

Resource Sharing Work Group

November 17, 2011

Present: Tracy Herald (SUN), Susan Lee (MAD), Brendan Faherty (MTH), Vicki Teal Lovey (SCLS), Shelley Selle (MCF), Molly Warren (MAD), Laure Rose (MAR), Wendy Rawson (FCH), Margie Navarre Saaf (MAD), Andy Barnett (MCM/phone), Recorder: Vicki Teal Lovely (SCLS).

1. Keeping New Items in Library

L. Rose reviewed the survey of other Wisconsin libraries that had been conducted by Martha Van Pelt. Most surveyed were pro. The one con library was OWLS. A. Barnett thinks there are libraries in the system that would like local holds, but they have not reached a majority.

L. Rose made a case for keeping new items in library: not doing local holds isn't working. The idea is that everybody shares fairly and everyone doesn't have equal access to the best sellers. But the fact is that a lot of libraries are cheating. A lot of libraries are hiding new materials in lucky day collections—MAR is one of them. A lot don't have the budget to buy as many copies as they should be buying. There is wastage if they buy a new copy and it is not in demand in the next year. Why should I buy a new title if my patrons don't get to see it? *Like Water for Elephants* DVD has 721 holds and there are some large libraries that do not have copies circulating. RTH causes items to leave the library and get caught in a big library's circulation. Most have lucky day collections because they want to provide their patrons with newer releases.

Keeping new items in library would reduce staff time in processing holds. It would reduce delivery. SCA would not have to be the police. It would reward libraries that are buying new materials for patrons. They are not penalized by libraries that are not buying materials. It would encourage them to be more on top of what is popular. It would encourage them to be fresh and looking at what their patrons want. Once patrons recognize that they have new materials in the library, it will be an incentive for them to come in and see the new materials.

S. Selle asked what will happen when patrons can't get the new materials from other libraries.

L. Rose reported that MAR did a pilot study on some materials that they hid. Their patrons got materials a lot faster and they got a lot more use. Patrons would be getting materials faster.

B. Miller pointed out that patrons return materials at different libraries and they will still go in delivery.

L. Rose provided another example: "Now That's What I Call Music! 39" has 209 holds and 25 copies. There are libraries that don't have copies but their patrons have placed holds. Someone asked how are libraries hiding these? As rentals and generic, etc. One library has over 500 rentals and MAR thinks they are probably not all rentals.

S. Selle: It bothers her that libraries are cheating because they are not. Their patrons usually get the first hold when an item is new and then yes, it does go out. If people are cheating, then why do we continue with this system?

A. Barnett does object to the word cheating. If they have two or three holds, they don't have to purchase the item. They are not cheating.

S. Selle: How many libraries are doing this?

S. Lee: Thinks they [MAR] would feel the impact. Is there a way to do a pilot that measures the number of titles that would not be filling holds at a library during a moratorium?

T. Herald: Koha could allow a library to keep items in house. Other libraries could pass you on the holds queue. What are the parameters?

V. Teal Lovely: We could create some new item loan types and batch change items.

Further discussion ensued with questions and objections.

- W. Rawson and S. Lee: Do not think this is really very consortium-like.
- S. Selle: What if they "cheat" in other areas such as putting their board books on a generic record.
- L. Rose: They are not talking about not sharing. They would eventually share.
- B. Miller: Thinks it's too long to ask patrons to wait any amount of time. It becomes irrelevant.
- M. Navarre Saaf: is concerned that MAR thinks MAR patrons only want MAR items. She is concerned that MAR patrons will blame Madison and other libraries when they won't fill holds.
- L. Rose: if their patrons want something they can't have, they may need to step up to the plate and purchase it.
- V. Teal Lovely: SCA has never monitored how many copies a library buys. Also Bruce has said he does not feel this would reduce delivery.

Issues to be considered by the group involved in the pilot project:

- Most new items holds are trapped at checkin, so the hold would have to be ignored
- Sorter – wouldn't recognize, but they have to be checked in a second time
- The holds queue has not been available for a while, so it is difficult to blame anyone for not purchasing items.

Possible Compromises:

- S. Selle: could a compromise be that new items are put out on the shelf first before it is checked in to trap holds?
 - Would it show up on the holds queue report? You could pass it for a certain amount of time.
 - If ignore button worked, could ignore hold if not for your patron.

- Could this be extended to other types of materials?
- Ignoring holds may be a slippery slope.
- V. Teal Lovely: Could raise RTH date and more holds would stay local.
- Buying fewer unique items and more popular copies
- T. Herald: would it be worth looking at RTH as a mechanism that is still serving us? SUN is a huge destination and dropoff. Do libraries use MAR and then return items at other libraries? MAR does have a lot of items returned to them, but to other libraries too.
- V. Teal Lovely: SCIDs money could be used to purchase rotating collections of new materials for rotating walkin collections. L. Rose pointed out that this is similar to rotating books on CD collection.

Pilot:

- W. Rawson: If we are going to have a pilot for selected libraries, we need to have very clear ideas of what we want to measure and ways to measure it.
- L. Rose: MAR will put out an email to see if there is interest in doing a pilot and what types of materials.
- 2 to 3 libraries
- One format
- If the decision after the pilot is that we are not moving forward with this as a system-wide practice, then libraries need to agree to not cheat and hide their new materials.

People thanked Marshall for doing the leg work and the research. They do wish that a good faith effort to do the pilot.

2. Library Staff Use of Other Libraries' Materials

- The Committee reviewed the presented guidelines.
- There are libraries that are putting books on display for extended periods of time.
- If these become policies, then libraries will be informed of the policies. After that, libraries could work through the Cooperation procedure if violations are noticed.

3. Final report

We will draft a report and review it and present it to the December AC meeting. They may wish to sunset the committee until some of the results of the pilot.