

## Section 2: Percentage Collection Unique and Overlap

In this section are contained the analyses for uniqueness by library groupings, by individual library, and by subject divisions. Overlap is also included for sub-groups. “Uniqueness by Languages” and “Overlap by Languages” are in the Languages section. For tables too large to include within the text, those tables are at the end of the narrative.

### About the measure, uniqueness.

Before analyzing the results of this measurement, a short summary of what is known about the measurement is in order. The uniqueness measurement obtains for the group of libraries in the study. Different percentages of unique records will be obtained if the grouping of libraries is constituted differently. As an example, when the three largest collections are compared only with each other, the percentages of unique materials are UF 53%, FSU 42%, USF 29%. When included in the SUL grouping, for the same institutions, the percentage unique is UF 40%, FSU 30% and USF 15%. Similarly, if three other institutions of comparable size are used as a grouping, the percentages are not the same for unique as within the total grouping of the 25 SUL institutions.

A caveat about the uniqueness measure is that the WCA programming is matching bibliographic records. There are titles that have more than one bibliographic record even though OCLC runs de-dup programs to eliminate duplicate records. Many times the records counted as unique are for variant editions of one title (the main reason that the term “record” is used in the study, and not “title”). The variant edition problem is very common in literature. Many of the titles that turn up as unique in the WCA lists have as many as 50 or more holdings locations in WorldCat. And there may be other records for the same title that have a much larger number of locations. One library in a grouping may own the same title but with a different bibliographic record for that title from the other libraries in the grouping. That particular title is counted as “unique” within the grouping when other libraries own the same title and edition but recorded in WorldCat with holdings attached to another bibliographic record for the title. Or libraries in the group own different editions of a title, which would not be considered unique, except that the WCA counts each edition that only one library owns as unique. In one instance this analyst noticed, a library had a Bantam Books paperback edition of a popular novel and this record was considered unique because no other library in the grouping owned the Bantam Books paper edition. Undoubtedly, other libraries owned different editions of the title. In terms of contributing unique content to the state university information commons, the title is not unique, but the bibliographic record is.

### “Shared by”

Included in the WCA product tables for uniqueness is a measurement for the number of records an individual institution shares with the other libraries within the grouping. The “shared by” measurement begins with “shared by 2” which means the individual institution owns the item in common with one other institution in the group. Clicking on the numbers in the cells brings up lists of titles and these records have the location

symbols for the other owning libraries attached. Thus, it is possible to identify titles and the institutions with which the titles are held in common. In groupings of just a few libraries, the “shared by” percentages for the individual institutions count up to the number of institutions in the grouping. In groups with large numbers of individual institutions, such as the SUL grouping of 25 libraries, the “shared by” percentages reduce to less than one percent and finally to zeroes before the maximum of all libraries in the group are reached. This is due to the limitations placed upon the sharing of a large number of records by the smaller collections in the grouping. The larger the number of libraries in the grouping to share records, and the greater the variance in the size of the collections, the fewer titles can be held in common by all libraries in the grouping.

The analysis for uniqueness begins with sub-groups of the SUL because the way the measurements of uniqueness and “shared by” operate can be more easily understood with smaller groupings. The entire SUL grouping is analyzed last. Overlap is included along with unique even though overlap is for all records, not just unique. Overlap is the opposite of unique. The similarity in the measures can be understood with both analyzed together.

Large Collections Group: UF, FSU & USF

The three institutions in the large group each have over one million bibliographic records for books. Among the group, the percentage of collection in unique records differs markedly.

Table 2-1  
**Uniqueness by Large Collections Group**

Uniqueness	Unique	Shared by 2	Shared by 3
FLORIDA STATE UNIV (FDA)	41.72%	30.17%	28.11%
UNIV OF FLORIDA (FUG)	52.59%	28.65%	18.76%
UNIV OF S FLORIDA (FHM)	28.87%	38.93%	32.20%

The two ARL libraries have higher percentages of unique records than the third institution, USF, the smallest collection. UF has the highest percentage unique at 53% followed by FSU at 42% and USF with 29%. The rankings for “shared by 2” are in reverse order with USF having the highest percentage of records shared with the other two libraries at 39%. FSU is in the middle with 30% shared with the other two libraries. UF has close to the same percentage shared with the other two libraries as FSU with 29%. The rankings for “shared by 3” are in the same order, but USF with 32% and FSU with 28% are closer together. UF has a much lower 19% of records shared with the other two libraries. The “shared by” for all members of the group is limited by the smallest collection. Out of over one million records for each library in the large collections grouping, only 354,561 records are held in common by all three of the libraries. This is nearly one-third of the USF collection, but less than one-fifth of the UF collections.

Table 2-2  
**Overlap for Large Collections Group**

Overlap	FDA	FUG	FHM
FLORIDA STATE UNIV (FDA)	100.00%	47.66%	38.73%
UNIV OF FLORIDA (FUG)	31.81%	100.00%	34.36%
UNIV OF S FLORIDA (FHM)	44.37%	58.97%	100.00%

USF has the highest percentage of overlap on all records with the other two libraries within the group: 44% with FSU and 59% with UF. Predictably, UF has the lowest percentage overlap with the other two institutions, and surprisingly close at 32% with FSU and 34% with USF. FSU is in the middle at 48% with UF and 39% with USF. It is easy to see how uniqueness and overlap act in opposite ways with this example. The higher the uniqueness in a collection, the lower will be the overlap with other libraries in the group. These two measures usually correlate to size of collections. The larger research collections will have a higher percentage of unique records and lower percentages of overlap with smaller library collections.

Medium size general library group: FAMU, FAU, FIU, UCF, UNF, UWF

The medium size general library group is composed of libraries that have over 500,000 book records but less than one million.

Table 2-3  
**Uniqueness for Medium Size General Library Group**

Uniqueness	Unique	Shared by 2	Shared by 3	Shared by 4
FLORIDA A&M UNIV (FCM)	21.97%	20.74%	18.86%	18.50%
FLORIDA ATLANTIC UNIV (FGM)	27.72%	21.29%	19.24%	17.09%
FLORIDA INT UNIV (FXG)	29.76%	22.01%	18.06%	15.86%
UNIV OF CENT FLORIDA (FTU)	30.45%	22.55%	19.20%	14.94%
UNIV OF N FLORIDA, CARPENTER LIBR (FNP)	20.29%	20.04%	21.37%	19.60%
UNIV OF W FLORIDA (FWA)	22.93%	18.62%	18.69%	19.42%

The largest collection in this grouping is UCF which has the largest percentage of unique records within the group at 30%. It is closely followed by FIU and FAU which have nearly 30% and 28% respectively. UWF (23%), FAMU (22%), and UNF (20%) have close to the same percentage. The percentages for “shared by 2,” are very close at 20%-22.5% for all of the libraries with the exception of UWF with slightly less at 19%. All of these collections have a lot in common as seen in the gradual reduction in percentages as the number of libraries increases. In all of the “shared by,” the percentages for all of the libraries in the group do not differ a great deal. UCF and FIU, the larger libraries in the group do begin to have lower shares in the “shared by 4.”

From Table 2-4 it can be seen that percentages of overlap are not in a tight range. The highest percentage overlap within the grouping is 51.6% between North Florida and Central Florida. The lowest level of overlap is between FIU and FAMU at 24 percent. Central Florida has its greatest overlap with Florida Atlantic at 39 percent. All five of the other libraries have their greatest percentage overlap with Central Florida, ranging from 43% for FIU to 52% for UNF. Four libraries have their second greatest overlap with Florida Atlantic: FAMU, FIU, UNF, and UWF. North Florida has the highest percentage of overlap with Central Florida at 52%. The other five libraries all have their lowest level of overlap with FAMU at less than 30%.

Table 2-4  
**Overlap for Medium Size General Library Group**

Overlap	FCM	FGM	FXG	FTU	FNP	FWA
FLORIDA A&M UNIV (FCM)	100.00%	43.99%	39.82%	50.20%	34.86%	31.51%
FLORIDA ATLANTIC UNIV (FGM)	25.52%	100.00%	39.38%	45.43%	33.90%	29.34%
FLORIDA INT UNIV (FXG)	24.22%	41.29%	100.00%	43.42%	31.69%	26.37%
UNIV OF CENT FLORIDA (FTU)	25.07%	39.12%	35.65%	100.00%	33.21%	27.48%
UNIV OF N FLORIDA, CARPENTER LIBR (FNP)	27.04%	45.35%	40.43%	51.59%	100.00%	37.16%
UNIV OF W FLORIDA (FWA)	27.80%	44.64%	38.26%	48.54%	42.25%	100.00%

In general, the medium-sized collections have higher percentages of overlap within the grouping than their percentage uniqueness.

Smallest general library grouping: FGCU, FIU Biscayne Bay, New College, and USF St. Petersburg

The smallest general library grouping is composed of general library collections with less than 500,000 book records.

Table 2-5  
**Uniqueness for Small General Library Grouping**

Uniqueness	Unique	Shared by 2	Shared by 3	Shared by 4
FLORIDA GULF COAST UNIV (FGA)	61.21%	25.67%	10.08%	3.04%
FLORIDA INT UNIV, BISCAYNE BAY CAMP LIBR (FXN)	66.48%	22.19%	9.04%	2.29%
NEW COL OF FLORIDA (FHC)	59.34%	25.80%	11.66%	3.21%
UNIV OF S FLORIDA, ST PETERSBURG (FHS)	51.68%	32.50%	12.93%	2.89%

Within the grouping of Florida Gulf Coast, FIU Biscayne Bay, New College, and USF St. Petersburg, the percentage uniqueness for each collection is very high, from 52% at USF St. Pete to 68% FIU Biscayne Bay. Predictably, with such high percentages of unique

records the “shared by” percentages are relatively low in comparison. The highest in “shared by 2,” is USF St. Pete (32.5%) which is also highest in “shared by 3” at 13%. All four of the collections share 3% or less of records with each other.

Table 2-6  
**Overlap for Small General Library Grouping**

Overlap	FGA	FXN	FHC	FHS
FLORIDA GULF COAST UNIV (FGA)	100.00%	18.30%	14.74%	21.91%
FLORIDA INT UNIV, BISCAYNE BAY CAMP LIBR (FXN)	13.78%	100.00%	13.83%	19.53%
NEW COL OF FLORIDA (FHC)	15.52%	19.34%	100.00%	23.87%
UNIV OF S FLORIDA, ST PETERSBURG (FHS)	20.82%	24.66%	21.55%	100.00%

The highest overlap is between FIU Biscayne Bay and USF St. Petersburg at 25 percent. The lowest is between FIU Biscayne Bay and FGCU. The other three libraries all have their highest overlap with USF St. Petersburg, which runs between 21% to 25 percent.

These four library collections appear to be quite different from one another. They each have large percentages of unique records within the group. There is considerable difference in size between the collections; a difference of 50,000 to 70,000 records is a large percentage of collections with less than 260,000 total records. But even with the differences in size, the percentages unique are in a range of 52% to 66 percent. The overlap ranges from 14% to 25 percent. The large percentages unique and the low percentages in overlap point to differences in holdings. Differences in the missions of the universities may account for collections being built differently. The phenomenon of variant editions may also have a role in the high number of unique titles.

Groups were also created for the health sciences and law libraries.

Medical/health sciences Grouping

Table 2-7  
**Uniqueness for Medical /Health Sciences Libraries**

Uniqueness	Unique	Shared by 2	Shared by 3	Shared by 4	Shared by 5
FLORIDA STATE UNIV COL OF MED (FFQ)	24.81%	49.15%	21.64%	4.33%	0.07%
UNIV OF FLORIDA, HEALTH CTR LIBR (FUH)	80.56%	16.82%	2.36%	0.26%	0.00%
UNIV OF FLORIDA, HEALTH SCI CTR, JHEP (FUJ)	53.17%	31.99%	12.31%	2.49%	0.04%
UNIV OF S FLORIDA, HEALTH SCI CTR (FHJ)	62.23%	31.52%	5.55%	0.69%	0.01%
UNIV OF S FLORIDA, MENTAL HEALTH (FHI)	87.59%	10.32%	1.92%	0.16%	0.02%

Within the health sciences library groupings, the level of uniqueness is very high with the exception of the Florida State University College of Medicine, a much younger collection than the others. It would seem puzzling that there are almost no records shared by all five

libraries. The inclusion of the USF Mental Health Institute library in the group may be contributing to the lack of shared records by all of the libraries in the group. In the “shared by 2” the different foci of FHMI show in the much lower percentage of records it shares with the other three libraries. The largest library, UF Health Science Center in Gainesville, has the next lowest percentage in “shared by 2.” As the smallest collection, the FSU Medical library has the largest percentages of “shared by.” 3, only over 21% shared with the other four libraries. The “shared by” 4 also have very low percentages.

Table 2-8  
**Overlap for Medical/Health Sciences Libraries**

Overlap	FFQ	FUH	FUJ	FHJ	FHI
FLORIDA STATE UNIV COL OF MED (FFQ)	100.00%	69.17%	10.63%	24.46%	1.44%
UNIV OF FLORIDA, HEALTH CTR LIBR (FUH)	3.95%	100.00%	3.86%	12.81%	1.71%
UNIV OF FLORIDA, HEALTH SCI CTR, JHEP (FUJ)	6.05%	38.53%	100.00%	18.11%	1.56%
UNIV OF S FLORIDA, HEALTH SCI CTR (FHJ)	3.75%	34.41%	4.88%	100.00%	1.70%
UNIV OF S FLORIDA, MENTAL HEALTH (FHI)	0.47%	9.75%	0.89%	3.61%	100.00%

Overlap among the medical/health sciences libraries is predictably low as the level of uniqueness is very high and the libraries do not share a large percentage of records. Both the UF Jacksonville library and the USF Health Sciences Center library share over one third of collection with UF Health Science Center, Gainesville. The low overlap for FMHI is clearly evident.

Law Libraries Grouping

There is a high level of uniqueness within the law libraries grouping with the two largest libraries being the most unique due to size. The level of uniqueness is also high in the other two libraries in the group. In “shared by 2” the largest libraries have a higher percentage of shared records than the other libraries. In “shared by 3” and “shared by 4” the FAMU Law library and the FIU Law library have higher percentages than the larger libraries. It is obvious in the “shared by 3” and “shared by 4” that the two smaller libraries have the most shared records.

Table 2-9  
**Uniqueness for Law Libraries**

Uniqueness	Unique	Shared by 2	Shared by 3	Shared by 4
FLORIDA A&M UNIV COL OF LAW (FAMLW)	41.24%	22.68%	21.77%	14.32%
FLORIDA INT UNIV COL OF LAW LIBR (FIUCL)	38.92%	23.04%	26.09%	11.95%
FLORIDA STATE UNIV, LAW LIBR (FSL)	52.42%	37.39%	7.64%	2.56%
UNIV OF FLORIDA, LAW LIBR (FUB)	61.82%	30.23%	5.98%	1.97%

Table 2-10  
**Overlap for Law Libraries**

Overlap	FAMLW	FIUCL	FSL	FUB
FLORIDA A&M UNIV COL OF LAW (FAMLW)	100.00%	23.99%	40.24%	44.94%
FLORIDA INT UNIV COL OF LAW LIBR (FIUCL)	20.02%	100.00%	42.76%	48.29%
FLORIDA STATE UNIV, LAW LIBR (FSL)	7.18%	9.14%	100.00%	44.00%
UNIV OF FLORIDA, LAW LIBR (FUB)	6.19%	7.97%	33.95%	100.00%

The FIU College of Law library has its highest overlap with FSU and UF Law. FAMU also has its highest overlap with the largest libraries, and also 24% overlap with the FIU Law Library. Overlap between the two largest libraries is relatively high at just over one third of collection for UF overlapping with FSU and 44% overlap for FSU with UF. It is perhaps unexpected that the level of uniqueness between even the large collections is so high.

Combined Groupings

Another set of sub-groupings within the SUL was constructed to bring together the records for each of the institutions that has more than one library holdings symbol. In the Combined Groupings, the records for each institution with branch or satellite libraries are combined to make one group for each institution. The special collections, health sciences, and law collections are brought together with the holdings for the general library collections for each of those institutions. (UCF is not included because the one special collection is too small to influence the general library profile)

Table 2-11  
**Uniqueness for Combined Groupings**

Uniqueness	Unique	Shared by 2	Shared by 3	Shared by 4	Shared by 5
FAMUcombined	14.73%	18.02%	20.18%	26.02%	21.05%
FIUcombined	17.60%	20.38%	26.12%	24.92%	10.97%
FSUcombined	35.78%	23.30%	18.62%	15.35%	6.96%
UFcombined	45.72%	21.09%	16.94%	11.71%	4.55%
USFcombined	22.34%	23.31%	27.05%	19.71%	7.59%

The combined groups were again combined to measure uniqueness, “shared by” and overlap among the five groups. The UF combined group has the highest percentage of unique within the combined groups although not the highest in “shared by 2.” The FSU combined group holds 36% of unique records of the combined groups and it has almost the same percentage in “shared by 2” as USF. USF is third in percentage of unique records with 22% and is highest in the “shared by 2” with 23.31 percent. FIU has nearly 18% in unique records and is also fourth in “shared by 2.” FAMU has the lowest percentage of unique records among the combined groupings with 15 percent. FAMU is also the lowest in “shared by 2” with 18 percent.

In “shared by 3” USF has the highest percentage at 27%, followed by FIU with 26%, FAMU with 20%, FSU with 15%, and UF with the lowest in “shared by 3” with 17 percent. The order changes with “shared by 4 with FAMU having the highest percentage at 26%, FIU with 25%, USF with 20%, FSU with 15%, and UF with 12 percent. In “shared by 5” the percentages reduce more for the larger three libraries. FAMU has the highest at 21%; FIU is next with a much lower 11 percent. The other three have less than 10% with USF at 7.6%, FSU with 7% and UP with 4.5%. The effect of size of collection can be seen in the uniqueness and “shared by” measurements. “Shared by” is limited by the grouping with the lowest number of records as all five of the combined groupings cannot share more records than those held by the library with the lowest number.

Table 2-12  
**Overlap for Combined Groupings**

Overlap	FAMUcombined	FIUcombined	FSUcombined	UFcombined	USFcombined
FAMUcombined	100.00%	46.26%	48.97%	64.34%	61.06%
FIUcombined	24.12%	100.00%	44.02%	63.80%	59.34%
FSUcombined	16.19%	27.92%	100.00%	49.53%	40.78%
UFcombined	13.91%	26.45%	32.38%	100.00%	35.55%
USFcombined	22.03%	41.05%	44.50%	59.33%	100.00%

Overlap between the combined groupings has very high percentages. FAMU has the highest percentage of overlap with each of the other combined groupings: 64% with UF; 61% with USF, 49% with FSU, and 46% with FIU. FIU is next with 64% with UF; 59% with USF; 44% with FSU; and 24% with FAMU. USF is third highest with 59% with UF; 44.5% with FSU; 41% with FIU, and 22% with FAMU. FSU has less overlap at 50% with UF; 41% with USF; 28% with FIU, and 16% with FAMU. UF has the lowest percentage of overlap with the other combined groupings, one reason being that UF has the largest number of records and the other groupings have fewer records to match. UF has its highest overlap with the USF combined at 35.5%, followed by 32% with FSU. Overlap with FIU is at 26% and FAMU at 14%.

Because of the differences in size of the combined collections, the similarities in the percentages of unique, “shared by” and overlap seen in the groupings of libraries of similar size book collections are not seen in the combined groupings.

The next analysis shows the percentage unique for all of the libraries.

### Uniqueness SUL

The percentage of the collection that is unique within the SUL grouping is shown in Table 2-13 for each of the twenty-five institutions in the study ranked by most unique records to least unique records.

Table 2-13  
**Uniqueness by Library**

Rank	Institution	% Unique
1	RINGLING MUS OF ART LIBR (FSJ)	54.37%
2	FLORIDA SOLAR ENERGY CTR (FSE)	41.40%
3	UNIV OF FLORIDA (FUG)	39.84%
4	UNIV OF S FLORIDA, MENTAL HEALTH (FHI)	38.14%
5	UNIV OF S FLORIDA, HEALTH SCI CTR (FHJ)	36.96%
6	UNIV OF FLORIDA, HEALTH CTR LIBR (FUH)	33.24%
7	FLORIDA STATE UNIV (FDA)	30.21%
8	FLORIDA STATE UNIV, LAW LIBR (FSL)	28.31%
9	UNIV OF FLORIDA, LAW LIBR (FUB)	25.85%
10	FLORIDA INT UNIV COL OF LAW LIBR (FIUCL)	24.37%
11	UNIV OF FLORIDA, HEALTH SCI CTR, JHEP (FUJ)	22.84%
12	FLORIDA STATE UNIV, MUSIC LIBR (FMZ)	22.57%
13	FLORIDA A&M UNIV COL OF LAW (FAMLW)	17.28%
14	UNIV OF S FLORIDA (FHM)	15.07%
15	UNIV OF CENT FLORIDA (FTU)	14.67%
16	FLORIDA STATE UNIV COL OF MED (FFQ)	13.71%
17	NEW COL OF FLORIDA (FHC)	12.84%
18	FLORIDA ATLANTIC UNIV (FGM)	12.71%
19	FLORIDA INT UNIV (FXG)	11.61%
20	UNIV OF W FLORIDA (FWA)	11.09%
21	FLORIDA GULF COAST UNIV (FGA)	9.93%
22	FLORIDA A&M UNIV (FCM)	9.39%
23	UNIV OF N FLORIDA, CARPENTER LIBR (FNP)	9.22%
24	FLORIDA INT UNIV, BISCAYNE BAY CAMP LIBR (FXN)	6.07%
25	UNIV OF S FLORIDA, ST PETERSBURG (FHS)	5.32%

The rank order in the table above does show the strengths of the special subject collections. Although among the smaller of the 25 institutions, the Ringling Museum Library (54%) and the Florida Solar Energy Center (41%) have the largest percentage of unique records among the 25 collections. The largest of the institutions, University of Florida, is third with 40% of the collection being unique. The next in ranking are the University of South Florida Mental Health (FMHI) library (38%), the USF Health Sciences Library (37%), and the University of Florida Health Science Center (33.24%). The Florida State University general collection ranks seventh in terms of percentage of unique records with 30%-- 10 percentage points less than the University of Florida.

Three of the four separate law collections rank very close to each other in the percentage of unique records. Florida State, University of Florida and Florida International law libraries range from 23-24% in unique records and rank 8-10 among the SUL in unique records. The FAMU law library has 17% in unique records and ranks thirteenth.

The next of the largest institutions, the University of South Florida and the University of Central Florida, rank fourteenth and fifteenth with 15% unique records. New College and

Florida Atlantic rank seventeenth and eighteenth with 13% unique records. Florida International (12%) and University of West Florida (11%) rank nineteenth and twentieth. Florida Gulf Coast has 10% unique records and ranks 21<sup>st</sup>. Florida A&M and the University of North Florida each have 9% and rank 22<sup>nd</sup> and 23<sup>rd</sup>. The two collections with the lowest percentage of unique records are FIU, Biscayne Bay (6%) and the library at the USF St. Petersburg campus, which has the lowest percentage of unique records at 5 percent.

Those ranking in the top 12 all have percentages of unique records at over one-fifth of the collection. The only two with above 40% are small special libraries. There are only seven libraries with over 30% in unique titles, including the two ARL libraries, UF and FSU. The remainder of the top 12 have percentages of unique records ranging from 22 to 28 percent.

Over half of the libraries have less than one-fifth in unique records. Institutions ranking from 14<sup>th</sup> to 25<sup>th</sup> are all institutions that were formed in the post WWII expansion with the exception of FAMU. As they began as regional institutions, the low percentages of unique records reflect their original missions as undergraduate institutions with programs in core subject areas for general undergraduate education. That is, the degree programs at these institutions were not unique within the system and thus, the collections reflect those degree programs. They all had similar core degree programs until growth and regional emphases began to give them differentiated missions. Although these institutions have much lower percentages of unique records within the SUL, they have highly unique collections within their size grouping as shown in the analysis by size grouping. They still do each contribute to the overall diversity of the SUL aggregated collection.

In the “shared by” analysis, the percentage of collection that is shared by from one to 19 other libraries is shown for each library in the SUL grouping. As the table displaying these data is rather elongated with all of the columns, it is included in the end of this section.

As with other measures in this study, the common patterns tend to be among libraries of similar size in number of bibliographic records for books. The largest of the general libraries, UF and FSU, have larger percentages of unique records within the SUL grouping simply because they have much larger total numbers. This also has the effect of reducing the percentages of shared records. UF, FSU, UCF, and New College are the only libraries in which the “shared by” overall percentage reduces as the number of libraries “shared by” increases. FIU only has one exception to this pattern, in reducing slightly in “shared by 3,” and increasing in “shared by 4,” but then resumes the reduction in percentage share after that. USF does not fit the pattern in that the “shared by 2-4” are nearly the same, but then the percentages reduce starting with “shared by 5.” With a lower overall percentage of unique, USF has higher percentages of “shared by.” The percentages of “shared by” for FAMU, FAU, FGCU, North Florida, West Florida, FIU Biscayne Bay, and St. Petersburg all have increases in “shared by” as the number of libraries increases. These libraries all have overall percentages of unique less than 10% with the exception of FAU with 13 percent.

When compared with the ASERL/TRLN/FCLA aggregate, the percentages unique are proportionately lower with more large research libraries in the grouping. The Florida libraries are anywhere from 5 to over 10 percentage points lower than the uniqueness within the SUL grouping. UF has 39% unique in SUL but 25% unique in the larger grouping. FSU is ten percentage points lower at 18% instead of 28%. USF has 8% instead of 15%. FIU has 10% instead of 7%. UCF has 8% instead of 15%. These examples serve to illustrate that in a larger grouping of academic libraries with a larger number of research libraries, the SUL members have less unique collections.

In “shared by 2,” the libraries with the larger percentages of unique records tend to have a much smaller percentage, whereas libraries with a low percentage of unique titles tend to have close to the same percentage in “shared by 2.” Three health sciences collections have the highest percentages of “shared by 2,” over 20%. Only one other collection has over 20% -- FSU Law. UF and FSU are less than one percentage point apart with 16.41% and 15.47% “shared by 2.” Florida Gulf Coast, University of West Florida, and University of North Florida all have a “shared by 2” of 9% and unique close to 9 percent. University of South Florida, UCF, and FIU have a “shared by 2” percentage of approximately 13%, but larger percentages for unique. In the “shared by 2,” the pairings by libraries vary as individual titles are considered

In looking at the lists of “unique” titles for a number of libraries, in an attempt to ascertain if there were any patterns to the titles, it is very obvious that the lists contain common titles. The analyst then began clicking on “state holdings” in the unique title lists. The common looking titles were indeed common in Florida, just not within the SUL grouping. Many of the titles in an SUL library’s unique list would have a considerable number of holdings in both public libraries and community colleges in the state. Indeed, many of these titles had at least several hundred holding libraries in WorldCat. The analyst then proceeded to look at the list for all titles by year, not just unique, for the number of holding libraries. These titles indeed did look more scholarly and they were held by at least several of the SUL. Thus, the number and percentages of unique titles for the time period 2000-2007 are deceiving in academic terms and the majority of those “unique” titles are from mainstream publishers and many of them are shared with public and other academic libraries in Florida; the titles are just held by only one of the SUL group.

Another type of material that frequently ends up in unique lists is an annual which is cataloged as a separate when most libraries are handling the title as a serial. Many of the titles are e-books which make up larger proportions in the most recent years.

As the number of shared libraries increases, the data are more meaningful with respect to the smaller general collections. For very large libraries, the number of records that can be shared with smaller specialized collections is limited by the size of the smaller collections. This has been seen in the groupings by size of collection. In the SUL groupings, the percentages reduce to less than 1% for any collection at the “shared by 10” measure. For example, the USF St. Petersburg library, which has the smallest percentage unique collection, has the largest percentage in “shared by 10.” Florida Gulf Coast and

New College have the next largest percentages in “shared by 10.” The University of Florida and Florida State have near the lowest percentages in “shared by 10” because their collections are much more unique. The special collections all have numbers of records that preclude the majority of their collections being shared with the general library collections.

On the other end of the scale from “shared by 2,” the titles that survive as being in common for the largest number of libraries, “shared by 19,” are the *Chicago Manual of Style*, the *Turabian Manual of Style...*, and *Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders*. The “last title left standing” does vary by library. In cases in which a library owns only one title “shared by 19,” that title is a style manual. The uniqueness analysis in the WCA does not go higher than “shared by 19” for the SUL group. In other words there are not titles shared by all 25 of the libraries. For the majority of the libraries, the number of records increases from “shared by 2” up to “shared by” 8 or 9 libraries. After that point, the number and percentage of records begin to drop off and continue to decline out to the last measure of “shared by 19.” Looking at individual titles and which libraries make up the shared group involves numbers of titles in the thousands for the large collections. A better measure on an institution by institution basis is the Overlap analysis which is in the Languages Section and includes English as well as non-English languages.

#### Overlap SUL

As there is no aggregate analysis available for uniqueness and overlap in the WCA, the overlap analysis is by library. Only the general libraries are analyzed for overlap as the special libraries were analyzed in groupings.

**FIU Biscayne Bay** has its highest overlap at 69% with UF, followed by USF 66%, 54% FAU, 52% FIU, 51% UCF, 39% UNF, 36% UWA, 31% FAMU and close to 20% with ST. Petersburg.

**USF St. Petersburg** has its highest overlap with UF at 67%, followed by 64.5% with USF, 60% UCF, 59% FSU, 55% USF, 50% FAU, 47% UWF, 43% FIU, 31% FAMU, 26% FIU Biscayne Bay, and 21% FGCU.

**Florida International** has its highest overlap at 63% with UF, followed by 57% USF, 44% FSU, 43% UCF, 41% FAU, 32% UNF, 26% UWF.

**New College** has its highest overlap with UF at 62%, followed by 53% with both FSU and USF, 45% with UCF, 43% UNF, 42% FAU, 39% UWF, 35% FIU, St. Petersburg 24%, 23% FAMU, FIU Biscayne Bay 20%, and FGCU 15%.

**FAMU** has high levels of overlap with the larger general libraries, ranging from 40% with FIU to 61% with the University of Florida. Overlap with UNF and UWF is in the 30% range.

**Florida Atlantic** has its highest overlap with UF at 61% and USF with 57%. Overlap with other general libraries is less at 47% for FSU, 45% for UCF, 39% FIU, 34% UNF, and 29% UWF.

The **University of West Florida** has its highest overlap with UF at 61%, followed by 57% with USF, 53% FSU, 48% with UCF, 45% FAU, 42% UNF, 38% FIU, 20% St. Petersburg, and 19% FIU Biscayne Bay.

The **University of North Florida** has its highest overlap with UF at nearly 60%, followed by 57% with USF, 52% UCF, 45% FAU, 40% FIU, 37% UWF, 27% FAMU, 20% with USF St. Petersburg, and 19% with FIU Biscayne Bay.

The **University of South Florida** has its highest overlap with UF at nearly 60%, followed by 44% with FSU, 40% UCF, 38% FAU, 36% FIU, 28% UNF, 25% UWF, and 22% FAMU.

**Florida Gulf Coast** has its highest overlap with UCF at 58%, followed by 56% with UF, 54% with USF, 49% FSU, 46% FAU, 44% UNF, 37% FIU, 34% UWF, and 27% FAMU.

**University of Central Florida** has its highest overlap at 54% with UF, followed by 51% USF, 45% FSU, 39% FAU, 35.5% FIU, 33% UNF, 27% UWF, and 25% FAMU.

**Florida State** has its highest overlap with UF at 48%, followed by USF at 39%, UCF at 30%, FAU 27%, FIU 24%, UNF at 23% and UWF at 20%.

The **University of Florida** has its highest overlap with USF at 34%, followed by FSU at 32%, 25% UCF, 24% FAU, and 23% with FIU.

### Uniqueness by Subject Divisions

Table 2-14 shows the average uniqueness by subject divisions. A table, which shows all of the libraries' percentage uniqueness by subject, is attached to the end of this section as it is too large to fit within the narrative text. As with other analyses by percentage of collection, large percentages unique can be on very low numbers of records, but all percentages are used in the calculations for the averages.

Table 2-14 shows the subject divisions in rank order according to the average percentage of unique records. By average percentage of uniqueness, Physical Education & Recreation is the subject division with the largest percentage of unique records with 28% unique. Government Documents has the lowest average percentage uniqueness at 11 percent. The allied health divisions also have among the lowest with 11% in Health facilities and nursing, 12% in Preclinical sciences, 13% in Medicine by body system and discipline. Health professions & public health are at 15 percent. The rank order by

percentage unique does not correlate with the percentages of total collection by subject divisions seen in Section 1, Table 3. In fact, the subject division that forms a high percentage of the holdings of the majority of the general libraries, Government Documents, has the lowest percentage of uniqueness, showing that the libraries are nearly all acquiring the same titles.

Table 2-14  
**Uniqueness by Subject Divisions**

Subject Divisions	Average Uniqueness
Physical Education & Recreation	27.84%
Agriculture	25.94%
Engineering & Technology	24.67%
Language, Linguistics & Literature	24.66%
Philosophy & Religion	24.62%
Medicine	24.41%
Art & Architecture	23.59%
History & Auxiliary Sciences	22.81%
Law	21.41%
Geography & Earth Sciences	21.28%
Business & Economics	20.77%
Physical Sciences	18.99%
Political Science	18.29%
Performing Arts	18.25%
Library Science, Generalities & Ref.	17.96%
Computer Science	17.60%
Biological Sciences	17.57%
Education	16.68%
Psychology	15.45%
Music	15.40%
Health Professions & Public Health	15.13%
Sociology	14.39%
Anthropology	14.14%
Chemistry	13.64%
Medicine By Discipline	13.47%
Medicine By Body System	13.03%
Mathematics	12.41%
Preclinical Sciences	11.80%
Health Facilities, Nursing & History	10.96%
Government Documents	10.81%

A caveat here, many libraries have high percentages of unique records, but very low numbers within the subject division. Only libraries with a considerable number of records as defined by each collection are included in the following analysis. The subject divisions are in rank order according to percentage uniqueness in Table 2-14.

Physical Education & Recreation ranks no. 1 in percentage uniqueness at 28 percent. Libraries with the highest percentages are FSU 40%, UF 38%, UCF & UWF 22%, FIU 21%, UNF 19% and FAU 18%. The ranking is influenced and somewhat skewed by a 100% unique for one library with one record.

Agriculture ranks second in percentage uniqueness among the 25 subject divisions at 26 percent. The libraries with the largest percentages of unique records in Agriculture are UF 66% and FSU 45%. FAMU has 22%; USF and FIU both have 20%, and North Florida has 19% unique in Agriculture.

Engineering & Technology rank third with 25% in percentage unique. The Florida Solar Energy Center has the highest percentage unique with 50%. UF & FIU Biscayne Bay are at 38%; UCF 26%; USF 20%; FAMU, FAU, and UWF 19%; FIU 17%; FGCU & UNF 16%.

Language, Linguistics & Literature ranks fourth in overall percentage unique with 25 percent. UF has 50%, FSU has 37%, USF 24%, FAU 23%, New College 21%, FIU 20%, UCF 20%, UWF 15%, FGCU 14.5%; FAMU & UNF 12%.

Philosophy/Religion is fifth at slightly under 25% in overall percentage unique. UF has 44% unique, FSU 32%, FAU 24%, USF 19%, FAMU 12%, FGCU 11%, FIU 15%; New College, UCF and UWF 13%; UNF 9%.

The general Medicine division ranks sixth in percentage unique with 24 percent. The collections with the largest percentages unique are FMHI at 55%, UF 46% and UF Health at 41%, USF Health at 35% and UF Jax Health at 30%; FSU 33%, FIU 22%, UCF 20%, USF 19%, FAMU 17%, UNF & UWF 15%, FAU 14% and FGCU 12%. It is natural that the special health sciences collections would have a higher percentage of unique titles than the general collections, but the general collections also have considerable percentages of unique records.

Art & Architecture is ranked seventh with slightly under 24% average uniqueness. The highest is FSU Ringling at 56%, then a considerable gap for UF 35%, FSU 33%, FAU & USF 23%, UCF 17%, New College 16%, FIU 14%, FAMU & FGCU 12%, UWF 11%.

History & Auxiliary Sciences rank eighth in average percentage uniqueness with slightly under 23%. UF 47%, FSU 34%, FAU 17%, FIU & USF 15%; New College, UCF & UWF have 13%.

The Law division is ninth in average percentage uniqueness at 21% with UF Law 35%, FSU Law 34%, FIU Law 26%, FAMU 18%. Of the general collections UF has 46% unique, FSU 25%, FIU 17%, UCF 13%, USF 10%; and FAMU, FAU, FGCU, UWF 9%. The low percentages of unique in the general collections points to core collections in Law with the more specialized materials in the Law libraries.

Geography & Earth Sciences are tenth in average percentage uniqueness at 21% with FSU 47%, UF 41%, FMHI 33%, USF 24%, FAU 12%, UCF 16%, UWF 14%, USF St. Pete 13%, and FIU 12 percent.

Business & Economics has nearly 21% in average percentage uniqueness for an eleventh place. After UF with 42% and FSU with 27%, the percentages drop off for the remaining general library collections. FIU and UCF have 13%; USF has 11%; FAU over 9%; UNF 8.5%, FGCU & UWF 8%, FAMU 7%, FIU Biscayne Bay 6.5% and New College 6%. Several of the special collections also have a considerable number of Business records. In the Florida Solar Energy collection, Business has the second highest number of records and 45% unique. Business has the third highest number of records in the UF Law Library and 22% unique. Business is also the third highest in the FSU Law collection with 18% unique.

After the “top eleven” above, no other subject division has over 20% in average uniqueness across the SUL. As the average uniqueness drops the percentages by library collection also decrease. Subject divisions with less than 20% unique follow below.

Physical Sciences is next with nearly 19% overall unique. UF has the highest unique at 38%; FSU 28%; UWF 22%; UCF nearly 22%, FIU 21%, FAU 15%, USF 13%, FAMU 11%, FIU 8.5%; FGCU, USF St. Pete, UNF, and FIU Biscayne Bay all close to 8%.

Two subject divisions have 18% in overall unique: Performing Arts and Political Science. For Performing Arts the highest percentage unique is UF with 30%, FSU 21%. The next tier is led by New College at 13% followed by FAU and UCF with 11%; FIU and USF 10%, UWF 8%.

For Political Science the two largest libraries have close to the same percentage unique: UF 28% and FSU 23%. Others are much lower -- UCF 9%; FAU, FIU, UNF, USF, UWF, New College 8%.

Very close behind Performing Arts and Political Science is the division of Library Science, Generalities & Reference with nearly 18% in overall uniqueness. UF and FSU have almost the same percentage at 38%; USF is lower at 17%; FIU 13%, FAU 12%, FAMU 10% and UCF & UWF, 9%.

Biological Sciences and Computer Science both also have over 17% in overall unique percentage. UF has 39% unique in Biological Sciences followed by FSU with 33%. USF 23%, UCF 14%, UWF 13%, FAU 12%, FIU 11%, FGCU 10%, FAMU & UNF 9%.

In Computer Science UCF 25%, FSU has 16% unique; FAU, FAMU & USF & UNF 14%; FGCU, FIU & UWF 13%, UF 10%.

Education is close to 17% in overall unique. UF has 45% in unique records; FSU has 27%. The next tier is UCF and UWF with 12%; FIU & USF at 10%. FAU & FAMU have over 8%. The much larger percentages of unique at UF and FSU may be due to the retrospective depth of the collections, whereas the younger universities may have comparable collections in more recent years.

With Psychology at just over 15% unique, the subject divisions are getting to low overall percentages of unique. FSU had the highest unique at 26%; FMHI 29%, UF 22%, UCF 16%, FAU & USF 12%, New College and FGCU, & UWF 10%; FAMU, FIU Biscayne Bay, UNF, 9%.

Music has nearly the same percentage unique as Psychology at 15%. FSU general collection has the highest percentage unique at 43%; UF is at 28% and FSU Music 22%. FAU & USF have 13%; FGCU, FIU, UCF 12%; New College 11%; UNF & UWF 10% unique records. The FSU Music Library collection reflects uniqueness in scores, recordings, etc. The general library is primarily the book collection. UF Music is not accounted for by a separate location symbol, so the UF uniqueness is across the Music collection.

Anthropology and Sociology each have 14% average uniqueness. For Anthropology UF has 43%, FSU has 22%; USF 14.5%, UCF 14%, FAU & FIU 12%, UWF 11%; FMHI & New College 9%; FAMU & UNF 8%.

For Sociology UF has 34%, FSU 21%, FIU, UCF & USF 10%, FAU 8% percentage unique.

Chemistry has over 13% in average uniqueness. UF has 27% unique; FSU 22%, UCF 14%, FAMU 13%, USF 12%, UWF 8%.

Two of the divisions for Medicine, by body system and by discipline have a small number of records and both have 13% in average uniqueness. As would be expected, the highest percentage of uniqueness for both divisions occurs in the health sciences collections at UF Health 38% and 32%; USF Health at 31% and 23% respectively; UF Health at Jacksonville 29% and 25%; 14% and 19% for FSU Med; FMHI 17% and 19%; FSU 23% and 13%.

Mathematics has 12% in average uniqueness with over 20% at UF, 17% at FSU; UCF 13%; FIU Biscayne Bay & UWF 12%; USF 10%; FAMU & FGCU 9%; New College & USF St. Petersburg 8%.

Preclinical Sciences has nearly 12% and Health Facilities, Nursing & History has nearly 11% in average uniqueness. In Pre-clinical sciences FSU has 26%, UF Health 24%, UF & USF Health, 22%, UF Jax, 21%, FAMU 20%, UCF, 16%, FSU Med & USF 14%,.

In Health Facilities... subject division the general libraries have larger numbers than the health sciences libraries in some cases. UF Health 40%, UF 28%, UF Jax 12%; USF has over 2,000 records in the general collection with 7% unique; USF Health Sciences has slightly less than 2,000 records with 16% unique, FMHI 20%; FSU 18%, FSU Med 6%.

And last in average uniqueness is Government Documents with slightly less than 11% unique. FMHI 26%; UF 22% unique; UNF 13%; FSU 12%; New College 9%; USF 7.5% & St. Petersburg 7%; UF Law 7%; FGCU & UCF 6%.

The general collections in the institutions without separate law and health sciences libraries do appear to have only core collections in those subject divisions from the lower percentages of uniqueness in comparison with the special libraries.

Higher percentages of unique are most desirable in subjects in which universities have advanced degree programs and retrospective materials are needed for research, especially in the humanities/arts and some social sciences fields. In subjects that need the most current materials, high percentages of unique may not be as important and high percentages of unique in older materials may not matter. As the possible universe of selections is narrower in the science and technology fields, collections in those subject divisions tend to be less unique.

### **Overlap for Business & Economics**

One subject division was analyzed for overlap below the division level.

Table 2-15  
**Business & Economics by Most Collected Subject Category**

	# records	Econ.	BA	Finance	Labor	Econ. history
FAMU	43,000	2	1	3	4	5
USF	25,600	1	2	3	4	5
UCF	25,500	1	2	3	4	5
UF	25,400	1	2	5	4	3
FSU	21,800	1	4	5	3	2
FIU	20,700	1	2	4	3	5
FAU	20,400	1	2	4	3	5
UNF	20,260	1	2	5	4	3
UWF	16,200	1	2	4	5	3
St. Pete	9,400	1	2	4	5	3
FIU BB	8,500	1	2		4	3
FGCU	6,500	1	2	3	4	
New Coll.	4,000	2	4	5	3	1

Business & Economics is tied with Government Documents for the third most collected subject division. As shown in the analysis by subjects in Section one, the division comprises from 6% to 12% of the general library collections. The majority of the libraries have in the 8% to 12% range. Business & Economics has a 20.77% uniqueness rate, which conversely means that nearly 70% of records are shared or overlapped with other libraries in the group. An analysis was performed on the Business & Economics subject division at the Category subject level to investigate similarities and differences in the general libraries.

In Table 2-15 the rank of the top five subject categories is shown by library. Two libraries have a 5<sup>th</sup> place subject category not in the table. Both New College and FIU Biscayne Bay have Economic theory as the 5<sup>th</sup> ranked subject. The Economics category in the table is Economics, Industries, Land Use, Labor.

There is a well-established pattern that the majority of the library collections follow. Economics is number one in all but two libraries, FAMU and New College. Business Administration is number two in all but three libraries: FAMU, FSU, and New College. The remaining three subject categories have less of a pattern. Finance has a mixture of rankings from 3-5, with four in each. Labor has seven 4<sup>th</sup> place, four 3<sup>rd</sup> place, and two 5<sup>th</sup> places. Economic history has one 1<sup>st</sup> place, one 2<sup>nd</sup> place, five 3<sup>rd</sup> places, and five 5<sup>th</sup> places.

FAMU has by far the largest collection in Business & Economics with 43,000 + records. The next tier has three libraries bunched at 25,000 + records: USF, UCF, and UF. FSU has close to 22,000 records and then three more libraries at bunched at 20,000 +: FIU, FAU, UNF. UWF is alone at another level of 16,000 records. There are four libraries with under 10,000 records. St. Pete and FIU Biscayne Bay are less than 1,000 records apart. FGCU is 2,000 lower at 6,500. New College has the smallest collection with 4,000 records.

Both FSU and New College do not follow the same pattern as the other libraries. New College, which has a liberal arts profile, follows that emphasis with Economic History as the top category and BA fourth. FSU looks more like New College with Economic History in 2<sup>nd</sup> place and BA fourth.

The general libraries are analyzed next for overlap from lowest to highest in the top two categories of Economics, Industries, Land Use, Labor and Business Administration.

The **University of Florida** has the lowest overlap among the general libraries in Business & Economics. The highest overlap in Economics is with FSU and UCF at 33%, followed closely by USF at 32 percent. Overlap with FIU is 29%, FAU 27%, North Florida 26%, West Florida 21%, FAMU 17.5%, FIU BB 12% and FGCU 11 percent. In Business Administration overlap is slightly higher with UCF at 41%, USF 37%, FSU 36%, FAU 33.5%, UNF 30%, FAMU 25%, UWF 23%, FIU BB 15%, and FGCU 13 percent.

The **University of Central Florida** has the next lowest overlap among the group of general libraries. In Economics the highest overlap is with UF and USF at 46%, followed by FIU at 44 percent. FSU and FIU overlap is 42% followed by UNF at 41%. West Florida (29%), FAMU (28%), FGCU (27%) are all close. St. Pete (18%) and FIU BB (17%) are also close. In Business Administration the highest overlap is with FAU at 42% followed by UF and USF at 41 percent. FAMU 37%, UNF 36%, and FIU 35% are in the 30% range. West Florida is at 27% and FGCU 20 percent. FIU BB overlap is 16 percent.

**Florida State University** has its highest overlap in Economics with UF at 52%, followed by FAU and FIU at 47% and UCF at 46 percent. UNF is at 38%, USF 30% and FAMU 24%. FSU's second place collection in Business & Economics is Economic History. FSU is the only library to have Economic History in the top two other than New College. The highest overlap is with UF at 56% and USF at 40%. Others are in the 30% range with FIU 38%, UCF 37%, FAU and UNF at 31 percent. UWF is less at 24 percent.

**Florida International University** has its highest overlap in Economics with UCF at 55% followed by UF at 53 percent. USF is at 49%, FAU and FSU at 42%, and UNF at 41 percent. FAMU is at 27%, FGCU 24%, FIU BB at 17 percent. In Business Administration FIU has close to the same range of percentage overlap. The highest overlap is with UCF at 54%, followed by USF at 49%, FAU 45%, UF 44%, and UNF at 42.5 percent. FSU is at 34% and FAMU 33 percent; West Florida 27%, FIU BB 20%, FGCU 19%.

The **University of South Florida** has its highest overlap in Economics with UCF at 57% and UF at 56 percent. FSU and FIU have 48%, FAU 45% and UNF 43 percent. West Florida is at 34% and FAMU 32 percent. FGCU is at 22%, St. Petersburg 20% and FIU BB 19 percent. In Business Administration the overlap is lower starting at 53% with UCF. Overlap with UF is 49%, FAU 44%, FIU 42% and UNF 40 percent. FSU is 36% and FAMU 35 percent. West Florida is at 26%, St. Petersburg 21%, and FGCU 20 percent.

**Florida Atlantic University** has overlap in the high 50% and 40% ranges. In Economics the highest overlap is with UCF at 59%, followed by UF 54%, and USF 51%. In the 40% range are FSU and UNF 48%, FIU 47%. West Florida is at 36% and FAMU 31 percent. FGCU is at 26% and St. Petersburg 21 percent. In Business Administration the highest overlap is with UCF at 55%. UF and USF are next at 45% followed by North Florida at 43 percent. FIU 39%, FSU 34%, and FAMU 31% are all in the 30 percent range. West Florida is 27%, and FGCU and St. Petersburg at 21 percent.

The **University of West Florida** has its highest overlap in Economics with UF at 58%, followed by UCF at 56% and FSU and USF at 52 percent. Overlap with FAU is 49% and FIU 44 percent. FAMU is at 36%, FIU BB 24.5%, and FGCU 20 percent. In Business Administration highest overlap is with UCF at 54%, UF

47%, UNF 42%, FAU 41%, and USF 40 percent. FSU has 36%, FIU 35%, FAMU 30 percent. FIU BB is at 20% and FGCU 17 percent.

The **University of North Florida** has its highest overlap in Economics with UCF at 61%, followed by UF at 56%, USF 52%, and FAU and FSU 51 percent. FIU is at 49% and UWF 41 percent. FAMU is at 32%, FGCU at 27% and FIU BB at 24 percent. Business Administration has slightly lower overlap. The highest is with UCF at 55%. FAU is at 49%, USF 47%, UF 46%, and FIU 43 percent. FSU is at 38%, FAMU and West Florida at 32 percent. St. Petersburg is at 22% and FGCU and UNF at 21 percent.

**FIU Biscayne Bay Campus** library has its highest overlap in Economics with UF at 60%, followed by UCF at 59%, UNF at 56%, USF at 54% and FAU at 52 percent. FSU is at 49%, FIU 46%, and UWF, 45 percent. FAMU is at 34%, St. Petersburg at 26%, FGCU at 23 percent. In Business Administration the highest overlap is with UCF at 55 %, UF 51%, USF 48%, UNF at 46%, and FSU 41 percent. In the 30% range is FAMU at 35% and West Florida at 34 percent. St. Petersburg has 26% and FGCU 16% overlap.

**Florida A & M University** has its largest percentages of overlap in Economics with UCF at 62% followed by USF at 56% and UF at 54 percent. Overlap with FAU, FIU, and FSU is 47 percent. UNF is 46%. St. Petersburg is at 23% and FGCU and FIU BB are at 21 percent. Highest overlap in Business Administration is with UCF at 57% and USF at 50 percent. UF is at 47%, FAU 46%, and FIU 40 percent. UNF is 39%, FSU 36%, and UWF 27 percent.

**Florida Gulf Coast University** has its highest overlap in Economics with UCF at 70% percent. After that the overlap with other libraries is much lower at 48% with FIU, 47% UNF, 45% USF, 41% FIU, and 40% FSU. Others are lower at 27% for UF and 25% FAMU. In Business Administration FGCU has its highest overlap with UCF. As with Economics, the overlap with the other libraries is much lower. The next highest overlap is with FAU at 49%, followed by USF at 48%, and UNF 43 percent. FIU is at 39% and FAMU at 29 percent. FSU and UWF are at 26 percent.

**USF St Petersburg** has the highest levels of overlap of all the general libraries within the Business & Economics subject division. The highest overlap in Economics is at 72% with UCF followed by 69% with UF, USF 63%, and UNF 62 percent. Next overlap is with FAU at 59%, FSU 58% and FIU at 53 percent. FAMU is at 42% and then the level drops to the 20% range. FIU BB is at 29% and FGCU 28 percent.

**New College** overlap is very high because the collection is small. The overlap is not figured because the top collected categories only have a few hundred records.

The highest overlap for all libraries in Business & Economics is with UCF with only a few exceptions. UCF, USF, and UF have the same size collections in Business & Economics and all three are at the top of overlap for the remaining libraries. As could be expected from the very high levels of overlap, uniqueness in records in Business & Economics is extremely low. For all of the libraries except UF, FSU and UCF, uniqueness is below 10% in all but a few categories, which have low numbers of records. Uniqueness is in the 20% to 30% range for all of the categories in the UF collection. FSU has most of the categories in the 10%-29% range. Economic theory has 45% uniqueness. UCF has most categories below 10%, but does have over 10% in Business Administration. Socialism, Communism, Utopias, Anarchism has higher percentages in a few libraries: UF 27%, UCF 19%, FAU 15%, FSU 12%.

The subject divisions were analyzed by date of publication in Section one of the report. In that analysis a number of libraries with comparatively large collections in Business & Economics are shown to have collections that have the highest number of records in Business & Economics prior to 1990. Only FGCU, FAU, FIU, UCF, UNF, and USF have the highest number of records in Business & Economics in the 1990s. Several of the libraries that have peak records prior to 1990 have Economic History as an emphasis. The 2000-2007 analysis shows Business & Economics to be about even in percentage share with the majority of the other subject divisions for that time period. It is too early to draw any conclusions about the state of the subject division since 2000.