Illinois State Library Resource Sharing Survey
Executive Summary

If you ask members of the Illinois library community for their thoughts on resource sharing, they are apt to tell you. That is one take-away that can be gleaned from the 693 responses to the resource sharing survey conducted by the Illinois State Library (ISL) in January and February 2014.

Demographics
Respondents were affiliated with all types of libraries: 425 (61.8%) of respondents, said they worked or were associated with public libraries; 120 (17.4%) with school libraries; 82 (11.9%) with academic libraries; 46 (6.7%) with special libraries; 9 (1.3%) with library systems; and 5 (.7%) with consortiums. Virtually all respondents were members of a multi-type library system: 469 (67.8%) of Reaching Across Illinois Library System (RAILS); 191 (27.6%) of Illinois Heartland Library System (IHLS); 12 (1.7%) did not know what system they belong to, while the remaining 19 (2.7%) did not respond.

The most respondents, 251 (36.4%) had service populations of 501 to 5,000; followed by 208 (30.2%) serving a population of 5,001 to 25,000; 73 (10.6%) at 25,001 to 50,000; and 52 (7.6%) with a population of 50,001 to 100,000. There were 55 (8%) respondents with a service population of 500 or fewer.

Finally, there were respondents from each of the online catalog consortia: 560 (80%) participate in a shared catalog with other libraries; 97 (14%) are online but not shared with others (stand-alone); and 24 (3.5%) are not online.

Resource Sharing Support and Barriers
Other take-aways from the responses abound. Respondents strongly support resource sharing, with nearly 98% reporting they agree or strongly agree with the statement. Nearly 95% report their library’s practice is to fill as many interlibrary loan (ILL) requests as possible; nearly 91% say they send ILL-requested physical items through Illinois Library Delivery Service (ILDS) or system delivery; and 81% said they use OCLC for ILL.

An undercurrent of concern and discontent with resource sharing is evident. Nearly 20% (132) of respondents to Question #8 expressed some level of frustration with library lending and borrowing, and when asked in Question #21 if they are not concerned about resource sharing because it seems to be working just fine, only 24.4% (161) agreed with the statement while nearly 65% (426) only partially agreed, and nearly 11% (70) totally disagreed.

What did the respondents see as the biggest barriers to resource sharing? Fiscal problems, slow or infrequent delivery, libraries leaving or not members of a catalog consortium, and limits libraries have placed on new or selected special materials were frequently mentioned in responses to Question #12.

Statewide Uniform Interlibrary Loan Periods
Responses to Question #18, which asked if respondents would support a uniform set of loan periods for ILL material that all libraries would use, helped the ISL decide not to recommend such a requirement be included in the current revision of the ILLINET Interlibrary Loan Code. The technological barriers and the strong philosophical divide between libraries on this issue, with virtually the same number of respondents either strongly supportive or strongly opposed to common ILL loan periods, revealed by the 678 responses received, helped convince ISL that now is not the time to pursue this change.

Illinois State Library Role in Resource Sharing Support and Expansion
Finally, the 217 responses to Question #19, about what the ISL should do to support and/or expand resource sharing in Illinois were surprisingly unsurprising. Maintaining or improving delivery frequency and turn-around time was mentioned most often at 22% (48) responses, followed by providing training in resource sharing procedures for library staff (27) responses, providing help with ebook and database purchases and digitization (22) responses, providing more financial support generally to libraries and library systems (20) responses, subsidizing Local Library System Automation Program (LLSAP) membership for small public libraries and schools (15) responses, and financial help with the cost of OCLC (8) responses. Twenty-two respondents, with varying degrees of diplomacy, thought the ISL should back off and leave them alone.
What follows are brief summaries of the responses to each of the survey’s 23 questions.

**Question #1**

**My library's catalog is:**

- Online and we participate in a shared catalog with other libraries (please answer question 3) - 81.4%
- Online but our library's catalog is not shared with other libraries - 14.1%
- Not online, we use a card catalog or other tangible record of our holdings - 3.5%
- I'm unsure - 0.7%
- NA - 0.3%

**Comments from School Libraries:**
- We share between buildings in our school district. We are still part of an ILL system, but previous librarians did not keep the catalog in compliance, and we will be dropping out because of financial concerns.
- My catalog is online, but it is only shared with other school libraries within my own district (six elementary buildings, one middle school, and two preschool sites). I'm not sure if we are considered one library with branches or as separate libraries.
- Shared with all schools in our district and available online for anyone else statewide to search.
- Software on local computers on the network, but not online and not card catalog. Not accessible to other libraries.
- I’m not sure if we are online. We use software for cataloging our books, but it is not available online.
- Online, but our library’s catalog is not shared with other libraries. We add all our holdings to OCLC.
- Although our catalog is shared, we have not had any requests in years and years!

**Comments from Libraries:**
- Our library catalog is online for employees, but I am not sure if it is shared. (Special)
- But many titles are available through WorldCat. (Special)
- We are using a card catalog as well as having our books cataloged in Past Perfect. What is on Past Perfect was converted from another program. Much of the information needs expanding and correcting. A cataloger is working on this project and eventually everything in the program will be online. (Special)
• Not online. We use ResourceMate, so we have an electronic database for our patrons and staff to use in-house, but are unable to share with other libraries due to the costs involved. (Public)
• Not online. We are in the process of getting our library's catalog in ResourceMate so that we may put it on our web site for availability. (Public)

Comments from Stand-Alone Libraries:
• We use a stand-alone so our older records are not on OCLC. We have been attaching our records to OCLC for around 10 years. So they are available for loan thru them. (Public)
• We use a stand-alone system, but catalog our items in OCLC to provide ILL access to our materials that way. (Special)

Comments from Online Shared Catalog Libraries:
• Online and part of a shared catalog. Our circulation system is not a part of the online catalog, but will be so in July. (Public)
• We participate in OCLC, use WorldShare Management Services (whole system), and Worldcat Local. However, our patrons do not see this sharing initially. We have totally integrated the WorldCat Local API into our website. (Special)
Question #2

The following comments show some confusion about the question:

- Champaign-Urbana (Public)
- OCLC (Special, Public and School)
- NSLS (School)
- RAILS (Special)
- We will be participating in eRead Illinois through RAILS, but our library catalog will not be shared with other libraries. I'm not sure if this counts as an answer to this particular question. (School)
- We are a stand-alone system, but catalog our items in OCLC to provide ILL access to our materials that way. (Special)
- Not sure, I think it is I-Share, but I do not think our collection shows there anymore. We are local enough for RSA, but we are not members. (School)

Comments:

- One school district uses Follett Destiny to loan within the district.
- SOAR – Chicago Public Schools.
- LibraryWorld.
- One small public library in RAILS would like to join CCS, but cannot afford to.
- One CARLI library is unable to join I-Share, due to inflexible scheduling of adding new members.
- One public library in RAILS states that they are members of RSA, but circulate as a stand-alone.
### Question #3

**My responsibilities at the library include (select as many as apply):**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Responsibility</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Acquisitions</td>
<td>380</td>
<td>56.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administration</td>
<td>461</td>
<td>67.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cataloging and metadata</td>
<td>302</td>
<td>44.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Circulation</td>
<td>423</td>
<td>63.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication/press/media</td>
<td>309</td>
<td>45.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delivery</td>
<td>223</td>
<td>32.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Digital library</td>
<td>218</td>
<td>32.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fiscal/budget</td>
<td>344</td>
<td>50.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government documents</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>17.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IT or data management and/or access</td>
<td>182</td>
<td>25.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interlibrary loan</td>
<td>395</td>
<td>58.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reciprocal borrowing/ending</td>
<td>339</td>
<td>49.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Serials</td>
<td>197</td>
<td>29.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stacks</td>
<td>239</td>
<td>35.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Other:**

- Reference/public service: 30
- Instruction/training/education: 13
- Shelving/cleaning/building maintenance: 5
- Shoveling snow: 1
- Small library/does everything: 18
- Story times/children’s programming: 6
- Teen services and programming: 2
- Outreach: 4

- Security: 1
- Trustee: 2
- Collection development: 4
- Bookkeeping: 1
- LAN and computer maintenance: 1
- Readers advisory: 1
- International programs: 1
- PR and social networking: 1
**Question #4**

The type of library or organization with which I am affiliated is:

- **Academic:** 11.9% (82)
- **Public:** 61.8% (425)
- **School:** 17.4% (120)
- **Special:** 6.7% (46)
- **Library System:** 1.3% (9)
- **Consortium:** 0.7% (5)
- **N/A:** 0.1% (1)
Question #5

The library system with which my library is affiliated is:

- Chicago Public Library System: 0.1% (1)
- Illinois Heartland Library System: 27.6% (191)
- Reaching Across Illinois Library System: 67.8% (469)
- I'm unsure: 1.7% (12)
- N/A: 2.7% (19)
Question #6

My service population is:

- up to 500: 8.0% (55)
- 501-5,000: 36.4% (251)
- 5,001-25,000: 30.2% (208)
- 25,001-50,000: 10.6% (73)
- 50,001-75,000: 5.1% (35)
- 75,001-100,000: 2.5% (17)
- 100,001-150,000: 0.6% (4)
- 150,001-200,000: 0.4% (3)
- 200,001-250,000: 0.3% (2)
- 250,001+: 1.0% (7)
- I'm unsure: 4.9% (34)
Question #7

Pros:
- Expressed positive attitudes about reciprocal borrowing and willingness to lend.
- One library acknowledged that they honor out-of-state cards: “Someone who carries a library card while traveling is typically a very good library patron.”

Cons:
- Expressed uncertainty about honoring intersystem vs. intra-system reciprocal borrowing transactions.
- There is a lack of common understanding about procedural issues in terms of honoring a reciprocal loan.

Misunderstandings:
- Some non-publics responded. They need to understand that even though they do not honor or participate in reciprocal borrowing, they can offer reciprocal access.
- Talked about loaning books to any library in the United States—so apparently the library does not understand the differences between ILL and reciprocal borrowing.
- Libraries that are consortia members restrict reciprocal borrowing to their own consortia.

Take-Aways:
- Libraries need training in and understanding of their responsibilities for the variety of resource sharing services: ILL, reciprocal borrowing (both intra-system and intersystem), and reciprocal access.
- Standardized, statewide procedures, including a checklist for staff, need to be developed in dealing with and for honoring a reciprocal borrowing patron’s transaction. (Procedures noted in the survey varied from simply
honoring a valid library card that has not expired to calling the patron’s home library to verify they are indeed a patron in good standing, have no overdues, no fines, no lost items, and/or no other restrictions.

- Reciprocal borrowing is a system service, not to be restricted only to automation consortia members.

**Question #8**

For each of the following statements, this response best characterizes my beliefs (select one answer per row):

- I strongly support library resource sharing: 1.18
- I resist any efforts to restrict resource sharing: 2
- I think my library needs to worry about its own needs: 3.05
- I am frustrated by the imbalances in library lending and borrowing: 3.25
- I am really proud of Illinois' tradition of resource sharing: 1.52
- My library seems less willing to lend because of tighter fiscal times: 4.07
- I wish other libraries in the state were as liberal as my library in terms of lending: 2.44
- I do everything I can to make sure as much of my collection as possible is available for lending: 1.81
- I do not see the value in participating in resource sharing (interlibrary loan, recip borrowing, etc.): 4.7
- I would like to borrow and lend more, but my collection isn't online/exposed to the web: 4.03
- I would like to borrow and lend more, but I don't know how: 4.17
- I am aware that resource sharing is part of Illinois library law and rule: 1.57
This question asked which response best characterizes my beliefs (strongly agree, agree, neither agree nor disagree, disagree, strongly disagree). This was one of the questions with the highest response rates, receiving 693 responses. Gleanings from those responses:

**Pros:**
Respondents strongly support resource sharing, are proud of their efforts, resist restrictions on resource sharing, and report that they are very aware that resource sharing is part of Illinois library law and rule.

**Cons:**
There were a surprising number of ambivalent responses regarding “I would like to borrow and lend more, but my collection is not online/or exposed to the web” and “I would like to borrow and lend more, but I do not know how.” The clear majority strongly disagreed with these two statements, but the next highest majority indicated they “neither agreed nor disagreed.”

**Take-Aways:**
- High percentage of the majority on the Pro side.
- Very low percentages on the Con side.
- Ambivalence (“neither agree nor disagree” responses) regarding libraries needing to worry about their own needs, frustration by the imbalances in library lending and borrowing, and wishing other libraries in the state were as liberal as their own library in terms of lending.

**Question #9**

I wish the following choices had been included in the previous question that would better characterize my feelings about resource sharing (optional):

Most of the 147 respondents to this question answered as if they were answering Question #12, which asks about barriers to resource sharing. Those responses to this question, therefore, have been included in the summary for Question #12.

**Pros:**
A few answered that the questions in Question #8 were fine.

**Cons:**
Stand-alone libraries should have answered the questions separately from those libraries who are part of an LLSAP…philosophy and lending policies are very different; leading questions.

**Suggestions:**
- How much does patron negligence affect your willingness to lend items?
- 10 and 11 should have the option to say “not applicable…”, “neither” was as close to “not applicable” as I could find.
- Question about why libraries restrict certain types of material.
- Needs N/A option for several of the questions.
- My library is able to function better, more effectively, and satisfy more patrons because of resource sharing.
- Should libraries be required to maintain a maintenance of effort (required number of hours open, qualified staff, number of items available) to be allowed to participate in reciprocal borrowing at other libraries?
- Special library question…Does your company allow you to make your catalog available for resource sharing?
- As a school district, do you share only within your district or are your resources available outside of your district?
- Reciprocity is an important value in resource sharing.
- Libraries should not request what they are unwilling to supply.
- Question about specifics of what a library lends.
- What do you consider to be a reasonable amount of time for a library to hold new books back for their own patrons/local request?
- Something about use if reciprocal borrowing vs. ILL.
- Do you share only within your school district?
Question #10

The following best characterizes my library's interlibrary loan practices about (select one answer per row):

- Keeping our lending policies up-to-date in L2's (librarylearning.info) Resource Sharing Directory or OCLC Policies Directory
- Sending articles to patrons electronically
- Sending physical items through delivery
- Filling requests as much as possible
- Training patrons about interlibrary options

Cons:
- Just a little over half of the respondents to the survey (56%) send articles to patrons electronically. When further explained, many of the respondents stated that either they do not get requests for articles, they do not have access to requested articles in electronic format to send that way, or their patrons do not have the technology to access articles electronically, or do not desire to have an article sent electronically.
- A repeating response regarding Library Learning (L2) that it is not used and/or the respondent was unaware of what L2 is.
- Limited staffing has the biggest effect on what all libraries can do when participating in ILL.

Comments:
- “We do not fill as many requests as possible because our current practice is to not lend more than we borrow. We mediate requests to keep lending and borrowing in balance as much as possible.”
- “Our district (Board) is not willing to pay the fees associated with being a full member of our library consortium and as a result we are not able to completely participate in resource sharing, though I know it would be incredibly valuable to our schools.”
- “To the best of my knowledge, we do not post our lending policies in the L2 Resource Sharing Directory or the OCLC Policies Directory. We do, however, post policies, and any changes to them, on the library's website.”
**Cons:**

Many respondents were unsure of two things: if their library used OCLC beyond FirstSearch 111 (16.9%) and if their library used OCLC ILL Direct Request 166 (24.8%).

- The overwhelming majority do not allow their patrons to directly place OCLC requests 464 (68.9%). However, most respondents when they further explained why they do not stated that they do so because: 1) Patrons are often times confused on how to place an OCLC request or request the wrong format, 2) library wants to be aware of what patrons are requesting, and 3) the library makes every attempt to get an item in the most efficient way and will therefore search for the item in its LLSAP or neighboring library’s catalog.

- In reviewing comments, problems with OCLC ranged from pricing of OCLC to the cost (postage) of filling out-of-state requests via OCLC. Training and education of OCLC, the tools available to its users would greatly benefit Illinois library staff. Many were unaware of the extensive services and general functionality of OCLC.
Comments:

- “Consider staff knowledge of library's resources before a request is made and knowledge of ILL staff from whom request can be made at speediness, low or no cost is an important element to the ILL service. The personal touch also takes the intimidation element out of the loan process for those who would be challenged by self serve, for now.
- “I do not promote or discourage the use of OCLC, because I myself still do not understand how OCLC works. I have had no training at all on it, just brief explanations by others, which are much appreciated but have not helped to get anywhere with actually using the system.”
- “Since we do not use OCLC (based on costs that I would be afraid to know about) we do not use their resources. I think FirstSearch is very clunky and difficult to use, especially for these young people accustomed to using Google for everything.”

Misunderstanding:
Many alluded to providing good customer service by not allowing patrons to submit a direct OCLC request and cited this will be an ongoing preferred practice at their library.

Question #12

*If I had to name the biggest barrier in resource sharing in Illinois, I would Say:*

(There were 387 responses.)

Pros:

- Happy with current resource sharing.
- Workflow in the state.
- Feel that they have a variety of options to search for and deliver items to their patrons.
- Miss not getting deliveries at school, but because they’re going to the local public library to pick up items, they’re getting to know the public library resources.
- Lack of awareness by the public that they have one of the strongest resource sharing rich library cultures in America. One of the truly respectable things Illinois does.

NOTE: This question was designed to encourage respondents to articulate what they saw as the biggest barriers are, so the responses that said “none” or articulated that they were happy with current model were few.

Cons (The majority of responses were negative observations.):

- Lack of funding for resources.
- Unhappiness with current ILDS delivery model…both in time it takes to receive items and lack of tracking of individual items.
- Time it takes to locate and request items due to use of different operating systems. OCLC, I-Share, system catalogs; lending policies (will not lend new items or AV material).
- Patron and staff training deficiencies.
- Staff time/manpower issues.
- Imbalance between libraries (haves and have nots).
- Libraries charging for lost items.
- Cost of being in a consortia (OCLC, I-Share, Library Systems, CCS).
- Restrictions placed on reciprocal borrowers.
- Non-consortia libraries.
- Public education on resources and ILL.
- Staff training.
- Library Director/Board training.
- Lack of school participating in resource sharing. Library System membership and constraints on participating in shared catalog (in particular, PRAIRIECAT received negative comments).
- OCLC not updated very often by library system to reflect holdings in shared catalog.
Misunderstandings:
- LLSAPS strongly encouraging school libraries to borrow only from other school libraries and not public libraries…response also indicated this was getting better.
- I wish the ISL would not require my patrons to borrow from ISL rather than my library to request via ILL.
- I would like to see more statewide consistency in policies about responsibility for lost or damaged ILL items.

Suggestions:
- Resource sharing policies and procedures need to be universal.
- Need for universal library card.
- Single combined borrowing system for the entire state.
- Regional or county-wide library districts based on legacy libraries in Michigan.
- Single statewide resource sharing system.

Take-Aways:
- ILDS timeliness/routing of items to all libraries and tracking of individual items.
- Budget constrains/funding issues.
- Patron education and staff training.
- Library Board/Director education on resource sharing/what it means to be a resource sharing library in Illinois.
- More affordable platform for schools to participate in resource sharing.

Question #13

The most critical issues facing resource sharing in Illinois in the next 5-10 years are:
(There were 393 responses.)

The most often mentioned critical issues:
- Delivery.
- Funding inequality between libraries.
- Budget constraints.
- Sharing of electronic material between libraries.
- Electronic material licensing restrictions.
- Embargo on e-journals with regards to ILL, copyright/e-copyright laws/regulations.
- Moving to more digital collections.
- Lack of universal library card.
- Amazon.
- Loss of school librarians.
- More libraries restricting material to local use only.
- Cataloging and resource sharing training.
- Libraries dropping out of OCLC.
- Staffing/manpower.

Suggestions:
Universal public library card: pay fee at DMV and take proof of payment to your closest public library and receive a card.

Take-Aways:
- Worries about continued delivery.
- Funding/budget worries.
- E-resources.
**Question #14**

I think these current/future trends identified should be incorporated in the resource sharing picture in Illinois the following way(s):

The 188 responses broke out as follows:

- Increased access to digitized resources, more statewide database subscriptions, greater availability of electronic resources. Overall more e-resources seemed to be a major priority. (50 comments)
- In favor of common loan period. (6 comments)
- Not in favor of common loan period and believe that ISL should not impose additional requirements on libraries. (6 comments)
- There were several comments about the importance to local autonomy to set policy “…let the individual libraries and consortia decide what is the best for customer service… one size does not fit all….
- “If it ain’t broke - don’t fix it. If there are libraries that need direction – then direct them – do not broad brush us into the problem.”
- Many comments focused on the need for cost effective solutions. Reduced funding demands more interlibrary cooperation. Several comments addressed the importance of consortial purchases for better prices and the need to continue offering grant opportunities.

Comments:

- More government funding to larger libraries, since they do most of the resource sharing.
- Require libraries to lend their current materials; many still wait several months before lending.
- Push libraries to new ways of sharing.
- More liberal lending laws.
- The need to expand ILDS.
- Hybrid vehicles should be considered at all delivery hubs.
- Keep delivery at five days a week, if possible.
- Make it easier for school library staff to learn technical processing, including cataloging, ILL, and circulation.
- ILL is a small part of what MOST libraries in consortia do. We could often purchase the book from Amazon with free shipping instead of using ILL. A cost analysis would be interesting. Each library must be allowed flexibility in lending and borrowing since resources vary from library to library.
- Several respondents said Illinois is doing a great job with promoting resource sharing. The ISL is on it by using grant funds to promote sharing programs.

**Question #15**

Here is my definition of “resource sharing:”

Many people showed a strong commitment to resource sharing, all libraries, all types of materials:

Over 100 respondents provided a very broad definition of resource sharing. Some mentioned nationwide and global access and inclusion of all types and formats of materials. Others limited their responses to statewide resource sharing.

Comments:

- We are extremely fortunate here in the State of Illinois, that for the majority of libraries, libraries love to share. Just because you do not have an item locally does not mean a user is out of luck. Because of our automation systems and OCLC, even the smallest library can share resources as well as get resources with the rest of the world. Resource Sharing = Access to the World
- Providing and receiving access to most materials nationwide among all participating libraries.
- Loaning information in any form to any patron of any library within the state, nation, or internationally. All information should be accessible to all people.
- Any item that circulates to the public will be shared with a patron at another United States library, barring extenuating circumstances.
Resource sharing, to me, is the sharing of resources, either in an electronic or physical format, so that there is no limitation or hindrance to the information they want or need.

Actively sharing local resources globally and borrowing global resources locally.

Loaning all of our books, DVDs, and audio books to share with patrons in other libraries.

Opening up your library collection to be borrowed by any library user, anywhere. Conversely, being able to request resources from any other participating library and expecting the same service.

Freely loaning and receiving materials among Illinois libraries delivered by efficient, quick delivery.

Allow other libraries throughout the state to request materials.

Sharing materials to not only our patrons but patrons throughout Illinois with the least amount of restrictions as possible.

Meeting the information needs of patrons throughout Illinois by providing access to our collections and materials.

The willingness of each library in the state to share with other libraries and patrons the resources that each library has. This way every library does not need to buy each item.

All materials from libraries shared throughout the state.

Libraries effectively increasing the size and quality of their collections exponentially by freely sharing with, and receiving resources from, other libraries across the state.

Being open to both lending and borrowing of all resources equally among ALL libraries in the State of Illinois.

SHARE = Sharing All Resources Equally!

Several respondents replied more narrowly, defining resource sharing only locally or within the context of their library system or consortium. These comments are as follows:

- We borrow within RSA, and within FirstSearch. I even drive to a library in the next town when one of our patrons needs books that we cannot provide, because he reads 50-75 westerns per month.
- To borrow from other libraries and to loan to other libraries, that is why we are trying to be full members of Share.
- The sharing of all items between each and every library in your system.
- ILL, participation in shared catalogs, and other programs/services that share our libraries' material between our two campuses and our local public library system.
- Sharing resources within the library system is currently in place. Sharing beyond the system is not necessary for a small school library.
- All libraries belong to an online catalog consortium that will allow easy borrowing and lending (no stand alones).

A few responses expressed the need for individualized policies:

- Allowing the 'home' library to decide loaning dates, fees, replacement costs - on the materials they bought with their taxpayer monies and graciously lent to their neighbors. If a neighboring library does not like the rules - they have the opportunity to buy their own copy and circulate it.
- Every library has the right to borrow and lend books with a reasonable amount of time of sharing and prices that even poor libraries and districts can afford. Somehow small libraries have to have the same stand in the sharing as the larger more vocal libraries.
- Sharing items will continue to be a need which is of benefit to schools. Schools should be able to restrict what they will share. Many of our resources are curriculum related and need to be available on demand, not when someone else is done with it. This is the reason many schools will not share DVD's etc.

Miscellaneous, Critical Comment Regarding Delivery:

- Not a definition, but... Resource sharing should return to the original ILL concept where libraries would borrow what they did not own, with patrons waiting their turn instead of expecting immediate gratification. It is a waste of tax dollars when a library owns three copies of a title, but its patrons must ILL because all of the home library's copies are elsewhere crossing paths in delivery. Another government waste of money by not doing the most efficient. Even with this personal belief, my professional behavior is that we resource share as currently defined.
Overall, responses seemed to indicate a need for statewide resource sharing education. No one mentioned the ILLINET Interlibrary Loan Code and only a couple of responses referred to the phrase “interlibrary loan.” There also seems to be a lack of understanding about the meaning of reciprocal borrowing. Examples of comments that were either vague or that revealed a lack of awareness regarding statewide resource sharing protocols are as follows:

- Allowing others to borrow physical or online information and reading sources of stories or data or factual written works.
- It seems to only work for the BIG libraries.
- Items in our collection and others in the state are loaned reciprocally.
- Sharing most materials with a slight delay in sharing the very newest....
- Making my collection available to patrons possessing a card from another Illinois library.
- Loaning of library materials to another library. Being able to walk into another library and checkout materials freely.
- As a school librarian, I will monitor student requests so that they are meaningful requests.
- If a library has material that another library’s patron needs or wants, every effort should be made to loan that material without expecting the lending library to go against its adopted policies.
- Allowing all types of libraries to borrow items responsibly from libraries without the state. (Makes more sense if “without” should be “throughout”.)
- To be able to process more data through WorldShare.
- Resource sharing is sharing your library with other libraries so patrons are kept well informed of the world around us.
- Sharing of any resources that are not considered "new."
- Using each other’s resources.
- Reciprocal sharing among libraries through ILL, either in print or documents.
- I think resource sharing extends beyond the collection and should include our various libraries' expertise in languages and subjects.
- From each according to her ability, to each according to her need, in a way that saves the time of the reader.
- Communities using collective financial resources and collectively bargaining with information distributors that guarantee access in writing explicitly to specific products for specific periods of time. Everyone upfront stating what is being purchased, by whom, for whom and for how long is an above board way to share the resources of the communities.
- A necessity in this time of increasing information.
Question #16

I would like to attend the following format of continuing education offering(s) that focuses on resource sharing for Illinois provided by the ISL, the library systems, or some other consortia/group (select one answer per row):

- virtually, via a real-time conference call or webinar: 365
  - no way: 18
  - not a great option: 60
  - not my first choice, but good: 199
  - this would be great!

- recorded videos, webinars and/or podcasts: 352
  - no way: 15
  - not a great option: 52
  - not my first choice, but good: 231
  - this would be great!

- an in-person, partial day conference that would allow for same-day travel: 283
  - no way: 40
  - not a great option: 130
  - not my first choice, but good: 194
  - this would be great!

- an in-person summit lasting a full day or more than one day: 260
  - no way: 119
  - not a great option: 163
  - not my first choice, but good: 94
  - this would be great!

Most of the rest of the comments included a mix of those who said that they preferred online, others preferred onsite, and others expressed no venue preference.

Comments:
- Have trainers come to our school libraries at least once per year to trouble-shoot problems with us. We feel "lost in cyberspace" because most of our energy goes into working with our patrons, and not enough time to read all the emails we are sent.
- It would be nice if they added closed caption to the recorded videos or added printouts of PowerPoint, etc. My problem is my hearing is bad and we work through the conference call or webinar schedule so not able to watch.
- In person conferences are expensive -- why do we need this. The real-time conference call or webinar would be great BUT LEAVE THIS TO THE CONSORTIUMS, PLEASE.
- All of these options are good, however, many libraries cannot attend conferences (either all day or half-day) due to budgets. When there is no money for services, there is also no money for conferences, for technology to provide webinars or recorded seminars, or for staff time to attend. Essentially, conferences, webinars, recorded seminars, and staff training become low priority when Illinois libraries are in crisis.
**Question #17**

The goal of a Continuing Education offering about resource sharing should be:

Of the 252 responses, about half expressed the need for an offering that would provide a broad overview of the meaning of resource sharing, expectations of libraries, best practices, and guidelines. This offering would increase awareness of the value of resource sharing in delivering excellent library service and would serve to get all Illinois libraries on the same page. Examples of these comments are as follows:

- Being sure everybody understands statewide policies and best practices.
- A better understanding of what is meant by resource sharing, the future of resource sharing, and what is expected from the libraries.
- Getting all libraries on the same page in what the system and other libraries expect from resource sharing.
- To inform people of the tradition Illinois has with resource sharing. To give information on the specifics of resource sharing and to keep people current in these trends.
- Improve service and spread the philosophy.
- Getting everyone enthusiastic about sharing and showing how easy it could be.
- Demonstrate the value of resource sharing by anecdotes and examples. Teach people the "how to" do their part.
- Instilling value of resource sharing. Training staff in standard procedures and guidelines.
- To raise awareness of the value and opportunities in resource sharing.
- Speakers on "best practices" for resource sharing in other states like California and Ohio which have exemplary research sharing networks.
- Making sure that all libraries are on "the same page" about resource sharing and standards.
- To inform library staff and Board members about the importance of resource sharing, how everyone does it differently and thinking of ways to make it more efficient and equitable throughout the entire state.
- Introduction to the *ILLINET Interlibrary Loan Code* as well as getting people to understand what resources they have available to them and how to use the resources.
- Educating library staff, Library Directors and Board about the *ILLINET Interlibrary Loan Code*. Educating library staff on how to properly train their patrons to use ILL effectively. Educating library staff about the services they have available to them for providing ILL service to their patrons.
- Educating library staff on issues related to resource sharing.

Most of the other half thought that the goal of a Continuing Education offering should be more narrowly scoped to ILS platform training and procedures. Comments are as follows:

- Qualified people who can be available to answer questions and train us in practical usage of Polaris.
- According to our ILL assistant, it would be real hands-on training with time to answer audience questions.
- How to better work within the system provided.
- Using the new WorldShare and the procedures used to ILL.
- Training, keeping staff up-to-date about changes to software, procedures, and new products.
- OCLC proficiency which might include searching/discovery and placing the request.
- OCLC training.
- Improving professional skills and information which is useful in the daily operations of a library. It is not a conference for networking.
- Training on new technologies.
- To complete more training that is easily accessible.
- Focused training, presented simply.
- On understanding OCLC. I am not sure what this involves.
- How-to training for staff.
- Helping people from all types of libraries with varying levels of technology understand how to share resources using the current system.
- To learn how to use WorldShare to its full potential and FirstSearch.
• Simple to-the-point training for basic resources. Larger libraries who need more extensive resources could attend a more in-depth session.
• The basics for those who lack them.
• Train staff on the easiest method of requesting materials through ILL.

Expressed the distinct needs of small libraries, schools, or offline libraries:
• Understanding the process and the requirements as a library. Educating school libraries on the best e-resource options suited for schools.
• Explaining ways for offline libraries to get their collections available with the least amount of money.
• To show how it can be done in a school setting. I think this is especially important at the High School level.
• To inform school libraries of the options.
• How schools might convince their Boards to become full members of the library system in order to facilitate greater resource sharing.
• Staff training on the process (forms, procedures, best practices, etc.) of fulfilling interlibrary loan requests.
• Resource sharing etiquette.
• Help the smaller libraries get and stay connected to what's going on. Doing the yearly statistics for the state are a nightmare; training needed!!!
• Options for schools.

Although a few respondents stated that they did not need this type of offering, overall, continuing education on the topic of resource sharing was seen as important both for basic training on technology platforms, as well as, educating library staff on the value, policies, and best practices for achieving statewide cooperation from all ILLINET libraries.
Question #18

**In order to improve customer service and experience, I would support a uniform set of loan periods by material type for interlibrary loan material that all libraries would use.**

**Pros:**
- Uniform loan periods prevent patron confusion.
- Already have uniform ILL periods, but my library set them.
- Need to be able to make exceptions if adopted.
- Everyone must participate or it will not work.

**Cons:**
- Software cannot support.
- Removing local control will lead to libraries’ not lending.
- Do not think this is a problem that needs a solution, if mandated how policed?
- Takes away local decision-making.
- They are our items bought with our money.
- Libraries could never agree on one setting.
- Patrons will be confused.
Misunderstandings:
- Severe strain on ILS- would have to rewrite 36.9 million lines of code.
- Is it legal for the state to mandate loan periods.
- No other state has this type of model.
- Uniform due dates are not beneficial to our patrons.

Suggestions:
- At our library we made everything one due date so patron does not have to be inconvenienced.
- As long as renewal is an option, a uniform period is unnecessary.
- How about one month loan with no renewals?
- Make the loan periods an average (per item type) of all libraries in the state.
- Do it, do it, do it.

Take-Away:
46.8% of respondents agree with the concept of uniform loan periods for ILL. This compares to 20.4% who disagree with the concept. However, those who disagreed provided the most vocal comments, which fell into the following three categories: 1) software cannot manage the complexity of different internal and external loan periods, 2) libraries are autonomous and should not have to change local policies, and 3) deciding on a uniform loan period for all formats and all types of libraries will be impossible. Both those for and those against uniform ILL loan periods felt their option provided the best customer service solution.

Question #19

I think the Illinois State Library should do the following to support and/or expand resource sharing in Illinois:

A number of responses recommended multiple actions the Illinois State Library should take, and each of those separate suggestions in reflected in the count below. One-third (231) of the 693 survey participants answered this narrative question:

48 Delivery (Increase frequency/leave it alone/it is not working since the mergers).
27 Training for library staff.
22 Help with ebooks, databases (FirstSearch was mentioned several times), and digitization.
22 Set resource sharing policies and encourage/police compliance.
22 Back off and leave us alone.
20 Provide more monetary support for libraries/systems.
15 Subsidize LLSAP membership for small libraries and schools.
14 More PR, discussion, networking, committees, surveys, and praise for good players.
10 Help with collection development.
8 Help financially with cost of OCLC, make OCLC more user-friendly.
7 Love what you/systems are doing now, keep doing it.
6 Extend library service to the unserved.
5 Establish a uniform lending period for ILL.
4 Do not establish a uniform lending period for ILL.
4 Help school libraries.
4 Overlay the LLSAPS.
3 Create a statewide LLSAP.
2 Help with net lenders and address their concerns.
2 Fund pilot projects.
1 Fix my system.
1 Trustee training.
1 Work with net lenders and address their concerns.
1 Force the merger of smaller libraries.

Receiving one mention each were:
- Do not create a statewide LLSAP.
- Create one system or distribute system funding more equitably.
Question # 20

My library's overall annual budget is:

- Under $5,000: 7.3% (50)
- $5,001 - $20,000: 8.5% (58)
- $20,001 - $50,000: 7.8% (53)
- $50,001 - $100K: 8.8% (60)
- $101K - $250K: 12.5% (85)
- $251K - $500K: 7.6% (52)
- $501K - $1M: 7.2% (49)
- $1M - $3M: 11.3% (77)
- Over $3M: 8.9% (51)
- I'm unsure: 18.3% (125)
- N/A: 1.8% (12)
Question #21

I'm not concerned about resource sharing in Illinois. It seems to be working just fine.

Pros:
- It works, but it’s not perfect.
- Most of us agree how important resource sharing is.
- Resource sharing in Illinois is a great unpublicized bargain.

Cons:
- It would be easier for patrons and staff if loan rules were uniform.
- Could be more efficient.
- There are libraries not playing by the rules.

Misunderstandings:
- Adding CARLI resources into the Polaris catalog would help.
- Why does this equalization over due dates and fines take precedence over libraries in need of closing/merging/fiscal responsibilities? …Where’s your legal right to take these determinations from an appointed/elected Board?

Suggestions:
- Small libraries that cannot afford to join an LLSAP should be financially assisted.
- Libraries restricting lending should also be restricted from borrowing.
Take-Away:
- 75% feel that there are problems with resource sharing.
- Slightly more than 10% feel that resource sharing is NOT working just fine.
- Almost 65% only partially agree that it is working fine.
- There is an overall feeling that resource sharing is not being implemented equally. The reasons cited ranged from fiscal issues (small libraries cannot afford LLSAPs) to complaints about libraries who restrict lending.

Question #22

The Secretary of State/Illinois State Library currently supports resource sharing in a variety of ways. Please indicate your familiarity with these programs/services (select one answer per row):

- Grants to library systems that support delivery: 445 (Yes) - 227 (No)
- Grants to library systems that support the consortial catalogs: 409 (Yes) - 262 (No)
- Grants like the recent "Back to Books" or PDA/e-books pilots: 479 (Yes) - 190 (No)
- FirstSearch Access to all ILLINET libraries: 610 (Yes) - 60 (No)
- Administration of the Interlibrary Loan Code: 503 (Yes) - 161 (No)

Take-Away:
Libraries are not familiar with the fact that ISL uses grants to support LLSAPS and delivery. One third (66% and 61%) of the respondents are NOT familiar with the fact that ISL grants support delivery and the consortial catalogs. ISL is not getting adequate credit for the money spent to support the most valued service, delivery.
Question #23

Please share additional comments, questions or suggestions:
(There were 79 respondents.)

Pros:
- Thank you for the opportunity to comment.
- Continue to keep us informed.
- The Illinois ILL system is a godsend for our students.

Cons:
- Leave the loan periods alone!
- Community concepts will be taxing on both staff time and travel.
- Libraries that refuse to loan should lose system membership or be fined. If Heartland cannot make ILL work then why have IHLS?
- The costs of resource sharing are an unfair burden on our library as a net lender. ISL could help by providing funding to net lenders.

Misunderstandings:
- Tell me how to access FirstSearch, I was informed we had to pay for it and we could not afford it.
- How does the Secretary of State administer the ILLINET Interlibrary Loan Code?
- I think I know something about ILLINET Interlibrary Loan Code; don’t we have to sign that every year? Or what is that?
- ISL needs to really look at getting consistent funding for libraries to ensure that library services do not suffer.
- The ISL should stick to lobbying for increased budgets and leave delivery and resource sharing to the systems.

Suggestions:
- Consider the needs of those libraries that cannot afford to join a consortium. The cost to join and to stay in is too high. There is an inequity of spending tax dollars on consortiums when there is no assistance for stand-alones.
- For stand-alone libraries, the only system service we receive is delivery. Yet the systems receive their grants based on our population as well.