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Summary

In this case study we investigated the technical feasibility and desirability of an OAB-enabled set of interventions in interlibrary loan forms and backroom processing. We conclude that this is in fact feasible, with many routes to delivery.

At Huddersfield we found a 2 to 4x reduction in the steps required to submit an ILL using OAB technology to remove data-entry from interlibrary loan forms, which would also increase data quality for staff. We also found that you could instantly supply ~20% of requests made through the form with subscribed content and green Open Access content. For staff, the Open Access Button could enable them to easily check green Open Access sources as part of their workflow and, with further development, radically reduce the work required to process an interlibrary loan.

We’d like to thank the staff at the University of Huddersfield (especially Christopher Beevers and Janet Chandler) for their time, expertise and openness during this process.

Background

This case study forms part of a broader lisc project with the Open Access Button to assess the feasibility of a service in the discovery/interlibrary loan (ILL) workflow utilising Open Access Button functionality to aid the discovery, creation and promotion of Open Access content. The case studies have run in parallel with work package one, which gathered evidence from a range of institutions as to how the creation of a service could
deliver the most benefit to the most institutions by developing use-cases to articulate where the service could sit within the discovery/ILL workflow. Within the case studies, we aim to understand the feasibility and desirability of each of the use-cases in greater depth at institutions. These two bodies of work will then inform the development of an assessment, in work package three, of whether there is value in developing any potential service further.

In work package one, we found a desire from ILL staff to integrate the Open Access Button into their workflows as it provided a way to make sure all ILLs could benefit from Open Access Button features.

![Diagram showing a traditional “discovery to delivery” pathway based on interviews carried out with 15 UK university libraries. The intervention points explored in this case study are highlighted. For more, see the work package one report.](image)

The University of Huddersfield was chosen as our case study to explore this use case. They use Summon for library search and its link resolver. Huddersfield utilizes CLIO for its ILL management, which, while not used widely within the university sector in the UK, has unique features many universities desire. Both Summon & CLIO present more of a challenge for the Open Access Button to provide value as they include, in some form, features we could provide in other systems.

In this case study, our objectives were to use the Open Access Button’s ability to find and make available Open Access resources, and user experience expertise, to:

1. Identify how to deliver existing Open Access content as soon as possible within ILL systems
2. Identify how to enable patrons to access content through streamlining the creation of ILLs and requests to authors
3. Explore broader challenges within ILL staff workflows, and how the Open Access Button's approach may be helpful.

This is one of three case studies exploring opportunities based on previously identified use-cases. Case study 2 at the University of York aimed to explore how to provide existing Open Access content into library search and link resolvers, while providing seamless access to the ILL system and Open Access Button requests. Case study 1 at the Imperial College London aimed to analyse the potential impact of stand-alone apps for delivering library services.

Current workflows and challenges
We asked campuses to write up and screenshot their current workflows. These were then reviewed remotely, and viewed in-person to clarify and expand how the systems worked and felt.

To establish a metric for the effectiveness of a workflow, we analysed the number of steps required from a user to achieve an objective. Here, a step may be clicking a link or button, or filling in a field. For this purpose, we've assumed a user's objective is landing on an article splash page (as clicks required to access full text may vary by journal). Where a “next-step” for a user wasn't visible on the page they were on, two numbers are presented, either infinite (where a user doesn't know where to go) or the lowest possible number if they did.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Workflows</th>
<th>Steps</th>
<th>Challenges</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Making an ILL      | Either: 1. User arrives from Summon  
|                    |   a. User on link resolver. Clicks ILL request link.  
|                    |   b. User lands on ILL page, must sign in (3 steps).  
|                    |   c. Information is already filled in, as far as possible. Copyright  
|                    |   statement is acknowledged.  
|                    |   d. Submit form.  
|                    |   e. Wait for delivery.  
|                    | 2. User arrives directly at ILL page.  
|                    |   ● User lands on ILL page, must sign in (3 steps).  
|                    |   ● User lands in on ILL system homepage. User clicks “new request”.  
|                    |   ● Fills in information. 2x steps for each field, assumed 5 fields.  
|                    |   ● Submit form.  
|                    |   ● Wait for delivery.  
|                    | Metrics: 1. 7 steps.  
|                    |   2. 14 steps.  
|                    |                                                                 | • Landing for ILL form is unfriendly.  
|                    |                                                                 | • Needing to key in copyright  
|                    |                                                                 | acknowledgement seems unnecessary  
|                    |                                                                 | compared to modern systems.  
|                    |                                                                 | • Not clear which fields are mandatory.  
|                    |                                                                 | • Copyright info provided upfront will  
|                    |                                                                 | likely be forgotten about by time  
|                    |                                                                 | request is fulfilled.  
|                    |                                                                 | • Words like “interlibrary loan” or  
|                    |                                                                 | “interlend” are likely unfamiliar to  
|                    |                                                                 | users.  
|                    |                                                                 | • ILL form needs many fields a user is  
|                    |                                                                 | unlikely to have immediately,  
|                    |                                                                 | requiring going back & forth. High  
|                    |                                                                 | chance of mis-entry, or not bothering.  
|                    |                                                                 | • ILL form is poorly designed for mobile  
|                    |                                                                 | or web use.  
|                    |                                                                 | • Landing page for ILL encourages lots  
|                    |                                                                 | of reading before using service.  
| Processing ILL     | ● Open CLIO. Navigate to new requests screen.  
| requests           | ● Open first request.  
|                    | ● Copy journal title into Summon & search (4 steps).  
|                    | ● Identify holdings information for record. Check this verse date of  
|                    | ● article given (3 steps).  
|                    | EITHER: 1. Send article found to patron.  
|                    |   a. Send pre-worded email.  
|                    | 2. Check the BL API  
|                    |                                                                 | • Staff must manually activate, interpret  
|                    |                                                                 | and process checks of various (even  
|                    |                                                                 | built-in) sources. This feels  
|                    |                                                                 | unnecessary given a relatively clear  
|                    |                                                                 | decision tree being present, and  
|                    |                                                                 | services using APIs.  
|                    |                                                                 | • Incorrect mapping of metadata  
|                    |                                                                 | leading to automatic searches being  
|                    |                                                                 | ineffective.  
|                    |                                                                 |
| 1. If found within time limits, send to BL (3 steps). | • Processing over the weekend, when students and researchers are still working. |
| 2. If not found, check Suncat. | a. Suncat presents a long list of options, and staff pick with well defined criteria. |
| i. EITHER: |  
| a. On CLIO, go to BL API tab. | 
| b. Click “check API”. |  
| i. EITHER: |  
| 1. If found within time limits, send to BL (3 steps). |  
| 2. If not found, check Suncat. |  
| a. Suncat presents a long list of options, and staff pick with well defined criteria. |  

Table 1. A comparison of various existing workflows relevant to the case study for accessing articles.
It should be noted that CLIO provided a significantly better experience for staff and patrons than what we've seen with “mainstream” ILL systems.

Exploring OAB-enabled Workflows
We discussed with library staff why workflows existed, the challenges they presented, and what potential solutions may be. After consideration and discussion a short list of options was generated. While Huddersfield's workflows and considerations were front of mind in this process, we also informed this with what we hear from other campuses more broadly.

Working with our developers and designers, we analysed solutions to these challenges with staff feedback. This work was also informed by user testing (both live, and in report format) of the systems and usage metrics provided to us. In this section, we'll speak to the feasibility and desirability of different interventions. In our work, a few simple rules guided us:

1. Use words users understand, and provide information only as needed
2. Limit complexity and standardise aggressively
3. Try and do work on the user's behalf, but plan to fail well

Please note that any following designs are to be used primarily for exploring possible implementations of a service. Their copy, styles and even user flow do not necessarily reflect a finished product. The included designs are provided to make some of the ideas we're outlining more tangible, and enable better feedback and discussion - rather than account for every scenario or circumstance. Other means of delivering the same benefits in the same place are usually possible.

Identify how to deliver existing Open Access content as soon as possible within ILL systems

1. Using the Open Access Button to check Open Access self-archived sources as part of staff workflow

Prior work with Imperial College London showed it was possible for us to automatically check ILL requests (made through the Open Access Button) for Open Access alternatives. Here, we tried to replicate this for ILLs made through traditional routes. Two clear routes stand out as feasible, desirable options here. First, using the existing Open Access Button website or API within ILL systems. In this case study, we found we could simply include a new “tab” within Clio to the Open Access Button site to enable a manual check.
Second, adapting our plugins to work on ILL pages. Usually, our plugins only work on journal pages; however, there is no reason why this couldn't also include web-based ILL systems. This would mean staff could simply click the Open Access Button without leaving the pages they're normally working on.

Both these approaches require little technical work, could work on a broad range of systems and are desirable for staff vs. the current status quo.

2. Integrating the creation of author requests inside staff's normal workflow

Currently, no institutions request authors make work available as part of their ILL process; however, many saw the sector-level value. For individual institutions, there was a challenge making it relevant “for them”. However, some opportunities were clear and seen as desirable from staff:

- Having requests provide a “freemium” alternative to ILLs
- Having requests sent automatically when ILL requests are made (before staff moderate them) and fulfilling an ILL request through this content if it’s successful prior to an ILL being made.

In actually implementing this, staff saw it as critical that a request to an author didn't slow a traditional ILL request, and that this added little to no work for staff. Staff also wanted to minimise the work patrons needed to use this system, and ensure that their privacy wasn't risked through its use. While staff thought there would be hurdles to implementing this on campus, they didn't feel these weren't easily surmountable.
In the case of Huddersfield, we agree a system is feasible where:

- All article requests, where Open Access is unavailable, would initiate a request to the author.
- Staff would send the request message from their institutional e-mail accounts (with “mailto” links generated by the Open Access team to keep this straightforward).
- No patron information would be provided in the request message.
- Requests would suggest that “a researcher” on campus wanted the article in question.
- If successful, the Open Access copy would only be supplied if the ILL request had not already been fulfilled by traditional means.

However, other configurations could exist that fulfil these same criteria.

**Identify how to enable patrons to access content through streamlining the creation of ILLs and requests to authors**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description / Discussion</th>
<th>Proposed</th>
<th>Current Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>On this page we've limited information to what would be now needed with added functionality. By integrating with the university's catalog and moving user authentication to the final step all we must ask the user to do is tell us what they want!</td>
<td>If the library doesn't have the resource you need, you can request that our staff find you a copy.</td>
<td><img src="image_url" alt="Image" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For users coming from the web, we can use technology like that powering our homepage to reduce the user input required. If they come with a DOI, URL or article title / citation a specific article can usually be identified. Reduced user input will reduce the steps and time needed to fill in the form, as well as data entry errors.</td>
<td></td>
<td><img src="image_url" alt="Image" /></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
If, as is common, the campus actually has access, we can deliver that result instantly through the use of an integration with Summon. A record of this fulfilled request could be logged for staff records.

This page (and all results pages) looks identical to a similar result from the link resolver. As the interlibrary loan system is not well known, or understood, keeping its design similar to other systems will aid usability.

Tuning a cellular lipid kinase activity hepatitis C virus to replication in cell culture

Meyrath, Ma Romero-Brey, Ines Schenk, Christian Condeau, Claire
Nature Microbiology 2016, Vol 2(5)
doi:10.1038/nmicrobiol.2016.247

Wrong article?

We have the full article
Access the article instantly here.

The functionality for this doesn't exist in ILL systems. Currently, staff reject the request and include a direct link to either the e-version of the article or to the specific catalog record for a paper copy in the notification email sent.
| If an Open Access copy is available a link can be provided instantly. It was suggested by staff that this should be prominent, but that information about the version should be provided. In simple terms, we've tried to provide that here.

If the patron is not happy with the Open Access version, a link to submit an ILL is shown. The phrase “This request will take up to 8 calendar days to be fulfilled” is intended to be dynamically generated based on what is being looked for. This can be done with API integrations to major sources and knowledge of when a campus will moderate requests (e.g. if it’s 8pm on a Friday, add two days to any estimate).

| Tuning a cellular lipid kinase activity hepatitis C virus to replication in cell culture
Mayrath, Ma Romero-Brey, Ines Schenk, Christian Gondeau, Claire
Nature Microbiology, 2016, Vol 2(1)
doi:10.1038/nmicrobiol.2016.247

| The functionality for this doesn't exists in ILL systems.

| There is a free, instantly accessible copy online
This may not be the final published version. It may be a version without graphs or images. You can request the final published version from the Library.

https://core.ac.uk/download/pdf/77010522.pdf

| Ask the Library to get you the published full-text
There is a £2 charge for each request. This request will take up to 8 calendar days to be fulfilled.

Ask the Library.
Tuning a cellular lipid kinase activity hepatitis C virus to replication in cell culture

Meyrath, Ma Romero-Brey, Ines Schenk, Christian Gondeau, Claire
Nature Microbiology, 2016, Vol 2(3)
doi:10.1038/nmicrobiol.2016.247

Wrong article?

Ask to make this research available

The Library can contact the author on your behalf to ask that a copy be made freely available online, for your and other readers’ use. This service is free, and may be faster than asking the Library to get you a copy. This may not be the final published version. It may be a version without graphs or images. You can request the final published version below.

Ask for a free copy.

Ask the Library to get you the published full-text

There is a £2 charge for each request. This request will take up to 8 calendar days to be fulfilled.

Ask the Library.

The functionality for this doesn't exists in ILL systems.
A streamlined ILL form can still be provided should other methods fail. This is a “safe” fallback point that can always be one click away, or defaulted to if uncertainty levels be too high.

As what article is desired at this point isn’t known, delivery information can be given from campus averages.

---

Ask the Library to get you a copy

We just need some additional information about your request, please complete as many of the remaining fields as you can. * are required.

### Article Details

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title *</th>
<th>An Account of a Very Odd Monstrous Calf</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Author / Editor</td>
<td>Boyle, Robert</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>URL</td>
<td><a href="http://rsti.royalsocietypublishing.org/content">http://rsti.royalsocietypublishing.org/content</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DOI</td>
<td>10.1038/microbiol.2016.247</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year of publication *</td>
<td>1965</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volume *</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part / Issue</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pages</td>
<td>1-10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Journal Details

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title *</th>
<th>Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Soc-</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ISSN</td>
<td>0970-2316</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There is a £2 charge for each request. This request will take up to 8 calendar days to be fulfilled.

---

2. I will not use the copy except for research for a non-commercial purpose or private study and will not supply a copy of it to any other person.

3. To the best of my knowledge, no other person with whom I work or study has made, or intends to make at about the same time as this request, a request for substantially the same material for substantially the same purposes.

4. If this item was delivered by an electronic method (which includes facsimile transmission), I will retain only a single paper copy and destroy any electronic copies after printing.

I understand that if this declaration is false in any material particular the copy supplied to me by you will be an infringing copy and that I shall be liable for infringement of copyright as if I had made it myself.

**Please key “YES” in the relevant field below to indicate that you agree to abide by these terms.**

---

Your Details Chris Beavers
Email Address: c.j.beevers@hud.ac.uk
Status: S
School: GLS
Staff I.d. card number: 7414153045

Book/Journal Title Pfla Medica
Article Author Balecz, A.Boke, E.Veligh, K.Reestar, A.
Article Title Supercritical extraction of marine alkaloids I
Volume 91
Issue 16
Pages PN_134
Date 2015-11-01
Publisher Georg Themen Verlag
Place of Publication
ISSN 0002-0643

***I will abide by copyright***

**YES**

Cost Centre
Notes info.rsti summon serialssolutions.com

Check Library Catalogue Submit Request
Initially, we suggested a passive acceptance of the copyright declaration (e.g. by submitting this for you agree to [link to copyright declaration]) as is increasingly standard practice. However, feedback suggested this wasn't in the libraries' interest and in at least some cases would be unlikely to be implementable. In those cases, we'd suggest tying accepting the declaration to a user's sign-in. This process mimics traditional signatures and requires the attention of the user while not presenting additional steps.

Generally, we suggest both these processes should be moved as far back in the process as possible - after the patron has decided they do want an ILL.

Read the Terms and Conditions
I declare that:
- I have not previously been supplied with a copy of the same material by you or any other librarian.
- I will use the material ONLY for research for a non-commercial purpose.
- I will not supply a copy of the material to any other person.
- To the best of my knowledge, no other person with whom I work or study has made, or intends to make, at or about the time of this request, a request for substantially the same material and substantially the same purpose.
- I will abide by any conditions dictated by the supplying library when the copy is received.

I understand that if the declaration is false in a material particular, the poly supplied to me by you will be an infringing copy, and I shall be liable for infringement of copyright as if I had made the copy myself.

Please authenticate using your University account to confirm that you have read and understand the Terms and Conditions.

Username: [blank]
Password: [blank]
Submit Request

Inter library loans login
Cost Centre Recharges – If you recharge your Inter-library Loans requests, from August 1st (the start of the new Financial Year) please ask your cost centre administrator to e-mail the Document Delivery Supervisor c.j.beever@hud.ac.uk to confirm your authorisation.

Thank you

ClioWeb
Log In
Username: [blank]
Password: [blank]
Log In

Please enter the same username and password that you use to log in to University computers

You will either be taken directly to the online requests forms etc. or, if we require more information about you, you will be invited to complete a few basic details first. After submitting these you will be able to start requesting immediately.
New Request Form - Article

After reading the Copyright Declaration please enter the Article Request Information in the fields below. Mandatory fields are marked with red asterisks.

Copyright Declaration

Your document is produced and supplied under the terms of Section 41 of the U.K. Copyright, Designs and Patents Act 1988. This legislation and EU Directive 2001/29/EC require that you agree to the following, before being supplied with a copy of the extract you require.

I declare that:

1. I have not previously been supplied with a copy of the same material by you or by any other librarian.

2. I will not use the copy except for research for a non-commercial purpose or private study and will not supply a copy of it to any other person.

3. To the best of my knowledge, no other person with whom I work or study has made, or intends to make, at about the same time as this request, a request for substantially the same material for substantially the same purposes.

4. If this item was delivered by an electronic method (which includes facsimile transmission), I will retain only a single paper copy and destroy any electronic copies after printing.

I understand that if this declaration is false in any material particular the copy supplied to me by you will be an infringing copy and that I shall be liable for infringement of copyright as if I had made it myself.

*Please key "YES" in the relevant field below to indicate that you agree to abide by these terms.*

Your Details
Chris Beavers
Email Address: c.j.beavers@hud.ac.uk
Status: Student
School: CLS
Staff I.D. card number: 741415/3045

Book(s) required Title(s) Publisher(s)
Usage metrics suggest occasionally users “spend the afternoon” submitting many ILLs at once. To facilitate this, we’d suggest simply landing them back on the page for submission.

Table 2. Key points in a potential workflow, with justifications and descriptions, for interlibrary loan forms and supporting pages. For all the designs shown, including high-res images see our Github repository.
Usually the proposed ILL form could be hosted by the campus, or externally, and connected up to other systems through APIs. The form could also be upgraded using a single line of Javascript, which is a technique commonly deployed by libraries to improve their vendors' systems. Unfortunately, within CLIO it wasn't clear if we could upgrade the form in this way.

While not clearly shown, it should be noted that the URL to access Huddersfield's ILL system is long and hard to remember (http://www-old.hud.ac.uk/library/borrowing/inter-library-loans/request/). URLs are an important part of a user interface and as such this should be a priority area to improve. We didn't explore how this could be done.

Explore broader challenges within ILL staff workflows, and how the Open Access Button's approach may be helpful.

1. An automatic catalog search that staff trusted

At Imperial College London, the Open Access Button had shown that we could conduct a catalog check prior to submitting an ILL when made through our plugin. Here, we found the options for doing this were similar to delivering Open Access content at this point. The additional challenge would be connecting a system to campuses' catalog records. Where APIs for these systems exist, this is straightforward.

At Huddersfield, we found CLIO has an automatic catalog check from Summon, which staff then interpret. On arrival, this wasn't functional, but was fixed during the course of the project and works effectively. Due to time constraints, we weren't able to complete a test of an automatic check of the Summon system through the Open Access Button.

2. An automated check of all sources staff usually check.

With Huddersfield staff we aimed to understand a generalised decision tree and the sources required to process an ILL. This in-depth look matched what we've found at other institutions. We then looked at the various sources required, to try and understand how they could be used. We found that it would be possible to implement automated checks for nearly all sources. This would, at the least, reduce the time needed by staff to check these sources manually and could provide suggestions to staff on the fastest way to process an ILL. Without further testing, it's hard to say if this could be completely automated; however, it seems feasible.

Where automation reduced staff workloads, and improved patron experience, this was seen as desirable to staff. The British Library On Demand API integration is seen as incredibly desirable.

Potential Impact
To estimate the effectiveness of our interventions, we obtained historical article ILL data from the campus and used the Open Access Button API to measure how much of it we could find in Open Access form. Other figures required, such as estimates of cost, were requested to make calculations from this data. User experience improvements were judged informally through staff response, and quantified based on steps required to work through our product mock-ups (where applicable) and decreases in delivery times. The data and analysis used to generate these insights are available here.

It should be noted that the data generated by CLIO was hard to parse, and as such we were only able to run a quarter of the data given. We ran 736 records and found 8% could be obtained through self-archived Open Access sources. 14% of the ILLs Huddersfield received were already accessible through subscriptions.

**User experience**

Staff responded positively to all our interventions, and they expected users would too. Concerns were raised about our proposed presentation of the “copyright declaration”, but through rapid prototyping we were able to reach a point where staff felt comfortable. The savings in “steps” can be seen below. For users arriving through Summon, there is little benefit in clicks, although there are UX benefits, as the visual experience and organization of the workflow should be more pleasing.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Workflow</th>
<th>Traditional</th>
<th>Proposed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>User arrives from Summon</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>User arrives directly at ILL pages</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>6 if making full ILL. 3 if it’s available in catalog or OA.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Table 3. A comparison of the steps required for a user to access content with existing technology and the solutions described above.*

The average delivery time was about 5 days (from request being made to content being delivered to a patron). Utilising self-archived Open Access content, this would drop to 4.6 days. 7% of content could be delivered instantly. Further efficiency gains of up to ~20% could be achieved if content from local subscriptions could be automatically delivered immediately when requested through the form. These figures are estimated from Huddersfield’s average delivery time as record by record figures were not available.

In running the ILL data, it was clear our “false positive” rate was far too high. It could be as high as 6% of entries run. Our system is optimized to run on URLs, or DOIs, which aren’t available in traditional ILL systems. The root issue here is poor repository metadata, which isn’t possible for us to fix. However, we are making significant improvements through checking results for full text before they’re presented and training our system against similar datasets.
Cost savings

The key assumptions behind the figure are that Open Access copies could be delivered to patrons instantly, and that an insignificant number would continue to desire an ILL. We also did not calculate the value to all requests in staff time saved through automatic catalog checks, OA checks or increases in OA by making requests.

Our analysis suggests that Huddersfield could save 8% on the ILLs we were able to run by utilizing Open Access. These cost savings are calculated only by considering the direct costs saved by delivering an OA copy instantly, which is a relatively limited analysis. A further 5% could be saved through staff time spent on ILLs that could be fulfilled automatically from the catalog.