



*A Program of the Minnesota Higher Education  
Services Office at the University of Minnesota*

# MESSENGER

February 26, 2004

## EXTRA

### **MINITEX Resource Sharing Report, FY03, & Trends and Predictions for the Future (Oct. 2003)**

#### **Introduction**

**Future Trends (Sept. 2003 Forward into 2004, 2005, 2005, etc.) Background  
Information from MINITEX**

- A. Document Delivery**
- B. Delivery — Courier**
- C. Licensed Resources: Electronic Library for Minnesota (ELM)**

### **& Comments (Nov. 2003)**

#### **Answers to:**

- 1. Do you foresee trends in addition to those identified in the “Future Trends” section of this report that will impact MINITEX’s Resource-Sharing programs?**
- 2. Do you foresee trends in addition to those identified in the “Future Trends” section of this report that will impact your library’s resource-sharing services?**
- 3. Do you have suggestions for how MINITEX and its participating libraries can deal most effectively with these trends**
- 4. Do you have questions about aspects of MINITEX’s Document Delivery, Delivery, and Electronic Resource Licensing programs that are not answered in this report?**
- 5. Do you have other questions about resource sharing?**

#### **General Responses**

# **MINITEX Resource Sharing Report, FY03, & Trends and Predictions for the Future (Oct. 2003)**

MINITEX, located at the University of Minnesota Libraries Twin Cities, provides services that have as an objective the provision of needed information to residents of Minnesota, North Dakota, and South Dakota. These services are funded by contract between the University of Minnesota and the Minnesota Higher Education Services Office (MHESO) and between MHESO and the state library agencies in Minnesota, North Dakota, and South Dakota. MINITEX also has reciprocal arrangements with Wisconsin Library Services (WiLS), located at the University of Wisconsin, Madison, and the Wisconsin Reference and Loan Library (WIRL).

The ultimate goal is to expand access to information resources and, ultimately, to provide information to the end-user, whether it is in the form of a book, a photocopy, an audio book or video, or electronic content and to do so in a timeframe that meets user needs. MHESO takes a broad view of MINITEX's resource sharing program, which includes the following services under a broad umbrella to facilitate the sharing of available resources.

**\* Document Delivery (returnables and non-returnables)**

**\* Courier Delivery (both physical and electronic delivery)**

MULS (providing locations for holdings of serials, including journals and magazines)

OCLC (providing locations for materials and populating local automated systems, in most cases)

**\* Licensing of electronic content (both ELM and specific databases for academic institutions)**

MLAC (providing storage & location of materials for which libraries no longer have space, but which remain important enough to make available for resource sharing purposes.

(\* This report provides more information about these portions of the MINITEX resource-sharing program.)

MINITEX staff work closely with local libraries and use available technology to the fullest extent possible. We also work with existing and emerging library organizations that provide shared automation services, including the University of Minnesota, Minneapolis Public Library, MnSCU/PALS, CLIC, additional public & academic libraries with local automation systems, MnLINK, South Dakota Library Network (SDLN) and Online Dakota Information Network (ODIN). All these entities, working collaboratively, have developed close interconnections that result in effective resource sharing to answer the information needs of their users.

Because we have worked to make this integrated resource-sharing network appear seamless, the results we've achieved are sometimes taken for granted. On any given morning, you can walk through the MINITEX delivery area and see books, audio books, articles, DVDs, videos, etc. moving between and among libraries. Materials are being lent from academics to publics and vice versa and from state government to academic and public library to state government libraries. The materials run the gamut of subject matter from expensive non-fiction books to inexpensive paperbacks (often out of print).

For this integrated resource-sharing network to continue to function smoothly, each MINITEX participating library is expected to:

- Share resources consistent with library policies, including collections, bibliographic records, reference support and staff expertise;

- Update and maintain cooperatively developed Network information (for example, serials holdings in MULS and for OCLC participants, current cataloging);
- Abide by current MINITEX policies and protocols, such as verifying requests in MULS (or OCLC, if a user), on the MnLINK Gateway, and using approved forms and communications systems;
- Keep up-to-date with new developments and changes in the Network through participation in MINITEX training/retraining opportunities and reading MINITEX communications, including having at least one staff member monitor the MINITEX electronic news list;
- Fill 95% of information needs from their own library and/or library system, including local resources;
- Be administered by at least one full-time professional librarian.

## **FUTURE TRENDS.... SEPTEMBER 2003 FORWARD INTO 2004, 2005, 2006, ETC.**

These future trends are based on current observations and available data, such as those following this section. We welcome responses from participating library staff — whether it's agreement, disagreement, alternative ideas, or suggested trends not listed here. (See the response form at <http://www.minitex.umn.edu/committees/advisory/resource.asp>) Attached for background are reports from the MINITEX Office that show the number of requests received and filled, requests referred to other libraries, items processed in the MINITEX Delivery System, and the use of electronic resources. These data do not include the thousands of requests made and filled by local libraries in communities or the usage of electronic resources licensed by local libraries throughout the three-state region, but we wanted to make the point that this additional activity exists and is probably much larger than the numbers at the state and regional level.

1. **TREND.** Requests for photocopies (non-returnables) will continue to decrease slowly, as electronic content is more readily available; however, the decrease will level off due to the imbalance between journals indexed, journals with electronic full-text content, and the number of years for which e-content is available and licensed by libraries.

### **Predictions:**

- a. It will become increasingly important that licensing agreements allow for the use of electronic content to fill interlibrary loan requests. This will be a larger issue as tight budgets force the University of Minnesota and other libraries to drop print subscriptions in favor of electronic-only subscriptions. Licenses should acknowledge the possibility of interlibrary loan as appropriate under fair use and copyright guidelines.
  - b. Libraries with only electronic access to general full-text journals eventually will be unable to obtain articles in the corresponding print journals if no library subscribes to them within the three-state region. There may be local costs to go outside the region for materials.
  - c. Increased use of OpenURL Linking software will help to link users to materials of equal interest that are available electronically through licensing arrangements, but it will require more user education and training in order to meet user expectations. OpenURL linking software will be used by a few libraries and create some inequity since such software would benefit all libraries and their users.
  - d. Index and abstract databases, including WorldCat, will continue to generate requests for articles when the material is not held locally.
  - e. The University Libraries' collections, together with MINITEX staff, provide economies of scale, cost effectiveness, and fast delivery to obtain loans and articles.
2. **TREND.** Requests for loans (returnables) will increase as more people have greater access to information about the availability of items held by libraries and more opportunity to initiate a request for a book, video, or other returnable.

**Predictions:**

- a. People are increasing their use of libraries, and they will check out more books, audio books, and movies on videotape or DVD than they did in the past.
- b. An increase in circulation in public libraries will result in a comparative increase in requests for interlibrary loans from other libraries.
- c. Requests for audiovisual materials will increase, resulting in more staff time required to check in interlibrary loans because of the need to verify that all pieces have been returned.
- d. In the three-state region, interoperability linkages among local and state integrated library systems will mean that all library resources are easily available to people, no matter where they live, and that systems need to be in place to deliver those resources to people quickly.

3. **TREND.** The MnLINK Gateway will increase access to all library catalogs in Minnesota and to ELM resources.

**Predictions:**

- a. MnSCU/PALS libraries will continue to experience a surge in requests for loans, possibly due to increased acquisitions resulting from special legislative appropriations over the last few years.
- b. The libraries of the University of Minnesota and private colleges will experience increased requests for loans as the functionality of the MnLINK Gateway is upgraded.
- c. Requests among public libraries will increase as users become accustomed to requesting titles they see on the MnLINK Gateway if the titles are not available in their local libraries.
- d. Libraries will continue to send requests for photocopies (non-returnables) to the University Libraries/MINITEX for fast fill rates with the option of electronic delivery.
- e. An increase of interlibrary loans by local libraries to other local libraries will have a major impact on staff's ability to search/retrieve/check out/check in material while serving local clientele while experiencing decreased staff levels and increased demands for local service. How do libraries plan for this?
- f. The ability for end-users to make interlibrary loan requests easily to other participating libraries over the MnLINK Gateway will increase user expectations about what they can obtain and in what timeframe as well as change current patterns of interlibrary loan.

4. **TREND.** The decision by MINITEX to stop referrals outside the three-state region and Wisconsin is having a negative impact on libraries.

**Predictions:**

- a. Some libraries have stopped going outside the region to access materials if there are costs involved or are spending time looking for lender libraries outside the region that don't charge.
- b. Some libraries have had to expend local resources (staff and funding) to obtain materials once obtained by MINITEX, and it may take longer to fill a request.
- c. Some libraries choose not to use an alternate ILL system to send to out-of-region locations, thereby filling fewer requests.

5. **TREND.** The volume of materials being transported on local delivery systems and the MINITEX Delivery System continues to increase as we make it easier to locate and request materials from libraries throughout the three-state region.

**Predictions:**

- a. An increase in interlibrary loans among local libraries and branches is having an impact on the need for increased delivery services, resulting in an increased volume of items delivered and requiring increased resources at both the local and state levels.
- b. Demand for resources will result in a need for increased overnight delivery between major resource-sharing communities. However, cost effectiveness and economies of scale will need to be studied before making changes in current delivery routes.

- c. The MINITEX Delivery System will continue to provide low cost, effective overnight delivery to a majority of participating libraries.
- d. Item deliveries (including courtesy returns) processed through the MINITEX Office in delivery bins for local library will continue to increase in the next few years.
- e. With additional resources to allow the addition of a late-night sort, MINITEX could decrease the delivery time for a majority of Minnesota delivery sites by one day.

6. **TREND.** Electronic resources will continue to be licensed by local libraries and at the state level in the three-state region. This growing acquisition of licensed content will have a significant impact on resource sharing in the years ahead.

**Predictions:**

- a. Growth of ebooks available in various formats and licensing arrangements will cause some confusion for libraries and for end-users. Vendors including netLibrary, ebrary, Gale (Virtual Reference Library), Baker & Taylor, and many STM publishers are offering electronic reference and non-reference books, most of which are licensed to use online, but some of which can be downloaded to devices using Adobe or Microsoft reader software. Libraries will have to make decisions on different eBook options (there are a whole range of things that needs to be considered – formats, access, etc.) and try to help users understand what can be used under which conditions.
- b. Licensing and/or purchase of reference and non-reference electronic books and journals will impact sharing of resources, not only because of licensing agreements, but the fact that an electronic file may not be usable by someone lacking adequate equipment.
- c. Archives and backfiles of electronic content, such as electronic books and journals, may not be available for resource sharing outside the licensed library. That is, the contents may be stored at a publisher or vendor location and not be accessible by any other library or person even though the item is located in the library's online system.
- d. The increase in ELM usage in Minnesota between FY02 and FY03 indicates people will continue to use electronic resources when they understand what is available through their libraries.
- e. Libraries will continue to cancel serial subscriptions because they have access to electronic journals and magazines. However, many of those electronic subscriptions are licensed for a particular period of time, and when the license is not renewed, the titles will no longer be available.

7. **TREND.** There is a continuing need for training and education of library staff and end-users as enhanced technologies and user friendly enhancements are added to integrated library systems, library web pages, and library statewide portals.

**Predictions:**

- a. More web-based training programs will be made available for library staff to help them deal with continuing change and to keep their knowledge and skills up-to-date in using the latest technologies for resource sharing and service delivery.
- b. Web-based training programs will be developed that are user focused and that allow end-users to take courses on searching and finding information in the vast resources that libraries have made available collaboratively, from their home, office, or from within the library.

## Background Information from MINITEX

### A. DOCUMENT DELIVERY

#### 1. The Largest Single Library Suppliers of Resources: The University Libraries and Minneapolis Public Library.

MINITEX is staffed to provide access to the collections of the University Libraries for book loans and photocopies. In addition, MINITEX staff visit the Minneapolis Public Library collection daily to search for and check out loans and to photocopy articles. These two sources provide the resources needed to fill over half the requests received by the MINITEX Office.

In FY03, the MINITEX staff **searched for 148,250 requests** for book loans (returnables) and photocopies (non-returnables) from the collections of the University of Minnesota Libraries and Minneapolis Public Library and **filled 134,644, or 91%**. According to a study in March 2003, MINITEX staff filled 95% of the requests in less than 24 hours when searching the University Libraries collections. The material is sent to requesting libraries via courier or electronically.

<u>University Libraries</u>	<u>FY02</u>	<u>FY03</u>	<u>Increase/Decrease</u>
<b>Total Searched</b>	<b>150,088</b>	<b>141,162</b>	- 6%
<b>Total Filled</b>	<b>139,257</b>	<b>128,921</b>	- 7%
Loans	34,464	36,177	+ 5%
Copies	104,793	92,719	- 12%
<b>Percent Fill Rate</b>	<b>93%</b>	<b>91%</b>	- 2%

Note that book loans are up and requests for photocopies are down due to:

- 1) increased availability to the end-user of general and academic journals with full-text articles via the Internet;
- 2) cancellation of over 7,500 subscriptions by the University Libraries between 1995-2002 plus the purchasing of fewer monographs.

<u>Minneapolis Public Library</u>	<u>FY02</u>	<u>FY03</u>	<u>Increase/Decrease</u>
<b>Total Searched</b>	<b>10,419</b>	<b>7,088</b>	- 32%
<b>Total Filled</b>	<b>8,779</b>	<b>5,723</b>	- 35%
Loans	6,771	5,560	- 18%
Copies	2,008	163	- 92%
<b>Percent Fill Rate</b>	<b>84%</b>	<b>81%</b>	- 3%

This decrease is attributed to the boxing up of major parts of the collections, especially journals, and moving them to a new site while the central library is under construction. We would expect to return to higher numbers once major parts of the collection are returned to the shelves.

	<u>FY02</u>	<u>FY03</u>	<u>Increase/Decrease</u>
<b>Combined MNU/MPI Fill Rates</b>	<b>148,137</b>	<b>134,644</b>	- 9%

## 2. Where Do Requests Come From?

### Requests from Libraries Within the Region

Within the region (which includes MN, ND, and SD plus WI), the following table indicates the origin of the requests. In analyzing available data, it is interesting to note the breakdown between requests for loans (returnables) and requests for photocopies (non-returnables). Though this is not a surprising finding, it is useful to keep it in mind in thinking about resource sharing in the future. On average, the percentage of loans and photocopies from these groups of libraries breaks down as follows:

	<u>Returnables</u>	<u>Non-returnables</u>
MN Academic Libraries	38%	62%
MN State Govt/Health Libraries	34%	68%
MN Public Libraries	90%	10%
North Dakota	38%	62%
South Dakota	36%	64%

The following table indicates the number of requests received by the MINITEX Office from these library groups:

	<u>FY02</u>	<u>Filled FY02</u>	<u>FY03</u>	<u>Filled FY03</u>
HESO Requests				
MnSCU				
State Universities	35,174	29,814	33,959	28,332
Two Year Colleges	17,104	13,877	16,583	12,909
Private Colleges	61,779	56,153	60,476	53,948
U of MN Campuses*	46,062	44,960	41,982	40,627
State Gov't Libraries	8,302	7,018	6,006	5,031
Hospital Libraries	2,654	2,465	1,900	1,680
MN Public Libraries	56,246	44,030	70,248	54,946
MN K-12 Schools**	181	172	607	550
South Dakota	16,919	13,681	14,486	12,155
North Dakota	15,603	13,393	15,930	13,625

### Requests from Libraries Outside Three-State Region

University of Illinois	90	51	47	15
Wisconsin – WiLS	1,461	1,128	1,233	951
(WiLS provides access to WI libraries that are WILS members)				
Wisconsin – WIRL	9,910	6,125	9,378	5,527
(WIRL provides access to WI public and two-year academic libraries)				
Lakehead University (Thunder Bay, Ontario)	353	306	314	246

\* Morris, Duluth, Crookston & Twin Cities ILL/DTU

\*\* These K-12 schools are in the Twin Cities metropolitan area. Many other K-12 school requests are received from public, multi-type, and academic libraries in Greater Minnesota through existing

resource-sharing arrangements. For example, working with Central Minnesota Library Exchange, St. Cloud State University sent 584 requests to the MINITEX Office through the PALS/ILL system in FY03 that were from K-12 schools in Central Minnesota. Additional school requests came from Minnesota State University Moorhead (Northern Lights), TdS (SMILE), SELCO (SELS), and Arrowhead Library System (North Country).

### 3. Referral of Requests to Other Libraries

#### When materials are not available from the collections of the University Libraries or Minneapolis Public Library, where are the requests filled?

When MINITEX staff determines that material is not available from the University Libraries and/or Minneapolis Public Library, we rely upon a highly effective referral network that includes:

a) libraries throughout the three-state region plus Wisconsin, and b) locations outside the region where we can locate desired materials. The following data provide just a snapshot of where requests are referred when staff cannot fill them from the two major collections, either because the material is checked out or not held. Once we send the referral, MINITEX no longer has control of the requests and must rely on local staff to expend time and resources to process referral requests.

<b>REFERRALS by MINITEX Staff</b>	<b>FY02</b>	<b>Filled FY02</b>	<b>FY03</b>	<b>Filled FY03</b>
MN State Universities	8,775	7,697	9,022	7,766
Two Yr Colleges	5,575	4,578	6,514	5,443
Private Colleges	24,721	20,377	29,602	24,422
Univ of MN campuses*	1,385	919	1,519	1,029
State Government	2,478	1,790	2,391	1,816
Health Centers/Hospitals	566	384	648	409
North Dakota	4,675	3,527	5,086	3,768
South Dakota	4,409	3,316	4,867	3,642
MN Public Libraries	24,294	20,531	33,241**	23,566

\* Morris, Crookston, Duluth, Twin Cities

\*\* Referral increases due to MnLINK Gateway VDX functionality. May change with upgraded software.

<b>REFERRALS to Libraries Outside MINITEX 3-State Region</b>	<b>FY02</b>	<b>Filled FY02</b>	<b>FY03</b>	<b>Filled FY03</b>
Wisconsin				
* WiLS	5,152	4,089	6,495	5,160
WIRL (WI State Library)	10,326	5,933	10,475	7,509
Lakehead University	1	1	3	1
North Central Experiment Station	2	1	2	2
US Environmental Library (Duluth)	43	33	69	56
Illinois State Library	245	201	276	239
* Great Britain (1)	34	26	30	21
* Univ of Illinois (1)	913	690	795	577
Nat'l Lib of Medicine	2	2	0	0
Library of Congress	6	3	1	1



* University of Alberta (1)	1,079	868	1,096	905
* OCLC – IFM out of region (2)	11,701	4,258	4,426	1,952

- \* MINITEX pays for this service from these sites
- (1) Suspended arrangements July 1, 2003
- (2) Suspended arrangements May 2003

## B. DELIVERY - COURIER

The MINITEX Delivery System is a collaborative effort of academic libraries, state government libraries, state library agencies, local public libraries, regional library systems, and multi-type library systems. The MINITEX Delivery System is designed to form the backbone delivery network in the three-state region. The delivery system uses commercial couriers to deliver materials overnight five days a week to the majority of libraries participating in resource sharing.

The Delivery System is supported by MINITEX using:

- 1) state appropriations from the MHESO,
- 2) LSTA funds from the MN Dept. of Education/Library Development & Services, and
- 3) funds from the North and South Dakota State Libraries.

MINITEX also contracts with WiLS and WIRL for reciprocal delivery between Wisconsin and Minnesota.

Materials delivered to local and regional hub sites by the MINITEX courier are delivered to local libraries or patrons by the regional public and multi-type systems. The regional systems also pick up materials from local libraries that are routed back through the Delivery System to other requesting libraries for their patrons.

The cooperative efforts of MINITEX and the regional systems, both public and multitype, and state library agencies result in seamless regional delivery of materials.

There are single site delivery locations and multiple site delivery locations. To explain:

- 1) **Single site delivery locations** – A courier bin from the MINITEX Office is delivered overnight, five days a week, to an academic library, which is usually located in a single building. Materials are processed and the end-user notified.
- 2) **Multiple site delivery locations** –A courier bin from the MINITEX Office with materials for various libraries is delivered to a designated public or academic library in Greater Minnesota. The materials are for libraries other than the site to which the courier bin was delivered. Processes are in place to distribute the material to public, school, or academic libraries using local delivery methods. When the material reaches the local library, the end-user is notified. Local delivery times depend upon local arrangements by libraries in a particular geographical region. This next-level delivery may be less frequent than daily, depending upon the region.

MINITEX Delivery staff provide and support central sorting and distribution of returnables that are being requested directly by a borrowing library from a lending library in the three-state region plus Wisconsin. These include books, videotapes, DVDs, audio books, etc. These are called ‘item deliveries’ and represent the number of items traveling back and forth in the Courier Delivery System. This happens in two ways and materials are included in the courier bins on the routes explained above:

- 1) Sorted by MINITEX staff in the MINITEX Office, or
- 2) Moved directly via courier routes overnight between Mankato, St. Cloud, Moorhead, and Rochester for academic, school, and public libraries borrowing and lending to one another using their local automated systems or the MnLINK Gateway ILL system.

Delivery volume is increasing at a rapid rate as technology allows for increased direct borrowing of materials. We predict that there will be a continuing increase in this volume.

	<u>FY02</u>	<u>FY03</u>	<u>Increase/Decrease</u>
Item Deliveries	120,720	145,182	+ 20%

### C. LICENSED RESOURCES: ELECTRONIC LIBRARY FOR MINNESOTA (ELM)

In the three-state region, we are fortunate to have full-text journal articles, newspapers and books available via the Internet for the general population, authenticated through local libraries or statewide authentication systems. Over the years, this has reduced the number of requests for articles from general magazines or academic journals. Academic libraries have greater access to scholarly journals available electronically, and this has also had an impact on requests for photocopies. However, greater access to indices has generated requests for journal articles that are not available electronically to local libraries, either because the local libraries do not have a license to access them or the journals are not available electronically. In some cases, older issues of journals are available only in print form.

We are tracking usage of statewide electronic databases in Minnesota, and I am sure libraries are doing the same in North and South Dakota. In the case of Minnesota's ELM, here are the usage statistics for FY02 and FY03. We hope the increase in usage was one result of the ELM awareness campaign in early 2003. However, we know that local libraries have been getting the word out to their users that these resources are available, and I believe that all efforts are leading to increased usage.

<u>Minnesota Usage</u>	<u>FY02</u>	<u>FY03</u>	<u>Increase/Decrease</u>
<b>GALE DATABASES</b>			
Sessions	1,551,978	2,153,640	+ 39%
Searches	5,050,931	6,784,625	+ 34%
Documents Retrieved	4,351,708	5,153,082	+ 18%
<b>OCLC SEARCHES</b>	848,930	1,013,446	+ 19%
<b>NEWSPAPERS *</b>	527,605	N/A	N/A
<b>ELECTRONIC BOOKS</b>	30,269	62,232	+105%

\*Suspended in MN statewide for FY03 but now available in FY04

MINITEX provides some academic libraries with licensed electronic resources, but usage statistics not available at this time. These include full-text scholarly journals from Elsevier, American Chemical Society, Project MUSE, and OVID for nursing journals.

# MINITEX Resource-Sharing Report: Comments (Nov. 2003)

(Comments are sorted in the order of the questions on the Feedback Form with general responses appearing at the end. The comments have been edited for brevity and clarity.)

1. **Do you foresee trends in addition to those identified in the "Future Trends" section of this report that will impact MINITEX's Resource-Sharing programs?**

- a. Agree with trends identified. I have noticed a marked increase in resource sharing of video/DVD materials. (Augustana College)
- b. The publishing picture for science journals is still in something of an upheaval. As more journals move to e-only publication, and, as libraries add more databases that inform users of publications, the demand for delivery is likely to increase, yet the economics of STM publishing have reached a point where things are really in flux. The boycott of *Cell* is a good example. How content creators and consumers (through libraries) respond will no doubt influence how we share information. Kind of an exciting time! (Gustavus Adolphus College)
- c. You have mentioned archiving problems related to copyright; in general it can be said that potential problems related to archiving are likely to be huge and include not only copyright issues, but also outright loss of materials. (Minnesota State University, Mankato)
- d. ... The major loss will be from funding reductions, since few individual libraries can cover lost resources from budget cuts. (Century College)
- e. With more and more of our acquisition dollars going to purchase the same electronic databases, the diversity of our collections will suffer. (College of St. Benedict/St. John's University)
- f. Trend 1.e. Economies of scale and cost effectiveness will necessarily extend to other "major" collections as libraries become more inter-dependent, forcing more collaborative and coordinated collection management.  
Trend 2.c. Availability of AV materials may be restricted as some libraries move to streaming as the primary means of access.  
Trend 3.e/f. The interdependency of libraries and collections and the enhanced MnLINK Gateway will create more direct library-to-patron and library-to-library lending than funneled-through-MINITEX lending; this in turn will create stress on staff to maintain expected turn-around and delivery.  
Trend 4. The loss of MINITEX referrals has required some libraries to shift allocations from acquisitions to borrowing to fulfill user expectations.  
Trend 6. Increasing cost of publisher subscription packages will limit library willingness to continue pursuing group discounts without some corresponding economic benefits. Increasing dependence upon electronic journals is already squeezing acquisition budgets and resource sharing. New pricing models for all formats of electronic information are inevitable, but will they arrive before budget support fails?  
Trend 7. Along with collection interdependencies, the Web will engender local, regional, and global service interdependencies as users expect not only access but assistance to be delivered electronically wherever and whenever. (St. Cloud State University)

- g. I would expect to see electronic sharing of other formats. e.g. online music, (i.e. the classical music database that is now available - subscription allows you to download as needed according to terms of license) and movie databases, where libraries would subscribe instead of buy physical DVDs. (Concordia University)
- h. One trend I see as worrisome relates to the expectations of participating libraries. With continued budget cuts to many libraries, they may be able to purchase fewer of the materials their users need, increasing the numbers of items they must borrow to provide good service. Will they be able to continue to provide the expected percentage of service locally? (This also relates to Trend #2.) Reduced professional staffing would also have an effect on the ability of trained staff to navigate the choices available to patrons; for example, identifying all the possible sources of an article electronically. Using MINITEX, as default in more cases will result in more requests, when some could have been filled locally, given the right expertise on staff. (MN Legislative Reference Library)
- i. Due to the continuing downward trend of state funding, state universities are going to be aggressive in trying to distinguish themselves. . . . This will have library implications. Demand for two kinds of electronic resources will increase: those that are "student centered" (i.e. those that can serve the student population whether or not they can be explicitly linked to classroom use -- examples being the Gale/Peterson databases and, perhaps, the CQ databases) and very specific databases that will serve those students enrolled in the "new" flagship programs (those that the university is marketing). (Winona State University)
- j. Decreased funding at local, state, and federal levels will lead to increased reliance on shared resources and MINITEX services. (Great River Regional Library)
- k. I think there will be growing demand for site-specific delivery (especially for reference/research requests) and that people and businesses will expect it electronically. Those who demand the physical materials will also increasingly seek site-specific delivery but may be willing to pay for it. There will be less and less patience with not having access to materials over distance. Why must I travel to get that genealogical resource when I know it could be scanned and delivered? Why aren't the newspapers from the 1920's available remotely from the Historical Society? Genealogy has been an important hobby for the middle-aged and older for years and, I think, even more so with the advent of so much support software, ancestry.com type resources and library cooperative lending (let alone the aging Baby Boom bubble who are used to demanding and getting needs met.) (SELCO)

2. **Do you foresee trends in addition to those identified in the "Future Trends" section of this report that will impact your library's resource-sharing services?**

- a. Our physicians like to have the print version of the journal, so it's likely our print subscriptions in the library will continue along with the online journals we have access to. However, print journals purchased by departments have decreased & online access, dept.-specific, has increased. (Avera McKennan Hospital, Sioux Falls)
- b. I see that electronic resources and media resources are sapping our book budget at an alarming rate. Since I do not think my library is unique, I wonder if we will have to go farther afield to obtain the requested book titles. (Augustana College)
- c. Expectations have grown among our users that they can get anything conveniently and quickly. We will have to see how these expectations will be funded--e.g. paying copyright fees, sharing costs of e-journal bundles, even footing the bill for computers and printing. We also need to address with our

faculty the pedagogical implications. The thing our students have the most trouble with is sorting through the abundance, reading carefully, and working with the sources they obtain. In an odd sense, by increasing access these questions become more and more pressing. (Gustavus Adolphus College)

- d. In MnSCU, the library's situation seems to depend on the local campus administration, . . . (Century College)
- e. Having only last 5 years in for some electronic databases will cause real problems 5 years from now if we all cancel our paper copies. (College of St. Benedict/St. John's University)
- f. Trend 7. Along with collection interdependencies, the Web will engender local, regional, and global service interdependencies as users expect not only access but assistance to be delivered electronically wherever and whenever. In order to fulfill this need, resource sharing will need to extend to human as well as content resources (e.g., virtual reference). This may extend to shared and jointly managed Web-based training and literacy programs. Another trend in this category is regional sharing of jointly managed servers to support resource tools, such as LibData, for user benefit. And last, in this area, is the increasing digitization for distributed access of rare and/or fragile primary and historic materials, e.g., photographs, texts, manuscripts, etc. (St. Cloud State University)
- g. Nothing other than our budgetary struggles. (St. Louis Park Junior High)
- h. It is hard to predict what will happen in the copyright realm (a bit of a wild card) but it is possible that some strange rulings may come about. (Concordia University)
- i. One POSTIVE trend is how technology continues to improve access. We scan reports mandated by the Legislature -- now if someone wants them, they needn't borrow them at all, just print them. Scanning is also a great solution to providing copies of high-interest, yet short and non-copyrighted, items from our collection. We prefer not to send a 50 page irreplaceable old report from our collection off to another state, and we opt to just make a scanned pdf and attach it to an e-mail. (MN Legislative Reference Library)
- j. No, I think you've identified them all. Just want to emphasize that we must cut paper subscriptions (when duplicated electronically) to fund growing demand for electronic full-text. (Winona State University)
- k. Limited local funding of staff hours dedicated to training may limit use of on-line resources, which are constantly changing (updates and expansions). Local staff need to be trained to train local customers to use these databases. (Great River Regional Library)
- l. I think the growing use of multiple libraries by [an]. . . individual and the use of multiple. . . phone numbers by individuals. . . [will] make master patron records difficult to maintain and an important aspect of resource sharing will be pinning down the where and how to deliver the request. (SELCO)

3. **Do you have suggestions for how MINITEX and its participating libraries can deal most effectively with these trends?**

- a. Keep communicating about what is expected of each library on an ongoing basis. (Avera McKennan Hospital, Sioux Falls)

- b. The most effective technique of dealing with identified trends has been to continue our path of negotiating group purchases and creating interoperable systems. (Augustana College)
- c. The combination of articulating to legislators what the real value of libraries is AND building an effective and grassroots decision-making process that invites so much participation has been mind-blowingly well done. Really. (Gustavus Adolphus College)
- d. ILL forms should be created consortially so that they are consistent and, therefore, easily serviced. (Minnesota State University, Mankato)
- e. I believe there has to be a carefully developed plan to deal with difficulties, with central impact as well as on specific library sites, such as campuses, which do not even give resources for a librarian supervising the library. . . . (Century College)
- f. We should look to at least one library in the region maintaining a paper copy of each of the electronic titles that we get. I think it is time that the libraries understand their responsibilities in our collaborative efforts. MINITEX cannot do everything on their own. They need our support. (College of St. Benedict/St. John's University)
- g. . . . many of the trends outlined will have an impact upon each library, and potentially each user, in the region as well as MINITEX. Solutions will require creativity, willingness to change, and considerable sweat; engaged collaboration will be required. Will individual libraries understand the need for this investment? Will legislators, who simply say, "make it so," understand the benefit and the cost? (St. Cloud State University)
- h. Continue to act as a facilitator to encourage libraries to work in smaller groups to gain common goals. I'm thinking of our plan to get a small group of interested librarians together to discuss ways we can cooperate. (Winona State University)
- i. Continue to look for efficiencies in procedures and staffing patterns. Solicit support from MN legislators to provide state funds for delivery of materials between library systems and types. Consider making this part of the MLA/MEMO platform. (Greater River Regional Library)
- j. I think we have to push for changes in copyright and digitization to satisfy the public. I also think there is potential for the distribution of electronic files that have a "shelf-life" built in to them. (SELCO)

4. **Do you have questions about aspects of MINITEX's Document Delivery, Delivery, and Electronic Resource Licensing programs that are not answered in this report?**

- a. No. I've been the recipient of articles sent to me via e-mail and feel that works quite efficiently. (Avera McKennan Hospital, Sioux Falls)
- b. I just want to point out that from the user's perspective, the MEDD program is just fantastic. It's so good in fact that some of our students prefer ILL to using local materials. Which is yet another one of those interesting unintended consequences that makes us reexamine local services. A good thing. (Gustavus Adolphus College)
- c. Overall, the MINITEX planning and implementation have been careful and thorough, and the success without waste has helped the state libraries have a strong credibility - and delivery does form a core

for interlibrary resource sharing, and gives obvious and direct proof of benefit to students and patrons. (Century College)

- d. A reminder of the services we have available to us other than ELM, i.e. document delivery as it relates to metro area K-12 schools. (St. Louis Park Junior High)

**5. Do you have other questions about resource sharing?**

- a. I worry about maintaining a unique collection/identity in this era of aggregators and shared electronic resources. It seems like our resources along with society are becoming more homogenized. Ultimately, this may be a good thing, but I am not sure. (Augustana College)
- b. Just a very vague, inchoate thought that somehow in our library systems we need to build in some kinds of help for people who want to find "really good sources" now that we have tools to find "billions and billions of sources." I know the underlying premise of Google's ranking algorithm is not unproblematic, but we really need to consider algorithms for ranking results other than by date or author's name in the alphabet. These are the six most often cited books on this subject. These journals are more important than those. Combinations would be terrific -- these are the six most important books on the topic published since 1995. I think as librarians we shy away from making these judgments, but when can search WorldCat for nearly a billion books, alphabetical order isn't really that helpful. The ISI model isn't quite what I'm looking for because it's so tied to arcane sub-sub-disciplines of the sciences, but something less scattershot than what we get with, say, Gale databases. Even the old HW Wilson practice of voting on which journals to index was better than this over-abundance of unsorted stuff. Sorry, that wasn't what you asked.... but is sort of tied to resource sharing in that we're approaching a strange nexus of "I want everything right now" and "okay, so what do I do with all this?" (Gustavus Adolphus College)
- c. Will MnLINK ever become a resource for coordinated collection management as well as facilitated user access? Will institutions be willing to "share" human resources to benefit users beyond traditional boundaries? (St. Cloud State University)
- d. Has there been any attempt to analyze collection development in the various consortia? (Concordia University)

**GENERAL RESPONSES:**

- a. I spend so much of my life on myriads of other things -- computer security, personnel issues, IFO contract negotiations, etc. etc., that it was good to review a summary of library trends and data specific to our region. It was particularly helpful for me to think about the impact of electronic access on users and library services. As you indicate, we can expect these changes to continue to put pressure on our resource-sharing activities. I'm not sure how big the surge will continue to be for MnSCU libraries (3.a) since many of us have had those funds removed or dwindled away because of increased costs/budget cuts. So this may have been a small blip in the whole framework of things....Of course, I have an ongoing concern with using electronic resources when it comes to continuation and backfiles. (St. Cloud State University)
- b. Message #1: I think this report was excellent and the trends it forecasts are right on. Expectations by users continue and will continue to rise. ... It is clear. . .that libraries of all types will depend more and more on shared state-provided resources. Some of the trends cited will be exaggerated because of funding issues. Especially true is the need for increased educations of patrons, especially as one is

forced to shift databases because of shrinking resources. The long-term use of ebooks is still unsettled. I believe they will dominate reference type materials, but they do not answer at least at present, the humanities need for guaranteed access and easy reading for sustained narratives as they are presently constituted in books. This not a trend, but I believe there is a need for the library community to advance beyond fixed aggregations of journals as we are presently forced to buy. We need to be able to subscribe to journals that best suit our own clientele. This would also make for more efficient use of funds. I also agree that there will be increasing pressure on all library staff to deliver the goods.

Message #2: Another trend that might have a significant [impact] upon the delivery of information is "online education" or what term one uses to describe this development. More and more people, companies for training and institutions of higher education are using and developing materials for this form of education. These people will need research materials. Not all of them will be provided by the online provide. That means they will look to more local resources or even more likely to state or consortial resources. Just how it will play out is uncertain at this point. But it will probably have a big impact on what we do. (Martin Luther College)

- c. I have the following comments to share from the **MELSA Advisory Team**:

Do you want to put something in #2 on p. 2 about library collection budget cuts impacting the amount of requests made for materials in the next few years??- I have to believe that the decreased collections will mean fewer materials available locally which in turn will generate requests.

I question trend 4. We go direct for some things and get very quick service. I also question the growth of e-books as discussed in trend 6.

The only suggestion I have is to remove "movies" on the bottom of page 2, since videotapes and DVDs are not just movies.

We've also seen loan requests increase because of books mentioned on websites and databases, and, because these are often more obscure than titles they would have seen in the Star Tribune, we often have to go outside MINITEX to borrow them, with mixed success. If the library allows e-mail requests, we sometimes receive the item within a week! Other times we can't get the item at all. And there's a definite increase in requests for AV! Which is more time-consuming for many reasons (have to check lending policies more than with books, more pieces to count, less uniform than books so harder to band and circulate).

I don't think trend 4 matters to us greatly--I don't think we were getting all that much through MINITEX from libraries outside MN, ND, SD, and WI, so we just add them to the ones we're going National for.

As to how we can deal with increased demand and fewer staff -- we'll try to be more efficient. If these trends slow down our service, we may be more likely to encourage patrons to travel to the nearest owning library for faster service, or try to find alternatives within our own system and collection of databases. If journal articles are not available via ILL, patrons may be able to pay for online articles from the publishers.