**Sponsor Meeting 5**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Date: | 1 March 2018 |
| Time: | 3pm – 4pm |
| Venue: | KGC Law Library Meeting Room |
| Attendees: | Joanne Ong Shi Ying  John Koh Wei De  Rachel Tay  Aaron Tay (SMU Libraries liaison)  Xia Wei (SMU Libraries liaison) |
| Absentees: |  |
| Agenda: | Presentation of Interim Presentation Content |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| No. | Details | Action By | Due Date |
| 1 | Showcase of Interim Presentation content | All | - |
| 2 | Sponsor feedback:   * Check if the title duplicates are really duplicates - they might be of different edition or publication year * Exclude data with missing return timestamp * It is possible that the faculty/adjunct loans were being overwritten by library staffs * 75% of the transactions are below 3 hours - shows that they are trying to avoid the fine. It doesn’t say that the loan period is enough. * Seeing the transactions as independent from one another (borrowings in succession); the users’ borrowing patterns are not taken into account. * Take into account the public holidays. * User successions: Add the hours up together when you find that the users are borrowing per succession. Count every successions then do a distributions of the successions. Re-shelving takes at least 15 minutes. To be safe, can be between 3-4 hours. * Define ‘sufficiency’ – it affects whether you think study sessions are independent. * Increasing the loan policy. * Would translate to less access to the book. * Are people just trying to keep below the loan? * Aaron will give 2016 data - he agrees it is a better idea. * New metric: How long the course reserves remain idle. Can focus on the 8.5% in the pareto chart. Circulation rate would be more appropriate. * Just focus on the undergraduates. The other patron groups are distorting the data. * Exam week; users want to borrow for open book exams for example. You may exceed it for the 3-hour one but not the 3-day one. * Alumni cannot borrow out of the library. Alumni detection has always been a problem. * Use the year of enrollment instead of the patron group due to irregularities. * Moving forward * Compare with 2016 2-hour loan period data → is it people just avoiding the fines? * Filter the analysis for undergraduates. * Sufficiency\_measure → binning it because absolute values will skew the data. * Come down to the user level [successions] * 3-day won’t see but 3-hour will see. * It has always been 3-day. Used to be with the 3-hour but moved it to intershelves and the usage fell quite drastically. * Those who finds the book would not change their pattern. * Mix of 3-hour and 2-hour. When they change from 2-hour to 3-hour? Did it help? * We want to increase the loan periods, but is there evidence to show it? Why is it not enough? Find ways to prove the reasoning. “I have to borrow many books in a row?”. | All | - |
| 3 | * Provide Aaron with the 323 transactions to check if the books are still around | All | - |

Meeting was adjourned at 4pm. These minutes will be circulated and adopted if there are no amendments reported in the next three days.

**Agenda for next meeting**

1. Compare the 2017 with 2016 to see if there are insights that can be found.
2. Have user level analysis like user successions. It might not be evident for 3-day but it will be obvious for 3-hour.
3. Filter the analysis to include only undergraduates.
4. Conduct primary research to see how students will react when they find the loan policy insufficient. Find ways to prove this reasoning.
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