

Request Phase 2 ILL Staff Satisfaction and Behavior Survey*

Summary

A 14 question online survey was made available to ILL staff for anonymous response from mid-June through July 2000. Attendees of the ILL best practices workshops were encouraged to respond, as were all ILL staff via the Resource Sharing Committee (RSC) and the RSC's interlibrary loan advisory group.

The survey provides moderately strong evidence that Request has positively affected workflow and operations by streamlining or increasing productivity, although many areas for improvement were identified. The majority of respondents were sure that loan activity had increased due to Request, but more than half thought it too soon to tell or were unsure whether overall ILL activity had increased on their campus. ILL staff, and the few public service staff who also took the survey, believe that Request is a real service to users and want to see it extended to undergraduates, to other CDL-hosted databases, and to allow patron tracking of requests.

Survey introduction: *Your input on the effects of Request on ILL units and workflow will complement end-user feedback in helping us plan the future of Request. Your input will be confidential unless you choose to sign your comments. A summary of results will be distributed later this summer.*

Responses Received: 47 (Results available at http://www.cdlib.org/libstaff/sharedcoll/projects/pir/survey/staff/request_staff-r.htm).

Questions and responses:

1) Do you advise patrons to use Request to place interlibrary loan requests?

yes 87% no 13%

2) If yes, explain the **key selling points** of using Request

Increased speed and convenience; no need to rekey info.; no need to come to library, can submit several requests at once; decreases staff intervention

3) If no, explain **why you do not advocate** the use of Request

Our own ILL web site is open to undergrads; (with no hook to Docline) doesn't work well for medical library patrons; don't know enough about it to recommend it

4.1) The use of Request **has streamlined the processing** of interlibrary loan requests via Request

<i>minimally</i>	<i>some</i>	<i>moderately</i>	<i>significantly</i>	<i>greatly</i>
12%	19%	19%	33%	16%

4.2) The use of Request **has increased productivity of the borrowing unit/section**

<i>minimally</i>	<i>some</i>	<i>moderately</i>	<i>significantly</i>	<i>greatly</i>
15%	21%	38%	23%	3%

4.3) The use of Request **has increased productivity of the lending unit/section**

<i>minimally</i>	<i>some</i>	<i>moderately</i>	<i>significantly</i>	<i>greatly</i>
32%	26%	32%	9%	0%

* A summary of user awareness and satisfaction surveying is also available. See the evaluation section of <http://www.cdlib.org/libstaff/sharedcoll/projects/pir/>.

4.4) The use of Request **has decreased the total turnaround time for items borrowed** from another UC library

<i>minimally</i>	<i>some</i>	<i>moderately</i>	<i>significantly</i>	<i>greatly</i>
8%	16%	32%	35%	8%

4.5) The use of Request **has decreased the total turnaround time for items lent** to another UC library

<i>minimally</i>	<i>some</i>	<i>moderately</i>	<i>significantly</i>	<i>greatly</i>
21%	30%	33%	15%	0%

5.1) The use of Request **has made the operations of your interlibrary loan unit more complex.**

<i>minimally</i>	<i>some</i>	<i>moderately</i>	<i>significantly</i>	<i>greatly</i>
17%	28%	31%	11%	14%

5.2) The use of Request **has made the operations of your interlibrary loan unit easier.**

<i>minimally</i>	<i>some</i>	<i>moderately</i>	<i>significantly</i>	<i>greatly</i>
8%	39%	31%	19%	3%

5.3) The use of Request **has increased the overall activity of interlibrary loan** at your campus?

<i>minimally</i>	<i>some</i>	<i>moderately</i>	<i>significantly</i>	<i>greatly</i>
13%	16%	32%	11%	27%

6) Has Request increased or decreased ILL activity at your campus?

Increased 41% Not sure/don't know 59%

7) Do you have **other comments** about the impact of Request on your ILL operations or unit workflow you would like to share?

a) More work, complexity and greater patron confusion caused by: *When UCs unable to fill patron has to start over; requests for things that campus lib. owns, but Request can't tell, tracking Requests is more complicated.* **b) Amount of change:** *decrease in borrowing activity (perhaps because of e-journals?) but lending has gone up; increase in overall activity but no funding for additional staff.* **c) Service:** *patrons like it it is for them; may increase frivolous requests; need hooks to DOCLINE for health sci. patrons; I'm proud UC offers this service.*

8) What do you think should be the **priorities for changing Request** to improve efficiency? To improve service to patrons? [NB: comments are in order of frequency of occurrence.]

Extend to undergraduates

Better processing: better matchin;, include non-circulating items but route to appropriate ILL unit; include borrower status; better checking on availability; add patron supplied doc. deli. account#.

Add patron tracking of requests

Add unverified citations

Extend to other databases (e.g. MLA, WorldCat)

Extend so that ILL transactions are treated as circulation transactions

Desktop delivery of scanned articles

Acquire CBS that everyone uses

Turn off Telnet Request, make Web the only option