Rapid Rocks!

Case Study #2: Saving with Rapid Borrowing

In January we published a case study on saving with Rapid on lending. At that time, we had interest from folks wanting to know more about savings in Rapid with borrowing. Here are *two* of the numerous and excellent case studies we received. This Rapid Rocks issue is 2 pages (Case Study 3 is on the next page) — the savings are that good! Remember, the more you use Rapid, the more you save.

**Case Study 2
University of Albany, SUNY**

Q. What percentage of your total ILL journal requests are filled in Rapid?

A. Approximately 85%

Q. What were your IFM charges before and after joining Rapid?

A. We joined Rapid half way through 2009. Our IFM bills for 2008 totaled $64,708.85. In 2011, they totaled $31,295.34.

Since our request volume fluctuates from year to year, the average IFM fee per request is a better reflection of the impact Rapid has had on our IFM bills. In 2008, we paid an average of $2.74 per filled request. In 2011, it was $1.36 per filled request.

Either way you look at it, we've experienced a savings of **more than 50%!**

Q. How much have you saved dollar-wise, since joining Rapid?

A. Rapid has cut our IFM bills by a grand total of approximately $85,000 since we joined in 2009.

We've avoided thousands of article transaction fees because of Rapid's reciprocity and by being on Rapid's ILL Reciprocal Lending List we've avoided many book transaction fees as well.

Q. Has RapidILL affected your borrowing turnaround time?

A. Since joining Rapid, our overall turnaround time for articles has been reduced by about 40%. Many articles arrive within 24 hours.

We receive quite a few emails from patrons who are impressed with how quickly we manage to acquire the materials they need.

Q. Has Rapid impacted your borrowing staff?

A. Rapid has undoubtedly helped make our workflow far more efficient. Prior to joining the system, all lending requests were received at our main library and then they were manually distributed to our branch libraries. Now staff at the branches can log onto the Rapid website and get their requests themselves. We've essentially cut out the middle man. That's made the biggest difference.

Oh, and not having to look up call numbers has certainly helped too!

Q. Has Rapid improved or streamlined your borrowing workflow?

A. Yes! It takes less time to process article requests now that we have Rapid, and that has certainly helped us keep on top of our request load, but our borrowing workflow is generally the same as it was pre-Rapid. We have considered setting up a routing rule to automatically route all article requests that have ISSN numbers directly to Rapid. We haven't done this yet because we want to screen requests before we send them out. On really busy days, we will manually route large batches of article requests that have ISSN numbers directly to Rapid. Doing that makes those days far more tolerable.

Q. What would you say to a library on the fence about joining Rapid?

I'd tell them that joining Rapid cut our IFM bills in half and helped streamline our borrowing workflow. If they're a net borrower, the IFM savings more than justify a Rapid membership. If they're a net lender, the added efficiency on the lending end is well worth the price of Rapid.

*Timothy Jackson
Interlibrary Loan Coordinator
University of Albany, SUNY*

RAPID ILL

http://RapidILL.org

Rapid Rocks!

Case Study #3: Saving with Rapid Borrowing

In January we published a case study on saving with Rapid on lending. At that time, we had interest from folks wanting to know more about savings in Rapid with borrowing. Here are *two* of the numerous and excellent case studies we received. This Rapid Rocks issue is 2 pages (Case Study 2 on the previous page) —the savings are that good! Remember, the more you use Rapid, the more you save.

Case Study 3
California State University, San Marcos

Q. What percentage of your total ILL journal requests are filled in Rapid?

A. Approximately 68-70%. However participation in the book chapter module would increase this figure.

Q. What were your IFM charges before and after joining Rapid?

A. Despite a 27.8% increase in ILL borrowing the year we began using Rapid, our OCLC IFM charges dropped from $5,927 in FY 2009/10 to $4,746 in FY 2010/11. **A cost decrease of 19.9%.** In addition, our invoiced charges (what we paid other libraries for supplying articles) for the same time period, dropped from $512. to $227. **That's a savings of 55.7%!**

Q. How much have you saved dollar-wise, since joining Rapid?

A. It's difficult to say for sure. We saved approximately $1500 the first year in IFM and invoice costs, despite a significant increase in borrowing requests. If we hadn't been participating in RapidILL, I hate to think what our charges would have been.

This year our borrowing statistics are back in line with what they were in 2009/10 (before RapidILL participation) and although the year is not complete, it looks like our savings will still be in the $1,300-$1,500 range.

Q. Has RapidILL affected your borrowing turnaround time?

A. DEFINITELY! We receive quite a few kudos when we first started using Rapid. Now, however, our patrons have just come to expect the quicker service and get a little impatient when they have to wait for a book or book chapter requested via traditional ILL.

Q. Has Rapid impacted your borrowing staff?

A. We save an estimated 35-40 hours per week because we don't have to search each request in OCLC for potential suppliers. Part of that time savings is spent on other ILL tasks like verifying incomplete citations, and checking OCLC for missing ISSNs. The remainder of our time has been re-distributed to our Lending unit to offset the increased workload resulting from Rapid. And with RapidILL less experienced staff are now able to do more of the work.

Q. Has Rapid improved or streamlined your borrowing workflow?

A, Oh, yes! We have saved a substantial amount of time in searching and ordering articles on OCLC.

With the time saved we're able to spend time cleaning up citations and checking <u>each</u> article for freely available online access. Since going live with Rapid, we've cancelled 970 borrowing requests as "available online" with direct links. This has helped reduce the costs associated with obtaining material and with copyright.

Q. What would you say to a library on the fence about joining Rapid?

A. Rapid is a MUST HAVE!
Despite its rather hefty start-up cost, the ongoing expense of RapidILL is more than made up for in IFM and invoiced charges; and through savings in staff time, which will enable your ILL unti to work more efficiently and implement other cost saving measures. But the most important reason for participating in RapidILL is that it allows you to provide quicker service to your users.

Teresa Roudenbush
Resource Services
California State Univ., San Marcos

http://RapidILL.org