

Date: July 28, 2005

To: Cindy Shelton, CDC Chair

cc: David Tambo, HOSC Chair
Gail Nichols, RSC Chair

From: Joint RSC/HOSC Task Force on the UC Interlibrary Loan of Special Collections Materials. Daryl Morrison, Task Force, Chair. (HOSC, UCD), Co-chair: Gail Nichols, (RSC, UCD). Members: Charlotte Rubens (RSC, UCB) and Christine Bunting (HOSC, RCSC)

RE: Response to the UC Interlibrary Loan of Special Collections Materials Report, 12/3/03

History of the Task Force Charge

This report is in response to the charge from John Tanno (e-mail of 12/30/03) who was the Chair of SOPAG in 2003. The charge identified six outstanding issues in the Resource Sharing Committee's (RSC) ILL/Special Collections Pilot Project Report, dated 12/8/03 that needed additional review. These issues included specific references to twenty "Potential Follow-Up Action Items" in the ILL/Special Collections Pilot Project Report (pages 8-10). The "Analysis of SOPAG Next Steps and Related RSC Follow-up Action Items" part of this report addresses in detail each of the six SOPAG issues and within each the related potential follow-up action items. It identifies revisions to systemwide documentation and local procedures that are needed to fully implement the goal of sharing special collections materials among the University of California libraries for our primary clientele.

E-mail from Cindy Shelton, Chair of the Collection Development Council (CDC), dated May 20, 2005 indicated that the Task Force should address issue 1 and 6 of the SOPAG charge that is to:

- "Refine the guidelines and establish standards or criteria for the interlibrary loan of special collections materials among the UC Libraries."
- "Create an action plan to post information regarding the ILL of special collections materials on appropriate websites, including SOPAG'S website."

The Task Force reviewed the charges and the follow up actions in the RSC report, and noted four types of actions:

1. Those that are no longer an issue because procedures have been worked out since the Pilot Project report that collected data prior to 2003.
2. Those that require a local library decision and are generally up to the library to determine the best action or procedure both for safety of material, speed of delivery, and the best use of staff resources.

3. Those that could be discussed further, and for which additional recommendations could be developed, and
4. Those that are problems with the system or our current technology and are beyond the power of HOSC/RSC to rectify.

The type of follow-up action needed (or no longer needed) is described in the “Analysis of SOPAG Next Steps and Related RSC Follow-up Action Items.” The following summary provides a list of the actions needed to successfully implement the UC interlibrary loan of special collections materials.

Summary of Actions Needed

The Task Force identified the following collaborative actions that are still needed to facilitate the interlibrary loan of special collections materials. These items should be acted upon by the identified group within the next six months.

- **UC Interlibrary Loan Code Revision**
Some revision of the UC Intercampus Interlibrary Loan Code is needed to incorporate the procedures and forms that were developed for the pilot project.
Action: the Interlibrary Loan Advisory Group of the Resource Sharing Committee (RSC-IAG) can undertake this revision in consultation with the Heads of Special Collections (HOSC).
- **UC Interlibrary Loan Forms Revision**
Modify and then continue to use the Special Collections loan forms found in the UC Guidelines for Shared Access to Special Collections Materials.
Action: RSC-IAG can undertake this revision in consultation with the HOSC.
- **Tracking Special Collections Items**
If recommended by the HOSC, implement an additional notification process between lending and borrowing institutions on the return and receipt of special collections interlibrary loan items.
Action: HOSC can implement additional tracking, if it deems it necessary to ensure the security of special collections materials loaned through interlibrary loan.
- **Melvyl Holdings Modifications**
The Melvyl holdings information for special collections materials is inconsistently displayed; this is probably the result of individual campus cataloging policies and local integrated library systems.
Action: RSC should continue to examine and recommend refinements to Melvyl and CDL Request to better enable the automatic identification Special Collections materials and provide additional information to patrons requesting these materials.
- **Digitization & Copying**
Digitization and copying of special collections materials provides an effective method of sharing some special collections materials.

Action: HOSC and the RSC should continue to pursue systemwide improvements to enhance copying and/or digitizing equipment. Local campuses should pursue additional Special Collections staffing for the copying of rare and unique materials.

- **Web Information:**

The Task Force prepared a statement (see page 13 of this report) about the interlibrary loan of special collections materials that can be added to the HOSC and RSC web pages.

Action: HOSC and RSC should add this information to their websites, and the Task Force recommends that this information be added to local campus web pages to describe the UC policy for the interlibrary loan and special collections.

Action: Local campus special collection departments, in conjunction with local campus library administrations and interlibrary loan units, should develop written policies that describe the kind of materials that will be shared through the UC interlibrary loan of special collections program.

Analysis of SOPAG Next Steps and Related RSC Follow-up Action Items

1. Status of the Interlibrary Loan of Special Collections Materials.

“RSC’s report indicated that there was some confusion regarding the status of the pilot project and whether or not it is now a permanent service and listed the need to clarify the status as the first of the twenty “potential follow-up action items. The status of the service was discussed at the Joint ULs/SOPAG meeting of November 21, [2004] and the University Librarians confirmed their commitment to loaning special collections whenever possible and asked SOPAG to continue resolving the remaining impediments. In addition, the University Librarians agreed to confirm their commitment among their own staff (cf. the Action Minutes which will be available on the SOPAG website in the near future). At this point, therefore, the pilot project has been completed and the interlibrary loan of special collections materials is now an ongoing service of the UC Libraries.”

SOPAG Next Steps: CDC should work with HOSC to refine the guidelines and establish standards or criteria for the interlibrary loan of special collections materials among the UC Libraries.

HOSC/RSC Response:

The special collections departments at the University of California campuses in partnership with their interlibrary loan departments will continue to participate in the program to loan or provide best available copies of special collections materials whenever possible.

The Heads of Special Collections and Resource Sharing Committee endorse the ACRL Rare Books and Manuscripts Section of the Association of College & Research Libraries *Guidelines for the Interlibrary Loan of Rare and Unique Materials*. These guidelines were adopted by ACRL in 1994 and revised and approved in June 2004. The guideline objectives were:

1. To encourage and facilitate interinstitutional loan from special collections for research use;
2. To affirm curatorial responsibility in decisions regarding the loan of special collections;
3. To specify the responsibilities of lending and borrowing institutions; and
4. To ensure the safety and security of items loaned.

The Guidelines are posted on the RBMS standards website at: <http://www.rbms.nd.edu/>

The Heads of Special Collections and Resource Sharing Committee also endorse the UC Intercampus Interlibrary Loan Code, Section III. B. Special Collections materials (<http://libraries.universityofcalifornia.edu/rsc/iag/manual/parta.htm#IIIB>) and Part E1 (<http://libraries.universityofcalifornia.edu/rsc/iag/manual/parte1.html>) that define and provide procedures for the intercampus loaning of special collections materials. Some revision of the code is needed to incorporate the procedures and forms that were developed for the pilot project; the Interlibrary Loan Advisory Group of the Resource Sharing Committee and the Heads of Special Collections can undertake this revision. The pilot project procedures and

forms provide a useful and standard method for transmitting specific handling information between campuses.

There may be periods of time when procedures need to be modified due to unusual circumstances at one campus or another such as construction projects or the temporary loss of staff. Campuses need to be flexible to accommodate such circumstances.

HOSC members expressed concern about workload and the need for the borrowing institution to review requests, so that when appropriate, readily available substitutes from non-special collections holdings, later editions, or requests for facsimile copies are made in lieu of loaning special collections materials. These issues will be addressed further in this report.

2. Workflow and Workload Issues.

RSC's report identified a variety of staffing and workload issues, particularly in regard to the relationship between Interlibrary Loan and Special Collections. (cf. potential follow-up action items #3, 4, 5, 9, 10, 12,13, 14, 16, 17, 18, & 19)

SOPAG Next Steps: RSC is asked to work with HOSC and the appropriate AULs at each campus to address these issues and seek ways to streamline the process to make it as efficient as possible and handle the workload within the local organizational structures and staffing.

HOSC/RSC Response: Workflow procedures were developed at each campus for the pilot project. These procedures require close communication and interaction between interlibrary loan departments, special collections, and library mail units, as well as involving appropriate AUL's when problems occur. Moving special materials between departments can be time consuming and can create possibilities for loss or mishandling. Each campus needs to make decisions about how best to move special collections materials destined to be loaned to another campus through their operation. The staffing and abilities of each special collections department may vary in their ability to wrap and ship items. A continuing dialogue and comparison of procedures throughout the UC system may help identify more streamlined methodologies. We should continue to look for ways to streamline the procedures to minimize the workload, while still protecting our unique resources.

The Task Force recommends the continued use of the Special Collections Request Loan Form found in the UC Guidelines for Shared Access to Special Collections ([Part E.2b. Form for Special Collections project using "Request"](#)), though some minor modifications are needed. The Interlibrary Loan Advisory Group of the Resource Sharing Committee in consultation with the Heads of Special Collections can undertake this revision. This form allows lending and borrowing libraries to inform each other regarding use restrictions, reasons for denial, due dates and special handling instructions, insurance requirements, and specific shipping information. This form, together with local campus procedures, should help to ensure the safety of special collections interlibrary loans.

Selection of a single shipping vendor is *not* recommended because individual campus agreements with vendors may cause one vendor to be considered a more secure shipper than another. Currently, all campuses use special mailing services (e.g., Fed Ex) that can be used to track and insure materials. The choice of a vendor may change from time to time. While the lending campus may prefer the use of a specific vendor, the lending campus should be open to receiving a request about the best shipping vendor for return from the borrowing library. Individual campus library organizations are in the best position to make processing and routing decisions that best fit the campus situation and the specific material being lent.

As indicated in the John Tanno email, each campus HOSC, RSC and appropriate AULs should meet to resolve specific local issues.

Follow up action #3. Continue discussing shipment vendor or method. Decide if it would be useful to agree on what borrowing departments will be responsible for when returning special collections items. This may include using specific shipping vendors or methods, especially if a specific vendor/method is requested by a lending Special Collections unit. Also, decide whether or not certain shipping vendors and insurance methods are preferred, recommended, required, or unacceptable.

HOSC/RSC Action-Item Response: According to the ACRL RBMS *Guidelines for the Interlibrary Loan of Rare and Unique Materials*, Section III. Liability and Transport for Borrowed Materials, “the safety of borrowed materials is the responsibility of the borrowing institution. The lending institution is responsible for packing the borrowed material so as to ensure its return in the condition in which it was sent. The borrowing institution is responsible for returning the material in the same condition as received, using the same, or equivalent, packing material and the same level of insurance as the lending institution. The contact name and information should be on the address and the form. Staff responsible for packing and shipment of materials should be instructed in proper handling and packing of rare material. If damage or loss occurs, the borrowing institution is responsible for the cost of repair, replacement or appropriate compensation, in accordance with the preference of the lending institution. The borrowing institution may specify that the material be delivered directly to its interlibrary loan department. The lending institution may specify that the material be returned to its special collections department and may also specify use of a preferred shipping service, insurance and/or special wrapping requirements. Verification of transfer and delivery should be made through the respective ILL staff, regardless of method of shipment.”

Currently, campuses generally use accepted safe and secure methods for packaging and shipping and unless specified on the item these general practices are followed. Each campus has determined the best shipping service for their local area. (See also response to 2 above).

Follow up action # 4. Review agreement on and packaging procedures for items being returned or shipped [to the] lending institution. Is it feasible to repackage borrowed items in the original wrap or should they be repacked to be certain that packaging requirements

meet national standards or, at least, standards upon other materials, yet with the same level of packaging/care as when they arrived? How can staff be certain that packaging requirements meet national standards, or at least, standards upon which UC agrees.

HOSC/RSC Action-Item Response: The University of California Guidelines for Shared Access to Special Collections Materials states in III. Non-Rare, Non-Fragile Materials Housed in Special Collections that “material will be carefully wrapped and shipped for use only in the borrower’s Special Collections Unit. The borrowing library will use equivalent wrapping and shipping to ensure safe return.”

If possible the same shipping material should be used to repackage borrowed items (unless deemed insufficient by the borrowing library). Using the lending library’s packing precludes any complaints about the packing material. However, space considerations or staffing at some campuses may make it difficult to save and track shipping materials. As long as equivalent or better packing occurs this should be acceptable. Packaging specifics should be annotated on the Special Collections Request Form.

Follow up action #5. Explore shipping loaned Special Collection materials directly from lending Special Collections to borrowing Special Collections, or point-to-point delivery, as a way to reduce security concerns involved in transporting these items.

HOSC/RSC Action-Item Response: Currently, most special collections ship special collection items to special collections departments. The item is then taken to interlibrary loan for check in and to notify the patron. It is a local decision to determine the best point of entry and tracking method within the library.

HOSC recommends that the borrowing institution notify the lending institution of the safe receipt of the item and when the loan is completed the borrowing institution notify the lending institution of the return shipment date of the item. It is then the responsibility of the lending institution to notify if a package has not been received in return. Notification that a package has not been received should be done by the lending institution within a 10 working day period to facilitate timely tracking and recovery.

Follow up action #9. Clarify what “date due” means. That is, gain agreement on where an item should be returned to by the date it is considered due.

HOSC/RSC Action-Item Response: The lending institution’s Special Collections/ILL should make the due date clear. The borrowing institution should indicate to the patron that the due date will be honored. The Interlibrary Loan Code clearly defines the responsibility of the borrowing library regarding due dates.

Due to languages, formats (e.g., microfilm), etc., an item may require more time for study. If the patron believes that a more extended loan time is needed, a request may be made for a lengthier loan period at the time of the initial request. A request for an

extension may be made by the borrowing special collection department to the lending special collection department being sure to keep the respective ILL units in the loop. Due to workload and the risk of shipping materials, an extension is preferable to a future request for a loan that could be denied. If the patron finishes earlier than the due date, the item should be returned promptly to the lending institution.

Follow up action # 10. Explore ways to increase acceptable turnaround time for special collections requests as a way to aid special collections staff efforts to integrate this service into their work processes. For instance, consider increasing, perhaps doubling the time period in OCLC allotted for responding to a special collections request before it is dropped or moves on to the next campus/library.

HOSC/RSC Action-Item Response: Both UDX and OCLC have procedures to stop a request from automatically moving to the next library. Libraries need to use the “conditional” messaging procedures and Interlibrary Loan units need to respond promptly to conditionals.

Special collections or interlibrary loan department staff may need extra time to conduct the research necessary to determine whether a requested item is readily available in general collections, to make a judicious decision regarding whether to loan an item or copy an item in lieu of loaning, and to determine whether an item is too fragile to be shipped. In some instances an item must first be called back from a regional library facility for review. Most special collections are able to make a decision within the time, but when extra time is needed, ILL departments need to use conditional messaging that will “stop the clock.” (For instance, some special collections departments, such as UC Santa Cruz a recall from an RLF can take up to seven days).

Follow up action # 12. Determine whether or not the condition of items lent requires better tracking as items move between departments on one campus, travel between institutions, and are used by the requesting patron. [See especially UCR’s response to guidelines item #14 on pages 26 of Appendix B].

HOSC/RSC Action-Item Response: The “Condition of item book wraps” (<http://libraries.universityofcalifornia.edu/rsc/iag/manual/parti.doc>) should be used to describe and track the condition of materials. See **Follow up action #5** for additional information on shipment tracking.

HOSC recommends that the use by the patron of an ILL special collections item be tracked in a manner similar to that used for regular special collections reading room materials, so that there is as good control of ILL materials in the reading room as the institution’s own special collections materials. This may also serve as a record to indicate whether the patron used the materials or whether an item was lost or damaged during use. The borrowing institution may use standard special collections check out slips to provide reading room control of the item or some other means to record in-house circulation use and return of the item in the reading room.

Follow up action #13. Evaluate and update, if need be, security procedures related to special collection loans. For instance, consider ways for having as few hands as possible involved in shipping; explore using identifiable wrapping that make the package readily recognizable as a special collections item, but not a security risk by clearly identifying the rare, valuable nature of items being shipped; and discuss whether or not borrowing campuses should be notified and acknowledge notification that a lending campus is about to ship a special collection item to it.

HOSC/RSC Action-Item Response: See HOSC/RSC **Follow up action #5** for shipping recommendations.

As **Follow up action # 13** states marking an item can cause its own security risks. Items sent from one special collection to another special collections department are generally tracked “quietly” as special collections interlibrary loan items. Once a package is opened forms should make it readily recognizable that the item is a special collections interlibrary loan item. Use of the Special Collections Request Loan Form would enable easy identification once the package is opened. Each UC needs to determine whether interdepartmental transitions between special collections, interlibrary loan departments, and mail services are occurring safely and efficiently. As an example, UC Davis staff carries a notebook from department to department collecting signatures at each step; although time consuming, such records help to track materials through the process. Other campuses may be minimizing steps by doing more in the special collections department or may have developed other secure transmission procedures.

Follow up action #14. Gain agreement on patron use issues, specifically under what, if any, circumstances can a requested item be viewed outside of a Special Collections environment.

HOSC/RSC Action-Item Response: Special collections items may not be used outside of the special collections reading room without the express permission of the lending library, as determined through follow up contacts by phone or e-mail from one head of special collections (or their designate) to another. As an example, microforms may need to be used in a microfilm reading area in another part of the library. It should clearly be stated both at the time of borrowing and lending whether this is necessary and possible. In such situations the lending library may want to consider a standard ILL marked Library Use Only. If permission is granted by the lending library for copying outside the home or lending library, special collections staff should be responsible for or monitor the copying of any item. It may be preferable for copying to be done at the lending institution both for safety and security.

Follow up action item #16. Explore ways to improve communication between campuses. Gain agreement for how and when to update campus contact information

relating to special collections loans. Consider naming one contact person per campus or perhaps per unit.

HOSC/RSC Action-Item Response: The RSC-IAG website has a list of special collections contact persons for each campus. It is the responsibility of each HOSC member to maintain up-to-date contact information on this website. It is also good operating procedure to have procedures in place to delegate responsibility during times of staff absences. It is not unusual for special collections staff to e-mail and/or call each other regarding a special collections loan. Communications appears to be good between the UC campuses special collections and interlibrary loan departments.

Follow up action item #17. Consider re-phrasing Recommendation 9, which currently reads "... and continue to provide support, at the campus level, to ensure that adequate staffing and funding are available ..." to a statement that encourages systemwide support for the service.

HOSC/RSC Action-Item Response: Systemwide support is needed for this service, if the program is to be enhanced. Managing the intercampus transfer of special collections materials is a detail oriented and time consuming process for both special collections and interlibrary loan departments. The CDL needs to continue to pursue systemwide improvements to Melvyl and CDL Request that will make the interlibrary loan of special collections materials less labor intensive while at the same time protecting special collections materials.

As well as being time consuming, there is a risk of damaging and losing our rare books in shipment. Both for the safety of the materials and service to the researcher, support is needed to purchase copying equipment to effectively copy rare books without damaging them. Additional staff may be needed at the campus level to provide this service.

Follow up action #18. Explore the possibility of having patrons work more closely with Reference staff to improve the quality of submitted special collections requests.

HOSC/RSC Action-Item Response: Implementing this action item would require going outside the automated patron initiated or request system that our patrons now use. The CDL Request process does forewarn patrons when they are requesting an item that is only held in a special collections department, and that process does route a request for additional local ILL review. Melvyl records with a mix of special collections and general collection locations, however, may not be identified for this extra review. RSC and HOSC should continue to seek refinements to CDL Request to identify special collections requests earlier in the process, so that local review can take place before the request leaves the borrowing library.

Follow up action # 19. Explore the feasibility of having alternate or back-up Special Collections decision makers to respond to requests in the event of key decision maker absences.

HOSC/RSC Action-Item Response: See **follow up action #16.**

3. **Digital Services.**

“There appears to a broad consensus on the part of Special Collections managers to provide copies of special collections materials as a preferred method of delivery.”

SOPAG Next Steps:

RSC has been charged to explore advanced delivery mechanisms as part of the Elsevier/ACM Shared Collections Project. This investigation can also serve to inform how special collections materials could be scanned and delivered electronically. On the basis of that investigation, RSC and HOSC should explore other options for digital services (cf. potential follow-up action item #2)

HOSC/RSC Task Force Response:

In many instances, providing digital copies make sense as a means to protect original materials from shipping and possible loss and the staff time of both institutions to monitor the loan. However, digitization also comes with a price in terms of staff work time and the possibility of damaging materials during the copying process. In some instances, a patron, upon seeing an item, may need only a few pages instead of the entire work, or may find that he does not need copies at all. Digitization of rare items needs to be reviewed in terms of patron needs, staff workload, and careful handling of the item to not damage it in the copying process. This should be balanced against the cost and risk of a loan of the original item.

RSC has completed its report on advanced delivery mechanisms. HOSC and RSC members at each campus together with the appropriate AUL should develop local procedures for providing digital copies of materials that special collections departments deem too fragile or rare to lend, and that otherwise are appropriate candidates for digitization. The creation of digital copies that can be shared electronically should be explored as a possible response to ILL requests for special collections materials.

Follow up action # 2. Discuss options for developing a digital service, especially using methods that would allow the scanned images to be retained and made searchable—(e.g., use of metadata, catalog links, etc.)

HOSC/RSC Action-Item Response: According to the *UC Guidelines for Shared Access to Special Collections*, III Non-Rare, Non-Fragile Materials Housed in Special Collections, “UC Special Collections departments will provide intercampus loan of this type of special collections material if possible.” Each request will be evaluated on a case-by-case basis. Copies may be provided in lieu of loan at the discretion of the head of special collections (or designate).

And also in IV. Rare and Unique Materials A. Providing Copies, “Each request will be examined on a case-by-case basis with a view to providing access through some form of copy. Copies of Special Collections material will be provided in various formats as appropriate; e.g. microfilm, photocopy, photographic prints, color slides, etc. Conditions that might preclude copying are as follows:

1. Condition of original is such that a readable, usable copy is not technically possible.
2. Original would be damaged by the reproduction process.
3. Restrictions imposed by donor (especially true of manuscript material).
4. Copyright restrictions.”

Special collections copying policies (e.g. limiting extensive copying to protect the provenance and ownership of a manuscript research collection) may also need to be considered.

A campus analysis should be made to determine how best to develop and maintain local digital services with regard to sharing material, protecting the movement of rare materials, maintaining copyright and donor restrictions, and also making the work of copying rare and fragile materials a “one time process.” UC libraries should work towards maintaining digital files and connecting them either as a closed record or open record depending on copyright requirements, as part of a “shared digital collection.” Further discussions need to take place both locally and systemwide regarding digital services.

4. **Enhancements to MELVYL.**

“The information patrons receive from MELVYL regarding the request for special collections materials are deemed confusing and unclear. Furthermore, because special collections materials sometimes appear before readily available circulating copies in the MELVYL display, users are unnecessarily requesting the special collections copy (cf. potential follow-up action item #15.”

SOPAG Next Steps: RSC will continue to work with appropriate CDL staff to explore ways to provide clear and accurate information regarding the services related to the ILL of special collections materials and to modify the MELVYL display so that circulating copies are listed first.

HOSC/RSC Task Force Response: The UC Guidelines for Special Collections, Part E-2 Special Collections Request Project indicates that the borrowing library’s ILL unit will double-check for a circulating copy. See the response to #15 below.

Follow up action #15. Explore ways to increase the patron usage rate of requested material by providing patrons different information about the service or other means. This may include editing CDL screens to more clearly indicate that a request for special

collections material is being made and that more time will be needed to fill such requests than is needed for filling requests for circulating materials.

HOSC/RSC Action-Item Response: If there is only a special collections copy available in the MELVYL system, the system will provide a form indicating to the patron that the loan will be directed to a special collections department and the item may be considered for loan and will only be available for use under restricted conditions. The patron is given the option to accept the special collections loan or cancel the request.

When a patron requests an item in MELVYL, the system will automatically select the circulating copy. When that copy is unavailable the system will then go on to the next copy, which could be a special collections copy. The patron is unaware that requests are routed from library to library, and that the item may come from a campus that has restricted use. As the request moves from one campus to another several weeks may go by before a library is located that will loan the item. Since Request may be forwarding the request to a library's special collections copy, it necessarily falls on the lending library at this point to either respond to the request by lending the item or not, do the bibliographic checking to identify potential general collections that might prevent the lending of a special collections copy, or communicate with the requesting library to indicate that a review of the request is needed. When a patron is not aware of the restriction and/or has waited several weeks, it becomes more likely that the item will be a "non-picked up" item. Once the loan is listed as "conditional", the borrowing library needs to communicate with the patron to see if a copy with special use restrictions is acceptable. Such an inquiry may help alleviate "non-pick ups." If several special collections have responded negatively, checking with the patron about travel options or whether the item is still needed might help alleviate putting other special collections and interlibrary loan departments through a round of work and decision-making.

5. OCLC/VDX.

"RSC's report recommends several potential follow-up action items which would involve exploring possible uses of OCLC and VDX to enhance the interlibrary loan of special collections materials (cf. potential follow-up action items #6, 7, 11, & 20)."

SOPAG Next Steps: RSC is asked to explore the feasibility of using OCLC and VDX as indicated in RSC's report.

Follow up action #6. Consider the idea of Special Collections departments having their own OCLC or VDX address and handling these loans independent of ILL departments.

HOSC/RSC Action-Item Response: A number of changes have occurred in the routing of requests among UC campuses since the Pilot Report was prepared. VDX is now in place and manages the routing of ILL requests among the campus interlibrary loan units. Melvyl does provide better location information than OCLC, so better

routing resolutions may be feasible with additional developments in Melvyl and VDX. The expense of creating OCLC accounts for special collections departments no longer seems reasonable. In addition, if such a course were pursued, each campus would be required to modify OCLC records with the new special collections identifying code, and this would require a significant local expense.

Follow up action #7. Explore modifying OCLC source codes in order to: 1 - make it simpler to identify a Special Collections item and 2 – make it easier to assess the availability of an alternate [non-special collections] item. (Note: this may not be necessary in VDX.)

HOSC/RSC Action-Item Response: Unfortunately, OCLC locations do not indicate whether an item is in special collections unless the special collections has established its own code and reported the location under that code. The implementation of VDX on UC campuses means that UC special collections requests no longer route to OCLC. Melvyl continues to be the best resources for understanding location of copies in the UC system.

To avoid going to a UC special collections by searching OCLC may require searching individual libraries OPACs to determine location in the general stacks of a library. This, however, may be the better option both in terms of service to the patron who would prefer a circulating copy and to protect a special collections copy that due to its special features (such as provenance, signatures, book jacket, special collections subject collecting area, fragility, etc.) would be put at risk, when readily available circulating copies could be found.

ILL departments are dealing with thousands of requests, and student assistants often do the searching. If special collections staff take the time to make this analysis, there needs to be an understanding that this is preferable to putting a UC special collections item at risk and in the long run may take less staff time than being reviewed through a series of special collections departments and also be of preference for the researcher as a check out copy. A search for readily available facsimile copies in microform or in facsimile editions is also warranted.

Follow up action # 11. Allow ILL borrowing staff to edit all appropriate fields of OCLC records for special collections requests.

HOSC/RSC Action-Item Response: See above; this is not an option in OCLC, and UC request processing is managed in VDX now.

Follow up action # 20. Study VDX features to determine if it can aid improvements needed for tracking special collections requested materials.

HOSC/RSC Action-Item Response: As VDX features are explored and implemented, it may very well be possible to improve the tracking of requests that are located in UC special collections. RSC should include this in their annual goal plans.

6. Provide Information on Website.

The need for further information regarding the ILL of special collections materials was identified in RSC's report (cf. potential follow-up action item #8).

SOPAG Next Steps: RSC should work with HOSC to post information regarding the ILL of special collections materials on appropriate websites, including SOPAG's website.

HOSC/RSC Task Force Action: RSC will work with HOSC to keep the RSC website current.

Follow up action #8. Add an explanation of the genesis of the Interlibrary Lending of Special Collections materials to the RSC, HOSC, and/or RSC-IAG web site. Have all staff review it as part of their orientation period. Such a description of the pilot might also be added to the SOPAG web site.

HOSC/RSC Action-Item Response: The reports generated by the Special Collections Pilot Project, the UC ILL code, and related ILL guidelines and forms are available on the RSC website. Appropriate information should be included in all staff training at each campus. Information about the lending of ILL special collections material is available on campus library websites; this information should be reviewed and modified as needed.

A statement regarding Special Collections interlibrary lending of materials should be mounted on appropriate SOPAG websites e.g. HOSC and RSC/IAG, as well as local campus' websites.

That statement should indicate:

Under the "one University one Library" policy, the University of California special collections departments participate in a program to lend special collections materials between the UC special collections departments. Requests are made via the interlibrary loan request system. Materials loaned (generally, non-manuscript materials in the form of books, pamphlets, serials, and microform) are carefully considered through a curatorial review process by the head of special collections. Requests may be filled by the provision of facsimile copies. Loaned materials are made available for use under the careful oversight of the special collections staff under regular special collections reading room rules at the requesting or borrowing library.

Requests will be considered if they can be met without damaging and/or endangering rare and unique materials. Each request will be reviewed on a case-by-case basis to determine the rarity and condition of the item. Whenever possible, it is recommended that patrons check with their reference or interlibrary loan department staff for assistance in locating alternate editions or works that may be more readily accessible

for loan and check out without the restrictions required for special collections material.

For further information regarding this program contact your local interlibrary loan or special collections department.