

# Saint Louis University Library Collections: Usage and Expenditures 2000–Present

Prepared by  
Pius/Medical Center Libraries Assessment Committee  
May 6, 2013

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

Introduction	1
Purpose and Approach	
Summary of Findings	
Data Used	
Benchmark Institutions	
Collection Size	2
Evaluating a Research Library	
Expenditures	3
Total Print Expenditures	3
Print Expenditures Per Student FTE	4
Electronic Resource Expenditures	5
Interlibrary Loan and Reserves Expenditures	6
Reserves Expenditures	7
Materials Usage	8
Use of Print Material – Circulations, Reserves, ILLs	8
Usage of Print Materials Per Student FTE	8
Print Usage Trend Compared to Student FTE	9
Interlibrary Loan	10
A Ratio to Reflect Our Collection's Usefulness	
Usage of Electronic Resources	12
Total Database Logins	12
Successful Full-Text Article Requests	12
Practical Implications and Significance	13
Appendix – Data Tables that correspond to Figures in report	15





# Expenditures


---

## TOTAL PRINT EXPENDITURES

Comparing the SLU libraries' expenditures for print materials during 2000 with our benchmark institutions, SLU ranged from having the smallest budget (#8 of 8) in 2000 to #5 in 2002 to #8 again in 2004, #4 in 2006, #4 in 2008, and #6 in 2010. Of our peer institutions, Marquette ranked SLU in four of the six years, Fordham in three out of six years, and Loyola Chicago in two out of six years.

In the most recent year, 2010, Fordham, Marquette, Georgetown, Notre Dame, and Washington University all have larger budgets for print collections.

Print expenditures represent a smaller portion of SLU libraries' budget than do electronic resources. For example in 2008, the print budget was 37.5% of the combined budget for print and electronic resources, while in 2010, print resources accounted for 30% of that budget.



Peer institutions: Fordham; Loyola Chicago; Marquette. Aspirational institutions: Boston College; Georgetown; Notre Dame; Washington U.

*PRINT EXPENDITURES PER STUDENT FTE*

Although there are some gaps in the comparative data for full

## *ELECTRONIC RESOURCES EXPENDITURES*

Electronic resources are defined as resources to which the libraries subscribe or have purchased in electronic format. This includes, but is not limited to, article indexes, full-text access to digital scholarly journals and dissertations, digitized historical archives and statistical resources.

Peerinstitutions: Fordham; Loyola Chicago; Marquette. Aspirational i

*INTERLIBRARY LOAN AND RESERVES EXPENDITURES*

The costs of providing materials in support of teaching and research





# Materials Usage

---

## *USAGE OF PRINT MATERIALS – CIRCULATIONS, RESERVES, ILLs*

Data displayed in the following three charts shows overall usage of the print collection has increased significantly over the decade from 2000 to 2010. The data show increased usage regardless of whether usage of the collection by non-SLU libraries patrons is included (see Fig. 8) or the data is limited to usage by SLU patrons only (see Fig. 9)

Peer institutions: Fordham; Loyola Chicago; Marquette. Aspirational institutions: Boston College; Georgetown; Notre Dame; Washington U.

*PRINT U TTTICIDG Tc O W E (R) Q K Tc T E M (S) D W 2*


# Interlibrary Loan

---

## *A RATIO TO REFLECT OUR COLLECTION'S USEFULNESS*

Another measure of usage has to do on one hand with the extent to which a library's own patrons are forced to resort to the resources of another library because needed resources are not available locally and, on the other hand, the extent to which patrons of other libraries resort to the use of SLU materials that are not available in their libraries. A "net lender" library's collection is highly useful to both its own patrons (who borrow proportionally less from other libraries) and those of other libraries (who borrow more from it proportionally than they borrow from their own library). A "net borrower" library's collection is less useful

Fig. 11- Ratio of Items Loaned to Items Borrowed (ILL)



Peer institutions: Fordham; Loyola Chicago; Marquette. Aspirational institutions: Boston College; Georgetown; Notre Dame; Washington U.

# Usage of Electronic Resources

---

## *TOTAL DATABASE LOGINS*

Total database logins reflect the number of times the SLTm L o o8r1(e o)-5(r1(e it)2(h)-8('m)-4(po)-5(id e)5(c)2(t)

*PRACTICAL IM*





# Appendix

---

	2000	2002	2004	2006	2008	2010	2012
<b>Saint Louis University</b>	\$1,085,088	\$1,277,421	\$1,246,239	\$1,384,976	\$4,053,868	\$4,272,091	\$3,528,497
<b>Fordham University</b>	\$91,009	\$246,355		\$2,035,268	\$2,770,970	\$715,284	
<b>Loyola University Chicago</b>	\$1,308,393	\$823,467	\$675,647	\$921,956	\$2,473,964	\$2,509,339	
<b>Marquette University</b>	\$647,104		\$1,320,440	\$2,261,147		\$4,014,155	
<b>Boston College</b>	\$583,421	\$1,525,664	\$1,978,359	\$2,027,743	\$5,168,684	\$6,259,720	
<b>Georgetown</b>	\$1,141,114	\$1,544,114	\$1,978,359	\$2,027,743	\$5,168,684	\$6,259,720	\$3,528,497

Fig. 6& 7 – See body of report.

603310114.2523 -729.36693cm 6033m 6033l 1033l h f\* Q Q603310933.2523 -729.36693cm 6033m 6033l 1

**Fig. 11 - Ratio of Items Loaned to Items Borrowed (ILL)**

	2000	2002	2004	2006	2008	2010
<b>Saint Louis University</b>	1.09	1.22	1.12	1.60	0.90	0.70
<b>Fordham University</b>	2.75	2.79		1.72	1.79	1.83
<b>Loyola University Chicago</b>	1.39	1.35	1.72	0.94	0.82	0.64
<b>Marquette University</b>	1.20		0.82	0.92		1.12
<b>Boston College</b>	1.81	1.67	1.63	1.17	1.29	1.12
<b>Georgetown University</b>	1.39				1.53	0.95
<b>University of Notre Dame</b>		2.11		1.35	1.23	1.00
<b>Washington University in St. Louis</b>	0.91	0.75	0.69	1.00	1.04	1.10

**Fig. 12 - Number of Logins to Databases or Services (SLU)**

	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011
<b>Saint Louis University</b>	357,292	400,000	459,953	620,255	955,738	1,183,873	698,086	781,671

**Fig. 13 - Number of Successful Full-Text Article Requests (SLU)**

	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011
<b>Saint Louis University</b>	542,862	661,901	\$1,480,622	1,602,151	1,318,170