

**TECHNOLOGY IMPROVEMENT AWARDS  
FINAL REPORT OUTLINE**

**COVER SHEET**

|    |  |   |
|----|--|---|
| 1. | Title of the Project   | WSU Technology Improvement<br>Microfilm scanner replacement   |
| 2. | Period of Performance (project start and end dates)                                    | August 1, 2009 – December 31, 2009  |
| 3. | Library Name (if applicable)   | Riverpoint Campus Library   |
| 4. | Name of Organization   | Washington State University Spokane   |
| 5. | Organization Address   | P.O. Box 1495<br>Spokane, WA 99210-1495   |
| 6. | Name, Mailing and E-Mail Addresses, Voice and Fax Numbers, of Person Submitting Report | Bob Pringle<br><i>Riverpoint Campus Library</i><br><i>P.O. Box 1495</i><br><i>Spokane, WA 99210-1495</i><br><a href="mailto:rpringle@wsu.edu">rpringle@wsu.edu</a><br>509-368-6973<br>FAX: 509-358-7928 |
| 7. | Date Submitted   | May 6, 2009   |

## NARRATIVE DESCRIPTION

1. Executive Summary (200-500 words):

Provide a summary about how funding from this award was used. Include an overview of the new or improved health information service or program that was implemented. Identify the hardware and/or software purchased to support this project.

We used the \$4,554.53 award to purchase a Minolta digital microfilm scanner (MS-6000). It replaced our outdated and non-repairable Canon digital microfilm scanner. We purchased the scanner from Comstor, Inc., a local Minolta dealer. To save money (around \$2,000), we were able to use several parts we had kept (the lens, film transporter, and microfiche holder) from an older Minolta reader/printer. The machine was installed and we began using it September 23, 2009. We are using it to deliver useable documents, mostly journal articles, for local library users, and interlibrary loan document delivery, which is the major use of our film backfiles.

Once we began using the new scanner, ILL staff were able to respond more positively to ILL requests for articles we held only on film. In the past year, they had been rejecting many requests for “Condition”, or as “not on shelf”, when they believed the quality of scanning was too poor to provide a useable document. That rarely happens with the new scanner; if it does, it relates to film quality. Local students and faculty who’ve used it commented that they found it easy to use, and it provided acceptable copies (they were thrilled at having the item in printable form).

2. Information needs:

Identify the main audience(s) that were intended to benefit from the proposed technology improvements. Did this project help to meet their information needs?

Primary audience is always our local health science students and researchers, from programs of Eastern Washington University, University of Washington, and Washington State University, but our “secondary” audience of the users of other libraries in the NN/LM is also very important to us. This scanner allows all our users to obtain best-available copies of materials from our microform collection. It does meet their needs.

3. Training:

If training was conducted to new audiences (not already affiliated with the organization), complete the Outreach Activity Data Collection Form for each training event and attach the form(s) to this Final Report. A copy of the form is available at <http://nmlm.gov/pnr/funding/toolkit.html>.

Below, provide a summary of all training events and participants:

|   |   |
|---|---|
| Total number of sessions conducted as part of the project   | 2 |
| Total number of sessions in which half or more than half of | 0 |

|  |   |
|--|---|
| participants were from minority populations  |   |
| Total number of participants in the project's sessions   | 8 |
| Breakdown of participants by role<br>Health care or service provider, with a subtotal for public health personnel: _____ / _____ public health<br><br>Health sciences library staff member: <u>  6  </u><br><br>Public/other library staff member: _____<br><br>Member of the general public: <u>  2  </u> (Individuals I trained) |   |

4. Training sites:  
Provide a brief description of the locations where you provided training.

Riverpoint Campus Library, microfilm scanner station.

5. Exhibits:  
If applicable, list all the exhibits, poster sessions, and/or professional presentations connected with this project. Include the meeting name, dates, location, estimated number of contacts made, demonstrations given and general impressions of success.

N/A

6. Evaluation :  
Describe whether and how the new or enhanced service accomplished the desired outcomes originally proposed. Or, if the originally proposed outcomes were not observed, what happened, instead? Include specific data that supports the evaluation results described, and how the data was collected.

We have accomplished our desired outcomes. We purchased and installed a new scanner, connecting it to our existing Adobe Acrobat software and to our printers and various network drives for staff access and use. ILL staff report themselves happy with the scanner, and with scanning documents for ILL delivery as PDF or TIFF files. Local users have reported themselves happy with scanning and printing or saving articles. Personal review of a number of pieces of film, and practice scanning, has assured me the new scanner meets my expectations.

7. Problems or barriers encountered:  
Provide details on problems encountered. If you were to start all over again, what, if anything, would you change about the project?

My estimate of the time it would take to negotiate two university purchasing systems, WSU and UW. Our supplier was ready to deliver in July, but system processes took us until September to be ready to actually issue the purchase order. Otherwise, things went very smoothly. RML staff were most helpful in working through the grant process.

8. Impact:

Include information on the perceived and actual impact of the project on the library or organization. This can include the effect of the project on the library's image, increased utilization of the library, etc.

I believe the impact is very positive. We reject fewer ILL requests, and share a valuable collection. Our local users get good quality reproductions of items they need. We continue to be a responsible partner in the National Network of Libraries of Medicine.

This project has been funded in whole or in part with Federal funds from the National Library of Medicine, National Institutes of Health, Department of Health and Human Services, under Contract No. NO1-LM-1-3516 with the University of Washington.