Title
Introduce / explain role in ILL Code revision

Excerpt of 1916 Code
The first interlibrary loan code, called the Code of Practice for Interlibrary Loans, was developed by the ALA Committee on Coordination and approved in December 1916. Since then it has undergone a number of revisions. Early codes were focused entirely on the academic need for ILL and reflect the cost concerns and labor-intensive nature of ILL in the early 20th century. Responsibility for the code transitioned to ACRL for the earliest revisions and then to RUSA and its precursors. After STARS was formed in 2004, it assumed responsibility for the ILL Code and conducted the 2008 revision. The current revision is the ninth in the history of the code.

Purpose
The purpose of the code is to establish principles that facilitate the interlibrary loan process and regulate the exchange of materials between libraries in the US. Transactions outside the US are regulated by IFLA’s “International Resource Sharing and Document Delivery: Principles and Guidelines for Procedure.”

Current Code
With the approval of the code’s revision, it is typically published in RUSQ as a way to announce the new code and inform the membership. It is also posted on the RUSA website with other RUSA guidelines for ready access. You can find the current code at the URL on the screen.

Structure
The meat of the Code is divided into responsibilities of the requesting library and those of the supplying library with many of the points in each section paralleling each other. Topics include policies, requesting,
payment, copyright, and responsibility for use restrictions and loss or damage, among others.

SUPPLEMENT
The supplement, which is linked from the ILL Code webpage, provides greater detail, background, and references for each point within the code. It is a valuable resource, especially for those relatively new to the practice of interlibrary loan.

ILL CODE MYTH 1
Several of the survey respondents referred to a need for improved “enforcement” of certain provisions of the ILL Code. Of course, as the introduction to the explanatory supplement points out, there is no official group charged with enforcing the code and the rules therein. Thankfully, there is no ILL police. Instead, the code indicates that failure to comply with the code can lead to suspension of services. (4.14 and 5.10, as well as several places in the supplement.) In other words, play by the rules or no one will want to play with you.

ILL CODE MYTH 2
Sections 4.14 and 5.10 of the supplement makes clear that supplying libraries should not suspend service without “attempting to resolve the problem(s).” A good faith effort should be made to contact the requesting library to discuss the issue and come to an agreement.

ILL CODE MYTH 3
Although the code itself does not make mention of these things, they are all mentioned in the explanatory supplement (where they are strongly discouraged). The code itself is intended to be “general and prescriptive.” The explanatory supplement allows for fuller explanation of the code, along with specific examples. It is “intended to amplify specific sections” of the code. The explanatory supplement is also more
flexible than the code, and can be revised without going through the rigorous approval process required for the code itself. This allows the supplement to cover topics with greater specificity, addressing things like old envelopes and removable labels, and also allows it to be updated more frequently if changes in the ILL landscape warrant it. So, if something is discouraged in the supplement, it may be considered to be discouraged by the code. In addition, the code itself is quite clear that requesting libraries must “prevent damage” to borrowed materials, and supplying libraries are still within their rights to deny service to libraries that don’t safeguard what they borrow.

**ILL CODE MYTH 4**
Actually, the ILL Code is “intended to provide guidelines for exchanges between libraries where no other agreement applies.” It “does not override individual or consortial agreements or regional or state codes.” So, it’s possible that your transactions may be covered by a number of agreements, and the ILL Code may only be one of them. However, most libraries will honor the ILL Code when an existing agreement is not in direct conflict with it. (i.e., when an agreement is silent on a particular topic.)

**ILL CODE MYTH 5**
Actually, section 4.8 states that the requesting library must “assume responsibility for borrowed material from the time it leaves the supplying library until it has been returned to and received by the supplying library.” The supplement states that this policy “is based on the concept that if the request had not been made, the material would not have left the supplier's shelf, and thus would not have been put at risk.”

**ILL CODE MYTH 6**
Section 4.4 of the supplement states that “the requesting library should clearly state on the request an amount that meets or exceeds the charges of suppliers to which the request is sent.” The same section indicates that the requesting library is responsible for any charges less than or equal to what is stated on the request. Sending a request with a max cost that is lower than the supplying library’s standard charge causes delays on both ends, and may result in a request being denied.

**ILL CODE MYTH 7**

Neither the code nor the supplement prohibit the use of ILL materials on course reserves. Section 4.6 indicates that requesting libraries who intend to use requested materials for course reserves should communicate this at the time of the request.

**ILL CODE MYTH 8**

Both the code and the supplement are quite clear on this point: requesting libraries must comply with “any special instructions” from the supplying library with regard to packaging or shipping. (4.13 of the code.) 4.13 of the supplement states, “It is the responsibility of the requesting library to follow the shipping and packaging requirements, including insurance and preferred shipping method, as stipulated by the supplying library.” However, “If no shipping or packaging methods are specified, the requesting library's regular form of shipment should be used.” In general, the code makes it clear that the requesting library must follow the instructions provided by the supplying library. The supplying library, in turn, has a responsibility to clearly communicate special requirements or restrictions (5.6 of code/ supplement)

**ILL CODE MYTH 9**

Section 5.4 of the supplement gives supplying libraries one year from the due date of a lost or damaged item to send the bill. However, section 4.8 points out that supplying libraries are not necessarily
required to bill at all, and are encouraged to work with the requesting library if possible. The requesting library is also given a clear timeline in section 4.8, and should pay invoices within 6 months of their receipt.

**ILL CODE MYTH 10**
Actually, like all RUSA guidelines, the code must go through a revision process on a regular basis. The code is currently under revision.

**REVISING THE ILL CODE AND SUPPLEMENT 1**
Schedule

**REVISING THE ILL CODE AND SUPPLEMENT 2**
Committee members

**SURVEY BACKGROUND**
Sent to ALA Video Roundtable community in order to sunset/retire their separate document for the interlibrary loan of audiovisual formats.

**SUREVEY RESPONDENTS**

**SURVEY RESULTS**

**SURVEY RESULTS**

**SURVEY RESULTS**

**REQUESTING THEMES**

**SUPPLYING THEMES**

**DUE DATE 1**
DUE DATE 2

DUE DATE 3

REVISION TIMELINE: WHAT’S BEEN DONE

Summer 2014
- Revision process began with in-depth reading and marking up of current code. Development of survey questions.

October through December 2014
- Survey is circulating in the resource sharing community. Results are reviewed and discussed by the group. Areas of possible change are flagged for analysis.
- The group continues with in-depth reading and revision where needed, with particular attention to changes in technology or prevailing practices.

January through April 2015
- Using survey results as a guide, the committee continues with the revision process.
- Rough draft of the revised code is completed and reviewed.
- Rough draft of revised ALA Request Form is completed.

May 2015
- Draft version of the revised code was sent to the STARS Executive Committee for approval.
- Upon STARS approval, the draft was sent to the RUSA Standards and Guidelines Chair and the RUSA Executive Director.

REVISION TIMELINE: YET TO COME

June 2015
- Will be reviewed by RUSA S&G
- Receive feedback from RUSA S&G at ALA Annual
Late Summer / Early Fall 2015
- After approval from RUSA Standards & Guidelines, the draft will be released for public comment.
- We’re not yet sure what form this will take, but it will be widely announced.

Fall 2015
- Revisions will be made based on comments.
- Final draft must be approved by: STARS Exec, RUSA S&G, RUSA Board

GOAL
STARS hopes to receive RUSA approval of the new ILL Code in 2016.

THANK YOU
Acknowledgement of Nora and Ryan’s contribution to the slides
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