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Background
Our Document Delivery Service: What We Do

- Interlibrary Loan for all 3 U-M campuses
  - Ann Arbor, Flint, Dearborn
- Document Delivery
- Manage our Health Sciences offsite facility
- Provide office delivery of ILL material and our local collection (pre-pandemic)
- MelCat Lending-MI statewide consortia (pre-pandemic)
- Participate in Rapid, Docline, UBorrow
Context and Goals of Current Study

● Changes on the horizon:
  ○ More physical materials will be moving off site
  ○ Planning for a large, modern repository
  ○ Preparing for move to true “collective collection”
  ○ Move to new LSP

● Ideal time to learn more about:
  ○ Awareness of DD services
  ○ Use of DD services (what’s working well, areas for improvement)
  ○ Patron perceptions of upcoming changes
Methods
Study Design

Selected for survey invite using propensity score matching (matched to FY19 users)

**FY 2019 Doc Delivery Users**

- Survey Data
- DD Data
- HR Data

**FY 2014-19 Non-DD Users**

- Survey Data
- HR Data

# of uses & delivery times
Survey Participants

FY 2019 Document Delivery Users

- 1,366 in sample
  - 25% survey response rate
- 52% grad students
- 48% faculty members (all tracks/ranks)
- Broad disciplinary areas:
  - 28% arts/humanities
  - 44% STEM
  - 25% social sciences
  - 3% mixed fields (e.g., pub. health)

FY14-19 Non-Users

- 458 in sample
  - 12% survey response rate
- 67% grad students
- 33% faculty members (all tracks/ranks)
- Broad disciplinary areas:
  - 13% arts/humanities
  - 58% STEM
  - 25% social sciences
  - 3% mixed fields (e.g., pub. health)
Findings
Reported Document Delivery Use

Physical Items Delivered

- FY19 DD Users: 62% Multiple Times, 13% Once, 25% Never
- Non-Users FY14-19: 17% Multiple Times, 9% Once, 74% Never

Documents Scanned/Emailed

- FY19 DD Users: 54% Multiple Times, 15% Once, 31% Never
- Non-Users FY14-19: 9% Multiple Times, 9% Once, 82% Never
FY19 Recorded DD Use: # of Item Deliveries

1 to 10 deliveries: 67% of survey respondents
FY19 Recorded DD Use: # of Scans

1 to 10 scans: 84% of survey respondents
Recorded Document Delivery Use

wow!
FY19 Document Delivery Use by Role

Analysis of users with at least one use within each DD type

Omits extreme outliers (200 + uses)

Faculty and students not significantly different in # of uses
FY19 Document Delivery Use by Faculty Track

Analysis of users with at least one use within each DD type

Omits extreme outliers (200 + uses)
FY19 Document Delivery Use by Field Type

Analysis of users with at least one use within each DD type

Omits extreme outliers (200 + uses)
Turnaround Time Questions

**Desired TAT** → What timing would you typically want for...

**Too-Long TAT** → What would typically be too long for...

**Experienced TAT** → From what you remember, how long did delivery take for...

...delivery of physical item  
...scan/email of document

**Response Scale**

- Less than one day
- 1 day
- 2 days
- 3 days
- 4-5 days
- 6-7 days
- More than a week
Both groups quite similar

Mean TAT ratings shorter for scan/email compared to physical doc

(for both desired and too-long TATs)
Delivery Turnaround Time -- FY19 Users

Faculty and students very similar

Mean desired TAT slightly lower than mean experienced TAT

Mean experienced TAT well lower than too-long TAT
Scan Turnaround Time -- FY19 Users

Scan TAT ratings lower than delivery TATs

But same pattern:

- Faculty & students similar
- Desired TAT slightly lower than experienced TAT
- Experienced TAT well lower than too-long TAT
Turnaround Times -- FY19 Users by Field

No big differences across broad academic areas

Delivery

Scan/Email
Non-Use of Delivery & Scanning Services

Why lack of use among many in comparison sample?

279 responded to questions about this

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Unaware of Services</th>
<th>Needed Docs are Online</th>
<th>Like Getting Stuff Myself</th>
<th>No Library Needs</th>
<th>Like Browsing Stacks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>58%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Who is Unaware of Services?

Are certain groups in comparison sample more likely to be unaware of services?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Faculty</th>
<th>Students</th>
<th>Arts/Hum</th>
<th>STEM</th>
<th>Soc Sci</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>48%</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>65%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

sig. difference (p = .04)  
difference not sig.
Who Gets All Needed Docs Online?

Are certain groups in comparison sample more likely to get all needed docs online?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Faculty</th>
<th>Students</th>
<th>Arts/Hum</th>
<th>STEM</th>
<th>Soc Sci</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>52%</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>42%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

difference not sig.  
sig. differences (p < .001)
Collections Scenario 1 -- Local Repository

More materials in local repository, with quick delivery

% neutral or fine with it

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Faculty</th>
<th>Students</th>
<th>Arts/Hum</th>
<th>STEM</th>
<th>Soc Sci</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>92%</td>
<td>91%</td>
<td>91%</td>
<td>92%</td>
<td>92%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

difference not sig.
differences not sig.
Collections Scenario 2 -- Collective Collection

More materials shared across universities, with quick delivery

% neutral or fine with it

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Faculty</th>
<th>Students</th>
<th>Arts/Hum</th>
<th>STEM</th>
<th>Soc Sci</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>91%</td>
<td>93%</td>
<td>88%</td>
<td>96%</td>
<td>90%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

difference sig. due to large sample

differences sig. (p < .001)
Collective Collection Scenario: Digging Deeper

Arts/Humanities area contains heaviest users and is least comfortable with this scenario

Differences within Arts/Hum? (% fine or neutral)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role</th>
<th>Faculty</th>
<th>Students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>86%</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Differences not sig.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role</th>
<th>TT Faculty</th>
<th>Lecturers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>84%</td>
<td>88%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Differences not sig.

Assistant: 79%  Associate: 86%  Full: 84%
Open-Ended Questions

Important features of a document delivery service:

- 1562 people wrote in responses! Very clear and unsurprising themes emerged:
  - Speed
  - Accuracy
  - Dependability
  - Good communication
  - Readability (for scans)
  - Easy process for making requests
  - Delivery to convenient location (e.g., to dept mailbox)
Open-Ended Questions

What can we do better?

● 509 people wrote in responses. Lots to code, but clear themes emerged:
  ○ Process for making requests should be even clearer
  ○ Cut down on problems with “Get This” links in Search records
  ○ Improve Library Search
  ○ Subscribe to more electronic resources (e.g., ebooks) / Make more things available online
  ○ More dropboxes around campus so that returning items is easier
  ○ Improve readability of scans
  ○ Speedier service (especially for scans)
  ○ Make it clearer how to use the service
What Now
Where We are Now

● **On hold:**
  ○ Immediate plans for new repository, due to spending freezes

● **Still moving forward:**
  ○ New accessibility remediation project for digital documents
  ○ Planning to place more material return boxes around campus
  ○ Working on ways to make scanning process faster
  ○ Collective collection: redefining what ownership means with departments on campus; it doesn’t need to be on our shelves in order for people to have easy access

● Importantly, we gained a good sense that most faculty and graduate students are positive about:
  ○ Planned changes to the onsite collection
  ○ Current document delivery services