

# NEW ZEALAND UNIVERSITY LIBRARY STATISTICS 2006

## Scope

Statistics for all New Zealand universities are included in this publication.

Names of the universities and their abbreviations are:

Auckland	University of Auckland
AUT	Auckland University of Technology
Canterbury	University of Canterbury
Lincoln	Lincoln University
Massey	Massey University
Otago	University of Otago
Victoria	Victoria University of Wellington
Waikato	University of Waikato

The libraries of the University of Otago's Christchurch and Wellington Schools of Medicine and Health Sciences are not included.

These statistics relate to the period 1 January to 31 December 2006. Student and staff numbers are from the Ministry of Education (MoE) return. The figures for library staff represent levels for 2006.

CP is used where libraries cannot provide any data.

The scope and arrangement of the statistics is based on that used by CAUL, the Council of Australian University Librarians, for the Australian and New Zealand university library statistics published in Australian Academic and Research Libraries, and on the CAUL website (<http://www.caul.edu.au/stats/>), with some additional figures as requested by New Zealand university libraries.

New Zealand University Library Statistics are accessible from the CONZUL website (<http://www.conzul.ac.nz/statistics.htm>).

In 2006 the University of Canterbury merged with the Christchurch College of Education. The merger between the two institutions has not yet been fully reflected in statistics for 2006. Books issued, interloans received and supplied, and information literacy figures all include Education Library service figures from 2006. Library holdings and expenditure on collections do not include EFTS, FTE, or collection numbers from the Christchurch College of Education.

## Trends in University Library Key Statistics and Ratios

Table 1, Trends in Overall University Library Key Statistics and Ratios, is an attempt to show the overall picture of university library services and collections for the last five years.

Overall student numbers decreased slightly, but the number of seats available to them increased.

The total number of loans increased slightly, mostly due to the Christchurch College of Education merger. Five institutions recorded a decline in the number of loans. Reserve collection loans continued to drop corresponding to the increasing availability of e-reserve collections; this is also reflected in the drop of reserve loans as a percentage of total loans.

Interloan traffic continued to decrease overall; two libraries reported increases in items supplied but all reported decreases in items received. This overall decline is no doubt linked to increasing access to e-resources in each institution.

Average numbers attending information literacy and instruction courses remained steady.

Metrics for use of electronic services should be treated with caution. Not every library provides returns for these columns and figures may not be comparative between institutions. CAUL does not collect statistics in this area.

With the increasing use of electronic resources, the number of physical volumes or items in a collection is becoming less useful as an indicator of its value. However it is notable that the number of physical volumes/items held per FTE continues to rise.

The combined university libraries' collections are a significant asset to the nation; the total budget for library materials increased to just over \$55.5 million in 2006, with over \$26.5 million devoted to e-resources. Seven universities recorded an increase in collection expenditure per FTE.

Total library staff numbers increased in 2006, with amalgamation with the College of Education at CU a factor. In general though, library staff per FTE user population has remained fairly static over the last 4 years.

Total library expenditure per FTE increased again. When compared with the collection expenditure trends per FTE, libraries are spending slightly more on staffing and operational costs, although the percentage differences are small. Library expenditure as a percentage of total university income remains much the same as 2005.

Comparisons with NZ and Australian university libraries is possible through the Council of Australian University Librarians' interactive website at <http://www.caul.edu.au/stats/caul2005.xls> and with the US Association of Research Libraries interactive website at <http://fisher.lib.virginia.edu/arl/index.html>

Table 2, University Library Key Performance Indicators 2006, includes some key ratios on a per EFTS (students only) and per FTE (staff plus students) basis, enabling comparisons to be made between universities.

### **Editor**

Christine Wilson  
Associate University Librarian, Access Services  
University of Auckland

### **Compilation**

Craigie Sinclair  
Executive Assistant  
New Zealand Vice-Chancellors' Committee