



# NMRLS Interlibrary Loan Committee Interlibrary Loan Best Practices Task Force

## Final Report

*Scott Kehoe, Task Force Chairperson, Consultant, NMRLS.*

June 28, 2002

---

### Introduction

The NMRLS Interlibrary Loan Best Practices Task Force was a result of the NMRLS Interlibrary Loan Committee plan of service objectives for fiscal years 2001 and 2002. For fiscal year 2001, the *NMRLS Plan of Service* states, "Form a task force to investigate ILL practices and make appropriate recommendations" (*NMRLS Plan of Service - FY 2001*, p.7, Objective B, Activity 5). For fiscal year 2002, the *NMRLS Plan of Service* states, "Identify and promote best ILL practices and make appropriate recommendations" (*NMRLS Plan of Service - FY 2002*, p.8, Objective 2, Activity 5).

The committee chairperson, Scott Kehoe, was approved in the Spring of 2001 by the NMRLS ILL Committee and charged with creating a task force to fulfill these charges. The following individuals graciously agreed to serve on this task force:

Scott Kehoe, Consultant/Trainer - NMRLS - *Chairperson*  
Mary Ann Blair, Circulation Librarian - Winthrop Public Library, Winthrop  
Marilyn Graves, Interlibrary Loan Librarian – NOBLE, Danvers  
Anna Kjoss, Interlibrary Loan Coordinator - Memorial Hall Library, Andover  
Kevin McGrath, Library Media Specialist, Beverly High School Library, Beverly  
Kristina Worcester, Head of Information Services – J. V. Fletcher Library, Westford

The committee met twice in May and June of 2001, discussed their charge, and divided up responsibilities for information gathering. After the initial two meetings, the committee corresponded by email. A preliminary report of the Task Force's conclusions was given by the chairperson at the NMRLS ILL Committee meeting on April 18, 2002 at O'Leary Library, UMass-Lowell.

## Task Force Methodology

The Task Force decided that the best way to gather information related to our charge would be a three-pronged approach. First, conduct a professional literature search using the online full-text databases available in our Region (Gale InfoTrac and EBSCOHost). Second, search for web sites on ILL best practices. Third, survey other multi-type regional library systems throughout the United States. The results of this research is available in the appendixes to this report:

**Appendix A – Interlibrary Loan: a selected literature review, p. 4.**

**Appendix B – An Annotated Bibliography of ILL Best Practices Websites, p.15.**

**Appendix C – Best Practices Survey Results, p.17.**

**Appendix D – Interlibrary Loan & Delivery Questionnaire, p.22.**

**Appendix E - Interlibrary Loan Services for Disabled Persons, p.25.**

## Recommendations

### ***Finalize NMRLS ILL procedures and best practices for member libraries in FY03.***

Every regional system that partook in our survey had an ILL policy in place for their members. We now have access to a number of manuals to draw on to update and enhance our own draft procedures and best practices.

### ***ILL Promotion.***

As has been discussed in previous ILL committee meetings, promoting ILL to our member libraries and helping them in turn promote this service to their patrons is a direction that the ILL committee has already decided to work toward. Survey participants indicated that they had promoted ILL to their member libraries or to their patrons, and that the results had been positive. This is experience that NMRLS can certainly tap into. Release of the NMRLS best practices manual for our members could be tied into general ILL promotion for our Region. The recent installation and use of ARIEL by both our Regional ILL centers has potential as a great tool for promoting ILL to both Regional librarians and their patrons.

### ***Copyright education.***

From our Task Force members' own experience as well as our survey respondents', copyright law, fair-use, and its relationship to ILL is something that library professionals are very interested in. Many regions surveyed stated that they provide continuing education in this area and there is a continual demand for more. Such an effort could also be tied-in with an overall ILL promotion campaign.

### ***Centralized pick-up/drop-off points for member Libraries not on delivery.***

While this was not a service apparently offered by any of the regions surveyed, we do feel that this is something that the ILL Committee should look into as a further enhancement to resources sharing in the Region. A proposal might be that the Public Library in each community be a pick-up/drop-off point for those member libraries in their community not on Regional delivery.

## Conclusion

The research conducted by the Task Force not only served as catalyst for new ideas but also as a self-check of ILL services in our Region. The work behind this report allowed us to re-examine the initiatives from the NMRLS ILL Committee as well as services and procedures already provided by the ILL centers in the Region. Our findings indicate that our Region is at or exceeds the level of services offered by other regional library systems across the country.

The most striking example of innovation in our Region is the use of ARIEL document delivery software as a regional ILL tool. While the use of ARIEL was not uncommon in our survey of other regional library systems, their use was limited to specific libraries and not seen as a shared tool for other members in that region. NMRLS application of ARIEL as a Regional ILL Center is unique; the ILL Committee should take pride in the fact that their support of this tool on a regional basis is a cutting-edge resource sharing innovation.

Our survey essentially confirmed many of our assumptions about ILL and delivery. Demand is increasing while funding is not. Nearly every library system surveyed had implemented patron placed holds via an OPAC. That in itself has had tremendous impact on ILL and delivery for regional systems while at the same time has increased positive feelings about library services by both librarians and their patrons. Direct-to-patron delivery of ILL items was also beginning to be considered by some regional systems.

Given the reality of fiscal restraints that many systems operate under, an overwhelmingly “can-do” attitude was evident from our survey respondents. This reflects quite positively on interlibrary loan librarians and the library profession as a whole.

In conclusion, the Task Force chair would like to acknowledge the hard work and professionalism displayed by all the committee members in their contributions to this final report and the Task Force recommendations.

# Appendix A

## Interlibrary Loan: a selected literature review.

Compiled and annotated by:

*Anna Kjoss, ILL Coordinator, Memorial Hall Library, Andover, MA.*

*Kevin McGrath, Library Media Specialist, Beverly High School, Beverly, MA.*

---

**Note:** The following bibliography is in alphabetic order by author's last name except for the last product review article by Mary Jackson. This has been placed at the end due to the length of its abstract.

**Cook, Anita. "Separate Systems, Common Cause: How Three Networks Have Fared" *American Libraries* 31:10 (November 2000), 38-41.**

Cook, director of library systems for OhioLINK, notes that successes in three consortia—Ohio (OhioLINK), three north-central states (Minitex), and California (California Digital Library)—in handling interlibrary loan exceed expectations. OhioLINK includes 78 public and private colleges and the State Library of Ohio. OhioLINK allows users to request books directly. Currently they do not allow direct requests for photocopies of journal articles. The reasons include issues of copyright (since the user request bypasses the borrowing library), and the expectation that the volume of requests, (which has increased steadily and exponentially since OhioLINK inception in the 1980's) would be too great to handle with current staff. Minitex, originally created to be a centralized interlibrary loan unit, has become more and more decentralized, with a plan to accelerate "user initiated requesting". Some libraries in Minitex currently allow for unmediated requests; in these cases user requests for articles held by the University of Minnesota are automatically routed without going through an interlibrary loan office. Minitex plans to implement electronic article delivery to end-users in the near future. Being a member of the Copyright Clearance Center, it will not process a request that does not indicate whether it is in compliance with copyright law. The California Digital Library has been accepting users-imitated requests through a centralized Web interface. These requests include both returnable items and journal articles.

**Delaney, Thomas G. "The day it rained in Fort Collins, Colorado," *Journal of Interlibrary Loan, Document Delivery & Information Supply*, 8:4, 1998, p.59 (12).**

Delaney briefly reviews the development of automated ILL and the factors which spurred that development. It specifically, reviews the development of an automated ILL system at Colorado State University. By 1997 CSU was in the final stages of automating their entire ILL process. A joint effort with OCLC using PRISM transfer enabled patrons to electronically enter requests which were then automatically transferred to the OCLC review files. CLIO software was selected as the automated database tracking package. With these implementations, ILL became virtually paperless. Concurrently, the library was nearing completion of extensive expansion and renovation. Much of the collection was temporarily housed in the basement of the building. On July 28, 1997, Fort Collins experienced a "500 year rainstorm" receiving 10 inches of rain

in the span of 2 hours. The ensuing flooding destroyed almost 50 % of the library's collection. Despite the enormity of the calamity, ILL remained functional without loss of records because of automation. Not surprisingly, the loss of so much of the collection had an enormous impact on the volume of ILL activity. However, the flexibility and power of the automated system plus some extra funding for staff and some programming adaptations permitted the department to cope admirably with the crisis. A pointed object lesson for all.

**Driver, Linda, et. al., “Meet the Implementers (They’re Concerned with Protocol)” *American Libraries* 31:10 (November 2000) 43-47.**

Interviews key figures in the plan for broad based acceptance and implementation of the ISO IL Protocol. All are members of the ILL Protocol Implementers Group (IPIG). All assert that compliance with the new ILL protocol will soon be a necessity, and that most systems already are, or have a plan for implementing the new protocol.

For more information on the ISO ILL Protocol:

[www.nlc-bnc.ca/iso/ill/](http://www.nlc-bnc.ca/iso/ill/)

For products that use the ISO LL Protocol:

[www.nlc-bnc.ca/wbin/illcntct/survsee/](http://www.nlc-bnc.ca/wbin/illcntct/survsee/)

IPIG members and status of testing:

[www.arl.org/access/naildd/ipig/ipig.shtml](http://www.arl.org/access/naildd/ipig/ipig.shtml)

**Eimer, Marianne B. and Kathleen L. Loomis. “The Future of Sharing: the Effect of Statewide Consortia on Select Interlibrary Loan Departments”, *Journal of Interlibrary Loan, Document Delivery & Information Supply* 10:3 (2000) 43-61.**

Describes four examples of efforts to develop statewide electronic library consortia, SUNYConnect, OhioLINK, GALILEO (Georgia), and VIVA (Virginia), based on surveys sent to consortia members. The purpose was to elicit information on “prior conditions and current conditions within the Interlibrary Loan departments of these institutions, pinpointing increases or decreases in particular categories.” The study found that respondents were pleased with the results of consorcial membership. The process of requesting and receiving loans within the consortia was considered faster and easier than those from out of state. This is due in part to the effect of patron-initiated loans. One major change reported was shifting of book loan transactions from the Interlibrary Loan department to the Circulation department.

OhioLINK: [www.ohio-link.edu](http://www.ohio-link.edu)

VIVA: [www.viva.lib.va.us](http://www.viva.lib.va.us)

SUNYConnect: [www.sunyconnect.suny.edu/](http://www.sunyconnect.suny.edu/)

GALILEO: [www.galileo.peachnet.edu/](http://www.galileo.peachnet.edu/)

**Fleck, Nancy W. “Interlibrary loan – a new frontier!” *Library Hi-Tech* 18: 2. (2000), 172-176.**

This article examines the introduction of patron-initiated requests at Michigan State University. It reviews how the new system has been received and whether or not it improved delivery time and lowered costs (it did). Nancy W. Fleck is head

of Technical Services. MSU has been offering patron-initiated requests since 1998. The new system uses Innovative Interfaces software, which at the time of writing did not have a lending function. However, this is anticipated in the near future. The system features a menu option in the catalog that allows registered users access to a basic interlibrary loan form. Once a request is generated, it enters a “new request” file in the Interlibrary Loan module, which staff review and process or send it to the OCLC review file. The system eliminates the need for staff to re-key in all the information. The system creates a “virtual record” once the request has been made, which is checked out to the patron upon receipt. It also allows staff to generate e-mails to patrons notifying them of the status of their request. Patrons can also check the status of their request by referring to the temporary record, which includes the status of the request. Overdue notices are also generated electronically. The staff no longer needs to keep a paper file, although printed notices can be easily produced upon demand.

At the time of writing, Fleck anticipated a move toward fully unmediated patron ILL requests, whereby a request will go directly to a server reserved for interlibrary loan at the lending library. Work has begun on a project (DRSS, Distributed Resource Sharing System), which uses the ISO ILL Protocol to send, receive, and process transactions. Work has also begun on a document delivery system using the Prospero and Ariel software systems to deliver articles. Workstations with Prospero software will allow users, with an ID and password, the ability to download Ariel documents in PDF format.

Fleck hypothesizes that requests will continue to increase as the process becomes easier and faster.

Prospero was developed at the John A. Prior Health Sciences Library at Ohio State University. Visit and download Prospero at:

<http://bones.med.ohio-state.edu/prospero/>

**Fuller, David H. “From Paper to Electronic: Migrating from Paper Interlibrary Loan Borrowing Request Forms to Electronic – One Approach” *Journal of Interlibrary Loan, Document Delivery & Information Supply* 10:3 (2000) 1-10.**

The author discusses the experience of the University of Florida’s experience in exploring ways to make an ever-expanding interlibrary loan demand less taxing on staff and resources. An initial solution was a 100% migration from paper to electronic borrowing request forms. Benefits included faster turnaround time, lower costs, and increased user satisfaction (overall). Describes the research done to find an appropriate product that would interact with the OCLC ILL Prism Subsystem, which the University currently used. Describes the planning involved to implement the State University System Interlibrary Loan Client (SILLC).

**Gasaway, Laura N. “Guidelines for Distance Learning and Interlibrary Loan: Doomed and more Doomed,” *Journal of the American Society for Information Science*, 50:14 (1999), 1337-1342.**

Gasaway reports on the proceedings of a recent Conference on Fair Use (CONFU), in which distance-learning guidelines were discussed along with interlibrary loan guidelines. While initially there was an anticipation of general agreement in negotiating guidelines for interlibrary loan, the divergent views of

the publishing and library industries led to an impasse that was never resolved, resulting in a complete failure to reach an agreement, “bringing an end to interlibrary-loan guidelines in the context of CONFU.

**Hudson, Laura. “Interlibrary Loan on the Web: Using Common Gateway Interface (CGI) with Web Forms at Ohio University’s Alden Library,” *Library Computing* 18:3 (2000), 235-244.**

Hudson describes Alden Library’s use of CGI scripts and web forms to produce a cost-effective way to provide library users enhanced document delivery, in a research library that is poorly staffed. She points out that CGI scripts and web forms are easy to produce, even by staff without scripting experience. Form design is discussed in detail. Finally, the benefits and drawbacks of the system compared to off-the-shelf products is discussed, concluding that while systems such as ILLIAD, ZAP, and III may involve some cost and training at the start, they are worthwhile in terms of saving in the long run. In the meantime, she suggests using CGI scripts and web forms as an intermediary step.

**Hutcheson, Cathy. “Interlibrary Loan Borrowing Policy Comparison,” *Journal of Interlibrary Loan, Document Delivery & Information Supply*, 8:3, 1998, pp.7-42.**

Because of the enormous changes in technologies, processes and procedures there is a need for many libraries to review and, if necessary, revise their ILL policies. This article surveys and analyzes the policies of 42 (university) libraries and attempts to identify trends in service from the data as well as provides examples for others to use in formulating their own policies. (All the policies reviewed were available on the web and addresses were given.) The author paid particular attention to five categories related to the borrowing end of ILL: who was eligible to use ILL; were there charges for the service; how were requests made; could patrons request materials owned by the library, but currently unavailable; how were patrons contacted when materials arrived. While the library policies surveyed were from academic libraries, many of the conclusions drawn about trends and policy development are relevant to all types of libraries. In summary, ILL policies should reflect the overall goals and objectives of the library, they should set the standards of, clarify the limits of, and help maintain continuity of service.

**Jackson, Mary E. “Loan stars: ILL comes of age,” *Library Journal*, 123:2, Feb. 1, 1998, pp.44-47.**

Jackson is the leading luminary on the ILL scene and her article is a must read for anyone involved in resource sharing. It reviews many of the changes and improvements in ILL service that have occurred over the last few years and summarizes some findings from a national ILL performance measures study. The direction of ILL is decidedly toward more patron-initiated requests, ILL management software, direct delivery of materials to patrons, and increasing reliance on technology. Ms. Jackson’s message is clear: it is time for all ILL departments to review their policies and procedures in light of current trends and technologies and, by marrying best practices to an experienced and dedicated staff, provide patrons with the best possible service.

**Jackson, Mary E. “Looking Back and Looking Ahead: The Best is Yet to Come”**  
*American Libraries* 31:10 (November 2000) 47-49.

Jackson predicts that the business of resource sharing will change dramatically, for the better, in the next five to seven years. She points to trends such as growing peer-to-peer based transactions, the emergence of the ISO ILL Protocol and the NISO Circulation Protocol, dynamic holdings based on Z39.50, and increased access to full-text resources in consortia. Statewide access to full-text resources is also a growing trend.

**Johnson, Ron and Sue Cody. “‘Git’ it for me on Interlibrary Loan: patron initiated electronic requesting and document delivery on the INNOPAC’s Interlibrary Loan Module,”** *Journal of Interlibrary Loan, Document Delivery & Information Supply*, 8:4,1998, p.19(12).

This article examines the potential of patron initiated electronic ILL requesting modules (in this case, Triple I’s INNOPAC system) which interface with library catalogs, circulation systems and other modules (including systems like OCLC and ERIC) of an integrated library system. The article details the experience of the University of North Carolina’s library system which purchased INNOPAC to link the members of the UNC Coastal Library Consortium. A beta version of the module was installed in 1995 and it was decided to implement full patron access to the software without any prior staff trials. The article well describes patron options, how the process worked, what statistics were garnered, problems encountered, impact on workflow, patron reaction, etc. In general the authors conclude that INNOPAC greatly improved the efficiency of the ILL process. Even though dated now, the article is relevant since both the major consortial players in this region use systems which have similar ILL components.

**Krall, Robert. “‘Get it Fast, and Get It Cheap’—What’s an ILL Librarian to Do?”**  
*American Libraries* 31:10 (November 2000), 41-43.

Krall writes that the only way for research libraries to keep up with scholarly output is through interlibrary loan and document delivery. He describes the University of Pennsylvania’s involvement in a pilot project called Borrow Direct, in which the University entered a partnership with Columbia and Yale. Borrow Direct is a virtual catalog of all three libraries with borrowing privileges for each. The system allows “lower-level staff or student help” to handle a large amount of requests.

**Murphy, Molly, and Karen Rupp-Serrano. “Interlibrary Loan and Document Delivery: Lessons to Be Learned,”** *Journal of Library Administration* 28:2 (1999), 15-24.

Analyzes recent developments in document delivery and interlibrary loan. The authors point out that a tradeoff for having interlibrary loan software is that staff must diligently administer the database in order to get meaningful statistics. These may be used for a variety of purposes such as analyzing subjects of material requested for collection development purposes. In some cases, titles requested twice could be flagged for purchase, saving time for the collection development librarian. The University of Oklahoma Libraries is using such a system (Clio).

**Preece, Barbara G. and Thomas L. Kilpatrick. "Cutting out the Middleman: Patron- Initiated Interlibrary Loans," *Library Trends*, 48, Summer 1998, p144.**

In the 50 years of formal ILL service, both theory and practice have become much more liberal, partly in response to the increased volume of publishing and partly as a result of technology, including the accessibility of materials with the advent of online catalogs and other databases, etc. Libraries have experienced enormous growth in ILL activity. The article tracks the response to this growth at the Morris Library at Southern Illinois University in Carbondale. (In a 30-year period, requests rose from 400 per annum to over 88,500.) Over the course of time, the ILL department responded to changing circumstances in a variety of ways, from staffing changes to new technology and equipment, consortial arrangements and, ultimately patron initiated holds. In the mid 1990's, SIUC undertook an extensive examination of their ILL process to see what was working well and what needed redesigning. The authors were specifically interested in turnaround times, fill rates, fill rates by format type, methods of request submission and patron satisfaction. The basic conclusion reached was that patron initiated loans were overwhelmingly popular and efficient and greatly enhanced the department's ability to meet its goal of maximizing access to resources while minimizing costs and effort.

**Schafer, Jay and Glenda A. Thornton. "From Ownership to Access: Re-Engineering Library Services", *Reference Librarian* 63 (1999) 25-41.**

Reports on the decision of the Auroria Library at the University of Colorado to re-think its collection development philosophy to include document delivery and interlibrary loan. The library adopted the idea that meeting the information needs of users is a collection development activity that should include access to information outside the library, and so the materials budget should include document delivery and interlibrary loan. Thus, access is incorporated into collection development. Notes that it costs an average of \$18.62 for a research library to borrow an item, and \$10.93 for another library to send an item, resulting in a total cost of \$29.95 for each completed transaction. These statistics have affected the thinking in reviewing costs of journal subscriptions.

**Schuyler, Michael. "ILL automation and the balance of trade deficit," *Computers in Libraries*, 18:5, May 1998, p.32-35.**

A regular contributor to *Computers in Libraries*, Schuyler presents his views on ILL service in light of his library's system recent implementation of Ameritech's Resource Sharing System, the final phase of a complete overhaul of the ILL department. He comments on the expense of maintaining and administrating interlibrary loan and how borrowing material is often more costly than buying it and voices his hope that automation and paper reduction will markedly increase efficiency. He comments on the phenomenon of skewed net lender ratios where "out-go" far exceeds "in-come" tending to undermine rather than promote the whole ideal of resource sharing. Regardless of the RSS bias, the article offers abundant food for thought regarding some very basic ILL issues.

**Jackson, Mary E. “Interlibrary Loan and Resource Sharing Products: an Overview of Current Features and Functionality”, *Interlibrary Loan Reports*, 36: 6 (November – December 2000), p. 5-228.**

This full-issue article reviews 23 products designed to support ILL operations, based on questionnaires and other research. The introduction points out that emerging collaborations and partnerships have brought an industry-wide ISO ILL Protocol compliance closer to reality. Special emphasis is placed on the importance of standards such as the ISO ILL Protocol and the NISO Circulation Interchange Protocol (NCIP). Key advantages to some of the systems include combinations of messaging and local management of requests, files, and statistics. Another is the ability to support a distributed, or peer-to-peer model of ILL, which may result in faster services and lower costs. Jackson also points out that ILL borrowing has increased 169% from 1986 to 1999, while lending increased ‘only’ 65%.

Each review includes sections on “Archiving Records”, “Creating and Accessing Records”, “Customization”, “Interface with External Systems”, “Patron-Initiated Requesting”, “Pricing”, “Reports and Statistics”, “Support of Standards”, “System Architecture”, “Target Audience”, “Technical Support”, “Training”, “Borrowing Functionality”, and “Lending Functionality”.

*Products Reviewed in Article:*

**ALEPH 500** by  
Integrated Library Automation System  
Ex Libris (USA)

*Notes:* The ALEPH 500 is a component of the Ex Libris integrated library system. Includes patron-initiated requesting, and both patron and staff web-based interfaces are “highly customizable.” A Z39.50 search tool is incorporated for “verification of requests and identification of potential lenders.” Target audience is large academic and research institutions and consortia, but is used in public, special and school libraries.

**CARLWeb**  
CARL Corp.  
Web: [www.carl.org](http://www.carl.org)

*Notes:* Facilitates Interlibrary Loan in two ways: System Holds is designed for unmediated ILL where patrons place holds on items held by other libraries. The patron placed hold generates a system hold. The CARLWeb ILL Request allows patrons to submit loan requests or photocopy requests to their local libraries. System Holds and CARLWeb ILL Request are only available as part of the CARL system.

**Clio (version B 2.1)**  
Clio Software  
Web: [cliosoftware.com](http://cliosoftware.com)

*Notes:* Clio is a stand-alone ILL product...designed to eliminate manual effort wherever possible. In a web-interface, ClioRequest, patrons do the typing, but currently all requests are mediated by staff. Prepares bookstraps with barcodes,

overdue notices and arrival notices. Patrons can check the status of their request via the web. Used in a variety of institutions and consortia.

**DOCLINE** (version 1.0)

National Library of Medicine

Web: [www.nlm.nih.gov](http://www.nlm.nih.gov)

*Notes:* “DOCLINE is the National Library of Medicine’s Web-based automated ILL request routing and referral system”. Only health sciences libraries are eligible to use DOCLINE.

**GeoWeb OPAC**

Geac Computer Corp. Ltd.

Web: [www.geac.com](http://www.geac.com)

*Notes:* “Geac’s Web-to-VDX is designed to provide an interface for patrons to submit requests to the ILL office. Requests are electronically sent to Fretwell-Downings’s Virtual Document eXchange (VDX)—a product within GeoWeb OPAC—for mediated or unmediated processing.” Target audience is Geac customers.

**ILL Manager** (version 1.0)

The Research Libraries Group (RLG)

Web: [www.rlg.org/illman/](http://www.rlg.org/illman/)

*Notes:* This is a stand-alone product that is designed to support a distributed, peer-to-peer interlibrary loan environment. Supports loan requests and photocopy requests. “Interacts with OCLC and RLIN via ISO ILL gateways and will communicate with DOCLINE as soon as DOCLINE becomes ISO compliant (planned for fall of 2000).” Is fully integrated with Ariel functionality through ISO ILL Protocol. Supports Z39.50 searching, and is highly customizable.

**ILLiad**

Atlas Systems

Web: [www.Atlas-sys.com](http://www.Atlas-sys.com)

*Notes:* This is a stand-alone product originally designed to manage OCLC borrowing requests at Virginia Tech. It was expanded to support requests for RLIN and DOCLINE. Support for ISO ILL Protocol is in development. OCLC recently became sole licensor of the software.

**Impact/ISO ILL** (version 2.1)

Auto-Graphics

Web: [www.auto-graphics.com](http://www.auto-graphics.com)

*Notes:* Stand-alone product designed to support peer-to-peer environments. Uses the ISO ILL Protocol for communication with OCLC and RLIN. Supports loan and photocopy requests. Bibliographic and location information can be captured from an external catalog. Does not support patron-initiated holds (mediated ILL only).

**INN-Reach** (version 2000)

Innovated Interfaces, Inc.

Web: [www.iii.com](http://www.iii.com)

*Notes:* INN-Reach is a component of an integrated system. Supports a patron-initiated circulation model, but is not designed to allow patrons to send ILL requests to an ILL department for processing. Does not support the ISO ILL Protocol, nor is it designed to be used by libraries that do a “majority of their ILL messaging on OCLC, RLIN, or DOCLINE.” Union catalog may be searched with a Z39.50 interface. May be used by any size library or consortium.

**Library-Request**

The Library Corp. (TLC)

Web: [tlcdelivers.com](http://tlcdelivers.com)

*Notes:* Can be used as either a stand-alone product or integrated with a library system. Complies with ISO ILL Protocol, and is designed to be used in consortial model where libraries share the same catalog. Does not permit patrons to place holds, but allows for them to initiate ILL requests to be sent electronically to the borrowing institution.

**Innovative Interlibrary Loan**

Innovative Interfaces, Inc.

Web: [www.iii.com](http://www.iii.com)

*Notes:* Innovative Interlibrary Loan is a component of III’s integrated system. Supports both mediated and unmediated models, including patron- or staff-initiated loan or photocopy requests and e-mail notification. Supports the ISO ILL Protocol, and has Z39.50 capability for both patrons and staff. Flexible and customizable for a variety of types of libraries.

**KLAS (Keystone Library Automation System)**

Keystone Systems, Inc.

Web: [www.klas.com](http://www.klas.com)

*Notes:* KLAS is a component of an integrated system. Processing of patron requests made electronically through the union catalog is automatic. However, if item is not available in the union catalog, the patron submits a traditional ILL request.

**Mandarin M3** (version 1.1)

Sirs Mandarin, Inc.

Web: [www.sirs.com](http://www.sirs.com)

*Notes:* The ILL module is only available for users of the Sirs Mandarin product.

**OCLC Interlibrary Loan Service**

OCLC Online Computer Library Center, Inc.

Web: [www.oclc.org](http://www.oclc.org)

*Notes:* OCLC ILL supports the ISO ILL Protocol, and employs mediated ILL requesting only. Available to any OCLC member.

**QuickDOC (Version QD4Win)**

Jay Daly

Web: [www.nlm.nih.gov/~quickdoc/QD4WinInfo.pdf](http://www.nlm.nih.gov/~quickdoc/QD4WinInfo.pdf)

*Notes:* Software program designed to track DOCLINE requests, for medical libraries.

**RSS (Resource Sharing System) (version 3.1)**

epixtech, inc.

Web: [www.epixtech.com](http://www.epixtech.com)

*Notes:* Stand-alone product designed to operate with other ISO ILL Protocol compliant systems. Permits unmediated patron borrowing that sends a message to a potential lender, but does not currently allow patrons to place holds.

**TLC (Total Library Computerization) (version 2.2)**

On Point, Inc.

Web: [www.onpointinc.com](http://www.onpointinc.com)

*Note:* TLC is an integrated system designed for small corporate, law, and special libraries.

**URSA (Universal Resource Sharing Application) (version 2.6)**

epixtech, inc.

Web: [www.epixtech.com](http://www.epixtech.com)

*Notes:* URSA is a stand-alone product designed for use by consortia whose members use multiple integrated library systems. Can be configured to support mediated or fully unmediated models of interlibrary loan. Currently used by the Boston Library Consortium.

**Virtual Document eXchange (VDX)**

Fretwell-Downing, Inc.

Web: <http://www.fdgroupp.com/fdiusa>

*Notes:* VDX is a stand-alone, ISO ILL Protocol compliant product designed to “manage all aspects of borrowing and lending”. Permits patrons to search remote catalogs and initiate ILL requests.

**Web Collection Plus (version 4.1)**

Follett Software Co.

Web: [fsc.follett.com](http://fsc.follett.com)

*Notes:* “Aimed at K-12 school libraries, Web Collection Plus is an online catalog that includes an ILL feature.”

**WebZap** (version 1.1)

Developed by Colorado State University.

Supported and Maintained by International Solutions and Technical Support (ISTS)

Web: [www.Webzap.org](http://www.Webzap.org)

*Notes:* Stand-alone product originally designed to aid in patron requests at Colorado State University, where requests were sent to the OCLC ILL system without requiring staff to key-in information. ILL staff must match patron request with bibliographic record on OCLC. Manages borrowing process only; no lending activity.

**Wings Request Management System** (version 2.1)

Pigasus Software, Inc.

Web: [www.pigasus.com](http://www.pigasus.com)

*Notes:* Stand-alone product designed to interact with integrated library systems. Manages all aspects of borrowing and lending. Supports loan requests, photocopy requests, subject requests, and requests for information. Interacts with OCLC, RLIN, DOCLINE and other ISO ILL systems. Does not permit patrons to place holds but may do so in the future.

**Winnebago Spectrum Union Catalog**

Sagebrush Corp.

Web: [www.winnebago.com](http://www.winnebago.com)

*Notes:* A component of the Winnebago Spectrum Union Catalog, the ILL module is aimed at K-12 school libraries and media centers.

# Appendix B

## An Annotated Bibliography of Interlibrary Loan Best Practices Websites

*Compiled and annotated by  
Marilyn Graves, Interlibrary Loan Librarian, NOBLE, Danvers, MA.*

Also online at: <http://www.noblenet.org/ill/bestpract.htm>

---

### **1. Report of the Big 12 Plus Task Force on Interlibrary Loan Best Practices**

<http://www.big12plus.org/committees/ill-bestpractices.htm>

The BTP Executive Committee mandated the establishment of a task force to study and improve interlibrary loan within the consortium.

### **2. Interlibrary Loan Code for the United States - ALA**

[http://www.ala.org/rusa/stnd\\_inc.html](http://www.ala.org/rusa/stnd_inc.html)

"The Reference and User Services Association, RUSA, acting for the American Library Association in its adoption of this code recognizes that the sharing of material between libraries is an integral element in the provision of library service and believes it to be in the public interest to encourage such an exchange. In the interest of providing quality service, libraries have an obligation to obtain material to meet the informational needs of users when local resources do not meet those needs. Interlibrary loan (ILL), a mechanism for obtaining material is essential to the vitality of all libraries. The effectiveness of the national interlibrary loan system depends upon participation of libraries of all types and sizes. This code establishes principles that facilitate the requesting of material by a library and the provision of loans or copies in response to those requests. In this code, "material" includes books, audiovisual materials, and other returnable items as well as copies of journal articles, book chapters, excerpts, and other non-returnable items. " ( *from Introduction* )

### **3. "Measuring the Performance of Interlibrary Loan and Document Delivery Services " by Mary E. Jackson - ARL Access & Delivery Services Consultant**

<http://www.arl.org/newsltr/195/illdds.html>

"Reports findings emerging from the Interlibrary Loan and Document Delivery (ILL/DD) Performance Measures Study, a two-year effort to measure 1995/96 performance of ILL departments in North American research and college libraries. The Study examined four performance measures: cost, fill rate, turnaround time, and user satisfaction. The Study also examined the differences among libraries and identified characteristics of low-cost, high-performing ILL operations to suggest strategies for other research and college libraries to improve local performance. " (*from document* )

#### **4. Report on Benchmarking Process January-May 1999**

<http://www.lib.virginia.edu/staff/management-information/bench-ProcessRept.html>

"For the 1998/2000 biennium, the University of Virginia Library chose as one of its goals (6f) to institute benchmarking as a tool for the analysis of internal processes and to establish benchmarks against which the Library can measure those processes. The Library's first Benchmarking Team was created in January 1999. The Team was charged with two challenges: to create a benchmarking process for the Library; and to carry out a short-term benchmarking project as a pilot (for which there is a separate Shelving Report). " *(from report)*

#### **5. Measuring the Performance of Interlibrary Loan Operations in North American / Research and College Libraries.**

<http://library.northernlight.com/PN19991030010132009.html?cb=0&sc=0#doc>

The Association of Research Libraries (ARL) has announced that it has published a report, Measuring the Performance of Interlibrary Loan Operations in North American Research and College Libraries (ISBN: 0-918006-33-3, \$45), that is the result of a 2-year study of interlibrary loan and document delivery operations by ARL.

#### **6. Library services for visually impaired people: a manual of best practices / Chapter 11 . Inter-lending of alternative formats by Deborah Ryan.**

<http://www.nlbuk.org/bpm/chapter11.html>

A National Library for the Blind best practices study on getting best services to disabled persons

#### **7. University of Arizona Library Interlibrary Loan Process Improvement Team.**

<http://www.library.arizona.edu/library/teams/ill/pi/illrep1.htm>

"In January of 1995, the Interlibrary Loan Process Improvement Team was charged to: Increase customer satisfaction by improving access to materials not owned by the Library and by improving customer education about the interlibrary loan/document delivery process. " *(from purpose statement)*

#### **8. Interlibrary Lending - Common Standards for Best Practice A Code of Practice issued by CONARLS (on behalf of the UK and Ireland).**

<http://www.nwrls.org.uk/Handbook/illstan.htm>

"Following "Why Requests Fail", the research project sponsored by the British Library Research and Innovation Centre, CONARLS members have attempted to develop some common standards for ILL activity to encourage greater efficiency and effectiveness. " *(from intro)*

#### **9. Site created by Jonathan and Julie Harwell, who collectively have 10 years of experience using OCLC's ILL subsystem within a U.S. academic library setting.**

<http://www.ddill.org/about.html>

This site designed to aid interlibrary loan and document delivery staff in all types of libraries. A "how to" manual type of best practices.

# Appendix C

## Interlibrary Loan & Delivery Questionnaire Survey Results

*Regional systems researched by Kristina Worcester, J. V. Fletcher Library, Westford.  
Survey data compiled by Dawn Fanning, Training Support Specialist, NMRLS.  
Survey data assembled and edited by Scott Kehoe, Consultant, NMRLS.*

---

### Overview of survey results.

The following is an edited tabulation of the results of the Best Practices Task Force survey on interlibrary loan and delivery. Survey results and notable respondent quotations are in **bold** type. A copy of the full survey and its introduction to respondents follows in Appendix D.

This survey was conducted almost exclusively via email and through a web-based form using *Perseus* survey software. A few respondents were contacted by phone after initial email invitations failed to illicit response, the survey then being filled out online. Survey respondents were chosen after scouring the Internet for contact names at multi-type library cooperatives and systems. An initial introductory email with a link to our survey form was sent to 20 potential contacts; of those, a representative from 12 multi-type systems responded, a 67% return rate! The multi-type systems that responded are listed below:

<b>Multi-type System</b>	<b>Website</b>
Arkansas Valley Regional Library Service System (Pueblo, CO).	<a href="http://www.avrlss.org">http://www.avrlss.org</a>
Central Massachusetts Regional Library System (Shrewsbury, MA)	<a href="http://www.cmrls.org/">http://www.cmrls.org/</a>
Central Minnesota Libraries Exchange (St. Cloud, MN)	<a href="http://lrs.stcloudstate.edu/cmle/">http://lrs.stcloudstate.edu/cmle/</a>
Central New York Library Resources Council (Syracuse, NY)	<a href="http://clrc.org/index.shtml">http://clrc.org/index.shtml</a>
Cleveland Area Metropolitan Library System (Ohio)	<a href="http://www.camls.org/">http://www.camls.org/</a>
Gold Coast Library Network (Ventura, CA)	<a href="http://goldcoastlibraries.org/">http://goldcoastlibraries.org/</a>
Golden Gateway Library Network (San Mateo, CA)	<a href="http://www.goldengateway.org/">http://www.goldengateway.org/</a>
North Suburban Library System (Wheeling, IL)	<a href="http://www.nslsilus.org/">http://www.nslsilus.org/</a>
Northeast Florida Library Information Network (Orange Park, FL)	<a href="http://www.neflin.org/">http://www.neflin.org/</a>
Southwest Kansas Library System (Dodge City, KS)	<a href="http://skyways.lib.ks.us/sowest/sowest.html">http://skyways.lib.ks.us/sowest/sowest.html</a>
Suburban Library System (Burr Ridge, IL)	<a href="http://www.sls.lib.il.us/">http://www.sls.lib.il.us/</a>
Western Massachusetts Regional Library (Hatfield, MA)	<a href="http://www.wmrls.org/">http://www.wmrls.org/</a>

1. Tell us about yourself:

**12 surveys returned, contact information compiled separately.**

2. Number of regional members?

**Low – 60 (Northeast Florida Library Information Network)**

**High – 560 (Suburban Library System, Ill.)**

3. Number of regional members by type

	Total	High		Low	NMRLS	
Academic:	<b>200</b>	55	Golden GateLibr. Network, CA	2	SW Kansas Library Sys.	<b>13</b>
Public:	<b>523</b>	103	WMRLS	2	Central NY Research Libr. Council	<b>53</b>
School:	<b>1028</b>	206	Central Minn. Libr. Exchange	4	Central NY Research Libr. Council	<b>222</b>
Special:	<b>366</b>	87	North Suburban Libr. Sys., IL	2	SW Kansas Library Sys.	<b>39</b>
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>2,117</b>					<b>327</b>

4. Does your region/consortium have an ILL center?

**YES = 5 NO = 6 N/A = 1**

4a. If YES, how many libraries does it handle ILL for?

**Libraries who responded overwhelmingly indicated that their centers handled ILL for all members.**

4b. If not, is there any centralization for ILL in your region?

Please explain further:

**YES = 4 NO = 2 N/A = 6**

5. How do you get multi-type libraries to cooperate and participate in ILL?

**[Notable quotations from respondent(s)] - Promote availability / Continuous training programs on ILL topics / Delivery has been a big support for the ILL process, even more than our net lender offset program (which we cannot fund next year) / Members sign agreement to join requires sharing of resources / Create union list of periodicals / State-wide ILL program ... that locates items and automatically sends requests / Procedures manual / ILL code.**

6. How do you publicize ILL availability to your patrons?

**Bookmarks = 3**

**Refrigerator magnets = 0**

**Flyers = 3**

**Continuing Education with member libraries = 6**

**Other freebie: mouse pads, Frisbees, key chains, etc. = 4**

**[Notable quotations from respondent(s)] - Tabletop tent-type posters letting patrons know items not held locally are available though ILL [has] dramatically increased use of ILL from our website.**

6a. Have these efforts yielded results?

**Yes = 9, N/A = 3**

6b. Do you have any statistical information for these results you could share?

**Yes = 6 Contact information compiled separately.**

7. Do you have a "good service" doctrine or customer service policy in place for regional members in regards to ILL?

**YES = 6 NO = 5 N/A = 1**

7a. How do you measure success for the end user?

**[Notable quotations from respondent(s)] - Thank you notes, focus groups, tracking statistics, growing popularity**

8. Do you educate your patrons and library staff about copyright issues?

**[Notable quotations from respondent(s)] - "we try" / photocopied items are accompanied by a standard copyright statement / copyright warning signs for copiers/printers / CE classes (CCL vs. CCG), annual ILL workshops**

9. Do you survey members on turn-around time?

**YES = 3 NO = 8 N/A = 1**

9a. How do you measure turn-around time for an item (request to ship to receive to return)?

**[Notable quotations from respondent(s)] - Courier statistics**

10. Would you be willing to share a copy of your ILL policy/code for the region?

**YES = 10 N/A = 2**

**Contact information compiled separately.**

11. How do ILL requests get processed in your region/consortium?

**Electronically = 8**

**fax = 9**

**e-mail = 6**

**web-form = 6**

**automated network = 5**

**do not process = 2**

12. Do any of your libraries or ILL centers use Ariel (and Prospero)?

**YES = 9 NO = 1 N/A = 2**

12a. Are the send/receive, receive only?

**YES = 4**

12b. How has this affected your workflow and patron satisfaction?

**[Notable quotations from respondent(s)] - Increased patron satisfaction**

13. Do your OPAC(s) allow patron initiated ILL?

YES = 7                      NO = 4                      N/A = 1

13a. If so, how has this changed workflow, patron satisfaction, staffing (statistics)?

**[Notable quotations from respondent(s)] - Increased patron satisfaction / staffing more difficult / workflow has been simplified / workload has increased / “everyone loves it!, patrons, staff think it’s great!”**

14. Any noticeable effects that e-books, commercial document delivery suppliers and / or licensed databases have had on ILL in your region?

YES = 4                      NO = 6                      N/A = 2

15. How does your libraries or ILL centers handle special material requests: Non-print; video; DVD; CD-ROM; maps?

**[Notable quotations from respondent(s)] - Same as book / virtually all media are ILL among our members / we will try for any format / “we’ll try to get anything”**

15a. Do these policies differ with-in region as opposed to out-of-region requests?

YES = 4                      NO = 3                      N/A = 3

16. How are "rush request" ILLs handled?

**[Notable quotations from respondent(s)] - Fax or phone / check on the ... databases to see if the region already own / “aren’t they all rush requests?” / only for photocopies / [automated system] does not allow rush requests**

17. Do your libraries buy materials to fill requests?

YES = 7                      NO = 5                      N/A = 2

18. Is there a direct-to-patron ILL mechanism in place/being considered (i.e. send a requested item directly to a patron)?

YES = 2                      NO = 7                      N/A = 3

19. Does your region have a delivery system (i.e. van service to member libraries)?

YES = 11                      NO = 0                      N/A = 1

20. How does the delivery system work: Expected/contracted turn around time?

**[Notable quotations from respondent(s)] - libraries are added to delivery based on volume of materials they need/share and their participation in resource sharing networks / one-day turnaround / 48 hour turnaround statewide / public [and academics] are delivered to every day, other libraries are delivered to on an as needed basis.**

20a. Are drivers contracted out?

YES = 3                      NO = 7                      N/A = 2

20b. *Are drivers regional staff?*

**YES = 4      NO = 6      N/A = 1**

20c. *Number of libraries/stops for delivery service?*

**High of 187, Low of 5, Average for group of respondents = 73 stops**

21. *What is the threshold for adding a member library to a regional delivery route?*

**[Notable quotations from respondent(s)] - Members who lend 100+ items per year / availability of funding / evaluating process (3 responses) / volume / whether the library is a local delivery distribution point for other libraries in their community/system.**

22. *Do you have a centralized pick-up/drop-off point(s) for libraries not on delivery?*

**YES = 2      NO = 8      N/A = 2**

23. *What has had the greatest impact on the delivery system in the past 5 years (check all that apply)?*

*Patron holds*

*new OPAC / new OPAC features implemented*

*budget = 6*

*delivery company/contractor = 2*

**[Notable quotations from respondent(s)] - Courier not as expensive as postage / more AV formats being requested / [before automated system] were 416,000 items now it is 1.7 million / expansion to our membership to multi-type, system-wide holds**

24. *Would you mind if we gave you a follow up call or e-mail if we have further question?*

**YES = 10      N/A = 2**

**Contact information compiled separately.**

# Appendix D

Northeast Massachusetts Regional Library System  
**Interlibrary Loan Best Practices Task Force**  
*Interlibrary Loan & Delivery Questionnaire*

<http://www.nmrls.org/surveys/illsurvey2002.shtml>

---

**Please answer by April 5, 2002**

We at the Northeast Massachusetts Regional Library System (NMRLS) are interested in other perspectives on ILL and delivery at similar multi-type Regional Library Systems. Toward this end, our ILL committee has formed a best practices task force. The questions that our Task Force has drawn up that deal with issues of multi-type cooperation, new technologies, best practices already in place and, of course, delivery.

NMRLS is one of 6 Regional Library Systems in Massachusetts which offer technical and consulting services to all types of libraries within our geographic boundaries. NMRLS is comprised of 54 cities and towns, North of Boston and has a present membership of over 300 libraries of all types (historic societies, school libraries, public and academic libraries). Please feel free to contact me, or visit our website ([www.nmrls.org](http://www.nmrls.org)), if you have further questions.

Thank you for your time,  
Scott Kehoe  
Chair, ILL Best Practices Task Force  
Consultant/Trainer  
Northeast Massachusetts Regional Library System  
175 Andover Street, Danvers MA 01923  
[scott@nmrls.org](mailto:scott@nmrls.org) / p 978-762-4433 / f 978-739-4537

**1. Tell us about yourself:**

Name:

Title:

Agency:

**2. Number of regional members?**

**3. Number of regional members by type**

Academic:

Public:

School:

Special:

**4. Does your region/consortium have an ILL center?**

**4a.** If YES, how many libraries does it handle ILL for?

**4b.** If not, is there any centralization for ILL in your region?

Please explain further:

5. How do you get multi-type libraries to cooperate and participate in ILL?
6. How do you publicize ILL availability to your patrons?
- Bookmarks
  - Refrigerator magnets
  - Flyers
  - Continuing Education with member libraries, encouraging them to promote ILL
  - Other freebie: mouse pads, Frisbees, key chains, etc.
- 6a. Have these efforts yielded results?
- 6b. Do you have any statistical information for these results you could share?
7. Do you have a "good service" doctrine or customer service policy in place for regional members in regards to ILL?
- 7a. How do you measure success for the end user?
8. Do you educate your patrons and library staff about copyright issues?
9. Do you survey members on turn-around time?
- 9a. How do you measure turn-around time for an item (request to ship to receive to return)?
10. Would you be willing to share a copy of your ILL policy/code for the region?
11. How do ILL requests get processed in your region/consortium?
- electronically
  - fax
  - e-mail
  - web-form
  - automated network
  - do not process
12. Do any of your libraries or ILL centers use Ariel (and Prospero)?
- 12a. Are the send/receive, receive only?
- 12b. How has this effected your workflow and patron satisfaction?
13. Do your OPAC(s) allow patron initiated ILL?
- 13a. If so, how has this changed workflow, patron satisfaction, staffing (statistics)?
14. Any noticeable effects that e-books, commercial document delivery suppliers and / or licensed databases have had on ILL in your region?

**15.** How does your libraries or ILL centers handle special material requests: Non-print; video; DVD; CD-ROM; maps?

**15a.** Do these policies differ with-in region as opposed to out-of-region requests?

**16.** How are "rush request" ILLs handled?

**17.** Do your libraries buy materials to fill requests?

**18.** Is there a direct-to-patron ILL mechanism in place/being considered (i.e. send a requested item directly to a patron)?

**19.** Does your region have a delivery system (i.e. van service to member libraries)?

**20.** How does the delivery system work: Expected/contracted turn around time?

**20a.** Are drivers contracted out?

**20b.** Are drivers regional staff?

**20c.** Number of libraries/stops for delivery service?

**21.** What is the threshold for adding a member library to a regional delivery route?

**22.** Do you have a centralized pick-up/drop-off point(s) for libraries not on delivery?

**23.** What has had the greatest impact on the delivery system in the past 5 years (check all that apply)?

- Patron holds
- new OPAC / new OPAC features implemented
- budget
- delivery company/contractor

**24.** Would you mind if we gave you a follow up call or e-mail if we have further question?

Please include contact information, email address and/or phone number:

Again, thank you for your time in completing this survey. We are planning to post a written report on our web site by July 2002.

# Appendix E

## Interlibrary Loan Services for Disabled Persons:

A checklist of best practices from The National Library for the Blind, United Kingdom.

<http://www.nlbuk.org/bpm/chapter11.html>

*Compiled and edited by Mary Ann Blair, Winthrop Public Library.*

---

1. Databases should include all alternative format materials and large materials held.
2. Forms should be in large print, or other accessible format such as electronic based format.
3. Some readers may still have to be helped by members of the staff.
4. We should ascertain whether the patron is a member of one of the four agencies that help the visually impaired. The agencies being Calibre, NLB, RNIB, and TNAUK.
5. Members should have a declaration form, and the home library should keep a record of the form
6. RNIB books have to be played on a special machine, and it is possible to borrow RNIB machines.
7. A copy of the form is supposed to be available at all regional libraries.
  - a. Do our regional libraries have such a form?
  - b. Do we know what medical citation is requested?
  - c. Do we have ILL requests for the visually handicapped?
  - d. Can we get Braille Books for the blind?
  - e. Can we get videos with description for the visually impaired?
  - f. Do we have a list of closed-captioned videos for the hearing impaired?
  - g. How many libraries have audio books for the hard of hearing.
  - h. Do we know how to request books specifically for the handicapped patron?
8. We should know how to package audio-visual material for ILL?
9. How many of us know that if there is proof the material is for the visually impaired, the post office does not charge postage?
10. Are the libraries willing to accept responsibility for damaged material?
11. Do we advertise ourselves to the visually and hearing impaired population?
12. In other words are we giving the same level of service to the handicapped population, as we are to everyone else?