

CDL REQUEST PHASE I EVALUATION PLAN JAN-APRIL 1999

Patron-initiated Request (PIR) Project Team
December 28, 1998

OVERVIEW

The PIR Project Team will evaluate the success and impacts of **Request** in several ways. Project Team member Tammy Dearie will collect and coordinate data collection and analysis.

- I. **Statistical evaluation will focus on volume of UC returnable requests, types of users, and time to complete the process**, from patron submission to receipt in borrower's pick-up location (turnaround time or TAT). Comparisons will be made of volume, load levels, and time measures to existing benchmark data. Statistical information gathered in Phase I of the project will be used to inform policy decisions and recommend changes for Phase II of CDL Request implementation.

In order to compare to the non-PIR environment, data were gathered from September-December, 1998 from UC OCLC transactions. Historical (1996) UC turnaround time (TAT) data will also be used for comparison because these are the only data we have that represent the time from patron submission to input into OCLC (transmission) by borrowing staff. This is the part of the entire process that should be reduced to minutes by Request in its most automated version. Library staff will need to supply some other historical and ongoing data (e.g., monthly data). More detail on the questions to be answered with these data is below.

- II. **Patron awareness and satisfaction** will be evaluated in three ways:
 1. CDL Focus groups in February will include questions on Request.
 2. A survey of patrons who pick up returnables will be conducted for one week in April 1999. In consultation with PIR liaisons, the Project Team will design a very short, easily administered survey.
 3. One or more specific questions on Request will be added to the CDL Feedback feature. CDL will compile and summarize these user comments and helpline questions for the period Jan-March 1999.
- III. Sampling will be used to determine the proportion of filled patron-initiated **Requests that could have been obtained locally** but were not because of cataloging vagaries (e.g., series not analyzed).

- IV. **Analysis of the volume and nature of all non-returnable interlibrary loan requests** during the same period (or extant historical data may be used) will be conducted. Library staff will have to supply data from Docline and “Science fax” requests that fall outside of OCLC data collection. The purpose is to anticipate the workload implications of extending Request to non-returnables.

REQUEST PHASE I QUESTIONS TO BE ANSWERED BY EVALUATION PROCESS

The questions the Project Team expects to answer and the likely form of answers are elaborated below.

Definitions: There are 3 different actions generated by the Request button:

1. **Request “Direct”** transmits directly to OCLC and a lending library (no staff intervention by borrowing campus).
 2. **Request “Review”** transmits to an OCLC review file for borrowing staff review and action (staff intervention). Review may be invoked because of staff preferences or because requests “fail” the profile for some reason.
 3. **Request “email”** sends an email to ILL unit (for non-book requests, e.g.) and to SRLF, which is not on OCLC (highest level of staff intervention).
- **How does the total volume (Jan-Mar 1999) of returnable UC transactions compare to a comparable period in the past?** Do we see an increase in overall volume since the introduction of Request? [Library staff will need to supply 1998 data for same months and current monthly data (annual data are currently submitted)].
 - **What are the relative volumes, by campus, of borrowing and lending transactions for returnables (i.e., which campuses are net lenders? how do the lending loads compare?)?** Are there changes in these patterns, since introduction of Request, in comparison to the past?
 - **What proportions of total UC returnable requests are handled via Request “Direct”, Request “Review”, Request e-mail, and all other methods of submission?** Total and by campus?
Why do Requests go to “Review”? Why do requests fail the profile?

- **Who is making Requests?** How many faculty, grads, staff? Total and by campus?
- **How does *total* Request “Direct” turnaround time (from date of submission to receipt in borrowing library pick-up location) compare to previous measures?** Has this time been reduced in comparison with the last comprehensive TAT in 1996? The data might appear as follows:

What percentage of UC returnable requests are received in the borrowing library:

	Request “Direct”	Request “Review” or e-mail	TAT 1996 (sample)
1-2 days			
3-5 days			
6-7 days			
8-10 days			

- **How does the turnaround time for the lending portion only compare to baselines?** Have 48-hour standards been met? Has the lending TAT improved? Has it declined in the face of possible volume increases?
- **What is the fill rate for Request?** How many requests are filled by the first, second, third lender, etc.? How do these data compare to baselines? Fill rates for this time period will be particularly useful as a baseline for Phase II of Request when circulation information should improve fill rate by automatically bypassing lenders that cannot supply. Fill rates and number of transmittals amongst potential lenders before filling exacerbate turnaround times that might otherwise, theoretically, not exceed 3 days (zero for transmission, 2 days to fill, 1 day to ship).
- **Are patrons aware of Request? Are they satisfied with its performance?** What improvements are suggested? The evaluation methods are outlined above. In addition, the Project Team will hold staff Update sessions in February or March.
- **What portion of successful Request “Direct” transactions are for items actually held locally but not rejected by the system because of vagaries of cataloging?** In consultation with the PIR liaisons, the Project Team will determine a sample period, a sample size, and provide instructions for Library staff to conduct. This will involve pulling the OCLC requests from the sample period and performing bibliographic checking.

- **What journal titles (of what age) are being requested within UC?** What proportion are from publishers and time periods that coincide with the CDL licensing program, our primary strategy for sharing journal literature? Have there been any trends in volume of returnable requests since site licensing of electronic journals began? These data can be obtained from the OCLC records, but to be a fair comparison will need to include Docline and Science fax transactions. Since most libraries keep title/date information for copyright compliance, providing these should not be burdensome.

- **What effect is introducing Request to article databases likely to have on the volume of UC non-returnable requests? What impacts on workload would volume increases represent?** With the data collected above as a sample, the degree to which such requests can be accurately automated (i.e., transmit directly to a lender with appropriate holdings) will be assessed. The experience of other patron-initiated request systems for articles will also be investigated. With this information, as well as experience to date with Request for returnables, we will estimate volume increases and per transaction workloads for extending Request to articles.

- **What is the volume of returnable transactions to/from the CSUs and Stanford?** We will collect these data for 1997/98 to provide background in consideration of extending Request to non-UC partners.