



SHARES Update

Dennis Massie
Program Officer
OCLC Research

RLG Partnership Meeting
1 June 2009

SHARES Since August 1, 2007

■ Who's out?

- Fashion Institute
- Harvard U Law School
- New York State
- U of Michigan Medical
- U of Nottingham
- U of Southampton
- Winterthur Museum
- National Library of New Zealand
- USC Law School
- King's College London

■ Who's in?

- King's College London
- U of Arizona
- U of Miami
- U of Texas at Austin
- U of Toronto Engineering and Computer Science
- U of Toronto OISE
- U of Toronto Gerstein
- National Library of New Zealand
- USC Law School

SHARES Filled Transaction Volume

- 2006
 - 79,741 transactions at \$10
 - 906 transactions at \$30

- 2007
 - 65,589 transactions at \$10
 - 785 transactions at \$30

- 2008
 - 66,650 transactions at \$10
 - 931 at \$30

Eight months of SHARES IFM data to compare

- Sep07 - Apr08
 - 46,593 filled SHARES requests
 - 16,185 \$10 copies
 - 29,934 \$10 loans
 - 547 \$30 loans
 - 35% copies
 - 64% loans
 - 1% international returnables
- Sep08 - Apr09
 - 59,794 filled SHARES requests
 - +28%
 - 19,325 \$10 copies
 - +20%
 - 39,776 \$10 loans
 - +33%
 - 693 \$30 loans
 - +27%
 - 32% copies
 - 67% loans
 - 1 % int. international returnables

SHARES Executive Group 2009

- Scott Britton, [University of Miami](#)
- Karen Bucky, [Clark Art Institute](#)
- Sue Hallgren, [University of Minnesota](#)
- Margarita Moreno, [National Library of Australia](#)
- Francie Mrkich, [Columbia University](#)
- Penelope Myers, [Temple University](#)
- Merle Slyhoff, [U of Pennsylvania Law](#)
- Susan Stone, [University of Toronto](#)

SHARES Executive Group: Finished 2-year terms in Dec '08

- Susan Currie, Binghamton University
- Michelle Foss, University of Florida
- Jesse Koennecke, Cornell University
- Marjory Lobban, University of Edinburgh

SEG Work for 2008-2009

- Create SHARES Value Statement template
- Rethink Pricing structure
- Explore Green Practices

- Four new working groups:
 - High-performing lenders
 - Rethink onsite access
 - SHARES documentation
 - What's not being filled

- One already-established group: Sharing expertise
 - Helped launch "Sharing Special Collections" initiative

SHARES Value Statement template

<http://www.oclc.org/programs/shares/value.doc>

- SHARES Value Statement
- SHARES Executive Group - May 2009
- **Context:** RLG Programs partner dues invoices are mailed out to library directors each May, with a due date of July 1. Given the strong need this year to find ways to reduce budgets, the SHARES Executive Group felt it timely to reiterate the value to institutions of SHARES membership and underscore the growing value of the SHARES program for library users.
- **Document Purpose:** The SEG offers this document as a template for making a case to library administration for continuing affiliation with RLG Programs, which is a prerequisite for SHARES participation.
- **Benefits of SHARES membership to Libraries**
- **Low Cost of Borrowing and Lending**
- Costs of interlibrary loan and document delivery are held to a minimum through agreements to supply members at fixed below market prices. SHARES fees are \$10 for nearly all requests (\$30 for international returnables) and remain consistent over time. Reconciliation is done in an automated, low-overhead manner.

Pricing Rethink Subgroup **Recommendations**

- **Keep SHARES pricing as it is**, based on:
 - Survey results (75% wanted no change)
 - Shipping costs have not increased substantially
 - No alternative model attracted majority support
 - Volume of returnables to Canada does not justify separate pricing level; burden of lending is distributed, and Canadian loans to US nearly balance out
- The idea of **charging more for domestic returnables than for non-returnables deserves more thought**
 - 25% of survey respondents felt pricing for domestic returnables was too low
 - More cost data and wider discussion is needed before another layer of complexity is added to the SHARES pricing structure
- **Review in 3 years, per Vision Statement; sooner if events warrant.**

SEG Rethinking SHARES Pricing Structure Subcommittee Survey Results: July-August 2008

- About two thirds of SHARES responded
- 3 out of 4 said current pricing “just right”
- 10% think SHARES pricing is too high
- 25% think pricing for returnables is too low
- 25 % have changed non-SHARES pricing in the past year

SHARES Pricing Survey Results, cont.

- The idea of considering other pricing models drew numerous comments and ideas
 - **Most popular:** charge only for overseas returnables, or no charges at all
 - Those making these suggestions: **NET BORROWERS**
 - **Least popular model:** strenuous objections to the idea of high-volume lenders setting themselves up as premium suppliers offering high-end service for a higher fee

SHARES Pricing Survey Results, cont.

- 75% said returnables between Canada and US should be treated as domestic
- One respondent said perhaps an in-between price for Canada could be considered - higher than \$10 but lower than \$30
- Respondents split 50-50 on whether UK and Europe returnables should be charged as domestic
- 60% were in favor of treating returnables between NZ and Australia as domestic

Two Questions to Ask Regarding Any Potential Change in SHARES Pricing Structure

- Will the change drive anyone out of SHARES?
- Is the change needed badly enough to warrant adding a new layer of complexity to the SHARES pricing model?

Average Shipping Costs - Library #1: 2 lb. between East Coast and Midwest via UPS

- 5 SHARES-bound packages chosen at random for each time period; ignored some “odd” packages with prices way out of whack from others (extra insurance?)

- March 2007: \$10.94
- October 2007: \$12.23 (+12%)
- December 2007: \$12.27

- March 2008: \$12.92 (+18% in yr.)
- October 2008: \$14.02 (+15% in yr.)
- December 2008: \$12.40 (+1% in yr.)

Average Shipping Costs, Library #2: Domestic (UPS) and International (USPS)

- | | | |
|------------------------------------|-------------|------------------------------------|
| ■ 08-09 (2Q) | 5.09 (-1%) | ■ 9.31 (+27%) |
| ■ 07-08 | 5.14 (+2%) | ■ 7.33 (-4%) |
| ■ 06-07 | 5.06 (+10%) | ■ 7.63 (+1%) |
| ■ 05-06 | 4.59 | ■ 7.56 |
| ■ <i>10% increase over 3 years</i> | | ■ <i>23% increase over 3 years</i> |

Returnables Shipped to Canada: Volume Worthy of a cost between \$10 and \$30?

- Two SHARES partners in Canada
- Looked at September 2007 - August 2008 stats
- Canadians borrowed 1016 returnables from US partners
- Average of 85 Canadian borrows of returnables per month
- **Questions:** How is the lending burden distributed? Is it balanced by Canadian lending of returnables?

Comparison of U of Toronto Returnables Borrowing and Lending within N.A.

- Borrowing
 - February 2009
 - Borrowed 119 returnables
 - From 21 SHARES libraries
 - 5 libraries loaned over 10
 - None loaned over 17
 - February 2008
 - Borrowed 119 returnables
 - From 19 SHARES libraries
 - 4 libraries loaned over 10
 - None loaned over 17
- Lending
 - February 2009
 - Loaned 92 returnables
 - To 19 SHARES libraries
 - 2 libraries borrowed over 10
 - 1 borrowed over 20
 - February 2008
 - Loaned 90 returnables
 - To 20 SHARES libraries
 - 3 libraries borrowed over 10
 - 2 borrowed over 20

High Performing Lenders survey results

- Most important criteria (% very important)
 - Prompt response 86.4%
 - Quality of scanning/copying 77.3%
 - Fast delivery 69.7%
 - Quality of holdings in WC 69.7%
 - Supply rare and hard-to-find 67.2%
 - Quality of packaging 53.0%
 - Willingness to renew 44.6%
 - Long loan period 21.2%

High Performing Lenders **revealed**

- Most often mentioned **by name**
 - Fast: COO, PUL, JPG
 - Prompt: COO, PUL, YUS, CGU, JPG
 - Scan/copy: COO, JPG, PUL
 - Packaging: JPG, MZA, PUL, BP1
 - Rare: JPG, PUL, COO
 - Holdings: FUG, UPM, PAU, COO
 - Can't believe: PUL, JPG, CGU, YUS, COO

Survey Comments: Other “high perf” Criteria

- Supply article electronically (5)
- Scan special collections material (4)
- Supply media (3)
- Copy long articles (2)

Survey comments: Packaging

■ Liked

- Easy to open
- Well-wrapped
- Top quality materials
- Bubble wrap and boxes
- Proper reinforcement
- Standardization
- Good quality control
- Neatness
- Green practices

■ Not so much

- Packaging that spills
- Takes too long to open
- Jiffy bags
- Peanuts
- Over-taping

High-Performing Lenders WG - next steps

- Follow up with high-performing lenders
- Identify and share best practices
- Arrange for Webinars, podcasts, Wiki, panels
- Discussion topic:
 - Best lenders finding it harder to deliver “special handling” items in tough economic times.
 - Yet during tough economic times those items are precisely the ones scholars need to borrow

Rethinking Onsite Access survey results

- 69 responses
- About 20% think onsite borrowing should be part of program
- 48% have knowingly received SHARES visitors
- Vast majority do not track use of program
- Most libraries report <10 SHARES visitors per year
- 3 libraries reported >200 SHARES visitors last year
- 2 libraries reported having different policies for SHARES libraries within their geographic area

Onsite Access and the End User

- 42% of libraries responded that they don't know how their patrons know about the SHARES onsite access program
- 25% respond that patrons learn by word of mouth
- 14% report teaching their patrons about onsite access via orientation, newsletter, flyer, or library blog
- Another 14% report that their patrons learn about SHARES onsite access from the library Web site
- 3 libraries reported knowing of an end user with whom they could out the working group in contact

Two Onsite Access survey comments

- “It is an underpublicized feature of shares, but the two experiences I have had with the program left a **profound feeling of value**. If I remember correctly, both faculty members ended up using the main library at Stanford. They were finishing projects that would have required extensive interlibrary loan and they were able to complete their work much faster on-site than remotely. They felt they were treated as serious scholars and complimented the professionalism of the hosting library.”
- “There should have been a representative from an **art museum library** on this working group. All the representatives are from academic libraries.”

SHARES Documentation Working Group: Topics for program-wide discussion

- Packaging
- Consider all requests
- No blanket use restrictions
- E-delivery
- No blanket restrictions by class of material
- Turn around time
- Policies Directory entries
- Trouble-shooting SHARES
- Net lending in's and out's
- EMST in SHARES
- Green practices
- Audience for specific pieces of SHARES documentation
- Level of granularity of guidelines and procedures
- Loan periods
- Lenders of last resort
- Dummy requests
- SHARES liaisons
- Renewals

SHARES “Reasons for No”

■ Aug08 Biggest Lender

- 620 unfilled requests
- 53 partner symbols
- 14 reasons-for-no used

■ Lacking 27%

■ In use/on loan 25%

■ Not on shelf 12%

■ Non-circ 9%

■ Auto-deflect (format) 5%

■ Aug08 Biggest Borrower

- 755 unfilled requests
- 64 partner symbols
- 24 reasons-for-no used

■ Lacking 23%

■ In use/on loan 21%

■ Non-circ 12%

■ Aged to next lender 8%

■ Not on shelf 8%

Issues Touched Upon by this Investigation

- What do our reasons-for-no say about our technical environment? Our collaborative environment?
- How can we improve our use of reasons-for-no to provide better service and more information to borrowers?
- Is reasons-for-no information useful for strategic planning and ILL management?
- What can SHARES do to encourage better representation of holdings data in WorldCat?

Methods for Improving WC Holdings Information

- **Ongoing batchloads.** Cost (aside from nominal setup fee) included in subscription price.
- **Free “cancel holdings” projects.** Libraries send MARC records or OCLC numbers as they weed items so records can be removed from WC. Can be simple text files in Notepad, fed into Connexion client. Some libraries handle as joint project among cataloging, circ and ILL.
- **Reclamation project.** Library sends whole collection to OCLC for reloading. Free, but holdings must be updated regularly afterwards.
- **New wrinkle:** to take advantage of **emerging products and services**, must have OCLC number linked with local control number in ILS. OCLC can provide this match.

NYU ILL Data Analysis

- Six years of peer-to-peer ILL data analyzed by OCLC Research
- 181,398 borrowing requests sent to 3,049 suppliers
- 11% sent to one supplier - MNU
- Top ten suppliers received half of all requests
- Top 100 received 80% of all requests
- Top 1500 received 99% of all requests

NYU ILL Borrowing by Material Type

- Monographs: 61,332
- Serials: 97,372
- Other: 10,866
- Type not included: 11,828

NYU Monograph Requests in Detail

- 61,332 requests for monographs
- 37,214 associated with OCLC number
- 20,366 unique items requested (that is, requested only once)
- 45% of requests represented either multiple attempts to fill the same request, or multiple requests from different parties

NYU Monograph Requests in Detail, cont.

- How widely held are the materials NYU tends to borrow?

■ 10 or fewer:	5,847	29%
■ 11-50	5,650	28%
■ 51-100	2,448	12%
■ 101-250	3,184	16%
■ 251-500	2,030	10%
■ 501-1000	912	4%
■ More than 1000	295	1%

NYU Monograph Requests in Detail, cont.

- What % of NYU monograph requests (with OCLC numbers) could be filled by ARL institutions?
- 94%
- What % of NYU monograph requests (with OCLC numbers) could be filled by LVIS institutions?
- 68%
- Including those requests without OCLC numbers would drive these percentages down significantly.

More questions for NYU data

- How does proportion of serials vs monographs change over the six years of data?
- What are fill rates of ARL and LVIS groups?
- Response times?
- How were dissertations counted?
- Any correlation between fill rates and how widely held an item is?
- Do materials requested more than once share any characteristics?
- What % of requests were for things owned by NYU?

Current thinking on the NYU analysis

- Answering questions based on requests without OCLC numbers will be labor intensive
- Will work with NYU to identify a set of high-priority questions we can answer
- All SHARES transactions since August 1, 2007, have gone through WCRS
- OCLC Research is exploring the technical and legal issues involved in getting that data
- NYU agrees looking at current environment more useful than at previous environment
- Will see if trends noted in NYU are present across the group

If we could query all SHARES ILL data...

- What would you be interested in learning?
- How would knowing the answers change your behavior?
- What information is of most use to you?
 - Performance of lenders?
 - Characteristics of items borrowed?
 - Activity inside vs. outside the group?

SHARES

- Questions?
- Comments?
- massied@oclc.org
- 650-287-2132