











Scholarly information and collections

Metric owner: Angela Bridgland

Analyst: MLRuwooldt

<p>C1. Collection development  </p> <p>C2. Collection usage </p> <p>C3. Collection management  </p> <p>C4. Public-access collections </p> <p>C5. Inter-library and co-op loans </p>	<p> Trends and insights</p> <p>C1. Materials Vote's purchasing power is declining. Acquisition patterns are changing, eg many journals only available digitally. Materials Vote is indexed against CPI and topped up from bequests and trust funds.</p> <p>C2. Includes physical and online resources. Our internal lending rates are high in comparison with other universities. However, a minority of items listed in catalogue as 'available' are actually borrowed; usage rates vary between collections.</p> <p>C3. Physical space is a constraining factor. Catalogues are incomplete, patchy in quality. Few systems allow regular monitoring and analysis of performance. Responsibility for analytics and reporting is unclear.</p> <p>C4. Includes ePrints and Aust Digital Theses repositories. We perform well on number of records; availability of theses has been an issue.</p> <p>C5. UofM is a net borrower from other institutions.</p>
<p> Implications for UofM</p> <p>C1. We have \$3-5 million less buying power than major Australian competitors, and we are slipping further behind. Possible options: index the Materials Vote differently; run a continuous fundraising campaign; reduce acquisitions.</p> <p>C2. Active management and development of collections could result in higher usage rates, greater value to scholars and the University: eg collections could be better leveraged in curriculum design.</p> <p>C3. Funding is needed for cataloguing and preservation of archives, special collections and cultural collections. Review of library systems in 2008 should include consideration of capacity to produce regular, useful statistical reports.</p> <p>C4. Usability of ePrints system could be improved. Current strategy of providing bibliographic data (regardless of whether the full text is available) remains sound, providing a public profile for UofM scholarship where none previously existed.</p> <p>C5. Demonstrable value in continuing to participate in cooperative lending schemes and shared repositories.</p>	<p> Actions that could change the ratings</p> <p>C1. Revise funding model for library acquisitions. Include sustained funding in terms of acceptance for any materials bequest or major acquisition.</p> <p>C2. Consider removing the 'available' flag in catalogue for any items that are on open shelves but cannot be borrowed. (Use a different flag?)</p> <p>C3. Conduct a quarterly metrics review to aid collection management.</p> <p>C4. Improve usability, accessibility and standards compliance of ePrints repository system.</p> <p>C5. Continue existing partnerships, pursue new opportunities.</p>