

Comments from Whitepaper/Committee of the Whole Meeting July 8, 2014

Setting ILL Lending (borrowing library determines the loan rules) -

Nicki Seidl (Evergreen Park): Their library has two loan rules, three weeks and one week. She is in favor of this recommendation overall, but has one concern; the added transit time will make best sellers stay out for up to 5 weeks. We should factor in the delivery times when extending check-outs.

Meg Klinkow-Hartmann (South Holland): Will we be able to restrict the circulation on new items? SWAN team stated that there will be different rules for separate libraries; new items may not even be holdable for certain libraries but it is still up for the library to determine how new items are circulated.

Jamie Bukovac (Indian Prairie): Jamie is in favor of this recommendation. Years ago when the discussion on this topic was first held, it was noted that patrons would get different loan and checkout times on home library and ILL items, and this caused patron dissatisfaction. Millennium did not allow us to set borrowing libraries as the controllers of loan rules previously.

Mary Beth Sharples (Midlothian): Thinks this is fine too, but it could also go the opposite direction.

Karen Keefe (Hinsdale): Would it default to a lending libraries' loan rule if it is a material that you do not circulate (puppets was used as an example)? Kate Boyle (SWAN) will need to look into this further, as the topic had not yet been considered. Pierre Gregoire (Frankfort) noted that if both the recommendation of universal loan rules and this recommendation are accepted, the loan rules may be available even if the material is not found at the borrowing library.

Jeannie Dilger (La Grange): If I want to allow others to use my new books, but it goes to a library that does not have a "new book" loan rule, what happens? This will help Jeannie determine whether or not to restrict new items. Boyle noted that this does go by i-type rather than by loan rules, but Boyle will be looking into this as well.

Consolidating Circ Configuration –

Eric Werthmann (Acorn): Eric inquired about alternate loan periods (i.e. for new materials), and asked for more information on how this works. Boyle described alternate loan periods; for example, a new item may have a lesser loan period than a non-new item. Werthmann expressed that this may cause confusion for the patrons.

Jamie Bukovac (Indian Prairie): Noted that if there are alternative periods, this will put us right back where we started with patron confusion.

Susan McNeil Marshall (Woodridge): Seconded this sentiment, and noted that it would also impact buying policies. Aaron Skog (SWAN) shared that since SWAN is still learning about the new software, pulling alternative loan periods out of this recommendation would be possible.

Vicki Totten (Cicero): Noted that unlimited renewals, but requiring item to be brought in after the second renewal, becomes confusing for patrons.

Melissa Gardner (Broadview): Stated that if the item doesn't have a hold, she doesn't see why the item needs to come back to her building for a renewal. Smaller libraries with limited space may feel this way.

Kathy Parker (Glenwood-Lynwood): Asked if other consortia using this configuration are having issues with this. Skog noted that this level of detail was not covered with the other consortia during the recently held summit.

Jeannie Dilger (La Grange) asked Rich Wolff (Tinley Park) how often patrons used this unlimited renewal policy to get around paying for an item that was lost, since Tinley Park had previously followed this policy. He felt that this was not an issue at his library, and McNeil Marshall seconded this at Woodridge (who also had this policy at one time).

Meg Klinkow-Hartmann (South Holland): Shared her experience with academic loans at a previous job; she expressed concerns about how patrons might use (and abuse) this policy. She also noted concerns with not having this material on shelf for browsing. There are many layers of analysis to consider. Boyle stated that if we were to adopt unlimited renewals, a solution for member libraries would be to pull reports for the items that have been checked out multiple times, and you can choose which items you want back, place a hold, and get the item back.

Diane Gallagher (Homewood): Stated that after the 2nd renewal, when the item comes in, the library could simply override the 3rd checkout. However, Sheri Starr (Prairie Trails): Noted that with ILL reciprocal borrowing, the patron could take it to another library to renew it even if the home library's policy would be not to renew after the 2nd renewal.

Sophia Anastos (River Forest): Recommendations given today range from "no brainer" to "requires some tweaking and collaboration" to possibly utilizing a pilot to determine whether it is best to use this for everyone. She is highly supportive of all of the recommendations, and feels that they are very patron-centric. These changes support the patron experience, rather than libraries simply "micro-managing" it. She felt that happier patrons will produce happier staff. She inquired about evidence-based outcomes from other consortia utilizing these policies. What evidence can we look forward to if we adopt these changes? Skog noted that the summit did not result in all of these recommendations, but simply helped to guide SWAN in creating them. For example, this recommendation is more based upon historical feedback from SWAN and member libraries over the years, and the ability of the system to be able to support this change. It will also make the administration of the system easier going forward.

David Seleb (Oak Park): Shared his experience using some of these policies during his time in CCS; there was a great deal of collaboration and unification in this consortium. There was almost always a consensus that it was a good thing; a better, more uniform experience for the patron was provided and member libraries were satisfied with these changes.

Jamie Bukovac (Indian Prairie): Agreed with Sophia about the importance of patron-centric focus, but noted the "balancing act." A browsing collection is important to maintain because patrons do like to stop in at the "spur of the moment" to check out things as well. Is it all or nothing? Can special collections be considered independently? Boyle feels that it is possible to tweak this based upon i-types, but will be looking into it.

Nicki Seidl (Evergreen Park): Noted that there are so many opinions expressed today that she can't figure out if we are supportive of these recommendations overall or not?

Rich Wolff (Tinley Park): This will be going to Circ Advisory for review first, after which a recommendation will be made to the board.

Jeannie Dilger (La Grange): Shared some evidence-based results from her library. At first there were no renewals for "hot titles," and then her staff asked to try two renewals on these items. Their library tried it, and the positive comments from patrons were overwhelming. The browsing collection was a little sparse, and there was some feedback, but overall this was an incredibly positive experience. It did change her mind and made her rethink this recommendation.

Meg Klinkow-Hartmann (South Holland): Felt that if two i-types were created, one with limited renewals and one with unlimited, this would allow some libraries to "opt out" if this were possible in the system.

Jamie Bukovac (Indian Prairie): Noted that she does not think that changing grace periods is appropriate and would be viewed as telling the library boards what to do. Numerous audience members then collaboratively shared that changing grace periods would not be a good change, and a source of confusion.

Rodger Brayden (Forest Park): Shared that he did not feel that this would be too big of a concession to make.

Roberta Richter (LaGrange Park): Grace periods can be granted to patrons on a case by case basis, but there are so many options to renew or return that she feels a grace period is not necessary.

Jeannie Dilger (La Grange): Shared that as a patron, she has lived in communities with grace periods. Having to go in and have a conversation to ask for a special treatment is aggravating, and grace periods would be good will for the patron.

Rodger Brayden (Forest Park): Stated that library boards generally do not get into circ details too much, at least not at his library.

Andrew (??): Information and opinions from libraries are coming from different points of view, but that a little bit of mercy for the patron couldn't hurt.

Melissa Gardner (Broadview): Made a general comment about all recommendations; she felt that an excellent compromise in the middle has been found for these recommendations, and she does feel that uniformity is important. The recommendations are not on one end of the spectrum or the other and so it allows libraries to compromise in the middle.

Nicki Seidl (Evergreen Park): Commented that it is important that recommendations stay reasonable, and she does not personally feel that unlimited renewals are reasonable.

Uniformity in Volume Cataloging –

No comments; the audience expressed that they support this recommendation.

Treatment of Boxed Sets –

Meg Klinkow-Hartmann (South Holland): Is supportive of this recommendation. But she did ask that, if someone lost disc 3 out of 6, how would we charge them going forward? SWAN leadership stated that this would not change; libraries could still charge whatever they like for lost materials (for example, charge for the entire boxed set).

A staff member (Homewood): Asked if cleanup should be done on any past records (volumes, i-types, etc.) before we go live? Boyle noted that SWAN is cleaning up bad codes and will be asking libraries to adhere to new standards by a set date (i.e. Jan 1 – not yet determined). Patron phone numbers will be cleared up by Unique Services, but changes for inputting new data going forward will be sent out to libraries when it is available.

Pick Up Anywhere –

Meg Klinkow-Hartmann (South Holland): If patrons can pick up at her library and not her neighbors, they will do that and this is not a benefit to those other home libraries.

Jeannie Dilger (La Grange): Argued that while she can see that happening, it can also be good. For example, if there is no parking patrons may prefer to go elsewhere to pick up material. This may allow libraries to survey patrons and provide this data to the board to support new parking lots. It is best for patrons to be able to get information, even if they have to go elsewhere.

Nicki Seidl (Evergreen Park): Is supportive of this recommendation; it rewards good patrons.

Kim (Prairie State?): Asked what this does to circulation statistics; fees for SWAN are going to be looked at as we get closer to migration to determine how fees will be determined going forward.

Katrina Harris (Riverdale): Noted that library hours have had to be cut, and this feature would help her patrons a great deal since they can now go to other libraries to pick up items at hours that are convenient for them. This is about patron convenience, not about member libraries' convenience.

Melissa Gardner (Broadview): She has a lot of Maywood patrons at her library already, and this will just help them out even more.

Mary Beth Sharples (Midlothian): Stated that this is just something that she feels whose time has come.

Jane Schulten (Crete): Gave two scenarios; underfunded library, shortened hours, lack of materials, but trying to convince the community to support them. Down the road, an adequately funded library, but with other libraries around her underfunded. At what point can the library say that there is a limit as to what they can do for other libraries' patrons? Unless patrons understand what their dollar is paying for, there is no reason for patrons to vote to support their libraries, or for boards to vote to provide new services for patrons. She feels that in some ways this is an unfunded mandate.

Jamie Bukovac (Indian Prairie): Is concerned about staff time and space. These are restricted at her library and this could become an issue.

Megan Millen (Flossmoor): She feels that libraries are lucky to get patrons at all in this Amazon world, and should not put barriers up for patrons. We could perhaps try it – put a 12 month pilot on this – and pull the data afterwards to see how this has impacted us.

David Seleb (Oak Park): Noted that he is listening and hearing how this might impact individual libraries, but he hopes that we are all thinking of the cost/benefit to patrons as members of the consortium. What is the quantifiable benefit that we are getting as institutions, and that our patrons are getting, balanced against whatever costs are being incurred from these decisions? He had shared the recommendations with his staff, and it was unanimous that this is the right thing to do for patrons. Though it may take some work to get these changes up and running, it is overall a great benefit for the patrons and for the consortium.