

# OWLSnet AAC Handout

## Information for June 2007 meeting

### **Circulating nonfiction videos for four weeks – Background Paper**

#### **Background**

Prior to the migration to Innovative, a few libraries circulated their nonfiction videos for four weeks. During the migration, after we had established a one week circulation period for all videos, a few of these libraries asked to have their loan rules changed to reflect a four week checkout for nonfiction videos, and this was done.

Libraries who've implemented this either shelve their nonfiction videos in with nonfiction books, and find it less confusing for patrons, and/or they consider nonfiction videos to be in the same general category of nonfiction books – mainly instructional, and therefore far more useful to the patron with a longer checkout.

Recently, this has become a problem, for a number of reasons:

1. More and more nonfiction videos, such as *An Inconvenient Truth*, and *Planet Earth* have become extremely popular. Unless the staff at the circulation desk of the four week nonfiction libraries notice the holds, and manually change the due date, some patrons get the videos for an extremely long time, while the queue becomes longer and longer.
2. There is no automatic way to change the checkout period for these popular nonfiction videos. The only current solution is for the circulation staff at the library with a four week nonfiction video checkout to notice that this is a popular video and manually change the due date to one week. This is very difficult to do, and unlikely to be consistent.
3. More libraries have expressed interest in the four week video checkout. Two libraries are currently using the four week checkout – New London and Iola. However, Kimberly-Little Chute and Appleton have also expressed a strong desire to do so, and others appear to be interested as well. The current strategy of expecting the circulation desk staff to notice that it's a popular video and manually change the due date isn't working now (in the last two weeks, *Who Killed the Electric Car* has been checked out twice for four weeks) and is likely to become more of a problem with an increase in the number of libraries using the four week checkout.

There is no easy solution. Any solution is likely to be a compromise – even continuing with what we are doing. It's likely that some or even all libraries will need to change their practices in order for us to be fair and consistent in our lending practices.

We'd like to attempt to come to a consensus decision at this AAC meeting on a new OWLSnet procedure for circulating nonfiction videos. Following are the potential solutions we discussed at the last AAC meeting.

# OWLSnet AAC Handout

## Information for June 2007 meeting

### Possible Options considered and eliminated.

These were discussed at the last AAC meeting. There was a general consensus that these will not work, and we agreed to eliminate them as possible solutions.

1. Eliminated by AAC (this is the status quo) - Circulation staff at four week nonfiction libraries will manually change due date on popular nonfiction videos. Basically, this is continuing what we are doing. Any library who wishes can continue to check out nonfiction videos for four weeks, with the stipulation that any video with holds needs to be checked out for one week.
  - a. Pros
    - i. Very easy to do.
    - ii. Allows individual libraries to check out nonfiction videos as they'd like.
  - b. Cons
    - i. Requires circ staff to be monitoring the status of nonfiction videos. Circulation staff will make mistakes and popular nonfiction videos will end up being checked out for four weeks.
    - ii. Some libraries may find their nonfiction videos gone much longer than they'd like – since their videos are being checked out at other libraries.
    - iii. Confusing for patrons and staff.
    - iv. Conflicts with our previous decisions to have loan periods the same in all libraries.
    - v. Several libraries interested in implementing four week nonfiction video don't like the idea – too much for the staff to remember at a busy circulation desk.
  
2. Eliminated by AAC - Staff at four week nonfiction video libraries will code their less popular nonfiction videos with a new four week nonfiction video ltype. These videos will check out for four weeks at all libraries. Their popular videos and other libraries nonfiction videos will check out for one week at all libraries.
  - a. Pros
    - i. Individual libraries have control over checkout time of their videos.
    - ii. Libraries who check out nonfiction videos for one week won't see them going to other libraries' patrons for four.
    - iii. Any library can implement four week checkout.
    - iv. Can make the four week distinction less arbitrary.
  - c. Cons
    - i. Very confusing for patrons and staff – the same title could check out for four weeks or one, depending on where it comes from. May need stickers to designate which videos are four week videos.
    - ii. Greatly conflicts with longstanding OWLSnet policy that loan rules are determined by the lending library, not the owning library.

# OWLSnet AAC Handout

## Information for June 2007 meeting

### Options under consideration

These were discussed at the last AAC meeting, and are still possible solutions. They are all changes to our current practice. The last two were not discussed at the last meeting, but have been suggested since then.

1. All libraries code popular nonfiction videos with a (newly created) short loan ltype.
  - a. Pros
    - i. Allows individual libraries to checkout nonfiction videos as they'd like.
    - ii. Doesn't require circulation staff to check to if a video is popular before checkout.
  - b. Cons
    - i. Creates an extra processing step.
    - ii. Some (many?) popular videos will be missed and not coded as short loan. We're currently having a hard time coding items with a short loan ltype, but this will be much worse if libraries have to do it *only for other libraries*. Since the videos will circulate in their library for one week, they won't ever see the results of the short loan ltype.
    - iii. Confusing for patrons and staff. Conflicts with our previous decisions to have loan periods the same in all libraries. Many libraries don't like the idea – too much for the staff to remember.
  
2. All libraries circulate all videos for one week. The four week nonfiction video option will be eliminated.
  - a. Pros
    - i. Very easy to do.
    - ii. All libraries check out all videos exactly the same, i.e. for one week. Very easy for staff and patrons to remember.
  - b. Cons
    - i. Libraries that currently circulate nonfiction videos for four weeks will have to change. Since they are pleased with the four week circulation, this will have a negative impact on them. Libraries interested in the four week circulation will not be able to implement this.
    - ii. May not be patron friendly – the reasons for implementing this still stand, and a one-week checkout for a how-to video may not be appropriate.
  
3. All libraries circulate all nonfiction videos for four weeks. The one week nonfiction video option will be eliminated. A short loan category will be added for nonfiction videos and all libraries will code popular nonfiction videos with a short loan ltype.
  - a. Pros
    - i. How-to videos will circulate for a longer period of time.
    - ii. All libraries check out videos exactly the same, i.e. for four weeks.
    - iii. A number of libraries who are interested in the four week checkout will now be able to implement it without difficulty.
  - b. Cons

# OWLSnet AAC Handout

## Information for June 2007 meeting

- i. Libraries that currently circulate nonfiction videos for one week (most of them) will have to change. Since they are pleased with the one week circulation, this will have a negative impact on them.
    - ii. A bit confusing for staff and patrons – sometimes there is confusion over what is nonfiction and fiction. It's somewhat of an arbitrary distinction – we're really talking about videos with popular appeal vs. videos with less popular appeal.
    - iii. Libraries with smaller collection may have difficulty having their nonfiction videos out for so long.
- 4. All libraries circulate all nonfiction videos for one week with two renewals.
  - a. Pros
    - i. Patrons will be able to keep less popular nonfiction videos for a longer period of time.
    - ii. All libraries will check out videos exactly the same, i.e. for one week with two possible renewals.
  - b. Cons
    - i. A bit confusing for staff and patrons – sometimes there is confusion over what is nonfiction and fiction. It's somewhat of an arbitrary distinction – we're really talking about videos with popular appeal vs. videos with less popular appeal.
- 5. All libraries circulate all videos for one week with two renewals.
  - a. Pros
    - i. Very easy to do
    - ii. All libraries will check out all videos exactly the same, i.e. for one week with two possible renewals. Very easy for staff and patrons to remember.
    - iii. If there is a hold, the system prevents the item from being renewed.
    - iv. Renewals = Circulation counts
  - b. Cons
    - i. The patron has to renew to keep the item out longer.
    - ii. Items still can't be kept out as long as books.
- 6. All libraries circulate all nonfiction videos for two weeks with one renewal – the same as magazines and CD-ROMs.
  - a. Pros
    - i. Nonfiction videos check out a bit longer, but not lots – it's a compromise
    - ii. All libraries will check out all videos exactly the same, i.e. for two weeks with one possible renewal.
    - iii. The checkout period mirror existing checkout periods, which makes it simpler for patrons and staff.
    - iv. With one renewal, the video can be checked out the same as books.
  - b. Cons
    - i. A bit confusing for staff and patrons – sometimes there is confusion over what is nonfiction and fiction. It's somewhat of an arbitrary distinction – we're really talking about videos with popular appeal vs. videos with less popular appeal.
    - ii. The patron has to renew to keep the item out longer.