University of Rhode Island
DigitalCommons@URI

Collection Development Reports and Documents | Collection Management

11-16-1993

Collection Development Update #33

William T. O'Malley
University of Rhode Island, rka101@uri.edu

Follow this and additional works at: http://digitalcommons.uri.edu/lib_cd_rpts

Part of the Library and Information Science Commons

Recommended Citation
O'Malley, William T., "Collection Development Update #33" (1993). *Collection Development Reports and Documents.* Paper 33.
http://digitalcommons.uri.edu/lib_cd_rpts/33

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by the Collection Management at DigitalCommons@URI. It has been accepted for inclusion in Collection Development Reports and Documents by an authorized administrator of DigitalCommons@URI. For more information, please contact digitalcommons@etal.uri.edu.

COLLECTION DEVELOPMENT UPDATE
#33
16 NOVEMBER 1993

Contents: AMIGOS/CACD Statistics

A number of the subject selectors had questions concerning the statistics distributed with the last Update [#32]. Those statistics compared our collecting practices with the largest academic libraries in North America [at least those ARL libraries who belong to OCLC, and who use the Library of Congress classification system]. There are three things to keep in mind when using the data:
Some definitions:

"Average Member"[avg mbr]==Statistically average peer group library obtained by dividing the number of peer group titles or holdings, as applicable, by the number of libraries in the peer group.
The 'avg mbr' figure for the peer group is the figure used when establishing the "Comparative Size".

"Comparative Size"==Relative size of our collection [titles] when compared with the Peer Group average member, expressed as a percentage.

"Percent of Collection"==The breakdown of our collection, or the average member of the peer group, according to the LC classification. You should note that the total of this column will always equal 100.00%

Attached is a summary sheet "AMIGOS/CACD 1981-1991; ARL and ACRL Libraries". I have prepared this sheet for your delight, edification, and instruction. AMIGOS calls the peer group 'large academic libraries'; while I have equated this group with our ACRL peer group, known as the 'second 100'.--They roughly correspond with one another. There are 93 libraries in our peer group: non-ARL libraries with more than 700,000 volumes to over a million in size.

Note "Total" line--the '% collection' column always equals 100.00. It is derived by dividing the figure in the 'avg mbr' column, or the URI title column, by the 'avg mbr' total figure. For example, the 'avg mbr' of an ARL library had 18,169 titles classed in 'D'. If you divide that figure by the total figure [i.e. 234,715], the result is 7.74% If you divide our 'H' title count [23,006] by our total count [117499], the result is 19.58%--i.e., about 20% of our recent collection is classified in H.

Note under URI, 'Comparative Size'--the first figure under ARL, compares us to the ARL figures, and the second figure under ACRL, compares that number to the ACRL figure: for example, our title count in 'N' is 4,166 titles, while the 'avg mbr' ARL library has 9896 titles, and the 'avg mbr' ACRL library has 4194 titles. By dividing our number of titles [4166] by the ARL [9896] and the ACRL [4194] you find our comparative size to both [42.10% and 99.33% respectively].

On average, we are 1/2 the size of the average ARL library [50.06%], and more than 10% larger than the average ACRL library [112.01%]. On a

comparative basis, we have far more S's[169.65%], V's[158.47%], PQ's[154.16%], Z's[143.74%], and R's[139.44%] than the average ACRL library.

It is instructive to look for anomalies up and down the columns and across them: for example, our efforts in BL-BX are extremely low no matter how you look at the figures. Our comparative size relative to both peer groups is the lowest of all, and the % of collection figure is also significantly less for URI. In what areas does URI have a larger comparative size than our overall comparative size: i.e. where are we higher than 50% for ARL, and 112% for ACRL? In what areas is our '% Collection' figure significantly greater than the ARL or ACRL average member [19.58% of our collection is in H, while only 16.25% of the ARL library is in H]. And so on.

Your interpretations of this data would be welcome.