February 2006

ATG Special Report -- ILL Purchase Express

Barbara M. Coopey

Pennsylvania State University Libraries, bmc4@psu.edu

Ann M. Snowman

Pennsylvania State University Libraries, ams32@psu.edu

Follow this and additional works at: <https://docs.lib.purdue.edu/atg>

Part of the [Library and Information Science Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Coopey, Barbara M. and Snowman, Ann M. (2006) "ATG Special Report -- ILL Purchase Express," *Against the Grain*: Vol. 18: Iss. 1, Article 15.

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.7771/2380-176X.4844>

This document has been made available through Purdue e-Pubs, a service of the Purdue University Libraries. Please contact epubs@purdue.edu for additional information.

implied license to link. Thus, no permission to link is required today. On the other hand, in a for-profit company, as a matter of business courtesy, seeking permission to link may be the norm. It clearly is no longer the norm in the non-profit world.

Using other corporate logos on Web pages as the link or next to the link raises trademark law questions and not copyright. The corporate logo is a trademark, and the company whose logo is pasted onto another Website may be forced to complain about this activity in order to maintain its rights in that logo as a trademark. Thus, one should ask permission to reproduce the logo on the library's Web page. Many companies indicate on their Webpages that if anyone wants to link to their Website, please use their logos, but this is on company by company basis.

QUESTION: *The library has been asked to scan the school yearbooks onto a CD-ROM to use in the library and then to publish the yearbooks from 1920 to the present on the Web. Are there copyright problems with doing this?*

ANSWER: If the school owns the copyright, there is no problem at all since it holds the rights to reproduce and distribute the yearbook in any format. Nor is there any difficulty with yearbooks published between 1920-1922. They are in the public domain just like all other materials first published in the United States.

Assume that the yearbook publisher owns the copyright. For yearbooks published from 1923 forward there are several additional facts that are needed in order to answer the question.

- (1) Were the yearbooks prior to 1978 published with copyright notice?
- (2) Did yearbooks published between 1978 and 1988 contain a notice of copyright?
- (3) If not, was an effort made to correct this accidental omission of notice?
- (4) For the period 1923-1963, was the copyright renewed?

For yearbooks published between 1923 and 1963, notice of copyright on the copies was essential; if published without a notice, they entered the public domain. Assuming there was a copyright notice on yearbooks published 1923-1963, were they renewed for copyright? If not, they are now in the public domain. It is most likely that if they were registered for copyright, they were not renewed, so assume these are also in the public domain.

Yearbooks published from 1964 to date are unlikely to be in the public domain. Those published between 1964 and 1977 also had to be published with notice in order to be protected by copyright. They did not have to be renewed, however, so they were automatically extended 95 years of protection after first publication since they are works of corporate authorship. Those published between 1978 and 1988 were also required to have a notice of copyright or the owner had to make an effort to correct "accidental omission of notice." Notice became optional in March 1989. If published with notice, yearbooks from 1978 to 1988, along with those to the present, receive 95 years of copyright protection from the date of first publication.

So the essential questions are who holds the copyright for particular yearbooks, and whether they were published with notice and renewed for copyright.

ATG Special Report — ILL Purchase Express

by **Barbara M. Coopey** (Assistant Head of Access Services, Pennsylvania State University Libraries, Pattee Library and Paterno Library, Curtin Road, University Park, PA 16802; Phone: 814-865-9697) <bmc4@psulias.psu.edu>

and **Ann M. Snowman** (Head of Access Services, Pennsylvania State University Libraries, Pattee Library and Paterno Library, Curtin Road, University Park, PA 16802; Phone: 814-865-9697) <ams32@psulias.psu.edu>

Abstract: The authors describe criteria, problem analysis, pilot project, and implementation of **Penn State's ILL Purchase Express** program to convert interlibrary loan requests to rush-order acquisitions via the approval plan. Significant in the process is that no selector intervention is required. ILL and Acquisitions staff facilitate the entire process aided by e-portable data.

Key words: access, acquisitions, approval plan, e-portable, interlibrary loan.

As the use of technology has flourished in the operation of the library, processes have grown more efficient. An interesting by-product of so much e-portable data has been to associate processes that were formerly unacquainted. We see online reference services crossing over into the circulation realm and partnerships that made sense but were too cumbersome to manage now find efficient collaboration. **ILL Purchase Express**, **Penn State's** response to the access vs. ownership debate is one such partnership.

Penn State University Libraries formed a task force in August 2001 to examine the possibility of rush purchasing materials that were being requested through interlibrary loan. Could we purchase materials to enhance our collection while simultaneously meeting the users' urgent need? This project was undertaken based on the **University of Wisconsin-Madison's "Book Express"** and **Purdue's "Books On Demand"** successful book purchasing programs.

The task force was comprised of representatives from the Interlibrary Loan Department, the Acquisitions Department, and the Collection Development Team, all stakeholders in the process to determine if a similar purchasing program would be a viable option for **Penn State**. Analysis of request samplings resulted in a unique purchasing model called "**ILL Purchase Express**" which melded collection development guidelines with ILL requests by rush ordering books which ostensibly would eventually be acquired through the Libraries' major approval plan vendor.

Literature Review

Currently, there are several ILL offices using some model of purchase-on-demand service. Some purchase any title priced below a set threshold, while others ask collection specialists to evaluate an order.

Williad Public Library purchases out-of-print books requested through their ILL system because items were hard to find from other libraries and out-of-print bookstores offered reasonable prices.¹ **University of Virginia Library** provides a "Purchase Request" link from their homepage offering users a choice to have the Library purchase the material instead of asking for an ILL.² **University of Hong Kong** found it more cost effective to purchase material instead of requesting an ILL from overseas.³ **Purdue** began a practice to purchase recent English imprints within an established cost range rather than borrow them.⁴ **University of Wisconsin-Madison** purchases books from **Amazon**, **Barnes and Noble**, or directly from a publisher, when ILL requests meet their chosen criteria.⁵

Background

Penn State University is comprised of 24 campus locations with 40,000 students at the main campus, **University Park**, and 40,000 at other campuses. Both Interlibrary Loan and Acquisitions are centralized at the **University Park** campus. Books owned by any of the **Penn State Libraries** are requested through the **CAT**, the online catalog, via the **Sirsi Unicorn Demand Management**⁶ module. Books are shipped between campuses daily. For books not owned by **Penn State**, there are several options. Users can request through **ILLiad**, the **OCLC** ILL management system or they can request books directly through a local consortium's catalog called **E-ZBorrow** (<http://www.lehigh.edu/~inpalci/>) and

continued on page 47

have the books shipped to their local campus library in either case. Users can also request through OCLC's FirstSearch WorldCat database or the CIC Virtual Catalog where requests download into ILLiad. Penn State ILL receives approximately 30,000 returnable loans per year.

Balancing Access and Acquisition

One point of particular importance in early discussions of the project was the need to balance access with acquisition. Penn State had already invested great energies and monies to streamline user access to materials available at other institutions and to ensure that these materials are delivered promptly. The Libraries collection development principles encourage selectors to purchase materials to ensure that the collection represents diverse points of view. Therefore, any new ILL acquisition process should not undermine these existing commitments but rather build upon the current ILL and acquisitions practices. Given initial investigations and discussions, the group chose the model and criteria presented by the University of Wisconsin-Madison at the Wisconsin Library Services Annual ILL Meeting, October 2, 2001 as a plausible model for Penn State. This model seemed to indicate a commitment to access by first trying to obtain an item through ILL, if "unfilled" it would then be considered for purchase. Another strong point of this model was the attempt to acquire only recent publications, which should be readily available. Various pricing thresholds were discussed and several concerns arose relating to this criterion. First, setting a low price cut off (e.g., under \$100) would exclude many otherwise desirable science titles. Second, there was a risk that this process would skew the balance of the collection by adding a number of \$30-\$50 items that might not be appropriate in the research setting. Finally, could we meet the pressing need of the user if selectors were required to help make sure the items acquired were truly within the scope of our collection?

Analysis

In order to come to terms with these concerns and to determine the cost and impact on the workflows in various departments affected by this new process, a sample set of ILL requests meeting the UW criteria was pulled from ILL requests received during a two-month period, February 1 - March 31, 2001. The following criteria were applied to the sample:

- The item was submitted to ILL during February and March 2001; this timeframe was chosen because it represented a period of heavy ILL demand and would allow the group to generalize results based on a potential maximum number of items that might be ordered using this new process.
- The item was a book; by excluding dissertations, parts of a series, and exclu-

Electronic access to the American Economic Association journals for libraries, institutions, and firms!

Institutional site licenses to issues of the *American Economic Review*, *Journal of Economic Literature*, and *Journal of Economic Perspectives* are now online!

Institutional access includes reference links to full-text articles through CrossRef and JSTOR, links to full-text articles citing AEA articles, table of contents alerts, and

searchable full-text. Site licenses include all years from 2002 forward so long as a subscription is active!

Contact the AEA at www.aeaweb.org/subscribe.html or your subscription agent to add an institutional site license to the AEA journals today!

Site License price as of 1/1/2006 (includes all three (3) AEA online journals).....\$315.00

Ask about...

EconLit – The foremost bibliographic database in economics is linked to full-text now more than ever!

Full-text linking options are available from all EconLit vendors:
CSA – Dialog – Ebsco – OCLC – OVID/SilverPlatter – ScienceDirect

American Economic Association

2403 Sidney Street #260
Pittsburgh, PA 15203-2167, USA
info@econlit.org

sively AV formats, we were able to simplify the analysis of the data. Some books included in the sample did have accompanying AV formats such as CDs or cassettes.

- The item was requested from more than five libraries. It did not matter whether the item was supplied (filled) by another library or remained unfilled at the end of the request cycle.
- The publication date of the item was within the current two years plus previous two years (1999-2001), maximiz-

ing the possibility that it was available for purchase.

- The item was submitted by any eligible Penn State user. No limit was placed on the number of items submitted per patron.
- The item met collection development guidelines as defined in the *Penn State University Libraries Collection Development Manual*.

Prices for items meeting the criteria were searched first on **Amazon.com**, then on

continued on page 48

Books in Print, if there was no price available on **Amazon**. As a practical matter, only items with a readily available price would be potentially obtainable through a rush order and **Amazon** was the preferred vendor for rapid delivery.

Results of the Sampling

During the two month sampling period 56 requests of 480 requests met the criteria defined for possible purchase. Thirty-nine of the 56 had a price readily available. It proved more likely that items supplied by another library would meet the criteria (66%) and would have a price listed (76%). The total cost of the 39 items that were eligible to have been rush ordered was \$1,361.70 with a range of \$90.00- \$10.39, and an average of \$34.92, seeming to fall within a reasonable cost structure.

A final and very crucial criterion, whether or not an item was in-scope for the collection, required each of these items to be examined more closely with the following results. Twenty-three items (actually 21 titles) were eventually acquired by the Libraries. Fourteen items were obviously not in-scope for the Libraries collection, such as self-help language guides, cookbooks or textbooks. Eighteen items, such as foreign language titles, fiction, or software titles required selector intervention for purchase. Only one item met the criteria, was not eventually acquired on the approval plan, and would not require selector intervention. Clearly, a program based on the **University of Wisconsin-Madison** model was not workable for **Penn State**. What struck an interest with the group, and were further examined, were the 23 books in the study that were eventually acquired by the Libraries. Why was ILL being used to request books the Libraries would soon acquire? The following elements were compiled for an analysis on those 23 books:

1. ILL component
 - a. Date submitted to ILL
 - b. Date item was received in ILL
2. Acquisitions component
 - a. Vendor used
 - b. Date received in Acquisitions
 - c. Date cataloged
 - d. Approval or firm order

In reviewing the data, it was found that six items ultimately were acquired via firm orders and another 14 were acquired through the approval plan, indicating they were in scope for the collection. Two items were never acquired, although we were notified about these items via the approval plan, and no information could be found on how the final item was acquired.

Of the 14 items (11 titles) eventually acquired through the YBP approval

plan, four arrived within a few days after the item was received in ILL, three arrived a month or more after the item was received in ILL and seven actually arrived earlier than the item was received in ILL. Was it possible, we wondered, to coordinate efforts between ILL and Acquisitions to have items such as these arrive in-house and be processed quickly enough to fulfill an interlibrary loan? We delved deeper into ILL requests for items eventually acquired. The Task Force turned its attention to an additional 46 requests that were entirely unfilled by ILL during the sample period. They were very recent publications that few or no other libraries had yet acquired or would not make them available for loan. **Penn State** eventually acquired several of these items, primarily through the approval plan. A closer analysis of these items produced similar results to those described in the original sample. Many of the items did, or would, eventually arrive via traditional acquisition mechanisms, leading us to investigate whether procedures could be developed that would allow the Libraries to acquire approval plan books quickly enough to fulfill an interlibrary loan request. Several process components needed clarification before this project could be implemented.

- At what stage in the approval plan would it be apparent the item will be received?
- Could we defer an ILL request to an on-order copy?
- What would the time frame be between when the item was approved and when it could be cancelled?
- What would be the impact on ILL and Acquisition staff processes?
- What elements could be gleaned from the **YBP Global Online Bibliographic Information (GOBI)** database record that would tell us when actions would potentially occur, such as when the customer number, plan, and inventory number would be added?
- Would selector intervention be needed somewhere along this procedure if the item has yet to be approved?
- How much extra staff time would be needed for this special procedure that may only yield a few rush orders?

In order to understand and project potential costs and volume, a larger sampling was taken of all ILL requests during five days in March 2002. Sample criteria was similar to the initial project criteria. The number of requests that fit the criteria numbered from 3 to 11 per day and totaled 31 items. Analysis revealed 13 out of 31 (about 40%) items were eventually received via approval plan. The projected cost (including book, shipping, and rush fees), was approximately \$9,000 for six months.

Pilot Project

Following the analyses, the Libraries implemented a trial

program which would target titles that could eventually be acquired through the approval plan. Rush-ordering approval plan books would displace associated ILL costs for the books while acquiring books that met collection development guidelines which would have eventually been added to the collection. An ordering process was developed to flow easily between the ILL and Acquisitions staff and not be slowed down by selector intervention. The program was named "**ILL Purchase Express**" and seeded with \$10,000. ILL staff would identify book requests that fell within the criteria previously described with a copyright date from the previous two calendar years plus future years and limited to U.S. publication. If the bibliographic record display showed that the title was "in process" or "on order" when ILL staff searched the Libraries catalog, the item was sent through the Libraries regular rush processing and not included in the pilot project. Pilot project books were then searched in the **GOBI** database. If any of the following criteria was apparent in the **GOBI** record, ILL staff did not send the item to the Acquisitions department:

- Identifiable Fiction (includes novels)
- Reprints
- Replacement Copies
- Self-Help/Guide Books
- Beauty and Fashion Guides
- Cook Books
- Items priced over \$150
- Items "Not Yet Published"

After selector review of the project's acquired titles at three and six month intervals the following criteria were added:

- Introductory text books
- Items that **GOBI** indicates are part of a set, series, or collection
- Biographies, autobiographies or personal narratives
- Computer guides or manuals
- Art/Exhibition catalogs
- Popular items
- Juvenile titles
- Out of stock items

Titles for potential purchase were forwarded to the **University Firm Order (UFO) Team** in the Serials and Acquisitions Services Department via email. A copy of the **GOBI** record, along with user name and ID taken from the **ILLiad** request, were included. Acquisitions tried other vendors beyond **YBP** when ILL staff included a note that there were no potential lending libraries from which to borrow the book.

If a title was selected for purchase an email generated by the **ILLiad** system was sent to the user. "*Ordered this via ILL Purchase Express. Request has been sent to our Acquisitions Department for possible Rush purchase. You will receive an email when the book is available for pick-up at your local circulation desk.*"

continued on page 49

UFO staff ordered items within 24 hours except those which matched criteria established to allow selectors to review particular types of material rather than receive them automatically via the approval plan, such as:

1. Items meeting criteria established for ILL review (those ILL staff did not readily identify)
2. Items that cannot be rush delivered (within about 1 week)
3. Items that have already been profiled in **GOBI** for **PSU**. These would follow the Libraries regular rush processing, a service designed to put just-arrived books quickly in the hands of users requesting them.
4. Other exceptions identified along the way.

Items identified as not acceptable for purchase were turned back to ILL via email within 24 hours. To help track the items when the order was placed, a 594 "RUSH" field (an open local tag) was inserted in the bib record and removed when the book arrived. If items had not yet been profiled in **GOBI**, they were ordered by the **UFO Team** and blocked in **GOBI**. If items could not be delivered to the Library within six working days the request was returned to ILL to re-enter the normal ILL processing queue. Once the book was received by Acquisitions it was rush processed with the call number provided in **GOBI** and assigned to the library location where the item would normally be placed if it arrived on approval. This was to ensure that books would be routed to the home location following the initial circulation to the user. For fastest possible delivery to the user no items were bound prior to making them available to the patron. A pink rush receipt flyer and a hand carry, rush flyer annotated with "ILL Rush" were placed in the book, indicating the user's ID number to facilitate the production of a hold available notice. A survey was included during the first three months of the project, as well. Once the processing was completed, a hold was placed on the item in the **CAT** for the user who then receives a circulation system-generated notice that the item is available for pick-up.⁶

At the end of nine months of the project, 115 books had been ordered for a total cost of \$6,652.58. The average cost of a book was \$47.38, the average rush processing cost per book at \$10.47 was roughly equivalent to the ILL processing cost. Procedures were reviewed and slightly altered after nine months and again after 18 months.

Results of the three-month user survey placed in the books were extremely positive, with responses expressing satisfaction with the new service, indicating approval with both arrival time and the selection as a permanent addition in the Libraries' collection. One user commented, "This is a terrific service!! Not only did I receive the book quickly but it is now part of the library's collection." Another said, "Thank you very much for not only acquiring, but promptly acquiring this book. With this request-based program everyone, especially students, benefit."

Publicity about **ILL Purchase Express** was distributed University-wide in September 2002 and a program description was added on the ILL Website.⁷ As selectors reviewed the criteria and the books acquired after three and six month intervals during the project, criteria were refined to better match the Libraries collection development guidelines. The result was fewer books being purchased in the program, but those purchased were more closely in-line with the Libraries collection development guidelines. Book selection criteria used in the program is not advertised as the criteria is reviewed and periodically refined.

Implementation

An analysis in 2005 showed that the program to acquire books in a timely manner with minimal staff intervention which follow the University's Libraries Collection Development guidelines is succeeding. Users who request books via ILL which match the criteria receive the purchased book just as quickly as a borrowed interlibrary loan book. The average delivery time once the order is placed by

Acquisitions staff is 3.88 days. The item is delivered to their local pick-up (circulation) desk, the same way they receive an interlibrary loan, with the advantage of a longer loan period for the purchased book. Usage statistics show that no one user or type of user benefits more from the program; the benefit is distributed among all user-types. Books being acquired through the program average around one acquisition per user. No single user placed an inordinate number of requests. In 2003, 120 users received 155 books. In 2004, 80 users received 103 books. And, for six months in 2005, 27 users received 28 books. ILL and Acquisitions staff feel confident they are purchasing books complying with the Libraries collection development guidelines without needing selector intervention. The program does not place a burden on collection development funds since it is only acquiring books which the Libraries would have eventually purchased. Additional rush fees are viewed as comparable to associated ILL costs for obtaining a book.⁸

Project Cost, Including Book, Shipping, and Rush Fees:

	2002/03	2003/04	2004/05
Annual Program Cost	\$6,705	\$2,470	\$1,746
Orders Placed	116	46	34
Per Item	\$57.81	\$53.70	\$51.37

Summary

Because of **ILLiad** tracking, email messaging and the accessible online ordering of books for Acquisitions staff, both ILL and Acquisitions easily incorporated the **ILL Purchase Express** program into their processes with minimal changes. ILL staff review the criteria while processing a request and searching for an **OCLC** record. If the book meets the criteria, staff search the **GOBI** database, review the record for additional criteria information, and see if the item is "in-stock." Orders are sent to Acquisitions via email. Acquisitions staff incorporate this order into their standard rush request process. When the book is ready for pickup, users receive a standard system-generated notice. When returned, the book becomes part of the collection. The successful cooperation of ILL and Acquisitions in the "**ILL Purchase Express**" program has resulted in one more avenue the **University Libraries** utilizes to fulfill users' needs while supporting an access versus ownership balance.

Endnotes

1. Hulsey, Richard. 2003. Purchase on demand. *Library Journal* 128 (10): 77.
2. Clendenning, Lynda Fuller. 2001. Purchase express for any user request: The University of Virginia Library offers delivery in seven days. *College and Research Libraries News* 62 (1): 16-17.
3. Chan, Gayle Rosemary Y.C. 2004. Purchase instead of borrow: An international perspective. *Journal of Interlibrary Loan* 14 (4): 23-37.
4. Ward, Suzanne M. 2002. Books on demand: Just-in-time acquisitions. *The Acquisitions Librarian* 27: 95-107.
5. Ward, Suzanne M., Tanner Wray and Karl E. Debus-Lopez. 2003. Collection development based on patron requests: Collaboration between interlibrary loan and acquisitions. *Library Collections, Acquisitions, & Technical Services* 27: 203-213.
6. Sirsi Unicorn Workflows is the software Penn State Libraries staff members use to manage circulation.
7. The Penn State University Libraries. 2002. <http://www.libraries.psu.edu/tas/ill/illpurchase.htm> [Accessed: September 7, 2005].
8. Jackson, Mary E. 1998. *Measuring the performance of interlibrary loan operations in North American research and college libraries*, 21. Washington, D.C.: Association of Research Libraries.