forum for interlending

Inter Library Loans

Requests

Document Supply

Best Practice & Policies

IFLA

Information

British Library

Interlend Conference

Copyright

Books, Articles & Theses

Conarls

Document Delivery

Esignatures

Training

Collaboration

Contents

Editorial

Message from the FIL Chair

Articles

Contributors

The FIL Committee

Hello and Goodbye from your Editor

This is by way of a proxy editorial. After sterling work ably assisted by Tracey in pulling this issue together our new and now erstwhile editor, Claudia Howard, has secured a new job and moved on. In her relatively short stint on Committee Claudia 'rolled up her proverbial sleeves' and helped to organise the FIL at Boston Spa event in November, at which she also doubled as a speaker, and she has also good naturedly cajoled our members to contribute the content for this issue. The current members of the FIL Committee (and me) wish Claudia all the very best in her future endeavours.

My involvement? I hear you ask. You may remember that I came to the end of my time on committee last year, but as I had been involved in compiling the last issue, I've been roped in to help put everyone's great content together for this one. So any typos or formatting errors blame me I'm afraid! No seriously, Claudia has obviously been very busy finishing one job and starting another. More latterly I have also found it difficult to find time to fit in doing the typography, so unfortunately there has been some delay in getting this issue out to you. For that I must apologise.

This seems like a good opportunity to further cajole, nay bully, our members into submitting articles, letters, pearls of wisdom, fragrant nosegays and any other forms of content you feel relevant for the next issue. If, as members, you enjoy seeing a regular if infrequent FIL Journal then can I urge you all to put pen to paper or digit(s) to keyboard and contribute. Here are some ideas to encourage you to get your thinking caps on:

❖ Have you consulted users on their satisfaction with your service? Are you willing to share how you did that and what the results were?
❖ Have you tried BL's plug-in-less document delivery service? Tell us about your experiences
❖ Could you write a piece on your management software, possibly in conjunction with your supplier?
❖ Have you had significant successes in alternative ways of fulfilling requests e.g. by purchasing or tracing open source copies?
❖ Tell us about the trends in requesting at your place. How does this relate to your wider environment?
❖ Have you restructured your service recently and what impact has this had on your workflows and services?
❖ Do you operate in a regional or sector consortium? Tell FIL about it

Don't be put off either by thinking it has to be anything highfalutin. A short, personal interest piece on your experiences at conference, or the long standing friendships you may have made via ILL would make just as avid reading. Don't be shy either. If you have never written a piece for publication before any member of the committee will be happy to proof read for you and offer constructive criticism if any is required. We have a friendly readership which is genuinely interested in our area of operation and comprising people who, by the very nature of our work, we form professional relationships with anyway.

So here's my simple challenge. Get writing. Quite apart from being good CV and Appraisal fodder, it's just So Cool to see yourself in print ☺!

Chris Beevers

Message from the Chair: Doesn't Time Fly *When You are Enjoying Yourself!*

Sandra DeRoy

Dear Everyone

Here are the first of my ramblings from the 'Chair'. For those who haven't met me, I am Sandra DeRoy. I work in the Interlibrary Loan Department at the University of Essex in the delightful setting of Wivenhoe Park in North East Essex. I have been involved in Interlending for the past 10 year plus – that is scary when you put it in words – as well as being a deputy for the Assistant Librarian /User Services at the main Service Desk. The two roles sit very nicely together and allow me a great deal of contrast in my daily routines which is lovely.

This is my second year on the executive committee for the Forum for Interlending so it was quite a daunting undertaking for me to take the 'Chair' after only one year. However, with all the help and support of the other committee members, as well as many emails to the outgoing Chair (many thanks to Marie Lancaster) I am gradually finding my feet and hopefully getting to grips with everything.

I cannot believe it is nearly two years since I was' recruited' to the committee as the time quite literally has flown. I can remember discussing the fact that I had just got two new kittens only a week or so before attending the conference in Cardiff in 2013 and they have just celebrated their 2nd birthday!

Now to the point of my ramblings – As we are heading rapidly toward Interlend 2015, I would like to ask all the members to consider whether they too would like to be involved with the FIL committee. Most years, spaces become available on the committee for enthusiastic like-minded ' ILLers' to get involved, and this year is no exception.

We would really like to hear from anyone who is considering standing for the committee this year, you can email or call me personally if you want a bit of an informal chat or you can email the Forum committee as a whole to express your interest. Even if you are not attending the conference personally, you can still put your name forward to stand for election on the committee. There are now only a couple of months left to the next conference and that will positively whizz by, judging by how fast the last two years have gone!

Really looking forward to meeting up with old friends and making new ones in Manchester.

Sandra DeRoy
 (FIL Chair)

Introducing Your New Committee Members:

Lesley Butler

Deputy Head of Customer Services, University of Liverpool Library

I graduated from Liverpool Polytechnic (now Liverpool John Moores University) in 1978 and started my career with a brief spell at Rotherham Public Library in my home county of Yorkshire where I worked on the computerisation of their music catalogue.

I relocated back to the North West in 1979 and quickly moved into academic libraries and have been at the University of Liverpool ever since where I have undertaken a variety of roles. I started in Acquisitions, moved on to Academic Liaison and then to Interlibrary loans where I stayed for a number of years. This transpired to be the most satisfying of jobs and I thoroughly enjoyed working as an active member of the ILL section. I became Customer Services Manager in 2009 and my responsibilities increased and broadened. In January 2015 I assumed the role of Deputy Head of Customer Services. Never one to completely let go of something I enjoy I have continued management of the small, experienced and dedicated ILL team who are fortunately based within Customer Services.

Outside of work I spend a lot of time in North Wales where I sail, canoe, and take my dog on very long walks in the lovely Welsh countryside.

Marjory Lobban

Document Delivery Supervisor, Edinburgh University Library

A 10-year spell as a School Librarian in Edinburgh ended in a 4-year family break, after which an evening post as a Library Assistant in the Royal (Dick) School Veterinary Library provided the ideal gateway back into work. During those 4 years I dealt with enquiries, while getting to grips with computers and email. Background tasks included book processing and compiling a subject index to the Barnard Veterinary classification system. 6 years in the Erskine Medical Library provided invaluable experience in managing serials subscriptions. The switch in 2002 to my current post as Document Delivery Supervisor might appear odd, but the preceding experience was ideal for understanding the requirements of an ILL service in times of restricted budgets. The department's work continues to evolve: electronic signatures; increasingly obscure requests; greater demands from international students who have paid vast fees; EDD. Future challenges? Make the student experience simple– don't let them leave the "library" (virtual or physical) without finding what they need or at least how to get it; break down barriers to international lending; solve the "lending from

e-journals" problem; balance ILL budgets against high serial subscriptions;   In short, I can't see work drying up in the short term!

Karen Paine

Senior Library Assistant, Procurement and Access - Library, The London School of Economics and Political Science

(Check out Karen's longer piece on becoming a committee member on p.12!)

Interlend 2014: Sponsored Delegate's Report

Jennifer Marvin

I was fortunate enough to be chosen as the FIL sponsored delegate at last year's Interlend Conference held at The Carlton Hotel in Edinburgh. Having spent the weekend seeing the sights, and reading up on which sessions I had signed up for, I checked out of my Premier Inn bright and early on Monday morning and made my way to The Carlton, excited for what lay ahead.

The first day kicked off with a keynote speech by Antony Brewerton, head of Academic Services at Warwick University. It was great to hear from an expert in marketing, with over fifteen years of experience behind him about how to market and brand your library effectively. This is an area I am very interested in, especially working in a fairly small NHS library myself, where promotion plays such an important role in ensuring our users get the most from our services. One of the most useful things I gleaned from Antony's presentation was the importance of establishing your brand and building a relationship with your customer.

He also spoke about the 4Ps of marketing: price, place, promotion and product. As universities raise tuition fees, students are expecting more and more from their libraries, and it is up to us to keep ahead of the game and live up to their expectations. The library is an integral part of a student's academic life, and as such needs to offer them not only a great service, but be perceived as a place they *want* to be. To explain this further, he added an additional three 'Ps' to the chart: process, participants and physical space, explaining to us the importance of not only looking great for your customers (he compared libraries to a pub, where "it's not just about ale, it's about atmosphere!") but also having staff and even other customers who meet expectations of those you wish to attract.

Branding was discussed next, focussing on the importance of how you put your product or service across. Antony mentioned the OCLC Perceptions of Libraries report, which having read after the conference proves interesting reading and shows how important getting your message across is. He asked us to picture what comes to mind when you think of a library. Often the answer is books, so it is important to show off any other skills or services your library has on offer. Antony then went on to tell us what the 12 elements of brand manifestation are, and I found a couple of points particularly useful to take back with me.

Firstly, the importance of continuity of style through your marketing materials. I liked the idea of simplicity and sticking to one colour to enhance your brand, especially as it could be changed to show updates in the future, without losing the message. The second element I made note of was 'shape'; the idea that users sum up your brand even through the thickness of the paper you use or the font on the cover. I had never really paid attention to paper quality before, but I certainly do now!

In any sector, marketing is needed to ensure the growth and survival of libraries, and as such, Antony's presentation was very relevant to everybody in the room. After the session there was a brief Q&A session, where one question stood out: how can you get your message across when your marketing department is separate from the library? Antony told the room that building a relationship between the two departments is the best way, and turn them into an advocate for your services!

After the keynote we heard from Ann Lees from NHS Education for Scotland (NES), who told us about their document supply experience. Until 2011, NES satisfied their document supply needs using local systems, however in 2011, the government stopped paying for the necessary copyright licence and as such all copying (not just for ILL but *all* copying) had to be stopped, and the British Library was relied upon for article requests. Ann's colleague Stephen Winch then demonstrated how they now request articles, which I was very interested in as their system was so different from my own. By integrating their SFX with the BL site, they could directly download articles if they were in stock. I think this could make a difference to the user experience, as requests could be completed very quickly and with more efficiency than under current procedures.

After this food for thought, we headed off for the real thing in the hotel dining room, which gave us all a chance to digest the morning's ideas and discuss how they could help in our respective libraries.

After lunch there were breakout sessions. The first session I attended was on the University of Kent's experiences of overhauling their document delivery services. Amongst other changes, they have gone from an Access database to a brand new ILL system and after a pilot in the University, have found that the new streamlined systems in place have had positive effects on users. It was good to see how other libraries are improving their services.

After this session was the one I was most looking forward to: the 7 Step Marketing Toolkit presented by Kay Grieves. Not only was her presentation one of the best I have ever seen graphically, it was very inspiring to see someone so enthusiastic about their subject. Kay spoke about marketing as an entire management process, with "the customer at the heart and beginning of everything you do", which resonated with me, as customer focus is such an important part of any library service. Strategic marketing helps to provide what the user needs and not what you want to give them, which is an important lesson to learn. Without getting what they want, users do tend to vote with their feet…

She went through the steps of the toolkit one by one, and gave ideas and examples for each one. One idea for how to get your users involved was to allow them to pin leaves on a tree with ideas written on them of how they would like to see the library 'grow'. I really liked this idea and have filed it away for the future!

After this session, and with a head full of ideas, we sat down for the Plenary and 'FIL the Gap' sessions before heading off to explore our cavernous hotel rooms and change for dinner, which was delicious and enjoyed in good company with the other delegates and speakers.

On the second day, bright and early after a hearty breakfast the day kicked off with the AGM where new FIL committee members were chosen. After this there was an update on the latest copyright rules by Emily Stannard, who lead us all through the baffling world of

copyright exceptions in an accessible way. Her talk was interesting and amongst other things, informed us of the new rules, including changes to charges, whereby libraries are now no longer forced to charge for articles, but instead have the option to charge, so long as the costs are equitable to the cost of production. Emily also pointed out that the rules around declaration forms had changed for the better, enabling digital authorisation rather than physical signatures for ILL requests. This is great news, as not only does this mean no more filing cabinets of forms, but hopefully with article requesting becoming increasingly easy, it should also lead to a higher take up of ILL services too.

After this session, and a well earned cup of tea, we heard from Ed Davidson from OCLC about their Article Exchange service. Although it was a sales pitch, it was interesting to hear about how the Cloud can be used for ILL storage. With over 1.4 million documents passing through their software since 2012, it seems to be a popular service, and well worth considering if you are thinking of making changes to the way you deal with document delivery.

For the morning breakout session, I chose to listen to Caroline Rauter and Lynette Summers talk about open access (OA) resources. As my library would like to find faster, easier ways to get articles to our users, I was interested to hear more. Lynette showed us the document delivery cycle, and explained the importance of checking for open access versions of articles when fulfilling ILL requests. A display of hands showed that hardly anybody in the room was trying these sources already, which I found surprising, but was relieved that we were not the only ones! She went on to show us examples of good places to look for OA resources, and the importance of checking legitimacy of the document, as sometimes articles are uploaded to sharing sites without the author's consent. After this, Caroline led a breakout workshop, where we got into groups to discuss issues surrounding OA and document delivery. One main concern raised in my group was the drain on staff time checking extra sources for a document, rather than going straight to the more expensive but guaranteed source. Is the article really free if you've taken additional time out to find it? It was interesting hearing the discussions from across so many different types of library afterwards, and how OA is or can be used in various settings, especially in different types of university (from traditional redbrick, specialist departmental, and modern polytechnic). Overall, this session sparked a lot of discussions throughout the room, but unfortunately, most could not be answered yet.

After lunch it was time for me to attend the talk from Kate Ebdon at the British Library on how to market your ILL service in today's austere environment. This session allowed the British Library to showcase their work and explain how lean thinking has enabled them to streamline their services and save tens of thousands of pounds. This followed nicely onto Alice Moore's talk on how the British Library document supply service has evolved as the services people want have changed. Alice explained the importance of innovation and exploring new technology in order to meet users' needs better. By reflecting on the challenges faced by the British Library, we were shown how tricky it can be to make changes to your service!

Having digested all the day's information, it was time for the conference round up, and everyone went to find their bags. I must say, I left Edinburgh that night full of ideas, excited to try and implement some of what I had learnt when I returned home. It is amazing how much marketing can affect a service, and certainly make a difference to a user's perception of the library!

Interlend 2014: Perceptions of a FIL Conference Newby
Marion Shepherd

I first heard about Interlend through the Swimming Pool back in the summer of 2013. A colleague had a written a report on her experience at the Cardiff conference. Immediately, I tried to cost out how much it would be for me to attend last year's event in Edinburgh and source funding where possible. By the time I spoke to my Manager about it, I had already mentally booked my ticket. Thankfully, Rowena agreed it would be a fantastic CPD opportunity and after applying for funding from Health Education England Thames Valley Library Staff Development Group, I was given full permission to attend.

As a 'first timer' at Interlend I was a bit nervous upon entering the amazing Carlton hotel in Edinburgh's city centre for the conference (to be honest, Cinderella came to mind!) So here I was, excited, armed with my notepad and pen to take lots of notes and learn new things, but knowing no-one. It didn't take me long to bond over the coffee and muffins with the other 45 members though as we discussed our various methods of interlibrary loans and how our different library management systems worked. I was certainly in the minority as an NHS library delegate, but it was a positive start and everyone seemed very friendly and welcoming.

So apart from feeling like my mobile phone was rather antiquated and noticing that my 'manual method' of taking notes was going to be rather unique, I was ready to be taught lots…

The conference was opened by Antony Brewerton who emphasised that marketing was 'more than pretty pictures' and that our mindset should be on building customer relationships by establishing brand credentials which capture the library ethos. We were taught about the ladder of loyalty – turning our potential customer into a partner. This was reinforced with the question 'What is a library?' and how to meet the varying needs of different groups. The clear message was 'a library is not just a stockpile of books'. The truth is, if we cannot change this perception then the invisible (often very expensive) resources are overlooked or at best seen as free from Google. To counter act this Antony gave examples of libraries (academic I know but…) who had set up virtual displays showing off their rare collections and explained how utilising their unique selling point (USP) had impacted their customer base and usage stats.

Next up was a talk from NHS Education Scotland. During this session Stephen Winch and Anne Lees shocked me by informing us that because NHS Scotland didn't have a copyright licence for a few years they had to go to the British Library (BL) for EVERYTHING. Even if they had the journal on their shelves, the poor library assistant had to ask the user to 'stand away from the photocopier' and make the request through BL. Since 11th June 2014 the CLA

agreement is in place things have improved somewhat, (but along with most academic libraries) there are no local agreements to supply reciprocal items through fair dealing. (such as our inter library loan process) They go straight to BL if the item is not on their shelves which apparently it saves money and time. The stats seem to agree with this statement but for me it felt odd and I found it difficult to understand how this could be a money saver.

With my brain a bit frazzled I set off to lunch and was rewarded with a hot, sit down buffet to recharge my batteries. After that we split into pre-chosen group sessions. I had chosen Suncat – the new interface as it was a totally new system to me. Zena Mulligan was interesting but I didn't feel that checking another system on top of the catalogues we already use was necessary. I can see the potential for academic libraries though and the website was easy to manoeuvre around. Next up was Kay Grieves with the '7 Step Marketing toolkit'. Kay explained how we 'cannot make conversations if you don't know what you're trying to achieve' and the need to profile each group of customers to meet their different needs. We did an interesting group session on translating benefits into messages (attention / interest/ desire/ action) to reach the customers. The purpose of this was to plan a 'conversational campaign' which would effectively communicate 'benefit messages' resulting in increased usage and appreciation of services offered.

Then it was time for dinner and networking. As most people at Interlend knew each other I was a bit apprehensive how this would work out for me. I had no need to worry though because the organisers had given all newcomers a different colour name badge so the committee could locate us easily and ensure we were looked after. As someone who helps organise events it was nice to see that other committees notice people on the edges looking a bit nervous and include then 'on purpose'.

The following day, I managed to keep my head down at the AGM and not get volunteered for anything. I was rather proud of this achievement! The first speaker of the day was Emily Stannard who did an entertaining copyright update. (yes you did hear me correctly) Ed Davidson spoke on OCLC's Worldshare article exchange system. He did a quick demonstration, with the obvious benefit that it can open large files up to 60MB and there is no problem with copyright breaches as the document deletes itself after 5 days of opening (30 days if unread) There are currently 30 users in the UK (mostly academic) and all are library to library.

Whilst Worldshare is a system that will probably come our way at some point I was more impressed with Clio. This is a complete automated ILL system. If I could make one plea 'to the powers that be' it would be to purchase this system. I was allowed to have a play with it and fell in love with its logical processes, ease of use and reporting abilities immediately. It is worlds away from WinChill, fit for purpose and stable. As it is cloud based there is no need to create back-ups, download upgrades or a need for local IT support. It interacts with BL and shared catalogues creating logs and audit trails as well as reducing a need for paper based processes.

After prising myself away from sampling Clio, I settled down for the next session which was by Marjory Lobban who discussed the way Edinburgh University reviewed their ILL process. She did stress that this was only viable due to the importance of IT being fit for purpose. (I tried not to laugh at this point) She noted that the more access to on-line journals their readers had, the more they expected them to get for them. They streamlined their processes

in 2010 when they moved to Worldshare (and the back view of this Illiad), cancelled all print journals, and made everything paperless by using Illiad and the Odyssey supply model.

The penultimate speaker was Kate Ebdon who talked on how the British Library was doing more with less. At BL they have implemented the Kaizen improvement method to meet their aim to "Focus on the voice of the customer and seek to delight" By empowering staff and standardising layout and processes in each department (similar to the productive ward in the NHS) they eliminated all items that didn't add value. It had the added bonus of speeding up the services offered and achieved £640,000 in savings to date.

Finally, Alice Moore presented a talk on 'Marketing BLDSS in the 21st Century'. Alice spoke a lot on identifying a genuine customer need and developing relationships with them, ensuring they are included in a continuous improvement model and listened to. She informed us that Artemail will be retired in Spring of 2017 as part of their improvements to an improved integrated service and application programming interface. (API) BL plan to launch their Twitter account shortly and use this to communicate service updates and general information.

After a brain busting two days, I was exhausted and as I made the long trip home I pondered over what I had learned and how I could put them into practice. In short, my main points are:

1. Thames Valley and Wessex should investigate Clio (and hopefully purchase it very quickly please to replace WinChill)

2. Capturing your library service effectively shows a benefit to users and ensures its survival (therefore we keep our jobs)

3. Capturing evidence of good practice that fits our brand image encourages new customers and is effective in annual reports and promotion

4. Continuity of style and theme is really important. One size doesn't fit all but it should all link together to form the brand.

5. The library's USP should be customer support

6. Users generally see the library as a source of books and the general perception is 'everything else is free from Google'

7. By using the ladder of loyalty we can move a potential customer to an advocate in a short space of time by doing things right

I would like to take this opportunity to thank TV+WLSDG for funding my place at the conference. It found it to be a very worthwhile event and I would love to attend next years in Manchester if the chance arises.

Copyright Issues in Interlending & Document Delivery: A Dummy's Guide

Emily Stannard

Interlending is a bit of a misleading term when it comes to copyright because there are two types: lending between libraries and lending to another library's individual users. This is a quick and fairly simple guide to help you make sense of the copyright issues associated with both!

Q1. Can my library supply a copy of a work to another library (NB this is not to do with supply to an end user of that library but rather a library which wants to add a work to stock)?

It depends on what type of material it is:

a) Whole or part of a published work (not periodical articles):

Any library, regardless of whether it is commercial or not, can make and supply a not-for-profit library with a single copy of the whole or part of a published work. The library can only supply if the librarian doesn't know or can't reasonably find out the name and address of a person (read: copyright owner/licensor) who can authorise the making of the copy. Given the last bit of this sentence, it's unlikely that a librarian wouldn't know who could authorise the making of the copy, so it's unlikely that a library could do this without a licence. This is where the British Library comes in: its Document Supply Centre has a licence from the CLA for supplying whole or parts of published text-based works.

b) Article in a periodical:

Any library, regardless of whether it is commercial or not, can make and supply a copy of an article in a periodical for supply to not-for-profit libraries. A fee may be charged by the supplying library (note: the supplying library is not required by law to charge) for the cost of production. Any contract terms applying to the original work suggesting that a copy cannot be made for supplying another library with a copy are null and void. Note that there is no need to seek permission from the copyright holder/authoriser for articles in periodicals, which gives more flexibility for libraries to respond to requests from libraries for off-prints of articles to add to stock. The receiving library can add the supplied copy to stock and end users can borrow it, as it becomes part of the permanent collection.

Q2. A user has asked for a single copy of a published work that we don't stock. What can we do?

This is a more typical interlibrary loan scenario. Provided you are a not-for-profit library that is accessible to the public, you can ask another library to supply a copy to you which you can then pass on to the user. You will be responsible for collecting the end user's declaration (see Q3) and the supplying library may want to see this to be reassured that by making a copy they are not infringing copyright. An example:

Step 1: User has requested one chapter from a published work that your library doesn't stock.

Step 2: Make sure your user provides a copyright declaration (see Q3 for more information - this no longer needs to be a paper Copyright Declaration Form with a physical signature but can now be made part of an electronic process).

Step 3: You can request a copy from a library which is not conducted for profit and which is publicly accessible or located within an educational establishment.

Step 4: The supplying library can make a single copy of a periodical article or a reasonable proportion of a published work (best judgement should be used here – two chapters of a book may not count as reasonable, but there is no exact quantity specified in the law) to your library's end user. In this case, one chapter of a book is likely to count as a 'reasonable proportion' of a published work.

Step 5: The supplying library may charge a fee for the cost of production of the copy (note that there doesn't have to be a charge, it is up to the supplying library), and any contract terms on the original work which suggest that a copy cannot be supplied for this purpose are null and void.

Step 6: You receive a copy from the supplying library and transmit it to your user, either in paper form or via an electronic service such as email.

Q3. What should the Copyright Declaration look like?

Your user must provide a declaration in writing (this can be electronic) which includes the following information:

- Their name & the material they are requesting
- A statement that they have not previously been supplied with a copy of that material by any library
- A statement that they require the copy for non-commercial research or private study, will only use it for those purposes and will not supply the copy to any other person
- That to the best of their knowledge, no other person with whom they work/study has made or intends to make a request for substantially the same material for substantially the same purpose

If their declaration is false, they are liable for infringement.

Q4. Should we keep copyright declarations?

It is probably best to keep copyright declarations for about 6 years, which is the length of time that a copyright holder can bring legal action for copyright infringement. Now that forms can be electronic, they should be easier to store (plus take up less space!).

Q5: Can documents be supplied to an individual end user electronically?

Yes.

Q6. Our user has asked for a copy of an unpublished work that we don't stock. What can we do?

You can request a copy from another library (provided it is not for profit), museum or archive, as they can supply a whole or part of a copy of an unpublished work. This is subject to two criteria:

1. The work must not have been published before it was deposited with the library/archive/museum
2. The rights owner must not have prohibited copying.

You will need to ask the user to provide a declaration in writing (same information as for published works – see Q3), and the supplying institution may charge a fee to cover the cost of the production of the copy (note that the institution does not have to charge a fee – it is not a legal requirement).

Q7. What about the British Library's Document Supply Centre (BLDSC)?

The BLDSC holds a licence from the CLA which allows it to make copies beyond the limits of the provisions for libraries (e.g. it can supply whole or parts of published works to other libraries and more than a 'reasonable' proportion of a whole work as an interlibrary loan to another library's user), in return for the payment of royalties set by the copyright owners. Copies received from the BLDSC can be added to stock or supplied to an end user. If the copies are added to stock, they can be further used for interlibrary loan (likely to only apply to articles in periodicals – see Q1) as contract terms do not override the supply of works to not-for-profit libraries and/or their end users.

Emily was the Copyright & Compliance Officer at the University of Reading for 5 years prior to her new role as Head Librarian at Bradfield College. She has a strong online presence as @copyrightgirl on Twitter and is a member of the Libraries and Archives Copyright Alliance (LACA) where she represents the Lis-Copyseek community of librarians & copyright officers in Higher and Further Education.

The FAQs above represent Emily's interpretation of current UK Copyright Legislation based on her significant experience in the field. It does not however constitute legal advice.

First Impressions: From a member of staff new to Inter-library Loans
Lauren Bell

As one of the newest staff members at the Queen Elizabeth Hospital in Birmingham, there are numerous facets to my position as Library Assistant: Serials which fascinated me, although the Inter-Library Loan (ILLs) procedure stood out the most.

Having recently completed my BA and been one of the many library users requesting articles it is fascinating to discover what procedures are undertaken to ensure the user receives a prompt and efficient library service, which is the foremost priority of any library. Now that I am on the receiving end and currently processing the incoming articles, I have a greater awareness of exactly what goes on in the library world, enabling me to gain a more profound insight within the profession.

My colleagues introduced me to the realm of ILLs by highlighting the different libraries we liaise with in order to obtain journal articles, and the external businesses who fulfil our orders when we conduct a wider search.

At the QE Library we undertake seven different steps in our pursuit of obtaining a requested article before extending the search internationally.

On a regional level, I have been introduced to Wishill (West Midlands Healthcare Library Network) where we work in conjunction with over forty other local (NHS and university) libraries in order to try and obtain a requested journal article.

On a national level, we liaise with the Royal Society of Medicine (RSM) and the British Library (BL) when our Wishill requests are unsuccessful. This is reassuring to know as it informs staff members that there are establishments within the UK which hold an abundance of historical knowledge that can be accessed and shared, and really puts into perspective how extensive the ILL network is channelling its way throughout the Midlands and the UK. Until now I wasn't aware of how extensive the ILL network can be – it almost reminds me of a labyrinth of information hunters (which I suppose it is) all searching for that particular article.

On a more personal level, there have been instances when our request system has been inundated with new requests, although by now the steps are firmly ingrained in my head. It's also nice to see how much our request system is used and valued by the users and that as a Library Assistant I am the link in the retrieval process.

Being at the heart of inter-library loan requests has increased my awareness regarding the amount of time and effort invested by all library staff in their pursuit of academic health

research, which in turn forces me to assess the versatility of staff members' roles and accentuates any protocols we are made aware of. For example, copyright restrictions aren't really considered from a user's perspective, although as a library staff member such protocols are hardwired into me, and as a department we ensure that these procedures are complied with.

Considering the fact that I have learned the above in just a couple of months and am still continuing to discover other aspects of my role, I'm excited to find out what other avenues remain to be explored, in what will hopefully be a long and productive career.

Initial Experiences: As a new FIL Committee Member

Karen Paine

I became a new member of the FIL committee in July 2014. I have worked in ILL for fourteen years now, but something has always got in the way of me taking an active role in FIL. I have been a keen delegate to FIL@BLDSC on many occasions and found this event very helpful for networking and learning about the latest British Library services, so I was already aware of the work of FIL.   I was pleased at getting the opportunity to join the committee, but nervous about just what I had let myself in for.

My first task as a committee member, a few weeks after I joined, was to contribute to the FIL blog (http://fil101blog.blogspot.co.uk/).   I racked my brains for something to write about, worried I was too busy to manage this, until I realised I could use a current project I was working on as a subject. Once I had written my blog my next challenge was to get it posted. As a blogging novice I did not have any experience to draw on. I found the technical side of getting a post put up difficult to master, but with help from my fellow committee members I got my blog posted on time. I have since posted two more blogs which I found easier to get posted, although I did learn a valuable lesson about checking copyright. As a recent graduate of the Open University I was used to referencing online articles and other websites, but I had no experience of checking for picture copyright.

In October 2014 I went to my first FIL committee meeting in Birmingham. It was a good chance to put faces to the email addresses I had been contacting.   I joined the sub group on conference planning as I felt I could be most useful in this capacity.   I came away from the discussion of the planning for the FIL Conference in June 2015 with a greater understanding of the work involved in arranging a conference. My previous experience of planning events had been arranging training sessions of no more than one day for colleagues and library visits from other ILL colleagues.

I found the chance to network with colleagues really helpful. It was heartening to learn that other colleagues were dealing with the same issues. Also the chance to talk through issues with a group who collectively have a national voice on ILL was exciting. As more and more ILL staff work alone or work part time it is often hard to get your voice heard. Being part of a national group dedicated to ILL was a new way of getting the ILL message out that I had not explored before.

It can be hard having emails about committee work popping up in your inbox in the middle of a very busy day at work, but the rewards have been worth it. I have had to improve my time management to find the time for this, and I would be the first to admit this is a work in progress. My current task as a member of the FIL subcommittee is to work on contacting

potential sponsors for the next FIL Conference. I have not been involved in this kind of project before so I am learning as I go.

In the first six months of my membership of the FIL committee I have improved my knowledge of copyright, entered the world of blogging - which has given me new confidence in communication and been an opportunity to learn new technical skills - and networked with colleagues both virtually and in the real world.   I have also improved my time management by implementing new systems to manage my workload. For me, however, the most valuable part of my FIL committee role has been a renewed sense of being part of an ILL community and a reinvigorated enthusiasm for ILL work.

The FIL Interlibrary Loans Benchmarking Survey: You show me yours and I'll show you mine – further findings

Introduction

In 2013, being aware of the Higher Education Interlibrary Loan Management Benchmarks Report produced annually by the Primary Research Group Inc. the FIL Committee discussed the possibility of carrying out a survey of our own. A few UK libraries did contribute to the PRG report but American libraries predominated, and the committee felt that it could benefit our members if we were to undertake a cross sector benchmarking exercise dedicated to the UK. We had already been involved in collating and making available data on Thesis loans, ILL Management Systems and Charging policies and individual members occasionally carried out spot surveys of their own on topics such as user charges and staffing/organizational structures via the JISC Mailing lists. A project to coordinate centrally the collection of information on key performance indicators seemed a natural progression that fitted well with part of FIL's remit to champion best practice in our field.

Background: Why benchmarking?

According to Voorbij (2009) "the primary goal of benchmarking is to assist in improving the performance of an organization". This can be achieved by assessing how good we are by comparing our results with similar service providers and learning from those who demonstrate best practice by achieving the best perfromance. My own introduction to benchmarking came in 2006 when my library at the University of Huddersfield was involved in an Inter-library Loans project with colleagues from other members of a small Higher Education benchmarking consortium. The institutions involved were:

- University of Derby
- Leeds Metropolitan University
- Liverpool John Moores University
- Staffordshire University

The project highlighted significant differences, as well as similarities in the way participating institutions operated their ILL/DD services, and the fact that the project necessitated regular meetings and online discussions provided a useful forum to discuss our different responses to common issues and local challenges.

Our aims then were that of any benchmarking project across similar service providers i.e.

i.   The opportunity to compare performance not only across participants but if ongoing, against ourselves, and thereby monitor our own continuous improvement with the external data providing a useful 'yardstick' to set ourselves in context)

ii. To provide 'leverage' to maintain or improve upon current resourcing levels by evidencing our efficiency and effectiveness when compared to similar providers in the field
iii. To identify examples of better performing services and try to find out what it is that they are doing that might be worth emulating

According to Hart and Amos (2014) such comparison between similar service providers,

"*will lead to a better understanding of relative performance in an environment where there is an increasing need to demonstrate value and provide evidence of accountability*".

Reviewing processes as a consequence of benchmarking can help to foster a culture of continuous improvement, Pringle, Croft and Braun (2001) and can be used as evidence for external accreditation. Under criterion 4.2.3 of the Customer Service Excellence Standard holders of the award must demonstrate that they compare their performance against that of similar or complementary organizations and have used that information to improve their service.

Methodology

Recommendations from our original HE Benchmarking Consortium project included:

- The importance of reaching consensus on a useful set of common comparators/performance indicators that all participants would find useful and could contribute to
- The necessity of collecting appropriate information on these comparators without overburdening staff with the chore of collecting significant additional data
- The absolute imperative for reaching agreed definitions of the comparators and their measures to ensure that we were comparing like with like.

These seemingly obvious conditions have been common features, and in some cases findings, of various benchmarking projects carried out by libraries across the world in recent years. Laevan and Smit (2003) highlighted the importance of using a shared language and reaching agreed interpretations of the terms used in any benchmarking exercise. Pringle, Croft and Braun (2001) and Laevan and Smit (2003) also stressed the importance of minimizing any data collection work for staff on the shop floor so that accuracy of the statistics wasn't compromised.

With these factors in mind an initial Bristol Online Surveys scoping questionnaire was circulated via various mailing lists back in Summer 2013. The aims of this scoping survey were threefold:

i.   To determine whether there was sufficient interest amongst the Interlending fraternity in participating in the exercise
ii. To find out what features of their services people were interested in comparing
iii. To attempt to achieve a consensus on a common set of definitions

42 libraries responded to this initial questionnaire. After demonstrating that there was sufficient interest out there, and achieving a working agreement on definitions of terms to be used, the benchmarking questionnaire proper was disseminated in Spring 2014. Again the

Bristol Online Surveys system was used and the questionnaire comprised 29 questions; some were multi-part and most were optional. The subjects of the questions posed were based on findings of what respondents to the scoping questionnaire were interested in sharing and comparing. By the FIL conference in June of that year there had been 32 respondents, and a brief overview of some of the findings was presented. Following interest shown, the survey was extended until August enabling a further 6 libraries to submit data.

Results

A set of tabulated results derived from analysis of the completed questionnaires is presented below. As most of the questions in the survey were optional, the size of the data sets varies and hence it is difficult to draw any conclusions based on relationships between one data set and another. However, within the limitations of the sample sizes, each of the tables provides a valid snapshot of a particular characteristic of our service and we can all position our services by comparing our own information with the results for our sector. To facilitate this, the quantitative data has been presented in terms of minimum, mean and maximum values.

1   Average numbers of requests from own customers

	Books	Articles	Theses	Conf. Procs	Music	AV	Other	Totals
University	1559	2596	42	40	13	0	119	4369
Health	169	1009	0	0	0	0.2	0	1178.2
Public	387	51	1	1	66	1.5	1	508.5
University/Public	467	625	-	-	1	0	-	1093
Private Subscription	71	2	0	0	0	0	0	73

2   Percentage of articles supplied electronically

	Percentage of Articles Supplied Electronically		
	Min.	Mean	Max.
University	14%	73%	99%
Health	0%	77%	99%
Public	0%	26%	100%
University/Public	NA	NA	NA
Private Subscription	0%	0%	0%

*NA = Not Available

3   Percentage fulfilment rates

	Loans (Books & Whole Journals)			Articles		
	Min.	Mean	Max.	Min.	Mean	Max.
University	60%	84%	99%	61%	82%	95%
Health	99%	100%	100%	79%	95%	100%
Public	50%	65%	93%	50%	64%	77%
University/Public	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Private Subscription	-	-	100%	-	-	100%

*NA = Not Available

4   Supply times to own users expressed in days

	Loans (Books)			Articles (photocopies)			Articles (electronic)		
	Min.	Mean	Max.	Min.	Mean	Max.	Min.	Mean	Max.
University	3.00	5.84	14.00	2.00	5.49	20.00	0	3.98	20.00
Health	3.00	4.29	5.00	1.8	2.97	4.00	1.00	1.97	3.00
Public	4.00	8.50	13.00	2.00	7.00	10.00	0	1.00	2.00
University/Public	9.00	-	-	3.00	-	-	2.00	-	-
Private Subscription	7.00	-	-	7.00	-	-	7.00	-	-

5   Percentage overall fulfilment rates

	All formats		
	Min.	Mean	Max.
University	62%	76%	96%
Health	84%	107%(?)	98%
Public	45%	53%	88%
University/Public	NA	NA	NA
Private Subscription	100%	100%	100%

6   Average staffing levels involved in processing ILLs

	ILL Staff (excl. supervisors)			Supervisors		
	Min.	Mean	Max.	Min.	Mean	Max.
University	0.20	1.80	4.80	0	0.70	1.00
Health	0.18	0.80	2.00	0	0.31	1.00
Public	0.50	0.65	1.00	0.10	0.34	1.00
University/Public	1.00	-	-	N/A	-	-
Private Subscription	0.25	-	-	0.25	-	-

*N/A = Not Applicable

7   Cost of supplying an item on ILL (irrespective of format)

	Staffing costs per ILL supplied			Overall unit cost per ILL supplied		
	Min.	Mean	Max.	Min.	Mean	Max.
University	£4.93	£8.36	£93.13	£11.27	£16.49	£44.05
Health	£1.09	£7.31	£20.44	£4.05	£10.30	£23.07
Public	£23.30	£27.58	£36.84	£14.95	£44.39	£45.45
University/Public	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Private Subscription	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA

*NA = Not Available

8   Requirement for a copyright signature

From of signature required	YES	NO
Paper form	19 (70.4%)	8 (29.6%)
Electronic signature	16 (51.6%)	15 (48.4%)
Combination of the two	3 (16.7%)	15 (83.3%)

9   Location of the ILL team is based within overall organizational structure

General area of organizational structure	Number
Front of house (including Customer Services, User Services, Circulation, Lending)	17 (46%)
Back office (including Acquisitions, Academic Services, Purchasing, Collection Development)	15 (41%)
Staff based across the library staff (plus we all do a bit of everything)	5 (14%)

10   British Library as supplier

	YES	NO
BL as potential first source of supply for most requests	23 (63.9%)	13 (36.1%)
Checking BL catalogue prior to requesting	21 (61.8%)	13 (38.2%)
Use of Add Address	14 (38.9%)	22 (61.1%)
Use of BLDSS API	8 (27.6%)	21 (72.4%)
Use of FIFM	5 (15.6%)	27 (84.4%)
Use of GIFM	5 (15.6%)	27 (84.4%)
Use of 24 hour	11 (34.4%)	21 (65.6%)
Use of 2 hour	8 (25.8%)	23 (74.2%)
Use of WW search	12 (33.3%)	24 (66.7%)

11   Requests from other libraries – The Supplier Function

		Books			Articles		
		Requests received	Items supplied	% Fulfillment	Requests received	Items supplied	% Fulfillment
University	Min.	0	0	0.0%	2	1	2.7%
	Mean	769	482	62.6%	530	273	51.5%
	Max.	4297	2727	95.5%	2086	1225	100.0%
Health	Min.	170	170	100.0%	221	195	86.7%
	Mean	363	363	100.0%	223	198	88.8%
	Max.	556	556	100.0%	225	201	91.0%
Public	Min.	195	32	16.4%	0	0	-
	Mean	1429	1262	88.3%	126	101	80.1%
	Max.	4500	4400	100.0%	500	400	100.0%
University/ Public	Min.	57	19	33.3%	113	113	100.0%
	Mean	-	-	-	-	-	-
	Max.	-	-	-	-	-	-
Private Subscription	Min.	71	27	38.0%	2	1	50.0%
	Mean	-	-	-	-	-	-
	Max.	-	-	-	-	-	-

12   Inter-library Loans Management Systems

	University	Public	University/ Public	Health	Private Subscription	Totals
Capita (Talis) Alto	5		1			6
Innovative Millenium	3					3
Aleph	3					3
Winchill	1			2		3
BaseDoc				3		3
Heritage	1			1		2
Sierra	2					2
SirsiDynix	1	1				2
ExLibris Alma	1					2
None	1			1		2
Axiel Open Galaxy Plus		1				1
Civica		1				1
Clio	1					1
IILLOS	1					1
Spydus		1				1

'Frustrations' with current ILL Management System

- Insufficient linking between online form/catalogue/data fields in LMS
- Inadequate interoperability with circulation
- Too complicated set ups – needs Systems/IT intervention
- Inability to edit requests at all points in the workflow
- Inadequate reporting/statistics functionality
- Ineffective messaging/range of notifications
- Inability to manage a quota system
- Compatibility problems when systems are upgraded
- Inflexibility – workflows have to be adapted to fit constraints of the system
- Notes field too short
- Lack of transparency – what's seen on screen isn't what's sent to BL
- Infrequent updating – Library codes out of date
- Lack of development/commitment shown by supplier

Desired enhancements to current ILL Management System

- Better reporting/statistics and interrogation functionality
- Greater interoperability with Circulation (or LMS generally)
- Automatic charging and online payment at point of request
- Integration of copyright declarations including electronic signatures
- More logical/accurate workflows - SED requests moving to Pending upon transmission rather than Filled
- Ability for user to view status of requests ala Amazon
- Improved compatibility with BL systems - Artemail fields, incorporation of Add Address and API
- Extended Notes field
- Regularly updated Library codes
- Increased flexibility - Ability to easily customize by ILL staff (without IT intervention)

13   Postal/Courier Services

	University	Public	University/ Public	Health	Private Subscription	Totals
Royal Mail	14	2	1	2	1	20
DX	3	3		1		7
NHS Delivery				4		4
FedEX						?
TNT	1					1
Regional Van	1					1

Reasons for Dissatisfaction with Courier

- Unreliability of collection
- Inflexibility regarding collection points
- Lack of communication and poor customer service
- Minimum monthly cost
- Delays caused by own internal transit arrangements

Good features

- Tracked service
- Reliability

Some other noteworthy features/trends highlighted in the results include:

i. Despite reductions experienced by some libraries in recent years, the numbers of requests received both from our own users and from other libraries seems to be quite buoyant over all sectors.

ii. Some libraries in the university, public and health sectors are making efforts to supply all articles electronically.

iii. Very high fulfillment rates are achieved by some libraries across the different sectors

iv. The numbers of staff (in terms of FTEs) involved in processing ILL requests seems uniformly low across all sectors

v. The unit costs of supplying items on ILLs seems much higher in the Public sector than in University or Health libraries

vi. A significant number of libraries still require their users to sign a paper copyright declaration (though this situation may have changed since updates to copyright legislation last year)

vii. Just less than $^{2}/_{3}$s of libraries responding use the British Library as a potential first source of supply

As far as learning from examples of best practice is concerned, between sectors it seems that Health sector libraries have reported the highest overall fulfillment rates as well as quick supply times. Though there may be further opportunity to examine what those libraries are doing to achieve these high levels of performance at our workshop at Interlend 2015 we could speculate that the following factors contribute:

- A more focused subject field might make tracing particular items easier
- A smaller and specialist user group may mean a much more tailored/personalized service can be offered i.e. staff get to know their customers, the types of material they are requesting, and where they can get hold of them
- Reciprocal supply relationships between libraries in the health sector linked with shared catalogues
- Customer demand for fast supply times (lives could depend on it after all!) driving much earlier transfer to electronic supply

The difficulties in cross referencing sets of answers to different questions has made further identification of the defining characteristics of better performing libraries almost impossible. For example two of the university libraries who responded, known here as no. 46 and no.69

processed some of the highest numbers of requests from their own clients and achieved some of the best turnaround times with some of the more modest staffing levels (see below). However, unfortunately, these Libraries didn't supply data on their other costs and aspects of their workflows. Again, these libraries will be contacted in time for our workshop at Interlend 2015 to recommend the particular aspects of their [best] practice that we might all emulate to achieve similar levels of performance.

		Library 46	Library 69	Sector Average
Total number of requests from own users		10,000	11,090	4,369
Turnaround Times (Days)	Loans (Books/Whole Journals)	3	3-4	5.84
	Articles (Photocopies)	2	3-5	5.49
	Articles (electronic-delivery)	1	1	3.98
Team Staff involved in processing ILLs (FTEs)		1	2	1.8
ILL Supervisor (FTEs)		1	1	0.7
Management System		Sierra	Talis Alto	N/A
Courier/Transport System		Royal Mail	Regional Van	N/A

The Future/ Lessons Learned

During the compilation and analysis of the results it became increasingly clear that features of the original questionnaire necessarily imposed limitations on the interpretation of the results. These included:

- After the initial scoping survey most of the questions in the main data collection questionnaire were made optional as it was recognized that not all the ILL staff wishing to participate on behalf of their institutions were in a position to provide data in response to all the proposed questions. This meant that although overall 38 libraries participated, few questions elicited a full data set making cross tabulation difficult.
- As FIL is cross-sectoral the survey was open to all libraries wishing to participate. Attempting to benchmark across different types of organization was felt to be justified in that Inter-library Loans is a significantly specialized field for us to attempt to make well-founded comparisons between sectors and potentially learn from each other. However, the majority of respondents were from University Libraries with only relatively small numbers of other libraries represented making like comparisons within these others sectors of limited significance.
- The lack of contextual information ("the backstory") imposes significant limitations on interpretations of the data. Numbers of ILL requests for example will obviously be influenced by several factors not least the size of the home user population and the range and extent of libraries' own collections. This is where some form of 'normalisation' of the data as demonstrated by a national study of Dutch academic libraries (Voorbij, 2009) study may have proved useful e.g. by dividing the number of requests by the size

of the local user group. However, in all but the university libraries this may have proved impossible and was perhaps beyond the scope of this project.

However, despite these reservations it is hoped that the participating libraries will find the quantitative and qualitative data presented here useful in positioning their own performance in relation to that of others across a range of key characteristics/indicators of an ILL service.

We will try to identify characteristics within the workflows of exemplars such as libraries no. 46 and no. 69 that could account for their apparent high performance during our workshop at Interlend 2015. We will also attempt to define a lighter, more flexible toolkit for benchmarking ILL performance indicators in the future. See you there!

References

Hart, S. and Amos, H. (2014) The development of performance measures through an activity based benchmarking project across and international network of academic libraries. Performance Measurement and Metrics, Vol. 15 (1/2) pp.58-66

Laevan, H. and Smit, A. (2003) A project to benchmark university libraries in The Netherlands. Library Management, Vol. 24 (6/7) pp.291-304

Jilovsky, C. (2011) Singing in harmony: benchmarking in academic libraries. Library Management, Vol. 32 (1/2) pp. 48-61

Missingham, R. and Moreno, M. (2007) Australian resource sharing: did ILL benchmarking make a difference? Interlending and Document Supply, Vol.35 (1) pp.21-27

Pringle, Jr., R.M., Croft, V.F. and Braun, R.E. (2001) Preparing to benchmark: Seven Northwest libraries replicate the Canadian project. Journal of Librarianship, Vol. 1 (3) pp.1-16

Voorbij, H (2009) Academic Library benchmarking in The Netherlands: a comparative study. Performance Measurement and Metrics, Vol. 10 (1) pp.59-72

Contributors

Jennifer Marvin
Queen Elizabeth Hospital Birmingham
Jennifer.Marvin@uhb.nhs.uk

Marion Shepherd
Royal Berkshire NHS Foundation Trust
marion.shepherd@royalberkshire.nhs.uk

Emily Stannard
Bradfield College
estannard@bradfieldcollege.org.uk

Lauren Bell
Queen Elizabeth Hospital Birmingham Library
Lauren.Bell@uhb.nhs.uk

Karen Paine
LSE Library
k.p.paine@lse.ac.uk

Chris Beevers
University of Huddersfield
c.j.beevers@hud.ac.uk

FIL Committee

Chair – Sandra DeRoy
sandrad@essex.ac.uk

Vice Chair & Marketing – Tracey Jackson
tracey.jackson@hertfordshire.gov.uk

Secretary – Joanne Docherty
joanne.docherty@glasgow.ac.uk

Treasurer – Julie Clement
Julie.clement@swansea.gov.uk

Membership - Marjory Lobban
marjory.lobban@ed.ac.uk

Web Officer - Natalie Guest
n.guest@reading.ac.uk

Su Fagg
s.fagg@worc.ac.uk

Karen Paine
k.p.paine@lse.ac.uk

Lesley Butler
l.m.butler@liverpool.ac.uk

Gillian Wilson – CONARLS Observer
nwlip@lancashire.gov.uk

Kate Ebdon – British Library Observer
Kate.ebdon@bl.uk

forum for interlending