

MERLIN Interlibrary Loan Committee
Minutes of August 10, 1999

Attendees:

Library Systems Office

Janet Jackson, jacksonjl@umsystem.edu

Saint Louis University

Doris Beeson, Pius, beesondj@slu.edu

Mary Ann McFarland, Health Sciences,
mcfarlma@slu.edu

MaryAnn Samson, Law, samsonma@slu.edu

David Shocklee, Pius, shockldg@slu.edu

Mary Smith, Health Sciences, smithma@slu.edu

University of Missouri, Columbia

June DeWeese, Ellis, deweesej@missouri.edu

Alice Edwards, Health Sciences,
edwardsaj@health.missouri.edu

Resa Kerns, Law, kernsr@missouri.edu

Marilyn Voegelé, Ellis, voegelem@missouri.edu

University of Missouri, Kansas City

Janet McKinney, Law, mckinneyj@umkc.edu

Nancy Radonovich

University of Missouri, Rolla

Minnie Brewer, mbreuer@umr.edu

University of Missouri, St. Louis

Mary Zettwoch, TJL, zettwoch@umsl.edu

Washington University

Judy Fox, Olin, judy-fox@library.wustl.edu

Nada Vaughn, Olin, nvaughn@library.wustl.edu

Vicky Witte, Olin,
victoria-witte@library.wustl.edu

Recorder: MaryAnn Samson

Review of minutes from October 29, 1998.

* The minutes of October 29 will be redistributed as some people received the minutes and others didn't. When Janet McKinney's CPU was rebuilt, all her e-mail was lost. Nancy Radonovich (recorder) will forward the minutes to the list.

Presentation on implications of the Digital Millennium Copyright Act on interlibrary loan by Nancie Hawke (UM System Counsel)

* Two recent cases of interest for copyright as it pertains to interlibrary loan are 188F3d 199 (Hotaling v Church Of Jesus Christ Of Latter-Day Saints) and 728 FS 873 (Association Of American Medical Colleges v. Carey).

Hotaling v Church Of Jesus Christ Of Latter-Day Saints deals with archival rights. Church of Christ of the Latter-Day Saints bought

two copies of a genealogical item. One item was for archival purposes and the other was put into the public catalog. The court ruled that the item could be put in the public catalog. This case focuses on distribution rights.

Association Of American Medical Colleges v. Carey deals with ownership of unpublished material. In this case the MCAT test. The law was amended to say that New York Department of Education was an archival unit and therefore could store the MCAT in their archives.

- * Creation of three digital copies for archives may be created. But the item may not be made available outside the library. The digital copy can be lent but cannot be used outside the borrowing library. The focus is on digital format rather than paper. It should not be sent to a person's e-mail account. It is all right for the lending library to scan a paper copy and send digitally to the borrowing library who prints out the request just for the patron. Libraries may also request that paper items be sent directly to the patron (faxes, mail).

- * 1976 CONTU guidelines are still in place.

- * Transmission of a paper copy electronically to the patron could be a problem because the item sent would be in digital form. The digital form could be altered and then distributed by the patron. ARIEL users who send directly to the patron's e-mail are affected.

- * The Act focuses on the physical building not a virtual library.

- * A 400 page report focuses on some of the copyright issues in distant learning.

- * Electronic reserves-Libraries are to keep records and pay copyright fees. If an article is not on the system, a letter must be sent to CCC. A response will be slow from CCC and the decision of whether to allow on reserve or not probably will come after the semester has ended. The rule of thumb is that it is ok to leave the article on for one semester while CCC makes its decision. ILL charges among MIRACL libraries.

- * Janet McKinney read a memo from Jean Eisenman to Ralph Caruso, dated April 22, 1999, which stated

"...that we agreed to levy no charges for patron-initiated

requests from any MIRACL member. We have also agreed to waive any overdue fines incurred by borrowers on those materials.

However, after combing our collective notes and memories, it seems apparent there never was a similar agreement-or even any discussion-regarding those request t hat go through the tradition interlibrary loan channels."

Bags v. bins.

- * MOBIUS has voted that the courier will be part of their operating cost. One half will be paid by the State of Missouri and one half will be paid by each participating library. A sliding scale will be used to determine the cost per library. There will be one pickup site per campus. There can be multiple pickup sites on a campus if the library requesting the additional site is willing to pay the additional cost (approx. \$1300).

The pricing is done per stop per day (\$9.50 per day) totaling \$2600. Lanter has an existing state contact and MOBIUS is pigging backing onto that contract with added specifics to MOBIUS. It is going to the Executive Committee and if approved goes back to LSO, legal looks it over and it is then signed. October 1, 1999 is the goal for implementation. If the libraries run out of bags, jiffy bags can be used as long as they are address correctly.

- * Several members voiced concern over using bags for large shipments of books and whether the UM courier system would still be in operation.

- * Everyone stated that additional bags needed to be ordered immediately since it was felt that the first order of bags would not be enough.

- * Some members voiced concern over having to keep track of the bags bar codes.

Innovative ILL module.

- * Module must be able to go to OCLC ILL Direct Request. Washington University is currently doing the Beta test on this feature.

- * June DeWeese will be attending a demo on OCLC Distributed Resource Sharing Software.

- * ACTION ITEM: Concerning the III ILL module what is exactly ready currently, what enhancements are in process and when are the enhancement expected to be completed, and what future enhancements are to come?

- * A Committee decision on implementation will be made when the above facts are known. The Committee also would prefer to wait for all components to be functioning rather than settle for what is there now. Some members voiced

concerns that III might not be responsive to ILL concerns and improvements if we signed on at this time.

- * III profiling sheets for the ILL module were handed out. Nada Vaughan went over the profiling sheets since they have already filled theirs out. Notices can be customized and can have for each library. Washington University has been a beta test of v.12 since April 1999. Parts are klunky but future enhancements are expected to streamline the process. There is no paper involved because all transactions are done online. The system should get easier as enhancements come out. Feeling at Washington University is that photocopy requests should not be counted toward the total number of items a patron may have at one time.

Purge of old ILL patron records.

- * MaryAnn Samson suggested that ILL patron records with an expiration date of 1982 be purged. Purging would result in fewer patron records and a faster database response time. MaryAnn Samson will create a list in the review file of all ILL patron records with an expiration date of 1982 and no book checkouts. Each library will be responsible for looking at the file and deciding to delete or keep.

New Chair and next meeting.

- * Resa Kerns, University of Missouri-Columbia, Law, volunteered as the next chair.

- * November 2, 1999 is the next meeting.

Adjourned around 2:30 p.m.