BIB-LEVEL HOLD REVIEW TEAM FINAL REPORT

9.27.11

Background: In 2005, the Collection Services Round Table charged a sub-group to design a procedure to use the Millennium feature "bib-level-hold" to store data about patron holds in the bibliographic record for materials that were on order or in process. A perceived advantage of "bib-level-holds" over the paper slips used previously is that staff throughout the library could see and work with the hold data, that holds would be visible to patrons in their library accounts, and that the hold transactions would be automated in the same way that the item-level holds are.

Bib-level holds are currently implemented, but it was discovered that technical limitations have caused the activation of item level holds to fail for certain patron types.   A subgroup of PACC recently isolated these problems and reported them to PACC. Further information is available on the Library's wiki.

Charge: The Bib-Level-Hold Review Team (BRT) is charged to perform an overall review of the current implementation of the "bib-level-hold" process.   Is the process successfully delivering the intended service to the user?   Are all holds that are placed via this process being filled? Do any aspects of the process need to be changed to provide better service to the user? Are all the "hold" features in the Millennium system being deployed correctly? The group is asked to do this review over the next month, and to make a final report to PACC on September 7th, 2011.

The review team included members from Acquisitions, Cataloguing, Access Services and DLTG: Lynn Amber, Jase Harris, Barbara Bushor, Stina McCarthy, Joe Montibello, Donna Vinopal and Kathy Walker. We met several times as a group and also presented the work we were doing to ASRT (Access Services Round Table) for feedback. All of the questions in the charge were addressed and our findings along with a new cross-departmental workflow document are included in this report.

Process: The first step was to gather bib-level hold documentation from each department and identify the steps that each area is employing when a request comes in from either a selector or an access services staff person.   Lynn Amber collected these documents and created a cross-departmental workflow document (see Appendix A) that could be shared with all departments and serve to de-mystify what each department does, help clarify the process and direct action at each stage of the workflow. The Bib-level hold review team examined the draft of this document and suggestions were incorporated. Each department will continue to maintain their own in-house documentation detailing steps taken within departments.

The second step was to share this cross-departmental workflow document with ASRT and solicit feedback. In addition, ASRT was asked to give input on some of the questions put forth in the charge that related to their workflow.

9.27.11 Lynn Amber

Finally, as a group we discussed all questions related to reviewing the process and made recommendations as needed.

Specific Questions with Solutions/Comments/Actions to Take:

- Define the service that the bib-level hold is designed to provide, and suggest a way to determine whether it is successful.

  Bib-Level holds are placed on materials that are either "on order" or "in-process". These materials do not have item records, and are either not yet physically available or are in "backlog" in the cataloguing department. Bib-level holds provide patrons an opportunity to request these items when processed and allow for a method that tracks and tags the item in the system to insure that when the item is processed, it will be placed on the circulation hold shelf and the patron will be notified of its availability. Patrons can request the item non-rush (whenever it comes in or gets processed) or rush (please process and make available as quickly as possible).

  ⇨ **ACTION:** Access Services will look at the text of circulation for our cancelled bib level holds to make sure we are giving patrons other options and thus improving our level of customer service. Also, Access Services will look at the message we give to patrons when requesting items in our catalog to determine if we should be including more information about options such as ILL.

  Through Web Management Reports (both the old system and the new), we can track statistics on holds filled and total number of holds using cross tabs to identify holds by i-type, location, department, patron type, description, etc. We could track these statistics over time and, in conjunction with developing a maintenance procedure for the Outstanding Holds table, determine our effectiveness in filling holds successfully.

  ⇨ **ACTION:** Access Services will track Holds statistics using Web Management Reports over the next year

- Define whether to hold materials for patrons without a current patron record and if yes, how to do that.

  Currently, if a request comes through to acquisitions/cataloging and no patron record exists to match the patron, then the request is sent back to the initiating department (selector or access services) for clarification and attention. There is a process in place for guests requesting items from storage and this is done through the Storage Visitor procedure at the Reference Desk. Other than that, there is no desire to hold materials for those without patron privileges.

- Define a process for periodic maintenance of Outstanding Holds table, including who will do it, how often it will be done, and how the information about long-outstanding holds will be shared, with a goal to make sure that all holds that are placed are filled.

9.27.11 Lynn Amber

Regularly monitoring the Outstanding Holds table allows staff to monitor and identify the following: bib and item holds on records that have gone lost, missing or claims returned; holds on bib records whose order has been cancelled; holds on records that are outdated and should be investigated.

⇨ **ACTION**: Access Services department will develop a procedure to monitor the hold shelf once a month and track the issues that are addressed, noting the steps that need to be taken for the varying problems that crop up. After 6 - 8 months, we will evaluate our findings and make adjustments to the procedure. The goal is to identify reasons why holds are not filled in a timely manner, and make corrections and recommendations.

⇨ **ACITON**: It was discussed whether the 24 month Not-Wanted-After date was still relevant and the conclusion was to leave it as it is now and re-evaluate the length of time after monitoring the Outstanding Hold shelf for the 6-8 month time frame.

- Identify any technical problems with Bib-Level holds.

Through running multiple tests in the millennium system, it was determined that the technical issue we were experiencing with bib-level holds is that they break down at the point where they are checked in to millennium circulation module. We were able to determine that this was happening to all patron types who did not have "holdable privileges".   Upon checking with Innovative, they confirmed that this is how the system is set up and it is working properly from their point of view. For us, however, there is a need to make everyone aware of how the system works for these holds and alter our workflow so that item level holds are placed manually, bib-level holds are removed, so that patrons are notified of available items when they reach the circulation desk.

⇨ **ACTION:** The technical way the Millennium Circulation module works with bib-level holds (when checked in at circulation) was communicated to Access Services staff and a process will be incorporated into an updated bib-level hold procedure for Access Services staff.

- Are there any outstanding problems with hold pickup notices?
This question was presented at a monthly meeting of the Access Services Round Table and there are no indications from anyone that there are any outstanding problems with hold pickup notices.

- Design/update procedures to prevent Bib-Level holds being put on items after they've been cataloged.
We discussed various options that would help prevent staff from placing bib-level holds on items with attached item records. One thought was to check and see if we could do this through the Millennium system. A setting was identified that could be set to prohibit bib-level

9.27.11 Lynn Amber

holds for records with **one** attached item record. Records with multiple item records would continue to allow bib-level holds.

> ⇨ **ACTION:** This setting was activated and tested. When viewing a record with one attached item record the "hold copy returned soonest" and "book any available item" buttons are grayed out, thus preventing anyone from accidentally placing a bib-level hold on this record.

- Identify any circumstances that may prevent an item from being checked out to a waiting patron due to a bib-level hold - make recommendations to address.

    The following situations could result in a breakdown in the system thus preventing an item from being checked out to the requesting patron.

    - o Wrong name or no name on green bib-level hold slip (no hold in record)
    - o Rush request comes in for an item with a green bib-level hold - request goes to wrong person first

    > ⇨ **ACTION:** Cataloging and Acquisitions will be more vigilant about being sure all books have a bib-level hold slip inserted in them, even if there is a bib-level hold in the record. For items with more than one hold, Access Services will pay attention to who should receive the item first, and be sure to place item levels holds at the circulation desk when material is received. This will also be included in an updated procedure document.

    > ⇨ **ACTION:** In addition, regular maintenance of the Outstanding Holds table (as mentioned above) will also help to identify situations where bib-level holds are not being filled and thus not getting to the patron. This will serve to inform us moving forward when other issues crop up that have yet to be identified.

- Update all relevant documentation and post the new versions to the Staff Web in a location that will be accessible to all library staff.

    > ⇨ **ACTION:** Each department will review documentation for thoroughness and clarity, update as needed, and post to relevant departmental websites. All documentation will be posted to PACC wiki and ASRT wiki.

- Design a plan for on-going maintenance of this documentation and-re-evaluation of procedure.

    > ⇨ **ACTION:** Once above action items are implemented, the procedures and documentation will be assessed and any adjustments needed will be discussed and implemented.

- Present to groups affected -- this report will be presented to PACC and ASRT (October meetings).

9.27.11 Lynn Amber

9.27.11 Lynn Amber