**MATERIALS & METHODS:**
For this project, we investigated the relationship between ILL lending counts and our subscribed journal usage. Using one publisher sample set, we examined individually subscribed journals and cross referenced those journals with their COUNTER JR1 usage and ILL lending usage over three years (2013-2015).

Taking these measurements, we calculated the percentage and ratio of use coming from our lending requests.

We used three years of data including:
- ILL lending counts
- COUNTER JR1 reports
- Subscription title list
- Purchase price per title

**INTRODUCTION:**
- Library material budgets are tightening and journal subscription costs continue to rise.
- Purchased collections must be analyzed in more detail. We must explore other factors that can impact usage and alter how we assess our collections.
- One unexplored area of assessment at Columbia University is how Interlibrary Loan (ILL) statistics impact our COUNTER journal usage totals.

**STATEMENT OF PURPOSE:** How does ILL lending counts impact journal usage and cost per use?

**RESULTS**
*Counts are derived from 3 year averages of usage*

- **Breakdown of Lending Usage**
- **JR1 Usage VS Lending Usage**

**KEY FINDINGS & FUTURE WORK:**
Titles with more lending counts had a greater general usage count. Titles with low usage had low to zero lending counts.

The analysis showed that there were numerous journals with low to no use for the time period investigated (2013-2015). Based on the data, 10.9% of the total sample set had zero use which could result in a cancelation cost savings of $28,000.

It is important to note that the time and effort it takes to pull and compare JR1 usage and ILL lending downloads may outweigh the actual cost savings benefit of the analysis.

The findings from this study along with the raw usage data will be disseminated to subject selectors at Columbia University. Subject selectors will then have the opportunity to make the appropriate cancelation decision for their departments.

**ISSUES WITH DATA:**
During this project we noticed several issues with matching up the data points:
- The only unique identifier we could use across data pulls was the ISSN.
- We choose RapidILL as our data source. We did not include ILLiad data.
- We viewed usage from one publisher’s platform but the ILL downloads could come from using other platforms.