

DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 309 784

IR 052 879

AUTHOR White, Marilyn Domas
TITLE The Reference Interview: Impact of Environmental Constraints.
PUB DATE 6 Nov 87
NOTE 18p.; Paper presented at the Joint Meeting of the District of Columbia Library Association and the Virginia Library Association (Crystal City, VA, November 6, 1987).
PUB TYPE Viewpoints (120) -- Reports - Research/Technical (143) -- Speeches/Conference Papers (150)
EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Environmental Influences; *Library Services; *Models; *Questioning Techniques; *Reference Services; User Needs (Information)
IDENTIFIERS *Reference Interviews

ABSTRACT

This paper develops two models of the reference interview: (1) the Need-Oriented Model, which emphasizes identifying the client's information needs and allows for a broad-ranging diagnostic interview; and (2) the Question-Oriented Model, which is constrained by the client's initial question and focuses on refining that specific question, identifying why the client needs the information only if the client raises the issue. The models are then related to various environmental features of reference service such as the physical setup of reference service and staffing. Suggestions for promoting more involved interviews are offered. (MES)

* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *

ED309784

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION
CENTER (ERIC)

This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

THE REFERENCE INTERVIEW: IMPACT OF ENVIRONMENTAL CONSTRAINTS

[Paper presented at the joint meeting of the D. C. Library Association, Reference Section and the Virginia Library Association, Bibliographic Instruction Section, November 6, 1987, Crystal City, Virginia)

Marilyn Domas White
Associate Professor
College of Library and Information Services
University of Maryland
College Park, MD 20742

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Marilyn D. White

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

FR052879



**Abstract: THE REFERENCE INTERVIEW: IMPACT OF ENVIRONMENTAL
CONSTRAINTS**

This paper develops two models of reference interviews: the Need-Oriented Model, which emphasizes identifying the client's information need and allows for a broad-ranging diagnostic interview, and the Question-Oriented Model, which is constrained by the client's initial question and focuses on refining that specific question, identifying why the client needs the information infrequently and only if the client raises the issue. Then, the author suggests that environmental constraints, such as physical setup and staffing patterns, often limit librarians to the Question-Oriented Model. The paper suggests that a more appropriate approach is to offer clients differentiated services and allowing clients to be intelligent consumers of reference service, based on their perceptions of their needs. The paper was originally presented at the joint meeting of the D. C. Library Association, Reference Section and the Virginia Library Association, Bibliographic Instruction Section, November 6, 1987, Crystal City, Virginia.

THE REFERENCE INTERVIEW: IMPACT OF ENVIRONMENTAL CONSTRAINTS

Introduction

Good morning, it's a pleasure to have a chance to talk with professional librarians, not just students, about an element of the reference process that I consider very important, the reference interview, and to have a dialogue with practicing librarians about some ideas that I am going to put forth in this talk.

What I will do first is discuss models for two different approaches to the reference interview, and then relate them to various environmental features of reference service. From this, I will make some suggestions for changes in the delivery of direct reference service.

Models of the Reference Interview

I have never heard a reference librarian say that one should not do a reference interview. Reference librarians avow an allegiance to it that is similar to their allegiance to God, motherhood, and apple pie. Talking about the reference interview is like waving the flag for good reference service. But how deep this allegiance is and how much it permeates their method of operating differs considerably. We have all observed very good interviews. We have witnessed fair to middling interviews. We have seen bad interviews. And we have observed encounters where, for all extents and purposes, there were no interviews.

And the explanations for what we have seen are almost

standard:

How can we conduct reference interviews when five other people are waiting in line?

Some people don't want us to ask a lot of questions.

The phone is ringing constantly.

It is impossible to work with this client.

I understood the question, so I didn't have to ask him anything.

I have heard these and a great many more, and even said these when I was a working reference librarian. And I am going to come back to the problems that they represent a little later in this talk.

Observation, of course, shows only surface behavior. Formally stated questions and answers are not the only elements within a reference interview. Librarians often know a vital bit of information and do not ask about it. If they did not, they would. The purpose of a reference interview, after all, is not to run through a standard set of questions, but to develop a meaningful overlap in the librarian's mental model for a reference problem and the client's mental model, enough so that the librarian can then go out and find appropriate information. If their mental models are similar, fewer questions have to be asked. An interview is not necessarily deficient because it did not follow a specified pattern or ask twenty critical questions.

But, in addition to simply observing, I usually ask librarians about what they are doing in the interview and why.

When you start to question librarians about the reference interview, it becomes apparent that there are differing opinions about what a reference interview is. These opinions, in turn, are based on what librarians view as their role as reference librarians.

For the purposes of this talk I want to set up two models which indicate differing approaches to the reference interview.

These models differ in their objectives, the perceptions or assumptions that underpin them, and their content. The first I will refer to as the Need-Oriented Model. The second is the Question-Oriented Model.

Figure 1. OBJECTIVES OF MODELS

NEED-ORIENTED

To understand the client's
INFORMATION NEED.

To identify information useful
to develop search strategy to
locate information to satisfy
that need.

QUESTION-ORIENTED

To understand the QUESTION.

To identify information useful
for locating information to
answer that question.

Objectives play a tremendous role in reference interviews because everything that follows is presumably guided by the objectives. With the Need-Oriented Model, the objectives are two-fold:

First, to understand the client's information need.

Second, to identify information that will allow the

librarian to conduct a successful search for information to satisfy that need.

With the Question-Oriented Model, the emphasis is on understanding the question the client asks, not the information need. The second objective in both models is similar, but, in the Question-Oriented Model, the emphasis is on seeking information that allows the librarian to answer this question. The relationship between the question the client asks and his need is not an objective.

Figure 2. UNDERLYING PERCEPTIONS OF MODELS

NEED-ORIENTED

Clients often do not know what they need and can benefit from the perspective of someone who knows more about information and information-seeking.

The reference librarian's role is first to verify that the request adequately represents the client's underlying information need, then to finding information or helping people find it.

RL's relevant information is a wide knowledge of information problems, problem-solving, strategies for finding information, and actual sources of information.

QUESTION-ORIENTED

Clients generally know what they need, but do not always phrase it usefully. If they do not, they will indicate their discomfort and I will be able to recognize it as a sign of a larger problem.

The reference librarian's role is to find information or help people find it, not to assist them in identifying the most useful information to resolve their problems.

RL's relevant knowledge is strategies for finding information and actual sources of information.

Now what is behind these two different approaches? What are the assumptions and ideas that they are based on? They differ in how they view the client: the Question-Oriented Model places greater faith in the client's ability to know his information need. But it recognizes that sometimes they do not phrase it exactly right so we can work with it. The Need-Oriented Model, on the other hand, believes that clients often are at sea about what to look for as well as how to find it. They need help in knowing what information will be useful to them.

With faith in the client's ability to know what he needs, the Question-Oriented Model says that the librarian's primary role is to find information or help the client find it. It is not as expansive as the Need-Oriented Model, which says that the librarian should first be intent on verifying that the request adequately represents the client's information need. Note that it at least allows for the possibility that, for some users, the question will match the real information need. It does not just assume that match, but checks on it.

As a result of this expanded role, the relevant knowledge base of librarians in the Need-Oriented Model is not just the knowledge of search strategies and actual sources of information that is called for in the Question-Oriented Model, but also a wide knowledge of information problems and problem-solving generally.

What are the implications of the objectives and these assumptions for the content of the interview? Let's look first

at the Need-Oriented Model. Remember, this model places less credence in the client's ability to know what he wants and calls for a larger role for the librarian. With this model, the client's opening question is simply an opening gambit in a conversation about the problem, what kind of information would be useful, how to solve it, and so on. The model recognizes that the initial question may have been rephrased to reflect what the client has found before, the kind of experiences he normally has

Figure 3. CONTENT AND PROCEDURE OF MODELS

NEED-ORIENTED

Initial question is viewed more as opening gambit in mutual problem-solving.

Less accepting of query as stated.

Analysis goes beyond semantics/syntax of question to assessing relationship between client's query and his problem.

More emphasis on diagnosis; therefore, more questions focusing on the problem.

Usually fewer questions related solely to search strategy.

QUESTION-ORIENTED

Initial question establishes parameters for subsequent discussion.

More accepting of query as given.

Emphasis on understanding semantics/syntax of question, not assessing whether it matches information need.

Often the questions emphasize the subject of the question, not the "answer requirements."

More questions related to search decisions.

No librarian-generated questions about underlying problem, why they need the information, how they are going to use it.

Still a tendency to followup problem/need comments if they occur, but not major focus of

interview.

in a library, and so on. As a result, the analysis that goes on during this interview ranges beyond the semantics and syntax of the immediate question to discussions about the reason the client is looking for the information he asked for. The emphasis is on diagnosis. Because this discussion is far-ranging, the librarian can often extract search-related information without asking specific questions. For example, if the librarian has gone on at great lengths about the subject and how it fits with various other subjects, he can draw on that to make decisions about index terms to use during the search.

The Question-Oriented Model accepts the initial question as a good match with the client's real information needs, so much so that a librarian, operating under this model, does not even bother to verify the match. The client makes a demand; the librarian accepts it. But, because the librarian may not exactly understand the demand, he or she may ask what a word means, and how that relates to another topic, and so on. Often the questions center around the subject of the question, not the nature of the information that is being sought. Because the emphasis is not on an independent diagnosis, but just acceptance of the client's diagnosis, or question, no questions are asked about problem or how the client intends to use the information. When the client mentions his motivation, the librarian, of course, follows up on it, but such problem-related questions are not a major focus of the interview. The emphasis is more on

search strategy and, with relatively little to go on other than the immediate question, the librarian may have to ask more search-related questions.

You may recognize similarities between these models and some of the approaches suggested by Patrick Wilson in his article about a face value rule in reference.¹ The first model is clearly need oriented; the second much more demand or question oriented. The impact of their objectives is obvious in the content of the interview. You may notice that I am not really addressing the form of the interview in my talk or in these models, but I suspect there may be some implications for the mix of open and closed questions and for some other form-related characteristics.

I really do not want to belabor the differences in these two approaches. They exist. My personal feeling is that the Need-Oriented Model gives the librarian greater flexibility in searching for information. In their initial question, people ask for what they know or what they have a reasonable expectation of finding. We may not be able to locate that information or it may not provide a good answer for them. In the Question-Oriented model, clients essentially make a demand, and librarians respond to that specific demand, perhaps clarified, but still a specific demand. There is no basis, unless it is accidentally obtained, for suggesting alternatives for that information. In the Need-

¹Patrick Wilson, "The Face Value Rule in Reference Work," RQ 25 (Summer, 1986), 468-75.

Oriented model, what should develop during the interview is a mutual understanding of a problem potentially answerable in several ways. One answer may be preferable for any number of reasons, but, if that answer is not available, the librarian can suggest other alternatives and may do that even before a search is attempted. There are simply more chances of solving the client's information need.

The Need-Oriented model is less limiting than the Question-Oriented and opens the door to a more dynamic, collegial relationship with the information seeker. And this, in turn, leads to better information retrieval.

Environmental Constraints

Everything that I have said so far is really just setting the stage for a few comments I want to make, however, on how the environment in libraries affects librarians' adherence to one or another of these models. I think the reference environment is a very strong factor in determining the kinds of reference interviews that take place.

Some librarians will never agree with me in my preference for the Need-Oriented model. They are philosophically opposed to the Need-Oriented model or they reject it because they feel that they cannot diagnose the client's need. The diagnostic role implied in the Need-Oriented model calls for greater subject knowledge and greater knowledge of problem-solving than the Question-Oriented. On the other hand, the knowledge of bibliographic control and information sources called for in both

does not differ radically. I could argue with them about their knowledge that is relevant to diagnosing, but convincing them may be more difficult. It is a riskier role and some librarians quite definitely do not want to assume it.

But I think many librarians agree with me and do feel a strong desire to respond to the real information need, rather than simply the question asked. They see the benefits of understanding how their clients are going to actually use the information or why they want it. It often makes their searches easier, helps to maintain their interest level over many years, and strengthens their sense of professional worth. And they act accordingly, or at least try to do so. But all too often, and this leads back to the reactions I mentioned earlier, they feel constraints outside themselves that prevent them from doing a good needs-oriented interview. And, as a result, they may feel some sense of guilt when they do less, even if the less is a necessity.

So, what are the constraints I have referred to? Are they fixable? Are they relics of a traditional stance that needs to be changed? Can they be changed? We must reconsider the options for reference service we give clients and offer them more differentiated services. We must allow them to be intelligent consumers of reference service, based on their perceptions of their needs. Let's shift some of the responsibility to them for determining the kind of reference service they want and need. Now, how can we do that? I wish I had all the answers, but I am

just going to broach some ideas at this stage about the elements that should be considered.

First of all, think about the physical setup of reference service in the libraries you know. The physical environment, for the most part, is optimal primarily for ready reference questions - you have a counter, a librarian standing or sometimes perching behind that counter so that he or she appears responsive to whoever comes up. The arrangement is completely open. Another client coming up hears the conversation between the librarian and the first client. They, in turn, are well aware that a queue that is starting to form. Sometimes a librarian actually walks away from the desk with the client to try to establish an arrangement that is more congenial to obtaining more information. Even then she is usually sensitive to neglecting other clients who may be approaching the desk or worse yet, not approaching because no one seems to be available. It conjures up an image of a sales clerk at a department store counter. Everything cries out for handling the client as quickly as possible and exchanging only information that can be regarded as non-personal. Is it surprising then that need-oriented reference interviews are relatively rare or that a high percentage of directional and ready reference questions are asked? Are librarians in this kind of setting effectively teaching the clients that the only kind of questions reference librarians can respond to are ready reference questions.

What about staffing patterns? I have watched desks at busy

times where not just one but several librarians are juggling clients, dispensing a few minutes here and there to try to be somewhat responsive. Are librarians doing anything to try to provide feedback to the client about slow periods during the day when the client could legitimately demand longer periods of attention, and, with it, the possibility of better reference interviews? Are we giving them an incentive for shifting their demands to another time? No, it seems to be we are simply rationing service by providing relatively few providers and then forcing them to spread themselves too thin among the many clients. And the first element to go is the needs-oriented reference interview!

What about the possibility of siphoning off some of the more programmable reference questions? Actually libraries have done a better job of this than with any solution, but more still needs to be done. Paraprofessionals are now valued for their ability to answer the easier questions. Better signs and point of use directions are the answer for some questions; pathfinders and other short bibliographies are another option. What about databases of suggested approaches or sources to frequent questions? The younger generation may actually feel more comfortable approaching a computer than an adult reference librarian. Bibliographic instruction in academic libraries is another way of presumably assisting a group of users efficiently.

How can we establish useful alternative channels for reference service that promote, or at least facilitate, more

involved responses. Can we establish systems, for example, which permit a client to choose between quick response and lengthier encounter and know what to expect. How about allowing a client to choose to enter a queue or come at a time slot where brief, search-directed encounters are the norm or, alternatively, to elect a time slot or a line where he can make claims to privacy, longer discussions, more assistance, needs-oriented interviews? Some libraries have done it, for special groups of clients, with reference by appointment. We do it as a matter of practice in many libraries when the client pays for an online search by an intermediary.

I do not think it has to be as elaborate as these alternatives necessarily, but it does seem that we should be thinking about optimizing something besides ready reference or service to clients who pay. Good needs-oriented reference interviews do not have to take an hour. A few minutes of concentration on the problem with the clear understanding about the purpose and expectations of the encounter are all that is necessary. Why not, for example, offer clients the chance to choose between a ready reference desk where they have to wait in line or signing up for a ten to fifteen minute interval to meet the librarian in his office, not at a public counter. They are guaranteed privacy, undivided attention, and a chance to seek significant help with their information problems. This kind of user is not well-served in many public and academic libraries today. Or, why not use the same system that is used in closed-

stack libraries. Ask the client to fill out a brief request form, which can be an interview schedule of sorts, submit it, take a number, and wait his turn -- away from the reference desk and the client being served -- for more substantial help. If library patrons are willing to wait for books from the stacks, it seems reasonable to expect that they will wait for good personal assistance. Couple this with a ready reference desk, and we are beginning to allow in a systematic way for greater differentiation in direct reference service.

Well, I hope I have given you food for thought. I am often frustrated when asked to talk about the reference interview or when I teach it in reference class. I can offer advice, guidelines, assistance about the interview itself. You can read similar items in the literature, but it isn't enough. We have to start talking about what prevents us from following this advice, what in the environment limits our ability to offer the kind of assistance that is needed in reference interviews. We help to make that environment, and we must recognize that only we can start to demand and create a healthy and long-needed change in the delivery of direct reference services.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Wilson, Patrick. The Face Value Rule in Reference Work. *RQ*, 25
(Summer, 1986), 468-75.

cafeteria is often dirty. This is especially apparent at lunchtime and in the afternoon. Oftentimes cups provided for hot beverage service, which have apparently been washed, are not adequately cleaned, still stained with coffee rings, lipstick, and food particles. Unbussed trays are left on tables for long periods of time, tray-holding carts are often filled to capacity; tables, chairs, and banquettes are unwiped, ashtrays overflow onto tables and carpets; the salad dressing/condiments areas are not clean; and spilled food, drinks, and paper products litter the floors. The result is an unattractive and messy environment, which reflects poorly on the Library and, in some cases, keeps staff from using the cafeteria, especially in the afternoon.

If fewer large groups use the cafeteria, this situation may be alleviated. In any case, the Committee proposes the following.

RECOMMENDATION

- 1) ARA be instructed to make staff available on a regular basis to maintain the cleanliness of the facility.
- 2) More prominent signs be placed at strategic locations, near eating areas, to request user-bussing of trays.
- 3) ARA be instructed to ensure adequate availability of places to store used trays.
- 4) There is need for updating some of the major equipment which is almost ten years old. Priority should be given to the dishwasher which has been a problem since its installation. The machine is undersized and breaks down frequently, resulting in

the accumulation of unsightly dishware and frequent shortages of clean utensils. Although limiting public access will ease the pressure, only replacing the dishwasher with upgraded equipment will assure a resolution to this problem, which strongly influences the perception of quality.

LONG-TERM ISSUES

While the immediate problem in the Madison cafeteria is one of overcrowding, other issues have been identified by various independent groups and individuals, that require time and study to resolve properly. This Committee proposes longer term evaluations of the Madison cafeteria to include food quality, food diversity, and pricing.

RECOMMENDATIONS

1) The Committee has been informed that the Library plans to conduct a financial audit sometime soon. In addition to the financial audit, the Committee recommends an "operations audit." Such an audit should determine not only how efficiently the operation is being run, but should also examine the nutritional value of the food being served and the variety of the menu to meet special needs such as low cholesterol, low salt, and vegetarian diets, and the labelling of foods containing additives which may cause allergic reactions, such as MSG. If separate audits cannot be funded, it is recommended that the financial audit be modified to include elements of an operations audit.

2) ARA has been in the Madison cafeteria since it first opened. The Committee suggests that the Library put out an RFP to

examine if another contractor might give the Library better service at the same or lower price.

3) The Committee also recommends that a joint labor/management cafeteria committee be established to monitor the cafeteria on an ongoing basis and to make recommendations to the Librarian for improvement.

1. Background

p. 1

The distinction among classes of users is problematic. The data provided by ARA is based on subjective judgments made by management observing the users. The proportion of each group's contribution to total sales is only an estimate based on professional opinion. What is known, is the count of tour group customers and their check average, the total cafeteria customer count and check average, and the total sales volume from the cafeteria, buffet and coffee shop, based on cash register receipts. We have attempted to extrapolate the shares of sales made to the tourists based on the facts about tour groups and total number of users in order to estimate the potential impact of their exclusion.

2. Calculations

Appendix A, page 4 provides an estimated distribution of sales among classes of food service patrons for the period February 1988 through July 1988. (May through July are estimated sales based on prior-year totals.) During these six months the total sales for tour groups and tourists are:

Tour Groups	\$126,600
Tourists	\$219,400

Dividing \$219,400 by \$126,600 gives a ratio of tourist sales to tour group sales of 1.73.

From the cash register totals on Appendix A, page 3, it is seen that there was no tour group activity for the five-month period p. 2

September 1987 through January 1988. Assuming that tourist sales during this period is also negligible, the tourist sales for the 12-month period can be estimated. .

Total sales to tour groups	\$242,108
Ratio of tourist sales to	
tour group sales	x 1.73
Estimated total sales to	
tourists	<u>\$418,847</u>

Total sales to tour groups and	
tourists	\$660,955

3. Impact on sales of the elimination of tour group and/or tourist sales.

	<u>Lost revenue</u>
Tour groups	\$242,108
Tour groups + 50% tourists	\$451,532
Tour groups + all tourists	\$660,955

APPENDIX A

ESTIMATED PARTICIPATION
LIBRARY OF CONGRESS FOOD SERVICE PROGRAM

5/12/88

	CAFETERIA CUSTOMER COUNT TOTAL -----	TOUR GROUP CUSTOMER COUNT (KNOWN) -----
MAY 87	44,808	4,785
JUN 87	• 60,551	6,623
JUL 87	46,255	5,965
AUG 87	44,403	4,325
SEP 87	• 49,789	0
OCT 87	43,766	0
NOV 87	40,694	0
DEC 87	• 46,573	0
JAN 88	42,216	0
FEB 88	50,695	3,830
MAR 88	• 72,137	10,160
APR 88	53,440	9,230
	-----	-----
TOTAL	595,327	44,918

•5 WEEK PERIOD

SALES	1,398,521	242,108
CHG: AVG	\$2.34	\$5.39

ESTIMATED PARTICIPATION
LIBRARY OF CONGRESS FOOD SERVICE PROGRAM

5/12/88

	FEB 88 *****	MAR 88 *****	APR 88 *****	MAY 88* *****	JUN 88* *****	JUL 88* *****
SALES *****	\$172.3	\$247.9	\$208.9	\$184.0	\$174.0	\$150.0
GROUP *****	\$11.9 6.9%	\$32.6 13.2%	\$29.1 14%	\$28.0 15.2%	\$17.0 9.7%	\$8.0 5.3%
TOURIST *****	\$5.5 3.1%	\$34.9 14%	\$37.8 18%	\$34.6 18.8%	\$53.8 31%	\$52.8 35.2%
VISITOR SCHOLARS C STAFF *****	\$43.0 25%	\$31.7 12.8%	\$20.8 10%	\$18.4 10%	\$16.2 9.3%	\$18.7 12.5%
LOC ***	\$111.9 65%	\$148.7 60%	\$121.2 58%	\$103.0 56%	\$87.0 50%	\$70.5 47%
♦ESTIMATES						

APPENDIX B :

PRICE AND PORTIONS COMPARISON
Report Dates: May 10, 1988

FOOD ITEM	LIBRARY OF CONGRESS		PENTAGON		SMITHSONIAN CAFETERIA		SENATE		HOUSE OFFICE BUILDINGS	
	PORTION	PRICE	PORTION	PRICE	PORTION	PRICE	PORTION	PRICE	PORTION	PRICE
FRIED EGG	1	.39	1	.45	N/A	N/A	1	.40	1	.40
BACON	1 strip	.39	1 strip	.45	N/A	N/A	1 strip	.40	1 strip	.35
BISCUIT	1	.39	1	.25	N/A	N/A	1	.30	1	.30
DONUTS	1	.52	1	.40	N/A	N/A	1	.40	1	.35
FRIED CHICKEN	1	1.77	1	1.55	1	2.00	1	3.40	1	2.35
VEAL PARMESAN	6 oz	1.75	4 oz	1.55	5 oz	1.80	4 oz	3.05	4 oz	3.10
VEGETABLES	4 oz	.56	3 1/2 oz	.60	4 oz	.60	4 oz	.70	4 oz	.65
SOUPS	10 oz	.78	6 oz	.60	10 oz	.75	10 oz	.75	10 oz	.75
HAM SANDWICH	3 oz	1.72	6 oz	2.50	3 oz	3.25	4 oz	2.30	3 oz	2.00
COFFEE	8 oz	.37	8 oz	.35	8 oz	.50	6 oz	.35	8 oz	.40
COFFEE	12 oz	.57	12 oz	.45	16 oz	.60	12 oz	.60	12 oz	.55
CARBONATED BEVERAGES	12 oz	.57	16 oz	.50	12 oz	.75	12 oz	.60	12 oz	.55

Subject: Security

DOC 88

UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT

Memorandum

LIBRARY OF CONGRESS

TO : Ellen Hahn, Chair
Management and Planning Committee

DATE: October 24, 1988

FROM : Ad Hoc Collections Security Committee
Victoria Hill^{VP} (Chair), Ralph Ehrenberg, Steve Herman,
Tom Jones, King Lee, Winston Tablada

SUBJECT: Report and recommendations on security issues

The Ad Hoc Collection Security Committee was given two charges: (1) to prepare a solicitation for a security audit and (2) to recommend means of implementing the twelve short-term (90-day) recommendations submitted to Executive Session by the MAP Subcommittee on Collections. After discussing the issues with appropriate Library staff and examining reports and proposed LCR's prepared by previous Library committees, the Ad Hoc Committee submits the attached report for your consideration. The major recommendations are:

1. Contract for a security audit.
2. Find funding for two Police positions to staff the control post at the Madison loading dock.
3. Issue revised LCR 1810-2 to require identification cards to be worn visibly by the public at all times. Long-term passes will include a photograph of the patron, be authorized by the reference librarians and be issued by the Photoduplication Service for a fee to be determined.
4. Issue revised LCR 1811 to require identification cards to be worn visibly by staff at all times, not only in the stack areas.
5. Issue LCR 610, which would require departments to provide secure areas for unprocessed Library collections.
6. Install lockers at at least one entrance of all three Library buildings and prohibit public from bringing in suitcases and other large bags. Install lockers in selected reading rooms, and empower division chiefs to establish policies concerning what may be brought in to these rooms.
7. Request the Architect of the Capitol to install electronic equipment for the Book Stack Security System in Phase I renovation space before beginning Phase II of renovation.

Attachments:

RFP for Security Audit
Draft LCR 610
Revised LCR 1810-2
Revised LCR 1811
Short-term Stack Pass Application
Long-term Stack Pass Application

BUY U.S. SAVINGS BONDS THROUGH THE PAYROLL PLAN

RECOMMENDATIONS

CHARGE I: To prepare a solicitation for a security audit to begin as soon as possible so that we will have a comprehensive long-range plan for addressing and solving our security problems.

ACTION: The committee submits the attached Request for Proposal (RFP) be forwarded to Procurement and Supply. The committee will review bids and monitor the consultant's performance to assure that the Library's needs are met.

CHARGE II: To recommend means of implementing twelve short-term (90-day) recommendations.

1. **ISSUE:** Enhance staff members' awareness of the danger of theft of collections materials and their responsibilities for safeguarding them.

ACTION: a. Assign LSSO to develop and implement an annual "Security Awareness Week," as described below, with representatives from the Information Office, Copyright Office (Information and Reference Division), Processing Services, Research Services (General Reference and Special Collections), and CRU.

[Garvey]

Sponsor an annual "Security Awareness Week".

- 1) Devise an eye-appealing logo.
- 2) Instruct staff about their responsibility through staff notices in the LCIB and Copyright Notices.
- 3) Send memorandum to each staff member, signed by the Librarian.
- 4) Begin developing a video or other presentation on security concerns to be used during staff orientations.

b. Instruct Information Office to address security concerns in the new video being designed for the public.

[Bush]

c. Issue new LCR 610, Security of Collections (draft attached). This regulation was proposed by a previous committee on security, and while it may not be possible to implement all of its recommendations within ninety days, it will provide guidance to all divisions on the handling of materials.

[McClung]

d. Charge divisions with appointing a security liaison, as required in LCR 610, within 30 days.

[Department Directors]

2. ISSUE: Require Library staff members to wear identification badges in a clearly visible manner.

- ACTION:
- a. Issue revised LCR 1811: (draft attached) to require LC staff to "wear visibly" their identification cards at all times including while in the stacks of the general collections. [McClung]
 - b. Negotiate changes with the unions. [Pinsen]
 - c. Make clips and neck chains for cards available to all Library employees through their division offices. [Hedrick]
 - d. Provide temporary employees with a standard LC photo ID card, which identifies them as temporary employees and shows an expiration date. (Temporary employees presently receive a paper ID without a photo.) [Garvey]

3. ISSUE: Intensify security at all exits from the Library, including careful searches of briefcases, purses and packages. These must include checks for non-book materials from the collections.

* Security of the collections should involve not only intensified exit searches, but also a coordinated effort at controlling the amount of material brought into both the Library and the reading rooms, and an effort to control removal of books and materials from the reading rooms by the public.

* At present the police check for books, periodicals and obvious library equipment such as computers. Thorough checking for non-book materials is not possible at this time since most of the non-book materials are not marked to indicate Library ownership.

* Increased exit checking will lengthen the lines during busy times, and management must be supportive of the police if complaints are lodged.

- ACTION:
- a. The Library must have a facility to accommodate researchers' suitcases, coats and other non-research material. Therefore (1) retain the checkstand in the Madison Building as a locker and cloakroom facility; [Trew] (2) obtain self-serve lockers for the Jefferson and Adams Buildings for the public to store non-research materials [Garvey and Trew]; and (3) obtain lockers for the special collections reading rooms, such as Manuscript and Prints and Photographs. [Garvey, Tabb and Trew]
 - b. Once lockers are installed, restrict the public from bringing suitcases, packages, large bags of materials, blankets, etc. into the Library and restrict them from bringing into the reading rooms any materials not

needed in their research.

[Garvey]

SIGN TO READ:

Research materials only in the Reading room.
Packages, suitcases, coats and other oversize materials may not be brought into the reading room.

- c. Close the two side doors now used for exit and entrance to the Jefferson Great Hall. At present the public is able to enter and exit all three doors, only one of which is policed.

[Garvey]

- d. Use stanchions and signs to direct staff and public to exit the C Street West corridor only through the door closest to the police desk.

[Garvey]

- e. Remind the police to inspect materials thoroughly, including periodicals.

[Garvey]

- f. Remind staff of their responsibility to cooperate with the police in this effort.

[Billington]

4. **ISSUE:** Through procedural and physical measures, reduce access to the stacks in the Jefferson and Adams Buildings.

* The committee believes that the stack pass policy, revised in 1985, is satisfactory although open to individual interpretation. The librarians in GRR and Science now give fewer than 5000 passes a year. While it may be possible to be more restrictive, we suggest no change in policy at this time.

- ACTION:** a. Instruct the Architect of the Capitol to install the electronic equipment for the Book Stack Security System, which allows entry to the stacks through a limited number of doors controlled by electronic card readers and secures all other doors with magnetic locks. Ask the AOC to assure the Library that the system, in accordance with the specifications provided by the Library, is in place and operational by the end of Phase I of the renovation.

[Billington]

- b. **SIGNAGE** for the decks

[Herman]

- 1) Install "Authorized Access Only" signs on all doors leading from public areas to the stacks.
- 2) Within the book stacks and especially in areas just inside stack access doors, place a specific notice, such as:

This is not a public area. All individuals must wear visibly L.C.- issued identification.

- c. Cease the automatic issuance of stack passes for

Library retirees.

- d. Authorize Loan Division to approve the issuance of stack passes to interlibrary loan staff from government agencies. [Thorin]
- e. Remind staff to call the Police if patrons refuse to produce an ID card in the stacks or refuse to leave an unauthorized area. [Wright]
- [Herman, Thorin and Price]

5. ISSUE: Require the wearing of identification badges or stack passes by all persons who enter stack areas.

- ACTION:
- a. Issue revised LCR 1810-2 (draft attached) requiring all researchers to "wear visibly" their stack passes. [McClung]
- b. Revise the stack pass information to notify readers that they must wear stack passes visibly at all times in the stack areas. [Thorin and Price]
- c. Prepare the redesigned short-term (1-3 days) stack pass (see attached) to be issued at the reference desk by the reference librarians. Printing on the new pass will be chemically treated to disappear in three days after its first use. Provide clips or neck chains to the reader. [Smith and Thorin]
- d. Prepare the redesigned long-term stack pass (see attached). The reference librarians will interview readers and determine eligibility for the pass. The reader will carry the approved application form to the Photoduplication Service where staff will take a picture of the reader, laminate the card and issue the reader the pass. A duplicate photo will be taken and attached to the application form for future use. [Smith and Thorin]
- e. Instruct Photodup to determine procedures and the fee necessary for reimbursement of its labor and supplies. [Shaffer]
- f. Purchase for Photoduplication Service one machine to laminate stack passes and one camera to take the picture. [Shaffer]

6. ISSUE: End the common practice of leaving unattended, in-process materials in nonsecure areas such as corridors and elevator lobbies.

ACTION: LCR 610 addresses this issue (see 1.d above).

7. **ISSUE:** Implement quick-fix improvements in security at the loading docks for incoming and outgoing materials

* Actions have been on-going to improve physical security at the Madison loading dock. Construction of a control post has been completed by Architect of the Capitol staff, but no staff are available to staff this position.

- ACTION:**
- a. Fund two additional police positions to staff the control post on the Madison loading dock during the Library's normal working hours. [Bilington]
 - b. Establish a working group to develop procedures governing the removal of bulk collection materials from Library buildings, for inclusion in LCR 1816 (Passes and Stamps Used for Removal of Material from the Library Buildings). [Curran]
 - c. Prohibit the storage of unsecured materials on the loading dock after normal work hours. [Curran]

8. **ISSUE:** Review existing security controls on mailing and shipping from the Library, and make quick-fix adjustments.

- ACTION:**
- a. Reduce size of mailbox slots in all three buildings permitting letters, but not packages, to be mailed. Place "Letters Only" signs on the mailboxes. [Smith]
 - b. Assure that all inside mail pickup stations are in non-public areas. [Smith]
 - c. Require all packages being sent outside the Library to be examined by a designated staff member before being sealed. [Division Chiefs]

10. **Issue:** Continue to diligently enforce policies for the timely return of materials loaned to Congressional offices, Federal agencies, other libraries, and Library staff members.

- * The Loan Division is actively enforcing policies governing return of materials.
- * The new circulation system, which is being used for 75% of all charges, and will be used for all external charges beginning in January 1989, automatically generates overdue notices.
- * The Chief of Loan and Director for Personnel have implemented a system for proposing adverse actions against LC employees who refuse to respond to overdue notices.
- * The Loan Division invariably suspends borrowing privileges

for all non-Congressional accounts when there is no response to the third overdue notice.

- ACTION:**
- a. Establish a 30-day waiting period between the time a suspended account is cleared and the restoration of borrowing privileges, and a 1-year waiting period after the third suspension. [Wright]
 - b. Require Congressional, Supreme Court and Research Facilities borrowers to 1) return all materials after one year, or 2) permit onsite review by Loan Division staff or 3) photocopy title pages and send them to the Loan Division, as determined by Loan Division. [Wright]
 - c. Make arrangements with the officers of the House and Senate to assure that Congressional staff clear their Loan accounts before receiving their final salary cuts. [McCormick and Wright]

11. **ISSUE:** Publicize the importance of staff members' use of the internal charging system, and the requirements of LCR 813 for the proper charging of all volumes removed from the stacks for prolonged periods.

* The Loan Division has highlighted the importance of internal charges (LCR 813) at recent Library Orientation classes and in its revision of the communique it gives to all new employees.

- ACTION:**
- a. Publish reminders about internal charges in the LCIB semi-annually. [Wright]
 - b. Instruct division chiefs and first-line supervisors to hold unannounced inspections at least semi-annually to insure that all Library materials in their work areas are properly charged. [Department Directors]
 - c. Instruct department directors to focus on uncharged items during annual "housecleaning" inspections. [Billington]
 - d. Remind department directors to hold subordinate supervisors responsible for "establishing procedures in their units to assure the prompt charging and return of books," as required by LCR 813. [Billington]

12. **ISSUE:** Educate readers and staff about the possible penalties for theft of Library materials.

ACTION: a. Prepare a brief statement concerning possible penalties for theft of library materials for possible inclusion on exit signs, table tents for reading room tables, call slips, and book markers.

[Kaminski]

13. **ISSUE:** Deal promptly, firmly, and resolutely with persons suspected of attempted or actual theft of Library materials.

* Procedures are in place for dealing with individuals attempting unauthorized removal collections from the Library :

* The General Counsel and Office of Counsel for Personnel staff believe that present procedures deal fairly and effectively with those caught attempting theft.

Staff: Copies of police Event Reports for incidents involving the attempted unauthorized removal of collection material are forwarded to the OCP by the Captain, Library Police. Each incident is considered on its own merits and on the previous disciplinary record of the staff member concerned. First-time offenders normally are sent a cautionary letter by the Director for Personnel. More serious cases, and/or cases involving staff members with a record of previous disciplinary actions, result in the initiation of an adverse action by OCP. The nature of adverse action proceedings precludes rapid action.

Non-staff: Individuals who are apprehended attempting the unauthorized removal of collection materials from the Library are arrested by Library Police. They are processed through the First District, D.C. Metropolitan Police, and a determination is subsequently made by the U.S. Attorney's Office as to whether or not prosecution is warranted. These cases are not usually prosecuted.