ILL Roundtable Meeting

Oct. 25, 2005

Attendance: Jay Bernstein (KB), Geraldine B. Hebert (BX), Dorothea Coiffe (BMCC), Norm Clarin (HC), Nancy Egan (JJ), Richard Hickerson (ME), Gene Laper (LE), Clementine Lewis (LG), Eric Neubacher (BB), Beth Posner (GC), Evelyn Silverman (QC), Judith Wilde (BC), Amy Wolfe (CC), guest—Julie Cunningham (GC).

The ILL Roundtable Meeting was held on Oct. 25, 2005 in the Baruch College Library Conference Room. Clementine called the meeting to order at 2:30 p.m. Members and guest introduced themselves at the beginning of the meeting.

Clementine passed out statistics for document delivery. There was some discussion about stats. Jay (new ILL librarian) wanted to know how he could obtain ILL accounts for document delivery services. Several members indicated that he could registrar online for Ingenta and CISTI or telephone them to set up an account.

Judith asked about procedures for late or unreturned books from other libraries. Most librarians agreed that it is hard to keep up with over dues. Several librarians indicated that they send bills to the libraries. However, there is no way to enforce payment from them. It was suggested that delinquent libraries should be blocked, but most agreed that they never cut a library off.

The discussion above was followed by one on CUNY patrons who do not return books on time. Amy suggested that there were problems obtaining materials from our own CUNY libraries. She indicated that she imposed very steep fines ($1.00 a day) and suggested all CUNY libraries should charge similar fines to get books back on time. Clementine stated that she sends a memo to the patrons. In rare cases where the faculty member does not respond, the faculty member's Chair may also receive a copy of the memo.

Julie Cunningham came to the meeting as a guest to discuss patron initiated intercuny borrowing. She is the Chair of the Chief Librarian's Task Force on Patron-Initiated Document Delivery. Eric, Amy, and Clementine are also members. She discussed the three major concerns of the committee—delivery, work flow, and staff costs:

Delivery—Julie stated that the Task Force discussed using LAND as a delivery service. At this point, there was a discussion about METRO's problematic services. Somebody said that everyone was underwhelmed with METRO. Norm said that METRO's service was so erratic that it was causing problems with workflow. Judith said that at Brooklyn they had problems, but her perseverance in contacting them did result improvements. She also said that METRO welcomes feedback. Julie stated that she had heard a lot of complaints about METRO, but that the Chiefs don't seem to be aware of the problems—so she asked the members present to speak to their chiefs and keep track of the problems. It was also suggested that all librarians should keep a record of the problems so that CUNY could evaluate METRO's service more effectively. It was mentioned that LAND does a public satisfaction survey and posts it on their website. If CUNY uses LAND for the document delivery project, each of the colleges will have to pay for their own service. However, Julie pointed out that perhaps money can come from other sources. One source that was discussed during the meeting was the funding for the commercial document delivery services. However, several librarians did not want to use this funding for another project.

Work flow—the Task Force is working on a work flow chart for Circulation and ILL librarians. However, the Task Force is aware that there will be problems unique to each college. For example, there is a difference among schools in how ILL and Circulation relate to each other. In some libraries, ILL and Circulation fall under the same department. In others, they are completely separate.
There were some suggestions for the work flow chart and there was some discussion on making some facets of the work flow uniform. Amy said that she checks the status of patrons (eligibility for borrowing) before doing any ILL requests for them. Some librarians mentioned that they do not check the status. Julie suggested that the new system may be able to block transactions when patrons enter the system with their barcodes. She said that each college will be able to limit the number of holds a patron can place. However, this function must be done at the local as opposed to university level.

Evelyn asked if there will be a time-out feature in CUNY+Plus, which advises the patron after a certain number of days the lending library is not responding to the request. Presently, we have this feature in WorldCat and it sends the transaction to the next lender if there is no response. Also, she asked about using an email notification system to communicate faster with students. There was confirmation that email notification was included in the original document presented by the Task Force.

There was also a discussion on the additional office space needed in the library or at the circulation desk to keep the books for patrons. This discussion included the funds required to buy supplies such as boxes or bags to sort and delivery books to each of the 18 campuses.

Staff costs—Julie said that Intercuny statistics from each school are being collected to work into the staff cost model. These figures were not available yet. Jay pointed out that for schools like KB that do not currently do ILL for students, the cost increase may be significant. According to Julie, other colleges have indicated their service did not increase significantly when they began serving students. However, it was noted that Jay does not have any staff to assist him. Colleges that are not staff for the service, especially community colleges, will have additional costs to set up and maintain the service.

Jay mentioned that money was a problem at KB and Julie suggested that he talk to the person who lobbies for student technology money on his campus.

Nancy asked if anyone was having problems with sending out ARIEL documents because JJ was experiencing problems. Most colleges indicated they had no problems in this area.

Nancy also wanted to know if anybody made paper copies of electronic requests (for articles) to keep for their records. The colleges that have ILLIAD don’t because ILLiad keeps track of their records for them. Richard said that he does not bother to keep copies because OCLC keeps records of the articles that are ordered for 18 months. (These records include journal titles as opposed to the management stats, which does not keep individual transaction info.)

The next meeting was scheduled for December 6, 2005.

The meeting was adjourned at 4:00 p.m.
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