Interim Report to the Program for Cooperative Cataloging Policy Committee

PCC Task Force on Assessment

Task Force Members
Ana Lupe Cristan, Library of Congress
Jean Hirons, Library of Congress
Glenn Patton, OCLC
Roxanne Sellberg, Northwestern University
Karen Smith-Yoshimura, The Research Libraries Group
Jim Stickman (chair), University of Washington

October 2003

Introduction and Actions Requested

The PCC Task Group on Assessment presents this status report on its work and seeks feedback from the Policy Committee. The Task Group has identified preliminary measures for gathering data to assess the effectiveness of PCC in meeting the needs of its libraries for monographs and serials. Three of these measures are identified for further development.

The TG seeks feedback on these general questions:

- Will the measures, particularly the three selected for immediate development, gather data useful to the Policy Committee?
- Are there suggestions for refinement of the measures?
- Are there additional measures or alternatives the PCC would like to pursue.
- In regard to Measure Three, are there other PCC libraries interested in participating in an expanded pilot to gather data using this model or a variation of it? Do other PCC libraries already gather similar data that could be shared?

The Task Group chose measures focusing on BIBCO and CONSER records or BIBCO records alone, recognizing that further investigation is needed of assessment measures for NACO, SACO.

A copy of the charge to the Task Group is appended as Attachment One.

Overview of Six Assessment Measures

Early in its discussions, the Task Group reviewed two statistical analyses available on BIBCO records in the RLIN data base. Using these analyses as one catalyst for discussion, the Task Group identified the six preliminary assessment measures. The Task Group sought measures that could be implemented sooner, rather than later. In other words, the Task Group tried to identify "low hanging fruit." As it turns out, some of the six preliminary measures hang considerably higher in the tree than it might first appear.

From these six preliminary measures, the Task Group selected three measures to pursue. They are described as Measures One, Two, and Three. Measures One and Two involve continuing work with the bibliographic utilities. Measure Three is a model developed at Northwestern for analyzing cataloging and backlogs within member libraries. Three other measures, Measures Four through Six, were explored. Action on these has been deferred, due to the difficulty in gathering the data.

Measure One: Reports on Language and Dates of Publication

Measure One gathers data on characteristics of BIBCO and CONSER records, focusing on language and date of publication. The resulting reports are intended to provide baseline data to assess the range of BIBCO and CONSER records and to assist in the identification of gaps. These reports may also provide insights into the timeliness of cataloging.

Reports from Karen Smith-Yoshimura on BIBCO records in RLIN are appended as Attachments Two and Three. The attachments also contain descriptions of the methodologies. Similar reports can be run on other formats in the RLIN database.

Draft specifications for reports from OCLC for Measure One are appended in Attachment Four. Glenn Patton and Ed O'Neill led the development of these reports. The draft specifications include a message and recommendation from Glenn Patton on the identification of PCC, BIBCO, and CONSER libraries. That recommendation applies to Measure Two as well.

Identical methodologies are not attempted for OCLC and RLIN reports, given the differences in the organization of the OCLC and RLIN data bases.

If the proposed reports in Measures One and Two warrant continued development, we can work to establish and document regular production cycles within OCLC and RLG.

Measure Two: Cataloging for a Given Period and That Portion which is BIBCO
Measure Two gathers data, for a specific time period, comparing the subset of BIBCO records in one or both of the big utilities with the subset of all BOOKS records in the utilities that are "held" by PCC member libraries. This data can then be used to determine what portion of our collective cataloging for the period was BIBCO. Additional reports can be generated using language, broad subject categories, formats, or other breakdowns.

The information gathered may assist in identifying gaps in coverage and provide insights into the timeliness of cataloging.

Draft specifications for reports from OCLC for this measure are appended in Attachment Three.

Measure Three: Materials Acquired by Member Libraries but not Cataloged
Measure Three attempts to assess, for a specific period of time, those materials acquired by PCC member libraries that were not cataloged (presumably because there was no suitable cataloging copy at the time of acquisitions).

Northwestern University Libraries developed a model illustrating how individual PCC libraries might collect this data.   Please see Attachment Five for a report by Roxanne Sellberg on the NU model. Statistics gathered by NUL are forwarded as a separate file.

As noted in the Introduction, the Task Group is interested in the feedback on the utility of the data gathered in this pilot, and on whether other PCC libraries would be interested in participating in an expanded pilot to gather data using this model or a variation of it. The Task Group is also interested in whether other PCC libraries gather similar data that could be shared.

Measure Four: Timing of Original Record Creation, PCC Upgrades, and Record Use
by PCC Libraries and non-PCC Libraries

By using data from the utilities about PCC upgrades, the goal of measure four would be to answer several questions, including: A) what is the gap between the original creation of the records until the upgrades; and, B) what portion of the holding libraries used the records before the upgrade and what portion used the record after they were upgraded to PCC?   If the majority of libraries use the record before the upgrade, then the upgrade has not been very useful. If the majority of libraries use the record after the upgrade, then either the upgrade was very timely, or the other libraries held materials for how ever long it took for a PCC version to appear.

The TG deferred action of this measure because gathering of this data is quite difficult. The reasons vary according to the structures of the OCLC and RLIN data bases.   The TG remains interested in these questions. If the Policy Committee shares this interest, the TG will continue to look for opportunities to pursue this data.

Measure Five: PCC Cataloging and Older Materials

The goal of measure five would be to assess timeliness by comparing publication dates with the time the PCC records were submitted. For example, is it worthwhile (in terms of usefulness to other libraries for cataloging purposes) to contribute PCC records for older books?   How often do others attach holdings to PCC records for books more than 5, 10, or 20 years old? Or, more generally, what is the rate of use of records for materials published 1, 2, 3, 5, and 10 years ago?

The RLIN reports in Attachments One and Two provide insight into answers to some of these questions. Questions about the rate of use and whether the record was a PCC record at the time other libraries use it are, as noted in Measure Four, more difficult to answer.   The TG deferred action on this measure, focusing, for now, on Measures One, Two, and Three.

Measure Six: Average Use of PCC Records by PCC and non-RCC members

The goal of measure six would be to assess how often PCC records are used by both PCC and non-PCC members and compare this to average use of member records general.

The TG remains interested in this measure but deferred action for now, since some of this information would be gathered as part of Measure One. The TG recommends continued deferral pending results of Measure One.

Next Steps
The next steps for the Task Group depend on feedback from the Policy Committee especially in regard to the three measures identified for further development. The Policy Committee may need time following its November meeting to provide that feedback.

Assuming that development with measures one and two proceeds, the Task Group can work with OCLC and RLG on the production of the proposed reports on a regular cycle consistent with the capabilities of the utilities. As part of this effort, the means and process for gathering the data would be documented.

Assuming that development proceeds with Measure Three, the Task Group would invite participation from other PCC libraries in an expanded pilot to determine whether this is a practicable means for data collection.

If there are suggestions from the Policy Committee regarding alternative measures for BIBCO and CONSER, the Task Group can investigate them.

As the development of Measures One, Two, and/or Three proceeds, the Task Group will pick up its assignment to identify data useful to the assessment of other areas of the Program.

To accomplish the above, the Task Group will need an extension of its deadline, possibly to the next annual meeting in 2004. A review of the membership of the Task Group is also warranted given changes that have occurred or will occur by November 2004.

PCC Task Group on Assessment
Charge

Charge:
    The Task Group on Assessment is charged with identifying data that would be useful to the Policy Committee in assessing the effectiveness of the Program in meeting the needs of libraries for cataloging records and authoritative headings. Specifically, the Task Group should:

1) identify measures to assess the extent to which PCC records cover the range of new materials acquired by PCC member libraries;
2) propose data needed to identify gaps in coverage of specific subjects, languages, and formats;
3) include measures of the timeliness with which new records are available;
4) propose practicable means by which such data could be collected, with the assistance of the bibliographic utilities and/or selected member libraries.

Timeline:
    The Task Group should submit its report to the Policy Committee in time for discussion at the November 2003 meeting.

Members:
    Sherry Kelley (resigned October 2003)
    Roxanne Sellberg
    Jim Stickman (chair)
    Ana Lupe Cristan, BIBCO liaison
    Jean Hirons, CONSER liaison
    Glenn Patton, OCLC liaison
    Karen Smith-Yoshimura, RLG liaison

Message 167 of 168

Date: Fri, 11 Apr 2003 21:38:52 -0700
From: Karen_Smith-Yoshimura@notes.rlg.org
To: Jim Stickman <stickman@u.washington.edu>,
    Roxanne Sellberg <sellberg@northwestern.edu>,
    Sherry Kelley <KelleyS@si.edu>, pattong@oclc.org
Cc: wolven@columbia.edu
Subject: Some Statistics on BIBCO Book Titles in the RLG Union Catalog
    (March 2003)

Dear PCC task force on assessment colleagues,

Each March RLG profiles the contents of the RLG Union Catalog,
and I went ahead and requested that we modify the program to
count the number of Book titles for which we had at least one BIBCO
record (with an 042 value of "pcc"). I requested Books since
the core level for Books was the first one established and
used; if you're interested in non-book statistics, we can
provide them.

Background: Each record contributed by an institution is
retained in the RLG Union Catalog. Records for the same
bibliographic item are "clustered" together. There may be
more than one BIBCO record in a cluster, but if so,
the profile counts it as a single BIBCO title.

The full profile offers a breakdown of the total number of
BIBCO records by language correlated by date of publication.
I've extracted some statistics here, rather than inundate you.

Total number of BIBCO Book titles in RLG Union Catalog
(as of March 2003): 560,776

Total number of languages represented by BIBCO Book
titles: 208

93.7% of the BIBCO titles were published in the 1990s-2000s.
8,125 BIBCO titles were for works published before 1900.
The first table below shows the breakdown by publication
date.

51.4% of the BIBCO titles were for English-language works.
Eleven other languages had 5,000 or more BIBCO titles, together
accounting for another 38.0% of all BIBCO titles in the RLG
Union Catalog. The second table below shows the breakdown
of these top twelve languages, correlated by three publication
date ranges (2000s, 1990s, pre-1990).

For your consideration,

Karen

Karen Smith-Yoshimura
RLG
E-mail: kss@notes.rlg.org
Phone: 1-650-691-2270

=================================
1. BIBCO Book Titles in RLG Union Catalog by Publication Date
(March 2003)

Decade	Titles
2000s	330,821
1990s	194,850
1980s	9,196
1970s	3,818
1960s	3,381
1950s	2,263
1940s	1,671
1930s	2,104
1920s	1,848
1910s	1,285
1900s	1,414
Century	
1800s	4,298
1700s	1,867
1600s	

	373
1500s	288
1400s	15
Other*	1,284
TOTAL	560,776

* Date unknown or not recorded

2. Top 12 Languages of BIBCO Titles in the RLG Union Catalog (5,000 or more) - March 2003

Language	Total		Pub Date: 2000s	Pub Date: 1990s	Pub Date: Pre-1990
English	288,133		211,842	64,634	11,657
Spanish	43,092		20,121	21,190	1,781
German	37,728		17,381	18,206	2,141
Russian	32,214		13,869	15,566	2,779
French	28,577		14,385	12,124	2,068
Italian	21,552		12,085	8,417	1,050
Chinese	12,283	4,896		7,166	221
Japanese	11,083	5,316		5,230	537
Vietnamese	8,054	3,168		4,279	607
Hebrew				2,132	2,591

	|7,010	|2,287			
Portuguese					3,250	483
	6,107		2,374			
Arabic					3,841	194
	5,209		1,174			
Totals			308,898	166,035	26,109	
	501,042					
As % of all BIBCO titles	89.3%		93.4%	85.2%	74.4%	

Date: Mon, 14 Apr 2003 20:38:47 -0700
From: Karen_Smith-Yoshimura@notes.rlg.org
To: Robert A. Wolven <wolven@columbia.edu>
Cc: KelleyS@si.edu, pattong@oclc.org, sellberg@northwestern.edu,
    stickman@u.washington.edu, wolven@columbia.edu
Subject: Re: Some More Statistics on BIBCO Book Titles in the RLG Union
    Catalog (March 2003)

Bob et al --

Per Bob's suggestion, I have appended below another
BIBCO Book titles in the RLG Union Catalog table -- a modified
table of the "Top 12" languages represented, but this time
focusing only on those with a Pub date of 2000s, and comparing
the BIBCO Book title count with the total number of book titles in that
language for the same publication date range.

Cheers,

Karen
=====================================

Comparison of Top 12 Languages of BIBCO Book Titles
in the RLG Union Catalog (5,000 or more) with All Book Titles
for Pub Date: 2000s - March 2003

Language	Total BIBCO		Pub Date: 2000s - BIBCO	Pub Date: 2000s - All	BIBCO %
English	288,133		211,842	965,812	21.9%
Spanish	43,092		20,121	93,982	21.4%
German	37,728		17,381	87,296	19.9%
Russian	32,214		13,869	29,914	46.4%
French	28,577		14,385	131,120	11.0%
Italian	21,552		12,085	171,108	7.1%

Language					
Chinese	12,283		4,896	92,410	5.3%
Japanese	11,083		5,316	257,929	2.1%
Vietnamese	8,054		3,168	5,957		53.2%
Hebrew	7,010		2,287	26,731	8.6%
Portuguese	6,107		2,374	12,255		19.4%
Arabic	5,209		1,174	20,401	5.8%
Totals	501,042		308,898	1,894,915	16.3%
As % of all BIBCO titles	89.3%		93.4%		

Measures One and Two: Draft Specifications for OCLC Data Capture and for Reports

Data Capture for Measures One and Two
OCLC would follow this general process for data capture as it creates files.

Create data files according to the requirements of measures one and two. See the measures for definition of the specific data files.

In creating data files, create a flat file of records, containing the data below. These data form the basis for future reports. It's desirable to identify attributes now. Identifying additional attributes later will be more complicated, but not impossible.

Data to be captured *
OCLC Number
LCCN
Type (Leader/06)
Bib lvl (Leader/07)
Encoding Level (Leader/17)
Type of Date (008, 06
Date 1 (008, 7-10)**
Date 2 (008, 11-14)
Language (008, 35-37)
Country of publication (008, 15-17)
Date record added to database (008, 0-5) [There are implications here for batchloaded recorded since this date is the local system date]
Data record added to WorldCat (Computed based on OCLC number)
ISBN (020 $a)
ISSN (022 $a)
Inputting library (040 $c)***
Authentication code (042 $a)
Total number of holdings
Number of holdings for PCC libraries
NATC call number ranges****

*While we want to include attributes that may form the basis for current and future assessments, we also want to limit the attributes to a manageable set. Generally, it is feasible to generate reports that involve one attribute or a pair of attributes. Generally, combining more than two attributes is more likely to produce a skewed result.

**Capture the date of publication as it appears in the record. For reporting periods, follow the instruction for each individual measure. Count ambiguous dates separately; e.g., if the date is 19xx, do not count as 1900. Count ambiguous dates in a separate category(ies). This approach may work better for books than for serials, and is a continuing discussion point.

***Message from Glenn Patton and Ed O'Neill re the definition of PCC Libraries (10/23/03)

"On the issue of "PCC libraries" versus "BIBCO libraries" versus "CONSER libraries", we propose to use a combined set of the BIBCO and CONSER libraries (excluding the NACO-only libraries) when we're counting holdings. There's so much overlap between the BIBCO and CONSER groups that we don't think it's practical to keep them as two separate groups.

We have another question related to the issues of holdings. Many OCLC member libraries may have several OCLC symbols. For example, if one really wants to get a picture of the holdings of the Ohio State University Libraries, one needs to consider at least the 3 separate symbols for the main library, the medical library and the law library, all three of which are on the Columbus campus. The Office of Research has recently developed the capability (for a project they're working on for the CIC) to combine these separate symbols to get a more complete picture of the holdings of an institution. We think it would be good to incorporate this into the PCC study. I'll try to put together a list of "families" of symbols so the group can see what this would mean." Glenn Patton.

****While mapping from call number to subject in the North American title count statistics is not the only one of its kind, OCLC has existing programming to support analysis using the North American title count. In the absence of a preferred alternative, it is much easier to use the existing program.

Measure One: Methodology for Reports
For Measure One, identify PCC Books and PCC Serials as separate subsets. Identifiers = format and authentication. (Defer other formats for now.)

Using the data captured above, generate the following separate reports for BIBCO and CONSER records.

Language Report
Generate separate reports for BIBCO and CONSER.
Count the top twenty languages.
Count all other languages as OTHER
For each language and for OTHER, give the average number of PCC library holding symbols attached and the average number of non-PCC holding symbols attached.

Date of Publication Report
Generate separate reports for BIBCO and CONSER
Count records in the following date ranges:
-prior to 1900
-1901-1950
-1951-1970
-1971-1990
-1991-1995

-1996-2000
-2001
-2002
-2003
-Ambiguous dates 1900's
-Ambiguous dates 2000's
-Other ambiguous dates

Subject Report
Generate separate reports for BIBCO and CONSER
Report by NATC subject/call number range
For each subject/call number range, give the average number of PCC library holding symbols and the average number of non-PCC holding symbols attached to records.

Measure Two: Methodology for Reports
Create a set of all the [BOOKS] records added to WorldCat from 1997-2002.
Separate the set into two subsets: 1) those created or upgraded by BIBCO libraries and 2) all others.
For "all others" set, select the records that have been used by PCC libraries.
Prepare the following reports:

Language Report
Count the top twenty languages.
Count all other languages as OTHER

Date of Publication Report
Count records in the following date ranges:
-prior to 1900
-1901-1950
-1951-1970
-1971-1990
-1991-1995
-1996-2000
-2001
-2002
-2003
-Ambiguous dates 1900's
-Ambiguous dates 2000's
-Other ambiguous dates

Subject Report
Generate separate reports for BIBCO and CONSER
Report by NATC subject/call number range
For each subject/call number range, give the average number of PCC library holding symbols and the average number of non-PCC holding symbols attached to records.

Measure Three: Northwestern University Pilot Project, report by Roxanne Sellberg

The PCC Policy Committee's Task Force on Assessment identified six initial issues to explore during the last year. One of them concerned a comparison between that set of titles for which PCC program records are available and the set of titles that PCC libraries are adding to their collections.

In order to make such a comparison, it is necessary to gather data about titles that PCC libraries catalog using non-PCC copy, and about titles for which they create original cataloging, and about titles that they have not yet been able to catalog. Gathering data about uncataloged titles in PCC libraries is a formidable challenge, and we see two possible approaches to meeting that challenge.

One approach would be a survey in which PCC libraries are asked to report characteristics of the titles in their cataloging backlogs. The data gathered in this fashion would probably be quite varied—in some cases representing careful statistics and in other cases impressionistic guesses. The other approach would be to identify a subset of PCC libraries that are able to measure characteristics of their backlogs in some kind of standardized, automated way.

In order to explore the feasibility of the second possible approach, Northwestern University volunteered to take an automated look at a part of its cataloging backlog. Northwestern was in an excellent position to do this, because the titles in its cataloging backlog are all represented by brief bibliographic records in its Voyager library management system database. Gary Strawn, a librarian there, is highly experienced and skilled in drawing cataloging-related information from NU's Voyager database. In addition, Northwestern University Library's central technical services units have adopted a method for keeping automated cataloging statistics that requires staff to record various kinds of local data in Voyager records (for instance, when the cataloging was completed and what kind of copy was used). This data can help answer some questions about the backlog.

Mr. Strawn created a program to analyze a set of Voyager records corresponding pretty closely with the set of books received by central technical services during the first six months of 2001 and for each 6-month period after that. The important pieces of data recorded for these books were language, date of publication, format, and date of cataloging, if applicable. For those that had been cataloged, the program also noted whether the titles had been originally cataloged by NU or copy cataloged. For those that had been copy cataloged, the program noted whether the copy was PCC.

The data gathered by Strawn's program was organized into several long reports. An excerpt from one of these reports is attached, as is a spreadsheet summarizing of some of the information. For this summary, the January-June 2001 and the January-June 2002 data sets are included for comparison. The summary includes three sections.

The first section of the summary considers "timelines of cataloging." It indicates how and when items received during January-June 2001 and January-June 2002 periods were or were not cataloged. Northwestern has by now cataloged over 80% of the titles received during the January through June 2001 period—about 24% using PCC copy. Northwestern has by now cataloged over 65% of the titles received during the January through June 2002 period—about 21% using PCC copy.

Please note with regard to the timeliness table: the cataloging date recorded was when the book was actually cataloged, not when the book could or should have been cataloged. In those cases where copy was used some considerable time after receipt, the cataloging date does not represent when copy appeared in the OCLC database. Neither should it be inferred that there is still no copy available for all the titles still not cataloged. Northwestern does not currently re-search the OCLC database for copy on any kind of schedule. Items are pulled out of the backlog for re-searching as other cataloging priorities permit.

The second section of the summary concerns "languages." For the same two sampling periods, this table indicates the top 20 languages coded for the titles received. Also shown are the relative numbers of those same languages in items that were cataloged with PCC copy, that were cataloged with other copy, that were cataloged originally by NU, and that have not yet been cataloged. The most surprising thing about this table may be the large percentage of the records with meaningful language codes, even in the uncataloged category.

The third section of the summary focuses on date of publication. The records in the samples were divided into categories based on how long before receipt the titles had been published. Then the PCC cataloging, non-PCC copy cataloging, original cataloging and uncataloged subsets were similarly divided. It is interesting that, for both sampling periods, the subset of titles cataloged with PCC copy looks quite different from the subset of titles cataloged with non-PCC copy. The PCC cataloging seems to lean more heavily to newer titles.

Northwestern was able to gather some interesting data about its uncataloged backlog fairly easily as part of this pilot, and it will be also be interesting to compare some characteristics of Northwestern's cataloging and backlog data with data gathered about the OCLC database. It is still unclear whether this approach should be pursued as part of the PCC assessment effort, however. By itself, the Northwestern data is not terribly meaningful to the PCC program as a whole. The PCC can only gain if similar data could be gathered by a reasonable sample of PCC libraries and if the data from a number of libraries could be aggregated.

[A spreadsheet of statistical highlights from the NUL pilot has been distributed as a separate file. The spreadsheet is the last item in the overall report.]

Northwestern University Library
PCC Assessment Measures Pilot Project
Highlights--Timeliness of Cataloging

28,412 Books received January through June 2001	**number**	**% of total**
PCC copy, first 3 mos	4,653	16.4%
PCC copy, 3-6 mos	352	1.2%
PCC copy, 6-9 mos	121	0.4%
PCC copy, 9-12 mos	108	0.4%
PCC copy, 12-24 mos	1,358	4.8%
PCC copy, more than 24 mos	195	0.7%
total PCC copy	**6,787**	**23.9%**
Non-PCC copy, first 3 mos	8,317	29.3%
Non-PCC copy, 3-6 mos	1,315	4.6%
Non-PCC copy, 6-9 mos	543	1.9%
Non-PCC copy, 9-12 mos	493	1.7%
Non-PCC copy, 12-24 mos	3,059	10.8%
Non-PCC copy, more than 24 mos	615	2.2%
total non-PCC copy	**14,342**	**50.5%**
original, first 3 mos	1,928	6.8%
original, 3-6 mos	145	0.5%
original, 6-9 mos	35	0.1%
original, 9-12 mos	72	0.3%
original, 12-24 mos	93	0.3%
original, more than 24 mos	36	0.1%
total original	**2,309**	**8.1%**
Still uncataloged after 3 mos	13,514	47.6%
Still uncataloged after 6 mos	11,702	41.2%
Still uncataloged after 9 mos	11,003	38.7%
Still uncataloged after 12 mos	10,330	36.4%
Still uncataloged after 24 mos	5,820	20.5%
Still uncataloged	**4,855**	**17.1%**
other, could not be counted	**119**	**0.4%**

Highlights--Timeliness of Cataloging, p.2

39,078 Books received January through June 2002	number	% of total
PCC copy, first 3 mos	5,734	14.7%
PCC copy, 3-6 mos	470	1.2%
PCC copy, 6-9 mos	232	0.6%
PCC copy, 9-12 mos	1,158	3.0%
PCC copy, after 1 year	568	1.5%
total PCC copy	**8,162**	**20.9%**
Non-PCC copy, first 3 mos	10,223	26.2%
Non-PCC copy, 3-6 mos	1,180	3.0%
Non-PCC copy, 6-9 mos	633	1.6%
Non-PCC copy, 9-12 mos	2,257	5.8%
Non-PCC copy, after 1 year	645	1.7%
total non-PCC copy	**14,938**	**38.2%**
original, first 3 mos	2,346	6.0%
original, 3-6 mos	152	0.4%
original, 6-9 mos	195	0.5%
original, 9-12 mos	347	0.9%
original, after 1 year	212	0.5%
total original	**3,252**	**8.3%**
Still uncataloged after 3 mos	20,775	53.2%
Still uncataloged after 6 mos	18,973	48.6%
Still uncataloged after 9 mos	17,913	45.8%
Still uncataloged after 12 mos	14,151	36.2%
Still uncataloged	**12,640**	**32.3%**
other, could not be counted	**86**	**0.2%**

Northwestern University Library
PCC Assessment Measures Pilot Project
Highlights--Date of publication

Books received January-June 2001	PCC copy		Non-PCC copy		Original		Uncataloged		Total	
published 1 yr before receipt	2,698	40%	2,728	19%	308	13%	389	8%	6,123	22%
published 2-3 yrs before receipt	3,964	58%	7,719	54%	1,117	48%	2,046	42%	14,846	52%
published 4-5 yrs before receipt	116	2%	1,114	8%	132	6%	727	15%	2,089	7%
published 6-10 yrs before receipt	19	0%	848	6%	72	3%	473	10%	1,412	5%
published >10 yrs before receipt	12	0%	1,974	14%	685	30%	1,238	25%	3,909	14%
could not be counted									33	0%
total	**6,809**	**100%**	**14,383**	**100%**	**2,314**	**100%**	**4,873**	**100%**	**28,412**	**100%**

Books received January-June 2002	PCC copy		Non-PCC copy		Original		Uncataloged		Total	
published 1 yr before receipt	3119	38%	2,998	20%	505	16%	277	4%	6,899	21%
published 2-3 yrs before receipt	4729	58%	6,684	45%	1,155	35%	2,567	39%	15,135	46%
published 4-5 yrs before receipt	275	3%	1,221	8%	279	9%	983	15%	2,758	8%
published 6-10 yrs before receipt	46	1%	874	6%	163	5%	767	12%	1,850	6%
published >10 yrs before receipt	11	0%	3,194	21%	1,152	35%	2,061	31%	6,418	19%
could not be counted									18	0%
total	**8180**	**100%**	**14,971**	**100%**	**3,254**	**100%**	**6,655**	**100%**	**33,078**	**100%**

Northwestern University Library
PCC Assessment Measures Pilot Project
Highlights--Languages

Books received January-June 2001			PCC copy		non-PCC copy		original		uncataloged		uncountable	
eng	18,339	64.5%	4,981	73.2%	997	6.9%	1,250	54.0%	2,113	43.4%	20	60.6%
fre	2,053	7.2%	359	5.3%	920	6.4%	470	20.3%	302	6.2%	2	6.1%
ger	1,929	6.8%	411	6.0%	1,179	8.2%	171	7.4%	165	3.4%	3	9.1%
spa	1,363	4.8%	426	6.3%	740	5.1%	100	4.3%	103	2.1%	3	9.1%
blank	918	3.2%	6	0.1%	87	0.6%	45	1.9%	780	16.0%	1	3.0%
ita	908	3.2%	374	5.5%	381	2.6%	42	1.8%	108	2.2%	3	9.1%
rus	673	2.4%	193	2.8%	441	3.1%	15	0.6%	23	0.5%	1	3.0%
l	516	1.8%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	516	10.6%	0	0.0%
NA	375	1.3%	3	0.0%	127	0.9%	5	0.2%	245	5.0%	0	0.0%
lll	309	1.1%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	13	0.6%	296	6.1%	0	0.0%
lat	193	0.7%	0	0.0%	102	0.7%	28	1.2%	63	1.3%	0	0.0%
por	181	0.6%	28	0.4%	93	0.6%	37	1.6%	23	0.5%	0	0.0%
heb	109	0.4%	6	0.1%	48	0.3%	52	2.2%	3	0.1%	0	0.0%
afr	107	0.4%	0	0.0%	76	0.5%	27	1.2%	4	0.1%	0	0.0%
mul	45	0.2%	1	0.0%	16	0.1%	5	0.2%	23	0.5%	0	0.0%
dut	38	0.1%	4	0.1%	23	0.2%	2	0.1%	9	0.2%	0	0.0%
ukr	35	0.1%	0	0.0%	32	0.2%	0	0.0%	3	0.1%	0	0.0%
ara	30	0.1%	0	0.0%	6	0.0%	11	0.5%	13	0.3%	0	0.0%
swe	27	0.1%	1	0.0%	13	0.1%	6	0.3%	9	0.2%	0	0.0%
dan	26	0.1%	0	0.0%	15	0.1%	8	0.3%	3	0.1%	0	0.0%
chi	23	0.1%	0	0.0%	20	0.1%	0	0.0%	3	0.1%	0	0.0%
und	22	0.1%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	2	0.1%	18	0.4%	0	0.0%
hun	14	0.0%	0	0.0%	4	0.0%	8	0.3%	2	0.0%	0	0.0%
other	179	0.6%	16	0.2%	9,063	63.0%	17	0.7%	46	0.9%	0	0.0%
total	**28,412**	**100%**	**6,809**	**100%**	**14,383**	**100%**	**2,314**	**100%**	**4,873**	**100%**	**33**	**100%**

Highlights--Languages, p.2

Books received January-June 2002			PCC copy		non-PCC copy		original		uncataloged		uncountable	
eng	20,184	61.0%	5,683	69.5%	10,431	69.7%	1,491	45.8%	2,571	38.6%	8	44.4%
fre	2,375	7.2%	376	4.6%	854	5.7%	603	18.5%	539	8.1%	3	16.7%
ger	2,350	7.1%	585	7.2%	1,228	8.2%	270	8.3%	266	4.0%	1	5.6%
spa	1,908	5.8%	589	7.2%	912	6.1%	184	5.7%	222	3.3%	1	5.6%
blank	1,201	3.6%	15	0.2%	75	0.5%	82	2.5%	1,028	15.4%	1	5.6%
N/A	1,149	3.5%	6	0.1%	118	0.8%	281	8.6%	753	11.3%	1	5.6%
ita	1,059	3.2%	540	6.6%	292	2.0%	79	2.4%	146	2.2%	2	11.1%
rus	743	2.2%	279	3.4%	416	2.8%	4	0.1%	44	0.7%	0	0.0%
Ill	588	1.8%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	9	0.3%	579	8.7%	0	0.0%
lat	192	0.6%	4	0.0%	98	0.7%	38	1.2%	52	0.8%	0	0.0%
por	174	0.5%	18	0.2%	91	0.6%	19	0.6%	45	0.7%	1	5.6%
afr	142	0.4%	1	0.0%	94	0.6%	31	1.0%	16	0.2%	0	0.0%
cat	128	0.4%	13	0.2%	84	0.6%	19	0.6%	12	0.2%	0	0.0%
und	123	0.4%	13	0.2%	0	0.0%	1	0.0%	118	1.8%	0	0.0%
heb	120	0.4%	35	0.4%	48	0.3%	12	0.4%	25	0.4%	0	0.0%
scr	68	0.2%	9	0.1%	43	0.3%	5	0.2%	11	0.2%	0	0.0%
mul	67	0.2%	2	0.0%	22	0.1%	12	0.4%	31	0.5%	0	0.0%
dut	47	0.1%	5	0.1%	20	0.1%	15	0.5%	7	0.1%	0	0.0%
ge	44	0.1%	0	0.0%	1	0.0%	0	0.0%	43	0.6%	0	0.0%
swe	46	0.1%	4	0.0%	21	0.1%	12	0.4%	9	0.1%	0	0.0%
jpn	31	0.1%	0	0.0%	13	0.1%	0	0.0%	18	0.3%	0	0.0%
dan	27	0.1%	0	0.0%	5	0.0%	20	0.6%	2	0.0%	0	0.0%
chi	20	0.1%	0	0.0%	13	0.1%	0	0.0%	7	0.1%	0	0.0%
other	292	0.9%	3	0.0%	92	0.6%	67	2.1%	111	1.7%	0	0.0%
total	**33,078**	**100%**	**8,180**	**100%**	**14,971**	**100%**	**3,254**	**100%**	**6,655**	**100%**	**18**	**100%**