Implications for Library Organization and Guideposts for Education and Training: The Many Hats of the Interlibrary Loan Librarian

Wayne A. Pedersen

ABSTRACT. To effectively manage an interlibrary loan (ILL) unit, the supervising librarian needs a variety of skills. Drawing upon published reports, interviews with ILL leaders, and experience at Iowa State University, the author outlines a new typology of seven skills, relating these diverse skills to the place of ILL in the library organization, and the need for a formalized approach to educating and training ILL librarians. doi:10.1300/J474v17n04_11 *[Article copies available for a fee from The Haworth Document Delivery Service: 1-800-HAWORTH. E-mail address: <docdelivery@ haworthpress.com> Website: <http://www.HaworthPress.com> © 2007 by The HaworthPress, Inc. All rights reserved.]*

THE ORGANIZATIONAL CONUNDRUM OF INTERLIBRARY LOAN

The interlibrary loan (ILL) unit's place in today's library organizational chart varies from one library to another. Published studies show a

Wayne A. Pedersen is Head, Interlibrary Loan/Document Delivery and Associate Professor, Iowa State University, Room 198B, Parks Library, Ames, IA 50011 (E-mail: wap5@iastate.edu).

wide range of approaches to placing the ILL unit in the library's hierarchy. LaGuardia and Dowell (1991) conducted a survey of the placement of ILL units in Association of Research Libraries (ARL) in 1988. One hundred libraries returned their survey instrument, representing a response rate of 94%. A diversity of administrative models was reported at the time. The top four models placed the ILL unit in reference (30%), a separate ILL unit (27%), access services (24%), and circulation (12%). The authors concluded, "No clear pattern for centralized ILL operations within libraries seems to exist." Shortly thereafter, an Association of Research Libraries' survey reported ILL units were usually either part of the reference department or the circulation/access services department (Dearie, 1992). Another ARL survey concluded ILL was largely in a public services department or an access services department in research libraries and in a public services department or reference department in college libraries (Jackson, 1998).

In recent years, some libraries are choosing to stay with traditional organizational models for ILL, while others are moving to more innovative approaches. The organizational location of ILL was a matter of debate at Wake Forest University in the mid-1990s, and they opted to keep ILL in the reference unit (Yu, 1997). At Baylor University, a science and technology ILL unit was combined with the science and engineering reference department to make a unit separate from the general ILL unit. In 1996 the two ILL operations were merged back into a single unit (Paradis, 1998). In 2003 Ryerson University merged ILL with circulation and reserve in a team-based reorganization (Cheung, 2003). Of late there seems to be some movement of ILL into heretofore unrelated library units. At Eastern Michigan, for instance, ILL was joined with the acquisitions unit (Badics, 2004). At Iowa State, ILL is part of the digital services department, emphasizing the scanning aspects of the operation. It seems there is still a great deal of uncertainty as to where ILL should be located organizationally in the library and the solutions seem to be getting more diverse. Cheung, Patrick and Cameron (2003) summarized the situation quite well when they wrote, "There is no consensus on where to place the department, and no clear trend is evident."

Based on library literature and current trends, there now appear to be nine basic models for ILL organization: (1) Joined with reference; (2) Joined with circulation; (3) Part of acquisitions; (4) Part of collection development; (5) Part of access services; (6) ILL as a separate department; (7) Part of public services department/division/unit; (8) Combined with some other unit not listed above, or combined with

multiple units; and (9) Split between two different units, usually along the lines of borrowing and lending.

Using the complex situation reported at Baylor University as a case study (Paradis, 1998), it is interesting to see how this model might be applied. Library administration at Baylor made the decision to have separate ILL units: One for general ILL and one for science and technology ILL. Borrowing and lending activities were being conducted in both units, but divided along subject lines. This approach would appear to reflect Model (9) from the list above, but it could be Model (1), since both ILL operations were joined with reference staff. Baylor later reconsidered this approach and merged them back into a single unit [Model (6) above].

One has to wonder why ILL is so difficult to place in the library organizational structure. My theory is that it relates to the varied job skills of the ILL librarian; or, in other words, the many "hats" worn by this individual.

THE MANY HATS OF THE ILL LIBRARIAN

Virginia Boucher (1989) was the first to recognize in print the many roles "mastered" by the ILL librarian. She listed eight roles:

1. Manager
2. Bibliographic Reference Practitioner
3. Legal Adviser
4. Automation Counsellor
5. Network Consultant
6. Teacher
7. Defender of Rights
8. Public Relations Expert

A great deal has changed in ILL since the late 1980s, of course, but most, if not all, of these roles are still pertinent to some extent today. What has changed in the last 20 years is the focus of ILL practitioners, and maybe some of the terminology. Therefore I feel it is time to update Boucher's ILL roles. For my own list, I would adopt four from Boucher, most with slightly different names. These are the first four of the hats listed below. The role in parentheses is the name supplied by Virginia

Boucher. In terms of contemporary practice, I would delete the last four of her roles and add three new ones, reducing the list to seven:

1. Reference Librarian (Bibliographic Reference Practitioner)
2. Manager (Manager)
3. Systems Expert (Automation Counsellor)
4. Lawyer (Legal Adviser)
5. Accountant
6. Shipping Expert
7. Imaging Expert

Reference Librarian

The typical ILL librarian or paraprofessional definitely needs to be acquainted with the bibliographic verification tools of a wide variety of subject disciplines. Advances in the last decade have provided an abundance of location and verification tools. Whether it is Compendex for engineering, MLA for English, Medline for medicine, CINAHL for nursing, etc., the well-trained ILL practitioner will benefit by knowing the bibliographic tools commonly used by his or her patrons. Identification of the proper bibliographic record is a prerequisite for finding potential libraries that can supply a requested item. Sometimes an incorrect reference is received and it is necessary to verify the accuracy of the bibliographic citation. ILL staff are often considered to be some of the more skilled searchers of OCLC's Worldcat database, which is also an important tool at the reference desk.

Most of the indexing/abstracting tools used in research libraries today have migrated from a paper format to an electronic format (usually Web-based) since Virginia Boucher first discussed the ILL librarian's reference skills. Needless to say, this has been a major time-saving development for ILL staff, who can now track down elusive citations on their own PC rather than page endlessly through paper indexes or abstracting tools. Moreover, there are now more generic verification tools available, such as the citation database Web of Knowledge. This tool is particularly good for chasing down old citations. Google, Yahoo, and other Web-based search engines have emerged as additional tools for verifying the difficult ILL citation, or providing the full-text of the document.

The well-developed bibliographic skills of ILL practitioners have been recognized at many libraries in the form of being asked to work at the reference desk. I myself work at the Iowa State University reference

desk at least five hours per week. This is truly a symbiotic relationship in that both ILL and reference benefit from this close collaboration. Yu (1997) was quite vocal in saying ILL and reference made the most sense in terms of an organizational combination for her library. The recent move of ILL to the Reference and User Services Association (RUSA) of the American Library Association might lend some credence to this viewpoint.

Manager

There is little doubt that personnel management is an important component of ILL operations today, as it was when Boucher was writing her article over 15 years ago. Automation is appreciably changing the nature of ILL work. There is a clear trend towards "unmediating" ILL requests, but ILL still requires a skilled work force. In ARL's second ILL-cost study, based upon FY 96 data, staff costs comprised 76% of the lending unit cost and 62% of the borrowing cost (Jackson, 1998). In the updated study, based upon FY 02 data, staff comprised 58% of borrowing costs and 75% of lending costs (Jackson, 2004). In the six years between the two studies, there was a small downward movement in the percentage of costs ascribed to personnel. But with more than 50% of the cost of a average borrowing transaction and more than three-quarters of the cost of an average lending transaction dedicated to staff salaries, wages, and benefits, human resources still represent by far the largest cost component in providing ILL service.

Cost data like this make it clear that personnel management needs to be a major consideration for the ILL librarian. It starts with hiring the best people possible. Once hired, good initial training is a must, but much of the skills necessary to work in a busy ILL office today are learned on the job, responding to individual requests. Training is an ongoing process rather than a finite process.

Although personnel management is a major component in managing an ILL operation, it is certainly not the only component. Working with other staff in the local library is also an essential facet of management, as is working with ILL colleagues on a local, regional, national and even international level. Collaboration in the form of resource sharing is central to the mission of ILL, and collaboration is necessary both inside the library as well as outside the library. Good interpersonal relations are absolutely necessary for the ILL librarian, as ILL is a highly cooperative endeavor.

Statistical analysis is also an important part of the ILL librarian's management duties. ILL service is highly quantifiable and the units of measure have been defined quite well over the years: total requests, requests filled, fill-rate, turnaround time, etc. The use of statistical data need to go beyond a simple tabulation and reporting, however. ILL statistics need to be analyzed and applied to practice. For instance, some borrowing data may suggest better library instruction for patrons who are not locating materials in the local library. Other data may suggest the need for a promotional campaign for a fee-based document delivery service. I would consider any resulting public relations efforts to be part of the ILL librarian's management duties, rather than a separate skill as suggested by Boucher. In a larger context, ILL statistics are routinely reported by library organizations, such as the Association of Research Libraries, and play a larger role in determining national rankings and establishing benchmarks for practice.

There are other aspects of ILL management that should be considered as important, such as budgeting, equipment procurement, software evaluation, policy writing, etc. Keeping current with the published literature is also an important part of ILL practice, as is attending professional meetings. ILL service is changing rapidly, especially in the area of technology, and any operation that is too isolated is a disservice to its clientele. Management of ILL is essentially a pulling together of all aspects of the operation so they function smoothly on a day-to-day basis. In this respect, it may be a catch-all hat worn by the ILL librarian, picking up anything not covered by the others listed.

Systems Expert

Virginia Boucher was correct in stressing the role of automation in ILL practice. Back in 1989 the stress was placed upon knowing bibliographic utilities, such as WLN, RLIN, OCLC, and UTLAS. The focus of automation in ILL practice has changed a great deal since that time. Any ILL librarian would now benefit by having a background in computer systems. At the very least, a familiarity with four systems is crucial to efficient operations: (1) The local Integrated Library System (ILS), especially the online catalog and circulation components; (2) The ILL unit's management software (e.g., ILLiad, Clio, URSA, VDX, etc.); (3) The document transmission system, such as Ariel or Odyssey; and (4) Requesting systems, such as OCLC, Rapid, ISO, etc. These four types of systems will see increased convergence and interoperability in

the future and ILL librarians would be well served by monitoring these changes closely.

The importance of large bibliographic databases may be waning as a consequence. WLN was absorbed by OCLC and RLIN has morphed into an end-user database called Eureka and an ILL system called ILL Manager. Z39.50 searching has enabled some software, such as Fretwell-Downing's VDX, to directly query the online catalogs of other libraries to determine if a book is checked out or if a specific volume of a particular serial is held. The OCLC Worldcat database can now connect to the online catalogs of many libraries in order to check on the circulation status of a book or the holdings of a particular serial, but this can only be done when prompted by the searcher. Worldcat can provide a more direct display of serial holdings when union listed by the holding library.

With the movement away from mainframe computer systems and towards client server applications, the importance of standards is of paramount importance. There is a standard for placing ILL requests (ISO), there is a standard for searching library catalogs (Z39.50), there is a standard for bibliographic records (MARC), and there is a standard for serials holdings (MARC 21). Many ILL librarians are experienced in tracking down industry standards for their patrons, which are usually pretty difficult requests to fill. But now they are being asked to recognize and understand the importance of myriad library standards applied to their own practice.

The types of materials being requested by ILL patrons are evolving, with an increased emphasis on non-print media such as CDs, DVDs, and digital materials in many formats. New standards are also being developed for library metadata that will have an effect upon ILL practice in the future. The adoption of library standards by both vendors and libraries holds great promise for ILL librarians in terms of handling a continued growth in service demands. It is entirely possible that the systems expert role may some day subsume the manager's role mentioned above.

Lawyer

No correct-thinking ILL librarian would be so bold as to say they are a legal professional, or even a paraprofessional, but there is definitely a proactive, legal aspect to ILL practice. The most obvious area is copyright. Any ILL librarian in the U.S. should be conversant with U.S. Copyright Law (Title 17, United States Code), CCL and CCG dichotomy, the Digital Millennium Copyright Act (DMCA), and the Sonny

Bono Copyright Term Extension Act. The application of the CONTU guidelines and the "suggestion of 5" doctrine (i.e., 5 articles per serial title published in the last 5 years obtained without copyright royalties) has historically been fundamental to ILL operations. Of late there has been a broader interpretation of the "fair use" clause of Title 17 to the U.S. Code by some ILL operations. Interpreting the four criteria of fair use is not easy to do, even for an experienced ILL librarian. What if two criteria weigh against copying and two weigh in favor of copying? At Iowa State the tie goes to the patron over the copyright holder. Without case precedent, each institution is left to its own interpretation and unfettered copying and scanning could be construed as "fair use."

One of the newer legal roles assumed by ILL librarians is that of a licensing monitor. Unlike paper journals, electronic serials carry the added baggage of being licensed products. The degree to which an ILL librarian gets involved in licensing varies a great deal from library to library, but all ILL librarians should be aware of the licenses maintained by their library and potential restrictions on ILL service. They should also take a proactive role in license negotiation and advocate for broad reproduction rights. Croft (2005) provides a good overview of the nexus between ILL service and the licensing of electronic resources, usually e-journals. She advocates taking a proactive role in negotiating the ILL clauses in licenses, expanding significantly the legal responsibilities of the ILL librarian.

Confidentiality is another legal concern in ILL. Preserving the confidentiality of ILL records has been on the radar of ILL staff for a long time, but the USA Patriot Act has really raised the "bar." Many ILL librarians are now stripping out personal names from their online databases when these names are linked to a specific bibliographic item. The legal aspect of ILL practice has definitely expanded since Boucher's 1979 paper.

Accountant

It seems these days that ILL librarians are knee deep in financial transactions. If they use OCLC, they are probably quite adept at monitoring the debits and credits of the ILL Fee Management (IFM) system. Moreover, almost all ILL operations have to pay invoices to some lenders and document suppliers. If they do not use IFM, more than likely that they have to pay a proportionately larger number of invoices.

For those libraries that charge fees, as is the case here at Iowa State, you need to generate invoices and monitor the receipt (or non-receipt) of payments. Many ILL operations, including ISU, accept credit card payments. Staff members need to be familiar with this type of electronic transaction and any legal restrictions that may apply to non-profit organizations. All electronic methods of payment, such as OCLC IFM, credit card, paypal, SHAZAM, etc., are both labor-saving and cost-effective methods of securing payment and avoiding long delays or defaults in payment. In the international ILL arena, electronic payment is almost a necessity for timely ILL and document delivery service.

The financial debits and credits resulting from individual ILL transactions are just part of the financial duties of the ILL librarian. These responsibilities are often overlaid with budgeting responsibilities. Many ILL librarians are experienced in setting up budgets for their unit, especially if they supervise an independent department. Some are even required to be self-sustaining in terms of balancing the income they generate through lending charges and/or document delivery fees with their unit's expenditures. In cases such as this, the ILL lending and/or document delivery services end up subsidizing the borrowing service, which usually does not generate much income.

Shipping Expert

Shipping of returnable materials was not mentioned by Virginia Boucher in 1979 but is a major part of the ILL librarian's skill-set. This is still true even in the age of electronic transmission of documents via Ariel or Odyssey, e-mailed PDFs, or other electronic formats. Despite the technological advances of the last 25 years, there is still a need to send a returnable item, such as a book, videotape, DVD, microform roll, or other library material, via the U.S. Mail or some kind of commercial shipping service. Most ILL librarians understand the difference between 4th class library rate and 1st class service offered by the United States Postal Service (USPS), but may not be familiar with the increasingly sophisticated shipping options provided by commercial firms.

ILL staff at many libraries–big and small–have grown accustomed to working with commercial shippers, such as UPS, DHL, Airborne, and Fedex.

I have been personally involved in negotiating group shipping contracts on three separate occasions: A statewide contract for the State Library of Iowa and a regional contract on two occasions for the Greater

Western Library Alliance (GWLA). At one time or another, the ISU ILL operation has contracted with RPS (which was later bought out by Fedex), UPS, and Fedex. This office has therefore gained a great deal of experience over the years with commercial shipping and the Web-based software provided by these companies. It has been a real boon to ILL service, especially as it relates to the shipping of returnables. Commercial shippers not only provide improved delivery speed, they also allow for tracking materials during shipment. One of the challenges facing the ILL librarian today is to assess the many shipping options that are available and determine their costs and benefits. Even with its improved level of service, such as express service, the USPS may not be the best option.

Imaging Expert

Imaging in the context of contemporary ILL activities is more and more a matter of scanning. The Iowa State University ILL unit now has four scanners in the office, three of which are flat bed scanners and the other a "face-up" scanner. Imaging used to be the exclusive domain of photocopy machines and to a lesser extent fax machines. For many libraries it is now predominantly a matter of scanning the material. Ariel still appears to be the world standard for Internet-based scan and delivery technology, but Odyssey may not be far behind now that they are offering their software for free. Until recently it had been tied exclusively to the Illiad software.

For any library with Ariel or equivalent software, scanning has become a large part of the ILL unit's workflow. At Iowa State, scanning lending documents into Ariel is probably the ILL office's single most challenging staffing issue. It is a growing workflow and one that requires a large pool of student labor. The quality of this scanning is very important to the borrowing library. Everyone hates to get an incomplete document or one that has a margin cut off. Document scanning is where management and technology converge to hopefully provide a high quality, timely product.

If an ILL operation serves individuals or organizations without formal libraries, other forms of imaging may be necessary in addition to that offered by Ariel and Odyssey. At Iowa State, a fee-based document delivery service (DDS) is offered to all users, both affiliated and unaffiliated with the university. Documents are delivered in PDF format to many of our DDS clients by scanning materials directly into the Adobe Acrobat software. As our users get more sophisticated, the demands placed upon scanning services are bound to increase. For instance, we are seeing some

requests for scanning in color, which is not always available on a particular scanner or software. Other requests are being placed where a higher resolution or certain DPI is requested. Besides color and image resolution, it is also necessary to understand the various file formats.

Typically, ILL staff scan and delete documents. But there could be a role for ILL in scanning for permanent retention sometime in the future. Document imaging is not necessarily a new role for the ILL librarian, but the digital approach to imaging is relatively recent. And it is proving to be both a dynamic and challenging role.

The seven hats listed above are a mix of three originally proposed by Boucher, one of hers that was significantly reworked, and three new roles. The four roles proposed by Boucher that I chose not to include are:

- Network Consultant
- Teacher
- Defender of Rights
- Public Relations Expert

I did not necessarily exclude these roles because they are no longer pertinent or important. In fact, I would say that public relations may be a growing part of the ILL librarian's skill-set as patrons decide not to utilize this service for one reason or another. Perhaps they have the opinion (mistaken or not) that the service is too slow, or maybe they limit their research and document retrieval to web engines such as Yahoo and Google. Or they may want only full-text materials immediately available at their desktop. The teacher role can definitely be practiced by the ILL librarian today, but I do not see this as a major component of practice, or one that will necessarily grow in importance. Teaching and public relations are both duties that are oftentimes the responsibility of other units or personnel in the library. At Iowa State, for instance, we have a Public Relations Committee to advance the former and a full-time Instruction Coordinator to handle the latter. Defender of Rights, on the other hand, relates very closely to the lawyer role I outlined above. And the network consultant role proposed by Boucher could very well relate to both the Systems Expert role I propose, as well as the teacher role proposed by Boucher. I feel the typical ILL librarian may legitimately wear all four of these hats, but not in a large enough capacity to merit inclusion.

ILL has been a unit experiencing rapid change with the advent of computer automation. Anyone working in this field really needs to be

comfortable with change, to the point where they need to embrace and expect change. The ILL librarian should understand the evolving skills required for the position and take a proactive role in advocating and leading change. I see some new roles developing for ILL practitioners, which are already well developed at some libraries, but are not widely diffused enough to make my short list. Here are three more roles to watch for in the future:

1. Serials Expert
2. Purchasing Agent
3. Economist

Serials Expert

ILL librarians have developed excellent searching skills for serials and the associated articles requested by their patrons. Searching and interpreting serial records and holdings records can be a daunting task, oftentimes because of the lack of standardization. Many libraries are undertaking a review of their serial holding statements with an eye toward standardizing records and improving machine-readability. Some ILL librarians are taking an active role in this process.

At Iowa State, ILL staff have taken on the duty of union listing heavily requested serials in order to help other libraries accurately request articles, and to improve our own lending fill rate. This has lead to a closer collaboration between ILL staff and serials/cataloging staff. I am now on the ISU serials holdings revision task force and can speak with some authority about the ANSI/NISO Z39.71 Standard for Holdings Statements for Bibliographic Items and the MARC 21 Format for Holdings Data (MFHD). This may not be apparent to many ILL practitioners, but both standards have very important implications for ILL operations, both on the lending and borrowing sides. Basically, any library that has a standardized, machine-readable set of serial holdings will be in a better position to have their holdings searched automatically, whether it be by a link resolver for users of the borrowing service, or by Z39.50 search software by other libraries utilizing the lending service.

Purchasing Agent

This role might even be called "collection development bibliographer for on demand access." This long title basically means the ILL

librarian will assist in the purchase of materials, such as a book, when it is requested by an ILL patron, and see to it that the item is cataloged and added to the collection before the patron picks it up or after the patron is finished using it. In this role, the ILL librarian is facilitating the purchase of materials and developing the collection, but is merely doing so at the behest of the library's patrons. The degree to which ILL staff are actually involved in the purchase of materials varies from library to library, but it appears the overlap between ILL and acquisitions is growing. For instance, the College of William and Mary Library instituted a program of ILL-initiated book purchases that has improved access, improved the collection and helped to reduce some of the work load in ILL (Reed, 2004). In this particular case, collection development, ILL and acquisitions are still separate departments, but with collaborations such as this, could a merger be far behind? As mentioned earlier, Eastern Michigan has already merged ILL and acquisitions (Badics, 2004).

Economist

ILL librarians, probably more than any other staff position in the library, are aware of the costs involved in providing their services. Numerous studies have been published measuring the cost and performance of ILL. Three studies have been conducted by the Association of Research Libraries alone: The first was based upon FY 1991 data, the second upon FY 1996 data, and third upon FY 2002 data. Any ILL librarian involved in the cost aspects of these studies has become very conversant with cost analysis. This new role relates somewhat to the role of accountant, but really stands apart because it involves more analysis and application to practice.

A 2004 study showed a typical borrowing request costs around $18.00 and a typical lending request around $9.00 (Jackson, 2004). The ILL librarian should consider the average borrowing cost when considering their options for filling borrowing requests. Is it more cost effective to get a particular document from a commercial document supplier, or from another library? At Iowa State there was recently a situation where the full text could be obtained immediately via the Iowa State University ConnectComplete web site (formerly the Ingenta Gateway) for a cost of over $30, or get a copy via the Rapid service in 24 hours at a reported cost of $5 (Jackson, 2004). Needless to say, the second option was chosen. Primarily because of cost considerations, the standard in the Iowa State ILL office is to try Rapid first before ConnectComplete,

even if ConnectComplete provides immediate desktop delivery of the document.

ILL librarians are increasingly being called upon to determine if unmediated ILL/document delivery services are a cost-effective alternative to traditional ILL. Some of the impetus for this trend is no doubt due to the Association of Research Libraries study that reported unmediated requesting oftentimes resulted in faster service at a lower cost (Jackson, 2004). Cost data is essential for such an evaluation.

On the lending side, cost data should be used to establish the ILL unit's lending fee schedule. There are a number of other applications for ILL cost data. One of these pertains to ILL-initiated acquisitions. Knowing the cost of a typical borrowing request is $18.00, in some cases it might make sense to simply buy the book rather than borrow it. Any book around $20.00 might be a good candidate. I would agree with Richard Hulsey (2003) that there is a place for ILL-initiated purchases, but I do not agree that such a program can substitute entirely for ILL service.

For the ILL librarian there needs to be a consideration of more than just the cost of a particular item. What are the benefits to the patron? Are there benefits to the library? A closer examination of cost/benefits is now needed in the ILL literature, rather than more cost studies. We have a very good idea of ILL costs right now.

Another question that needs to be resolved is how the costs of ILL relate to the costs of other services and work activities in the library. For instance, if you are to compare the cost to borrow a book on ILL with the cost of buying it, you must first determine the total cost of acquisition, including staff salaries, benefits, binding, shelving, labeling, and other parts of the process. Otherwise you are comparing apples and oranges. Perhaps the well-developed cost finding skills of the ILL librarian will be utilized next to study cost centers throughout the library.

IMPLICATIONS FOR THE ORGANIZATIONAL LOCATION OF ILL

With all of the hats worn by ILL librarians, it should really come as no surprise that the ILL unit cannot be pigeonholed neatly into the library organizational structure. ILL staff interact with so many units in the library on a routine and repetitive basis that many library managers find it difficult to place the unit in the organizational chart. ILL even duplicates the

work of some units. For instance, many ILL lending operations check-out books just like staff at the circulation desk. The difference is that ILL checks books out to libraries and not to individuals. The amount of book check-out going on in ILL today is really not sufficient to justify merging circulation and ILL. The implementation of a National Circulation Interchange Protocol (NCIP) compliant circulation system at any particular library may blur the administrative division between ILL and circulation, but the minimal overlap of duties between these two units at most libraries would seem to mitigate their merger.

Bibliographic verification work in ILL is also not sufficient to justify merging with reference. The vast majority of ILL requests are handled with little problem. At Iowa State, just 2% of new borrowing requests are referred to the ILL librarian by paraprofessional staff for further evaluation. If it came down to merging ILL with circulation or reference, however, I would have to go along with the Wake Forest model and recommend reference, largely because reference service requires a more involved level of training than circulation services: The former is taught at the graduate level in library schools while the latter is a skill best taught at the local library based upon the local integrated library system (ILS) in place.

In the mid-1990s, Mary Jackson advocated for ILL being a separate department (Jackson, 1995). I recently corresponded with her and she still holds this opinion. I personally feel there is no best model for locating the ILL unit in a library. It is best determined by local circumstances. The real key is to see where the largest overlap occurs between ILL and the other units in the library. As mentioned above, checking out books to other libraries and verifying difficult citations are ILL processes going on every day in the ISU library, but these are not major work flows. A much larger part of the day's work, and a growing workflow, is document scanning. So the current arrangement where ILL is a part of the digital services unit appears to be a good fit at Iowa State.

One possible location for ILL that I have not seen mentioned in the literature is the information technology (IT) department. As automated as this service has become, merging ILL and IT may make sense in some libraries. To operate smoothly, the modern ILL unit must have good IT support. There are some ILL units that actually have full-time IT staff working in ILL, such as Colorado State University (CSU), which is arguably one of the best borrowing operations in the U.S. (Jackson, 1998). Colorado State has long been an innovator in ILL operation and much of this is due to good IT support. According to Julie Wessling, Assistant Dean at CSU, it began with computer-savvy

students and evolved into two full-time IT staff members being located in ILL after the disastrous flood of 2001. Today these two IT professionals are in a separate administrative unit, but still interact closely with the CSU ILL staff. The ILL unit at CSU is a separate department, currently reporting to an Assistant Dean. We can learn a lot from Colorado State both in terms of organizational placement and staffing.

The congruence of a high-achieving borrowing operation and a close relationship with IT at Colorado State may provide a good model for other libraries. At the very least it supports the placement of IT staff directly in the ILL unit. Taken ever further, it suggests the possibility of a merger between ILL and IT: An "ILL-IT" department (pun intended). I know of no ILL unit that has been organizationally merged with an IT unit. Any future move by a library to join ILL with IT would be a strong validation of the "Systems Expert" hat mentioned earlier in this paper. It would also be a further elaboration of organizational Model (8), combining ILL with an atypical unit.

All too many times the location of ILL service in the library hierarchy is dictated by personalities rather than effectiveness. Will these people get along? Is this person a good manager? Another factor is whether or not the head of ILL has a graduate degree in library science or related field. This topic is a bit of a hot potato in the ILL community, but I would tend to agree with Hawley (1995) that it is not essential for the head of ILL in a smaller operation to have an MLS or equivalent. Having said that, however, the larger the ILL operation, the more desirable it may be for the unit head to have an advanced degree. This may be dictated by the sheer volume of requests being processed. More important than the educational qualifications of the ILL librarian, I believe, is the training and/or experience of this individual.

IMPLICATIONS FOR THE EDUCATION AND TRAINING OF ILL LIBRARIANS

It would appear that today's ILL librarian has quite a few skills that need to be mastered in order to fulfill their job. These roles, or hats, have necessarily evolved over the years and will continue to evolve. If we know the skills necessary to become a good ILL librarian, how does one acquire them? How do we prepare future librarians to discharge their duties effectively? Certainly library school is an option. I know of no program that currently offers ILL librarianship as a special

curriculum or even as an explicit class. This deficiency has been confirmed by Mary Hollerich, a member of the ALA RUSA ILL Education and Training Committee, who has devoted quite some time to studying this matter. The Education and Training Committee is addressing this issue by establishing two priorities: (1) Survey library and information science (LIS) programs regarding coverage of resource sharing in library school curricula and (2) Develop a model curriculum for LIS programs. When completed, these initiatives would provide a positive step forward in the formal training of ILL librarians.

What is most important for any ILL practitioner is to have the requisite skills needed to supervise and operate a quality ILL operation. Since these skills are not currently taught by a graduate program in library science, they have to be learned on the job. That is, if no other formal training options are available. The ILL Committee on Education and Training is working on this as well. One of the committee's priorities is to develop a WebCT introductory ILL course. Certainly, the seven hats listed above might serve as guideposts for this course.

An extrapolation of skills that should be taught to practicing ILL librarians has already been discussed in the literature. A model statement of objectives for training ILL practitioners was developed by a committee of the American Library Association in the early 1990s, but its usefulness is limited by its age (ALA, 1991). Five broad categories were specifically outlined:

1. ILL codes
2. Procedures: borrowing
3. Procedures: lending
4. Copyright compliance
5. Management of ILL

Cornish further examined the training of ILL practitioners in 1994 and identified seven elements that were deemed important by library associations:

1. Management
2. User education
3. Legal aspects
4. Finance
5. Union catalogs

6. Knowledge of collections
7. Basic routines

Another seven elements were identified by Cornish as important to library schools:

1. Management
2. Policies
3. User education
4. Legal aspects
5. Union catalogs
6. Knowledge of collections
7. Basic routines

Practicing librarians had their own list. Cornish presented these in priority order:

1. Finance, management, and personnel
2. Union catalogs
3. Knowledge of ILL systems
4. ILL in developing countries
5. Online services
6. User education
7. Basic routines
8. Computer programs
9. Collection development/legal deposit
10. Standards for practice
11. Audiovisual materials
12. Postal and packaging matters
13. Political/social issues
14. Technical definitions
15. Preservation problems

There is clearly an overlap between these lists and the seven skills I have proposed. In concluding his paper, Cornish reduced the various lists to just two basic skills: (1) Policy and management and (2) Systems expertise.

Within policy and management, he addressed the need for written policies, an evaluation of costs, financial expertise, and some legal training. He also discussed the organizational location of ILL, suggesting a relationship between the location of ILL in the library organization

and training and education for the ILL supervisor. It would be nice to reduce training issues to just two, as suggested by Cornish, but even he recognizes a number of considerations under the first category of policy and management. ILL management appears to be the one constant in all of these lists. I was particularly pleased to note that Cornish recognized the value of systems expertise as far back as 1994. This lends some credence to the "systems expert" role I suggested and may give additional support to IT staff in ILL or the organizational placement of ILL in the IT department.

CONCLUSION

ILL today is quite a bit different than it was in 1979, when Virginia Boucher first introduced her eight roles of the ILL librarian. Despite all the changes, however, I see at least three of her roles still pertinent today (manager, bibliographic reference practitioner, legal adviser), two as being better handled by library staff in other units (teacher and public relations expert), and the other three (automation counselor, network consultant, defender of rights) as either less pertinent today or reconfigured in other roles. Taken from this perspective, maybe things have not changed that much after all. The many hats of the ILL librarian can be cut and diced in many ways. The seven I proposed can be debated: (1) Reference Librarian, (2) Manager, (3) Systems Expert, (4) Lawyer, (5) Accountant, (6) Shipping Expert, and (7) Imaging Expert.

What I believe is not debatable is that the ILL librarian is in need of a multiplicity of skills. This diverse set of roles makes the ILL unit difficult to place in the organizational structure and the ILL librarian a challenge to educate and train. There is apparently no formal educational program currently in place for ILL practitioners, despite a call by Cornish to establish such a program in 1994. ILL librarians in RUSA of the American Library Association are currently working on a formal training program for this area of specialty. The education and training of this library professional or paraprofessional should be structured around a commonly accepted set of skills. Virginia Boucher set forth a baseline of skills in 1979. I have provided an updated model for today. It is now the responsibility of current practitioners to accept the challenge of preparing future ILL librarians for handling this important service.

REFERENCES

Amdursky, Saul J., Hulsey, Richard and Brandau, Christine Pearson. June 1, 2003. ILL: Sacred Cow or Vital Service? *Library Journal* 128 (10), 76-79.

American Library Association, Reference and Adult Services Division, Interlibrary Loan Committee. Winter, 1991. Interlibrary Loan Training and Continuing Education Model Statement of Objectives. *RQ* 31, 177-184.

Badics, Joe. 2004. Acquisitions and Interlibrary Loan Together: Good Marriage or Will George W. Bush Object? *Against the Grain* 16 (4), 52,54.

Boucher, V. 1989. The Interlibrary Loan Librarian. *Interlending and Document Supply* 17 (1), 11-15.

Cheung, Ophelia, Patrick, Susan, Cameron, Brian D. 2003. Restructuring the Academic Library: Team-Based Management and the Merger of Interlibrary Loans with Circulation and Reserve. *Journal of Interlibrary Loan, Document Delivery and Information Supply* 14 (2), 5-17.

Cornish, Graham Peter. Spring 1994. Training Opportunities for Interlibrary Loan and Document Supply Staff. IFLA UAP Study. *Journal of Education for Library and Information Science* 35, 138-146.

Croft, Janet Brennan. 2005. Interlibrary Loan and Licensing: Tools for Proactive Contract Management. *Journal of Library Administration* 42 (3/4), 41-53.

Hawley, Lorin M. 1995. Why You Do Not Need an MLS to Work in ILL. *Journal of Interlibrary Loan, Document Delivery and Information Supply* 6 (1), 89-94.

Jackson, Mary E. 1995. The Ideal ILL Service Model. *Wilson LibraryBulletin.* 68,69, 125. LaGuardia, Cheryl and Dowell, Connie V. 1991. The Structure of Resource Sharing in Academic Research Libraries. *RQ* 30, 370-374.

Jackson, Mary E. 1998. *Measuring the Performance of Interlibrary Loan Operations in North American Research and College Libraries.* Washington, DC: Association of Research Libraries.

Jackson, Mary E. with Bruce Kingma and Tom Delaney 2004. *Assessing ILL/DD Services: New Cost-Effective Alternatives.* Washington DC: Association of Research Libraries.

Nickelson-Dearie, Tammy A., Steel, Virginia. 1992. Interlibrary Loan Trends: Staffing and Organization. *SPEC Kit* 187, 1-5.

Paradis, Olga. 1998. An Experiment: Combining Interlibrary Loan with a Science/Engineering Reference Department at Baylor University in Waco, Texas. *Journal of Interlibrary Loan, Document Delivery and Information Supply* 8 (3), 43-53.

Reed, Catherine A. 2004. Expanding the ILL Role–Interlibrary Loan Contributing to Collection Development *Against the Grain* 16 (4), 44, 46, 49, 52.

Yu, Cristina. 1997. Interlibrary Loan and Reference–Partners for Life? The Story at Wake Forest University. *Journal of Interlibrary Loan, Document Delivery and Information Supply* 7 (3), 13-19.