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**Policies and Strategies for Addressing the Needs Identified through ILL Data**

No two libraries are the same, and appropriate practices vary with the size and philosophy of each library. The linkages between ILL and acquisitions must be meaningful for the library’s own community rather than try to emulate someone else’s policies. However, some guiding principles can provide a helpful starting point. Although there is no “one size fits all” approach to determining these linkages, ILL data are generally used both qualitatively and quantitatively. Evaluating ILL requests for monographs tends to be more philosophical and qualitative in nature than the task of analyzing article requests.

**Serials**

While article requests are also (qualitatively) reviewed to determine how closely they connect to supporting the curriculum, the decision of whether to commit library funds to in-house subscriptions to journals rests primarily with cold cash: If the copyright fees and delivery costs associated with accommodating article requests for a particular journal exceed that journal's subscription price (over a sustained period of time), the decision of whether to buy is heavily influenced by these financial factors.

**Monographs**

Glimping gaps: If the library has an approval plan, systematic collection gaps revealed through ILL data can be addressed by incorporating the topicality of these gaps into the approval-plan profiles to begin systematic coverage. Area-targeting immediate selections can quickly address the gap. In libraries where all monographs are firm ordered, bibliographers can use the awareness of the ILL-identified collection gaps to specifically seek out publications in these areas.

Examples of library policies implemented for the sake of consistency (and to reduce the need to examine all ILL requests on a title-by-title basis) at various libraries include:

- Automatic ordering of all ILL-requested books published within the current or previous year, at the same time as requesting the item through ILL (Peterson, 2003).
- Rush purchase of new ILL-requested books which are sent to the patron through Interlibrary Loan; upon return they are processed into the regular library collection. (Wray, 2003)
- Automatic ordering when the same title is ordered a second time.
- Automatic ordering of non-book formats, such as new instructional videos.
- Automatic ordering if the title is within scope. (Ward, et al, 2002)
- International libraries: It is important to compare the advantages of purchasing versus borrowing the book. Exploration should be drawn from quantitative analysis of the costs and by qualitative analysis of determining if a book is within the university’s scope and likely to be requested several times. In the latter instance, purchase is comparatively advantageous despite high costs of shipping, customs, and per-item handling costs. Customs fees and shipping costs for libraries on other continents can raise the cost of buying the item far above the actual purchase price, and curricular pertinence patron satisfaction becomes a powerful qualitative factor that is weighed against purely monetary costs of purchasing. A “borrow or buy” cost-benefit analysis was undertaken at Hong Kong University Libraries yielding the conclusion that customer satisfaction was higher when the library bought the item, primarily because ownership meant repeat use for the patron. Turnaround times for purchase could be accelerated (express shipping at higher cost) in many cases faster than borrowing (Chan, 2003).
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