

Kansas State University  
Veterinary Medical Library  
Impact Grant

Enhancing Access to Biomedical Information via Ariel

Veterinary Medical Library  
Kansas State University  
Manhattan, Kansas 665056

Gayle Willard, Director  
Veterinary Medical Library  
Kansas State University  
408 Trotter Hall  
Manhattan, KS 66506-5614  
gwillard@vet.k-state.edu  
785-532-6006  
785-532-2838 (Fax)

April 1, 2002 – June 30, 2003

March 1, 2004

# **NARRATIVE DESCRIPTION**

## **1. Summary/Introduction**

The goal of this project was to provide enhanced access to biomedical literature in a timely and accurate manner to our broad clientele. With the implementation of Ariel 3.01, we were able to provide a reliable and expedient way to transmit copies of the literature located in the Veterinary Medical Library. By being able to transmit the copies in this manner, it made the information more valuable to the wide population of researchers and medical libraries we serve. Also with the implementation of Ariel 3.01 we were able to transmit the documents via the internet and provide not only desktop service to the end user but also color copies. Our long-term objective was also met to become a Loansome Doc provider and we now have active Loansome Doc users.

## **2. Geographic region/number of counties**

The libraries that were served in this grant are located all throughout the United States and Canada.

## **3. Collaborations/Partnerships**

The libraries that are part of Docline's Freeshare Reciprocal Interlibrary Loan Program were our main partners. There were a few libraries that contacted us asking for free reciprocal lending arrangements. We entered into agreements with everyone that requested them. All partnerships are still in good standing. The free reciprocal programs are ideal for a library of our size and staffing. Too much time can be spent invoicing, tracking invoices, receiving payments, and making deposits. We found ourselves busy enough trying to get the information into the hands of the users, let alone worrying about the billing. It can be cumbersome at times, checking the (long) list of reciprocal agreements to determine if a library should be billed or if the item is free, but that time is still wisely spent.

#### 4. Training

Not applicable to this grant

#### 5. Training sites

Not applicable to this grant

#### 6. Exhibits

Not applicable to this grant

#### 7. Resource Materials

A procedures manual was developed for in-house use and training. It documents the workflow used and lists all of the reciprocal partners if they are not part of the Freeshare Reciprocal Interlibrary Loan Program.

#### 8. Web sites

Information regarding Loansome Doc can be found at <http://www.vet.k-state.edu/depts/library/research.services.htm>.

#### 9. Document delivery and reference services

During the grant reporting period (7/1/02-7/31/03), 2,587 articles were supplied to participating Docline libraries. The Veterinary Medical Library received 775 articles. The Veterinary Medical Library supplied three times as many articles to other libraries than what was needed on site. Due to the delay in the appropriate paperwork to purchase the hardware and software, Ariel was not implemented until January 2003. For the seven month period in 2003, 1578 articles were delivered. Of these 1578 articles, 86% of them were delivered either by Ariel or by posting to a web server via Ariel software. Prior to Ariel implementation all articles were either faxed or mailed to the requesting institution.

Reference services were not applicable to this grant.

## 10. Approaches and interventions used

All requests are received through Docline. Cindy Logan, Docline Coordinator, announced our participation in Ariel on the appropriate listservs. Initial training was provided by the Veterinary Medical Library's computer support staff. Most training was done via hands-on learning. Cindy Logan trained various student employees to process the Docline requests and to send articles via Ariel. Staffing was scheduled on an as needed basis.

## 11. Evaluation

The project was evaluated on a daily basis. The two basic questions were, "Are we able to supply the necessary material?" and "Are we able to supply the material in an expedient manner?" By the sheer total number of articles that were supplied the answer to the first question is a resounding "YES!" With the purchase and installation of the Ariel software, the answer to the second question is again a resounding "YES!" Prior to January 2003, all articles were mailed or faxed. Faxing articles does put the material into the end users' hands much faster, but due to the quality of the fax, diagrams, radiographs, etc., may be compromised. By being able to scan documents and deliver them in grayscale or color the quality of the document is increased tenfold. Concurrently, the recipient receives the document, in some cases the same day the request is placed, or at least within 48 hours of the placement of the request.

## 12. Problems or barriers encountered

The largest problem we faced was from a bureaucratic standpoint. It took significant months to complete the contractual paperwork and then order the hardware and software.

## 13. Continuation plans

The Veterinary Medical Library will continue to fill Docline and Loansome Doc requests via Ariel software. The staffing, upgrade, and equipment costs will be absorbed by the library.

#### 14. Impact

The ability to serve other libraries in such an expedient manner has made a huge impact on our lending statistics. We received appreciative emails on a weekly basis commenting on the service that we provided.

#### 15. Recommendations for improvement

Not applicable to this grant.

### **FOLLOW-UP QUESTIONS**

1. Were your original project goals and objectives met? If not, why not?

Yes, the project goals and objectives were met.

2. What significant lessons were learned which would be of interest or use to others conducting outreach projects? Which strategies were the most effective in implementing the project?

From an institutional standpoint, the “red tape” from every side that needed to be addressed was frustrating at times. Now we know what will be in front of us in the future. It was also beneficial participating in Docline prior to the implementation of the grant. It would have been very overwhelming to try to implement in Docline and institute a new procedure the magnitude of Ariel.

3. If you were to start all over again, what, if anything, would you change about your goals, project plans, etc.

The process went quiet smoothly and we achieved the goals we set out. We were surprised at the magnitude of items are from us and the amount of staff time needed to do the scanning of the articles.

4. What advice or recommendations would you give to anyone considering a similar outreach effort?

Give it a try ... you too can make an “impact” ... we did.