This was followed by a series of emergency planning and salvage priority tours of the Library and Special Collections. These focussed on the location of salvage priorities in both areas, and understanding when an incident can be dealt with locally or needs to be escalated. Emergency response equipment boxes were assessed to understand how they could be used to deal with small-scale incidents. The tours were also used to recruit staff on to the salvage team. The Library Management Team, duty managers, customer services teams (including weekend and evening teams) and security staff have all taken the tour, and as a result 59 library and security staff now have detailed knowledge of how to respond to a disaster.

Next steps

Further practical training is planned for the Library Management Team and Salvage Team which will focus on applying the plan to a variety of scenarios. The Library Management Team will meet the University Press Office to generate pre-approved press statements to be issued swiftly in the event of an emergency.

In Special Collections, our Conservators are continuing to create salvage cards for objects and collections, and to purchase conservation-grade boxes for paper archives.

The plan is very much an evolving document and has already had been updated just six months after being published. It will be important to continue to consult with key stakeholders such as Health & Safety, Fire Safety, Security and the Legal team as the plan continues to develop.

About the Authors

Fiona Hughes has worked for Manchester Metropolitan University for 28 years in a variety of roles and has been a member of the Library Management Team since 2005. In 2017 she became responsible for delivering library services to the Arts & Humanities Faculty and managing the university's Special Collections. Her new responsibilities included updating the Library Emergency Management Plan.

Alison Draper is the Decorative Art and Object Conservator for Manchester Metropolitan University Special Collections. This is the University Museum, and includes significant collections of books, objects and archives. She is responsible for all aspects of Collection Care.

Evaluation and mapping: A responsive approach

■ Eloise Carpenter

Introduction

To what extent are library collections meeting user needs? Are collections keeping pace with research and teaching demands? Do library staff have the necessary information to provide evidence-based collection management?

The Library & Archives Service (LAS) of the London School of Hygiene & Tropical Medicine (LSHTM) sought answers to these questions by running a collection evaluation and mapping project throughout 2018. At its completion, the project had reviewed print and electronic book and journal collections held or made accessible by LAS, ascertaining the extent to which these collections supported current research and teaching interests of LSHTM academic-related staff.

Understanding users' evolving information needs and informed development of services delivered by empowered staff are key objectives in the current Library & Archives Service Strategy. The context also included a wider interest in collection evaluation in Higher Education libraries, and collaborative collection management by the University of London Federal Collections Group (FCG).

Research and teaching interests

The project looked at 459 staff profile pages for Assistant Professors, Associate Professors and Professors, converting research and teaching interests into the Library's classification scheme, Barnard. A standardised approach and list of interests mapped to Barnard minimised reader-subjective bias, enabling process repeatability.

Profile pages are a good indicator of interest levels, but varying detail and broad subject descriptors made specifying some interests difficult. There were also classification issues. The Barnard classification scheme is principally designed for medical subjects, and not for detailed cataloguing in social sciences. With LSHTM increasingly engaged in social science and cross-disciplinary research, this issue will become more prominent. In addition, several subjects had no comparable classification, so proved impossible to map.

Print books

The next step was determining content (subject, publication date) and usage of book collections. 19,502 books were analysed at title (not copy) level, facilitating reports in Alma Analytics.

to collection management

Alma Analytics title reports provided collection, publication date (where available), and call number information. Reports required substantial editing due to extraneous data in several fields. The exercise revealed some older titles with no classification, or classified under previous editions of Barnard. Sorting collections by Barnard classification and publication year gave a detailed picture of subject coverage and date range.

Fulfilment reports in Alma Analytics recorded print book circulation. Standardising call number fields allowed grouping of classification data and calculation of loan totals for each subject. Circulation data provided insights into subject usage, although no data was available for books used as reference.

Ebooks

The number of ebooks made accessible by LAS is relatively small. Ebook platforms provided title lists, proving easier than Alma portfolios. Due to different acquisition methods involved, Patron Driven Acquisitions (PDA) were analysed separately. Ebook catalogue records have no classification, so for subject analysis each title had a classification assigned. Analysis was at title level, by classification and date published. COUNTER BR1 and BR2 reports were complete for 2016-17, but not for 2017-18: ProQuest were unable to provide data for titles transferred from MyiLibrary. No meaningful usage comparison was therefore possible between 2016-17 and 2017-18. LAS staff wanted to

analyse zero usage titles, but the process of adding ebooks to Alma includes checking access. During 2017-18, no titles recorded zero usage, but this is not an accurate reflection of user behaviour.

Book expenditure

Alma Analytics invoice reporting proved incomplete, needing supplementary in-house data. Adding classifications to titles enabled data on expenditure per subject, and titles purchased per subject. This project combined print and eBook expenditure. Future projects could separate print and eBook spending – direct and PDA. Results highlighted subjects where expenditure did not reflect academic-related interests and subjects with zero expenditure.

Print journals

The LAS no longer subscribes to print journals, which are located in closed storage areas. Combining and de-duplicating Alma location title lists resulted in 920 unique titles. Each title had a classification added.

Date analysis was not possible except by manually checking 866 fields for holdings, complicated by multiple date ranges. Analysis was by subject only. An unforeseen result was the high number of titles in general medicine, which was due to titles published by medical societies. Collating off-site store title requests provided the only available usage metric for print journals.

Ejournals

Alma electronic collection portfolio reports provided current and backfile title lists. It was impractical to access ejournals for content, so classification was title-based. Title lists were analysed as current (4,070 titles) and backfile (799 titles), and de-duplicated as a combined collection (4,278 titles). No Open Access titles were included. Subjects were strong where large collections or full text database dominated, and for class level subjects: many titles had broad subject themes rather than specific focus. No expenditure analysis was possible due to most titles being part of a collection or database, with no breakdown of pricing by individual title available.

COUNTER JR1 supplied usage data. Analysis included zero usage, which meant laborious checking of title lists for publishers excluding zero usage from JR1. Due to several popular titles making usage very high for one Barnard class, the central tendency for each Barnard class was calculated. A significant number of titles had zero usage, especially where subscription was to a large proportion, or all, of a publisher's titles.

Inter Library Loans (ILL)

To enable subject analysis, completed ILL requests made by users needed classifications added. Alma reporting had several limitations: there is no journal title field for articles, for example, and inconsistencies in request fields due to input variations. The 1,033 requests

indicated demand for titles and subjects currently not met by Library collections. User categories showed different demands, but further data is required to identify trends.

Staff survey

The LAS sought academic-related staff involvement in the project. However, it proved very challenging to engage staff. Emails were sent to selected staff matching top 20 research interests for each Faculty, asking for top 5 must-have books and/or journals. The response rate was 24%. Results were therefore not statistically significant, though they indicated a high proportion of must-have titles held in the Library collection.

Copac Collections Management (CCM)

The selection criteria used for identifying libraries to match holdings with was that they were members of the FCG or that they were libraries that we had compared our holdings with in previous projects. Holding comparison was limited to titles with ISBNs or ISSNs.

Importing Alma holdings into CCM was straightforward. However, checking discrepancies in the results was a time-consuming process. Classification comparison was impossible due to CCM search parameters and other libraries not using Barnard. Results showed title overlap and title uniqueness with peer libraries, albeit for more recently published resources.

Collection mapping

Mapping collections and staff interests presented significant challenges. For example:

- Staff interests varying in specificity
- Classifications focussing on main subject of a resource
- Resource formats or classifications not suited to all subjects, or subject granularity
- Percentage matching skewed by staff profile options and size of collections
- Resource numbers by themselves not necessarily showing that the Library was meeting, or missing, academic needs
- Numbers not measuring quality, relevance or timeliness of resources

After deliberation and despite many caveats, two mapping exercises were completed, and the average result taken.

The first step calculated each staff interest as a percentage of all interests. For each collection, the percentage of each classification against the

whole collection was calculated. The initial exercise mapped interests with exact classification matches. The second exercise mapped interests against broader classification groups.

Results were colour coded according to whether collections missed, matched or exceeded academic interests.

Recommendations and next steps

- Faculty engagement to conduct further research on academic interests, especially where mapping indicates that the Library collection is not meeting needs
- Review Library acquisition policies and procedures so they support and align with School research and teaching priorities
- Ensure collections that are subscribed to provide cost-effective access at point of need
- Investigate current cataloguing practices and ways to update Barnard classification scheme, providing metadata-enhancing information retrieval
- Participate in FCG initiatives on collaborative collection management where relevant
- Provide guidance and training to Collection Services team, enabling integration of evaluation into workflows and annual updating of data

About the Author

Eloise Carpenter is the Collection Services Manager at the London School of Hygiene & Tropical Medicine, where she has worked for 6 years. Her role includes responsibility for the procurement, acquisition and management of collections, access to and promotion of resources, and management of the Collection Services team.