TO: SOPAG
FROM: Claire Bellanti, Chair, Resource Sharing Committee (RSC)
RE: ILL/Special Collections Pilot Project
Date: December 8, 2003

Attached is a report of qualitative information gathered about the ILL/Special Collections pilot project. This report is intended to augment the quantitative feedback gathered during a two week data collection period about the pilot during early summer 2002, and which was reported March, 2003 to SOPAG in The Special Collections/Interlibrary Loan Pilot Project Final Report and Recommendations, located at: http://libraries.universityofcalifornia.edu/rsc/speccoll/index.html. RSC has been in communication with both the Heads of Special Collections (HOSC) and RSC-ILL Advisory Group (IAG) regarding these reports

In theory, special collections requesting (using the Request feature in Melvyl) is fully functional and users are able to request materials. That is, all the procedures and programming are in place to allow the requests to occur. In practice, the special collections staff, and in some cases the ILL staff, still determine what will be considered for loan. We have determined that the prevailing response is "no" on the part of some libraries; others have relied heavily on electronic delivery options. HOSC and RSC have been able to articulate guidelines for sharing special collections materials (see http://libraries.universityofcalifornia.edu/rsc/iag/manual/parte1.html) as well as procedures for ILL units (see http://libraries.universityofcalifornia.edu/rsc/iag/manual/parte2a.html). HOSC has also developed and distributed guidelines for proper handling and protection. However, several outstanding issues remain and may interfere with attempts to successfully go forward with the sharing of Special Collections materials within UC Libraries as planned in the pilot.

Outstanding issues:

1. There has been some confusion about the *status of the pilot* and whether or not it is now a permanent service. Although SOPAG told RSC to go ahead with this as a permanent service, many HOSC members seem to be under the impression that the pilot ended and no explicit instructions to continue were received. If the loan of special collections materials is indeed now a permanent service, it may be useful for an official, systemwide announcement to be disseminated from the most appropriate group.
    a. Two campuses, indeed the largest, have indicated serious issues with going forward to a permanent service. UCB reports that it is unable/unwilling to participate (see Appendix C); UCLA recommends against participating but has continued to do so (see Appendix D). All the other campuses view the pilot negatively or at least ambivalently, as well.
    b. This confusion about the status of the program has prevented discussions about how to handle educating patrons on the availability of this service.

The lack of such efforts may also be contributing to the low patron usage of this service—both in terms of making initial requests as well as actual use of loaned items. More comprehensive marketing of this service may provide greater insight into whether or not such a service would truly reduce duplicative collection developing in special collections system wide.

    c. It was estimated that almost half of the patrons who initiated special collection loans did not come to the borrowing Special Collections department to use the loaned item. RSC identified that improved Melvyl/Request screens may be a way to have patrons confirm that their request for a special collections item was intentional.

2. ILL departments require the efficient movement of great volumes of materials, whereas Special Collections departments must be more concerned with preservation and security for rare and expensive materials. The pilot challenged staff to bridge these different work flows at considerable effort to both departments. Some methods were successfully discovered, but many issues remained unresolved. It may be useful to *determine under what, if any, circumstances a Special Collections department may opt to not participate*. Now is the time to discuss an evaluation of how the service impacts Special Collections departments (staffing, work loads, preservation, etc.) as well as of how the service can be refined to make it more effective for users and staff.

3. Systems issues that remain include:
    a. There have been inquiries whether Melvyl/Request and VDX can be altered to allow staff at the patron's home library to review a special collections item request before they are forwarded to the lending library. Such a review may provide more expedient service for patrons while reducing, or even preventing, related workloads for the lending library. The system was originally designed to follow "best-practices," that is, routine requests for non-archival materials skip a review by the home campus, allowing UC to maximize efficiencies. Changing this default for special collections materials will mean less efficiency for ILL staff but may mean more acceptable requests to special collections staff.
    b. Modifying OCLC source codes such that they clearly identify special collection items may assist in a more successful, efficient implementation of this service.
    c. Because of cataloging practices it is not easy for patrons to determine if there is a circulating copy of the desired item. The current process of identifying items to request is dependent on the patron selecting the correct item in Melvyl. Cataloging variations and Melvyl displays do not allow for sophisticated matching of materials by title. Such a matching system could eliminate many special collections requests for items circulating at other UC libraries, but in Special Collections at one library.

d. The implementation of VDX, an ILL management system, affords HOSC and RSC the opportunity to explore new procedures that may streamline processing for both Special Collections and ILL staff.

4. New delivery methods
   Many special collections staff members would be much more comfortable providing digital copies of these rare materials. Digitizing special collections materials on demand, however, represents a major change in workflow as well as a new and considerable expense in staff and equipment. If the University Librarians propose to share these resources through digitization, then special collections departments would need to know that this is a priority and receive some support for the effort.

The Resource Sharing Committee looks forward to continued dialogues on the issues surrounding the loans of special collections materials.

UC ILL/Special Collection Project
Report on information gathered regarding the 2001-2002 ILL/Special Collections pilot
Prepared by D. Turner, December 2003

I. Contents

II. Executive Summary

From Summer 2001 through Summer 2002, University of California Interlibrary Loan and Special Collections staff members participated in a resource sharing pilot project to test the feasibility of interlibrary lending special collections material among the UC campuses. This report contains a summary of responses made during joint dialog sessions held between these two departments at each campus during the first half of 2003 (completed responses are provided in Attachment B).

Overall, there has been considerable effort on the part of many staff throughout the UC system to help make all aspects of the pilot—and the resulting service—a success. Still, it seems it may have impacted Special Collections staff more than ILL staff due to the introduction of new work load and processes to most of those departments. Conversely, the pilot may have provided more evidence of the demand for access to special collections materials. On some campuses, the additional workload included processing and managing transport efforts for requested special collections items. Federal Express and Tricor were the two shipping methods most campuses used, although one campus substantially relied on electronic delivery methods. It was estimated by Special Collections staff that patrons came to the borrowing Special Collections department to use just over half of pilot requested materials system-wide. Finally, it was noted that staffs' ability to respond successfully to pilot requests seemed directly linked to the low volume of pilot requests received, although one campus noted that having received a higher volume of special collections requests provided staff a great deal of practice that led to efficiency in responding to pilot requests.

The joint dialogs generated substantial comments on possible pilot follow up activities—some of which have already been implemented for immediate improvements. Ideas ran the gamut from clarifying specific procedures to fully

exploring digitization options to ending the services (at least 2 out of six campuses support this option). Twenty potential follow-up activities generated by the dialogs are presented at the end of this report.

III. Introduction
Genesis of the ILL/Special Collections Pilot: SOPAG charged the Resource Sharing Committee (RSC) with developing a way to fill UC patron ILL requests for Special Collections materials. The Heads of Special Collections (HOSC) and RSC worked with the Request Project Team and RSC-Interlibrary Loan Advisory Group (IAG) to facilitate the loan/copy of such materials. The pilot relied on information conveyed in an 8/2/00 statement HOSC produced for SOPAG on ILL needs for UC Special Collections.

In 2002, a survey was completed about the ILL/Special Collections Pilot. Quantitative data about the Pilot was collected for two weeks. RSC decided to also gather qualitative, and even anecdotal, information. The goal was to try to learn how each campus handled the pilot and/or made reasonable changes to accommodate different campus, departmental, or unit needs associated with it.

IV. ILL/Special Collections Dialog Objectives
- Hold a joint ILL and Special Collections staff meeting on each campus to discuss the ILL/Special Collections pilot.
- Develop responses to the joint dialog guidelines provided (see Appendix A).
- Prepare a report of the dialogs and submit the final report to SOPAG.

V. List of Joint Dialog Respondents
Berkeley, Davis, Irvine, Los Angeles, Riverside, San Diego, Santa Barbara, Santa Cruz

VI. Summary of Responses

Summary of comments regarding "the genesis of the project"
(Note: comments were not solicited for this descriptive statement in the dialog guidelines. However, several campuses responded with comments.) Some staff described not being aware of any external patron request or suggestion for such a service for interlibrary lending Special Collections materials. This prevented staff from determining if it met a user need. Data was used to try to determine what need had been met. Some staff expressed that faculty pressuring University Librarians to make Special collections items more available led to the pilot. Both support for the concept of the pilot and reservations about its implementation were also expressed. Some commented that the pilot began before some staff involved in the dialog were hired.

Summary of responses to questions regarding the actual "requests" (Questions #1 - 5)

Most expressed that the UC agreed upon 48 hour turnaround time was adequate for staff to review, evaluate, and respond to a special collections request for a Special Collections item, though one campus responded that it took up to three days. It took about 24 regular business hours or less to respond to a good number of pilot requests. It took more time to respond to a pilot request if Special Collections decision making staff were unavailable; when ILL or Special Collections staff needed additional time (and energy, one campus added) to make certain no circulating copies were available; when Special Collections staff needed to verify bibliographic information; if the requester was unclear about their specific pilot request; or, when the pilot requested item was stored off site (i.e. at an RLF). The standard 4-day OCLC time allotment for ILL transactions seemed to be at odds with the longer time needed to process pilot transactions.

Some exceptions to time spent on processing were made. Exceptions included: performing initial screenings for categories of Special Collections items that staff had previously decided not to lend; ILL staff checked to see if an item could be copied instead of loaned; ILL lending staff contacted the borrowing campus to request that they re-enter a pilot request; and, Special Collections staff sent copies of tables of contents to help patrons clarify their pilot request (though it was noted that often patrons did not respond to this exception [getting information about table of contents]). Exceptions were communicated to patrons as well as between staff as follows:

By phone:	5 campuses
Via e-mail:	4 campuses
In person:	4 campuses
Via fax:	1 campus

Staff properly considered filling pilot requests for Special Collections items with alternatives. One borrowing unit reported filling 93% of the pilot requests with non-special collections materials. One Special Collections unit reported denying ~33% of all pilot requests because they were deemed widely available. One campus reported filling pilot requests with other [non-special collections] sources occasionally. It was also noted that modifying the OCLC source code made identifying a Special Collections item simpler and assessing alternative sources easier. One campus suggested having patrons, who make pilot requests, work with a reference librarian. This may decrease some confusion caused by multiple Melvyl records and obviate the need for a pilot request.

Summary of comments regarding "turnaround time" (Questions #6 – 7)

It usually took 30 minutes to 48 hours from the time/date a pilot request was received to approve an item for lending, prepare it for shipping, and ship it. Most responded that this took ~24 hours; one responded that it was within the 4-day OCLC window; another that it took 0-3 days. Turnaround time was closer to 48 hours if a pilot requested item was stored at an RLF; when shipping schedules

didn't fit the workflow (so items sat until a shipping vendor arrived to pick it up); or, if Special Collections staff had to complete Federal Express paperwork. Turnaround time was closer to 30 minutes when shipping via Tricor; staff gained easy access to accurate Special Collection unit addresses; or, an item was prepared for shipping at the time it was approved for lending.

Additional concerns were raised regarding turnaround time. Special Collections staff at one campus noted considerable disruption caused by the pilot because the materials required special review and handling. Also, "it is unknown if [the pilot was] a regular part of their workflow, what priority would be assigned to it, and what level of staff would be used." One campus requested the 4-day OCLC window be lengthened. Another noted that it took approximately 45 minutes to adequately package an item and call FedEx for shipping. Plus, additional time was required to notify the intended recipient at one campus—one of that campus' units reported that they do not ship until they get a reply to such notifications.

Summary of comments regarding "patron usage" (Questions #8 – 11)

Most campuses reported not keeping statistics [beyond OCLC ones]. One campus reported two major factors making it difficult to estimate use: not distinguishing between the method of request and implementing internal changes not related to the pilot. Still, patrons retrieved or viewed requested items according to the following guesstimates:

guesstimated # of times viewed	B	D	I	LA	R	SB	SC	SD
3+ times per request	--	10%		**	5%*	Often		10%
1-2 times per request	--	80%	probably	**	30%*	Normally		65%
0 times per request	100%	10%		**	65%*	60-70%	100%	25%

* These percentages represent requests in general, not just the UC study.
** Borrowers did use pilot requested materials; statistics were not kept.

Renewals seemed to be handled slightly differently at each campus that reported patron usage of pilot requested items. E-mail and phone was mainly used to communicate renewal requests between Special Collections and ILL—one campus also reported handling these requests in person; OCLC was used, between institutions, although one campus noted that when renewals were approved by the lending campus OCLC was not always updated. Processes for pilot renewals were handled differently depending on whether a patron approached ILL or Special Collections staff at one campus. One campus reported that ILL and Special Collections records were not always in sync due to this; it also reported that the joint dialog meeting helped staff there discover ways to improve in this area. Two campuses reported that longer loan periods were used to decrease the number of requests for pilot renewals.

Responses regarding the "due date" revealed different interpretations of this phrase. Five campuses said yes due dates were adhered to in most cases. One

campus said every transaction required a post "due date" follow-up phone call to track items. Yet another reported that items were returned by the due date, but went on to discuss to where the item was due by the "due date."

When asked if there was adequate time to update OCLC records and communicate to lending ILL and Special Collection departments when a patron finished using an item, most campuses responded yes. Some added that the item was taken directly to ILL staff for updating before the item was shipped/returned. Another campus responded that this was an issue of communication and not of time, particularly when the status at other campuses had not been updated in a timely manner.

Summary of comments regarding "shipping procedures" (Questions #12 – 14)

Tricor	5 campuses—most for photocopies only, one of the 3 for microfilm as well
UPS	4 campuses—one reported using 2nd Day service only when an item arrived via this method; one reported using UPS Overnight service
Federal Express	5 campuses—two of the 5 responded that this is the 'normal method'
UC Mail	None
Electronic means	3 campuses—two reported using Ariel
Other	1 campus used Airborne Express
Comments	One campus reported that campus mailing practices shaped which vendor it used. One campus stated it would ask that a specific method be used for returning material it lent. One campus reported that Ariel was usually the chosen delivery method over loans and copies.

Staff from ILL, Special Collections, and library mail rooms or receiving offices were involved in shipping materials. Two campuses reported that campus mail room staff also handled packaged items during shipping—one of the two noted that this step is required due to heightened security procedures. Two campuses reported ILL staff handled the shipping of all copies. For loans (not copies), Special Collections staff at four campuses handled all aspects of shipping. At three campuses, ILL and Specials Collections staff shared aspects of these responsibilities. Two of those three campuses reported a similar breakdown of shipping duties: Special Collections staff at one of the three determined packaging and insurance instructions, then ILL staff transported the item and these instructions to the Mail Room staff; at another of the two, ILL staff did that packaging and paperwork, then mail room staff finalized packing and shipping items. One campus reported that mail room staff only became involved if returned items were incorrectly addressed. One campus reported that returned items were not as carefully packaged as they had been sent.

One campus noted that "the physical piece is most vulnerable" while being shipped. More than five items were reported lost or damaged; at least two were damaged—mainly loose binding, twisted spines. One campus reported that one item had been delivered to the wrong place and had been assumed lost, but was later recovered. One campus responded with specific ideas for creating a conditions report form and process to track the condition of items prior to their being sent, after they are received, after a patron uses them, before they are returned, and finally once they are returned to the lending campus. Another campus noted appreciation for UPS tracking features and cautioned of Tricor services rendered.

Summary of comments regarding "pilot work flow" (Questions #15 – 18)

Five out of eight responding campuses reported that an additional work flow was created by the pilot, especially on the part of Special Collections staff. Two campuses referred to the pilot as disruptive and as an extra strain; another noted that it required significant cost in ILL and Special Collections staff time.

The one campus that responded by noting that the pilot had a minimal impact on work flow reported that it was similar to the existing work flow. One campus reported that ILL staff noted that pilot requests initiated via PIR fit into the "review" request work flow.

One campus expressed concern about system-wide ramifications that may arise should something go wrong. One campus linked the low volume to making the workload not being a factor. While another expressed that a higher volume may help reinforce the learning of procedures. One campus suggested the process may take less time if pilot requests were received by the borrowing unit.

All campuses reported adequate and timely communication between ILL and Special Collections departments [on the same campus]. Two added that ILL and Special Collections staff held meetings prior to the pilot, set up communication channels (that included an e-mail reflector for one campus), developed written procedures, and/or identified contacts. One campus noted that a significant time was usually needed when contacting another campus in an attempt to resolve or get information about pilot matters.

Only two campuses reported setting up space for processing and/or packaging pilot requested materials; one of the two specified that this space was set up in Special Collections. One campus set up a Federal Express account and allocation. Another reported using Excel to track items. No campus purchased new equipment specifically dedicated to the pilot.

Most campuses kept the agreed upon UC-wide pilot statistics, yet most kept no additional statistics about the pilot. The following responses come from those that

did keep additional statistics: one campus kept statistics similar to the pilot ones and wrote reports monthly; one reported gathering statistics on when items were received and returned; and, one Special Collections department reported keeping their own statistics on the number of pilot requests received, denied, and loaned. Finally, it was also noted that Special Collections staff did not track whether or not a pilot request was Request/PIR generated.

Summary of comments regarding "ideas for 'post-pilot' activities" (Questions #19 – 22)
Four campuses responded that the pilot should continue; two responded that it should not; one that "the data is satisfactory." One respondent stated that a reasonable volume of pilot requests made the pilot possible and that lending Special Collections materials should be reconsidered if the volume of such requests increased. Still another campus observed that having higher volume of pilot requests provides opportunities to repeatedly use pilot procedures which helped reinforce training for processing pilot requests in staff.

One respondent cited the low number of actual items loaned for not wanting to continue the pilot. Another noted that 65% of patrons did not show up to use requested material. Another commented that rejecting a high number of requests made the pilot more of a disservice to patrons.

Numerous responses regarding future related activities included the following:
- Clarify the borrowing library's responsibilities and what can be requested would be necessary.
- The patron Request/PIR screen indicating that a request is being made for a Special Collections item needs to be made much clearer.
- Use Tricor, not Federal Express, to mainstream shipping and improve speed.
- Further modify to the automated screening of pilot requests would help. For instance, have CDL Request more accurately screen and send pilot requests to all libraries without Special Collection copies first before sending it to libraries that do own Special Collections copies. Also, program Request to further screen pilot requests so that collections at libraries that simply don't loan materials are not an option.
- One campus suggested having ILL not be involved in the pilot and allow Special Collections staff to run it completely.
- Finally, one campus noted that redundancy of staffing in Special Collections would improve the process (the process stops when one of the two key staff are not available).

Additionally, two suggestions were submitted for future pilots: loaning videos and not lending Special Collections items.

There were also numerous responses to the idea of digitizing materials in lieu of lending. Most campuses said they would be willing to digitize. Potential barriers mentioned included:

- Fragility, condition, and size of the material requested (one campus said that if it can be photocopied, then it can be digitized and that this would exclude bound volumes)
- availability of funding, trained staff, required technology/equipment, server space, staff time needed to digitize, and workload issues involved
- guarantee that quality of digitization/scans could be consistently good
- ability to retain digitized copy as part of the collection and have access to meta data to facilitate retrieving the files
- copyright issues involved in such an effort could be considered and resolved
- lack of Special Collections departments having their own high-end scanner

The one campus that responded as not being willing to digitize stated that additional, qualified staff and a server would be needed in order to support time needed for such activities; that a digitized copy should be the equivalent of a preservation (or a high resolution) copy; that ILL time frames would restrict such efforts; that software restrictions and the lack of a Special Collections copy center may also be preventative.

Finally, one campus included a report prepared by a Special Collection staff member, from the Brancroft Library, and sent to Research Library Group (RLG, see Attachment C).

Summary of additional comments (Question #23)

Numerous responses included the following. One campus commented that its responses were based solely on the two week statistics gathering period. Two campuses noted confusion about the length of the pilot. One campus reported experiencing many problems with the pilot stemming from confusion when tracking down lent items; security issues; inaccurate contact lists; and a narrow focus on turnaround time instead of on the justification for extra procedures and patron needs. One campus reported using the dialog as an opportunity to improve communication between ILL and Special Collections with regards to the pilot. One campus inquired about the status of the pilot/service to interlibrary lend Special Collections materials and whether or not a campus can opt out of making the service available to patrons; citing that staff want to correctly inform users, that campus noted the importance of having further discussions and effective communication about the interlibrary lending Special Collections materials.

VII. Potential Follow-Up Action Items

1. Clarify the status of the pilot and under what conditions, if any, a campus may chose to not participate. That should include a discussion on any implications of not having all campuses participate in the pilot.

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.).

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.

4. Review agreement on and packaging procedures for items being returned or shipped other lending institution. Is it feasible to repackage borrowed items in the original wrap or should they repacked in 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.

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.

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

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.)

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.

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.

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.

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

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].

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.

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.

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.

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.

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 …" [*emphasis* mine] to a statement that encourages system wide support for the service.

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

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.

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

VIII. Attachment A: *Original guidelines and questions for the joint dialogs*

ILL/Special Collection Joint Dialogs regarding the Pilot
November, 2002

Introduction

Earlier this year, a survey was completed about the ILL/Special Collections Pilot. The survey was a two week data collection period that gathered quantitative information about the Pilot. RSC discussed using the following questions as a way to gather qualitative, and even anecdotal, information about the Pilot. This second survey will provide an opportunity to learn about how each campus has handled the Pilot and/or made reasonable changes to accommodate different campus, departmental, or unit needs associated with it.

Objective
- Hold a joint ILL and Special Collections staff meeting to discuss the ILL/Special Collections pilot by March 31, 2003.
- During the meeting, develop responses to the following questions.
- Send the responses and any additional comments to Deborah Turner, at dturner@ucsc.edu or 831.459.5114, for compilation.
- RSC will prepare a report from the information gathered and submit it to SOPAG.

Questions
Genesis of the project
> SOPAG created the charge to develop a way to fill UC faculty member's ILL requests for Special Collections materials. The Heads of Special Collections (HOSC) and RSC worked with the Request Project Team and IAG to facilitate the loan/copy of such materials. Since its inception, a certain amount of misunderstanding has developed around the pilot's origin and the service need it fulfills. Please discuss the genesis of the project and whether or not it has been able to meet those needs.

Requests
1. a. How much time does a Special Collection unit need to evaluate a loan request? Or, how much time does the ILL unit need to process a request for a Special Collections item?
   b. Was the time allotted for staff to review, evaluate, and respond to the initial requests adequate? Why or why not?

2. In general, was there adequate response time to respond to requests?

3. What, if any, exceptions were made to time spent on processing initial requests?

4. How were exceptions communicated between units?

5. Were alternative sources properly considered? And were you satisfied with the review of the request?

Turnaround time
6. How much time was allowed for preparing an item approved for shipping to and from the borrowing campus?

7. Was that amount of time adequate for most transactions? Why or why not?

Patron usage
8. How often did patrons retrieve or view requested items (if exact figures are unavailable, please respond with estimated percentages)?
    3 or more times per request _____
    1-2 times per request _____
    0 times per request   _____

9. How was the renewal process handled between ILL and Special Collections departments or units?

10. On average, were items returned to the Lending ILL by the due date?

11. When the patron finished using the requested materials, was there sufficient time to communicate this to the borrowing ILL so that they could update OCLC records?

Shipping procedures

12. Which shipping methods were used to send requested items?
    Tricor _____   US Mail _____
    UPS _____   electronic means _____
    FedEx _____   other _____

13. What library staff and/or departments were involved in the shipping of requested materials (packaging, labeling, tracking, etc.)?

14. Were any materials lost or damaged in the process?

Overall
15. How has the pilot fit into the department or unit work flow?

16. Are communications between your campus ILL unit and your campus Special Collections adequate and timely?

17. Was any new equipment installed or space redesigned specifically for the pilot?

18. What, if any, statistics were gathered about the pilot separate from the OCLC ones?

19. How might the ILL/Special Collections pilot be improved?

20. Should the pilot continue? Why or why not?

21. Do you have any recommendations for future pilot activities?

22. Would you be willing to digitize material in lieu of lending? Can you describe any barriers to digitizing?

23. Additional comments:

<hr>

Campus

<hr>

Name of individual(s) who filled out survey

<hr>

Email address of individual(s) who filled out survey

<hr>

Date

IX. Attachment B: *Campus responses*

ILL/Special Collection Joint Dialogs regarding the Pilot
March-July, 2003

Responses to info regarding the genesis of the project:
UCB: At UCB we were unaware of any faculty member raising this issue, so we are uncertain whether it has met any needs of UCB faculty members. We can say that of the 91 requests for special collections materials that were generated by eligible UCB patrons (not just faculty) during the one-year+ pilot, we were able to fill 85 with circulating copies by rerouting the requests to non-special collections. Only six requests were filled by UC's supplying special request materials

UCD: --

UCI: --

UCLA: Staff on both sides (ILL and Special Collections) expressed the view that the project had been started because of faculty pressure on the University Librarians to make special collections materials more available. While UCLA Special Collections librarians were generally supportive of the concept they had and still have some reservations about how the concept is implemented. Also, they noted that some campuses are not actively participating.

UCR: There was a mix of people at the session—some had knowledge of the beginning of the project; others started working at UCR after the project had been under discussion for some time. During the narrowly defined two-week pilot, there was only one request. However, the previous week there had been approximately 15 requests. In some respects, the "pilot" of lending Special Collections materials has been going on for approximately 1.5 years. The comments encompass this larger period of time, as completing the survey based on the 1 request would not make it worth while. Also, somewhere during the 1.5 years, some misunderstanding had crept in and loaning Special Collections materials might have opened up to more than just the other UC campuses.

Interlibrary loan personnel felt that having them in the mix (for lending) slowed down response time. However, Special Collections personnel wanted ILL to screen the requests to make sure that a request to Special Collections was because they were a last resort, that any possible circulating copy had been located before the request was forwarded to Special Collections.

UCSB: --

UCSC: --

UCSD: --

Requests

1.   a. How much time does a Special Collection unit need to evaluate a loan request? Or, how much time does the ILL unit need to process a request for a Special Collections item?

UCB: 24 hours, excluding weekends and holidays for each unit.

UCD: Special Collections takes anywhere from a few hours to one day to evaluate a loan request. One day is a reasonable amount of time.

UCI: 0-3 days

UCLA: As one Special Collections participant quipped, "Everything in special collections takes longer."   Many of UCLA Special Collections materials are in storage at the SRLF and must be paged back to campus before staff can assess the item's condition for loan. They need at least a couple of days to evaluate if they will loan.

UCR (response to first question): Less than 1 day if all the conditions are right. If those who make the decision to lend or not are away from campus, then it might take Special Collections up to three days or more. Time may be lost in ILL researching for other circulating copies before a request gets to Special Collections. It is recommended that the time period in OCLC for responding to a request before it is dropped or moves on to the next library be extended to one week.
(response to second question): 4 days

UCSB: Minimal time has been needed, and virtually all requests are granted

UCSC: Special Collections needs at least 1-2 days to process a loan, and can take up to two weeks. It takes longer when staff who make lending decisions are unavailable due to exhibit or donor related activities. It takes ILL minimal time to evaluate a loan.

UCSD: The ILL unit does not process requests from Special Collections. Special Collections does all of its own photocopying and shipping of items. To update OCLC requests, the Special Collections contact sends an email to the ILL staff person with a response (yes or no or conditions), usually within 24 hours of receiving requests. The only caveat is when the Special Collections contact person or the librarian who approves the loans is not available (vacation, sick, conference, etc.)

1.   b. Was the time allotted for staff to review, evaluate, and respond to the initial requests adequate? Why or why not?

UCB: Just about everything was done within the U.C. agreed-to 48 hr, turnaround time. There was only one request that expired (due to unexpected curator or special collections staff absence).

UCD: This is an adequate amount of time in normal situations.

UCI: Yes.

UCLA: No. One ILL participant offered that many of the requests they denied were because they had timed out of the OCLC 4 day allotment. All participants agreed that these requests need lender listed twice (at least) to allow a more reasonable time to respond.

UCR: If people are here or not or if the requester is clear on the specific request being made affects the timeliness of response

UCSB: Yes, time was adequate.

UCSC: See response to #1a.

UCSD: Yes, the 4-day window on OCLC is adequate for both Special Collections and ILL.

2.   *In general, was there adequate response time to respond to requests?*

UCB: Yes.

UCD: Yes.

UCI: Yes.

UCLA: No, for reasons stated above.

UCR: Special Collections personnel thought yes, whereas ILL personnel thought no. Special Collections personnel are generally unfamiliar with ILL procedures. Some requests arrive in Special Collections without call numbers, which need to be researched. When the requests come to Special Collections, the item is pulled by a Library Assistant and given to the Head or Asst. Head for a decision if the item is sturdy enough to be lent. On the one hand, Special Collections personnel prefer, for the sake of the materials, to go directly from the lending Special Collections to the borrowing Special Collections. However, in this scenario it would take more staff in Special Collections to absorb this work load. From the paperwork standpoint, and to verify that a requested item is not available in any other library as a circulating item, would take more Special Collections time when this is something already handled in ILL. UCR Special Collections personnel do NOT like Tricor. Mailing, packing etc., done by receiving for regular items, would also have to be done in Special Collections for their items, thus taking time for other

responsibilities. Special Collections needs tight control over their collection. It is protected while in the building, but then in some places the safeguards are ignored by sending it through various library departments. UCLA & UCR apparently are the only campuses that send directly from Special Collections to Special Collections. The other UCs Special Collections loans go through ILL, acquisitions, etc. If the requests go through ILL and not directly to Special Collections, Special Collections personnel are unable to check patron IDs, are unaware of the rationale for why the patron needs this item, etc. ILL tends to be very customer oriented and not be "exclusive" as to whom they lend or borrow (as long as it is institution to institution) and the item is available.

UCSB: Yes

UCSC: From the ILL staff perspective, there was adequate response time. Special Collections staff felt there was not. Responding meant dropping already full workloads to process these requests. They realize ILL had time frames to work under, but still could not always meet the time frame. All expressed that the pilot could have benefited by programming CDL Request to allot additional time for processing Special Collections items.

UCSD: **Yes.**

3.   *What, if any, exceptions were made to time spent on processing initial requests?*

UCB: ILL (lending) weeded requests at the outset in categories that had already been designated as material which would not be loaned (i.e. manuscripts, pictorials, etc.). However, there was less of this weeding than usual. ILL checked the format to see if the material could be copied instead of loaned.

UCD: No exceptions were encountered.

UCI: When the head of Special Collections is unavailable to make a loan decision, we send an OCLC Conditional message and ask the borrowing library to retry at a later date if the title is still needed.

UCLA: --

UCR: If request is not clear, it is more time consuming for everybody. Special Collections personnel are willing to send tables of contents to help a patron narrow down what part of a book is needed, but that takes time and often the patron will not respond after receiving the table of contents.

UCSB: None. The only delays occurred when personnel in Special Collections were out for a day and were unable to make a decision to lend.

UCSC: Some requests just took longer. Occasionally when a request fell off the lender string, borrowing staff at other libraries were contacted and asked to re-request Special Collections items.

UCSD: Typically for clarification of the request (i.e., communication with borrowing or lending institution: would a photocopy be OK, we only have volume 1 – type questions).

4.   *How were exceptions communicated between units?*

UCB: Email/phone/in person (if necessary or convenient).

UCD: In reviewing requests, if additional communication was needed, it was accomplished by telephone.

UCI: In person or by phone

UCLA: --

UCR: Telephone and fax

UCSB: Person to person or e-mail

UCSC: Email/phone/in person… method used depended on how long each transaction was taking

UCSD: Email is the predominate communication method.

5.   *Were alternative sources properly considered? And were you satisfied with the review of the request?*

UCB: UCB's Interlibrary Borrowing Service reviewed requests from UCB patrons, and, as mentioned above, was able to fill more than 93% of requests for UC special collections materials with non-special collections materials.

UCB's Lending did not make judgments about the requests received in this regard.

UCB's Special Collections did search requests received and in general was not satisfied with the review of requests by the borrowing units. Fully 1/3 of the requests denied were because the material was deemed widely available.

UCD: Both ILL staff (prior to forwarding a request to Special Collections) and Special Collections staff check Melvyl and other resources, if necessary, to determine if a non-Special Collections copy is available somewhere. Occasionally other sources were found and the request was denied.

UCI: Yes. ILL staff reviews the requests so Special Collections loans are only considered when no circulating UC copy exists.

UCLA: Although the borrowing campus was responsible for checking, one Special Collections librarian would also search before responding to a borrowing request.   She also took the additional step of checking the OPAC for the owning library to see if their copy was in Special Collections or a circulating copy. The additional searching takes significant staff time and energy. Another respondent observed that multiple records in Melvyl often confused users and would result in the request for a special collections item when circulating copies were readily available. Ideally, users would sit down with a reference librarian before requesting a special collections item, as better searches would often obviate the need for such a request. It was also noted that even though it was assumed that faculty were choosing a special collections item because they needed that particular piece, it isn't necessarily the case.

UCR: Yes? If there is a circulating copy available, ILL needs to find it and use that instead of a copy from Special Collections. *(response to second questions…)* Most of the time.

UCSB: Once the OCLC source code was modified, identifying a Special Collections item became much simpler which made assessing alternative sources easier. The review of these items was satisfactory.

UCSC: At first, ILL staff would not re-verify requests. When pilot instructions were made clear, verification took place twice at both the borrower's and lender's end. Special Collections staff allowed ILL staff to verify requests.

UCSD: Yes, ILL does a good job of looking for circulating copies, especially for collections that are not rare (New Archives for Poetry, for example).

Turnaround time

6.   *How much time was allowed for preparing an item approved for shipping to and from the borrowing campus?*

UCB: There was no set amount of time "allowed," but it took approximately 24 hrs. from approval to shipment (longer if the item was at the NRLF: 24-48 hrs.)

UCD: Preparing an item for shipment usually occurred at the time of approval for lending; shipment is usually the same day, depending upon what time of day the request is processed.

UCI: 0-3 days

UCLA: Special Collections staff estimated that it takes 45 minutes to adequately package a piece for shipping and call FedEx for pick-up.   Additional time is required to call or email notification to the intended recipient. One unit said they do not ship until they get a reply to the email notification.

UCR: About 30 minutes or more. Initially as a list of the Special Collections locations on other campuses was not available, there was a problem finding correct addresses the first time. However, over time a database was created with this information. (Special Collections are not always in the same building as the ILL where materials are generally received.)

UCSB: No more than one day—all requests were shipped out no later than the day following the receipt of the request. Any shipping delays had to do with the shipping schedules from campus generally. Special Collections personnel noted that filling out paperwork for FedEx was more time-consuming than being able to transport materials by Tricor.

UCSC: It usually took about one working day. If it took longer, again, it was due to library activities making Special Collections staff unavailable.

UCSD: Completed within the OCLC 4 day window.

7. *Was that amount of time adequate for most transactions? Why or why not?*

UCB: The Special Collections staff indicate that if processing these kinds of requests were a regular part of their responsibilities, more time would probably be needed, because they basically dropped everything to process these requests. The pilot was especially disruptive for special collections staff. It is unknown if it were a regular part of their workflow, what priority would be assigned to it, and what level of staff would be used. They note that these materials do require special review and handling.

UCD: Yes.

UCI: Yes.

UCLA: Yes.

UCR: Yes, usually. Why or why not? Regarding turnaround time generally, there was some confusion as to when the clock started ticking. Special Collections assumed it was the date of fax. However, ILL may have had the request a day or two attempting to verify something. The conversation around the room was helpful to realize that ILL might not have gotten the request to Special Collections the very day it arrived and that if Special Collections needs more time to make a decision, they could inform ILL and ILL personnel

can add a note to the file that the request is still under consideration so that the time limit does not end and the request moves on to the next library (if there is one).

UCSB: Yes, plenty of time

UCSC: Yes, most of the time. It would be useful to have more time on the borrowing string (more than 4 days) to prevent requests from rolling off. Other campuses did get items to use within the allotted time.

UCSD: Yes.

Patron usage

8. How often did patrons retrieve or view requested items (if exact figures are unavailable, please respond with estimated percentages)?
3 or more times per request _____
1-2 times per request   _____
0 times per request   _____

UCB: 0 times per request _____X___ Collections staff indicate maybe one person came that she was unaware of, but certainly not multiple times.

UCD: No exact records were kept.
3 or more times per request	10%
1-2 times per request	80%
0 times per request	10%

UCI: probably 1-2 times, but this is not tracked

UCLA: UCLA Biomed reports that the borrowed items were used by the requestors. UCLA Research Library – the largest special collections unit on campus – did not track usage. For one thing, there was no distinction made between items that had been requested on PIR versus other methods. Also, because of an internal change in procedures between YRL Special Collections and ILL, the amount of traffic in Special Collections for using borrowed items increased dramatically about the same time as the pilot project.

UCR: 3 or more times per request   5%
    1-2 times per request   30%
    0 times per request   65%
    These percentages represent requests in general, not just the UC study.

UCSB: Statistics were not kept. Those items retrieved and used by patrons were normally used at least 1-2 times, and quite often several times. We estimate that about 60-70% of the items sent to us were never viewed.

UCSC: No patron retrieved any items requested through the pilot.

UCSD: 3 or more times per request   10%
    1-2 times per request   65%
    0 times per request   25%

9. How was the renewal process handled between ILL and Special Collections departments or units?

UCB: Via OCLC Request between the institutions and email between the ILL and Special Collections Units.

UCD: By phone to the lending Special Collections Dept. or through ILL; sometimes records have not been kept synchronized. Where the request is made depends upon whether the patron approached Special Collections or ILL staff with the renewal request.

UCI: In person or by phone

UCLA: Renewals were handled differently between Biomed and YRL. YRL sent items "non-renewable", but gave a longer initial loan period to try avoiding the need for renewals. Biomed did have some renewal requests made, which Biomed special collections authorized, but the Biomed ILL staff noted that the borrowing library didn't update the OCLC record.

UCR: When renewals are negotiated or when the materials are returned directly to Special Collections, they need to inform ILL personnel so the records can be updated. This may not have been consistently done in the past, but after this discussion there will be better communication between these two units

UCSB: Normally not an issue. SB made its original loan period longer—normally 4 weeks, so renewals were not requested.

UCSC: No requests for renewals were made.

UCSD: Email between ILL and Special Collections staff with updates to OCLC.

10. On average, were items returned to the Lending ILL by the due date?

UCB: Special Collections staff indicate the items were seldom returned by the due date. UCB staff had to call and follow-up almost every time.

UCD: Items are usually returned to our ILL unit on the due date on the ILL strap; this is usually the date due at the other institution. This practice could be modified easily, if needed.

UCI: Yes.

UCLA: Both Biomed and YRL noted that materials were usually returned by the due date.

UCR: Yes

UCSB: Yes, normally. In one or two cases, items may have been returned a day late.

UCSC: Items were supposed to have been returned to Special Collections. We tended to return items late. We received items we had lent to other campus on time. No statistics were specifically kept about this.

UCSD: Yes

11. When the patron finished using the requested materials, was there sufficient time to communicate this to the borrowing ILL so that they could update OCLC records?

UCB: UCB Lending and Special Collections staff agree that there were problems with ILL and Special Collections staff at the other campuses not communicating with each other, so records were not updated to "received," "returned," etc. We do not think this is a time issue, but a communications issue.

UCD: This has not been a problem at UC Davis, because Special Collections staff hands off the item to ILL staff who update the OCLC records and hand carry the item with shipping/packaging instructions to the library's Mail Room.

UCI: Yes.

UCLA: --

UCR: Enlarging upon this, which was answered in 12., above, except for UCLA where UCR-UCLA send directly from and to Special Collections, borrowed items were sent back to ILL before being sent from campus, so ILL personnel were able to update their records.

UCSB: Yes, plenty of time. Simply done by e-mail.

UCSC: Special Collections staff emailed ILL that an item had been returned/sent. Yes, there was sufficient time to communicate this.

UCSD: Yes.

Shipping procedures
    12. Which shipping methods were used to send requested items?
Tricor _____   US Mail   _____
UPS _____   electronic means _____
FedEx _____   other _____

    UCB: Tricor X- for mfilm and copies
        FedEx X- for other materials
        We would specify our materials must be returned to Bancroft via FedEx, yet some
        campuses would not comply.

    UCD: Tricor   X (photocopies)
            UPS   X
            Other   Ariel
        Borrowing will use whatever method required by the Lender. UC Davis prefers UPS,
        because local campus mail operations facilitate UPS shipping. We have recently had a
        FedEx processing change that may make FedEx easier to use in the future. Lending almost
        never sends photocopies, but rather uses Ariel; it's easier and a better copy. Lending
        rarely sends out loans, almost all is copy – about 1 per week.

    UCI: Tricor   copies only
            UPS   Overnight
            electronic means   Ariel

    UCLA: This area, Shipping Procedures, elicited the most discussion because this is where
        the physical piece is most vulnerable. UCLA Special Collections units want point-to-
        point delivery, but that is not happening. Both Biomed and YRL use FedEx exclusively to
        ship materials, and are able to send materials out with a direct FedEx pick up. However,
        as part of the heightened security measures instituted after 9/11/01, incoming materials at
        Biomed must go through the Center for Health Sciences central mail services. This adds
        another opportunity for materials to incorrectly delivered.

    UCR: other   Airborne express

    UCSB: Tricor   (photocopies only)
        UPS   2nd Day (only when shipped to us that way)
        FedEx   normal method

    UCSC: FedEx   only

    UCSD: Tricor   for copies
        UPS   XX

```
electronic means        XX
FedEx                   XX
```

13. What library staff and/or departments were involved in the shipping of requested materials (packaging, labeling, tracking, etc.)?

UCB: ILL and Bancroft (FedEx direct). However, we received things through the mailroom, if not addressed properly.

UCD: Special Collections determines the packaging, insurance; ILL takes the item to the Mail Room and transmits special instructions; Mail Room staff package and mail.

UCI: Special Collections shipped all loans. ILL staff shipped all copies.

UCLA: At both Biomed and YRL, packaging was done by Special Collections staff, as per the original agreement.   They also called FedEx for pick up then took the package to a designated point in either the ILL unit (Biomed) or the Library mail room (YRL). Materials were carefully packaged to prevent damage, but staff noted that many materials being returned to UCLA were neither repackaged in the original wrap (also part of the original agreement), nor repacked in other materials but with the same care. UCLA received some materials delivered by UPS, who at least has package tracking abilities. Staff also reported that one campus was returning special collections items via Tricor who has no tracking system.

UCR: At UCR Special Collections personnel prepared the material completely except for the final putting in a hard box, which was done by Receiving Department personnel

UCSB: Special Collections for all items shipped/ ILL for photocopies

UCSC: Special Collections wraps for all items shipping. Mail room staff ship them out.

UCSD: Special Collections does all the packaging, mailing and tracking. The prepared packages are sent to the carrier (UPS or Fed Ex) through the library mail room to the campus mail room.

14. Were any materials lost or damaged in the process?

UCB: 1 item was damaged of 20 sent.

UCD: Not that we know of.

UCI: No.

UCLA: A Biomedical Library loan, a $10K two volume set, was delivered to the wrong department and was missing for two weeks before some conscientious staff member contacted the library. YRL reported a few instances of damage – loose binding, twisted spines.

UCR: Yes, 2 books. One was temporarily lost for 4 months. One of the two books was not shipped properly. The front cover was gouged. Would like to see a conditions report used, which the lending library completes in duplicate and has a copy at the front of the book stating the condition as it left: i.e. missing or loose pages listed, cover damage if any, etc. Checking this form would add 5 minutes to the process. The copy of the condition report that travels with the book would have a place to sign when the material is received, so that the lending library knows it was not damaged in shipping to the other library, and another place to sign when the item is ready to be packed to return, so the lending library would know the patron did not damage the material (and can also know if there was damage in shipping when the material was returned).

UCSB: No

UCSC: No

UCSD: No

Overall
6. *How has the pilot fit into the department or unit work flow?*

UCB: It does not fit into regular workflow. Everything was specially handled and would take even longer if it were a regular function (i.e. batched into regular flow). The process might be shorter if requests were reviewed by the borrowing units. It was very disruptive.

UCD: ILL and Special Collections staff are sensitive to and have concerns about the impact of Special Collections materials that are not handled in a manner consistent with the policy and thereby put these materials at risk.

UCI: The volume was very low, so the workload was not a significant factor.

UCLA: A conscious effort was made to work the pilot into the normal flow of both ILL and Special Collections procedures. Biomed and YRL ILL and Special Collections staff had a number of meetings to discuss procedures and work out contacts.

UCR: This has been an extra strain on the staff, whose number did not increase, like other new ventures.

UCSB: For ILL, PIR requests fit into a "review" request workflow and were thus treated like a mediated request; for Special Collections, an additional workflow for doing shipping and keeping records had to be created.

UCSC: Work for the pilot did not fit into the regular work flow. Each request had to be mediated by ILL staff. Special Collections staff created a new work flow to respond to item/request evaluation, decision making, and packaging activities needed. Both staffs expressed that the two units work very differently specifically in terms of time frames, volumes of work, work/office cultures, patron bases, and types of users. While ILL handles large volumes quickly, Special Collections must handle each transaction carefully.

UCSD: The impact would be on Special Collections but the workflow is similar to existing workflow. Minimal impact.

16. Are communications between your campus ILL unit and your campus Special Collections adequate and timely?

UCB: Yes. ILL and Bancroft staff conducted meetings prior to the beginning of the pilot and set up communication channels, including a reflector; written procedures; and regular email and telephone communication.

UCD: Yes

UCI: Yes.

UCLA: UCLA ILL and Special Collections units have worked out communications by including each other on emails regarding transactions and by telephone calls between contacts.   However, it seemed to one Special Collections staffer that every time she called another campus' Special Collections unit, the transaction required lots of explanation and no one seemed to know who the contact was or what to do. When the borrowing campus is disorganized, it puts more of a burden on the lending campus staff. UCLA had enough volume to help ingrain the procedures into staff workflow. However, if a campus has little or no practice, then there can be confusion about proper handling. Repetition helps reinforce procedures and if a campus is low volume there is not enough repetition.

 UCR: They are usually excellent.

UCSB: Yes. The units work very well together.

UCSC: Communication was as timely as possible given the workload of the day.

UCSD: Yes.

17. Was any new equipment installed or space redesigned specifically for the pilot?

UCB: Packaging space and a FedEx account and allocation were set up.

UCD: No.

UCI: No.

UCLA: No .

UCR: No

UCSB: No new equipment was needed. Special Collections had to create a small space for processing materials. ILL required no additional space.

UCSC: No new equipment was purchased. Excel was used to track the status of items shipped and received.

UCSD: No.

18. What, if any, statistics were gathered about the pilot separate from the OCLC ones?

UCB: UCB ILL gathered statistics regarding filled and denied requests by categories; Bancroft kept similar monthly information and wrote reports.

UCD: None

UCI: ILL staff kept paper records of all lending transactions during the pilot.

UCLA: None.

UCR: None.

UCSB: None. We relied on the pilot to collect statistics.

UCSC: Statistics on what items were received and what was returned were gathered.

UCSD: Special Collections keeps their own statistics (which are probably not reported to UC). The only track number of requests received, number of requests denied, and number of requests loaned. Special Collections doesn't track if they are PIR generated or not.

19. How might the ILL/Special Collections pilot be improved?

UCB: The pilot ended in July, and at this point, UCB is no longer participating. To improve the program, see the attached report from Bancroft. Clarification about the borrowing library's responsibilities and what can be requested would be necessary.

UCD: Further modification of the automated screening of requests would help. Screening needs to happen for items when a Special Collections copy is 2nd or later in the queue of possible lending libraries.

UCI: Insure effective communication for procedures.

UCLA: Better packaging .   ALL parties should adhere to the national standards or at least the project standards.   Also, institute some sort of identifying wrapping that makes the package readily recognizable as part of the project, but doesn't scream "I'm rare and valuable, steal me" either.

UCR: Stop calling it a pilot. Call it a mandate if that is what it is to be.

UCSB: *The patron PIR screen indicating that a request for Special Collections information needs to be made much clearer. The high rate of materials loaned and never retrieved by patrons indicates in part that it may not have been clear what was being requested.

*Use Tricor, not Fedex, to mainstream shipping of materials and improve speed of delivery.

*It should be a goal to have Melvyl further screen requests so that collections at libraries that simply don't loan materials are not an option. This will make it clearer to patrons.

UCSC: Cut ILL out as the "middle man." Currently, when we receive ILL requests for Maps, ILL and Maps staff contact the patron to see if an alternative on-site source could be used and/or to make certain the request is truly accurate. If the requested Map item is still needed via ILL, it becomes a Map room to Map room transactions. Another idea would be to see if CDL request could be programmed to go to all libraries without Special Collections copies first, then go to libraries with Special Collections copies. This may have already been done, but not as successful as it could be.

UCSD: Redundancy of staffing in Special Collections would improve the process (the process stops when one of the two key staff are not available).

20. Should the pilot continue? Why or why not?

UCB: No. From the UCB point of view, the program is not worth the effort: 20 books of 350 requested were supplied.

UCD: Yes; the number of requests is reasonable to handle; making judgments is not a burden. If volume were to increase significantly, we might reconsider.

UCI: The data is satisfactory.

UCLA: The original concept is solid, but needs some improvement especially in
    communication between campuses. One aspect that would help is more regular updating
    and distribution of the contacts list and regular review of the procedures.

UCR: No.
    (See #27, following)

UCSB: Yes, it should simply become a standard procedure.

UCSC: Yes, but it'd be more effective and less of a disservice to patrons to not have Special
    Collections staff routinely reject requests that could have been handled/rejected/screened
    earlier in the process. When this happens, inefficiencies come in the form of staff time
    spent following up (watching and/or calling) to see if a request has been approved.
    Perhaps HOSC or another all campus group make a UC wide decision regarding how
    many requests we should aim to fill.

UCSD: Yes.

21. Do you have any recommendations for future pilot activities?

UCB: No.

UCD: Not at this time.

UCI: n/a

UCLA: --

UCR: Do a pilot on not lending Special Collections materials to see response. Special
    Collections collect for the future, i.e. Eaton Collection. Many users to not realize that even
    if an issue only cost $0.85 when it was originally published, that is not its value now and
    there may not be many copies of this available. Many people are requesting Special
    Collections materials just because they can. The serious researcher knows that s/he might
    have to travel to a Collection. "Pilots" have been going on for about two years. When
    approximately 65% of patrons are not showing up to use material, why are we continuing?
    Willing to contribute. Some of the participants are not receiving results/summary data.
    Every time an item is lent, there is a risk of loss to an item that may be one of a kind.

UCSB: Consider a procedure for loaning videos.

UCSC: 1- Yes, digitize; perhaps in cooperation with ERes staff. 2- ILL transactions that involve Special Collections materials being handled by Special Collections staff only at the two libraries involved.

UCSD: Digitize on demand, with full metadata so the scanned images can be retrained and searchable by patrons, would be ideal. Special Collections would need their own high-end scanner to make participation worthwhile.

22. Would you be willing to digitize material in lieu of lending? Can you describe any barriers to digitizing?

UCB: If money and expertise were available; the condition of the material lent itself to that process; the digital copy was retained as part of the collection; and copyright issues were considered and resolved - yes.

UCD: Yes. No immediate barriers unless volume were significant.

UCI: Yes, but fragility and condition of the material may be barriers. UC Irvine Special Collections is willing to digitize most materials that can be photocopied. This does not include bound volumes at present. Of course, there are also workload issues involved.

UCLA: Participants at UCLA were willing to digitize material in lieu of lending. Some barriers discussed were the technology/equipment required, size of the project, staff time and costs. Once material is digitized, meta data is needed to facilitate retrieving the files.

UCR: No. *Can you describe any barriers to digitizing?* Doing an entire book is very time consuming. In principle not against it, but would need more staff. Formats different than the norm make it more difficult to digitize, sometimes taking 20 minutes to scan a page. There is the issue of server space. Special Collections is not a copy center. This is just one more thing to do among all the items on the job card. A digitized copy is not a preservation copy. Electronic may become obsolete before paper. Additional staffing and server needed. Trying to get material digitized and sent out in ILL time frames is not realistic. Would need a copy center just for Special Collections. Format of digitized copy is often not able to import into other software such as Word. If material already digitized, it is easy to send. We do scan i.e. photographs, small articles. Person doing the scanning needs to be higher paid than student; should be a photo technician. Thus it would cost more money and would be overkill for an ILL request, but a high resolution copy would be needed for preservation.

UCSB: Yes, we do digitize some items for lending. There are several possible barriers for any item:
>   quality of the digitizing
>   size of the physical item and the ability to digitize that size
>   server space needed
>   time needed to digitize an item

training of those doing the scanning to be able to provide good quality scans.

UCSC: Yes

UCSD: Yes.

23. Additional comments:

UCB: There were many problems with the pilot. There were serious problems with differences on campuses as to who was handling the material at the borrowing library – special collections staff or ILL. Bancroft staff would be told "let us try to find the material," when contacting the borrowing library staff. Although security was supposed to be guaranteed during the pilot, this did not happen.   Although a revised contact list was requested, it is our impression that is was never issued. The pilot seemed to focus too much on turnaround time and less on whether extra procedures were justified or actually benefited patrons.

   Copied here is Susan Snyder's (from the Bancroft Library) report to RLG regarding the pilot [please see Appendix C].

UCD: --

UCI: Special Collections staff is interested to know the status of CDL Request and Special Collections requests. There was an implicit assumption that Request for Special Collections would be turned off after the pilot. Staff needs to be informed to advise users correctly. Do campuses have the right to opt out of ILL for Special Collections material? Further discussions and effective communication are very important.

UCLA: One Special Collections librarian observed that "this is not a "no cost" project - there is significant cost in staff time which ILL and Special Collections are subsidizing." This was echoed at the second session held where another librarian suggested 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 …"   His observation was that we have not had support, so how can statewide "continue to provide" support?

UCR: This discussion among Special Collections and ILL personnel has been healthy. UCR ILL and Special Collections personnel need to communicate and coordinate more. If we change the current procedures significantly, more staff would be needed. If no further steps/work happens in Special Collections to process requests, there is still more work for ILL to reject requests for Special Collections material (outside the UC system). Better communication will help internally.

UCSB: It was noted in discussion that there had been some confusion amongst campuses about how long the pilot lasted (e.g. 6 months, one year).

We have based our answers on how well the pilot work from the 2-week statistics gathering period forward, since that is when OCLC was modified, and requests became more accurately appropriate to the pilot.

UCSC: No

UCSD: No

X. Attachment C: *Report to the Research Library Group (RLG),*
written by Susan Snyder, a UCB Bancroft Library staff member

From June 2001 through June 2002, The Bancroft Library at the University of California at
Berkeley participated in a pilot project to test the feasibility of interlibrary loan of special
collections material among the nine UC campuses. Though supported by various groups
representing special collections libraries on all the campuses, the project was beset with
problems from its inception. When the pilot ended, Bancroft elected to pull out of the project,
though some other UC campuses have continued to share their resources under the guidelines
and procedures issued under the auspices of the pilot program. Successes, good intentions
and ideas have no doubt been present from the beginning, but I think it may be useful to list
the failures and weak points of the project from the perspective of Bancroft Library staff. It is
hoped that the lessons derived from our experiences will assist and alert others planning or
participating in a shared resource program.

1. Patron initiated online requests must be reviewed by library staff for
    appropriateness. We received many requests for items that were readily available
    from circulating libraries, as well as for manuscript and pictorial material. There
    were requests for items available on microfilm and for books that were owned by
    the requesting institution.
2. A single contact person is essential for each participating library. Sharing and
    delegating responsibility on a case by case basis between special collections and
    interlibrary service units does not work. A clear chain of communication and
    strong, well-defined partnerships are essential.
3. There must be a workable agreement on a courier or delivery service, one that will
    provide door to door delivery, avoiding institutional mailrooms and multiple units.
    (It is impossible to protect material completely while in transit, however. Damage
    and loss will occasionally occur, no matter how well packaged and labeled the
    material is. To the courier, it's just a package.)
4. There must be agreement on uniform packaging, addressing, book bands, and
    insurance procedures.
5. Online tracking information for individual loans must be updated by all participants
    throughout the loan process.
6. Patron use issues must be regularized. A special collection loan should be used in a
    special collection environment – expectations for this environment should be clear
    and not optional.
7. Most special collections books borrowed and loaned during the pilot were not used
    by the requesting patrons. It was a risk-, cost-, and labor-intensive program for what
    may be considered very low return.

Of the 469 patron-initiated requests for Bancroft Library loans processed during the pilot,
330 were denied, 21 were filled as microfilm loans, 98 were filled as photocopies, and 20
items were sent to the borrowing institution. Of the 20, one was damaged in transit. Most
denials fell into two groups – too dear to lend or too common to lend. In the end, it was felt
that the program as it had been developed was not able to "guarantee the security and safe
handling of Special Collection material during loans."

XI. Attachment D: *Report on UCLA YRL Department of Special Collections Participation in the PIR Project 2002-2003*

UCLA's YRL Dept. of Special Collections has been an active, cooperative participant in the UC pilot project to determine the feasibility of patron initiated requests to borrow special collections materials among the UC libraries. The Department has been the largest lender of materials in this project. The nature of the Department's previous responses to surveys and reports has been diluted in collective responses and constrained by the framework of the questions. To be more specific, the Department has been asked to respond to reports and participate in surveys and discussions all within the context of mandated participation in the project. Participation was undertaken with the shared understanding that interlibrary loan staff and special collections curators are by experience, purpose, and organization at opposite ends of a resource-sharing spectrum. The comments and concerns of YRL Special Collections have heretofore been direct and cooperative, but have not reflected the Department's underlying desire to terminate its participation.

The PIR project has put additional strains on an already over-burdened public services staff which lost .5 FTE (out of 2.5 FTE) around the time the pilot began. Increased workload includes bibliographic verification, identification of possible microfilm copies, retrieval of items, required forms, processing, packing and shipping, unpacking and reshelving/returning. It includes related correspondence regarding receipt, renewal, and return of materials. Public services absorbed this additional workload of up to 10 hours per week willingly, but at a cost to other users. As a result, researchers have experienced delays and glitches in their efforts to obtain information about our collections, obtain access to them, and obtain copies of items in our collection. Creating additional confusion, the Department experienced, independently of the PIR workload, an increase in the number of non-PIR items that needed to be used in our protected environment. Planning, monitoring, and execution of this complex initiative have taken staff away from primary responsibilities.

Most of the recommendations from the Report of March 2003 (12 recommendations) and from the August 2003 Dialog summary (20 recommendations) demonstrate the many ways, even basic ones, in which the project is not working. For example, researchers request items that are available as circulating copies elsewhere; adjustments still need to be made to MELVYL and OCLC; the security and condition of loaned items cannot be guaranteed; the basic nature of the project (who is required to participate? is the project is still on-going?) is unclear to some campuses; other UC groups and constituents are not aware of this service; there is no funding for this program; and most frustrating of all, patrons are not showing up to use requested materials. It is discouraging to see that several of the recommendations for improvements are identical to points made in the planning document "Interlibrary Loan Needs Statement for UC Special Collections" from December 2000.

In summary, the project has diverted staff from serving other researchers, endangered the collections and highlighted *again* the need for user education to alleviate unnecessary duplicative work. Special collections are special: they are not acquired, cataloged, housed, accessed, duplicated, or loaned in any manner similar to procedures used for stack materials. The square peg of special materials cannot be expected to fit the round hole of a complex and highly structured inter-library loan system without extensive remodeling of the infrastructure, nor can this be carried out without additional staff. Only when the recommendations become realities, a digitization pilot has been completed, and an ongoing PIR program has been fully funded would we be willing to resume the sharing of our unique and rare materials.

Suzanne Shellaby
Assistant Head,
YRL Dept. of Special Collections
UCLA
10/20/03