

LIBRARY RESOURCE SHARING IN BRITISH COLUMBIA



OPEN LEARNING
AGENCY

LIBRARY RESOURCE SHARING IN BRITISH COLUMBIA

POST-SECONDARY LIBRARIES

**A Report Prepared For
The Electronic Library Network
Open Learning Agency**

Basil Stuart-Stubbs

November 1992



**STUART
STUBBS
& ASSOCIATES**

Canadian Cataloguing in Publication Data

Stuart-Stubbs, B. (Basil), 1930 -

Library resource sharing in British Columbia post-secondary libraries

Includes biographical references.

ISBN 0-86498-652-1

1. Library cooperation — British Columbia. 2. Library information networks — British Columbia. 3. Inter-library loans — British Columbia. 4. Library resources — British Columbia. I. Electronic Library Network (B.C.) II. Open Learning Agency (Burnaby, B.C.) III. Title.

Z735.B7B38 1993 021.6'4'09711 C93-091206-3

CONTENTS

Executive Summary	1
Acknowledgements	11
Organization of Report.....	12
Definitions and Sources	13

PART I: Resources

Nature and Distribution of Resources	19
Collection Statistics	19
Standards.....	20
Resource Ownership and Resource Sharing	24
Policies	25
Goals and Plans	26
Management	29
Collection Contents.....	30
Periodicals	30
Monographs.....	32
Other Formats.....	33
Collection Expenditures	34
Cooperative Collection Development.....	36
Options for Change.....	39
Solutions Proposed By Participants	39
General Recommendations.....	40
Development of Policies	40
Periodical Subscriptions.....	41
College Libraries	41

PART II: Resource Sharing Mechanisms

Overview of Interlibrary Loan in Canada	45
Policies and Administration.....	46
Traffic in Resource Sharing	49
Borrowing and Lending Volumes.....	49
Copies vs. Volumes	53
Content	53
Value	55
Source Libraries and Cooperatives.....	56
Projected Traffic.....	57
Elements of Interlibrary Loan	59
Location Systems.....	59
Early Location Systems	59
Traditional Union Catalogues	59

Printed Union Lists	60
Fiche	60
Online	61
Role of Utilities	61
National vs. Regional Catalogues.....	62
OPACs.....	63
CD-ROM.....	64
Electronic Full-Text Documents	67
Options for Change.....	70
Solutions Proposed By Participants	70
Recommendations.....	70
Enhancements of ELN Databases and Outlook.....	70
Communication Systems	71
Mail	71
Telex	72
Electronic Mail.....	72
UBCLINC	72
Internet	73
Options for Change.....	73
Solutions Proposed By Participants	73
Recommendations.....	73
Extension of Internet.....	73
Delivery Systems.....	74
Mail	75
Couriers.....	75
FAX.....	75
ARIEL	75
Alternative Document Delivery Systems	76
OJAC	77
Options for Change.....	78
Solutions Proposed By Participants	78
Recommendations.....	78
Implementation of ARIEL.....	78
Canada Priority Courier.....	78
Cost Allocation Systems.....	78
Recognition of Costs	78
Evolution of Charging.....	80
Cost Studies	82
Options for Change.....	83
Solutions Proposed By Participants	83
Recommendations.....	83
ELN Resource Sharing Fund	83

Management Systems.....83

 System Level: NET and MEC84

 Evolution.....85

 Performance.....85

 Institutional Level: Management of the Process.....86

 Standards.....87

 UBCLINC87

 Other Software.....87

Options for Change.....87

 Recommendations.....87

 ELN As Manager.....87

 Training.....89

 Planning and Coordination.....89

Resource Sharing and the Future of Libraries89

PART III: References

References.....93

PART IV: Appendices

Appendix 1: Initialisms, Acronyms and Abbreviations103

Appendix 2: Tables.....107

 Table 1: Library Expenditures109

 Table 2: Library Expenditures As A Percentage Of Institutional Expenditures110

 Table 3: Library Dollars Per Student.....111

 Table 4: Library Materials Expenditures112

 Table 5: Materials Expenditures As A Percentage Of Total Library Expenditures113

 Table 6: Books: Expenditures114

 Table 7: Periodicals: Expenditures115

 Table 8: Periodicals Expenditures As A Percentage Of Materials Expenditures116

 Table 9: Holdings: Books117

 Table 10: Holdings: Subscriptions.....118

 Table 11: Circulation.....119

 Table 12: Interlibrary Loan: Print Items Borrowed.....120

 Table 13: Interlibrary Loan: Media Items Borrowed121

 Table 14: Borrowing: Copies As A Percentage Of Total Circulation.....122

 Table 15: NET Borrowing As A Percentage Of Total I.L.L. Borrowing123

 Table 16: Interlibrary Loan: Print Items Loaned124

 Table 17: Interlibrary Loan: Media Items Loaned125

 Table 18:Lending: Copies As A Percentage Of Total Items Loaned126

Table 19: Lending: NET's Percentage Of Total Items Loaned.....	127
Table 20: Simon Fraser University	128
Table 21: University Of British Columbia.....	130
Table 22: University Of Victoria	132
Table 23: British Columbia Institute Of Technology	134
Table 24: Camosun College.....	136
Table 25: Capilano College.....	138
Table 26: Cariboo College.....	140
Table 27: Douglas College	142
Table 28: East Kootenay Community College.....	144
Table 29: Emily Carr College Of Art And Design	146
Table 30: University College Of The Fraser Valley	148
Table 31: Justice Institute Of British Columbia	150
Table 32: Kwantlen College	152
Table 33: Malaspina College	154
Table 34: College Of New Caledonia.....	156
Table 35: North Island College	158
Table 36: Northern Lights College	160
Table 37: Northwest Community College	162
Table 38: Okanagan University College.....	164
Table 39: Open learning Agency	166
Table 40: Pacific Marine Training Institute	168
Table 41: Selkirk College	170
Table 42: Vancouver Community College	172

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Objective of Study

This report on library resource sharing among B.C. post-secondary libraries has been prepared for the Open Learning Agency under the direction of its Electronic Library Network Office. The objective of the study as described by the O.L.A. was:

“To identify and evaluate the key components that facilitate or restrict resource sharing of library collections and other information resources among B.C. libraries. A primary goal is to determine what can be done to extend resource sharing by removing barriers and improving those elements that affect the quantity and quality of services. Information is to be collected about current policies and practices, costs and related financial requirements. Proposals for change and improvement are to be developed, addressing financial as well as policy or procedural matters.”

Scope of Study

The report concentrates primarily on resource sharing among the libraries at twenty-four provincially supported post-secondary institutions: four universities, three established and one new; sixteen colleges; three institutes; and one agency. It also examines the present condition of resources at those libraries. Secondly it deals with public, special and school libraries in their resource-sharing relationships with post-secondary libraries.

The report's recommendations are directed to the Electronic Library Network and the Open Learning Agency and deal with issues appropriate to and within their mandate. However, in carrying out this study the consultant naturally encountered other issues of major importance to the welfare and progress of post-secondary libraries, but not necessarily within the mandate of ELN or OLA; these will be described in the report for the information of anyone concerned.

The consultant noted the absence of any provincial coordinating agency for post-secondary libraries, parallel to the Library Services Branch of the Ministry of Municipal Affairs, which, among other things, plays a coordinating role in respect to the public libraries, and provides them with direct financial support. In the absence of such a coordinating agency the Electronic Library Network is performing that role, but its mandate does not extend to cover all matters concerning the collective welfare and activities of post-secondary libraries.

Resources

Collections in the B.C. post-secondary libraries now total approximately 7.6 million volumes. These libraries currently subscribe to approximately 55,000 serials. For purposes of comparison the library at the University of California, Berkeley alone contains 7.7 million volumes and subscribes to 87,000 serials.

Of these totals, the three established university libraries account for approximately 6.1 million volumes and 42,000 subscriptions, whereas the college, institute and agency libraries together account for 1.5 million volumes and 13,000 subscriptions.

Like most of the educational and cultural resources of the provinces, library collections are not evenly distributed geographically. Two university, one institute and five college libraries in the Lower Mainland account for 5.6 million volumes and 40,000 subscriptions. Given that public library resources are also concentrated in the Lower Mainland, students in this region enjoy advantages of access not available to students elsewhere in the province. One of the principal objectives of resource sharing is to address this imbalance.

The college library collections in general, and particularly those outside the Lower Mainland, fall short of or barely exceed the minimum standards recommended by both U.S. and Canadian standards for libraries of this type. The elevation of some colleges to university-college status has pointed up the weakness of these collections, and attempts are being made to improve them.

However efficient resource sharing can be made, it cannot compensate for the fundamental weakness of collections at the colleges.

Computer-based techniques are now available for assessing collections against comparable collections at other libraries and against standard bibliographies. These techniques could be employed in a separate inquiry into the condition of college library collections.

B.C. post-secondary library expenditures for all purposes amounted to approximately \$54 million in 1990/91. Of this amount, approximately \$15 million was spent on information resources of all kinds: books, periodicals, and the media. Approximately 55.5% of university collection expenditures is for serials, compared to 29.9% for the other post-secondary libraries.

University library expenditures for all purposes increased by 47.5% in the ten years from 1981/82 to 1990/91; for collections alone the increase was 70.2%. The percentage of total university expenditures allocated to libraries declined from about 8.2% to 7%.

College and institute library expenditures for all purposes increased by approximately 47.1% in the same period; for collections alone the increase was 65.5%. These figures approximate those for the university libraries. However, the percentage of total college and institute expenditures allocated to libraries averaged about 3.5% over the entire ten-year period.

The universities spent an average of \$720 per student for library purposes and the college and institute libraries spent an average of \$299 per student in 1990/91. The range at the college and institute libraries was from \$30 to \$541, with a median of \$294.

The rate of inflation in the costs of books and serials, particularly those of an academic nature, has exceeded the general rate of inflation. This, coupled with the decline in the value of the Canadian dollar, particularly against U.S. and U.K. currencies, has reduced the purchasing power of library collections budgets. Libraries are buying fewer books than they did ten years ago, though more are being published. They are cancelling journal subscriptions in significant numbers because they can no longer afford them. These facts, coupled with the general weakness of college collections, will increase the importance of resource sharing in coming years.

Despite early and continuing predictions that information technology would lead to a decline in the quantity of printed material, the opposite has happened. The computer has abetted the production of new knowledge and its recording in printed form. At the same time, the number of electronic information products is increasing, in the form of databases on tape, compact discs, videodiscs, etc. New services based on electronically stored information are proliferating. Access to all information formats is essential for educational purposes, and libraries must be capable of obtaining and providing that access.

For purposes of resource sharing, the various publication formats (printed books and serials, microforms, media, electronic documents) can and must be handled in different ways.

Resource Sharing

Volume of Traffic

In 1990/91 B.C. post-secondary libraries acquired 47,124 items through resource sharing, or interlibrary loan. Of this total, they provided 16,374 items to one another (35%), and the rest were acquired from other libraries both in and outside of B.C.

In 1981/82, the comparable figures were 27,962 items and 16,979 items (60%). At that time resource sharing received financial support directly from the government. When this support was redirected through the universities and colleges the result was a quick decline in resource sharing. By 1985/86 the total number of items shared among the B.C. post-secondary libraries had decreased to 10,472 items. It has increased gradually since then; however, lending and borrowing among the B.C. post-secondary libraries as a group has declined as a percentage of the total traffic from a high of 60% to the present 35%, even though total traffic has increased by 74% in ten years. It appears that the libraries, in order to avoid a fee-based lending/borrowing structure, are diverting their requests away from each other to libraries which are not yet charging for interlibrary loans. Thus use of the total resource of the B.C. post-secondary libraries is not being maximized.

Location Systems

At the same time, the Electronic Library Network has greatly simplified the first time-consuming step in the interlibrary borrowing process, the locating of items, through its online products the ELN Serials Database and the ELN Media Database, and through the Outlook database on CD-ROM, produced jointly with the Library Services Branch of the Ministry of Municipal Affairs. These products, combined with the now available direct access to the online public catalogues of the three university libraries, allow the post-secondary libraries to know quickly whether a specific item is held by any of them, or by a public library in British Columbia.

The ELN databases are now central to the future success of resource sharing among B.C. post-secondary libraries, and should be maintained and enhanced indefinitely.

Indexing and Abstracting Services

The university libraries are beginning to enrich their own online public access catalogues by adding to them the databases of major indexing and abstracting services. These services continue to be available in their original printed form, and access to their electronic form has been available for years through commercial

computer-based information brokers; these brokers charge customer libraries or individuals for each search made. However, the university libraries are now able to acquire the same databases for a fixed and predetermined annual fee, and are thus able to allow faculty and students direct access to these services through the same terminal used to locate items in the universities' own catalogues. The proprietors of these databases use a variety of bulk pricing systems, based for example on the size of the institution's budget, or the number of students. They also require the purchasers to sign a contract obliging them to confine use to a specific body of users.

At the same time, increasing numbers of indexing and abstracting services are making their databases available on CD-ROM. B.C. post-secondary libraries have been actively acquiring these products, and making them directly available to faculty and students. Because of the ease of use and efficiency of CD-ROM, students and faculty are identifying more citations relevant to their interests, and expectations are raised concerning access to the cited documents, with implications for interlibrary loan. For convenience of use, many libraries are dedicating one CD-ROM reader per CD-ROM service, a practice to which there must be physical and economic limits. There are now at least thirty-two different CD-ROM products located at the post-secondary libraries, with more appearing on the market every month. They are expensive to acquire, usually more expensive than their paper equivalents; and as in the case of the proprietors of the databases mentioned in the previous paragraph, pricing schedules and contracts are used to regulate access and thereby protect the market for the product. Opportunities for savings through group purchases are available and could be exploited by the ELN.

Electronic Full-Text Services

While these databases and CD-ROMs deal mainly with indexes and abstracts, some deal with full texts, e.g. dictionaries, encyclopedias, tables of contents and even the full text of journal articles. More and more information will become available both in paper and electronic form; some of it will be available only in electronic format. Electronic publishing is in its early years, and it is a growth industry.

There is an important difference between printed documents and electronic documents where a group of libraries is concerned. From the point of view of the student and faculty member, in the great majority of cases the most desirable situation is to have immediate access to the printed document, and not to have to wait for it to arrive on interlibrary loan; that is, the optimum situation for library users is the local ownership of printed documents.

Electronic documents, however, can be centrally owned. If costs of telecommunications can be equalized within a region, it does not matter where an

6

electronic document is mounted; location is of no significance to the user so long as he or she has immediate access. For both technical and economic reasons, central acquisition of electronic documents offers advantages.

The Electronic Library Network can be compared to the B.C. Knowledge Network; the latter deals with visual images, the former with text. The Open Learning Agency, as the proprietor of both, is a natural location for an Electronic Library, serving all of B.C. post-secondary education, and containing electronic documents of all kinds as they become available in increasing numbers. On a system basis, this is more cost-effective than leaving individual libraries to acquire electronic documents for mounting on local systems; and it will give all institutions access to a greater number of electronic documents.

Printed documents form the largest part of the total information resource at B.C. post-secondary libraries, and will continue to do so in the near future, and probably the distant future; electronic documents will complement printed documents as part of the total information resource.

Communications and Delivery Services

Locating printed documents within B.C. libraries has been simplified through information technology as applied by the Electronic Library Network. The ELN is also actively investigating ways of making the delivery of printed documents more efficient.

In the nineteen sixties the appearance of the low-cost photocopying machine assisted libraries greatly in sharing resources; for the first time it was practical to make copies of documents, in lieu of mailing out entire volumes. Generally, periodical articles are seldom supplied now in their original form, but almost always as copies. The same is not true of entire books, which are usually supplied in their original and complete form.

In the nineteen eighties the appearance of the facsimile transmission or fax machine allowed libraries to overcome problems inherent in conventional delivery systems; copies could be transmitted directly and instantaneously to a distant library, or even to an individual. However, the fax machine was not perfect: resolution was not sufficient for some type faces and points, illustrations and diagrams. Moreover, the fax machine, like the photocopy machine, is labour intensive.

The Electronic Library Network has commenced a pilot project with a technology more advanced than fax, called ARIEL, which permits entire digitized page images to be transmitted through the Internet, with improved resolution, and at

lower cost. The probability of success of this technology is very high. However, it will not be available to all post-secondary libraries, and especially those in the more distant parts of the province who need it most, until Internet is extended to their campuses. Access to Internet would also allow those distant libraries to access a variety of other catalogues and indexing services not available to them now.

It is not practical, or even legal, to use fax or any similar electronic technology to deliver the conventional book, which accounts for roughly half of all interlibrary loan traffic among B.C. post-secondary libraries. Yet the Open Learning Agency without great effort and with little expense could assist in improving delivery time of printed materials among the post-secondary libraries; as one of the largest clients of Canada Priority Courier, OLA enjoys its most favourable rate, and the inclusion of the libraries in its contract would extend that rate to libraries. The cost of a parcel up to ten pounds would be between \$3.04 and \$3.12; several books could be included in one parcel. Canada Priority Courier will provide the statistics needed to allow OLA to charge back delivery costs to the respective libraries. Regular use of Canada Priority Courier by all libraries would probably reduce delivery times to all regions to an average of forty-eight hours for printed volumes or media items such as videotapes. Probably this could only be improved upon by institutionally-based and committed courier systems, some of which are in place.

The locating and delivering of items are two segments of the total interlibrary loan process where the Electronic Library Network has introduced and will be introducing improvements. The third segment of the process falls in between: the actual processing of the document request within the individual library. In this area too the ELN can make a contribution.

Management Systems

Interlibrary loan processes are labour intensive: in effect, the library is performing all the routines that the individual borrower conventionally does for him or herself. The item has to be located, physically retrieved, checked out, perhaps copied, packaged, weighed, mailed or otherwise delivered.

At UBC a subsystem was developed within the online public access catalogue system for the purpose of handling interlibrary loan requests, under the name of UBCLINC. This subsystem is now widely used by borrowing libraries throughout the province. It has many features, among which is the ability of the borrowing library to search UBC's catalogue and to indicate wanted items at the same session, on the same terminal. At UBC the requests from other libraries are printed out in call number order, by branch library (UBC has a dozen). The system also maintains internal records, and has eliminated a variety of manual routines.

8

Software packages which make interlibrary borrowing routines more efficient are now being offered by vendors of library systems; these will operate on a personal computer, in contrast to UBC's system which like its catalogue operates on a mainframe computer. The implementation of this software at all sites and its integration into the network will improve the efficiency of interlibrary loan operations significantly.

Another respect in which ELN could assist is in the area of training. Interlibrary lending and borrowing requires specialized skills and knowledge; normal staff turnover, combined with constant technological change, results in a need for a regular program of education. Whether this is best handled by annual workshops or by distance education methods, in which OLA is expert, is a question that requires further study. However, an initiative in the area of training is required, and ELN is well situated to provide it.

One of the most persistent and problematical of obstacles to efficient resource sharing among B.C. post-secondary libraries is cost. That there must be costs associated with a process so labour-intensive is obvious: the difficult questions are what are the costs and who pays them?

Accounting Systems

The practice of one library charging another for an interlibrary loan began in the nineteen seventies, following almost a decade of debate mainly among the major research libraries of the United States and Canada. Early in the century the practice of interlibrary loan commenced on the understanding that the amounts of any library's borrowing and lending would be more or less equal; and if a library turned out to be a net lender, it would provide the service as a courtesy. This worked well enough when the number of loans annually amounted to a few hundred. But with the burgeoning of the post-secondary educational system in both countries, and the expansion of programs of graduate study and research, major libraries found themselves deluged with an increasing number of requests for materials, obliging them to spend more and more of their resources on serving other universities and colleges.

As a means of dealing with this problem, some major libraries began to charge fees, both to discourage use and to derive revenue for the staffing of interlibrary loan offices. The University of Toronto Library was the first to do so in Canada; the University of British Columbia followed.

When the B.C. Post-Secondary Interlibrary Loan Network was established in 1978, it was fee-based, and the Ministry responsible for universities funded the

system. As a result the three universities, which because of the size of their collections were automatically net lenders, were compensated for their net lending activity; this revenue was (and is) used to provide staff to carry out interlibrary loan routines. As the statistical evidence demonstrates, the NET system was at its most effective under this arrangement. When central funding ceased, it became less effective. The Library Services Branch has now instituted a compensation system for public libraries; however, post-secondary libraries are not yet compensated for loans they make to the public libraries. A provincial system involving all types of libraries would have the effect of encouraging use of the total provincial library resource: the holdings of all the public libraries of British Columbia would be accessible to students at post-secondary institutions.

Recommendations

General

- A.** That the members of the Council of Post-Secondary Library Directors attempt to agree on a common format for collection policy documents, and take steps to revise or develop individual policy documents at their respective institutions.
- B.** That the three major university libraries attempt to coordinate the development of their periodical collections, both in respect to selection and deselection and with particular attention to titles unique in the province; and that when the procedures for coordination have been determined, other post-secondary libraries be involved in the process.
- C.** That the Ministry of Advanced Education carry out an in-depth study of the condition of college and institute libraries, their collections, services, staff and physical plant, in relation to the future and developing programs of those teaching institutions; and on the basis of that study develop programs to improve where necessary the condition of those libraries.
- D.** That consideration be given by the Ministry of Advanced Education to the establishment of a coordinating agency for B.C. post-secondary libraries.

Specific to the Electronic Library Network

- 1.** That ELN maintain a database of statistical information concerning B.C. post-secondary libraries, building on the database developed for this report.

10

- 2.** That ELN continue to maintain, enhance and improve access to its union databases for serials and the media.
- 3.** That ELN continue to cooperate with the Library Services Branch in the compilation and improvement of the Outlook database; and that it investigate the feasibility of enhancing the database by including holdings of other types of libraries such as government and special libraries.
- 4.** That ELN, in order to improve the efficiency of the locating function by eliminating the necessity to look in several databases for the location of an item, explore ways to enable libraries to search at a single session the foregoing databases, together with the catalogues of the four university libraries.
- 5.** That ELN assume the role of broker in negotiating network prices for access to online bibliographic databases and document delivery services, and for the purchase of databases and other electronic documents on CD-ROM.
- 6.** That ELN establish a true Electronic Library by acquiring electronic documents on behalf of all B.C. post-secondary libraries and making them available through the same central computing facility used to maintain and provide access to its own databases and those of the post-secondary and public libraries; in effect to become the textual equivalent of the visual image-based Knowledge Network.
- 7.** That ELN lobby with the appropriate authorities for the extension of the Internet to all post-secondary libraries.
- 8.** That ELN continue to pursue electronic alternatives to physical document delivery, as in the case of its ARIEL Pilot Project.
- 9.** That ELN take advantage of OLA's favourable rate with Canada Post's Priority Courier Service, to expedite delivery of documents in physical formats, at lower unit costs.
- 10.** That ELN seek the means to reimburse post-secondary libraries for their lending activities, based on the numbers of items provided; and that it explore with the Library Services Branch the establishment of reciprocal reimbursement arrangements with public libraries, so as to facilitate access to the resources of all public libraries on behalf of post-secondary students.
- 11.** That ELN arrange for programs of education for the purpose of training staff in interlibrary loan routines, on at least an annual basis.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This report would not have been possible without the cooperation of the librarians of the post-secondary institutions who completed long, detailed and frequently difficult questionnaires. I hope that their aspirations for improved service to the students and faculty of their institutions are served by this report and its recommendations. Particular thanks are due to Margaret Friesen and Mary Anne Epp, respectively the coordinators of the B.C. Post-Secondary Interlibrary Loan Network (NET) and the Media Exchange Cooperative (MEC), for the statistical and other factual information they were able to provide as work progressed on this study.

Basil Stuart-Stubbs

November, 1992

ORGANIZATION OF REPORT

This report has two major parts: the first deals with resources, in other words the collections and other assets of the individual libraries that can be shared. The second and longer part deals with resource sharing; chapters deal with the activities involved in resource sharing, namely identifying and locating items, communicating messages, delivering documents, accounting for costs and managing operations. Sections within each chapter provide background and historical information, survey findings, a description of current problems, possible solutions to these problems, and recommendations.

DEFINITIONS AND SOURCES

The term "resource sharing" came into common use among librarians during the nineteen eighties, just as the word "network" entered their vocabulary in the nineteen sixties. There is no accepted definition of "resource sharing" or even of the word "resource" in the library context. It has yet to be used as a subject heading in the standard index *Library Literature*, which continues to place general articles on resource sharing under the heading **Library Cooperation**, a phrase which has been in use since the turn of the century. Articles dealing with one element of resource sharing, the provision of materials by one library to another, it places under another long-established heading, **Interlibrary Lending**. For the purpose of this report "resource" will be taken to mean any element of a library which can be shared: not just printed materials, but information in all other formats, including electronic formats; computer time and programs; and staff. The report deals mainly with interlibrary lending, which itself has been a misnomer since the invention of the Xerox machine, when libraries began to supply copies of documents in lieu of lending original printed copies. But it also deals to a lesser extent with the sharing of other resources of the kinds listed above.

The information and opinion on which the report is based was derived from a variety of sources: from library literature, from reports both published and unpublished, from questionnaires completed by post-secondary librarians, and from statistics supplied by libraries or collected previously by governments and library organizations.

Both available and supplied statistics presented the consultant with a variety of problems, as follows:

Incompleteness. Some information was either never collected or has been lost in intervening years.

Inconsistency. Figures reported in questionnaires were sometimes different from figures given in other documents for the same year and item.

Incompatibility. Libraries and library organizations do not always count the same things in the same ways. Moreover, a library can also change what it counts, so that statistics cease to be comparable over a span of time. The same can be said of the government and the teaching institutions, which during the eighties changed the way in which they measured enrollment.

Inexplicable fluctuations. Some figures will appear to be the result of error because they diverge noticeably from a norm or trend. But sometimes there may be good reasons, not always stated, for these fluctuations; for example, a prolonged strike can cause circulation figures to drop dramatically.

As a result of these problems it was not possible for the consultant to develop a completely accurate picture of measurable library performance and development in the last ten years. Nevertheless, the available statistical information can be accepted as an approximation of reality, sufficient to allow the determination of some major trends.

Experience with the available statistics suggests to the consultant that it would be desirable to build a single, consistent database of basic statistics concerning post-secondary libraries in B.C. At the present time the three existing university libraries complete an annual statistical report for the Canadian Association of Research Libraries. The college and institute libraries complete a similar but not identical report for the Council of Post-Secondary Library Directors. Statistics concerning lending and borrowing activity within the B.C. Post-Secondary Interlibrary Loan Network (NET) and the Media Exchange Cooperative (MEC) are separately maintained by the coordinating offices of those two consortia.

To create a database it would be necessary to decide what items should be measured for future inclusion. Most of these items, such as circulation, are already measured and reported, and could be taken directly from the annual reports forms prepared for CARL and CPSLD. But there may be other items essential to an understanding of the operations and development of post-secondary libraries which should be measured and included in the database. This will be especially true for the area of resource sharing. For example, it may be essential to keep track of in-province and out-of-province loans, or the traffic between types of libraries, or the number of documents delivered electronically as opposed to physically.

Recommendation

If the ELN Office is to play a central role in resource sharing in this province, it would be logical to give it the responsibility of determining through consultation with the post-secondary librarians what the nature of the statistical database will be; of developing and administering a questionnaire supplemental to those prepared for CARL and CPSLD; of receiving information from these two organizations as well as from NET and MEC; and of creating and maintaining the database. It would be the responsibility of the libraries to ensure that the required statistics were collected locally and reported to ELN according to a predetermined and agreed-upon schedule.

Recommendation 1:

That ELN maintain a database of statistical information concerning B.C. post-secondary libraries, building on the database developed for this report.

PART I: RESOURCES

Nature and Distribution of Resources

Collection Statistics

As explained earlier in this report, it was not possible to assemble a complete set of statistics dealing with ten years of activity within the post-secondary library group. For some years figures are missing. Statistical methodology changed over this period of time, so that what was counted one way in one year was counted a different way in succeeding years. Variations in methodology were most apparent in the non-print area, so that it is not possible to provide aggregate figures for such materials as microforms and videos. Nevertheless, some general statements can be made about the size and nature of the resources available for sharing.

Although it does not tell the whole story, the most commonly used measure of the size of libraries is the number of physical volumes they contain. In 1990/91 the post-secondary libraries held about 7.6 million volumes. Of this number the three developed university libraries held 6.1 million volumes, and the college and institute libraries held the balance of 1.5 million.

University library and college library collections appear to be growing at different rates. University collections grew by 30% over the ten year period from 1981/82 to 1990/91, whereas the college library collections grew by nearly 57%, although there are significant variations in the growth rate of colleges. One college grew by only 14%.

Statistics on periodical subscriptions can be affected by the definition of "periodical" which seems to have changed over the years, and which seems to be different among libraries. If there has been no change in methodology at SFU and UBC in the past decade, it appears that SFU's subscription list has been reduced from 13,570 titles to 11,508, and UBC's from 33,815 to 22,729. This squares with the fact that both libraries have been forced by financial circumstances to cancel periodical subscriptions. Because more cancellations are in prospect, this is an ominous development for resource sharing, given that these two libraries are perceived as major resources for periodical literature in the province, and not just by the academic sector.

By contrast, the number of periodical titles maintained by college libraries has increased from over 8,000 to nearly 13,000 in ten years. This is supported by statements made by college librarians to the effect that they are strengthening their periodical collections. However, it is likely that there is necessarily a considerable amount of duplication among college and university library periodical collections.

The provincial resource of monographs, periodicals and audiovisual materials is concentrated in the Lower Mainland. Two university, one institute and five college libraries in the Lower Mainland account for 5.6 million volumes and 40,000 subscriptions out of the above totals. Students in this region are in an advantageous position compared to students elsewhere in the province.

Standards

Standards provide a useful means of assessing the adequacy of libraries in relation to the kinds of communities they serve. Existing standards for academic libraries are derived from a prolonged examination and analysis of these libraries internally and in the context of teaching and research institutions. Once defined, the standards are subject to periodic revision in the light of developments in both the information and the educational sectors. Standards deal with all components of libraries, but all include a section dealing exclusively with collections.

Twelve libraries (one university and eleven college) stated that they are attempting to achieve published standards where their collections are concerned. The university library referred to the National Collection Inventory Project, stating that generally it hoped to achieve Level 3 in this system of grading collections. However, the NCIP is not a standard. There are still no accepted standards as such for large university libraries, those that were in use proving to be unworkable for organizations that ranged in size, for example, from Harvard to Brandon. In 1989 the Association of College and Research Libraries adopted a document called *Standards for University Libraries: Evaluation of Performance*. (Association of College and Research Libraries 1989) To call these standards is a misnomer: they simply suggest measures of performance that can be used in evaluating university libraries without offering any qualitative or quantitative norms.

The situation is different for college libraries, which have a variety of standards to choose from. Some of the eleven college libraries stated that they were basing their objectives not on one but on two standards. There are now four sets of standards or guidelines in use by B.C. college libraries:

Association for College and University Libraries. Standards for College Libraries, 1986. (Association for College and Research Libraries, 1986) This Association is a section of the American Library Association. The first edition of the standards was approved in 1959, and revised in 1975 and 1986. These standards are "...intended to apply to libraries supporting academic programs at the bachelor's and master's degree level.... They are not designed for use in two year colleges, larger universities,³ or independent professional schools." The standards are both qualitative and quantitative.

Association of College and Research Libraries and the Association for Educational Communications and Technology. Standards for Two-Year College Learning Resource Programs: A Draft. (1989). (Association of College and Research Libraries 1989) These standards apply to two-year and three-year academic institutions awarding an associate degree or certificate. Like the preceding *Standards for College Libraries*, these are both qualitative and quantitative.

Canadian Association of College and University Libraries. Community & Technical College Libraries Division. Standards for Learning Resource Centres: The Canadian Context, 1991. These are an adaptation of the foregoing standards to the Canadian situation, and are also both qualitative and quantitative.

Carter, Ross and Chisholm, Virginia. Statements of Learning Resource Centre Standards for British Columbia Colleges and Institutes. First Edition, 1991. This document draws upon the previously mentioned standards and on the 1978 report of the Subcommittee on Role Definition of the B.C. Regional College and Institute Library Standards Committee. The "statements" expand on those found in the other documents, but are qualitative only. An appendix provides some suggestions for measuring performance quantitatively. Both these *Statements* and the previous document are applicable to two-year colleges only. Thus the only standards useful to those B.C. colleges offering four-year programs are the 1986 ACRL standards.

In respect to collections, the qualitative standards proposed by these standards and guidelines are similar:

"The library's collections shall comprise all types of recorded information, including print materials in all formats, audiovisual materials, sound recordings, materials used with computers, graphics and three-dimensional materials. ... The library shall provide as promptly as possible a high percentage of the materials needed by its users." (ACRL 1986)

"The learning resources program shall make available an organized collection of materials and diversified forms of information useful in the educational process, including various forms of print and non-print media, computer software, optical storage technologies, and other formats. ... A collection policy statement shall serve as the basis for selection and acquisition of materials. The selection of materials shall be coordinated by the professional staff, working closely with the campus community ... The collection shall be of sufficient scope and currency to support the curriculum as well as meet individual information needs of students and faculty..." (ACRL 1989)

The CACUL 1991 standards quote the previous ACRL document.

Carter/Chisholm provide fifteen guidelines for collections assessment and development, building upon the standards above. In avoiding the complex and controversial issue of quantitative standards, Carter/Chisholm offer this: "The size of the collection depends on such criteria as the scope and complexity of the curriculum, level and types of programs offered and the size and character of the student body. The collection's size will ensure that students may rely on it solely (except for very esoteric materials) to complete normal instructional assignments."

Measured by the latter criterion, many of the college library collections require improvement, to judge from comments made by the librarians. However, this type of evidence is often not convincing to those who decide the fate of libraries; simple assertions are not persuasive. Verner Clapp and Robert Jordan, pioneers in the development of quantitative measures of library performance, made the point nearly three decades ago: "When ... standardizing authorities omit or refuse to set standards in quantitative terms, the budgeting and appropriating authorities, who cannot avoid quantitative bases for their decisions, are compelled to adopt measures which though perhaps having the virtue of simplicity, may be essentially irrelevant." On the other side of the argument, some of the best economists and consultants in North America have had difficulty in quantifying the operations and costs of libraries. In respect to interlibrary lending, a detailed analysis of costs is taking place at the present time, under the auspices of the Association of Research Libraries and the Research Libraries Group. When it comes to collections themselves and their appropriate size in relation to a given institutions, there is no other guide than the collective judgement reflected in the available standards.

To examine each of the college libraries in relation to the standards listed above would take another report. However, a simple comparison of the book and periodical holdings of the college libraries, as of 1990/91, with the quantitative tables provided in *Standards for Learning Resource Centres: The Canadian Context*, indicates that many of the collections of British Columbia college libraries fall short of minimum standards, while others barely exceed those minima. In the following table the colleges are arranged in groups according to the number of FTE students, this being the system of classification used in the above standards. The table also shows the "minimum" and "excellent" standards as recommended in the above document.

500-999 FTE

	Volumes	Periodical Subs.
Minimum	45,000	400
Excellent	67,500	700
Emily Carr College of Art	11,069	150
Northern Lights	31,272	301

1,000-2,999 FTE

	Volumes	Periodical Subs.
Minimum	60,000	600
Excellent	90,000	1,200
EK	37,129	572
FV	59,579	488
NC	112,400	720
NW	26,571	417
SEL	69,429	538

3,000-4,999 FTE

	Volumes	Periodical Subs.
Minimum	85,000	800
Excellent	120,000	1,280
CAM	46,517	316
CAP	101,595	564
CAR	68,755	1,279
DOUG	91,536	638
MAL	94,515	1,002
OK	88,289	1,339

9,000-10,999 FTE

	Volumes	Periodical Subs.
Minimum	166,000	1,400
Excellent	250,510	2,180
VCC	155,670	1,333

In examining these comparisons, it should be kept in mind, first, that these are standards for colleges offering two-year programs only, and, second, that they apply only to single campus colleges. This simple exercise gives credence to the claims by college librarians that they are not able to meet in an appropriate and timely way the information needs of their student clients. The fundamental weakness of college

library collections at most institutions cannot be dealt with exclusively by resource sharing.

Resource Ownership and Resource Sharing

Post-secondary librarians in B.C. have not been alone in North America in attempting to meet minimum standards with limited means. All libraries have been contending with spiraling costs and relatively flat or declining budgets. This has led to an increasing number of discussions at conferences and in the literature on the relative merits of owning published materials as opposed to acquiring them temporarily. Should a library buy or borrow? But those who raise the question of "access vs. ownership" give the impression that these are exclusive alternatives, either in general or in specific cases. Some of those who are most vigorous in their advocacy of access in preference to ownership happen to be the managers of some of the largest academic libraries, who not only have significant resources to make available to their local users, but who also face the most severe budget problems in attempting to maintain these resources. Their situation and that of college librarians in B.C. are vastly different, and so is the situation of students and faculty at their institutions.

From the point of view of the student, whose needs are pressing and who is usually working within a narrow time frame, there is no substitute for being able to go to a library and obtaining in one place at one time all the material he or she requires. To be told that the library does not own a given item and that it can be obtained through interlibrary loan in a week or two is not helpful to the majority of students. Even with the most effective work routines and the use of the most efficient document delivery systems, such delays are commonplace. In the Lower Mainland, students have alternatives: if they can't obtain what they need at one library, they can visit another, including two university libraries and one major public library. Even then, they may find that they are not able to borrow materials, or that they are already in use by other students. Outside the Lower Mainland students are much less fortunate.

Nor will the maximum use of available technology address the shortcomings of local collections. To borrow the words of Noelene Martin:

"Widespread but incomplete information about the possibilities inherent in electronic information technologies have led many, particularly institutional administrators, to see in these technologies the ultimate solution to the problems caused by the information 'explosion' and shrinking institutional budgets. To some extent the library profession has been at fault in over-emphasizing the benefits. Users have come to assume that the new ways will simply make everything quicker and easier to obtain." (Martin 1989)

It is too soon for at least the college libraries to think of resource sharing or the most complete exploitation of electronic technology as substitutes for local resource development. These should be considered as a complement to local resources, and every effort should be made to make the resource sharing process more efficient and to improve access to remote resources. As will be discussed in the second part of this report, whether resource sharing is less expensive than resource ownership has yet to be established.

Policies

At twelve libraries, including one university library, collection development is guided by written policies. Six other libraries, including two university libraries, stated that they were in the process of developing collections policies. Three do not have a policy statement, and one did not answer the question. With one exception, all the policy statements have been adopted or reviewed since 1986, one as recently as June 1992. They vary in size from a single page to nearly a hundred pages.

The policies do not appear to have been developed from a single model. Although they differ in organization and language, some have several features in common. No existing policy statement contains all of the elements listed below, compiled from the collection of all policies submitted for this report:

- *Policy objectives*
- *Policy scope*
- *Budget procedures and management*
- *Statement of responsibilities*
- *Selection procedures*
- *Nature and purpose of collection*
- *Objectives of collection development*
- *Standards adopted for collections*
- *Criteria for selection in relation to:*
 - *Types of publication*
 - *Types of media*
 - *Subjects*
- *Duplication*
- *Textbooks*
- *Gifts*
- *Weeding and withdrawals*
- *Copying and copyright*
- *Intellectual freedom*
- *Appeals procedures*
- *Policy review procedures and timetable*

In only one instance does there appear to be provision for an annual review of policy. Although librarians take the initiative in developing policy statements, it is not always clear from the documents by whom the policies are formally adopted.

Statements in some of the policies bear directly on topics discussed in this report, and deserve to be quoted.

"New Programs. Additional funding must be allocated to the Library budget sufficiently in advance to ensure that appropriate resources are available for both instructors prior to and students at the time of start up. The actual amount of funding should be determined at the time the program proposal is being developed and should be included in the proposal as it goes forward for approval." (BCIT)

This deals with one of the most common complaints made by college and institute librarians, that educational programs are approved and started by institutions without either notifying or consulting the library, and/or making adequate and timely provision for funding to develop related collections. In the process of curriculum development, approval and implementation at many institutions the needs of students for immediate access to appropriate collections seems to be ignored.

"Recognition of Other Institutions' Collections. The Library considers the holdings of other libraries in its region when developing its collection. In particular, it takes into account the proximity of [local academic and public libraries]. The Library relies on the province's university libraries to provide materials at the post-graduate research level and on the public libraries to provide popular and recreational material." (DOUG) In the same vein: "... the collection will be maintained with an awareness of the library resources of cooperating institutions in the Vancouver area." (VCC).

However, with these two exceptions, there is no reference in the available policy statements to the practice, actually followed by many libraries, of taking into consideration for purposes of local collection development the holdings of other nearby or remote libraries.

Goals and Plans

Collection development at the post-secondary libraries in the past decade has taken place against a background of increasing expectations and demands for library

services, concurrent with a decline in purchasing power, the latter arising from inflation in the cost of materials, the depreciation of the Canadian dollar, and, when these are expressed in constant dollars, relatively level or in some cases declining budgets for collections.

Eighteen libraries stated that they have established goals for the development of their collections; all have plans. In some cases the goals are very general, e.g. "to support teaching and research programs within budget limitations." In other cases they are more definite, relating to the attainment of collections of a given size. The plans described in the responses were even more specific, dealing with particular elements of the collection. Taken together, these goals and plans demonstrate that the post-secondary librarians are striving to provide their institutions with collections that will serve their students and faculty well, and doing this by addressing the problems that are interfering with the attainment of this objective. The following list of goals and plans is drawn from the responses of the librarians, and gives an indication of how they intend to proceed in the coming years.

There is a general desire to develop a better relationship with the faculty. First, the librarians hope to be included in the program planning process or at the very least have their libraries' needs considered during the development of programs and courses. Closer liaison with faculty would help to achieve this, but some librarians will seek a formal step in the approval process whereby no program will go forward unless the library's collections can support it, or unless the library is given the means to develop a collection to support it. Second, the librarians want to involve individual faculty members to a greater extent in the collection development process, down to the level of selecting individual items.

Improvements to budgets will be sought. Libraries would like to increase their share of the institutional budget, and within the library budget increase the percentage spent on collections. Rather than relying exclusively on institutional support, some libraries will be actively seeking donations, grants and endowment funds from foundations, organizations and individuals.

There will be changes to the way in which the collections budget is managed. Some libraries will explore different methods of allocation, to ensure that all fields of knowledge covered by the curriculum are fairly treated in the development of the collection. The proportion spent on various kinds of material will change, with some libraries, particularly those adjusting to new third- and fourth-year level programs, spending

more on periodicals and on retrospective collections.

Special areas will be targeted for development in the collections. At many college libraries it still remains to develop core collections in all the subjects being taught, and this has been identified as a priority for attention. Reference collections are also frequently mentioned as being in need of improvement through expansion and updating.

An increasing portion of the budget will be spent on materials in non-print formats. Film has been all but completely replaced in the last decade by videotape, which is now being joined by videodisc. Substantial collections of microforms already exist in post-secondary libraries, but this format will receive more attention as all libraries attempt to deal with the costs of periodicals, and particularly at college libraries where microforms will be acquired as an alternative to back files of printed serials, and even to current subscriptions. In the last few years indexes and full texts on CD-ROM have been welcomed enthusiastically as substitutes or additions to the printed versions, and more of these appear on the market every month. Undoubtedly other information storage media will appear during the present decade and will find their place in the libraries' constellation of information sources. In connection with non-print materials, there is a desire to make this material more accessible through improvements in the standards of cataloguing, and through the acquisition of more and better hardware for its use.

Included in the plans of several libraries are programs for improving some specific aspect of the collection, for example its Canadian content, or its depth in narrow subject areas.

Ongoing weeding programs also figure in the plans of the librarians, as a means of ensuring that the collections are current and relevant, and that space in the library is not taken up with material that is no longer needed or wanted.

The majority of librarians, in responding to questions about goals and plans regarding collections, answered from the perspective of their own library in isolation. Only a few libraries took into account in their plans the possibility of cooperative collections development programs and resource sharing. These were the libraries of northern B.C., where the libraries of the University of Northern British Columbia, the College of New Caledonia, Northwest Community College and Northern Lights College have recently established a consortium to deal with matters of common interest.

Management

Although the administrative arrangements for collections development vary among the university and college libraries, depending primarily on their size and complexity as institutions, in all cases the responsibility for collection development rests ultimately with librarians, working within policies where these exist, and within budget limitations. In the smallest libraries the director will be personally involved in the selection of materials. In the largest the task of developing the collection is delegated to a separate administrative division staffed with bibliographers, who work with other librarians and faculty members in selecting materials. Between these extremes the most common arrangement is for reference librarians to assume responsibility for selection, usually along subject lines. Faculty members are involved in the process in various ways, and to varying degrees, though only one college described its selection process as "faculty-driven". Decisions about selection of individual items are frequently subject to an approval process, either by a more senior librarian or by a committee established to oversee the development of the collection.

Librarians may have the responsibility for development of the collection, but at many college libraries they encounter difficulty in meeting that responsibility. There are three common complaints. First, as mentioned above, they are not notified about the development of new programs and courses, nor given resources to support such developments. Second, budgets are not sufficient to develop or maintain collections with enough breadth and depth to support existing programs. Third, librarians are either too few in number or have too little time to attend to the work of collections development. Conditions are somewhat different at those colleges which are developing university programs, at Cariboo, Fraser Valley, Malaspina and Okanagan. These four libraries have received supplementary funding for collections, though not the additional staff needed to deal with the increased workload of selection, acquisition and processing. Furthermore, the supplementary funding is just that: it is not a permanent addition to the budget and it is not certain that, following the expenditure of these grants over the next few years, any continuing provision will be made for the maintenance of collections which will have been expanded in scope.

All libraries report that, though they may be spending more, they are buying less. To deal with this, systems of priorities have been introduced, with attention being given to maintaining the reference collections, and developing core collections to meet the requirements of the many new programs and courses that have been and are being introduced.

Collection Contents

Periodicals

College libraries in the process of developing their collections to support university programs state that they are increasing the numbers of their periodical subscriptions, with the emphasis on those which are indexed, especially by indexes on CD-ROM. In addition to current subscriptions, libraries are acquiring back files on microform. Because journal subscriptions are expensive and require a continuing commitment, titles are being chosen carefully. Sixteen libraries reported that they took into consideration the holdings of other post-secondary libraries in the province in the development of their own subscriptions list. Asked to list in rank order the libraries they considered, the majority pointed to the three established university libraries:

	Rank 1	Rank 2	Total
Simon Fraser University	1	6	7
University of British Columbia	10	2	12
University of Victoria	2	2	4
Total	13	10	23

Given that the university libraries, and UBC in particular, have been the primary source for journal articles supplied through ILL, this is not a surprising result. College libraries also mentioned considering the collections of other proximate college libraries, but usually assigned them a lower rank.

Thirteen libraries also stated that they paid attention to the periodical holdings of local public libraries, and a few reported that they considered the holdings of government and special libraries where these libraries maintained specialized collections relating to the programs of colleges and institutes.

When it is a question of cancelling rather than subscribing to serials, twelve libraries reported that they had implemented a program of cancellations in the past five years, of whom eleven also reported giving consideration to the holdings of the university libraries in selecting titles for cancellation. In this connection, UBC was ranked first by seven libraries, and SFU was ranked second by five libraries.

These responses suggest that the university libraries are regarded as resource libraries where periodicals are concerned, and the implicit assumption is that these libraries can be counted on to respond to needs for access to periodical literature that college libraries in particular cannot meet themselves. However, this assumption may be proved false, given that all three university libraries have been obliged to engage in periodical cancellation programs in the last five years, and expect to carry

out more such programs in the near future. Moreover, there is little evidence that any formal consultation concerning their respective cancellation programs is carried out among the three university libraries. SFU reported that although it does consider the holdings of UBC and UV in connection with new subscriptions, it gives no such consideration when it comes to cancelling titles. UBC pays attention to the holdings of SFU, but only in a few subject areas where SFU is known to have strong collections. Only UV states that it gives consideration to the holdings of UBC and SFU, in that rank order, when either subscribing to or cancelling serials.

Sixteen libraries stated that they made reference to their interlibrary borrowing of serials when deciding on new subscriptions. Eleven of these libraries reported that they conducted formal studies of their interlibrary borrowing, and of these nine said that they did so periodically. Only one library submitted a copy of a report: the College of New Caledonia provided Kathy Bernsohn's Interlibrary Loan Study, completed on August 23, 1990. This detailed report is an excellent example of what can be learned from a close examination of interlibrary loan records, for use in guiding acquisition policies and decisions. It covered the period from February 1988 to April 1990, during which time there were 6,030 requests, 4,002 for periodicals and 2,028 for books. She discovered that 85% of the requests were for serials in two subject areas: psychology/psychiatry and dentistry. Ninety-four titles were requested more than once. Twenty of these were requested between fourteen and forty-two times each. Clearly this kind of information can act as a guide in selection decisions.

For the past two decades the journal literature has been increasing in quantity and cost, and consuming an ever higher percentage of library expenditures on collections everywhere in the world. Libraries across North America have struggled to deal with this situation by adopting several measures. They have implemented rationing programs, allowing faculty members to recommend new titles only if they can propose the cancellation of another title of equal value. They have engaged in sometimes massive cancellation programs. They have come to rely on cooperative solutions for some seldom used titles, either within a region, or by using such national institutions as the Center for Research Libraries in Chicago, or the British Library Lending Division. They are making increasing use of recently established document delivery services such as CARL UnCover and RLG's CitaDel. They have condemned certain periodical publishers for their pricing, or overpricing, practices, and one major library cancelled these publishers' serials en bloc and encouraged other libraries to do the same. Librarians have urged scholars to reconsider their relationship to commercially published serials, and suggested that the academic world should repossess this element of scholarly communication. (Okerson 1991) Technological solutions have been proposed, whereby the printed journal would be replaced by an electronic equivalent, theoretically as efficient or more efficient to access and at the same time less expensive. Some printed serials are becoming available in full

text online databases and on CD-ROM. However, though changes in the patterns and means of scholarly communication are taking place, the present reality, and one that will continue for many years to come, is that serials continue to be printed and indexed, and persist as a favoured form of publication both by authors and readers. But whatever form they assume in the future, the library will still be required to play a role in providing access to the kind of information that is currently found in the pages of serials and newspapers. This access will come at a price, which may be less or more than the price currently paid for that same kind of information in its printed form.

Monographs

Twelve libraries reported giving consideration to the holdings of other libraries in selecting books for purchase. This is slightly fewer than in the case of selecting periodicals, for understandable reasons. The unit costs of books are generally lower than those of periodicals, and unlike periodicals no long-term commitment is undertaken when a book is purchased. Furthermore, to check every title against the catalogues of other libraries, and to try to decide in each instance whether the book will be used frequently or infrequently in the local library would require more staff time, a commodity which is in short supply. To judge from the comments added to some questionnaires, only requests for expensive monographs are reviewed against the holdings of other libraries.

The rank order in which other libraries' holdings are considered is roughly the same as for periodicals:

Rank	1	2	3	4	Total
Simon Fraser University	1	4	0	0	5
University of British Columbia	8	0	1	0	9
University of Victoria	2	0	2	0	4
Colleges	2	2	3	6	13

The university libraries were ranked in first or second place fifteen times, whereas college libraries were ranked only four times in first or second place; however, the college libraries paid more attention overall to each other's monograph collections. The identification of the universities as resource libraries for monographs may not just be because of their relative size, but because it has been possible to search the holdings of at least two of them on OPACs. A year from now, given that the Outlook database became available only shortly before this survey commenced, the emphasis on college collections may be even greater. Another factor is the proximity of one library to another. Logically, Camosun College considers the holdings of the University of Victoria libraries, just as the colleges in the Lower

Mainland consider the holdings of Simon Fraser University and U.B.C.

The same number of libraries, twelve, pay attention to the holdings of public, school and special libraries, in the development of their monograph holdings.

Rank	1	2	3	4
Public	10	3	4	0
School	1	1	0	0
Special	1	3	1	1

Again logically, the public libraries taken into consideration are the local ones. The holdings of special libraries, including government libraries, while they are not listed in Outlook, are of interest to those colleges and especially institutes with special programs.

Fifteen libraries reported that they make reference to their interlibrary borrowing of monographs in selecting books for their own collections. Of these eleven say that they have conducted studies of their interlibrary borrowing, and of these nine say that they do this on a periodic basis. Only one study was received, the one conducted by Kathy Bernsohn for the College of New Caledonia, referred to above.

Whatever duplication of monograph holdings exists among post-secondary libraries, or occurs in the process of selection and ordering, should not be regarded as wasteful. Duplication of many works, not just within the libraries collectively but within individual libraries, is essential for efficient access by students. Duplication is also inevitable because many programs and courses are common to all post-secondary institutions. When institutions decide to duplicate major specialized academic or professional programs, libraries have no choice but to provide collections in support of these. An example from the past would be the decision by the University of Victoria to create a Faculty of Law, a step which necessitated the development of a second major law collection at a B.C. university.

Again, as in the case of periodicals, there is little coordination in the development of collections of monographs among the B.C. post-secondary libraries. To approach coordination on a title-by-title basis would be impractical, except in the case of very expensive, or potentially low-demand titles. If coordination is to be attempted, another methodology should be used.

Other Formats

Libraries collect information in whatever form it appears. At the present time these other forms include: microforms, either photographic copies of printed

documents or computer-output microform; audio recordings, including vinyl records, tapes, or compact discs; video recordings, either film, videotape or videodisc; microcomputer programs on floppy discs; and CD-ROMs, an increasingly popular medium for storing large quantities of textual information. The electronic formats are discussed at greater length in the section dealing with Location Systems.

Of all these media, the one that is the most subject to sharing among libraries is video. For this purpose a consortium, the Media Exchange Cooperative or MEC, was founded in the late nineteen sixties. At that time the visual medium in common use was film, a medium so expensive that coordinated acquisition and sharing were essential activities. In recent years film has been supplanted by videotape and videodisc, and although the unit costs of these media are lower, MEC continues to function as an effective means of resource sharing. Its operations are described in greater detail in the section dealing with Management Systems.

Collection Expenditures

The three developed university libraries spent a total of \$37.5 million for all purposes in 1990/91, an increase of 47.5% in ten years. The percentage increase for colleges was similar, at 47.1%, based on a total of \$16.7 million spent in 1990/91.

To maintain collections, the university libraries spent over \$11.6 million in 1990/91, an increase of 70.2% in ten years. College libraries spent less than a third of that amount on collections, about \$3.3 million, representing an increase of 65.5% in ten years. It should be noted that these average percentage increases in collection spending exceed the percentage increases for total expenditures: the libraries are spending proportionately more on collections than they were ten years ago. It should also be noted that there are great variations among college libraries, with some actually reporting a decrease in dollars spent on collections between 1981/82 and 1990/91. And these dollar figures have not been adjusted for inflation; there is a significant difference in what a Canadian dollar would buy ten years ago and today.

At universities the percentage of library expenditures accounted for by collections rose from 27.3% to 31.9% in ten years. The college libraries averaged 19% in 1990/91, with a range from 5.9% to 37.6%. On the whole college libraries spend a lower percentage of their budgets on collections, which is related to the fact that their parent institutions spend a smaller percentage of their budgets on libraries than do the universities, and few dollars per student for library purposes. The university average is currently 7% of total institutional expenditures (down from 8.2% in 1981/82, representing a significant loss in dollar terms) whereas the range at colleges is currently between .7% to 4.8%.

University libraries spend a higher percentage of their collections budget on periodicals, an average of 55.5%, compared to an average of 29.9% at colleges able to report statistics for this category of expenditure.

In responding to the question "What are the major problems or obstacles you encounter in the development of your collections", virtually all of the libraries pointed to the collections budget. The feeling is general that there is simply not enough money to create or sustain the kinds of collections needed to support the ever-expanding programs of the post-secondary institutions.

Costs of materials have increased at a rate greater than general inflation in the economy, exacerbated for libraries by the decline in the value of the Canadian dollar, particularly against the U.S. dollar and U.K. pound.

The Association of Research Libraries reported that in the five year period from 1985/86 to 1990/91 unit costs of serials increased by 72% (the median unit cost was \$147.52 U.S.) and unit costs of monographs increased by 47%. (Okerson and Stubbs 1992) In a study dealing with prices paid for periodicals in Canada, Morgulis and Phillips found that the average price of a title increased by 10.5%, from \$255.36 to \$281.82, in one year. (Morgulis and Phillips 1992) Because of the decline in the value of the U.S. dollar in relation to European currencies, mirrored by the Canadian dollar, a major periodical agent is now predicting an increase of ten to eighteen percent in the cost of European serials in 1993. (1992c) Clearly, B.C. post-secondary library collections budgets are not increasing at rates that will enable them to deal with rising costs of this magnitude.

The second most frequently cited problem, mentioned by twelve libraries, was the lack of staff to select, acquire and catalogue materials for the collection.

Five libraries added a third problem: shortage of space and equipment for collections.

Another problem, mentioned by those colleges which have them, was the satellite campus, for which neither collections, staff nor space appear to be adequate.

All of these problems or obstacles, touched upon earlier in this report, stem from a perceived lack of financial support for libraries, at a time when teaching institutions are pressing ahead with expanded programs that require stronger information services, and about which librarians are seldom consulted or even informed in a timely way.

Cooperative Collection Development

No matter how large libraries become, they can only possess a representation of the world's knowledge. From this simple acknowledgement of reality was born the notion that libraries could cooperate in developing their individual resources in ways that would improve their collective strength. There have been countless numbers of attempts around the world to create effective arrangements for cooperation in the development of collections. Those arrangements that have been most successful have involved libraries of a similar type (e.g. large academic libraries) concentrating on materials of a specific class, either in terms of format (e.g. periodicals or microforms) or in terms of subject or language.

An example of such an arrangement was the Farmington Plan (named after the town in Connecticut where the Library of Congress convened a meeting to discuss the subject) which was adopted by the Association of Research Libraries in 1947 and which operated until 1972. Under this scheme responsibility for the collecting of materials in foreign (i.e. non-English) languages was distributed among the participating university libraries. This was successful in that it did result in the acquisition within the U.S. of a significant representation of the world's publishing. However, at the level of the individual library the program created problems: a given library would find itself spending a significant percentage of its budget on materials that were never used locally, and seldom requested on interlibrary loan. Thus enthusiasm for this approach waned.

To an extent the Farmington Plan was replaced by another program created by Title IIc of the U.S. Higher Education Act, 1965. This program allowed countries indebted to the U.S. to, in effect, pay off their loans with books contributed to the Library of Congress and cooperating U.S. academic libraries. This program wound down as U.S. currency surpluses were exhausted. The Canadian government operates a similar program for Indic materials through the Shastri Institute.

The Association of Research Libraries also devised a plan for acquiring microforms of foreign newspapers; this program eventually was managed by the Center for Research Libraries in Chicago. The Center itself was an outgrowth of a regional cooperative acquisitions program, the Midwest Interlibrary Corporation, created in 1949 to store seldom used materials from a number of midwest academic libraries. The Center today is an international collective, maintaining on behalf of its members (UBC is one) a large collection of materials that are seldom used but nevertheless are of importance to research. (Mouw 1990)

In 1980 the first steps were taken by a consortium of U.S. research libraries, the Research Libraries Group, to establish a methodology for cooperative collection development. The resulting instrument is called *Conspectus*. It consists of a detailed

list of over 6,000 subjects based on the Library of Congress classification system, and a scale of six levels of collection evaluation (0= not collected, 5= comprehensive). The results derived from applying this instrument to individual collections are then compared to determine where strengths and weaknesses exist within the membership of RLG. Weaknesses were to be addressed deliberately and eliminated in the name of the whole.

Since the membership of RLG and ARL are not identical, ARL members decided to adopt *Conspectus*, launching what it called the North American Collections Inventory Project. During the nineteen eighties the instrument was further adopted, and adapted, in other countries, including the United Kingdom, Sweden and Canada, where the National Library of Canada assumed responsibility for its design and development. The Canadian application is bilingual and expanded to deal with the Canadian content of collections.

The primary purpose of the *Conspectus* methodology is to measure and describe collections and collecting activity. It does not by itself lead to cooperative collecting arrangements. As is readily apparent, the task of using *Conspectus* in relation to a large collection is time-consuming, difficult and expensive, resulting in a large and complex document. The Canadian *Conspectus* database is still relatively small, consisting mainly of information about the collections of major academic libraries. Yet in both the U.S. and Canada the *Conspectus* methodology is now the accepted standard for describing and assessing collections for the purpose of cooperation. Can it be used successfully by libraries that vary greatly in size, in relation not to a specific format, or subject or language area, but to collections generally?

Attempts to do exactly this have been made by British Columbia's immediate neighbours, Alaska, Washington and Oregon. In 1982 the Alaska State Library funded a grant proposal from Dennis Stephens of the University of Alaska Library for the purpose of developing a "statewide cooperative development policy." Paul Mosher, involved in that time in developing the *Conspectus* methodology for RLG, acted as a consultant to the project, producing a report which advocated the use of *Conspectus* among Alaska academic and public libraries. This was done, and the results have been used to reach agreement on collecting responsibilities within many subject areas. Some transfers of books between libraries were arranged, and donated materials have been channelled to appropriate libraries.

In 1986 the Pacific Northwest *Conspectus* Database Program was established at the Oregon State Library with funds initially provided by the Fred Meyer Charitable Trust. It was to be a multi-state database, including information about academic, public and special library collections in Oregon, Washington, Idaho, Montana and Alaska. The state library agencies joined with the Trust in funding a second phase

of the project, from 1987 to 1989. However, in its third phase (1989-90), Idaho, Montana and Alaska could not continue its support due to their financial obligations to the Washington Library Network. In 1989 the name of the enterprise was changed to the Pacific Northwest Collection Development Project, to reflect its changing nature and dimensions. The methodology adopted by PNCD used as its model the earlier adaptation of Conspectus by the Alaska project.

The database created by this project is only a starting point for cooperative collection development, and each state has established committees charged with the responsibility of applying the information in the database to actual programs. It is conceded by those involved that the use of this methodology requires a serious commitment of time, both in creating the original database and in continuing to maintain it, accompanied by a willingness to change collecting policies based on the outcome. They also discovered that the conspectus approach was not readily applicable to different types of libraries. On the positive side, the assessment data can be used in the local budget process, for evaluating the collection in the light of new programs, and for accreditation purposes. In Alaska, where work on Conspectus started a decade ago, considerable progress has been made in arriving at cooperative collection and reciprocal borrowing agreements, mainly within population centres. (Pinnell-Stephens 1991)

In 1990 the Pacific Northwest Collection Development Program (PNCD), together with its Conspectus Database and software was transferred to the Western Library Network, which is now actively developing and marketing it as the cornerstone of its Collection Assessment Services. This service allows a library, or consortium of libraries, to compare holdings with those of other libraries of similar size and type, or with the 50,000 titles recommended in the 3rd edition of *Books for College Libraries*. As of August 31, 1992 only two Canadian libraries had used this service: Canadian Union College, College Heights, Alberta, and the University of Manitoba Library. A similar assessment tool is available through OCLC, and is in active use at Simon Fraser University. Given that the collections of all the college and institute libraries are in machine-readable form, these assessment tools could be used in British Columbia.

The Conspectus methodology has been used by other consortia in the United States. METRO is the nickname of the New York Metropolitan Reference and Library Research Agency, which includes some 230 member libraries of all types. In the course of implementing a Conspectus program for METRO, one of the consultants observed that although the resulting documents would provide a tool for cooperative collection development, such development would face a number of obstacles:

- *need to share bibliographic data*
- *need for efficient document delivery*
- *need for continuous presence of widespread trust that all partners will maintain their commitments*
- *user attitudes toward dependency on other collections*
- *tradition and history; i.e., lack of funds, fear on the part of larger libraries that they will be over-used*
- *legal and administrative problems with parent governing bodies about ownership and access to materials (Fedunok 1990)*

Some of these obstacles may exist in British Columbia. Attempts at the "rationalization" of collection development among the universities in the past have been hampered by the duplication of major academic programs among the universities. Moreover, faculty members may be unwilling to forego local ownership of research materials unless the library can provide an iron-clad guarantee that those same materials can be delivered promptly from another source.

Since 1990 British Columbia university libraries have been members of the Council of Prairie and Pacific University Libraries (COPPUL), which is in the process of developing a strategic plan. The plan will encompass cooperative collection development and resource sharing. COPPUL has already established a Regional Title Project, concentrating initially on serials in science and technology. The COPPUL member libraries are attempting to identify periodical titles which they believe can be held on a regional rather than a local basis; the library holding a regional subscription is expected to guarantee to maintain it for a period of five years. However, in times of financial restraint it is not easy to make such guarantees. It is also recognized that the development of a body of regionally held subscriptions will only be useful if accompanied by highly efficient document delivery processes. (1992a)

With this exception, there appears to be very little cooperative or collaborative collection development among the university libraries. The four member libraries of the recently established Northern Post-Secondary Library Consortium do intend to work together on collection development.

Options for Change

Solutions Proposed by Participants

Since the inadequacy of budgets was the problem most frequently cited by the post-secondary librarians, it is not surprising that the solution most frequently

offered was: more money, for collections, staff, space and equipment, in that order of priority. Several librarians also stated that an improvement in the budget was a definite goal toward which they would be working. Some believed that their institution would not or could not provide the financial resources the library needed, and that fund raising should be pursued. A closer relationship with the institution's administration and with the faculty was seen as essential.

Some spoke in favour of a provincial strategy on collections development, of closer cooperation among the university libraries in the development of their resources and in resource sharing, and of an "objective body to facilitate discussion". Resource sharing was only mentioned by three libraries as offering part of the answer to the development of the resources themselves.

General Recommendations

The focus of this report is on resource sharing, yet to discuss this subject it was essential to investigate the resources themselves. A number of issues and problems that arose from this investigation lie outside the mandate of the Electronic Library Network. Therefore the consultant decided to make some general recommendations for consideration by the university, college and institute librarians, and by anyone else concerned about library collections in support of post-secondary education in B.C.

Development of Policies

As noted above, twelve libraries, half of the number covered by this survey, have policy statements regarding their collections, and these differ in scope and content. Few are subject to regular review, and some have not been revised for many years. The list of items drawn from all of the extant policy statements, given in the section on Policies above, could serve as the basis for a standard outline for policy documents at all libraries.

The consultant advocates the development of such policy documents in accordance with an agreed-upon standard format. This would serve a number of useful purposes. First, it requires that thought be given to what the collection is and should be, thereby providing a sense of direction for short- and long-term growth, and a framework within which the selection process can take place. Second, it provides an opportunity for librarians to engage faculty members and the administration in discussions about the library, its mission and its condition; thus it can have a political as well as a practical purpose. Third, the policy document can be used for information purposes beyond the institution; a collection of such documents, revised on a regular basis, would provide an ongoing overview of the state of library resource development in the province.

Recommendation A:

That the members of the Council of Post-Secondary Library Directors attempt to agree on a common format for collection policy documents, and take steps to revise or develop individual policy documents at their respective institutions.

Periodical Subscriptions

Periodicals recommend themselves as appropriate for collaborative action, especially on the part of the university libraries. Periodical articles account for roughly half of the interlibrary loan transactions among post-secondary libraries. They are expensive, and their cost is rising at a faster rate than the cost of monographs. Unlike monographs, periodical articles lend themselves to electronic transfer and thus more efficient delivery. In recent years many subscriptions have been cancelled because libraries can no longer afford to maintain their subscription lists; it is likely that many titles unique in the province have disappeared in this process. More cancellations are in prospect. It is time for a broader approach to the selection and deselection (the latter being the word now used by librarians for cancellations) of serials, keeping not just the individual institution but all provincial post-secondary institutions in mind. Since the university libraries are the principal repositories of periodicals, and are reducing the size of their lists, collaboration should begin there, and be extended to include college libraries, among whom the university-college libraries are actively developing their periodical collections. The Electronic Library Network Serials Database is available for immediate use in this work.

Recommendation B:

That the three major university libraries attempt to coordinate the development of their periodical collections, both in respect to selection and deselection and with particular attention to titles unique in the province; and that when the procedures for coordination have been determined, other post-secondary libraries be involved in the process.

College Libraries

On the whole, the collections of the colleges are too underdeveloped to warrant a great expenditure of time and effort on cooperative collection programs involving monograph literature. Cooperation in the selection of videotapes is taking place now through the agency of MEC. However, as the college libraries develop their individual collections they could benefit from the use of Conspectus database services to determine the relative strength or weakness of their holdings by subject areas, and to identify materials for purchase. Particularly given the changing educational mandate of several of the colleges, an inquiry into the state of the college collections

is needed, and Conspectus database services could play a role in the methodology of that inquiry. But the inquiry need not be restricted to collections of the colleges; it could be extended to examine the condition of the libraries generally, including their staffing levels and physical plants. Such a review has not been conducted since the Stokes Report of 1975. (Stokes 1975) While some effort is being made to improve the condition of libraries at the four university colleges, more needs to be done.

Recommendation C:

That the Ministry of Advanced Education carry out an in-depth study of the condition of college and institute libraries, their collections, services, staff and physical plant, in relation to the future and developing programs of those teaching institutions; and on the basis of that study develop programs to improve where necessary the condition of those libraries.

PART II:
.....
RESOURCE SHARING
.....
MECHANISMS
.....

Overview of Interlibrary Loan in Canada

The possibility of systematic sharing of resources among libraries was first raised in the literature in 1876, but serious discussion was delayed until the turn of the century. Among the most ardent proponents of resource sharing was the librarian of McGill University, Charles H. Gould, who wrote a number of far-sighted articles on the subject. In the years prior to the second world war, and the foundation of the Canadian Library Association, the attention of Canadian librarians tended to be focussed on developments in the United States. Interlibrary lending undoubtedly was a developing practice, but the main location services were located in the United States (the National Union Catalog at the Library of Congress, the Pacific Northwest Bibliographic Center at the University of Washington) or compiled and published there (the Union List of Serials); as a result, traffic in interlibrary loans probably flowed north and south rather than east and west. However, nothing can be said definitely about the subject because no studies were done and no statistics maintained: even major university libraries in Canada were loaning and borrowing only a few hundred volumes per year.

In 1974 the National Library of Canada entered into a contract with UBC Library to carry out the first national survey of interlibrary loan. The work was performed between March 1974 and March 1975 and resulted in a lengthy report (hereafter referred to as the 1975 Study) with four recommendations. The first of these dealt with compensation payments for net lending libraries, and is discussed below in the section on cost allocation systems. (Stuart-Stubbs and others 1975a)

The second recommendation was: "That the national libraries develop a resource for periodical literature, and systems for the expeditious delivery of items from that resource." The National Science Library, later to become the Canada Institute for Scientific and Technical Information, was already pursuing that course, and has continued on it. The National Library of Canada commenced the development of periodical collections in the humanities and social sciences, a program that it has recently abandoned.

The third recommendation was: "That the National Library serve as coordinator of the development of a national system of national, provincial and regional union catalogues, through the provision of standards, cataloguing data, and other suitable forms of support." The National Library has attempted to do this, and continues to play a coordinating and supportive role.

The fourth recommendation was: "That the Canadian Library Association and the Association pour l'avancement des sciences et des techniques de la documentation work together on a new edition of an interlibrary loan code for Canadian libraries,

to be founded on present practice and future possibilities." This was done.

In 1981 the National Library Advisory Board established a Resource Network Committee which at its first meeting called for another comprehensive study of interlibrary loan in Canada. This was carried out by the Centre for Research in Librarianship at the University of Toronto, and resulted in the publication in 1983 of Claire England's *Interlibrary Loan and Document Delivery in Canada*. (Hereafter referred to as the 1983 Report). (England 1983) It contained ten recommendations, four of which echoed the recommendations from the previous report.

Throughout this period, The National Library has moved on many fronts to improve interlibrary lending in Canada, and its interest and active involvement continues. Between 1985 and 1988 it conducted a series of resource sharing meetings across Canada. As an outcome of these meetings and a survey of eight hundred and four libraries, the National Library formed a Resource Sharing Strategy Team in 1989. To establish contact with all regions it created a network of provincially based Resource Sharing Committees; in British Columbia the chair of that Committee is the Manager of the Electronic Library Network, and the committee members are drawn from university, college, public, government and special libraries. In 1990 it produced a strategy and plan. (National Library of Canada Resource Sharing Strategy Team 1990) In 1992 it carried out an out-of-province interlending study, the results of which are discussed in the following pages. (Lunau 1992) Throughout the reports emerging from the National Library one of the recurrent themes is the desirability of well-developed regional arrangements for resource sharing. Similarly, resource sharing at the regional level is a recurrent theme at conferences of library organizations, and the interest in efficient and cost-effective resource sharing has never been stronger.

Policies and Administration

Nine libraries have a written policy on library services relating to resource sharing, including interlibrary loan, and four stated that they were in the process of developing such a policy. Ten had no written policy and one library did not reply to the question.

Eleven libraries provided printed statements or handouts concerning interlibrary loan to either individual borrowers or borrowing libraries. Ten had no such document, two failed to answer the question, and one said that a document was in preparation. Where a library did not have a written policy, policy was implicit in these handouts.

These policy documents and handouts vary in format and content, and some

are more comprehensive than others, but collectively they deal with all aspects of the interlibrary lending process, and they give an indication of the philosophies and practices of libraries, and of the present dimensions and limitations of interlibrary lending. In the following pages the headings and statements found in these documents have been used to sketch a portrait of interlibrary loan as it is managed among B.C. post-secondary libraries today.

Description of Interlibrary Loan. This section outlines the nature of the service, and may indicate that it is governed by codes. Some handouts describe NET and how it operates.

Location of Service.

Hours of Service.

Materials Available. Usually books, periodicals, government publications, theses (often involving purchase) microforms, videos; special materials for the handicapped.

Materials Seldom or Not Available. Usually reserve or heavily used books, reference tools, software, rare, expensive or fragile materials, archival materials.

Exclusions. Items unrelated to coursework or research, e.g. materials relating to hobbies, genealogy.

Alternatives. Descriptions of reciprocal or special borrowing arrangements with other libraries in the community. Advice on direct access to other libraries.

Eligibility. Universally faculty (including retired), staff, graduate and undergraduate students are eligible for access to ILL. Alumni and community users are accorded differing treatment; they may be denied access to ILL, or required to pay fees.

Authorization. Some libraries require a librarian's signature before providing access to ILL. One library requires a faculty signature for requests involving items held in libraries outside B.C.

Limitations. At sixteen libraries some system of rationing is in place. This may be stated in terms of a time period, e.g. a limit to the number of interlibrary loans in an academic year or term.; in terms

of items requested per visit; in terms of requests per course or per assignment; or a quota may be set for each academic department. These systems apparently are intended to control expenditures, both in terms of staff time and interlibrary loan fees. Their effect is to reduce the effectiveness of interlibrary loan as a means of improving student access to information.

Timelines. Statements here do not encourage great expectations. Some libraries promise to deal with the patron's request within twenty-four hours, but state that they can't predict what will happen thereafter. Delivery times for materials within B.C. are variously estimated, some suggesting a waiting period of "10 to 14 days"; "...a few days to a few months". Delivery times for materials outside B.C. are also variously estimated at at least four weeks. Some libraries request the patron to specify a date beyond which the material will be of no use.

Procedures. Patrons are requested to check thoroughly the holdings of the library before initiating a request, and in most cases to seek the assistance of a librarian in determining that either an item is not in the library, or that a substitute will not meet the patron's needs. This is the point at which some libraries require the signature of a reference librarian. The patron is also told what to expect once the library receives the material: a phone call, a mailed notification, a mailed copied document, etc.

Instructions. These pertain to the completion of forms, and the necessity of providing a correct citation, with a references to the source of the citation. Search strategies pertaining to both institutional and union catalogues are suggested. One library charges a search fee for incomplete or incorrect citations, or for items that turn out to be held by the library.

Loan and use policies. Statements about the duration of the loan, renewals, and penalties; about the use of materials in the library only, as requested by the lending library; about restrictions on the copying of borrowed materials.

Borrower's Responsibility. Statements concerning damage, loss, theft.

Costs. Seventeen libraries sometimes require partial or full cost recovery for some or all elements of ILL, including ILL fees, fax and

photocopy charges, postage, etc., and in the case of video and film, booking fees. Often these involve a minimum charge regardless of the length of the document. They may apply to a specific clientele, such as community borrowers; or they may apply to material which is of personal interest rather than related to study or research. .

Billing. Procedures for billing patrons, and methods of payment by individuals or by departments.

Read in succession and as a group, these policy documents and handouts leave one with the impression of a service that is complicated, costly, and if useful, only as a last resort. And this may be close to the truth. None of the policy documents explore the matter of resource sharing in the context of a total service or collections policy.

Traffic in Resource Sharing

Borrowing/Lending Volume - Print

The traffic in interlibrary lending has been increasing ever since its inception as a conventional library service. However, in the past quarter century that traffic has experienced a higher rate of increase, for a number of obvious reasons. The universe of information itself has expanded rapidly during this period, with a concomitant increase in the number of publications in all formats. The number and size of institutions, including governments and private and public sector organizations, including universities and colleges, have increased dramatically. Populations are larger, and a higher percentage of populations are involved in learning and research. Given these conditions, the rapid growth of libraries was inevitable; and given that libraries are able to contain within their individual walls only a diminishing proportion of the universe of knowledge, an accompanying rapid rise in interlibrary loan traffic was equally inevitable.

Unfortunately national interlibrary loan traffic statistics were not collected during these years of growth, but an examination of forty years of borrowing and lending statistics at UBC give an indication of how rapid that rise has been; UBC's experience would probably be typical of the experience of other university libraries of its size and age. In 1951 UBC was the only university in the province, with a student body of about six thousand and a collection of under a quarter of a million volumes.

Between 1951 and 1965 UBC's interlibrary lending increased by 328.4%, which sounds like a significant figure; however, the number of items involved in those two years were respectively 557 and 2,386.

In the next two years there was a sudden increase in lending of 316.6%, and by the end of the decade traffic had increased seven fold. The reasons were evident: new universities and colleges had been created across the province; and the development of the low cost photocopier made document delivery easier and cheaper. At the same time, UBC's own borrowing was rising at a steady rate, reflecting the development of its programs of graduate studies and research; and although UBC's own collection now exceeds 3,000,000 volumes, its reliance on other libraries continues to increase.

Historical statistics for ILL borrowing and lending by all B.C. post-secondary libraries do not exist. Accurate figures for NET activity have been kept since 1977/78, but the post-secondary libraries borrow from and lend to many other libraries within and beyond this province, thus NET statistics do not reflect the total reality. The consultant attempted to collect comprehensive statistics for the ten-year period 1981/82 to 1990/91, and although he was not completely successful, there is sufficient evidence to draw some conclusions about where post-secondary interlibrary lending has been, is now, and is going.

The earliest statistics available for ILL traffic among B.C. libraries of all types are to be found in the 1975 Survey, which reported that in 1973 thirty-one libraries borrowed 31,655 items (67.2% from other libraries in B.C.) and twenty-six libraries loaned 33,652 items (63.4% to other libraries in B.C.) (Stuart-Stubbs and others 1975b) The 1983 Survey reported that in 1981 thirty-five B.C. libraries of all types borrowed 45,500 items (rounded off), and thirty-three libraries loaned 56,100 items. (England 1983) Although figures from these two surveys are not strictly comparable, the number and type of libraries involved in the two samples being different, a permissible generalization might be that among B.C. libraries of all types borrowing increased by over 40% and lending by over 60% in an eight year period mainly during the 1970s.

In 1991 twenty-two B.C. post-secondary libraries borrowed 47,124 items and twenty-one of these libraries loaned 44,838 items. Thus in a decade the post-secondary libraries alone are borrowing slightly more items than were all libraries in the 1983 Survey sample. Again, while it is impossible to arrive at any reliable numerical comparisons between these figures, it is evident that interlibrary lending and borrowing has been and continues to be on the rise, and to a significant degree.

As for growth during the last decade, our survey discovered a two thirds increase

in borrowing activity among B.C. post-secondary libraries, from a total of 27,962 borrowed items in 1981/82 to a total of 47,124 items in 1990/91, an increase of 68.5%. Lending among the same libraries grew at a lesser rate: from 33,534 items in 1981/82 to 44,838 in 1990/91, an increase of 33.7%. In both instances it must be remembered that traffic fell off significantly in the first few years of this time period, due to the disappearance of special funding.

The Association of Research Libraries reported an average increase among its members of 47% in borrowing and 45% in lending between the years 1985/86 and 1990/91. The B.C. post-secondary libraries exceeded the major research libraries of the U.S. and Canada in both respects: in the same time period their borrowing increased by 84% and their lending by 74%.

The difficulty with borrowing and lending statistics among the B.C. post-secondary libraries is that for some institutions, for some years, there are no ILL statistics available apart from those collected by NET. Thus fluctuations in figures for one library might have less to do with actual activity and more to do with incomplete data. Similarly, the totals and percentages are also affected, so that the figures given in the paragraph above and in the accompanying tables will be lower than actuality. In other cases the fluctuations may be an accurate reflection of events, as in the case of Vancouver Community College, where a prolonged strike affected library activity generally. But even taking such caveats into account, it is likely that the recent steep increases in borrowing by Cariboo, Malaspina and Okanagan Colleges arise from the introduction of fourth-year level courses into their instructional programs.

The consultant attempted to determine the contribution of NET to total ILL activity. NET has maintained an accurate database of its own transactions. Because it is a closed system, the number of items loaned through NET equals the number of items borrowed through NET. In the first three years of its activity, starting in 1977/78, during which funding was available from the government, borrowing/lending rose from 16,924 to 20,140 to 22,362. In the fourth year, as funding dried up, activity began to decline, decreasing to 18,938 and sinking to a low of 10,472 in 1985/86. Then activity began to increase again, rising to 16,374 in 1990/91, roughly the level at the start of the decade, but still not where it stood in the years when special funding was available. There could be no clearer indication that the absence of special funding deters ILL in the achievement of its potential. Nevertheless, in the ten-year period considered by this report, NET handled a total of 135,110 items, roughly the equivalent of the province's largest college library.

As for NET's share of the total traffic, only two university and six college libraries kept track over ten years of the number of transactions completed within NET and

outside of NET, and in the case of the college libraries even these are not complete. In respect to borrowing, it is not surprising that UBC, where because of the size of the local collection undergraduates make little use of ILL, should be the least dependent on NET, which provided between 7.4% and 10.8% of the items required by its users. As for borrowing by SFU and the six colleges, in recent years NET has accounted for approximately 50% to 60%. The University of Victoria's reliance on NET has declined from 59.4% to 8.4%. Overall, the number of items borrowed through NET has declined from 60.7% to 34.7% in ten years. This is perhaps less a reflection of the unavailability of specific titles with the NET libraries, and more an indication that because of fees libraries are seeking lending libraries that do not charge, or entering into service agreements with libraries outside the province. That libraries of all kinds in B.C. go beyond the provincial borders for borrowing is confirmed by the findings of a study performed by the National Library, indicating that their sample group of B.C. libraries of all types borrowed 23,077 items within the province and 16,525 outside the province. (Lunau 1992)

Lending statistics present a different picture. UBC's NET lending has remained in the 40% range of its total ILL activity, whereas at SFU it appears to have accounted for a decreasing percentage, arriving at a low of 27% in 1990/91. There is a considerable difference in these statistics for the colleges, but overall about half of their lending takes place within NET.

Another approach to determining the contribution of NET to total interlibrary lending was to compare NET statistics to the total ILL statistics for all libraries, imperfect though they are. The figures achieved by this approach are not identical to those for the two universities and six colleges, but they are not incompatible with those results. They appear to indicate a decreasing reliance on NET, which is to say that the post-secondary libraries are increasingly reliant on non-NET libraries. In respect to borrowing, the NET percentage declined from 67.2 in 1981/82 to 34.1 in 1990/91. Given that post-secondary library statistics are more complete and reliable in the past three years than they have ever been, it would be reasonable to assume that NET now accounts for approximately a third of the ILL activity of the post-secondary libraries taken as a group. Also given what questionnaire respondents have to say about their financial problems, it is also reasonable to assume that were special funding available, use through NET would rise to higher levels.

Borrowing and Lending Volume - Media

Historical information on the borrowing and lending of media by the post-secondary libraries is incomplete, so it is difficult to determine trends. The year for which data is most complete is the last used in this study, 1990/91.

In 1990/91 the three universities and eighteen colleges reported borrowing a total of 9,203 media items. Although several libraries were unable to provide figures for some of the previous years, totals for the decade suggest that total borrowing has been fairly stable, in the range of 8,500 to 9,500 items. Traffic among the college libraries is heavier than among the university libraries; the former borrow in the range of 7,000 to 7,500 items per year.

Of the total of 9,203 media items, borrowing within the Media Exchange Cooperative accounted for 2,583 items in 1990/91, or 28.1% of the traffic. Again, because of incomplete data, it is difficult to generalize, but it appears that throughout the decade MEC accounted for about 30% to 35% of total borrowing. MEC is the stated preference of all libraries when it comes to choosing a source for a loan, and the ELN Media database is the first location tool used by borrowing libraries.

What is the source of the other 65% to 70%? It appears that the post-secondary libraries obtain some media items from special libraries and from school district resource libraries, but the primary source is probably the National Film Board Library.

In 1990/91 the three universities and seventeen colleges reported lending a total of 5,571 media items. This is approximately the same as the number loaned in the previous year, but less than in the years 1984/85 to 1988/89. Over the years the difference between borrowing and lending is in the range of 3,500 to 4,000 items; the post-secondary libraries are therefore net borrowers, and again the National Film Board Library may be the principal source of those items.

Of the 5,571 items loaned, 2,583 were loaned within MEC. Since the National Film Board does not borrow films, this difference of approximately 3,000 items must be accounted for by lending to other libraries: public, school and special. The pattern of lending and borrowing for media items is obviously different from the pattern for print items. In the case of print items, there is no equivalent to the National Film Board Library to act as a major supplier.

The one reliable set of statistics available for media lending and borrowing is provided by MEC itself, and these indicate a level of activity in the range of 2,500 to 3,000 items per year; traffic will increase as the local collections of media grow and become more diverse in content.

Copies vs. Volumes

Printed documents are physically delivered in two ways: in their original form, as volumes; or as copies, whether sent by mail or courier, or transmitted by fax. At the present time media publications, such as microforms, audio tapes or videos, are

delivered in their original form, though some kind of facsimile transmission would seem to be a future technical possibility, though not necessarily a legal one.

It is generally the case that monographs are delivered in their original form, unless a user indicates that only a few pages are needed; whereas the transmission of copies most frequently involves articles from periodicals. In considering how ILL might be improved, the two publication formats and their usual modes of delivery need to be considered separately. It would therefore be useful to know how much of the ILL traffic consists of copied items and how much consists of items in their original format.

In attempting to discover this, the 1975 Study had the cooperation of one hundred and twenty-seven libraries across Canada which kept a detailed record of all ILL transactions they conducted in the month of November, 1974. For this group, it was learned that 48.9% of loans were for periodicals, 44.1% were for monographs, and the balance was for government publications, theses and other forms. The same group reported that of the items they borrowed, 43.5% were periodicals, 43.8% were for books, and the balance was for other formats.

The consultant, rather than asking B.C. post-secondary libraries for a detailed analysis of a sample of transactions, hoped that some conclusions could be drawn from the percentages of transactions delivered in original format and in copy. As it turned out, only UBC, SFU and BCIT have maintained statistics in this way for the ten-year period. In 1990/91 copied items accounted for an average of slightly over 40% of the total items provided by the two universities, and just 19% of the items provided by BCIT (down from 25.4% in the previous year); in all three cases the percentage seems to be declining slightly. On the side of borrowing, in 1990/91 copied materials accounted for an average of 65.4% at the universities, and 76.4% at BCIT. At the universities this figure has remained fairly constant over ten years.

If the equation of copies with journal articles is a reasonable one to make, based on the findings of these three surveys a rough generalization would be that the university libraries in B.C. provide something in the range of 40-50% of their interlibrary loans as copies, and something in the range of 50-60% of their interlibrary loans in their original format. Since BCIT was the only non-university library providing statistics, it is difficult to say what the situation of the other colleges and institutes would be, but based on the BCIT figures and the 1983 Survey it would be reasonable to imagine that they provide proportionately less as copies and acquire proportionately more as copies, again because of the relative weakness of periodical collections at these libraries. The Bernsohn Study at the College of New Caledonia discovered that 66.4% of the requests it made between February 1988 and April 1990 was for periodicals. (Bernsohn 1990)

Content

The consultant did not attempt to determine the content of ILL transactions, in terms of subject or date of publication; nor was this attempted by the 1983 Survey. The 1975 Survey did analyze its sample from November 1974, and found that in the case of periodicals, 44.8% of the items borrowed and 41.2% of the items loaned had been published in the previous five years; and 71.2% of the items borrowed and 66.9% of the items loaned had been published in the previous fifteen years. The situation with monographs was not much different: 65.2% had been published in the previous fifteen years. Interlibrary loan librarians confirm that the emphasis in borrowing and lending continues to be on relatively current materials. This suggests that a significant and consistent strengthening of college library monograph collections over a ten- to fifteen-year period would reduce their dependency on interlibrary loan and increase their immediate usefulness to students and faculty.

In connection with the subject content of ILL traffic, the 1975 Study discovered, not surprisingly, that proportionately more periodical articles than books in the pure, life, applied and social sciences were requested; whereas in the humanities and arts proportionately more books were requested. The Bernsohn Study examined subject content and discovered, for example, that 85% of the most frequently requested serials were on two subjects: psychology/psychiatry and dentistry. More comprehensive studies of content could be useful in planning collection development, either at the level of the individual institution or at the provincial level.

Value

In a ten year period the post-secondary libraries borrowed over three hundred thousand items on behalf of their users. In considering the value of this service the most important criterion would be the one that it is impossible to measure: what would have been the effect of denying users access to three hundred thousand items? What would have been the effect on their studies and research? What would the quality of the educational experience have been without access to the information they sought? Librarians who work closely with students and faculty have ready answers to such rhetorical questions. However, only numbers carry significance for some observers.

Measured as a proportion of total library circulation, interlibrary borrowing does not bulk large. For the post-secondary libraries, the range in 1990/91 was between .3% and 2.8%, and the average was 1.37%. Viewed from this perspective, resource sharing is not as significant as the direct borrowing of materials on site. To reiterate, numbers say nothing about the significance of access to a specific item on behalf of the individual user; one item can make all the difference to a successful completion of a project.

However, the items acquired temporarily through borrowing obviously have a dollar value, but it is difficult to say exactly what it is. It could be argued that an item borrowed is not an item purchased, and therefore represents an expense foregone. What is the value of an "item", when it could be a book, a periodical article, a video, a microfilm? A very rough approach to estimating the average cost of a serial subscription is to take the amount of money spent in 1990/91 on periodicals by the three university libraries and divide that amount by the number of subscriptions: costs were \$6,496,000 and the number of subscriptions was 42,335, yielding a unit cost of \$153 per subscription. Using the same rough approach, the cost of monographs to the three university libraries was \$4,453,000, in which year they catalogued (which is not the same as the number they acquired, because there are cataloguing backlogs and time lags between acquisitions and cataloguing of them) 153,000 volumes; this yields an average of \$29.10 per monograph. Rough though these calculations may be, anyone who has purchased a book or subscribed to a technical journal lately will see that the results are not unrealistic. In 1990/91 the post-secondary libraries were borrowing close to 50,000 items a year. Even using a low figure of \$30 per item, whether a book, periodical or anything else, the "value" of interlibrary borrowing would be a million and a half dollars in foregone acquisitions costs.

Source Libraries and Cooperatives

The post-secondary libraries of B.C. are their own best customers, with most of the borrowing and lending taking place within this group, though, it appears, to a decreasing degree. When asked to list in rank order the other libraries from which they borrow, the two other libraries mentioned most frequently were the National Library of Canada (eight times, never in first place, four times in second place), and the University of Alberta Library (seven times, three times in first place). The Canada Institute for Scientific and Technical Information was mentioned four times (twice in first place, twice in second place). Nine other Canadian university libraries were cited thirteen times, with the preponderance being the libraries in the prairie provinces. Public or regional libraries in the same locations as the universities or colleges were mentioned seven times, four times in first place. Libraries in the U.S. were mentioned six times, only once in first place. Outside of these libraries and groups of libraries, a variety of special and school district libraries rated a few mentions.

When several locations for an item are known, how do libraries choose from which libraries they borrow? Affiliation with NET proved to be the most important factor, mentioned by twenty libraries, eleven times in first place, and sixteen times in the first three places.. A close second was turnaround time, mentioned by twenty libraries, four times in first place, and fifteen times in the first three places. Fees

were an important consideration for nineteen libraries, mentioned four times in first place, and thirteen times in the first three places. A fourth important factor was the proximity of the lending library, which is obviously a consideration in turnaround time: it was mentioned nineteen times, two times in first place, but thirteen times in the first three places. Other factors, such as the availability of a courier or the status of the borrower, were of less significance.

Responses to this question pointed up a problem with the way it was phrased. In indicating the factors that entered into the choice of a source, when fees are cited, it can be taken to mean that those libraries would choose not to borrow from libraries which charge a fee. Thus in indicating NET affiliation as the most important factor, we do not know whether libraries are stating this as a reason for using or not for using another B.C. post-secondary library as a source, since NET involves the payment of a fee.

Overall, we believe the responses indicate a desire on the part of borrowing libraries to provide efficient service, first and foremost; and at the same time, concern about the costs of doing business within NET.

In addition to cooperating within NET, several libraries are involved in special arrangements with one or more libraries for the purpose of sharing resources. The three universities are participating in the evolving program of the Council of Prairie and Pacific University Libraries (COPPUL); to date this has resulted in lower fees for photocopying. One library, UBC, is a member of the Center for Research Libraries in Chicago, which is in effect a library for libraries. UBC and the University of Washington have established a special arrangement for sharing of their collections. Simon Fraser University is operating an online journal access system, under the title OJAC; a successful pilot test with Cariboo College is encouraging its extension to other institutions. Simon Fraser also provides materials to Open Learning Agency students through a contractual arrangement, with OLA staff being located at SFU. In the north, the new university and three colleges have established, effective April 1, 1992, the Northern Post-Secondary Library Consortium, which has as one of its objectives "... to enhance cooperation among member libraries..." and which will provide for reciprocal borrowing privileges among their users. These and other initiatives are measures taken by libraries in an attempt to serve their users better.

Projected Traffic

The further growth of interlibrary loan traffic will be affected by many things: by the creation of a new university in Prince George; by the expansion of existing institutions, particularly the creation of university colleges; by an increase in the number of students; by the seemingly inexorable increase in the numbers of available documents in all formats; by available funding. Taking all circumstances into

consideration, it would seem reasonable to believe that interlibrary loan traffic will at least double in the next decade, to about a hundred thousand items; with appropriate financing and other measures, including the lifting of rationing systems at the colleges, it could more than double.

ELEMENTS OF ILL

Location Systems

Early Location Systems

On June 23, 1908, at the dedication of a new library at Oberlin College, William Coolidge Lane, the librarian of Harvard University, described his vision of a central loan collection and bureau of information for academic libraries. It was a vision that has been pursued in many places and many ways since then. The practice of interlibrary lending was in its infancy at that time, and the need for a centralized source of location information was becoming evident. Lane saw his hypothetical bureau collecting printed book catalogues and copies of card catalogues wherever they existed. The bureau would then answer inquiries about locations, and act as a clearing house, directing loan requests to the nearest library holding a copies of the wanted items. (Lane 1908)

Traditional Union Catalogues

The Library of Congress was backing into the creation of a national union catalog on cards. Beginning in 1901 it had begun to exchange catalog copy on cards with the New York Public Library, for mutual information. As years passed more major academic, public and government libraries became involved in this exchange, and a national union catalogue began its evolution. Regional union catalogues made their appearance as early as 1909, when the California State Library compiled a list of the holdings of all public libraries in the state. The Great Depression helped in the process: through the Works Progress Administration funding was provided to establish a number of other regional catalogues. The Pacific Northwest Union Catalogue, housed at the University of Washington Library, and in which a number of B.C. libraries participated, started in 1936. The Canadian Union Catalogue was commenced in 1950, even before the first National Library Act was passed.

These union card catalogues had one great advantage: they provided a centralized access point for location information. But their disadvantages became more apparent the larger they became. By 1968 the National Union Catalog at the Library of Congress held some sixteen million cards. A partial solution to the mounting work loads experienced by the location service was provided when the national union catalogue was issued in printed form. However, the manual procedures of revising and interfiling increasing quantities of cards became so labour-intensive and expensive that union card catalogues began to break down as a result of their own bloated size. Fortunately, computer technology would provide an alternative. For example,

the National Library of Canada closed its manual union catalogue in 1980 when it adopted the DOBIS system. Similarly, the Board of the Pacific Northwest Bibliographic Centre voted to close its catalogue on August 1, 1981, and to cease providing bibliographic verification, location and switching functions effective July 1, 1982, while the Washington Library Network system was gradually assuming the role of the union catalogue.

Printed Union Lists

The printed union list recommended itself as a practical way of dealing with periodicals, which were fewer in number than books. The first edition of the *Union List of Serials In Libraries of the United States and Canada* appeared in 1927, and contained location information about seventy-five thousand titles held by two hundred and twenty-five libraries. Again, for libraries it presented the convenience of a single source for location information. At the same time, not all libraries' holdings were represented, and the same problems of collecting information and producing updated editions conspired to hinder the production of major printed lists. However, such lists continue to exist, and smaller lists are still common in regions and among groups of libraries, such as special libraries within a major city or a province, or among libraries specializing in the same subject areas. Again, the computer has assisted in their maintenance and production.

When asked if they still used any printed sources for locations of printed materials, the post-secondary libraries cited twelve different printed location tools, ranging from the large New Serials Titles to the Calgary Police Library Serial List. Similarly, printed sources are in regular use in locating media items; thirteen different printed sources for locations were cited, the most frequently consulted being the National Film Board Catalogue.

Fiche

Pioneering applications of computers to bibliographic records used two available forms of output: printed cards (doing this proved to be a challenge) and printed lists. The first computer printers were primitive, and the resulting bulky products, produced in capitals only on thin paper, were inconvenient and not well adapted to regular, hard use by the public. In the 1970s computer-output-microfiche, or COM, provided a convenient alternative. This was the medium of choice when, in 1978, the majority of B.C. post-secondary libraries closed their card catalogues; it was also used to produce the B.C. Union Catalogue. Fiche is still in use today in libraries, often in tandem with a computer-based catalogue, the so-called online public access catalogue, or OPAC. The disadvantage of COM, apart from the fact that it requires an optical device for reading, is the same as that for printed indexes: revision and reprinting.

Another great advantage of fiche is that it can be produced in any number of copies and disseminated. It is a useful medium for the publication of full text, as an alternative to paper copies, as in the case of theses or university and college calendars. It is used as a means of publishing reference and bibliographic tools, including union catalogues and lists, and individual library catalogues and lists. These kinds of fiche documents are in widespread use for location purposes among B.C. post-secondary libraries. COM fiche catalogues produced by the three university libraries are used by some libraries as a supplement to the now outdated B.C. Union Catalogue fiche. Fiche catalogues are also available from some B.C. libraries which do not yet have OPACs. Even where online access to catalogues and lists is possible, the use of a fiche copy of a university library catalogue eliminates communication costs.

Online

Role of Utilities

Libraries began experimenting with computers in the early 1960s, during which period the Library of Congress, recognizing the need for a standardized system for recording bibliographical information in machine readable form, commenced the development of the MARC format. By 1969 it was making tapes of MARC records available to the library community, a step that would allow the development of the Ohio College Library Center, a consortium through which participating libraries could use a centralized database of catalogue records to create local catalogues, though still in card format. The rest, as they say, is history. Today the successor of this organization, the Online Computer Library Center, or OCLC, is the world's largest bibliographic utility, and for its thousands of participating libraries it has become the de facto online national union catalogue, providing in addition special services for interlibrary lending. Nor is it alone: its concept was emulated by the Research Library Group's Research Libraries Information Network (RLIN), the Washington Library Network (WLN) and in Canada by the University of Toronto Library Automation System (UTLAS). Many libraries have access to all these systems, and use them regularly for location information and interlibrary loan services, as well as sources of bibliographic information for local cataloguing purposes.

However, developing technology is having an impact on these utilities. Whereas they were involved in providing access to bibliographic information and maintaining entire catalogues on behalf of individual libraries, local cataloguing systems operating on mini- and microcomputers have permitted libraries to use the utilities for records alone, downloading them; or, alternatively, deriving records from CD-ROM packages that also became available in the 1980s. In this situation the utilities will not automatically obtain location information as in the past; and their usefulness as a

convenient single source for locations will gradually decline unless special measures are taken.

National vs. Regional Catalogues

In Canada in the 1950s, because of the relatively small size and number of its libraries, it did seem possible that a single union catalogue at the National Library of Canada might suffice indefinitely. The enormous growth that was to follow in the 1960s was simply not foreseen. Eventually some provinces wished to see the holdings of smaller libraries included in a union catalogue, to make local resource sharing more efficient, a desire that led to the establishment of union catalogues in card form in Saskatchewan and Nova Scotia. When UTLAS emerged from the University of Toronto's own internal cataloguing system, and became accessible first to other universities and colleges in Ontario, some libraries simply stopped reporting locations to the National Library, satisfied that recording their locations in UTLAS would be enough. Moreover, the Canadian National Union Catalogue remained in card form until 1980, by which time several major libraries had stopped producing cards, in favour of fiche catalogues. As years passed and more Canadian libraries became customers of UTLAS it began to serve as a source for locations in the same way as OCLC was doing in the U.S. For its part, the National Library started building its own database of locations, and is still doing so; in 1991 it received funding for the retrospective conversion of the five and a half million titles in the old manual catalogue, consisting of more than five thousand drawers of cards.

When the B.C. Union Catalogue project started, post-secondary libraries in B.C. became customers of UTLAS en bloc. It was the database compiled at UTLAS, resulting from cataloguing activities of B.C. post-secondary libraries, from which the B.C. Union Catalogue on fiche was produced. While the National Library was grappling with the problem of automating the National Union Catalogue, the B.C. Union Catalogue Project was pursuing the objective of establishing a provincial cataloguing utility, similar to UTLAS or WLN.

In the U.S. regional networks began to proliferate, many of them based on the affiliation of individual libraries to OCLC; in 1991 there were eighteen such networks, including such major enterprises as ILLINET (serving Illinois), MINTTEX (serving Minnesota and the Dakotas) and NELINET (serving New England). Originating at the Washington State Library but now an independent organization, the Washington Library Network serves mainly U.S. libraries in the northwest, though some Canadian libraries are members; its database too serves as a source for locations.

OPACs

At the beginning of the decade the online public access catalogue was a novelty. Today it is almost commonplace. Libraries of all sizes have a variety of commercially available software packages from which to choose. Eighteen of the B.C. post-secondary libraries now have OPACs, and the six without them at the present time plan to install them. There are seven different software packages in use, the one in common use by the college libraries being BUCAT/TKM. It is technically possible to access these catalogues from a remote location, although only the university libraries offer that feature at the present time.

Among B.C. post-secondary libraries the remotely accessible OPAC has become the favoured method of obtaining locations for ILL. The Electronic Library Network has made available union lists of serials and media held by B.C. post-secondary libraries, using OPAC software, and these have quickly become the most frequently used tools for locating those forms of publication. Twenty-two libraries ranked the ELN Serials database as one of their top four choices for locating items. UBC's OPAC was a close second, identified by twenty-one libraries as being one of their top four choices. SFU's OPAC ranked third, with eleven libraries listing it in their top four. Undoubtedly the advent of VICTOR, the University of Victoria's OPAC, will result in increased use of that library's collection for ILL. Less frequently used by the post-secondary libraries but also important sources for locations are the online utilities, OCLC, WLN and UTLAS; and, at the National Library, DOBIS. One library mentioned using MELVYL, the University of California's state-wide union catalogue.

As convenient as the university library-based OPAC has become for post-secondary ILL librarians, there are complaints. As a consequence of the demise of the B.C. Union Catalogue Project, which could have acted as a coordinating body, the implementation of these OPACs occurred independently of one another. Thus there is no linkage among them. A search for the location of a given item therefore involves dialling into one OPAC after another, and being familiar with the command language and conventions of each one. Once the college libraries provide remote access to their OPACs, the searching process can only become longer and more complex. In effect, the current situation is an electronic equivalent of William Coolidge Lane's turn-of-the-century Bureau of Information, with its proposed collection of separate printed catalogues.

Several librarians responding to our survey expressed the hope that some kind of front-end software could be developed that would perform the searching routines on their behalf; they would be able to enter a single request for location information, and the software would poll all available OPACs. That is, the software would create a virtual centralized database on behalf of the inquirer. Another alternative would be to create an actual centralized database.

CD-ROM

The past decade also witnessed the advent and proliferation of compact discs with read-only memory, or CD-ROMs. In 1987 the number of CD-ROM titles in existence was estimated at under fifty. In 1992 it is estimated to be over two thousand. Just a few years ago the first public library in British Columbia to acquire an encyclopedia on CD-ROM made headlines in the Vancouver newspapers. Today twenty-two of the post-secondary libraries possess CD-ROMs. Among them they have over thirty different titles, almost all the disks containing indexes and/or abstracts, but including some encyclopedias and dictionaries, and numerical databases such as the Canadian census.

Union catalogues and lists are also becoming available on CD-ROM, as in the case of Outlook, the joint effort of the B.C. Library Services Branch and the Electronic Library Network. It lists the holdings of all B.C. public libraries whose holdings are now in machine-readable form, and the holdings of all B.C. college and institute libraries (not the university libraries). Seventeen post-secondary libraries listed it as a source they use for locating items wanted through ILL; in terms of frequency of use it ranks third, after the ELN Serials database and UBC's OPAC. Survey respondents begged for its improvement, through the addition of the holdings of other libraries, including the university libraries, government libraries and special libraries. They also expressed concern about the lack of standardization in cataloguing practice, a problem also mentioned with the ELN Media database. Although Outlook only became available to the post-secondary libraries in the early months of 1992, its effect on traffic between these libraries and public libraries has already been evident. Some colleges recorded impressive increases in the numbers of items provided to public libraries. Comparing the first eight months of 1991 with the first eight months of 1992, loans by Okanagan College went from 3 to 127, a 4133% increase! The library lending the most items was New Caledonia, which provided 957 items, an increase of 32% over 1991. In general there were more items borrowed by public libraries from post-secondary libraries than vice versa. At this point the post-secondary libraries are net lenders, with one very notable exception: New Caledonia borrowed 2,220 items from public libraries in the first eight months of 1992. This is almost double the number of items that New Caledonia borrowed from other post-secondary libraries in the twelve months of 1991/92. This suggests that the public libraries can be a rich source of materials for post-secondary libraries, once the transfer of materials between these two library sectors becomes a matter of routine.

The National Library of Canada and the Canada Institute for Scientific Information have announced the impending release of a CD-ROM product called Romulus, which will incorporate in one database the Union List of Serials in the Social Sciences and Humanities, the Union List of Scientific Serials in Canadian

Libraries, the Union List of Canadian Newspapers, and CISTI's own serials list; it will also contain a directory for over four thousand Canadian libraries. It promises software for ordering documents through ILL. (VanBuskirk 1991)

At the same time that these national lists and location services are being developed, it is recognized that they can't record every location for every library in Canada; at the present time the National Library is recording the holdings of only two hundred and seventy eight out of thousands of Canadian libraries, and none of B.C.'s college and institute libraries are included. There is thus an essential role for regional catalogues, and the National Library of Canada is encouraging the development of these. (1992d)

Fifteen of the libraries now allow faculty and/or students to do their own searching on these databases, and others plan to do so when more equipment is available. Many such users find the databases both more convenient and more productive to use than their printed equivalents, since most of the CD-ROM products are based on established indexing and abstracting services. Not only do the CD-ROMs yield more citations more quickly, they allow the user to print out rather than copy out the bibliographical information. This appears to be resulting in an increased demand for access to publications, with the emphasis on periodicals, both in the library and through ILL.

CD-ROM products are also expensive, usually more expensive than their printed equivalents, though actual production and distribution costs are probably lower. This has given rise to twin hopes: first, that it might be possible to share access to CD-ROMs; second, that lower prices could be obtained through group purchasing.

The technology for sharing access to CD-ROMs, at least through Local Area Networks, appears to be available. One manufacturer claims that its equipment can deal with up to twenty-one CD-ROMs in one server, and multiple servers can be used to increase the number of available CD-ROMs to over five thousand. It also states that simultaneous use of one CD-ROM by several users is possible. Presumably the publishers of CD-ROM products would adjust their prices upward for applications of this kind.

Some librarians have suggested that access to CD-ROM products could be shared through interlibrary loan. "A patron initiates a subject search request for a specific database through the ILL office ... The ILL office send the written request to the proper library... The search request is then executed ... The printed or downloaded results are the treated like photocopies ... and sent back ... via U.S. mail or FAX or electronic mail..." (Brown and Farr 1991)

Another alternative for sharing access to the contents of CD-ROMs is to add the databases to the OPACs. This is being done at the university libraries now, and users can gain access to a number of major indexing services from the same terminal they use for accessing the catalogue. A precondition of this kind of application is the availability of the indexing services for mounting on local OPACs.

This development is changing the conception of the catalogue as primarily an index to the local collection, with other bibliographical information as a useful adjunct, to the conception of the catalogue as an index to almost the universe of knowledge, with library holdings at the national, regional, provincial, local and institutional level all recorded. The faculty or student user of the OPAC, generally unaware of the technical, administrative and economic complexities involved in such expectations, would prefer such a convenient catalogue, where citations to serials found in indexing and abstracting services would be displayed with local call numbers and loan status.

Information providers, including publishers, booksellers, learned and scientific societies, library utilities and consortia, are increasingly aware of the potential offered by computer and communication technologies. New services are becoming available not just through libraries but directly to the information seeker, now referred to in library circles as the "end-user", an individual with sufficient computer skills and knowledge of the principles by which information is organized to carry out his or her own information searches. The end-user, without reference to a library or a librarian, can identify a printed item through a remote database, request a copy of it, and can be sure of receiving it by fax within twenty-four hours. This is the model used by the Colorado Alliance of Research Libraries' service CARLUncover2, by the Research Libraries Group's service CitaDel, and by Simon Fraser University's OJAC service.

The online journal is in its developmental years, both as an electronic equivalent to a printed journal and as a unique record. Journal literature lends itself to this kind of application, and the potential exists for linking the serials directly to indexes and abstracts, allowing end-users to both search for and retrieve articles during the same session. There are scores of issues to be resolved, concerning such things as the physical permanence of the electronic medium, continuous access to electronic back files, and the jurying of the content of electronic journals. Nevertheless, it is highly probable that increasing quantities of information now published in journals will become available in electronic form, and exclusively in electronic form; how the library, acting in its role as a collective and allowing individuals access to information at no direct cost, will relate to fee-based electronic journals is yet to be determined. Given that the price and physical mass of printed journals are creating insurmountable problems for libraries, electronic journals may provide welcome and needed relief.

Electronic Full-Text Documents

It requires little imagination to see that the online catalogue, enriched by the addition of bibliographical databases, is the first step in the evolution of the online library, where these tools for identifying and locating documents will be joined by the documents themselves, in electronic format. How such a development will relate to the contemporary essentially print-based library is a subject of much speculation in the popular as well as the professional literature. In a recent short but important book, Michael Buckland of the University of California draws a distinction between the "paper library" and the "electronic library" and makes this observation:

"Just as the change from the Paper Library to the Automated Library, in conjunction with the rise of on-line bibliographies, changes our perspective on the catalog, so also the rise of the Electronic Library changes our perspective on collecting and local collections. Instead of our thinking being dominated by local collections, as is unavoidable with the Paper Library and the Automated Library, the effect of having electronic documents is to make local storage optional rather than necessary." (Buckland 1992)

At the moment, individual libraries like UBC and SFU are acquiring online databases and mounting them on their OPACs. What will happen as electronic documents become abundant? Will it be desirable for all institutions to acquire these individually, therefore engaging in duplication, when a single copy, mounted centrally, could be accessed system-wide? What will be the economic aspects of these alternative approaches to electronic documents? The proprietors of these documents will certainly formulate their pricing structures in ways that will assure them of revenue, but how are the costs best dealt with, individually or collectively? Robert Campbell, Managing Director of Blackwell Scientific Publications, in an article describing his firm's participation in the ADONIS project, observes that its methodology for delivering documents allows for metering of use, a definite benefit to the publisher and, he believes, potentially to libraries. "Revenue from document delivery, at present minimal, through systems such as ADONIS could be sufficient to enable publishers to hold increases in their subscription rates to no more than the cost of inflation, or even less - an obvious incentive to the library community to cooperate." (Campbell 1992)

The electronic journal is now a reality, though as a medium for the storage and transfer of information it is still in an experimental stage. The Association for the Advancement of Science and OCLC have collaborated in the April 1992 launch of The Online Journal of Current Clinical Trials which purports to be the first rigorously edited electronic journal. The annual subscription rate is \$110 U.S., for unlimited online access, a price competitive with the subscription prices of printed serials in this field. (1991) OCLC is also collaborating with the American Chemical

Society and Chemical Abstracts Inc. to develop a database of twelve thousand journal articles, drawn from twenty key serials published since 1982, and to make this database available online; a prototype is being tested at Cornell University. (1992b) How will OCLC deal with these products? Will it continue to sign up individual subscribers, whatever their number? Will it contract out access, as it has done in the case of some of its other services? Are the medical and scientific communities themselves ready for these kinds of products?

In a separate development, the Association for Research Libraries and the National Association of College Stores have launched a Reserve Materials Publishing Project, to determine whether and how student needs for access to "reserve" material can be satisfied through customized publishing. The possibility of supplying such material electronically will be explored. For their part, textbook publishers are investigating on-demand electronic publishing as another way of reaching their market. During 1992 a consortium of three companies (Random House, Voyager Company and Apple Powerbook) promises to issue ten books on floppy disk, including such classics of literature as Moby Dick and Crime and Punishment, at about \$20 per disk. Can textbooks be far behind?

Cornell University and the Xerox Corporation are carrying out a Joint Study In Digital Preservation, in which they are capturing the contents of a thousand "brittle" books as digital images and reproducing them on paper. They have already concluded that this is "...a cost-effective adjunct or alternative to microfilm preservation" of deteriorating library materials and that "The infrastructure developed for library preservation and access activities supports other applications in the electronic dissemination of information." (Kenney and Personius 1992) At the same time Yale University has been engaged in its own Open Book Project, in which it is attempting to convert ten thousand volumes in microfilm format to digital image form. (Waters and Weaver 1992) Though these experiments are designed to seek solutions to the problems of preserving large collections of older library materials, it is clear that digital imaging technology will play an increasingly important role in the transfer of documents between libraries. Ultimately there may be data banks of digital images of entire library collections available for purchase or for access.

Anticipating the emerging electronic information environment, in 1989 Senator Albert Gore, Jr. (recently elected as Vice-President) introduced a Bill that is leading to the establishment of the National Research and Education Network (NREN), which will connect higher education, government and industry and establish a digital library of databases and knowledge banks accessible through the network. This resulted in the passage of the High Performance Computing Act of 1991, which describes how "...The Network is to provide users with appropriate access to high-performance computer systems, electronic information resources, other research

facilities and libraries. The Network shall provide access, to the extent practicable, to electronic information resources maintained by libraries, research facilities, publishers and affiliated organizations." An organization of organizations with a stake in this development has been formed, under the name of The Coalition of Networked Information, quartered in the same offices in Washington as the Association of Research Libraries. How Canada will relate to this next development of the Internet concept remains to be seen, though the National Library of Canada has become a member of the Coalition.

The development of computer networks for research purposes has been somewhat random; several regional and provincial networks already exist in Canada. Discussions among the operators of these networks with each other, the federal government and private sector organizations led the establishment in October 1990 of the Canada Network, or CA*net. This is linked to the Internet, and thus allows Canadian users to communicate with computers within Canada and around the world. A project to further develop and enhance CA*net, sponsored by Communications Canada and Industry, Science and Technology Canada, is now proceeding under the title of CANARIE, standing for the Canadian Network for Advancement of Research, Industry and Education. The National Library of Canada is a participant in this project. (Tallim 1991) (Cleveland 1992)

Meanwhile, it is clear that electronic documents can be effectively collected on a central rather than distributed basis, with access to those documents being provided through existing and emerging computer networks. In this regard the Electronic Library Network is ideally poised to act as a true Electronic Library; the Open Learning Agency already operates the Knowledge Network as a centralized agency for handling visual images, and its Electronic Library can be seen as a parallel service dealing in text.

For the OLA to take this next step and recognize its provincial role in the distribution of textual information would not be revolutionary in North American terms. Such developments are taking place elsewhere. Charles Hildreth, Read Ltd., Worthington, Ohio, summed it up this way:

"No single model of computerized library networking will suffice to adequately characterize current library networking and computer-based resource sharing activities in the U.S. and Canada. The networking environment today is decentralized, multi-layered, increasingly populated at the local level with distributed processing systems, and resplendent with a resurgence of local, grassroots networking and linking initiatives. Local, state, provincial, and regional bibliographic databases supported by a variety of computer systems are populating the library landscape in North America. A wide variety of computer networking and linking arrangements can be found for sharing cataloguing, holdings, and reference information sources." (Hildreth 1987)

In the view of the consultant, developments in information technology point to the need for an Electronic Library created to support in the first instance B.C. post-secondary education, with linkages to other national and international networks created as and where necessary and practical.

Options for Change

Solutions Proposed by Participants

The extension of Internet to all post-secondary libraries in the province is desired by the survey participants. Among other things, it would give them direct access to databases outside B.C. and Canada.

Continuation of both the ELN Serials and ELN Media databases was greatly favoured, though enhancements and improvements are sought. These relate to inclusiveness, currency, and standardization.

Continuation of the Outlook database was also greatly favoured, with the same desire for changes. Duplication of entries, arising out of the lack of standardization in cataloguing practice, should be eliminated.

There was a plea from several libraries for the completion of retrospective conversion of catalogue records, particularly at UBC, where a high percentage of pre-1978 holdings remains to be converted to machine-readable form.

Some hoped for access to OPACs at all libraries; but since this would involve the serial searching of up to two dozen separate OPACs, some hoped for a merged database as a single source of bibliographic and location information. Related to this was the idea that the ELN databases and Outlook should all be maintained online.

Recommendations

Enhancement of ELN Databases and Outlook:

Recommendation 2:

That ELN continue to maintain, enhance and improve access to its databases for serials and the media.

Recommendation 3:

That ELN continue to cooperate with the Library Services Branch in the

compilation and improvement of the Outlook database; and that it investigate the feasibility of enhancing the database by including holdings of other types of libraries such as government and special libraries.

Recommendation 4:

That ELN, in order to improve the efficiency of the locating function by eliminating the necessity to look in several databases for the location of an item, explore ways to enable libraries to search at a single session the foregoing databases, together with the catalogues of the four university libraries.

Recommendation 5:

That ELN assume the role of broker in negotiating network prices for access to online bibliographic databases and document delivery services, and for the purchase of databases and other electronic documents on CD-ROM.

Recommendation 6:

That ELN establish a true Electronic Library by acquiring electronic documents on behalf of all B.C. post-secondary libraries and making them available through the same central computing facility used to maintain and provide access to its own databases and those of the post-secondary and public libraries; in effect to become the textual equivalent of the visual image-based Knowledge Network.

Communication Systems

.....

Once a location of an item is known, the length of time it takes to provide it to the patron depends on a number of steps in the ILL process. First, the speed with which the request is delivered to the lending library. Second, the efficiency of the lending library in carrying out its own routines. Third, the length of time taken to deliver the item. Finally, the time taken by the borrowing library in notifying the patron that the item has arrived.

Mail

Prior to the 1960s virtually all interlibrary loan requests were delivered by mail; in cases of extreme urgency a library might use long-distance telephone. The American Library Association had devised a standard form for use by libraries which was widely used. In those increasingly rare instances where libraries are not participating in a consortium, do not have access to the services of one of the utilities, or do not own a fax machine, the A.L.A. form is still in use and is delivered by mail. Obviously

this is not the most efficient way of transmitting requests.

Telex

In the 1960s teletypewriters, leased by competing carriers under the names of Telex or TWX, began to be used by libraries for communicating requests for locations only. Probably the first such installation in Canada was at the Toronto Public Library in 1962, which used its equipment to communicate to a service bureau in Ottawa, which in turn delivered the messages to the National Library. (1963) During Canada Library Week in 1966 the first coast-to-coast teletype network was demonstrated to show the public how quickly information could be exchanged. (1966) By 1968 the *Library Telecommunications Directory* listed seventy-four Canadian libraries with Telex, a number that had grown to one hundred and thirty-two by 1973. A year later the National Librarian reported that one hundred and seventy six libraries were using Telex, and it was rapidly replacing mail as the communication vehicle of choice for ILL. In 1978, when the B.C. Post-Secondary Interlibrary Loan Network (NET) commenced operations, its protocols provided for general use of Telex for messages of all kinds, including ILL requests.

Electronic Mail

With the advent of electronic mail, and in particular the service offered through the B.C. Telephone Company under the name of ENVOY, the demise of Telex was rapid. During the 1980s all major libraries in Canada, and all post-secondary libraries in B.C. became users of ENVOY, and today among Canadian libraries generally it is the preferred means of communicating ILL requests. The NET manual (Friesen and Pitfield 1988) provides standard abbreviated formats for requesting documents of all kinds via ENVOY. While use of ENVOY in combination with NET protocols made the requesting of documents vastly more efficient, staff were still required to re-key bibliographical information. Typically a borrowing library would identify an item on UBC's OPAC and would then have to re-copy the information in submitting a request for that item via ENVOY.

UBCLINC

In order to deal with this source of inefficiency and with other time-consuming tasks in the ILL process, in late 1989, using funds provided by the Ministry of Advanced Education, UBC developed an automated interlibrary loan system, primarily to enhance services to the university-college programs. After a survey and evaluation of existing ILL software had been completed, design of the UBC system commenced in February 1990, with first priority being given to a feature that would allow borrowing libraries to search UBC's OPAC and to order located items online, without re-keying.

By October this feature was in its testing stage, and today it is in general use by B.C. post-secondary libraries, as well as by the Vancouver Public Library. The system also improves efficiency within UBC, by generating pick slips, automatically arranged by location (UBC Library has many branch libraries and divisions) and call number.

Internet

The Internet, mentioned above, is a global computer network of networks, and is estimated to link together about four thousand different networks involving as many as a million host computers, and therefore some millions of users. It provides access to many services and resources of direct interest and importance to libraries and their users, such as OPACs and bibliographic utilities, citation, numeric and full-text databases including electronic newsletters and serials. However, there is no satisfactory directory to the vast resources of Internet, which is notable for its lack of overall organization. In place of a comprehensive directory a number of software packages have been developed to assist users in "navigating" or "surfing" the Internet, a choice of words that evokes images of vast uncharted oceans and cloudless skies. (Polly 1992)

Because the Internet provides online access to remote information resources, it is of obvious importance to BC post-secondary librarians who are geographically distant from the places where the largest collections of information exist. The Internet also supports electronic mail applications and can be used to transmit digital images of text. Given the developments described in the section above on electronic full-text documents, it is vital that all B.C. post-secondary libraries be linked to the Internet, and to other such networks now under development in Canada and the U.S.

Options for Change

Solutions Proposed by Participants

High on the list of desired changes was the extension of Internet, as mentioned above.

Recommendations

Extension of Internet

Recommendation 7:

That ELN lobby with the appropriate authorities for the extension of the Internet to all post-secondary libraries.

Delivery Systems

With the use of contemporary communications technology the process of locating and requesting a document has become vastly more efficient. Document delivery systems, while they have also improved, remain as one of the obstacles to efficiency within ILL. This is particularly true where actual physical volumes are involved, and less true for short documents. In a study of interlibrary loan and document delivery as an alternative to local ownership of seldom-used scientific journals librarians at Washington State University and Arizona State University discovered the obvious: that the speed with which documents were delivered was crucial to the acceptance of the alternative. They concluded: "Document delivery should be given the same high priority that is currently given to the acquisition of journals and books... Document delivery should be developed into a first-class operation - both fast and dependable Faculty should be convinced that document delivery is a reasonable (and perhaps necessary) substitute for purchasing lesser-used research titles..." (Roberts 1992)

In 1989 the National Library struck a working group on document delivery which explored the feasibility of establishing a nation-wide delivery service based on either a devoted courier service or through Canada Post. On first inspection these options appeared to be too expensive on a national basis, and the group concluded that linked regional systems might be more viable. To proceed further with this study the National Library has contracted with Peat Marwick Stevenson & Kellog to investigate present document delivery arrangements and their costs, and to propose alternatives. This study is proceeding at the present time. (Lowenberg 1991)

B.C. post-secondary libraries were asked to indicate which delivery services they used in supplying materials to other libraries, and to list in them in order of frequency of use.

PRINT					
	1	2	3	4	5
Canada Post	15	8	1		
FAX	2	6	10	2	
Commercial Courier	4	5	6	4	
Institutional Courier	5	2	3	1	1
Bus			2	1	

MEDIA

	1	2	3
Canada Post		4	1
Commercial Courier	1	5	
Institutional Courier	1		1

Mail

Canada Post is the principal carrier for documents provided through ILL, whether envelopes containing photocopy of parcels containing printed volumes. Libraries use both conventional mail services and Priority Post, depending on their need for faster delivery and on their ability to pay. However, Canada Post was criticized by some libraries for being slow and unreliable, and the additional costs of Priority Post are a problem for libraries generally. There have been cases of lost and damaged items.

Couriers

Couriers are also in use, both commercial and institutional. There are a number of institutional couriers operating in the Lower Mainland and elsewhere, and although these could be potentially the most efficient means of delivering materials between libraries, some couriers do not operate on a daily basis. Infrequent delivery is a particular problem for colleges with satellite campuses and learning centres. Commercial couriers, while also undoubtedly efficient, are costly.

FAX

The wide adoption of facsimile transmission or FAX machines has been even swifter among libraries than was the adoption of Telex or electronic mail. Its use for delivering copies of articles or short extracts from books or other documents is now common. It serves as the basic means of document transmission for new services such as CARL Uncover2. Yet fax is not without its problems for ILL librarians. First, it is labour intensive, particularly if the library does not possess one of the more expensive machines that can scan open volumes, not just single pages; in that latter instance a photocopy must be made first before a the document can be faxed. Second, there are some post-secondary libraries which do not have a fax machine, and which rely on a machine in another department, even in another building. The extra charge required by NET for faxing a document is also an obstacle to its more frequent use.

ARIEL

ARIEL is another technique for document transmission which promises to be

even more cost-effective for libraries than FAX. Developed by the Research Libraries Group, the ARIEL software links a personal computer, document scanner and laser printer to transmit high-resolution copy over Internet. The costs of transmission are significantly reduced: fax transmissions travel at 9,600 bits per second, whereas ARIEL transmissions can travel at 1.5 megabits per second, not even taking into account the ability to compress data prior to transmission. Further, since ARIEL uses a conventional microcomputer, document delivery becomes one more ILL function along with document locating and requesting that can be handled from a single workstation. (Jackson 1991) ELN and the SFU OJAC project will be pilot testing an ARIEL workstation. However, province-wide use of this technology depends on the extension of Internet to all post-secondary libraries.

Alternative Document Delivery Systems

In the last few years several private and public sector organizations have established document delivery services, primarily for journal articles, and these have met with considerable success, attracting both libraries and individuals as regular customers. Faxon, long in business as a periodical subscriptions agent, now offers a serviced called Faxon Finder and Faxon XPress. Faxon Finder is a database of 11,000 serials which can be searched online; articles are ordered through Faxon XPress, and delivery by fax is promised within twenty-four hours. CARL Uncover2, based on the holdings of university libraries in Colorado, claims a database of 12,000 serials and twenty-four hour delivery; however, they have a direct connection with the British Library Document Supply Centre to amplify their own service. Not to be left out, the Research Libraries Group has a similar service which it calls CitaDel. It offers access to a number of specialized databases, dealing with such things as foreign law and the history of technology; it also uses fax, but will also use ARIEL. All services permit payment with a credit card, and usually a deposit account can be established. Indications are that these services are enjoying commercial success and are growing rapidly.

The National Library of Medicine has been at the forefront of technological applications to information retrieval for decades. Its MEDLARS system, inaugurated in the 1960s, was the first successful operating information retrieval system. It has now introduced an automated interlibrary loan system under the name of Docline. This is related to the Library's union serials databases, Serline for bibliographic information and Serhold for holdings information; these provide information about holdings of medical literature in U.S. and some Canadian libraries. Libraries participating in Docline send requests to a NLM computer, which automatically routes requests to libraries holding the wanted documents, according to a table of location preferences established by the borrowing library. The system is also linked to other systems offered by NLM, and designed for the individual user as well as for libraries, Grateful Med, which is used for searching MEDLARS, and Loansome Doc,

a document delivery module. The B.C. Medical Library Service is coordinating a pilot project in the use of Docline by B.C. health libraries, the first such project in Canada.

Other similar services are offered by Engineering Information Inc. and by University Microfilm Inc., and undoubtedly other organizations will enter the marketplace in the near future. Obviously access to such services allows libraries to rethink their collection policies where serials are concerned. Will it be cheaper in the long run to pay fees for articles as they are wanted, or to subscribe to and maintain the serials from which the articles are copied? There is no clear answer to this question, nor any satisfactory way of finding an answer, because it is not possible to predict how often users will require access to a specific journal title. Nevertheless, these services offer an alternative to requesting journal copies from another library, where service may not be as quick, and where there may also be a fee to pay.

These services are also designed for use by individuals, which means that anyone who is willing and able to pay can acquire wanted articles without the intervention of a library. The combination of a computer, a modem, a fax machine, a credit card and some skills in information seeking on databases brings the electronic library into the home. A historical parallel might be the invention of books by mail, earlier in this century, that led to the creation of the Book-of-the-Month Club and its hundreds of imitators. However, this kind of direct service did not lead to the demise of either bookstores or libraries. The online information and document delivery services will divert traffic away from libraries, but since they are based on the ability to pay, they will not replace libraries; that is, unless libraries cease to operate on the principle of serving individual users at no direct cost.

OJAC

The ELN and Simon Fraser University Library have collaborated in developing a service similar to these, under the name of OJAC, standing for Online Journal Access. A commercially developed software package for database searching and document retrieval has been mounted on a VAX computer at SFU and loaded with the Social Science Index. In the pilot project students and faculty at Cariboo College were encouraged to search the database themselves, and to request documents directly from SFU. Requests were dealt with at SFU on a turnaround basis, with delivery by priority post usually completed within a span of twenty-four to forty-eight hours. At the time of this writing, the Humanities Index had been added to the database, and the service extended to Okanagan College, with possible future extension to Fraser Valley College. Concerns that students and faculty, who must come to the library to use a dedicated OJAC terminal, might abuse the system, neglecting to use local resources, have not been borne out. An important feature is that the citations in the databases are linked to the holdings of the libraries themselves, so users of the system

can know immediately whether it is necessary to order articles from a remote location.

OJAC and UBCLINC can be seen as steps toward the full development of the Electronic Library Network, allowing users immediate access to both information about the total resources of libraries in B.C. and eventually electronically delivered copies of documents in those libraries.

Options for Change

Solutions Proposed by Participants

Some perceived a dedicated courier system as being a solution to many of the problems associated with document delivery. Others believed that more extensive use should be made of existing services, with a group rate being negotiated by ELN. More frequent use of FAX for short documents was generally favoured, with support for the purchase of FAX machines in libraries which do not have them.

Recommendations

Implementation of ARIEL

Recommendation 8:

That ELN continue to pursue electronic alternatives to physical document delivery, as in the case of its ARIEL Pilot Project.

Canada Priority Courier

Recommendation 9:

That ELN take advantage of OLA's favourable rate with Canada Post's Priority Courier Service, to expedite delivery of documents in physical formats, at lower unit costs.

Cost Allocation Systems

Recognition of Costs

Although the practice of interlibrary lending commenced in the late nineteenth century, it was not until December 1916 that the Council of the American Library

Association approved the first Code of Practice for Interlibrary Loans. This set out the terms and conditions of interlibrary lending: its purpose, the kinds of materials available for lending, categories of eligible users, loan periods, etc. Its only reference to cost related to "carriage and insurance", which were to be paid by the borrowing library. But it was not long before major lending libraries noticed that there were other costs; speaking to a meeting of librarians in 1922, a reference librarian from Yale University, observing that its interlibrary lending had risen by 30% in ten years, stated that this increase in activity "raises the question of possible charges to cover actual expenses." (Pratt 1922) Hardly a year passed thereafter without this subject being raised at meetings of the American Library Association, though the main concerns about interlibrary lending at that time had to do with the kinds of materials which would be loaned, and who could borrow for what purposes. Interlibrary lending was restricted to research purposes and researchers: loans to undergraduate students were not permitted. Subsequent revisions to the code in 1940 and 1952 were actually less liberal than the original code of 1917.

Even under a restrictive code the volume of interlibrary lending began to increase dramatically in the nineteen sixties. Many new universities and colleges were established, and lacked resources adequate for their programs. Pressure on the larger university libraries was mounting, with demands for access on behalf of undergraduates. Representing one large university library, T.E. Ratcliffe of the University of Illinois wrote: "...whose money and for whose use? ... The notion that libraries with restrictive lending policies are necessarily so out of smug self-sufficiency or without genuine comprehension of a service responsibility to all comers ignores the hard facts of budget insufficiency, prior obligation to internal clientele, or inadequate resources for voluminous demand." (Ratcliffe 1967)

In 1967 the ALA Interlibrary Loan Committee decided that a study of costs was essential, but it delegated the task to the Association of Research Libraries. This led to the first serious and comprehensive study of interlibrary loan costs, carried out by Westat Inc. under contract to ARL, with results published in 1972 under the title *A Study of the Characteristics, Cost and Magnitude of Interlibrary Loans in Academic Libraries*. (Palmour 1972) Two years later Westat produced a companion study with the title *Methods of Financing Interlibrary Loan Service*. (Palmour 1974). Vernon Palmour, the primary consultant, estimated that it cost \$5.82 U.S. to lend an item, and \$7.61 to borrow one. These figures, and his methodology, were immediately challenged by some librarians, and several other cost studies were carried out at individual institutions. The response of the ARL to the report was to recommend a standard fee for borrowing libraries, public subsidization of interlibrary loan, and a coupon payment system. But the American Library Association, obviously representing the interests of the smaller libraries of the nation, resolved that no fees should be levied, pending further studies.

Evolution of Charging

Even within the membership of the ARL there was no unanimous agreement that major academic libraries should move to a fee-based system. In the absence of such an agreement, some libraries, including the major private university libraries, began unilaterally to levy fees.

Interlibrary loan studies were also being carried out in Canada during the early nineteen seventies. Robert Blackburn, Librarian of the University of Toronto, estimated that interlibrary lending was increasing at the rate of 25% per year; he identified three libraries, Toronto, McGill and UBC, as being responsible for a third of all lending nationally. (Blackburn 1973) In 1974 the National Library of Canada entered into a contract with UBC to carry out a national survey; this was conducted between March 1974 and March 1975. It demonstrated that net lenders and net borrowers also existed in Canada, and made the following recommendation to the National Library: "...that the federal government, through the Canada Council, the National Library, or some other agency capable of making direct grants to or negotiating contracts with individual libraries, reimburse net lending libraries, other than national, provincial or government libraries, such reimbursement to be in terms of the difference in numbers between items loaned to and items borrowed from Canadian libraries (providing this difference exceeds 999 loans), multiplied by the average cost of lending an item, as determined by an annual survey of these costs at net lending libraries." (Stuart-Stubbs and others 1975a) The National Library did not act on this recommendation, saying that it could not interfere in provincial jurisdictions.

In his 1989 history of the University of Toronto Library, Robert Blackburn recalls subsequent events: "By 1974-75 the number of interlibrary loans supplied by Toronto had risen to more than 32,000 per year, costing us at least \$250,000. Budget cuts had brought about a thinning of staff and reduction of services to readers on our own campus ... It appeared that we should have either to discontinue the service - which was unthinkable - or to recover the cost somehow... Aid was not forthcoming (from the federal government), and at the beginning of 1976 Toronto and the University of British Columbia introduced a fee ... Unfortunately the fee is an inhibitor ... the fullest possible use of Canada's expensive library resources will not be attained until our governments are prepared to reimburse the cost of interlibrary lending." (Blackburn 1989)

In fact, the levying of a fee at UBC was not simultaneous with that act at the University of Toronto. Once the Toronto fee went into effect, interlibrary loan requests formerly directed to that library began to flow toward UBC, and the already heavy workload quickly became insupportable, at which point a fee was introduced. The existence of this new fee was quickly brought to the attention of the B.C. Post-

Secondary Coordinating Committee, which commissioned a report the main object of which would be to "...identify, in as much detail as possible, the nature of the problem of providing effective library service to all parts of the post-secondary system in British Columbia." In April 1976 Basil Stuart-Stubbs and Ross Carter delivered their report to the Committee, which recommended what the authors called a "constellation of solutions." These included rapid development of college collections, support for resource collections at the universities, the establishment of a funded interlibrary loan network, dissemination of information about the holdings of university, college and public libraries, support for the cataloguing process, and the establishment of a communications network and inter-institutional delivery systems. (Stuart-Stubbs and Carter 1976)

The Committee endorsed the report, and forwarded it to the government. Recommendations concerning the bibliographic and interlibrary loan network were accepted and funded by the Ministry of Universities, Science and Communication, and so the B.C. Union Catalogue Project and the B.C. Post-Secondary Interlibrary Loan Network were born. Unfortunately the other recommendations concerning collection development were not given particular attention, and in the early nineteen eighties the government's direct funding of the Project and the Network ended, just at the point that the Project had made a major request for the establishment of a bibliographic utility. (B.C. Union Catalogue Project 1980) The Network continues in existence, supported by the post-secondary libraries themselves, but despite a gradual rise in its activity its usefulness has not been fully realized. In effect, the ELN office is now carrying on in a partial way where the BCUC Project was forced to leave off.

The debate over costs and fees continues. Many believe that as a matter of principle libraries should not charge for services of any kind. Others feel that costs should be shared. Yet others believe that someone other than libraries should pay for the costs of interlibrary loan. Richard M. Dougherty, formerly the director of two major libraries, Michigan and California-Berkeley, and the editor of the *Journal of Academic Librarianship* offered this perspective recently:

"In many respects, interlibrary lending has been and remains partly an altruistic activity ... This is a worthy activity, and I'm sure elements of this philosophy will survive, but at the same time, if we are to build new library service models, resource sharing and interlibrary lending must be placed on a more business-like basis.... The first step would simply be to have libraries charge each other for transactions ... If this is an unacceptable strategy, then let us open the debate on alternative strategies and discuss how, if cooperation and collaboration are important, we can create a climate so that client success and client support can be achieved." (Dougherty 1992) British Columbia post-secondary libraries have been charging each other for

over a decade: but there is an alternative and more effective strategy, and one that will work to the greater advantage particularly of students at the colleges.

Cost Studies

Since there was continuing concern over the increasing quantities of loans demanded from large research libraries, in the past decade there have been new attempts at measuring costs. (King Research 1985) (King and Roderer 1977) (Herstand 1981) These studies arrived at lending costs ranging from \$6.23 to \$8.40 U.S. At UBC a study arrived at a figure of \$8.50, which was used to set the NET cost recovery fee. However, there was no agreed-upon methodology for measuring these costs until one was developed recently by Dickson and Boucher, who took account of virtually every factor entering into the cost of interlibrary lending. (Dickson and Boucher 1989) The shortcoming of this methodology was that it did not measure the cost of borrowing, which, it was known from earlier studies, exceeded the cost of lending.

In the fall of 1991 the Association of Research Libraries and the Research Libraries Group joined forces to "...establish benchmark data ... on the economics of document delivery." They adapted the Dickson and Boucher methodology, extending it to cover borrowing as well as lending. Their questionnaire was distributed in February 1992 for return in April. A final report of this study is imminent.

As a member of ARL, UBC was requested to participate in this survey. The ELN Office asked SFU and UV also to complete the questionnaire, which the latter declined to do. As a result, we now have figures for the cost of lending and borrowing at two of the three major net lending post-secondary libraries in the province.

The questionnaire was complex and therefore subject to interpretation. Although UBC and SFU calculated supervisory staff costs in different ways, this did not seem to have much effect on the eventual results: at UBC the borrowing cost was calculated at \$25.50 and at SFU \$26.44, less than a dollar apart. As for lending costs, these were calculated as \$10.00 at UBC and \$7.74 at SFU. UBC's higher cost is probably largely accounted for by two factors. First, it is a decentralized system with many branch libraries, and worse, with several widely scattered closed storage areas. Second, unlike SFU, UBC lends bound volumes and unbound issues of periodicals. The only other figures available at the time of writing are those for the University of Pennsylvania: \$22.28 for borrowing and \$18.66 for lending, expressed in Canadian dollars. (Jackson 1992)

It should be noted that the cost of borrowing includes any fees paid to lending libraries, and that unit costs at both universities would decrease markedly in a resource sharing system without fees.

Options for Change

Solutions Proposed by Participants

One librarian summed up the attitude of many: "I would like to see a provincially led incentive program for resource sharing. If libraries/colleges/universities were clearly expected to share resources and received compensation to do so, I think resource sharing would grow as would efficiency and productivity, on a provincial basis."

Recommendations

ELN Resource Sharing Fund

Recommendation 10:

That ELN seek the means to reimburse post-secondary libraries for their lending activities, based on the numbers of items provided; and that it explore with the Library Services Branch the establishment of reciprocal reimbursement arrangements with public libraries, so as to facilitate access to the resources of all public libraries on behalf of post-secondary students.

Management Systems

There are two levels of management in resource sharing: the system level and the institutional level.

At the system level, the most successful resource sharing systems can be found in the U.S., in such states as Illinois (ILLINET) and Minnesota (MINITEX), where government funding is provided through the state libraries and a central agency has been established to carry out normal administrative functions of planning, coordination, budgeting, communication, training, etc. There is no exact equivalent to the state library in Canada, and the nature and powers of the state library varies from jurisdiction to jurisdiction. In British Columbia the Library Services Branch in the Ministry of Municipal Affairs performs a coordinating, service and financial support function for public and regional libraries, under the terms of the Public Libraries Act. No similar body exists for school libraries, though the organization representing teacher librarians has long lobbied for the creation of a position of coordinator within the Ministry of Education. And no similar body exists to coordinate the activities of the post-secondary libraries. In the absence of such a coordinating

agency, the post-secondary librarians have undertaken cooperative enterprises themselves. The Electronic Library Network office is now performing a welcome coordinating function in areas within its mandate.

System Level: B.C. NET and MEC

Resource sharing among B.C. post-secondary libraries has been coordinated for over a decade by two informal organizations, one dealing with printed materials, the other with the media.

The B.C. Post-Secondary Interlibrary Loan Network (NET) commenced operation in September 1977, with initial funding provided by the government; its general purpose was to make the sharing of resources among the libraries more efficient. Because it was centrally funded, the fee that had been introduced by UBC was in effect waived: the three university libraries, all of them net lenders, were reimbursed by the government for their net loans. The NET Office was established at UBC, and it swiftly developed a set of routines and conventions for general use among the libraries, incorporating these into a Manual, now in its fifth edition. (Friesen and Pitfield 1988) For purposes of communication telex was then the medium of choice, and a telex network was established to link all of the post-secondary libraries. Experiments were conducted to test the efficiency of various delivery systems, and a mix of arrangements resulted. NET has greatly facilitated the sharing of resources among post-secondary libraries, introducing a uniform and efficient methodology for locating and exchanging materials.

A parallel organization, the Media Exchange Cooperative (MEC) was established even earlier, in the late nineteen sixties, to facilitate the sharing of films and videotapes. This involved not just libraries, but also media centres where these existed separately at colleges and universities. MEC's objectives are:

- 1.** To exchange audiovisual resources among post-secondary institutions.
- 2.** To produce a catalogue of media holding in post-secondary institutions.
- 3.** To establish mechanisms to facilitate collection development.
- 4.** To exchange information on media resources, collections and operations.
- 5.** To act on behalf of post-secondary educational institutions as an interface with other agencies in regard to audiovisual services.

MEC's members engage in cooperative selection of titles, system purchases, bulk purchases and the securing of duplication rights. Like NET, MEC is fee based

in relation to resource sharing. (Epp 1989)

Evolution

As has been explained in previous pages, NET continued to operate effectively after direct government funding was withdrawn. It appears that the money allocated for this purpose was redirected through institutional administrations, where it might or might not have appeared in library budgets. Whatever the case, funding for interlibrary borrowing remained constant or declined during the nineteen eighties, and in straitened budget conditions the colleges in particular encountered difficulty in paying for interlibrary loans. This resulted in the use of rationing systems at the colleges, a search on the part of the borrowing libraries for lending libraries that did not charge fees, and a decline in traffic among the B.C. post-secondary libraries. Among the university libraries, UBC, the largest net lender, was experiencing its own budget problems and had become dependent on income from fees to maintain its interlibrary lending operations. Although traffic within NET has increased every year since the low point of 1985/86, it accounts for a diminishing percentage of total interlibrary borrowing by the B.C. post-secondary libraries.

Performance

In 1990/91 the three universities continued to provide most of the loans within NET: 95.3% of the total. UBC accounted for 72.05%, SFU for 16.67% and UV for 6.62%. Looking at this result from another perspective, the college and institute libraries supplied less than 5% of items wanted on interlibrary loan. It is anticipated that the figures for 1992/93 will reflect changes in access to location information. The Outlook database, which became available to libraries in the spring of 1992, provides previously inaccessible location information for college libraries. In the fall of 1992 the University of Victoria's OPAC became operative, allowing libraries the same online access that they have had for several years to the holdings of UBC and SFU. Finally, the success of the OJAC project and its extension to other university-college libraries should increase ILL traffic with SFU.

On the borrowing side, SFU remains the major borrower, accounting for 30.82% of NET traffic in 1990/91, followed by Okanagan College at 12.14%. No other single university, college or institute library accounts for more than 8% of total traffic.

In 1990/91, success rates, that is, the percentage of requests successfully filled, were 81% at UBC, 79% at SFU and 71% at UV.

Institutional Level: Management of the Process

The consultant attempted to discover how interlibrary loan processes were managed within the libraries, both in relation to borrowing materials and to lending materials, and with which other library functions these processes were related. Some generalizations are possible.

The three established universities deal with enough traffic to require separate work units and specialized full-time professional and supporting staff members. Some college libraries allocate a full-time technician or library assistant to the task, generally under the supervision of a public service librarian. But at smaller post-secondary libraries, ILL processes occupy only part of the time of a supporting staff member. Librarians, and mainly reference librarians, are generally involved in the borrowing side of the process, ensuring that the request is both justified and bibliographically correct; but the lending side may be carried out without the intervention of a librarian. In most libraries the same individuals carry out the routines involved in both borrowing and lending, but not in all; at a few libraries borrowing is a responsibility of reference services, whereas lending is allocated to circulation services. Both at the universities and colleges frequently part-time staff are employed to assist full-time staff.

In the case of media, usually other staff members are involved, there being specialized audiovisual supervisors and clerks, who carry out both borrowing and lending routines.

There is nothing surprising in all of this, but it does point to one fact: there are many individuals employed in interlibrary loan. This has implications for training, and even greater implications depending on whether there is a high rate of turnover in staff involved in ILL processes. The conduct of these processes is growing more complicated, not less, and training and retraining will be essential to the effective utilization of the total resource. It will not be enough to invite one representative per library to attend a workshop held every few years.

Within the individual library routines for interlibrary loan are dominantly clerical, time-consuming and therefore labour-intensive. These tasks are like the ones that are routinely performed by the users of libraries: locating items in the library, retrieving them, perhaps photocopying them, checking them out, protecting them from the elements, transporting them to the place they will be used. Experience has led to the development of routines that allow trained staff members to carry these tasks out more efficiently than most library patrons. Interlibrary loan librarians are constantly searching for ways to become more efficient. Recent developments in software are helping.

Standards

The National Library of Canada has been a leader in developing standards for interlibrary loan software protocols. These standards and protocols are utilized by software developers, whether in the private sector, in utilities or in individual libraries, making possible the effective linking of systems internationally and nationally. The National Library has created a software package using the draft protocols, and is using that package internally; but it has not made it available to the library community.

UBCLINC

UBCLINC is described in this report's section on Communications, because communication is one facet of the software, which allows a distant library to both locate and request an item in one session at the terminal. However, the software also provides benefits within UBC, eliminating a number of manual routines; with further development, it will eliminate more.

Other Software

UBCLINC operates on a UBC mainframe computer, and is functionally related to the library's OPAC. Proprietary software with similar features has also been developed for use on personal computers, and four college libraries have already acquired one such package, AVISO; thirteen other college libraries indicate that they intend to acquire such software. The net effect of installation of this software will be to make the total operation of the interlibrary loan more efficient and cost-effective.

Options for Change

.....

Recommendations

ELN as Manager

As noted above, the creation of the Electronic Library Network office provided a needed centre for the planning and coordination of collective projects aimed at improving the sharing of resources among post-secondary libraries in B.C. Up until the point of its creation any such planning and coordination resulted from the work of basically volunteer organizations of librarians. To put it bluntly: there hasn't been much support for cooperative enterprises. In that respect British Columbia is below standard, compared with other provinces such as Quebec or Ontario, and certainly with many U.S. states. The situation of post-secondary libraries in B.C. does not even compare favourably with that of the province's public libraries, with their

Library Services Branch in the Ministry of Municipal Affairs.

The state of Ohio provides a current example of how such cooperation can be sponsored and managed. In that state a Board of Regents oversees the post-secondary educational system, and the origins of OhioLINK can be traced to this source. The mandates established for OhioLINK are:

- To establish high-speed telecommunications links among Ohio's university libraries that will support user searching of both the central site and other institution's databases.
- To develop a central database that contains the holdings of all Ohio academic libraries.
- To provide gateway access to a wide range of information formats, including databases purchased or leased by OhioLINK for member libraries, and commercial databases and services not specifically funded by OhioLINK.
- To provide up-to-date circulation information to patrons and to allow patrons to initiate interlibrary loan and circulation transactions without library staff assistance.
- To offer document delivery service to participating sites, including telefacsimile, electronic image and document transfer. A delivery turnaround time of forty-eight hours is targeted.
- To provide for retrospective conversion of those materials held by participating institutions whose records are not currently in electronic format.
- To provide collection management information for improved use and development of state resources..
- To develop a workstation that enhances user and staff interactions with OhioLINK services and databases. (Sessions and others 1992)

There is much in this report that relates directly to these mandates: what Ohio is doing in a determined and directed fashion British Columbia needs also to do. The difference is that the planning and coordinating activity is recognized in Ohio as being essential to the successful attainment of these objectives, and the state is providing for that activity.

The Electronic Library Network office, in the absence of any coordinating agency at the level of government itself, is assuming the responsibility for projects which together will assist in developing something like OhioLINK.

One alternative for providing overall coordination for post-secondary libraries would be the establishment within the Ministry of Advanced Education of a library

services branch, parallel to the one existing for public libraries.

The other alternative would be to expand the mandate of the Electronic Library Network office. Given that the Open Learning Agency is responsible for the Knowledge Network, which disseminates visual information throughout the province, as suggested in previous sections of this report it is not illogical for the Open Learning Agency to develop the Electronic Library Network as a parallel system for the delivery of textual information. It could also assume responsibility for a general planning and coordinating role for post-secondary libraries and funded and staffed at levels appropriate to its task.

Training

Recommendation 11:

That ELN arrange for programs of education for the purpose of training staff in interlibrary loan routines, on at least an annual basis.

Planning and Coordination

Recommendation D:

That consideration be given by the Ministry of Advanced Education to the establishment of a coordinating agency for B.C. post-secondary libraries.

Resource Sharing and the Future of Libraries

There is no dearth of predictions about the future of libraries, and these are increasing in number as the magic year 2000 approaches. Although there are some who predict the death of libraries, the consensus seems to be that libraries will still be around, though adapted to increasing amounts of information in electronic formats.

It is in the nature of libraries that they are finite, and can only represent a fraction of the world's knowledge. For the individual library the question, which requires a different answer every day, and which remains the same whatever the format in which information appears, is: what can I do to provide my users with the most immediate access to the information they require, selected from the universe of knowledge?

Local ownership of printed materials directly relevant to an institution's teaching program must remain a priority for all universities, colleges and institutes, until such time as printed materials disappear, a possibility which most informed pundits now reject. At the same time the machinery for delivering printed or electronic material from a distant resource, must be in place for efficient use by faculty and students. Some librarians see the latter as the key to the future successful operation of libraries. Richard Dougherty puts it this way:

"Perhaps the most important issue which librarianship must confront in order to maintain a central role in the future development of information services is that of shared collection development and document delivery. ... Librarians must take the leadership role now in designing effective systems to prove their ability to exploit the resources which have been given to their care.." (Dougherty and Hughes 1990)

Because it will subject to constant alteration, it is not possible to state with finality what the exact balance should be between the ownership of resources at the local level, and the provision of access to remote resources. Depending on which authority one chooses to cite, either the library will not exist at all, or it will continue to play its role as a mediator between the users and the providers of information. In the former camp one would find Robert L. Parks, director of the Office of Public Affairs of the American Physical Society:

"We are fast approaching the day when electronic databases will largely supplant conventional libraries as the repository of scientific and technical information and will become the preferred means by which scientists communicate their findings." (Ra 1990)

This may be a true statement as it applies to scientists. But what about other disciplines? And how will this kind of access to information relate to the learning needs of students? Another person, like Parks someone outside the profession of librarianship, does not see libraries as being supplanted; Ronald F.E. Weissman, Assistant Vice-President for Academic Computing at Brown University believes the role of the library will be enhanced:

"The University will increasingly see its role as that of online information provider to aid exploratory learning and research. And providing a rich body of online information will be a growing challenge for academic libraries worldwide, and will foster much cooperation, sharing and joint development efforts between libraries and computing centers. Indeed, the provision of such a data-rich world will make academic libraries significant change agents in higher education, and key to our next-generation technology architecture." (Ra 1990)

Significantly, North America's largest academic library is planning to maintain and develop its print collections while simultaneously providing access to electronic services and documents. Two of the goals enunciated in Harvard University Library's 1992 Strategic Plan are:

"Strengthen the research collection by sustaining acquisitions and improving intellectual access, preservation, security, and maintenance of the collection.

"Build and support computer and communications technologies and implement a comprehensive program for delivering electronic research materials ..." (Harvard University Library 1992)

If such goals are good enough for Harvard, they should be good enough for the post-secondary libraries of British Columbia. Coincidentally, this report's recommendations are directed toward those goals.

PART III: REFERENCES

References

"Hard-To-Find Books and Periodical Articles Located by Telex for Toronto Public Library Users." *Ontario Library Review* 47 (August 1963): 97.

"Telex Network Demonstrated for Canadian Library Week." *Library Journal* 91 (May 1 1966): 2302.

"New Online Journal to Speed Publication of Peer-Reviewed Reports on Clinical Trials of Medical Treatments." *OCLC Newsletter* 193 (September/October 1991): 4.

"The COPPUL Regional Title Project." *Library Editions* (Winter 1992): 1-2.

"Libraries: Database Will Offer Text and Graphics from Chemical Journals." *Chronicle of Higher Education* (May 13 1992):

"U.S. Libraries May Be Harder Hit Than Expected by 1993 Subscription Rate Increases." *EBSCO Subscription Services - At Your Service ...* (No. 22 1992): p.1.

"The Union Catalogue - 40 Years Later." *National Library News* 24 (June 1992): 11-12.

Association of College and Research Libraries. "Standards for University Libraries: Evaluation of Performance." *College & Research Library News* 50 (September 1989): 679-91.

Association of College and Research Libraries. "Standards for Two-Year College Learning Resources Programs: a Draft." *College & Research Libraries News* 50 (June 1989): 496-505.

B.C. Union Catalogue Project. "BCUC Proposal to Fund the Establishment of a Computer Based Library Utility in B.C." *BCLA Reporter* 22 (September/October 1980): 6-9, 11-13.

Bernsohn, Kathy. *Interlibrary Loan Study ... for CNC Library*. Prince George, B.C.: College of New Caledonia, 1990.

Blackburn, Robert H. "Of Mice and Lions and Interlibrary Things." *IPLO Quarterly* 13 (October 1973): 68-80.

Blackburn, Robert H. *Evolution of the Heart: A History of The University of Toronto Library up to 1981*. Toronto: University of Toronto Library, 1989.

Brown, Barry N. and Marianne Farr. "Sharing Electronic Data Bases Through Interlibrary Loan." *PNLA Quarterly* 55 (Summer 1991): 19-21.

Buckland, Michael. *Redesigning Library Services: a Manifesto*. Chicago: American Library Association, 1992.

Campbell, Robert. "Document Delivery and the Journal Publisher." *Scholarly Publishing* 23 (July 1992): 212-221.

Cleveland, Gary. "Canadian Libraries and the Emerging Information Network." *Canadian Library Journal* 49 (October 1992): 367-375.

Dickson, Stephen P. and Virginia Boucher. "A Methodology for Determining Costs of Interlibrary Lending." In *Research Access Through New Technology*, ed. Mary E. Jackson. 137-160. New York: AMS Press, 1989.

Dougherty, Richard and Carol Hughes. "Library Cooperation: a Historical Perspective and a Vision for the Future." *Advances In Library Resource Sharing* 1 (1990): 1-21.

Dougherty, Richard M. "Editorial: Making Resource Sharing Really Work." *Journal of Academic Librarianship* 18 (May 1992): 75.

England, Claire. *Interlibrary Loan and Document Delivery in Canada*. Ottawa: National Library of Canada, 1983.

Epp, Mary Anne. "Media Matters: a Cooperative Process." *PNLA Quarterly* 53 (Spring 1989): 23-24, 26.

Fedunok, Suzanne. "METRO Collection Inventory Project: a Conspectus Case Study." *Advances In Library Resource Sharing* 1 (1990): 95-119.

Friesen, Margaret and Isabel Pitfield. *B.C. Post-Secondary Interlibrary Loan Network Manual*. 5th ed., Vancouver: 1988.

Harvard University Library. *Commitment to Renewal: a Strategic Plan for the Harvard College Library*, February 3, 1992. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Library, 1992.

Herstand, Jo Ellen. "Interlibrary Loan Cost Study and Comparison." *RQ* 20 (Spring 1981): 249-56.

Hildreth, Charles R. "Automated Library Networking in North America: New Realities, Major Trends." In *International Library Cooperation: 10th Anniversary Essen Symposium 19 October-22 October 1987.*, ed. Ahmed H. Helal and Joachim W. Weiss. 221-42. Essen: Universitätsbibliothek Essen, 1987.

Jackson, Mary E. "Library to Library - [ARIEL]." *Wilson Library Bulletin* 65 (April 1991): 84-87.

Jackson, Mary E. "Library to Library - Fitting the Bill." *Wilson Library Bulletin* 66 (June 1992): 95-97.

Kenney, Anne R. and Lynne K. Personius. *The Cornell/Xerox/Commission on Preservation and Access Joint Study in Digital Preservation. Report: Phase I ...* Washington, D.C.: Commission on Preservation and Access, 1992.

King, Donald W. and Nancy K. Roderer. "Economic Considerations for Interlibrary Loan Networks." In: *40th ASIS Annual Meeting, 1977.*

King Research. *Interlibrary Loan Compensation for the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania: Final Report.* Harrisburg: State Library of Pennsylvania, 1985.

Lane, William Coolidge. "A Central Bureau of Information and Loan Collection for College Libraries." *Library Journal* 33 (November 1908): 429-33.

Lowenberg, Emilie. "Document Delivery Working Group - Update." *National Library News* 23 (May 1991): 10.

Lunau, Carrol D. *Out-Of-Province Interlending Findings Report.* Ottawa: National Library of Canada, 1992.

Martin, Noelene P. "Information Transfer, Scholarly Communication, and Interlibrary Loan: Priorities, Conflicts, and Organizational Imperatives." In *Research Access Through New Technology*, ed. Mary E. Jackson. 1-21. New York: AMS Press, 1989.

Morgulis, Sam and Jocelyn Phillips. "Foreign and Domestic Periodicals Price Index for Canada 1992: the Second Survey." *Canadian Library Journal* 49 (June 1992): 203-208.

Mouw, James R. "The Center for Research Libraries: One Model for Cooperative Resource Sharing." *Advances In Library Resource Sharing* 1 (1990): 39-51.

National Library of Canada Resource Sharing Strategy Team. *Canadian Resource Sharing: a Proposed Strategy and Plan*. Ottawa: National Library of Canada, 1990.

Okerson, Ann. "Back to Academia? The Case for American Universities to Publish Their Own Research." *Logos* 2 (No. 2 1991): 106-112.

Okerson, Ann and Kendon Stubbs. "ARL Annual Statistics 1990-91: Remembrance of Things Past, Present ... and Future?" *Publishers Weekly* (July 27 1992): 22-23.

Palmour, Vernon. *A Study of the Characteristics, Costs and Magnitude of Interlibrary Loans in Academic Libraries*. Rockland, Md.: Westat Inc. for The Association of Research Libraries, 1972.

Palmour, Vernon. *Methods of Financing Interlibrary Loan Service*. Rockland, Md.: Westat, Inc., for The Association of Research Libraries, 1974.

Pinnell-Stephens, June. "The WLN Conspectus in Alaska." *WLN Participant* (November/December 1991): 6-8.

Polly, Jean Armour. "Surfing the Internet: an Introduction." *Wilson Library Bulletin* 66 (June 1992): 38-42, 155.

Pratt, Anne Stokely. "Meeting of the College and Reference Section, American Library Association." *ALA Bulletin* 16 (1922): 270.

Ra, Marsha. "Technology and Resource Sharing: Recent Developments and Future Scenarios." *Advances In Library Resource Sharing* 1 (1990): 141-153.

Ratcliffe, T.E. "A View from the Larger Library." *RQ* 6 (Summer 1967): 161-3.

Roberts, Elizabeth P. "ILL/Document Delivery as an Alternative to Local Ownership of Seldom-Used Scientific Database." *Journal of Academic Librarianship* 18 (March 1992): 30-34.

Sessions, Judith, Hwa-Wei Lee, and Stacey Kimmel. "OhioLINK: Technology and Teamwork Transforming Ohio Libraries." *Wilson Library Bulletin* 66 (June 1992): 43-45.

Stokes, Roy. *Report of the College Library and Media Services Study Committee Appointed by the Academic Board*. Vancouver: 1975.

Stuart-Stubbs, Basil and Ross Carter. *The Needs of Libraries and Post-Secondary Education in British Columbia: a Report to the B.C. Post-Secondary Coordinating Committee*. Vancouver: 1976.

Stuart-Stubbs, Basil, Margaret Friesen, and Douglas McInnes. *Interlibrary Loan in Canada; a Report of a Survey*. Vancouver: University of B.C. Library, 1975.

Stuart-Stubbs, Basil, Katherine Nichol, Margaret Friesen, and Douglas McInnes. *A Survey and Interpretation of the Literature of Interlibrary Loan*. Vancouver: University of B.C. Library, 1975.

Tallim, Paula. "The National Library's Networking Program." *National Library News* 23 (December 1991): 14-16.

VanBuskirk, Mary. "Joint Union List on CD-ROM." *National Library News* 23 (October/November 1991): 9.

Waters, Donald and Sheri Weaver. *The Organizational Phase of Project Open Book*. Washington, D.C.: Commission on Preservation and Access, 1992.

PART IV: APPENDICES

Appendix 1:

Initialisms, Acronyms and Abbreviations

The world of information abounds with initialisms, acronyms, abbreviations and nicknames. Whether it is a computer, a network, a piece of software, or an organization, it is likely to be known by a collection of capital letters, often meaningless to the uninitiated. The following list of initialisms and acronyms is intended to assist those readers unfamiliar with the subjects dealt with in this report.

- ACRL** The Association of College and Research Libraries is a division of the American Library Association.
- ALA** The American Library Association, founded in 1876, headquartered in Chicago, with nearly 50,000 members.
- ARL** The Association of Research Libraries, founded in 1932, headquartered in Washington, D.C., with a membership of 110 U.S. and Canadian libraries, primarily those at major universities, but including national libraries and some large public libraries.
- BCUC** The British Columbia Union Catalogue Project, now defunct.
- CACUL** The Canadian Association of College and University Libraries is a division of the Canadian Library Association, based primarily on personal membership drawn from libraries at all post-secondary institutions in Canada; it is the Canadian equivalent of ACRL.
- CANARIE** The Canadian Network for the Advancement of Research, Industry and Education, the Canadian equivalent of NREN.
- CA*Net** The Canada Network links ten provincially-based computer networks.
- CARL** The Canadian Association of Research Libraries, headquartered in Ottawa, with a membership consisting of libraries at those Canadian universities granting doctoral degrees.
- CD-ROM** Compact Disc-Read Only Memory.
- CISTI** The Canada Institute for Scientific and Technical Information, formerly the National Science Library.

- CLA** The Canadian Library Association is the national English-language association for librarians, library trustees and other interested in libraries.
- CNI** The Coalition of Networked Information is a Washington-based consortium of library organizations, libraries, publishers and other with an interest in the development of computer networks dedicated to the transfer of information.
- COM** Computer Output Microfiche
- COPPUL** The Council of Prairie and Pacific University Libraries is comprised of the chief librarians of the university libraries in the four western provinces.
- CPSLD** Council of Post-Secondary Library Directors, representing the twenty-four post-secondary libraries in British Columbia.
- MARC** Machine Readable Cataloguing Record, the standard format for recording bibliographic information in machine-readable form.
- MEC** The Media Exchange Cooperative, founded in the late nineteen sixties, to facilitate sharing of media materials among B.C. post-secondary institutions.
- METRO** The New York Metropolitan Reference and Library Research Agency.
- NCIP** The National Collection Inventory Project, established in the U.S. in the early nineteen eighties to create an inventory of collections at major libraries.
- NET** The B.C. Post-Secondary Interlibrary Loan Network, established in 1977 to facilitate sharing of printed materials among B.C. post-secondary libraries.
- NLC** The National Library of Canada.
- NREN** The National Research and Education Network is a U.S. government project to establish a high-speed computer network.
- OCLC** The Online Computer Library Center, founded in 1967 as the Ohio College Library Center, has become the largest bibliographic utility in the world, with a database of over ten million records.

- OPAC** The abbreviation for Online Public Access Catalogue.
- PNCD** The Pacific Northwest Collections Development Program, established in the early nineteen eighties, has created an inventory of collections in the northwestern states; its database is maintained by WLN.
- RLG** The Research Libraries Group, a consortium founded in 1978 to pursue the interests of the largest academic libraries in the U.S.; RLG is the proprietor of the RLIN system.
- RLIN** The Research Libraries Information Network is a computer-based bibliographical system supporting the cataloguing activities of the members of RLG.
- WLN** The Washington Library Network is a bibliographic utility originally established at the Washington State Library, but now a separate corporation serving libraries mainly in the Pacific Northwest.
- UTLAS** University of Toronto Library Automation Systems is a bibliographic utility founded at the University of Toronto, and now a separate corporation.

Appendix2:

Tables

Sources of Information

Information in these tables has been drawn from many sources. While it is the best information available about the post-secondary libraries of British Columbia, it is neither complete nor perfect; its weaknesses have been described in the body of the report. The sources of the information were:

- B.C. Ministry of Advanced Education, Training and Technology.
- Canadian Association of Research Libraries.
- Council of Post-Secondary Library Directors.
- B.C. Post-Secondary Interlibrary Loan Network.
- Media Exchange Cooperative
- Post-Secondary Libraries in responses to this Survey's questionnaires.
- College and Institute Libraries statistical submissions to the government ministries responsible in the early nineteen eighties.

For reasons discussed in the section on Definitions and Sources at the beginning of this report, the following tables contain many blank spaces. In the case of the tables dealing with individual institutions, the absence of data indicates that no information was supplied by those institutions, and could not be found in other sources. In the case of aggregate tables, the absence of data indicates that no sum, difference or percentage could be calculated due to lack of information.

Abbreviations

SFU	Simon Fraser University
UBC	University of British Columbia
UV	University of Victoria
BCIT	British Columbia Institute of Technology
CAM	Camosun College
CAP	Capilano College
CAR	Cariboo University College
DOUG	Douglas College
EK	East Kootenay Community College
ECCA	Emily Carr College of Art & Design
FV	University College of The Fraser Valley
JI	Justice Institute of British Columbia

KW	Kwantlen College
MAL	Malaspina College
NC	College of New Caledonia Library
NI	North Island College
NL	Northern Lights College
NW	Northwest Community College
OK	Okanagan University College
OLA	Open Learning Agency
PMTI	Pacific Marine Training Institute
SEL	Selkirk College
VCC	Vancouver Community College
NET	B.C. Post-Secondary Interlibrary Loan Network
MEC	Media Exchange Cooperative

Table 1: Library Expenditures

	1981/82	1982/83	1983/84	1984/85	1985/86	1986/87	1987/88	1988/89	1989/90	1990/91	Increase
SFU	\$5,074,000	\$5,752,000	\$5,712,000	\$5,588,000	\$5,360,000	\$5,396,000	\$5,880,000	\$5,750,000	\$5,384,000	\$8,075,000	59%
UBC	\$14,960,000	\$17,524,000	\$17,351,000	\$16,061,000	\$16,230,000	\$17,290,000	\$18,153,000	\$17,692,000	\$19,872,000	\$21,479,000	44%
UV	\$5,419,000	\$6,283,000	\$6,229,097	\$6,034,896	\$5,960,693	\$6,387,818	\$6,399,000	\$7,023,000	\$7,344,000	\$7,995,000	48%
Subtotal	\$25,453,000	\$29,559,000	\$29,292,097	\$27,683,896	\$27,550,693	\$29,073,818	\$30,432,000	\$30,465,000	\$32,600,000	\$37,549,048	47%
BCIT	\$1,580,755	\$1,504,364	\$1,570,110	\$1,399,570	\$1,258,009	\$1,626,902	\$1,852,032	\$1,804,911	\$1,920,784	\$2,163,157	37%
CAM	\$523,579	\$504,121	\$493,172		\$566,146	\$399,640	\$678,329	\$676,677	\$605,436	\$581,609	11%
CAP	\$523,579	\$504,121	\$493,172		\$566,146	\$399,640	\$678,329	\$676,677	\$605,436	\$581,609	11%
CAR	\$561,810	\$591,202	\$663,233		\$528,497	\$427,943	\$475,620	\$455,000	\$893,526	\$938,409	67%
DOUG	\$847,732	\$856,453	\$866,374	\$977,300	\$1,013,051	\$1,044,631	\$1,114,200	\$1,218,113	\$1,279,200	\$1,282,015	51%
EK	\$312,266	\$318,539	\$315,824	\$305,632	\$282,119	\$325,956	\$354,406	\$412,928	\$608,234	\$550,057	76%
ECCA	\$186,333	\$167,407	\$186,842	\$210,490	\$227,535	\$222,062	\$244,837	\$263,779	\$288,218	\$241,312	30%
FV	\$528,003	\$553,901	\$593,791	\$579,411	\$501,545	\$513,999	\$613,692	\$672,377	\$534,583	\$617,545	17%
JJ	\$567,571	\$235,363	\$307,527	\$177,000	\$224,173	\$231,044	\$191,469	\$202,368	\$239,517	\$241,755	-57%
KW	\$896,817		\$843,758		\$856,618	\$873,029	\$795,485	\$795,845	\$899,757	\$1,004,764	12%
MAL	\$828,250	\$850,698	\$809,977	\$809,977	\$677,533	\$508,102	\$861,835	\$861,385	\$1,099,900	\$1,434,518	73%
NC	\$587,632	\$628,400	\$598,968	\$513,017	\$517,956	\$511,139	\$665,289	\$665,289	\$723,015	\$778,691	33%
NI	\$587,632	\$628,400	\$598,968	\$513,017	\$517,956	\$511,139	\$665,289	\$665,289	\$723,015	\$778,691	33%
NL	\$208,704	\$148,607			\$196,119	\$196,329	\$173,590	\$173,750	\$262,972	\$248,724	19%
NW	\$319,272				\$475,882	\$183,703	\$233,891	\$196,026	\$302,667	\$336,947	6%
OK	\$591,596	\$613,056	\$532,219		\$630,571	\$678,094	\$704,908	\$807,511	\$1,238,306	\$1,748,571	196%
OLA					\$95,060			\$146,239	\$179,000	\$190,000	
PMTI	\$28,397	\$39,168	\$36,270		\$43,050	\$44,193		\$54,840	\$65,312	\$84,298	197%
SEL	\$377,055	\$479,004	\$407,377	\$314,844	\$453,178	\$426,207	\$444,316	\$409,261	\$415,286	\$512,414	36%
VCC	\$1,373,483	\$1,575,106	\$1,551,531	\$1,427,745	\$1,522,663	\$1,513,484	\$1,630,467	\$1,803,890	\$2,132,023	\$2,387,130	74%
Subtotal	\$11,420,466	\$10,197,910	\$10,869,113	\$7,228,003	\$11,058,747	\$10,732,296	\$12,377,984	\$12,962,155	\$15,016,187	\$16,702,216	46%
TOTAL	\$36,873,466	\$39,756,910	\$40,161,210	\$34,911,899	\$38,609,440	\$39,806,114	\$42,809,984	\$43,427,155	\$47,616,187	\$54,251,216	47%

**Table 2: Library Expenditures As A
Percentage Of Institutional Expenditures**

	1981/82	1982/83	1983/84	1984/85	1985/86	1986/87	1987/88	1988/89	1989/90	1990/91
SFU	6.2	7.4	7.6	7.5	6.5	6.5	6.9	6.3	5.1	6.6
UBC	8.4	8.5	8.0	5.5	5.4	7.7	7.9	7.1	7.1	7.0
UV	10.0	10.2	10.0	9.0	8.8	9.0	8.5	8.5	8.3	7.5
Average %	8.2	8.7	8.5	7.3	6.9	7.7	7.7	7.3	6.8	7.0
BCIT			2.9	2.9	2.6	2.2	2.5	2.3	2.3	2.4
CAM					2.5	1.7	2.6	2.2	1.6	1.4
CAP			4.8	4.8	4.9	4.5	4.5	4.3	3.8	3.5
CAR					3.2	2.5	2.7	2.2	3.4	2.9
DOUG				6.0	5.8	5.4	5.1	5.0	4.6	4.0
EK				5.2	4.7	5.3	5.1	5.5	6.9	5.5
ECOA				4.3	4.3	4.1	4.2	4.3	4.2	3.0
FV				5.5	4.7	4.4	4.5	4.8	3.3	3.3
JL							2.8		3.0	2.5
KW					5.3	5.2	4.3	4.0	3.9	3.5
MAL				4.4	3.6	2.3	3.8	3.5	3.9	4.3
NC				3.5	3.4	3.3	4.1	3.7	3.6	3.4
NI					0.0	3.8		0.0		0.0
NL					2.7	2.6	2.0	1.8	2.3	2.1
NW					6.2	2.3	2.6	2.1	2.7	2.8
OK					3.4	3.3	3.2	3.3	4.0	4.8
OLA					0.0	1.3		0.8	0.9	0.7
PMTI					2.2	2.3		2.4	2.3	2.4
SEL				2.7	3.8	3.6	3.4	3.2	2.7	3.1
VCC				2.7	2.9	2.8	2.8	3.0	3.2	3.4
Average %			2.1	2.1	3.3	3.1	3.0	2.9	3.1	2.9
Total Av. %			2.8	2.8	3.8	3.7	3.6	3.5	3.6	3.5

Table 3: Library Dollars Per Student

	1981/82	1982/83	1983/84	1984/85	1985/86	1986/87	1987/88	1988/89	1989/90	1990/91
SFU	444.15	471.63	450.51	447.83	423.45	419.30	423.08	403.82	338.13	642.35
UBC	561.33	641.69	612.74	584.16	594.05	650.27	665.09	635.28	698.22	775.11
UV	544.73	573.63	548.87	560.81	555.72	590.15	533.07	562.83	553.93	744.62
AVERAGE	516.74	562.32	537.37	530.93	524.41	553.24	540.42	533.98	530.09	720.69
BCIT	107.65	108.09	119.00	99.76	95.98	117.46	121.30	117.42	124.27	253.00
CAM	125.44	114.83	107.07		122.57	88.53	146.92	131.52	111.38	130.76
CAP	169.78	167.05	182.13	176.10	162.38	173.37	166.17	161.06	156.63	209.28
CAR	212.08	201.64	179.20		159.62	119.54	116.46	115.66	205.98	259.80
DOUG	272.06	261.91	208.01	216.26	221.43	226.60	215.22	212.25	231.24	289.79
EK	290.48	239.14	235.69	308.72	290.25	337.43	9.03	425.70	552.94	541.39
ECCA	386.58	328.89	278.45	323.33	246.52	337.99	238.63	265.37	239.98	291.79
FV	274.86	259.44	243.16	232.79	211.80	204.45	235.58	222.05		294.21
JJ						319.12			435.49	402.93
KW	275.69		212.91		213.20	229.32	186.91	168.43	182.43	245.18
MAL	278.68	255.85	254.23	274.48	228.59	163.11	252.89	242.23	251.06	396.06
NC	236.28	227.35	214.99	203.50	189.66	200.84	236.84	248.15	258.77	312.98
NI	152.57					118.47				
NL	189.21	141.80			161.68	193.24	161.48	177.66	249.26	253.28
NW	358.73				525.26	191.76	235.78	205.48	287.43	315.79
OK	174.05	180.36	146.98		167.17	165.31	165.16	175.97	233.03	427.84
OLA						15.93		28.31	28.43	30.18
PMTI	194.50	281.78	171.90		187.99	329.80		267.51	277.92	490.10
SEL	307.80	370.75	299.98	220.32	323.93	318.06	299.40	256.59	233.83	302.85
VCC	148.37	160.35	153.42	144.83	151.36	151.23	153.21	179.35	218.38	230.33
AVERAGE	207.74	164.96	150.36	11	182.97	200.08	147.05	180.04	213.92	
TOTAL AVE.	248.05	216.79	200.84	164.91	227.50	246.14	198.36	226.20	255.16	

Table 4: Library Materials Expenditures

	1981/82	1982/83	1983/84	1984/85	1985/86	1986/87	1987/88	1988/89	1989/90	1990/91	10 Yr. Inc.
SFU	1,369,000	1,753,000	1,619,000	1,756,000	1,743,000	1,820,000	2,088,000	2,030,000	2,162,000	2,429,000	0.77%
UBC	3,956,000	4,480,000	4,266,000	3,950,000	4,583,000	5,285,000	5,267,000	5,470,000	6,092,000	6,417,000	0.62%
UV	1,547,000	1,936,000	2,239,201	2,026,250	2,059,128	2,415,692	2,291,000	2,530,000	2,527,000	2,850,000	0.84%
Subtotal	6,872,000	8,169,000	8,124,201	7,732,250	8,385,128	9,520,692	9,646,000	10,030,000	10,781,000	11,696,000	0.70%
BCIT	376,199	410,908	352,998	253,701	357,723	430,240	596,789	516,876	502,506	561,462	0.49%
CAM	70,554	43,635	46,500	49,799	51,170	49,341	71,682	74,285	86,536	70,748	0.00%
CAP	93,496	73,220	82,899	77,032	54,385	56,000	98,911	120,890	115,718	47,790	-0.49%
CAR	119,879	96,968	126,703		133,925		118,100	118,100	407,700	352,500	1.94%
DOUG	139,500	131,500	162,419	153,300	220,500	217,748	226,600	290,276	249,700	260,300	0.87%
EK	39,025	42,804	39,134	33,363	45,733	54,655	55,430	40,500	48,500	55,513	0.42%
ECCA	56,050	23,322	47,500		38,914	36,671	42,000	38,667	40,117	48,700	-0.13%
FV	72,619	69,206	65,000	65,000	70,000	71,000	71,800	112,800	73,250	73,250	0.01%
JJ	46,762	61,155	35,269	25,000	30,814	28,374	25,660	23,970	29,099	24,805	-0.47%
KW	209,188	36,300	46,800		43,979	107,322	109,254	113,918	152,758	172,501	-0.18%
MAL	130,166	132,533	135,139	94,767	133,820		148,100	148,738	244,238	325,661	1.50%
NC	133,620	127,140	174,768	109,547	107,143	101,372	105,358	139,493	139,000	134,331	0.01%
NI	124,047										-1.00%
NL	37,536	21,085	27,168		16,801	21,314	36,000	44,350	24,707	48,768	0.30%
NW	90,605	74,750	60,500		30,286	18,286	20,845	17,500	47,500	36,800	-0.59%
OK	68,750	70,900	64,150	74,150	82,867	110,100	107,291	154,224	414,039	757,201	10.01%
OLA								17,500	17,500	21,500	
PMTI	5,682	13,172	8,498		13,131	13,379		16,122	23,217	30,986	4.45%
SEL	54,423	76,473	69,731	46,386	77,242	77,222	78,514	79,609	87,349	92,191	0.69%
VCC	155,912	242,075	182,458	134,258	185,053	210,081	251,249	224,307	279,720	233,798	0.50%
SUBTOTAL	2,024,013	1,747,146	1,727,634	1,116,303	1,693,486	1,602,105	2,163,583	2,292,125	2,983,154	3,348,805	0.66%

**Table 5: Materials Expenditures As A
Percentage Of Total Library Expenditures**

	1981/82	1982/83	1983/84	1984/85	1985/86	1986/87	1987/88	1988/89	1989/90	1990/91
SFU	27.0%	30.5%	28.3%	31.4%	32.5%	33.7%	35.5%	35.3%	40.2%	30.1%
UBC	26.4%	25.6%	24.6%	24.6%	28.2%	30.6%	29.0%	30.9%	30.7%	29.9%
UV	28.5%	30.8%	35.9%	33.6%	34.5%	37.8%	35.8%	36.0%	34.4%	35.6%
BCIT	23.8%	27.3%	22.5%	18.1%	28.4%	26.4%	32.2%	28.6%	25.2%	25.0%
CAM	13.5%	8.7%	9.4%		9.0%	12.3%	10.6%	11.0%	14.3%	12.2%
CAP	14.7%	11.0%	11.7%	10.6%	7.6%	8.0%	13.5%	15.3%	14.4%	5.9%
CAR	21.3%	16.4%	19.1%		25.3%		24.8%	26.0%	45.6%	37.6%
DOUG	16.5%	15.4%	18.7%	15.7%	21.8%	20.8%	20.3%	23.8%	19.5%	20.3%
EK	12.5%	13.4%	12.4%	10.9%	16.2%	16.8%	15.6%	9.8%	8.0%	10.1%
ECCA	30.1%	13.9%	25.4%		17.1%	17.5%	17.2%	14.7%	13.9%	20.2%
FV	13.8%	12.5%	10.9%	11.2%	14.0%	13.8%	11.7%	16.8%	13.7%	11.9%
JF	8.4%	26.0%	11.5%	14.1%	13.7%	12.3%	13.4%	11.8%	12.1%	10.3%
KW	23.3%		5.5%		5.1%	12.3%	13.7%	14.3%	17.0%	17.2%
MAL	15.7%	15.6%	16.7%	11.7%	19.8%		17.2%	17.3%	22.2%	22.7%
NC	22.7%	20.2%	29.2%	21.4%	20.7%	19.8%	15.8%	21.0%	19.2%	17.3%
NI	31.4%									
NL	18.0%	14.2%			8.6%	10.9%	20.7%	25.5%	9.4%	19.6%
NW	28.4%				6.4%	10.0%	8.9%	8.9%	15.7%	10.9%
OK	11.6%	11.6%	12.1%		13.1%	16.2%	15.2%	19.1%	33.4%	43.3%
OLA								12.0%	9.8%	11.3%
PMTI	20.0%	33.6%	23.4%		30.5%	30.3%		29.4%	35.5%	36.8%
SEL	14.4%	16.0%	17.1%	14.7%	17.0%	18.1%	17.7%	19.5%	21.0%	18.0%
VCC	11.4%	15.4%	11.8%	9.4%	12.2%	13.9%	15.4%	12.4%	13.1%	9.8%
Univ. Average	27.3%	29.0%	29.6%	29.9%	31.8%	34.0%	33.4%	34.1%	35.1%	31.9%
College Average	18.5%	16.9%	16.1%	13.8%	15.9%	13.7%	16.7%	17.7%	19.2%	19.0%

Tabl 6: Books: Expenditures

	1981/82	1982/83	1983/84	1984/85	1985/86	1986/87	1987/88	1988/89	1989/90	1990/91
SFU	\$1,220,000	\$510,000	\$537,000	\$539,000	\$598,000	\$504,000	\$583,000	\$651,000	\$691,000	\$781,000
UBC	\$3,653,000				\$2,253,000	\$2,446,000	\$2,484,000	\$2,556,000	\$2,762,000	\$2,967,000
UV	\$1,408,000	\$764,000	\$821,354	\$695,053	\$605,448	\$894,912	\$444,000	\$583,000	\$726,000	\$705,000
SUBTOTAL	\$6,281,000	\$1,274,000	\$1,358,354	\$1,234,053	\$3,456,448	\$3,844,912	\$3,511,000	\$3,790,000	\$4,179,000	\$4,453,000
BCIT	\$155,681	\$183,305	\$171,413	\$168,233	\$312,662	\$366,988	\$241,222	\$205,433	\$208,141	\$237,780
CAM	\$53,012	\$35,529	\$40,000	\$38,697	\$39,970	\$38,472	\$33,233	\$35,743	\$38,000	\$25,572
CAP	\$52,200	\$42,727	\$40,789	\$48,885	\$54,385	\$56,000	\$62,411	\$92,680	\$76,707	\$7,781
CAR	\$106,848	\$94,397	\$123,543				\$53,300	\$53,300	\$315,000	\$260,000
DOUG	\$65,500	\$78,500	\$82,929	\$90,400	\$171,400	\$189,999	\$146,900	\$205,556	\$155,700	\$153,300
EK			\$32,009	\$28,347	\$37,830	\$44,961	\$36,760	\$20,500	\$27,000	\$26,385
ECCA	\$43,849	\$15,482			\$25,686	\$24,986	\$19,287	\$15,737	\$15,017	\$23,902
FV							\$46,050	\$86,050	\$36,000	\$36,000
JJ	\$29,396	\$40,000	\$30,230	\$11,000	\$22,244	\$20,716	\$7,060		\$13,865	\$12,115
KW	\$187,918	\$27,300	\$37,800		\$30,352	\$86,800	\$56,254	\$55,872	\$77,199	\$104,491
MAL	\$90,607	\$90,087	\$84,320	\$84,019	\$133,820		\$89,000	\$86,309	\$115,863	\$213,000
NC	\$127,620	\$121,140	\$165,881	\$102,547	\$98,752	\$101,372	\$65,788	\$93,327	\$93,000	\$88,833
NI										
NL					\$16,801	\$21,314	\$22,000		\$24,707	\$29,049
NW	\$36,605	\$68,750			\$18,286	\$10,286	\$4,000	\$8,000	\$33,000	\$22,800
OK					\$74,367	\$107,000	\$58,106	\$76,265	\$303,719	\$607,201
OLA								\$17,500	\$17,500	\$9,500
PMTI			\$6,091		\$6,450	\$7,046		\$4,540	\$12,425	\$12,192
SEL	\$49,432	\$70,129	\$65,479		\$74,624	\$73,356	\$44,368	\$43,699	\$47,758	\$51,926
VCC	\$118,153	\$213,836	\$146,118				\$156,999	\$138,012	\$168,981	\$117,369
SUBTOTAL	\$1,116,821	\$1,081,182	\$1,026,602	\$542,128	\$1,117,629	\$1,149,296	\$1,142,738	\$1,238,533	\$1,779,562	\$2,039,196
TOTAL	\$7,397,821	\$2,355,182	\$2,384,956	\$1,776,161	\$4,574,077	\$4,994,208	\$4,653,738	\$5,028,533	\$5,958,582	\$6,492,196

Table 7: Periodicals: Expenditures

	1981/82	1982/83	1983/84	1984/85	1985/86	1986/87	1987/88	1988/89	1989/90	1990/91
SFU	\$1,071,000	\$954,000	\$954,000	\$1,091,000	\$1,028,000	\$1,221,000	\$1,480,000	\$1,263,000	\$1,354,000	\$1,501,000
UBC					\$2,013,000	\$2,641,000	\$2,575,000	\$2,705,000	\$2,821,000	\$3,030,000
UV	\$1,011,000	\$1,244,554	\$1,244,554	\$1,156,946	\$1,289,794	\$1,343,280	\$1,604,000	\$1,675,000	\$1,653,000	\$1,955,000
SUBTOTAL	\$2,082,000	\$2,198,554	\$2,198,554	\$2,247,946	\$4,330,794	\$5,205,280	\$5,659,000	\$5,643,000	\$5,828,000	\$6,496,000
BCIT	\$108,351	\$110,901	\$94,152	\$56,825			\$199,261	\$209,662	\$191,659	\$229,328
CAM							\$26,000	\$26,844	\$34,137	\$32,573
CAP	\$27,460	\$21,239	\$24,920	\$25,683			\$22,000	\$28,200	\$32,180	\$34,602
CAR							\$48,500	\$48,500	\$75,000	\$75,000
DOUG	\$54,000	\$33,000	\$34,500	\$39,800			\$48,200	\$49,042	\$57,100	\$60,300
EK							\$18,670	\$20,000	\$20,000	\$21,000
ECCA							\$5,713	\$5,930	\$7,100	\$6,798
FV							\$25,750	\$26,750	\$37,250	\$37,250
JJ				\$6,000			\$14,100		\$7,557	\$8,010
KW							\$40,000	\$36,314	\$40,490	\$40,290
MAL	\$28,495	\$36,374	\$37,523	\$31,738			\$48,000	\$51,762	\$128,375	\$112,661
NC							\$39,570	\$46,166	\$46,000	\$45,498
NI										
NL							\$14,000			\$19,719
NW							\$9,523	\$9,500	\$14,500	\$14,000
OK							\$49,185	\$63,355	\$83,000	\$130,000
OLA										\$12,000
PMTI								\$5,760	\$6,424	\$7,960
SEL							\$28,554	\$32,148	\$33,749	\$39,263
VCC							\$56,000	\$59,000	\$64,000	\$74,868
SUBTOTAL	\$218,306	\$201,514	\$191,095	\$160,046			\$693,026	\$718,933	\$878,521	\$1,001,120
TOTAL	\$218,306	\$2,283,514	\$2,389,649	\$2,407,992	\$4,330,794	\$5,205,280	\$6,352,026	\$6,361,933	\$6,706,521	\$7,497,120

Table 8: Periodicals Expenditures As A Percentage Of Materials Expenditures

	1985/86	1986/87	1987/88	1988/89	1989/90	1990/91
University Periodicals Exp.	\$4,330,794	\$5,205,280	\$5,659,000	\$5,643,000	\$5,828,000	\$6,496,000
University Materials Exp.	\$8,385,128	\$9,520,692	\$9,646,000	\$10,030,000	\$10,781,000	\$11,696,000
Periodicals %	51.6%	54.7%	58.7%	56.3%	54.1%	55.5%
College Periodicals Exp.			\$693,026	\$718,933	\$878,521	\$1,001,120
College Materials Exp.			\$2,163,583	\$2,292,125	\$2,983,154	\$3,348,805
Periodicals %			32.0%	31.4%	29.4%	29.9%

Table 9: Holdings: Books

	1981/82	1982/83	1983/84	1984/85	1985/86	1986/87	1987/88	1988/89	1989/90	1990/91 10 Yr. Inc.
SFU	755,000	785,000	820,000	847,000	850,000	858,000	885,000	900,000	955,000	981,000 29.9%
UBC	2,913,000	2,894,000	3,004,000	3,129,000	3,226,000	3,324,000	3,433,000	3,542,000	3,653,000	3,780,000 29.8%
UV	1,073,000	1,115,000	1,152,813	1,194,368	1,235,925	1,279,224	1,316,000	1,346,000	1,376,000	1,400,000 30.5%
SUBTOTAL	4,741,000	4,794,000	4,976,813	5,170,368	5,311,925	5,461,224	5,634,000	5,788,000	5,984,000	6,161,000 30.0%
BCIT	139,197	152,810	131,298	139,915	154,030	160,000	260,404	276,696	437,192	441,251 217.0%
CAM	39,944	39,348	38,680	39,318	39,101	39,416	39,838	42,303	44,499	46,517 16.5%
CAP	80,613	83,869	86,887	89,592	91,679	94,706	96,690	95,441	98,076	101,595 26.0%
CAR	60,125	61,000	62,731	64,000			60,000	57,000	60,500	68,755 14.4%
DOUG	61,030	67,060	68,546	72,955	78,203	81,242	85,649	89,511	95,486	91,536 50.0%
EK	21,360	21,936	25,346	26,980	28,388	29,053	31,725	33,156	34,753	37,129 73.8%
ECCA	7,761	8,200	9,021	9,476	9,476	9,837	10,141	10,386	10,523	11,069 42.6%
FV	34,000	38,108	40,611	42,527	45,949	48,721	51,069	53,602	56,448	59,579 75.2%
JL	8,230	8,695	9,207	9,747	11,046	11,837	12,251	12,165	11,494	11,912 44.7%
KW	61,677	63,382	66,544	69,974	73,485	75,296	85,512	85,942	75,998	79,817 29.4%
MAL	56,529	60,717	66,846	65,487	71,736		84,355	86,290	84,139	94,515 67.2%
NC	61,331	69,895	75,881	82,641	84,550	92,900	95,287	93,398	104,550	112,400 83.3%
NI	65,600									
NL	22,632	25,429		26,505	25,903	26,620	27,608	27,738	29,474	31,272 38.2%
NW	21,338	23,018		19,720	20,670	20,670	20,154	22,262	23,381	26,571 24.5%
OK	62,318	64,216	66,890	69,083	71,236	72,883	74,402	77,654	81,336	88,289 41.7%
OLA								3,395	3,700	3,811
PMTI	1,915	2,330	2,450	2,586	2,678	2,565		2,614	3,014	3,290 71.8%
SEL	59,162	62,067	66,900	68,821	66,922	69,346	65,342	66,307	67,466	69,249 17.0%
VCC	115,134	120,297	126,309		124,095		143,158	147,562	153,075	155,670 35.2%
SUBTOTAL	979,896	972,377	935,126	898,872	999,147	835,092	1,243,585	1,283,422	1,475,104	1,534,227 56.6%
TOTAL	5,720,896	5,766,377	5,911,939	6,069,240	6,311,072	6,296,316	6,877,585	7,071,422	7,459,104	7,695,227 34.5%

Table 10: Holdings: Subscriptions

	1981/82	1982/83	1983/84	1984/85	1985/86	1986/87	1987/88	1988/89	1989/90	1990/91
SFU	13,570	13,384	13,114	12,163	11,500	11,500	11,500	11,606	11,242	11,508
UBC	33,815	34,689	21,434	21,555	19,123	18,046	18,681	18,681	8,100	22,729
UV	17,500	64,885	48,073	34,548	33,718	32,935	38,623	37,752	38,023	42,337
SUBTOTAL										
BCIT	2,117	2,196	2,305	3,061	3,250	1,900	2,109	2,199	2,199	2,100
CAM	494	357	363	368	362	395	445	503	316	316
CAP	737	619	610	585	633	641	665	693	730	564
CAR	550	550	501			500	500	500	600	1,279
DOUG	649	635	538	588	574	584	559	568	616	638
EK	347	406	403	340	404	407	394	544	560	572
ECCA	150	150		136	127	138	138	138	138	150
FV	808	493	623	540	468	468	487	480	490	488
JJ	344	306	286	208	198	196	230	240	250	260
KW	829	752	777	589	600	546	873	880	511	520
MAL			538	590	450	602	602	660	783	1,002
NC	750	760	770	774	756	599	633	706	720	720
NI	145									
NL	237	237	252	263	263	295	294	289	295	301
NW	390	366	423	473	473	452	323	376	393	417
OK	500	444	500	625	582	582	513	564	752	1,339
OLA								260	325	325
PMTI	49	56	55	54	54	56	60	60	72	75
SEL	527	509	477	612	550	515	547	548	513	538
VCC	1,376	1,485	1,501	1,581	1,581	1,707	1,811	1,811	2,939	1,333
SUBTOTAL	8,882	10,242	10,138	8,853	11,145	9,113	10,810	11,929	13,202	12,937
TOTAL	8,882	75,127	58,211	43,401	44,863	42,048	49,433	49,681	51,225	55,274

Table 11: Circulation

	1981/82	1982/83	1983/84	1984/85	1985/86	1986/87	1987/88	1988/89	1989/90	1990/91	10 Yr. Inc.
SFU	425,955	486,555	504,275	465,371	464,246	435,136	479,110	530,006	501,650	546,921	28.4%
UBC	2,181,794	2,255,632	2,345,512	2,323,019	2,284,844	2,274,626	2,246,726	2,200,644	2,143,524	2,097,962	-3.8%
UV	535,922	583,666	591,973	619,208	602,488	598,521	629,195	627,765	649,900		
Subtotal	3,143,671	3,325,853	3,441,760	3,407,598	3,351,578	3,309,283	3,355,031	3,358,415	3,295,074	2,644,883	-15.9%
BCIT	53,414	53,414	119,337	59,908	46,933	56,356	43,821	102,305	85,275	92,602	
CAM	74,442	72,191	86,666	77,552	79,468	70,142	70,486	65,406	53,391	67,892	-8.8%
CAP	74,442	72,191	86,666	77,552	79,468	70,142	70,486	65,406	53,391	67,892	-8.8%
CAR	31,805	39,951	38,815	40,671	40,597	50,000	62,642	59,993	75,160	91,325	187.1%
DOUG	46,784	36,568	63,873	67,448	72,532	73,480	73,752	88,003	78,930	97,294	108.0%
EK	11,098	17,527	19,708	18,036	20,928	25,733	39,264	52,381	49,575	47,785	330.6%
ECCA	13,889	18,667	12,170	17,205	40,922	47,245	48,020	56,156	56,203	58,686	322.5%
FV	46,482	51,278	53,505	56,717	60,668	61,530	65,269	62,430	74,093	80,843	73.9%
JL	5,383	3,709	6,972	7,274	6,662	6,644	6,356	6,840	7,087	7,486	39.1%
KW	50,287	53,487	76,851	70,269	75,415	81,682	75,868	73,803	74,572	81,424	61.9%
MAL	50,905	66,559	112,675	65,156	62,016	64,910	74,639	78,281	93,222	107,124	110.4%
NC	61,105	70,388	82,720	71,022	89,857	103,418	106,593	109,657	115,922	121,613	99.0%
NI											
NL	7,765	11,544			5,286	13,651	8,605	7,766	11,291	12,803	64.9%
NW	10,959	13,532	12,151	9,899	10,244	12,047	12,301	15,235	16,097	17,345	58.3%
OK	64,154	70,482	66,575	63,383	67,252	88,642	89,727	93,521	115,328	147,652	130.2%
OLA									4,387	4,878	
PMTI	9,410							5,122	3,526		
SEL	22,433	23,693	23,459	23,349	22,804	26,467	28,425	27,389	29,532	31,815	41.8%
VCC	198,826	212,790	222,252		252,390	281,813	303,462	274,875	310,118	258,092	29.8%
Subtotal	760,169	887,971	1,092,270	724,441	1,033,442	1,133,902	1,179,716	1,244,569	1,307,100	1,394,551	78.7%
TOTAL	3,923,840	4,213,824	4,534,030	4,132,039	4,385,020	4,443,185	4,534,747	4,602,984	4,602,174	4,039,434	2.9%

Table 12: Interlibrary Loan: Print Items Borrowed

	1981/82	1982/83	1983/84	1984/85	1985/86	1986/87	1987/88	1988/89	1989/90	1990/91	10 Yr.Inc.	10 Yr. Total
SFU	5,867	5,507	5,844	5,651	7,152	7,923	8,156	8,840	9,562	9,677	64.9%	74,179
UBC	6,117	7,093	8,010	8,859	9,014	9,849	10,723	11,026	13,699	14,598	138.6%	98,988
UV	4,828	4,699	4,853	4,269	4,253	5,117	5,164	7,045	7,089	7,237	49.9%	54,554
Subtotal	16,812	17,299	18,707	18,779	20,419	22,889	24,043	26,911	30,350	31,512	87.4%	227,721
BCIT	1,126	939	895	615	322	393	549	479	349	626	-44.4%	6,293
CAM	232		160	123	125	97	414	319	314	233	0.4%	2,017
CAP	216	136	130	74	36	38	63	115	269	442	104.6%	1,519
CAR	693	689	897	799	909	516	484	529	1,028	1,561	125.3%	8,105
DOUG	791	259	532	540	546	336	494	570	428	509	-35.7%	5,005
EK	695	359	323	245	291	161	394	240	872	1,060	52.5%	4,640
ECCA	4	6	3		4	3	2	3	1	3	-25.0%	29
FV	302	479	587	358	422	387	321	494	750	714	136.4%	4,814
JL	284	275	146	71	82	127	80	147	129	181	-36.3%	1,522
KW	1,479	688	479	624	769	950	871	832	790	738	-50.1%	8,220
MAL	437	305	228	252	97	132	169	158	454	1,241	184.0%	3,473
NC	1,944	1,754	2,787	1,441	1,810	2,109	2,605	2,898	2,783	2,867	47.5%	22,998
NI	20	38	20	9	6	12	28	20	19			172
NL	214	126	82	78	237	288	254	241	387	354	65.4%	2,261
NW	377	195	242	96	112	103	116	71	527	335	-11.1%	2,174
OK	273	199	251	268	127	304	361	333	1,950	2,658	873.6%	6,724
OLA	42	31	92	135	50	81	98	387	415	581	1283.3%	1,912
PMTI												
SEL	626	642	264	316	308	359	499	297	433	396	-36.7%	4,140
VCC	1,395	1,941	1,727	1,055	1,256	1,661	2,153	1,858	1,200	1,113	-20.2%	15,359
Subtotal	11,150	9,061	9,845	7,099	7,509	8,057	9,955	9,991	13,098	15,612	40.0%	101,377
TOTAL	27,962	26,360	28,552	25,578	27,928	30,946	33,998	36,902	43,448	47,124	68.5%	329,098
NET Total	16,979	13,735	12,823	10,878	10,472	12,030	13,057	13,292	15,460	16,374	-3.6%	135,110
Non NET Total	10,983	12,625	15,729	15,000	17,456	18,916	20,931	23,610	27,988	30,750	180.0%	193,988
NET %	60.7	52.1	44.9	42.0	37.5	38.9	38.4	36.0	35.6	34.7		41.0

Table 13: Interlibrary Loan: Media Items Borrowed

	1981/82	1982/83	1983/84	1984/85	1985/86	1986/87	1987/88	1988/89	1989/90	1990/91
SFU	732	505	288	270	862	774	708	572	664	547
UBC		763	779	817	828	670	560	519	372	281
UV						1,082	983	514	1,028	767
Subtotal	732	1,268	1,067	1,087	1,690	2,526	2,251	1,605	2,064	1,595
BCIT	728	445	455	361	305	276	221	223	146	115
CAM	841		620	862	644	645	711	634	616	673
CAP								90	594	635
CAR	558	659	813	625	472	515	440	567	446	287
DOUG	1,266	1,216	1,016	816	586	468	432	603	394	307
EK	384	366	199	223	232	292	456	278	235	369
ECCA									66	50
FV	868	990	650	650	901	876	832	846	778	1,185
JF	168	34	25	15	39	112	81	46	35	45
KW	1,235	1,483		274	286	596	513	707	592	470
MAL	1,660	1,235	1,004	1,171	848	868	680	670	707	693
NC							447	406	348	297
NI										
NL				29	20	20	49	22	212	234
NW	598	125		64	81	160	158	133	173	199
OK				75	128	100	111	122	153	159
OLA									20	100
PMTI										
SEL	674	713	658	376	462	444	553	273	333	355
VCC	2,092	1,879	1,736	1,657	1,477	1,732	1,489	1,399	1,097	1,435
Subtotal	11,072	9,145	7,176	7,198	6,481	7,104	7,173	7,019	6,945	7,608
TOTAL	11,804	10,413	8,243	8,285	8,171	9,630	9,424	8,624	9,009	9,203
MEC Borrowed				2,950	2,753	2,759	2,805	2,801	2,717	2,583
Non MEC Borrowed				5,335	5,418	6,871	6,619	5,823	6,292	6,620
MEC %				36	34	29	30	33	30	28

Table 14: Borrowing: Copies As A Percentage Of Total Circulation.....

	1981/82	1982/83	1983/84	1984/85	1985/86	1986/87	1987/88	1988/89	1989/90	1990/91
SFU	65.5	62.3	65.3	65.4	64.7	65.8	67.7	67.8	64.3	67.1
UBC	58.4	60.2	64.5	63.8	67.9	67.7	68.6	69.6	70.2	63.7
AVERAGE	61.9	61.2	64.9	64.6	66.3	66.8	68.2	68.7	67.3	65.4
BCIT	81.2	85.0	81.2	86.0	79.8	58.0	64.8	66.6	62.8	76.4

Table 15: NET Borrowing As A Percentage Of Total I.L.L. Borrowing

	1981/82	1982/83	1983/84	1984/85	1985/86	1986/87	1987/88	1988/89	1989/90	1990/91
SFU	60.6	48.4	35.9	35.1	38.3	39.3	42.0	49.1	50.6	51.9
UBC	9.5	9.4	9.1	9.1	10.5	10.8	9.0	8.8	7.7	7.4
UV	59.4	53.0	45.4	38.4	17.1	13.5	14.8	12.2	11.0	8.4
BCIT	57.1	48.9	47.3	34.3	46.6	35.6	38.6	40.9	35.5	32.1
FV	75.2	50.5	55.9	65.9	76.3	65.4	90.0	49.6	48.9	51.4
NC	94.3	97.7	94.4	92.8	88.5	85.5	78.3	64.7	47.8	31.7
OK	74.0	83.9	63.3	43.7		49.0	49.0	57.1	65.7	74.8
SEL	52.1	55.6	77.7	96.2	76.0	69.6	47.7	56.9	68.1	66.4
VCC			89.2	91.4	91.6	88.5	90.6	92.4	86.6	89.4
College Average	75.4	72.8	71.3	70.7	79.8	65.6	65.7	60.3	58.8	57.6

Table 16: Interlibrary Loan: Print Items Loaned

	1981/82	1982/83	1983/84	1984/85	1985/86	1986/87	1987/88	1988/89	1989/90	1990/91	10 Yr. % Inc.	10 Yr. Total
SFU	4,062	4,583	4,986	5,377	4,922	4,655	5,034	4,777	7,241	10,243	152.2	55,880
UBC	21,097	17,230	16,097	14,736	16,694	18,212	20,370	23,340	26,672	27,803	31.8	202,251
UV	3,065	3,151	2,915	3,444	3,335	3,468	2,815	3,195	3,075	2,989	-2.5	31,452
Subtotal	28,224	24,964	23,998	23,557	24,951	26,335	28,219	31,312	36,988	41,035	45.4	289,583
BCIT	1,505	1,208	925	912	485	467	442	353	307	305	-79.7	6,909
CAM	181		111	10	84	81	78	108	103	88	-51.4	844
CAP	309	256	241	191	181	159	151	77	146	142	-54	1,853
CAR	165	142	232	163	163	64	36	25	22	35	-78.8	1,047
DOUG	347	200	196	73	123	162	513	234	218	145	-58.2	2,211
EK	41	56	54	21	40	89	136	195	128	186	353.7	946
ECCA	6	5	4	1		7	2	5	2		-100	32
FV	93	83	89	96	80	70	62	76	79	90	-3.2	818
JL	42	65	63	101	122	51	122	143	183	368	776.2	1,260
KW	410	193	176	132	96	126	105	76	87	87	-78.8	1,488
MAL	253	216	127	218	65	89	64	54	36	31	-87.7	1,153
NC	200	146	992	883	879	1,161	1,514	1,381	1,877	1,383	591.5	10,416
NI												
NL	34	67	16	16	58	52	33	7	39	61	79.4	383
NW	31	25	19	19	8	22	8	6	12	39	25.8	189
OK	286	294	233	159	43	103	53	37	60	42	-85.3	1,310
OLA	21	19	16	6	5	35			10	24	14.3	136
PMTI												
SEL	736	716	480	365	279	674	504	611	457	437	-40.6	5,259
VCC	650	847	338	435	355	333	328	380	449	340	-47.7	4,455
Subtotal	5,310	4,538	4,312	3,801	3,066	3,745	4,151	3,768	4,215	3,803	-28.4	40,709
TOTAL	33,534	29,502	28,310	27,358	28,017	30,080	32,370	35,080	41,203	44,838	33.7	330,292
NET Total	16,979	13,735	12,823	10,878	10,472	12,030	13,067	13,292	15,460	16,374		195,110
Non NET Total	16,555	15,767	15,487	16,480	17,545	18,050	19,303	21,788	25,743	28,464		195,182
NET %	50.6	46.6	45.3	39.8	37.4	40	40.4	37.9	37.5	36.5		

Table 17: Interlibrary Loan: Media Items Loaned

	1981/82	1982/83	1983/84	1984/85	1985/86	1986/87	1987/88	1988/89	1989/90	1990/91
SFU	713	473	365	323	269	228	277	215	243	211
UBC		1,343	1,075	994	895	823	779	769	559	407
UV					159	83		174	149	155
Subtotal	713	1,816	1,440	1,317	1,164	1,210	1,139	1,158	951	773
BCIT	3,353	1,664	1,275	1,140	1,033	724	714	792	675	602
CAM	385		284	317	434	534	420	326	265	311
CAP				323	264	217	237	231	121	166
CAR	91	136	59	45	65	58	65	53	49	42
DOUG	2,373	1,875	1,187	918	815	730	706	984	703	517
EK	593	206	216	204	173	198	312	140	125	138
ECCA									83	57
FV				192	159	127	148	115	97	123
JJ	145	154	150	150	150	73	194	237	237	206
KW	1,112		238	241	241	155	178	248	214	194
MAL	61	113	64	128	260	620	652	473	654	1,267
NC			10	27	27	35	401	448	543	402
NI										
NL			3	4	4	1	5		20	14
NW	49	43	43	32	32	71	57	68	14	40
OK						36	66	60	67	40
OLA										
PMTI										
SEL	179	185	148	508	805	894	655	333	230	308
VCC	1,553	1,355	577	434	797	604	688	650	435	371
Subtotal	9,894	5,731	3,961	4,685	5,259	5,067	5,498	5,158	4,532	4,798
TOTAL	10,607	7,547	5,401	6,002	6,423	6,277	6,637	6,316	5,483	5,571
MEC Total			2,950	2,753	2,759	2,805	2,801	2,717	2,583	
Non MEC Total			3,052	3,670	3,518	3,832	3,515	2,766	2,988	
MEC %			49.2	42.9	44.0	42.3	44.3	49.6	45.4	

Table 18: Lending: Copies As A Percentage Of Total Items Loaned

	1981/82	1982/83	1983/84	1984/85	1985/86	1986/87	1987/88	1988/89	1989/90	1990/91
SFU	52.4	48.8	48.0	48.6	49.8	45.4	44.0	43.2	36.1	36.9
UBC	51.3	49.3	45.7	43.0	48.2	46.3	44.0	42.9	45.0	46.3
Average	51.8	49.0	46.9	45.8	49.0	45.8	44.0	43.0	40.5	41.6
BCIT	27.9	15.3	9.9	11.0	12.0	13.1	15.6	24.6	25.4	19.0

Table 19: Lending: NET's Percentage Of Total Items Loaned

	1981/82	1982/83	1983/84	1984/85	1985/86	1986/87	1987/88	1988/89	1989/90	1990/91
SFU	46.7	52.4	42.5	32.7	32.2	36.7	36.8	38.8	33.3	27.0
UBC	48.0	44.4	43.5	42.5	40.6	45.4	44.8	42.4	43.5	44.1
UV	41.9	37.7	40.4	30.1	28.2	30.4	39.4	29.6	31.2	33.2
BCIT	49.0	54.3	65.2	57.8	69.1	77.7	66.5	64.0	51.1	41.0
FY	76.3	16.9	80.9	69.8	60.0	68.6	66.1	47.4	45.6	18.9
NC	97.5	92.5	96.7	94.2	93.1	97.5	5.4	3.8	2.5	3.0
OK	43.4	45.6	36.9	40.9		49.5	73.6	67.6	48.3	92.9
SEL	29.6	17.7	26.3	28.5	20.1	10.7	8.7	13.1	12.5	12.6
VCC	54.9	37.3	72.2	69.7	61.4	59.5	49.7	41.6	33.4	25.6
Average	58.5	44.0	63.0	60.1	67.3	60.6	45.0	39.6	32.2	32.3

Table 20: Simon Fraser University

	1981/82	1982/83	1983/84	1984/85	1985/86	1986/87	1987/88	1988/89	1989/90	1990/91	
EXPENDITURES											
Institution	82,260,000	77,988,000	75,188,000	74,777,000	82,366,000	83,825,000	85,160,000	91,710,000	105,675,000	122,453,000	Institution
Library	5,074,000	5,752,000	5,712,000	5,588,000	5,360,000	5,396,000	5,880,000	5,750,000	5,384,000	8,075,000	Library
Library%	6.2	7.4	7.6	7.5	6.5	6.5	6.9	6.3	5.1	6.6	Library%
Books	1,220,000	510,000	537,000	539,000	598,000	504,000	583,000	651,000	691,000	781,000	Books
Periodicals	1,071,000	954,000	1,091,000	1,028,000	1,028,000	1,221,000	1,480,000	1,263,000	1,354,000	1,501,000	Periodicals
AV											AV
Software											Software
Microforms											Microforms
Binding	110,000	92,000	92,000	102,000	92,000	70,000	107,000	107,000	107,000	109,000	Binding
Other	39,000	80,000	36,000	24,000	25,000	25,000	25,000	9,000	10,000	38,000	Other
Total Materials	1,369,000	1,753,000	1,619,000	1,756,000	1,743,000	1,820,000	2,088,000	2,030,000	2,162,000	2,429,000	Total Materials
Materials %	27.0	30.5	28.3	31.4	32.5	33.7	35.5	35.3	40.2	30.1	Materials %
HOLDINGS											
Books	755,000	785,000	820,000	847,000	850,000	858,000	885,000	900,000	955,000	981,000	Books
Subscriptions	13,570	13,384	13,114	12,163	11,500	11,500	11,606	11,242	11,242	11,508	Subscriptions
Microforms	557,000	767,000	565,000	567,000	571,000	571,000	572,000	576,000	595,000	612,000	Microforms
AV											AV
Film											Film
Video											Video
Software											Software
Pamphlets											Pamphlets
Enrolment	11,424	12,196	12,679	12,478	12,658	12,869	13,898	14,239	15,923	12,571	Enrolment
Lib \$/Student	444.15	471.63	450.51	447.83	423.45	419.30	423.08	403.82	338.13	642.35	Lib \$/Student
Books/Student	66.1	64.4	64.7	67.9	67.2	66.7	63.7	63.2	60.0	78.0	Books/Student
Micro/Student	48.8	62.9	44.6	45.4	45.1	44.4	41.2	40.5	37.4	48.7	Micro/Student
CIRCULATION											
Total	425,955	486,555	504,275	465,371	464,246	435,136	479,110	530,006	501,650	546,921	Total
Loans/Student	37.3	39.9	39.8	37.3	36.7	33.8	34.5	37.2	31.5	43.5	Loans/Student
ILL BORROWING											
Titles - NET	1111	1048	934	999	1151	1035	2388	1269	1449	1119	Titles - NET
Titles - Non-NET	915	1029	1091	954	1375	1678	246	1576	1960	2065	Titles - Non-NET
Total Titles	2026	2077	2025	1953	2526	2713	2834	2845	3409	3184	Total Titles

1981/82 1982/83 1983/84 1984/85 1985/86 1986/87 1987/88 1988/89 1989/90 1990/91

ILL BORROWING (cont.)										
	1981/82	1982/83	1983/84	1984/85	1985/86	1986/87	1987/88	1988/89	1989/90	1990/91
Copies - NET	2447	1618	1162	986	1591	2075	1037	3072	3391	3908
Copies - Non/NET	1394	1812	2657	2712	3035	3135	4485	2923	2762	2585
Total Copies	3841	3430	3819	3698	4626	5210	5522	5995	6153	6493
Total NET Items	3558	2666	2096	1985	2742	3110	3425	4341	4840	5027
Total Non-NET It.	2309	2841	3748	3666	4410	4813	4731	4499	4722	4650
TOTAL BORROWED	5867	5507	5944	5651	7152	7923	8156	8840	9562	9677
Copies % of Total	65.5	62.3	65.3	65.4	64.7	65.8	67.7	67.8	64.3	67.1
NET % of Total	60.6	48.4	35.9	35.1	38.3	39.3	42.0	49.1	50.6	51.9

ILL LENDING										
	1981/82	1982/83	1983/84	1984/85	1985/86	1986/87	1987/88	1988/89	1989/90	1990/91
Titles - NET	900	1142	1047	894	801	850	986	896	1244	1294
Titles - Non-NET	1033	1205	1547	1869	1670	1693	1835	1817	3384	5170
Total Titles	1933	2347	2594	2763	2471	2543	2821	2713	4628	6464
Copies - NET	997	1260	1073	866	783	858	868	956	1168	1472
Copies - Non-NET	1132	976	1319	1748	1668	1254	1345	1108	1445	2307
Total Copies	2129	2236	2392	2614	2451	2112	2213	2064	2613	3779
Total NET Items	1897	2402	2120	1760	1584	1708	1854	1852	2412	2766
Total Non-NET It.	2165	2181	2866	3617	3338	2947	3180	2925	4829	7477
TOTAL LOANED	4062	4583	4986	5377	4922	4655	5034	4777	7241	10243
Copies % of Total	52.4	48.8	48.0	48.6	49.8	45.4	44.0	43.2	36.1	36.9
NET % of Total	46.7	52.4	42.5	32.7	32.2	36.7	36.8	38.8	33.3	27.0

% Circs:Borrowing	1.4	1.1	1.2	1.2	1.5	1.8	1.7	1.7	1.9	1.8
% Circs:Lending	1.0	0.9	1.0	1.2	1.1	1.1	1.1	0.9	1.4	1.9
Net Print Loans	-1805	-924	-858	-274	-2230	-3268	-3122	-4063	-2321	566

MEDIA BORROWED										
	1981/82	1982/83	1983/84	1984/85	1985/86	1986/87	1987/88	1988/89	1989/90	1990/91
MEC	732	505	288	270	243	186	170	226	242	224
Non-MEC					619	588	538	346	422	323
Total	732	505	288	270	862	774	708	572	664	547
MEC % of Total					28.2	24.0	24.0	39.5	36.4	41.0

MEDIA LOANED										
	1981/82	1982/83	1983/84	1984/85	1985/86	1986/87	1987/88	1988/89	1989/90	1990/91
MEC	713	473	365	323	269	228	277	215	243	211
Non-MEC					269	228	277	215	243	211
Total	713	473	365	323	269	228	277	215	243	211
NET % of Total					26.9	22.8	27.7	21.5	24.3	21.1

Net Media Loans	-19	-32	77	53	-593	-546	-431	-357	-421	-336
-----------------	-----	-----	----	----	------	------	------	------	------	------

Table 21: University of British Columbia

	1981/82	1982/83	1983/84	1984/85	1985/86	1986/87	1987/88	1988/89	1989/90	1990/91
EXPENDITURES										
Institution	178,881,000	209,842,000	219,552,000	292,269,000	300,513,000	223,222,000	231,159,000	249,554,000	278,932,000	308,777,000
Library	14,960,000	17,524,000	17,351,000	16,061,000	16,230,000	17,290,000	18,153,000	17,692,000	19,872,000	21,479,000
Library%	8.4	8.5	8.0	5.5	5.4	7.7	7.9	7.1	7.1	7.0
EXPENDITURES										
Books	3,853,000			2,253,000	2,446,000	2,484,000	2,556,000	2,762,000	2,967,000	
Periodicals				2,013,000	2,641,000	2,575,000	2,705,000	2,821,000	3,030,000	
A/V										
SOFTWARE										
Microforms										
Binding	175,000	172,000	194,000	181,000	203,000	198,000	208,000	209,000	219,000	244,000
Other	124,000			114,000					290,000	176,000
Total Materials	3,956,000	4,480,000	4,266,000	3,950,000	4,583,000	5,285,000	5,267,000	5,470,000	6,092,000	6,417,000
Materials %	26.4	25.6	24.6	24.6	28.2	30.6	29.0	30.9	30.7	29.9
HOLDINGS										
Books	2,913,000	2,894,000	3,004,000	3,129,000	3,226,000	3,324,000	3,433,000	3,542,000	3,653,000	3,780,000
Subscriptions	33,815	34,689	21,434	21,555	21,435	19,123	18,046	18,681	22,729	
Microforms	1,909,000	1,865,000	2,122,000	2,305,000	2,375,000	2,520,000	2,606,000	1,938,000	2,768,000	2,830,000
A/V										
Film										
Video										
SOFTWARE										
Pamphlets										
Enrollment	26,651	27,309	28,317	27,494	27,321	26,589	27,294	27,849	28,461	27,711
Lib \$/Student	561.33	641.69	612.74	584.16	594.05	650.27	665.09	635.28	698.22	775.11
Books/Student	109.3	106.0	106.1	113.8	118.1	125.0	125.8	127.2	128.4	136.4
Micro/Student	71.6	68.3	74.9	83.8	86.9	94.8	95.5	69.6	97.3	102.1
CIRCULATION										
Total	2,181,794	2,255,632	2,345,512	2,323,019	2,284,844	2,274,626	2,246,726	2,200,644	2,143,524	2,097,962
Loans/Student	81.9	82.6	82.8	84.5	83.6	85.5	82.3	79.0	75.3	75.7
ILL BORROWING										
Titles - NET	349	387	389	439	474	519	511	513	535	487
Titles - Non-NET	2195	2439	2451	2767	2416	2658	2854	2835	3541	4816
Total Titles	2544	2826	2840	3206	2890	3177	3365	3348	4076	5303

	1981/82	1982/83	1983/84	1984/85	1985/86	1986/87	1987/88	1988/89	1989/90	1990/91
ILL BORROWING (cont.)										
Copies - NET	232	277	336	367	474	543	459	460	515	595
Copies - Non/NET	3341	3990	4834	5286	5650	6129	6899	7218	9108	8700
Total Copies	3573	4267	5170	5653	6124	6672	7358	7678	9623	9295
Total NET Items	581	664	725	806	948	1062	970	973	1050	1082
Total Non-NET It.	5536	6429	7285	8053	8066	8787	9753	10053	12649	13516
TOTAL BORROWED	6117	7093	8010	8859	9014	9849	10723	11026	13699	14598
Copies % of Total	58.4	60.2	64.5	63.8	67.9	67.7	68.6	69.6	70.2	63.7
NET % of Total	9.5	9.4	9.1	9.1	10.5	10.8	9.0	8.8	7.7	7.4

	ILL LENDING									
Titles - NET	2260	2303	2286	2120	2442	2902	3029	3164	3627	3919
Titles - Non-NET	8020	6436	6448	6276	6204	6885	8392	10173	11045	11019
Total Titles	10280	8739	8734	8396	8646	9787	11411	13337	14672	14938
Copies - NET	7867	5344	4722	4140	4329	5362	6105	6272	7978	8330
Copies - Non-NET	2950	3147	2641	2200	3719	3063	2854	3276	4022	4535
Total Copies	10817	8491	7363	6340	8048	8425	8959	10003	12000	12865
Total NET Items	10127	7647	7008	6260	6771	8264	9134	9891	11605	12249
Total Non-NET It.	10970	9583	9089	8476	9923	9948	11236	13449	15067	15554
TOTAL LOANED	21097	17230	16097	14736	16694	18212	20370	23340	26672	27803
Copies % of Total	51.3	49.3	45.7	43.0	48.2	46.3	44.0	42.9	45.0	46.3
NET % of Total	48.0	44.4	43.5	42.5	40.6	45.4	44.8	42.4	43.5	44.1
% Circ:Borrowing	0.3	0.3	0.3	0.4	0.4	0.4	0.5	0.5	0.6	0.7
% Circ:Lending	1.0	0.8	0.7	0.6	0.7	0.8	0.9	1.1	1.2	1.3
Net Print Loans	14880	10137	8087	5977	7680	8363	9847	12314	12973	13205

	MEDIA BORROWED									
MEC	191	195	195	164	199	131	143	138	106	140
Non-MEC	572	584	584	653	629	539	417	381	266	141
Total	763	779	779	817	828	670	560	519	372	281
MEC % of Total	25.0	25.0	25.0	20.1	24.0	19.6	25.5	26.6	28.5	49.8

	MEDIA LOANED									
MEC	739	591	591	482	442	412	405	396	335	396
Non-MEC	604	484	484	512	453	411	374	373	224	11
Total	1343	1075	1075	994	895	823	779	769	559	407
MEC % of Total	55.0	55.0	55.0	48.5	49.4	50.1	52.0	51.5	59.9	97.3

	Net Media Loans									
MEC	580	296	296	177	67	153	219	250	187	126
Non-MEC	580	296	296	177	67	153	219	250	187	126
Total	1160	592	592	354	134	306	438	500	374	252
MEC % of Total	50.0	50.0	50.0	49.7	49.3	49.7	50.0	50.0	50.0	50.0

Table 22: University Of Victoria

	1981/82	1982/83	1983/84	1984/85	1985/86	1986/87	1987/88	1988/89	1989/90	1990/91	EXPENDITURES
EXPENDITURES											
Institution	54,288,000	61,568,000	62,441,000	67,071,000	67,597,000	70,869,000	75,512,000	82,820,000	88,495,000	106,565,000	Institution
Library	5,419,000	6,283,000	6,229,097	6,034,896	5,960,693	6,387,818	6,399,000	7,023,000	7,344,000	7,995,000	Library
Library%	10.0	10.2	10.0	9.0	8.8	9.0	8.5	8.5	8.3	7.5	Library%
Books	1,408,000	764,000	821,354	695,053	605,448	894,912	444,000	583,000	726,000	705,000	Books
Periodicals		1,011,000	1,244,554	1,156,946	1,289,794	1,343,280	1,604,000	1,675,000	1,653,000	1,965,000	Periodicals
A/V											A/V
Software											Software
Microforms											Microforms
Blinding	139,000	161,000	173,293	174,251	163,886	177,500	138,000	169,000	147,000	139,000	Blinding
Other							105,000	103,000	1,000	41,000	Other
Total Materials	1,547,000	1,936,000	2,239,201	2,026,250	2,059,128	2,415,692	2,291,000	2,530,000	2,527,000	2,850,000	Total Materials
Materials %	28.5	30.8	35.9	33.6	34.5	37.8	35.8	36.0	34.4	35.6	Materials %
HOLDINGS											HOLDINGS
Books	1,073,000	1,115,000	1,152,813	1,194,368	1,235,925	1,279,224	1,316,000	1,346,000	1,376,000	1,400,000	Books
Subscriptions		17,500					8,000	8,100	8,100	8,100	Subscriptions
Microforms	1,418,000	1,091,000					1,204,000	1,206,000	1,218,000	1,712,000	Microforms
A/V											A/V
Film											Film
Video											Video
Software											Software
Pamphlets											Pamphlets
Enrolment	9,848	10,853	11,349	10,761	10,726	10,824	12,004	12,478	13,258	10,737	Enrolment
Lib \$/Student	544.73	573.63	548.87	560.81	555.72	590.15	533.07	562.83	553.93	744.62	Lib \$/Student
Books/Student	107.9	101.8	101.6	111.0	115.2	118.2	109.6	107.9	103.8	130.4	Books/Student
Micro/Student	142.5	99.6				100.3	96.7	91.9	159.4		Micro/Student
CIRCULATION											CIRCULATION
Total	535,922	583,866	591,873	619,208	602,488	599,521	629,195	627,785	649,900		Total
Loans/Student	53.9	53.3	52.2	57.5	56.2	55.4	52.4	50.3	49.0		Loans/Student
ILL BORROWING											ILL BORROWING
Titles - NET									254	181	Titles - NET
Titles - Non-NET									1787	2277	Titles - Non-NET
Total Titles									2041	2458	Total Titles

	1981/82	1982/83	1983/84	1984/85	1985/86	1986/87	1987/88	1988/89	1989/90	1990/91	ILL BORROWING (cont.)	
ILL BORROWING (cont.)												
Copies - NET											527	429
Copies - Non/NET											4521	4270
Total Copies											5048	4699
Total NET Items	2870	2492	2253	1639	728	693	764	858			781	610
Total Non-NET It.	1958	2207	2600	2630	3525	4424	4400	6187			6308	6627
TOTAL BORROWED	4828	4699	4853	4269	4253	5117	5164	7045			7089	7237
Copies % of Total	59.4	53.0	46.4	38.4	17.1	13.5	14.8	12.2			71.2	64.9
NET % of Total											11.0	8.4

	ILL LENDING	
ILL LENDING		
Titles - NET	449	279
Titles - Non-NET	1169	1067
Total Titles	1618	1346
Copies - NET	510	713
Copies - Non-NET	947	930
Total Copies	1457	1643
Total NET Items	1284	1188
Total Non-NET It.	1781	1963
TOTAL LOANED	3065	3151
Copies % of Total	41.9	37.7
NET % of Total	40.4	30.1
% Circ:Borrowing	0.9	0.8
% Circ:Lending	0.6	0.5
Net Print Loans	-1763	-1548
% Circ:Borrowing	1.1	1.1
% Circ:Lending	0.5	0.5
Net Print Loans	-4014	-4248
MEDIA BORROWED		
MEC	284	306
Non-MEC	798	461
Total	1082	767
MEC % of Total	26.2	39.9
MEDIA LOANED		
MEC	61	131
Non-MEC	98	24
Total	159	155
MEC % of Total	38.4	84.5
Net Media Loans	-923	-612

	MEDIA BORROWED	
MEDIA BORROWED		
MEC	284	306
Non-MEC	798	461
Total	1082	767
MEC % of Total	26.2	39.9
MEDIA LOANED		
MEC	61	131
Non-MEC	98	24
Total	159	155
MEC % of Total	38.4	84.5
Net Media Loans	-923	-612

	MEDIA LOANED	
MEDIA LOANED		
MEC	61	131
Non-MEC	98	24
Total	159	155
MEC % of Total	38.4	84.5
Net Media Loans	-923	-612

Table 23: British Columbia Institute Of Technology

	1981/82	1982/83	1983/84	1984/85	1985/86	1986/87	1987/88	1988/89	1989/90	1990/91	
EXPENDITURES											
Institution	48,828,000	48,526,000	72,595,000	75,586,000	76,933,000	83,749,000	88,486,000				Institution
Library	1,580,755	1,504,364	1,570,110	1,399,570	1,258,009	1,626,902	1,804,911	1,920,784	2,163,157		Library
Library%	2.9	2.6	2.2	2.2	2.3	2.3	2.3	2.3	2.3	2.4	Library%
EXPENDITURES											
Books	155,881	183,305	171,413	168,233	312,862	366,988	241,222	205,433	208,141	237,780	Books
Periodicals	108,351	110,901	94,152	56,825		199,261	209,662	191,659	229,328		Periodicals
A/V	23,482	56,366	50,706	24,379		105,203	33,782	43,461	37,342		A/V
Software						27,673	51,409	40,561	38,526		Software
Microforms	59,567	29,438	36,727	45,061	63,252	23,430	16,590	18,684	18,486		Microforms
Blinding											Blinding
Other	29,138	30,898	4,264								Other
Total Materials	376,199	410,908	352,998	253,701	357,723	430,240	596,789	516,876	502,506	561,462	Total Materials
Materials %	23.8	27.3	22.5	18.1	28.4	26.4	32.2	28.5	26.2	26.0	Materials %
HOLDINGS											
Books	139,197	152,810	131,298	139,915	154,030	160,000	260,404	276,696	437,192	441,251	Books
Subscriptions	2,117	2,196	2,305	3,061	3,250	1,900	2,109	2,199	2,100		Subscriptions
Microforms	242,866	240,036	235,970	236,772	239,500	243,403	245,194	246,697	231,774		Microforms
A/V		2,853	2,871			7,552	7,980	8,311	6,928		A/V
Film	1,525	1,527	1,533	1,544	1,632						Film
Video	850	1,022	1,099	1,400	1,400	2,941	3,326	3,291			Video
Software						626	889	262	1,140		Software
Pamphlets		37,614				72,438	76,931				Pamphlets
HOLDINGS											
Enrolment	14,684	13,918	13,194	14,029	13,107	13,851	15,268	15,371	15,457	8,550	Enrolment
Lib \$/Student	107.65	108.09	119.00	99.76	95.98	117.46	121.30	117.42	124.27	253.00	Lib \$/Student
Books/Student	9.5	11.0	10.0	10.0	11.8	11.6	17.1	18.0	28.3	51.6	Books/Student
Micro/Student	17.4	18.2	18.2	16.8	18.2	17.3	15.9	16.0	16.0	27.1	Micro/Student
CIRCULATION											
Total	53,414	119,337	58,908	46,833	56,356	43,921	102,305	85,275	92,602		Total
Loans/Student	3.8	9.0	4.2	3.6	4.1	2.9	6.7	5.5	10.8		Loans/Student
ILL BORROWING											
Titles - NET	147	82	93	45	43	68	77	32	44		Titles - NET
Titles - Non-NET	65	51	75	41	22	125	83	98	104		Titles - Non-NET
Total Titles	212	133	168	86	65	193	160	130	148		Total Titles

	1981/82	1982/83	1983/84	1984/85	1985/86	1986/87	1987/88	1988/89	1989/90	1990/91
ILL BORROWING (cont.)										
Copies - NET	496	377	330	166	107	97	144	119	92	157
Copies - Non/NET	418	429	397	363	150	131	212	200	127	321
Total Copies	914	806	727	529	257	228	356	319	219	478
Total NET Items	643	459	423	211	150	140	212	196	124	201
Total Non-NET It.	483	480	472	404	172	253	337	283	225	425
TOTAL BORROWED	1126	939	895	615	322	393	549	479	349	626
Copies % of Total	81.2	85.8	81.2	86.0	79.8	58.0	64.8	66.6	62.8	76.4
NET % of Total	57.1	48.9	47.3	34.3	45.6	35.6	38.6	40.9	35.5	32.1

	ILL LENDING									
Titles - NET	643	588	554	479	299	318	261	186	138	103
Titles - Non-NET	442	435	279	333	128	88	112	80	91	144
Total Titles	1085	1023	833	812	427	406	373	266	229	247
Copies - NET	94	68	49	48	36	45	33	40	19	22
Copies - Non-NET	326	117	43	52	22	16	36	47	59	36
Total Copies	420	185	92	100	58	61	69	87	78	58
Total NET Items	737	656	603	527	335	363	294	226	157	125
Total Non-NET It.	768	552	322	385	150	104	148	127	150	180
TOTAL LOANED	1505	1208	925	912	485	467	442	353	307	305
Copies % of Total	27.9	15.3	9.9	11.0	12.0	13.1	15.6	24.6	25.4	19.0
NET % of Total	49.0	54.3	65.2	57.8	69.1	77.7	66.5	64.0	51.1	41.0
% Circ:Borrowing	1.8	0.7	0.7	1.0	0.7	0.7	1.3	0.5	0.4	0.7
% Circ:Lending	2.3	0.8	0.8	1.5	1.0	0.8	1.0	0.3	0.4	0.3
Net Print Loans	379	269	30	297	163	74	-107	-126	-42	-321

	MEDIA BORROWED									
MEC	307	184	187	155	135	102	102	94	72	37
Non-MEC	421	261	268	206	170	174	119	129	74	78
Total	728	445	455	361	305	276	221	223	146	115
MEC % of Total	42.2	41.3	41.1	42.9	44.3	37.0	46.2	42.2	49.3	32.2

	MEDIA LOANED									
MEC	2931	1466	1158	1064	977	685	679	756	656	572
Non-MEC	422	198	118	76	56	39	35	36	19	30
Total	3353	1664	1276	1140	1033	724	714	792	675	602
MEC % of Loans	87.4	88.1	90.8	93.3	94.6	94.6	95.1	95.5	97.2	95.0

	Net Media Loans									
Net Media Loans	2825	1219	821	779	728	448	493	569	-55	487

Table 24: Camosun College

	1981/82	1982/83	1983/84	1984/85	1985/86	1986/87	1987/88	1988/89	1989/90	1990/91	
EXPENDITURES											
Institution				20,864,000	22,285,000	23,895,000	25,913,000	30,945,000	37,023,000	43,026,000	Institution
Library	523,579	504,121	493,172	566,146	399,640	678,329	676,677	605,436	581,609		Library
Library%				2.6	1.7	2.6	2.2	1.6	1.4		Library%
Books	53,012	35,529	40,000	38,697	39,970	38,472	33,233	35,743	38,000	25,572	Books
Periodicals							26,000	26,844	34,137	32,573	Periodicals
A/V	17,542	8,106	6,500	11,102	11,200	10,869	12,449	11,698	14,399	12,603	A/V
Software											Software
Microforms											Microforms
Blinding											Blinding
Other											Other
Total Materials	70,554	43,635	46,500	49,799	51,170	49,341	71,682	74,285	86,536	70,748	Total Materials
Materials %	13.5	8.7	9.4	9.0	9.0	12.3	10.6	11.0	14.3	12.2	Materials %
HOLDINGS											
Books	39,944	39,348	38,980	39,318	39,101	39,416	39,838	42,303	44,499	46,517	Books
Subscriptions	494	357	363	368	362	395	445	503	316	316	Subscriptions
Microforms	1,186	1,202	1,292	1,393	1,393	1,423	1,392	1,444	1,550	1,650	Microforms
A/V	2,426	2,439	2,406	2,382	5,394		5,174	5,434	5,542	2,600	A/V
Film	293	308	313	325	338	351					Film
Video	737	1,024	1,041	1,098	1,183	1,268		1,332	1,358	1,399	Video
Software										16	Software
Pamphlets											Pamphlets
Enrolment	4,174	4,390	4,606	4,756	4,619	4,514	4,617	5,145	5,436	4,448	Enrolment
Lib \$/Student	125.44	114.83	107.07	0.00	122.57	88.53	146.92	131.52	111.38	130.76	Lib \$/Student
Books/Student	9.6	9.0	8.4	8.3	8.5	8.7	8.6	8.2	8.2	10.5	Books/Student
Micro/Student	0.3	0.3	0.3	0.3	0.3	0.3	0.3	0.3	0.3	0.4	Micro/Student
CIRCULATION											
Total	74,442	72,191	86,666	77,552	79,468	70,142	70,486	65,406	53,391	67,892	Total
Loans/Student	17.8	16.4	18.8	16.3	17.2	15.5	15.3	12.7	9.8	15.3	Loans/Student
ILL BORROWING											
Titles - NET	122		101	59	59	28	78	108	103	88	Titles - NET
Titles - Non-NET	0		1	6	6	3	125	336	211	145	Titles - Non-NET
Total Titles	122		102	65	65	31	203	444	314	233	Total Titles

	1981/82	1982/83	1983/84	1984/85	1985/86	1986/87	1987/88	1988/89	1989/90	1990/91	
ILL BORROWING (cont.)											
Copies - NET	110		49	58	60	59					Copies - NET
Copies - Non/NET	0		9	58	60	66					Copies - Non/NET
Total Copies	110		58	117	119	87	78	108	103	88	Total Copies
Total NET Items	232		150	117	119	87	336	211	211	145	Total NET Items
Total Non-NET It.	0		10	6	6	10	414	319	314	233	Total Non-NET It.
TOTAL BORROWED	232		160	123	125	97	414	319	314	233	TOTAL BORROWED
Copies % of Total	47.4		36.3	47.2	48.0	68.0	18.8	33.9	32.8	37.8	Copies % of Total
NET % of Total	100.0		93.8	95.1	95.2	89.7	18.8	33.9	32.8	37.8	NET % of Total
ILL LENDING											
Titles - NET	151		89	65	65	65					Titles - NET
Titles - Non-NET	12		5	8	10	3					Titles - Non-NET
Total Titles	163		94	73	75	68	70	59	74	82	Total Titles
Copies - NET	17		17	9	9	8					Copies - NET
Copies - Non-NET	1		0	2	0	5					Copies - Non-NET
Total Copies	18		17	11	9	13					Total Copies
Total NET Items	168		106	74	74	73	78	108	103	88	Total NET Items
Total Non-NET It.	13		5	10	10	8					Total Non-NET It.
TOTAL LOANED	181		111	84	84	81	78	108	103	88	TOTAL LOANED
Copies % of Total	9.9		15.3	13.1	10.7	16.0	0.6	0.5	0.6	0.3	Copies % of Total
NET % of Total	92.8		95.5	88.1	88.1	90.1	0.1	0.2	0.2	0.1	NET % of Total
% Circ:Borrowing	0.3		0.2	0.2	0.2	0.1	0.1	0.2	0.2	0.1	% Circ:Borrowing
% Circ:Lending	0.2		0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.2	0.2	0.1	% Circ:Lending
Net Print Loans	-51		-49	-113	-41	-16	-336	-211	-211	-145	Net Print Loans
MEDIA BORROWED											
MEC	790		620	827	573	582	121	130	616	229	MEC
Non-MEC	51		35	71	71	63	590	504	444	444	Non-MEC
Total	841		620	862	644	645	711	634	616	673	Total
MEC % of Total	93.9		95.9	89.0	89.0	90.2	17.0	20.5	34.0	34.0	MEC % of Total
MEDIA LOANED											
MEC	385		284	317	434	532	113	89	265	134	MEC
Non-MEC						2	307	237	265	177	Non-MEC
Total	385		284	317	434	534	420	326	265	311	Total
MEC % of Total						99.6	26.9	27.3	43.1	43.1	MEC % of Total
Net Media Loans	-456		-336	-545	-210	-111	-291	-308	-351	-362	Net Media Loans

Table 25: Capilano College

EXPENDITURES		1981/82	1982/83	1983/84	1984/85	1985/86	1986/87	1987/88	1988/89	1989/90	1990/91	EXPENDITURES	
Institution				15,087,000	14,570,000	15,330,000	16,272,000	16,833,000	21,394,000	21,394,000	23,564,000	Institution	
Library		638,043	668,207	711,232	728,700	711,232	697,123	733,311	792,113	804,277	816,406	Library	
Library%				4.8	4.9	4.5	4.5	4.5	4.3	3.8	3.5	Library%	
Books		52,200	42,727	40,769	48,885	54,385	56,000	62,411	92,690	76,707	7,781	Books	
Periodicals		27,460	21,239	24,920	25,683			22,000	28,200	32,180	34,602	Periodicals	
A/V		10,000	8,139	13,596				10,000				A/V	
Software								1,000				Software	
Microforms		3,836	1,115	3,594	2,464			3,500		6,831	5,407	Microforms	
Blinding												Blinding	
Other												Other	
Total Materials		93496	73220	82899	77032	54,385	56000	98911	120890	115718	47790	Total Materials	
Materials %		14.7	11.0	11.7	10.6	7.6	8.0	13.5	15.3	14.4	5.9	Materials %	
HOLDINGS													
Books		80,613	83,869	86,887	89,592	91,679	94,706	96,690	95,441	98,076	101,595	Books	
Subscriptions		737	619	610	585	633	641	665	693	730	564	Subscriptions	
Microforms		3,273	3,383	3,391	3,450	3,930	3,557	3,602	3,817	3,973	12,854	Microforms	
A/V		21,305	21,448	21,503	21,927	21,751		10,653	10,611	5889	6,369	A/V	
Film		368	405	410	417	441	428					Film	
Video						534	584		998	1,400	1,862	Video	
Software					71	91		91	91	64	69	Software	
Pamphlets									5,000	5,000	5,000	Pamphlets	
Enrolment		3,758	4,000	3,905	4,138	4,380	4,021	4,413	4,918	5,135	3,901	Enrolment	
Lib \$/Student		169.78	167.05	182.13	176.10	162.38	173.37	166.17	161.06	156.63	209.28	Lib \$/Student	
Books/Student		21.5	21.0	22.3	21.7	20.9	23.6	21.9	19.4	19.1	26.0	Books/Student	
Micro/Student		0.9	0.8	0.9	0.8	0.9	0.9	0.8	0.8	0.8	3.3	Micro/Student	
CIRCULATION													
Total		71,582	71,985	53,416	45,768	45,634	45,221	51,952	64,097	71,631	68,577	Total	
Loans/Student		19.0	18.0	13.7	11.1	10.4	11.2	11.8	13.0	13.9	17.6	Loans/Student	
ILL BORROWING													
Titles - NET										157	241	Titles - NET	
Titles - Non-NET										5	64	Titles - Non-NET	
Total Titles										162	305	Total Titles	

1981/82 1982/83 1983/84 1984/85 1985/86 1986/87 1987/88 1988/89 1989/90 1990/91

ILL BORROWING (cont.)										
ILL BORROWING (cont.)										Copies - NET
Copies - NET										137
Copies - Non/NET										
Total Copies										
Total NET Items	216	136	130	74	36	38	63	115	264	378
Total Non-NET It.										64
TOTAL BORROWED	216	136	130	74	36	38	63	115	269	442
Copies % of Total									39.8	31.0
NET % of Total									98.1	85.5

ILL LENDING										
ILL LENDING										Titles - NET
Titles - NET										26
Titles - Non-NET										114
Total Titles										140
Copies - NET										2
Copies - Non-NET										
Total Copies										2
Total NET Items	309	256	241	191	181	159	151	77	54	28
Total Non-NET It.										114
TOTAL LOANED	309	256	241	191	181	159	151	77	146	142
Copies % of Total									3.4	1.4
NET % of Total									37.0	19.7

% Circ:Borrowing	0.3	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.2	0.4	0.6
% Circ:Lending	0.4	0.4	0.5	0.4	0.4	0.4	0.3	0.1	0.2	0.2
Net Print Loans	93	120	111	117	145	121	88	-38	-123	-300

MEDIA BORROWED										
MEC										192
Non-MEC										443
Total										635
MEC % of Total										30.2

MEDIA LOANED										
MEC										94
Non-MEC										72
Total										166
MEC % of Total										56.6

Net Media Loans										-469
-----------------	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	------

Net Media Loans

Table 26: Cariboo College

	1981/82	1982/83	1983/84	1984/85	1985/86	1986/87	1987/88	1988/89	1989/90	1990/91	
EXPENDITURES											
Institution			15,594,000	16,603,000	17,339,000	17,663,000	20,255,000	26,008,000	32,716,000		institution
Library	561,810	591,202	663,233	528,497	427,943	475,620	455,000	893,526	938,409		Library
Library%				3.2	2.5	2.7	2.2	3.4	2.9		Library%
Books	106,848	94,397	123,543			53,300	53,300	315,000	260,000		Books
Periodicals						48,500	48,500	75,000	75,000		Periodicals
A/V	10,000					12,300	12,300	12,500	11,000		A/V
Software						4,000	4,000	5,200	6,500		Software
Microforms	3,031	2,571	3160								Microforms
Blinding											Blinding
Other											Other
Total Materials	119,879	96,968	126,703		133,925	118,100	118,100	407,700	352,500		Total Materials
Materials %	21.3	16.4	19.1		25.3	24.8	26.0	45.6	37.6		Materials %
HOLDINGS											
Books	60,125	61,000	62,731	64,000		60,000	57,000	60,500	68,755		Books
Subscriptions	550	550	501			500	500	600	1,279		Subscriptions
Microforms	1,504		1,795			5,000	5,500		13,400		Microforms
A/V	224		1,177			2,800	2,348	2,790	2,239		A/V
Film	139		202								Film
Video	793		1,401			1,221	1,433		1,580		Video
Software											Software
Pamphlets								3,777	2,615	3,059	Pamphlets
Enrolment	2,649	2,932	3,701	3,611	3,311	3,580	4,084	3,934	4,338	3,612	Enrolment
Lib \$/Student	212.08	201.64	179.20	0.00	159.62	119.54	116.46	115.66	205.98	259.80	Lib \$/Student
Books/Student	22.7	20.8	16.9	17.7	0.0	14.7	14.5	13.9	19.0	3.7	Books/Student
Micro/Student	0.6		0.5		0.0	1.2	1.4				Micro/Student
CIRCULATION											
Total	31,805	39,951	38,815	40,671	40,587	50,000	62,642	59,983	75,160	91,325	Total
Loans/Student	12.0	13.6	10.5	11.3	12.3	14.0	15.3	15.2	17.3	25.3	Loans/Student
ILL BORROWING											
Titles - NET											
Titles - Non-NET											
Total Titles											

1981/82 1982/83 1983/84 1984/85 1985/86 1986/87 1987/88 1988/89 1989/90 1990/91
ILL BORROWING (cont.)

ILL BORROWING (cont.)										
Copies - NET	1981/82	1982/83	1983/84	1984/85	1985/86	1986/87	1987/88	1988/89	1989/90	1990/91
Copies - Non/NET										
Total Copies		656	720	799	613	516	484	1028	1213	
Total NET Items		33	177	296					348	
Total Non-NET It.		683	689	897	799	516	484	529	1028	1561
TOTAL BORROWED										
Copies % of Total		95.2	80.3		67.4					77.7
NET % of Total										

ILL LENDING										
Titles - NET	1981/82	1982/83	1983/84	1984/85	1985/86	1986/87	1987/88	1988/89	1989/90	1990/91
Titles - Non-NET										
Total Titles										
Copies - NET										
Copies - Non-NET										
Total Copies		145	124	109	142	64	36	25	22	35
Total NET Items		20	18	123	21	92				
Total Non-NET It.		165	142	232	163	64	36	25	22	35
TOTAL LOANED										
Copies % of Total		87.9	87.3	47.0	87.1	43.6				
NET % of Total										

% Circ:Borrowing	2.2	1.7	2.3	2.0	2.2	1.0	0.8	0.9	1.4	1.7
% Circ:Lending	0.5	0.4	0.6	0.4	0.4	0.1	0.1	0.0	0.0	
Net Print Loans	-526	-547	-665	-636	-746	-452	-448	-504	-1006	-1526

MEDIA BORROWED										
MEC	1981/82	1982/83	1983/84	1984/85	1985/86	1986/87	1987/88	1988/89	1989/90	1990/91
MEC		151	115	107	130	259	146	70		
Non-MEC		474	357	408	310	308	300	217		
Total	558	659	813	625	472	515	440	567	446	287
MEC % of Total	0.0	24.2	24.4	20.8	29.5	45.7	32.7	24.4		

MEDIA LOANED										
MEC	1981/82	1982/83	1983/84	1984/85	1985/86	1986/87	1987/88	1988/89	1989/90	1990/91
MEC		45	39	58	65	53	49	42		
Non-MEC		26								
Total	91	136	59	45	65	58	65	53	49	42
MEC % of Total	0.0	60.0								
Net Media Loans	-467	-523	-754	-580	-407	-457	-375	-514	-397	-245

Table 27: Douglas College

	1981/82	1982/83	1983/84	1984/85	1985/86	1986/87	1987/88	1988/89	1989/90	1990/91	
EXPENDITURES											
Institution Library	847,732	856,453	866,374	977,300	1,013,051	1,044,631	1,114,200	1,218,113	1,279,200	1,282,015	Institution Library
Library%	6.0	5.8	5.4	5.1	5.0	4.6	4.0	4.0	4.6	4.0	Library%
Books	65,500	78,500	82,929	90,400	171,400	189,999	146,900	205,556	155,700	153,300	Books
Periodicals	54,000	33,000	34,500	39,800	48,200	49,042	57,100	60,300	60,300	60,300	Periodicals
A/V	20,000	20,000	26,743	23,100	31,300	27,749	30,500	30,261	33,800	35,900	A/V
Software					1,000	883				6,200	Software
Microforms			18,247	17,800		4,534	3,100	4,600			Microforms
Binding											Binding
Other											Other
Total Materials	139,500	131,500	162,419	153,300	220,500	217,748	226,600	290,276	249,700	260,300	Total Materials
Materials %	16.5	15.4	18.7	15.7	21.8	20.8	20.3	23.8	19.5	20.3	Materials %
HOLDINGS											
Books	61,030	67,060	68,546	72,955	78,203	81,242	85,649	89,511	95,486	91,536	Books
Subscriptions	649	635	538	588	574	584	559	568	616	638	Subscriptions
Microforms	5,187	15,477	18,944	3,468	3,995	3,448	7,126	9,250	12,706	12,706	Microforms
A/V	1,948	2,229	2,585	4,174	5,149	998	11,409	7,137	6,293	6,498	A/V
Film	800	823	883	945	982						Film
Video	378	538	665	850	1,118	1,201.0	97	114	120	122	Video
Software											Software
Pamphlets									168	21,679	Pamphlets
Enrollment	3,116	3,270	4,165	4,519	4,575	4,610	5,177	5,739	5,532	4,424	Enrollment
Lib \$/Student	272.06	261.91	208.01	216.26	221.43	226.60	215.22	212.25	231.24	289.79	Lib \$/Student
Books/Student	19.6	20.5	16.5	16.1	17.1	17.6	16.5	15.6	17.3	20.7	Books/Student
Micro/Student	1.7	4.7	4.5	0.8	0.9	0.9	0.7	1.2	1.7	2.9	Micro/Student
CIRCULATION											
Total	46,784	36,568	63,873	67,448	72,532	73,480	73,752	88,003	78,930	97,294	Total
Loans/Student	15.0	11.2	15.3	14.9	15.9	15.9	14.2	15.3	14.3	22.0	Loans/Student
ILL BORROWING											
Titles - NET	294	135	215	144	142	151	254				Titles - NET
Titles - Non-NET	4	2	14	39	28	15	37				Titles - Non-NET
Total Titles	298	137	229	183	170	166	291				Total Titles

ILL BORROWING (cont.)											
	1981/82	1982/83	1983/84	1984/85	1985/86	1986/87	1987/88	1988/89	1989/90	1990/91	
Copies - NET	491	112	303	340	373	160	170				Copies - NET
Copies - Non/NET	2	10	303	17	3	10	33				Copies - Non/NET
Total Copies	493	122	303	357	376	170	203				Total Copies
Total NET Items	785	247	518	484	515	311	424	521	403	431	Total NET Items
Total Non-NET It.	6	12	14	56	31	25	70	49	25	78	Total Non-NET It.
TOTAL BORROWED	791	259	532	540	546	336	494	570	428	509	TOTAL BORROWED
Copies % of Total	62.3	47.1	57.0	66.1	68.9	50.6	41.1		0.0		Copies % of Total
NET % of Total	99.2	95.4	97.4	89.6	94.3	92.6	85.8	91.4	94.2	84.7	NET % of Total
ILL BORROWING (cont.)											
ILL LENDING											
Titles - NET	287	181	172	50	77	112	103				Titles - NET
Titles - Non-NET	3	9	8	14	18	39	15				Titles - Non-NET
Total Titles	290	190	180	64	95	151	118				Total Titles
Copies - NET	55	10	16	8	12	8	395				Copies - NET
Copies - Non-NET	2			1	16	3					Copies - Non-NET
Total Copies	57	10	16	9	28	11	395				Total Copies
Total NET Items	342	191	188	58	89	120	498	151	126	94	Total NET Items
Total Non-NET It.	5	9	8	15	34	42	15	83	92	51	Total Non-NET It.
TOTAL LOANED	347	200	196	73	123	162	513	234	218	145	TOTAL LOANED
Copies % of Total	16.4	5.0	8.2	12.3	22.8	6.8	77.0	64.5	57.8	64.8	Copies % of Total
NET % of Total	98.6	95.5	95.9	79.5	72.4	74.1	97.1				NET % of Total
% Circ:Borrowing	1.7	0.7	0.8	0.8	0.8	0.5	0.7	0.6	0.5	0.5	% Circ:Borrowing
% Circ:Lending	0.7	0.5	0.3	0.1	0.2	0.2	0.7	0.3	0.3	0.1	% Circ:Lending
Net Print Loans	-444	-59	-336	-467	-423	-174	19	-336	-210	-364	Net Print Loans
MEDIA BORROWED											
MEC	812	838	338	300	388	286	210	226	152	136	MEC
Non-MEC	454	378	678	516	198	182	222	377	242	171	Non-MEC
Total	1266	1216	1016	816	586	468	432	603	394	307	Total
MEC % of Total	64.1	68.9	33.3	36.8	66.2	61.1	48.6	37.5	38.6	44.3	MEC % of Total
MEDIA LOANED											
MEC	1288	1098	700	549	505	501	542	516	441	412	MEC
Non-MEC	1085	777	487	369	310	229	164	468	262	105	Non-MEC
Total	2373	1875	1187	918	815	730	706	984	703	517	Total
MEC % of Total	54.3	58.6	59.0	59.8	62.0	68.6	76.8	52.4	62.7	79.7	MEC % of Total
Net Media Loans	1107	659	171	102	229	262	274	381	309	210	Net Media Loans

Table 28: East Kootenay Community College

	1981/82	1982/83	1983/84	1984/85	1985/86	1986/87	1987/88	1988/89	1989/90	1990/91	
EXPENDITURES											
Institution				5,857,000	6,009,000	6,204,000	6,914,000	7,547,000	8,803,000	9,947,000	Institution
Library	312,266	318,539	315,824	305,632	282,119	325,956	354,406	412,928	608,234	550,057	Library
Library%				5.2	4.7	5.3	5.1	5.5	6.9	5.5	Library%
Books			32,009	28,347	37,830	44,961	36,760	20,500	27,000	26,385	Books
Periodicals							18,670	20,000	20,000	21,000	Periodicals
A/V			7,125	5,016	7,903	9,694			1,500	8,128	A/V
Software											
Microforms											Microforms
Blinding											Blinding
Other											Other
Total Materials	39,025	42,804	39134	33363	45,733	54,655	55430	40500	48500	55513	Total Materials
Materials %	12.5	13.4	12.4	10.9	16.2	16.8	15.6	9.8	8.0	10.1	Materials %
HOLDINGS											
Books	21,360	21,936	25,346	26,980	28,388	29,053	31,725	33,156	34,753	37,129	Books
Subscriptions	347	406	403	340	404	407	394	544	560	572	Subscriptions
Microforms	75	75	75	75	9	45.0	64	12	12	17	Microforms
A/V	511	374	699	729	2,349		3,093	3,176	2,009	4,425	A/V
Film	156	168	168	177	209	208					Film
Video	242	566	501	838	1,151	1,446	753	1,032	559	3,529	Video
Software			47	112	124	285	572	350	559	420	Software
Pamphlets											
Enrolment	1,075	1,332	1,340	990	972	966	897	970	1,100	1,016	Enrolment
Lib \$/Student	290.48	239.14	235.69	308.72	290.25	337.43	9.03	425.70	552.94	541.39	Lib \$/Student
Books/Student	19.9	16.5	18.9	27.3	29.2	30.1	0.8	34.2	31.6	36.5	Books/Student
Micro/Student	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1		0.0		0.0		0.0	Micro/Student
CIRCULATION											
Total	11,098	17,527	19,708	18,036	20,928	25,733	39,264	52,381	49,575	47,785	Total
Loans/Student	10.3	13.2	14.7	18.2	21.5	26.6	43.8	54.0	45.1	47.0	Loans/Student
ILL BORROWING											
Titles - NET	412	243	203	143	91	156	394	240	872	1060	Titles - NET
Titles - Non-NET	1	2	3	6	9	5					Titles - Non-NET
Total Titles	413	245	206	149	100	206	394	240	872	1060	Total Titles

1981/82 1982/83 1983/84 1984/85 1985/86 1986/87 1987/88 1988/89 1989/90 1990/91

ILL BORROWING (cont.)										
ILL BORROWING (cont.)										
Copies - NET	273	113	117	95	172					Copies - NET
Copies - Non/NET	9	1	1	19						Copies - Non/NET
Total Copies	282	114	117	96	191					Total Copies
Total NET items	685	356	320	238	263	156	240	872	1060	Total NET items
Total Non-NET It.	10	3	3	7	28	5				Total Non-NET It.
TOTAL BORROWED	695	359	323	245	291	161	240	872	1060	TOTAL BORROWED
Copies % of Total	40.6	31.8	36.2	39.2	65.6					Copies % of Total
NET % of Total	98.6	99.2	99.1	97.1	90.4	96.9				NET % of Total

ILL LENDING										
Titles - NET	36	52	30	16	22	136	195	128	186	Titles - NET
Titles - Non-NET	1	0	12	0	9	0	0	0	0	Titles - Non-NET
Total Titles	37	52	42	16	31	136	195	128	186	Total Titles
Copies - NET	4	4	12	5	9					Copies - NET
Copies - Non-NET										Copies - Non-NET
Total Copies	4	4	12	5	9					Total Copies
Total NET items	40	56	42	21	31	136	195	128	186	Total NET items
Total Non-NET It.	1	0	12	0	9	0	0	0	0	Total Non-NET It.
TOTAL LOANED	41	56	54	21	40	136	195	128	186	TOTAL LOANED
Copies % of Total	9.8	7.1	22.2	23.8	22.5	15.7				Copies % of Total
NET % of Total	97.6	100.0	77.8	100.0	77.5	76.4	100.0	100.0	100.0	NET % of Total

% Circ:Borrowing	6.3	2.0	1.6	1.4	1.4	0.6	0.5	1.8	2.2	% Circ:Borrowing
% Circ:Lending	0.4	0.3	0.3	0.1	0.2	0.3	0.4	0.3	0.4	% Circ:Lending
Net Print Loans	-654	-303	-269	-224	-251	-72	-45	-744	-874	Net Print Loans

MEDIA BORROWED										
MEC	382	361	189	200	210	288	278	235	369	MEC
Non-MEC	2	5		23	22	4				Non-MEC
Total	384	366	199	223	232	292	278	235	369	Total
MEC % of Total	99.5	98.6		89.7	90.5	98.6				MEC % of Total

MEDIA LOANED										
MEC	542	206	215	192	173	198	140	125	138	MEC
Non-MEC	51		1	12		0				Non-MEC
Total	593	203	216	204	173	198	140	125	138	Total
MEC % of Total	91.4		99.5	94.1		100.0				MEC % of Total
Net Media Loans	209	-160	17	-19	-59	-94	-138	-110	-231	Net Media Loans

Table 29: Emily Carr College Of Art And Design

	1981/82	1982/83	1983/84	1984/85	1985/86	1986/87	1987/88	1988/89	1989/90	1990/91	
EXPENDITURES											
Institution				4,862,000	5,315,000	5,438,000	5,765,000	6,091,000	6,921,000	7,933,000	Institution
Library	186,333	167,407	186,842	210,490	227,535	222,062	244,837	263,779	288,218	241,312	Library
Library%				4.3	4.3	4.1	4.2	4.3	4.2	3.0	Library%
Books	43,849	15,482		25,686	24,986	19,287	15,737	15,017	23,902		Books
Periodicals						5,713	5,930	7,100	6,798		Periodicals
A/V	12,201	7,840		13,228	10,685	17,000	17,000	18,000	18,000		A/V
Software											Software
Microforms											Microforms
Binding											Binding
Other											Other
Total Materials	56050	23322	47,500	38,914	35,671	42,000	38,667	40,117	48,700		Total Materials
Materials %	30.1	13.9	25.4	17.1	17.5	17.2	14.7	13.9	20.2		Materials %
HOLDINGS											
Books	7,761	8,200		9,021	9,476	9,837	10,141	10,386	10,523	11,069	Books
Subscriptions	150	150		136	127	138	138	138	138	150	Subscriptions
Microforms	17					18	18	18	18	18	Microforms
A/V				60,801		71,350	96,722	100,608	105,321		A/V
Film											Film
Video				270	270		505	505	505		Video
Software				93		247					Software
Pamphlets							2,926	2,926	2,926		Pamphlets
Enrolment	482	509	671	651	923	657	1,026	994	1,201	827	Enrolment
Lib \$/Student	386.58	328.89	278.45	323.33	246.52	337.99	238.63	265.37	239.98	291.79	Lib \$/Student
Books/Student	16.1	16.1		13.9	10.3	15.0	9.9	10.4	8.8	13.4	Books/Student
Micro/Student	0.0	0.0		0.0		0.0		0.0	0.0	0.0	Micro/Student
CIRCULATION											
Total	13,889	18,667	12,170	17,205	40,922	47,245	48,020	56,156	56,203	58,686	Total
Loans/Student	28.8	36.7	18.1	26.4	44.3	71.9	46.8	56.5	46.8	71.0	Loans/Student
ILL BORROWING											
Titles - NET	4	6		4	4	3	2	3	1	3	Titles - NET
Titles - Non-NET											Titles - Non-NET
Total Titles	4	6		4	4	3	2	3	1	3	Total Titles

1981/82 1982/83 1983/84 1984/85 1985/86 1986/87 1987/88 1988/89 1989/90 1990/91

ILL BORROWING (cont.)										
Copies - NET										Copies - NET
Copies - Non/NET										Copies - Non/NET
Total Copies	4	6	3	4	3	2	3	1	3	Total Copies
Total NET Items										
Total Non-NET It.										
TOTAL BORROWED	4	6	3	4	3	2	3	1	3	TOTAL BORROWED
Copies % of Total	0.0				0.0		0.0		0.0	Copies % of Total
NET % of Total										
ILL LENDING										
Titles - NET	6	5			7	2	5	2		Titles - NET
Total Titles	6	5			7	2	5	2		Total Titles
Copies - NET										
Copies - Non/NET										
Total Copies										
Total NET Items	6	5	4	1	7	2	5	2		Total NET Items
Total Non-NET It.										
TOTAL LOANED	6	5	4	1	7	2	5	2		TOTAL LOANED
Copies % of Total	0.0			0.0		0.0		0.0		Copies % of Total
NET % of Total										
MEDIA BORROWED										
MEC										
Non-MEC										
Total	2	-1	1	1	4	2	2	1	-3	Total
MEC % of Total	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	MEC % of Total
MEDIA LOANED										
MEC										
Non-MEC										
Total	66				66	66	66	50	50	Total
MEC % of Total										
Net Media Loans										
MEC										
Non-MEC										
Total	83				83	83	83	8	57	Total
MEC % of Total										
Net Media Loans	17				17	17	17	7	86.0	Net Media Loans

1981/82 1982/83 1983/84 1984/85 1985/86 1986/87 1987/88 1988/89 1989/90 1990/91
ILL BORROWING (cont.)

ILL BORROWING (cont.)										
										Copies - NET
Copies - NET										Copies - Non/NET
Copies - Non/NET										Total Copies
Total NET Items	227	242	328	236	322	253	289	245	367	367
Total Non-NET It.	75	237	259	122	100	134	32	249	383	347
TOTAL BORROWED	302	479	587	358	422	387	321	494	750	714
Copies % of Total	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
NET % of Total	75.2	50.5	55.9	65.9	76.3	65.4	90.0	49.6	48.9	51.4

ILL LENDING										
										Titles - NET
Titles - Non-NET										Total Titles
Copies - NET										Copies - Non-NET
Copies - Non/NET										Total Copies
Total NET Items	71	14	72	67	48	48	41	36	36	17
Total Non-NET It.	22	17	17	29	32	22	21	40	43	73
TOTAL LOANED	93	83	89	96	80	70	62	76	79	90
Copies % of Total	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
NET % of Total	76.3	16.9	80.9	69.8	60.0	68.6	66.1	47.4	45.6	18.9

% Circ:Borrowing	0.6	0.9	1.1	0.6	0.7	0.6	0.5	0.8	1.0	0.9
% Circ:Lending	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1
Net Print Loans	-209	-396	-498	-262	-342	-317	-259	-418	-671	-624

MEDIA BORROWED										
										MEC
Non-MEC										Non-MEC
Total										Total
MEC % of Total										MEC % of Total
MEC				140	140	162	181	202	227	207
Non-MEC				510	761	714	651	644	551	978
Total	868	990	650	650	901	876	832	846	778	1,185
MEC % of Total	0.0	0.0	0.0	21.5	15.5	18.5	21.8	23.9	29.2	17.5

MEDIA LOANED										
										MEC
Non-MEC										Non-MEC
Total										Total
MEC % of Total										MEC % of Total
MEC				19	51	48	63	67	41	31
Non-MEC				173	108	79	85	48	56	92
Total				192	159	127	148	115	97	123
MEC % of Total				9.9	32.1	37.8	42.6	58.3	42.3	25.2
Net Media Loans	-868	-990	-650	-458	-742	-749	-684	-731	-681	-1062

Table 31: Justice Institute Of British Columbia

	1981/82	1982/83	1983/84	1984/85	1985/86	1986/87	1987/88	1988/89	1989/90	1990/91	EXPENDITURES
Institution Library	557,571	235,363	307,527	177,000	224,173	231,044	191,469	202,368	239,517	241,755	Institution Library
Library%					2.8		2.8		3.0	2.5	Library%
Books	29,396	40,000	30,230	11,000	22,244	20,716	7,060		13,865	12,115	Books
Periodicals				6,000			14,100		7,557	8,010	Periodicals
A/V	15,866	21,155	5,039	8,000	8,570	7,658	4,500		7,677	4,680	A/V
Software											Software
Microforms	1,500										Microforms
Blinding											Blinding
Other											Other
Total Materials	46762	61155	35269	25000	30,814	28,374	25660	23,970	29099	24805	Total Materials
Materials %	8.4	26.0	11.5	14.1	13.7	12.3	13.4	11.8	12.1	10.3	Materials %
HOLDINGS											
Books	8,230	8,695	9,207	9,747	11,046	11,837	12,251	12,165	11,494	11,912	Books
Subscriptions	344	306	286	208	198	196	230	240	250	260	Subscriptions
Microforms	37	40	40	40	44	44	45	46	46	46	Microforms
A/V	231	335	349	386	951		1,116		1,356	1,589	A/V
Film	206	290	309	312	314	316					Film
Video	93	140	156	217	267	363			416	601	Video
Software											Software
Pamphlets									10,640	10,640	Pamphlets
Student FTEs					724				550	600	Student FTEs
Lib \$/Student					319.12				435.49	402.93	Lib \$/Student
Books/Student					16.3				20.9	19.9	Books/Student
Micro/Student					0.1				0.1	0.1	Micro/Student
CIRCULATION											
Total	5,383	3,709	6,972	7,274	6,662	6,640	6,356	6,840	7,087	7,486	Total
Loans/Student					9.2				12.9	12.5	Loans/Student
ILL BORROWING											
Titles - NET											Titles - NET
Titles - Non-NET											Titles - Non-NET
Total Titles	164		35		35	87					Total Titles

	1981/82	1982/83	1983/84	1984/85	1985/86	1986/87	1987/88	1988/89	1989/90	1990/91	ILL BORROWING (cont.)
ILL BORROWING (cont.)											
Copies - NET											
Copies - Non/NET											Copies - NET
Total Copies	100	275	111	58	47	40	33	56	77	57	Total Copies
Total NET Items				13			47	91	52	124	Total NET Items
Total Non-NET It.				71	82	127	80	147	129	181	Total Non-NET It.
TOTAL BORROWED	284	275	146	71	82	127	80	147	129	181	TOTAL BORROWED
Copies % of Total	35.2		76.0		57.3	31.5		0.0		0.0	Copies % of Total
NET % of Total				81.7	59.8	34.6	41.3	38.1	59.7	31.5	NET % of Total
ILL LENDING											
Titles - NET											
Titles - Non-NET											Titles - Non-NET
Total Titles	35		52		92	40					Total Titles
Copies - NET											Copies - NET
Copies - Non-NET	7		11		30	11					Copies - Non-NET
Total Copies	42	52	38	40	53	47	53	71	44	102	Total Copies
Total NET Items		13	25	61	69	3	69	72	139	266	Total NET Items
Total Non-NET It.		65	63	101	122	51	122	143	183	368	Total Non-NET It.
TOTAL LOANED	16.7		17.5		24.6	21.6		0.0		0.0	TOTAL LOANED
Copies % of Total	100.0	80.0	60.3	39.6	43.4	92.2	43.4	49.7	24.0	27.7	Copies % of Total
NET % of Total											NET % of Total
% Circ:Borrowing	5.3	7.4	2.1	1.0	1.2	1.9	1.3	2.1	1.8	2.4	% Circ:Borrowing
% Circ:Lending	0.8	1.8	0.9	1.4	1.8	0.8	1.9	2.1	2.6	4.9	% Circ:Lending
Net Print Loans	-242	-210	-83	30	40	-76	42	-4	54	187	Net Print Loans
MEDIA BORROWED											
MEC							37	34	23	22	MEC
Non-MEC							44	12	12	23	Non-MEC
Total	168	34	25	15	39	112	81	46	35	45	Total
MEC % of Total		0.0					45.7	73.9	65.7	48.9	MEC % of Total
MEDIA LOANED											
MEC					111		118	142	143	108	MEC
Non-MEC					39		76	95	94	98	Non-MEC
Total	145	154	150	150	150	73	194	237	237	206	Total
MEC % of Total					74.0		60.8	59.9	60.3	52.4	MEC % of Total
Net Media Loans	-23	120	125	135	111	-39	113	191	202	161	Net Media Loans

Table 32: Kwantlen College

	1981/82	1982/83	1983/84	1984/85	1985/86	1986/87	1987/88	1988/89	1989/90	1990/91	EXPENDITURES
EXPENDITURES											
Institution				15,296,000	16,135,000	16,873,000	18,307,000	19,816,000	22,955,000	28,426,000	Institution
Library	896,817		843,758	856,618	873,029	795,485	795,485	795,845	899,757	1,004,764	Library
Library%				5.3	5.2	4.3	4.0	4.0	3.9	3.5	Library%
Books	187,918	27,300	37,800	30,352	86,800	56,254	55,872	77,199	104,491	104,491	Books
Periodicals						40,000	36,314	40,490	40,290	40,290	Periodicals
A/V	17,899	6,000	6,000	9,861	16,522	10,000	7,032	14,387	14,387	14,387	A/V
Software							10,850	15,778	13,333	13,333	Software
Microforms	3,371	3,000	3,000	3,786	4,000	3,000	3,850	4,904	4,904	4,904	Microforms
Blinding											Blinding
Other											Other
Total Materials	209188	36300	46800	43,979	107322	109254	113918	152758	172501	172501	Total Materials
Materials %	23.3		5.5	5.1	12.3	13.7	14.3	17.0	17.2	17.2	Materials %
HOLDINGS											
Books	61,677	63,382	66,544	69,974	73,485	75,296	85,512	85,942	75,998	79,817	Books
Subscriptions	829	752	777	589	600	546	873	880	511	520	Subscriptions
Microforms	14,100	14,880	14,999	1,120	1,305	1,305	1,132	1,135	1,135	1,133	Microforms
A/V	3,507	3,735	3,735	5,772	740	763	8,125	8,153	7,431	5,767	A/V
Film	614	628	717	724	740	763					Film
Video	292	332	510	594	697	807	41	1,287	1,652	1,616	Video
Software								45	55	55	Software
Pamphlets									1,200		Pamphlets
Enrolment	3,253	3,664	3,963	3,934	4,018	3,807	4,256	4,725	4,932	4,098	Enrolment
Lib \$/Student	275.69	0.00	212.91	0.00	213.20	229.32	186.91	168.43	182.43	245.18	Lib \$/Student
Books/Student	19.0	17.3	16.8	17.8	18.3	19.8	20.1	18.2	15.4	19.5	Books/Student
Micro/Student	4.3	4.1	3.8	0.3	0.3	0.3	0.3	0.2	0.2	0.3	Micro/Student
CIRCULATION											
Total	50,287	53,487	76,851	70,269	75,415	81682.0	75,868	73,803	74,572	81,424	Total
Loans/Student	15.5	14.6	19.4	17.9	18.8	21.5	17.8	15.6	15.1	19.9	Loans/Student
ILL BORROWING											
Titles - NET			216	240	221	250	191	139	178	210	Titles - NET
Titles - Non-NET			11	17	20	21	12	19	12	10	Titles - Non-NET
Total Titles			227	257	241	271	203	158	190	220	Total Titles

1981/82 1982/83 1983/84 1984/85 1985/86 1986/87 1987/88 1988/89 1989/90 1990/91

ILL BORROWING (cont.)

ILL BORROWING (cont.)

Copies - NET	244	353	496	609	481	523	467	393	
Copies - Non/NET	8	14	32	70	187	151	133	125	
Total Copies	252	367	528	679	668	674	600	518	
Total NET Items	1,053	493	717	859	672	662	645	603	
Total Non-NET It.	426	19	52	91	199	170	145	135	
TOTAL BORROWED	1479	688	769	950	871	832	790	738	
Copies % of Total	0.0	52.6	68.7	71.5	76.7	81.0	75.9	70.2	
NET % of Total	71.2	71.7	93.2	90.4	77.2	79.6	81.6	81.7	

ILL LENDING

ILL LENDING

Titles - NET	314	156	133	75	74	57	41	29	
Titles - Non-NET	15	21	14	10	11	24	15	36	
Total Titles	329	177	147	85	85	81	55	77	
Copies - NET	81	15	22	11	37	22	18	9	
Copies - Non-NET	1	1	4	4	2	2	3	1	
Total Copies	81	16	22	11	41	24	21	10	
Total NET Items	395	171	162	111	79	79	58	34	
Total Non-NET It.	15	22	14	15	26	18	37	53	
TOTAL LOANED	410	193	176	132	126	105	76	87	
Copies % of Total	19.8	8.3	16.5	11.5	32.5	22.9	27.6	11.5	
NET % of Total	96.3	88.6	92.0	88.1	88.1	75.2	76.3	57.5	

% Circ:Borrowing

% Circ:Borrowing	2.9	1.3	0.6	1.0	1.2	1.1	1.1	0.9	
% Circ:Lending	0.8	0.4	0.2	0.1	0.2	0.1	0.1	0.1	
Net Print Loans	-1069	-495	-303	-673	-824	-766	-756	-703	

MEDIA BORROWED

MEC	1,049	1,060	231	238	255	289	340	272	
Non-MEC	186	423	43	48	341	224	367	320	
Total	1235	1483	274	286	596	513	707	592	
MEC % of Total	84.9	71.5	84.3	83.2	42.8	56.3	48.1	45.9	

MEDIA LOANED

MEC	791	791	213	209	155	178	235	199	
Non-MEC	321	321	25	32	0	0	13	15	
Total	1112	1112	238	241	155	178	248	214	
MEC % of Total	71.1	71.1	89.5	86.7	100.0	100.0	94.8	93.0	
Net Media Loans	-123	-1483	-36	-45	-441	-335	-459	-378	
Net Media Loans									-276

Table 33: Malaspina College

EXPENDITURES		1981/82	1982/83	1983/84	1984/85	1985/86	1986/87	1987/88	1988/89	1989/90	1990/91
Institution					18,225,000	18,907,000	22,026,000	22,670,000	24,382,000	27,953,000	33,541,000
Library		828,250	850,698	809,977	809,977	677,533	508,102	861,835	861,385	1,099,900	1,434,518
Library%				4.4	3.6	2.3	3.8	3.5	3.9	4.3	
Books		90,607	90,087	84,320	54,019	133,820	89,000	86,309	115,863	213,000	
Periodicals		28,495	36,374	37,523	31,738		48,000	51,762	128,375	112,661	
A/V		11,064	6,072	13,296	9,010		11,000	10,667			
Software							100				
Microforms											
Blinding											
Other											
Total Materials		130166	132533	135139	94767	133,820	148100	148738	244238	325661	
Materials %		15.7	15.6	16.7	11.7	19.8	17.2	17.3	22.2	22.7	
HOLDINGS											
Books		56,529	60,717	66,846	65,487	71,736	84,355	86,290	84,139	94,515	
Subscriptions				538	590	450	602	660	783	1,002	
Microforms		747	758	758	348	1,173	400	450	450		
A/V		2511	2552	2558	2575	5,026	4,629	5,111	4,871	4,969	
Film		126	147	94	96	166					
Video		479	607	711	858	855	1,689	1,875	1,955		
Software							1			3	
Pamphlets									5,985	7,980	
Enrolment		2,972	3,325	3,186	2,951	2,964	3,115	3,408	3,556	4,381	3,622
Lib \$/Student		278.68	255.85	254.23	274.48	228.59	163.11	252.89	242.23	251.06	396.06
Books/Student		19.0	18.3	21.0	22.2	24.2	24.8	24.3	19.2	26.1	
Micro/Student		0.3	0.2	0.2	0.1	0.4	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1	
CIRCULATION											
Total		50,905	66,559	112,675	65,156	62,016	64,910	74,639	78,281	93,222	107,124
Loans/Student		17.1	20.0	35.4	22.1	20.9	20.8	21.9	22.0	21.3	29.6
ILL BORROWING											
Titles - NET		265	182		144						
Titles - Non-NET		1	6		2						
Total Titles		266	188		146						

1981/82 1982/83 1983/84 1984/85 1985/86 1986/87 1987/88 1988/89 1989/90 1990/91
ILL BORROWING (cont.) **ILL BORROWING (cont.)**

Copies - NET	157	111	88							
Copies - Non/NET	14	6	18							
Total Copies	171	117	106							
Total NET Items	422	293	232	97	132	169	158	454	1241	
Total Non-NET It.	15	12	20							
TOTAL BORROWED	437	305	252	97	132	169	158	454	1241	
Copies % of Total	39.1	38.4	42.1							
NET % of Total	96.6	96.1	92.1							

ILL LENDING

Titles - NET	222	177	171							
Titles - Non-NET	11	24	33							
Total Titles	233	201	204							
Copies - NET	20	15	14							
Copies - Non-NET										
Total Copies	20	15	14							
Total NET Items	242	192	185	65	89	64	54	36	31	
Total Non-NET It.	11	24	33							
TOTAL LOANED	253	216	218	65	89	64	54	36	31	
Copies % of Total	7.9	6.9	6.4							
NET % of Total	95.7	88.9	84.9							

% Circ:Borrowing	0.9	0.5	0.2	0.4	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.5	1.2	
% Circ:Lending	0.5	0.3	0.1	0.3	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.0	0.0	
Net Print Loans	-184	-89	-101	-34	-43	-105	-104	-418	-1210	

MEDIA BORROWED

MEC	379	251	223	276	274	214	196	184	178	
Non-MEC	1281	984	781	895	594	466	474	523	515	
Total	1660	1235	1004	1171	868	680	670	707	693	
MEC % of Total	22.8	20.3	22.2	23.6	31.6	31.5	29.3	26.0	25.7	

MEDIA LOANED

MEC				7	45	34	30	26	19	
Non-MEC				108	575	618	443	628	1248	
Total	61	113	64	128	620	652	473	654	1267	
MEC % of Total				15.6	7.3	5.2	6.3	4.0	1.5	
Net Media Loans	-1899	-1122	-940	-1043	-248	-28	-197	-53	574	

Table 34: College Of New Caledonia

EXPENDITURES		1981/82	1982/83	1983/84	1984/85	1985/86	1986/87	1987/88	1988/89	1989/90	1990/91
Institution				14,812,000	15,307,000	15,272,000	16,414,000	18,125,000	20,221,000	22,792,000	
Library		587,632	628,400	598,968	513,017	517,956	511,139	665,289	723,015	778,691	
Library%				3.5	3.4	3.3	4.1	3.7	3.6	3.4	
Books		127,620	121,140	165,861	102,547	98,752	101,372	65,788	93,327	93,000	88,833
Periodicals								39,570	46,166	46,000	45,498
A/V											
Software											
Microforms		6,000	6,000	8,867	7,000	8,391	7625.0				
Blinding											
Other											
Total Materials		133620	127140	174768	109547	107,143	101,372	105358	139493	139000	134331
Materials %		22.7	20.2	29.2	21.4	20.7	19.8	15.8	21.0	19.2	17.3
HOLDINGS											
Books		61,331	69,895	75,861	82,641	84,550	92,900	95,287	93,398	104,550	112,400
Subscriptions		750	760	770	774	756	599	633	706	720	720
Microforms		2,360	2,400	2,670	2,870	3,691	2,523	2,652	2,700	2,700	2,830
A/V		1,816	1,944	2,017	2,059	4,268	4,500	5,010	5,390	5,390	4,030
Film		353	353	359	443	445					
Video		393	1,080	1,663	1,768	1,578	192	2,510	2,900	2,900	2,240
Software											
Pamphlets		81	114	155	158			6,000	6,500	6,500	13,240
Enrolment		2,487	2,764	2,786	2,521	2,731	2,545	2,809	2,681	2,794	2,488
Lib \$/Student		236.28	227.35	214.99	203.50	189.66	200.84	236.84	248.15	258.77	312.98
Books/Student		24.7	25.3	27.2	32.8	31.0	36.5	33.9	34.8	37.4	45.2
Micro/Student		0.9	0.9	1.0	1.1	1.4	0.9	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.1
CIRCULATION											
Total		61,105	70,388	82,720	71,022	88,857	103,418	106,593	109,657	115,922	121,613
Loans/Student		24.6	25.5	29.7	28.2	32.9	40.6	37.9	40.9	41.5	48.9
ILL BORROWING											
Titles - NET		1054	878	1706	788	957	987				
Titles - Non-NET		75	23	97	73	86	155				
Total Titles		1129	901	1803	861	1043	1142				

1981/82 1982/83 1983/84 1984/85 1985/86 1986/87 1987/88 1988/89 1989/90 1990/91

ILL BORROWING (cont.)										
										ILL BORROWING (cont.)
Copies - NET	779	835	926	549	645	816				Copies - NET
Copies - Non/NET	36	18	58	31	122	151				Copies - Non/NET
Total Copies	815	853	984	580	767	967				Total Copies
Total NET Items	1833	1713	2632	1337	1602	1803	2040	1875	1331	910
Total Non-NET It.	111	41	155	104	208	306	565	1023	1452	1957
TOTAL BORROWED	1944	1754	2787	1441	1810	2109	2805	2898	2783	2867
Copies % of Total	41.9	48.6	35.3	40.2	42.4	45.9	78.3	0.0	64.7	0.0
NET % of Total	94.3	97.7	94.4	92.8	88.5	85.5	78.3	64.7	47.8	31.7

ILL LENDING										
										ILL LENDING
Titles - NET	167	124	911	756	778	1025				Titles - NET
Titles - Non-NET	5	10	31	50	50	25				Titles - Non-NET
Total Titles	172	134	942	806	828	1050				Total Titles
Copies - NET	28	11	48	76	40	107				Copies - NET
Copies - Non-NET			2	1	11	4				Copies - Non-NET
Total Copies	28	12	50	77	51	111				Total Copies
Total NET Items	195	135	959	832	818	1132	81	52	47	42
Total Non-NET It.	5	11	33	51	61	29	1433	1329	1830	1341
TOTAL LOANED	200	146	992	883	879	1161	1514	1381	1877	1383
Copies % of Total	14.0	8.2	5.0	8.7	5.8	9.6	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
NET % of Total	97.5	92.5	96.7	94.2	93.1	97.5	5.4	3.8	2.5	3.0

% Circ:Borrowing	3.2	2.5	3.4	2.0	2.0	2.0	2.4	2.6	2.4	2.4
% Circ:Lending	0.3	0.2	1.2	1.2	1.0	1.1	1.4	1.3	1.6	1.1
Net Print Loans	-1744	-1608	-1795	-558	-831	-948	-1091	-1517	-906	-1484

MEDIA BORROWED										
										MEDIA BORROWED
MEC			40	36	51	37	68	58	36	MEC
Non-MEC						410	338	290	261	Non-MEC
Total						447	406	348	297	Total
MEC % of Total						8.3	16.7	16.7	12.1	MEC % of Total

MEDIA LOANED										
										MEDIA LOANED
MEC			10	27	35	43	14	45	15	MEC
Non-MEC						358	434	498	387	Non-MEC
Total						401	448	543	402	Total
MEC % of Total						10.7	3.1	8.3	3.7	MEC % of Total
Net Media Loans			10	27	35	-46	42	195	105	Net Media Loans

Table 36: Northern Lights College

EXPENDITURES	1981/82	1982/83	1983/84	1984/85	1985/86	1986/87	1987/88	1988/89	1989/90	1990/91
EXPENDITURES										
Institution				7,019,000	7,310,000	7,505,000	8,609,000	9,420,000	11,244,000	12,013,000
Library	208,704	148,607		196,119	196,329	173,590	173,590	262,972	248,724	
Library%				2.7	2.6	2.0	1.8	2.3	2.1	
Books				16,801	21,314	22,000	24,707	29,049	19,719	
Periodicals						14,000				
A/V										
Software										
Microforms										
Blinding										
Other										
Total Materials	37,536	21,085	27,168	16,801	21,314	36,000	44,350	24,707	48,768	
Materials %	18.0	14.2		8.6	10.9	20.7	25.5	9.4	19.6	
HOLDINGS										
Books	22,632	25,429		26,505	25,903	26,620	27,608	27,738	29,474	31,272
Subscriptions	237	237		252	263	295	294	289	295	301
Microforms	287	95		300	300	83	83	96	96	96
A/V	504	1,014			2,576		2,153	827	830	830
Film	49	49		49	49					
Video	504	1,224		1,450	1,750			165	201	201
Software										
Pamphlets										
Enrollment	1,103	1,048	1,195	1,404	1,213	1,016	1,075	978	1,055	982
Lib \$/Student	189.21	141.80		161.68	193.24	161.48	177.66	249.26	253.28	
Books/Student	20.5	24.3		18.9	21.4	26.2	25.7	28.4	27.9	31.8
Micro/Student	0.3	0.1		0.2	0.2	0.1	0.1		0.1	0.1
CIRCULATION										
Total	7,765	11,544		5,286	13,651	8,605	7,766	11,291	12,803	
Loans/Student	7.0	11.0		4.4	13.4	8.0	7.9	10.7	13.0	
ILL BORROWING										
Titles - NET	214	93	82	78	107	288	254	241	350	303
Titles - Non-NET		33			130			37		51
Total Titles	214	126	82	78	237	288	254	241	387	354

1981/82 1982/83 1983/84 1984/85 1985/86 1986/87 1987/88 1988/89 1989/90 1990/91

ILL BORROWING (cont.)										
Copies - NET										
Copies - Non/NET										
Total Copies										
Total NET Items	214	93	82	78	107	288	254	241	350	303
Total Non-NET It.	33	33	82	78	130	288	254	241	37	51
TOTAL BORROWED	214	126	82	78	237	288	254	241	387	354
Copies % of Total		73.8			45.1				90.4	85.6
NET % of Total										

ILL LENDING										
Titles - NET										
Titles - Non-NET										
Total Titles										
Copies - NET										
Copies - Non-NET										
Total Copies										
Total NET Items										
Total Non-NET It.										
TOTAL LOANED										
Copies % of Total										
NET % of Total										
Titles - NET	34	38	16	16	6	14	33	7	4	7
Titles - Non-NET	29	29	16	16	52	38	33	7	35	54
Total Titles	34	67	16	16	58	52	33	7	39	61
Copies - NET										
Copies - Non-NET										
Total Copies										
Total NET Items	34	38	16	16	6	14	33	7	4	7
Total Non-NET It.	29	29	16	16	52	38	33	7	35	54
TOTAL LOANED	34	67	16	16	58	52	33	7	39	61
Copies % of Total		56.7			10.3	26.9			10.3	11.5
NET % of Total										

% Circ:Borrowing	2.8	1.1			4.5	2.1	3.0	3.1	3.4	2.8
% Circ:Lending	0.4	0.6			1.1	0.4	0.4	0.1	0.3	0.5
Net Print Loans	-180	-59	-66	-62	-179	-236	-221	-234	-348	-293

MEDIA BORROWED										
MEC										
Non-MEC										
Total										
MEC % of Total										
MEC			29	20	20	20	49	22	20	48
Non-MEC									192	186
Total			29	20	20	20	49	22	212	234
MEC % of Total									9.4	20.5

MEDIA LOANED										
MEC										
Non-MEC										
Total										
MEC % of Total										
Net Media Loans										
MEC			3	4	1	5	5	7	3	3
Non-MEC								13	11	11
Total			3	4	1	5	5	20	14	14
MEC % of Total								35.0	21.4	21.4
Net Media Loans			-26	-16	-19	-44	-22	-192	-220	-220

Table 37: Northwest Community College

	1981/82	1982/83	1983/84	1984/85	1985/86	1986/87	1987/88	1988/89	1989/90	1990/91	
EXPENDITURES											
Institution				7,856,000	7,679,000	7,934,000	9,008,000	9,322,000	11,278,000	11,897,000	Institution
Library	319,272			475,882	183,703	233,891	196,026	302,667	336,947		Library
Library%				6.2	2.3	2.6	2.1	2.7	2.8		Library%
Books	36,605	68,750		18,286	10,286	4,000	8,000	33,000	22,800		Books
Periodicals						9,523	9,500	14,500	14,000		Periodicals
A/V	49,000	6,000		12,000	8,000	7,122					A/V
Software											Software
Microforms	5,000					200					Microforms
Binding											Binding
Other											Other
Total Materials	90605	74750	60,500	30,286	18,286	20845	17500	47500	36800		Total Materials
Materials %	28.4			6.4	10.0	8.9	8.9	15.7	10.9		Materials %
HOLDINGS											
Books	21,338	23,018		19,720	20,670	20,670	20,154	22,262	23,381	26,571	Books
Subscriptions	390	366		423	473	452	323	376	393	417	Subscriptions
Microforms	92	92		480	483		1,595	1,595	1,595	1,595	Microforms
A/V	573	624		5,046	5,046		1,836	1,613	1,967	1,946	A/V
Film	103	103		143	141	141					Film
Video	376	333		865	977	974		1,281	1,312	1,374	Video
Software							18	20	18	20	Software
Pamphlets								5,985		8,645	Pamphlets
Enrolment	890	1,063	1,080	968	906	958	992	954	1,053	1,067	Enrolment
Lib \$/Student	358.73	0.00	0.00	0.00	525.26	191.76	235.78	205.48	287.43	315.79	Lib \$/Student
Books/Student	24.0	21.7		20.4	22.8	21.6	20.3	23.3	22.2	24.9	Books/Student
Micro/Student	0.6	0.6		0.5	0.5		1.6	1.7	1.9	1.5	Micro/Student
CIRCULATION											
Total	10,959	13,532	12,151	9,899	10,244	12,047.0	12,301	15,235	16,087	17,345	Total
Loans/Student	12.3	12.7	11.3	10.2	11.3	12.6	12.4	16.0	15.3	16.3	Loans/Student
ILL BORROWING											
Titles - NET				91			116	71	286	223	Titles - NET
Titles - Non-NET									110		Titles - Non-NET
Total Titles	292	159		91			116	71	396	223	Total Titles

1981/82 1982/83 1983/84 1984/85 1985/86 1986/87 1987/88 1988/89 1989/90 1990/91
ILL BORROWING (cont.) **ILL BORROWING (cont.)**

	1981/82	1982/83	1983/84	1984/85	1985/86	1986/87	1987/88	1988/89	1989/90	1990/91
Copies - NET									131	91
Copies - Non/NET										21
Total Copies	85	37		5					131	112
Total NET Items	31	195	242	91	88	81	116	71	417	314
Total Non-NET It.	346			5	24	22			110	21
TOTAL BORROWED	377	195	242	96	112	103	116	71	527	335
Copies % of Total	22.5	19.0		5.2					24.9	33.4
NET % of Total	8.2			94.8	78.6	78.6			79.1	93.7

	ILL LENDING	
	Titles - NET	Titles - Non-NET
Titles - NET	2	11
Titles - Non-NET	10	26
Total Titles	12	37
Copies - NET		2
Copies - Non-NET		
Total Copies	2	2
Total NET Items	31	25
Total Non-NET It.		19
TOTAL LOANED	31	19
Copies % of Total		8
NET % of Total		16.7

% Circ:Borrowing	3.4	1.4	2.0	1.0	1.1	0.9	0.9	0.5	3.3	1.9
% Circ:Lending	0.3	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.1	0.2	0.1		0.1	0.2
Net Print Loans	-346	-170	-223	-77	-104	-81	-108	-65	-515	-296

	MEDIA BORROWED	
	MEC	Non-MEC
MEC	598	125
Non-MEC		80
Total	598	125
MEC % of Total		50.0

	MEDIA LOANED	
	MEC	Non-MEC
MEC	49	43
Non-MEC		46
Total	49	43
MEC % of Total		35.2

Net Media Loans	-549	-82	-21	-49	-89	-101	-65	-159	-159
------------------------	------	-----	-----	-----	-----	------	-----	------	------

1981/82 1982/83 1983/84 1984/85 1985/86 1986/87 1987/88 1988/89 1989/90 1990/91
ILL BORROWING (cont.) **ILL BORROWING (cont.)**

Copies - NET	1981/82	1982/83	1983/84	1984/85	1985/86	1986/87	1987/88	1988/89	1989/90	1990/91
Copies - Non/NET										
Total Copies	202	167	159	117	127	149	177	190	1282	1989
Total NET Items	71	32	92	151	155	184	184	143	668	669
TOTAL BORROWED	273	199	251	268	127	304	361	333	1950	2658
Copies % of Total	74.0	83.9	63.3	43.7	49.0	49.0	49.0	57.1	65.7	74.8
NET % of Total										

ILL LENDING	1981/82	1982/83	1983/84	1984/85	1985/86	1986/87	1987/88	1988/89	1989/90	1990/91
Titles - NET										
Titles - Non-NET										
Total Titles	124	134	86	65	43	51	39	25	29	39
Copies - NET	162	160	147	94	52	52	14	12	31	3
Copies - Non-NET	286	294	233	159	43	103	53	37	60	42
Total Copies	43.4	45.6	36.9	40.9	49.5	49.5	73.6	67.6	48.3	92.9
Total NET Items	0.4	0.3	0.4	0.4	0.2	0.3	0.4	0.4	1.7	1.8
Total Non-NET It.	.4	.4	.3	.3	.1	.1	.1	.0	.1	.0
TOTAL LOANED	13	95	-18	-109	-84	-201	-308	-296	-1890	-2616
Copies % of Total										
NET % of Total										

MEDIA BORROWED	1981/82	1982/83	1983/84	1984/85	1985/86	1986/87	1987/88	1988/89	1989/90	1990/91
MEC	75	128	100	111	122	153	159	159	159	159
Non-MEC										
Total	75	128	100	111	122	153	159	159	159	159
MEC % of Total										

MEDIA LOANED	1981/82	1982/83	1983/84	1984/85	1985/86	1986/87	1987/88	1988/89	1989/90	1990/91
MEC	32	36	66	60	67	67	40	40	40	40
Non-MEC										
Total	32	36	66	60	67	67	40	40	40	40
MEC % of Total										

Net Media Loans	1981/82	1982/83	1983/84	1984/85	1985/86	1986/87	1987/88	1988/89	1989/90	1990/91
Net Media Loans	-43	-128	-64	-45	-62	-86	-119	-86	-119	-119

1981/82 1982/83 1983/84 1984/85 1985/86 1986/87 1987/88 1988/89 1989/90 1990/91

ILL BORROWING (cont.)										
	1981/82	1982/83	1983/84	1984/85	1985/86	1986/87	1987/88	1988/89	1989/90	1990/91
Copies - NET										
Copies - Non/NET										
Total Copies										
Total NET Items	42	31	92	135	50	81	98	40	50	59
Total Non-NET It.										
TOTAL BORROWED	42	31	92	135	50	81	98	387	415	581
Copies % of Total								10.3	12.0	10.2
NET % of Total										

ILL LENDING										
	1981/82	1982/83	1983/84	1984/85	1985/86	1986/87	1987/88	1988/89	1989/90	1990/91
Titles - NET										
Titles - Non-NET										
Total Titles										
Copies - NET										
Copies - Non-NET										
Total Copies										
Total NET Items	21	19	16	6	5	35				13
Total Non-NET It.										
TOTAL LOANED	21	19	16	6	5	35		10		24
Copies % of Total										
NET % of Total										54.2

% Circ:Borrowing								9.5		11.9
% Circ:Lending								0.2		0.5
Net Print Loans	-21	-12	-76	-129	-45	-46	-98	-387	-405	-557

MEDIA BORROWED		
MEC		
Non-MEC		
Total	20	100
MEC % of Total		

MEDIA LOANED		
MEC		
Non-MEC		
Total		
MEC % of Total		
Net Media Loans	-20	-100

Table 40: Pacific Marine Training Institute

		1981/82	1982/83	1983/84	1984/85	1985/86	1986/87	1987/88	1988/89	1989/90	1990/91	EXPENDITURES	
EXPENDITURES													
Institution					1,924,000	1,984,000	1,935,000	2,078,000	2,271,000	2,814,000	3,477,000	Institution	
Library		28,397	39,168	36,270	43,050	44,193	54,840	65,312	84,298	Library			
Library%					2.2	2.3	2.4	2.3	2.4	2.3	2.4	Library%	
Books				6,091	6,450	7,046	4,540	12,425	12,192	Books			
Periodicals							5,760	6,424	7,960	Periodicals			
A/V				2,407	6,681	6,333	5,822	4,368	10,834	A/V			
Software												Software	
Microforms												Microforms	
Blinding												Blinding	
Other												Other	
Total Materials		5,682	13,172	8498	13,131	13,379	16,122	23,217	30,986	Total Materials			
Materials %		20.0	33.6	23.4	30.5	30.3	29.4	35.5	36.8	Materials %			
HOLDINGS													
Books		1,915	2,330	2,450	2,586	2,565	2,614	3,014	3,290	Books			
Subscriptions		49	56	55	54	56	60	72	75	Subscriptions			
Microforms					43	58	130	130	130	Microforms			
A/V		12			373		290	389	466	A/V			
Film		108		124	122	132	173			Film			
Video		4	9	37	77	84	173	132	208	Video			
Software								73	78	Software			
Pamphlets							350	370	400	Pamphlets			
Enrolment		146	139	211	156	229	134	140	205	235	172	Enrolment	
Lib \$/Student		194.50	281.78	171.90	0.00	187.99	329.80	267.51	277.92	490.10	Lib \$/Student		
Books/Student		13.1	16.8	11.6	16.6	11.7	19.1	12.8	12.8	19.1	Books/Student		
Micro/Student					0.2	0.4	0.6	0.6	0.6	0.8	Micro/Student		
CIRCULATION													
Total		9,410		7,875			5,122	3,526				Total	
Loans/Student		64.5		37.3			25.0	15.0				Loans/Student	
ILL BORROWING													
Titles - NET												Titles - NET	
Titles - Non-NET												Titles - Non-NET	
Total Titles												Total Titles	

1981/82 1982/83 1983/84 1984/85 1985/86 1986/87 1987/88 1988/89 1989/90 1990/91

ILL BORROWING (cont.)

ILL BORROWING (cont.)	1981/82	1982/83	1983/84	1984/85	1985/86	1986/87	1987/88	1988/89	1989/90	1990/91
Copies - NET										
Copies - Non/NET										
Total Copies										
Total NET Items										
Total Non-NET It.										
TOTAL BORROWED										
Copies % of Total										
NET % of Total										

ILL LENDING	1981/82	1982/83	1983/84	1984/85	1985/86	1986/87	1987/88	1988/89	1989/90	1990/91
ILL LENDING										
Titles - NET										
Titles - Non-NET										
Total Titles										
Copies - NET										
Copies - Non-NET										
Total Copies										
Total NET Items										
Total Non-NET It.										
TOTAL LOANED										
Copies % of Total										
NET % of Total										

% Circ:Borrowing										
% Circ:Lending										
Net Print Loans										

MEDIA BORROWED	1981/82	1982/83	1983/84	1984/85	1985/86	1986/87	1987/88	1988/89	1989/90	1990/91
MEDIA BORROWED										
MEC										
Non-MEC										
Total										
MEC % of Total										

MEDIA LOANED	1981/82	1982/83	1983/84	1984/85	1985/86	1986/87	1987/88	1988/89	1989/90	1990/91
MEDIA LOANED										
MEC										
Non-MEC										
Total										
MEC % of Total										

Net Media Loans										
-----------------	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

	1981/82	1982/83	1983/84	1984/85	1985/86	1986/87	1987/88	1988/89	1989/90	1990/91
ILL BORROWING (cont.)										
Copies - NET										
Copies - Non/NET										
Total Copies										
Total NET Items	326	357	205	304	234	250	238	169	295	263
Total Non-NET It.	300	285	59	12	74	109	261	128	138	133
TOTAL BORROWED	626	642	264	316	308	359	499	297	433	396
Copies % of Total										
NET % of Total	52.1	55.6	77.7	96.2	76.0	69.6	47.7	56.9	68.1	66.4
ILL LENDING										
Titles - NET										
Titles - Non-NET										
Total Titles										
Copies - NET										
Copies - Non-NET										
Total Copies										
Total NET Items	218	127	126	104	56	72	44	80	57	55
Total Non-NET It.	518	589	354	261	223	602	460	531	400	382
TOTAL LOANED	736	716	480	365	279	674	504	611	457	437
Copies % of Total										
NET % of Total	29.6	17.7	26.3	28.5	20.1	10.7	8.7	13.1	12.5	12.6
% Circ:Borrowing	2.8	2.7	1.1	1.4	1.4	1.4	1.8	1.1	1.5	1.2
% Circ:Lending	3.3	3.0	2.0	1.6	1.2	2.5	1.8	2.2	1.5	1.4
Net Print Loans	110	74	216	49	-29	315	5	314	24	41
MEDIA BORROWED										
MEC				130	165	196	199	139	134	140
Non-MEC				246	297	248	354	134	199	215
Total	674	713	658	376	462	444	553	273	333	355
MEC % of Total				34.6	35.7	44.1	36.0	50.9	40.2	39.4
MEDIA LOANED										
MEC				97	86	107	97	60	81	81
Non-MEC				411	719	777	558	273	149	227
Total	179	185	148	508	805	884	655	333	230	308
MEC % of Total				19.1	10.7	12.1	14.8	18.0	35.2	26.3
Net Media Loans	-495	-528	-510	132	343	440	102	60	-103	-47

Table 42: Vancouver Community College

		1981/82	1982/83	1983/84	1984/85	1985/86	1986/87	1987/88	1988/89	1989/90	1990/91
EXPENDITURES											
Institution					52,306,000	52,844,000	54,801,000	58,092,000	60,509,000	66,265,000	71,072,000
Library		1,373,483	1,575,106	1,551,531	1,427,745	1,522,663	1,513,484	1,630,467	1,803,890	2,132,023	2,387,130
Library%				2.7	2.9	2.8	2.8	2.8	3.0	3.2	3.4
EXPENDITURES											
Books		118,163	213,836	146,118				156,999	138,012	168,981	117,369
Periodicals								56,000	59,000	64,000	74,868
A/V		31,759	24,239	31,840				38,250	27,295	46,739	40,519
Software											1,042
Microforms		6,000	4,000	4,500							
Blinding											
Other											
Total Materials		155,912	242,075	182,458	134,258	185,053	210,081	251,249	224,307	279,720	233,798
Materials %		11.4	15.4	11.8	9.4	12.2	13.9	15.4	12.4	13.1	9.8
HOLDINGS											
Books		115,134	120,297	126,309		124,095		143,158	147,562	153,075	155,670
Subscriptions		1,376	1,485	1,501		1,581		1,707	1,811	2,939	1,333
Microforms		6,216	9,538	11,049		37,486		43,854	48,825	52,452	8,751
A/V		44,242	46,094	43,661		16,311		37,077	29,045	44,468	39,020
Film		834	967	1,016		1,193					
Video		719	764	1,063		1,759		3,190	4,213	4,756	
Software						255		569	679	1,010	965
Pamphlets											39,302
EXPENDITURES											
Enrolment		9,257	9,823	10,113	9,858	10,060	10,008	10,642	10,058	9,763	10,364
Lib \$/Student		148.37	160.35	153.42	144.83	151.36	151.23	153.21	179.35	218.38	230.33
Books/Student		12.4	12.2	12.5		12.3		13.5	14.7	15.7	15.0
Micro/Student		0.7	1.0	1.1		3.7		4.1	4.9	5.4	0.8
CIRCULATION											
Total		198,826	212,790	222,252		252,390	261,813	303,462	274,875	310,118	258,092
Loans/Student		21.5	21.7	22.0		25.1	28.2	28.5	27.3	31.8	24.9
ILL BORROWING											
Titles - NET		823	1,323	1,008	558	719	912	1,063	897	535	491
Titles - Non-NET			150	50	50	57	84	108	61	71	51
Total Titles		823	1323	1158	608	776	996	1171	958	606	542

ILL BORROWING (cont.)		1981/82	1982/83	1983/84	1984/85	1985/86	1986/87	1987/88	1988/89	1989/90	1990/91
Copies - NET	572	618	532	406	431	558	888	819	504	504	504
Copies - Non/NET		37	41	49	81	107	94	81	67	67	67
Total Copies	572	618	569	447	480	665	982	900	594	594	571
Total NET Items	1,395	1,941	1,540	964	1,150	1,470	1,951	1,716	1,039	1,039	995
Total Non-NET It.		187	91	106	191	202	202	142	161	161	118
TOTAL BORROWED	1,395	1,941	1,727	1,055	1,256	1,661	2,153	1,858	1,200	1,200	1,113
Copies % of Total	41.0	31.8	32.9	42.4	38.2	40.0	45.6	48.4	49.5	49.5	51.3
NET % of Total	100.0	100.0	89.2	91.4	91.6	88.5	90.6	92.4	86.6	86.6	89.4

ILL LENDING		ILL LENDING										
Titles - NET	357	316	211	234	188	181	148	135	125	125	62	
Titles - Non-NET	293	531	82	120	128	120	147	190	243	243	213	
Total Titles	650	847	293	354	316	301	295	325	368	368	275	
Copies - NET		33	69	30	30	17	15	23	25	25	25	
Copies - Non-NET		12	12	9	9	15	18	32	56	56	40	
Total Copies		45	81	39	39	32	33	55	81	81	65	
Total NET Items	357	316	244	303	218	198	163	158	150	150	87	
Total Non-NET It.	293	531	94	132	137	135	165	222	299	299	253	
TOTAL LOANED	650	847	338	435	355	333	328	380	449	449	340	
Copies % of Total		13.3	18.6	11.0	11.0	9.6	10.1	14.5	18.0	18.0	19.1	
NET % of Total	54.9	37.3	72.2	69.7	61.4	59.5	49.7	41.6	33.4	33.4	25.6	

% Circ:Borrowing	0.7	0.9	0.8		0.5	0.6	0.7	0.7	0.4	0.4	0.4
% Circ:Lending	0.3	0.4	0.2		0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1
Net Print Loans	-745	-1,084	-1,389	-620	-901	-1,328	-1,825	-1,478	-751	-751	-773

MEDIA BORROWED		MEDIA BORROWED										
MEC	1,489	1,079		541	638	845	626	531	511	511	431	
Non-MEC	603	800	1,736	1,116	839	887	863	868	586	586	1,004	
Total	2,092	1,879	1,736	1,657	1,477	1,732	1,489	1,399	1,097	1,097	1,435	
MEC % of Total	71.2	57.4		32.6	43.2	48.8	42.0	38.0	46.6	46.6	30.0	

MEDIA LOANED		MEDIA LOANED										
MEC	677	848		238	456	461	536	438	336	336	306	
Non-MEC	876	507	577	196	341	143	152	212	99	99	65	
Total	1,553	1,355	577	434	797	604	688	650	435	435	371	
MEC % of Total	43.6	62.6		54.8	57.2	76.3	77.9	67.4	77.2	77.2	82.5	
Net Media Loans	-539	-524	-1,159	-1,223	-680	-1,128	-801	-749	-662	-662	-1,064	

M100218
Printed by Open Learning Agency
Copyright ©1993