

**ACRL/RBMS Guidelines for Borrowing and Lending Special Collections Materials
Task Force**

ALA Midwinter Meeting
Friday, 15 January 2010, 4:00 – 5:30 p.m.
Boston Convention Center, Room 160c

MINUTES - DRAFT

I. Introductions

Task Force Chair Hjordis Halvorson called the meeting to order at 4:00 p.m.

Task Force members, advisors, and guests introduced themselves:

Task Force (all members were present):

Hjordis Halvorson, Newberry Library, *Chair*
Christian Dupont, Atlas Systems, Inc.
Jeffrey Marshall, University of Vermont
Laila Miletic-Vejzovic, University of Central Florida
Heather Smedberg, University of California, San Diego
Shannon Supple, University of California, Berkeley
Cherry Williams, Indiana University

Advisors:

J. B. Hill, ACRL/SAC Liaison (not in attendance)
Dennis Massie, OCLC Research/RLG Programs (not in attendance; see ** below)
Jennifer Schaffner, OCLC Research/RLG Programs
Laura Micham, Past chair, *ACRL/RBMS Guidelines for the Interlibrary Loan of Rare and Unique Material* task force (not in attendance)
Everett Wilkie, Past chair, *ACRL/RBMS Guidelines for Borrowing and Lending Special Collections Material for Exhibition* task force; RBMS liaison to ACRL/SAC (not in attendance)
Fernando Peña, RBMS Member-At-Large liaison to the Task Force (not in attendance)

Guests (some attended only part of the meeting; indicated by *):

*Nicole Bouché, University of Virginia
*Alla Barabtarlo, University of Missouri
JoEllen Dickie, Newberry Library
*Moir Fitzgerald, Beinecke Library, Yale University
Mark Greenberg, University of South Florida

** The OCLC Research/RLG Programs SHARES group, chaired by Dennis Massie, met at the same time in a different location, so it was unfortunately not possible for Massie to attend our meeting or for task force members to attend his.

II. Approval of agenda

The agenda was approved with no changes.

III. Request for volunteer recorder

Dupont volunteered to record the minutes.

IV. Approval of minutes from ALA Annual 2009

The draft minutes from the task force's meeting at ALA Annual 2009 were approved with no changes.

V. Discussion of the general approach, framework/rationale, principles, general guidelines, and basic structure of the draft guidelines

Halvorson reported on her initial attempt to merge the existing ILL and Exhibition Loan (hereafter EL) guidelines. She found some redundant sections that could be combined and reworded. These mainly concerned the general principles of facilitating access in borrowing and lending special collections materials and general guidelines that apply to both types of activity. Halvorson posted the merged document to the Task Force's (hereafter TF) ALA Connect site on 11 December. She reported that Dupont sent her some extensive suggestions on how the editorial work might proceed. He also sent her a new version of the document in which he had reworked and expanded the Introduction and sections on ILL procedures. Halvorson then incorporated some further revisions and circulated an updated version by email to all TF members on 12 January.

Halvorson indicated that she would use the draft of 12 January as a point of departure for discussion about the structure of the document later in the meeting, but first asked TF members to report on the tasks they had been working on since the last meeting.

TF Member Task Reports

Marshall reported on the survey that he created to gather information about the experience and attitudes that TF members had with regard to ILL and EL of special collections materials. Marshall sent out the survey to TF members on 12 December. All had responded by 28 December, and Marshall compiled and distributed the results to TF members the next day over email. Marshall summarized the results briefly, noting, among other points, that most TF members currently work or have worked at institutions that have written guidelines for exhibition and ILL lending. In most cases EL policies were based on the ACRL guidelines, but this was true for only about half with regard to the ACRL guidelines for interlibrary loans or special collections materials. For exhibition loans, most TF member institutions require facilities reports of borrowers, condition-of-item reports as lenders and borrowers, and insurance certificates of borrowers; such are

not generally required for ILL, and almost none reported that they maintained lists of approved institutional borrowers.

Supple reported on the OCLC Research/RLG Programs “Sharing Special Collections” initiative. Supple is a member of the advisory group. She offered to provide the TF with meeting notes from the group’s December meeting. Details on the initiative can be found at:

<http://www.oclc.org/research/activities/sharing/default.htm>

Schaffner gave some historical background on this initiative, explaining the overlap between the RLG SHARES program, the interlibrary sharing program that goes back 20 years, and the “Sharing Special Collections” initiative, which is part of the RLG Programs work on Mobilizing Unique Collections; see:

<http://www.oclc.org/research/activities/shares/default.htm>

As noted above, the SHARES group chaired by Massie was meeting at the same time as the TF meeting. Part of that meeting included a report on the Sharing Special Collections initiative.

Dupont reported that he will be attending two conferences this coming spring at which he will be giving presentations relevant to the TF’s work. At the 2010 ILLiad International Conference (Virginia Beach, VA, 24-26 March 2010), Dupont will lead a presentation and discussion titled “ILL for Archives and Special Collections: Enhancing Access to Unique and Rare Materials” (see: <https://www.atlas-sys.com/conference/ConferenceSessions.aspx>). At the joint “Round-Up” meeting of the Conference of Inter-Mountain Archivists, Northwest Archivists, Society of California Archivists, and Society of Rocky Mountain Archivists (Seattle, WA, 28 April-1 May 2010), Dupont will join Elizabeth Nielsen and Geoff Wexler in presenting a panel session titled “ILL for Archives and Special Collections: Enhancing Access to Materials” (see: <http://northwestarchivistsinc.wildapricot.org/descriptions>). Dupont will discuss the TF’s work at both venues and encourage attendees to look for and comment on eventual public drafts of the merged ILL and EL guidelines.

Smedberg reported briefly on the borrowing and lending guidelines bibliographies that she and other TF members have been building over the past few months on the TF’s ALA Connect site.

Discussion of Current Working Draft

Following the above reports, Halvorson turned attention back to the working draft of the merged guidelines that she distributed to TF members on 12 January.

Halvorson began by asking whether the general approach reflected in the draft made sense. Supple said that she thought so. Greenberg agreed, pointing out that both of the

original documents had the same goal of facilitating access to special collections; in the merged document, this shared purpose is made the more evident. He commented further that the new document could serve as a standard by which an institution could evaluate its access policies and practices to see whether it is meeting generally accepted norms. Marshall commented that at first he was not sure that it would be possible to effectively merge the previous guidelines, but after seeing the preliminary draft he said he thought it was heading the right direction. Miletic-Vejzovic commented that she especially liked the portion of the draft that brought together the general guidelines that would apply to both ILL and EL.

Dupont noted that in working through the draft, he thought it best to replace the mention of “museums” in the intended audience section with “museum libraries.” He reasoned that museums as such already have their own EL standards and that only museum libraries would likely be engaged in arranging ILL research loans. He also wondered whether the statement of purpose in the Introduction should come before the audience, or vice versa. Consensus emerged to try this.

Greenberg asked whether the ACRL guidelines should take priority over museum guidelines when libraries are involved with loans to or from museums, or whether museum practices should take precedence. Dupont suggested that perhaps the lender’s policies and practices should take precedence regardless of the institutional types involved. He added that he thought the question was one that merited more discussion and that should be addressed in a future draft.

Halvorson then asked the group whether the Background or Principles section should come first. Smedberg and Miletic-Vejzovic said that they thought the Principles should come first.

Halvorson then handed out copies of a new draft of the Principles and General Guidelines sections that she had been working on in the days leading up to the meeting. In this new document, she endeavored to further delineate general “principles” from practical “guidelines.”

Greenberg remarked that the distinction makes good sense from a philosophical perspective. Principles should apply to both borrowing and lending, and to both ILL and EL. Guidelines, on the other hand, are specific to the discharge of borrowing and lending responsibilities in the fulfillment of ILL and EL. Greenberg asked whether it might make sense to structure and label the document such that individual guideline statements would refer back to specific principles. Halvorson suggested that sometimes a single principle can inform multiple guidelines so such a structure might be too limiting. Dupont commented that it might make for a more legible document if the references were implicit rather than explicit, but added that the suggestion was certainly worth considering if the suggested approach of separating “principles” and “guidelines” were more strictly followed in future drafts. Halvorson agreed that there should be strong coherence between the principles and guidelines.

Halvorson remarked that there seemed to be consensus that the separation of “principles” and “guidelines” was a good approach to take going forward. All agreed.

Dupont then raised a topic that he said he had discussed at one point with Halvorson, namely whether some explicit attention should be given in the document to providing the intended audiences with criteria for evaluating and making lending decisions in addition to the procedures already outlined for fulfilling loan requests. Halvorson suggested that the more procedural elements might be moved to an expanded set of appendices.

Halvorson asked whether it would be useful for the group to go over the principles in her outline one by one. Supple commented that that might take too much time and that perhaps ALA Connect would be a better venue for such a discussion. Dupont did ask if some time could be devoted to discussing the fourth bullet under the “general approach” heading (“When the original cannot be loaned, the lending library is encouraged to offer a reproduction in an acceptable format”). He remarked that he thought this principle would apply most directly to EL, since in ILL the presumption that reproductions would be offered as a first option rather than last resort. Miletic-Vejzovic, Marshall and others said that they thought this might be an example of an issue that would be better addressed as a guideline under the respective section rather than expressed as a general principle. Halvorson observed that more work was evidently needed on the distinction in this case and perhaps others.

Dupont asked everyone whether they were comfortable with what was looking more and more like a thorough restructuring and rewriting of the current ILL and EL guidelines. He noted that much work went into the current guidelines and that the TF should be respectful of that. On the other hand, he observed that the charge the TF had received to merge the guidelines might realistically necessitate a more radical approach than simply combining them and eliminating obvious redundancies, which is more or less how the recent merger of the ACRL/RBMS Security and Theft guidelines had preceded. Some discussion ensued; consensus indicated that the group was comfortable in following an approach that would result in a substantial restructuring and redrafting of the merged ILL and EL guidelines.

Halvorson asked whether it would make sense to introduce more parallelism between the sections for ILL and EL by applying the ILL model of distinguishing borrowing and lending responsibilities in the EL section. Marshall commented that perhaps we should not try to fix what is not broken. On the other hand, it would make sense to follow a common structure and order in a unified document. Consensus favored introducing an explicit borrowing-lending structure in the EL section in the next round of drafting.

VI. Questions/report for RBMS Executive Committee

Halvorson next turned discussion toward goals and timelines for next steps. She said that she thought the TF should aim to have a complete draft ready for a hearing by Annual. Everyone agreed. Halvorson then suggested that the TF should therefore aim to have a

more or less complete working draft ready by March or early April so that the TF would have time to review and revise the whole before publicizing it in advance of the hearing.

Halvorson said that in her report to the RBMS Executive Committee she would request a separate meeting slot for public hearing at Annual and that the hearing should be scheduled before the regular TF meeting so that the TF would be able to discuss feedback gathered at the hearing during its meeting.

Halvorson said that she would take the next steps on revising the main body of the current draft document to incorporate the several recommendations noted above and then share it with TF members for further input. She then asked for volunteers to work on revising the appendices, and especially creating a new appendix for ILL procedures. Smedberg and Miletic-Vejzovic offered to work on this new appendix.

VII. Adjournment

Halvorson adjourned the meeting at 5:35 p.m..