high-use, interdisciplinary, recently published, and about emerging topics.

Research questions

The current study of using education and psychology ILL titles and book reviews in collection development is condensed into three main research questions:

1. What are the characteristics of the titles borrowed through ILL?
2. What is the quality of the titles borrowed through ILL?
3. Does a book that has been received through ILL represent a useful title or subject that a research library should consider in collection development decisions?

Literature review

Livingston (2004) succinctly describes the relationship between ILL and collection development when she says:

While acquisitions is geared to supporting the core information needs of the library constituency, interlibrary loan complements this role by providing access to additional materials that are out of scope, beyond the library's purchasing power, or any combination of these factors. Interlibrary loan data provide a glimpse into what is being borrowed. When viewed from an acquisitions standpoint, these data can point to gaps in the library collection and/or to specialized research in areas beyond the library's scope.

Because ILL has changed from being an auxiliary service to a heavily used service for any item a library does not own, some libraries are thinking more carefully about purchasing some of the ILL titles. Known as BOD programs, libraries at Purdue University and the University of Wisconsin Madison (UWM) created such services (Allen, 2003; Anderson et al., 2002; Ward, 2002, 2003). Purdue libraries order scholarly non-fiction monographs published in English during the last five years that cost less than $50 and ship within five days. The UWM libraries created a BOD program with similar criteria for acquisitions, with the exception of ordering both English and non-English monographs published during the last three years.

Studies published on these libraries' BOD programs provide useful statistics and insights. Materials purchased through both Purdue and UWM's BOD programs arrive one to four days sooner than regular ILL materials, and they circulate more than materials purchased through routine collection development methods. Anderson found that 68 percent of the BOD titles purchased during the project's first two years circulated at least one more time after the initial checkout by the ILL patron, while 42 percent circulated more than once (Anderson et al., 2002).

Anderson et al. (2002), Ward (2002, 2003), and Allen (2003) state that the BOD approach meets several needs:

- to collect books with a guarantee of at least one use;
- users who normally would not have a voice in collection development get to participate in the process of acquiring books;
- a safety net for acquiring interdisciplinary materials; and
- to acquire recently-published titles.

Bibliographers reported that, depending on the subject, 80-90 percent of the BOD titles were appropriate for the library's collection (Ward, 2003). It is true that many ILL requests are for recently purchased titles, as proved in Roberts and Cameron’s (1984) study. They found that a “considerable proportion of book ILLs consisted of recent, inexpensive in-print items, rarely outside the immediate subject interest of the requesting faculty” (Roberts and Cameron, 1984). Over 50 percent of the ILLs were published during the previous six years and 52 percent were in print (Roberts and Cameron, 1984). Roberts and Cameron (1984) state that ILLs indicate “unmet demand” within the requesting library.

Parker makes a uniquely sound argument when she notes that ILL provides no equity to the library collection. She says, “Money spent for books yields a capital asset in a community” (Parker, 1991). Later, Perdue and Van Fleet (1999) reiterate Parker’s ideas by stating:

In contrast, for each ILL transaction, the material only passes through our hands and satisfies a single library patron. While ILL is a cost-effective means of document delivery and provides for the immediate information need, the library collection does not benefit.

Parker’s article is the only one that discusses ILL in consideration of long-term value.

Perdue and Van Fleet describe a BOD program at Bucknell University's Bertrand Library that began as an effort to reduce ILL activity while improving the library collection. Books added to the collection were cataloged within two days, and subsequently routed to circulation to be held for the requesting patron. Overall, the turn-around time for fulfilling requests was 2.5 weeks. By taking into consideration delivery time, cost-per-title, processing costs, and circulation statistics, Perdue and Van Fleet (1999) conclude that:

... the purchase of books requested through ILL continues to be effective and cost-effective. ILL requests for books, generated at the point of need, result in a higher percentage of circulation and a higher number of uses than a similar selection of firm-ordered books.
To put cost-per-title into more concrete terms, the 2003 Bowker Annual of Library and Book Trade Information lists the average list price of a book purchased for university libraries during 2001 as $58.45 (Council of National Library Associations, 2003), while Blackwell North America’s average list price for 2004 is $67.44 (or $56.19 for US titles only) (Blackwell Book Services, 2005). Taken together, the current average price range for an academic monograph is $58.45-$67.44. In contrast, the estimated cost for ILL-per-title is much lower, and varies according to whether it is mediated (requiring the involvement of ILL staff at some point in the request stage) or non-mediated (user-initiated). In an ARL study published in 2004, Mary Jackson states the borrowing unit cost for mediated ILL in research libraries is $17.50 per title ($2.39-$14.70 for user-initiated borrowing) and the turnaround time is 7.6 calendar days (2.5-6.6 calendar days for user-initiated borrowing) (Jackson, 2004a, b). The average cost for both mediated and user-initiated ILL borrowing transactions in 2004 is $14.76 (Jackson, 2004a, b).

Discussing BOD services and the cost of ILL and of purchasing monographs calls for background on the access versus ownership debate. Articles frequently state that the average cost of borrowing a book is less than that of purchasing it. In fact, many authors have acknowledged that it is almost impossible to determine the true cost of owning an item, as well as to determine the true cost of a borrowed item. Higginbotham and Bowdoin (1993), however, give some guidelines on when to buy instead of borrow:

- the item is obviously relevant to the library’s collection development policies;
- buying the title is less expensive than borrowing it; and
- speed is critical, and buying is faster than borrowing.

Part of the debate surrounding access versus ownership centers on the uncertainty of how much a particular item will be used. Research has found that the most important factor in determining whether an item will circulate is whether it has already circulated. Fussler and Simon (1969) first posited that past circulation is the only reliable indicator of future use:

We theorize that books that have never been used have far less probable future use than books that have been used.

Later, Thornton (1993) published a dissertation on the relationship between book reviews and the circulation of books in an academic library. She concludes, as Simon and Fussler did, that the only predictor that a book will circulate in the future is whether it has already circulated.

**Methodology**

The author obtained information for 18,322 monographic items borrowed through I-Share, Illinois’ statewide catalog, by SIUC patrons during the period January-December 2004. The author sorted the entries by call number and chose education and psychology titles by examining the call numbers and titles. After the author deleted duplicate titles, textbooks, software guides, test preparation titles, reference titles, style manuals, career books, and grammar books, the final list of ILL items contained 574 unique education and psychology monographic titles.

The fact that the titles have been borrowed through ILL indicates a need for Morris Library to own them. Reading the titles’ reviews, however, provides another measure of each title’s value. Overall, the Education librarian’s goal was to find out more about each of the ILL titles. Depending on whether the title’s associated call number fell under education or psychology, the author searched for a review in either Education Abstracts (Wilson) or PsycINFO (OVID), two indexes that contain scholarly book reviews. The goal was to find at least one review for each title.

Once all of the available book reviews were located, the author read them, and recorded the following information: reviewer recommendation, date of publication, publisher, source of review, and price. “Reviewer recommendation” refers to the reviewer’s opinion of the reviewed title. A “P” (positive) was recorded for titles where the reviewer’s thoughts were entirely favorable, or mostly favorable. If the reviewer’s thoughts were unfavorable, or mostly unfavorable, the title was assigned an “N” (negative). If the reviewer’s comments were equally divided between favorable and unfavorable, the author assigned an “M” (mixed) to the title. Still, some reviews were purely objective; in these cases the author assigned the title a “D” (descriptive).

In general, the book reviews include either the cloth price or the paperback price of the title. In cases where no price was given, the author looked up the title in Books in Print (Bowker) and recorded the title’s cloth (hardcover) price.

**Findings**

This study resulted in 574 unique education and psychology monographic titles borrowed through I-Share by SIUC patrons between January and December 2004 (see Table I). Many titles were listed more than once, indicating they were borrowed multiple times by SIUC patrons. Of the 574 unique titles, the author located 132 reviews for 92 titles. Several titles had multiple reviews. Although 18 titles were borrowed two to five times, each title was counted one time.

Overall, 60 percent of the reviews were positive, while 23 percent were mixed, 10 percent were descriptive, and 7 percent were negative (see Table II). By discipline, the reviewers’ recommendations break down in a fairly similar fashion. Within the education titles, 58 percent were positive,

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table I</th>
<th>Examples of education and psychology monographs borrowed by SIUC patrons</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Title</strong></td>
<td><strong>Date</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bad Boys: Public Schools in the Making of Black Masculinity</td>
<td>2000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creating Inclusive Classrooms: Effective and Reflective Practices</td>
<td>2001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Divine Nine: The History of African American Fraternities and Sororities</td>
<td>2000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electroboy: A Memoir of Mania</td>
<td>2002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Next Generation: Third Wave Feminist Psychotherapy</td>
<td>2001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychology of Happiness</td>
<td>2001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychotherapy with Gay Men and Lesbians</td>
<td>2003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Readings in Deviant Behavior</td>
<td>2001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schoolteacher: A Sociological Study</td>
<td>2002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching and Learning at a Distance: Foundations of Distance Education</td>
<td>2003</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: * Indicates examples of titles borrowed more than once
Table II Book review recommendations of monographs borrowed by SIUC patrons

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Education</th>
<th>Psychology</th>
<th>All*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>P (Positive)</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M (Mixed)</td>
<td>58.18</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>62.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D (Descriptive)</td>
<td>21.82</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>23.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N (Negative)</td>
<td>14.55</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>132</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: * All* refers to both education and psychology titles

22 percent were mixed, 15 percent were descriptive, and 5 percent were negative. Within the psychology titles, 62 percent were positive, 23 percent were mixed, 6 percent were descriptive, and 8 percent were negative.

Considered together, most of the education and psychology titles were published in 2003 (24 percent), 2001 (22 percent), and 2002 (20 percent) (see Table III). The numbers differ when the subjects are considered separately. The largest number of education titles was published in 1999, while the largest number of psychology titles was published in 2003.

Recorded prices are a combination of cloth (hardcover) and paperback list prices. The average list price of all of 92 titles is $48.82. By discipline, the average list price is $42.44 for education titles, and $53.60 for psychology titles. The most expensive book costs $146.00, while the cheapest book is $12.95. Prices derived from the current study are in Table IV. Approximately 64 percent of the titles cost less than $50.00 to purchase, and 85 percent cost less than $75.00. A comparison of the average prices of an academic monograph and that of an ILL borrowing transaction is in Table V.

Conclusion

The Education librarian undertook this study of education and psychology titles borrowed from other libraries in order to find the answers to three main research questions:

1. What are the characteristics of the titles borrowed through ILL?
2. What is the quality of the titles borrowed through ILL?
3. Does a book that has been received through ILL represent a useful title or subject that a research library should consider in collection development decisions?

From the present study, the following characteristics of the ILL titles are discovered:

- Most (66 percent) are relatively new, published between 2001 and 2003.
- The average list price of the books is $48.82. The average list price of the education books is $42.44. The average list price of the psychology books is $53.60.
- A total of 18 books were borrowed more than once (two to five times).
- Most of the books are “good,” which we learn from their reviews. Only 7 percent received negative reviews.

In order to discuss the answers to the second and third research questions, we should review the most influential studies on this topic:

- Fussler and Simon’s (1969) study found that the only factor that determines whether an item will circulate is prior circulation.
- Anderson et al., 2002 discovered that 68 percent of UWM’s books-on-demand titles circulated at least once more time after the initial circulation by the ILL patron, and 42 percent circulated more than once.
- Parker (1991) and Perdue and Van Fleet (1999) stated that purchasing a title, as opposed to borrowing it, adds equity to a library’s collection, and provides for use by more than one patron.
- Ward (2002) reported higher turn-around times for books-on-demand programs than for regular ILL transactions.

The 574 education and psychology titles requested through I-Share represent research interests of SIUC students and faculty, and therefore are indicators of subjects needed in Morris Library’s collection. The current results are useful not only because they represent local research interests, but also because the titles in question have been requested through ILL. In essence, all of the education and psychology titles borrowed through the statewide catalog have been checked out at Morris Library at least one time. In some cases, a title has been checked out multiple times.

Table III Publication dates of monographs borrowed by SIUC patrons

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Education</th>
<th>Psychology</th>
<th>All*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>7.50</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>36.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>7.50</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>28.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>20.00</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>23.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>30.00</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999</td>
<td>35.00</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>3.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: * All* refers to both education and psychology titles

Table IV Prices in current study

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Education</th>
<th>Psychology</th>
<th>All*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Average price ($)</td>
<td>42.44</td>
<td>53.60</td>
<td>48.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Under $25.00</td>
<td>33.33</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>7.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$25.00-49.99</td>
<td>41.04</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>49.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$50.00-74.99</td>
<td>10.25</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>28.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$75.00-99.99</td>
<td>5.13</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$100 +</td>
<td>10.25</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: * All* refers to both education and psychology titles

Table V Average academic monograph price vs ILL borrowing cost

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Monograph price ($)</th>
<th>ILL borrowing cost ($)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Current study</td>
<td>Bowker Blackwell ARL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>42.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychology</td>
<td>53.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All</td>
<td>48.82</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Fussler and Simon’s (1969) study revealed that the only way a librarian can determine if a title will be checked out is if it has already circulated. Anderson later found that 68 percent of UWM’s BOD titles circulated at least one more time after the initial circulation by the ILL patron, and 42 percent circulated more than once. The current author equates one ILL request with one circulation. In the long-term, the cost of purchasing, processing, cataloging, and preserving the book will benefit multiple SIUC patrons, and will improve Morris Library’s collection.

Another contributing factor in the author’s feelings towards the titles is the fact that 60 percent of the titles received a positive review. The purpose of locating book reviews for the ILL titles was two-fold:
1. to find out more about each title; and
2. to learn the quality, or caliber, of titles requested through ILL at SIUC.

Because such a low number of the titles received negative reviews (5 percent), it is established that depending on patrons’ ILL requests, and therefore depending on their opinion of titles, is a useful method for selecting titles to purchase for an academic library.

Many of the education and psychology titles are cheap, new, and easy to obtain. Of the 92 titles for which book reviews were located, 85 percent cost $75.00 or less (64 percent cost $50.00 or less). As all of the titles have been published since 1999, 64 titles (70 percent) during the past three years, most of them will still be in print. A total of 85 percent of the ILL titles are “cheap,” which is defined by the author as priced under $75.00. In the academic library world, this is indeed cheap. Considering discounts given to libraries by many book vendors, the average price of an academic monograph ($58.45-67.44) could be as much as 40 percent lower (not counting the cost of library processing, cataloging, etc.). This price range is admittedly higher than the average price of an ILL borrowing transaction, currently estimated at $14.76.

There is another compelling reason Morris Library should purchase the titles in the current study, and should maintain a similar policy in the future. Adding a title to a library collection benefits the library’s community of users, not just one patron at one time, as in the case of interlibrary loan. Purchasing an item for a library provides an asset, or an investment, for the community to use in the future. If a title can be purchased and received just as quickly (or quicker) as if it had been borrowed through ILL, and it fits the library’s collection development policy, the library should purchase it. This leads the author to the overall recommendation resulting from this study: to begin a BOD program at Morris Library.

When ILL staff members notice a request for a book written in English published during the last five years that fits Morris Library’s collection development policy, the request should not continue as an ILL request, but rather should be transferred to the acquisitions department. Acquisitions staff should find out if the title can be obtained soon enough to satisfy the patron, i.e. quicker than, or as soon as, an ILL would arrive. It is hoped that turn-around time for a BOD program would be similar to that mentioned by Ward (one to four days sooner than regular ILL materials) and Jackson (7.6 days for mediated ILL and 2.5-6.6 for user-initiated ILL). At the least, it should meet the LibQUAL report of user expectations: 6.6-8 days (Jackson, 2004a, b).

This process cannot be done through I-Share because it is user-initiated (unmediated by library staff), but it can be accomplished for titles requested via the manual ILL request system, currently ILLiad. If Acquisitions staff members determine the title can be obtained immediately, it should be ordered and rush-cataloged for the patron. If Acquisitions staff determine the title cannot be obtained quickly enough, the request should be transferred back to ILL staff, where it can continue as an ILL request.

A BOD program at SIUC will have an impact on the materials budget. If a specific amount of money (e.g. $5,000) is taken from the regular monograph budget for a pilot BOD, there will be less money for the subject liaisons to spend on other monographs for that year. The amount would be subtracted from each subject-related fund, because the BOD monographs will cover all subjects. On the other hand, the money could be transferred from the “lost” fund, which is meant for purchasing new copies of lost/missing books. After the first year of the BOD project, the amount, as well as the overall program, should be assessed with the help of subject liaisons. At that time, it will also be possible to assess the number of titles being borrowed through ILL. If there is a significant reduction in the number of borrowed monographs, it may be possible to reallocate ILL funds to the materials budget.

A few other miscellaneous ideas were discovered during this study, related to collection development. The author plans to regularly read the education journals in which the book reviews were located, including Modern Language Journal and Teachers College Record. Also, the education publishers in this study will also be used in future collection development, especially with customizing the library’s approval plan. Publishers include Cambridge University Press and Lawrence Erlbaum Associates (four titles).

This study proves that integrating ILL information into routine collection development is an effective way to improve monographic purchasing decisions in a research library. The titles in the study represent the research interests of local patrons and are good quality, cheap, new, and easy-to-obtain. Morris Library, and potentially any library that develops a BOD program, will add equity to its collection. By purchasing titles requested through ILL rather than borrowing them, the library will be investing in the local community, not just one patron. The library pays a price whether the book is borrowed or purchased. If the title is purchased, it provides an investment for the library’s community to use now and in the future.

A BOD program will add several new elements of service to the library, as previously discussed (Anderson et al., 2002; Ward, 2002; Allen, 2003). The institution will regularly acquire recently published titles with a guarantee of at least one use. Many of these titles will be from interdisciplinary areas that are often missed in routine collection development. Lastly, users who do not normally have a voice in collection development will get to participate in monographic purchasing. As a result, the library’s collection development policy will become more responsive to the university community’s research needs.
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