Introduction

Fiscal Year 2018 was a productive and at times, challenging year for the Information Delivery and Library Access (ID&LA) department. Our staff continue to do the foundational work that makes up much of public services and both take satisfaction from this work and do the work well. However, most staff are still waiting for the work of projects coming from Strategic Priorities to push out to them and are waiting to see how it will change the work of the Libraries. ID&LA’s managers are heavily involved already (see below) and stand ready to work with their staff to retool workflows once we know more.

II. Accomplishments

A. Improving our services to users

From the Task Force Report, one message that ID&LA heard clearly was that our communities value the services we already provide. ID&LA has spent the past year working to improve our existing services to our communities. Whether it was a process of streamlining workflows or improving supporting technology, here are some of the improvements ID&LA was able to accomplish this year that directly impact users:

- Continuing the Makerworks program on a student-run initiative to lend “makerworkshop” equipment in Rotch.
- Working with an external furniture vendor and Facilities to refurbish the Hayden mezzanines (creating new work environments for users), and coordinating analyses of the new furniture’s usage and user feedback.
- Collaborating with IS&T to implement Session Management Software (SMS) (launching in July 2018) – this in combination with policy revisions to usage monitoring by staff will bring the visitor computer workstation policies into much closer alignment with the Libraries’ values.
- Working with the List Gallery to review and refresh the Libraries’ artwork with an eye to far greater diversity of artists to provide a more welcoming, inclusive space for our user communities.
- Piloting experimental equipment check-outs based on user feedback (book and tablet stands, standing desks).
- Working with Collections to implement a new, rotating short-term book display to highlight the Libraries’ collections in light of current events (featuring works by authors from/works about the seven countries targeted by the Federal Travel Ban, etc.) as a supplement or potential alternative to bookmobiles.

B. Increasing organizational effectiveness

ID&LA is always looking for ways to expand its reach while keep its portfolio to a reasonable size, and this year many of our efforts focused on ways to collaborate with other parts of the Libraries, either to improve services or to maintain existing service levels in a more efficient fashion:

- Staff attendance at professional development activities continues to increase.
- Managing the increasingly active MIT Ivies Plus (IP) work, including collaborating with other IP MIT staff to better facilitate understanding of how these projects are developing as well as to provide better support for the MIT Libraries’ Director as she assumes the chair role for the IP Directors group.
- Working on a proposal to drastically reduce the Libraries’ use of fines.
- Working with DLS to offer laptops to all staff to support their changing work.
- Dedicated significant staff resources to strategically important projects, including:
  - ILS and Integrations group (part of DLS’s Tech Teams initiatives to upgrade our infrastructure).
  - Priority E space groups.
  - Priority G group.
  - Working to support and manage projects for the Barker Active Learning Classroom and the Rotch GIS/RDM project.

C. Notable collaborations between the Libraries and other groups on campus

- In collaboration with Collections and the Scanning Lab, ID&LA has performed an analysis of our scanning and is working on a plan to move this work into our own department to free up resources for Collections to focus on inside-out workflows.
- Working with PCG and selectors to ensure that collections moves for the Rotch storage project met community needs.
• Worked with TS3 to migrate MIT computers in library spaces from Athena to WIN domains (based on user feedback) and to implement SMS on visitor workstations
• Working with Sloan to incorporate their new Content Management System (Canvas) into our existing Reserves support workflows
• Working with LIRS and DSS to continue to develop awareness of the Libraries’ community engagement possibilities beyond traditional methods, including events, classes and general outreach

III. Challenges, obstacles and unmet needs observed

Challenges for ID&LA remained largely the same as last year (helping ID&LA staff to understand how the Libraries’ myriad and diverse projects fit together into a roadmap of our future direction, fostering communication across departments in a busy, high-change environment. Some specific challenges arose this year:

• Near total loss of our Program Head as she was requested to serve as Project Manager for the Libraries’ many space projects and experiments. Cassandra has a unique skillset in physical project management and was happy to serve in this capacity, but communication about and expectations of her were not always tightly managed, causing this work to take over a great deal of her time.
• Throughout much of this past year, ACE has had an Interim AD, Patricia Flanagan. Pat has worked hard and done an admirable job coming up to speed, but this is a uniquely challenging time for the MIT Libraries and our AD has been asked to take on far more than would normally be standard for an Interim. Like Cassandra’s additional Project Management role, this extra work has made Pat’s guidance and presence less available to ID&LA.
• The Resource Sharing group had two staff members out for a total of three months, which negatively affected the workloads of other Resource Sharing staff and the ID&LA Delivery Team, which both staff are on.
• Increases in local and consortial work have eaten up tremendous bandwidth this year, including the Tech teams, Priority Groups, DJA’s work with us, Brightspot’s work, requests for membership on focus groups and search teams. Staff participation has been requested/required at difficult times (end of semesters and staff review periods) leading to higher-than-normal levels of exhaustion.
• The breakneck pace of projects seems to be degrading the projects’ outcomes, diminishing staff investment in Library-wide efforts, eroding process and increasing staff’s perception that there is no place for them to have impact or influence in the organization. While the ID&LA Leads have done an excellent job of working with their staff to provide clarity and improve morale, this remains an overall challenge for our department.

IV. Future Directions

In the coming year, ID&LA will be reviewing and refining its new offerings, continuing to hone existing services and looking for new opportunities. Here are some of the areas we are looking at:

• Working with DLS on implementing new workflows and products as we address the Libraries’ technology debt
• Work with Nina Davis-Millis and the new music librarian to support Lewis in the coming years
• Work with managers to begin mapping key development areas for all our staff based on job descriptions to make development efforts more meaningful and directed
• Continue to work on and support Priorities work for efforts in the areas of spaces, staff, technology and services
• Work with the rest of ACE to develop a robust program for Community Engagement of the MIT communities

V. Conclusions

While ID&LA may have focused on smaller and incremental gains and improvements, its work has again been increasingly focused on the emerging goals of the Libraries; increasing focus on customer needs and feedback, thoughtful approaches to collaborative efforts across departments and directorates and careful stewardship of the Institute’s resources.
1. Relative Use of Various MIT Libraries during FY 17-18 ................................................................. 19
2. Relative Use of Various MIT Library 24/7 Spaces during FY 17-18 .................................................. 19
3. Trends in TOTAL use, all MIT Libraries ......................................................................................... 20
4. Trends in use of public spaces, all MIT Libraries ............................................................................ 20
5. Trends in use of 24/7 spaces, all MIT Libraries ............................................................................. 21

K. Events ............................................................................................................................................ 22
   1. Requests versus Hosted Events ................................................................................................. 22
   2. Internal versus External Requests ......................................................................................... 22
   3. By Library Requested Location ............................................................................................. 23
   4. By Event Type ....................................................................................................................... 23
   5. Where Closing a Library Space was needed ......................................................................... 24

L. Incident Reports ............................................................................................................................ 25
   1. By Reason for Report, all Libraries ......................................................................................... 25
   2. By Library Location ............................................................................................................... 25
   3. By Patron Outcome, all Libraries ......................................................................................... 26
   4. By Police Involvement, all Libraries ..................................................................................... 26
   5. Trends in total incidents reported, all Libraries .................................................................... 27

M. Labor Budget Expenditures ........................................................................................................ 28
   1. Trends in student and temp expenditures, all Libraries .......................................................... 28
   2. Trends budget management, all Libraries ............................................................................. 28
   3. Extra staffing used from approved pool (pilot for FY 17-18) by hours .................................... 29
   4. Extra staff hours used from approved pool (pilot for FY 17-18) by instance .......................... 29

N. Draper Service Purchases .......................................................................................................... 30
   1. Draper card purchases and renewals ...................................................................................... 30
   2. Draper card income ............................................................................................................... 30

O. Associated Services (Copying, Scanning, Printing) ................................................................. 31

P. ID&LA by the Numbers ................................................................................................................ 32
VI. Appendices and Tables

A. Submitted by:
- Ashley Clark, Access Services Assistant (ID&LA)
- Melissa Feiden, Annex Services and User Experience Librarian (ID&LA)
- Jeremiah Graves, Access Services Manager, Barker and Rotch Libraries (ID&LA)
- Judith Gallagher, Financial Associate (Administrative Services)
- Sam Spencer, Access Services Associate and Administrative Assistant (ID&LA)
- Greg Padilla, Access Services Manager, Dewey Library (ID&LA)
- Molly McInerney, DOT Liaison and Course Support Librarian (ID&LA)
- Pat Page, Resource Sharing Manager (ID&LA)
- Maria Rodrigues, Access Services Manager, Hayden Library (ID&LA)
- Cassandra Silvia, Program Head for Access and Information Services (ID&LA)
- Felicity Walsh, Department Head (ID&LA)

B. Personnel Changes

Arrivals
- Hannah Winkler -- LAII at Barker/Rotch, September 2017
- Xindi Li -- LAII at Hayden, October 2017
- Maura Liggio -- LAIII at Hayden, March 2018

Departures
- Joe Hankins -- LAIII at Barker/Rotch (20% time to DSS), August 2017
- Alli Gofman -- LA II at Barker/Rotch, August 2017
- ASM at Dewey -- Irene Mazor, September 2017

Promotions
- Gregory Padilla -- ASM at Dewey (was previously LAIII at Hayden) – January 2018
C. Current ID&LA Organizational Chart
D. Professional development by ID&LA Staff

1. Attendance totals by FY

![Conference Attendance by ID&LA staff past 3 Years](image)

2. Attendance by conference

![Number of Attendances by conference, 2016-Present](image)

---

1 It’s worth noting that as of July 2018, ID&LA staff’s attendance at professional development opportunities for the upcoming year has nearly matched that of FY 17-18.
3. Expenditures (minimum, maximum, average and total) by FY

Staff Development Expenditures for ID&LA 2016 - Present

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Max</th>
<th>Min</th>
<th>Ave</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FY16-17</td>
<td>$2,822.35</td>
<td>$326.48</td>
<td>$918.39</td>
<td>$10,102.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY17-18</td>
<td>$1,796.53</td>
<td>$292.39</td>
<td>$989.87</td>
<td>$10,888.61</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. Type of development, 2016 to present

Type of Development (as noted by assigned cost object) 2016 to Present

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Development Type</th>
<th>Number of Staff Attending</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Administrative</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DISJ</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incidental</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prof Dev</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skill Dev</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Slack continues to be a strong tool to foster collaboration between departments in ACE. Reviewing transaction logs reveals that overall responsiveness is extremely high (a request for help getting no response is extremely rare) and that LIRS and DSS staff are beginning to use Slack to consult their ID&LA colleagues about specialized information topics specific to ID&LA.
### Reference Support Requests – Support Requests by location and response

#### Reference Support Requests for FY 17-18 by location and response

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Response</th>
<th>Hayden</th>
<th>Rotch</th>
<th>Barker</th>
<th>Dewey</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No response</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes - helped by phone</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes - helped in person</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes - gave referral</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes but question from Librarians</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*No response vs. Yes response categories: No response, Yes - helped by phone, Yes - helped in person, Yes - gave referral, Yes but question from Librarians*
F. Service Trends – Circulation and Related Data³

1. Total Circulation

All Circ (Regular and Reserves) Past 5 Years FY 17-18

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Library Location</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2018</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Barker Library</td>
<td>14,484</td>
<td>11,697</td>
<td>11,429</td>
<td>10,478</td>
<td>10,259</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dewey Library</td>
<td>25,893</td>
<td>19,724</td>
<td>18,650</td>
<td>15,742</td>
<td>14,191</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hayden Library</td>
<td>51,352</td>
<td>41,557</td>
<td>41,979</td>
<td>37,813</td>
<td>36,232</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library Storage Annex</td>
<td>1,344</td>
<td>1,146</td>
<td>1,331</td>
<td>1,307</td>
<td>802</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Music Library</td>
<td>7,864</td>
<td>6,468</td>
<td>5,857</td>
<td>5,774</td>
<td>5,123</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rotch Library</td>
<td>26,678</td>
<td>21,717</td>
<td>22,400</td>
<td>20,896</td>
<td>20,402</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total, all circs, all locations</td>
<td>129,629</td>
<td>104,324</td>
<td>103,662</td>
<td>94,027</td>
<td>87,009</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. Physical Resource Usage

Physical Resource Usage by Type Past 5 Years FY 17-18

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Transactions by Type, by Year</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2018</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Regular Loans</td>
<td>103,637</td>
<td>88,444</td>
<td>88,138</td>
<td>81,412</td>
<td>78,102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ILB Circulations</td>
<td>1,937</td>
<td>1,689</td>
<td>1,810</td>
<td>1,718</td>
<td>2,422</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reserves Loans</td>
<td>10,352</td>
<td>7,317</td>
<td>6,507</td>
<td>5,561</td>
<td>4,946</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reserves Renewals</td>
<td>484</td>
<td>313</td>
<td>266</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>142</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holds</td>
<td>6,688</td>
<td>4,972</td>
<td>5,830</td>
<td>4,094</td>
<td>3,072</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Book Page Requests</td>
<td>25,281</td>
<td>23,972</td>
<td>22,482</td>
<td>21,161</td>
<td>20,459</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LSA Requests</td>
<td>3,864</td>
<td>3,340</td>
<td>4,046</td>
<td>4,260</td>
<td>3,819</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unmediated Borrowing</td>
<td>5,236</td>
<td>7,574</td>
<td>8,215</td>
<td>8,119</td>
<td>9,892</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

³ While some traditional circulation measures continue to decline across the libraries, patron initiated activities including holds and unmediated borrowing have held steady or risen (tables 2 and 3 of this section).
3. Patron Initiated Circulation Activity

Patron Initiated Circulation Activity Past 5 Years FY 17-18

- Renewals via Your Account
  - 2014: 80,696
  - 2015: 105,606
  - 2016: 106,382
  - 2017: 104,448
  - 2018: 105,556

- Holds via Your Account
  - 2014: 46,750
  - 2015: 37,874
  - 2016: 41,485
  - 2017: 40,795
  - 2018: 45,760

- Unmediated Borrowing
  - 2014: 5,236
  - 2015: 7,574
  - 2016: 8,215
  - 2017: 8,119
  - 2018: 9,892

4. Circulation Related Collection Maintenance

Circulation Related Collection Maintenance by ID&LA Past 5 Years FY 17-18

- Re-shelved Loans
  - 2014: 242,290
  - 2015: 198,422
  - 2016: 199,915
  - 2017: 157,096
  - 2018: 155,705

- Items moved to OCC or Annex
  - 2014: 57,753
  - 2015: 23,847
  - 2016: 106,022
  - 2017: 13,826
  - 2018: 5131

- In-House use of material
  - 2014: 25,195
  - 2015: 23,015
  - 2016: 19,692
  - 2017: 15,940
  - 2018: 12,038

- Searches
  - 2014: 3,275
  - 2015: 1,028
  - 2016: 1,367
  - 2017: 1,198
  - 2018: 636

While LSA did not have as heavy a load of collection storage as in prior years, not that Annex staff work on scanning and collection maintenance remained steady or increased (pg. 16) and staff took on collections moves to OCC this year as well.
5. Searching outcomes, all types of searching\(^5\)

**Searches, Patron vs. Staff initiated for past 2 years FY 17-18**

- **On Search/In Transit**
  - Returned by patron after unsuccessful search, this number may be low as it depends on patron self identifying to staff.
  - FY 16-17: 545
  - FY 17-18: 297
  - Total: 842

- **PCRs (Circ-RT & ILB)**
  - Returned by patron after unsuccessful search, this number may be low as it depends on patron self identifying to staff.
  - FY 16-17: 301
  - FY 17-18: 22
  - Total: 323

- **PCRs (Circ-RT & ILB) Not Found**
  - FY 16-17: 141
  - FY 17-18: 87
  - Total: 228

- **PCRs (Circ-RT & ILB) Found**
  - FY 16-17: 123
  - FY 17-18: 102
  - Total: 225

**Note**

The overall volume of searches was much higher in FY 16-17, so percentages are particularly important in this data area.

6. Relative success of searching, past 2 years

**All search types by outcome FY 16-17**
- Returned by patron after unsuccessful search, this number may be low as it depends on patron self.
- Found: 668 (35%)

**All search types by outcome FY 17-18**
- Returned by patron after unsuccessful search, this number may be low as it depends on patron self.
- Found: 399 (49%)
This summer Sloan adopted Canvas. In meeting with Sloan, we are guardedly hopeful it could be more widely adopted as the current 3-tier state of Stellar (which is no longer in active development) is problematic for users and staff alike.

---

6 This summer Sloan adopted Canvas. In meeting with Sloan, we are guardedly hopeful it could be more widely adopted as the current 3-tier state of Stellar (which is no longer in active development) is problematic for users and staff alike.
H. Storage Activity

1. Scanning Work by Type

LSA Scanning Work by Type Past 5 Years FY 17-18

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of scanning, by year</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2018</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DS PDF Scans</td>
<td>679</td>
<td>606</td>
<td>720</td>
<td>424</td>
<td>156</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MIT PDF Scans</td>
<td>2,087</td>
<td>1,947</td>
<td>2,118</td>
<td>2,599</td>
<td>3,097</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RAPID PDF Scans</td>
<td>2,297</td>
<td>2,347</td>
<td>1,750</td>
<td>1,148</td>
<td>1,695</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total LSA Scanning by Year</td>
<td>5,063</td>
<td>4,900</td>
<td>4,588</td>
<td>4,171</td>
<td>4,948</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. Circulation Related Collection Maintenance

Circulation Related Collection Maintenance by Annex Past 5 Years FY 17-18

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Activity by Year</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2018</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Book Searches</td>
<td>1,060</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>219</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In House Use</td>
<td>535</td>
<td>393</td>
<td>612</td>
<td>401</td>
<td>417</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LSA Retrievals</td>
<td>4,972</td>
<td>4,875</td>
<td>3,998</td>
<td>4,260</td>
<td>3,163</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OCC Retrievals</td>
<td>5,132</td>
<td>4,727</td>
<td>5,848</td>
<td>5,764</td>
<td>5,274</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reshelled Returns</td>
<td>11,840</td>
<td>10,445</td>
<td>13,174</td>
<td>11,367</td>
<td>16,544</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
I. Resource Sharing

1. Borrowing and Lending totals

Interlibrary Borrowing (ILB) transactions increased overall by 13%.

- MIT’s article borrowing increased 9%. The statistic of note here is that RAPID article fulfillment is 84% of all filled article requests. This is good news for our users as RAPID requests average under 24 hours for turnaround time.
- MIT’s mediated borrowing of loans via ILB increased 34% to 2,811 loans in FY18.
  - Unmediated items obtained for the MIT community through Borrow Direct increased 22% from FY17.
  - Turnaround time for Borrowing via BD averaged 4.21 days.
  - 27% (2,829) of all materials borrowed through BD in FY18 were owned by MIT compared to 27% (2,218) in FY17.
  - These materials would not have been available to our user community through traditional ILB, highlighting the importance of the service.
- MIT’s fill rate for Interlibrary Borrowing increased slightly to 95% for borrowing transactions for FY18.
- Copyright clearance expenses decreased to $28,675 during the 2017 calendar year. This represents a 17% decrease overall from the previous year.
- RAPID ILL:
  - In FY 18, MIT obtained 10,300 articles for the MIT community through RAPID ILL, which represents 84% of all article borrowing.
  - Within RAPID ILL, ARL libraries provided 100% of the items borrowed by MIT.
  - The average turnaround time for RAPID ILL transactions in FY 2017 was just under .32 days. Therefore, 83% of all articles borrowed by MIT arrived in just under 8 hours.

---

7 Borrow Direct and ILL continue to grow this year:
- Interlibrary Borrowing (ILB) transactions increased overall by 13%
- MIT’s article borrowing increased 9%. The statistic of note here is that RAPID article fulfillment is 84% of all filled article requests. This is good news for our users as RAPID requests average under 24 hours for turnaround time.
- MIT’s mediated borrowing of loans via ILB increased 34% to 2,811 loans in FY18.
  - Unmediated items obtained for the MIT community through Borrow Direct increased 22% from FY17.
  - Turnaround time for Borrowing via BD averaged 4.21 days.
  - 27% (2,829) of all materials borrowed through BD in FY18 were owned by MIT compared to 27% (2,218) in FY17.
  - These materials would not have been available to our user community through traditional ILB, highlighting the importance of the service.
- MIT’s fill rate for Interlibrary Borrowing increased slightly to 95% for borrowing transactions for FY18.
- Copyright clearance expenses decreased to $28,675 during the 2017 calendar year. This represents a 17% decrease overall from the previous year.
- RAPID ILL:
  - In FY 18, MIT obtained 10,300 articles for the MIT community through RAPID ILL, which represents 84% of all article borrowing.
  - Within RAPID ILL, ARL libraries provided 100% of the items borrowed by MIT.
  - The average turnaround time for RAPID ILL transactions in FY 2017 was just under .32 days. Therefore, 83% of all articles borrowed by MIT arrived in just under 8 hours.
2. Fill Rates

8,020 (numbers from IDLA database do not include MIT Reports) requests for documents were filled in FY 2018, an increase of 8% from FY 2017.

- FY 2018’s lending fill rate was 42%.
- There were a total of 10,313 unfilled lending transactions.
  - 2,620 were due to items being currently in use, and unavailable for loan.
  - 2,964 were unfilled RAPID requests.
  - 124 unfilled transactions were for Theses freely available in DSpace.
  - 112 transactions were unfilled due to unsuccessful authorization of credit card payment. The majority of those transactions were filled by subsequent successful orders in the Request Management System.
- 1,353 returnable items (books) were loaned through mediated ILL in FY 2018, a decrease of 18%.
- 6,495 articles were loaned electronically in FY 2017, an increase of 16%.
  - 4,958 of those articles were loaned to RAPID ILL partners.
- Article delivery to commercial or corporate library users decreased by 29% in FY 2017 to 176 filled article requests.
- There were 172 filled requests for MIT theses in FY 2018. This represents an increase of 30% from the prior year. Thesis-related revenue decreased by 9% to $6,145.
- This is the third full year that DSpace theses are freely available. Please note that theses revenues are now assessed as Digital Collections Reformatting Team activity. — (Judith)
- Document delivery related revenues were $55,939. The revenue decreased by 64% from FY 2016.
3. Borrow Direct Activity

Borrow Direct and BLC Activities Past 5 Years FY 17-18

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2018</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Items obtained for MIT community via Borrow Direct</td>
<td>1,720</td>
<td>3,010</td>
<td>5,341</td>
<td>8,119</td>
<td>9,892</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Items obtained for MIT community via BLC WorldCat</td>
<td>3,435</td>
<td>4,564</td>
<td>2,874</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Items obtained through Borrow Direct or BLC WorldCat</td>
<td>5,155</td>
<td>7,574</td>
<td>8,215</td>
<td>8,119</td>
<td>9,892</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MIT Items loaned to Borrow Direct Partners</td>
<td>12,691</td>
<td>12,582</td>
<td>12,847</td>
<td>14,725</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MIT Items loaned to BLC Partners via BLC WorldCat</td>
<td>2,157</td>
<td>1,667</td>
<td>1,019</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total MIT Items loaned to Borrow Direct or BLC Partners</td>
<td>14,848</td>
<td>14,249</td>
<td>13,866</td>
<td>14,040</td>
<td>14,725</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
J. Library Usage and Occupancy

1. Relative Use of Various MIT Libraries during FY 17-18

![Library Use By Door Count 2018 (main and 24/7)](image)

2. Relative Use of Various MIT Library 24/7 Spaces during FY 17-18

![Library Use by 24/7 Space 2018](image)
3. Trends in TOTAL use, all MIT Libraries

Library Use TOTAL (door counts plus 24/7 spaces) Past 5 Years FY 17-18

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Library Location</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2018</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Barker Library</td>
<td>155,124</td>
<td>147,567</td>
<td>153,310</td>
<td>156,237</td>
<td>161,216</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dewey Library</td>
<td>117,456</td>
<td>116,211</td>
<td>124,715</td>
<td>107,150</td>
<td>117,282</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hayden Library</td>
<td>210,395</td>
<td>159,446</td>
<td>135,073</td>
<td>136,798</td>
<td>232,259</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library Storage Annex</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Music Library</td>
<td>26,288</td>
<td>26,361</td>
<td>27,563</td>
<td>28,694</td>
<td>26,940</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rotch Library</td>
<td>110,511</td>
<td>105,964</td>
<td>104,355</td>
<td>104,538</td>
<td>104,439</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. Trends in use of public spaces, all MIT Libraries

Library Use by Door Count (main entrance) Past 5 Years FY 17-18

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Library Location</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2018</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Barker Library</td>
<td>142,909</td>
<td>135,037</td>
<td>137,876</td>
<td>139,565</td>
<td>146,547</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dewey Library</td>
<td>114,431</td>
<td>112,951</td>
<td>121,036</td>
<td>103,360</td>
<td>113,244</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hayden Library</td>
<td>201,475</td>
<td>147,995</td>
<td>124,595</td>
<td>126,158</td>
<td>222,579</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library Storage Annex</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Music Library</td>
<td>26,288</td>
<td>26,361</td>
<td>27,563</td>
<td>28,694</td>
<td>26,940</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rotch Library</td>
<td>110,511</td>
<td>105,964</td>
<td>104,355</td>
<td>104,538</td>
<td>104,439</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5. Trends in use of 24/7 spaces, all MIT Libraries

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Library Location</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2018</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Barker Library</td>
<td>12,215</td>
<td>12,530</td>
<td>15,434</td>
<td>16,672</td>
<td>14,669</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dewey Library</td>
<td>3,025</td>
<td>3,260</td>
<td>3,679</td>
<td>3,790</td>
<td>4,038</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hayden Library</td>
<td>8,920</td>
<td>11,451</td>
<td>10,478</td>
<td>10,640</td>
<td>9,680</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library Storage Annex</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Music Library</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rotch Library</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
K. Events

1. Requests versus Hosted Events

Interesting to note that despite the very small sample size, the number of event requests is going down and more of those requested are being approved.

2. Internal versus External Requests
3. **By Library Requested Location**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>AY17-18</th>
<th>AY16-17</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Barker Dome</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rotch Map Room</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hayden 2nd floor event</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rotch Reading Room</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hayden 1st floor</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Killian Hallway</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dewey</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. **By Event Type**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>AY17-18</th>
<th>AY16-17</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reception</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dinner</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Talk/workshop</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Filming</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open House/Orientation</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5. Where Closing a Library Space was needed

Did the event necessitate closing the library?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>AY17-18</th>
<th>AY 16-17</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
L. Incident Reports

1. By Reason for Report, all Libraries

Incident Reports FY 17-18 (133 total) by report reason

- Theft, 15, 11%
- Computer Issue, 27, 21%
- Policy Enforcement, 69, 52%
- Disruptive behavior, 7, 5%
- Other behavioral issue, 15, 11%

2. By Library Location

Incident Reports FY 17-18 (133 total) by location

- Hayden, 63, 48%
- Rotch, 17, 13%
- Barker, 36, 27%
- Dewey, 14, 10%
- Other, 1, 1%
- Music, 1, 1%
- Archives, 0, 0%
- LSA, 0, 0%

---

Incident reports continued at similar levels this year (133 in 2018 vs. 134 in 2017), and as with last year, the majority of reports do not result in MIT Police involvement or with users being asked to leave. The majority of reports are for computer use and policy enforcement and is expected that between implementing session management software on our visitor workstations and changes to staff’s monitoring of workstation use, the number of incidents reported will drop significantly as a result.
3. By Patron Outcome, all Libraries

Incident Reports FY 17-18 (133 total) by outcome

- User asked to leave library by staff, 14, 10%
- User asked to leave library by police, 5, 4%
- User not asked to leave, 114, 86%

4. By Police Involvement, all Libraries

Incident Reports FY 17-18 (133 total) police involvement

- Police Called, 22, 17%
- Police not Called, 111, 83%

While total number and percentage of users asked to leave in 2018 was the same as 2017, the majority (n=14 or 10%) were asked to leave by staff and fewer (n=5 or 4%) were asked to leave by police, possibly indicating 1.) the types of incidents are less problematic or 2.) staff feel increasingly empowered to work with users when incidents do arise.
5. Trends in total incidents reported, all Libraries

With the implementation of TLM session management, we anticipate these numbers will drop by close to 50%.

---

12 With the implementation of TLM session management, we anticipate these numbers will drop by close to 50%.
M. Labor Budget Expenditures

1. Trends in student and temp expenditures, all Libraries

Labor Expenditures (students and temps) Past 5 Years FY 17-18

How Well ID&LA Stayed in Budget for Labor Past 5 Years FY 17-18
3. Extra staffing used from approved pool (pilot for FY 17-18) by hours

Extra hours usage by reason, in hours FY 17-18 (399.25 hours used of an approved pool of 400 total hours)

- Over-committed, 27.25, 7%
- Short Staffed, 123.5, 31%
- Holiday, 248.5, 62%

4. Extra staff hours used from approved pool (pilot for FY 17-18) by instance

Extra hours usage by reason, in instances, FY 17-18

- Over-committed, 16, 15%
- Short Staffed, 41, 38%
- Holiday, 50, 47%

---

In May 2017 the AD’s for Administration and ACE approved a pilot pool of 400 staff hours per academic year to be used to keep Libraries’ service points open in order to ensure business continuity to our user communities. The pilot successfully empowered managers and stayed within the budgeted number of hours. The pilot has been extended for AY 18-19.
N. Draper Service Purchases\textsuperscript{14}

1. Draper card purchases and renewals

\begin{figure}
\centering
\includegraphics[width=\textwidth]{chart1.png}
\caption{Draper Cards, new purchases and renewals past 5 years}
\end{figure}

\begin{figure}
\centering
\includegraphics[width=\textwidth]{chart2.png}
\caption{Draper Cards, total dollars spent past 5 years}
\end{figure}

2. Draper card income

\textsuperscript{14} MIT Libraries did not charge for renewals until FY16-17 (new vs. renewal was not tracked until FY 17-18), when Draper requested to review their agreement with MIT and shortly after that elected to close their on-site library, so this increase can be attributed to the Libraries’ charging for renewals and new cards as well as an increase in total card registrations.
The color printer was a request by the community and has been hugely popular since its installation.
### ID&LA by the Numbers: FY 2017

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Images scanned by users in ID&amp;LA spaces</td>
<td>429,814</td>
<td>-23%</td>
<td>561,177</td>
<td>-9%</td>
<td>613,780</td>
<td>-4%</td>
<td>640,008</td>
<td>-16%</td>
<td>759,309</td>
<td>-2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Library Occupancy</td>
<td>615,789</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>533,436</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>515,471</td>
<td>-8%</td>
<td>561,457</td>
<td>-7%</td>
<td>618,560</td>
<td>-3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Circulation (regular)</td>
<td>80,590</td>
<td>-3%</td>
<td>83,192</td>
<td>-12%</td>
<td>94,873</td>
<td>-60%</td>
<td>240,013</td>
<td>-4%</td>
<td>246,433</td>
<td>-8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resheling of loaned items</td>
<td>155,705</td>
<td>-1%</td>
<td>157,096</td>
<td>-21%</td>
<td>199,915</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>198,422</td>
<td>-18%</td>
<td>242,290</td>
<td>-16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Your Account activity</td>
<td>151,316</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>145,243</td>
<td>-2%</td>
<td>147,867</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>143,480</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>127,446</td>
<td>-9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hayden Circulation (regular)</td>
<td>33,200</td>
<td>-1%</td>
<td>33,540</td>
<td>-6%</td>
<td>35,647</td>
<td>-9%</td>
<td>38,960</td>
<td>-17%</td>
<td>47,118</td>
<td>-6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total 24x7 Occupancy</td>
<td>28,387</td>
<td>-8%</td>
<td>30,886</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>29,475</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>27,172</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>24,160</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bookpage requests via Your Account</td>
<td>20,459</td>
<td>-3%</td>
<td>21,161</td>
<td>-6%</td>
<td>22,482</td>
<td>-6%</td>
<td>23,972</td>
<td>-5%</td>
<td>25,256</td>
<td>-1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Items moved to the Annex or Off-Campus collection</td>
<td>5,131</td>
<td>-63%</td>
<td>13,826</td>
<td>-87%</td>
<td>106,022</td>
<td>345%</td>
<td>23,847</td>
<td>-58%</td>
<td>57,753</td>
<td>-6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In-House use of material</td>
<td>12,038</td>
<td>-24%</td>
<td>15,940</td>
<td>-19%</td>
<td>19,692</td>
<td>-14%</td>
<td>23,015</td>
<td>-9%</td>
<td>25,195</td>
<td>-14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rotch Circulation (regular)</td>
<td>19,714</td>
<td>-1%</td>
<td>19,960</td>
<td>-9%</td>
<td>21,899</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>21,324</td>
<td>-18%</td>
<td>26,189</td>
<td>-2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dewey Circulation (regular)</td>
<td>13,350</td>
<td>-7%</td>
<td>14,404</td>
<td>-15%</td>
<td>16,970</td>
<td>-5%</td>
<td>17,866</td>
<td>-24%</td>
<td>23,544</td>
<td>-11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pages copied by users through copiers in ID&amp;LA spaces</td>
<td>9,082</td>
<td>-31%</td>
<td>13,209</td>
<td>-13%</td>
<td>15,207</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>14,140</td>
<td>-43%</td>
<td>24,732</td>
<td>-12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ID&amp;LA By the Numbers: FY 2017</td>
<td>FY 2018</td>
<td>% change</td>
<td>FY 2017</td>
<td>% change</td>
<td>FY 2016</td>
<td>% change</td>
<td>FY 2015</td>
<td>% change</td>
<td>FY 2014</td>
<td>% change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MIT loans to Borrow Direct partners</td>
<td>14,725</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>14,040</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>12,847</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>12,582</td>
<td>-1%</td>
<td>12,691</td>
<td>-53%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barker 24x7 Occupancy</td>
<td>14,669</td>
<td>-11%</td>
<td>16,456</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>15,318</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>12,461</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12,215</td>
<td>264%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dewey 24x7 Occupancy</td>
<td>4,038</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>3,790</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>3,679</td>
<td>-70%</td>
<td>12,461</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>3,025</td>
<td>-17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hayden 24x7 Occupancy</td>
<td>9,680</td>
<td>-9%</td>
<td>10,640</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>10,478</td>
<td>-8%</td>
<td>11,451</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>8,920</td>
<td>-28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barker Circulation (regular)</td>
<td>9,082</td>
<td>-1%</td>
<td>9,219</td>
<td>-11%</td>
<td>10,324</td>
<td>-7%</td>
<td>11,140</td>
<td>-15%</td>
<td>13,229</td>
<td>-15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Service Prints made in ID&amp;LA Spaces</td>
<td>205,186</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>180,835</td>
<td>956%</td>
<td>17,130</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>11,004</td>
<td>-56%</td>
<td>24,959</td>
<td>39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ILB Articles Filled</td>
<td>12,238</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>11,254</td>
<td>-5%</td>
<td>11,870</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>9,651</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>8,194</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ILL articles loaned</td>
<td>6,495</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>5,604</td>
<td>-14%</td>
<td>6,529</td>
<td>-25%</td>
<td>8,726</td>
<td>-10%</td>
<td>9,663</td>
<td>-15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Fines $ Collected at service points</td>
<td>$3,571.30</td>
<td>-29%</td>
<td>$5,048.50</td>
<td>-29%</td>
<td>$7,157</td>
<td>-15%</td>
<td>$8,453</td>
<td>-11%</td>
<td>$9,560</td>
<td>-31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Reserves Circulation</td>
<td>4,946</td>
<td>-14%</td>
<td>5,761</td>
<td>-15%</td>
<td>6,773</td>
<td>-13%</td>
<td>7,763</td>
<td>-29%</td>
<td>10,836</td>
<td>-16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annex PDF's delivered to users electronically</td>
<td>4,632</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>4,171</td>
<td>-9%</td>
<td>4,588</td>
<td>-15%</td>
<td>5,422</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>5,063</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ILL Loans filled</td>
<td>1,353</td>
<td>-18%</td>
<td>1,652</td>
<td>-54%</td>
<td>3,629</td>
<td>-13%</td>
<td>4,166</td>
<td>-8%</td>
<td>4,519</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annex items delivered to desks for pickup</td>
<td>9,892</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>8,517</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>5,341</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>3,010</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>1,720</td>
<td>73%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Items processed for print reserves</td>
<td>2,544</td>
<td>-4%</td>
<td>2,648</td>
<td>-10%</td>
<td>2,957</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>2,953</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>4,064</td>
<td>-15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ILB requests found at MIT</td>
<td>1,636</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>1,505</td>
<td>-25%</td>
<td>1,995</td>
<td>-3%</td>
<td>2,060</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>1,690</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ILB Loans Filled</td>
<td>2,811</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>2,098</td>
<td>-7%</td>
<td>2,264</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>2,036</td>
<td>-21%</td>
<td>2,586</td>
<td>-25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Searches</td>
<td>636</td>
<td>-47%</td>
<td>1,198</td>
<td>-12%</td>
<td>1,367</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>1,028</td>
<td>-69%</td>
<td>3,275</td>
<td>-8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MIT Thesis requests filled by Resource Sharing</td>
<td>172</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>-6%</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>-78%</td>
<td>655</td>
<td>-31%</td>
<td>945</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Items processed for e-reserves</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>-23%</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>-36%</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>