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Minutes 5 November 2010 Meeting:

**Attending:** Matthew Shaw, Elaine Nelson, Holli Moseman, Collette Mak, Rita Rogers, Tina Baich

**Location:** IUPUI

1. **Introductions:**
   
   Since this was our first face-to-face meeting in some time, members introduced themselves.

2. **Plan for conversation with Randy Dykhuis & Debbi Schaubman:**
   
   Randy Dykhuis and Deb Schaubman of MCLS were invited to speak to the RSC about interstate returnable delivery service and the use of MeLCat, Michigan’s union catalog, for remote circulation. RSC members briefly formulated some of the main issues we wanted to discuss with the representatives including Mr. Dykhuis’s vision for an interstate delivery model and a basic workflow model for remote circulation.

3. **Begin Review of Resource Sharing Assessment Survey:**
   
   The RSC reviewed a draft of the research report based on the Resource Sharing Assessment Survey, which was conducted by the RSC in summer 2010. Matthew Shaw developed some of the introductory sections and editorial changes were suggested. Holli Moseman will rewrite point 2 under the Executive Summary to more adequately represent the diversity and overlap in electronic delivery options. Holli developed an appendix with data graphs based on the responses to survey questions. Holli will add a chart showing days of delivery for INFOExpress as well. A final draft will be sent for ratification by the Committee via the listserv.
4. Meeting with Randy Dykhuis and Deb Schaubman:

Mr. Dykhuis discussed various models of interstate delivery and suggested that Indiana and Michigan look into the possibility of developing a system which will link up Indiana’s INFOExpress with Michigan’s ProMed courier company. He suggests “hand-off” stations located at various border points along the Indiana/Michigan line. Randy Dykhuis has held preliminary conversations with Wisconsin and Illinois as well about facilitating interstate delivery.

Debbi Schaubman, recently named Manager of Shared Library Systems, at MCLS was instrumental in coordinating the establishment of MeLCat and remote circulation system in Michigan. She discussed the advantages of a remote circulation system for both end users and local libraries. She also provided the Committee with a realistic sense of the challenges in creating consensus for the adoption of a union catalog and discussed the impact on interlibrary loan departments’ activity throughout the State.

5. Utilization of the Listserv

The Committee is interested in expanding the use of the listserv to promote discussion of resource-sharing issues amongst colleagues throughout the ALI membership. Matthew Shaw will work to develop a wiki for the Committee in order to free up the listserv for this broader purpose. Interlibrary loan staff, deans and directors, and other interested constituents of ALI will be invited to join the listserv at that time.

6. Develop a Proposal for the ALI Board for the 11 March Conference

This issue was tabled due to time restrictions. We will have a future telephone conference to flesh this out more fully.

Meeting was adjourned at 12 PM.

Minutes 3 December 2010 Meeting:

Attending: Tina Baich, Judy Tribble, Collette Mak, Holli Moseman, Elaine Nelson, and Matthew Shaw

Budget Proposal: We want the registration fee to be as low as possible. Registration must include lunch. Lunch fee will be $10 a head. Our budget should assume that we will comp our key note speaker(s), those working the conference, possibly our session speakers. We should estimate on the high side to be safe. ISU is donating folders and pencils, bagels/pastries for morning break and popcorn for the afternoon. There will be no charge for parking.

Our budget needs to cover:

- Handouts
- Keynote speaker(s) (travel and overnight)
- Promotional materials (if we send things out)
- Lunch at $10 per
- Name tags

We do want to open registration to public libraries as well. The first D2D conference did include public libraries and was financially supported by ALI and the State Library.

Other materials: Do we want to contact vendors for promotional materials on their products? Yes, vendors will be glad to provide collateral and possibly small items such as pens or note pads.

Rooms: There are 3 large rooms with the largest capacity at 250 (cap for registration), another room for 75-100 and a computer room with 30 machines. There are other, smaller, rooms in the library. Holli has reserved the whole library for the day.
Sessions/Tracks: We may wish to have a plenary session in the morning with breakout sessions in the afternoon. The plenary session would include a keynote speaker as well as any announcements that we want to share with the group such as the regional mentoring program or the new ALI Resource Sharing code (assumes approval).

We would like for the morning to focus on remote circulation. This could include a presentation by Randy Dykhuis and Debbi Schaubman about Michigan’s program and another presentation by a library from either Ohio or Illinois where remote circulation has been in place for some time. This would not be system specific but rather what it is, how it can work and what the benefits are to the participants.

While we like this idea we need to make sure the board is in agreement because it could result in a lot of questions for ALI about when, who, how, how much. Matthew will bring this up at the next ALI board meeting on 13 December. Breaks could include posters or displays for smaller topics and a summary of the survey results.

The afternoon sessions may be based on the topics suggested in the survey

- License agreements
- Cooperative buying
- Odyssey stand alone
- Trusted sender
- Direct request
- Custom holdings
- Open source

These could be simultaneous sessions. What had we originally thought to have two tracks: Open Access and the Changing Resource Sharing/Discovery landscape. Having a track aimed at different staff levels will be make the conference more attractive to a variety of people and groups. We may want to reserve a session specifically for a public library to encourage their participation.

We will want to have both a call for proposals AND targeted invitations to speak to ensure we have the right mix and the right presenters.

Once we have sessions we can ask people to state preferences (1-X) so we can minimize scheduling conflicts for popular sessions and make it possible for more people to attend the sessions they want.

Action Items:

- ISU’s corporate hotel rate to feed into the budget (Holli will try to get a rate on Monday, 6 December)
- ALI Board agreement on remote circ as the ‘big topic’ for the conference (Matthew will present this proposed focus to the Board)

Recent Activity:

- A final draft of the proposed ALI Resource Sharing Code, finalized by the Resource Sharing Committee, has been sent to deans and directors and interlibrary loan contacts throughout the ALI membership. Comments and feedback are solicited through 15 January 2011.

- Committee members finalized the Resource Sharing Assessment Survey (attached), which includes important recommendations to the ALI Board.
Committee members met with Randy Dykhuis and Debbi Schaubman on 5 November to discuss the benefits of a statewide union catalog for the facilitation of remote circulation.

Committee members met on 3 December to discuss an estimated budget for a one-day resource-sharing conference to be held at Indiana State University on 11 March 2011.
Resource Sharing Assessment Survey:
A Brief Report with Recommendations

Committee Membership:
Matthew Shaw, Ball State University, Chair, RSC
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Introduction to the Resource Sharing Assessment Survey:

The Academic Libraries of Indiana (ALI) was formed in 2003 to:

- Support economic development in Indiana
- Promote collaboration, innovation, preservation, and resource sharing
- Maintain resources for improving teaching, learning, research and service
- Improve Indiana’s information infrastructure

The Resource Sharing Committee (RSC) was established to “Serve as a focal point for exploring resource-sharing issues, discussing new opportunities that would further facilitate resource-sharing among ALI members as well as with other libraries, and recommend courses of action to the Board.”

As part of the most recent charge issued to the RSC for 2009/10, the Committee has been tasked with the assessment of the current resource sharing capabilities of ALI member libraries, including their current use of technology, direct borrowing and/or unmediated options, turnaround time, document delivery modes such as Odyssey or Ariel, degree of satisfaction with their own current operations as well as with the receipt of materials from other libraries, needs, and desired improvements.

Goals & Objectives of the Survey:

In June 2010, the RSC developed and distributed a survey to scan the environment of the Interlibrary Loan departments of the ALI membership and to gather important information about participation in consortial programs, use of resource sharing technologies and services, and staff training and infrastructure needs.

The survey results will be used to make informed and strategic recommendations to the ALI Board for:

- Encouraging participation of ALI members in the ALI Reciprocal Borrowing Program
- Increasing implementation of electronic delivery technologies and encouraging more frequent delivery/pickup through the statewide courier service
- Planning an effective statewide resource sharing conference and developing sustainable, regional partnerships to help ALI libraries with practical training and support and development of mutually-beneficial infrastructure.

Development & Distribution of the Survey:

Members of the Committee created the Resource Sharing Assessment Survey using Google Docs, which provides respondents with a web-based interface. The survey was distributed electronically to local Interlibrary Loan management staff at all 72 ALI member libraries.

During a 5-week period (13 July – 20 August 2010), the Committee collected results from 45 respondents, and used the Google utilities to analyze data in Microsoft Excel.

Executive Summary:

Highlights:

- Only 17 of the 45 respondents (≈38%) participate in the ALI Reciprocal Borrowing Program.
- 88% of ALI Libraries use some method of electronic delivery between libraries. While 82% will utilize email delivery, only 62% utilize Odyssey or Ariel.
- While ≈91% of respondents participate in INFOExpress statewide delivery, ≈29% (13/45) do not have 5-day service, and ≈24% (11/45) have 3 or less days of service.
• Local Interlibrary Loan staff would benefit from training on set-up and use of Trusted Sender, Direct Request and Custom Holdings.
Recommendations:

- Develop an ALI Resource Sharing Code to promote best practices and standardized service levels for resource sharing throughout the ALI membership.

- Support an upcoming statewide conference, organized by the RSC, on resource sharing to offer practical training and foster collaboration and innovation.

- Develop a regional partnering system for set-up, implementation, and technical support for resource sharing innovation and infrastructure.

- Investigate the benefits of increased participation in 5-day INFOExpress delivery/pickup for ALI member libraries.

- Re-emphasize to ALI membership the benefits of the reciprocal borrowing program.

Outcomes:

- The Committee has developed a proposed draft of an ALI Resource Sharing Code, which will be distributed to Interlibrary Loan librarians/managers and directors/deans of ALI libraries. Comments will be collected during an established period, and a revised document will be submitted to the ALI Board.

- The Committee is developing a proposed plan and budget for a one-day resource sharing conference to be held at Indiana State University on 11 March 2011.

- Based on survey results, the Committee has identified a need for expanded infrastructure to facilitate electronic delivery of materials. Regional partnerships will be useful in implementing state-of-the-art technologies like Odyssey stand-alone and could also be a vehicle for promoting and sustaining stronger mutual support, training, and development toward a shared vision of resource sharing innovation and practices.

- The Committee will more fully investigate the benefits of 5-day INFOExpress delivery-pickup for ALI member libraries and ask the ALI Board to consider appropriate levels of subsidization for this service.

- The Committee is interested in raising awareness of the ALI Reciprocal Borrowing program through a renewed and aggressive marketing effort.
Appendix:

Data

What is your ILL management system?
- Worldcat: 20
- Worldcat in conjunction with Clio: 2
- ILLiad: 18
- Non-Electronic: 2
- Private system: 2
- Clio (only): 1

- Do you participate in any of these ILL services?
  - Docline: 1
  - RapidILL: 1
  - Indiana Share: 1

- Do you use Direct Request?
  - Yes: 25
  - No: 20

- Do you use Trusted Sender?
  - Yes: 14
  - No: 31

- Do you ever request that materials be sent directly to your patrons?
  - Yes: 2
  - No: 43

- Are you willing to send your materials directly to another library’s patron?
  - Yes: 14
  - No: 31

- Do you participate in any programs that allow patrons from other libraries to check out your materials directly?
  - Yes: 32
  - No: 13

- If so, please specify which programs. ***{not exact language – placed in category}
  - ALI: 16
ALI & local 1
Local consortiums 7
PALNI 2
PALNI & ALI 3
No response 16

- Do you participate in the Indiana courier service (INfoExpress)?
  Yes 41
  No 4

- If not, why not? ***{not exact language – placed in category}
  Too few requests 2
  We just use mail 1
  No response 42

- If so, how many days of delivery do you have?
  1 day 4
  2 days 4
  3 days 3
  4 days 2
  5 days 28
  No response 4

- If you do not have 5 day service, why not? ***{not exact language – placed in category}
  Cost 3
  Too few requests 6
  What we have is sufficient 5
  Cut back in the summer 2
  No Response 29

- Do you offer electronic delivery?
  Yes 40
  No 5

- If so, which methods do you use?
  Odyssey 12 out of 45 libraries
Ariel  15  out of 45 libraries
Email  37  out of 45 libraries

- **If you don't use Odyssey, what do you consider the barriers to adoption?**  ***{not exact language – placed in category}***
  - Technical difficulties 4
  - Local IT help needed or refused 4
  - No need at this time 6
  - Cost 3
  - No time 3
  - Getting it soon 1
  - No Response 24

- **How do you think the current economy and your own institutional budgetary issues have affected your services?**  ***{not exact language – placed in category}***
  - Budget cuts or less income 9
  - Staff (including students) cut or doing more than ILL 7
  - Little to no affect 15
  - Higher requests 11
  - Affecting service 3

- **Do you use document suppliers or purchase articles directly from publishers?**
  - Yes 22
  - No 23

- **If yes, please list the document suppliers or publishers you purchase from most frequently.**
  - Sage
  - Proquest
  - Dissertations
  - Springer
  - Chemical Abstracts Service
  - National Research Council Canada
  - Sport Information Resource Center
  - Institute for Science Info
  - Standards
  - InformaWorld
  - Science Direct
  - Wiley Interscience
  - Ingenta
  - Infotrieve
  - National Library of Medicine
  - British Library
  - Guy Brown

- **Do you have a purchase on demand program for books?**
  - Yes 14
  - No 31
• **How many ILL staff members do you have?**

  No dedicated staff 5
  Less than 1 full-time 2
  1 full-time 19
  1.5 full-time 2
  2 full-time 10
  2.5 full-time 1
  3 full-time 2
  4 full-time 1
  5 full-time 1
  6 full-time 1
  7 full-time 1

• **If you do not have staff members devoted to ILL, please provide an estimate of the number of hours spent on ILL per week.**

  30 hrs 1
  20 hrs 2
  15 hrs 1
  5 hrs 2
  2 hrs 3

• **Do you have a purchase on demand program for audio/visual materials?**

  Yes 11
  No 34

• **Please share any other thoughts you may have on Indiana Resource Sharing.**

  *I would love to see more complete, specific, and up-to-date documentation about longstanding agreements, especially where ALI is concerned. The best documentation I've found is a best practices document distributed by INCOLSA.*

  *In the 2009-10 year, Indiana libraries supplied nearly 60% of all book requests and almost 50% of all article requests. We couldn't be as successful as we are without everyone in the state! Thank you!*

  *We would like to know if it is possible to receive email notifications when we get a request from another library. We would like more libraries to participate in InfoExpress.*

  *I appreciate Indiana Resource Sharing. I am glad that the libraries can cooperate with each other in helping patrons. We think that Indiana has a great group of people in Resource Sharing who are willing to go the extra mile to serve our patrons.*

  *Indiana libraries are highly cooperative and responsive to each others lending needs.*
InfoExpress is an extremely useful service to have, the low cost for single week deliveries makes it much easier to use and encourage use of ILL services.

I would like to see standard statewide ILL policies for academic libraries including: loan period, materials available for loan, delivery turnaround, etc. While I have reasons for our current policies, I think we would be willing to basically adopt a statewide policy if it were in existence due to our interest in serving our partners well. Of course, there could be exceptions here and there for special collections. But it would be nice to have a common starting point. This would allow us to communicate clearly with users so they have accurate expectations for interlibrary loan service. This is the kind of statement I imagine being able to provide to users: "Materials borrowed from other Indiana academic libraries may be used for 30 days with one renewal. Loans will arrive in 3-10 business days. Copies will arrive in 0-72 hours, Monday through Friday. The following may always be requested from other Indiana academic libraries: books, audiovisual materials, and copies of articles."

Originally I thought we were to place items in the courier service to be sorted overnight and then out to the next library the next day. I understand if libraries do not have daily service that would slow things, but it still takes about a week, like slow US mail. Can that be sped up. Our students are in a want it now not an hour from now lifestyle and it would be helpful if books could make overnight turnarounds.

With the cost of books going up, more people will be doing interlibrary loan than buying the books. Need longer loan time.
There has not been a wage increase in 2 years and combined with the implementation of synchronous time keeping morale is low among employees.

Would be interested in any discussion which has or will take place regarding possible cooperative buying of databases for the sake of license agreements that would allow for sharing of electronic articles. The delivery service is not dependable. There have been some missed days and some days the delivery arrives too late to process the materials for that day.

SHARE program - they need to get this better organized - so that the borrowing libraries get their requests updated. This is time consuming b/c I have to follow up with the requests.

A note on a question above - where you asked about favorite way to submit articles. I did say Ariel as first - but that is not what we use the most - we probably send 75% or more through Odyssey - we just like the speed and the finer control on the scanner settings with Ariel.

Thanks for doing the study! Would love to see the results.

I wouldn't want to be without it.

- Approximately how many items did you borrow during 2009?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Range</th>
<th>Borrowed</th>
<th>Loaned</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0 - 500</td>
<td>21</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>501 - 1000</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1001 - 5000</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5001 - 10000</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10001 - 20000</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20001 - 30000</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30001 or more</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
• **Approximately how many items did you lend during 2009?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items Ranged</th>
<th>Number of Libraries</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0 - 500</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>501 - 1000</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1001 - 5000</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5001 - 10000</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10001 - 20000</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20001 - 30000</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30001 or more</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

• **Do you use Custom Holdings?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Choice</th>
<th>Number of Libraries</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

• **If so, do you separate Indiana libraries from out of state?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Choice</th>
<th>Number of Libraries</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

• **Which of the following item types do you lend?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item Type</th>
<th>Number of Libraries</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Books</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CDs</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DVDs</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VHS</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scores</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Periodicals</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Microform</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reference Materials</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Collections</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
• Does your library direct your users to Google Books full view and other free digital repositories if requested material is available online?
  Yes  34
  No   11

• If yes, do you cancel borrowing requests for material available freely online?
  Yes   23
  No    11
  Depends on Patron Preference  2
Academic Libraries of Indiana
Resource Sharing Committee
Conference Proposal

Building on the success of the 2007 *Discovery to Delivery* conference, held at Ball State University in August 2007, the Resource Sharing Committee requests funding for an upcoming meeting to be held on 11 March 2011 at Indiana State University.

The Committee is in the process of developing a working schedule for the event, but we propose a two-track program, offering an afternoon sequence option for those interested in fundamentals and another sequence for those interested in more advanced aspects of resource sharing.

Because of our interest in building positive and mutually-beneficial resource-sharing relationships with public libraries throughout the State of Indiana, we request permission to open registration to interested public library attendees.

The Indiana State University Library is prepared to offer the Committee:

- Free parking for meeting participants and presenters
- Morning refreshments (pastries, bagels, coffee tea, hot chocolate, water)
- Afternoon refreshments (popcorn, coffee, tea, hot chocolate, water)\(^1\)
- Door prize bags (2-3) with library giveaways
- Pocket folders and pencils for each attendee

In order to encourage broad participation, the Resource Sharing Committee is interested in offering attendees (ALI members and public library attendees) free registration and requests support from the ALI Board to cover the costs of lunch, break refreshments, and travel for outside speakers (to be determined).

Lunch will be catered by Indiana State University and will cost $10 per person. Afternoon snacks, which will include cookies, lemon bars, a veggie tray, and a fruit tray will cost $174.

We estimate tentative travel costs for speaker(s) to be $500, providing mileage, overnight lodging, and per diem meal costs. Indiana State receives a special rate from the Hilton Garden Inn, located 2 blocks from campus (nightly rates $107-120 per room).

An itemized, estimated budget follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Preliminary Discovery to Delivery Conference Budget Proposal</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(Based on 120 Registrants)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lunch and Afternoon Snack</td>
<td>$1500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speaker Lodging/Travel</td>
<td>$500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name Tags/Registration Materials</td>
<td>$150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>$2150</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Additional funding may be requested if registration exceeds 120 persons.

\(^1\) In addition to the popcorn, the RSC requests funding for broader snack offerings in the afternoon.