

**Library Collection and Services in Support of
the Curriculum and Specialized Research:
AY 2015-2016 Summary**

This summary is a revision and expansion of the previously named “Citation Analysis Study of Faculty Publications and Ph.D. Dissertations.” The expansion allows for the Library to illustrate clearly in one annual report evidence of how the Library collection supports two spheres of activity at PTS: support of the curriculum (course work) and support of specialized research (faculty publications and Ph.D. dissertations).

In preparing the data for this year’s report, the Library expresses thanks to library student assistant Joshua Patrick Wilder, who conducted the detailed citation analysis research summarized in the second half of this report.

Curriculum Support: PTS Course Readings

The Library collection provides excellent support for PTS courses, providing 100% required reserve readings for every course, each semester (approximately 100 courses each semester), either through hard copy access or via full-text electronic access to readings via the “E-reserves” button in each course’s Blackboard site.

Fall 2015 semester courses – required readings	100% full text access
Spring 2016 semester courses – required readings	100% full text access

Specialized Research: 2014-15 Interlibrary Loans

The Library provides loans and documents to researchers around the world via its interlibrary loan networks. Additionally, the Library provides access to external content to PTS faculty and students via these same networks.

Total interlibrary loans and documents provided to other libraries: 1,068
Total interlibrary loans and documents received from other libraries: 130

Specialized Research: 2015 Faculty Publications and Ph.D. Dissertations

Libraries undertake citation analysis projects for a variety of purposes: to assess student and faculty research patterns or skills, to assess library collection and resource usage, to explore any relationships between publication and use patterns for use analysis and collection evaluation, etc. For the initial year of the Citation Analysis Project, citation analysis was used to provide a snapshot of two things: 1) what types of resources PTS faculty and doctoral students use in their published work; and 2) how many of their resources were available to them via the Library’s collections.

The value of this snapshot for the Library is that it provides a way to keep a pulse on how the collection is being used in practice/publication and how our patrons are using or creating other kinds of resources. Over several years, these patterns can grow in value.

*** The very nature of academic inquiry means that it is perfectly healthy for faculty members*

and doctoral students to range far and wide in gathering sources or in undertaking the creation of new original data in their work. The use of a wide variety of sources and source providers is a sign of the strength of patrons' research skills and creativity—an indicator of strong patron information fluency.

Faculty Publications – 2015

This year, the library looked at seven randomly selected faculty publications—journal articles, chapters, or selections from monographs bibliographies from items published in the calendar year of 2015.

What we discovered:

- The Library supplied on average 71.9% (compared to 83.4% in 2014 and 68.6% in 2013) of book and 69.8% (76.3% in 2014 and 88.3% in 2013) of journal article (paper or full-text electronic) resources in faculty publications in 2015.
- Overall, faculty used the Library collection for an average of 71.6% of total sources in published works (books and journal articles).
- Faculty publications for 2015 again indicate a low amount of diversity in source type beyond books and journals: only 2 publications cited archival sources and one referenced open access content available via the web. This is the third year that this characteristic has been noted.

	Book Yes - PTS owns	Book No - Not at PTS	Article Yes - PTS paper journal for this issue/volume	Article - Yes-PTS full-text electronic via Databases	Article Yes- Available full-text via Paper AND Electronic	Article No - No PTS full text access in any format	Archives	Archives PTS Special Collections	Outside PTS	Interview	Dictionary or Encyclopedia owns	Dictionary or Encyclopedia PTS	Collected Data	Unpublished Material	Other Type of Source	Note what kind
2015 Faculty Publications																
Faculty A - VOID																
Faculty B	60	4	6	1	10	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Faculty C	44	50	2	1	0	11	5	0	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	0
Faculty D	13	2	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8
Faculty E	5	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Faculty F	70	13	9	0	6	4	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Faculty G	26	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
TOTALS	218	82	18	2	17	16	6	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	8	370
Books by Percentage (books plus dictionary/encyclopedia): 71.9% total books (218 of 303)																
Articles by Percentage: 69.8% total articles (37 of 53)																
Archives: 100% of total special collections material (6 of 6)																
OTHER TYPES:																
Open access via web	8															
Archival sources total	6															

It is anticipated that this year's data will be of use for both planning relating to reference, information literacy, and collection development. Going forward, it would be ideal to expand the faculty publication sample set, but the task is very time intensive and may not be feasible with current resources.

Ph.D. Student Dissertations – 2015 Graduates

Six Ph.D. dissertations from 2015 graduates were analyzed (from the 8 total doctoral dissertation available full-text in ProQuest; two dissertations were available citation only, not full-text).

What we discovered:

- The Library supplied on average 70.8% (compared to 78.0% in 2014 and 66.8% in 2013) of book and 67.4% (88.2% in 2014 and 68.5% in 2013) of journal article (paper or full-text electronic) resources in Ph.D. dissertations in 2015.
- Overall, doctoral students used the Library collection for an average of 70.0% (82.7% in 2014 and 66.2% in 2013) of total sources in books and journals.
- Ph.D. dissertations reflected a wider range of diversity in source type beyond books and journals than in previous years, including 18 citations for open access material on the web and a number of citations from unpublished material. Interviews and collected original data were cited in two dissertations. Interestingly, this year’s dissertations reflected zero use of archives.

	Book Yes - PTS owns	Book No - Not at PTS	Article Yes - PTS paper journal for this issue/volume	Article - Yes-PTS full-text electronic via databases	Article Yes- Available full-text via Paper AND Electronic any format	Article No - No PTS full text access via Archives	PTS Special Collections	Outside PTS	Interview	Dictionary or Encyclopedia Yes - PTS owns	Dictionary or Encyclopedia No - Not at PTS	Collected Data	Unpublished Material	Other Type of Source Note what kind	Note what kind
2015 PhD Dissertations															
Dissertation A	93	13	9	1	26	1	0	0	0	4	1	0	0	3	
Dissertation B	44	11	3	6	1	19	0	0	0	1	0	1	3	15	
Dissertation C	110	7	6	0	15	2	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	1	
Dissertation D	85	12	8	1	21	3	0	0	0	1	0	0	2	0	
Dissertation E	60	44	2	6	3	17	0	0	0	1	0	0	8	0	
Dissertation F	18	80	7	5	0	16	0	0	1	0	1	0	1	5	
TOTALS	410	167	35	19	66	58	0	0	1	6	4	1	15	24	806
Books by Percentage (books plus dictionary/encyclopedia): 70.8% total books (416 of 587)															
Articles by Percentage:67.4% total articles (120 of 178)															
Archives: none cited															
OTHER TYPES:															
Open access via web	18														
Microform dissertation	1														
Public presentation	1														
Paper	2														
Dissertation	13														
MA Thesis	4														
Unpublished report	1														

Overall Summary

The third year of analysis of citation data suggests that the Library may want to grapple with some key questions in conversation with faculty and students:

- Does the relative lack of diversity in resource type used by faculty and doctoral students signify the need for the Library to cultivate expanded research skills in various kinds of sources? Or is the lack of diversity more inherent to the discipline?

- There is almost no evidence of a regular practice of original data generation through surveys, interviews, discussions, or formal studies. Is this anything the Library should be concerned about?