



**Higher Education Interlibrary
Loan Management
Benchmarks, 2013 Edition**

Primary Research
Group

ISBN 978-1-57440-216-2

Higher Education Interlibrary Loan Management Benchmarks, 2013 Edition

ISBN: 978-1-57440-216-2

Library of Congress Control Number: 2012954843

© 2012 Primary Research Group, Inc.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

TABLE OF CONTENTS	3
LIST OF TABLES	4
THE QUESTIONNAIRE	16
SURVEY PARTICIPANTS	22
CHARACTERISTICS OF THE SAMPLE	24
SUMMARY OF MAIN FINDINGS.....	25
1. ILL Services	37
2. Shipping.....	47
3. Special Collections and Unique Circumstance	51
4. State or Provincial Borrowing Networks.....	70
5. End User Preferences.....	76
6. Departmental Responsibility.....	97
7. Systems	119
8. Workflow Studies.....	132
9. Personnel.....	135
10. Budgets & Fees.....	145
11. Distance Learning and ILL	159
12. Use of Digital Repositories	161

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1.1: What has been the aggregate increase or decrease in traditional interlibrary loan services over the past three years?	37
Table 1.2: What has been the aggregate increase or decrease in traditional interlibrary loan services over the past three years? Broken out by Country	37
Table 1.3: What has been the aggregate increase or decrease in traditional interlibrary loan services over the past three years? Broken out by Total Student Enrollment.....	37
Table 1.4: What has been the aggregate increase or decrease in traditional interlibrary loan services over the past three years? Broken out by Public or Private Status.....	37
Table 1.5: What has been the aggregate increase or decrease in traditional interlibrary loan services over the past three years? Broken out by Carnegie Class	38
Table 2.1 • Turnaround Time for Borrowing - Article Requests (in Days)	39
Table 2.2 • Turnaround Time for Borrowing - Book Requests (in Days)	39
Table 2.3 • Turnaround Time for Lending - Article Requests (in Days)	39
Table 2.4 • Turnaround Time for Lending - Book Requests (in Days)	39
Table 2.5 • Turnaround Time for Lending - Videos (in Days)	39
Table 2.6 • Turnaround Time for Borrowing - Videos (in Days).....	39
Table 3: What are your average turnaround times for the following services? Broken out by Country	40
Table 3.1 • Turnaround Time for Borrowing - Article Requests (in Days)	40
Table 3.2 • Turnaround Time for Borrowing - Book Requests: (in Days)	40
Table 3.3 • Turnaround Time for Lending - Article Requests (in Days)	40
Table 3.4 • Turnaround Time for Lending - Book Requests (in Days)	40
Table 3.5 • Turnaround Time for Lending - Videos (in Days)	40
Table 3.6 • Turnaround Time for Borrowing - Videos (in Days).....	40
Table 4.1 • Turnaround Time for Borrowing - Article Requests (in Days)	41
Table 4.2 • Turnaround Time for Borrowing - Book Requests (in Days)	41
Table 4.3 • Turnaround Time for Lending - Article Requests (in Days)	41
Table 4.4 • Turnaround Time for Lending - Book Requests (in Days)	41
Table 4.5 • Turnaround Time for Lending - Videos (in Days)	41
Table 4.6 • Turnaround Time for Borrowing - Videos (in Days).....	42
Table 5.1 • Turnaround Time for Borrowing - Article Requests (in Days)	43
Table 5.2 • Turnaround Time for Borrowing - Book Requests (in Days)	43
Table 5.3 • Turnaround Time for Lending - Article Requests (in Days)	43
Table 5.4 • Turnaround Time for Lending - Book Requests (in Days)	43
Table 5.5 • Turnaround Time for Lending - Videos (in Days)	43
Table 5.6 • Turnaround Time for Borrowing - Videos (in Days).....	44
Table 6.1 • Turnaround Time for Borrowing - Article Requests (in Days)	45
Table 6.2 • Turnaround Time for Borrowing - Book Requests (in Days)	45
Table 6.3 • Turnaround Time for Lending - Article Requests (in Days)	45
Table 6.5 • Turnaround Time for Lending - Videos (in Days)	46

Table 6.6 • Turnaround Time for Borrowing - Videos (in Days).....	46
Table 7.1: How much did the library spend in the last year for which you have records on shipping and courier fees related to interlibrary loan? (in \$US)	47
Table 7.2: How much did the library spend in the last year for which you have records on shipping and courier fees related to interlibrary loan? Broken out by Country (in \$US)	47
Table 7.3: How much did the library spend in the last year for which you have records on shipping and courier fees related to interlibrary loan? Broken out by Total Student Enrollment (in \$US)	47
Table 7.5: How much did the library spend in the last year for which you have records on shipping and courier fees related to interlibrary loan? Broken out by Carnegie Class (in \$US).....	48
Table 8.1 Interlibrary Loan for College Textbooks	54
Table 8.2 Interlibrary Loan for State-Adopted Textbooks	54
Table 8.3 Interlibrary Loan for State Non-Adopted Textbooks	54
Table 9.1 Interlibrary Loan for College Textbooks	55
Table 9.2 Interlibrary Loan for State-Adopted Textbooks	55
Table 9.3 Interlibrary Loan for State Non-Adopted Textbooks	55
Table 10.1 Interlibrary Loan for College Textbooks	56
Table 10.2 Interlibrary Loan for State-Adopted Textbooks	56
Table 10.3 Interlibrary Loan for State Non-Adopted Textbooks	56
Table 11.1 Interlibrary Loan for College Textbooks	57
Table 11.2 Interlibrary Loan for State-Adopted Textbooks	57
Table 11.3 Interlibrary Loan for State Non-Adopted Textbooks	57
Table 12: Does the library allow interlibrary loan of any of the following? Broken out by Carnegie Class.....	58
Table 12.1 Interlibrary Loan for College Textbooks	58
Table 12.2 Interlibrary Loan for State-Adopted Textbooks	58
Table 12.3 Interlibrary Loan for State Non-Adopted Textbooks	58
Table 13.1 Spending on E-book Borrowing from Ebrary (in \$US)	64
Table 13.2 Spending on E-book Borrowing from Ingram MyiLibrary (in \$US)	64
Table 13.3 Spending on E-book Borrowing from Overdrive (in \$US)	64
Table 13.4 Spending on E-book Borrowing from All Other Vendors and Publishers (in \$US).....	64
Table 14.1 Spending on E-book Borrowing from Ebrary (in \$US)	65
Table 14.3 Spending on E-book Borrowing from Overdrive (in \$US)	65
Table 14.4 Spending on E-book Borrowing from All Other Vendors and Publishers (in \$US).....	65
Table 15.1 Spending on E-book Borrowing from Ebrary (in \$US)	66
Table 15.3 Spending on E-book Borrowing from Overdrive (in \$US)	66
Table 15.4 Spending on E-book Borrowing from All Other Vendors and Publishers (in \$US).....	66
Table 16.1 Spending on E-book Borrowing from Ebrary (in \$US)	67
Table 16.3 Spending on E-book Borrowing from Overdrive (in \$US)	67
Table 16.4 Spending on E-book Borrowing from All Other Vendors and Publishers (in \$US).....	67

Table 17.1: Does your library participate in the state borrowing network?.....	70
Table 17.2: Does your library participate in the state borrowing network? Broken out by Country	70
Table 17.3: Does your library participate in the state borrowing network? Broken out by Total Student Enrollment	70
Table 17.5: Does your library participate in the state borrowing network? Broken out by Carnegie Class.....	71
Table 18.2: Does your library use state ILL/DD/EDD statistical reports for any purposes? Broken out by Country	72
Table 18.3: Does your library use state ILL/DD/EDD statistical reports for any purposes? Broken out by Total Student Enrollment.....	72
Table 18.4: Does your library use state ILL/DD/EDD statistical reports for any purposes? Broken out by Public or Private Status.....	72
Table 18.5: Does your library use state ILL/DD/EDD statistical reports for any purposes? Broken out by Carnegie Class	73
Table 19.2: Does your state borrowing network identify net lenders and perform load levelling? Broken out by Country.....	74
Table 19.3: Does your state borrowing network identify net lenders and perform load levelling? Broken out by Total Student Enrollment.....	74
Table 19.4: Does your state borrowing network identify net lenders and perform load levelling? Broken out by Public or Private Status	74
Table 20.1: Does your library have any of the following default delivery policies? ..	76
Table 20.2: Does your library have any of the following default delivery policies? Broken out by Country	76
Table 20.4: Does your library have any of the following default delivery policies? Broken out by Public or Private Status.....	77
Table 21.1 Fax Delivery is offered.....	79
Table 21.2 Email Attachment Delivery is offered	79
Table 21.3 Document Delivery for Photocopied Documents is offered.....	79
Table 21.4 Document Delivery for Actual Documents is offered	79
Table 21.5 Document Delivery for Scanned Documents is offered.....	79
Table 21.6 Document Delivery for E-text from a Database is offered	79
Table 21.7 Document Delivery for Distance Education Use is offered.....	79
Table 21.8 Document Delivery for Interlibrary Use is offered.....	79
Table 21.10 There is a Fee for Use of Document Delivery.....	80
Table 21.11 Another form of Document Delivery is offered	80
Table 22.1 Fax Delivery is offered.....	81
Table 22.2 Email Attachment Delivery is offered	81
Table 22.3 Document Delivery for Photocopied Documents is offered.....	81
Table 22.4 Document Delivery for Actual Documents is offered	81
Table 22.5 Document Delivery for Scanned Documents is offered.....	81
Table 22.6 Document Delivery for E-text from a Database is offered	81
Table 22.7 Document Delivery for Distance Education Use is offered.....	81
Table 22.8 Document Delivery for Interlibrary Use is offered	82
Table 22.9 Document Delivery between Campus Libraries/Units is offered	82
Table 22.10 There is a Fee for Use of Document Delivery.....	82

Table 22.11 Another form of Document Delivery is offered	82
Table 23.1 Fax Delivery is offered.....	83
Table 23.2 Email Attachment Delivery is offered.....	83
Table 23.3 Document Delivery for Photocopied Documents is offered.....	83
Table 23.4 Document Delivery for Actual Documents is offered	83
Table 23.5 Document Delivery for Scanned Documents is offered.....	83
Table 23.6 Document Delivery for E-text from a Database is offered	84
Table 23.7 Document Delivery for Distance Education Use is offered.....	84
Table 23.8 Document Delivery for Interlibrary Use is offered.....	84
Table 23.9 Document Delivery between Campus Libraries/Units is offered	84
Table 23.10 There is a Fee for Use of Document Delivery.....	84
Table 23.11 Another form of Document Delivery is offered	85
Table 24.1 Fax Delivery is offered.....	86
Table 24.2 Email Attachment Delivery is offered.....	86
Table 24.3 Document Delivery for Photocopied Documents is offered.....	86
Table 24.4 Document Delivery for Actual Documents is offered	86
Table 24.5 Document Delivery for Scanned Documents is offered.....	86
Table 24.6 Document Delivery for E-text from a Database is offered	87
Table 24.7 Document Delivery for Distance Education Use is offered.....	87
Table 24.8 Document Delivery for Interlibrary Use is offered.....	87
Table 24.9 Document Delivery between Campus Libraries/Units is offered	87
Table 24.10 There is a Fee for Use of Document Delivery.....	87
Table 24.11 Another form of Document Delivery is offered	87
Table 25: Which of the following document delivery or end uses do you use at your library for inter library loan? Broken out by Carnegie Class	88
Table 25.1 Fax Delivery is offered.....	88
Table 25.2 Email Attachment Delivery is offered.....	88
Table 25.3 Document Delivery for Photocopied Documents is offered.....	88
Table 25.4 Document Delivery for Actual Documents is offered	88
Table 25.5 Document Delivery for Scanned Documents is offered.....	89
Table 25.6 Document Delivery for E-text from a Database is offered	89
Table 25.7 Document Delivery for Distance Education Use is offered.....	89
Table 25.8 Document Delivery for Interlibrary Use is offered.....	89
Table 25.9 Document Delivery between Campus Libraries/Units is offered	89
Table 25.10 There is a Fee for Use of Document Delivery.....	90
Table 25.11 Another form of Document Delivery is offered	90
Table 26.2: By what aggregate percentage has your library's electronic document delivery cumulatively changed over the past three years? Broken out by Country..	91
Table 26.3: By what aggregate percentage has your library's electronic document delivery cumulatively changed over the past three years? Broken out by Total Student Enrollment.....	91
Table 26.4: By what aggregate percentage has your library's electronic document delivery cumulatively changed over the past three years? Broken out by Public or Private Status	91

Table 26.5: By what aggregate percentage has your library's electronic document delivery cumulatively changed over the past three years? Broken out by Carnegie Class	92
Table 27.1: Does your library ever share full-text articles from your subscribed database?	95
Table 27.2: Does your library ever share full-text articles from your subscribed database? Broken out by Country	95
Table 27.3: Does your library ever share full-text articles from your subscribed database? Broken out by Total Student Enrollment	95
Table 27.4: Does your library ever share full-text articles from your subscribed database? Broken out by Public or Private Status.....	95
Table 28.1: Are your library's interlibrary loan and document delivery services performed largely by the same library unit or separate units?	97
Table 28.2: Are your library's interlibrary loan and document delivery services performed largely by the same library unit or separate units? Broken out by Country	97
Table 28.3: Are your library's interlibrary loan and document delivery services performed largely by the same library unit or separate units? Broken out by Total Student Enrollment.....	97
Table 28.4: Are your library's interlibrary loan and Document Delivery services performed largely by the same library unit or separate units? Broken out by Public or Private Status.....	97
Table 28.5: Are your library's interlibrary loan and document delivery services performed largely by the same library unit or separate units? Broken out by Carnegie Class	98
Table 29.1 ILL is under the Auspices of the Reference Department	99
Table 29.2 ILL is under the Auspices of the Circulation Department	99
Table 29.3 ILL is under the Auspices of the Access Services Department.....	99
Table 29.4 ILL is under the Auspices of the Document Delivery Services Department	99
Table 29.5 ILL is under the Auspices of the Technical Services Department	99
Table 29.6 ILL is under the Auspices of the Collection Development Department.....	99
Table 29.7 ILL is under the Auspices of another Department.....	99
Table 30.1 ILL is under the Auspices of the Reference Department	100
Table 30.2 ILL is under the Auspices of the Circulation Department.....	100
Table 30.3 ILL is under the Auspices of the Access Services Department.....	100
Table 30.4 ILL is under the Auspices of the Document Delivery Services Department	100
Table 30.5 ILL is under the Auspices of the Technical Services Department	100
Table 30.6 ILL is under the Auspices of the Collection Development Department	100
Table 30.7 ILL is under the Auspices of another Department.....	100
Table 31: Interlibrary loan is under auspices of which department(s)? Broken out by Total Student Enrollment.....	101
Table 31.1 ILL is under the Auspices of the Reference Department	101
Table 31.2 ILL is under the Auspices of the Circulation Department.....	101

Table 31.3 ILL is under the Auspices of the Access Services Department.....	101
Table 31.4 ILL is under the Auspices of the Document Delivery Services Department.....	101
Table 31.5 ILL is under the Auspices of the Technical Services Department	101
Table 31.6 ILL is under the Auspices of the Collection Development Department	102
Table 31.7 ILL is under the Auspices of another Department.....	102
Table 32.1 ILL is under the Auspices of the Reference Department	103
Table 32.2 ILL is under the Auspices of the Circulation Department.....	103
Table 32.3 ILL is under the Auspices of the Access Services Department.....	103
Table 32.4 ILL is under the Auspices of the Document Delivery Services Department.....	103
Table 32.5 ILL is under the Auspices of the Technical Services Department	103
Table 32.6 ILL is under the Auspices of the Collection Development.....	103
Table 32.7 ILL is under the Auspices of another Department.....	104
Table 33: Interlibrary loan is under auspices of which department(s)? Broken out by Carnegie Class	105
Table 33.1 ILL is under the Auspices of the Reference Department	105
Table 33.2 ILL is under the Auspices of the Circulation Department.....	105
Table 33.3 ILL is under the Auspices of the Access Services Department.....	105
Table 33.4 ILL is under the Auspices of the Document Delivery Services Department.....	105
Table 33.6 ILL is under the Auspices of the Collection Development Department	106
Table 33.7 ILL is under the Auspices of the another Department.....	106
Table 34.1 Document Delivery is under the Auspices of the Reference Department	107
Table 34.2 Document Delivery is under the Auspices of the Circulation Department.....	107
Table 34.3 Document Delivery is under the Auspices of the Access Services Department.....	107
Table 34.4 Document Delivery is under the Auspices of the Document Delivery Services Department	107
Table 34.5 Document Delivery is under the Auspices of the Technical Services Department.....	107
Table 34.6 Document Delivery is under the Auspices of the Collection Development Department.....	107
Table 34.7 Document Delivery is under the Auspices of another Department....	107
Table 35: Document delivery/electronic document delivery is under the auspices of which department(s)? Broken out by Country	108
Table 35.1 Document Delivery is under the Auspices of the Reference Department	108
Table 35.2 Document Delivery is under the Auspices of the Circulation Department.....	108
Table 35.3 Document Delivery is under the Auspices of the Access Services Department.....	108

Table 35.4 Document Delivery is under the Auspices of the Document Delivery Services Department	108
Table 35.5 Document Delivery is under the Auspices of the Technical Services Department	108
Table 35.6 Document Delivery is under the Auspices of the Collection Development Department.....	108
Table 35.7 Document Delivery is under the Auspices of the another Department	109
Table 36.1 Document Delivery is under the Auspices of the Reference Department	110
Table 36.2 Document Delivery is under the Auspices of the Circulation Department	110
Table 36.3 Document Delivery is under the Auspices of the Access Services Department	110
Table 36.4 Document Delivery is under the Auspices of the Document Delivery Services Department	110
Table 36.6 Document Delivery is under the Auspices of the Collection Development Department.....	111
Table 36.7 Document Delivery is under the Auspices of another Department....	111
Table 37.1 Document Delivery is under the Auspices of the Reference Department	112
Table 37.2 Document Delivery is under the Auspices of the Circulation Department	112
Table 37.3 Document Delivery is under the Auspices of the Access Services Department	112
Table 37.4 Document Delivery is under the Auspices of the Document Delivery Services Department	112
Table 37.5 Document Delivery is under the Auspices of the Technical Services Department	112
Table 37.6 Document Delivery is under the Auspices of the Collection Development Department.....	113
Table 37.7 Document Delivery is under the Auspices of another Department....	113
Table 38: Document delivery/electronic document delivery is under the auspices of which department(s)? Broken out by Carnegie Class	114
Table 38.1 Document Delivery is under the Auspices of the Reference Department	114
Table 38.2 Document Delivery is under the Auspices of the Circulation Department	114
Table 38.3 Document Delivery is under the Auspices of the Access Services Department	114
Table 38.4 Document Delivery is under the Auspices of the Document Delivery Services Department	114
Table 38.5 Document Delivery is under the Auspices of the Technical Services Department	115
Table 38.6 Document Delivery is under the Auspices of the Collection Development Department.....	115

Table 38.7 Document Delivery is under the Auspices of another Department....	115
Table 39: Which of the automated systems does your ILL document delivery/electronic document delivery operation(s) use?	119
Table 39.1 Our Document Delivery Operation Uses OCLC's Illiad.....	119
Table 39.2 Our Document Delivery Operation Uses OCLC ILL Subsystem.....	119
Table 39.3 Our Document Delivery Operation Uses OCLC's Odyssey.....	119
Table 39.4 Our Document Delivery Operation Uses OCLC Article Exchange	119
Table 39.5 Our Document Delivery Operation Uses Ariel	119
Table 39.6 Our Document Delivery Operation Uses DOCLINE	119
Table 39.7 Our Document Delivery Operation Uses WorldCat Local.....	119
Table 39.9 Our Document Delivery Operation Uses OCLC's E-Serials Holdings..	120
Table 40.1 Our Document Delivery Operation Uses OCLC's Illiad.....	121
Table 40.2 Our Document Delivery Operation Uses OCLC ILL Subsystem.....	121
Table 40.3 Our Document Delivery Operation Uses OCLC's Odyssey.....	121
Table 40.4 Our Document Delivery Operation Uses OCLC Article Exchange	121
Table 40.5 Our Document Delivery Operation Uses Ariel	121
Table 40.6 Our Document Delivery Operation Uses DOCLINE	121
Table 40.7 Our Document Delivery Operation Uses WorldCat Local.....	121
Table 40.8 Our Document Delivery Operation Uses Link Resolvers	122
Table 40.9 Our Document Delivery Operation Uses OCLC's E-Serials Holdings..	122
Table 41.1 Our Document Delivery Operation Uses OCLC's Illiad.....	123
Table 41.2 Our Document Delivery Operation Uses OCLC ILL Subsystem.....	123
Table 41.3 Our Document Delivery Operation Uses OCLC's Odyssey.....	123
Table 41.4 Our Document Delivery Operation Uses OCLC Article Exchange	123
Table 41.5 Our Document Delivery Operation Uses Ariel	123
Table 41.7 Our Document Delivery Operation Uses WorldCat Local.....	124
Table 41.8 Our Document Delivery Operation Uses Link Resolvers	124
Table 41.9 Our Document Delivery Operation Uses OCLC's E-Serials Holdings..	124
Table 42.1 Our Document Delivery Operation Uses OCLC's Illiad.....	125
Table 42.2 Our Document Delivery Operation Uses OCLC ILL Subsystem.....	125
Table 42.3 Our Document Delivery Operation Uses OCLC's Odyssey.....	125
Table 42.4 Our Document Delivery Operation Uses OCLC Article Exchange	125
Table 42.5 Our Document Delivery Operation Uses Ariel	125
Table 42.6 Our Document Delivery Operation Uses DOCLINE	125
Table 42.7 Our Document Delivery Operation Uses WorldCat Local.....	126
Table 42.8 Our Document Delivery Operation Uses Link Resolvers	126
Table 42.9 Our Document Delivery Operation Uses OCLC's E-Serials Holdings..	126
Table 43.1 Our Document Delivery Operation Uses OCLC's Illiad.....	127
Table 43.2 Our Document Delivery Operation Uses OCLC ILL Subsystem.....	127
Table 43.3 Our Document Delivery Operation Uses OCLC's Odyssey.....	127
Table 43.4 Our Document Delivery Operation Uses OCLC Article Exchange	127
Table 43.5 Our Document Delivery Operation Uses Ariel	128
Table 43.6 Our Document Delivery Operation Uses DOCLINE	128
Table 43.7 Our Document Delivery Operation Uses WorldCat Local.....	128
Table 43.8 Our Document Delivery Operation Uses Link Resolvers	128
Table 43.9 Our Document Delivery Operation Uses OCLC's E-Serials Holdings..	128

Table 44.2: Has your library ever tried to negotiate broader license terms for institutional and patron use of your digital collections, specifically for interlibrary loan and e-reserve use? Broken out by Country	130
Table 44.3: Has your library ever tried to negotiate broader license terms for institutional and patron use of your digital collections, specifically for interlibrary loan and e-reserve use? Broken out by Total Student Enrollment	130
Table 44.4: Has your library ever tried to negotiate broader license terms for institutional and patron use of your digital collections, specifically for interlibrary loan and e-reserve use? Broken out by Public or Private Status.....	130
Table 45.1: Has your ILL/DD/EDD unit performed workflow studies to review practices and staffing?	132
Table 45.2: Has your ILL/DD/EDD unit performed workflow studies to review practices and staffing? Broken out by Country.....	132
Table 45.3: Has your ILL/DD/EDD unit performed workflow studies to review practices and staffing? Broken out by Total Student Enrollment.....	132
Table 45.4: Has your ILL/DD/EDD unit performed workflow studies to review practices and staffing? Broken out by Public or Private Status	132
Table 45.5: Has your ILL/DD/EDD unit performed workflow studies to review practices and staffing? Broken out by Carnegie Class	133
If the library has performed workflow studies for ILL, please describe the purposes of the studies, and outline what changes resulted from them...134	
Table 46.1: What is the total number of FTE positions in your ILL/DD/EDD staff?.....	135
Table 46.2: What is the total number of FTE positions in your ILL/DD/EDD staff? Broken out by Country	135
Table 46.3: What is the total number of FTE positions in your ILL/DD/EDD staff? Broken out by Total Student Enrollment.....	135
Table 46.4: What is the total number of FTE positions in your ILL/DD/EDD staff? Broken out by Public or Private Status.....	135
Table 47.1 Full-Time Professionals (MLS) on ILL Staff.....	137
Table 47.2 Full-Time Non-Professionals on ILL Staff	137
Table 47.3 Part-Time Professionals (MLS/MLIS) on ILL Staff	137
Table 47.4 Part-Time Non-Professionals on ILL Staff	137
Table 47.5 Student Workers on ILL Staff.....	137
Table 48.1 Full-Time Professionals (MLS) on ILL Staff.....	138
Table 48.2 Full-Time Non-Professionals on ILL Staff	138
Table 48.3 Part-Time Professionals (MLS/MLIS) on ILL Staff	138
Table 48.4 Part-Time Non-Professionals on ILL Staff	138
Table 48.5 Student Workers on ILL Staff.....	138
Table 49: How many of each of the following do you have on your ILL/DD/EDD staff? Broken out by Total Student Enrollment.....	139
Table 49.1 Full-Time Professionals (MLS) on ILL Staff.....	139
Table 49.2 Full-Time Non-Professional on ILL Staff	139
Table 49.3 Part-Time Professionals (MLS/MLIS) on ILL Staff	139
Table 49.4 Part-Time Non-Professionals on ILL Staff	139
Table 49.5 Student Workers on ILL Staff.....	139
Table 50.1 Full-Time Professionals (MLS) on ILL Staff.....	140

Table 50.2 Full-Time Non-Professionals on ILL Staff	140
Table 50.3 Part-Time Professionals (MLS/MLIS) on ILL Staff	140
Table 50.4 Part-Time Non-Professionals on ILL Staff	140
Table 50.5 Student Workers on ILL Staff.....	140
Table 51: How many of each of the following do you have on your ILL/DD/EDD staff? Broken out by Carnegie Class	141
Table 51.1 Full-Time Professionals (MLS) on ILL Staff.....	141
Table 51.2 Full-Time Non-Professionals on ILL Staff	141
Table 51.3 Part-Time Professionals (MLS/MLIS) on ILL Staff	141
Table 51.5 Student Workers on ILL Staff.....	142
What criteria does your institution use to measure staff productivity? For example, turnaround time, number of requests filled per day, etc.? Please list all that are used.	143
Does your library charge fees for any portion of Interlibrary Loan, Document Delivery, or Electronic Document Delivery? Please explain what fees are charged, and why.....	145
Table 52.2: What is your current annual budget for ILL DD/EDD operations, excluding staff costs, but including automation, copyright, materials and other operating costs? Broken out by Country (in \$US)	147
Table 52.3: What is your current annual budget for ILL DD/EDD operations, excluding staff costs, but including automation, copyright, materials and other operating costs? Broken out by Total Student Enrollment (in \$US)	147
Table 52.5: What is your current annual budget for ILL DD/EDD operations, excluding staff costs, but including automation, copyright, materials and other operating costs? Broken out by Carnegie Class (in \$US).....	148
Table 53.2: What has been the percentage change in your budget over the past year? Broken out by Country	149
Table 53.3: What has been the percentage change in your budget over the past year? Broken out by Total Student Enrollment.....	149
Table 53.4: What has been the percentage change in your budget over the past year? Broken out by Public or Private Status.....	149
Table 54.2: What do you expect will be the percentage change in your budget over the next year? Broken out by Country	151
Table 54.3: What do you expect will be the percentage change in your budget over the next year? Broken out by Total Student Enrollment.....	151
Table 54.4: What do you expect will be the percentage change in your budget over the next year? Broken out by Public or Private Status.....	151
Table 55.2: What were total annual fee revenues for ILL/EDD/DD in the past year? Broken out by Country (in \$US).....	153
Table 55.3: What were total annual fee revenues for ILL/EDD/DD in the past year? Broken out by Total Student Enrollment (in \$US)	153
Table 55.4: What were total annual fee revenues for ILL/EDD/DD in the past year? Broken out by Public or Private Status (in \$US)	153
Table 55.5: What were total annual fee revenues for ILL/EDD/DD in the past year? Broken out by Carnegie Class (in \$US)	154

Table 56.2: Library management expects ILL/DD/EDD services to...? Broken out by Country.....	155
Table 56.3: Library management expects ILL/DD/EDD services to...? Broken out by Total Student Enrollment.....	155
Table 56.5: Library management expects ILL/DD/EDD services to...? Broken out by Carnegie Class	156
Table 57.2: Does your ILL DD/EDD operation work from “unit costs” in order to determine budget needs and work productivity? Broken out by Country	157
Table 57.3: Does your ILL DD/EDD operation work from “unit costs” in order to determine budget needs and work productivity? Broken out by Total Student Enrollment.....	157
Table 57.4: Does your ILL DD/EDD operation work from “unit costs” in order to determine budget needs and work productivity? Broken out by Public or Private Status.....	157
Table 57.5: Does your ILL DD/EDD operation work from “unit costs” in order to determine budget needs and work productivity? Broken out by Carnegie Class....	158
Table 58.1: If your college has a distance learning program, what percentage of your library's interlibrary loan request volume (from other institutions to your library) is accounted for by requests from distance learning students or instructors?	159
Table 58.2: If your college has a distance learning program, what percentage of your library's interlibrary loan request volume (from other institutions to your library) is accounted for by requests from distance learning students or instructors? Broken out by Country	159
Table 58.3: If your college has a distance learning program, what percentage of your library's interlibrary loan request volume (from other institutions to your library) is accounted for by requests from distance learning students or instructors? Broken out by Total Student Enrollment	159
Table 58.4: If your college has a distance learning program, what percentage of your library's interlibrary loan request volume (from other institutions to your library) is accounted for by requests from distance learning students or instructors? Broken out by Public or Private Status.....	160
Table 58.5: If your college has a distance learning program, what percentage of your library's interlibrary loan request volume (from other institutions to your library) is accounted for by requests from distance learning students or instructors? Broken out by Carnegie Class.....	160
Table 59.1: What percentage of your interlibrary loan requests are satisfied by downloads of content from any institutional digital repository?	162
Table 59.2: What percentage of your interlibrary loan requests are satisfied by downloads of content from any institutional digital repository? Broken out by Country.....	162
Table 59.3: What percentage of your interlibrary loan requests are satisfied by downloads of content from any institutional digital repository? Broken out by Total Student Enrollment.....	162
Table 59.4: What percentage of your interlibrary loan requests are satisfied by downloads of content from any institutional digital repository? Broken out by Public or Private Status.....	162

Table 59.5: What percentage of your interlibrary loan requests are satisfied by downloads of content from any institutional digital repository? Broken out by Carnegie Class 163

Table 60.2: Have you made efforts to monitor what is available through digital repositories in the subject areas for which you have the most ILL requests? Broken out by Country 164

Table 60.3: Have you made efforts to monitor what is available through digital repositories in the subject areas for which you have the most ILL requests? Broken out by Total Student Enrollment 164

Table 60.4: Have you made efforts to monitor what is available through digital repositories in the subject areas for which you have the most ILL requests? Broken out by Public or Private Status..... 164

Table 60.5: Have you made efforts to monitor what is available through digital repositories in the subject areas for which you have the most ILL requests? Broken out by Carnegie Class..... 165

THE QUESTIONNAIRE

1. Provide the following contact information.

Name:

College:

Country:

Email Address:

Phone Number:

1. Is your college public or private?

(a) Public

(b) Private

2. In the past year, what was the full-time equivalent enrollment of your college?

3. Which choice best approximates your college's Carnegie Class?

(a) Community College

(b) 4-Year College

(c) MA or PHD Granting College

(d) Research University

4. What has been the aggregate increase or decrease in traditional interlibrary loan services over the past three years? This is not an annual rate but a total percentage change over the past three years. What is the volume relative to three years ago?

5. What is your average turnaround time (in days) for the following services?

Borrowing – Article Requests:

Borrowing – Book Requests:

Lending – Article Requests:

Lending – Book Requests:

Lending – Videos:

Borrowing – Videos:

6. How much did the library spend in the last year for which you have records on shipping and courier fees related to interlibrary loan?

7. What materials and resources does your courier service distribute? Please explain.

8. What is the policy of your library on the interlibrary loan of audio-visual materials, such as video recordings, software, audio recordings, and other special materials, including maps, art work, rare materials, and so on? If your library does not allow ILL of these materials, please explain the reasons why.

9. Does the library allow interlibrary loan of any of the following? Select all that apply.

- (a) College Textbooks
- (b) State Adopted Textbooks
- (c) State Non-Adopted Textbooks

10. Please explain your library's policies on the interlibrary loan of textbooks. If allowed, what is the general loan period? What restrictions might apply?

11. Explain your library's policies towards the interlibrary loan of e-books. How do you track rights for interlibrary loan? Has your library itself made requests for e-books through interlibrary loan? Have you negotiated with publishers successfully for these rights?

12. How much did your library spend on each of the following services in borrowing e-books from these major vendors for limited periods of time and then returning them so that they are no longer available to your patrons without another act of borrowing the same title from the e-book vendor? Note that this does not include sales of e-books from these vendors.

Ebrary:

Ingram MyiLibrary:

Overdrive:

All Other Vendors and Publishers:

13. What problems, if any, does your library encounter with foreign country interlibrary loan? Please explain.

14. Does your library participate in the state borrowing network?

- (a) Yes
- (b) No
- (c) We don't have a state borrowing network in my state/province

15. Does your library use state ILL/DD/EDD statistical reports for any purposes?

- (a) Yes
- (b) No

16. Does your state borrowing identify Net Lenders and perform load leveling?

- (a) Yes
- (b) No

17. Does your library have any of the following default delivery policies?

- (a) Document delivery is an electronic file unless otherwise specified
- (b) Document delivery is hard copy unless otherwise specified
- (c) End User is expected to specify electronic or print form when this option is available

(d) Document delivery form is at the discretion of the librarian and forms are not generally specified

18. Which of the following document delivery or end uses do you use at your library for inter library loan?

- (a) Fax delivery
- (b) Email attachment delivery
- (c) Photocopy delivery
- (d) Actual document
- (e) Scanned document
- (f) E-text from database
- (g) Distance education use
- (h) Interlibrary use
- (i) Delivery between campus libraries/units
- (j) Fee for use
- (k) Others (please explain)

19. By what aggregate percentage has your library's electronic document delivery cumulatively changed over the past three years?

20. What are the top 5 service expectations that your DD/EDD users express to you that they need or want?

21. Does your library ever share full-text articles from your subscribed database?

- (a) Yes
- (b) No

22. Are your library's interlibrary loan and document delivery services performed largely by the same library unit or separate units?

- (a) Largely by the same unit
- (b) Separate units

23. ILL is under auspices of which department(s)? Select all that apply.

- (a) Reference
- (b) Circulation
- (c) Access Services
- (d) Document Delivery Services
- (e) Technical Services
- (f) Collection Development
- (g) Other (please explain)

24. DD/EDD is under the auspices of which departments(s)? Select all that apply.

- (a) Reference
- (b) Circulation

- (c) Access Services
- (d) Document Delivery Services
- (e) Technical Services
- (f) Collection Development
- (g) Other (please explain)

25. Has the use of ILL automation changed over the last five years? Please explain and describe the effect it has had on workflows and staffing.

26. Which of the automated systems does your ILL DD/EDD operation(s) use? Select all that apply.

- (a) OCLC's Illiad
- (b) OCLC ILL Subsystem
- (c) OCLC's Odyssey
- (d) OCLC Article Exchange
- (e) Ariel
- (f) DOCLINE
- (g) WorldCat Local
- (h) Link Resolvers
- (i) OCLC's E-Serials Holdings
- (j) Other (please specify)

27. Has your library ever tried to negotiate broader license terms for institutional and patron use of your digital collections, specifically for interlibrary loan and e-reserve use?

- (a) Yes
- (b) No

28. Has your ILL/DD/EDD unit performed workflow studies to review practices and staffing?

- (a) Yes
- (b) No

29. If the library has performed workflow studies for ILL, please describe the purposes of the studies, and outline what changes resulted from them.

30. What is the total number of FTE positions in your ILL/DD/EDD staff?

31. How many of each of the following do you have on your ILL/DD/EDD staff?

- Full-Time Professionals (MLS):
- Full-Time Non-Professionals:
- Part-Time Professionals (MLS/MLIS):
- Part-Time Non-Professionals:
- Student Workers:
- Other (please explain):

32. What criteria does your institution use to measure staff productivity, i.e. turnaround time, number of requests filled per day, etc.? Please list all that are used.
33. Does your library charge fees for any portion of interlibrary loan, document delivery or electronic document delivery? Please explain what fees are charged, and why.
34. What is your current annual budget for ILL DD/EDD operations, excluding staff costs, but including automation costs, copyright costs, material costs, and other operating costs?
35. What has been your percentage change in your budget over the past year?
36. What do you expect will be the percentage change in your budget over the next year?
37. What were total annual fee revenues in the past year for ILL/EDD/DD in the past year?
38. Library management expects ILL/DD/EDD services to...?
(a) We don't really charge for document delivery or ILL
(b) Defray some of the cost but definitely less than half
(c) Defray more than half the costs exclusive of salaries and overhead
(d) More or less pay for itself exclusive of salaries and overhead
(e) Completely pay for itself including salaries and overhead
(f) Completely pay for itself and produce a surplus for the library for use in other areas
39. Does your ILL DD/EDD operation work from "unit costs" in order to determine budget needs and work productivity?
(a) Yes
(b) No
40. If your college has a distance learning program of any kind, what percentage of your library's interlibrary loan request volume (from other institutions to your library) is accounted for by requests from distance learning students or instructors?
41. Please comment on how, or if, your institution's distance learning programs have affected your ILL/DD/EDD operations and statistics.
42. What percentage of your interlibrary loan requests are satisfied by downloads of content from any institutional digital repository?
43. Have you made efforts to monitor what is available through digital repositories in the subject areas for which you have the most ILL requests?

- (a) Yes
- (b) No

44. What do you think of the finding aids available for locating resources in digital repositories?

SURVEY PARTICIPANTS

Alma College
Baker University
Becker College
Bocconi University
Brenau University
Brevard College, Brevard, NC 28712
Bridgewater State University
Bryn Mawr College
Coastal Carolina University
Colorado State University
Connecticut College
Cuyahoga Community College
Divine Word College
Embry-Riddle Aeronautical University
F.W. Olin College of Engineering
Ferris State University
Florida Keys Community College
Florida State University College of Medicine
Gannon University
Gettysburg College
Harper Adams University College
Hartford Seminary
Idaho State University
Lafayette Community College
Louisiana State University
Lower Columbia College
Loyola University New Orleans
Lubbock Christian University
Mansfield University
Massachusetts College of Pharmacy and Health Sciences
Middlebury College
Millersville University
Mount Olive College
Muhlenberg College
Naugatuck Valley Community College
Naval Postgraduate School
Newman University
Open University
Ouachita Baptist University
Pfeiffer University
Portland Community College

Potomac State College of West Virginia University
Reinhardt University
Renton Technical College
Rollins College
Southampton Solent University
Southern New Hampshire University
Southern Virginia University
St. Charles Community College
St. Francis University
State University of New York at New Paltz
Temple University
Texas Woman's University
Thompson Rivers University
University of Guam
University of Houston
University of Montevallo
University of Nottingham
University of St. Thomas
University of Western Ontario
University of York
University of Great Falls
Virginia Tech
Washington State University Vancouver
Wayne State College
Western Michigan University
Young Harris College

CHARACTERISTICS OF THE SAMPLE

Overall sample size: 68

By Country

United States	60
Other	8

By Type of College

Community college	9
4-year college	22
MA and PHD granting college	24
Research university	13

By Public or Private Status

Public	37
Private	31

By Total Student Enrollment (FTE)

Less than 2,500	22
2,500 to 7,500	21
More than 7,500	25

SUMMARY OF MAIN FINDINGS

ILL Services

Over the past three years, traditional interlibrary loan services transactions in college libraries in the sample have increased by a mean of 17.94%. ILL services have increased by a mean of 16.84% in college libraries in the United States and by a mean of 26.5% in those abroad. Public colleges have increased ILL services by nearly 23%, whereas private colleges have experienced a mean increase of 12.56%. Libraries in MA and PHD granting colleges and those in research universities have led this trend, increasing ILL services by 26.22% and 20.43% respectively, while libraries in 4-year and community colleges have lagged behind. Colleges with 2,500 to 7,500 students enrolled have increased traditional interlibrary loan services by a mean 31.92% over the past three years, more than twice as much as those with 7,500+ students enrolled.

Turnaround Time: Borrowing

The mean turnaround time for article borrowing requests among libraries in the sample is 2.99 days, though some libraries focused on internet transactions average just 1.2 hours. Community college libraries have a mean turnaround time of 2.63 days for article borrowing requests, whereas research university libraries take a mean of 3.45 days to process these requests. Among public colleges, the average turnaround time for article borrowing requests is 2.8 days, about 8.4 hours less than that of private colleges in the sample.

Book borrowing requests usually take libraries in the sample a mean of 6.07 days to fill, 6.27 days for colleges in the United States and 4.69 days for those in other countries, a difference of 1.58 days. The mean turnaround time for book borrowing requests among colleges with less than 2,500 students is 6.89 days, as opposed to a mean 5.24 days for colleges with 2,500 to 7,500 students and a mean of 6.02 days for those with more than 7,500 students. As with article requests, turnaround time for book borrowing requests is somewhat longer in private colleges than in public colleges, averaging 6.46 days in the former and 5.7 days in the latter.

Video borrowing requests in libraries in the sample have a mean turnaround time of 7.11 days and a maximum of 4 weeks. Libraries in colleges with 2,500 to 7,500 students enrolled have a mean turnaround time of 9.18 days for video borrowing requests, compared with 6.69 days in colleges with less than 2,500 students and 5.62 days in colleges with more than 7,500 students. Public colleges have a mean turnaround time of 7.37 days for these requests, 0.75 days or 18 hours more than that of private colleges in the sample. On average, research universities and 4-year colleges take less than 6 days and no more than 14 to fill a video borrowing request, whereas 4-year college libraries

have a mean turnaround time of 8.02 days and community college libraries have a turnaround time of 9 days.

Turnaround Time: Lending

College libraries in the sample have a mean turnaround time for article lending requests of 1.36 days and none take more than 4 days to process these requests. It takes community colleges a mean of 1.11 days to fill most article lending requests, whereas research universities have a mean turnaround time of 1.59 days and 4-year colleges have a mean turnaround time of 1.55 days. It takes colleges with more than 7,500 students enrolled about 1.44 days to fill article lending requests, less than half the time it takes these same colleges to fill article borrowing requests, but 4.8 hours more than colleges with 2,500 to 7,500 students and 1.4 hours more than those with less than 2,500 students.

Book lending requests take college libraries somewhat longer to process; average turnaround time for these requests is 2.46 days among libraries in the sample, 2.51 days in colleges in the United States and 2.13 days in colleges in other countries. Colleges with 2,500 to 7,500 students enrolled have a mean turnaround time of 3.51 days, nearly double that of colleges with more than 7,500 students and 63.2% longer than that of colleges with less than 2,500 students. 4-year colleges have the shortest turnaround time for book lending requests, a mean of 1.89 days, while community colleges have a mean turnaround of 2.91 days and MA and PHD granting colleges take a mean of 3.07 days.

Video lending requests have a mean turnaround time of 4.2 days in community colleges, but just 1.42 days in MA and PHD granting colleges, 1.86 days in 4-year colleges and 2.39 days in research universities. In total, video lending requests take libraries in the sample a mean of 2.27 days and a maximum of 14 days to fill, with college libraries in the United States taking slightly longer. Colleges with less than 2,500 students enrolled have a mean turnaround time of 3.06 days for video lending requests, whereas colleges with more than 7,500 students have a mean turnaround time of 1.76 days.

Shipping

Shipping and courier fees related to interlibrary loan have cost colleges in the sample a mean of \$11,254 in the past year, with colleges in the United States spending a mean of \$11,796 to this end. Public colleges have spent a mean of \$13,978 on ILL related shipping, about \$6,902 or 97.5% more than private colleges. Colleges with less than 2,500 students enrolled have spent a mean of \$3,984 on ILL related shipping in the past year, compared with the mean \$8,798 spent by colleges with 2,500 to 7,500 students and the mean \$19,192 spent by those with over 7,500 students. Community colleges spent a mean of \$1,913 on shipping and courier fees related to interlibrary loan,

whereas 4-year colleges spent a mean of \$9,425 and research universities spent a mean of \$30,560.

Textbooks

51.47% of college libraries, 53.33% of those in the United States and 37.5% of those in other countries, allow interlibrary loan of college textbooks. These include 54.55% of colleges with less than 2,500 students enrolled, 52.38% of colleges with 2,500 to 7,500 students enrolled, and 48% of those with more than 7,500 students. 38.24% of college libraries in the sample offer interlibrary loan for state-adopted textbooks and 32.35% offer interlibrary loan for state non-adopted textbooks, the latter including 36.67% of college libraries in the United States but 0% of those in other countries. Just 22.22% of community college libraries and 27.27% of 4-year college libraries offer interlibrary loan for state-adopted textbooks, compared with 58.33% of libraries in MA or PHD granting colleges and 30.77% of those in research universities.

E-Book Borrowing

In the past year, libraries in the sample spent a mean of \$525 and a maximum of \$5,000 on borrowing e-books from Ebrary for limited periods of time and then returning them so that they were no longer available to patrons without another act of borrowing. Libraries spent just \$49 on borrowing e-books from Overdrive for limited periods of time and \$0 on borrowing e-books from Ingram MyiLibrary. All other vendors and publishers accounted for a mean of \$972 in e-book borrowing, though some libraries spent as much as \$15,000 on e-book borrowing from these vendors. Colleges with more than 7,500 students enrolled spent a mean of \$3,750 on e-book borrowing from other vendors, whereas colleges with between 2,500 and 7,500 students spent a mean of \$313 and those with less than 2,500 students spent nothing at all.

State or Provincial Borrowing Networks

69.12% of college libraries in the sample participate in their state borrowing network, while 16.18% of survey participants say that their state does not have one. 77.78% of community college libraries participate in their state borrowing network, as do 81.82% of libraries in 4-year colleges, 62.5% of libraries in MA and PHD granting colleges and 53.85% of libraries in research universities. 29.41% of survey participants say that their state borrowing network identifies net lenders and performs load levelling, including 32.43% of participants in public colleges and 37.5% of those in MA and PHD granting colleges.

State statistical reports on interlibrary loan, document delivery and/or electronic document delivery are used by 32.35% of libraries in the sample, many of these in colleges with more than 7,500 students, 44% of which use these reports. 37.84% of public colleges use state ILL/DD/EDD statistical reports, along with 25.81% of private

colleges. 22.22% of community colleges use reports of this kind, whereas 31.82% of 4-year colleges, 38.46% of research universities and a third of MA and PHD granting colleges do the same.

Document Delivery Policies

In 47.06% of libraries in the sample, document delivery is in electronic form unless otherwise specified. 8.82% of college libraries deliver documents in hard copy form, while the same percentage expect end users to specify the format and another 20.59% leave it up to the discretion of their librarians. Colleges with more students enrolled tend to use electronic document delivery as their default, as is the case with 60% of colleges with more than 7,500 students, while those with fewer students rely more on their librarians' discretion. 33.33% of community colleges deliver documents in hard copy form and just 22.22% use electronic delivery, whereas 53.85% of research universities and 66.67% of MA and PHD granting colleges deliver documents in electronic form unless otherwise specified.

Document Delivery Services

Fax delivery is offered in 35.29% of libraries in the sample. Nearly 30% of public colleges offer fax delivery for interlibrary loan, whereas 41.94% of private colleges do the same. 72.73% of colleges with less than 2,500 students use fax delivery, compared with 14.29% of colleges with 2,500 to 7,500 students. Document delivery for photocopied documents is offered by 50% of libraries, including 55.56% of those in community colleges and 54.17% of those in MA and PHD granting colleges. 59.09% of colleges with fewer than 2,500 students offer document delivery for photocopies, as do 38.1% of colleges with between 2,500 and 7,500 students and 52% of those with more than 7,500 students.

Email attachment delivery is offered by 75% of college libraries, including 91.67% of libraries in MA and PHD granting colleges, 72.73% of libraries in 4-year colleges and 53.85% of libraries in research universities. 78.33% of colleges in the United States and 50% of those in other countries have email attachment delivery for interlibrary loan. These include 81.82% of colleges with less than 2,500 students, 76.19% of colleges with 2,500 to 7,500 students and 68% of colleges with more than 7,500 students.

39.71% of libraries in the sample, 37.84% of those in public colleges and 41.94% of those in private colleges, offer document delivery for actual documents. 41.67% of 4-year colleges and more than half of research universities offer document delivery for actual documents, while just 22.22% of community colleges do so. In contrast, 69.12% of college libraries offer document delivery for scanned items and 38.24% offer delivery for e-text from a database. 76.67% of colleges in the United States offer document delivery for scanned documents, compared with just 12.5% of colleges abroad. 79.17% of MA

and PHD granting colleges offer document delivery for scanned items, whereas 45.83% of this group offer document delivery for e-text from a database.

33.82% of college libraries offer document delivery for distance education use and 32.35% offer it for interlibrary use, while 26.47% have document delivery between campus libraries/units. 44% of colleges with more than 7,500 students enrolled have document delivery for distance education use, as opposed to 33.33% of colleges with 2,500 to 7,500 students and 22.73% of those with less than 2,500 students. The tables are turned when it comes to document delivery for interlibrary use, with just 24% of colleges with more than 7,500 students offering this service and 36.36% of colleges with less than 2,500 students doing the same. Document delivery between campus libraries/units is offered in 40% of colleges with more than 7,500 students and 27.27% of colleges with less than 2,500 students, but less than 10% of colleges with 2,500 to 7,500 students.

Only 5.88% of survey participants said that their library charges a fee for use of document delivery, though 8.82% did not provide a response. 8.11% of libraries in public colleges and 3.23% of those in private colleges charge a fee for this service, all of these located in the United States. 11.11% of community colleges and 7.69% of research universities charge a fee for document delivery, as do 4.55% of 4-year colleges and 4.17% of MA and PHD granting colleges.

Changes in Electronic Document Delivery

Electronic document delivery in libraries in the sample has increased cumulatively by a mean of 37.1% over the past three years. This increase has been largest in MA and PHD granting colleges, averaging about 52.5%, and smallest in community colleges and research universities, which have experienced increases in EDD of 18.33% and 23.67% respectively. Libraries in the United States have increased electronic document delivery by a mean of 39.21%, some by as much as 200%, while others have nearly cut EDD in half. Public colleges have experienced a mean cumulative increase of 28.92% in electronic delivery over the past three years, whereas private colleges have experienced a mean increase of 50.3%.

Full-Text Articles

76.47% of college libraries in the sample, 83.33% of those in the United States and 25% of those in other countries, have shared full-text articles from databases to which they subscribe. 86.36% of libraries in 4-year colleges have shared full-text articles of this kind, not to mention 66.67% of libraries in community colleges, 79.17% of those in MA and PHD granting colleges and 61.54% of those in research universities. 72.97% of libraries in public colleges and 80.65% of libraries in private colleges have shared full-text articles from databases to which they subscribe.

Departmental Responsibility: ILL

83.82% of survey participants say that interlibrary loan and document delivery services in their college are performed largely by the same library unit, while 4.41% say that these services are performed by separate units. The latter are limited to survey participants in public colleges in the United States, all with 7,500 or fewer students enrolled. These include 11.11% of survey participants in community colleges, 4.17% of participants in MA and PHD granting colleges, 7.69% of participants in research universities, but 0% of those in 4-year colleges.

13.24% of survey participants say that interlibrary loan at their college is under the auspices of the reference department, while another 14.71% say that it falls under the authority of the circulation department. 8.11% of public colleges designate interlibrary loan to the reference department, compared with 19.35% of private colleges. 33.33% of survey participants in community colleges say that ILL falls under the auspices of the reference department, while 22.22% say that it is handled by the circulation department. 13.64% of survey participants in 4-year colleges, 16.67% of participants in MA and PHD granting colleges and 7.69% of those in research universities agree with the latter assessment.

32.35% of libraries in the sample put interlibrary loan under the auspices of access services, including 22.73% of colleges with less than 2,500 students enrolled, 33.33% of colleges with 2,500 to 7,500 students and 40% of colleges with more than 7,500 students enrolled. 35.15% of public colleges and 29.03% of private colleges put ILL under the auspices of access services, as do 38.46% of research universities, 36.36% of 4-year colleges, 11.11% of community colleges and a third of all MA and PHD granting colleges.

In 13.24% of college libraries in the sample, 6.67% of those in the United States and 62.5% of those in other countries, interlibrary loan is handled by the document delivery services department. These include 27.27% of 4-year colleges, 8.33% of MA and PHD granting colleges and 7.69% of research universities. 16.18% of colleges in the sample, many of them community and 4-year colleges, put ILL under the auspices of technical services. 18.29% of public colleges and 12.9% of private colleges designate interlibrary loan to this department. Whereas 9.52% of colleges with 2,500 to 7,500 students enrolled put ILL under the auspices of the document delivery services department, almost 24% of this group attribute it to the technical services department.

Only 2.94% of survey participants say that interlibrary loan at their college is under the auspices of collection development. These are limited to 9.09% of participants in 4-year colleges, all of them public universities in the United States with 2,500 to 7,500 students enrolled. 14.71% of survey participants say that ILL is designated to a department other than the ones previously mentioned, including 20.83% of those in MA and PHD granting colleges and 18.18% of those in colleges with fewer than 2,500 students.

Departmental Responsibility: DD/EDD

In 8.82% of libraries in the sample, document delivery is under the auspices of the reference department. 5.41% of public colleges and 12.9% of private colleges attribute document delivery to the reference department, including 22.22% of community colleges and 13.64% of 4-year colleges. In 16.18% of colleges in the sample, document delivery is the circulation department's domain. 22.73% of colleges with less than 2,500 students enrolled put document delivery under the auspices of the circulation department, whereas 14.29% of colleges with 2,500 to 7,500 students and 12% of colleges with more than 7,500 students do the same.

As with inter-library loan, a significant percentage of libraries in the sample put document delivery under the auspices of the access services department; 31.67% of college libraries in the United States designate document delivery thus, including 35.14% of public colleges and 19.35% of private colleges. Another 13.24% of libraries in the sample have document delivery in its own department; 8.33% of college libraries in the United States and half of those in other countries have a document delivery department which manages this service, as do 13.64% of libraries in colleges with less than 2,500 students and 16% of libraries in colleges with more than 7,500 students.

10.29% of libraries in the sample have document delivery under the auspices of the technical services department and 1.47% have it under the auspices of collection development, while 17.65% leave it to another department altogether. 22.22% of community colleges put document delivery under the auspices of technical services, along with 13.64% of 4-year colleges and 8.33% of MA and PHD granting colleges. The bulk of these are colleges with 2,500 to 7,500 students enrolled, 19.05% of which designate document delivery to this department, though they also include 4.55% of colleges with less than 2,500 students and 8% of colleges with more than 7,500 students.

Automated Systems

OCLC's Illiad is used for document delivery or electronic document delivery by 36.76% of libraries in the sample, all of these in the United States and most in public colleges, 48.65% of which use this service. 46.15% of research universities, 41.67% of MA and PHD granting colleges, 31.82% of 4-year colleges and 22.22% of community colleges use OCLC's Illiad for their document delivery operation. The same is true of 52% of colleges with more than 7,500 students enrolled and around 47.62% of those with 2,500 to 7,500 students, but just 9.09% of colleges with fewer than 2,500 students enrolled.

In contrast, OCLC's ILL Subsystem is more popular with smaller colleges but is used less by colleges with over 7,500 students, only 12% of which use it for their document delivery operation. 28.33% of college libraries in the United States and 12.5% of those in other countries use OCLC ILL Subsystem, together accounting for 26.47% of colleges in

the sample. 55.56% of community colleges use OCLC ILL Subsystem for document delivery, as do 27.27% of 4-year colleges and nearly 21% of MA and PHD granting colleges.

32.35% of libraries in the sample use OCLC's Odyssey for document delivery, about 35% of public college libraries and 29 % of private college libraries. OCLC's Odyssey is used by 22.73% of colleges with less than 2,500 students enrolled, but by 38.1% of those with 2,500 to 7,500 students and 36% of those with more than 7,500 students. OCLC Article Exchange is used by even more mid-sized colleges, 57.14% of those with 2,500 to 7,500 students, as well as by 31.82% of colleges with fewer than 2,500 students. 43.24% of libraries in public colleges and 38.71% of those in private colleges use OCLC Article Exchange for document delivery.

39.71% of libraries in the sample use Ariel for document delivery, including 45.95% of libraries in public colleges and 32.36% of those in private colleges. 40% of colleges in the United States use Ariel in their document delivery operation, as do 37.5% of colleges in other countries. Ariel is used by a third of community colleges in the sample, 31.82% of 4-year colleges, 45.83% of MA and PHD granting colleges and 46.15% of research universities. DOCLINE, on the other hand, is used by just 16.18% of libraries in the sample, most of these in public colleges, 24.32% of which use this system. 46.15% of research universities and 20.83% of MA and PHD granting colleges use DOCLINE, though no community or 4-year colleges do the same.

WorldCat Local is used for document delivery by 19.12% of colleges in the sample, all of them in the United States. 25% of libraries in MA and PHD granting colleges, 18.18% of libraries in 4-year colleges and 15.38% of libraries in research universities use WorldCat Local for document delivery, in addition to the 11.11% of community college libraries that use the program. Many of these are in colleges with 2,500 to 7,500 students enrolled, 28.57% of which use it, but they also include 12% of libraries in colleges with over 7,500 students and 18.18% of libraries in colleges with less than 2,500 students. In comparison, OCLC's E-Serials Holdings is used by just 7.35% of colleges in the sample and these are limited to private 4-year and MA/PHD granting colleges, all of which have less than 7,500 students enrolled.

Link resolvers are used by document delivery operations in 20.59% of college libraries in the sample, including 36% of colleges with more than 7,500 students enrolled, 19.05% of colleges with 2,500 to 7,500 students, and 4.55% of colleges with less than 2,500 students. As many as 25% of libraries in MA and PHD granting colleges and 38.46% of those in research universities use link resolvers for document delivery.

Workflow Studies

Workflow studies to review practices and staffing have been performed by interlibrary loan or document delivery units in 23.53% of libraries in the sample, including 35.14% of

public college libraries and 9.68% of private college libraries. 30.77% of libraries in research universities have performed workflow studies, along with 25% of libraries in MA and PHD granting colleges and 22.22% of those in community colleges. Just 4.55% of colleges with less than 2,500 students have had their ILL unit perform workflow studies, whereas 23.81% of colleges with 2,500 to 7,500 students and 40% of colleges with more than 7,500 students have done so.

Personnel

Colleges in the sample have a mean of 2.49 full-time equivalent employees in their interlibrary loan staff, a mean of 1.94 in colleges in the United States and a mean of 7.33 in colleges abroad. Colleges with less than 2,500 students have a mean of 0.85 ILL staff, whereas those with 2,500 to 7,500 students have a mean of 1.76 such employees and colleges with more than 7,500 students have a mean of 4.82. Community colleges average 1.07 ILL staff, while 4-year colleges have a mean of 1.49, MA and PHD granting colleges have a mean of 3.05 and research universities have a mean of 4.45 employees in this field.

Colleges in the sample maintain a mean of 0.42 full-time (MLS) professionals on their interlibrary loan staff, though nearly half as many in public colleges as in private ones; Public colleges have a mean of 0.29 full-time (MLS) professionals on their interlibrary loan staff, while private colleges have a mean of 0.57. MA and PHD granting colleges have a mean of 0.7 full-time professionals on their ILL staff, but research universities have just 0.1 such professionals and community colleges have a mean of 0.17. Colleges with less than 2,500 students enrolled have a mean of 0.59 full-time professionals on their ILL staff, while colleges with 2,500 to 7,500 students have a mean of 0.31 and those with more than 7,500 students have a mean of 0.35.

With a mean of 1.36 full-time non-(MLS) professionals on their ILL staff, colleges in the sample have more than three times the number of full-time non-(MLS) professionals as they do full-time professionals. Colleges in the United States have a mean of 1.26 full-time non-professionals working in interlibrary loan, whereas those in other countries have a mean of 2.4. In colleges with more than 7,500 students, a mean of 2.44 full-time non-professionals on staff, compared with 0.74 such employees in colleges with fewer than 2,500 students. Research universities have a mean of 3.3 full-time non-professionals on their ILL staff, while 4-year colleges have 0.95 full-time non-professionals and community colleges have 0.63.

Colleges in the sample have a mean of 0.08 part-time (MLS/MLIS) professionals and a mean of 0.46 part-time non-professionals on their interlibrary loan staff. Public colleges have a mean of 0.06 of the former and a mean of 0.48 of the latter, whereas private colleges have somewhat more part-time professionals and fewer part-time non-professionals. Colleges with less than 2,500 students enrolled have a mean of 0.33 part-

time non-professionals on their ILL staff, while those with more than 7,500 students have a mean of 0.62 such employees.

Whereas colleges in the United States have a mean of 2.28 student workers and a maximum of 20 in their ILL staffs, colleges in other countries have a mean of just 0.30. In total, colleges in the sample employ a mean 2.11 student workers for interlibrary loan, many of these in research universities, which average 5.3 workers of this kind. Community colleges have a mean of 0.16 student workers on their ILL staff, while 4-year colleges have a mean of 1.21 and MA and PHD granting colleges have a mean of 2.15. Public colleges have a mean of 2.45 student workers in interlibrary loan operations and private colleges have a mean of 1.68.

Annual Budget

The mean current annual budget for interlibrary loan and document delivery operations for libraries in the sample, excluding staff costs but including automation, copyright, materials and other operating expenses, is \$30,601. College libraries in the United States spend a mean of \$29,242 on ILL and document delivery operations each year, whereas those in other countries spend a mean of \$40,573. Colleges with less than 2,500 students enrolled spend a mean of \$4,976 to this end, while those with more than 7,500 students have a mean annual budget of \$63,386. Community and 4-year colleges spend more than double the mean \$14,933 spent by MA and PHD granting colleges, while research universities have a mean budget of \$135,682.

Survey participants report a mean 0.59% increase in their interlibrary loan and document delivery budget over the past year. Colleges with fewer than 2,500 students enrolled actually decreased their ILL budget by a mean of 2.25%, while those with 2,500 to 7,500 students grew theirs by a mean of 2.09% and those with more than 7,500 students experienced an increase of 1.38%. Community and 4-year colleges also reduced their ILL budgets, as did private colleges, though research universities and MA and PHD granting colleges increased this spending by about 2.5%.

Libraries in the sample are slightly more optimistic about the year to come, anticipating a mean 0.88% increase in their interlibrary loan and document delivery operating budget. Colleges in the United States will increase this spending by nearly 1%, while those in other countries will keep their budgets flat. Colleges with 2,500 to 7,500 students enrolled will decrease their ILL budget by a mean of 1.45%, though smaller colleges expect to bounce back with a 1.07% increase and larger ones anticipate a mean increase of 3.88%. Research university libraries will reduce their budgets by a mean of 3.33%, whereas community, 4-year and MA and PHD granting colleges expect a modest increase.

8.82% of interlibrary loan and document delivery operations in colleges in the sample work from “unit costs” in order to determine budget needs and work productivity.

These include 13.64% of 4-year colleges and 15.38% of research universities, but just 4.17% of MA and PHD granting colleges and 0% of community colleges. 5% of college libraries in the United States and 37.5% of those in other countries use unit costs to make these determinations, as do 12% of colleges with more than 7,500 students enrolled and 9.09% of those with less than 2,500 students.

Fees

In the past year, colleges in the sample have accrued a mean of \$1,918 in fee revenues from interlibrary loan and document delivery services, with some colleges earning as much as \$25,000. Colleges in the United States received \$1,823 in revenue from these fees, while those in other countries brought in a mean of \$3,207. Whereas colleges with more than 7,500 students enrolled earned a mean of \$6,552 in revenue from these sources, colleges with less than 2,500 students averaged just \$93. Research universities brought in a mean of \$7,500 in ILL and document delivery fees, while MA and PHD granting colleges made a mean of \$863 and 4-year colleges made a mean of \$286.

While library management in 4.41% of college libraries in the sample expect interlibrary loan and/or document delivery to pay for itself, 10.29% of colleges defray some of the cost of these services and 73.53% do not charge students at all. Colleges in other countries and those with more than 7,500 students enrolled are more likely to charge students for these services, with 16% of the latter defraying some of the costs. 0% of private college libraries expect their interlibrary loan to pay for itself, compared with 8.11% of public college libraries. Library management in 23.08% of research universities expect ILL and document delivery fees to defray some but less than half of the costs of these services, while 7.69% expect them to be more or less self-sustaining.

Distance Learning

In colleges with distance learning programs, a mean of 11.3% of the interlibrary loan request volume is accounted for by requests from distance learning students or instructors. These requests make up about 11.7% of total ILL requests in colleges in the United States and 6.67% of total requests in colleges in other countries. Requests from distance learning students or instructors account for 17.45% of the total in private college libraries, but only 8.23% of all requests in public college libraries. A mean of 14.21% of requests in MA and PHD granting college libraries and 12.67% of requests in research university libraries are from distance learners, whereas these same requests represent just 2.2% of the total in community college libraries.

Use of Digital Repositories

Approximately 6.58% of interlibrary loan requests among libraries in the sample are satisfied by downloads of content from a digital repository. Content from digital repositories satisfies a mean of 10.63% of interlibrary loan requests in 4-year college

libraries, 6.33% of ILL requests in research university libraries and 4.86% of such requests in MA and PHD granting college libraries. Libraries in colleges with 2,500 to 7,500 students satisfy a mean of 8.6% of their ILL requests with downloads from digital repositories, though those with less than 2,500 students fill just 4.19% of ILL requests this way.

13.24% of colleges in the sample have made efforts to monitor what is available through digital repositories in the subject areas for which they receive the most ILL requests. These include 22.73% of colleges with less than 2,500 students, 22.22% of community colleges and 16.13% of all private colleges, but 0% of research universities. 11.67% of college libraries in the United States and 25% of those in other countries have also made efforts of this kind.

CHAPTER 1: ILL SERVICES

Table 1.1: What has been the aggregate increase or decrease in traditional interlibrary loan services over the past three years?

	Mean	Median	Minimum	Maximum
Entire Sample	17.94%	5.00%	-50.00%	175.00%

Table 1.2: What has been the aggregate increase or decrease in traditional interlibrary loan services over the past three years? Broken out by Country

Country	Mean	Median	Minimum	Maximum
United States	16.84%	5.00%	-50.00%	175.00%
Other	26.50%	18.00%	-25.00%	90.00%

Table 1.3: What has been the aggregate increase or decrease in traditional interlibrary loan services over the past three years? Broken out by Total Student Enrollment

Total Student Enrollment	Mean	Median	Minimum	Maximum
Less than 2,500	11.06%	-0.50%	-50.00%	175.00%
2,500 to 7,500	31.92%	7.50%	-10.00%	158.10%
More than 7,500	14.51%	10.00%	-25.00%	90.00%

Table 1.4: What has been the aggregate increase or decrease in traditional interlibrary loan services over the past three years? Broken out by Public or Private Status

Public or Private Status	Mean	Median	Minimum	Maximum
Public	22.74%	10.00%	-50.00%	158.10%
Private	12.56%	1.73%	-33.00%	175.00%

Table 1.5: What has been the aggregate increase or decrease in traditional interlibrary loan services over the past three years? Broken out by Carnegie Class

Carnegie Class	Mean	Median	Minimum	Maximum
Community College	4.57%	5.00%	-50.00%	75.00%
4-Year College	12.83%	4.00%	-33.00%	80.00%
MA or PHD Granting College	26.22%	12.50%	-32.00%	175.00%
Research University	20.43%	-0.55%	-25.00%	100.00%

Table 2: What are your average turnaround times for the following services?

Table 2.1 • Turnaround Time for Borrowing - Article Requests (in Days)

	Mean	Median	Minimum	Maximum
Entire Sample	2.99	2.84	0.05	14.00

Table 2.2 • Turnaround Time for Borrowing - Book Requests (in Days)

	Mean	Median	Minimum	Maximum
Entire Sample	6.07	6.00	0.38	14.00

Table 2.3 • Turnaround Time for Lending - Article Requests (in Days)

	Mean	Median	Minimum	Maximum
Entire Sample	1.36	1.00	0.17	4.00

Table 2.4 • Turnaround Time for Lending - Book Requests (in Days)

	Mean	Median	Minimum	Maximum
Entire Sample	2.46	1.27	0.21	21.00

Table 2.5 • Turnaround Time for Lending - Videos (in Days)

	Mean	Median	Minimum	Maximum
Entire Sample	2.27	1.25	0.21	14.00

Table 2.6 • Turnaround Time for Borrowing - Videos (in Days)

	Mean	Median	Minimum	Maximum
Entire Sample	7.11	7.00	0.38	28.00

Table 3: What are your average turnaround times for the following services? Broken out by Country

Table 3.1 • Turnaround Time for Borrowing - Article Requests (in Days)

Country	Mean	Median	Minimum	Maximum
United States	2.95	2.61	0.05	14.00
Other	3.25	3.50	1.00	5.00

Table 3.2 • Turnaround Time for Borrowing - Book Requests: (in Days)

Country	Mean	Median	Minimum	Maximum
United States	6.27	7.00	0.38	14.00
Other	4.69	4.00	3.00	10.00

Table 3.3 • Turnaround Time for Lending - Article Requests (in Days)

Country	Mean	Median	Minimum	Maximum
United States	1.28	1.00	0.17	4.00
Other	1.88	2.00	1.00	4.00

Table 3.4 • Turnaround Time for Lending - Book Requests (in Days)

Country	Mean	Median	Minimum	Maximum
United States	2.51	1.00	0.21	21.00
Other	2.13	2.00	1.00	4.00

Table 3.5 • Turnaround Time for Lending - Videos (in Days)

Country	Mean	Median	Minimum	Maximum
United States	2.29	1.00	0.21	14.00
Other	2.00	2.00	2.00	2.00

Table 3.6 • Turnaround Time for Borrowing - Videos (in Days)

Country	Mean	Median	Minimum	Maximum
United States	7.28	7.00	0.38	28.00
Other	2.00	2.00	2.00	2.00

Table 4: What are your average turnaround times for the following services? Broken out by Total Student Enrollment

Table 4.1 • Turnaround Time for Borrowing - Article Requests (in Days)

Total Student Enrollment	Mean	Median	Minimum	Maximum
Less than 2,500	3.06	2.70	0.05	14.00
2,500 to 7,500	2.88	2.00	0.50	14.00
More than 7,500	3.02	3.00	0.38	5.00

Table 4.2 • Turnaround Time for Borrowing - Book Requests (in Days)

Total Student Enrollment	Mean	Median	Minimum	Maximum
Less than 2,500	6.89	7.00	1.50	14.00
2,500 to 7,500	5.24	5.00	1.00	10.00
More than 7,500	6.02	6.50	0.38	10.46

Table 4.3 • Turnaround Time for Lending - Article Requests (in Days)

Total Student Enrollment	Mean	Median	Minimum	Maximum
Less than 2,500	1.38	1.00	0.50	4.00
2,500 to 7,500	1.24	1.00	0.45	3.00
More than 7,500	1.44	1.05	0.17	3.00

Table 4.4 • Turnaround Time for Lending - Book Requests (in Days)

Total Student Enrollment	Mean	Median	Minimum	Maximum
Less than 2,500	2.22	1.00	0.50	14.00
2,500 to 7,500	3.51	1.50	0.60	21.00
More than 7,500	1.84	1.39	0.21	7.00

Table 4.5 • Turnaround Time for Lending - Videos (in Days)

Total Student Enrollment	Mean	Median	Minimum	Maximum
Less than 2,500	3.06	1.00	0.50	14.00
2,500 to 7,500	2.30	1.50	0.74	7.00
More than 7,500	1.76	1.50	0.21	7.00

Table 4.6 • Turnaround Time for Borrowing - Videos (in Days)

Total Student Enrollment	Mean	Median	Minimum	Maximum
Less than 2,500	6.69	5.75	1.00	14.00
2,500 to 7,500	9.18	7.00	2.50	28.00
More than 7,500	5.62	6.00	0.38	10.46

Table 5: What are your average turnaround times for the following services? Broken out by Public or Private Status

Table 5.1 • Turnaround Time for Borrowing - Article Requests (in Days)

Public or Private Status	Mean	Median	Minimum	Maximum
Public	2.80	2.85	0.38	6.00
Private	3.19	2.74	0.05	14.00

Table 5.2 • Turnaround Time for Borrowing - Book Requests (in Days)

Public or Private Status	Mean	Median	Minimum	Maximum
Public	5.70	5.00	0.38	14.00
Private	6.46	7.00	1.50	14.00

Table 5.3 • Turnaround Time for Lending - Article Requests (in Days)

Public or Private Status	Mean	Median	Minimum	Maximum
Public	1.36	1.00	0.17	4.00
Private	1.36	1.00	0.50	4.00

Table 5.4 • Turnaround Time for Lending - Book Requests (in Days)

Public or Private Status	Mean	Median	Minimum	Maximum
Public	2.49	1.00	0.21	21.00
Private	2.43	1.56	0.50	9.00

Table 5.5 • Turnaround Time for Lending - Videos (in Days)

Public or Private Status	Mean	Median	Minimum	Maximum
Public	2.28	1.25	0.21	14.00
Private	2.25	1.25	0.50	7.00

Table 5.6 • Turnaround Time for Borrowing - Videos (in Days)

Public or Private Status	Mean	Median	Minimum	Maximum
Public	7.37	6.50	0.38	28.00
Private	6.62	7.00	1.00	14.00

Table 6: What are your average turnaround times for the following services? Broken out by Carnegie Class

Table 6.1 • Turnaround Time for Borrowing - Article Requests (in Days)

Carnegie Class	Mean	Median	Minimum	Maximum
Community College	2.63	2.51	1.00	6.00
4-Year College	2.87	2.50	0.05	14.00
MA or PHD Granting College	2.98	2.50	0.50	14.00
Research University	3.45	3.89	1.00	5.00

Table 6.2 • Turnaround Time for Borrowing - Book Requests (in Days)

Carnegie Class	Mean	Median	Minimum	Maximum
Community College	6.39	4.92	1.00	14.00
4-Year College	5.74	6.50	0.38	9.00
MA or PHD Granting College	6.15	5.00	2.00	14.00
Research University	6.24	6.50	1.00	10.46

Table 6.3 • Turnaround Time for Lending - Article Requests (in Days)

Carnegie Class	Mean	Median	Minimum	Maximum
Community College	1.11	1.00	0.45	2.00
4-Year College	1.55	1.10	0.17	4.00
MA or PHD Granting College	1.12	1.00	0.50	2.00
Research University	1.59	1.28	1.00	3.00

Table 6.4 • Turnaround Time for Lending - Book Requests (in Days)

Carnegie Class	Mean	Median	Minimum	Maximum
Community College	2.91	1.15	1.00	14.00
4-Year College	1.89	1.00	0.21	7.00
MA or PHD Granting College	3.07	1.41	0.50	21.00
Research University	2.03	1.50	0.50	7.00

Table 6.5 • Turnaround Time for Lending - Videos (in Days)

Carnegie Class	Mean	Median	Minimum	Maximum
Community College	4.20	2.00	1.00	14.00
4-Year College	1.86	1.00	0.21	7.00
MA or PHD Granting College	1.42	1.00	0.60	3.00
Research University	2.39	1.82	0.50	7.00

Table 6.6 • Turnaround Time for Borrowing - Videos (in Days)

Carnegie Class	Mean	Median	Minimum	Maximum
Community College	9.00	10.00	1.00	14.00
4-Year College	5.92	7.00	0.38	14.00
MA or PHD Granting College	8.02	6.00	1.00	28.00
Research University	5.57	6.00	2.00	10.46

CHAPTER 2: SHIPPING

Table 7.1: How much did the library spend in the last year for which you have records on shipping and courier fees related to interlibrary loan? (in \$US)

	Mean	Median	Minimum	Maximum
Entire Sample	\$11,253.91	\$3,600.00	\$95.00	\$72,600.00

Table 7.2: How much did the library spend in the last year for which you have records on shipping and courier fees related to interlibrary loan? Broken out by Country (in \$US)

Country	Mean	Median	Minimum	Maximum
United States	\$11,796.02	\$3,600.00	\$95.00	\$72,600.00
Other	\$6,646.00	\$3,045.50	\$1,281.00	\$19,212.00

Table 7.3: How much did the library spend in the last year for which you have records on shipping and courier fees related to interlibrary loan? Broken out by Total Student Enrollment (in \$US)

Total Student Enrollment	Mean	Median	Minimum	Maximum
Less than 2,500	\$3,983.91	\$2,000.00	\$95.00	\$19,212.00
2,500 to 7,500	\$8,798.30	\$4,750.00	\$100.00	\$43,000.00
More than 7,500	\$19,191.65	\$5,000.00	\$250.00	\$72,600.00

Table 7.4: How much did the library spend in the last year for which you have records on shipping and courier fees related to interlibrary loan? Broken out by Public or Private Status (in \$US)

Public or Private Status	Mean	Median	Minimum	Maximum
Public	\$13,978.46	\$4,500.00	\$95.00	\$72,600.00
Private	\$7,076.27	\$3,200.00	\$573.78	\$43,000.00

Table 7.5: How much did the library spend in the last year for which you have records on shipping and courier fees related to interlibrary loan? Broken out by Carnegie Class (in \$US)

Carnegie Class	Mean	Median	Minimum	Maximum
Community College	\$1,912.67	\$1,100.00	\$100.00	\$5,926.00
4-Year College	\$9,425.00	\$4,600.00	\$500.00	\$43,000.00
MA or PHD Granting College	\$4,882.88	\$4,245.00	\$573.78	\$15,000.00
Research University	\$30,559.74	\$27,657.48	\$95.00	\$72,600.00

What materials and resources does your courier service distribute?

1. No courier
2. No courier - we use USPS
3. Ship via courier to our distant customers. Ship loans and returns to other Virginia Libraries via courier.
4. We use a courier service for our inter-state resource sharing service (MeLCat), but not for ILL. ILL items are almost exclusively sent through US postal service.
5. We use USPS Library Rate
6. Our state courier service carries books and other items lent by one library to another
7. Books and occasional print articles
8. Books, videos, anything lendable
9. Returnable materials (books, videos, etc.)
10. Courier service is done by staff. Deliver and pick up transit items at a central location, then process for patrons to pick up in the library.
12. We use UPS WorldShip - the only thing distributed is updates to the software. Generally related to the price of gasoline; when it goes up, the shipping charges follow suit.
13. Books and DVDs
14. Library materials, UPS, FEDEX, International
15. Loans
16. Books
17. Books only
18. We don't use a courier service
19. Any library item (books, oversized items, media, photocopies)
20. Books, rarely photocopies
21. Books, articles
22. Books and journal articles delivered via Royal Mail
23. Book, Articles, Videos, Journals
24. Books, non-electronic photocopies of journal articles, and DVDs within our eight institution consortium, with direct link to state-wide courier system
25. Do not have a courier service
26. Our courier service allows us to send anything except liquids or flammable materials.
27. Books, audio/video, etc. (we send items in bags, so virtually anything can be sent)
28. Mostly US Postal Service
29. They don't contribute any materials. We purchase our own packaging materials, print our own labels, and package all outgoing items.
30. Books, video, CDs
31. We do not have a courier service
32. Books and articles only
33. All: articles, loans, A/V materials, microform, and more
34. Books and videos
35. Books and videos
36. No courier
37. Books and CD/DVDs
38. We use Fed Ex ground and USPS Media mail
39. State-wide courier service picks up and distributes books, videocassettes, DVDs, audio CDs, audio cassettes, microfilm and microfiche
40. Any, but mostly books. Any ILL item type can be delivered through courier. They just must be within the courier's network. Otherwise, the item is shipped via USPS.
41. IDS via UPS, courier of LVAIC colleges in the area, regular mail
42. All types of materials are handled by our variety of couriers, i.e. print, microforms, A/V, maps, etc.
43. We do not use a courier - US mail - they'll ship anything
44. So not use a courier service, but the US Mail and sometimes UPS

45. Books, articles, whatever we care to borrow or lend
46. Books and articles
47. Books and media of all kinds. We don't send photocopies, but they would deliver them if we did.
48. No Courier service!
49. Books and journal articles between libraries at the university, books between academic libraries throughout the state
50. USPS delivers everything
51. Courier bags, for use in shipping items (however, they ask that we package items in a protective mailer before putting them in the courier bags; bar codes that are affixed to every outgoing courier bag or package (when items are too big for courier bags)
52. We use them for book and A/V shipping
53. We use the postal service
54. Just materials to VTU and SMD
55. No courier service
56. Books and videos - whatever we put in the package/box
57. Assume courier accept what we place in our bags for them. We ship mostly books, but also articles occasionally. We do not loan A/V materials.
58. Books and media owned within the consortia PLUS ILLs to non-consortia libraries in the region

CHAPTER 3: SPECIAL COLLECTIONS AND UNIQUE CIRCUMSTANCE

What is the policy of your library on the interlibrary loan of audio-visual materials, such as video recordings, software, audio recordings, and other special materials, including maps, art work, rare materials, and so on? If your library does not allow ILL of these materials, please explain the reasons why.

1. Lend on case by case basis only.
2. A/V lending is separate. They lend depending upon class/instructor demand. We lend almost anything else we can within reason and licensing. I've lent microfiche, microfilm, genealogy, and reference on a case by case basis. We do not lend rare materials or sets of books. We have never had a request for maps or art.
3. Our map and art collections are limited.
4. We do not loan material from our special collections. We loan audiovisual material on a case-by-case basis. We do loan maps.
5. We do not generally lend A/V materials. We will occasionally loan rare materials.
6. We do not loan microforms-our collection is small anyway. We have a modest archive which we do not loan. We will copy if the volume is not fragile. We will loan all other returnable items including A/V; no cost.
7. Do not loan
8. We do not circulate these materials via ILL. A/V is managed by a separate department. Other items would be considered rare, fragile, and/or irreplaceable.
9. We lend most things. No reserve items.
10. We lend A/V materials. Rare materials are held in Special Collections and do not circulate outside the library.
11. If we have it on the shelf we send out, unless it on reserve by our faculty
12. Will loan Special Collection items on an item by item basis. Must be in-library use only.
13. We lend everything except for materials in our Special Collections. We used to lend our Special Collections on a case by case basis but that ended when we lost a very rare item through Interlibrary Loan.
14. Videos - it depends on the title. The media librarian makes that determination - very popular titles are not lent. We lend special collections type materials to libraries with which we have a special relationship, primarily libraries in OCLC Shares.
15. We allow for all except for some archival/special collections, and we do not lend textbooks or e-books
16. Have lent everything in the past but are limiting some now
17. We do not lend or borrow these materials. They are among the higher circulating (DVDs) or most expensive to replace items in our collection.
19. We circulate audiovisual materials with the exception of our Instructional Video collection which is in high demand on campus. We do not lend artwork, maps or rare materials but offer copies where possible.
20. Do not loan out A/V materials or other special/rare items for fear of them getting damaged in shipping
21. We do not loan audio-visual material, our licenses only permit our own students use
22. We loan current media (DVDs, CDs, audio books). Decisions on art, rare maps, etc. are made by reference librarians at the holding campus library. We have three libraries.
23. Our policy is lending as much as we can. If we cannot lend, for damaged or very expensive issues, we try to send a copy or facilitate the user requesting library.
24. We do not lend these materials, but we are happy to borrow them for patrons if available. We own few DVDs, and those that we do are very costly and irreplaceable educational DVDs. We do not own the other materials.
25. Don't allow ILL of these materials. Only a small collection but concerns would arise over damage during delivery.

26. We will supply most materials unless they have a loan/copyright restriction, i.e. University produced course materials or archive rare material. Also, items with license restrictions on ILL.
27. We do not loan A/V or special material on ILL because the department head of our Media Collection and Special Collections do not support interlibrary loan of these items because of item cost and also the desire to have them on hand for the use of our local patrons.
28. Loan videos, audio recordings
29. Loan only audio-visuals, CDs, DVDs. Do not loan software, maps, art work, rare materials and other items that cannot be replaced
30. We do not loan any of these materials, yet. Our DVD collection is for in-house use only for our faculty and staff. Also we do not loan art work or rare books because of the materials cannot be replaced.
31. We ILL A/V material, but not any special collections. We allow A/V because we also request that type of material. We do not circulate special material as we have only a small collection that is important to the school.
32. We loan Media. Do not loan anything from our archives.
33. We lend videos, DVDs, LPs, and reference materials for in library use only. We do not loan anything from archives or Special Collections.
34. 40 days for A/V. Special collection or rare materials do not circulate.
35. We do not lend audio-visual materials. The checkout time for these items is very limited to our own patrons, so an ILL would be checked out for too long. I am actually trying to lift that ban and negotiating with the director and staff.
36. We have very few titles and they are old
37. We have a small collection, so we do not loan materials of this nature because there is usually a high need for audio-visual materials and other special materials
38. We do not loan A/V materials, art work, or rare items. These rules were put into place when I started in this position (5 months ago). We will be reviewing the possibility of revising our A/V material rules in the near future.
39. Anything that checks out to our patrons we will lend to other people's patrons
40. 4 week loan
41. Loan all circulating materials if not on reserve. Includes most video and many reference books.
42. We will lend CDs and DVDs; we don't have art work or rare materials to lend
43. We loan audio-visual to Virginia consortium libraries only (Virtual Library of Virginia). We will loan maps and genealogy, but not rare books or art work. Our library is small and not well-equipped to loan the few rare or special materials we have.
44. The library loans out all materials from its circulating collections with very few exceptions. The library allows all audio and visual materials, books from the general collections, micro-format items, maps and atlases, and scores. Items in non-circulating collections such as reference materials, unbound journal issues, and special collections items are not available for interlibrary loan.
45. If the item circulates, we allow ILL on that item. So, rare items, reserve items, and reference items do not. But, DVDs, CDs, VHS tapes, etc. all can be lent out.
46. We do not allow ILL use of these materials because our faculty and students rely heavily on it for classes and we can not be sure of what they need at what time
47. Rarely do we have requests for software and art work. All other materials are eligible for ILL - rare materials and maps at the discretion of the Librarians in charge of those collections.
48. Some of the items have restrictive licenses and we don't have the staff to determine which materials can or cannot be lent via ILL
49. We loan all audio-visual materials
50. We lend A/V materials: DVDs, CDs, videos, audio-cassettes. Did not receive requests for maps, artwork or rare materials.
51. We don't loan A/V materials
52. Sometimes we ILL audiovisual and media items to state-affiliated consortia members. We never lend other special materials as they can not easily be replaced.
53. Currently do not allow A/V borrowing since the majority of our materials are on reserve

54. Video recordings - only to other BC library's due to current Canadian copyright restrictions re: public performance. Other special materials - no, due to past practice that hasn't changed.
55. We do not send LPs (fragile, no sturdy packaging available) or music CDs (we consider them to be reserve items). Other CDs we do lend.
56. Non-circulating, cost for replacement
57. We do not have these materials in our collection. We are a digital library.
58. We borrow and lend anything except archival materials due to their age/rarity. We will sometime copy from these instead.
59. We loan all A/V. We do not loan Course Reserves items, since these are needed locally for student use. We do not loan any non-circulating materials, including items in our Special Collections, rare items, or items in poor condition. These items are not circulated to our own patrons, and are valuable or in condition that would not survive shipping, so we do not feel it appropriate to lend them. If possible, we will try to provide scans of pertinent sections from these items.
60. We loan A/V material on an item-by-item basis, determined by the license of the material and our media specialist. We lend some maps. Art work and rare materials are lent not through ILL but through Special Collections for exhibits. Sometimes they will scan certain sections or pages to email to ILL patrons.
61. Not allowed, policy states that we do not lend
62. No group by type, Special Collections determines what rare material circulates, and what we can scan
63. Don't loan
64. We rarely lend these materials, only on special request. Videos are in too high demand to lend.
65. We do not loan videos - small collection - primarily used for in library use only; need to be available for faculty at all times
66. We will loan media on short-term loans; we loan software if it comes with a monograph; we don't have any audio recordings; we don't loan special or archival materials for policy and copyright reasons.

Table 8: Does the library allow interlibrary loan of any of the following?

Table 8.1 Interlibrary Loan for College Textbooks

	No Answer	Yes	No
Entire Sample	4.41%	51.47%	44.12%

Table 8.2 Interlibrary Loan for State-Adopted Textbooks

	No Answer	Yes	No
Entire Sample	4.41%	38.24%	57.35%

Table 8.3 Interlibrary Loan for State Non-Adopted Textbooks

	No Answer	Yes	No
Entire Sample	5.88%	32.35%	61.76%

Table 9: Does the library allow interlibrary loan of any of the following? Broken out by Country

Table 9.1 Interlibrary Loan for College Textbooks

Country	No Answer	Yes	No
United States	3.33%	53.33%	43.33%
Other	12.50%	37.50%	50.00%

Table 9.2 Interlibrary Loan for State-Adopted Textbooks

Country	No Answer	Yes	No
United States	3.33%	40.00%	56.67%
Other	12.50%	25.00%	62.50%

Table 9.3 Interlibrary Loan for State Non-Adopted Textbooks

Country	No Answer	Yes	No
United States	5.00%	36.67%	58.33%
Other	12.50%	0.00%	87.50%

Table 10: Does the library allow interlibrary loan of any of the following? Broken out by Total Student Enrollment

Table 10.1 Interlibrary Loan for College Textbooks

Total Student Enrollment	No Answer	Yes	No
Less than 2,500	9.09%	54.55%	36.36%
2,500 to 7,500	0.00%	52.38%	47.62%
More than 7,500	4.00%	48.00%	48.00%

Table 10.2 Interlibrary Loan for State-Adopted Textbooks

Total Student Enrollment	No Answer	Yes	No
Less than 2,500	9.09%	31.82%	59.09%
2,500 to 7,500	0.00%	38.10%	61.90%
More than 7,500	4.00%	44.00%	52.00%

Table 10.3 Interlibrary Loan for State Non-Adopted Textbooks

Total Student Enrollment	No Answer	Yes	No
Less than 2,500	13.64%	27.27%	59.09%
2,500 to 7,500	0.00%	38.10%	61.90%
More than 7,500	4.00%	32.00%	64.00%

Table 11: Does the library allow interlibrary loan of any of the following? Broken out by Public or Private Status

Table 11.1 Interlibrary Loan for College Textbooks

Public or Private Status	No Answer	Yes	No
Public	2.70%	51.35%	45.95%
Private	6.45%	51.61%	41.94%

Table 11.2 Interlibrary Loan for State-Adopted Textbooks

Public or Private Status	No Answer	Yes	No
Public	2.70%	43.24%	54.05%
Private	6.45%	32.26%	61.29%

Table 11.3 Interlibrary Loan for State Non-Adopted Textbooks

Public or Private Status	No Answer	Yes	No
Public	2.70%	37.84%	59.46%
Private	9.68%	25.81%	64.52%

Table 12: Does the library allow interlibrary loan of any of the following? Broken out by Carnegie Class

Table 12.1 Interlibrary Loan for College Textbooks

Carnegie Class	No Answer	Yes	No
Community College	0.00%	44.44%	55.56%
4-Year College	9.09%	50.00%	40.91%
MA or PHD Granting College	0.00%	58.33%	41.67%
Research University	7.69%	46.15%	46.15%

Table 12.2 Interlibrary Loan for State-Adopted Textbooks

Carnegie Class	No Answer	Yes	No
Community College	0.00%	22.22%	77.78%
4-Year College	9.09%	27.27%	63.64%
MA or PHD Granting College	0.00%	58.33%	41.67%
Research University	7.69%	30.77%	61.54%

Table 12.3 Interlibrary Loan for State Non-Adopted Textbooks

Carnegie Class	No Answer	Yes	No
Community College	0.00%	22.22%	77.78%
4-Year College	13.64%	27.27%	59.09%
MA or PHD Granting College	0.00%	41.67%	58.33%
Research University	7.69%	30.77%	61.54%

Please explain your library's policies on the interlibrary loan of textbooks. If allowed, what is the general loan period? What restrictions might apply?

1. We will lend textbooks. Loan period is 6 weeks with two 2 week renewals allowed.
2. We do not purchase textbooks. We do not borrow textbooks for our students.
3. We loan any item that is not checked out or on reserve. We do have many of our textbooks on reserve, and cannot be loaned.
4. We have very few textbooks, and allow them to be loaned just like our other general collection items. General loan period is 3 weeks.
5. We have no restrictions. We also will try to borrow textbooks if possible.
6. Library does not purchase textbooks, so we do not loan them
7. We do not circulate textbooks; these are considered high demand items so we do not loan out ours. Students are expected to purchase textbooks and we do not allow ILL as a replacement for purchase.
8. We don't collect textbooks
9. Items that are not on Course Reserve may circulate. Standard loan period is 6 weeks with one 4-week renewal.
10. We lend everything for one month
11. We do not purchase textbooks for the library. We may have titles in our collection that other institutions use as textbooks. If it is available we will loan it. The loan period is 6 weeks.
12. We do not restrict our lending of textbooks -- if they are available and not on Course Reserve, they circulate just like anything else and receive the same loan period of four weeks plus up to three renewals. We very much embrace the concept of LVIS and put as few of restrictions as possible on what we are willing to lend.
13. We don't have a separate category of textbooks so I cannot answer - if we own them they are part of our general collection
14. No loan of textbooks
15. Will try within our consortial groups
16. We do not collect textbooks, so they are not in our collection to lend. We discourage students from using ILL to borrow these items because they cannot be kept for the whole semester.
17. We will loan what is available. We try to borrow on behalf of our patron; however we send them a message before requesting explaining the difficulties and restrictions of renewals when ordering textbooks.
18. The same as any book. If it is not on loan it can be lent for 6 weeks.
19. General loan period: 4 weeks. No restrictions.
20. 3 weeks plus 3 weeks renewal
21. We have few textbooks in the general collection, but we will loan those items. Textbooks on reserve for our students do no go out on ILL.
22. The policy is the same as the other books
23. We do not borrow textbooks and, since most of them are on reserve for students use, we do not lend them either
24. 4-week loans. Reference, short loan or on reading lists not allowed.
25. We loan for 2 months as default, restriction would be reference use to library loaned on rare material, i.e. PHD thesis
26. We do not make a practice of buying textbooks for our collection, but the few we do have, go out with our normal loan period of 6 weeks. We allow up to 3 renewals if the item doesn't have a hold on it.
27. We do not loan any textbooks
28. Loan for 4 weeks the textbooks in collection
29. As long as they are not textbooks currently in use by our students, we treat them like any other book. In general the loan period is 3 weeks, but can be extended upon request.
30. Do not loan due to loan period required
31. If it's not on reserve, it has the same loan period as any other loan
32. 40 days with 1 renewal of 30 days allowed

33. We will loan any book that is available for checkout. Typically the textbooks we carry are not the newest editions.
34. Catalogued with regular checkout period
35. We do not allow our patrons to request textbooks currently required for LSU course work. However, if a student explains to us that they are not using the item in question as a textbook, but for other academic purposes, we will usually make an exception.
36. We try to borrow anything anyone asks for. Since the bulk of the requests go through an unmediated consortial circ service there is no way to stop it.
37. 4 week loan as long as they are not on reserve
38. If we have a textbook on reserve it is not loaned. If it is in the general collection we will loan it. As a rule we do not purchase textbooks for the library collection if they are required for our classes.
39. We have a collection of state-adopted textbook for K-12 education that we will lend out
40. We do not knowingly purchase textbooks (unless for faculty) so the only textbooks we have are donated, and usually out of date. We will interlibrary loan them.
41. The library does not collect college textbooks and the Commonwealth of Massachusetts does not have a state-adopted textbook program - each school district selects its textbooks. All monographs requested through the state-wide virtual catalogue and sent via the state-wide courier service circulate for a total of 56 days including travel time to and from the sending library.
42. Current textbooks do not circulate. Older textbooks that have matriculated into the circulation collection may be lent.
43. I'm not sure that we actually own any college textbooks in our collection but if we do they would be allowed out for a 4 week period with one renewal. If you're referring to our borrowing we do not restrict our students from borrowing textbooks if we can find them making sure they are aware they could be recalled by the lender at any point so this may not be a good option for them.
44. Textbooks are not collected by this library
45. We don't borrow text books currently in use in classes. I can't borrow the same book for 20 students.
46. We do not collect college text books
47. The lending period is usually 4 weeks for textbooks from our general collection. No restrictions apply.
48. We interlibrary loan textbooks with a normal checkout period. We treat it as any other book.
49. We don't usually purchase college textbooks. If we happen to have one (usually donated), we will lend. We lend for 3 weeks. We try not to borrow textbooks as we have trouble getting them back.
50. We do not interlibrary loan required textbooks, we provide supplemental material only
51. We don't borrow textbooks when we're aware of the situation, we do lend them although we have very few. We would make an exception for a faculty member or student who is evaluating a textbook for some reason.
52. We loan all circulating books in our library
53. If the book is in our 4-hour lending collection of textbooks (in Reserves), we do not lend. All other books in our library, regardless of their status as textbooks, are loaned for full loan period to all eligible users.
54. We loan anything for our standard 30-day period. We try not to request textbooks but will for short-term use or students in dire financial straits.
55. We do not collect textbooks, so we do not loan them. We do not allow our patrons to request textbooks via ILL, per our user agreement. For more information about our textbook policy, please see <http://ask.lib.uh.edu/a.php?qid=183692>
56. We do not lend any textbooks in use by our classes. If a textbook is no longer needed but in the collection and not checked out, we loan it under the same rules and loan period as the rest of the materials.
57. 30 days
58. If not on reserve they circulate for 1 month with 1-2 renewals
59. If in general collection and not on reserve, will loan
60. If we have a textbook and it's not on course reserve we will lend it, we frequently request textbooks from other libraries, if an item is requested we should try to get it.

61. Students would not return ILL textbooks when they were due. Retrieval process too time consuming for small staff.

62. We do not borrow textbook, nor do we generally collect these; however, if one happens to be in our circulating collection we loan it. We also loan any state-adopted textbooks as long as they are not in a restricted collection.

63. If we own a textbook title and it is in the circulation collection, we will loan via ILL. The textbook titles we have in our circulation collection are generally older editions, not the most current edition.

Explain your library's policies towards the interlibrary loan of e-books. How do you track rights for interlibrary loan? Has your library itself made requests for e-books through interlibrary loan? Have you negotiated with publishers successfully for these rights?

1. We currently do not lend e-books
2. We do not have licensing rights to ILL our e-books - almost all our e-books are from EBSCOhost's e-Book Collection (formerly NetLibrary)
3. At this point, we do not loan textbooks
4. We currently have not worked out how to ILL e-books
5. We only send copy of a handful of e-books which we know we have permission to do so. Otherwise we have a "reason for no" that is called "E-book: Not licensed to fill copy."
6. We do not loan or request loan of e-books
7. This is an option we are exploring. At this point we are considering purchasing e-books to send via ILL.
8. Not loaned
9. We do not lend e-books. We do not request e-book through ILL.
10. Don't have e-books
11. Have not even considered loaning e-books
12. We are still in the process of developing a policy for e-books. So far we have only had requests for chapters of e-books and if the providing vendor allows electronic copies for interlibrary loan, then we fill the request. We have not made any requests for e-books through interlibrary loan. As far as I know, there have been no negotiations specific to the interlibrary loan of e-books with publishers.
13. We do not lend e-books over ILL - they are behind a firewall for temple users so cannot be lent
14. No loan of e-books
15. No lending or borrowing
16. We do not have the ability to lend e-books
17. We do not track rights for e-books.
18. We do not lend e-books
19. Not borrowing or loaning e-books.
20. Our license does not allow us to lend outside our own students
21. We do not loan e-books through regular ILL. Our shared e-book collection is paid for/purchased cooperatively through our 37 academic library consortia called Orbis Cascade Summit.
22. We have to negotiate with the rights holders this possibility. In Italy the law on copyright does not allow digital lending.
23. We do not lend e-books
24. Have neither requested nor been requested. No policy at moment but presume wouldn't be allowed.
25. We can't loan e-books or grant access to e-resources in general, we can supply a physical copy under UK copyright legislation if the license allows
26. We do not loan an entire e-book. We will provide a chapter from an e-book, but we do not track rights for ILL on the lending side. We have only requested book chapters from other libraries. Our librarian in charge of Collection Management has tried to get rights for patrons of the other libraries in our consortium with which we share a catalogue, to use our e-books, but has found reluctance on the part of publishers to set up this kind of access.
27. Have never loaned e-books
28. We do not loan nor do we request e-books through ILL.
29. Do not loan e-books due to license agreements. Have not requested e-books.
30. Unfortunately, we do not currently lend e-books, but we want to
31. We do not loan e-books. Honestly, we don't know how or if we have the rights.
32. We do not ILL e-books
33. We do not loan or borrow e-books.
34. We loan Springer e-books
35. Do not loan due to publisher limitations

36. Few e-books = no loans
37. Don't lend e-books
38. We do not interlibrary loan e-books. We do not request to borrow e-books.
39. The library does not loan out e-books
40. We do not lend out e-books
41. We will send a chapter of an e-book via lending. We try to get e-books if that is the only way they are published but have not actually received any this way.
42. ILL use of e-books is negotiated and if allowed, only portions of the book can be supplied, in accordance with Copyright law. Entire e-books are not eligible at this time.
43. We have not borrowed or lent e-books
44. We have no mechanism to loan or borrow e-books
45. We do not have e-books, as far as I know. We did not borrow any e-books either.
46. We don't ILL e-books
47. We have yet to venture into e-lending!
48. We do not lend e-books
49. We haven't implemented this yet
50. We have not had or made any requests for e-books yet. We intend to abide by the publishers conditions. We haven't purchased individual titles or sets directly from a publisher, yet, this is a new area for us.
51. This has not come up yet, or if it has, it has been so infrequent, that we don't have hard and fast policies. We comply fully with fair use guidelines regardless of format.
52. We do not borrow or lend e-books
53. Thus far we have neither received nor placed any requests for e-books. However, our Electronic Resources Librarian always asks for these rights in contract negotiations.
54. We do not currently have any licenses that allow for ILL of e-books, though we are exploring it for the future
55. We have no e-books to lend
56. We only fill article requests for e-books. We have never borrowed e-books.
57. Don't have e-books. Would "borrow" if could be arranged.
58. We will lend e-book chapters, within copyright guidelines. We do not request many book chapters, e or not. We often purchase via consortia and cannot negotiate rights.
59. E-book loans only permitted when allowed by license agreement. We do not request e-books. 60. We have small number of e-books.
61. We do not have license for e-book interlibrary loan at this time. We can, from some collections, provide chapters.
62. Very few of our e-book licenses come with ILL rights. Some Springer titles allow limited lending, which we interpret to mean chapters but not the entire book. The licenses for our e-books are collected in our ERM system. We have requested e-books through ILL but only chapters are generally filled. These requests usually come back as Unfilled

Table 13: How much did your library spend on each of the following services in borrowing e-books from these major vendors for limited periods of time? (in \$US)

Table 13.1 Spending on E-book Borrowing from Ebrary (in \$US)

	Mean	Median	Minimum	Maximum
Entire Sample	\$525.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$5,000.00

Table 13.2 Spending on E-book Borrowing from Ingram MyiLibrary (in \$US)

	Mean	Median	Minimum	Maximum
Entire Sample	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00

Table 13.3 Spending on E-book Borrowing from Overdrive (in \$US)

	Mean	Median	Minimum	Maximum
Entire Sample	\$48.61	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$875.00

Table 13.4 Spending on E-book Borrowing from All Other Vendors and Publishers (in \$US)

	Mean	Median	Minimum	Maximum
Entire Sample	\$972.22	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$15,000.00

Table 14: How much did your library spend on each of the following services in borrowing e-books from these major vendors for limited periods of time? Broken out by Country

Table 14.1 Spending on E-book Borrowing from Ebrary (in \$US)

Country	Mean	Median	Minimum	Maximum
United States	\$552.63	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$5,000.00
Other	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00

Table 14.3 Spending on E-book Borrowing from Overdrive (in \$US)

Country	Mean	Median	Minimum	Maximum
United States	\$51.47	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$875.00
Other	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00

Table 14.4 Spending on E-book Borrowing from All Other Vendors and Publishers (in \$US)

Country	Mean	Median	Minimum	Maximum
United States	\$1,029.41	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$15,000.00
Other	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00

Table 15: How much did your library spend on each of the following services in borrowing e-books from these major vendors for limited periods of time? Broken out by Total Student Enrollment

Table 15.1 Spending on E-book Borrowing from Ebrary (in \$US)

Total Student Enrollment	Mean	Median	Minimum	Maximum
Less than 2,500	\$714.29	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$5,000.00
2,500 to 7,500	\$500.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$4,000.00
More than 7,500	\$300.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$1,500.00

Table 15.3 Spending on E-book Borrowing from Overdrive (in \$US)

Total Student Enrollment	Mean	Median	Minimum	Maximum
Less than 2,500	\$145.83	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$875.00
2,500 to 7,500	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
More than 7,500	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00

Table 15.4 Spending on E-book Borrowing from All Other Vendors and Publishers (in \$US)

Total Student Enrollment	Mean	Median	Minimum	Maximum
Less than 2,500	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
2,500 to 7,500	\$312.50	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$2,500.00
More than 7,500	\$3,750.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$15,000.00

Table 16: How much did your library spend on each of the following services in borrowing e-books from these major vendors for limited periods of time? Broken out by Public or Private Status

Table 16.1 Spending on E-book Borrowing from Ebrary (in \$US)

Public or Private Status	Mean	Median	Minimum	Maximum
Public	\$550.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$4,000.00
Private	\$500.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$5,000.00

Table 16.3 Spending on E-book Borrowing from Overdrive (in \$US)

Public or Private Status	Mean	Median	Minimum	Maximum
Public	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
Private	\$109.38	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$875.00

Table 16.4 Spending on E-book Borrowing from All Other Vendors and Publishers (in \$US)

Public or Private Status	Mean	Median	Minimum	Maximum
Public	\$1,944.44	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$15,000.00
Private	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00

What problems, if any, does your library encounter with foreign country interlibrary loan? Please explain

1. We have never borrowed from an international library. We lend to international libraries. I lend about one book a year to a library in Denmark. The cost of shipping is prohibitive.
2. We don't borrow or loan to foreign countries. We have had material lost in the past, therefore, have made this policy not to lend or request material from foreign countries.
3. We currently will borrow and loan to all foreign libraries in the OCLC network (we do require an OCLC ILL number)
4. Length of processing time
5. Long loans and some lost material
6. We do borrow and lend internationally, primarily requesting and providing articles. It has worked well.
7. Most don't lend. Cost to send in a decent time frame.
8. We do very limited ILL with foreign countries. Mainly with Canada and have had no problems.
9. We only lend physical items to Canada, no other countries. We have not had problems with this.
10. Language barrier, obviously, but we have had good relationships with foreign lending
11. Non-lenders make for very slow ILL
12. Time lag for receiving some items. Copyright laws for different countries and libraries who do require prepayment. Having to mail IFLA vouchers causing further delays and currency exchange problems.
13. Delays
14. We tend not to offer a world wide search for material but on the few occasions we have done so there have been no problems
15. We are a community college, and do not loan except to US, and Canadian libraries of all types. We stopped the practice of loaning internationally due to the cost of shipping, and the long times to get things safely shipped back and forth.
16. We do not encounter any problems with printed materials, but we do with recent electronic journals and e-books
17. Very little in the way of foreign interlibrary loans. The odd occasion has been smooth enough.
18. We have had a good record with borrowing from non UK based institutions. Only in libraries which have a non international loan policy have there been difficulties - we then source from another institution.
19. The major problem we have had is sending returnable material to various countries, and either, they never receive it, or it is lost coming back to us (China, African countries, Middle Eastern Countries). We successfully loan to the United Kingdom, Denmark, and Australia/New Zealand.
20. We do not loan or borrow from foreign countries
21. Do not loan to foreign countries
22. Expensive to ship overseas
23. Time constraints
24. We haven't had any problems borrowing or lending internationally
25. Majority only accepts IFM and we do not participate in that system
26. No problems with electronically delivered materials. Very few loans are sought overseas.
27. We have never had a foreign ILL
28. We don't generally borrow or loan from foreign countries with the exception of journal articles sent via email or OCLC's Article Exchange
29. Sometimes we do not receive a response
30. Copyright regulations, digital delivery of articles not allowed, shipping times and fees
31. None
32. So far, have had no requests except from Canada and UK. No problems.
33. Limited borrowing from foreign countries, no problems
34. We do not interlibrary loan or borrow with foreign countries
35. The university discourages using international vendors or libraries unless the transaction can be conducted in US dollars and fulfilled using a credit card

36. The few times we did this (many years ago), the item never returned. We no longer lend internationally, or to Puerto Rico.
37. Many times we are told they will not loan to us. If they do loan there have been times the book didn't arrive in time for the patrons use.
38. Occasionally, because of the method used for shipping, the material is due very soon after we receive it if not before. Traditional methods of shipping are time consuming; courier would be better but is often expensive.
39. Minimal because we only deal with the US system and the British Library. Occasional problems with items from the US coming through customs.
40. We do very little of it and have not had significant problems
41. We do not loan books, only fill request for articles with a viable email address!
42. Only the cost of shipping materials there
43. Only long delays in both shipping and email communications (the later due to time differences, I assume)
44. Customs and mailing issues
45. Slow return of materials
46. Time, copyright restrictions, failure to reply to requests. We have lost materials in shipping. We still do it.
47. Getting the University post office to know international requirements. Even when presented with copies of U.S. postal requirements found on the UPS website, the University post office says: "No, it isn't done that way," delaying shipments.
48. We only borrow/lend with Canada, and rarely.
49. Delivery time is too long
50. We do not loan items to foreign countries - we will provide copies, but not loans
51. Physical items - takes a long time; occasionally there is loss or damage. Electronic items - if the foreign library does not use OCLC, it can frequently take quite a bit of email negotiation for items to go through both on the borrowing and lending side. Different copyright restrictions are also a factor.

CHAPTER 4: STATE OR PROVINCIAL BORROWING NETWORKS**Table 17.1: Does your library participate in the state borrowing network?**

	No Answer	Yes	No	We don't have a state borrowing network
Entire Sample	4.41%	69.12%	10.29%	16.18%

Table 17.2: Does your library participate in the state borrowing network? Broken out by Country

Country	No Answer	Yes	No	We don't have a state borrowing network
United States	1.67%	71.67%	8.33%	18.33%
Other	25.00%	50.00%	25.00%	0.00%

Table 17.3: Does your library participate in the state borrowing network? Broken out by Total Student Enrollment

Total Student Enrollment	No Answer	Yes	No	We don't have a state borrowing network
Less than 2,500	4.55%	72.73%	9.09%	13.64%
2,500 to 7,500	0.00%	76.19%	4.76%	19.05%
More than 7,500	8.00%	60.00%	16.00%	16.00%

**Table 17.4: Does your library participate in the state borrowing network?
Broken out by Public or Private Status**

Public or Private Status	No Answer	Yes	No	We don't have a state borrowing network
Public	5.41%	70.27%	2.70%	21.62%
Private	3.23%	67.74%	19.35%	9.68%

**Table 17.5: Does your library participate in the state borrowing network?
Broken out by Carnegie Class**

Carnegie Class	No Answer	Yes	No	We don't have a state borrowing network
Community College	0.00%	77.78%	0.00%	22.22%
4-Year College	4.55%	81.82%	9.09%	4.55%
MA or PHD Granting College	0.00%	62.50%	20.83%	16.67%
Research University	15.38%	53.85%	0.00%	30.77%

Table 18.1: Does your library use state ILL/DD/EDD statistical reports for any purposes?

	No Answer	Yes	No
Entire Sample	4.41%	32.35%	63.24%

Table 18.2: Does your library use state ILL/DD/EDD statistical reports for any purposes? Broken out by Country

Country	No Answer	Yes	No
United States	1.67%	33.33%	65.00%
Other	25.00%	25.00%	50.00%

Table 18.3: Does your library use state ILL/DD/EDD statistical reports for any purposes? Broken out by Total Student Enrollment

Total Student Enrollment	No Answer	Yes	No
Less than 2,500	4.55%	31.82%	63.64%
2,500 to 7,500	0.00%	19.05%	80.95%
More than 7,500	8.00%	44.00%	48.00%

Table 18.4: Does your library use state ILL/DD/EDD statistical reports for any purposes? Broken out by Public or Private Status

Public or Private Status	No Answer	Yes	No
Public	5.41%	37.84%	56.76%
Private	3.23%	25.81%	70.97%

Table 18.5: Does your library use state ILL/DD/EDD statistical reports for any purposes? Broken out by Carnegie Class

Carnegie Class	No Answer	Yes	No
Community College	0.00%	22.22%	77.78%
4-Year College	4.55%	31.82%	63.64%
MA or PHD Granting College	0.00%	33.33%	66.67%
Research University	15.38%	38.46%	46.15%

Table 19.1: Does your state borrowing network identify net lenders and perform load levelling?

	No Answer	Yes	No
Entire Sample	11.76%	29.41%	58.82%

Table 19.2: Does your state borrowing network identify net lenders and perform load levelling? Broken out by Country

Country	No Answer	Yes	No
United States	8.33%	33.33%	58.33%
Other	37.50%	0.00%	62.50%

Table 19.3: Does your state borrowing network identify net lenders and perform load levelling? Broken out by Total Student Enrollment

Total Student Enrollment	No Answer	Yes	No
Less than 2,500	9.09%	27.27%	63.64%
2,500 to 7,500	4.76%	28.57%	66.67%
More than 7,500	20.00%	32.00%	48.00%

Table 19.4: Does your state borrowing network identify net lenders and perform load levelling? Broken out by Public or Private Status

Public or Private Status	No Answer	Yes	No
Public	16.22%	32.43%	51.35%
Private	6.45%	25.81%	67.74%

Table 19.5: Does your state borrowing network identify net lenders and perform load levelling? Broken out by Carnegie Class

Carnegie Class	No Answer	Yes	No
Community College	0.00%	33.33%	66.67%
4-Year College	13.64%	27.27%	59.09%
MA or PHD Granting College	4.17%	37.50%	58.33%
Research University	30.77%	15.38%	53.85%

CHAPTER 5: END USER PREFERENCES

Table 20.1: Does your library have any of the following default delivery policies?

	No Answer	Document delivery is in electronic form unless otherwise specified	Document delivery is in hard copy form unless otherwise specified	End user is expected to specify delivery form	Document delivery form is at the discretion of the librarian and forms are generally not specified
Entire Sample	14.71%	47.06%	8.82%	8.82%	20.59%

Table 20.2: Does your library have any of the following default delivery policies? Broken out by Country

Country	No Answer	Document delivery is in electronic form unless otherwise specified	Document delivery is in hard copy form unless otherwise specified	End user is expected to specify delivery form	Document delivery form is at the discretion of the librarian and forms are generally not specified
United States	13.33%	48.33%	8.33%	6.67%	23.33%
Other	25.00%	37.50%	12.50%	25.00%	0.00%

Table 20.3: Does your library have any of the following default delivery policies? Broken out by Total Student Enrollment

Total Student Enrollment	No Answer	Document delivery is in electronic form unless otherwise specified	Document delivery is in hard copy form unless otherwise specified	End user is expected to specify delivery form	Document delivery form is at the discretion of the librarian and forms are generally not specified
Less than 2,500	9.09%	31.82%	9.09%	9.09%	40.91%
2,500 to 7,500	14.29%	47.62%	14.29%	4.76%	19.05%
More than 7,500	20.00%	60.00%	4.00%	12.00%	4.00%

Table 20.4: Does your library have any of the following default delivery policies? Broken out by Public or Private Status

Public or Private Status	No Answer	Document delivery is in electronic form unless otherwise specified	Document delivery is in hard copy form unless otherwise specified	End user is expected to specify delivery form	Document delivery form is at the discretion of the librarian and forms are generally not specified
Public	16.22%	56.76%	10.81%	10.81%	5.41%
Private	12.90%	35.48%	6.45%	6.45%	38.71%

Table 20.5: Does your library have any of the following default delivery policies? Broken out by Carnegie Class

Carnegie Class	No Answer	Document delivery is in electronic form unless otherwise specified	Document delivery is in hard copy form unless otherwise specified	End user is expected to specify delivery form	Document delivery form is at the discretion of the librarian and forms are generally not specified
Community College	33.33%	22.22%	33.33%	0.00%	11.11%
4-Year College	13.64%	31.82%	13.64%	13.64%	27.27%
MA or PHD Granting College	4.17%	66.67%	0.00%	0.00%	29.17%
Research University	23.08%	53.85%	0.00%	23.08%	0.00%

Table 21: Which of the following document delivery or end uses do you use at your library for interlibrary loan?

Table 21.1 Fax Delivery is offered

	No Answer	Yes	No
Entire Sample	8.82%	35.29%	55.88%

Table 21.2 Email Attachment Delivery is offered

	No Answer	Yes	No
Entire Sample	8.82%	75.00%	16.18%

Table 21.3 Document Delivery for Photocopied Documents is offered

	No Answer	Yes	No
Entire Sample	8.82%	50.00%	41.18%

Table 21.4 Document Delivery for Actual Documents is offered

	No Answer	Yes	No
Entire Sample	8.82%	39.71%	51.47%

Table 21.5 Document Delivery for Scanned Documents is offered

	No Answer	Yes	No
Entire Sample	8.82%	69.12%	22.06%

Table 21.6 Document Delivery for E-text from a Database is offered

	No Answer	Yes	No
Entire Sample	8.82%	38.24%	52.94%

Table 21.7 Document Delivery for Distance Education Use is offered

	No Answer	Yes	No
Entire Sample	8.82%	33.82%	57.35%

Table 21.8 Document Delivery for Interlibrary Use is offered

	No Answer	Yes	No
Entire Sample	8.82%	32.35%	58.82%

Table 21.9 Document Delivery between Campus Libraries/Units is offered

	No Answer	Yes	No
Entire Sample	8.82%	26.47%	64.71%

Table 21.10 There is a Fee for Use of Document Delivery

	No Answer	Yes	No
Entire Sample	8.82%	5.88%	85.29%

Table 21.11 Another form of Document Delivery is offered

	No Answer	Yes	No
Entire Sample	8.82%	5.88%	85.29%

Table 22: Which of the following document delivery or end uses do you use at your library for inter library loan? Broken out by Country

Table 22.1 Fax Delivery is offered

Country	No Answer	Yes	No
United States	6.67%	36.67%	56.67%
Other	25.00%	25.00%	50.00%

Table 22.2 Email Attachment Delivery is offered

Country	No Answer	Yes	No
United States	6.67%	78.33%	15.00%
Other	25.00%	50.00%	25.00%

Table 22.3 Document Delivery for Photocopied Documents is offered

Country	No Answer	Yes	No
United States	6.67%	48.33%	45.00%
Other	25.00%	62.50%	12.50%

Table 22.4 Document Delivery for Actual Documents is offered

Country	No Answer	Yes	No
United States	6.67%	40.00%	53.33%
Other	25.00%	37.50%	37.50%

Table 22.5 Document Delivery for Scanned Documents is offered

Country	No Answer	Yes	No
United States	6.67%	76.67%	16.67%
Other	25.00%	12.50%	62.50%

Table 22.6 Document Delivery for E-text from a Database is offered

Country	No Answer	Yes	No
United States	6.67%	41.67%	51.67%
Other	25.00%	12.50%	62.50%

Table 22.7 Document Delivery for Distance Education Use is offered

Country	No Answer	Yes	No
United States	6.67%	33.33%	60.00%
Other	25.00%	37.50%	37.50%

Table 22.8 Document Delivery for Interlibrary Use is offered

Country	No Answer	Yes	No
United States	6.67%	31.67%	61.67%
Other	25.00%	37.50%	37.50%

Table 22.9 Document Delivery between Campus Libraries/Units is offered

Country	No Answer	Yes	No
United States	6.67%	26.67%	66.67%
Other	25.00%	25.00%	50.00%

Table 22.10 There is a Fee for Use of Document Delivery

Country	No Answer	Yes	No
United States	6.67%	6.67%	86.67%
Other	25.00%	0.00%	75.00%

Table 22.11 Another form of Document Delivery is offered

Country	No Answer	Yes	No
United States	6.67%	6.67%	86.67%
Other	25.00%	0.00%	75.00%

Table 23: Which of the following document delivery or end uses do you use at your library for inter library loan? Broken out by Total Student Enrollment

Table 23.1 Fax Delivery is offered

Total Student Enrollment	No Answer	Yes	No
Less than 2,500	4.55%	72.73%	22.73%
2,500 to 7,500	4.76%	14.29%	80.95%
More than 7,500	16.00%	20.00%	64.00%

Table 23.2 Email Attachment Delivery is offered

Total Student Enrollment	No Answer	Yes	No
Less than 2,500	4.55%	81.82%	13.64%
2,500 to 7,500	4.76%	76.19%	19.05%
More than 7,500	16.00%	68.00%	16.00%

Table 23.3 Document Delivery for Photocopied Documents is offered

Total Student Enrollment	No Answer	Yes	No
Less than 2,500	4.55%	59.09%	36.36%
2,500 to 7,500	4.76%	38.10%	57.14%
More than 7,500	16.00%	52.00%	32.00%

Table 23.4 Document Delivery for Actual Documents is offered

Total Student Enrollment	No Answer	Yes	No
Less than 2,500	4.55%	40.91%	54.55%
2,500 to 7,500	4.76%	42.86%	52.38%
More than 7,500	16.00%	36.00%	48.00%

Table 23.5 Document Delivery for Scanned Documents is offered

Total Student Enrollment	No Answer	Yes	No
Less than 2,500	4.55%	72.73%	22.73%
2,500 to 7,500	4.76%	76.19%	19.05%
More than 7,500	16.00%	60.00%	24.00%

Table 23.6 Document Delivery for E-text from a Database is offered

Total Student Enrollment	No Answer	Yes	No
Less than 2,500	4.55%	36.36%	59.09%
2,500 to 7,500	4.76%	42.86%	52.38%
More than 7,500	16.00%	36.00%	48.00%

Table 23.7 Document Delivery for Distance Education Use is offered

Total Student Enrollment	No Answer	Yes	No
Less than 2,500	4.55%	22.73%	72.73%
2,500 to 7,500	4.76%	33.33%	61.90%
More than 7,500	16.00%	44.00%	40.00%

Table 23.8 Document Delivery for Interlibrary Use is offered

Total Student Enrollment	No Answer	Yes	No
Less than 2,500	4.55%	36.36%	59.09%
2,500 to 7,500	4.76%	38.10%	57.14%
More than 7,500	16.00%	24.00%	60.00%

Table 23.9 Document Delivery between Campus Libraries/Units is offered

Total Student Enrollment	No Answer	Yes	No
Less than 2,500	4.55%	27.27%	68.18%
2,500 to 7,500	4.76%	9.52%	85.71%
More than 7,500	16.00%	40.00%	44.00%

Table 23.10 There is a Fee for Use of Document Delivery

Total Student Enrollment	No Answer	Yes	No
Less than 2,500	4.55%	4.55%	90.91%
2,500 to 7,500	4.76%	4.76%	90.48%
More than 7,500	16.00%	8.00%	76.00%

Table 23.11 Another form of Document Delivery is offered

Total Student Enrollment	No Answer	Yes	No
Less than 2,500	4.55%	4.55%	90.91%
2,500 to 7,500	4.76%	9.52%	85.71%
More than 7,500	16.00%	4.00%	80.00%

Table 24: Which of the following document delivery or end uses do you use at your library for interlibrary loan? Broken out by Public or Private Status

Table 24.1 Fax Delivery is offered

Public or Private Status	No Answer	Yes	No
Public	10.81%	29.73%	59.46%
Private	6.45%	41.94%	51.61%

Table 24.2 Email Attachment Delivery is offered

Public or Private Status	No Answer	Yes	No
Public	10.81%	72.97%	16.22%
Private	6.45%	77.42%	16.13%

Table 24.3 Document Delivery for Photocopied Documents is offered

Public or Private Status	No Answer	Yes	No
Public	10.81%	51.35%	37.84%
Private	6.45%	48.39%	45.16%

Table 24.4 Document Delivery for Actual Documents is offered

Public or Private Status	No Answer	Yes	No
Public	10.81%	37.84%	51.35%
Private	6.45%	41.94%	51.61%

Table 24.5 Document Delivery for Scanned Documents is offered

Public or Private Status	No Answer	Yes	No
Public	10.81%	70.27%	18.92%
Private	6.45%	67.74%	25.81%

Table 24.6 Document Delivery for E-text from a Database is offered

Public or Private Status	No Answer	Yes	No
Public	10.81%	37.84%	51.35%
Private	6.45%	38.71%	54.84%

Table 24.7 Document Delivery for Distance Education Use is offered

Public or Private Status	No Answer	Yes	No
Public	10.81%	37.84%	51.35%
Private	6.45%	29.03%	64.52%

Table 24.8 Document Delivery for Interlibrary Use is offered

Public or Private Status	No Answer	Yes	No
Public	10.81%	29.73%	59.46%
Private	6.45%	35.48%	58.06%

Table 24.9 Document Delivery between Campus Libraries/Units is offered

Public or Private Status	No Answer	Yes	No
Public	10.81%	29.73%	59.46%
Private	6.45%	22.58%	70.97%

Table 24.10 There is a Fee for Use of Document Delivery

Public or Private Status	No Answer	Yes	No
Public	10.81%	8.11%	81.08%
Private	6.45%	3.23%	90.32%

Table 24.11 Another form of Document Delivery is offered

Public or Private Status	No Answer	Yes	No
Public	10.81%	8.11%	81.08%
Private	6.45%	3.23%	90.32%

Table 25: Which of the following document delivery or end uses do you use at your library for inter library loan? Broken out by Carnegie Class

Table 25.1 Fax Delivery is offered

Carnegie Class	No Answer	Yes	No
Community College	11.11%	44.44%	44.44%
4-Year College	4.55%	59.09%	36.36%
MA or PHD Granting College	4.17%	20.83%	75.00%
Research University	23.08%	15.38%	61.54%

Table 25.2 Email Attachment Delivery is offered

Carnegie Class	No Answer	Yes	No
Community College	11.11%	66.67%	22.22%
4-Year College	4.55%	72.73%	22.73%
MA or PHD Granting College	4.17%	91.67%	4.17%
Research University	23.08%	53.85%	23.08%

Table 25.3 Document Delivery for Photocopied Documents is offered

Carnegie Class	No Answer	Yes	No
Community College	11.11%	55.56%	33.33%
4-Year College	4.55%	50.00%	45.45%
MA or PHD Granting College	4.17%	54.17%	41.67%
Research University	23.08%	38.46%	38.46%

Table 25.4 Document Delivery for Actual Documents is offered

Carnegie Class	No Answer	Yes	No
Community College	11.11%	22.22%	66.67%
4-Year College	4.55%	36.36%	59.09%
MA or PHD Granting College	4.17%	41.67%	54.17%
Research University	23.08%	53.85%	23.08%

Table 25.5 Document Delivery for Scanned Documents is offered

Carnegie Class	No Answer	Yes	No
Community College	11.11%	66.67%	22.22%
4-Year College	4.55%	63.64%	31.82%
MA or PHD Granting College	4.17%	79.17%	16.67%
Research University	23.08%	61.54%	15.38%

Table 25.6 Document Delivery for E-text from a Database is offered

Carnegie Class	No Answer	Yes	No
Community College	11.11%	22.22%	66.67%
4-Year College	4.55%	36.36%	59.09%
MA or PHD Granting College	4.17%	45.83%	50.00%
Research University	23.08%	38.46%	38.46%

Table 25.7 Document Delivery for Distance Education Use is offered

Carnegie Class	No Answer	Yes	No
Community College	11.11%	11.11%	77.78%
4-Year College	4.55%	31.82%	63.64%
MA or PHD Granting College	4.17%	41.67%	54.17%
Research University	23.08%	38.46%	38.46%

Table 25.8 Document Delivery for Interlibrary Use is offered

Carnegie Class	No Answer	Yes	No
Community College	11.11%	22.22%	66.67%
4-Year College	4.55%	36.36%	59.09%
MA or PHD Granting College	4.17%	29.17%	66.67%
Research University	23.08%	38.46%	38.46%

Table 25.9 Document Delivery between Campus Libraries/Units is offered

Carnegie Class	No Answer	Yes	No
Community College	11.11%	11.11%	77.78%
4-Year College	4.55%	13.64%	81.82%
MA or PHD Granting College	4.17%	33.33%	62.50%
Research University	23.08%	46.15%	30.77%

Table 25.10 There is a Fee for Use of Document Delivery

Carnegie Class	No Answer	Yes	No
Community College	11.11%	11.11%	77.78%
4-Year College	4.55%	4.55%	90.91%
MA or PHD Granting College	4.17%	4.17%	91.67%
Research University	23.08%	7.69%	69.23%

Table 25.11 Another form of Document Delivery is offered

Carnegie Class	No Answer	Yes	No
Community College	11.11%	0.00%	88.89%
4-Year College	4.55%	9.09%	86.36%
MA or PHD Granting College	4.17%	8.33%	87.50%
Research University	23.08%	0.00%	76.92%

Table 26.1: By what aggregate percentage has your library's electronic document delivery cumulatively changed over the past three years?

	Mean	Median	Minimum	Maximum
Entire Sample	37.10%	10.95%	-48.00%	200.00%

Table 26.2: By what aggregate percentage has your library's electronic document delivery cumulatively changed over the past three years? Broken out by Country

Country	Mean	Median	Minimum	Maximum
United States	39.21%	14.95%	-48.00%	200.00%
Other	21.25%	5.00%	0.00%	75.00%

Table 26.3: By what aggregate percentage has your library's electronic document delivery cumulatively changed over the past three years? Broken out by Total Student Enrollment

Total Student Enrollment	Mean	Median	Minimum	Maximum
Less than 2,500	35.82%	8.45%	0.00%	150.00%
2,500 to 7,500	48.77%	20.00%	0.00%	200.00%
More than 7,500	32.67%	10.00%	-48.00%	200.00%

Table 26.4: By what aggregate percentage has your library's electronic document delivery cumulatively changed over the past three years? Broken out by Public or Private Status

Public or Private Status	Mean	Median	Minimum	Maximum
Public	28.92%	10.00%	-48.00%	200.00%
Private	50.30%	11.89%	-13.00%	200.00%

Table 26.5: By what aggregate percentage has your library's electronic document delivery cumulatively changed over the past three years? Broken out by Carnegie Class

Carnegie Class	Mean	Median	Minimum	Maximum
Community College	18.33%	12.50%	0.00%	65.00%
4-Year College	36.32%	11.89%	0.00%	90.00%
MA or PHD Granting College	52.49%	25.00%	-13.00%	200.00%
Research University	23.67%	0.00%	-48.00%	200.00%

Please list the top 5 service expectations that your DD/EDD users express to you that they need, or want.

1. Patrons or borrowing libraries? I scan and deliver all documents electronically. With database/e-journal licensing, I occasionally have get faxed or mailed photocopies for my patrons. Naturally, they all want immediate electronic delivery.
2. Quick access to material. Free service
3. PDFs, Promptness, Convenience, Courteous customer service (YES!), Color documents
4. Everything they want. Want it immediately.
5. Speed! Ease of placing requests, ability to track their orders, electronic delivery, and clean, clear copies
6. Quick turnaround, electronic delivery, digitized version of an article (not a photocopy from print)
7. Speed, PDF
8. (1) Speed, (2) Electronic Delivery
9. Prompt delivery of resources, good quality images, attention paid to accuracy, seamless delivery
10. Speed, accuracy, legibility, helpfulness with determining correct document, friendliness
11. Prefer print book, DVD media, and electronic copy of article
12. Fast service, clear instructions for downloading electronic delivery, full access to all journals
13. (1) E-delivery of articles, notes are often found stating "PDF file preferred please," (2) many of our serial journals are online, but with 6-9 month embargoes, and they ask "can you get me this 2012 article?," (3) "Can you get this FAST?" as in a couple of hours
14. Timeliness, e-mail from other libraries, opening hours, ways of contacting ILL (we have a web form)
15. Quick delivery
16. (1) Everything will be available, (2) speed of service, (3) no reference use, (in library) material
17. Electronic delivery, quality copies, speed
18. Speed of delivery, PDF format, no charge
19. (1) Electronic document delivery and (2) mail books to home
20. Faster access to materials, access to items held at only a few libraries
21. E-mail delivery for articles
22. Scanned document, photocopy, email attachment, e-text, fax
23. Immediate receipt at no cost
24. Electronic delivery, fast service, loans delivered directly to patron through mail
25. Speed, color copies
26. Speed - they want it fast. No other requests.
27. Fast, reliable delivery, effective and efficient
28. Fast. Free. Color scans or prints if the original is in color. Electronic delivery (we use only university identified email accounts). Not willing to pay copyright fees if more than \$35.00 generally.
29. Convenience, flexibility, speed
30. They need it fast (preferably yesterday), they prefer electronic format and they need a contact point/person that they can talk to on the phone about any special needs
31. Requests in the past have been for photocopies and those requests have been few for our library
32. (1) Immediate use, (2) free, (3) e-format, (4) delivery to regional campuses, (5) translations
33. Want it now. Want it free. Want it correct. Want it in color. Want to keep it longer.
34. Desktop delivery
35. Speedy delivery, electronic delivery, delivered to their homes/offices if not electronic
36. Rapid turnaround
37. Speed, electronic delivery
38. Rapid response time, clear copies, concerned customer service, the ability to request both ILL and DD services via one form (i.e., they don't want to have to determine if the library owns the item, they just want to send us the citation and let us figure out how to get the item), the ability to keep the file indefinitely (currently, our server is set to delete DD files after 45 days - many faculty members would like this to be longer or permanent)

- 39. (1) Electronic delivery, (2) instant (or almost instant) delivery, (3) want e-books, (4) entire issues of journals - usually the latest issue
- 40. Fast, free, accurate service
- 41. Quick service, correct item, no cost. Those are really the only services expectations we have.
- 42. PDF copy, speed, color scans

Table 27.1: Does your library ever share full-text articles from your subscribed database?

	No Answer	Yes	No
Entire Sample	10.29%	76.47%	13.24%

Table 27.2: Does your library ever share full-text articles from your subscribed database? Broken out by Country

Country	No Answer	Yes	No
United States	8.33%	83.33%	8.33%
Other	25.00%	25.00%	50.00%

Table 27.3: Does your library ever share full-text articles from your subscribed database? Broken out by Total Student Enrollment

Total Student Enrollment	No Answer	Yes	No
Less than 2,500	9.09%	77.27%	13.64%
2,500 to 7,500	4.76%	85.71%	9.52%
More than 7,500	16.00%	68.00%	16.00%

Table 27.4: Does your library ever share full-text articles from your subscribed database? Broken out by Public or Private Status

Public or Private Status	No Answer	Yes	No
Public	10.81%	72.97%	16.22%
Private	9.68%	80.65%	9.68%

Table 27.5: Does your library ever share full-text articles from your subscribed database? Broken out by Carnegie Class

Carnegie Class	No Answer	Yes	No
Community College	11.11%	66.67%	22.22%
4-Year College	9.09%	86.36%	4.55%
MA or PHD Granting College	4.17%	79.17%	16.67%
Research University	23.08%	61.54%	15.38%

CHAPTER 6: DEPARTMENTAL RESPONSIBILITY

Table 28.1: Are your library's interlibrary loan and document delivery services performed largely by the same library unit or separate units?

	No Answer	Same Unit	Separate Units
Entire Sample	11.76%	83.82%	4.41%

Table 28.2: Are your library's interlibrary loan and document delivery services performed largely by the same library unit or separate units? Broken out by Country

Country	No Answer	Same Unit	Separate Units
United States	10.00%	85.00%	5.00%
Other	25.00%	75.00%	0.00%

Table 28.3: Are your library's interlibrary loan and document delivery services performed largely by the same library unit or separate units? Broken out by Total Student Enrollment

Total Student Enrollment	No Answer	Same Unit	Separate Units
Less than 2,500	9.09%	86.36%	4.55%
2,500 to 7,500	4.76%	85.71%	9.52%
More than 7,500	20.00%	80.00%	0.00%

Table 28.4: Are your library's interlibrary loan and Document Delivery services performed largely by the same library unit or separate units? Broken out by Public or Private Status

Public or Private Status	No Answer	Same Unit	Separate Units
Public	10.81%	81.08%	8.11%
Private	12.90%	87.10%	0.00%

Table 28.5: Are your library's interlibrary loan and document delivery services performed largely by the same library unit or separate units? Broken out by Carnegie Class

Carnegie Class	No Answer	Same Unit	Separate Units
Community College	11.11%	77.78%	11.11%
4-Year College	9.09%	90.91%	0.00%
MA or PHD Granting College	8.33%	87.50%	4.17%
Research University	23.08%	69.23%	7.69%

Table 29: Interlibrary loan is under auspices of which department(s)?

Table 29.1 ILL is under the Auspices of the Reference Department

	No Answer	Yes	No
Entire Sample	8.82%	13.24%	77.94%

Table 29.2 ILL is under the Auspices of the Circulation Department

	No Answer	Yes	No
Entire Sample	8.82%	14.71%	76.47%

Table 29.3 ILL is under the Auspices of the Access Services Department

	No Answer	Yes	No
Entire Sample	8.82%	32.35%	58.82%

Table 29.4 ILL is under the Auspices of the Document Delivery Services Department

	No Answer	Yes	No
Entire Sample	8.82%	13.24%	77.94%

Table 29.5 ILL is under the Auspices of the Technical Services Department

	No Answer	Yes	No
Entire Sample	8.82%	16.18%	75.00%

Table 29.6 ILL is under the Auspices of the Collection Development Department

	No Answer	Yes	No
Entire Sample	8.82%	2.94%	88.24%

Table 29.7 ILL is under the Auspices of another Department

	No Answer	Yes	No
Entire Sample	8.82%	14.71%	76.47%

Table 30: Interlibrary loan is under auspices of which department(s)? Broken out by Country

Table 30.1 ILL is under the Auspices of the Reference Department

Country	No Answer	Yes	No
United States	6.67%	15.00%	78.33%
Other	25.00%	0.00%	75.00%

Table 30.2 ILL is under the Auspices of the Circulation Department

Country	No Answer	Yes	No
United States	6.67%	16.67%	76.67%
Other	25.00%	0.00%	75.00%

Table 30.3 ILL is under the Auspices of the Access Services Department

Country	No Answer	Yes	No
United States	6.67%	36.67%	56.67%
Other	25.00%	0.00%	75.00%

Table 30.4 ILL is under the Auspices of the Document Delivery Services Department

Country	No Answer	Yes	No
United States	6.67%	6.67%	86.67%
Other	25.00%	62.50%	12.50%

Table 30.5 ILL is under the Auspices of the Technical Services Department

Country	No Answer	Yes	No
United States	6.67%	16.67%	76.67%
Other	25.00%	12.50%	62.50%

Table 30.6 ILL is under the Auspices of the Collection Development Department

Country	No Answer	Yes	No
United States	6.67%	3.33%	90.00%
Other	25.00%	0.00%	75.00%

Table 30.7 ILL is under the Auspices of another Department

Country	No Answer	Yes	No
United States	6.67%	16.67%	76.67%
Other	25.00%	0.00%	75.00%

Table 31: Interlibrary loan is under auspices of which department(s)? Broken out by Total Student Enrollment

Table 31.1 ILL is under the Auspices of the Reference Department

Total Student Enrollment	No Answer	Yes	No
Less than 2,500	4.55%	18.18%	77.27%
2,500 to 7,500	4.76%	23.81%	71.43%
More than 7,500	16.00%	0.00%	84.00%

Table 31.2 ILL is under the Auspices of the Circulation Department

Total Student Enrollment	No Answer	Yes	No
Less than 2,500	4.55%	22.73%	72.73%
2,500 to 7,500	4.76%	14.29%	80.95%
More than 7,500	16.00%	8.00%	76.00%

Table 31.3 ILL is under the Auspices of the Access Services Department

Total Student Enrollment	No Answer	Yes	No
Less than 2,500	4.55%	22.73%	72.73%
2,500 to 7,500	4.76%	33.33%	61.90%
More than 7,500	16.00%	40.00%	44.00%

Table 31.4 ILL is under the Auspices of the Document Delivery Services Department

Total Student Enrollment	No Answer	Yes	No
Less than 2,500	4.55%	13.64%	81.82%
2,500 to 7,500	4.76%	9.52%	85.71%
More than 7,500	16.00%	16.00%	68.00%

Table 31.5 ILL is under the Auspices of the Technical Services Department

Total Student Enrollment	No Answer	Yes	No
Less than 2,500	4.55%	13.64%	81.82%
2,500 to 7,500	4.76%	23.81%	71.43%
More than 7,500	16.00%	12.00%	72.00%

Table 31.6 ILL is under the Auspices of the Collection Development Department

Total Student Enrollment	No Answer	Yes	No
Less than 2,500	4.55%	0.00%	95.45%
2,500 to 7,500	4.76%	9.52%	85.71%
More than 7,500	16.00%	0.00%	84.00%

Table 31.7 ILL is under the Auspices of another Department

Total Student Enrollment	No Answer	Yes	No
Less than 2,500	4.55%	18.18%	77.27%
2,500 to 7,500	4.76%	19.05%	76.19%
More than 7,500	16.00%	8.00%	76.00%

Table 32: Interlibrary loan is under auspices of which department(s). Broken out by Public or Private Status

Table 32.1 ILL is under the Auspices of the Reference Department

Public or Private Status	No Answer	Yes	No
Public	8.11%	8.11%	83.78%
Private	9.68%	19.35%	70.97%

Table 32.2 ILL is under the Auspices of the Circulation Department

Public or Private Status	No Answer	Yes	No
Public	8.11%	13.51%	78.38%
Private	9.68%	16.13%	74.19%

Table 32.3 ILL is under the Auspices of the Access Services Department

Public or Private Status	No Answer	Yes	No
Public	8.11%	35.14%	56.76%
Private	9.68%	29.03%	61.29%

Table 32.4 ILL is under the Auspices of the Document Delivery Services Department

Public or Private Status	No Answer	Yes	No
Public	8.11%	13.51%	78.38%
Private	9.68%	12.90%	77.42%

Table 32.5 ILL is under the Auspices of the Technical Services Department

Public or Private Status	No Answer	Yes	No
Public	8.11%	18.92%	72.97%
Private	9.68%	12.90%	77.42%

Table 32.6 ILL is under the Auspices of the Collection Development

Public or Private Status	No Answer	Yes	No
Public	8.11%	0.00%	91.89%
Private	9.68%	6.45%	83.87%

Table 32.7 ILL is under the Auspices of another Department

Public or Private Status	No Answer	Yes	No
Public	8.11%	13.51%	78.38%
Private	9.68%	16.13%	74.19%

Table 33: Interlibrary loan is under auspices of which department(s)? Broken out by Carnegie Class

Table 33.1 ILL is under the Auspices of the Reference Department

Carnegie Class	No Answer	Yes	No
Community College	0.00%	33.33%	66.67%
4-Year College	4.55%	18.18%	77.27%
MA or PHD Granting College	8.33%	8.33%	83.33%
Research University	23.08%	0.00%	76.92%

Table 33.2 ILL is under the Auspices of the Circulation Department

Carnegie Class	No Answer	Yes	No
Community College	0.00%	22.22%	77.78%
4-Year College	4.55%	13.64%	81.82%
MA or PHD Granting College	8.33%	16.67%	75.00%
Research University	23.08%	7.69%	69.23%

Table 33.3 ILL is under the Auspices of the Access Services Department

Carnegie Class	No Answer	Yes	No
Community College	0.00%	11.11%	88.89%
4-Year College	4.55%	36.36%	59.09%
MA or PHD Granting College	8.33%	33.33%	58.33%
Research University	23.08%	38.46%	38.46%

Table 33.4 ILL is under the Auspices of the Document Delivery Services Department

Carnegie Class	No Answer	Yes	No
Community College	0.00%	0.00%	100.00%
4-Year College	4.55%	27.27%	68.18%
MA or PHD Granting College	8.33%	8.33%	83.33%
Research University	23.08%	7.69%	69.23%

Table 33.5 ILL is under the Auspices of the Technical Services Department

Carnegie Class	No Answer	Yes	No
Community College	0.00%	33.33%	66.67%
4-Year College	4.55%	18.18%	77.27%
MA or PHD Granting College	8.33%	8.33%	83.33%
Research University	23.08%	15.38%	61.54%

Table 33.6 ILL is under the Auspices of the Collection Development Department

Carnegie Class	No Answer	Yes	No
Community College	0.00%	0.00%	100.00%
4-Year College	4.55%	9.09%	86.36%
MA or PHD Granting College	8.33%	0.00%	91.67%
Research University	23.08%	0.00%	76.92%

Table 33.7 ILL is under the Auspices of the another Department

Carnegie Class	No Answer	Yes	No
Community College	0.00%	11.11%	88.89%
4-Year College	4.55%	13.64%	81.82%
MA or PHD Granting College	8.33%	20.83%	70.83%
Research University	23.08%	7.69%	69.23%

Table 34: Document delivery/electronic document delivery is under the auspices of which department(s)?

Table 34.1 Document Delivery is under the Auspices of the Reference Department

	No Answer	Yes	No
Entire Sample	8.82%	8.82%	82.35%

Table 34.2 Document Delivery is under the Auspices of the Circulation Department

	No Answer	Yes	No
Entire Sample	8.82%	16.18%	75.00%

Table 34.3 Document Delivery is under the Auspices of the Access Services Department

	No Answer	Yes	No
Entire Sample	8.82%	27.94%	63.24%

Table 34.4 Document Delivery is under the Auspices of the Document Delivery Services Department

	No Answer	Yes	No
Entire Sample	8.82%	13.24%	77.94%

Table 34.5 Document Delivery is under the Auspices of the Technical Services Department

	No Answer	Yes	No
Entire Sample	8.82%	10.29%	80.88%

Table 34.6 Document Delivery is under the Auspices of the Collection Development Department

	No Answer	Yes	No
Entire Sample	8.82%	1.47%	89.71%

Table 34.7 Document Delivery is under the Auspices of another Department

	No Answer	Yes	No
Entire Sample	8.82%	17.65%	73.53%

Table 35: Document delivery/electronic document delivery is under the auspices of which department(s)? Broken out by Country

Table 35.1 Document Delivery is under the Auspices of the Reference Department

Country	No Answer	Yes	No
United States	6.67%	10.00%	83.33%
Other	25.00%	0.00%	75.00%

Table 35.2 Document Delivery is under the Auspices of the Circulation Department

Country	No Answer	Yes	No
United States	6.67%	16.67%	76.67%
Other	25.00%	12.50%	62.50%

Table 35.3 Document Delivery is under the Auspices of the Access Services Department

Country	No Answer	Yes	No
United States	6.67%	31.67%	61.67%
Other	25.00%	0.00%	75.00%

Table 35.4 Document Delivery is under the Auspices of the Document Delivery Services Department

Country	No Answer	Yes	No
United States	6.67%	8.33%	85.00%
Other	25.00%	50.00%	25.00%

Table 35.5 Document Delivery is under the Auspices of the Technical Services Department

Country	No Answer	Yes	No
United States	6.67%	11.67%	81.67%
Other	25.00%	0.00%	75.00%

Table 35.6 Document Delivery is under the Auspices of the Collection Development Department

Country	No Answer	Yes	No
United States	6.67%	1.67%	91.67%
Other	25.00%	0.00%	75.00%

Table 35.7 Document Delivery is under the Auspices of the another Department

Country	No Answer	Yes	No
United States	6.67%	20.00%	73.33%
Other	25.00%	0.00%	75.00%

Table 36: Document delivery/electronic document delivery is under the auspices of which department(s)? Broken out by Total Student Enrollment

Table 36.1 Document Delivery is under the Auspices of the Reference Department

Total Student Enrollment	No Answer	Yes	No
Less than 2,500	4.55%	18.18%	77.27%
2,500 to 7,500	4.76%	9.52%	85.71%
More than 7,500	16.00%	0.00%	84.00%

Table 36.2 Document Delivery is under the Auspices of the Circulation Department

Total Student Enrollment	No Answer	Yes	No
Less than 2,500	4.55%	22.73%	72.73%
2,500 to 7,500	4.76%	14.29%	80.95%
More than 7,500	16.00%	12.00%	72.00%

Table 36.3 Document Delivery is under the Auspices of the Access Services Department

Total Student Enrollment	No Answer	Yes	No
Less than 2,500	4.55%	9.09%	86.36%
2,500 to 7,500	4.76%	33.33%	61.90%
More than 7,500	16.00%	40.00%	44.00%

Table 36.4 Document Delivery is under the Auspices of the Document Delivery Services Department

Total Student Enrollment	No Answer	Yes	No
Less than 2,500	4.55%	13.64%	81.82%
2,500 to 7,500	4.76%	9.52%	85.71%
More than 7,500	16.00%	16.00%	68.00%

Table 36.5 Document Delivery is under the Auspices of the Technical Services Department

Total Student Enrollment	No Answer	Yes	No
Less than 2,500	4.55%	4.55%	90.91%
2,500 to 7,500	4.76%	19.05%	76.19%
More than 7,500	16.00%	8.00%	76.00%

Table 36.6 Document Delivery is under the Auspices of the Collection Development Department

Total Student Enrollment	No Answer	Yes	No
Less than 2,500	4.55%	0.00%	95.45%
2,500 to 7,500	4.76%	4.76%	90.48%
More than 7,500	16.00%	0.00%	84.00%

Table 36.7 Document Delivery is under the Auspices of another Department

Total Student Enrollment	No Answer	Yes	No
Less than 2,500	4.55%	22.73%	72.73%
2,500 to 7,500	4.76%	19.05%	76.19%
More than 7,500	16.00%	12.00%	72.00%

Table 37: Document delivery/electronic document delivery is under the auspices of which department(s)? Broken out by Public or Private Status

Table 37.1 Document Delivery is under the Auspices of the Reference Department

Public or Private Status	No Answer	Yes	No
Public	8.11%	5.41%	86.49%
Private	9.68%	12.90%	77.42%

Table 37.2 Document Delivery is under the Auspices of the Circulation Department

Public or Private Status	No Answer	Yes	No
Public	8.11%	16.22%	75.68%
Private	9.68%	16.13%	74.19%

Table 37.3 Document Delivery is under the Auspices of the Access Services Department

Public or Private Status	No Answer	Yes	No
Public	8.11%	35.14%	56.76%
Private	9.68%	19.35%	70.97%

Table 37.4 Document Delivery is under the Auspices of the Document Delivery Services Department

Public or Private Status	No Answer	Yes	No
Public	8.11%	10.81%	81.08%
Private	9.68%	16.13%	74.19%

Table 37.5 Document Delivery is under the Auspices of the Technical Services Department

Public or Private Status	No Answer	Yes	No
Public	8.11%	10.81%	81.08%
Private	9.68%	9.68%	80.65%

Table 37.6 Document Delivery is under the Auspices of the Collection Development Department

Public or Private Status	No Answer	Yes	No
Public	8.11%	0.00%	91.89%
Private	9.68%	3.23%	87.10%

Table 37.7 Document Delivery is under the Auspices of another Department

Public or Private Status	No Answer	Yes	No
Public	8.11%	16.22%	75.68%
Private	9.68%	19.35%	70.97%

Table 38: Document delivery/electronic document delivery is under the auspices of which department(s)? Broken out by Carnegie Class

Table 38.1 Document Delivery is under the Auspices of the Reference Department

Carnegie Class	No Answer	Yes	No
Community College	0.00%	22.22%	77.78%
4-Year College	4.55%	13.64%	81.82%
MA or PHD Granting College	8.33%	4.17%	87.50%
Research University	23.08%	0.00%	76.92%

Table 38.2 Document Delivery is under the Auspices of the Circulation Department

Carnegie Class	No Answer	Yes	No
Community College	0.00%	22.22%	77.78%
4-Year College	4.55%	13.64%	81.82%
MA or PHD Granting College	8.33%	16.67%	75.00%
Research University	23.08%	15.38%	61.54%

Table 38.3 Document Delivery is under the Auspices of the Access Services Department

Carnegie Class	No Answer	Yes	No
Community College	0.00%	11.11%	88.89%
4-Year College	4.55%	22.73%	72.73%
MA or PHD Granting College	8.33%	33.33%	58.33%
Research University	23.08%	38.46%	38.46%

Table 38.4 Document Delivery is under the Auspices of the Document Delivery Services Department

Carnegie Class	No Answer	Yes	No
Community College	0.00%	0.00%	100.00%
4-Year College	4.55%	27.27%	68.18%
MA or PHD Granting College	8.33%	8.33%	83.33%
Research University	23.08%	7.69%	69.23%

Table 38.5 Document Delivery is under the Auspices of the Technical Services Department

Carnegie Class	No Answer	Yes	No
Community College	0.00%	22.22%	77.78%
4-Year College	4.55%	13.64%	81.82%
MA or PHD Granting College	8.33%	8.33%	83.33%
Research University	23.08%	0.00%	76.92%

Table 38.6 Document Delivery is under the Auspices of the Collection Development Department

Carnegie Class	No Answer	Yes	No
Community College	0.00%	0.00%	100.00%
4-Year College	4.55%	4.55%	90.91%
MA or PHD Granting College	8.33%	0.00%	91.67%
Research University	23.08%	0.00%	76.92%

Table 38.7 Document Delivery is under the Auspices of another Department

Carnegie Class	No Answer	Yes	No
Community College	0.00%	11.11%	88.89%
4-Year College	4.55%	18.18%	77.27%
MA or PHD Granting College	8.33%	20.83%	70.83%
Research University	23.08%	15.38%	61.54%

Has the use of ILL automation changed over the last 5 years? Please explain and describe the effect it has had on workflows and staffing.

1. No change in 5 years
2. Not really. We've been using Ariel, Odyssey, Clio, and DocMorph for over 10 years. We've used OCLC for over 20 years. Changes to workflow and work burden have come from the greater use of e-journals and the restrictive licensing most have. I have to search three times longer to find libraries with print sources or with licensing agreements for e-journal ILL.
3. Yes. We have ILLiad and it greatly automates our ILL and Document Delivery processes. We have lost 2 positions due to budget constraints. Automation has made it a little easier.
4. Big time. We now use ILLiad 8.2 as opposed to III WCRS. Workflows have been improved exceptionally and one staff member has been able to handle the increase in requests (1800 to 4000 per year).
5. Use some additional ILL automation products has taken place in the past five years. We first used Ariel and now Odyssey. They have not changed staffing greatly. Workflows require attention to these technologies for incoming and outgoing requests.
6. Much better use of scanners and ILLiad
7. The library acquired ILLiad in 2005. ILLiad has improved service and workflow for both staff and patrons.
8. It hasn't changed over the last 5 years
9. Newer and better equipment (scanners, computers) do a quicker more efficient job
10. The ability to scan microfilm was the impetus for our starting a document delivery service for our faculty and students. The film is scanned by work-study students who staff the Microforms 11. Desk and they e-mail the PDF to Interlibrary Loan and then deliver it seamlessly and electronically to our patrons.
12. No longer using Ariel - switching to Odyssey
13. Change in database (ILLiad/RAPID)
14. No, we have been automated much longer
15. We just started scanning our print journal articles for our students this year
16. No change
17. The main change has been desktop delivery of journal articles. At present the British Library is undergoing a system change which is causing problems whilst two systems are running together. Hopefully we will end up with a much more efficient system both for requesting and fulfilling.
18. We moved to ILLiad in 2010, and the change has been dramatic: requests are cleaner requiring less bib verification, e-delivery through Odyssey is a snap, email file attachments are processed through Odyssey using OCLC FTP, and Ariel and Odyssey have been blending into one Remote Desktop Application for very easy "pulling" of both Ariel delivered e files and Odyssey e files. ILLiad has allowed us to split Lending out to the holding campus; Central ILL staff simply route the request to the proper campus NVTGC and that NVTGC campus staff do Lending. Borrowing is a little more centralized, starting 10/12 so that we can get our Borrowed ILLs into our circ module and track them better, so we "blend" Odyssey and a "magic app" designed by Lewis and Clark's Access Services staff.
19. No
20. Simplified. Number of staff involved decreased.
21. We have 2 staff members doing the ILL/DD, which has not changed in 5 years. We have an online request system however the processing of actual requests still requires the current staff as we have a 60/40% split in loan/copy requests which has remained static in the last 5 years.
22. We have a much better scanner now with software that automatically crops and cleans up the pages, sends the article and updates our ILLiad/OCLC
23. We started using ILLiad in 2009. Electronic Direct Delivery via Odyssey has significantly reduced the number of requests to be handled by staff.
24. No
25. When we migrated from a "home grown library system" 3 years ago the new system had no ILL component, so I use an Access program to record stats - so basically the workload has increased

26. We are a small library of six people. One person handles the ILL functions (in addition to several other duties) using both our local ILS and WorldCat.
27. E-mail delivery, article exchange and OCLC label printing have all made the process simpler and quicker. Being a small school we have had only one staff person for ILL.
28. We started using Odyssey this year and it saves a little time
29. No change
30. In April 2011 we went from a paper-based system to ILLiad. Everything changed.
31. State changed software and reconfigured state-wide offices. ILL process is now done by librarian instead of staff person.
32. We are finding and taking advantage of the available options for electronic delivery services
33. More electronic journal article delivery, less requests for books
34. More electronic delivery of documents
35. Adopted use of ILLiad which improved efficiency
36. Has not changed perceptively
37. Large format scanner and continuous document feed. Both devices have improved response rate and ability to loan more materials.
38. The opposite has happened. Our staffing was reduced. What was once a full-time position is now a part-time position, and our ILL librarian must fulfil the duties of a full-time position in half the time. There has been improvement, but only to salvage time.
39. We now have the stand alone Odyssey whereas before we only had Ariel. Odyssey helps us to send articles electronically whereas we can only print out Ariel articles. It has changed the workflow but not the staffing. Workflow change means less paper and more time at the computer sending emails with attachments.
40. Automediation of requests was implemented in 2007; complex requests have been handled in a more timely fashion as automediaiton has made staff time available
41. Same staff, but we mostly borrow articles and send them to students by email
42. Yes - Ariel has gone from heavy use to almost non-existent use. Now most document requests are sent via email instead. This is actually easier/preferable.
43. OCLC WorldCat Sharing has sped up the whole process and workflow through the various ILL functions it offers. SILO (the state library interlibrary loan system) is easy to use and also speedy in delivering requests for loans. One librarian here takes care of all ILL requests both borrowing and lending.
44. More efficient use of staff time
45. Not really changed. Using OCLC and a homemade, Excel spreadsheet stat tracking system.
46. More scanning, less photocopying
47. New software has changed workflow. No change to staffing.
48. Article exchange and patron-initiated requests have increased the amount of borrowing a great deal, but the work has only increased some
49. No
50. No
51. Very much so. In the last 5 years, we've implemented Odyssey, BScan ILL and two Bookeye scanners, have done away with paper overdue notices have implemented ILLiad Lending Web and no longer accept requests via phone, fax, mail, or email. We have seen greater efficiencies with these steps, and have been able to cut full time staff in the ILL unit by 2 FTE. Much of the work has been simplified by these changes, and pushed down to the student worker level.
52. Much more electronically-based. We have invested in new software and programs to allow for easier scanning and sharing of documents electronically.
53. ILL is part of Research and Collection Services. Increase automation Rapid ILL, links direct to articles.
54. Use of file servers such as Article Exchange, Dropbox, YouSendIt. No real change in workflow and staffing. Users appreciate access to larger files. The few that have requested Dropbox appreciated having their research in one place.
55. We have been using ILLiad for over five years, but improvements in the software have streamlined processes, RapidILL has improved turnaround time. No staff had been added, student assistants have increased.

56. Yes, we moved from using Voyager ILL system (CLIO) to ILLiad; moving from an email record for submitted requests, to a request in ILLiad - as a formatted database record. This has improved our control and ability to become nearly paperless. Staffing has decreased as we are able to easily provide semi-automated notices about requests we could not fill or are available from our e-resources. It also has allowed us to go from a centralized single access for processing requests, to a distributed system.

57. Biggest change is the rapid decline of Ariel, rapid increase in use of Rapid, OCLC Article Exchange and DOCLINE

CHAPTER 7: SYSTEMS

Table 39: Which of the automated systems does your ILL document delivery/electronic document delivery operation(s) use?

Table 39.1 Our Document Delivery Operation Uses OCLC's Illiad

	No Answer	Yes	No
Entire Sample	11.76%	36.76%	51.47%

Table 39.2 Our Document Delivery Operation Uses OCLC ILL Subsystem

	No Answer	Yes	No
Entire Sample	11.76%	26.47%	61.76%

Table 39.3 Our Document Delivery Operation Uses OCLC's Odyssey

	No Answer	Yes	No
Entire Sample	11.76%	32.35%	55.88%

Table 39.4 Our Document Delivery Operation Uses OCLC Article Exchange

	No Answer	Yes	No
Entire Sample	11.76%	41.18%	47.06%

Table 39.5 Our Document Delivery Operation Uses Ariel

	No Answer	Yes	No
Entire Sample	11.76%	39.71%	48.53%

Table 39.6 Our Document Delivery Operation Uses DOCLINE

	No Answer	Yes	No
Entire Sample	11.76%	16.18%	72.06%

Table 39.7 Our Document Delivery Operation Uses WorldCat Local

	No Answer	Yes	No
Entire Sample	11.76%	19.12%	69.12%

Table 39.8 Our Document Delivery Operation Uses Link Resolvers

	No Answer	Yes	No
Entire Sample	11.76%	20.59%	67.65%

Table 39.9 Our Document Delivery Operation Uses OCLC's E-Serials Holdings

	No Answer	Yes	No
Entire Sample	11.76%	7.35%	80.88%

Table 40: Which of the automated systems does your ILL document delivery/electronic document delivery operation(s) use? Broken out by Country

Table 40.1 Our Document Delivery Operation Uses OCLC's Illiad

Country	No Answer	Yes	No
United States	10.00%	41.67%	48.33%
Other	25.00%	0.00%	75.00%

Table 40.2 Our Document Delivery Operation Uses OCLC ILL Subsystem

Country	No Answer	Yes	No
United States	10.00%	28.33%	61.67%
Other	25.00%	12.50%	62.50%

Table 40.3 Our Document Delivery Operation Uses OCLC's Odyssey

Country	No Answer	Yes	No
United States	10.00%	36.67%	53.33%
Other	25.00%	0.00%	75.00%

Table 40.4 Our Document Delivery Operation Uses OCLC Article Exchange

Country	No Answer	Yes	No
United States	10.00%	46.67%	43.33%
Other	25.00%	0.00%	75.00%

Table 40.5 Our Document Delivery Operation Uses Ariel

Country	No Answer	Yes	No
United States	10.00%	40.00%	50.00%
Other	25.00%	37.50%	37.50%

Table 40.6 Our Document Delivery Operation Uses DOCLINE

Country	No Answer	Yes	No
United States	10.00%	16.67%	73.33%
Other	25.00%	12.50%	62.50%

Table 40.7 Our Document Delivery Operation Uses WorldCat Local

Country	No Answer	Yes	No
United States	10.00%	21.67%	68.33%
Other	25.00%	0.00%	75.00%

Table 40.8 Our Document Delivery Operation Uses Link Resolvers

Country	No Answer	Yes	No
United States	10.00%	20.00%	70.00%
Other	25.00%	25.00%	50.00%

Table 40.9 Our Document Delivery Operation Uses OCLC's E-Serials Holdings

Country	No Answer	Yes	No
United States	10.00%	8.33%	81.67%
Other	25.00%	0.00%	75.00%

Table 41: Which of the automated systems does your ILL document delivery/electronic document delivery operation(s) use? Broken out by Total Student Enrollment**Table 41.1 Our Document Delivery Operation Uses OCLC's Illiad**

Total Student Enrollment	No Answer	Yes	No
Less than 2,500	4.55%	9.09%	86.36%
2,500 to 7,500	9.52%	47.62%	42.86%
More than 7,500	20.00%	52.00%	28.00%

Table 41.2 Our Document Delivery Operation Uses OCLC ILL Subsystem

Total Student Enrollment	No Answer	Yes	No
Less than 2,500	4.55%	36.36%	59.09%
2,500 to 7,500	9.52%	33.33%	57.14%
More than 7,500	20.00%	12.00%	68.00%

Table 41.3 Our Document Delivery Operation Uses OCLC's Odyssey

Total Student Enrollment	No Answer	Yes	No
Less than 2,500	4.55%	22.73%	72.73%
2,500 to 7,500	9.52%	38.10%	52.38%
More than 7,500	20.00%	36.00%	44.00%

Table 41.4 Our Document Delivery Operation Uses OCLC Article Exchange

Total Student Enrollment	No Answer	Yes	No
Less than 2,500	4.55%	31.82%	63.64%
2,500 to 7,500	9.52%	57.14%	33.33%
More than 7,500	20.00%	36.00%	44.00%

Table 41.5 Our Document Delivery Operation Uses Ariel

Total Student Enrollment	No Answer	Yes	No
Less than 2,500	4.55%	36.36%	59.09%
2,500 to 7,500	9.52%	42.86%	47.62%
More than 7,500	20.00%	40.00%	40.00%

Table 41.6 Our Document Delivery Operation Uses DOCLINE

Total Student Enrollment	No Answer	Yes	No
Less than 2,500	4.55%	9.09%	86.36%
2,500 to 7,500	9.52%	14.29%	76.19%
More than 7,500	20.00%	24.00%	56.00%

Table 41.7 Our Document Delivery Operation Uses WorldCat Local

Total Student Enrollment	No Answer	Yes	No
Less than 2,500	4.55%	18.18%	77.27%
2,500 to 7,500	9.52%	28.57%	61.90%
More than 7,500	20.00%	12.00%	68.00%

Table 41.8 Our Document Delivery Operation Uses Link Resolvers

Total Student Enrollment	No Answer	Yes	No
Less than 2,500	4.55%	4.55%	90.91%
2,500 to 7,500	9.52%	19.05%	71.43%
More than 7,500	20.00%	36.00%	44.00%

Table 41.9 Our Document Delivery Operation Uses OCLC's E-Serials Holdings

Total Student Enrollment	No Answer	Yes	No
Less than 2,500	4.55%	9.09%	86.36%
2,500 to 7,500	9.52%	14.29%	76.19%
More than 7,500	20.00%	0.00%	80.00%

Table 42: Which of the automated systems does your ILL document delivery/electronic document delivery operation(s) use? Broken out by Public or Private Status

Table 42.1 Our Document Delivery Operation Uses OCLC's Illiad

Public or Private Status	No Answer	Yes	No
Public	10.81%	48.65%	40.54%
Private	12.90%	22.58%	64.52%

Table 42.2 Our Document Delivery Operation Uses OCLC ILL Subsystem

Public or Private Status	No Answer	Yes	No
Public	10.81%	24.32%	64.86%
Private	12.90%	29.03%	58.06%

Table 42.3 Our Document Delivery Operation Uses OCLC's Odyssey

Public or Private Status	No Answer	Yes	No
Public	10.81%	35.14%	54.05%
Private	12.90%	29.03%	58.06%

Table 42.4 Our Document Delivery Operation Uses OCLC Article Exchange

Public or Private Status	No Answer	Yes	No
Public	10.81%	43.24%	45.95%
Private	12.90%	38.71%	48.39%

Table 42.5 Our Document Delivery Operation Uses Ariel

Public or Private Status	No Answer	Yes	No
Public	10.81%	45.95%	43.24%
Private	12.90%	32.26%	54.84%

Table 42.6 Our Document Delivery Operation Uses DOCLINE

Public or Private Status	No Answer	Yes	No
Public	10.81%	24.32%	64.86%
Private	12.90%	6.45%	80.65%

Table 42.7 Our Document Delivery Operation Uses WorldCat Local

Public or Private Status	No Answer	Yes	No
Public	10.81%	18.92%	70.27%
Private	12.90%	19.35%	67.74%

Table 42.8 Our Document Delivery Operation Uses Link Resolvers

Public or Private Status	No Answer	Yes	No
Public	10.81%	29.73%	59.46%
Private	12.90%	9.68%	77.42%

Table 42.9 Our Document Delivery Operation Uses OCLC's E-Serials Holdings

Public or Private Status	No Answer	Yes	No
Public	10.81%	0.00%	89.19%
Private	12.90%	16.13%	70.97%

Table 43: Which of the automated systems does your ILL document delivery/electronic document delivery operation(s) use? Broken out by Carnegie Class

Table 43.1 Our Document Delivery Operation Uses OCLC's Illiad

Carnegie Class	No Answer	Yes	No
Community College	11.11%	22.22%	66.67%
4-Year College	4.55%	31.82%	63.64%
MA or PHD Granting College	12.50%	41.67%	45.83%
Research University	23.08%	46.15%	30.77%

Table 43.2 Our Document Delivery Operation Uses OCLC ILL Subsystem

Carnegie Class	No Answer	Yes	No
Community College	11.11%	55.56%	33.33%
4-Year College	4.55%	27.27%	68.18%
MA or PHD Granting College	12.50%	20.83%	66.67%
Research University	23.08%	15.38%	61.54%

Table 43.3 Our Document Delivery Operation Uses OCLC's Odyssey

Carnegie Class	No Answer	Yes	No
Community College	11.11%	22.22%	66.67%
4-Year College	4.55%	36.36%	59.09%
MA or PHD Granting College	12.50%	37.50%	50.00%
Research University	23.08%	23.08%	53.85%

Table 43.4 Our Document Delivery Operation Uses OCLC Article Exchange

Carnegie Class	No Answer	Yes	No
Community College	11.11%	55.56%	33.33%
4-Year College	4.55%	36.36%	59.09%
MA or PHD Granting College	12.50%	41.67%	45.83%
Research University	23.08%	38.46%	38.46%

Table 43.5 Our Document Delivery Operation Uses Ariel

Carnegie Class	No Answer	Yes	No
Community College	11.11%	33.33%	55.56%
4-Year College	4.55%	31.82%	63.64%
MA or PHD Granting College	12.50%	45.83%	41.67%
Research University	23.08%	46.15%	30.77%

Table 43.6 Our Document Delivery Operation Uses DOCLINE

Carnegie Class	No Answer	Yes	No
Community College	11.11%	0.00%	88.89%
4-Year College	4.55%	0.00%	95.45%
MA or PHD Granting College	12.50%	20.83%	66.67%
Research University	23.08%	46.15%	30.77%

Table 43.7 Our Document Delivery Operation Uses WorldCat Local

Carnegie Class	No Answer	Yes	No
Community College	11.11%	11.11%	77.78%
4-Year College	4.55%	18.18%	77.27%
MA or PHD Granting College	12.50%	25.00%	62.50%
Research University	23.08%	15.38%	61.54%

Table 43.8 Our Document Delivery Operation Uses Link Resolvers

Carnegie Class	No Answer	Yes	No
Community College	11.11%	0.00%	88.89%
4-Year College	4.55%	13.64%	81.82%
MA or PHD Granting College	12.50%	25.00%	62.50%
Research University	23.08%	38.46%	38.46%

Table 43.9 Our Document Delivery Operation Uses OCLC's E-Serials Holdings

Carnegie Class	No Answer	Yes	No
Community College	11.11%	0.00%	88.89%
4-Year College	4.55%	13.64%	81.82%
MA or PHD Granting College	12.50%	8.33%	79.17%
Research University	23.08%	0.00%	76.92%

What other automated systems does your ILL document delivery operation use?

1. Voyager ILL/Clio
2. Rapid
3. We use ARTemail to send our requests to the British Library
4. A "magic app," designed by Lewis and Clark College's Access Services staff, which imports mini bib records from ILLiad into Millennium, allowing us to place Millennium holds, which check-in/out of Millennium and handles overdue items and fines. YAY!
5. ARTemail
6. BSCAN software
7. WorldCat Resource Sharing
8. AGENT through our State library
9. Email attachment
10. Rapid, Relais
11. VDX
12. CLIO
13. FirstSearch
14. Relais FTP
15. CLIO
16. RapidILL, OCLC Knowledge Base
17. YouSendIt, Dropbox
18. Will be discontinuing use of Ariel in November 2012

Table 44.1: Has your library ever tried to negotiate broader license terms for institutional and patron use of your digital collections, specifically for interlibrary loan and e-reserve use?

	No Answer	Yes	No
Entire Sample	13.24%	33.82%	52.94%

**Table 44.2: Has your library ever tried to negotiate broader license terms for institutional and patron use of your digital collections, specifically for interlibrary loan and e-reserve use?
Broken out by Country**

Country	No Answer	Yes	No
United States	11.67%	33.33%	55.00%
Other	25.00%	37.50%	37.50%

**Table 44.3: Has your library ever tried to negotiate broader license terms for institutional and patron use of your digital collections, specifically for interlibrary loan and e-reserve use?
Broken out by Total Student Enrollment**

Total Student Enrollment	No Answer	Yes	No
Less than 2,500	9.09%	31.82%	59.09%
2,500 to 7,500	9.52%	19.05%	71.43%
More than 7,500	20.00%	48.00%	32.00%

**Table 44.4: Has your library ever tried to negotiate broader license terms for institutional and patron use of your digital collections, specifically for interlibrary loan and e-reserve use?
Broken out by Public or Private Status**

Public or Private Status	No Answer	Yes	No
Public	10.81%	40.54%	48.65%
Private	16.13%	25.81%	58.06%

Table 44.5: Has your library ever tried to negotiate broader license terms for institutional and patron use of your digital collections, specifically for interlibrary loan and e-reserve use? Broken out by Carnegie Class

Carnegie Class	No Answer	Yes	No
Community College	11.11%	22.22%	66.67%
4-Year College	9.09%	31.82%	59.09%
MA or PHD Granting College	12.50%	20.83%	66.67%
Research University	23.08%	69.23%	7.69%

CHAPTER 8: WORKFLOW STUDIES

Table 45.1: Has your ILL/DD/EDD unit performed workflow studies to review practices and staffing?

	No Answer	Yes	No
Entire Sample	11.76%	23.53%	64.71%

Table 45.2: Has your ILL/DD/EDD unit performed workflow studies to review practices and staffing? Broken out by Country

Country	No Answer	Yes	No
United States	10.00%	20.00%	70.00%
Other	25.00%	50.00%	25.00%

Table 45.3: Has your ILL/DD/EDD unit performed workflow studies to review practices and staffing? Broken out by Total Student Enrollment

Total Student Enrollment	No Answer	Yes	No
Less than 2,500	4.55%	4.55%	90.91%
2,500 to 7,500	9.52%	23.81%	66.67%
More than 7,500	20.00%	40.00%	40.00%

Table 45.4: Has your ILL/DD/EDD unit performed workflow studies to review practices and staffing? Broken out by Public or Private Status

Public or Private Status	No Answer	Yes	No
Public	10.81%	35.14%	54.05%
Private	12.90%	9.68%	77.42%

Table 45.5: Has your ILL/DD/EDD unit performed workflow studies to review practices and staffing? Broken out by Carnegie Class

Carnegie Class	No Answer	Yes	No
Community College	11.11%	22.22%	66.67%
4-Year College	4.55%	18.18%	77.27%
MA or PHD Granting College	12.50%	25.00%	62.50%
Research University	23.08%	30.77%	46.15%

If the library has performed workflow studies for ILL, please describe the purposes of the studies, and outline what changes resulted from them.

1. No studies performed
2. Due to staffing shortages, we have had to review our workflow. We have created routing rules within ILLiad and used other tools to save staff time.
3. Ways to scan and deliver articles more efficiently. Got a face up scanner to assist with this.
4. Informal workflow study led to exploration of ILL management tools resulting in the acquisition of ILLiad in 2005
5. Try to show need for more staff and this has failed because expectations of a digital world run by reference librarians is still the dream
6. We are currently engaged in a Customer Service Excellence project and document delivery is part of this. Although we are conscious of best practice wherever possible, it is hoped that this project will streamline our service even more.
7. We studied two years of campus based borrowing workload: overdue fines, etc, were a pain and hard to get back from students. The switch to putting borrowing bib records in Millennium allows us to streamline and better control the circulation of ILL items. Much less hassle for the ILL Coordinator (me!). We are going to be looking at ways to streamline lending next year.
8. (1) Searching through online catalogues and Google. The aim was to shorten the searching process. We easily find articles on the web and books in our national catalogues. (2) Sharing activities with students that support us one hour per day to get better result from this collaboration. We got it, we could better our turnaround time as suppliers.
3. A year after we implemented ILLiad we conducted an ILLiad patron satisfaction survey. We received overwhelmingly positive feedback, and so we strive to maintain personal attention to our patrons' ILL needs.
10. Since we have been down a borrowing position for three years we had to examine workflow in borrowing, where we could have more assistance from student employees, where we could borrow employees from other departments, where lending staff could contribute time to borrowing process. ILL staff also contributes eight hours per person per week to staffing the reference desk, two staff members also have responsibilities in the Electronic Reserves processing. We are taking on additional responsibilities without any increasing in staffing.
11. Reorganized ILL, shifted workload to evening and nights
12. In process - time saving measures. There has been a dramatic decrease in staff time devoted to ILL, and our work needs to reflect that.
13. A staff member's leave of absence necessitated a review of workflow. This resulted in the elimination of most paper files reducing the amount of time required to handle each request. At this point, we are operating without having hired a contract position to fill the LOA and are managing the daily workload. Vacations and illness may compromise our ability to deliver.
14. Managing staff and workflow
15. To see if the existing staff complement would be able to absorb the work of the integration of another branch that was closing
16. We're looking at this now. We use Ariel and DOCLINE and are considering ILLiad.
17. Changes to what we can lend
18. Allowing temporary barcodes for ILL items in our ILS system. The purpose was to put all patron accounts in one place rather than scattered over three separate systems. Result is higher patron satisfaction with services.

CHAPTER 9: PERSONNEL**Table 46.1: What is the total number of FTE positions in your ILL/DD/EDD staff?**

	Mean	Median	Minimum	Maximum
Entire Sample	2.49	1.50	0.00	27.00

Table 46.2: What is the total number of FTE positions in your ILL/DD/EDD staff? Broken out by Country

Country	Mean	Median	Minimum	Maximum
United States	1.94	1.30	0.00	9.00
Other	7.33	4.00	1.00	27.00

Table 46.3: What is the total number of FTE positions in your ILL/DD/EDD staff? Broken out by Total Student Enrollment

Total Student Enrollment	Mean	Median	Minimum	Maximum
Less than 2,500	0.85	1.00	0.00	1.50
2,500 to 7,500	1.76	2.00	0.00	3.25
More than 7,500	4.82	3.50	1.00	27.00

Table 46.4: What is the total number of FTE positions in your ILL/DD/EDD staff? Broken out by Public or Private Status

Public or Private Status	Mean	Median	Minimum	Maximum
Public	2.66	2.00	0.00	9.00
Private	2.27	1.00	0.00	27.00

Table 46.5: What is the total number of FTE positions in your ILL/DD/EDD staff? Broken out by Carnegie Class

Carnegie Class	Mean	Median	Minimum	Maximum
Community College	1.07	1.00	0.00	2.50
4-Year College	1.49	1.00	0.25	4.00
MA or PHD Granting College	3.05	1.80	0.00	27.00
Research University	4.45	4.25	0.50	9.00

Table 47: How many of each of the following do you have on your ILL/DD/EDD staff?

Table 47.1 Full-Time Professionals (MLS) on ILL Staff

	Mean	Median	Minimum	Maximum
Entire Sample	0.42	0.00	0.00	4.00

Table 47.2 Full-Time Non-Professionals on ILL Staff

	Mean	Median	Minimum	Maximum
Entire Sample	1.36	1.00	0.00	6.00

Table 47.3 Part-Time Professionals (MLS/MLIS) on ILL Staff

	Mean	Median	Minimum	Maximum
Entire Sample	0.08	0.00	0.00	1.00

Table 47.4 Part-Time Non-Professionals on ILL Staff

	Mean	Median	Minimum	Maximum
Entire Sample	0.46	0.00	0.00	6.00

Table 47.5 Student Workers on ILL Staff

	Mean	Median	Minimum	Maximum
Entire Sample	2.11	0.50	0.00	20.00

Table 48: How many of each of the following do you have on your ILL/DD/EDD staff? Broken out by Country

Table 48.1 Full-Time Professionals (MLS) on ILL Staff

Country	Mean	Median	Minimum	Maximum
United States	0.39	0.00	0.00	4.00
Other	0.67	0.50	0.00	2.00

Table 48.2 Full-Time Non-Professionals on ILL Staff

Country	Mean	Median	Minimum	Maximum
United States	1.26	1.00	0.00	6.00
Other	2.40	2.00	0.00	6.00

Table 48.3 Part-Time Professionals (MLS/MLIS) on ILL Staff

Country	Mean	Median	Minimum	Maximum
United States	0.07	0.00	0.00	1.00
Other	0.17	0.00	0.00	1.00

Table 48.4 Part-Time Non-Professionals on ILL Staff

Country	Mean	Median	Minimum	Maximum
United States	0.44	0.00	0.00	6.00
Other	0.60	0.00	0.00	3.00

Table 48.5 Student Workers on ILL Staff

Country	Mean	Median	Minimum	Maximum
United States	2.28	0.78	0.00	20.00
Other	0.30	0.00	0.00	1.00

Table 49: How many of each of the following do you have on your ILL/DD/EDD staff? Broken out by Total Student Enrollment

Table 49.1 Full-Time Professionals (MLS) on ILL Staff

Total Student Enrollment	Mean	Median	Minimum	Maximum
Less than 2,500	0.59	0.00	0.00	4.00
2,500 to 7,500	0.31	0.00	0.00	1.00
More than 7,500	0.35	0.00	0.00	2.00

Table 49.2 Full-Time Non-Professional on ILL Staff

Total Student Enrollment	Mean	Median	Minimum	Maximum
Less than 2,500	0.74	1.00	0.00	4.00
2,500 to 7,500	0.96	1.00	0.00	2.00
More than 7,500	2.44	2.00	0.00	6.00

Table 49.3 Part-Time Professionals (MLS/MLIS) on ILL Staff

Total Student Enrollment	Mean	Median	Minimum	Maximum
Less than 2,500	0.10	0.00	0.00	1.00
2,500 to 7,500	0.11	0.00	0.00	1.00
More than 7,500	0.05	0.00	0.00	1.00

Table 49.4 Part-Time Non-Professionals on ILL Staff

Total Student Enrollment	Mean	Median	Minimum	Maximum
Less than 2,500	0.33	0.00	0.00	2.00
2,500 to 7,500	0.43	0.00	0.00	2.00
More than 7,500	0.62	0.00	0.00	6.00

Table 49.5 Student Workers on ILL Staff

Total Student Enrollment	Mean	Median	Minimum	Maximum
Less than 2,500	1.25	0.00	0.00	14.00
2,500 to 7,500	1.24	0.75	0.00	6.00
More than 7,500	3.84	1.00	0.00	20.00

Table 50: How many of each of the following do you have on your ILL/DD/EDD staff? Broken out by Public or Private Status

Table 50.1 Full-Time Professionals (MLS) on ILL Staff

Public or Private Status	Mean	Median	Minimum	Maximum
Public	0.29	0.00	0.00	1.00
Private	0.57	0.00	0.00	4.00

Table 50.2 Full-Time Non-Professionals on ILL Staff

Public or Private Status	Mean	Median	Minimum	Maximum
Public	1.70	1.00	0.00	6.00
Private	0.92	1.00	0.00	4.00

Table 50.3 Part-Time Professionals (MLS/MLIS) on ILL Staff

Public or Private Status	Mean	Median	Minimum	Maximum
Public	0.06	0.00	0.00	1.00
Private	0.11	0.00	0.00	1.00

Table 50.4 Part-Time Non-Professionals on ILL Staff

Public or Private Status	Mean	Median	Minimum	Maximum
Public	0.48	0.00	0.00	6.00
Private	0.43	0.00	0.00	2.00

Table 50.5 Student Workers on ILL Staff

Public or Private Status	Mean	Median	Minimum	Maximum
Public	2.45	0.50	0.00	20.00
Private	1.68	1.00	0.00	14.00

Table 51: How many of each of the following do you have on your ILL/DD/EDD staff? Broken out by Carnegie Class

Table 51.1 Full-Time Professionals (MLS) on ILL Staff

Carnegie Class	Mean	Median	Minimum	Maximum
Community College	0.17	0.00	0.00	1.00
4-Year College	0.40	0.00	0.00	1.00
MA or PHD Granting College	0.70	0.00	0.00	4.00
Research University	0.10	0.00	0.00	1.00

Table 51.2 Full-Time Non-Professionals on ILL Staff

Carnegie Class	Mean	Median	Minimum	Maximum
Community College	0.63	0.50	0.00	2.00
4-Year College	0.95	1.00	0.00	3.00
MA or PHD Granting College	1.10	1.00	0.00	4.00
Research University	3.30	3.50	0.50	6.00

Table 51.3 Part-Time Professionals (MLS/MLIS) on ILL Staff

Carnegie Class	Mean	Median	Minimum	Maximum
Community College	0.13	0.00	0.00	1.00
4-Year College	0.10	0.00	0.00	1.00
MA or PHD Granting College	0.10	0.00	0.00	1.00
Research University	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00

Table 51.4 Part-Time Non-Professionals on ILL Staff

Carnegie Class	Mean	Median	Minimum	Maximum
Community College	0.78	0.00	0.00	6.00
4-Year College	0.24	0.00	0.00	2.00
MA or PHD Granting College	0.66	0.00	0.00	3.00
Research University	0.25	0.00	0.00	2.00

Table 51.5 Student Workers on ILL Staff

Carnegie Class	Mean	Median	Minimum	Maximum
Community College	0.16	0.00	0.00	1.00
4-Year College	1.21	0.00	0.00	6.00
MA or PHD Granting College	2.15	1.00	0.00	15.00
Research University	5.30	1.50	0.00	20.00

Are there any other personnel on your ILL/DD/EDD Staff?

1. 1.67 other personnel
2. Two people are 0.8 ILL and 0.2 reference, one person is 0.2 reference, 0.4 electronic reserves, one person is 0.8 ILL and 0.2 Document Delivery.
3. One position does all work as part of their job, about 20%
4. Another staff member is cross-trained and fills in when needed either when someone is on vacation or there is a large influx of requests

What criteria does your institution use to measure staff productivity? For example, turnaround time, number of requests filled per day, etc.? Please list all that are used.

1. Doesn't measure. If I get bogged down and can't get my work done, we know I have a problem.
2. ILLiad web reports and OCLC statistics
3. Full range of ILLiad web reports. We also use the LibQUAL survey.
4. Turnaround time and requests filled
5. Turnaround time
6. Turnaround time, accuracy with scanning, customer satisfaction
7. Main criteria for us would be patron satisfaction
8. Turnaround time and fill statistics
9. ILLiad record logs/Rapid Record Logs, Database Usage/Downloads
10. None
11. Turnaround time, number of unfilled requests
12. We guarantee our turnaround time in a statement in the service agreement for the library
13. Turnaround time is greatly impacted by our work shifts. All of us also cover the public circulation desk, so we look at requests done per day, articles scanned per day, ILLs placed on Hold shelves each day. Fill rate is not a good metric we have discovered.
14. They do not measure our efficiency in terms of quantity. We have a qualitative performance evaluation.
15. Turnaround time
16. Requests per day
17. We do not measure staff productivity
18. Monthly OCLC usage statistics
19. All requests handled same day
20. We are not overwhelmed by requests. We stay on top of things and make sure that when we leave for the day there are no more than 20 requests in the queue.
21. We try to have incoming requests and items fully processed each workday
22. Fill rates, turnaround time, patron comments
23. Fill rate, turnaround time, customer satisfaction
24. Total lending and borrowing requests
25. Turnaround time, number of items requested, number of items filled, number of unfilled requests, denied time
26. Number of requests filled per month, in various forms, such as, type of item fulfilled, in-state/ out-of-state, reason for decline.
27. I don't believe we are measuring these numbers. We are just looking at our OCLC usage statistics.
28. We do not track activity in any kind of formal way. As long as requests are processed within 24-48 hours, we are more than satisfied with staff productivity.

29. Number of requests filled, both borrowing and lending. Accuracy of delivery of ILL loans & borrowing requests, and speed with which these are done. Satisfaction of institutional borrowers with the fulfillment and speedy delivery of their requests. Number of internal requests that are fulfilled over the whole year.
30. Number of requests per quarter
31. Number or requests handled
32. Accuracy, quality over quantity
33. Turnaround time, number of requests initiated each day
34. We don't. We have a lot of variation in demand from week to week and an average is meaningless.
35. Our lending and borrowing are both so small that this hasn't been necessary. We are reviewing applications and may move to Iliad in the next couple of years.
36. TAT, fill rate, number of incoming requests, number of resends, number of patron calls answered, #number of emails responded to
37. Requests filled
38. Turnaround - if everything done at the end of the day. Nothing left unfinished for the next day.
39. Number of requests per month and turnaround time
40. Turnaround time, requests outstanding
41. Turnaround time, unfilled rate

CHAPTER 10: BUDGETS & FEES

Does your library charge fees for any portion of Interlibrary Loan, Document Delivery, or Electronic Document Delivery? Please explain what fees are charged, and why.

1. Rush fees only
2. No, never
3. Yes, \$15.00 out of state libraries for article requests only
4. No
5. None ever
6. We do not charge any fees to out requesters for items they request. We are a reciprocal library, so we do charge libraries for loans when they charge us.
7. We charge a library if they charge us.
8. We do not charge fees
9. Only if over \$50 for the semester. Eight years and have yet to have to.
10. Library will pay up to \$25 per item. Patron is responsible for amounts over that limit.
11. No
12. We charge for-profit libraries = primarily law firms for articles and books. We charge for articles we lend to libraries with whom we do not have a reciprocal agreement.
13. None
14. No
15. IFM only: we don't charge our own users
16. No fees
17. No. Only for world wide searchers and these are the same as the British Library charges us.
18. We only charge for copyright, and since 2010 no patron has permissioned copyright charges to be added to their library account
19. We charge only some public libraries (IFLA vouchers)
20. None
21. No charge to our patrons as they are limited to PhD students and staff
22. No charge to our patrons to use ILL. For libraries borrowing from us: free reciprocal unless they charge, then fee is \$20.00.
23. We charge \$15.00 for articles or books to non-LVIS libraries
24. Yes, \$8.00 to cover postage and supplies
25. No fee charged unless the loaning library charges a fee to our library
26. Only charge fees when the lending library charges for an item
27. No
28. No
29. We charge reciprocally
30. No
31. No
32. No
33. Only if the cost of a request is more than \$50.00
34. Lending fees to borrowing libraries that we do not have reciprocal agreements
35. Our patrons are charged for any cost over \$50 per quarter
36. No
37. No fees
38. Yes, when a copyright fee or transaction fee exceeds \$35.00, then the customer is consulted and asked to pay the difference. Many requests are cancelled at this point.

39. No fees charged, unless a book is lost or damaged. If the lending library charges for a replacement, then we must pass those fees along to the patron.
40. We charge the same fee we would be charged by the borrower
41. Charges for the purchase of a thesis are passed along to the patron. All other ILL, etc. requests are free.
42. If the lending library charges, we pass the charge onto the student
43. We charge patrons postage costs for physical document delivery (if we must use mail, instead of electronic delivery). We do charge libraries who charge us or who refuse to join reciprocal groups (LVIS, etc) or who refuse to enter into reciprocal contracts with us.
44. No fees are charged for lending or delivery of materials
45. No
46. No, only if a lending library charges us and then we deflect the charges to the student
47. No
48. No
49. No
50. No
51. No
52. No
53. No
54. We charge fees to libraries that charge us, though we prefer reciprocity. We do not charge our patrons.
55. \$5.00 if not LVIS or SOLINE SO6 to cover our costs for non reciprocating libraries
56. No
57. Borrowing: we pass along costs to users. 89% obtained at no cost. Most colleges supply funds to cover faculty research. Lending: \$11.00 charge unless member of LVIS or FreeShare
58. We charge if the other library charges. Charges are passed on to Undergraduate students if the lending library charged; we pay for faculty and graduate students.
59. We only charge our users when we cannot find a free lender - and only order if they are willing to pay the fee. We charge other libraries if they are not reciprocal.
60. No

Table 52.1: What is your current annual budget for ILL DD/EDD operations, excluding staff costs, but including automation, copyright, materials and other operating costs? (In \$US)

	Mean	Median	Minimum	Maximum
Entire Sample	\$30,601.40	\$15,000.00	\$0.00	\$260,000.00

Table 52.2: What is your current annual budget for ILL DD/EDD operations, excluding staff costs, but including automation, copyright, materials and other operating costs? Broken out by Country (in \$US)

Country	Mean	Median	Minimum	Maximum
United States	\$29,241.59	\$8,400.00	\$0.00	\$260,000.00
Other	\$40,573.33	\$25,660.00	\$24,015.00	\$72,045.00

Table 52.3: What is your current annual budget for ILL DD/EDD operations, excluding staff costs, but including automation, copyright, materials and other operating costs? Broken out by Total Student Enrollment (in \$US)

Total Student Enrollment	Mean	Median	Minimum	Maximum
Less than 2,500	\$4,975.71	\$2,500.00	\$0.00	\$24,015.00
2,500 to 7,500	\$26,045.45	\$15,000.00	\$0.00	\$75,000.00
More than 7,500	\$63,386.43	\$25,660.00	\$10,000.00	\$260,000.00

Table 52.4: What is your current annual budget for ILL DD/EDD operations, excluding staff costs, but including automation, copyright, materials and other operating costs? Broken out by Public or Private Status (in \$US)

Public or Private Status	Mean	Median	Minimum	Maximum
Public	\$34,750.59	\$15,000.00	\$0.00	\$260,000.00
Private	\$21,784.38	\$5,400.00	\$0.00	\$72,000.00

Table 52.5: What is your current annual budget for ILL DD/EDD operations, excluding staff costs, but including automation, copyright, materials and other operating costs? Broken out by Carnegie Class (in \$US)

Carnegie Class	Mean	Median	Minimum	Maximum
Community College	\$3,108.33	\$2,050.00	\$0.00	\$10,000.00
4-Year College	\$31,669.17	\$24,507.50	\$0.00	\$72,000.00
MA or PHD Granting College	\$14,932.50	\$15,000.00	\$0.00	\$35,000.00
Research University	\$135,681.67	\$75,000.00	\$72,045.00	\$260,000.00

Table 53.1: What has been the percentage change in your budget over the past year?

	Mean	Median	Minimum	Maximum
Entire Sample	0.59%	0.00%	-15.00%	20.00%

Table 53.2: What has been the percentage change in your budget over the past year? Broken out by Country

Country	Mean	Median	Minimum	Maximum
United States	0.25%	0.00%	-15.00%	20.00%
Other	3.33%	0.00%	0.00%	10.00%

Table 53.3: What has been the percentage change in your budget over the past year? Broken out by Total Student Enrollment

Total Student Enrollment	Mean	Median	Minimum	Maximum
Less than 2,500	-2.25%	0.00%	-15.00%	0.00%
2,500 to 7,500	2.09%	0.00%	-10.00%	20.00%
More than 7,500	1.38%	0.00%	-10.00%	10.00%

Table 53.4: What has been the percentage change in your budget over the past year? Broken out by Public or Private Status

Public or Private Status	Mean	Median	Minimum	Maximum
Public	1.44%	0.00%	-15.00%	20.00%
Private	-1.11%	0.00%	-10.00%	3.00%

Table 53.5: What has been the percentage change in your budget over the past year? Broken out by Carnegie Class

Carnegie Class	Mean	Median	Minimum	Maximum
Community College	-2.50%	0.00%	-15.00%	0.00%
4-Year College	-1.17%	0.00%	-10.00%	3.00%
MA or PHD Granting College	2.55%	0.00%	-3.00%	20.00%
Research University	2.50%	5.00%	-10.00%	10.00%

Table 54.1: What do you expect will be the percentage change in your budget over the next year?

	Mean	Median	Minimum	Maximum
Entire Sample	0.88%	0.00%	-15.00%	20.00%

Table 54.2: What do you expect will be the percentage change in your budget over the next year? Broken out by Country

Country	Mean	Median	Minimum	Maximum
United States	0.98%	0.00%	-15.00%	20.00%
Other	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%

Table 54.3: What do you expect will be the percentage change in your budget over the next year? Broken out by Total Student Enrollment

Total Student Enrollment	Mean	Median	Minimum	Maximum
Less than 2,500	1.07%	0.00%	-10.00%	12.00%
2,500 to 7,500	-1.45%	0.00%	-15.00%	5.00%
More than 7,500	3.88%	0.00%	0.00%	20.00%

Table 54.4: What do you expect will be the percentage change in your budget over the next year? Broken out by Public or Private Status

Public or Private Status	Mean	Median	Minimum	Maximum
Public	0.89%	0.00%	-15.00%	20.00%
Private	0.84%	0.00%	0.00%	7.60%

Table 54.5: What do you expect will be the percentage change in your budget over the next year? Broken out by Carnegie Class

Carnegie Class	Mean	Median	Minimum	Maximum
Community College	0.57%	0.00%	-10.00%	12.00%
4-Year College	1.09%	0.00%	0.00%	7.60%
MA or PHD Granting College	2.09%	0.00%	-15.00%	20.00%
Research University	-3.33%	0.00%	-10.00%	0.00%

Table 55.1: What were total annual fee revenues for ILL/EDD/DD in the past year? (in \$US)

	Mean	Median	Minimum	Maximum
Entire Sample	\$1,918.17	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$25,000.00

Table 55.2: What were total annual fee revenues for ILL/EDD/DD in the past year? Broken out by Country (in \$US)

Country	Mean	Median	Minimum	Maximum
United States	\$1,822.67	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$25,000.00
Other	\$3,207.50	\$3,207.50	\$0.00	\$6,415.00

Table 55.3: What were total annual fee revenues for ILL/EDD/DD in the past year? Broken out by Total Student Enrollment (in \$US)

Total Student Enrollment	Mean	Median	Minimum	Maximum
Less than 2,500	\$93.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$1,000.00
2,500 to 7,500	\$232.89	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$1,296.00
More than 7,500	\$6,551.88	\$500.00	\$0.00	\$25,000.00

Table 55.4: What were total annual fee revenues for ILL/EDD/DD in the past year? Broken out by Public or Private Status (in \$US)

Public or Private Status	Mean	Median	Minimum	Maximum
Public	\$2,672.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$25,000.00
Private	\$684.64	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$6,415.00

Table 55.5: What were total annual fee revenues for ILL/EDD/DD in the past year? Broken out by Carnegie Class (in \$US)

Carnegie Class	Mean	Median	Minimum	Maximum
Community College	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
4-Year College	\$285.71	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$1,000.00
MA or PHD Granting College	\$862.70	\$58.00	\$0.00	\$6,415.00
Research University	\$7,500.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$25,000.00

Table 56.1: Library management expects ILL/DD/EDD services to...?

	No Answer	We don't really charge for document delivery or ILL	Defray some of the cost but definitely less than half	More or less pay for itself exclusive of salaries and overhead
Entire Sample	11.76%	73.53%	10.29%	4.41%

Table 56.2: Library management expects ILL/DD/EDD services to...? Broken out by Country

Country	No Answer	We don't really charge for document delivery or ILL	Defray some of the cost but definitely less than half	More or less pay for itself exclusive of salaries and overhead
United States	10.00%	76.67%	10.00%	3.33%
Other	25.00%	50.00%	12.50%	12.50%

Table 56.3: Library management expects ILL/DD/EDD services to...? Broken out by Total Student Enrollment

Total Student Enrollment	No Answer	We don't really charge for document delivery or ILL	Defray some of the cost but definitely less than half	More or less pay for itself exclusive of salaries and overhead
Less than 2,500	4.55%	81.82%	9.09%	4.55%
2,500 to 7,500	9.52%	80.95%	4.76%	4.76%
More than 7,500	20.00%	60.00%	16.00%	4.00%

Table 56.4: Library management expects ILL/DD/EDD services to...? Broken out by Public or Private Status

Public or Private Status	No Answer	We don't really charge for document delivery or ILL	Defray some of the cost but definitely less than half	More or less pay for itself exclusive of salaries and overhead
Public	10.81%	67.57%	13.51%	8.11%
Private	12.90%	80.65%	6.45%	0.00%

Table 56.5: Library management expects ILL/DD/EDD services to...? Broken out by Carnegie Class

Carnegie Class	No Answer	We don't really charge for document delivery or ILL	Defray some of the cost but definitely less than half	More or less pay for itself exclusive of salaries and overhead
Community College	11.11%	77.78%	0.00%	11.11%
4-Year College	4.55%	81.82%	13.64%	0.00%
MA or PHD Granting College	12.50%	79.17%	4.17%	4.17%
Research University	23.08%	46.15%	23.08%	7.69%

Table 57.1: Does your ILL DD/EDD operation work from “unit costs” in order to determine budget needs and work productivity?

	No Answer	Yes	No
Entire Sample	16.18%	8.82%	75.00%

Table 57.2: Does your ILL DD/EDD operation work from “unit costs” in order to determine budget needs and work productivity? Broken out by Country

Country	No Answer	Yes	No
United States	13.33%	5.00%	81.67%
Other	37.50%	37.50%	25.00%

Table 57.3: Does your ILL DD/EDD operation work from “unit costs” in order to determine budget needs and work productivity? Broken out by Total Student Enrollment

Total Student Enrollment	No Answer	Yes	No
Less than 2,500	4.55%	9.09%	86.36%
2,500 to 7,500	14.29%	4.76%	80.95%
More than 7,500	28.00%	12.00%	60.00%

Table 57.4: Does your ILL DD/EDD operation work from “unit costs” in order to determine budget needs and work productivity? Broken out by Public or Private Status

Public or Private Status	No Answer	Yes	No
Public	18.92%	8.11%	72.97%
Private	12.90%	9.68%	77.42%

Table 57.5: Does your ILL DD/EDD operation work from “unit costs” in order to determine budget needs and work productivity? Broken out by Carnegie Class

Carnegie Class	No Answer	Yes	No
Community College	11.11%	0.00%	88.89%
4-Year College	9.09%	13.64%	77.27%
MA or PHD Granting College	12.50%	4.17%	83.33%
Research University	38.46%	15.38%	46.15%

CHAPTER 11: DISTANCE LEARNING AND ILL

Table 58.1: If your college has a distance learning program, what percentage of your library's interlibrary loan request volume (from other institutions to your library) is accounted for by requests from distance learning students or instructors?

	Mean	Median	Minimum	Maximum
Entire Sample	11.30%	5.00%	0.00%	50.00%

Table 58.2: If your college has a distance learning program, what percentage of your library's interlibrary loan request volume (from other institutions to your library) is accounted for by requests from distance learning students or instructors? Broken out by Country

Country	Mean	Median	Minimum	Maximum
United States	11.77%	5.00%	0.00%	50.00%
Other	6.67%	10.00%	0.00%	10.00%

Table 58.3: If your college has a distance learning program, what percentage of your library's interlibrary loan request volume (from other institutions to your library) is accounted for by requests from distance learning students or instructors? Broken out by Total Student Enrollment

Total Student Enrollment	Mean	Median	Minimum	Maximum
Less than 2,500	13.73%	5.00%	0.00%	50.00%
2,500 to 7,500	8.73%	5.00%	0.00%	30.00%
More than 7,500	11.45%	5.00%	0.00%	50.00%

Table 58.4: If your college has a distance learning program, what percentage of your library's interlibrary loan request volume (from other institutions to your library) is accounted for by requests from distance learning students or instructors? Broken out by Public or Private Status

Public or Private Status	Mean	Median	Minimum	Maximum
Public	8.23%	5.00%	0.00%	50.00%
Private	17.45%	5.00%	0.00%	50.00%

Table 58.5: If your college has a distance learning program, what percentage of your library's interlibrary loan request volume (from other institutions to your library) is accounted for by requests from distance learning students or instructors? Broken out by Carnegie Class

Carnegie Class	Mean	Median	Minimum	Maximum
Community College	2.20%	1.00%	0.00%	5.00%
4-Year College	10.88%	5.00%	0.00%	50.00%
MA or PHD Granting College	14.21%	8.00%	0.00%	50.00%
Research University	12.67%	5.50%	0.00%	50.00%

Please comment on how, or if, your institution's distance learning programs have affected your ILL/DD/EDD operations and statistics.

1. Increases workflow and statistics
2. Not much. We offer, but as our students have access to all our databases remotely, they usually stick with what they can get full-text.
3. We have been providing service to distant customers for many years. We continue to try and add services to better accommodate them.
4. We have only begun this planning this process
5. Students in distance programs are active users of interlibrary loan services. We do not track their use as a group, so no numbers are available.
6. Our distance learning students have the same privileges as our onsite students. We regularly reach out to them and encourage their use of our ILL services.
7. Very little
8. Our distance learning programs have definitely increased our statistics and also allowed for the addition of one half-time staff person
9. No affect
10. Not much
11. Not at all
12. This is going to happen in the future and our ILL librarian is very on top of distance learning progress at our Community College
13. Distance learning increased ILL
14. Very minor effect
15. Not much, it is rarely used by our distance learning faculty and students
16. Very little
17. Started a mediated search service to deliver items overlooked by our students/faculty
18. Negligible in the grand scheme of things
19. Little or no effect yet
20. The university has few students who are exclusively enrolled in distance courses. The university only has one program where a student could conceivably take all courses online. Students are encouraged to visit campus, use the university resources, and take course on campus.
21. Not much
22. The new BSN programs has had a huge impact on the number of ILL requests
23. Not at all
24. Still trying to figure out how to move forward in providing document delivery to e-learners
25. More articles requested
26. Total statistics have increased, less peaks and valleys with workload because there is a steady stream of requests for distance learning
27. It has been the same for about 10 years now
28. Increased our article requesting significantly
29. Very little. The volume is so low as to be negligible.
30. Can't get instructors on distance learning courses/programs to inform students of the service
Little to no effect - very few distance programs
31. Since it is difficult for us to determine who is or who is not a distance learning student, it has been hard to separate out those the need extended services from those "on campus"
32. We mail books to distance degree students living outside the local area so our mailing costs have increased slightly

CHAPTER 12: USE OF DIGITAL REPOSITORIES

Table 59.1: What percentage of your interlibrary loan requests are satisfied by downloads of content from any institutional digital repository?

	Mean	Median	Minimum	Maximum
Entire Sample	6.58%	1.00%	0.00%	75.00%

Table 59.2: What percentage of your interlibrary loan requests are satisfied by downloads of content from any institutional digital repository? Broken out by Country

Country	Mean	Median	Minimum	Maximum
United States	6.88%	1.00%	0.00%	75.00%
Other	3.00%	3.00%	1.00%	5.00%

Table 59.3: What percentage of your interlibrary loan requests are satisfied by downloads of content from any institutional digital repository? Broken out by Total Student Enrollment

Total Student Enrollment	Mean	Median	Minimum	Maximum
Less than 2,500	4.19%	1.00%	0.00%	15.00%
2,500 to 7,500	8.60%	1.00%	0.00%	75.00%
More than 7,500	6.64%	4.00%	0.00%	25.00%

Table 59.4: What percentage of your interlibrary loan requests are satisfied by downloads of content from any institutional digital repository? Broken out by Public or Private Status

Public or Private Status	Mean	Median	Minimum	Maximum
Public	5.74%	1.00%	0.00%	30.00%
Private	7.78%	2.50%	0.00%	75.00%

Table 59.5: What percentage of your interlibrary loan requests are satisfied by downloads of content from any institutional digital repository? Broken out by Carnegie Class

Carnegie Class	Mean	Median	Minimum	Maximum
Community College	3.29%	1.00%	0.00%	15.00%
4-Year College	10.63%	2.75%	0.00%	75.00%
MA or PHD Granting College	4.86%	2.00%	0.00%	30.00%
Research University	6.33%	1.50%	0.00%	25.00%

Table 60.1: Have you made efforts to monitor what is available through digital repositories in the subject areas for which you have the most ILL requests?

	No Answer	Yes	No
Entire Sample	22.06%	13.24%	64.71%

Table 60.2: Have you made efforts to monitor what is available through digital repositories in the subject areas for which you have the most ILL requests? Broken out by Country

Country	No Answer	Yes	No
United States	21.67%	11.67%	66.67%
Other	25.00%	25.00%	50.00%

Table 60.3: Have you made efforts to monitor what is available through digital repositories in the subject areas for which you have the most ILL requests? Broken out by Total Student Enrollment

Total Student Enrollment	No Answer	Yes	No
Less than 2,500	22.73%	22.73%	54.55%
2,500 to 7,500	14.29%	9.52%	76.19%
More than 7,500	28.00%	8.00%	64.00%

Table 60.4: Have you made efforts to monitor what is available through digital repositories in the subject areas for which you have the most ILL requests? Broken out by Public or Private Status

Public or Private Status	No Answer	Yes	No
Public	18.92%	10.81%	70.27%
Private	25.81%	16.13%	58.06%

Table 60.5: Have you made efforts to monitor what is available through digital repositories in the subject areas for which you have the most ILL requests? Broken out by Carnegie Class

Carnegie Class	No Answer	Yes	No
Community College	11.11%	22.22%	66.67%
4-Year College	18.18%	18.18%	63.64%
MA or PHD Granting College	25.00%	12.50%	62.50%
Research University	30.77%	0.00%	69.23%

What do you think of the finding aids available for locating resources in digital repositories?

1. I don't know what you mean. Before submitting requests, I search our library databases and the web to make sure the article isn't available freely. I usually locate items from journal web sites or author web sites. They are usually open access journals.
2. Not sure
3. No experience
4. No opinion
5. Under development at this time
6. It would be helpful if there was a standard for finding aids for digital repositories
7. Poor aids and poor questions
8. Haven't used
9. I use Google Scholar and have good luck with that resource. It ALSO pulls up copies we have access to through our College e journal databases, so it really helps.
10. We would need a meta-repository. Something like OAISTER
11. Good
12. It is time consuming, as repositories are not included library holdings and hence made available through ILL databases such as OCLC FirstSearch
13. Very helpful
14. User friendly
15. Not used often
16. I think they work well
17. Use Google or Blekko
18. Depends on how well written and how clearly defined the items within the collection are identified
19. I haven't used them
20. Unaware
21. Uneven. Some are great, many are not.
22. We don't use them regularly
23. We have a good resource!
24. Probably a good idea
25. Often not available through Google; hard to find if metadata is not searchable.
26. Have not investigated
27. Sometimes it is difficult to determine exact what is available and what is not
28. Some are useful, some are not